



*A Policy Research Partnership  
to Reduce Youth Substance Use*

## **Assessment of Youth Responses to Anti-Smoking Ads: Description of a Research Protocol**

Melanie Wakefield, PhD  
George I. Balch, PhD  
Yvonne Terry-McElrath, MSA  
Glen Szczypka, BA  
Katherine Clegg Smith, PhD  
Erin Ruel, MA  
Brian Flay, PhD  
Sherry Emery, PhD

July 2002

### **Research Paper Series, No. 23**

ImpacTeen is part of the Bridging the Gap Initiative: Research Informing Practice for Healthy Youth Behavior, supported by The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and administered by the University of Illinois at Chicago.

# **Assessment of Youth Responses to Anti-Smoking Ads: Description of a Research Protocol**

Melanie Wakefield  
The Cancer Council Victoria, Australia

George I. Balch  
Balch Associates, Chicago, IL

Yvonne Terry-McElrath  
University of Michigan, MI

Glen Szczypka  
Katherine Clegg Smith  
Erin Ruel  
Brian Flay  
Sherry Emery  
University of Illinois at Chicago, IL

**ImpacTeen Working Paper Number 23  
Health Research and Policy Centers  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
850 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 400  
Chicago, Illinois, 60607**

[www.impactteen.org/media/home.htm](http://www.impactteen.org/media/home.htm)

**Acknowledgments**

This project, Youth Smoking and the Media, was funded by a grant from the State and Community Tobacco Control Initiative of the National Cancer Institute, (Melanie Wakefield, Principal Investigator; Grant #1 RO 1 CA86273-01). The project is an extension of ImpacTeen: a Policy Research Partnership to Reduce Youth Substance Use, funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (Frank Chaloupka, Principal Investigator, Grant #041037). We thank Lois Biener, Phillip Klufta, David Hill, William Wells and Kim Worden who provided helpful advice in the development of the methods for this study. We also thank Kim McLeod for assistance with scoring ad comprehension and ad characteristics and Edith Szabo for assistance in locating and synthesizing relevant literature. Finally, we thank the youth who gave of their time to participate in this study.

**ABSTRACT**

This working paper summarizes the protocol used in a study to determine the characteristics of anti-smoking ads more and less likely to be potentially effective in influencing teenage smoking. The study was conducted as part of the NCI-funded project Youth Smoking and the Media, in order to assist decision-making about how to relate volume of anti-smoking advertising to survey data on teenage smoking. Since it was recognized that different anti-smoking advertisements are likely to have different effects, it was planned to “weight” the media monitoring records of anti-smoking volume, according to the characteristics of the actual advertisements that were broadcast. The study was designed to determine which ad characteristics were associated with higher teen ratings on standard advertising response scales and which advertisement characteristics were associated with higher rates of recall, thinking about the ad and discussion about the ad at follow-up. The ad rating study described in this working paper employed a sample of 50 anti-smoking ads drawn from US state and national tobacco control programs, tobacco companies and pharmaceutical companies from 1997 to 2001. The ads represented both those targeted to youth and non-youth audiences, and a range of message themes including ‘cessation’, ‘general health effects’, ‘health benefits’, ‘second hand smoke’, ‘industry manipulation’, ‘family guidance’, ‘uncool’, and ‘other’. In total, 278, 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade youth in Chicago and Boston who were either non-susceptible nonsmokers or experimenter smokers participated in the study. Each youth attended a group viewing session with 12-18 other youth. After viewing a practice ad, each stimulus anti-smoking ad was shown twice and the youth was required to complete a one-page rating form. This process was repeated until 10 ads had been viewed. One week later, each youth was telephoned and asked about any ads that they recalled, had thought more about, or discussed with anyone. The protocol included a test for advertising order effects and familiarity with the ads. Analyses will examine differences between youth and non-youth focused ads and between ads from different sponsors, what ad themes and characteristics predict higher rates of teen comprehension and higher overall ad appraisal, and at follow-up, higher rates of recall, discussion about the ad and thinking about the ad; and subgroup differences in these variables.

## **Context for the research study**

While there is evidence that media can influence youth tobacco use, not all campaigns report these effects (Flay, 1989; Wakefield et al., in press [a]) and there is a dearth of research on the impact of media advocacy on youth smoking (Wakefield et al., in press [b]). Youth Smoking and the Media (YSM), funded by the National Cancer Institute, aims to better understand the relationship between the amount and type of anti-smoking advertising exposure, newspaper coverage on tobacco and youth smoking related attitudes and behaviour. The project builds on the work of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation-funded 'Bridging the Gap' project which links data from the nationally-representative Monitoring the Future surveys (MTF) (Bachman et al., 2001) of 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders, to a project called 'ImpacTeen' ([www.impactteen.org](http://www.impactteen.org)), which measures tobacco policy and environmental influences relevant to tobacco that prevail in each participating schools' community. The overall aim of the YSM project is to better understand the influence of the media, in concert with community level policy and environmental influences, on measures of youth smoking uptake, prevalence, consumption and quitting behavior.

Three main components are included in the YSM study: 1) identification, collection, and preparation of archival data on televised anti-smoking advertising from the top 75 media markets in the United States in order to provide information about the quantity of anti-smoking advertising in each media market over time; 2) youth rating of television anti-smoking advertising in order to better understand the factors influencing youth evaluation, comprehension, recall, and processing of anti-smoking advertising; and 3) the identification and

coding of newspaper coverage on tobacco issues in a sample of communities across the United States. This current working paper focuses on the second component: describing the aims of the YSM television anti-smoking advertising rating study as well as a description of the protocols used in youth rating of ads.

The universe of media influences includes anti-smoking advertising on television, radio, billboards and print media; news coverage on tobacco issues; portrayal of smoking in movies, in television programs and music media; and internet-based messages about smoking. While all of these media influences may be important, the focus of YSM is on those media influences that (a) vary by geographic location, (b) overlap with a sufficient number of ImpacTeen and MTF sites and (c) are amenable to retrospective and prospective measurement. For the purposes of this project, these media sources include televised anti-smoking advertising and newspaper coverage on tobacco issues. The methods used to identify and code news coverage on tobacco are outlined elsewhere (Clegg Smith et al., 2002).

For television advertising, where highest financial investment is made, the amount and type of anti-smoking advertising is amenable to retrospective measurement, using archival data sources. YSM is using archival data from Nielsen Media Research to construct indices of exposure to anti-smoking advertising (gross rating points and teen-targeted rating points (TRPs)<sup>1</sup>) in each of the top 75 media markets in the United States from 1994 through 2002. Results will be linked with MTF sites, as well as the subset of MTF sites that are ImpacTeen sites from 1999 through

---

<sup>1</sup> Rating points are estimates of the viewership achieved by ads in particular media markets, with 100 teen rating points per week indicating that on average, the average teen would have viewed one ad over the period.

2002. A separate working paper details the methods being used to identify, obtain and prepare archival data on televised anti-smoking advertising for the YSM project (in progress). This part of the project will provide information about the quantity of anti-smoking advertising in each media market over time. The data permits identification of the main advertisers or sponsors and also which specific anti-smoking ads were shown.

### **Research on anti-smoking advertisements**

Although anti-smoking advertising is important in reducing youth smoking (Siegel & Biener, 2000; Wakefield et al., in press [a]), it is obvious that not all anti-smoking advertising is equal. To date, efforts to identify the optimal elements of anti-smoking ads have yielded mixed conclusions. Research has begun to identify and characterize anti-smoking ads based upon the main 'theme' of the ad. For example, Goldman & Glantz (1998) reviewed selected descriptions of focus group studies of anti-smoking ads and concluded that ads that featured tobacco industry manipulation and deception and ads featuring secondhand smoke were most effective. They also recommended that advertisers should avoid messages focusing on youth access to tobacco, short and long term health effects of tobacco and romantic rejection of smokers. However, this study was roundly criticized for having poor methods and ignoring many of the other elements of advertising (Balch & Rudman, 1998; Worden et al., 1998). A recent descriptive study by Beaudoin (2002) of 197 anti-smoking ads produced between 1991 and 1999 found that youth-oriented ads have youth characters, sociability and humor as common appeals and focused on

social and short-term consequences. In contrast, adult-oriented ads relied on fear appeals and long term health related consequences.

Pechmann & Goldberg (1998) in an experimental study found that ads that contained family or social norm messages about smoking significantly lowered 7<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> graders' intentions to smoke. The three types of messages in this category included ads that discussed the negative impact of smoking on family members, ads implying that youth who smoke have taken the wrong life path, and ads that depicted non-smoking as normative and acceptable to peers. However, ads that focused on short-term cosmetic effects, long-term personal health effects and/or tobacco marketing practices had no impact on intentions to smoke. Yet another study using 110 focus groups of youth in five US states and 40 different ads found that ads that made youth "stop and think" and which they found more relevant, credible and persuasive included message themes of addiction, short-term health effects, athletic performance, role model for younger siblings and effects on the family (Teenage Research Unlimited, 1999). Ads with a theme emphasizing that teens need to make a choice about whether or not to smoke generally had the lowest ratings among youth (Teenage Research Unlimited, 1999). Thus, research focusing on ad themes has produced mixed findings, perhaps due to the differences in methodologies. However, it is clear that ads vary not only in relation to their main message, but also in the many executional elements of the ad – the visual stimuli, the actors, the kind of affect it arouses in the viewer, the lighting, voiceover, music, imagery, tone, and innumerable other factors.



