
FINAL

POR 254-07
Contract #: H4133-071141/001/CY
Call-Up Date: December 31, 2007

**QUANTITATIVE STUDY OF
CANADIAN YOUTH SMOKERS AND
VULNERABLE NON-SMOKERS**

**EFFECTS OF MODIFIED PACKAGING
THROUGH INCREASING THE SIZE OF
WARNINGS ON CIGARETTE PACKAGES**

HC POR-07-47



***Prepared for
HEALTH CANADA***

April 2008

Ce rapport est également disponible en français

LES ÉTUDES DE MARCHÉ CRÉATEC +

206 Avenue des Pins Est - Montréal (Québec) H2W 1P1

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1	<i>Purpose.....</i>	1
1.2	<i>Methodology.....</i>	1
1.3	<i>Overview of Findings.....</i>	4
1.4	<i>Conclusion</i>	5
1.5	<i>Summary Results of Statistical Testing</i>	5
2.	BACKGROUND	10
3.	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	12
4.	METHODOLOGY	12
4.1	<i>Target Population.....</i>	12
4.2	<i>Experimental design.....</i>	12
4.3	<i>Effectiveness criteria.....</i>	14
4.4	<i>Sampling</i>	15
4.5	<i>Data analysis.....</i>	16
4.6	<i>Questionnaire.....</i>	18
4.7	<i>Limitations</i>	18
5.	DETAILED FINDINGS	20
5.1	ABOUT THIS REPORT	21
5.1.1	<i>Overall Organization</i>	21
5.1.2	<i>Statistical Notes</i>	22
5.2	CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WEIGHTED SAMPLE.....	23
5.3	UNAIDED RECALL OF CURRENT HWMS	24
5.4	KNOWLEDGE OF CURRENT WARNING SIZE	25
5.5	PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT OF HWMS	26
5.6	EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT	28
5.6.1	<i>Univariate Analysis</i>	28
5.6.2	<i>Multivariate Analysis</i>	31
5.6.3	<i>Conclusion</i>	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Continued)

5.7	PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH CURRENT HWM	33
5.8	EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON PERSUASIVENESS	36
5.8.1	<i>Univariate Analysis</i>	36
5.8.2	<i>Multivariate Analysis</i>	38
5.8.3	<i>Conclusion</i>	38
5.9	EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH SIX SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS	39
5.9.1	<i>Univariate Analysis</i>	39
5.9.2	<i>Multivariate Analysis</i>	42
5.9.3	<i>Conclusion</i>	42
5.10	EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON SMOKER IMAGE	44
5.10.1	<i>Univariate Analysis</i>	45
5.10.2	<i>Multivariate Analysis</i>	49
5.10.3	<i>Conclusion</i>	50
5.11	EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON PRODUCT IMAGE	51
5.11.1	<i>Univariate Analysis</i>	51
5.11.2	<i>Multivariate Analysis</i>	54
5.11.3	<i>Conclusion</i>	54
5.12	EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON EMOTIONAL IMPACT	55
5.12.1	<i>Univariate Analysis</i>	55
5.12.2	<i>Multivariate Analysis</i>	58
5.12.3	<i>Conclusion</i>	58
5.13	EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON PACKAGING ATTRACTIVENESS	59
5.13.1	<i>Univariate Analysis</i>	59
5.13.2	<i>Multivariate Analysis</i>	61
5.13.3	<i>Conclusion</i>	61
6.	SUMMARY TABLES	62
TABLE 1	PROFILE OF THE TEENAGE WEIGHTED SAMPLE.....	64
TABLE 2	UNAIDED RECALL OF CURRENT HWMS ON CIGARETTE PACKS.....	67
TABLE 3	KNOWLEDGE OF CURRENT SIZE OF HWMS ON CIGARETTE PACKS.....	68
TABLE 4	PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT OF HWMS ON CIGARETTE PACKS.....	69
TABLE 5	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT.....	70
TABLE 6	PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH CURRENT HWM.....	71
TABLE 7	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PERSUASIVENESS	76

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Continued)

TABLE 8	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH 6 SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS	77
TABLE 9	PERSONALITY TRAITS ASSOCIATED WITH SMOKERS.....	79
TABLE 10	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON SMOKER IMAGE	80
TABLE 11	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PRODUCT IMAGE	83
TABLE 12	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON THEIR EMOTIONAL IMPACT	85
TABLE 13	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PACKAGING ATTRACTIVENESS	86

APPENDIX 1 - QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX 2 - SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS

APPENDIX 3 - WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS

APPENDIX 4 - EXAMPLE OF SPSS MANOVA RESULTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NOTE TO READER

The opinions expressed by the authors should not be considered to be the opinions of the Government of Canada or of Health Canada.

1.1 PURPOSE

- For the past several years, sixteen picture-based Canadian health warning messages (HWMs) have been portrayed on cigarette packages, occupying 50% of the principal panel's surface. Health Canada (HC) wanted to revisit the relationship of message effectiveness and size when the surface occupied by HWMs is increased to as much as 100%.
- This study was designed to test the potential impact on teenagers' perceptions of three new increased size options for HWMs on cigarette packages, using the current scenario A (where 50% of the surface is occupied by a warning) as the benchmark.

1.2 METHODOLOGY

Target population

- The target population for this study was English and French **teenagers**¹ 14 to 17 years old, segmented in two groups as follows:
 1. *Current smokers*: daily and occasional smokers of manufactured cigarettes;
 2. *Vulnerable Non-smokers*: non-smokers who say that they will probably smoke a puff or more of a cigarette over the next 12 months or who have a reason in mind that might lead them to start smoking.

¹ A similar study was conducted at the same time with adult smokers and its findings were reported separately: *Quantitative Study of Adult Canadian Smokers: Effects of Modified Packaging by Increasing the Size of HWMs on Cigarette Packages*.

Experimental Design

- This study applied an experimental approach in which respondents were exposed to four warning size scenarios in which their reactions were measured according to a pre-defined protocol. Findings were inferred by statistical analysis and not from opinions directly expressed by respondents.
- The experimental design was based on repeated measures with one control scenario (50% – current size) and three test increased size options (75%, 90% and 100%).
 - All respondents were exposed to all four size scenarios, in rotated order.
 - The same two picture-based HWMs were used to illustrate each size scenario, placed on a 3-dimensional king size cigarette pack with the part of the principal panel reserved for the cigarette brand marked ‘Cigarettes’.

Sample

- A quota sample of n=746 interviews, including 306 Current smokers and 440 Vulnerable Non-smokers, with a 50% / 50% gender split was distributed equally across ten shopping malls.
- All data were collected using face-to-face interviews in the official language preferred by respondents. They averaged about 30 minutes in length and were conducted from February 8 to February 24, 2008.

Measures of impact

- A total of 38 effectiveness indicators were used, grouped into seven sets:
 1. Perceived communication impact (5 indicators)
 2. Personal persuasiveness (1)
 3. Persuasiveness associated with six social style of smokers (6)
 4. Smoker image (12)
 5. Product image (9)
 6. Emotional impact (4)
 7. Packaging attractiveness (1)
- The impact of the new increased size options was determined by their deviations from the current scenario A (50%) and their deviations from its smaller alternative option (incremental effects – e.g., option C - 90% vs. B - 75%).
- To conclude that an impact was “substantial“, at least a scale slide of 0.5 on the 9-point scale used had to be observed. This represents about 20% of respondents who responded differently.

Statistical testing

- Two types of statistical tests were performed on the observed effects of increased warning size options:
 - Univariate T-test for testing individual effects i.e. deviations of each individual indicator, from the current scenario and the smaller alternative option;
 - Multivariate MANOVA F-Tests for testing generalized effects i.e., effects on the whole set of indicators, based on deviations from the current scenario and the smaller alternative option, even if some of the individual indicators may not have reached significance in univariate testing.
- Strict standards to decide whether to call an effect / deviation “statistically significant”. In order to earn this label, all tests must have had a probability of a type I error of less than 0.01, with a 95% confidence interval.

Limitations

- As with most laboratory experiments, conclusions were inferred from a convenience sample, and no statistical formula can be used to generalize what is observed. However, the weight of evidence comes into play: if similar experiments conducted by HC and others find no contradictory evidence under varying conditions, there is more confidence in these findings and greater evidence is provided for their generalization. Moreover, if the findings can be explained or have ‘face validity’, the confidence in these findings increases even more.
- Also, as all laboratory studies, this study suffers from the generic limitations of forced exposure to material in that the external validity is sacrificed at the cost of internal validity.
 - It is possible that under natural viewing conditions smokers will only choose to expose themselves to information of their choice.
 - Therefore, observed effects in the study may or may not materialize in a natural setting (real life), depending on the HWMs’ ability to attract attention and motivate reading.

1.3 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

- A large majority of respondents in both teenage groups underestimated the size of current warnings on the regular (66%) as well as on the king size (60%) package.
 - Findings suggest that teenagers believe current cigarette packages give more importance to the brand than to the warning about the health risks of smoking, especially Vulnerable Non-smokers.
- Most respondents associated moderate levels of effectiveness with HWMs, in general, as a vehicle for communicating with the public.
 - However, a substantial share of the sample thought HWMs were very effective in achieving the five communication objectives that were read to them.
 - In addition, other findings suggest that teenagers underestimated the effectiveness of warnings on cigarette packs: when they rated the persuasive value of each of the 16 current HWMs, their average rating was significantly and substantially higher than the effectiveness they associated with HWMs in general, as a vehicle for communicating with the public.
 - Finally, reactions to new increased warning size options showed that teenage smokers and non-smokers are sensitive to HWMs and their size.
- Results of this experiment showed that any of the three increased size options for warnings on cigarettes packages would make HWMs a more effective vehicle for communicating with teenage smokers and non-smokers than the current size: larger and more visible warnings are more likely to effectively support efforts against smoking.
- However, to achieve significant and substantial generalized effects on most indicators, HWMs had to cover at least 90% of the front panel (option C).
- While impact on most indicators started to be statistically significant at the smallest increased option B (75%), incremental effects of option C (90%) over B (75%) and option D (100%) over C (90%) were generally proportionally larger than those of option B (75%) over A (50%).
 - This means that each percent of surface increase with option C (90%) and D (100%) generally delivered more impact than each percent increase from current scenario A (50%) to option B (75%).
- Two sets of indicators were less sensitive to warning size increase: smoker image (personality traits) and product image (cigarette attributes). These image indicators required option D (100%) for being substantially affected.
 - Findings suggest that increasing the current size of warnings on cigarette packages is not very effective to negatively affect image of smokers or perception of cigarette product attributes, unless HWMs occupy the entire front panel.

