

Final Report
QUALITATIVE TESTING
OF SECOND-HAND SMOKE
CAR RADIO SPOT

Prepared for
The Tobacco Control Programme
Health Canada

Contract #: H1011-040089/001/CY POR-04-100

March, 2005

LES ÉTUDES DE MARCHÉ CRÉATEC +

206 Avenue des Pins East - Montreal (Québec) H2W 1P1

Tel.: (514) 844-1127 - Fax: (514) 288-3194

Email: info@createc.ca / Web Site: www.createc.ca

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	1
1.1	<u>BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY</u>	1
1.2	<u>KEY FINDINGS</u>	1
1.3	<u>IMPLICATIONS</u>	2
2.	<u>SYNTHÈSE DES RÉSULTATS</u>	4
2.1	<u>CONTEXTE, BUT ET MÉTHODOLOGIE</u>	4
2.2	<u>PRINCIPAUX RÉSULTATS</u>	4
2.3	<u>IMPLICATIONS</u>	5
3.	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	7
3.1	<u>BACKGROUND</u>	7
3.2	<u>PURPOSE OF THE STUDY</u>	7
3.3	<u>QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGY</u>	8
3.4	<u>TARGET AUDIENCES</u>	8
3.5	<u>SELECTION CRITERIA</u>	8
3.6	<u>PARTICIPANT INCENTIVE</u>	8
3.7	<u>DISCUSSION GUIDE</u>	9
3.8	<u>RESEARCH TEAM</u>	9
3.9	<u>ABOUT THIS REPORT</u>	9
4.	<u>DETAILED FINDINGS</u>	10
4.1	<u>OVERVIEW</u>	11
4.2	<u>KEY FINDINGS FOR INDIVIDUAL CONCEPTS</u>	14
4.2.1	<u>Concept A: Kids</u>	14
4.2.2	<u>Concept B: Safety</u>	18
4.2.3	<u>Concept C: Spelling</u>	21
4.3	<u>CONCLUDING COMMENTS</u>	26

APPENDIX 1 - WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRE VERBATIMS

APPENDIX 2 - DISCUSSION GUIDE (English and French)

APPENDIX 3 - SCRIPTS OF THE RADIO ADS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

- The Tobacco Control Programme (TCP), under the auspices of Health Canada, wanted to launch a national radio campaign in March 2005, to increase awareness among adults 20-55 (smokers and non-smokers living with smokers) on the dangers of second-hand smoke and to have them stop smoking when children under 18 are in their cars.
- The main purpose of the study was to test the communication effectiveness and attention-getting ability of 3 proposed creative radio concepts: Kids, Safety and Spelling.
- Accordingly, 4 x 90-minute focus groups with the target audiences were conducted, 2 each in Montreal (French) and Toronto (English), with a total of 28 participants on February 28 and March 1, 2005.
- By its very nature, focus groups, as all other qualitative methods do not provide measurable or quantifiable results. Findings may or may not reflect the opinions and suggestions of the target audiences at large.

1.2 KEY FINDINGS

- Smokers and non-smokers alike were well aware of the harmful effects of second-hand smoke, particularly on children, and many smokers took precautions around children in their homes. In cars, some smokers felt that opening a window reduced or eliminated the harm, while several others did not smoke in cars when children were present.
- As parents, all expressed concern about the health and well-being of their children. But tension existed between doing right by their children and satisfying their addiction.
- Overall, all 3 concepts received positive reaction, and had potential and definite strengths as radio ads. In addition, Toronto respondents could visualize all 3 as TV ads.
- Safety (Concept B) seemed to have many positives, virtually no real negatives, and no major improvements to be made. It could be broadcast, as is because (1) the straightforward and clear adult tone and irony effectively conveyed the message, (2) the idea that buckling a child into seat belts (plus other safety measures) and then smoking were contradictory was a new one which made sense, (3) the subtle approach and message was more palatable to smokers, and (4) it did not use children and was considered the least offensive.

- The other 2 concepts seemed to create more controversy because (1) they both packed an emotional punch and paired seemingly young children with a direct link to disease and second-hand smoke, and (2) the children made smokers feel guilty and somewhat harassed.
- Kids (Concept A) had many positives, but some strong negatives, including a first impression dislike of the "whiny" children, which some said could be a great excuse for smokers not to pay attention. While the depiction of kids complaining in the car was realistic and easy for parents to identify with, and while the perceived message was on target for some, others felt that hearing "Are we there yet?" would wear quickly, and that the idea was not original. In addition, it was debatable whether children would or would not tell their parents that smoke bothered them. Some agreed with the ad's premise, while others said their children spoke up.
- Spelling (Concept C) generated the most polarized reaction, positive and negative. The information about opening the window was educational, new, thought-provoking and had broad appeal, because it directly contradicted some cherished beliefs that "cracking open" the car window would dilute the effects of second-hand smoke. On the other hand, while some thought the children's spelling was realistic, others felt the words were too difficult for children that young, and that the whining voices and spelling of diseases would wear quickly. This concept seemed to induce guilt and irritation in smokers.

1.3 IMPLICATIONS

- If Health Canada wanted to, all 3 concepts have merit, and could be used in a radio campaign.
- Safety (Concept B) would be the first spot to launch in both English and French because it meets the objectives of the campaign head-on. It directly confronts current behaviour, and would be the most likely to encourage smokers to change their thinking and actions in their cars. The sound effects on Safety strongly enhanced the impact of the ad and made it easy to remember. Plus, the irony of incoherence appealed to both reason and emotion.
 - Note that there is a fine balance to be struck between disturbing smokers enough to get them to consider change, and disturbing them so much that their resistances are activated. Concept B accomplished the former.
- Perhaps, to add even more of a punch, the idea that "cracking open a window" doesn't get rid of the smoke (which had strong appeal in Concept C), could be added to Concept B.
 - In fact, the open-window idea could be added to each concept as a unifying link for the campaign.
- Kids (Concept A) and Spelling (Concept C) both made more of a direct emotional hit, but overall seemed to include a range of fuzzier, less car-specific anti-smoking messages.

- Smokers expressed their irritation and frustration at the difficulties of finding a place to smoke, and how much they are hassled everywhere. Both Concepts A and C were seen to continue such a barrage, inducing guilt and conflicting feelings related to disease-inducing second-hand smoke, which may or may not lead to specific behavioural changes in their cars. Further irritation could encourage more resistance, rather than change.
- However, both Concepts A and C do have merit.
- Concept A could be the second ad in the campaign, with 3 main adjustments:
 - Have the children speak in a less whiny, more direct tone, perhaps criticizing parental in-car smoking behaviour. Some parents described their children in just this way.
 - Adjust the sound track for the French version.
 - In addition, adding the open-window concept could make it even stronger.
- Concept C could also be adjusted, perhaps to make the child sound a bit older or a little more sophisticated (at the upper range of the spelling tendency), and perhaps choosing fewer or different diseases to spell.
 - In addition, perhaps cut the seemingly sarcastic statement at the end about spelling it out. While appealing to non-smokers, it might well be overkill and irritating to smokers.

2. SYNTHÈSE DES RÉSULTATS

2.1 CONTEXTE, BUT ET MÉTHODOLOGIE

- Le Programme de la lutte au tabagisme (PLT) de Santé Canada souhaitait lancer une campagne radio nationale au cours de mars 2005 afin d'accroître la notoriété des dangers de la fumée secondaire chez les adultes âgés de 20-25 ans (fumeurs ou non-fumeurs résidant avec des fumeurs) et les amener à cesser de fumer dans leur véhicule lorsque des enfants de moins de 18 ans sont présents.
- Le but premier de l'étude était de vérifier l'efficacité de la communication et la valeur de capte-attention de trois concepts publicitaires pour la radio : Enfants, Sécurité et Épellation.
- En conséquence, quatre groupes de discussion de 90 minutes chacun ont été menés avec des personnes du groupe ciblé, deux à Montréal (français) et deux à Toronto (anglais). Un total de 28 participants ont été réunis les 28 février et 1er mars 2005.
- La technique du groupe de discussion, tout comme n'importe quelle autre méthode qualitative, ne peut produire de résultats mesurables ou quantifiables. Les constats découlant de ces groupes peuvent être représentatifs ou non des opinions et suggestions de l'ensemble du groupe visé.

2.2 PRINCIPAUX RÉSULTATS

- Tant les fumeurs que les non-fumeurs étaient très au courant des effets nocifs de la fumée secondaire, particulièrement pour les enfants, et beaucoup de fumeurs prennent déjà des précautions lorsqu'il y a des enfants à la maison. Dans leur auto, certains fumeurs croyaient que le fait d'ouvrir une fenêtre réduisait ou même éliminait le risque, alors que d'autres ne fumaient pas du tout dans leur véhicule lorsqu'il y a des enfants.
- En tant que parents, tous ont exprimé des préoccupations reliées à la santé ou au bien-être de leurs enfants. Mais le désir de bien paraître aux yeux des enfants et le besoin de satisfaire leur dépendance créent des tensions.
- Dans l'ensemble, les trois concepts de création ont suscité une réaction positive, comportant des forces certaines et un potentiel pour en faire des messages radiophoniques. Par ailleurs, les participants de Toronto pouvaient imaginer chacun des trois concepts sous la forme d'annonces télévisées.
- Sécurité (Concept B) est ressorti avec plusieurs forces, pratiquement aucune faiblesse et aucune amélioration importante à lui apporter. Ce concept pourrait être mis en ondes tel quel car (1) le ton adulte direct, clair et l'ironie véhiculaient efficacement le message, (2) l'idée d'attacher un enfant à son siège (avec les autres mesures de sécurité) et ensuite de fumer était contradictoire, ce qui était nouveau et révélateur, (3) l'approche subtile et le message ont plu davantage aux fumeurs et (4) le fait de ne pas faire appel aux enfants rend ce concept le moins choquant de tous.