An alternative line of research has been focusing on the emotional responses to anti-smoking advertising. Hill et al. (1999) contend that there are good theoretical reasons why anti-smoking ads that evoke fear can be effective in reducing smoking among youth. A recent review of fear-based approaches to behavior change concluded that high fear messages in public health campaigns can be effective, providing that a high fear appeal message is accompanied by a high self-efficacy message (Witte & Allen, 2000). Wakefield et al. (1999) found that ads used in an Australian anti-smoking campaign which graphically portrayed the message that every cigarette is doing damage, were perceived by 15-17 year old smokers as making them more likely to try to quit smoking and to feel more uncomfortable about smoking, than a concurrent advertising campaign which depicted non-smoking youth as smarter than smokers. Moreover, Tan et al., (2000) found that most 14-17 year old smokers found this graphic advertising, which was aimed at adults, relevant to them and made them more likely to quit smoking.

More recently, Biener and her colleagues have been investigating the broader role of emotional responses to anti-smoking ads. In a population based study of adults, Biener et al. (2000) found that among nine specific ads studied, the more 'moving' an ad was considered to be by an independent panel of judges, the more effective it was rated by survey respondents. In a later population survey of youth aged 14-17 years, Biener (in press) found that youth are more likely to perceive as effective, anti-smoking ads that stress the serious consequences of smoking, rather than ads that give a message that one has a choice about smoking. Biener & Taylor (2002) make the point that ads may elicit not only fear, but also sadness (when family members die, for example) and anger (at tobacco companies), as well as empathy and hope (for someone

struggling to quit). Research on the relative effectiveness of anti-drug ads has also found evidence in favor of eliciting negative emotions. Fishbein et al (2002) found, in a study involving 30 anti-drug ads, that ads perceived as effective by 5<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> graders were highly related to negative emotion, realism and amount learned and negatively related to positive emotion.

There is considerable evidence that emotional arousal mediates the effectiveness of advertising. For example, emotional messages are better remembered than non-emotional ones (Lang et al., 1995) and are more likely to promote higher order cognitive processing (Keller & Block, 1996; Donohew et al., 1998). Furthermore, ads high in sensation value (reflecting content that is novel, graphic, stimulating etc) are more likely to increase viewer's attention, motivation to call a hotline, ad recall and intention to perform the target behavior, than those with lower sensation value (Donohew et al., 1998). Thus, there is evidence emotional responsiveness to advertising might be a key element of advertising effectiveness.

Since 1998, tobacco companies began to advertise on television with the face-value message to persuade youth not to smoke. From 2000, the American Legacy Foundation commenced a national television advertising campaign drawing attention to the deceptive and misleading marketing practices of the tobacco industry. Recently, a population survey evaluation of the American Legacy Foundation campaign indicated that youth exposure to "Truth" anti-smoking advertisements was consistently associated with an increase in anti-tobacco attitudes and beliefs, whereas exposure to Philip Morris advertisements generally was not (Farrelly et al., 2002). In

addition, those exposed to Philip Morris advertisements were more likely to be open to the idea of smoking. Further, in an experimental study, Henriksen & Fortmann (in press) found that Philip Morris ads were rated less favorably by Californian students who were aware that the sponsor was a tobacco company, than by those who were unaware. However, only slightly more than half of the students knew that Philip Morris was a tobacco company. This suggests that there is still some way to go in educating youth about tobacco company behavior. In addition, it illustrates how some of anti-smoking advertising messages may reduce the potential effectiveness of other messages.

Although it is known that nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) and Zyban double the likelihood of long-term cessation in clinical trial settings, there has been little study of the advent of direct-to-consumer advertising for NRT. This advertising means that increasingly more people are being exposed to persuasive messages about the products. Because such mass-reach advertising will *ipso facto* reach more than the primary target group, it is important to consider the responses of those at risk of taking up smoking, namely teenagers, to the advertising. For example, teenagers exposed to the advertising might perceive a message that it is easy to quit smoking or that there is a reduced risk of addiction, and conclude that there is less of a problem with taking up smoking (Bloom, 2000). This is consistent with research that finds optimism about quitting is a major predictor of trial and subsequent progression to heavier smoking among young people (Hanson & Kysar, 2001).

The YSM project team recognized that many of these ad-specific factors are likely to mediate the impact of anti-smoking advertising on youth smoking. Some anti-smoking advertising messages may undermine the potential benefits of other messages. Some anti-smoking advertising may be effective when first introduced, but lose salience over time or “wear out” as it fights to capture attention amidst the clutter of other ads. For this reason, one component of the YSM project involves the ultimate development of a method of ‘weighting’ the indices of anti-smoking advertising exposure (gross rating points and teen-targeted rating points) from Nielsen Media Research, so as to generate more sensitive measures of the likely impact of antismoking advertising on youth smoking. Ultimately, it is planned that these weights will be employed in the statistical analysis by providing a multiplier for the indices of exposure (teen rating points) associated with each ad.

In order to achieve this, we developed a protocol to enable youth to appraise different kinds of anti-smoking ads from the wide range of ads that have been broadcast in the United States. The aim of this component of the research project was to empirically identify ad characteristics reliably associated among youth with higher ratings on standard advertising response scales and to predict high rates of processing of the advertisements, including higher rates of recall, more discussion with others and more thinking about the ad.

## **Method**

### Ad Selection and Preparation

As ad ratings were conducted in 2001, ads eligible for inclusion in the study were limited to those produced no earlier than 1997, since perceptions of “dated” material could substantively affect ad ratings. Ads were obtained up to early 2001 from the Media Resource Center at CDC’s Office on Smoking and Health, state tobacco control media campaign contacts and a media monitoring organization called Video Monitoring Services, which keeps videotaped records of televised advertising in the United States. Anti-smoking advertising was largely sponsored by four groups of organizations: state anti-smoking campaigns, the American Legacy Foundation, pharmaceutical companies, and tobacco companies.

In total, 50 ads representing the range of advertising messages and sponsors was included for study. A full listing of ads used in this study is contained in Appendix 1. Five videotaped reels of ads each contained one practice ad about a hair styling product and 10 anti-smoking ads. Every reel included ads produced by each of the four groups of organizations, youth and non-youth focused, and represented a range of 8 themes including: cessation methods or strategies, health effects of smoking, health benefits of quitting, second hand smoke, exposing tobacco industry manipulation, parental or sibling guidance about tobacco, ads portraying tobacco as uncool, and other.

Additional characteristics recorded for each ad included the source of the ad (tobacco company; pharmaceutical company; state or national tobacco control organization, general non-

smoking public service announcements, and other), the target audience for the ad (youth or general). We also included indicator variables according to whether ads involved a personal testimonial, a dominant visual that carried the main message of the ad, and a negative visceral image (provoking an “ugh” response). These characteristics were determined by a consensus method involving 5 members of the research team (GB, MW, GS, SE, KM). Definitions for each characteristic are contained in Appendix 2.

Decision on the total number of ads to include on each reel was based on the results of a pilot test involving two rating and follow-up sessions with 32 teens. Reels initially prepared for the pilot study included 12 ads. Project staff carefully observed teens for signs of fatigue and/or lack of attention, and questioned teens after the pilot session about their experience. Consensus from this process was that 10 ads provided the most optimal number for rating in a single session.

The order of ads on each reel was determined by a systematic process of assigning different types of ads to different positions. To enable testing for potential order effects, two reels were prepared for each ad collection, with one presenting ads in the original order and the other presenting them in reverse order.

#### Study participants and recruitment methods

Youth were eligible for participation in the study if they were: in the 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, or 12<sup>th</sup> grade; neither confirmed non-smokers nor regular smokers -- those deemed potentially most susceptible to influence via communication; able to read and write English; and had not participated in a focus group within the last six months. Confirmed non-smokers were defined as those who reported never smoking (even a puff), as well as being unwilling to try cigarettes under any circumstances. Regular smokers were defined as those who had smoked 100 cigarettes or more in their lifetime. These distinctions were guided by smoking uptake definitions as defined by Pierce and colleagues (Pierce et al., 1996; Choi et al., 2001). Each session was comprised to have equal number of males and females, an even number of 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders and a small representation of Hispanics and African American youth, thereby roughly approximating the distribution of these characteristics in the MTF study.

Teens were recruited by established market research field services in each of Chicago and Boston<sup>2</sup>. We selected these US cities to represent sites with long term (Boston) and short term (Chicago) exposure to anti-smoking advertising. Both field services began recruitment with their own proprietary databases that include listings of teens who had expressed interest in participating in market research. From these initial listings, recruitment followed a snowball sampling approach, with contacted teens referring other teens who might be interested and eligible to participate.

---

<sup>2</sup> We used Fieldwork in Chicago and Performance Plus in Boston, both coordinated by Fieldwork.

Based on the described recruitment procedures, sub-contractor staff in both Chicago and Boston called identified telephone numbers to recruit participants. Staff first requested to speak with an adult, to whom they explained the purpose and nature of the study, and inquired as to the grade and sex of teens living in the household (see Appendix 3 for the screening questionnaire). Staff requested parental permission to speak with the teen, and either spoke with the teen at that time or arranged a time to call back. When speaking with the teen, staff first confirmed their grade, age, and smoking status. If the teen was eligible for study participation, staff then explained the purpose and nature of the study. To ensure that the teen understood the study's purpose, the youth was requested to explain their understanding of the study. If the teen demonstrated comprehension of the project, sub-contractor staff then inquired if anyone in the teen's immediate family worked for the following types of organizations: a) marketing/market research, b) public relations, or c) tobacco manufacturing, retail, or distribution (if the teen was under 18 years of age, the sub-contractor requested to speak with the parent from this point forward). If so, the identified household was deemed ineligible. Ethnicity was ascertained, and contact information was obtained in order to send consent forms to the teen or, if the teen was under 18 years of age, both a consent form for the parent and an assent form for the teen.