-
- Option D (100%) generally amplified the observed effects with option C (90%) in a discernable way and this ‘total HWM coverage’ option always delivered the largest effects compared to the current scenario A (50%).
 - Except for smoker image and product image where differences were small between increased size option C (90%) and D (100%), incremental effects of option D (100%) over option C (90%) were often sizeable.

1.4 CONCLUSION

- If the size of current HWMs was increased from 50% to 75%, impact would be statistically significant on all indicators, but small in most cases. With modified packaging option B (75%) only two effects would be substantial compared to the current scenario. Compared to the current scenario, HWMs with option B were perceived as substantially more efficient in:
 - Convincing respondents, personally, to stay away from smoking;
 - Communicating with the public about the risks of smoking.
- Considering all effectiveness indicators, HWMs with increased size option B (75%) were unlikely to remain more effective over a number of years than with the current scenario A (low sustainability of impact as a result of modified packaging).
- To achieve substantial effects on most effectiveness indicators, at least option C (90%) was required. With modified packaging option C (90%) three additional substantial effects were observed. Compared to the current scenario, HWMs with option C were perceived as substantially more efficient in:
 - Convincing various styles of smokers to stay away from smoking;
 - Connecting with their emotions and shocking them;
 - Making cigarette packages less attractive.
- With modified packaging option D (100%) two additional substantial effects were observed. Compared to the current scenario, HWMs with option D affected substantially several (but not all) attributes of:
 - Smoker image;
 - Product image.

1.5 SUMMARY RESULTS OF STATISTICAL TESTING

- The following tables summarize the results of statistical testing of all 38 effectiveness indicators.
 - **Table A** summarizes results of the univariate T-tests to determine the significance of individual effects of each increased size option over the current scenario.

- **Table B** summarizes the results of the univariate T-tests to determine the significance of incremental individual effects of each increased size option over its smaller alternative (e.g., option D over C).
- **Table C** summarizes the results of the multivariate F-tests to determine the significance of the generalized effects of each increased size option i.e., the significance of its impact on the whole set of indicators, even if some of them do not test significant.

LEGEND FOR READING THE TABLES

- ▲ T-test significant at $P < 0.01$
- T-test significant at $P < 0.05$
- NS = Not significant
- A = Current warning size (50%)
- B = Increased size (75%)
- C = Increased size (90%)
- D = Increased size (100%)

TABLE A **SUMMARY OF UNIVARIATE STATISTICAL TESTING**
– INDIVIDUAL EFFECTS COMPARED TO CURRENT SCENARIO A (50%) –

SIGNIFICANCE OF INDIVIDUAL DEVIATIONS AGAINST CURRENT SCENARIO A (50%) (all tests based on total sample)	INCREASED SIZE OPTION		
	B (75%) vs. A	C (90%) vs. A	D (100%) vs. A
PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT			
■ In informing the public about the risks of smoking	▲	▲	▲
■ In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking	▲	▲	▲
■ In increasing the number of smokers who quit smoking	▲	▲	▲
■ In discouraging people from starting to smoke	▲	▲	▲
■ In reinforcing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings	▲	▲	▲
PERSUASIVENESS - PERSONAL			
■ Would keep people like you from smoking	▲	▲	▲
PERSUASIVENESS - ASSOCIATED WITH 6 SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS			
■ Business man	▲	▲	▲
■ Teenage boy	▲	▲	▲
■ Sporty girl	▲	▲	▲
■ Biker man	▲	▲	▲
■ Young woman	▲	▲	▲
■ Fisherman	▲	▲	▲

SIGNIFICANCE OF INDIVIDUAL DEVIATIONS AGAINST CURRENT SCENARIO A (50%) (all tests based on total sample)	INCREASED SIZE OPTION		
	B (75%) vs. A	C (90%) vs. A	D (100%) vs. A
SMOKER IMAGE			
▪ Risk-takers / Very prudent	▲	▲	▲
▪ Image conscious / Sloppy	●	▲	▲
▪ Not cool / Very cool	▲	▲	▲
▪ Concerned for others / Selfish	▲	▲	▲
▪ Health negligent / Health conscious	NS	●	▲
▪ Higher education / Lower education	NS	●	▲
▪ Afraid of death / Do not worry about death	NS	▲	▲
▪ Financially secure / Poor	NS	NS	NS
▪ In control of their destiny / Not in control of their destiny	NS	●	▲
▪ Disciplined / Disorganised	NS	▲	▲
▪ Leader / Follower	NS	●	▲
▪ Rebellious / Follow the rules	NS	▲	▲
PRODUCT IMAGE			
▪ High quality standards / Low quality standards	NS	NS	NS
▪ Very popular / Not very popular	▲	▲	▲
▪ Addictive / Non addictive	●	▲	▲
▪ Dangerous / Safe	NS	▲	▲
▪ Lot of taste / Not much taste	NS	NS	▲
▪ High nicotine content / Low nicotine content	▲	▲	▲
▪ Toxic / Non toxic	●	▲	▲
▪ Sold at standard prices / Sold at lower prices	NS	NS	▲
▪ Low tar content / High tar content	▲	▲	▲
EMOTIONAL IMPACT			
▪ Would be disturbed to see this type of warnings on the cigarette packages purchased (Yes/No)	▲	▲	NS
▪ You had waves of strong feelings when looking at these warnings (Agree/Disagree)	▲	▲	▲
▪ It would be difficult to hide or control your feelings so that nobody would know what you really feel about these warnings (Agree/Disagree)	▲	▲	▲
▪ These warnings shocked you (Agree/Disagree)	▲	▲	▲
PACKAGING ATTRACTIVENESS			
▪ Overall attractiveness	●	▲	▲

TABLE B

SUMMARY OF UNIVARIATE STATISTICAL TESTING
– INCREMENTAL INDIVIDUAL EFFECTS –

SIGNIFICANCE OF INCREMENTAL DEVIATIONS AGAINST THE SMALLER ALTERNATIVE OPTION (all tests based on total sample)	INCREASED SIZE OPTION		
	B (75%) vs. A	C (90%) vs. B	D (100%) vs. C
PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT			
▪ In informing the public about the risks of smoking	▲	▲	▲
▪ In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking	▲	▲	▲
▪ In increasing the number of smokers who quit smoking	▲	▲	▲
▪ In discouraging people from starting to smoke	▲	▲	▲
▪ In reinforcing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings	▲	▲	▲
PERSUASIVENESS- PERSONAL			
▪ Would keep people like you from smoking	▲	▲	▲
PERSUASIVENESS - ASSOCIATED WITH 6 SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS			
▪ Business man	▲	▲	▲
▪ Teenage boy	▲	▲	▲
▪ Sporty girl	▲	▲	▲
▪ Biker man	▲	▲	▲
▪ Young woman	▲	▲	▲
▪ Fisherman	▲	▲	▲
SMOKER IMAGE			
▪ Risk-takers / Very prudent	▲	●	▲
▪ Image conscious / Sloppy	●	NS	NS
▪ Not cool / Very cool	▲	●	NS
▪ Concerned for others / Selfish	▲	●	▲
▪ Health negligent / Health conscious	NS	NS	▲
▪ Higher education / Lower education	NS	●	NS
▪ Afraid of death / Do not worry about death	NS	▲	NS
▪ Financially secure / Poor	NS	NS	NS
▪ In control of their destiny / Not in control of their destiny	NS	NS	●
▪ Disciplined / Disorganised	NS	●	NS
▪ Leader / Follower	NS	NS	NS
▪ Rebellious / Follow the rules	NS	●	NS
PRODUCT IMAGE			
▪ High quality standards / Low quality standards	NS	NS	NS
▪ Very popular / Not very popular	▲	NS	▲
▪ Addictive / Non addictive	●	NS	NS
▪ Dangerous / Safe	NS	▲	NS
▪ Lot of taste / Not much taste	NS	NS	▲
▪ High nicotine content / Low nicotine content	▲	●	●
▪ Toxic / Non toxic	●	NS	NS
▪ Sold at standard prices / Sold at lower prices	NS	NS	▲
▪ Low tar content / High tar content	▲	●	NS

SIGNIFICANCE OF INCREMENTAL DEVIATIONS AGAINST THE SMALLER ALTERNATIVE OPTION (all tests based on total sample)	INCREASED SIZE OPTION		
	B (75%) vs. A	C (90%) vs. B	D (100%) vs. C
EMOTIONAL IMPACT			
▪ Would be disturbed to see this type of warnings on the cigarette packages purchased (Yes/No)	▲	▲	NS
▪ You had waves of strong feelings when looking at these warnings (Agree/Disagree)	▲	▲	▲
▪ It would be difficult to hide or control your feelings so that nobody would know what you really feel about these warnings (Agree/Disagree)	▲	▲	▲
▪ These warnings shocked you (Agree/Disagree)	▲	▲	▲
PACKAGING ATTRACTIVENESS			
▪ Overall attractiveness	●	▲	NS

TABLE C **SUMMARY OF MULTIVARIATE STATISTICAL TESTING**
– GENERALIZED EFFECTS –

SIGNIFICANCE OF GENERALIZED DEVIATIONS (all tests based on total sample)	SIZE SCENARIOS COMPARED				
	A (50%) vs. B (75%)	B (75%) vs. C (90%)	C (90%) vs. D (100%)	A (50%) vs. C (90%)	A (50%) vs. D (100%)
▪ PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT (5 scales)	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
▪ PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS (6 scales)	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
▪ SMOKER IMAGE (12 scales)	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
▪ PRODUCT IMAGE (9 scales)	▲	NS	▲	▲	▲
▪ EMOTIONAL IMPACT (4 scales)	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

N.B. Personal persuasiveness and Packaging attractiveness were not tested by MANOVA because they included only one indicator.

