

We are asking ChatGPT to run a marketing focus group to test our product. The focus group involves 10 participants, each with a different background and priority. The participants will be selected based on our different target audiences and will be representative to each target segment. In this way, we are 'testing' our products against our potential customer segments to better understand which products work best with each audience.

Personas

- Gender: M/F
- Age: 18-50
 - 18-25
 - 26-33
 - 34-41
 - 42-50
- Health condition
 - Hypertension (High Blood Pressure)
 - Obesity / Overweight
 - Heart disease
 - Asthma / Respiratory issues
 - Food allergies (e.g., gluten, dairy, nuts)
 - Digestive issues (IBS, acid reflux, etc.)
- Ethnicity
 - Latino
 - Not Latino
- Geographic Location
 - Urban
 - Suburban
 - Rural

Persona 1: Young Urban Health-Conscious Latina

- Gender: Female
- Age: 18-25
- Health Condition: None (health-conscious preventatively)
- Ethnicity: Latino
- Geographic Location: Urban
- Profile: College student or early career professional living in a city, interested in healthy snacking options that connect with cultural roots

Persona 2: Middle-Aged Suburban Latino Managing Hypertension

- Gender: Male
- Age: 42-50
- Health Condition: Hypertension (High Blood Pressure)
- Ethnicity: Latino
- Geographic Location: Suburban
- Profile: Family-oriented, needs low-sodium snack alternatives, shops at mainstream grocery stores

Persona 3: Young Urban Non-Latino with Food Allergies

- Gender: Female
- Age: 26-33
- Health Condition: Food allergies (gluten, dairy, nuts)
- Ethnicity: Not Latino
- Geographic Location: Urban
- Profile: Health-focused millennial seeking allergen-free snacks, shops at specialty stores, active on social media

Persona 4: Middle-Aged Rural Non-Latino with Obesity

- Gender: Male
- Age: 34-41
- Health Condition: Obesity / Overweight
- Ethnicity: Not Latino
- Geographic Location: Rural
- Profile: Blue-collar worker trying to make healthier choices, limited access to specialty products, price-sensitive

Persona 5: Young Suburban Latina with Digestive Issues

- Gender: Female
- Age: 18-25
- Health Condition: Digestive issues (IBS, acid reflux)
- Ethnicity: Latino
- Geographic Location: Suburban
- Profile: Lives with family, seeks snacks that won't trigger symptoms, influenced by family food traditions

Persona 6: Middle-Aged Urban Non-Latino with Heart Disease

- Gender: Male
- Age: 42-50
- Health Condition: Heart disease
- Ethnicity: Not Latino
- Geographic Location: Urban
- Profile: White-collar professional, doctor-recommended dietary changes, willing to pay premium for heart-healthy options

Persona 7: Young Rural Latino with Asthma

- Gender: Male
- Age: 26-33
- Health Condition: Asthma / Respiratory issues
- Ethnicity: Latino
- Geographic Location: Rural
- Profile: Agricultural or service worker, seeks familiar cultural foods, shops at local markets or budget chains

Persona 8: Middle-Aged Suburban Non-Latina (Healthy)

- Gender: Female
- Age: 34-41
- Health Condition: None (general wellness focus)
- Ethnicity: Not Latino
- Geographic Location: Suburban
- Profile: Soccer mom, shops for family, interested in trying diverse/ethnic foods, values convenience

Persona 9: Young Urban Non-Latino Male with Obesity

- Gender: Male
- Age: 18-25
- Health Condition: Obesity / Overweight
- Ethnicity: Not Latino
- Geographic Location: Urban
- Profile: Gamer/tech worker, convenience-driven snacker, looking for healthier alternatives to chips, delivery-focused

Persona 10: Middle-Aged Rural Latina with Multiple Conditions

- Gender: Female
- Age: 42-50
- Health Condition: Hypertension + Obesity
- Ethnicity: Latino
- Geographic Location: Rural
- Profile: Working mother, managing multiple health issues, seeks affordable cultural foods that fit dietary restrictions

Plantain Chips Product Testing Survey

Calibrated Quantitative Assessment (1-5 Scale)

Cuzco Crunch (Product A) vs. Plantain Lite (Product B)

Brief Descriptions of Each Product

CuzcoCrunch (Product A):

- CuzcoCrunch

Golden, ultra-crispy plantain slices dusted with Peruvian sal de Maras for a clean, mineral-salt finish. Savory with a hint of natural sweetness from the plantain, they're perfect straight from the bag or alongside dips and sandwiches.