Recruitment goals for rating sessions were set at 15 teens per session, with equal quota sampling goals for gender and school grade and proscribed sampling goals for race/ethnicity. The sub-contractors were asked to make efforts to minimize the likelihood of teens who knew each other participating in the same group by assigning young people from the same high school to different rating sessions. In addition, only one teen could be recruited from each household.



A \$50 incentive was offered for study participation, paid out as \$35 at the end of the ad rating session and \$15 after completion of a follow-up call one week later. The study protocols and instruments were approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

#### Data collection procedure

The protocol we used for assessing teen responses to anti-smoking advertising involved both an initial rating session and a short follow-up call. Development of the rating and follow-up forms was done in consultation with experienced marketing and psychology professionals. Based on the expertise of the study personnel and extant literature, six areas of data were viewed as essential for collection. These included: 1) previous exposure to and appraisal of generic anti-smoking advertising, 2) ad comprehension, 3) specific appraisals of each ad, 4) assessment of each ad's relative success as an anti-smoking ad and 5) previous exposure to the specific ads included in each rating session. In addition, it was considered important to assess 6) the extent to which each ad was recalled, thought about and discussed with others within one week of the rating sessions through a follow-up contact.

Rating sessions were held at the sub-contractors' offices in similar environments, including similar video projection equipment. Each teen attended a viewing session with 12-18 other teens to appraise a total of 10 ads over a 75 minute period. We randomly allocated teens to viewing seats so as to minimize the possibility that those who may know each other would sit

together. Each rating group was facilitated by a member of the study team (KCS), who explained the purpose and format of the rating session and emphasized the importance of each participant providing their honest evaluation of the ads. Data collection extended from March to May 2001.

Participants first completed several questions from the Monitoring the Future study (MTF) about recent general anti-smoking ad exposure and personal reaction to such advertising. At the start of viewing, a hair styling product practice ad was shown to ensure that all teens could hear and see the ads and understood the rating forms. During the session, each anti-smoking ad was shown twice, after which the teen would complete a one-page rating form for that ad. The rating form first asked two open-ended questions about what the main point of the ad was and then sought their rating of the ad on 16 rating scales, overall assessment of each ad's relative success as an anti-smoking ad ("how good an ad was this ad?") and whether they recalled previously seeing the ad. The 16 rating scales used were drawn from previous rating scales used by commercial and academic researchers to assess response to advertising. Each was assessed using a 7-point Likert scale where 0 represented "not at all" and 7 represented "extremely". Examples of items included "this ad made me feel angry", "this ad made me stop and think", "this ad told me something new" and "this ad made me feel happy". This process was repeated until 10 ads had been shown. Then a final page asked teens "Which ONE of these ads will most make you stop and think?" and left space for respondents to explain why they chose that ad.

Following the rating sessions, all teens were given their initial incentive payment of \$35 and asked to sign up for a time for the follow-up call, set approximately one week after the rating sessions. As arranged, site field agencies conducted follow-up telephone interviews with participants one week later. Calls lasted approximately five minutes and were monitored by study personnel. The follow-up questionnaire asked teens to identify which, if any, of the ads they could recall from the rating session. For each identified ad, they were further asked to describe whether they had thought more about that ad and whether they had discussed that ad with anyone. Interviewers had a brief description of each ad to help them identify the ads the teen described. When the teens could recall no further ads, they were asked whether they had seen any of the anti-smoking ads shown at the rating session on television in the week between the rating session and follow-up interview. Those who said yes were asked to describe the ad and a record was made of ads that had been seen to enable analysis to control for any impact of interim viewing of ads on the likelihood of recall at follow-up. Copies of rating session and follow-up instruments are contained in Appendices 4 and 5.

Ten rating sessions were held in each city, for a total of 20 rating sessions with 278 participants (47% of participants at the Chicago site). The overall response rate for follow-up data collection was 96.4 percent (97.7% for Chicago, and 95.3% for Boston). Table 1 summarizes the number of teens who participated in rating sessions and follow-up calls for each site.

**Table 1: Site Data Collection Summary**

Site	Group	Ad Rating Sessions			Follow-up Calls		
		Data Collection	Participant N	Range of Participants per Group	Data Collection	N	% of Original Group N
Chicago	1-10	26 Mar – 4 Apr	130	10-16	2 Apr – 17 Apr	127	97.7%
Boston	11-20	23 Apr – 1 May	148*	11-18	30 Apr – 8 May	141	95.3%

\*We excluded two raters because they were later found to have indicated that they were smokers.

### Data Preparation and Coding

After rating and follow-up forms were received from the field agencies, all name sheets were stripped from the rating forms and only ID numbers were used thereafter. Data collection forms were entered by research assistants using Excel spreadsheets and double-checked by input staff. Following this, primary project staff randomly checked the Excel files against rating forms for input error. Open-ended items, such as those for understanding of the main point of the ad, were recorded verbatim as text responses.

The framework for assessing the main message of each advertisement followed the lines of a consumer-based strategy (Sutton, Balch and Lefebvre, 1995; Balch, 1999; Wells, 1999), a framework long used in commercial advertising, and more recently in health communications. Two members of the project team (GB & MW) then scored teen's comprehension of each ad by using text responses to the questions "what is the main point this ad is trying to make?" and

“what else is it trying to say?”. Responses were scored as “1” (generally understood the main point of the ad) or “0” (generally did not understand the main point). Overall level of project staff scoring agreement was 86%, representing a high level of concordance. We therefore used GB’s scores for all teens to indicate teen understanding of each ad.

Each ad was identified with an ID number, so that ad characteristics attributed to the ad by the study team were attached for each ad. In addition, each teen had their own ID number. In this way, it was possible to undertake analysis at the level of ads, where aggregate responses on the part of teens to the ads were made. For example, ad level analyses will employ variables such “% of teens who viewed the ad who understood the main point”, % of teens who viewed the ad who recalled it at follow-up” and so on.

### **Planned Analyses**

Analyses are planned around a number of issues. These are framed as a series of questions, outlined below. Analysis of these data will permit a better understanding of ad characteristics potentially associated with change in youth smoking-related attitudes and behavior. In addition, it will be possible to examine how teen characteristics differentially relate to ad appraisal and processing of messages.

1. How do anti-smoking ads from tobacco companies, pharmaceutical companies and tobacco control programs differ when rated by teens on a range of dimensions at the rating session?
2. What ad themes and characteristics predict higher rates of teen comprehension and higher overall ad appraisal, and at follow-up, higher rates of recall, discussion about the ad and thinking about the ad?
3. Is overall ad appraisal related to follow-up rates of recall, discussion about the ad, and thinking about the ad?
4. For what subgroups of teens (considering different ad characteristics) are there higher and lower rates of comprehension and overall ad appraisal, and at follow-up, higher and lower rates of recall, discussion about the ad and thinking about the ad?
5. To what extent do teens appraise and process (as above) the messages from teen-targeted ads as opposed to ads made for a general audience?
6. Do ad effects change based on the prior level of exposure of the audience (for example, do audiences with less anti-smoking advertising exposure show differences in theme comprehension, appraisal, etc)?

## References

- Aylesworth AB, MacKenzie SB. Context is key: The effect of program-induced mood on thoughts about the ad. *J Advertising*. 1998; 27: 17-31.
- Bachman JG, Johnston LD, O'Malley PM. The Monitoring the Future Project after twenty-seven years: Design and procedures. *Monitoring the Future Occasional Paper Series #54*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, 2001.
- Balch GI. Anti-tobacco media campaigns: toward consumer-based communication strategies. Tobacco Counter-Marketing Campaigns Conference, Chicago, 1999.
- Balch G, Rudman G. Antismoking advertising campaigns for youth. *JAMA* 1998; 280: 323-24.
- Beaudoin CE. Exploring anti-smoking ads: appeals, themes and consequences. *J Health Comm* 2002; 7: 123-138.
- Biener L. Anti-tobacco ads by Massachusetts and Philip Morris: what teenagers think. *Tobacco Control*. (In press)
- Biener L, McCallum-Keeler G, Nyman A. Adults' response to Massachusetts anti-tobacco television advertisements: impact of viewer and advertisement characteristics. *Tobacco Control* 2000; 9: 401-407.
- Biener L, Taylor T. The continuing importance of emotion in tobacco control media campaigns: a response to Hastings and MacFadyen. *Tobacco Control* 2002; 11: 75-77.
- Bloom PN, Bolton LE, Cohen JB. Are there unintended consequences of nicotine replacement messages? Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 2000.
- Choi WS, Gilpin EA, Farkas AJ, Pierce JP. Determining the probability of future smoking among adolescents. *Addiction*. 2001; 96: 313-23.
- Clegg Smith K, Wakefield M, Siebel C, Szczypka G, Slater S, Terry-McElrath Y, Emery S, Chaloupka F. Coding the News: the development of a methodological framework for coding and analyzing newspaper coverage of tobacco issues. Chicago, IL: ImpacTeen Working Paper Number 21, Health Research and Policy Centers, University of Illinois at Chicago, May 2002.
- Donohew L, Lorch EP, Palmgreen P. Applications of a theoretic model of information exposure to health interventions. *Human Communication Research* 1998; 24: 454-68.
- Farrelly MC, Healton CG, Davis KC, Messeri P, Hersey JC, Havilland MH. Getting to the truth: evaluating National tobacco countermarketing campaigns. *Am J Public Health* 2002; 92: 901-907.