- Les deux autres concepts ont semblé provoquer plus de controverse car (1) les deux avaient une forte décharge émotive en associant les enfants à la maladie et la fumée secondaire et (2) les enfants faisaient sentir les fumeurs coupables tout en les harcelant quelque peu.
- Enfants (Concept A) comportait beaucoup de points forts mais aussi de grandes faiblesses, incluant une première impression déplaisante créée par les enfants « pleurnicheurs », qui font craindre à certains que cela soit récupéré comme une excuse par les fumeurs pour ne pas prêter attention au message. Bien que la scène des enfants se plaignant dans l'auto soit une situation réaliste à laquelle les parents s'identifient facilement et que le message ait été correctement capté par plusieurs, d'autres pensaient que le « *Est-ce qu'on arrive?* » s'userait vite et que l'idée manquait d'originalité. En outre, que les enfants disent ou non à leurs parents que la fumée secondaire les dérange était un sujet de débat. Certains penchaient en faveur de l'approche prise dans le concept; par contre, d'autres ont dit que leurs enfants s'exprimeraient ouvertement.
- Épellation (Concept C) a généré la réaction la plus polarisée, positive et négative. Ce qui était dit à propos de l'ouverture de la fenêtre était instructif, nouveau, portait à réflexion et a suscité un intérêt certain parce que cette information allait à l'encontre d'une idée préconçue à laquelle on croyait : en gardant la fenêtre de l'auto légèrement ouverte, on diminuait les effets de la fumée secondaire. D'autre part, tandis que certains ont trouvé réaliste l'épellation des enfants, d'autres avaient le sentiment que les mots étaient trop difficiles pour de si jeunes enfants et que l'impact des voix « plaignardes » qui épelaient les maladies allait s'user rapidement. Ce concept semblait occasionner de la culpabilité et de l'irritation chez les fumeurs.

2.3 IMPLICATIONS

- Si Santé Canada le désire, les trois concepts de création ont chacun leurs mérites et pourraient faire l'objet d'un message radiophonique.
- Sécurité (Concept B) pourrait être la première capsule à être diffusée dans les deux langues officielles parce que ce concept rencontre complètement les objectifs souhaités pour cette campagne. Il remet directement en question le comportement actuel et il est le plus susceptible d'encourager les fumeurs à modifier leur façon de penser et d'agir dans leur auto. Les effets sonores de Sécurité ont fortement amplifié l'impact de l'annonce et l'ont rendue facile à mémoriser. En plus, l'ironie de l'incohérence s'adressait autant à la raison qu'aux émotions.
 - On notera qu'il y a un équilibre subtil à réaliser entre déranger suffisamment les fumeurs afin qu'ils envisagent changer de comportement et les rendre si inconfortables que leur résistance est activée. Dans le Concept B, cet équilibre était réussi.
- On pourrait peut-être rendre ce concept encore plus frappant si on lui incorporait l'idée qu'une ouverture de la fenêtre ne fait pas disparaître la fumée (idée qui a eu un large écho dans le Concept C).
 - En fait, l'idée de l'ouverture dans la fenêtre pourrait être un élément de cohésion de la campagne, présent dans chacun des concepts.

- Enfants (Concept A) et Épellation (Concept C). Tous deux se sont avérés avoir une forte charge émotive, mais dans l'ensemble, ils semblaient aussi transmettre une variété de messages assez flous et moins spécifiques à l'auto.
 - Les fumeurs ont manifesté leur irritation et frustration quant à la difficulté de trouver un endroit pour fumer et du harcèlement généralisé dont ils sont l'objet. Les concepts A et C ont été perçus comme une continuité de ce harcèlement, suscitant la culpabilité et des sentiments conflictuels au sujet des maladies occasionnées par la fumée secondaire, ce qui peut ou non les amener à modifier leur comportement en auto. Une forte irritation peut susciter plus de résistance qu'un changement de comportement.
- Cependant, les concepts A et B ont tous deux leurs mérites.
- Le concept A pourrait être la seconde annonce de la campagne, après trois ajustements :
 - Rendre les enfants moins pleurnichards, un ton plus direct, peut-être plus critique du tabagisme de leurs parents en automobile. Certains parents ont considéré cette façon d'être plus réaliste et reflétant le comportement de leurs propres enfants.
 - Régler la trame sonore de la version française.
 - Enfin, ajouter l'idée de l'ouverture de la fenêtre pour donner plus de force à l'annonce.
- Le concept C peut aussi être ajusté, peut-être en vieillissant un peu les enfants ou en les rendant plus subtils, et peut-être aussi en choisissant moins de maladies ou des maladies différentes à épeler.
 - Enfin, peut-être également éliminer l'affirmation à tonalité sarcastique à la fin, au sujet de l'épellation. Bien que cette affirmation plaise aux non-fumeurs, il se pourrait qu'elle soit trop poussée et trop irritante pour les fumeurs.

3. INTRODUCTION

3.1 BACKGROUND

- As part of an ongoing effort to address the health hazards of second-hand smoke, an important issue for the federal government, the Tobacco Control Programme (TCP), under the auspices of Health Canada, planned to launch a national radio campaign aimed at parents, to reduce the number of children under 18 exposed to second-hand smoke when traveling in a car.
 - The aim of the campaign: to increase awareness among adults 20-55 (smokers and non-smokers living with smokers) on the dangers of second-hand smoke and to have them stop smoking when children under 18 are in their cars.
- The campaign was scheduled to run for three weeks in March 2005. In this context, a disaster check was proposed with smokers and non-smokers, to assess their feelings about 3 potential creative radio spots.

3.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

- The purpose of the study was twofold:
 - 1) To test the communication effectiveness and attention-getting ability of 3 creative radio concepts, in terms of:
 - Credibility and relevance
 - Sensitivity to the cultural and emotional feelings of the targeted audiences
 - Memorability
 - Effective communication of the intended message
 - Appropriateness for radio, and car-radio listening
 - Motivation to intended action (i.e., decrease smoking while children are in the car)
 - Capacity to mobilize public support behind government action.
 - 2) To gather insights on parent's attitudes, knowledge and behaviours with regards to second-hand smoke, specifically with reference to their smoking behaviour while driving with other passengers in the vehicle.

3.3 QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGY

- Given the nature of the research objectives, 4 x 90-minute focus groups with the target audiences were conducted, 2 each in Montreal (French) and Toronto (English), with a total of 28 participants on February 28 and March 1 2005.
- After some brief introductory remarks, participants in each group listened to one concept, answered a few questions on a written questionnaire to capture their first impressions, were probed on their reactions, and then heard the concept a second time before being queried along the lines of the appended discussion guide. This procedure was followed for the remaining 2 concepts. To avoid order bias, the 3 concepts were played in rotation sequence.
- By its very nature, focus groups, as all other qualitative methods (such as individual in-depth interviews) do not provide measurable or quantifiable results. Findings may or may not reflect the opinions and suggestions of the target audiences. However, qualitative research elicits many levels of reaction to the issues under study and allows us to learn in-depth the responses to the advertising material. Such an in-depth review of communication factors is not possible with a quantitative survey. Since the approach to the work is not based on the principles of probability sampling, it is left to the judgment of the reader to evaluate the direction and guidance generated from such research.

3.4 TARGET AUDIENCES

- The target audiences were comprised of 2 main groups:
 - Smokers (adults aged 20-55, mixture of males and females with children in the home) who sometimes or frequently smoke in the car.
 - Non-smokers living with smokers (adults aged 20-55, mixture of males and females with children in the home).

3.5 SELECTION CRITERIA

- Participants had not participated in a focus group over the last year.
- Some usual employment categories were excluded (e.g., public relations, advertising and market research agencies, all forms of media, as well as those who directly or indirectly were involved with the tobacco industry).

3.6 PARTICIPANT INCENTIVE

- All respondents received an incentive payment of \$45 to thank them for participating.

3.7 DISCUSSION GUIDE

- All groups were conducted as per the outline of the appended Discussion Guide, except for the knowledge, attitudes and behaviour (KAB) section, which was omitted in Toronto due to heavy snowfall and resulting late starts. However, some of that information was covered while discussing the concepts.
- Individual questionnaires were administered to each person immediately after exposure to each radio spot, to facilitate probing of opinion differences.
 - First impression verbatims from these questionnaires are provided in the Appendix.
- Health Canada provided CDs of the 3 creative concepts tested (see Appendix 3):
 - Concept A: Kids
 - Concept B: Safety
 - Concept C: Spelling

3.8 RESEARCH TEAM

- **Mr. Grégoire Gollin** was the project manager, responsible for client relations, the design of the work methodology and supervision of the final report as well as overall coordination.
- **Ms. Natalie Gold** (based in Toronto) moderated the Toronto sessions (English), incorporating findings from all 4 sessions and wrote this Summary Report.
- **Ms. Louise Saint Pierre** (based in Montreal) moderated and analyzed the sessions in Montreal (French).

3.9 ABOUT THIS REPORT

- All findings on the 3 concepts have been presented together, with differences based on language or respondent type pointed out where relevant.
- In the report, respondents' language has been used throughout, to let them speak in their own words.
 - For simplicity, verbatims are presented in *italicized print*, without quotation marks, unless included in the text.