Les Études de Marché Créatec+

206 Pine avenue East - Montréal (Québec) H2W 1P1
Tel.: 514-844-1127 – Fax: 514- 288-3194
Email: info@createc.ca

PWGSC contract number: H4133-071141/001/CY
Award date: December 31, 2007
Health Canada: TCP-PLT-questions@hc-sc.gc.ca

2. BACKGROUND

- Health Canada (HC) Tobacco Control Program (TCP) plays a leadership role in implementing the Government of Canada's Federal Tobacco Strategy – the TCP is responsible for the administration and enforcement of the Tobacco Act. It regulates the manufacturing, sale, labelling and promotion of tobacco products. Its Office of Research, Evaluation and Surveillance is responsible for evaluating Health Warning Messages (HWMs).
- The effectiveness of HWMs as a means to raise awareness of the dangers linked to smoking, and to prevent and reduce smoking has been demonstrated by numerous studies from many countries. HWMs inform smokers directly about the harm associated with smoking and the health improvements associated with quitting. HWMs have 3 objectives:
 1. Inform users and non-users about tobacco products, their emissions, the health hazards and effects arising from tobacco use;
 2. Encourage cessation; and,
 3. Encourage avoidance of the use of tobacco products where they can harm others.
- In Canada, there are currently 16 HWMs which must appear in equal numbers on each cigarette brand's package. HWMs must cover 50% of each of the front and back panels of the package. One side is in English and one side is in French. Each package must also include an insert (a flyer or printed material on the inside of the package) which provides information on quitting.
- Canada has been a world leader in the field of tobacco product labelling. Many countries, including the U.S., are using Canadian requirements as a model. However, there are currently countries that have labelling requirements that are more stringent than Canadian requirements (e.g., Brazil, Australia and some others).
- Now that Canadian HWMs occupying 50% of the principal panel surface have been in the marketplace for several years, HC wanted to revisit the relationship of effectiveness and size when the message size is increased to as much as 100% of the front panel from the current 50%.
- Evidence suggests that HWMs can be effective, provided they are large, prominent and hard-hitting. Size was linked to recall and impact on a number of critical effectiveness indicators, in many studies from various countries:

-
-
- Previous HC studies² showed that size has a dramatic impact on persuasiveness (to stay away from smoking) and a number of other effectiveness criteria (product image, smoker image, packaging attractiveness, message credibility).
 - A U.K. study³ comparing warning styles from several countries showed that smokers had a tendency to interpret the smallest of HWMs as evidence of government complicity and to equate the size of warnings with the magnitude of the risk. In addition to highly emotional and disturbing pictures, larger HWMs also reduce the attractiveness of cigarette packages and help create an environment where smoking is less acceptable.
 - Two U.S. studies confirmed previous HC findings: the increased effectiveness of larger, more visible cigarette HWMs has a dramatic impact on communicating health risks to smokers and non-smokers.
 - One of these U.S. studies⁴ showed that the emotional response evoked by HWMs, a key feature of effective HWMs, is amplified by their size.
 - Based on these recent studies, the U.S. FDA is now considering increasing the warning size to 50% of the front and back panels and adopting picture-based warnings, as in Canada.⁵

² *Effects of Increasing the Size of Warnings on Cigarette Packs -- Créatec, 1999. This study found that there was a relatively linear relationship between effectiveness and size in the range of 30% to 50%, which tended to soften after 50%.*

³ *Health Warnings on Cigarette and Tobacco Packs: Report on research to inform European standardisation, London, 1990. This quantitative and qualitative study was commissioned by The Health Education Authority to test the new European Union health warnings and their impact.*

⁴ *The Impact and Acceptability of Canadian-style Cigarette Warning Labels among U.S. Smokers and Non-smokers -- April 2007 issue of Nicotine and Tobacco Research -- Annenberg Public Policy Center -- Ellen Peters; Daniel Romer; Paul Slovic; Kathleen Hall Jamieson; Leisha Wharfield; C. K. Mertz; Stephanie M. Carpenter. This study showed that Canadian HWMs were much more effective in engaging smokers in communicating the harms of tobacco use, compared to American HWMs. It also confirmed that the intensity of the emotional reaction helps explain why larger warnings are more effective.*

⁵ *Text and Graphic Warnings on Cigarette Packages: Findings from the International Tobacco Control Four Country Study -- March 2007 issue of the American Journal of Preventive Medicine -- David Hammond, Geoffrey T. Fong, Ron Borland, K. Michael Cummings, Ann McNeill and Pete Driezen. This study showed that Canadian HWMs were the most likely to prompt cigarette smokers to think about the health risks of smoking, and to think about quitting, because of the HWMs.*

3. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

- The purpose of this study was to test three increased size options of HWMs on the front and back panels of cigarette packages (75%, 90% and 100%) and compare them with the current size (50%), in order to verify the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between the size of HWMs and the effectiveness of their intended message.
- Findings will help answer the following two questions:
 1. *Does effectiveness actually increase with size, and if it does, in what respect, and starting at what percentage of increase?*
 2. *Does effectiveness stop increasing beyond a certain percentage increase in size, or does it continue increasing in a relatively linear fashion?*

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 TARGET POPULATION⁶

- The target population of this study was **teenage Canadians**⁷ 14 to 17 years old, English and French, segmented in two groups as follows:
 1. **Current smokers:** daily and occasional smokers of manufactured cigarettes;
 2. **Vulnerable Non-smokers:** non-smokers who say that they will probably smoke a puff or more of a cigarette over the next 12 months or who have a reason in mind that might lead them to start smoking.

4.2 EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

⁶ Incidence of target population was estimated at 40% of this age cohort.

⁷ A similar study was conducted at the same time with adult smokers and its findings were reported separately: *Quantitative Study of Adult Canadian Smokers: Effects of Modified Packaging by Increasing the Size of HWMs on Cigarette Packages.*

-
-
- This study differed from conventional public opinion research because it applied an experimental approach in which respondents were exposed to differing stimuli to which their reactions were then measured according to a pre-defined protocol.
 - Conclusions about the effectiveness of each scenario and the nature of the relationship between effectiveness and warning size were inferred by statistical analysis, not from opinions expressed directly by respondents.
 - A simple experimental design with one control scenario (50% - current size) and 3 test scenarios (increased size options 75%, 90%, and 100%) was established.
 - All respondents were exposed to four size scenarios (3 tests plus 1 current) in a specified order of rotation.
 - The same two picture-based HWMs were used to illustrate each size option, placed on a 3-dimensional king size cigarette pack with the part of the principal (front) panel reserved for the brand marked 'Cigarettes'.⁸
 1. *Where there's smoke, there's hydrogen cyanide* (cognitive-based message)
 2. *Cigarettes cause mouth diseases* (affective-based message)
 - Except for the surface occupied by the warnings, all mock-ups of cigarette packages shown were strictly identical (the only change in sensory stimuli was the percent of area occupied by warnings, with all else remaining unchanged).
 - A copy of the mock-ups used is appended to this report.
 - Each effectiveness criteria measured the average / combined reaction brought by the two warnings selected for this experiment. Because these warnings are typical of the two main ways to communicate the risks of smoking (cognitive and affective channel), this ensured that measures were not overtly based on only one consumer learning process.
 - The exposure sequence of size options was rotated between respondents, as shown in the following table. The eight exposure sequences / questionnaires were pre-printed in equal number to ensure respondents were assigned to a specific sequence of exposure strictly at random (this is a key requirement underlying statistical testing) to reduce bias due to the order in which questions are asked.

⁸ All mock-ups were supplied by Health Canada printed on cardstock, sized at approximately 4 inches by 3 1/2 inches, imitating an actual 25-cigarette pack size. English and French mock-ups were identical linguistic versions of the same two HWMs that were selected for this experiment. English-speaking respondents viewed the English mock-ups while French-speaking respondents viewed French mock-ups.

EXPOSURE SEQUENCE OF SIZE OPTIONS

Rotation of packages	Words vs. Photos sequence	% Total
ABCD	WP	13
	PW	13
BAD C	WP	12
	PW	12
CDAB	WP	12
	PW	12
DCBA	WP	13
	PW	13
Total:		100

A = 50% (control), B = 75%, C = 90%, D = 100% of front panel area occupied by warnings.

P = Photos of different social styles to measure persuasive value of warnings associated with different styles of smokers.

W = Word-based questions on personality traits, product attributes, perceived communication impact and emotional impact of warnings.

PW = Photos and related questions shown before word-based questions.

WP = Word-based questions asked before showing photos of social styles.