Fishbein M, Hall-Jamieson K, Zimmer E, Von Haeften I, Nabi R. Avoiding the boomerang: testing the relative effectiveness of anti-drug public service announcements before a national campaign. *Am J public Health* 2002; 92: 238-245.

Goldman LK, Glantz SA. Evaluation of antismoking advertising campaigns. *JAMA* 1998; 279: 772-77.

Hanson JD, Kysar DA. The joint failure of economic theory and legal regulation. In Slovic P (ed.) *Smoking: risk, perception and public policy*. Sage: Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, 2001.

Henriksen L, Fortmann SP. Young adults' opinions of Philip Morris and its television advertising. *Tobacco Control* (in press)

Hill D, Chapman S, Donovan R. The return of scare tactics. *Tobacco Control* 1998; 7: 5-8.

Keller PA, Block LG. Increasing the persuasiveness of fear appeals: the effect of arousal and elaboration. *J Consumer Research* 1996; 22: 448-59.

Lang A, Dhillon K, Dong Q. The effects of emotional arousal and violence on television viewers' cognitive capacity and memory. *J Broadcasting Electronic Media* 1995; 39: 313-27.

Pechmann C, Goldberg M. Evaluation of ad strategies for preventing youth tobacco use. California Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program, 1998.

Pierce JP, Choi WS, Gilpin EA, Farkas AJ, Merritt RK. Validation of susceptibility as a predictor of which adolescents take up smoking in the United States. *Health Psychology* 1996; 15: 355-361.

Siegel M, Biener L. The impact of anti-smoking media campaigns on progression to established smoking: Results of a longitudinal youth study in Massachusetts. *Am J Public Health* 2000; 90: 380-386.

Sutton, SM; Balch, GI; Lefebvre, CR. Strategic questions for consumer based health communications. *Public Health Reports* 1995; 110: 725-733.

Tan N, Montague M, Freeman J. Impact of the National Tobacco Campaign: comparison between teenage and adult surveys. In: Hassard K (Ed.) *Australia's National Tobacco Campaign Evaluation Report Volume Two*. Canberra, Australia: Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care, 2000.



Teenage Research Unlimited. Counter-tobacco advertising exploratory. The States of Arizona, California, and Massachusetts Public Health Anti-Tobacco Media Campaigns: Summary Report, January-March, 1999.

Wakefield M, Flay B, Nichter M, Giovino G. Effects of anti-smoking advertising on youth smoking: a review. *Journal of Health Communication* (in press (a)).

Wakefield M, Flay B, Nichter M, Giovino G. Role of media in influencing trajectories of youth smoking. *Addiction* (in press (b)).

Wakefield M, Miller C, Roberts L. Comparison of the National Tobacco Campaign with a youth targeted South Australian campaign. In: Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care. Australia's National Tobacco Campaign: Evaluation Report Vol 1. Canberra, Australia: CDHAC, 1999.

Wells, WD. Consumer-based communication strategies. Tobacco Counter-Marketing Campaigns Conference, Chicago, 1999.

Witte K, Allen M. A meta-analysis of fear appeals: implications for effective public health campaigns. *Health Educ Behav* 2000; 27: 591-615.

Worden JK, Flynn BS, Secker-Walker RH. Anti-smoking advertising campaigns for youth. *JAMA* 1998; 280: 323.

**Appendix 1:** Short titles and sponsors of ads used in the study

**Appendix 2:** Definitions for ad characteristics

**Appendix 3:** Screening questionnaire

**Appendix 4:** Questions and rating forms completed during the ad-rating session

**Appendix 5:** One week follow-up questionnaire

### Appendix 1: Short titles and sponsors of ads used in the study

Short title of ad	Ad ID number	Creative description	Source of ad
Congrats teen call	21	Teens call tobacco advertiser	Program <sup>3</sup>
Ashtray upside down	22	Ashtray turns upside down, Zyban	Pharmaceutical
Tail pipe	23	Man places mint in tail pipe	Program
Smelly puking dog	24	Dog pees on teen's cigarette	Program
Electronic counter	25	Teen holds digital counter	Program
Listening to parents	26	Teens talk about listening to their parents	Tobacco company
Woman walks to work	27	Woman walks to work where she is quit line counselor	Program
Girl covers smell with perfume	28	Girl tries to cover up smoke with perfume	Program
Boy looks like chimp	29	Boy looks like a chimp with pack of cigarettes	Tobacco Company
Teen addiction to cigs	30	Teen talks about her addiction to cigarettes	Program
Smelly puking frankenstein	31	Mad doctor refuses to use smoker's lung in Frankenstein	Program
Crocodile	32	Tobacco industry portrayed as crocodile lashes out at critic	Program
Global poisoning	33	Deadly pollution caused by international tobacco farming	Program
Couple @ restaurant	34	Waitress encourages use of nicotine patch	Pharmaceutical company
Pep squad	35	Gas masked teen in school restroom demonstrates secondhand smoke with pep squad	Program
Janet Sackman	36	Ex-model talks about tobacco advertising and the health effects of smoking	Program
Karate girl	37	Girl gets black belt	Tobacco company
Electro-larynx	38	Man with electronic voice box talks about the tobacco industry	Program
10:00 curfew	39	Dad reminds daughter about curfew and not to smoke	Tobacco company
Soccer team	40	US Women's Soccer Team	Program
ETS – smoke entering body	41	Black and white image of face inhaling smoke; ad demonstrates the dangers of secondhand smoke	Program
Kids' eye POP	42	Teens send child into convenience store with concealed camera to show how many cigarette ads he sees	Program
Monica	43	Monica; girl tries to touch up photo of herself with hair spray, perfume, etc.; photo wrinkles at end of ad to show how smoking causes premature aging	Program
Clean laryngectomy	44	Asian man in bathroom cleans his laryngectomy; hole in throat	Program
Pierced tongue	45	Teen goes in basement to have tongue pierced by evil looking man; man asks teen if he will join him for a smoke; teen refuses	Tobacco Company
Woman talks re.	46	Woman talks about nicorette gum and becoming an	Pharmaceutical company

<sup>3</sup> "Program" advertisements include those from state and county tobacco control programs and American Legacy Foundation.

Nicorette		ex-smoker	
Daughter – laugh track	47	Tobacco executives testify at congressional hearing; exec answers question about recommending smoking to his daughter	Program
Rid-a-zit	48	Three teens in bedroom talk about their pimples; one suggests Rid-A-Zit crème; all try it; one explodes from it	Program
Bowl cleaner	49	Two teens in restroom stall; one puts head in toilet; various shots of diseased body parts; skulls	Program
Nightclub	50	African American teens bring dead friend in black body bag to nightclub	Program
Chuck – naked	51	Chuck, a middle aged man, tries to quit smoking; after smoking his last cigarette, Chuck appears naked.	Program
Wife ETS victim	52	Older man talks about his wife who was a victim of his own secondhand smoke	Program
One mind/body	53	Active teens portrayed in spots such as jogging, football, karate; voice over: the body does what the mind says.	Tobacco company
Web letters	54	Web letters; Justin answers email about tobacco profits and the industry's deceit of smokers	Program
Electronic counter	55	Teens holds electronic counter; 400,000 Americans die each year from smoking	Program
Pam Laffin	56	Truth; Pam Laffin; young woman talks about the effects of smoking on her body; she smoked to look older and now she appears older	Program
Barbershop	57	Teen goes into barbershop to get a comb-over style haircut; voice-over: if you don't like their haircut (seniors) why would you want their lungs	Program
Man/woman on balcony	58	Woman must smoke outside of party on balcony; man suggest the Nicoderm patch	Pharmaceutical company
Mr Butts	59	Mr. Butts; animated butt of cigarette goes to Washington to testify at congressional committee	Program
Teens dance	60	Teens dance to song, <i>I Would Rather</i>	Program
Kids on the beach	61	Group of friends at beach; boy explains that they do not have to smoke to fit in; Tag line: Think, Don't Smoke	Tobacco company
Artery	62	Man lights cigarette from stove-top; surgeon squeezes fatty deposits from a young smoker's aorta; Tag line: Every cigarette is doing you damage	Program
Father races son and loses	63	Father races his son and loses because he smokes	Program
Christy Turlington, father	64	Model, Christy Turlington, talks about the death of her father from smoking	Program
Vending machine	65	Kids talk about their cigarette preference; young teen purchase two packs from vending machine	Program
Body bags	66	Outside a major tobacco company, teens pull body bags out of 18 –wheeler and stack in front of building; Sign: Every day 1200 people die from smoking	Program
Teen talks w/ younger brother	67	Teen talks to younger brother about not smoking on basketball court	Tobacco company

Smoke in restaurant/waitress	68	Waitress at restaurant; scenes of people exhaling smoke; dangers of secondhand smoke	Program
Marlboro man in hospital	69	Truth; Cowboy; Marlboro man in hospital	Program
Filet mignon	70	Man at party says cigarette reminds him of filet mignon; Nicorette	Pharmaceutical company

## Appendix 2: Coding categories for ad characteristics

### Visceral negative (VN)

These ads use a health-related message that elicits a visceral "ugh!" response from the teen audience, a response that lingers. The important thing is that this reaction endures through at least the end of viewing the ad (for example, it is not relieved by humor). The VN element of the ad may or may not convey the main point of the ad. If it does convey it, the ad will also be coded as having a *Dominant Visual* (see next).