4. DETAILED FINDINGS

4.1 OVERVIEW

- Second-hand smoke was a familiar concept to virtually all respondents. All acknowledged that it might be dangerous to non-smokers.
 - Many acknowledged that second-hand smoke in the car, a small confined space, was not a good thing. That is why many smokers and the spouses of non-smokers opened the windows.
 - In all groups, some tension exists between smokers and non-smokers in their families, and trade-offs are often made. For example:
 - Some people go outside to smoke.
 - Some only smoked in certain rooms of the house where children were not present.
 - Some abstain from smoking when driving short distances and a few smokers wouldn't smoke when children were in the car.
 - Some non-smokers have laid down the law to their spouses. Others have tried without success.
- As parents, all expressed concern about the health and well-being of their children. But tension exists when it comes to doing right by their children and satisfying their addiction.
- All 3 concepts received positive reaction, had potential and definite strengths as radio ads.
 - In addition, Toronto respondents could visualize all 3 as TV ads.
- Safety (Concept B) seemed to have many positives, virtually no real negatives, and no major improvements to be made. It could be broadcast, as is.
 - People liked the adult tone, and the irony conveyed by the message.
 - In fact, it was the concept preferred by most participants.
 - The ad contained new previously unheard information – something that made sense to smokers and non-smokers alike.
 - The tone was straightforward and clear, and lent itself to the informative message.
 - To a certain extent, the ad's more subtle approach was palatable to smokers, often beset by ads encouraging them to quit.

- Some smokers felt the message was tolerable, and what the ad was asking them to do was reasonable.
 - *I can tolerate the message in a small space.*
- It was the least offensive concept, mainly because it didn't use children to convey a message.
- The other 2 concepts seemed to create more controversy.
 - They both packed an emotional punch, both used seemingly young children coupled with a direct link to disease and second-hand smoke.
 - Both garnered strong support as well as criticism, and both needed adjustments before being ready to broadcast.
 - Some participants, especially smokers, strongly disliked the use of children in these ads, because it made them feel guilty and to some degree, harassed.
- Kids (Concept A) had many positives, but some strong negatives, including a first impression dislike of the "whiny" children, which some said could be a great excuse for smokers not to pay attention.
 - The depiction of kids complaining in the car was realistic, and easy for parents to identify with.
 - The perceived message was on target for some, slightly off-base for others.
 - It struck an emotional chord, and had the potential to induce guilt in smokers.
 - *Makes you feel like a criminal.*
 - On the other hand, some felt that hearing "Are we there yet" would wear quickly, or that the idea was unoriginal.
 - In addition, whether children would or would not tell their parents that smoke bothered them drew some discussion. Some parents said their children already did, while others agreed with the ad's premise, and felt it would be hard for their children to speak up.
- Spelling (Concept C) generated the most polarized reaction, positive and negative. Some loved it, others strongly disliked it.
 - One factor largely noticed and most agreed on: the information about opening the window was educational, new and thought-provoking. It directly contradicted some cherished beliefs that "cracking open" the car window would dilute the effects of second-hand smoke.

- However, the children spelling sparked controversy.
 - On the one hand, it was realistic, although some weren't certain that such young-sounding children would be able to spell those particular diseases.
 - On the other, because both the whiny voices and spelling could grate on drivers' nerves, it might wear quickly.
- Concept C struck an emotional chord, and had the potential to induce both guilt and irritation in smokers.

4.2 KEY FINDINGS FOR INDIVIDUAL CONCEPTS

4.2.1 CONCEPT A: KIDS

FIRST IMPRESSIONS

- Mainly negative
 - Children do not behave or talk like this because it's not the tone or level of language that children use.
 - *It's not the way children would behave. If there was a real problem, they would say it out loud and directly. Not natural enough.*
 - *Disturbing to hear the child say he is unable to breathe.*
 - *You would think that the parent would know better not to smoke.*
 - *Déjà vu. Nothing new. Not original.*
 - *Predictable.*
 - *Announcer too unemotional.*
- Some positive
 - *Liked it, reminds me that kids are trying to tell you something.*
 - *Different, when the kid says I can't breathe, I don't want to get sick again.*
 - *I can relate because both my parents smoked.*

MAIN STRENGTHS

- Most could identify with the realistic situation -- kids complaining in the car.
 - *It's reality. They [the ad] have a point.*
 - *Sounded like everyday living.*
 - *Pretty routine, the complaining part.*
 - *Focused more on what the kids were saying. Lets the kids make the point.*
 - *Kids' point of view.*
- Clear message: people shouldn't smoke in cars.
 - *I agree, I no longer smoke in the car. I don't want my kid to smoke ever.*
 - *Reminds us that we have to think about our kids.*

- Credible for some whose children would not speak up to their parents about smoking.
 - *Made you think that it is true, that kids really would not think to tell their parents that smoke is making me sick.*
 - *They [children] can't say it. Are afraid to say it.*
 - *It's what they [children] won't say.*
- Had some emotional impact.
 - *Struck a cord with me "I can't breathe".*
 - *If I heard it only one time I probably would not pay attention, but more often I would listen to it.*

MAIN WEAKNESSES

- Not many
 - "Are we there yet" was too irritatingly familiar, and annoying to some, who said they would tune it out.
 - In Montreal, several criticisms related to production values:
 - Some said the children's tone was too soft-spoken, not the way children would really speak if something was wrong.
 - The announcer's voice was too serious.
 - Sound-track was annoying.

PERCEIVED MESSAGE

- Many understood the main message as: Don't smoke in the car.
 - *Smoking in the car is harmful to your kids.*
 - *Second-hand smoke is a killer.*
 - *Stop smoking in the car.*
- Other messages were close.
 - *Safety of your kids affected by your smoking.*
 - *Le message c'est qu'on est encore des gens irresponsables, les enfants sont victimes. On nous dit d'arrêter de fumer. / Again, the message is that smokers are irresponsible and their children are victims.*
 - *Make a better choice.*
 - *Kid says he can't breathe you have to judge for yourself.*

- In both Montreal groups, the slogan "Roulez sans fumer" was spontaneously noticed and liked.

ATTENTION-GETTING

- Mixed:
 - High among French non-smokers and English smokers.
 - *Not a sledgehammer.*
 - Medium among French smokers and English non-smokers.
 - One French smoker, a kindergarten teacher, said it would catch her attention.

CREDIBILITY AND REALISM

- Basically credible, with a realistic situation most could identify with.
- However, some found children's language unrealistic, and a contradiction with the realistic situation.
 - *I don't want to get sick again is not believable. [Would be] more believable if the child said "I feel sick again" (general agreement among Toronto non-smokers).*
- Some, including Montreal smokers, disagreed that children don't say what they think.
 - *C'est pas vrai que les enfants ne disent pas ce qu'ils pensent. / It is not true to say that children do not express what they think.*

EMOTIONS AND LOGIC

- Some guilt-inducing emotional impact for Toronto smokers, but not in other groups.
 - *Makes you feel like a criminal.*
 - *That is exactly how I feel, very strong message.*
 - *Feel guilty, you know that you shouldn't do it but you do anyway.*

SMOKER DISTURBANCE

- Overall, a mixed verdict.
- Observationally, this ad may have the potential to disturb smokers because they could identify with the situation.
- However, non-smokers in both locations felt smokers would either deny it based on typical already-known arguments (disease), or would cite the kids' whining as justification to ignore it.

- *Ça s'adresse plus aux non-fumeurs qu'aux fumeurs. Les fumeurs ne vont pas s'en occuper. / It is aimed more at non-smokers than smokers. Smokers will not pay attention.*
- *Je trouve que ça prêche à des convertis; c'est trop mielleux pour des fumeurs. / I find it preaches to the converted; it is too syrupy for smokers.*
- In Montreal, generally seen as too soft-spoken.
- In Toronto, smokers felt it was aimed at them, with some impact.
 - *Aimed at us and our spouses.*
 - *If I don't smoke in the car because I got this message then I will also tell my friend not to smoke in the car as well.*
 - *Maybe it is not such a good idea to smoke in the car after all.*
 - *My kid would say: See Mom I told you!*

MAIN IMPROVEMENTS

- Several
 - In Montreal, some suggested changing how the children spoke. Make it more direct and punchy, and less whiny. The tone should not be rebellious but more critical and straightforward.
 - In Toronto, 2 suggestions were made:
 - *Change what the kid is saying to "I feel sick again" (instead of "I don't want to feel sick again").*
 - *Get rid of "Are we there yet?"*

RATINGS

- Good radio ad: ranged widely
 - Higher in Toronto.
 - Lowest among French smokers.
- Good car radio ad: ranged widely
 - Higher in Toronto.
 - Lowest among French smokers.

