



**Lessons Learned Globally:
Secondhand Smoke
Mass Media Campaigns**



GLOBAL
FOR EFFECTIVE
STOP SMOKING
CAMPAIGNS
DIALOGUE

Lessons Learned Globally: Secondhand Smoke Mass Media Campaigns

Suggested Citation

Kosir M, Gutierrez K, *Lessons Learned Globally: Secondhand Smoke Mass Media Campaigns. Saint Paul, Minnesota, United States: Global Dialogue for Effective Stop Smoking Campaigns; 2009.*

Listings of Case Studies

Two lists of case studies are provided for more convenient review based on readers' interests.

The Table of Contents presents the case studies section in alphabetical order by country, then province or state (if applicable), and then in chronological order. It also lists the other parts of the document, such as the Executive Summary, Methodology, Lessons Learned, etc.

The List of Campaigns by Objective found after the Table of Contents focuses only on the case studies, organizing them by the main objective of each campaign. Campaigns are grouped according to whether they sought to:

1. change individual behaviors, such as not smoking in homes or cars;
2. build support for smoke-free environments and/or future policy changes;
3. announce or prepare the population for an upcoming smoke-free policy implementation; or
4. encourage compliance with existing smoke-free laws.

The List of Campaigns by Objective may be helpful to those who are seeking insights from campaigns that have a common objective.



GLOBAL
FOR EFFECTIVE
STOP SMOKING
CAMPAIGNS
DIALOGUE

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	5
II. Introduction	8
Acknowledgements	8
Purpose of This Document	9
Methods	9
Limitations	11
Additional Campaign Information	12
III. Key Lessons Learned	13
Process Lessons	13
Content Lessons	18
IV. Case Studies	25
Australia (New South Wales) – 2002-2005 <i>Car & Home: Smoke-free Zone</i> Campaign	26
Australia (Queensland) – 2004-2006 <i>Nobody Smokes Here Anymore</i> Campaign	29
Australia (Victoria) – 2007 <i>Smoke-free Homes and Cars</i> Campaign	32
Australia (Western Australia) – 2007 <i>Smoke-free Home & Car</i> Campaign	36
Canada – 2002-2003 <i>Secondhand Smoke Diseases</i> Campaign (Youth)	39
Canada – 2002-2004 <i>Heather Crowe</i> Campaign	41
Canada – 2005 <i>Secondhand Smoke in the Home and Car</i> Campaign	44
Canada – 2006-2007 <i>Secondhand Smoke in the Home and Car</i> Campaign	47
Canada (Ontario) – 2000 <i>Anti-Tobacco Strategy: Mass Media</i> Campaign	50
Canada (Ontario) – 2000-2003 <i>Breathing Space</i> Campaign	53
England – 2003 <i>Smoking Kids</i> Campaign	58
England – 2006 <i>Smoke Is Poison</i> Campaign	61
England – 2007 <i>Smoke-free England</i> Campaign	64
France – 2004 'Maison' & 'Entreprise' ('House' & 'Business') Advertisements	68
Hong Kong – 2005-2006 <i>Smoke-free Hong Kong</i> Campaign	70
India – 2008-2009 <i>Phase 1 Smoke-free</i> Campaign	73
Ireland – 2004-2005 <i>Smoke-free Ireland</i> Campaign	78
Israel – 2001 <i>The Shy</i> Campaign	81
Mexico (Mexico City) – 2008 <i>Finally They Are Giving us a Breath/Breather</i> Campaign	83
New Zealand – 2003 <i>Secondhand Smoke Workplace Concept Testing</i>	87
New Zealand – 2003-2008 <i>Secondhand Smoke in Domestic Settings</i> Campaign	90
Norway – 2004 <i>Secondhand Smoke Hospitality</i> Campaign	94
Philippines – 1999-2000 <i>It's Okay to Say You Mind</i> Campaign	97
Poland – 2002-2003 <i>Clearing the Air</i> Campaign Pilot	100
Turkey – 2008 <i>Smoke-free Policy Implementation</i> Campaign	103
United States – 2002-2005 Campaign for Tobacco-free Kids Research	106
United States (Maryland) – 2008 <i>air!</i> Campaign	110
United States (Minnesota) – 2001-2002 <i>Secondhand Smoke Awareness</i> Campaign	113
United States (Minnesota) – 2007 <i>Fresh Air</i> Campaign	116
United States (New Mexico) – 2007 <i>Hold Your Breath</i> Campaign	119
United States (New York) – 2003 <i>Clean Indoor Air Act</i> Campaign	122
United States (New York) – 2005-2006 <i>Secondhand Smoke</i> Campaign	125
United States (New York City) – 2002-2003 <i>Smoke-Free Air Act (SFAA)</i> Campaign	128
Uruguay – 2006 <i>Un Millón de Gracias (A Million Thanks)</i> Campaign	132
Vietnam – 2006-2007 <i>Speak Up</i> Campaign	135
Appendix A – Glossary	139
Appendix B – Questionnaire Used to Solicit Campaign Data	144
Appendix C – Contributing Individuals and Organizations	145
Appendix D – Review Panel	146
End Notes	147

List of Campaigns by Objective

The grid below lists each case study and identifies its primary objective(s). The objectives are to:

1. change individual behaviors, such as not smoking in homes or cars
2. build support for smoke-free environments and/or future policy changes
3. announce or prepare the population for an upcoming smoke-free policy implementation
4. encourage compliance with existing smoke-free laws

In many cases, a campaign had more than one objective, and in those cases the multiple objectives are reflected in the grid.

Case Study	Objectives			
	1	2	3	4
Australia (New South Wales) – 2002-2005 <i>Car & Home: Smoke-free Zone</i> Campaign	•			
Australia (Queensland) – 2004-2006 <i>Nobody Smokes Here Anymore</i> Campaign			•	•
Australia (Victoria) – 2007 <i>Smoke-free Homes & Cars</i> Campaign	•			
Australia (Western Australia) – 2007 <i>Smoke-free Home & Car</i> Campaign	•			
Canada – 2002-2003 <i>Secondhand Smoke Diseases</i> Campaign (Youth)	•			
Canada – 2002-2004 <i>Heather Crowe</i> Campaign		•		
Canada – 2005 <i>Secondhand Smoke in the Home and Car</i> Campaign	•			
Canada – 2006-2007 <i>Secondhand Smoke in the Home and Car</i> Campaign	•			
Canada (Ontario) – 2000 <i>Anti-Tobacco Strategy: Mass Media</i> Campaign	•	•		
Canada (Ontario) – 2000-2003 <i>Breathing Space</i> Campaign	•			
England – 2003 <i>Smoking Kids</i> Campaign	•			
England – 2006 <i>Smoke Is Poison</i> Campaign	•	•		
England – 2007 <i>Smoke-free England</i> Campaign			•	
France – 2004 'Maison' & 'Entreprise' ('House' & 'Business') Advertisements	•	•		
Hong Kong – 2005-2006 <i>Smoke-free Hong Kong</i> Campaign	•	•	•	
India – 2008-2009 <i>Phase 1 Smoke-free</i> Campaign			•	•
Ireland – 2004-2005 <i>Smoke-free Ireland</i> Campaign			•	•
Israel – 2001 <i>The Shy</i> Campaign				•
Mexico (Mexico City) – 2008 <i>Finally They Are Giving us a Breath/Breather</i> Campaign				•
New Zealand – 2003 <i>Secondhand Smoke Workplace Concept Testing</i>		•		
New Zealand – 2003-2008 <i>Secondhand Smoke in Domestic Settings</i> Campaign	•			
Norway – 2004 <i>Secondhand Smoke Hospitality</i> Campaign			•	•
Philippines – 1999-2000 <i>It's Okay to Say You Mind</i> Campaign	•			
Poland – 2002-2003 <i>Clearing the Air</i> Campaign Pilot	•	•		
Turkey – 2008 <i>Smoke-free Policy Implementation</i> Campaign			•	•
United States – 2002-2005 Campaign for Tobacco-free Kids Research		•		
United States (Maryland) – 2008 <i>air!</i> Campaign			•	•
United States (Minnesota) – 2001-2002 <i>Secondhand Smoke Awareness</i> Campaign	•			
United States (Minnesota) – 2007 <i>Fresh Air</i> Campaign			•	•
United States (New Mexico) – 2007 <i>Hold Your Breath</i> Campaign		•		
United States (New York) – 2003 <i>Clean Indoor Air Act</i> Campaign			•	•
United States (New York) – 2005-2006 <i>Secondhand Smoke</i> Campaign	•			
United States (New York City) – 2002-2003 <i>Smoke-Free Air Act (SFAA)</i> Campaign			•	•
Uruguay – 2006 <i>Un Millón de Gracias (A Million Thanks)</i> Campaign				•
Vietnam – 2006-2007 <i>Speak Up</i> Campaign	•			