### Dominant visual (DV)

These ads have a dominant visual or key picture (ie. not including writing or tag lines on the screen) that conveys the main point of the ad. The picture must 'stand alone' and not rely on any associated text in the ad to explain what it means. Without the voice-over/music – with the sound turned off (try it if in doubt; if still in doubt, turn away from the screen and turn on the sound to judge if it communicates the same thing) -- one would still be able to be able to understand the main point of the ad. This category recognizes that visual memory is more powerful than auditory memory. In addition, it recognizes that often people cannot hear the voiceover because of background noises and that words are easier to misinterpret than pictures. Pictures and images do tell a thousand words. DV ads may or may not have VN images.

### Personal Testimonial

This type of story is presented in the first person, often with a person directly addressing the camera. These ads portray real people (not actors) telling their story about smoking; how smoking has affected their life and/or the lives of their families. The story must be from personal experience, but does not have to be about health effects. Often the ads depict an individual talking to the audience about his or her pain and suffering in a familiar setting like home or a hospital. There is good research from the advertising literature to suggest that testimonials can be powerful ways of communicating about issues.

**Appendix 3: screening questionnaire**  
 University of Illinois at Chicago  
 INVITATION/SCREENER

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_ from (NAME OF RECRUITING COMPANY)

**1. ASK TO SPEAK TO AN ADULT. IF NOT AVAILABLE, ASK WHEN TO CALL BACK.**

[REPEAT, IF NOT SAME PERSON, Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_ from (NAME OF RECRUITING COMPANY).] We are assisting in a research study for the University of Illinois on the opinions of teenagers about anti-smoking advertising. The research study is to find out which anti-smoking messages are most effective in reducing smoking among teenagers.

**2.** I am phoning to see if there are any 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> grade teenagers in the household, who might be able to be involved in the research. We are interested in teenagers who don't smoke, as well as those who do. Are there any teenagers of that age in your home?

- ( ) Yes            (Continue)  
 ( ) No            (Thank and End Interview)

The purpose of the research project is to better understand the types of anti-smoking television advertisements that might influence teenagers not to smoke. We wish to hear from teenagers themselves as to what they think of various anti-smoking TV advertisements. The research would involve your teenager viewing and rating several anti-smoking TV ads with about 15 other teenagers at a nearby market research office in your city, under the leadership of a researcher from the University of Illinois. This will be after school or on a weekend. The group will fill out a short rating scale for each ad, and at the end, discuss all of them for about 10 minutes. A week later, a researcher will phone and ask some questions about the ads they saw. This call will take about 10 minutes.

The group will last about 75 minutes. Your teenager may or may not know other group members. Only the researchers will have access to the information collected and discussed in the group and your teenager's name will not be on the rating form they fill out.

Each teenager will be paid a total of \$50 - \$35 at the end the group and \$15 after the brief telephone call.

Would you let your child participate in a group interview with other teenagers guided by a researcher from the University of Illinois?

- A. ( ) Yes            (Continue to Q3) B. ( ) No            (Thank and End Interview)

**3.** Now, I would like to ask you a few questions about your teenagers. Please tell me the name, grade and sex of each teenager currently living in your household in the 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade. (CHECK QUOTA – 1 TEENAGER PER HOUSEHOLD – CIRCLE NAME OF CHILD SELECTED)

Name	Grade	Sex
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

**4.a.** We would like to invite (TEENAGER'S NAME) for the study we are conducting. Would you let (TEENAGER'S NAME) participate in a rating exercise with other teenagers guided by a researcher from the University of Illinois?

- A. ( ) Yes (Continue to Q. 4B)  
 B. ( ) No (Thank and End Interview)

**4.b.** May I please ask (TEENAGER'S NAME) a few questions now?

(IF THE TEENAGER IS NOT AT HOME, ESTABLISH A TIME TO CALL BACK)

WHEN THE TEENAGER IS ON THE PHONE, PLEASE INTRODUCE YOURSELF AND SAY: Before I explain the purpose of this study, I'd like to ask you a couple of questions to make sure you are eligible to participate. Some of these questions will be about smoking, and you will be asked to give the letter that indicates your response. Whatever you tell me will be between us and will not be repeated to anyone including your parents or guardian. Are you comfortable talking to me right now?

Yes (Continue to 4c)

No (Propose option below)

IF NO ASK THE TEENAGER: Would you like me to call back at a more convenient time, or would you like to call me yourself?

Recruiter call back (Thank and establish convenient time.)

Teenager will call back (Thank and determine when they would call.)

Don't want to answer any questions. (Thank and end call)

These are multiple choice questions. You only have to give us the **letter** for your response – don't say the whole answer.

**4.c.** First, what grade are you in at school?

- A. ( ) No (Thank and End Interview)  
 B. ( ) 8th (Continue to Q. 4D)  
 C. ( ) 10<sup>th</sup> (Continue to Q 4D)  
 D. ( ) 12<sup>th</sup> (Continue to Q4D)

**4.d.** How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_ (AT LAST BIRTHDAY)

**4.e.** Have you ever been in a focus group discussion before?

- A. ( ) No (Skip to Q. 5A)



B. ( ) Yes (Continue to Q. 4F)

**4.f.** In the last six months have you participated in a focus group?

A. ( ) Yes (Thank and end interview)

B. ( ) No (Continue to Q. 5A)

**5.a.** First, I'd like to know if you have tried or experimented with smoking, even a puff?

A. ( ) Yes (Skip to Q. 5B)

B. ( ) No (Skip to Q5D)

**5.b.** Have you ever smoked 100 cigarettes or more in your lifetime?

A. ( ) Yes (IF yes, THANK AND END INTERVIEW)

B. ( ) No (Continue to Q. 5C)

**5.c.** Have you smoked in the past 30 days?

A. ( ) Yes (Skip to Q. 6)

B. ( ) No (Continue to Q. 5D)

**5.d.** Do you think you will try a cigarette soon?

A. ( ) Yes (Skip to Q6.)

B. ( ) No (Continue to Q5E)

**5e.** If one of your best friends were to offer you a cigarette would you try it?

READ RESPONSE OPTIONS

A. ( ) Definitely Yes

(Skip to Q. 6)

B. ( ) Probably Yes

(Skip to Q. 6)

C. ( ) Probably Not

(Skip to Q. 6)

D. ( ) Definitely Not

(Continue to Q5F)

**5.f.** At any time during the next year do you think you will smoke a cigarette?

READ RESPONSE OPTIONS

A. ( ) Definitely Yes

(Continue to Q. 6)

B. ( ) Probably Yes

(Continue to Q. 6)

C. ( ) Probably Not

(Continue to Q. 6)

B. ( ) Definitely Not

(Continue to Q. 6)

**6.** (IF TEENAGER HAS NEVER SMOKED, NOT EVEN A PUFF (5A='B') AND WOULD NOT TRY UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES (IE ANSWERS 'D' TO 5D, 5E AND 5F) THANK AND END INTERVIEW)

IF OTHER RESPONSE, CONTINUE:

INTERVIEWER: CHECK CHILD'S GROUP # AND TIME AND PLACE AND FILL IN BELOW. (Q12)

ASK TEENAGER: We would like you invite you to participate in a group rating exercise with other students about your opinions. Our research is to understand teenagers' reactions to various anti-smoking advertisements. We need to hear from teens themselves what they think of various anti-smoking TV advertisements. You would complete a short set of questions in writing about

10 TV ads, along with about 15 other teenagers at the office of a nearby market research company in your city. There will be a 10-minute discussion at the end about all the ads you saw. A week later, at an agreed upon time, a researcher will phone you to ask some questions about the ads you saw. This call will take about 10 minutes.



The group session will last no more than 75 minutes. You may or may not know other group members. The discussion will not be recorded. Only the researchers will have access to the information and your name will not be on the form you fill out.

You will be paid a total of \$50 - \$35 at the end of the group and \$15 after the brief phone call.

The group session is on (DATE) at (TIME) at (PLACE) and will take no more than 75 minutes. All you'll need is someone to take you there and back and a consent form signed by your parent or guardian. Would you like to join us?

- ( ) Yes (Continue to Q7)  
( ) No (Thank and End Interview)

**7. IF YES, ASK:** Now, just to make sure everything is clear, can you explain to me your understanding of what you will be doing in this research study?  
(INTERVIEWER TO USE AS OPPORTUNITY FOR CLARIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF TEEN'S UNDERSTANDING. PROMPT FOR UNDERSTANDING THAT THEY WILL BE (A) ATTENDING A GROUP SESSION; (B) SEEING VIDEOS OF ANTI-SMOKING ADS AND COMPLETING RATINGS OF THEM; (C) TAKING A 10-MINUTE PHONE CALL ONE WEEK LATER TO ANSWER SOME MORE QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ADS; (D) PAID \$50 IN TOTAL - \$35 AFTER THE RATING AND \$15 AFTER THE PHONE CALL.)