4.3 EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA

- To measure respondents' perceptions and reactions, the following seven sets of effectiveness indicators were used, for a total of 38 criteria:
 1. *Communication impact* – perception of the warning size scenarios ability to achieve the following specific communication objectives with the public (5 scales):
 - i. Inform the public about the risks of smoking;
 - ii. Increase the number of people who disapprove of smoking;
 - iii. Increase the number of smokers who quit smoking;
 - iv. Discourage people from starting to smoke; and,
 - v. Increase respondent's personal belief in the delivered warning message.
 2. *General persuasive value* – perception of the warning size scenarios ability to discourage people from smoking (1 scale)
 3. *Persuasive value associated with social styles of smokers* – perception of the warning size scenarios ability to discourage smokers representing different personality types (6 scales - a copy of the photos used is appended)
 4. *Smoker image* – perception of personality traits of people who keep smoking cigarettes packaged with the warning size scenarios (12 scales)
 5. *Product image* – perception of cigarette product attributes packaged with the warning size scenarios (9 scales)

6. *Emotional impact* – intensity of emotion as a result of looking at the warning size scenarios (4 scales)
7. *Overall package attractiveness* with the warning size scenarios (1 scale)

4.4 SAMPLING

- A quota sample of **n=746 interviews**, including 306 Current Smokers and 440 Vulnerable Non-smokers, with a 50% / 50% gender split was distributed equally across ten shopping malls in the following location:

French speaking

- Quebec City
- Sherbrooke
- Trois-Rivières

English speaking

- Toronto
- Halifax
- Kitchener
- London
- Vancouver
- Calgary
- Regina

- The split between English and French-speaking respondents was relatively proportional to the Canadian English and French-speaking population (3 out of 10 shopping malls used were in French-speaking areas).
- The table below shows the distribution of the completed sample by target population.

SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION

	TOTAL	Current Smokers	Vulnerable Non-smokers
TOTAL	746	306	440
▪ French	231	104	127
▪ English	515	202	313
▪ Male	369	173	196
▪ Female	377	133	244

Field procedures

- All data were collected using face-to-face interviews, averaging about 30 minutes in length, from February 8 to February 24, 2008.
- There were 30 interviewers and supervisors. All attended a briefing session and simulated interviews.
- A supervisor was always present at each interview on site to oversee and check the accuracy of each interviewer's work.

-
- In the week following the completion of the field interviews, an independent validation was done on 10% of all the interviews, by telephone. In each telephone call, a few socio-demographic questions were verified.
 - Each respondent received a \$10 incentive at the end of the interview.

4.5 DATA ANALYSIS

- Before comparing the response associated with each scenario, equal weights were applied to the rotations in the exposure, the target groups and the shopping malls. In addition, the data were weighted by language to reflect the distribution of the official language communities of the country.
- Once weighted, deviations of the new increased size options from the current scenario (e.g., C vs. A) and from their preceding smaller alternative (e.g., C vs. B) were calculated – these deviations or scale slides from the control current scenario are the effects caused by increasing the area occupied by the warnings.
- The effects were subsequently examined in the total sample as well as for each of the two groups of teenagers (Current Smokers and Vulnerable Non-smokers).
- Note that all measurements associated with the effects of size were repeated for each size option (i.e. they are dependent measurements from a statistical point of view). Therefore, statistical tests are more sensitive compared to measurements taken on an independent sample, where each size option would be evaluated by different respondents. As a rough guideline, with the sample size completed, statistical tests had the ability to detect a variation of at least 0.2 or 0.3 point on a 9-point scale as being significant in the total sample.

Univariate analysis of the variance caused by increased size options

- For each effectiveness indicator, the effects of each new increased size option vs. the current scenario, and each increased size option vs. its preceding smaller alternative (B vs. A, C vs. B, D vs. C) was determined. Statistical significance of the deviations was tested for each indicator and for each new increased size option, in the total sample.
- To conclude that a new increased size option had a significant effect on a particular indicator, two conditions had to be met:
 1. The deviation had to be statistically significant in the total sample.
 2. The significant deviation in the total sample had to be consistently corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.

The term “*significant difference*” means that the observed differences are probably “true” differences and not due to chance.

Multivariate analysis of the variance caused by increased size options

- To verify if each of the three new increased size options had a significant effect on the entire set of indicators (and not only on some of them) used to measure a particular factor (e.g., perceived communication impact) 20 multivariate analyses⁹ of variance (MANOVA) were performed. This analysis also determined the presence, if any, of interaction effects with teenage sub-groups.
 - Exposure to the 4 size options was the only within-respondents factors.
 - Teenage sub-group, gender and language were the between-respondents factors.
 - Current scenario was always the benchmark when contrasting differences.
- The MANOVA model used for this study was the “*doubly multivariate repeated measures design*” and required the data to be organized in the “*multivariate setup*”. The following effects were tested:
 - Main multivariate effects of each of the three new increased size options.
 - Interaction effects of each of the new increased size options with teenage sub-groups.

Statistical tests of significance

- The purpose of testing is to draw conclusions about the population based on results observed in a random sample.
- Larger sample sizes have a tendency to inflate some measures of statistical significance that may lead to false conclusions about effect and strength of associations, as smaller confidence intervals do. Some statistical tests are particularly susceptible to this, such as the Chi-square measure of association and the T-test of differences between means.
- Therefore, strict standards were used to decide whether to call a relationship or a difference “statistically significant”. In order to earn this label, T-tests and MANOVA tests must have had a probability of a type I error of less than 0.01, with a 95% confidence interval.
 - In addition, any significant deviation found in the total sample must have been consistent (same direction), if not statistically significant, in both teenage sub-groups.
- Two types of statistical tests were performed (at a 95% confidence level) on the observed deviations:
 - Univariate T-tests for paired comparisons.
 - Multivariate MANOVA F-tests (Pillais, Hotellings, Wilks and Roys).

⁹ One for each of 5 sets of indicators X one for each of 4 contrast bases [A] vs. [B], [B] vs. [C], [C] vs. [D], [A] vs. [C]. Univariate analysis of variance was used for Indicators containing only one scale (personal persuasiveness and packaging attractiveness).

4.6 QUESTIONNAIRE

- The questionnaire used in this study was based on the Createc 1999 study. Because this questionnaire had already been pre-tested and used in previous studies, with the same number of size options, there was no need to pre-test it again.
- The average interview was 30 minutes.
- To facilitate administration of the interviews and numerous rotations (size options and photos), eight different versions of the questionnaire were prepared.
- In all cases, respondents were asked at the beginning of the interview for their unaided recall and impressions of the 16 current HWMs before being asked for their perceptions of the warning size scenarios.

4.7 LIMITATIONS

- The groups of teenagers represented in this experiment had characteristics that should be taken into account when interpreting the results:
 1. Face-to-face intercept interviews in shopping malls is a convenience sampling method widely used for research designs primarily focused on comparability of sub-groups rather than on representativeness of a sample. But mall intercept interviews cannot provide a random sample and therefore, margins of sampling error cannot be calculated to extrapolate findings to the population as a whole.
 - The purpose of this study was not to generate findings that would be extrapolated to the entire population but to compare different warning size options with representatives of a population observed in particular conditions (shopping malls).
 - The sample was geographically well distributed (10 shopping centres across the country); this reduced the potential for bias.
 2. As with most laboratory experiments, conclusions were inferred from a convenience sample, and no statistical formula can be used to generalize what is observed. However, the weight of evidence comes into play: if similar experiments conducted by HC and others find no contradictory evidence under varying conditions, there is more confidence in these findings and greater evidence is provided for their generalization. Moreover, if the findings can be explained or have 'face validity', the confidence in these findings increases even more.
 - Because generalization is stepwise, every feasible effort was made to make the current step as sound as it could be, not only by care in the experiment but by a detailed description of what was done. Every effort was made, at critical points of the experiment, to ensure the data was suitable for variance analysis.

-
3. As all laboratory studies, this study suffers from the generic limitations of forced exposure to material in that the external validity is sacrificed at the cost of internal validity.¹⁰
- It is possible that under natural viewing conditions teenagers will focus their attention only on information of their choice.
 - Therefore, observed effects in the study may or may not materialize in a natural setting (real life), depending on the HWMs' ability to attract attention and motivate reading.

¹⁰ When we conduct experiments, our goal is to demonstrate cause and effect relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

Internal validity associated with experimental research refers both to how well the study was run (research design, operational definitions used, how variables were measured, what was/wasn't measured, etc.), and how confidently one can conclude that the change in the dependent variable was produced solely by the independent variable and not extraneous ones. Internal validity answers the question, "Was it really the exposure to the size options that caused the difference between the means/variances of the measures in the control and experimental groups?"

*The extent to which a study's results (regardless of whether the study is descriptive or experimental) can be generalized/applied to other people reflects its external validity. (For more details read: Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally).*



5.

DETAILED FINDINGS

5.1 ABOUT THIS REPORT

5.1.1 OVERALL ORGANIZATION

- In order to provide clear and consistent analysis of the large quantity of information and results of statistical testing presented in this report, the following approach was used:
 - Each section of the Detailed Findings begins with a summary of the questions asked of respondents and addressed in the section, with reference to more complete tables in the Summary Tables section where further detail can be found.
 - In each section where effects of increased size options are analyzed, interpretation of univariate analysis is highlighted first, followed by multivariate (MANOVA) analysis and an overall conclusion on observed effects.
 - Univariate analysis tests the effect of increasing warning size on each *individual* indicator, while multivariate analysis tests if the observed effects are *generalized* i.e. significantly affecting the series of indicators taken as a whole, even if some individual indicators are not significantly affected.
 - Linearity of effects and trends observed in the two teenage sub-groups are discussed, followed by a summary table of the univariate statistical testing (T-test) and a summary table of rating deviations from the current warning size (50%) to each of the increased size options (75%, 90%, 100%).
- The Table of Contents was designed to allow easy navigation through the seven sets of effectiveness indicators used to evaluate the impact of the three new increased size options.
- The Summary Tables section, with its own Table of Contents, regroups all the raw responses and ratings provided by respondents into an easy-to-read tabular format, by targeted teenage groups and language.