Executive Summary

Reducing exposure to secondhand smoke has become a public health priority for many countries because of the compelling facts regarding the health harms of secondhand smoke and the recent spread of smoke-free policies around the globe. The WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (WHO FCTC) includes *protection from exposure to tobacco smoke* as one of the obligations that Parties (countries which have ratified the WHO FCTC) have to meet (see Article 8 of the Convention).¹ In addition, the MPOWER statement of evidence-based strategies developed by the World Health Organization lists “Protect people from tobacco smoke” as one of its six recommended policies for reducing tobacco’s negative impact globally.²

The WHO FCTC also includes *education, communication, training and public awareness* as one of the obligations that Parties have to meet (see Article 12 of the Convention)³, and the WHO MPOWER statement lists “Warn about the dangers of tobacco” as another one of its six recommended tobacco control policies.⁴

Public education campaigns designed to address secondhand smoke play a key role in ensuring that populations:

- Are knowledgeable about the dangers of exposure to secondhand smoke
- Understand the benefits of smoke-free environments for everyone
- Support smoke-free policy initiatives
- Are motivated to make changes in their own behaviors, in order to protect their children and other loved ones and/or to comply with policies that protect the broader community.

There will never be enough health department officials or enforcement officers in any country to enforce smoke-free laws on an ongoing basis; thus, public education campaigns are essential to the long-term

success of smoke-free law implementation. With adequate public education, smoke-free laws become self-enforcing, with the vast majority of individuals and businesses in compliance.

Because of the important role that public education campaigns play in the success of efforts to reduce exposure to secondhand smoke at both the individual and policy levels, this review has been conducted to summarize experiences around the globe and to try to draw conclusions about lessons learned that cross national and regional boundaries. The authors hope to provide campaign managers and researchers with helpful direction as they plan, implement and evaluate their secondhand smoke campaigns. While the data are not complete enough to draw firm conclusions, some patterns emerged upon reviewing the diverse campaign data, providing insights regarding the processes followed and the content included in various campaigns.

It is important to note that public education campaigns should not be conducted in isolation or to the exclusion of other key tobacco control interventions; they should be part of multi-faceted, comprehensive tobacco control programs.⁵ Mass media campaigns can

be extremely expensive, potentially draining funding and human resources from other key tobacco control initiatives, such as policy efforts or tobacco cessation services. If funds are limited, tobacco control advocates must evaluate the costs versus benefits of various tobacco control interventions and must set priorities in terms of what can and should be implemented based on the unique environment, timing and funding. Prioritizing a public education campaign may not be appropriate in some cases versus pursuing other interventions which may have greater impact based on the situation.

The authors feel fortunate to have been able to work with knowledgeable individuals in 16 countries to compile over 30 campaign case studies, as well as with a diverse review panel representing five continents whose members provided input and direction throughout the document development process. Among the case studies is one or more from each of the following countries: Australia, Canada, England, France, India, Ireland, Israel, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Turkey, United States, Uruguay and Vietnam. In addition, one campaign case study is from Hong Kong.

Finding campaigns to review was relatively easy. Numerous secondhand smoke campaigns have been conducted over the last ten years, and international contacts were more than willing to share their experiences and campaign materials. Many of these campaigns, however, lacked thorough research and evaluation (R&E) from which strong conclusions could be drawn. This became one of the main key lessons learned—specifically that thorough research and evaluation are necessary in order to draw conclusions, understand what went well, and determine what needs to be improved going forward.

Nevertheless, with the limited data available, the authors and reviewers were able to compile a variety of lessons learned that should not be considered absolutes but rather considerations for future campaign development. In the authors' opinion, the process used to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate campaigns is just as important as the content (messages, vehicles, etc.) of the campaign. Thus, we have chosen to highlight key lessons learned in both categories:

1. Process lessons learned
2. Content lessons learned

[See next page for lists of these lessons learned](#)

Lessons Learned

Key *process* lessons learned include the following:

1. Target audience research and pre-campaign evaluation of materials improve the likelihood of campaign success.
2. Measuring campaign outcomes requires data collection before (i.e., baseline) and after the campaign.
3. Television appears to be the strongest single medium for reaching and influencing enough people to make a population-level impact (where television viewership is widespread).
4. Multiple outreach strategies broaden a campaign's penetration of one or multiple audiences.
5. Advertisements developed in one country can be adapted effectively to other countries, provinces or states, and can serve to guide other campaigns' creative development.
6. Sizeable and consistent advertising placements can contribute significantly to campaign success.
6. Focusing on protecting one segment of the population from secondhand smoke (such as wait staff or children) provides strategic specificity and clarity, but also requires trade-offs.
7. Advertisements that do not attack or demean smokers are typically better accepted by smokers (and in some cases even by non-smokers), influencing smokers to change their behaviors more effectively than messages perceived as critical or judgmental of them.
8. Successfully communicating with specific populations, such as ethnic minorities or Indigenous peoples, requires understanding how members of that population view themselves in relation to the mainstream culture and how they prefer to be portrayed.
9. Secondhand smoke campaigns may motivate some smokers to quit, so campaigns should plan accordingly.
10. The tone of secondhand smoke ads (i.e., serious, humorous, emotional, authoritative) may differ significantly based on the primary goal of the campaign.

Key *content* lessons learned include the following:

1. Testimonials, or personal stories, can persuasively and credibly communicate the dangers of secondhand smoke and the need to protect people from it.
2. Focusing on the health impacts of secondhand smoke appears to be an effective strategy for raising awareness and building knowledge on the dangers of secondhand smoke, changing attitudes about secondhand smoke and building support for protecting people from it.
3. Ads that elicit negative emotions or discomfort from the audience typically generate high levels of persuasiveness, even when the ads are not perceived as enjoyable.
4. Portraying innocent victims exposed to secondhand smoke can motivate smokers to avoid smoking around others, particularly in personal settings such as homes and cars.
5. Showing the impact of secondhand smoke on children generally mutes smokers' arguments about individual rights to smoke.

Interestingly, several of the lessons learned mirror conclusions from international reviews of stop smoking campaigns. In those cases, the authors have referred to the similar lessons learned and have provided citations to the other campaign review documents.

In addition to the Lessons Learned, review of the individual case studies (organized alphabetically by country in a Table of Contents and organized by campaign objective in a List of Campaigns by Objective) will interest readers working in a certain region or working to achieve a specific secondhand smoke or smoke-free goal.

Introduction

This is the first international review conducted to summarize lessons learned from secondhand smoke mass media campaigns. Several countries have many years of experience conducting such campaigns, but not until recently have there been campaigns conducted and evaluated in a sufficient range of low, middle, and high income countries to conduct a thorough review. Throughout this document, the term “campaign” will refer to “the strategic use of mass media to build awareness and knowledge, and to change beliefs, attitudes, behaviors and community norms.”

This document was produced by Global Dialogue for Effective Stop Smoking Campaigns (Global Dialogue), a collaborative initiative between public, non-profit, and private partner organizations focused on increasing the impact of mass media, public education campaigns to reduce tobacco use and exposure to secondhand smoke. Current partner organizations include:

- American Cancer Society
- American Legacy Foundation
- Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids
- Clarity Coverdale Advertising
- Department of Health England
- European Network of Quitlines
- Health Canada
- Health Sponsorship Council (New Zealand)
- InterAmerican Heart Foundation
- International Non-Governmental Coalition Against Tobacco
- Institute for Global Tobacco Control at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
- Johnson & Johnson
- Pfizer
- VicHealth Centre for Tobacco Control (Australia)
- World Lung Foundation

Global Dialogue’s campaign resources include campaign lessons learned, a Website, campaign development tool kit, training workshops, individual campaign consultation, and a traveling advertising exhibit. For more information about Global Dialogue, please visit www.stopsmokingcampaigns.org.

Acknowledgements

This document could not have been produced without funding from several Global Dialogue partner organizations: primary funding came from the American Cancer Society, with supplemental funding from New Zealand’s Health Sponsorship Council, Pfizer and Johnson & Johnson.



Purpose of This Document

This document has been created to provide guidance to tobacco control advocates, as well as to the media, advertising, public relations and research professionals who work with them. Its contents can provide insights into the development of effective mass media, public education campaigns to reduce exposure to secondhand smoke, both in terms of the *process* of campaign development and the most promising *content and approaches* for campaigns. The work represented here comes from campaigns conducted across the globe from 1998 through 2008.