PlantainLite (Product B):

- Plantain Chips

A lighter, everyday snack with a delicate crunch and simple seasoning that lets the natural plantain flavor shine. Great when you want something crisp and satisfying without feeling heavy—ideal for lunchboxes, road trips, or a quick afternoon bite

PART 1: CALIBRATION EXERCISE

Before we begin, let's establish a common rating framework.

Reference Product: You'll first taste a sample of **Lay's Classic Potato Chips** as our benchmark.

Rate the Lay's Classic on overall quality: ____/5

Now let's align on what the numbers mean:

Scale Definition:

- **1:** Unacceptable - I would not eat this even if free
- **2:** Poor - Significant problems, would not purchase
- **3:** Acceptable/Average - Meets basic expectations, might buy occasionally
- **4:** Good - Above average, would consider regular purchase
- **5:** Excellent - Exceeds expectations, would actively seek out and buy regularly

Practice Question: "Thinking about the Lay's Classic you just rated, why did you give that score?" (Brief discussion to ensure group understanding)

PART 2: PLANTAIN CHIPS EVALUATION

Now taste the plantain chips and answer the following questions.

A. OVERALL SATISFACTION

1. Overall product quality

- Rate from 1-5, where the Lay's Classic you tasted = your benchmark
- **1** = Much worse than Lay's | **3** = About the same | **5** = Much better than Lay's
- **Rating:** ____/5

2. Purchase Intent Select the statement that best matches, then rate:

- **1:** Would not buy even if heavily discounted
- **2:** Would only buy if on sale and convenient
- **3:** Would buy occasionally when I see it
- **4:** Would actively look for this product
- **5:** Would make a special trip to buy this / buy regularly

Rating: ____/5

3. Recommendation likelihood

- **1:** Would not recommend, might warn against
- **2:** Would not recommend
- **3:** Neutral, wouldn't mention either way
- **4:** Would recommend if asked
- **5:** Would actively recommend without prompting

Rating: ____/5

B. TASTE & FLAVOR

4. Overall taste quality

- Compare to your ideal plantain chip flavor

- **1** = Far from ideal | **3** = Close to ideal | **5** = Perfect/ideal taste
- **Rating:** ___/5

5. Flavor intensity appropriateness

- **1** = Way too bland, no flavor
- **2** = A bit too bland
- **3** = Just right, well-balanced
- **4** = A bit too strong
- **5** = Way too strong, overpowering
- **Rating:** ___/5
- (Note: 3 is optimal; scores of 1-2 or 4-5 indicate problems)

6. Saltiness level

- **1** = Not salty enough
- **2** = Could use a bit more salt
- **3** = Perfect salt level
- **4** = Slightly too salty
- **5** = Way too salty
- **Rating:** ___/5
- (Note: 3 is optimal)

7. Flavor naturalness

- **1** = Tastes very artificial/chemical
- **2** = Somewhat artificial
- **3** = Somewhat natural
- **4** = Mostly natural
- **5** = Completely natural, authentic plantain taste
- **Rating:** ___/5

8. Aftertaste quality

- **1** = Unpleasant aftertaste
- **2** = Slightly off aftertaste
- **3** = Neutral
- **4** = Pleasant aftertaste
- **5** = Excellent aftertaste, makes me want more
- **Rating:** ___/5