5.1.2 STATISTICAL NOTES

- Most of the tables contained in the report are average ratings or deviations based on a 9-point scale.
- Throughout the tables in the Summary Tables section, numbers in (N) refer to the number of cases (respondents) on which ratings or percentages have been calculated (sample base) for a specific analysis.
- In reporting percentages, “<1%” indicates that at least one respondent was included in the category while “0%” means no one was included in the category.
- In reporting deviations, the term “significant” is used to qualify the result of a statistical test (T-test or F-test with type I error of less than 0.01 and at a 95% confidence interval). This means that the observed difference was quite probably a “true” difference and not due to chance ($P < 0.01$ was the significance level set for this experiment.)
- **All results are presented based on the weighted sample. Percentages over .5 and deviations over .05 are rounded up.**

5.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WEIGHTED SAMPLE

- **Table 1** in the Summary Tables section presents the demographic characteristics and smoking habits of the respondents in the total (weighted) sample, in each of the two teenage sub-groups and two official language communities¹¹.
- Almost all (91%) of the 746 teenagers who participated in this study were enrolled at high school level or less and were aged 16-17 years old (86%). The average age was 15.5 years, with no difference between the two teenage sub-groups.
 - Vulnerable Non-smokers included more females (55%) than Smokers (43%).
 - Vulnerable Non-smokers were younger (19% were aged 14-15 years old vs. 9% Smokers)
- Of those who currently smoke:
 - 67% were everyday smokers.
 - 78% had smoked for more than a year and the average daily number of cigarettes smoked was 9.9 (the average number was higher for French current smokers – 11.1 vs. their English counterparts – 9.5).
 - The average amount spent on a weekly basis for smoking was \$26.6 (the average amount was lower for French current smokers - \$28.1 vs. their English counterparts - \$21.8).
 - Half (49%) of all smokers reported having tried quitting smoking in the past 12 months.
 - Half (51%) of the regularly purchased brands were packaged in a regular size format, mostly of 'regular' strength (68%), and 71% had a secondary brand in addition to a regular brand.

¹¹ The sample was weighted by gender (50/50) and language (21% French / 79% English). In addition, each of the 10 testing locations, two target groups and each of the 8 versions of the questionnaire (rotations in exposure to the mock-ups) received an equal weight.

5.3 UNAIDED RECALL OF CURRENT HWMS

As you already know, on each package of cigarettes there is a health warning message.

Please, tell me all the current warnings you know, by describing me the picture and/or telling me the phrase written on top of each package.

*This first question provided immediate context to the study for the respondent. For a warning to be counted as “recalled”, some unambiguous element was mentioned such as a key word of its text message or at least some part of its picture message. (See **Table 2** in the Summary Tables section for further detail.)*

OVERVIEW

- On average, 3.3 of the 16 current HWMs were recalled, without prompting, with little difference between Smokers (3.5) and Vulnerable Non-smokers (3.1).
- The highest recalled HWMs were the same in both groups of teenagers, with almost the same ranking¹².

DETAILED RESULTS

- Of the 16 current HWMs, four were consistently recalled more often in both groups of teenagers and in both linguistic groups, and one of these warnings (*‘Cigarettes cause mouth diseases’*) clearly stood out, as shown in the table below.

MOST RECALLED CURRENT HWMS

<i>Current HWMs most frequently recalled (unprompted)</i>	Total Teenagers (746) %	Smokers (306) %	Vulnerable Non-smokers (440) %	English speaking (515) %	French speaking (231) %
1. Cigarettes cause mouth diseases	62	61	63	61	64
2. Cigarettes cause lung cancer (lungs)	42	38	46	42	42
3. Cigarettes hurt babies	34	36	32	32	42
4. Tobacco smoke hurts babies	24	26	21	25	20
5. You're not the only one smoking this cigarette	23	24	22	20	34
6. Tobacco use can make you impotent	19	26	11	19	15
7. Children see children do	18	21	15	18	19

N.B. All other current HWMs were recalled by less than 18% of respondents in any teenage sub-group.

¹² Note that of the two current warnings used throughout the tests for illustrating size scenarios, one (*Where there's smoke, there's hydrogen cyanide*) was the second least often recalled and the other (*Cigarettes cause mouth diseases*) was the most often recalled.

5.4 KNOWLEDGE OF CURRENT WARNING SIZE

Here is an exact drawing of a king size and a regular package of cigarettes. I would like you to show me the line which outlines or best describes the size currently occupied by the warning.

*Respondents were shown a blank king size and regular face panel of a cigarette package and asked to estimate the surface currently occupied by HWMs. (See **Table 3** in the Summary Tables section for further detail.)*

OVERVIEW

- A large majority of respondents in both teenage sub-groups underestimated the size of current warnings on the regular as well as on the king size package.
- On average, the current size of warnings on the regular size format was estimated by respondents only slightly above 40 percent of the principal panel (43 percent of the surface). For the king size format, respondents were closer to reality but still with a tendency to underestimate (46 percent of the surface).

DETAILED FINDINGS

- Only one-quarter of respondents (28% for the king size and 26% for the regular size format) were able to correctly delineate the surface currently occupied by warnings i.e., half the principal panel of a cigarette package.
 - Most (66% for the king size and 60% for the regular size format) underestimated the current size of warnings while a minority overestimated it (13% for the king size and 8% for the regular size format).
 - Vulnerable Non-smokers were more likely to underestimate both formats.
- These findings suggest that teenagers believe current cigarette packages give more importance to the brand than to the warning about the health risks of smoking, especially Vulnerable Non-smokers.

5.5 PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT OF HWMS

To what extent do you think that health warnings on each package of cigarettes are effective in...?

Respondents were asked five questions on the effectiveness of HWMs as a vehicle for communicating with the public, without any particular warning shown to them.

*Because the same questions were asked later for each of the current HWMs and each of the three increased size options tested, opinions based on these questions answered without exposure to any material may be used as benchmark. (See **Table 4** in Summary Tables section for further detail.)*

OVERVIEW

- Most respondents associated moderate levels of effectiveness with HWMs, as a vehicle for communicating with the public. However, a sizeable share of the sample thought HWMs were very effective in achieving the five communication objectives that were read to them.
 - Vulnerable Non-smokers were more likely to associate higher levels of communication effectiveness than Smokers, especially to the objective of “reinforcing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings”.

DETAILED FINDINGS

- On average, perceived communication impact of HWMs ranged from 4.6 to 5.6 on the 9-point scale.
 - The highest perceived impact (significantly above middle scale) went to the communication objectives of :
 - “Discouraging people from starting to smoke” (43% gave it at least 7, for an average of 5.6).
 - “Reinforcing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings” (38% gave it at least 7, for an average of 5.6).
 - “Informing the public about the risks of smoking” (34% gave it at least 7 on the 9-point scale, for an average of 5.3).

- The lowest perceived impact (middle scale) went to the objective of:
 - “Increasing the number of smokers who quit smoking” (23% gave it at least 7, for an average of 4.6).
- The table below summarises the findings related to the perceived communication impact of HWMs with the public, before exposure to warning size scenarios.
 - These findings suggest that, while most young people presently think that HWMs are moderately effective for communicating with the public, warnings are perceived to play an important supporting role among a sizeable share of teenagers who do not currently smoke but have a reason in mind that might lead them to start smoking in the next year (Vulnerable Non-smokers).

AVERAGE RATINGS OF PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT OF HWMS WITH THE PUBLIC

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE HEALTH WARNINGS ON EACH PACKAGE OF CIGARETTES EFFECTIVE.

<i>All figures are based on total sample (average ratings on 9-point scale)</i>		Total Teenagers (746) %	Smokers (306) %	Vulnerable Non-smokers (440) %
1.	In informing the public about the risks of smoking	5.3*	5.2	5.3
2.	In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking	5.1	5.1	5.1
3.	In increasing the number of smokers who quit smoking	4.6	4.7	4.5
4.	In discouraging people from starting to smoke	5.6	5.6	5.7
5.	In reinforcing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings	5.6	5.1	6.0

Figures are average ratings on the 9-point scale used to assess communication impact with the public (lowest = 1 – “not at all”, and highest = 9 – “very much”).

- * **Read:** Teenagers gave an average rating of 5.3 on the 9-point scale used for rating effectiveness of HWMs on cigarette packs “In informing the public about the risks of smoking”.

5.6 EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT

I think that warnings presented this way are effective in...?

Respondents were exposed in rotated order to each of the four size scenarios¹³ and asked to what extent the warnings 'presented this way' were effective in achieving each of five communication objectives.

Effects of each of the three new increased size options are the measured deviations of the ratings on the 9-point scale used from the current scenario and from their preceding smaller alternative (e.g., option D vs. C).

Statistical comparisons against the current scenario and incremental effects of each increased size option were tested with T-tests (univariate) and F-tests (multivariate).

Table 5 in the Summary Tables section summarizes the raw ratings received by each of the four size scenarios.

Interpretation of univariate analysis is presented first, followed by MANOVA results.

Univariate analysis tests the effect of increasing warning size on each individual indicator, while multivariate analysis tests if the observed effects are generalized i.e., significantly affecting the series of indicators taken as a whole, even if some of the individual indicators do not yield significantly different ratings.

5.6.1 UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Increasing the size of warnings had significant individual effects on the perceived effectiveness of HWMs as a vehicle for communicating with the public.

All individual deviations from the current scenario started to be statistically significant and substantial at the first increased size option B (75%). When warning size was set at 75% (option B), deviations ranged from 0.5 to 0.7 point on the 9-point scale used and from 1.3 to 1.7 points for option D (100%).

- The largest effect was on the communication objective '*in informing the public about the risks of smoking*', but only by a slight margin: all objectives started to be substantially affected at option B (75%).

¹³ The same two picture-based HWMs were used to illustrate each size scenario on a 3-dimensional king size cigarette pack with the part of the principal panel reserved for the brand left neutral (for more details see 4.3 'Experimental Design' in Methodology Section and copies of the prototypes in appendix).

- All individual deviations from the current scenario for all three new increased size options were statistically significant.
- Deviations of each new increased size option from its smaller alternative (incremental effects)¹⁴ were also all statistically significant.
- Examination of the magnitude of incremental effects indicated that the effects from B (75%) to C (90%) and even more from C (90%) to D (100%) were proportionally (i.e., for each percent size increase) larger than from A (current) to B (75%).
 - This means that the effects were not linear and each additional percent of the principal panel occupied by the warnings had even more impact after 75% than between 50% and 75%.
- All deviations in both groups of teenagers were in the same direction, with no discernable pattern. The significant observed effects in the total sample were all corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
- **Table A** below summarizes the statistical testing in the total sample of the individual effects of increased size options on the perceived communication impact with the public. As can be seen, all T-tests were significant at $P < 0.01$.