These collected campaigns all had a main goal of contributing to reducing exposure to secondhand smoke, but they focused on different aspects, such as influencing individual behaviors in homes and cars; gaining support for policy initiatives such as smoke-free public place laws; encouraging compliance with existing smoke-free policies; or building awareness and knowledge about the health implications of secondhand smoke to create a more supportive environment for future policy initiatives.

This is not a meta-analysis or a comprehensive review of the scientific literature on media campaigns in tobacco control. Rather, it is a review of existing secondhand smoke campaign information provided by researchers and practitioners in tobacco control programs who responded to a request for information or were identified through the authors' efforts to find those involved in secondhand smoke campaigns in various countries. Likewise, this document is not a scientific or medical review of the impact of secondhand smoke on individuals or communities.

Methods

In the first quarter of 2008, the authors (Karen Gutierrez, Director of Global Dialogue for Effective Stop Smoking Campaigns, and Michael Kosir, Project Manager) sent an e-mail request for information (materials and data) on secondhand smoke campaigns to more than 300 individuals worldwide, most representing tobacco control NGOs and ministries of health. The questionnaire requesting campaign data is attached as Appendix B. A panel of regional experts was recruited to review the document and to provide additional contacts in various countries. (See Appendix D for list of panel members.) Approximately two dozen phone calls were made directly to recognized campaign managers and experts in the tobacco control community. A list of people who supplied campaign information related to the case studies has been included in this report and is found in Appendix C.

As part of the request for information, the authors asked for published and unpublished data from campaigns (including target audience research and pre-campaign evaluation data collected as the campaign was being developed, and process and outcome evaluation data collected before and after the campaigns' implementation), as well as for specific advertisements and other campaign materials. Only campaigns conducted during 1998-2008 were considered for this review.

The campaign information received was thoroughly reviewed to determine relevance and whether the data provided warranted inclusion in the campaign review. (i.e., Were the data robust enough to draw conclusions? Did they indicate whether the campaign itself had caused changes in the population versus other efforts going on at the same time? Were there outcome data on knowledge, beliefs, attitudes and/or behaviors?) Many campaigns submitted were not included in the campaign review because they did not have sufficient or any target audience research data, pre-campaign evaluation data and/or outcome evaluation data.

Campaign data were compiled and analyzed from March 2008 through January 2009. From this analysis, key findings for each campaign and overall lessons learned were developed. Conclusions in this report are based on the following four types of data: 1) target audience research, 2) pre-campaign evaluation of draft materials, 3) process evaluation and 4) outcome evaluation. The use of these four categories is supported by documents published by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Global Dialogue for Effective Stop Smoking Campaigns.⁶

Types of Research and Evaluation used to assess campaigns:

1. Target Audience Research

Target audience research (sometimes referred to as formative research) is used to develop a better understanding of the target audience and the context of audience members' current behaviors, attitudes, beliefs, and opinions in order to plan campaign activities and messages that will bring about the desired changes outlined in the campaign's objectives. In some cases, this research can also help better define the target audience.

Target audience research helps to answer questions such as:

- How is the target audience behaving now?
- What are the (perceived) barriers to and drivers for behavior change?
- What can help overcome the barriers and/or appeal to the drivers?
- How does the target audience communicate and learn about new information, ideas, and behaviors?

Target audience research may include qualitative, quasi-quantitative (non-representative sampling of 100-300 respondents) and quantitative methods (representative sampling of 300 or more respondents)—including in-depth interviews, focus group discussions and surveys—to gain insight into these questions. The result should be a documented strategy that guides campaign development and implementation.

2. Pre-Campaign Evaluation of Draft Communications Materials

Pre-campaign evaluation (sometimes referred to as formative evaluation) is used to test advertising concepts or draft materials that are developed or selected based on findings from target audience research. Pre-campaign evaluation helps to determine whether the campaign materials are communicating the intended messages clearly and persuasively, and may include qualitative, quasi-quantitative and quantitative methods.

Pre-campaign evaluation helps to answer questions such as:

- How well designed is each component of our campaign?
- How likely is each component to make an impact?
- What changes do we need to make to campaign

components to optimize them before airing/placing/sending them?

3. Process Evaluation

Process evaluation examines how a campaign is working while it is being implemented and helps determine whether the campaign is being conducted as originally designed. This type of evaluation might include assessments of whether an advertisement was aired at the proposed times and whether the target group was exposed to the message as often as planned.

Unforeseen obstacles might be recorded during this evaluation, as well as other influencing events that could be used to interpret the findings. For example, if a large tobacco company announces its new “stop-smoking” program the same month that your stop-smoking campaign is launched, this activity might cause the general public to be confused about which effort is sponsored by which organization. On the other hand, if a well-known TV journalist dies of a smoking-related illness during the same time period, that event may increase the general public's interest in your stop-smoking campaign or increase media attention to the issue.

For a public relations effort, process evaluation could involve documenting whether targeted key journalists were reached, whether the content of the presentation made to them was appropriate, and whether certain planned events took place. For a community-based effort, process evaluation might mean counting how many tobacco control advocates got involved, how many events were conducted, and how many people new to tobacco control attended the events.

Process evaluation helps you to answer questions such as:

- Are we implementing the campaign as planned, and is it on schedule?
- What are we doing that was not in our original plan?
- What else may be influencing the impact of our campaign?

4. Outcome Evaluation

Outcome evaluation can determine whether expected or anticipated changes with the target audience(s) are being realized and whether the expected short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes are being achieved. For example, in an

advertising campaign, the outcome evaluation can show whether there is any change in the target audience's awareness and recall of the message, and tobacco-related attitudes, beliefs, and behavior. With a community-based marketing initiative, the outcome evaluation can show changes in the community's level of involvement in, and commitment to, the tobacco control issue. An outcome evaluation can assess whether your media advocacy efforts led to a change in tobacco-related policy, assuming that controlling for other factors is possible.

Outcome evaluation helps to answer questions such as:

- What effects is the campaign having?
- What unexpected outcomes arose?
- Is the campaign making progress toward the goals?

In addition to these four main types of data collected from campaign staff for this secondhand smoke campaign review, information was also gathered through interviews with people closely involved with the campaigns and those in the tobacco control community who have extensive experience working on this topic.

Each campaign is summarized in a case study. Key findings from the individual campaigns were synthesized and overall lessons learned were developed based on findings that were common to *several* campaigns. The Lessons Learned section precedes the Case Studies section.

Because the methods and rigor of the campaign evaluations varied widely, the lessons learned should be regarded as the perspectives of the authors, based on careful review of available information and with input from campaign staff and the internationally-recruited review panel. The conclusions are intended to provide campaign managers and researchers with practical guidance for planning, implementing, and evaluating future secondhand smoke campaigns rather than representing absolute truths or firm recommendations.

Drafts of each case study were sent to campaign staff to review, edit and approve. Two drafts of the full document were sent to the expert panel for their review and comments. Input from these rounds of review was incorporated into the text.

Limitations

The authors would like to highlight for readers the following limitations observed in compiling, analyzing, and summarizing campaign data represented in this document.

- **Reliance on campaign data/information provided voluntarily by international contacts.** The authors recognize that there may be useful campaign data in various countries that were not provided, either because the authors were unaware of those campaigns and, thus, did not request the data or because the campaign practitioners and researchers did not provide them after being asked for campaign information. Likewise, some campaign case studies lack complete information or final approval of the text by campaign contacts.
- **Lack of thorough audience research and evaluation of draft materials during campaign development and lack of thorough evaluation after campaign implementation.** Many campaign planners did not use the full range of research and evaluation steps in order to increase the likelihood that their campaigns would be effective and in order to measure their outcomes. While the reasons for the limited research and evaluation are numerous, the leading reasons seem to be lack of R&E funds, lack of knowledge on how to adequately conduct research and evaluate campaigns, and lack of time. Many campaigns to which the authors were directed had done very little or no target audience research, pre-campaign evaluation of materials, process evaluation, or outcome evaluation including a baseline survey (the four key types of research and evaluation), and thus the authors were not able to include those campaigns as case studies because findings could not be compiled. Among the campaigns included in this review, only about 10% benefitted from all four types of research and evaluation; and even putting process evaluation aside, only about 25% benefitted from the other three types of R&E. This lack of thorough data made it challenging to determine the impact of each campaign against its goals.
- **General outcome data that made it difficult to draw conclusions about specific campaign impacts.** Somewhat related to the above point, there were few campaigns for which the evaluation data provided tied closely to the campaigns in a way that the authors could draw confident conclusions about each campaign's impact on the outcomes versus the impact of other factors, such as the smoke-free laws themselves and other tobacco control activities occurring during the same time periods.