---

---

---

(IF TEEN IS UNABLE TO COMPREHEND REQUIREMENTS OF PROJECT, THANK AND END INTERVIEW)

IF AGED UNDER 18 YEARS, ASK TO SPEAK AGAIN TO PARENT OR GUARDIAN, IF AGED 18 YEARS OR MORE, CONTINUE Q8 WITH TEENAGER.

**8. PARENT IS ON THE PHONE.**

Your teenager is interested in participating in a group interview in our research study. (READ THE FOLLOWING TO PARENT) We just need to ask you a couple of questions to see which group rating exercise (CHILD'S NAME) will go into.

Does anyone in your immediate family work for any of the following?

**8.a.** A marketing or market research firm or department?  
filled) ☐ Yes (Thank and End Interview, all quotas have been filled)  
☐ No (Continue to Q 8.B)

**8.b.** A Public relations firm or department?  
filled) ☐ Yes (Thank and End Interview, all quotas have been filled)  
☐ No (Continue to Q 8.C)

**8.c.** A manufacturer, retailer or distributor of tobacco products?  
filled) ☐ Yes (Thank and End Interview, all quotas have been filled)  
☐ No (Continue to Q 9)

**9.** Which of the following categories best describes your race or ethnic group? (READ LIST)

- A. ☐ White (CHECK QUOTAS)
- B. ☐ Black (CHECK QUOTAS)
- C. ☐ Hispanic (CHECK QUOTAS)
- D. ☐ Asian (CHECK QUOTAS)
- E. ☐ Other (CHECK QUOTAS)

(IF TEENAGER IS AGED 18 YEARS OR MORE, SAY: ) We will be sending you a consent form that gives you more information about this study from the University of Illinois. We need you to bring this form to the group and sign it before you can participate in this research. You should sign the form on the day you come to the group, and not before. May we have a fax number, e-mail address, or postal address for us to send you this form? (RECORD NUMBER/ADDRESS BELOW, THANK, AND END INTERVIEW)

(IF SPEAKING TO PARENT/GUARDIAN, SAY: ) Your teenager's opinions are very important to us. We will be sending you two forms. One form is for you – a consent form - and gives you more information about this study from the University of Illinois. The other form is for your teenager – an assent form - and gives information for them about the study. Your teenager needs to bring both of these forms signed to the group before (HE/SHE) can participate in this research.

**10.** We also need to know how (TEENAGER'S NAME) might get to and from (LOCATION) on (DATE). The University will not transport (HIM/HER). Please tell us which if the following ways are acceptable to you. You can accept as many as you wish:

A ☐ You or another responsible adult can bring (TEENAGER'S NAME) to (LOCATION) and pick them up after the session is finished. This means that we will not allow (TEENAGER'S NAME) to participate in the group unless (HE/SHE) is accompanied by a responsible adult and (HE.SHE) will not leave

(LOCATION) unless a responsible adult comes into the facility and picks (HIM/HER) up.

B ( ) Another teenager can drive (TEENAGER'S NAME) to (LOCATION) and pick (HIM/HER) up after the group is finished.

C ( ) (TEENAGER'S NAME) can be responsible for (HIS/HER) own transportation to and from (LOCATION).

**11. HAVE PARENT PROVIDE FOLLOWING INFORMATION (OR TEENAGER IF AGED 18 YEARS OR OLDER).**

Name (Teenager) \_\_\_\_\_

Name (Parent or  
guardian)\_\_\_\_\_

Address\_\_\_\_\_

Phone (Home)\_\_\_\_\_(Work)\_\_\_\_\_

Fax number\_\_\_\_\_E-mail address \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_Confirmed by\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_

**12. Mark appropriate time and group and respondent ID#:**

# University of Illinois at Chicago

Please complete the questions on this page before we start watching the ads.

The first questions are about anti-smoking commercials or 'spots' that are intended to discourage cigarette smoking.

**In recent months, how often have you seen such anti-smoking commercials on TV, or heard them on the radio?** (Circle one number)

1. Not at all
2. Less than once per month
3. 1-3 times per month
4. 1-3 times per week
5. Daily or almost daily
6. More than once a day

**In recent months, about how often have you seen anti-smoking ads on billboards or in magazines and newspapers?** (Circle one number)

1. Not at all
2. Less than once per month
3. 1-3 times per month
4. 1-3 times per week
5. Daily or almost daily
6. More than once a day

**To what extent do you think such ads on TV, radio, billboards or in magazines and newspapers have...** (Circle one number for each statement)

	Not at all	To a little extent	To some extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent
<b>...made you less favorable toward smoking cigarettes?</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<b>...made you less likely to smoke cigarettes?</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<b>...overstated the dangers or risks of cigarette smoking?</b>	1	2	3	4	5

**STOP HERE and WAIT for the first ad to be shown before turning the page.  
It will be shown twice.  
Please watch and listen closely.**

**ID #****PRACTICE AD****AD # 00****What is the MAIN point that this ad is trying to make?****What ELSE is it trying to say?****How well do the following phrases describe this ad? (Circle one number for each phrase)**

<b><u>This ad...</u></b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
...was clear	1	2	3	4	5
...had a message that is important to me	1	2	3	4	5
...said things that were hard to believe	1	2	3	4	5
...made me stop and think	1	2	3	4	5
...made me curious to know if what the ad says is true	1	2	3	4	5
...is one that I would talk to other people about	1	2	3	4	5
...told me something new	1	2	3	4	5
...talked down to me	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad made me feel...**

...sad	1	2	3	4	5
...angry	1	2	3	4	5
...happy	1	2	3	4	5
...scared	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad was...**

...funny	1	2	3	4	5
...powerful	1	2	3	4	5
...boring	1	2	3	4	5
...emotional	1	2	3	4	5

**Overall, I thought this ad was a very good anti-smoking advertisement...**

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

**What makes it that way?****Have you seen this ad on TV before today?**

Yes

No

Not Sure



**ID #****AD # 21****What is the MAIN point that this ad is trying to make?****What ELSE is it trying to say?****How well do the following phrases describe this ad? (Circle one number for each phrase)**

<b><u>This ad...</u></b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
...was clear	1	2	3	4	5
...had a message that is important to me	1	2	3	4	5
...said things that were hard to believe	1	2	3	4	5
...made me stop and think	1	2	3	4	5
...made me curious to know if what the ad says is true	1	2	3	4	5
...is one that I would talk to other people about	1	2	3	4	5
...told me something new	1	2	3	4	5
...talked down to me	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad made me feel...**

...sad	1	2	3	4	5
...angry	1	2	3	4	5
...happy	1	2	3	4	5
...scared	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad was...**

...funny	1	2	3	4	5
...powerful	1	2	3	4	5
...boring	1	2	3	4	5
...emotional	1	2	3	4	5

**Overall, I thought this ad was a very good anti-smoking advertisement...**

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

**What makes it that way?****Have you seen this ad on TV before today?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

**ID #****AD # 22****What is the MAIN point that this ad is trying to make?****What ELSE is it trying to say?****How well do the following phrases describe this ad? (Circle one number for each phrase)**

<b><u>This ad...</u></b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
...was clear	1	2	3	4	5
...had a message that is important to me	1	2	3	4	5
...said things that were hard to believe	1	2	3	4	5
...made me stop and think	1	2	3	4	5
...made me curious to know if what the ad says is true	1	2	3	4	5
...is one that I would talk to other people about	1	2	3	4	5
...told me something new	1	2	3	4	5
...talked down to me	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad made me feel...**

...sad	1	2	3	4	5
...angry	1	2	3	4	5
...happy	1	2	3	4	5
...scared	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad was...**

...funny	1	2	3	4	5
...powerful	1	2	3	4	5
...boring	1	2	3	4	5
...emotional	1	2	3	4	5

**Overall, I thought this ad was a very good anti-smoking advertisement...**

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

**What makes it that way?****Have you seen this ad on TV before today?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

**ID #****AD # 23****What is the MAIN point that this ad is trying to make?****What ELSE is it trying to say?****How well do the following phrases describe this ad? (Circle one number for each phrase)**

<b><u>This ad...</u></b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
...was clear	1	2	3	4	5
...had a message that is important to me	1	2	3	4	5
...said things that were hard to believe	1	2	3	4	5
...made me stop and think	1	2	3	4	5
...made me curious to know if what the ad says is true	1	2	3	4	5
...is one that I would talk to other people about	1	2	3	4	5
...told me something new	1	2	3	4	5
...talked down to me	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad made me feel...**

...sad	1	2	3	4	5
...angry	1	2	3	4	5
...happy	1	2	3	4	5
...scared	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad was...**

...funny	1	2	3	4	5
...powerful	1	2	3	4	5
...boring	1	2	3	4	5
...emotional	1	2	3	4	5

**Overall, I thought this ad was a very good anti-smoking advertisement...**

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

**What makes it that way?****Have you seen this ad on TV before today?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

**ID #****AD # 24****What is the MAIN point that this ad is trying to make?****What ELSE is it trying to say?****How well do the following phrases describe this ad? (Circle one number for each phrase)**

<b><u>This ad...</u></b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
...was clear	1	2	3	4	5
...had a message that is important to me	1	2	3	4	5
...said things that were hard to believe	1	2	3	4	5
...made me stop and think	1	2	3	4	5
...made me curious to know if what the ad says is true	1	2	3	4	5
...is one that I would talk to other people about	1	2	3	4	5
...told me something new	1	2	3	4	5
...talked down to me	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad made me feel...**