C. TEXTURE & PHYSICAL QUALITY

9. Crunchiness level

- Compare to the Lay's Classic benchmark
- **1** = Too soft/stale
- **2** = Less crunchy than Lay's
- **3** = Similar crunch to Lay's
- **4** = Crunchier than Lay's
- **5** = Much crunchier than Lay's
- **Rating:** ____/5

10. Thickness appropriateness

- **1** = Way too thin
- **2** = A bit too thin
- **3** = Just right
- **4** = A bit too thick
- **5** = Way too thick
- **Rating:** ____/5
- (Note: 3 is optimal)

11. Texture consistency

- How uniform is the texture across different chips?
- **1** = Very inconsistent, every chip different
- **2** = Somewhat inconsistent
- **3** = Mostly consistent
- **4** = Very consistent
- **5** = Perfectly uniform, every chip the same
- **Rating:** ____/5

12. Oiliness/Greasiness level

- **1** = Way too greasy, leaves residue on hands
- **2** = A bit too greasy
- **3** = Just right, minimal grease
- **4** = Slightly too dry
- **5** = Too dry, not enough oil
- **Rating:** ____/5
- (Note: 3 is optimal)

13. Freshness perception

- **1** = *Tastes stale/old*
 - **2** = *Not very fresh*
 - **3** = *Acceptably fresh*
 - **4** = *Fresh*
 - **5** = *Extremely fresh, just made*
 - **Rating:** ___/5
-

D. VISUAL APPEAL

14. Overall appearance attractiveness

- *How appealing do the chips look?*
- **1** = *Unappealing, looks unappetizing*
- **2** = *Below average appearance*
- **3** = *Average appearance*
- **4** = *Attractive appearance*
- **5** = *Very attractive, looks premium/delicious*
- **Rating:** ___/5

15. Color appeal

- **1** = *Unattractive color (too dark/burnt or too pale)*
- **2** = *Below average color*
- **3** = *Acceptable color*
- **4** = *Good color*
- **5** = *Perfect, appetizing golden color*
- **Rating:** ___/5

16. Visual uniformity/consistency

- **1** = *Very inconsistent sizes and shapes*
- **2** = *Somewhat inconsistent*
- **3** = *Reasonably uniform*
- **4** = *Very uniform*
- **5** = *Perfectly uniform, professional appearance*
- **Rating:** ___/5

17. Packaging appeal

- **1** = *Unattractive, would skip on shelf*
- **2** = *Below average, not appealing*

- **3** = Average, blends in
- **4** = Appealing, catches attention
- **5** = Eye-catching, stands out positively
- **Rating:** ____/5

18. Packaging information clarity

- **1** = Confusing, missing important info
 - **2** = Somewhat unclear
 - **3** = Adequate information
 - **4** = Clear and informative
 - **5** = Very clear, comprehensive, helpful
 - **Rating:** ____/5
-

E. VALUE & COMPETITIVE POSITIONING

Shown price: \$ ____ for ____ oz

Product: PlainainLite (\$5 to 1.5 oz)

Product: Cuzco Crunch (\$7 to 1.5 oz)

19. Value for money at this price

- **1** = Extremely overpriced, would never pay this
- **2** = Somewhat overpriced
- **3** = Fair price, reasonable value
- **4** = Good value for the price
- **5** = Excellent value, cheaper than expected
- **Rating:** ____/5

20. What price would represent "excellent value" to you?

- \$ ____ for the same package size

21. Preference vs. regular potato chips

- *If both were the same price, how likely would you choose this over regular potato chips?*
- **1** = Would always choose potato chips
- **2** = Would usually choose potato chips
- **3** = Would choose about equally/depends on mood

- **4** = Would usually choose plantain chips
- **5** = Would always choose plantain chips
- **Rating:** ___/5

22. Preference vs. other plantain chip brands (if you've tried them)

- ☐ I haven't tried other plantain chips (skip to next question)
 - If you have tried others, how does this compare?
 - **1** = Much worse than competitors
 - **2** = Somewhat worse
 - **3** = About the same as competitors
 - **4** = Somewhat better
 - **5** = Much better than competitors
 - **Rating:** ___/5
-