- **Stated attitudes and behaviors that may not accurately represent actual attitudes and behaviors.** Many of the campaign surveys provided relied on survey respondents to state their attitudes and beliefs and their intended or actual behaviors. Some survey respondents might provide responses that they believe are the most “socially acceptable,” regardless of whether the responses are accurate (for example, a smoking parent stating that he/she does not smoke around the children, when in reality, he/she may very well do so). Although pre- and post- campaign evaluation surveys can somewhat control for this because one would expect respondents to equally report socially acceptable attitudes and behaviors before and after a campaign, respondents might be more likely to provide socially acceptable responses *after* secondhand smoke campaigns, given that many of these campaigns highlight the negatives of secondhand smoke and the importance of not smoking around others.
- **Lack of data regarding the effectiveness of campaign elements other than television advertising.** The vast majority of the campaign outcome data compiled is related to television advertising since the great majority of the campaigns reviewed chose to focus on television as a primary communications vehicle. Where multiple media vehicles were used (i.e., print, radio, outdoor advertising), data were not provided that allowed the authors to isolate the impact of one medium versus another. Furthermore, the authors received no specific outcome data on new/emerging communications vehicles, such as Website campaigns, cell phone advertising or text messaging, chat rooms discussions, etc. In some countries, television viewership may not be widespread, so drawing conclusions about the strength of television as a medium may be irrelevant there.
- **Lack of data regarding campaigns focused on secondhand smoke from other forms of tobacco than cigarettes.** None of the campaigns reviewed in this document focused on secondhand smoke from hookah, bidis, kreteks or other non-cigarette forms of tobacco.
- **Limited campaign data from low and middle income countries.** Approximately three quarters of the campaigns for which the authors received campaign data were from high income countries, such as Australia, Canada, England, France, New Zealand, Norway and the United States.

Additional Campaign Information

At the time this document was finalized in March 2009, numerous secondhand smoke campaigns were being conducted across the globe, for which results were not yet available. In addition, many campaigns were in the early stages of development.

As you conduct your own secondhand smoke campaigns or come across campaigns that are not listed here, please forward data and contact information related to these campaigns to Global Dialogue for Effective Stop Smoking Campaigns (info@stopsmokingcampaigns.org). Ongoing collection of this information will be extremely helpful in the development and dissemination of future campaign review documents and will help improve tobacco control public education initiatives worldwide. In addition, feel free to contact Global Dialogue if you have questions about this document or need additional information.

Some of the terminology in this document may be new to some readers. Please refer to Appendix A for a glossary of terms used throughout this document.

Key Lessons Learned

This section synthesizes findings from the individual case studies and provides overall conclusions that cross various campaigns' or countries' efforts. Each key lesson learned is described in summary format, with reference to examples of case studies that support it. Further information on each campaign can be found in Section IV where the campaign case studies are organized alphabetically by country name, then province or state (if appropriate), and then in chronological order.

Many factors can impact the effectiveness of second-hand smoke campaigns. Most of them relate to either **process**—aspects that are involved in *how* a campaign is developed—or **content**—aspects involved with *what* a campaign is comprised of. Thus, the Key Lessons Learned section organizes its points under these two categories.

- The *how* of a campaign includes things such as whether strategic planning is conducted prior to campaign implementation, whether and how research is conducted to gain insights about the target audience, how a media placement plan is developed, whether and how campaign evaluation is conducted, how media placements are selected, etc.
- The *what* of a campaign includes things such as what topics are addressed in a campaign; the messages, imagery, tone, etc. that are used; which media vehicles are selected; whether the ads include a call to action or an offer; and what executional elements are selected as the advertisements are being produced (i.e., the setting, choice of actors, length, number of scenes, tone, colors, pace, etc.).

Despite the significant impact that both aspects can have on the effectiveness of a campaign, some campaigns focus solely on the content (*what*) of a campaign, and do not focus enough on the process (*how*). As this document will show, successful campaigns

commonly have invested in both process and content.

Note that the lessons learned apply most directly to the specific locations in which they occurred, based on the unique aspects of those locations and their tobacco control environment at the given time. Applying any one of these lessons directly to another location or situation without some research and/or evaluation to ensure compatibility may be inappropriate.

Process Lessons

1. Target audience research and pre-campaign evaluation of materials improve the likelihood of campaign success.

Due to budget and timing constraints, it is not always possible to invest fully in target audience research and evaluation of concepts and materials prior to launching a campaign. However, research and evaluation used in the formation of a campaign contribute significantly toward success. Target audience research results in a better understanding and definition of the audience, what motivates and influences them, and obstacles to changing their behaviors. Pre-campaign evaluation of draft materials provides audience reactions to messages, advertising concepts and other campaign approaches before significant funds are invested in implementing the campaign interventions. The funds required to conduct audience research & pre-campaign

evaluation of materials are usually a fraction of those required to place advertisements and could be considered an insurance against wasting precious funds on airing/placing sub-optimal material.

The pre-campaign research conducted for the *Smoke-Free Hong Kong* campaign led to the successful identification of key audiences, and thus to the development of advertising directly targeting those who were in greatest opposition to legislated smoke-free policy efforts. Similarly, considerable target audience research was conducted in preparation for England's *Smoking Kids* campaign. England's research showed that nonsmokers' largest concerns related to secondhand smoke had to do with aesthetic, not health, effects, such as how it made their clothes and hair smell. Based on this knowledge, messages were developed to help people understand the serious health implications of secondhand smoke.

Staff for the Australian (New South Wales) *Car & Home: Smoke-free Zone* campaign learned during pre-campaign evaluation of draft materials that smoking parents resisted ad concepts that spoke down to or belittled them, yet responded positively to concepts that showed parents modeling positive behavior (such as smoking outside). This helped the campaign staff craft the ideal messaging and imagery for their campaign.

In New Zealand, for the *Secondhand Smoke in Domestic Settings* campaign, target audience research led to some considerations as the campaign planners produced the ads, including the importance of portraying the desired behavior change (e.g., smoking outside) as a choice – a decision which the smoker himself reaches—as opposed to being told to behave in a certain way.

England's *Smoking Kids* advertisement is an example of an “innocent victims” concept that tested well with respondents in research. The fact-based, yet moving, television ad was one of England's most highly recalled smoking information ads, and was successful in positively influencing both attitudes and behavior. Its success was likely due in part to including elements that were identified in initial testing as likely to influence smoking parents, such as showing children with smoke coming out of their noses as they breathed, with a voiceover stating, “If you smoke around children, they smoke, too.”

Target audience research conducted for the *Speak Up* campaign in Vietnam showed that people had little specific understanding of the health effects of

secondhand smoke. This resulted in the development of ads that, among other things, aimed to accurately communicate the negative health consequences of secondhand smoke. Research also found that Vietnamese women (the vast majority of whom did not smoke) were generally uncomfortable asking men (the majority of whom smoked) to stop smoking near them and their children. Based on this, ads were developed to encourage confidence in women to object to smoking around them.

2. Measuring campaign outcomes requires data collection before (i.e., baseline) and after the campaign.

Knowing whether and how a campaign succeeded (as well as the ways in which it could be improved) requires determining the audience's awareness, knowledge, beliefs, attitudes and behavior prior to the start of the campaign and then measuring the changes in those measures after the campaign is conducted. For example, Cancer Research UK and the Department of Health in England conducted a broad spectrum of surveys over many years in conjunction with a variety of tobacco control campaigns in order to regularly measure and analyze the public's views and attitudes related to secondhand smoke and other tobacco-related issues. Tracking key measures before and after each campaign gave them data demonstrating the effectiveness of mass media campaigns as an intervention to change attitudes and behaviors related to secondhand smoke. These data helped campaign staff to secure funding for campaign development year to year. Moreover, the findings from the research were important in guiding the development of each subsequent campaign.

One of the aims of Canada's *Heather Crowe* campaign was to improve the public's understanding of the negative health consequences of secondhand smoke and motivate them to take action accordingly. Based on pre- and post-campaign data collection, campaign managers were able to measure a significant increase in the general population's understanding of the importance of employers' providing smoke-free work environments for their workers, as well as significant increases in the percentage of respondents willing to ask a smoker to put out a cigarette or not to smoke near them. Furthermore, after the campaign significantly more smokers indicated that they were likely to put out their own cigarettes if asked than prior to the campaign.

The *Smoke-free Hong Kong* campaign and the New Mexico *Hold Your Breath* campaign are two

examples of thorough post-campaign evaluation, but with no pre-campaign evaluation conducted for comparison. While secondhand smoke legislation was passed in both Hong Kong and New Mexico, the contribution of the campaigns themselves is difficult to measure without having pre- and post-data from which to measure changes in knowledge and attitudes related to secondhand smoke and support for smoke-free policies.