4.2.2 CONCEPT B: SAFETY

FIRST IMPRESSIONS

- Mainly positive reaction in all groups
 - It's surprisingly true. Something they never thought about but now that they do, the incoherence of the behavior is striking evidence of something everyone does, and should not.
 - *You fasten the kids in, and then you poison them. (On attache les enfants et ensuite on les empoisonne.)*
 - *Strong finish, hits home.*
 - *C'est vrai. Tout le monde est attaché et on fume une cigarette. C'est une grande contradiction! / It is true. Everybody buckles up and we smoke a cigarette. It is a big inconsistency.*
 - Induced some feelings of guilt among smokers and even non-smokers.
 - Some Toronto smokers very positive.
 - *Loved it, very realistic, clear message, soft spoken.*
 - Some liked the tone and voice of the English announcer.
 - *Not a harsh voice, smooth voice.*
 - *Very serious, very straightforward to the point.*
- Only a few negatives
 - *Didn't like web site can't write it down if you are driving.*
 - *Too boring, would not pay attention to it.*

MAIN STRENGTHS

- Very realistic
 - *Realistic and true.*
 - *Easy to identify with.*
- Ironical tone
 - The incoherence of the behavior was striking.
 - *Kids have a seatbelt on while you are smoking.*
 - *Ça vient vraiment chercher l'incohérence des adultes. C'est correct! / The inconsistency of human beings is brought out. It's correct!*
 - Strong link between safety, the car and "poison" from second-hand smoke.

- Sound effects noticed, liked and helped make the ad easy to remember.
 - *I see it being done. (Je le vois faire.)*
 - *Sound effects, the buckling and the door.*
- Easy to visualize
 - "Then you light up a cigarette" several in Toronto envisioned it.
- Positive association with strong TV anti-second-hand-smoke campaign in Toronto.
 - Reminded several people of TV commercial with smoke rings turning into a target.
- Concept didn't use children (unlike other 2 ad concepts).
 - *Do not need children to get the message.*
 - *Il n'y a pas de voix d'enfant qui nous fait la morale. C'est mieux. / There's no child's voice preaching at smokers. It is better.*
- Will disturb smokers.
 - *Evokes strong guilt feelings.*

MAIN WEAKNESSES

- No main weaknesses identified.

PERCEIVED MESSAGE

- Overall: Very clear message perceived in all groups.
 - Don't smoke in the car because second-hand smoke is dangerous.
 - *Change your mindset re second-hand smoke.*
 - *Contradiction in safety.*
 - *Toxic smoke.*
 - Don't smoke in the car with children.
 - *Seatbelts clicking gives strong message you should not be smoking in car with kids.*
 - *Children do not have a choice if their parents are smoking.*
 - Don't smoke in the car with people.

- Other positive interpretations, slightly off-message but close:
 - *Second hand smoke will kill you.*
 - *More than one thing can harm your child.*
 - *Sometimes people don't realize the harm that they are doing.*
 - *What you are doing is affecting others.*

ATTENTION-GETTING

- Generally high in all groups for most participants.
 - *Catches your attention because it was speaking about your children.*

CREDIBILITY AND REALISM

- Ranging from high to very high in all groups, including smokers.
 - *The kids say, dad put your seat belt on but they don't say dad, stop smoking.*

EMOTIONS AND LOGIC

- Contained both.
- Demonstrates logical behavioral incoherence and evokes guilt feelings and some regret.
 - *Children's safety. You went through so much to have them, why would you do something to harm them?*
 - *Pulled at your heart strings.*
 - *Hitting home.*

SMOKER DISTURBANCE

- Perceived by most in both locations as high.
 - *This ad might bring it home to quit.*
 - *This one would catch my attention, even though my kids are 18 and 22, I still ask "Seatbelts on?"*
- Some Toronto non-smokers weren't sure, because of smoker denial and age differences.
 - *They'd say, "I know, I know".*
 - *Younger people would react differently than older smoker. Older smokers would argue that they have been doing it their whole life. Younger people have a different mindset, they're educated to non-smoking.*

- A few Toronto smokers enjoyed the irony.
 - *Children in the back seat will hear the message while you are smoking.*

MAIN IMPROVEMENTS

- Only a few, suggested mainly by non-smokers.
- In Montreal
 - Someone thought the announcer's language needs to be more down-to-earth.
 - The French music needs to be less dramatic and less exaggerated, less irritating.
- One Toronto man felt the beginning was unclear, and wasn't sure if it was an ad for seat-belt violations.

RATINGS

- Good radio ad: mostly high.
- Good car radio ad: mostly high to very high.

4.2.3 CONCEPT C: SPELLING

FIRST IMPRESSIONS

- Generally mixed reaction in both locations.
- Mainly the Toronto non-smokers liked this concept.
 - *Powerful.*
 - *Went for the throat.*
 - *Your kids could develop asthma or cancer.*
 - *Educational: not enough to open car window.*
 - *That is exactly how my son talks. He spells instead of talking.*
 - *Liked the message when child spelt it out.*
- Only one Toronto smoker (who did not smoke in the car when her children were in it) liked it.
 - *It really hits you.*
- Another Toronto smoker
 - *My son would listen along and definitely start spelling those words and I would be annoyed.*
- Some felt spoken to because of the diseases.
- The French non-smoking group was split: for some it was direct, catchy and clear, and for the others it was less involving, had too much emphasis on diseases, and they would not listen through to the end.

- Many in both locations criticized the use of children in this ad.
 - *Sounded like brats.*
 - *Why should a child have to be spelling those words out?*
 - *Whining voice.*
 - *Can't picture a child spelling it out like that.*
 - *Kids that age didn't sound like they could spell bronchitis.*
- Other initial negative response
 - *Hated it.*
 - *Too strong.*
 - *Flat.*
 - *Not appropriate.*
- Ad seen as too hard-hitting by some, feeling that most smokers would not like it.

MAIN STRENGTHS

- Learning about the window. Some smokers and non-smokers acknowledged that opening the window is not a good excuse for smoking in the car.
 - *The window is a big deal.*
- Strong message
 - *Immediately right off the bat, tells you the effects of smoking.*
- Some liked the use of children because it hit the point home.
- Awareness of diseases caused by smoking.
 - *Asthma caught my attention (2 in Toronto non-smokers group have had asthma since childhood).*
- The spelling would have effective repercussions with children who heard the ad.
 - *Young kids like to spell so now they are going to start spelling cancer. So that is a good thing.*
 - *When they hear the commercial you will have to explain the spelling to them (laughter).*

MAIN WEAKNESSES

- Not direct enough.
- Most negative comments related to the spelling.
 - Was irritating to some in both locations, smokers and non-smokers.
 - Several agreed it was irksome that the kid does not finish spelling the word.
 - *Children would not spell these words, and are not that conscious of diseases.*
 - *Not the kind of words that children would spell.*
 - *Spelling annoying. No time to listen to spelling. It puts me off but my kids would like it.*
 - *The monotone of the kids' voices.*
- In the Toronto smokers group, most agreed with the man who disliked the perceived sarcasm at the end.
 - *Too sarcastic at the end "Do we have to spell it out for you?"*

PERCEIVED MESSAGE

- In most groups, many perceived a generic message: that smoking is dangerous, that smoking causes diseases, that second-hand smoke has consequences.
 - *Second-hand smoke is as dangerous as first-hand smoke.*
 - *Second-hand smoke can kill.*
- According to a Montreal smoker
 - *C'est comme les images sur les paquets, au début c'est traumatisant, mais plus maintenant. / It is like the pictures on cigarette packs, horrifying at first but not after a while.*
- But in Toronto, some saw a clear and direct message:
 - *Do not smoke in the car with your kids.*
- Some in Toronto saw the message as educational:
 - *Educational because most people think that opening the window makes a difference.*
 - *Opening a window doesn't make a difference. Makes you start to think about it more.*

ATTENTION-GETTING

- Mixed verdict: only for some, in both locations
 - *Yes strong but subtle.*
 - *Rude awakening for some people.*
 - *More of an attention-getter to use actual kids.*

CREDIBILITY AND REALISM

- Mixed verdict.
- Some found it credible, but not realistic because children wouldn't speak this way or spell those particular words.
- One Toronto smoker and others whose children liked to spell found it believable for that reason.
 - *Believable. My kids like to play the spelling game, spell bad words because they are not allowed to say them.*
- One Montreal smoker found it believable, but trite.
 - *Oui, c'est crédible, mais on le sait tous que c'est nocif, ça fait 25 ans qu'ils nous le disent. / Yes it is believable but everybody knows that smoke is harmful, we've heard about it for 25 years!*
- Some addressed the window aspect and found that to be very credible.
 - *Educational: Rolling down the window doesn't work.*

EMOTIONS AND LOGIC

- To a certain degree, this concept had both – the emotional impact of the diseases being spelled out by innocent children, plus the educational information about the window.
 - *Ugly reality. We hear the truth from the children.*
- In Toronto, one could feel the energy-level of the non-smokers group deflate after this ad was played. And most Toronto smokers, seeming to feel the impact of this ad, strongly disliked it.
 - *Happy go lucky kids spelling horrible words.*

SMOKER DISTURBANCE

- Expected to be low in Montreal because the facts are well-known and don't work.
 - *Je ne suis pas certaine qu'en faisant épeler les enfants, ça va venir chercher les fumeurs. / I am not sure that using children spelling diseases will succeed in getting smokers' attention.*

→ *On le sait que c'est pas bon. Les fumeurs sont tannés de l'entendre. / Everybody knows that smoking is not good. Smokers are tired of hearing it.*

- But for most, because of the window information, this has the potential to disturb smokers. Most agreed this made sense.

→ *Very hard for smokers to quit but it will go in their memory card.*

→ *It could influence parents of young kids.*

MAIN IMPROVEMENTS

- Nothing consistent.
- In Toronto, several suggestions:
 - *Make it catchier, because the spelling requires too much attention to listen to in a car.*
 - *Make the children sound a bit older.*
 - *Get rid of the sarcasm at the end, it was overkill.*
 - *Repeat the website and phone number.*
- One Toronto smoker suggested:
 - *Take out the spelling.*

RATINGS

- Good radio ad: medium to high.
- Good car radio ad: medium to high.