TABLE A **T-TEST SUMMARY OF THE EFFECTS OF INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS ON PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT**

I THINK THAT WARNINGS PRESENTED THIS WAY ARE EFFECTIVE.

<i>Individual deviations of perceived communication impact in the total sample</i>	Option B (75%) vs.	Option C (90%) vs.		Option D (100%) vs.	
	A	A	B	A	C
1. In informing the public about the risks of smoking	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
2. In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
3. In increasing the number of smokers who quit smoking	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
4. In discouraging people from starting to smoke	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
5. In reinforcing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

- ▲ T-test significant at $P < 0.01$
 ● T-test significant at $P < 0.05$
 NS = Not significant
 A = Current scenario (50%)

¹⁴ B vs. A, C vs. B and D vs. C.

- **Table B** below summarizes the deviations from the current size associated with each increased size option. T-test results associated with these deviations in the total sample were summarized in Table A above.

TABLE B **DEVIATION FROM CURRENT SIZE OF PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION**
IMPACT ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS

I THINK THAT WARNINGS PRESENTED THIS WAY ARE EFFECTIVE.

<i>All figures are based on total sample (average ratings on 9-point scale)</i>		Current size	Increased size options		
		A (50%)	B (75%)	C (90%)	D (100%)
1. In informing the public about the risks of smoking					
■ Total Teenagers (746)		5.0*	0.7**	1.2	1.7
■ Smokers (306)		5.0	0.6	1.1	1.5
■ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)		5.0	0.7	1.3	1.9
2. In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking					
■ Total Teenagers (746)		4.9	0.7	1.1	1.6
■ Smokers (306)		4.9	0.6	1.0	1.3
■ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)		5.0	0.7	1.2	1.7
3. In increasing the number of smokers who would stop smoking					
■ Total Teenagers (746)		4.7	0.5	1.0	1.3
■ Smokers (306)		4.8	0.4	0.9	1.2
■ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)		4.6	0.7	1.0	1.5
4. In discouraging people from starting to smoke					
■ Total Teenagers (746)		5.2	0.6	1.1	1.5
■ Smokers (306)		5.1	0.8	1.2	1.5
■ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)		5.2	0.6	1.1	1.6
5. In increasing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings					
■ Total Teenagers (746)		5.1	0.6	1.0	1.4
■ Smokers (306)		4.9	0.5	0.9	1.1
■ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)		5.2	0.7	1.1	1.7

Figures are average ratings on the 9-point scale used to assess effectiveness in communicating with the public (lowest = 1 – “not at all”, and highest = 9 – “very much”).

* **Read:** Teenagers gave to current size A an average rating of 5.0 on the 9-point scale used for rating effectiveness of HWMs presented this way “In informing the public about the risks of smoking”.

** **Read:** Teenagers gave to increased size option B an average rating of 5.7 for rating effectiveness of HWMs presented this way “In informing the public about the risks of smoking”. Compared to current size A, it represents a deviation (scale slide) of 0.7.

5.6.2 MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Multivariate analysis of the deviations from the current scenario indicated that increasing the size of warnings had a significant generalized positive effect on the perceived effectiveness of HWMs as a vehicle for communicating with the public¹⁵.
- Increasing the size of warnings had a significant generalized effect on the perceived communication impact of HWMs for each increased size option over its smaller alternative (e.g., option C over B).
 - This means that all incremental effects were significant on communication impact indicators taken as a whole.
 - These findings confirmed those of univariate analysis where each increased size option had significant individual effects on each scale of this set of indicators.
- There were no significant interaction effects caused by teenage sub-groups.
 - This finding confirmed univariate analysis which showed that: a) both teenage sub-groups shared the same views on each of the scales used to assess the effectiveness of HWMs as a vehicle for communicating with the public, and, b) magnitude of incremental effects of increased size options was similar between teenage sub-groups.

5.6.3 CONCLUSION

- Univariate and multivariate analysis of this experiment indicated that increasing the size of warnings had a significant impact on the perceived effectiveness of HWMs as a vehicle for communicating with the public:
 1. Effects were already significant and substantial at the smaller increased size option B (75%), on each of the five scales used to measure the perceived communication impact with the public.
 2. Incremental effects of each increased size option over its smaller alternative were also significant.
 3. Observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.

¹⁵ See appendix for example of SPSS MANOVA results testing the effects of option B vs. A in the total sample on the 12 personality traits. Four contrast bases were analyzed by MANOVA to determine if increasing the size of warnings had a generalized effect on perceived communication impact: [A] vs. [B], [B] vs. [C], [C] vs. [D], [A] vs. [C].

-
4. Effects were not linear: each additional percent increase of the principal (front) panel occupied by the warnings had more impact on perceived effectiveness for communicating with the public with option C (90%) and D (100%) than with option B (75%).

These findings confirmed that the larger the warnings, the more they are perceived as an effective vehicle for communicating with the public. The larger the warnings are, the stronger their influence.

5.7 PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH CURRENT HWM

Now, I will show you various health warnings that are found on the packages of cigarettes sold in Canada. For each warning, I will show you, I will ask you to what extent you think it convinces you, personally, to stay away from smoking.

Respondents were shown in rotated order the 16 current HWMs and asked, for each, to what extent it would convince them, personally, to stay away from smoking.

Table 6 in the Summary Tables section summarizes the raw ratings of persuasiveness associated with each of the 16 current HWMs.

OVERVIEW

- Vulnerable Non-smokers were consistently much more likely to recognize that HWMs are effective in convincing them, ‘personally’, to stay away from smoking. Smokers seemed less permeable to health warning messages as a means of convincing them to stay away from smoking.
- However, their ratings of personal persuasiveness were high and the same six warnings topped the list of both groups of teenagers and in almost the same order of recognized persuasiveness.
 - These six warnings were recognized as ‘personally’ very convincing by more than half of all respondents.

DETAILED FINDINGS

- All warnings were not equal: there was a large gap between the most and the least convincing¹⁶.
 - *Tobacco smoke hurts babies*: 73% gave it at least 7 on the 9-point persuasiveness scale used - this warning was recognized as the most convincing.
 - *When there’s smoke, there’s hydrogen cyanide* and *Cigarettes are highly addictive* were recognized as the least convincing: only 28% and 29% respectively gave them at least 7 on their ability to convince them, personally, to stay away from smoking.
- **Table A** presents the overall average ratings across the 16 HWMs. As can be seen, 48% of the respondents found current HWMs quite convincing: they gave them an average of at least 7 on the 9-point scale used.

¹⁶ Note that of the two current warnings used throughout the tests for illustrating the warning size scenarios, one (*Where there’s smoke, there’s hydrogen cyanide*) ranked last on ‘personal’ persuasiveness while the other (*Cigarettes cause mouth diseases*) was the second most convincing.

- **Table B** summarizes only the combined 7-9 ratings ('very' convincing percentages) respondents gave to the top (above average) ranking HWMs in terms of their ability to convince them to stay away from smoking.
- **Table C** compares ratings of perceived effectiveness for communicating with the public and ratings of 'personal' persuasiveness.
 - In general, these comparisons suggest that teenagers underestimate the effectiveness of warnings on cigarette packs: when they looked at the warnings, their average rating of persuasiveness across the 16 current HWMs was significantly and substantially higher than the effectiveness they associated with HWMs in general, as a vehicle for communicating with the public.

TABLE A **OVERALL AVERAGE RATINGS OF PERSONAL PERSUASIVENESS
ACROSS THE 16 CURRENT HWMs**

TO WHAT EXTENT IT CONVINCES YOU, PERSONALLY, TO STAY AWAY FROM SMOKING.

<i>All figures are based on total sample (average ratings on 9-point scale)</i>	Total Teenagers (746) %	Smokers (306) %	Vulnerable Non-smokers (440) %
▪ Convincing (7-9)	48*	45	52
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	31	33	29
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	21	22	19
▪ Overall average rating (1-9)	5.9	5.8	6.1

Figures are overall averages of the ratings received by each of the 16 current HWMs on persuasiveness to stay away from smoking (lowest = 1 – “not at all”, and highest = 9 – “very much”).

* **Read:** 48% of teenagers gave at least an average rating of 7 on the 9-point scale used when rating the 16 current HWMs on their persuasiveness to keep them away from smoking.

TABLE B **MOST PERSUASIVE (ABOVE AVERAGE) CURRENT HWMs**

TO WHAT EXTENT IT CONVINCES YOU, PERSONALLY, TO STAY AWAY FROM SMOKING.

<i>All figures are based on total sample (combined 7-9 ratings on 9-point scale are shown)</i>	Total Teenagers (746) %	Smokers (306) %	Vulnerable Non-smokers (440) %
▪ Tobacco smoke hurts babies	73*	68	77
▪ Cigarettes cause mouth diseases	67	59	75
▪ Cigarettes hurt babies	65	61	70
▪ Cigarettes cause lung cancer (patient)	65	60	70
▪ Cigarettes cause lung cancer (lungs)	64	59	69
▪ Cigarettes cause strokes	62	56	69
▪ Cigarettes are a heart breaker	51	46	56

* **Read:** 73% of teenagers were able without any prompting to recall the HWM “Tobacco smoke hurts babies”.

**TABLE C COMPARISON BETWEEN RATINGS OF PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION
IMPACT WITH THE PUBLIC AND PERSONAL PERSUASIVENESS**

<i>Overall average rating on 9-point scales</i>	Total Teenagers (746)	Smokers (306)	Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)
▪ Perceived communication impact with the public (Q3 – average for the 5 objectives)	5.2	5.1	5.3
▪ Personal persuasiveness (Q4 – average for the 16 current HWMs)	5.9	5.8	6.1

5.8 EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON PERSUASIVENESS

I would like your views on what you think might happen if all cigarettes in Canada were packaged with new health warnings. I will show you a selection of these new warnings. The warnings you will see, will look exactly the same. However, below the warnings, where the word 'cigarettes' is written, the brand identification will vary from one brand to another, as is the case currently. If cigarettes were available only in packages like this one, to what extent do you think it would keep people like you from smoking?