It is fairly common for organizations to conduct only pre-campaign evaluation or only post-campaign evaluation, due to limited time, funds or other resources to accomplish the task. When pre- and post-campaign measures are not available to compare, it is very difficult to determine the impact of the campaign itself versus other interventions. It is therefore best to conduct at least a minimum amount of pre- and post-campaign evaluation with the funds available, so that some conclusions may be drawn, even if limited. This will be helpful in informing the development of future campaigns.

3. Television appears to be the strongest single medium for reaching and influencing enough people to make a population-level impact (where television viewership is widespread).

When messages are communicated via a variety of media, television consistently generates the highest levels of recall, as noted throughout various case studies. For example, the *Smoke-free Hong Kong* campaign found that six times as many post-campaign survey respondents recalled the TV ads as recalled ads from the other media used in the campaign, such as print, radio, etc. England's *Smoking Kids* campaign generated significantly greater recall for TV versus for print ads. The Australia (New South Wales) *Car & Home: Smoke-free Zone* and the Australian (Queensland) campaigns showed similar results, with significantly more survey respondents seeing the TV ads, versus hearing radio or seeing posters and other collateral.

While recall is not the most important measure for determining an ad's or a campaign's effectiveness (better measures are changes in attitudes, beliefs and behavior), it provides a key initial measure of whether anyone noticed and recalled elements of the ads.

For perspective on the use of various media on *other* tobacco control topics, a few recent studies have suggested that television advertising may have greater impact on motivation to quit than any other smoking cessation interventions. One United

States (Massachusetts) study found that among recent quitters, more found TV advertising helpful than any other quitting aid, including nicotine replacement therapy, professional help, self-help, prescriptions, counseling programs, radio, print ads, Website and quitline. In addition, Department of Health England found in 2004 that TV advertising was cited by smokers as the biggest trigger to quit attempts--even more so than health professionals' advice and friends and family. The greater impact of television advertising is partially explained by its high penetration and also partially perhaps by its combination of moving visuals and sound which many other media vehicles do not have.

In 2004 and 2006 studies, Department of Health England found that smokers who recalled several campaign elements (not just TV ads but also collateral or supplemental elements, such as posters, giveaways, and news articles) were more likely to have changed desired attitudes and behaviors than those who recalled only the television ads. It is possible that synergy between campaign elements may be what drives better results, rather than the impact of collateral materials alone, since dramatically more smokers cited TV advertising as the main prompt for their quitting attempts than cited collateral materials. If collateral materials were used alone in the campaign, their impact may not be sufficient to produce significant changes in attitudes and behaviors.⁷

Some organizations have begun using newer types of media technology as part their comprehensive media campaigns. Types of emerging media include web banners, blogging, social networking sites, and mobile phone texting among others. These forms of media are so new there are few data regarding the efficacy for tobacco control campaigns. Some organizations using them in their comprehensive campaigns see them as more cost effective and better able to target hard-to-reach populations than traditional forms of media.

The *NCI Monograph 19: the Role of the Media in Promoting and Reducing Tobacco Use* recognizes that "Much research on tobacco control media interventions revolves around television, regarded as the most powerful medium." Unfortunately, not enough studies have been conducted on the relative impact of different media vehicles (controlling for differences in funds spent on each) to be able to draw firm conclusions regarding the effectiveness of each. Thus, television should not be considered

the default leading medium for all campaigns, as it is generally the most costly tool to use and its appropriateness and availability vary from country to country. An assessment of the available media should always be conducted, since an equal investment in other media may generate positive results as well.

4. Multiple outreach strategies broaden a campaign's penetration of one or multiple audiences.

As has been found with campaigns on other tobacco control topics, the use of multiple outreach strategies in secondhand smoke campaigns can increase a campaign's overall reach to more people.⁸ Multiple strategies can include both paid media (TV, radio, print, outdoor, Internet advertising) and earned media (public relations events, working with news outlets and reporters to get articles placed, etc.), as well as outreach activities, such as distributing brochures to community centers, manning booths at community events, coordinating with health care providers, and other local interventions.

The contact for the Australian (New South Wales) *Car & Home: Smoke-free Zone* campaign stated that a multiple outreach strategy was critical to their de-normalization objective. This campaign used numerous mass media outlets (TV, radio, print, billboard, etc.) in combination with a public relations campaign to secure articles in newspapers across the state and conduct community-based outreach to caregivers, community centers and health professionals. As a result, the topic of secondhand smoke was kept in front of smokers and the broader community wherever they turned. This multiple outreach strategy contributed to a steady climb over time in the number of homes and cars identified as smoke-free.

The *Smoke-free Ireland* campaign combined paid television, radio, and print advertising with a strong public relations effort that managed the messages communicated to news outlets. The data collected throughout the time period of Ireland's campaign on the topics covered by select print news sources showed the success of the campaign in influencing news stories up to and after the implementation of smoke-free legislation.

Canada's *Heather Crowe* campaign was considered to be successful in great part due to the activities of Heather Crowe (the waitress spokesperson who was dying from lung cancer caused by secondhand smoke) and Barb Tarbox (a smoker dying from can-

cer caused by smoking), specifically their meetings with government officials and the public during the same time period as the paid media portion of the campaign.

Other areas in which campaigns used multiple interventions included Norway, Poland, Uruguay, and the United States (New York; New York City; and Minnesota), all of which combined a variety of paid vehicles with earned media efforts, and in some cases community outreach, in order to optimize their outcomes.

Earned media or news media coverage can play an even more important role when paid mass media campaigns are infeasible due to budget constraints. Gaining broad news media coverage that educates the community on the harms of secondhand smoke and the interventions that can protect people from secondhand smoke can motivate smokers to change their behaviors and mobilize individuals to advocate for and support smoke-free laws, regardless of whether that news coverage is complimented with paid advertising regarding secondhand smoke.

Published literature corroborating the impact of news media coverage includes a 2004 Canadian article that found that print [news] media had a positive influence on municipal smoking bylaw enactment: Data analysis from various bylaw initiatives in Canada identified print news media coverage as one of two most powerful influences on bylaw enactment. The author noted that "Media is able to draw attention to public health issues that may go unrecognized or unacknowledged by policy makers, and to provide the necessary support for policy action" and "...media [assisted] in transforming knowledge of the harmful effects of SHS into a common discourse in public and political spheres."⁹

5. Advertisements developed in one country can be adapted effectively to other countries, provinces or states, and can serve to guide other campaigns' creative development.

Numerous campaigns in this review either used advertisements from other countries, provinces or states to inform their own ad development or adapted others' ads to their own countries. Doing so can lead to materials that communicate effectively as long as the process includes adequate local target audience research, pre-testing of draft campaign materials and appropriate adaptation based on findings from the research.

For example, in the United States in 2003, New

York's Tobacco Control Program (NYTCP) provided funds for local health departments to use various ads from other U.S. states, adapted as needed. Again in 2005, they funded locals to run ads from other states and ran some ads themselves as well. This allowed New York campaign planners to reserve more of their budget for advertising placement, rather than spending time and funds on new creative development.

Vietnam's *Speak Up* campaign staff re-shot portions of a United States (Massachusetts) ad called 'Kids' with Vietnamese actors but were able to retain other portions of the ad that could be used in virtually any region. Pre-campaign evaluation with the original ad revealed that the core concept was relevant, credible and persuasive, however the language and the look of the actors needed to change to appropriately reflect the Vietnamese population. Campaign planners also adapted Australian ads from the "Every Cigarette is Doing You Damage" campaign, using key visuals from the original ads in combination with new scripts and local actors.

The Workplace Testing concept in New Zealand was a creative idea adapted from a TV advertisement called 'Restaurant' that was originally produced in United States (Massachusetts). Also, the *Smoke Is Poison* campaign conducted in England was original creative, but was based on very similar documentary-style advertisements from United States (Massachusetts).

In Turkey, campaign planners saved money and time by adapting ads from Ireland's smoke-free workplace campaign, re-shooting an ad called "Post-Implementation—Office" in Turkish with local actors. They felt that this ad clearly communicated key information that would help meet their objectives of 1) educating the population of the harms of secondhand smoke; 2) building awareness of the new smoke-free legislation; and 3) encouraging compliance with the new law.