4.3 CONCLUDING COMMENTS

- It would seem that non-smokers are very willing to have a campaign, radio or otherwise, to reduce or cut smoking in cars when children are present, or even when they are present. Understandably, smokers are much less willing, but even they seemed open to considering some of the ideas expressed in the concepts. English-speaking participants were even willing to suggest how to make the ads into TV spots.
- Clearly, Health Canada is on track to aim this type of message at those who smoke in cars when children are present. There is evidence to suggest receptivity to Concept B (Safety) and to a certain extent, Concept A (Kids), among the target audience. Plus, the thought-provoking idea about the ineffectiveness of opening the car window to reduce the impact of second-hand smoke (introduced in the polarizing Concept C) had merit.

APPENDIX 1

WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRE VERBATIMS

Concept A	
Like Most	Like Least
Toronto Smokers	
☒ <i>It is very truthful</i> ☒ <i>Reminds that we have not only enjoy by smoking but think about kids</i> ☒ <i>That the children are telling their parents they don't like smoke</i> ☒ <i>I like the way the children complain about breathing</i> ☒ <i>Makes you think</i>	☒ <i>Reminds me of why I should not smoke in the car</i> ☒ <i>Too serious, not alive</i> ☒ <i>That the parents are smoking while the one child doesn't want to be sick again</i> ☒ <i>I don't like the fact that they blame</i> ☒ <i>But giving kids perception without even knowing</i>
Montreal Smokers	
☒ <i>Les enfants qui se plaignent / Children are complaining</i> ☒ <i>Les enfants qui n'arrivent plus à respirer / Children who can't breathe</i> ☒ <i>L'enfant dit ce qu'il pense, il manque d'air / Child says what he feels, a lack of air</i> ☒ <i>Annonce plus naturelle / It is more natural</i> ☒ <i>Réflexion intérieure des enfants / Children's thoughts</i> ☒ <i>Passe inaperçu / Doesn't get attention</i> ☒ <i>Message : les enfants sont victimes des actes de leurs parents / Message : children are victims of their parents' behavior</i>	☒ <i>Trop plate /Annoying</i> ☒ <i>Le côté éducatif (primaire) / Educational</i> ☒ <i>Fade, trop sérieux / dull, too serious</i> ☒ <i>Tout me déplaît, banal /I dislike it all, not original</i> ☒ <i>Ça me touche pas / I don't feel anything</i>
Toronto Non-Smokers	
☒ <i>Emotional facts about second-hand smoke in car</i> ☒ <i>Direct message</i> ☒ <i>Truthful, believable</i> ☒ <i>It is very straight, the child breathing.</i> ☒ <i>Children's voices. Makes you think about the message</i> ☒ <i>I heard things that kids said all the time.</i> ☒ <i>Uses the children to help make their point</i>	☒ <i>The whiney children, "Are we there yet?"</i> ☒ <i>Shouting "Are we there yet?" just like many of those commercials</i> ☒ <i>Memories</i> ☒ <i>Needs to repeat website and phone # again</i> ☒ <i>Nothing</i>
Montreal Non-Smokers	
☒ <i>Participation des enfants / Children's participation</i> ☒ <i>Les enfants sont directs / Children are direct</i> ☒ <i>Message de ne pas fumer en auto / Don't smoke in the car</i> ☒ <i>Pub pour bébé : non à la cigarette /Ad for a baby, no smoking</i> ☒ <i>L'enfant dit des choses réalistes, informations claires, fumée peut causer des maladies / The child says realistic things, clear information, smoke can cause diseases</i> ☒ <i>Faire parler les enfants, cela dit l'essentiel, c'est vrai, réaliste / Talking children, this is essential, it is true and realistic</i> ☒ <i>Les enfants s'expriment / Children express themselves</i> ☒ <i>Clarté du propos /Clarity of the message</i>	☒ <i>Les enfants ne sont pas comme ça, ils ne sont pas gênés de dire ce qu'ils pensent / Children do not behave like that, they don't mind saying what they think</i> ☒ <i>Message trop court / Message is too short</i> ☒ <i>Difficile à entendre les voix / It's difficult to listen to the voices</i> ☒ <i>Les enfants disent ce qu'ils pensent / Children say what they think</i> ☒ <i>Musique de fonds agaçante / Sound track is annoying</i>

Concept B	
Like Most	Like Least
Toronto Smokers	
☒ <i>Very truthful</i> ☒ <i>Sound effects</i> ☒ <i>About safety</i> ☒ <i>Soft spoken, clear meaning</i> ☒ <i>The seriousness of the adult talking</i>	☒ <i>Dislike</i> ☒ <i>Too boring</i> ☒ <i>The message about second hand smoke</i> ☒ <i>Nothing</i>
Montreal Smokers	
☒ <i>Le parallèle sécurité-danger / The safety-danger parallel</i> ☒ <i>Énoncé très réaliste / Very realistic statement</i> ☒ <i>Pas des enfants qui nous parlent / no children are speaking to you</i> ☒ <i>On attache nos enfants mais on fume pour les rendre malades / We buckle-up children but put them in danger with smoke</i> ☒ <i>Plus direct, sécurité automobile mais aussi sécurité, santé sans fumée / More direct, road safety and health protection</i> ☒ <i>On cible sur la sécurité sur la route, mais pas sur leur santé / We focus on road safety but not on our children's health</i> ☒ <i>Démontre l'incohérence des adultes / It shows adult inconsistency</i> ☒ <i>C'est la vérité / it is the truth</i> ☒ <i>Association: danger, fumée secondaire, auto / Associations: danger, second-hand smoke, car</i>	☒ <i>La trame sonore, musique tragique / Dramatic sound track</i> ☒ <i>Pas d'enfant qui s'exprime / No children as speakers</i> ☒ <i>Musique trop dramatique / Music is much too dramatic</i> ☒ <i>Pas de voix d'enfant, on ne sait pas ce que la SHS fait, pas accrocheur pour les enfants / No child's voice, we don't know the effects of SHS, not catchy for children</i> ☒ <i>Demande plus d'écoute que les autres / It needs more attention to listen to</i> ☒ <i>Il n'y a pas que la cigarette qui dérange directement / Smoke is not the only harmful agent</i> ☒ <i>Musique de fond moralisateur / Moralizing sound track</i>
Toronto Non-Smokers	
☒ <i>Drives a great message, do not poison children when in car</i> ☒ <i>Very direct. Smoking is no good for everyone</i> ☒ <i>It gets right to the point</i> ☒ <i>About the security and the danger of smoking in the car for the children</i> ☒ <i>The calm tone of the woman's voice. She sounded sensible.</i> ☒ <i>She has a smooth voice to listen to, she tells you how it is</i> ☒ <i>Emphasis on the children's health and safety</i>	☒ <i>Nothing</i> ☒ <i>Beginning</i> ☒ <i>Email address</i> ☒ <i>This is very important and tells you the children can't even breathe</i> ☒ <i>Music</i> ☒ <i>Started slowly. Questioned what is it about.</i>

Concept B	
Like Most	Like Least
Montreal Non-Smokers	
☒ C'est toujours pareil, rien / Nothing to say ☒ Mise en situation: sécurité en voiture = important pour terminer avec mise en garde sur la cigarette / Context: car safety. Important to end the ad with a warning on cigarettes ☒ Attache les enfants puis on s'allume une cigarette / Buckle up children and lighting a cigarette ☒ Très sérieuse comme annonce, c'est vraiment le quotidien / Serious but it is really daily life ☒ Ce qui est dit est vrai / What it said is true ☒ Aspects plus humains en général, monde idéal / More human aspects, as an ideal world ☒ Message est toujours bon / Message is always good ☒ Le fait qu'on n'utilise pas de voix d'enfants / The fact that we do not use children's voices ☒ L'ironie de la "sécurité" des fumeurs / The irony of smokers, a false sense of security	☒ Très plate / Very dull ☒ Timbre de la voix fade / A monotonous tone of voice ☒ Fade, pas de vie, passe inaperçu / Not attention-getting, dull ☒ Monocorde / Monotonous ☒ Ton moralisateur / Moralizing tone

Concept C	
Like Most	Like Least
Toronto Smokers	
☒ Truthful ☒ Talk about serious issue of second-hand smokers ☒ That there is a message of what illness you can have ☒ Nothing ☒ The message it brought	☒ Too strong a message ☒ Too sad. But it has to be this way ☒ That the children need to spell it out ☒ They should like a bunch of brats ☒ The kids spelling
Montreal Smokers	
☒ L'enfant dit qu'il y a des maladies / A child is talking about diseases ☒ Font parler un enfant / They are using a child as a spokesperson ☒ Un enfant qui épelle les mots / A child who is spelling ☒ Créatif l'épellation / The spelling is creative ☒ La prévention des maladies reliées au tabac / Prevention of disease from SHS ☒ L'enfant qui nous fait prendre conscience de la SHS / The child tries to make us sensitive to SHS ☒ Percutante / Punchy	☒ Le ton, l'enfant qui épelle les mots / The tone, the child's voice spelling words ☒ L'utilisation d'un enfant / The use of a child ☒ Fade / Dull ☒ L'épellation, ça me gosse / The spelling is irritating