...sad	1	2	3	4	5
...angry	1	2	3	4	5
...happy	1	2	3	4	5
...scared	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad was...**

...funny	1	2	3	4	5
...powerful	1	2	3	4	5
...boring	1	2	3	4	5
...emotional	1	2	3	4	5

**Overall, I thought this ad was a very good anti-smoking advertisement...**

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

**What makes it that way?****Have you seen this ad on TV before today?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

**ID #****AD # 25****What is the MAIN point that this ad is trying to make?****What ELSE is it trying to say?****How well do the following phrases describe this ad? (Circle one number for each phrase)**

<b><u>This ad...</u></b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
...was clear	1	2	3	4	5
...had a message that is important to me	1	2	3	4	5
...said things that were hard to believe	1	2	3	4	5
...made me stop and think	1	2	3	4	5
...made me curious to know if what the ad says is true	1	2	3	4	5
...is one that I would talk to other people about	1	2	3	4	5
...told me something new	1	2	3	4	5
...talked down to me	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad made me feel...**

...sad	1	2	3	4	5
...angry	1	2	3	4	5
...happy	1	2	3	4	5
...scared	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad was...**

...funny	1	2	3	4	5
...powerful	1	2	3	4	5
...boring	1	2	3	4	5
...emotional	1	2	3	4	5

**Overall, I thought this ad was a very good anti-smoking advertisement...**

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

**What makes it that way?****Have you seen this ad on TV before today?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

**ID #****AD # 26****What is the MAIN point that this ad is trying to make?****What ELSE is it trying to say?****How well do the following phrases describe this ad? (Circle one number for each phrase)**

<b><u>This ad...</u></b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
...was clear	1	2	3	4	5
...had a message that is important to me	1	2	3	4	5
...said things that were hard to believe	1	2	3	4	5
...made me stop and think	1	2	3	4	5
...made me curious to know if what the ad says is true	1	2	3	4	5
...is one that I would talk to other people about	1	2	3	4	5
...told me something new	1	2	3	4	5
...talked down to me	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad made me feel...**

...sad	1	2	3	4	5
...angry	1	2	3	4	5
...happy	1	2	3	4	5
...scared	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad was...**

...funny	1	2	3	4	5
...powerful	1	2	3	4	5
...boring	1	2	3	4	5
...emotional	1	2	3	4	5

**Overall, I thought this ad was a very good anti-smoking advertisement...**

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

**What makes it that way?****Have you seen this ad on TV before today?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

**ID #****AD # 27****What is the MAIN point that this ad is trying to make?****What ELSE is it trying to say?****How well do the following phrases describe this ad? (Circle one number for each phrase)**

<b><u>This ad...</u></b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
...was clear	1	2	3	4	5
...had a message that is important to me	1	2	3	4	5
...said things that were hard to believe	1	2	3	4	5
...made me stop and think	1	2	3	4	5
...made me curious to know if what the ad says is true	1	2	3	4	5
...is one that I would talk to other people about	1	2	3	4	5
...told me something new	1	2	3	4	5
...talked down to me	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad made me feel...**

...sad	1	2	3	4	5
...angry	1	2	3	4	5
...happy	1	2	3	4	5
...scared	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad was...**

...funny	1	2	3	4	5
...powerful	1	2	3	4	5
...boring	1	2	3	4	5
...emotional	1	2	3	4	5

**Overall, I thought this ad was a very good anti-smoking advertisement...**

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

**What makes it that way?****Have you seen this ad on TV before today?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

**ID #****AD # 28****What is the MAIN point that this ad is trying to make?****What ELSE is it trying to say?**How well do the following phrases describe this ad? **(Circle one number for each phrase)**

<b><u>This ad...</u></b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
...was clear	1	2	3	4	5
...had a message that is important to me	1	2	3	4	5
...said things that were hard to believe	1	2	3	4	5
...made me stop and think	1	2	3	4	5
...made me curious to know if what the ad says is true	1	2	3	4	5
...is one that I would talk to other people about	1	2	3	4	5
...told me something new	1	2	3	4	5
...talked down to me	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad made me feel...**

...sad	1	2	3	4	5
...angry	1	2	3	4	5
...happy	1	2	3	4	5
...scared	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad was...**

...funny	1	2	3	4	5
...powerful	1	2	3	4	5
...boring	1	2	3	4	5
...emotional	1	2	3	4	5

**Overall, I thought this ad was a very good anti-smoking advertisement...**

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

**What makes it that way?****Have you seen this ad on TV before today?**

Yes

No

Not Sure



**ID #****AD # 29****What is the MAIN point that this ad is trying to make?****What ELSE is it trying to say?**How well do the following phrases describe this ad? **(Circle one number for each phrase)**

<b><u>This ad...</u></b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
...was clear	1	2	3	4	5
...had a message that is important to me	1	2	3	4	5
...said things that were hard to believe	1	2	3	4	5
...made me stop and think	1	2	3	4	5
...made me curious to know if what the ad says is true	1	2	3	4	5
...is one that I would talk to other people about	1	2	3	4	5
...told me something new	1	2	3	4	5
...talked down to me	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad made me feel...**

...sad	1	2	3	4	5
...angry	1	2	3	4	5
...happy	1	2	3	4	5
...scared	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad was...**

...funny	1	2	3	4	5
...powerful	1	2	3	4	5
...boring	1	2	3	4	5
...emotional	1	2	3	4	5

**Overall, I thought this ad was a very good anti-smoking advertisement...**

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

**What makes it that way?****Have you seen this ad on TV before today?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

**ID #****AD # 30****What is the MAIN point that this ad is trying to make?****What ELSE is it trying to say?**

How well do the following phrases describe this ad? (Circle one number for each phrase)

<b><u>This ad...</u></b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
...was clear	1	2	3	4	5
...had a message that is important to me	1	2	3	4	5
...said things that were hard to believe	1	2	3	4	5
...made me stop and think	1	2	3	4	5
...made me curious to know if what the ad says is true	1	2	3	4	5
...is one that I would talk to other people about	1	2	3	4	5
...told me something new	1	2	3	4	5
...talked down to me	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad made me feel...**

...sad	1	2	3	4	5
...angry	1	2	3	4	5
...happy	1	2	3	4	5
...scared	1	2	3	4	5

**This ad was...**

...funny	1	2	3	4	5
...powerful	1	2	3	4	5
...boring	1	2	3	4	5
...emotional	1	2	3	4	5

**Overall, I thought this ad was a very good anti-smoking advertisement...**

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

**What makes it that way?****Have you seen this ad on TV before today?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

**ID #**

**Which ONE of these ads will most make you stop and think? (Circle one number only)**

21. Teens call tobacco advertiser
22. Ashtray turns upside down; Zyban
23. Man places mint in tail pipe
24. Dog pees on teen's cigarette
25. Teen holds electronic counter
26. Teens talk about listening to their parents
27. Woman walks to work where she is a quit line counselor
28. Girl tries to cover up smoke with perfume
29. Boy looks like a chimp with pack of cigarettes
30. Teen talks about her addiction to cigarettes

**Why?**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Appendix 5: Follow-up Questionnaire

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

INTERVIEWER: Hello. I am calling from xx Research Company about the advertising study in which he/she participated at the Anti Cancer Council of Victoria last week. Can I speak to xx please - he/she agreed to take a brief call from us to answer some questions today.

When xx is on the line. Hello. I have a few questions to ask you in relation to the ads you saw last week.

**1. Do you remember any of the ads that you saw at [LOCATION] and [DATE]?**

Yes

No (THANK AND END INTERVIEW)

**2. Please describe the anti-smoking ads that you remember.**

[INTERVIEWER: AFTER EACH DESCRIPTION, ASK: **Any other ads that you remember?** REPEAT UNTIL NO MORE ADS ARE RECALLED. REFER TO THE LIST BELOW TO IDENTIFY ADS. WRITE ORDER OF RECALL (1=FIRST AD RECALLED, 2=SECOND AD RECALLED ETC...) IN BOX NEXT TO AD DESCRIPTION. IF RESPONDENT'S DESCRIPTION DOES NOT MATCH AD DESCRIPTION, PROMPT FOR MORE DESCRIPTION. IF STILL UNABLE TO MATCH TO LIST, WRITE VERBATIM DESCRIPTION BELOW.