F. PRODUCT ATTRIBUTES & POSITIONING

Rate your agreement with each statement (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree):

23. This product is unique/different from other snacks

- **1** = Strongly Disagree | **3** = Neutral | **5** = Strongly Agree
- **Rating:** ___/5

24. This product seems like a healthy snack option

- **1** = Strongly Disagree | **3** = Neutral | **5** = Strongly Agree
- **Rating:** ___/5

25. This product is suitable for serving to guests

- **1** = Strongly Disagree | **3** = Neutral | **5** = Strongly Agree
- **Rating:** ___/5

26. This product meets my expectations for plantain chips

- **1** = Strongly Disagree | **3** = Neutral | **5** = Strongly Agree
- **Rating:** ___/5

27. I would feel good about eating this snack

- **1** = Strongly Disagree | **3** = Neutral | **5** = Strongly Agree

- **Rating:** ___/5

28. This is a product I could eat regularly without getting tired of it

- **1** = Strongly Disagree | **3** = Neutral | **5** = Strongly Agree
 - **Rating:** ___/5
-

G. USAGE CONTEXT

29. How often would you purchase this product?

- **1** = Never/almost never
- **2** = A few times per year
- **3** = Monthly
- **4** = 2-3 times per month
- **5** = Weekly or more
- **Rating:** ___/5

30. Which occasions would you eat this? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Solo snacking at home
 - ☐ Work/office snack
 - ☐ Party/entertaining guests
 - ☐ With lunch/meals
 - ☐ Watching TV/movies
 - ☐ On-the-go/travel
 - ☐ Other: _____
-

H. VALIDATION & CALIBRATION CHECKS

These help us ensure rating consistency:

31. A "perfect" plantain chip would be: ___/5

32. The worst plantain chip you could imagine would be: ___/5

33. Looking back at all your ratings, do you feel you:

- ☐ Rated too generously (most scores 4-5)
- ☐ Rated too harshly (most scores 1-2)

- ☐ Used the full scale appropriately
-

PART 3: QUALITATIVE INSIGHTS

34. What ONE thing did you like MOST about this product?

35. What ONE thing would you change to improve this product?

36. In one sentence, how would you describe this product to a friend?

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Age range: ☐ 18-24 ☐ 25-34 ☐ 35-44 ☐ 45-54 ☐ 55-64 ☐ 65+

How often do you eat snack chips? ☐ Daily ☐ Few times/week ☐ Weekly ☐ Few times/month ☐ Rarely

Have you eaten plantain chips before? ☐ Yes, regularly ☐ Yes, occasionally ☐ Yes, once or twice ☐ No, never

Analysis Notes for Researchers:

Interpreting the 1-5 Scale:

- **1.0-1.9:** Critical issues, product failure
- **2.0-2.9:** Below expectations, needs significant improvement
- **3.0-3.4:** Meets minimum expectations, neutral
- **3.5-3.9:** Above average, positive reception
- **4.0-4.4:** Good product, strong performance
- **4.5-5.0:** Excellent, market-ready

Red flags to check:

- *Straight-lining (all same scores)*
- *Validation mismatch (Q31-32 don't align with other ratings)*
- *Inverted scales misunderstood (Q5, Q6, Q10, Q12 - where 3 is optimal)*
- *Purchase intent (Q2) below 3.0 = unlikely to succeed*
- *Overall quality (Q1) below 3.5 = needs reformulation*

Key metrics to track:

- **Top 2 Box (4-5 ratings):** Target >60% for overall satisfaction
- **Bottom 2 Box (1-2 ratings):** Should be <15% for overall satisfaction
- **Net Promoter Score (Q3):** 4-5 = Promoters, 3 = Passive, 1-2 = Detractors

Normalization approach:

- *Calculate mean rating per respondent across all questions*
- *Identify "tough raters" (mean <2.8) vs "easy raters" (mean >3.8)*
- *Apply z-score standardization if variance is high between raters*