Concept C

Toronto Non-Smokers

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☒ <i>The children's voices, educational, "think of your children"</i> ☒ <i>My 5 and 6 year old would understand it better</i> ☒ <i>Do you have to have it spelt out</i> ☒ <i>Cancer, asthma. Clean your car out of smoke. This is a very good message.</i> ☒ <i>Children taking part. New information I did not know</i> ☒ <i>I like how the kids are involved in it</i> ☒ <i>Everything</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☒ <i>To me, as an adult, the spelling would bore me very fast</i> ☒ <i>Web site, phone number</i> ☒ <i>I like the ad</i> ☒ <i>Nothing</i> |
|--|--|

Montreal Non-Smokers

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☒ <i>Début plus accrocheur + les enfants / Attention-getting with the children at the beginning</i> ☒ <i>Pas accrocheur, je changerais de poste / Not catchy, I would zap it</i> ☒ <i>Punch: maladie et mort exprimés par un enfant / Punchy: disease and death expressed by children</i> ☒ <i>Rien à part les maux que cause la cigarette / Nothing except cigarette causes diseases</i> ☒ <i>On dit clairement les maladies liées à SHS / It clearly states that SHS causes specific diseases</i> ☒ <i>Fenêtre ouverte que ce n'est pas assez, j'apprends quelque chose / I learned something when they said opening the window is not enough</i> ☒ <i>Punch: message court et efficace / Punchy: short and effective message</i> ☒ <i>Voix d'enfant, voix d'adulte, clarté du propos / Voice of children and adult, clear message</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☒ <i>L'énumération des maladies / Listing diseases</i> ☒ <i>Sous-entendus de maladies / Diseases implied</i> ☒ <i>J'ai de la difficulté à me mettre dans le contexte / I have difficulty being in the mood</i> ☒ <i>Trop sérieux / Too serious</i> ☒ <i>Très accrocheuse / Very catchy</i> ☒ <i>Pas clair, pas direct / Not clear, not direct</i> |
|---|--|

APPENDIX 2

DISCUSSION GUIDE (English and French)

DISCUSSION GUIDE

Second-hand Smoke (SHS)

1. INTRODUCTION (10 minutes)

This initial stage of the discussion is to establish a level of confidence and a rapport between the moderator and the participants. The persons being interviewed are informed of the purpose of the discussion and what is expected of them.

GUIDELINES

- Word of welcome and introduction of moderator.
- Objectives of the research: *We are going to discuss **some ideas for an information campaign aimed at parents like you. We are also going to talk about smoking.** I would like to have your feedback on what you like, dislike, etc. There are no right or wrong answers. All opinions are acceptable. If you like it – that's fine. If you don't like it – that's fine too. Nobody else will know what you said – it's all confidential. We're talking to lots of people to find out what they think. **We are not here to convince you about anything.** Your opinions will help develop a radio ad.*
- Role of moderator / observer behind one-way mirror / taping for note-taking purpose only.
- Neutrality of moderator (*doesn't work for an advertising agency, the government, an association or a cigarette manufacturer or any organization related to the topic being discussed, didn't work on the radio ad and is not here to judge anything or anyone but only to listen*).
- Role of participants
- Duration: 90 minutes maximum
- Are there any questions?

GO-AROUND

- Given name / occupation
- Children at home – age of children
- Driving habits – Do you drive to work? Do you drive your family?
 - Do you ever ride as a passenger?
- Radio listening habits – at home, while driving

- For Smoker Group – Are there any non-smokers at home? Do you smoke while driving?
- For Non-smoker Group – Are there any smokers at home? Do they smoke while driving?

- Focus groups are used as a learning tool. The process is not to build consensus, but to explore the range of reactions.
- Findings may or may not represent the target population at large.

2. RADIO AD (50 minutes)

For the remainder of the discussion, we will talk about smoking and second-hand smoke.

Moderator says:

First of all, I'm going to play a radio ad, the kind of ad you could hear while listening to the radio at home or in your car. I'll want to know what you think of it. Remember: there are no right or wrong answers. All opinions are acceptable. Please do not express your reactions aloud so as not influence your neighbours.

Moderator: PLAY RADIO SPOT, then administer the QUESTIONNAIRE immediately after (making sure that they write their answer according to the concept under examination (i.e., A, B, or C)

Then engage discussion followed by a second exposure to the spot.

Presentation sequence

1. Rotate concepts (see rotation table).
2. Questionnaire administered before discussion of each concept.
3. Individual evaluation of each concept with the same standard questions.

The KAB section follows the ad testing section. However, some of the KAB questions may be asked while discussing the radio spot, if appropriate.

ROTATION TABLE

- A. Kids
- B. Safety
- C. Spelling

	Montreal	Toronto
Group 1	ABC	BCA
Group 2	CAB	ACB

STANDARD QUESTIONS (about 15 minutes per concept – first concept may take longer)

1. Ever heard this ad before?
2. I would like to ask each of you to give your first impressions of this ad.
 - Who wants to begin? (Moderator: do not probe in much detail at this stage).
3. What did you **like** about this ad? What did you **dislike** about it? (Quick go around on responses to the likeability question.)
4. What do you **remember** most? What makes you remember this the most?
 - What do you remember of the story?
 - Of what was said -- what words/phrases?

Moderator: Play ad a second time and probe (if not discussed previously).

5. While listening to this ad, what pictures or **images** came to mind?
6. How do you feel as a result of hearing this ad? What **feelings** or **emotions** were brought out by the ad?
7. What is the **main message** of this ad? What are they trying to say?
 - About second hand smoke?
 - How **believable** is this message?
 - Is this message **realistic or exaggerated**?
 - What did you **learn** from this message?
 - How easy or difficult is this message to understand?
8. What is this ad is trying to achieve? What is its **purpose**?
 - What are they asking you to do?
 - Is this a good way to ask it?
9. **Who is this ad aimed at?** (If not "me") Why isn't it aimed at you?
 - How would smokers in general react?
 - How would non-smokers react?
 - How would children react?
10. **How different** is this ad from other ads around the issue of smoking and second-hand smoke?
11. Would it get your **attention**?
12. What do you think of the **style** of this ad?
13. What do you think **smokers will do** as a result of hearing this ad several times?
14. On a scale of 1-10 (1 is low, 10 is high)
 - How good a radio ad is this?
 - How effective is it as a car radio ad?
15. How would you **improve** this ad?

3. Knowledge Attitudes Behaviours - KAB (20 minutes)

- 16AB 1. What exactly is second-hand smoke? ^A
- What thoughts, ideas or images come to mind when you hear the words "second-hand smoke"? ^B
- 17A→E 2. Nowadays, what do we hear about second-hand smoke? (on TV, radio, newspapers) ^A
- **Who** talks to us about second-hand smoke? ^B
 - **Where** (sources) do you hear things about second-hand smoke? ^C
 - Who are they talking to, mainly? Who is targeted? ^{D E}
- 18A→D 3. What do people around you (friends, family) **say** about second-hand smoke? ^A
- **Is there more talking about second-hand smoke today** than 5 years ago? ^B ⁴
 - Why? ^C
 - Is there **too much, just enough or not enough** talk about second-hand smoke? ^D
- 19 4. Does what you hear about second-hand smoke have **any effect** on you?
- 20A→K 5. Is second-hand smoke dangerous? ^A
- How serious are the dangers? Are they exaggerated? ^B ^C ¹¹
 - What can second-hand smoke cause? ^D
 - To non-smokers? To children? ^{E F}
 - Are **children more vulnerable** to second-hand smoke than adult non-smokers? Why? ^{G H}
 - Have you heard that second-hand smoke is a major cause of children's illness? ^I
 - Do you think it's true? ^J
 - How would you compare second-hand smoke with air pollution in terms of health risks to non-smokers? ^K

ASK SMOKERS ONLY

- 21A→C 6. At home, do you **ever** smoke when non-smokers are present? ^A
- What about children? ^B
 - How do you deal with this? ^C
- 22Ab 7. Overall, **how do you feel** about second-hand smoke? ^A
- What about when children are around? ^B

23A→E 8. When driving your car, do you usually smoke? ^A

- When you are alone? ^B
- With non-smokers? ^C
- With children? ^D
- Are there times you find it difficult to refrain from smoking in the car? ^E

24 9. Do you do anything to minimize the effect of second-hand smoke when you are driving? (open a window, have the fan on, etc.)

ASK NON-SMOKERS ONLY

25Ab 10. Overall, **how concerned** are you by the second-hand smoke of smokers in your **home**? Why are you concerned/not concerned? ^A ^B

26A→C(3) 11. Overall, how concerned are you by the second-hand smoke of smokers when you are **in a car**? Why are you concerned/not concerned? ^A ^B

- Do you do anything to minimize the effect of second-hand smoke when someone is smoking in the car? (open a window, put on fan, etc.) ^C

27A→C(3) 12. Did you ever **complain** about the second-hand smoke **while in a car**? What did you say? ^A ^B

- What should be said to smokers to convince them not to smoke in their car? ^C

ASK ALL

28A→C(3) 13. Have you heard of any upcoming regulations or laws about second-hand smoke? ^A

- **What kind** of regulations or laws about second-hand smoke could they be talking about? ^B
→ Would you want this to become reality? ^C

4. END OF DISCUSSION (10 minutes)

29AB 1. Overall, to what extent do you **approve** of this radio ad? On a scale of 1-10 (1 is low, 10 is high), rate your approval ^A ^B

30AB 2. After hearing this ad, has anything **changed for you**? What? ^A ^B

31 3. What should be said to parents who smoke in their cars to encourage them not to expose children to second-hand smoke?

32 4. Do you have any other suggestions or comments on this topic?