6. Sizeable and consistent advertising placements can contribute significantly to campaign success.

Insufficient advertising placements typically result in low reach (percentage of the audience potentially reached with the messages) and limited frequency (the number of potential exposures to the ads by the audience in a certain period of time), the two most common measures of a campaign's penetration or presence. Increasing the advertising's presence usually results in higher levels of awareness and

recall, and larger changes in knowledge, attitudes and behavior than could be achieved through low levels of media.¹⁰ Unfortunately, there is not a universal level of reach and frequency to recommend internationally. Each organization must work with media planning professionals in their country to determine what level of media presence is typically necessary in order to significantly build awareness and contribute to changes in knowledge, attitude and behaviors.

In the United States, Minnesota's *Secondhand Smoke* Awareness campaign invested considerably in its paid media placement including, but not limited to, placement of ads on every television station in the state, print ads in two statewide newspapers as well as in small community papers, extensive radio advertising, outdoor ads and public relations over a 15-month period. The results of the campaign included extremely high campaign recall and main message recall, and significant increases in the percentages of respondents reporting that they 1) felt that secondhand smoke was harmful, 2) had recently asked a friend or relative not to smoke, and 3) had decreased their own smoking.

Also in the United States, New York's *NYTCP Secondhand Smoke* campaign began in 2005 with multiple ads running concurrently, resulting in high awareness of advertisements related to secondhand smoke. Then, in late 2005 and early 2006, a significant multi-month decrease in ad placement occurred. The result was an immediate shift downwards in ad awareness.

Interestingly, both the Minnesota and New York campaigns measured a positive correlation between the presence of secondhand smoke ads and viewers' increased awareness of the harms of secondhand smoke. The two campaigns, however, had differing results related to whether or not awareness of the harms of secondhand smoke translated into specific actions. In Minnesota, where spending was strong and consistent over 15 months, there was a strong positive correlation between smokers' understanding of secondhand smoke harms and either asking others not to smoke around them or attempting to stop smoking. In New York, although campaign staff saw a significant increase in the percentage of respondents recognizing the negative effects of secondhand smoke, that knowledge build did not cause respondents to impose home smoking bans, one of the key behavioral measures for that campaign. This could have been influenced by the

unplanned gaps in advertising in New York, or perhaps because achieving behavior change within the home is more difficult than asking smokers not to smoke in other locales.

Another example of the importance of well-placed ads with strong media presence include the Western Australia campaign which attributed significant attitude changes to the strong presence of evidence-based ads. Campaign planners' experience in India, on the other hand, illustrates the challenges of reaching and influencing the majority of the population in a large country—their significant media spending of USD 2.8 million led to lower than hoped for levels of recall. This reinforced to them the need for long-term, dedicated campaign efforts in order to make significant changes in a country as large and diverse as India.

Content Lessons

1. Testimonials, or personal stories, can persuasively and credibly communicate the dangers of secondhand smoke and the need to protect people from it.

Testimonials—real stories from those negatively impacted by secondhand smoke—can significantly impact audiences' knowledge and attitudes. One example is from a 2002-2003 Canadian campaign which relied on the testimonial of a waitress, Heather Crowe, who had lung cancer—she never smoked but had been exposed to secondhand smoke for many years at work. Heather not only appeared in television, cinema, transit and print ads but also visited with many municipal, provincial and territorial leaders cross Canada, advocating for smoke-free workplaces. This campaign generated extremely high recall, was perceived by survey respondents as believable, and was believed by Health Canada to be a key catalyst for smoke-free legislation.

In some cases, testimonial-type ads are produced using *actors*, not regular people telling their own stories. One example is a United States (California) ad titled 'Victim Wife.' about a man whose wife died due to her exposure to the secondhand smoke from his cigarettes. The ad generated more calls to the smokers' helpline than any previous advertisement. Although an actor was used for this ad, he had a similar experience to the story in the ad. He, too, lost someone close to him from secondhand smoke; thus, he was able to deliver the lines of the script with emotion and conviction.¹¹

In the United States, the state of Nebraska also had

good results from airing the 'Victim Wife' ad in 2004. A 2006 survey found that the 'Victim Wife' ad generated the second highest recall among various ads aired over the previous few years.⁶ Furthermore, in Canada (Ontario)'s *Anti-Tobacco Strategy: Mass Media Campaign*, staff found that the 'Victim Wife' ad and another testimonial-type ad personalized the issue more than other creative approaches tested and were perceived credibly by viewers, helping to change their attitudes related to secondhand smoke and acceptability of tobacco use.

Sometimes using an actor for a testimonial-type ad is required due to the inability or unwillingness of the actual person to tell his/her story (for health or other reasons). Other times, using actors allows for better delivery of the story. To be credible and evoke emotion, campaign staff in New South Wales, Australia found that testimonials need to reflect a tangible age for the target audience (not too old or too young) and need to visibly show the effects of the disease (i.e., sores produced by mouth cancer or hair loss caused by chemotherapy).¹³

Some examples from *stop smoking campaigns* corroborate the strength of testimonial and testimonial-type advertisements. Campaigns in several countries had success using such testimonial ads with regular people to communicate hard-hitting "why to quit" messages and/or supportive, hopeful "how to quit" messages¹⁴. Qualitative research and anecdotal evidence suggest that one reason audiences are receptive to the ads is because they can relate to the people in the ads. In Australia (New South Wales) and United States (Minnesota), airing testimonial-type TV ads to motivate smokers to quit initially caused some negative publicity because of the ads' use of actors rather than regular people; however, in both cases, campaign outcomes were positive, in terms of motivating people to try to quit.¹⁵

These results suggest that using *actors* in testimonial-type ads did not hinder their effectiveness; however, negative publicity might have been avoided if the campaign planners had proactively communicated with the news media about the reasons for choosing to use actors rather than the actual people who had suffered from the negative consequences of tobacco use or secondhand smoke. One strategy now used by the Cancer Institute NSW to diffuse or avoid criticism is to ensure that they use a person whose real story matches the ad as a spokesperson for interactions with the news media.¹⁶

The testimonial format should be considered for cost-efficiently reaching and influencing specific populations who want to see people like themselves in ads. The documentary style of testimonials does not require the high production quality of other types of ads, allowing for production budgets to go further in order to produce ads tailored to a variety of specific populations.

2. **Focusing on the negative health impacts of secondhand smoke appears to be an effective strategy for building knowledge of the dangers of secondhand smoke, changing attitudes about secondhand smoke and building support for protecting people from it.**

One of the strongest links among the campaign case studies is the common focus on the health harms of secondhand smoke. While difficult to quantify the exact impact of focusing on health versus other topics, the number of campaigns focused on health that have successfully built knowledge, changed attitudes or impacted behaviors indicates that it can be an effective strategy. Additionally, many campaign managers interviewed for this review said they had found that the topic of health was the strongest argument that could be made in their communities to support smoke-free environments.

Because the facts about the negative health consequences of secondhand smoke are so sound and widely accepted in the medical and public health communities, those against smoke-free public place policies rarely focus on health in *their* arguments, and instead focus on topics such as economic impact and individual rights. Experience has shown that the health arguments, properly delivered, are typically more compelling than these other topics and usually convince the public of the importance of smoke-free policies for protecting everyone's health.

Smoke-free Ireland maintained its focus on health, even in the face of strong arguments regarding economics and individual rights that were publicized by smoke-free opponents and the news media. This approach helped to achieve strong public approval of the smoke-free workplace law and very high compliance with it. United States (New York City) also found that using compelling health data to frame the smoke-free policy debate allowed staff to thwart attempts by smoke-free opponents to distract the public and policy makers with other issues. The Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids' research in the United States corroborated this focus, concluding that health arguments were much more persua-

sive than economic arguments in gaining support for smoke-free laws.

Due to parents' lack of understanding of the full health implications of secondhand smoke, England's *Smoking Kids* campaign focused on health, resulting in increases in knowledge about the harms of secondhand smoke, particularly to children. Vietnam's *Speak Up* campaign also used health as the main topic in ads, showing images of smoke entering children's bodies and describing the negative health consequences of secondhand smoke.

In England's *Smoke is Poison* campaign, the ads focused on the toxic makeup of secondhand smoke, indirectly making a link to health. Results for this campaign were positive, building adult viewers' awareness of the dangers of secondhand smoke after seeing the ads. Other areas in which campaigns have effectively focused on negative health effects of secondhand smoke include New Zealand, the Philippines, and United States (New Mexico).

3. **Ads that elicit negative emotions or discomfort from the audience typically generate high levels of persuasiveness, even when the ads are not perceived as enjoyable.**

Ads that elicit negative emotions have been found to be persuasive, particularly when trying to convince people of the dangers of secondhand smoke. While these ads are sometimes defined by viewers as difficult to watch or as causing uneasiness, this aversion typically seems to enhance rather than inhibit their impact. However, it is important that ads eliciting negative emotions do so while respecting the target audience—for example, not using highly emotional content to criticize or ridicule smokers. (For more on the need to communicate respectfully with smokers, see the following Lesson Learned.)