Respondents were shown four size scenarios in rotation, and asked to what extent it would keep people like them from smoking, if cigarettes were available only in packages like the ones shown.

Effects of each of the three new increased size options are deviations of the ratings on the 9-point scale used from the current scenario and from their preceding smaller alternative (e.g., option D vs. C).

They were tested for statistical significance using T-tests (univariate). Multivariate testing was not used because only one indicator measured 'personal' persuasiveness.

Table 7 in the Summary Tables section summarizes the raw ratings received by each of the four size scenarios.

5.8.1 UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Increasing the size of warnings had a significant effect on the scale measuring personal persuasiveness of HWMs.

Deviations from the current scenario started to be quite substantial and significant already at option B (75%): increasing the surface occupied by warnings from 50% to 75% caused a scale slide of one point (1.0) on the 9-point scale used. Option D (100%) caused a scale slide of more than 2 points (2.3), the largest effect registered in this experiment.

- Deviations from the current scenario of all three new increased size options were significant.
- Incremental effects of each new increased size option from its smaller alternative (e.g., C vs. B or D vs. C) were significant.

- Examination of the magnitude of incremental effects indicated that the effects were proportionally larger from option B (75%) to C (90%) and from option C (90%) to D (100%) than from the current size to option B (75%).
 - This means that each additional percent of the principal panel occupied by the warnings had even more impact on personal persuasiveness with option C (90%) and D (100%) than with option B (75%).
- Warnings were recognized as much more convincing by Vulnerable Non-smokers than by Smokers, and both teenage sub-groups reacted in the same direction, generally with similar intensity (no interaction effects between teenage group and increased warning size options.)
 - The significant observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
- **Table A** below summarizes the statistical tests of the individual effects of increased size options on the persuasive value associated with HWMs, in the total sample. As can be seen, all T-tests were already significant at $P < 0.01$, at option B (75%).

TABLE A **T-TEST SUMMARY OF THE EFFECTS OF
INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS ON PERSONAL PERSUASIVENESS**

IF CIGARETTES WERE AVAILABLE ONLY IN PACKAGES LIKE THIS ONE, TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK IT WOULD KEEP PEOPLE LIKE YOU FROM SMOKING?

<i>Individual deviations of persuasiveness in the total sample</i>	Option B (75%) vs.	Option C (90%) vs.		Option D (100%) vs.	
	A	A	B	A	C
Would keep people like you from smoking	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

- ▲ T-test significant at $P < 0.01$
 ● T-test significant at $P < 0.05$
 NS = Not significant
 A = Current scenario (50%)

- **Table B** summarizes the deviations from the current size associated with each increased size option. T-test results associated with these deviations in the total sample were summarized in Table A above.

TABLE B **DEVIATION FROM CURRENT SIZE OF PERSONAL PERSUASIVENESS
ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS**

IF CIGARETTES WERE AVAILABLE ONLY IN PACKAGES LIKE THIS ONE, TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK IT WOULD KEEP PEOPLE LIKE YOU FROM SMOKING?

<i>All figures are based on total sample (average ratings on 9-point scale)</i>	Current size	Increased size options		
	A (50%)	B (75%)	C (90%)	D (100%)
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	4.7*	1.0**	1.8	2.3
▪ Smokers (306)	4.3	1.0	1.7	2.1
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	5.0	1.1	2.1	2.5

Figures are average ratings on the 9-point scale used for rating personal persuasiveness to stay away from smoking (lowest = 1 – “not at all”, and highest = 9 – “very much”).

* **Read:** Teenagers gave to current size A an average rating of 4.7 on the 9-point scale used for rating its persuasiveness.

** **Read:** Teenagers gave to increased size option B an average rating of 5.7 for rating its persuasiveness. Compared to current size A, it represents a deviation (scale slide) of 1.0.

5.8.2 MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Multivariate analysis of the generalized effect on personal persuasiveness was not applicable because only one indicator was in the analysis.

5.8.3 CONCLUSION

- Results of this experiment indicated that increasing the size of warnings had a significant and substantial impact on personal persuasiveness:
 1. Effects on personal persuasiveness were already important and significant at the smaller increased size option B (75%).
 2. Incremental effects of each increased size option were also significant.
 3. Observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
 4. Effects were not linear: each additional percent of the principal panel occupied by the warnings had even more impact on personal persuasiveness with option C (90%) and D (100%) than with option B (75%).

These findings suggest that the larger the warnings, the more persuasive they are perceived. If warnings would occupy the entire principal (front) panel of the cigarette package, their persuasive value would be maximized.

5.9 EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH SIX SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS

Now I will show you pictures of people who currently smoke and packages of cigarettes with the warnings you just saw. Please take a careful look at them. For each picture I show you, I will ask you to what extent do you think it would keep this person from smoking.

Six photos (appended), each depicting a character representing a social stereotype of smoker, were shown to respondents in rotated order.

For each social style of smoker, respondents were asked to indicate on a 9-point scale, the extent to which they thought the warnings they were being shown would keep the character in the photo away from smoking.

By comparing the deviations from the current scenario (e.g., option D vs. A) and from its preceding smaller alternative option (e.g., option D vs. C) of the ratings received by each new increased size option, effects of increasing the size of warnings on their persuasiveness associated with various social styles of smokers were derived.

As for the analysis of other effects, comparisons were made using both univariate (T-tests) and multivariate tests (MANOVA F-Tests).

Table 8 in the Summary Tables section summarizes the raw ratings received by each of the four size scenarios.

5.9.1 UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Increasing the size of HWMs had significant individual effects on the persuasiveness of HWMs associated with the six social styles of smokers.

Individual deviations from the current scenario for all six social styles started to be significant and sometimes substantial at option B (75%): on average, increasing the surface occupied by the warnings from 50% to 75% caused a scale slide of one-half point (0.6) on the 9-point scale used. If warnings would occupy the entire principal panel, this would cause an average scale slide of 1.7 points from current scenario A (50%).

- Deviations of all social styles from the current scenario for all three new increased size options were significant.
 - Effects were large for all characters, except for the most masculine stereotype i.e., the “*biker man*”, but still significant for this social stereotype.
- Incremental effects of each new increased size option from its smaller alternative (ex. option C vs. B) were significant for all social styles.

- Examination of the magnitude of incremental effects indicated that the effects across the six social styles were larger with increased option C (90%) and D (100%) than with option B (75%).
 - This means that each additional percent occupied by the warnings had more impact between option B (75%) and C (90%), and between option C and D (100%).
- Deviations in both teenage sub-groups were in the same direction and of comparable magnitude.
 - The significant observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
- **Table A** below summarizes the statistical testing of the individual effects of increased size options on the persuasive value of warnings associated with six social styles of smokers, in the total sample. As can be seen, all T-tests were already significant at $P < 0.01$, at option B (75%).

**TABLE A T-TEST SUMMARY OF THE EFFECTS OF INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS ON
PERSUASIVE VALUE OF WARNINGS ASSOCIATED WITH
6 SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS**

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK IT WOULD KEEP THIS PERSON FROM SMOKING?

<i>Individual deviations of persuasiveness associated with 6 social styles of smokers in the total sample</i>	Option B (75%) vs.	Option C (90%) vs.		Option D (100%) vs.	
	A	A	B	A	C
1. Business man	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
2. Teenage boy	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
3. Sporty girl	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
4. Biker man	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
5. Young woman	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
6. Fisherman	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

▲ T-test significant at $P < 0.01$

● T-test significant at $P < 0.05$

NS = Not significant

A = Current scenario (50%)

- **Table B** summarizes the deviations from the current size associated with each increased size option. T-test results associated with these deviations in the total sample were summarized in Table A above.

TABLE B DEVIATION FROM CURRENT SIZE OF PERSUASIVE VALUE ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS AND 6 SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK IT WOULD KEEP THIS PERSON FROM SMOKING?

<i>All figures are based on total sample (average ratings on 9-point scale)</i>		Current size	Increased size options		
		A (50%)	B (75%)	C (90%)	D (100%)
Business man					
▪ Total Teenagers	(746)	4.5*	0.9**	1.6	2.0
▪ Smokers	(306)	4.3	1.0	1.5	1.9
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers	(440)	4.8	0.8	1.6	2.0
Teenage boy					
▪ Total Teenagers	(746)	4.1	0.7	1.4	2.0
▪ Smokers	(306)	4.1	0.7	1.2	1.8
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers	(440)	4.2	0.6	1.5	2.1
Sporty girl					
▪ Total Teenagers	(746)	5.9	0.5	1.1	1.4
▪ Smokers	(306)	5.7	0.5	1.0	1.4
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers	(440)	6.1	0.6	1.1	1.4
Biker man					
▪ Total Teenagers	(746)	2.6	0.3	0.8	1.3
▪ Smokers	(306)	2.7	0.3	0.6	1.1
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers	(440)	2.5	0.4	1.0	1.4
Young woman					
▪ Total Teenagers	(746)	5.3	0.7	1.4	1.8
▪ Smokers	(306)	5.2	0.8	1.5	1.8
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers	(440)	5.4	0.7	1.2	1.8
Fisherman					
▪ Total Teenagers	(746)	3.8	0.5	1.1	1.6
▪ Smokers	(306)	3.8	0.5	1.0	1.5
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers	(440)	3.8	0.5	1.2	1.6

Figures are average ratings on the 9-point scale used for rating persuasiveness to stay away from smoking (lowest = 1 – “not at all”, and highest = 9 – “very much”).

* **Read:** Teenagers gave to current size A an average rating of 4.5 on the 9-point scale used for rating its persuasiveness among business men.