QUESTIONNAIRE

A

Q1 What is your overall impression of this ad? What score would you give on a scale from 1 to 10? (**Circle one answer**)

Dislike a lot 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 **Like a lot**

Q2 What do you like **most** about this ad?

Q3 What do you like **least** about this ad?

B

Q1 What is your overall impression of this ad? What score would you give on a scale from 1 to 10? (**Circle one answer**)

Dislike a lot 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 **Like a lot**

Q2 What do you like **most** about this ad?

Q3 What do you like **least** about this ad?

C

Q1 What is your overall impression of this ad? What score would you give on a scale from 1 to 10? (**Circle one answer**)

Dislike a lot 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 **Like a lot**

Q2 What do you like **most** about this ad?

Q3 What do you like **least** about this ad?

GUIDE DE DISCUSSION

Fumée secondaire (FS)

1. INTRODUCTION (10 minutes)

Cette première partie de l'entretien consiste à détendre l'atmosphère et créer un climat de confiance entre l'animatrice et les participants. C'est à ce moment que l'animatrice rassure les personnes interrogées sur ses intentions et précise ses attentes à leur égard.

CONSIGNES

- Bienvenue et introduction de l'animatrice.
- Objectifs de la recherche : *Nous allons discuter de **diverses idées pour une campagne d'information adressée aux parents comme vous. Nous allons également parler de tabagisme.** J'aimerais avoir votre opinion sur ce que vous aimez, n'aimez pas, etc. Il n'y a pas de bonnes ou de mauvaises réponses. Toutes les opinions sont acceptables. Si vous aimez ça, c'est très bien. Si vous n'aimez pas ça, c'est très bien aussi. Personne d'autre ne saura ce que vous avez dit. Tout est confidentiel. Nous allons parler à plusieurs personnes afin de savoir ce que les gens pensent. **Nous ne sommes pas ici pour vous convaincre de quoi que ce soit.** Vos opinions aideront à développer **un message publicitaire pour la radio.***
- Rôle animateur/observateur en arrière du miroir sans tain/enregistrement seulement dans le but de prendre des notes.
- Neutralité de l'animatrice (*ne travaille pas pour une agence de publicité, le gouvernement, une association ou un manufacturier de cigarettes ou toute organisation reliée au sujet qui sera discuté, n'a pas travaillé sur le message publicitaire radiophonique et n'est pas ici pour juger les commentaires ou les personnes mais bien pour écouter*).
- Rôle des participants
- Durée : 90 minutes maximum
- Des questions?

TOUR DE TABLE

- Prénom / occupation
- Enfants à la maison – âge des enfants
- Habitudes de conduite – Conduisez-vous pour aller au travail? Conduisez-vous avec des membres de votre famille dans l'auto?
 - Vous arrive-t-il d'être passager en auto?
- Habitudes d'écoute de la radio – à la maison, en conduisant

- Pour le groupe des fumeurs – Y a-t-il des non-fumeurs à la maison? Fumez-vous lorsque vous conduisez?
- Pour le groupe des non-fumeurs – Y a-t-il des fumeurs à la maison? Fument-ils lorsqu'ils conduisent?

- *Les groupes de discussion sont utilisés comme outil exploratoire. Le but de la discussion n'est pas d'aboutir à un consensus, mais bien d'explorer la gamme des réactions.*
- *Les résultats peuvent être ou non représentatifs de la population ciblée dans son ensemble.*

2. MESSAGE PUBLICITAIRE RADIO (50 minutes)

Pour le reste de la discussion, nous allons parler de tabagisme et de fumée secondaire.

L'animatrice dit :

Tout d'abord, je vais faire entendre une annonce radio, le genre d'annonce que vous pourriez entendre à la radio, que ce soit à la maison ou dans votre auto. J'aimerais savoir ce que vous en pensez. Rappelez-vous : il n'y a pas de bonnes ni de mauvaises réponses. Toutes les opinions sont acceptables. Veuillez garder vos réactions pour vous-même afin de ne pas influencer vos voisins.

Animatrice : FAITES ENTENDRE LE MESSAGE RADIOPHONIQUE puis administrez le QUESTIONNAIRE immédiatement après (en vous assurant qu'ils écrivent leurs réponses pour le concept évalué (i.e. A, B, ou C)

Ensuite, engagez la discussion suivie par une seconde écoute du message publicitaire.

Séquence de présentation

1. Présenter les concepts en rotation (voir la table de rotation).
2. Pour chacun des concepts, administrer le questionnaire avant de le discuter.
3. Évaluation individuelle de chaque concept avec les mêmes questions uniformisées.

La section CAC suit la section du test publicitaire. Toutefois, si c'est utile ou pertinent on peut poser certaines questions de la section CAC durant la discussion sur l'annonce radio.

TABLEAU DE ROTATION

- A. Enfants
- B. Sécurité
- C. Épellation

	Montréal	Toronto
Groupe 1	ABC	BCA
Groupe 2	CAB	ACB

QUESTIONS UNIFORMINÉES (environ 15 minutes par concept – le premier concept pourrait prendre un peu plus de temps)

1. Aviez-vous déjà entendu cette annonce avant ce soir?
2. J'aimerais demander à chacun de vous de me donner sa première impression sur cette annonce.
 - Qui veut commencer? (Animatrice : ne sondez pas trop en détail à cette étape).
3. Qu'est-ce qui vous **a plu** à propos de cette annonce? Qu'est-ce qui vous **a déplu**? (Tour de table rapide sur les réponses à la question d'appréciation.)
4. De quoi vous **rappelez-vous** le plus? Qu'est-ce qui fait que vous vous rappelez davantage de ça?
 - Que vous rappelez-vous au sujet de l'histoire?
 - De ce qui a été dit – quels mots/phrases?

Animatrice : Faites entendre l'annonce une seconde fois et sondez (si ça n'a pas été discuté précédemment).

5. Pendant que vous écoutiez cette annonce, quelles **images vous sont venues à l'esprit**?
6. Que ressentez-vous suite à l'écoute de cette annonce? Quels **sentiments** ou **émotions** a-t-elle suscités chez vous?
7. Quel est le **principal message** de cette annonce? Qu'est-ce qu'ils essaient de dire?
 - À propos de la fumée secondaire?
 - Dans quelle mesure ce message est-il **crédible**?
 - Ce message est-il **réaliste ou exagéré**?
 - Qu'est-ce que ce message vous a **appris**?
 - Ce message est-il facile ou difficile à comprendre?
8. Qu'est-ce que cette annonce tente de réaliser? Quel est son **but**?
 - Qu'est-ce qu'ils vous demandent de faire?
 - Est-ce une bonne façon de le demander?
9. **À qui s'adresse cette annonce?** (Si pas à « moi ») Pourquoi ne s'adresse-t-elle pas à vous?
 - Comment les fumeurs en général réagiraient-ils?
 - Comment les non-fumeurs réagiraient-ils?
 - Comment les enfants réagiraient-ils?
10. **En quoi** cette annonce est-elle **différente** d'autres annonces qui portent sur le tabagisme et la fumée secondaire?
11. Capterait-elle votre **attention**?

12. Que pensez-vous du **style** de cette annonce?
13. Que pensez-vous que les **fumeurs feront** après avoir entendu cette annonce plusieurs fois?
14. Sur une échelle de 1 à 10 (1 étant faible et 10 élevé)
 - Jusqu'à quel point est-ce une bonne annonce radio?
 - Jusqu'à quel point est-elle efficace en tant qu'annonce radio pour l'auto?
15. Comment **amélioreriez-vous** cette annonce?

3. Connaissances, attitudes et comportements - CAC (20 minutes)

1. Qu'est-ce que la fumée secondaire, exactement?
 - Quelles pensées, idées ou images vous viennent à l'esprit lorsque vous entendez les mots « fumée secondaire »
2. De nos jours, qu'est-ce qu'on entend au sujet la fumée secondaire? (à la télé, à la radio, dans les journaux)
 - **Qui** nous parle de fumée secondaire?
 - **Où** (sources) entendez-vous des choses au sujet de la fumée secondaire?
 - À qui parlent-ils principalement? Qui est ciblé?
3. Qu'est-ce que les gens autour de vous (amis, famille) **disent** au sujet de la fumée secondaire?
 - **Est-ce qu'on parle davantage de la fumée secondaire maintenant** comparativement à il y a 5 ans? Pourquoi?
 - Est-ce qu'on parle **trop, juste assez ou pas assez** de fumée secondaire?
4. Est-ce que ce que vous entendez au sujet de la fumée secondaire a **un impact** sur vous?
5. Est-ce que la fumée secondaire est dangereuse?
 - Jusqu'à quel point les dangers sont-ils sérieux? Sont-ils exagérés?
 - Qu'est-ce que la fumée secondaire peut causer?
 - Aux non-fumeurs? Aux enfants?
 - Est-ce que les enfants sont **plus vulnérables** à la fumée secondaire que les adultes non-fumeurs? Pourquoi?

- Avez-vous déjà entendu dire que la fumée secondaire est une cause importante de maladies chez les enfants?
→ Pensez-vous que c'est vrai?
- Comment compareriez-vous la fumée secondaire avec la pollution de l'air en termes de risques pour la santé des non-fumeurs?