In the *Smoke-free Hong Kong* campaign's evaluation study, respondents were asked to view each campaign ad and define it as either humorous or gruesome. The ad defined as humorous was reported to be enjoyable and resulted in higher recall than the two ads considered gruesome, however this did not translate into a higher level of persuasiveness. The ads considered gruesome generated higher levels of persuasiveness. In the New Zealand Workplace Concept Testing research, some ads that were less favorably received among viewers had a higher likelihood of influencing their secondhand smoke attitudes, knowledge, and behavior. The Hong Kong and New Zealand examples highlight the need to look beyond favorability and likeability

to determine what is likely to be most effective in achieving campaign objectives.

In the United States, the *New York Tobacco Control Program Secondhand Smoke Campaign* found that significantly more smokers strongly agreed that the messages in “high impact advertisements” “said something important” than the messages in “low impact” advertisements. Matthew Farrelly, of the research group RTI International which produced the campaign’s evaluation report, defined “high impact” ads as those that “use graphic images and/or strong negative emotional appeals.”

Furthermore, in France, the secondhand smoke campaign featuring the ‘Maison’ and ‘Enterprise’ ads not only generated very high awareness, high recall of specific ad elements (e.g., the piles of cigarettes and the child and office worker) and higher levels of concern for the health of self and others than the previous five campaigns conducted by INPES, it was also the most accepted of the previous campaigns among smokers and nonsmokers, despite its hard-hitting emotional ads.

These examples are supported by other tobacco control research on this topic. For example, research conducted in the United States (Massachusetts) found that advertisements eliciting strong negative emotions in a smoking cessation campaign were rated as being more effective by quitters or those who were planning to quit than humorous or neutral ads. Research on tobacco control advertisements that elicit negative emotions included both adult and youth audiences.¹⁷

It is important to note, however, that in order to motivate smokers to take action, in some cases it may be necessary to combine ads eliciting negative emotions with ads that are more positive in tone, for example emphasizing self-efficacy. Similar to the lesson learned from stop smoking campaigns that hard-hitting “why to quit” and hopeful, supportive “how to quit” messages are an effective combination employed in many campaigns, in secondhand smoke campaigns sometimes educating the population about the harms of secondhand smoke can be effectively combined with celebrating the positive actions that individuals can take to protect each other from those harms (see case studies from Norway, Uruguay and England (Smoke-Free)).¹⁸ This is consistent with some literature about the limitations of fear messages alone.¹⁹

4. Portraying innocent victims exposed to secondhand smoke can motivate smokers to avoid smoking around others, particularly in personal settings such as homes and cars.

Many successful secondhand smoke ads include images of, and messages related to, those negatively affected by secondhand smoke. In particular, many of these ads focus on innocent victims, those people who are unable to voice their disapproval of secondhand smoke or are unable to change their environments to avoid exposure to it.

The ad concept that Australia’s (Victoria) ‘Repeat’ advertisement was based on—containing the image of smoke entering the lungs of a young girl while her father smoked—tested positively against three other concepts during pre-campaign evaluation. Specifically, the evaluation found that smokers were prompted by the concept “...to reconsider their smoking behaviors...” based on this imagery.

England’s *Smoking Kids* campaign produced very positive results by portraying children as innocent victims. The TV ad showed children appearing to have smoke coming out of their noses and mouths to visualize how they breathe smoke in and out when in smoke-filled environments. Campaign staff emphasized that the use of innocent victims, especially kids, was the best way to deflect the argument that often comes from smokers—specifically that, “this is my life and I can do with it what I want.”

In the United States, California’s ‘Victim Wife’ advertisement – showing a man talking about his wife who died from exposure to his secondhand smoke –also represented an innocent victim, even though the victim herself was not present in the commercial.²⁰

In the United States, the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids’ research corroborated that most people agree vulnerable populations (i.e., elderly, children, those with health problems) should be protected from secondhand smoke.

Additional campaigns that have depicted adults and/or children as innocent victims include Australia (New South Wales) ‘*Car & Home: Smoke-free Zone*’, France’s ‘Maison’ and ‘Entreprise’ advertisements, Western Australia’s *Smoke-free Home & Car*, India’s *Phase 1 Smokefree*, Canada’s *Heather Crowe*, Canada’s *Breathing Space* and Poland’s *Clearing the Air*.

The following Lesson Learned highlights in greater detail the use of children as subject matter in campaigns.

5. **Showing the impact of secondhand smoke on children generally mutes smokers' arguments about individual rights to smoke.**

Smokers often argue that they have the right to smoke if they want to, despite acknowledging the adverse health effects of smoking on themselves. However, even smokers resistant to change have difficulty making this argument when the impact on children becomes part of the discussion.

The combination of evidence that secondhand smoke is harmful and the emotive power of children combine to persuade many smokers not to smoke around children. Moreover, some research shows that the impact of their smoking on children is a significant reason for smokers to consider quitting altogether.²¹ For example, see *Secondhand Smoke in Domestic Settings* from New Zealand; *Smoking Kids* from England; the three smoke-free home and car campaigns from Australia; and *Speak Up* from Vietnam. Each of these case studies, either through their target audience research or in their outcome results, provides some evidence that smokers changed their attitudes and beliefs when arguments against secondhand smoke involved the health of children.

Research conducted for New Zealand's *Secondhand Smoke in Domestic Settings* campaign resulted in very specific recommendations to use children over two years old, not babies, in ads to most credibly and persuasively communicate the impact of secondhand smoke on children. Specifically, respondents felt that infant portrayals were unrealistic—most smokers said they would never smoke around a child and were upset that the ad would represent smokers doing something so insensitive. Also, research data revealed that some smokers perceived older children (i.e., 10 years or older) as having the ability to make their own decision to move away from smoke.

In Canada's 2005 *Secondhand Smoke in the Home & Car* campaign and Western Australia's 2007 *Smoke-Free Home & Car* campaign, staff found it very challenging to clear up misconceptions about what constitute safe, protective behaviors—most smokers felt they could completely protect family members from secondhand smoke by smoking with doors and windows open, smoking in other rooms, using fans, etc. Inroads were made in Canada when their

2006-07 *Secondhand Smoke in the Home & Car* campaign was able to significantly reduce the level of misconceptions by addressing them directly.

Note that there are significant considerations when deciding to focus on the effects of secondhand smoke on children, which make this focus more appropriate for changing behaviors in personal settings (i.e., homes and cars) and less appropriate for building support for smoke-free public place and workplace laws (see below point for more details).

6. **Focusing on protecting one segment of the population from secondhand smoke (such as wait staff or children) provides strategic specificity and clarity, but also requires trade-offs.**

As mentioned above, focusing on children may influence the attitudes and behaviors of parents and other caretakers, but doing so may exempt those who do not live, or interact frequently with, children. For example, a 2000 UK report *A Breath of Fresh Air: Tackling Smoking through the Media* cited qualitative research in which some smokers without children felt exempted from advertising messages emphasizing secondhand smoke effects on children.²² Focusing on children may be particularly useful when seeking to change behaviors in personal settings, such as in homes and cars, but might be less useful in campaigns with other objectives, such as those seeking to build support for smoke-free workplace legislation. A focus on protecting children excludes a broad range of public places and worksites, providing the opposition with an opportunity to argue for exempting bars and other worksites from comprehensive measures while also introducing harmful policies like restricting smoking only when children are present or only during certain times of the day or night.

Similarly, as revealed in the United States' Tobacco-Free Kids case study, focusing on workers may make audiences think the secondhand smoke issue is only relevant to workplaces and to those individuals who are exposed to secondhand smoke for long periods of time each day. Many respondents viewed intermittent exposure as more annoying than harmful, except for certain vulnerable populations such as children, the elderly and people with health conditions.

Emphasizing the impact of secondhand smoke on workers may garner support for smoke-free policies in countries where workers' rights are a priority but may not be as salient in countries where the major-

ity of the population does not sympathize with hospitality workers. Campaigns in Norway and Ireland succeeded in building support for their smoke-free laws when they employed a workers' rights message, however in New Zealand (see the Workplace Concept Testing case study) and in the United States (see the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids case study), audiences were not generally persuaded by the workers' rights approach alone. In the CTFK research, they also found that respondents considered bars and restaurants as sites of entertainment or leisure rather than as workplaces. In situations like this, communicating messages about the right of *all* people to breathe clean air, versus the right of workers alone, may be more effective.