AD ID	Ad Description	Order
21	Teens call tobacco advertiser	
22	Ashtray turns upside down; Zyban	
23	Man places mint in tail pipe	
24	Dog pees on teen's cigarette	
25	Teen holds digital counter	
26	Teens talk about listening to their parents	
27	Woman walks to work where she is quit line counselor	
28	Girl tries to cover up smoke with perfume	
29	Boy looks like a chimp with pack of cigarettes	
30	Teen talks about her addiction to cigarettes	

## UNCLASSIFIED VERBATIM DESCRIPTIONS

---

---

---

---

3. **Which one ad stands out most in your mind?**  
[INTERVIEWER: WRITE THE ID NUMBER OF THE AD FROM LIST]

(IF NO AD STANDS OUT, SKIP TO Q. 33)

4. **Over the past week, did you happen to think about anything specific in this ad since the rating session?**

YES  
NO

5. **Over the past week, did you happen to discuss this ad with anyone other than the group participants?**

YES  
NO

6. **You described the ad where...[INTERVIEWER: EXCLUDING THE AD THAT STANDS OUT MOST, GO DOWN LIST AND READ OUT DESCRIPTION OF ANOTHER AD THAT WAS RECALLED]**

WRITE THE AD ID YOU DESCRIBED FROM THE LIST (NOT THE ORDER OF RECALL)

(IF NO OTHER AD DESCRIBED, SKIP TO Q. 33)

7. **Over the past week, did you happen to think about anything specific in this ad since the rating session?**

YES  
NO

8. **Over the past week, did you happen to discuss this ad with anyone other than the group participants?**

YES

9. **You described the ad where...[INTERVIEWER: EXCLUDING THE AD THAT STANDS OUT MOST, GO DOWN LIST AND READ OUT DESCRIPTION OF ANOTHER AD THAT WAS RECALLED]**

WRITE THE AD ID YOU DESCRIBED FROM THE LIST (NOT THE ORDER OF RECALL)

(IF NO OTHER AD DESCRIBED, SKIP TO Q. 33)

10. **Over the past week, did you happen to think about anything specific in this ad since the rating session?**

YES

NO

11. **Over the past week, did you happen to discuss this ad with anyone other than the group participants?**

YES

NO

12. **You described the ad where...[INTERVIEWER: EXCLUDING THE AD THAT STANDS OUT MOST, GO DOWN LIST AND READ OUT DESCRIPTION OF ANOTHER AD THAT WAS RECALLED]**

WRITE THE AD ID YOU DESCRIBED FROM THE LIST (NOT THE ORDER OF RECALL)

(IF NO OTHER AD DESCRIBED, SKIP TO Q. 33)

13. **Over the past week, did you happen to think about anything specific in this ad since the rating session?**

YES

NO

14. **Over the past week, did you happen to discuss this ad with anyone other than the group participants?**

YES

NO

15. **You described the ad where...[INTERVIEWER: EXCLUDING THE AD THAT STANDS OUT MOST, GO DOWN LIST AND READ OUT DESCRIPTION OF ANOTHER AD THAT WAS RECALLED]**

WRITE THE AD ID YOU DESCRIBED FROM THE LIST (NOT THE ORDER OF RECALL)

(IF NO OTHER AD DESCRIBED, SKIP TO Q. 33)

16. **Over the past week, did you happen to think about anything specific in this ad since the rating session?**

YES  
NO

17. **Over the past week, did you happen to discuss this ad with anyone other than the group participants?**

YES  
NO

18. **You described the ad where...[INTERVIEWER: EXCLUDING THE AD THAT STANDS OUT MOST, GO DOWN LIST AND READ OUT DESCRIPTION OF ANOTHER AD THAT WAS RECALLED]**

WRITE THE AD ID YOU DESCRIBED FROM THE LIST (NOT THE ORDER OF RECALL)

(IF NO OTHER AD DESCRIBED, SKIP TO Q. 33)

19. **Over the past week, did you happen to think about anything specific in this ad since the rating session?**

YES  
NO

20. **Over the past week, did you happen to discuss this ad with anyone other than the group participants?**

YES  
NO

21. **You described the ad where...[INTERVIEWER: EXCLUDING THE AD THAT STANDS OUT MOST, GO DOWN LIST AND READ OUT DESCRIPTION OF ANOTHER AD THAT WAS RECALLED]**

WRITE THE AD ID YOU DESCRIBED FROM THE LIST (NOT THE ORDER OF RECALL)

(IF NO OTHER AD DESCRIBED, SKIP TO Q. 33)

22. **Over the past week, did you happen to think about anything specific in this ad since the rating session?**

YES  
NO

23. **Over the past week, did you happen to discuss this ad with anyone other than the group participants?**

YES  
NO

24. **You described the ad where...[INTERVIEWER: EXCLUDING THE AD THAT STANDS OUT MOST, GO DOWN LIST AND READ OUT DESCRIPTION OF ANOTHER AD THAT WAS RECALLED]**

WRITE THE AD ID YOU DESCRIBED FROM THE LIST (NOT THE ORDER OF RECALL)

(IF NO OTHER AD DESCRIBED, SKIP TO Q. 33)

25. **Over the past week, did you happen to think about anything specific in this ad since the rating session?**

YES  
NO

26. **Over the past week, did you happen to discuss this ad with anyone other than the group participants?**

YES  
NO



27. **You described the ad where...[INTERVIEWER: EXCLUDING THE AD THAT STANDS OUT MOST, GO DOWN LIST AND READ OUT DESCRIPTION OF ANOTHER AD THAT WAS RECALLED]**

WRITE THE AD ID YOU DESCRIBED FROM THE LIST (NOT THE ORDER OF RECALL)

(IF NO OTHER AD DESCRIBED, SKIP TO Q. 33)

28. **Over the past week, did you happen to think about anything specific in this ad since the rating session?**

YES  
NO

29. **Over the past week, did you happen to discuss this ad with anyone other than the group participants?**

YES  
NO

30. **You described the ad where...[INTERVIEWER: EXCLUDING THE AD THAT STANDS OUT MOST, GO DOWN LIST AND READ OUT DESCRIPTION OF ANOTHER AD THAT WAS RECALLED]**

WRITE THE AD ID YOU DESCRIBED FROM THE LIST (NOT THE ORDER OF RECALL)

(IF NO OTHER AD DESCRIBED, SKIP TO Q. 33)

31. **Over the past week, did you happen to think about anything specific in this ad since the rating session?**

YES  
NO

32. **Over the past week, did you happen to discuss this ad with anyone other than the group participants?**

YES  
NO

**33. In the week since the group ad rating session at [LOCATION] on [DATE], have you seen any anti-smoking advertising on TV at all?**

YES

NO (THANK AND END INTERVIEW)

NOT SURE (THANK AND END INTERVIEW)

REFUSED (THANK AND END INTERVIEW)

**34. Did you see any of the same ones that you saw at the group rating session?**

YES

NO (THANK AND END INTERVIEW)

**35. Which ones did you see?**

[WRITE AD IDs THAT APPLY FROM LIST]


THANK AND END CALL.

## **Recent ImpactTeen and YES! Research Papers**

Effects of Price and Access Laws on Teenage Smoking Initiation: A National Longitudinal Analysis, Tauras JA, O'Malley PM, Johnston LD, April 2001.

Marijuana and Youth, Pacula R, Grossman M, Chaloupka F, O'Malley P, Johnston L, Farrelly M, October 2000.

## **Recent ImpactTeen Research Papers**

Assessment of Youth Responses to Anti-Smoking Ads: Description of a Research Protocol, Wakefield M, Balch GI, Terry-McElrath Y, Szczypka G, Clegg Smith K, Ruel E, Flay B, Emery S, July 2002.

Projected Smoking-Related Deaths Among U.S. Youth: A 2000 Update, Hahn EJ, Rayens MK, Chaloupka FJ, Okoli CTC, Yan J, May 2002.

Coding the News: The Development of a Methodological Framework for Coding and Analyzing Newspaper Coverage on Tobacco Issues, Clegg Smith K, Wakefield M, Siebel C, Szczypka G, Slater S, Terry-McElrath Y, Emery S, Chaloupka F, May 2002.

Binge Drinking and Violence among College Students: Sensitivity to Correlation in the Unobservables, Powell LM, Ciecierski C, Chaloupka FJ, Wechsler H, February 2002.

Study Habits and the Level of Alcohol Use Among College Students, Powell LM, Williams J, Wechsler H, February 2002.

Does Alcohol Consumption Reduce Human Capital Accumulation? Evidence from the College Alcohol Study, Williams J, Powell LM, Wechsler H, February 2002.

Habit and Heterogeneity in College Students' Demand for Alcohol, Williams J, January 2002.

Are There Differential Effects of Price and Policy on College Students' Drinking Intensity? Williams J, Chaloupka FJ, Wechsler H, January 2002.

Alcohol and Marijuana Use Among College Students: Economic Complements or Substitutes? Williams J, Pacula RL, Chaloupka FJ, Wechsler H, November 2001.

The Drugs-Crime Wars: Past, Present and Future Directions in Theory, Policy and Program Interventions, McBride DC, VanderWaal CJ, Terry-McElrath, November 2001.

State Medical Marijuana Laws: Understanding the Laws and their Limitations, Pacula RL, Chiqui JF, Reichmann D, Terry-McElrath YM, October 2001.

The Impact of Prices and Control Policies on Cigarette Smoking among College Students, Czart C, Pacula RL, Chaloupka FJ, Wechsler H, March 2001.

Youth Smoking Uptake Progress: Price and Public Policy Effects, Ross H, Chaloupka FJ, Wakefield M, February 2001.

**ImpacTeen**

Coordinating Center  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
Frank Chaloupka, PhD  
[www.impacteen.org](http://www.impacteen.org)

Health Research and Policy Centers  
850 West Jackson Boulevard  
Suite 400 (M/C 275)  
Chicago, Illinois 60607

312.413.0475 phone  
312.355.2801 fax

**State Alcohol Research**

University of Minnesota  
Alexander Wagenaar, PhD  
[www.epl.umn.edu/alcohol](http://www.epl.umn.edu/alcohol)

**State Tobacco Research**

Roswell Park Cancer Institute  
Gary Giovino, PhD  
[www.roswellpark.org](http://www.roswellpark.org)

**State Illicit Drug Research**

Andrews University  
Duane McBride, PhD  
[www.andrews.edu](http://www.andrews.edu)