DEMANDEZ SEULEMENT AUX FUMEURS

6. À la maison, vous arrive-t-il, ne serait-ce qu'à l'occasion de fumer en présence de non-fumeurs?
 - Et en présence d'enfants?
 - Comment gérez-vous cela?
7. Dans l'ensemble, **comment vous sentez-vous** au sujet de la fumée secondaire?
 - Et lorsque des enfants sont dans les environs?
8. Lorsque vous conduisez votre auto, avez-vous l'habitude de fumer?
 - Lorsque vous êtes seul?
 - Avec des non-fumeurs?
 - Avec des enfants?
 - Y a-t-il des occasions où vous trouvez difficile de ne pas fumer en auto?
9. Faites-vous quelque chose pour minimiser les effets de la fumée secondaire lorsque vous conduisez (ouvrir une fenêtre, faire fonctionner le ventilateur, etc.)?

DEMANDEZ SEULEMENT AUX NON-FUMEURS

10. Dans l'ensemble, **jusqu'à quel point êtes-vous préoccupé** par la fumée secondaire des fumeurs dans votre **maison**? Pourquoi / pourquoi pas préoccupé?
11. Dans l'ensemble, jusqu'à quel point êtes-vous préoccupé par la fumée secondaire des fumeurs lorsque vous êtes **dans une auto**? Pourquoi/pourquoi pas préoccupé?
 - Faites-vous quelque chose pour minimiser les effets de la fumée secondaire lorsque vous conduisez (ouvrir une fenêtre, faire fonctionner le ventilateur, etc.)?
12. Vous êtes-vous déjà **plaint** de la fumée secondaire **dans une auto**? Qu'avez-vous dit?
 - Qu'est-ce qui devrait être dit aux fumeurs pour les convaincre de ne pas fumer dans leur auto?

DEMANDEZ À TOUS

13. Avez-vous entendu parler de réglementation ou de lois qui seraient en discussion au sujet de la fumée secondaire?

- **De quel genre** de règlements ou de lois discuterait-on au sujet de la fumée secondaire?

→ Voudriez-vous que cela se concrétise?

4. FIN DE LA DISCUSSION (10 minutes)

1. Dans l'ensemble, jusqu'à quel point **approuvez**-vous cette annonce radio? Sur une échelle de 1 à 10 (1 signifie faible, 10 signifie élevé), quel serait votre niveau d'appui?
2. Est-ce que l'écoute de cette annonce a **changé** quelque chose **en vous**? Quoi?
3. Qu'est-ce qui devrait être dit aux parents qui fument dans leur auto pour les encourager à ne pas exposer les enfants à la fumée secondaire?
4. Avez-vous d'autres suggestions ou commentaires à apporter sur ce sujet?

QUESTIONNAIRE

A

Q1 Quelle est votre impression générale de cette annonce? Quelle note donneriez-vous en utilisant une échelle de 1 à 10? (**Encerclez une réponse**)

**M'a beaucoup
Déplu**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**M'a beaucoup
plu**

Q2 Qu'est-ce qui vous **plaît** le plus à propos de cette annonce?

Q3 Qu'est-ce qui vous **déplaît** le plus à propos de cette annonce?

B

Q1 Quelle est votre impression générale de cette annonce? Quelle note donneriez-vous en utilisant une échelle de 1 à 10? (**Encerclez une réponse**)

**M'a beaucoup
Déplu**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**M'a beaucoup
plu**

Q2 Qu'est-ce qui vous **plaît** le plus à propos de cette annonce?

Q3 Qu'est-ce qui vous **déplaît** le plus à propos de cette annonce?

C

Q1 Quelle est votre impression générale de cette annonce? Quelle note donneriez-vous en utilisant une échelle de 1 à 10? (**Encerclez une réponse**)

**M'a beaucoup
Déplu**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**M'a beaucoup
plu**

Q2 Qu'est-ce qui vous **plaît** le plus à propos de cette annonce?

Q3 Qu'est-ce qui vous **déplaît** le plus à propos de cette annonce?

APPENDIX 3

SCRIPTS OF THE RADIO ADS

CONCEPT A: KIDS

Kid 1: "Are we there yet?"

KID 2 (about 5yrs): "Can we stop for ice cream?"

ANNC'R (upbeat): It's almost certain that when you're in the car, your children
say
almost anything

ANNC'R (serious): But there are many things they may not say...

Kid 1: "I can't breathe very well"

Kid 2 "I don't want to get sick again"

ANNC'R: The reality is, many children are exposed to second-hand smoke
every day, increasing their risk of asthma, bronchitis, pneumonia
and even cancer.

Make your vehicle smoke-free.

For more information, call 1 800 O-Canada or visit our web site
www.GoSmokefree.ca.

A message from the Government of Canada.



Creative and Production

Client: HEALTH CANADA

Date: February 25, 2005

Product: SSD-Home

Revision: 1

Docket: TOB 05 400

Account Supervisor : N. Wiesenfeld

Title: SSD Car – Safety – AS RECORDED

Copywriter: T. Paquet

Description: RADIO 30 sec.

File Name:

CONCEPT B: SAFETY

MUSIC: Tension track

AVO:

When you're driving with your children in the car, their safety is always the first thing you think about.

So you secure your baby in a car seat.

You make sure your older kids are buckled in with seat belts.

(SFX: Seatbelt being buckled)

You lock all the doors... (SFX: automatic door locks being locked)

Drive a little slower.

Then, you light up a cigarette, (SFX: crackle of burning cigarette, exhaling of smoke) exposing your children to toxic second-hand smoke.

(pause)

For your kids' safety, make your vehicle smoke-free. For more information call 1 800 O CANADA or visit our website at GoSmokeFree.ca

A message from the government of Canada.



Creative and Production

Client: HEALTH CANADA	Date: February 14, 2005
Product: SSD-Home	Revision 2: Feb. 25, 2005
Docket: TOB 05 502	Account Supervisor : T. Lecordier
Title: SSD Kids – SPELLING – AS RECORDED	Copywriter: wordboy
Description: RADIO 30 sec.	File Name:

CONCEPT C: SPELLING

MUSIC: OMINOUS

BOY: Bronchitis... B-R-O-N-C-H-I-T-I-S

WOMAN: If you smoke in the car with your children, you expose them to second-hand smoking diseases.

BOY: Asthma... A-S-T-H- (fade out)

WOMAN: Unfortunately, opening a window won't protect them.

BOY: Cancer.... C-A-N-(fade out)

WOMAN: So now it should be clear what the dangers are. Or do we have to spell it out.

MAN: Make your vehicle smoke-free. For more information call 1 800 O CANADA or visit our website at GoSmokeFree.ca

A message from the government of Canada.

CONCEPT A: ENFANTS

- ENFANT N° 1 :** Est-ce qu'on est presque arrivé ?
- ENFANT N° 2 :** Est-ce qu'on peut arrêter manger un cornet ?
- ANNONCEUR :** En voiture, les enfants disent presque tout ce qui leur passe par la tête.
- ANNONCEUR :** Mais il y a bien des choses qu'ils gardent pour eux...
- ENFANT N° 1 :** J'arrive pas à respirer.
- ENFANT N° 2 :** J'veux pas être encore malade.
- ANNONCEUR :** Chaque jour, nombre d'enfants sont exposés à la fumée secondaire et voient accroître leurs risques de développer de l'asthme, une bronchite, une pneumonie ou un cancer.
- Roulez sans fumer. Pour tout renseignement, composez le 1 800 O-Canada ou visitez le site VivezSansFumee.ca.

Un message du gouvernement du Canada.



Creation et production

Client : SANTÉ CANADA	Date : 25.02.05
Produit : SSD-Home	Révision : T.Q.E. 28.02.05
Dossier : TOB 05 400	Adm. pub. : N. Wiesenfeld
Titre : MFS voiture – SÉCURITÉ	Rédact : M.-C. Boulet
Description : RADIO 30 sec.	Nom du fichier :

CONCEPT B: SÉCURITÉ

MUSIQUE : Intrigante

VHC :

En voiture, personne ne lésine sur la sécurité des enfants.

On installe les tout-petits dans leur siège.

On s'assure que les plus grands sont bien attachés. (E.S. : ceinture qu'on boucle)

On verrouille toutes les portières. (E.S. : portières automatiques qu'on verrouille)

On roule moins vite.

Ensuite, on s'allume une cigarette...

... et on les expose aux dangers de la fumée secondaire.

Protégez vos enfants. Roulez sans fumer. Pour tout renseignement, composez le 1 800 O-Canada ou visitez le site VivezSansFumee.ca.

Un message du gouvernement du Canada.



Création et production

Client : SANTÉ CANADA	Date : 25.02.05
Produit : SSD-Home	Révision : T.Q.E. 28.02.05
Dossier : TOB 05 400	Adm pub. : N. Wiesenfeld
Titre : MFS voiture – LE DERNIER MOT	Rédact : M.-C. Boulet
Description : RADIO 30 sec.	Nom du fichier :

CONCEPT C: ÉPELLATION

- MUSIQUE :** Alarmante
- GARÇON :** Bronchite... (épelle le mot) B-R-O-N-C-H-I-T-E
- FEMME :** Si vous fumez dans votre voiture en présence d'enfants, vous les exposez aux maladies causées par la fumée secondaire.
- GARÇON :** Asthme... A-S-T-H-M-E
- FEMME :** Et ouvrir une fenêtre ne suffit pas à les protéger.
- GARÇON :** Cancer... C-A-N-C-E-R (en fondu)
- FEMME :** Ne laissez pas la cigarette avoir le dernier mot.
- ANNONCEUR :** Roulez sans fumer. Pour tout renseignement, composez le 1 800 O-Canada ou visitez le site VivezSansFumee.ca.

Un message du gouvernement du Canada.