On the other hand, focusing on workplaces might make the message more palatable to a broader audience because they may not conclude that the government is trying to dictate people's behaviors in personal settings, such as in homes and cars.

Bottom line, in considering the focus of a secondhand smoke campaign, planners must consider the trade-offs and ensure that stakeholders agree that the benefits of focusing on one segment outweigh the potential negatives.

7. Advertisements that do not attack or demean smokers are typically better accepted by smokers (and in some cases also by non-smokers), influencing smokers to change their behaviors more effectively than messages perceived as critical or judgmental of them.

As has been found in other tobacco control campaign reviews, smokers often admit to feeling under attack and judged by the broader community when it comes to the topic of smoking. Moreover, smokers often do not appreciate messages that they perceive as speaking down to them or criticizing their decisions and/or behaviors. Secondhand smoke advertisements reviewed for this study that depicted smokers positively and showed them as being concerned about the health of others and for their children (when relevant) were generally received more positively by smokers than ads that did not. This is consistent with conclusions from two international reviews of stop smoking campaigns, in which smokers wanted communications to acknowledge their struggles and speak to them respectfully.²³

For example, during pre-campaign evaluation for Australia's *Car & Home: Smoke-free Zone* campaign, ad concepts that modeled positive behavior were better received by respondents than ads showing smok-

ing parents behaving in ways that were perceived as unrealistically negative (e.g., blowing smoke in a child's face). Likewise, the Workplace Concept Testing in New Zealand indicated that smokers preferred the positive tag line "Let's Clear the Air" versus "Please, Put it out or Take it out," the latter of which was perceived as confrontational and authoritarian. The testing also found that ad concepts showing workers who were distressed by secondhand smoke were perceived as diminishing the workers' professionalism, and thus negatively influenced the overall perception of those ad concepts.

Target audience research for the *Secondhand Smoke in Domestic Settings* campaigns in New Zealand indicated that smokers sought more acknowledgment for the changes they had already undergone in their smoking behaviors, such as the attempts they had already made to not smoke near their loved ones, and they desired to be portrayed positively. The research also indicated that marginalizing smokers would likely be counter-productive, causing them to reject messages about changing their behaviors to support smoke-free environments.

Staff on the Mexico *Finally, They are Giving us a Break/Breather* campaign found that the radio ads they produced and aired without time for pre-testing were perceived by some smokers, business owners and even nonsmokers as being antagonistic and aggressive toward smokers. Research respondents claimed to prefer a more positive tone that brought smokers and nonsmokers together, to motivate everyone to comply with the smoke-free law.

In Uruguay, the *Un Millón de Gracias* campaign used a positive tone to thank smokers in advance for trying to uphold the smoke-free law and refrain from smoking around others. Results indicated this approach was effective, since the vast majority of respondents (including a majority of smokers) in a post-campaign survey felt that "Secondhand smoke is dangerous to non-smokers" and that "All workers have the right to work in an environment free of other people's smoke. In addition, the majority of smokers interviewed said they supported the smoke-free law, with only a small percentage saying they had no opinion and just one quarter saying they did not support the law.

8. Successfully communicating with specific populations requires understanding how members of each sub-population view themselves in relation to the general population and how they prefer to be portrayed.

While data were limited regarding how best to communicate about secondhand smoke to specific populations (unique racial, socio-economic, cultural, gender, or ethnic sub-groups within a community), the experiences of a few countries made it clear that not all specific populations desire or appreciate ads that are targeted solely to them.

In New Zealand's *Secondhand Smoke in Domestic Settings* campaign, campaign staff found that ads showing a mix of people of various ethnicities were more accepted by Maori, the Indigenous population, than ads portraying Maori people alone. Concept testing revealed concern that focusing on a single ethnic group could potentially stigmatize that group and distract from the goal of reducing children's exposure to secondhand smoke.

Focus group research conducted among primarily urban Aboriginal youth and adults in six Canadian provinces found that respondents considered themselves to be mainstream Canadians, desiring the same messages in the same formats and languages as non-Aboriginal audiences. The Canadian research also found that when depictions of their communities were used, Aboriginal audiences desired realistic portrayals versus portrayals that they considered to be "stereotypes" (such as picturing a native person dancing at a pow-wow or other traditional celebration or event).²⁴ Note that if this research had been done in a reservation setting, respondents' preferences would likely have been different—experience in Canada suggests that more rural Aboriginal populations want to see and hear communications tailored to them, in terms of language and depictions of them.²⁵

9. Secondhand smoke campaigns may motivate some smokers to quit, so campaigns should plan accordingly.

Some secondhand smoke campaigns, either conducted alone or in coordination with the implementation of smoke-free laws, have been shown to lead smokers to want to quit; thus, program staff should be prepared for this possible outcome by making available and publicizing resources to quit smoking. In addition, campaign staff may want to measure cessation-related attitudes and behaviors in their pre- and post-campaign evaluations to determine the campaign's impact on the percentage of smokers wanting to quit, taking action to quit or

successfully quitting.

One example is from England's *Smoking Kids* campaign which sought to motivate parents not to smoke around their children. Campaign results indicated that not only did more parents claim to not smoke around their children after the campaign but also that a significant number of smoking parents said the campaign motivated them to want to quit smoking.

In New York and Maryland in the United States, materials were designed, adapted, and/or selected based on their ability to not just educate people about the harms of secondhand smoke but also to motivate smokers to want to quit. Campaign results indicated that they were successful—both in New York and Maryland, calls to the quit line increased significantly when secondhand smoke advertisements were aired. In the United States (Minnesota), too, quitting interest and smoking cessation attempts rose following the implementation of the 2007 smoke-free law and the accompanying campaign.

An example from Ireland shows the risks of not fully preparing to support smokers who want to quit as a result of secondhand smoke campaigns. Ireland's secondhand smoke campaign contributed to an extremely successful implementation of, and very high compliance with, their smoke-free law; however smoking prevalence did not decline significantly over time. Campaign staff felt that not emphasizing quitting resources more aggressively was a missed opportunity in the campaign.²⁶

10. The tone of secondhand smoke campaigns and ads (i.e., serious, humorous, emotional, authoritative) may differ significantly based on the primary goal of the campaign.

Numerous strategies can be taken when addressing secondhand smoke topics, as is evidenced in the wide variety of approaches reflected in the case studies. However, some commonalities were noted in terms of the tone used for various campaigns that shared a primary goal.

In campaigns that aim to educate the population about the harms of secondhand smoke in order to change individual behaviors and/or gain the general population's agreement on the need to protect people from secondhand smoke, the tone is typically serious and authoritative, and the words and visuals are quite hard-hitting, eliciting negative emotions. This tone often is used to gain and keep audiences' attention and to cause them to take the

topic seriously—to internalize the information, to ponder it and to discuss it with others. Examples of this approach include England’s *Smoking Kids*, England’s *Smoke is Poison*, Canada’s *Heather Crowe*, France’s ‘Maison’ (‘House’) and ‘Entreprise’ (‘Business’) and United States’ (California) ‘Victim Wife’ (mentioned in the Canada (Ontario) *Anti-Tobacco Strategy: Mass Media Campaign* case study).

In campaigns that aim to announce the passing of a new smoke-free law and its future implementation and/or prepare people for it, the tone is typically more neutral to positive, sometimes combining facts and visuals about the dangers of secondhand smoke with information about the new law and when it will be implemented. The clear and somewhat neutral approach often is used to ensure that everyone understands why the law is being implemented, what it covers and how to comply with it. Examples of this approach include Ireland’s *Smoke-Free Implementation*, Turkey’s *Smoke-Free Policy Implementation* and England’s *Smoke-Free England* campaign.

In some campaigns that announce the immediate implementation of new smoke-free laws and in

most campaigns that seek to build compliance with smoke-free laws, the tone is typically light, very positive, sometimes celebratory, and sometimes even humorous. This tone is often employed in order to make people feel good about supporting smoke-free policies and to lessen the divisions between smokers and non-smokers, emphasizing the benefits that everyone can enjoy when environments are smoke-free. Examples of this approach include Israel’s *The Shy*, Norway’s *Smoke-Free Hospitality*, Australia (Queensland)’s *Nobody Smokes Here Anymore*, United States (Maryland)’s *air!* and Uruguay’s *Un Millón de Gracias* (A Million Thanks).

In addition, in some countries and in some situations, campaigns change their tone over time as they move along this continuum. Examples of this are from Hong Kong, England, and United States (Minnesota).

Although there is not an absolute correlation between the tone of each campaign and its message, there does seem to be a *general* continuum along which certain campaign objectives and certain tones line up, as illustrated in the diagram below.

Campaign Objective / Tone Continuum