** **Read:** Teenagers gave to increased size option B an average rating of 5.4 for rating its persuasiveness among business man. Compared to current size A, it represents an average deviation (scale slide) of 0.9.

5.9.2 MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Multivariate analysis of the deviations from the current scenario indicated that increasing the size of warnings had a significant generalized effect on persuasiveness of HWMs associated with the six social styles of smokers¹⁷:
 - Increasing the size of HWMs had a significant generalized effect on persuasiveness associated with the six social styles starting at option B (75%), for all increased size options when compared with the current scenario and when compared with its smaller alternative (e.g., option D over C).
 - This means that all incremental effects were significant on this set of persuasiveness indicators taken as a whole.
 - These findings confirmed those of univariate analysis where each increased size option had significant effects associated with each social style.
- There was no interaction effect between teenage group and increased size options.
 - This finding was confirmed by univariate analysis which showed that both teenage sub-groups had practically the same response profile on this set of indicators and their deviations caused by increased warning size options were of similar magnitude.

5.9.3 CONCLUSION

- Univariate and multivariate results of this experiment indicated that increasing the size of warnings had a significant impact on the persuasiveness of HWMs associated with the six social styles of smokers:
 1. Effects were already significant at the smaller increased size option B (75%), for each of the six social styles used to measure persuasiveness on a projective basis. Effects became substantial for all social styles at option C (90%).
 2. All incremental effects of each increased size option over its smaller alternative were also significant.
 3. Observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
 4. Effects were not linear: each increased percent of the surface occupied by warnings had larger effects after option B (75%) than from current size (50%) to option B (75%).

¹⁷ Four contrast bases were analyzed by MANOVA to determine if increasing the size of warnings had a generalized effect on persuasiveness associated with six social styles of smokers: [A] vs. [B], [B] vs. [C], [C] vs. [D], [A] vs. [C].

These findings suggest that the larger the warnings, the more they are perceived as being able to convince people to stay away from smoking, irrespective of the diversity of their backgrounds. Also, the larger the warnings, the stronger their influence.

5.10 EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON SMOKER IMAGE

Below is a statement about people like you who smoke cigarettes. Complete the sentence to describe your own impressions of people like you who smoke cigarettes by circling a number from 1 to 9 on each of the scales listed after the statement.

Twelve attributes were used to determine the personality traits generally associated with smokers, using a 9-point semantic differential scale (e.g., risks-takers vs. very prudent).¹⁸

Respondents were asked to provide their views on the personality traits that characterize smokers, as a group, without reference to any HWM size scenarios. Respondents were then asked the same questions, but associated with each size scenario (in rotated order).

Effects based on deviations from the current scenario and the smaller alternative options were tested with T-tests (univariate) and F-tests (multivariate).

Tables 9 and 10 in the Summary Tables section summarize the raw ratings obtained by each personality trait scale, when asked without and with size scenarios.

Personality traits of smokers, in general

- From the response profile on personality traits of smokers without any reference to a warning size scenario, four traits emerged as particularly associated with smokers:
 - *Do not worry about death*
 - *Health negligent*
 - *Risk-takers*
 - *Rebellious*
- Vulnerable Non-smokers and Smokers shared the same views about the distinct characteristics of people who smoke. However, Vulnerable Non-smokers had a much more negative response profile on all personality traits: their image of smokers was much less desirable.

Effects of current size on smoker image

- The perceived personality traits of smokers, as a group, were compared with the response profile to the same traits after exposure to the current scenario (A). Differences provide an indication to what extent the current scenario is still influencing perception of the personality traits associated with smokers i.e., its impact is still sustainable.

¹⁸ *Osgood's semantic differential was designed to measure the connotative meaning of concepts. The respondent is asked to choose where his or her position lies, on a scale between two bipolar words, or a range of words ranging across a bipolar position. All figures are average ratings on the 9-point semantic differential scales used to assess personality traits associated with smokers. On each of these scales, lower ratings (1-4) give primacy to the left side and higher ratings (6-9) to the right side of the bipolar scale, while a score of 5 is the middle point.*

- Next **Table A** compares the two response profiles (before and after exposure to the current size scenario). Findings suggest that the current size scenario A (50%) has little potential for negatively affecting the image smokers project. As can be seen, almost all differences in the total sample were within 0.2 point.

TABLE A PERSONALITY TRAITS ASSOCIATED WITH SMOKERS BEFORE AND AFTER BEING EXPOSED TO THE CURRENT SIZE SCENARIO

Below is a statement about people like you who smoke cigarettes. Complete the sentence to describe your own impressions of people like you who smoke cigarettes by circling a number from 1 to 9 on each of the scales listed after the statement.

<i>All figures are average ratings based on total sample (9-point semantic differential scales)</i>	Total sample Teenagers (746)			Smokers (306)			Vulnerable non-smokers (440)		
	Before	After	Dif.	Before	After	Dif.	Before	After	Dif.
1. Risk-takers / Very prudent	4.1*	4.4	0.3	4.1	4.7	0.6	4.0	4.0	0.0
2. Concerned for others / Selfish	5.1	5.4	0.3	4.8	5.1	0.3	5.5	5.7	0.2
3. Health negligent / Health conscious	4.2	4.1	-0.1	4.4	4.5	0.1	3.9	3.7	-0.2
4. Financially secure / Poor	4.9	5.1	0.2	4.8	5.1	0.3	5.0	5.2	0.2
5. Image conscious / Sloppy	4.8	5.2	0.4	4.7	5.0	0.3	4.9	5.3	0.4
6. Not cool / Very cool	4.7	4.6	-0.1	5.1	4.9	-0.2	4.4	4.2	-0.2
7. Leader / Follower	5.4	5.6	0.2	5.0	5.3	0.3	5.7	5.8	0.1
8. Higher education / Lower education	5.3	5.5	0.2	5.1	5.3	0.2	5.5	5.7	0.2
9. In control of their destiny / Not in control of their destiny	5.0	5.4	0.4	4.8	5.1	0.3	5.4	5.6	0.2
10. Afraid of death / Do not worry about death	6.0	6.0	0.0	6.0	5.8	-0.2	6.0	6.1	0.1
11. Disciplined / Disorganised	5.4	5.4	0.0	5.2	5.2	0.0	5.6	5.7	0.1
12. Rebellious / Follow the rules	4.3	4.4	0.1	4.5	4.7	0.2	4.1	4.0	-0.1

* **Read:** Teenagers gave an average rating of 4.1 on the 9-point semantic differential scale on the personality trait "Risk-takers / Very prudent" used to describe smokers, before they were exposed to any warning scenarios.

5.10.1 UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Compared to the effectiveness indicators discussed previously, smoker image appeared more resistant to increased warning size. Individual deviations from the current scenario indicated that a warning size increase from 50% (current) to 75% (option B) would have statistically significant effects (but negligible) for only three personality traits. This means that option B would not be effective in impacting the image projected by people who smoke.

-
- Across the twelve personality traits, increasing the surface occupied by warnings from 50% to 75% caused an average scale slide of only 0.1 point on the 9-point scale used.
 - An increase from 50% to 75% would make smokers project an image only slightly more:
 - *Risk-takers*
 - *Selfish*
 - *Not cool*
 - In order to achieve more significant effects, the size had to be increased to at least 90% (option C). At that level, seven of the twelve traits were significantly affected, but still in a minor way.
 - Only when the size was increased to 100% (option D) almost all (eleven) personality traits were affected significantly compared to the current scenario, but, only four were affected substantially: on average across the twelve personality traits, increasing the surface occupied by the warnings from 50% to 100% caused a scale slide of less than 0.5 point (0.4) on the 9-point scale used. An increase from 50% to 100% would make smokers project an image more:
 - *Risk-takers*
 - *Selfish*
 - *Health negligent*
 - *Not cool*
 - Resistance of smoker image to be negatively affected by increased warning size is also illustrated by the few significant incremental effects of each new increased size option over its smaller alternative.
 - From current scenario A (50%) to option B (75%), only three significant, but minor effect was observed.
 - From option B (75%) to C (90%), only one significant, but minor incremental effect was observed.
 - From option C (90%) to D (100%), only three significant, but minor incremental effects were observed.
 - Examination of the magnitude of incremental effects indicated that the effects were not linear and were proportionally (i.e., for each percent size increase) the largest with new increased size option D (100%).
 - However, even with option D, incremental effects were significant only for three personality traits.

- Overall, findings suggest that increasing the size of warnings on cigarette packages is not a very effective method for negatively affecting smoker image, unless they occupy the entire surface of the principal panel. With option D (100%), desirability of smoker image was substantially eroded, especially among Vulnerable Non-smoking teenagers.
- Deviations in both groups of teenagers were in the same direction, with no discernable pattern of magnitude.
 - The significant observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
- **Table B** below summarizes the results of statistical testing of the individual effects on smoker image of increased size options in the total sample. When the size was increased from current (50%) to option B (75%), only three of the twelve T-tests was significant at $P < 0.01$.

TABLE B **T-TEST SUMMARY OF THE EFFECTS OF INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS ON SMOKER IMAGE**

IN GENERAL, PEOPLE LIKE ME WHO WOULD CONTINUE TO SMOKE CIGARETTES PACKAGED WITH THIS TYPE OF WARNING ARE:

<i>Individual deviations of smoker image in the total sample</i>	Option B (75%) vs.	Option C (90%) vs.		Option D (100%) vs.	
	A	A	B	A	C
1. Risk-takers / Very prudent	▲	▲	●	▲	▲
2. Concerned for others / Selfish	▲	▲	●	▲	▲
3. Health negligent / Health conscious	NS	●	NS	▲	▲
4. Financially secure / Poor	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
5. Image conscious / Sloppy	●	▲	NS	▲	NS
6. Not cool / Very cool	▲	▲	●	▲	NS
7. Leader / Follower	NS	●	NS	▲	NS
8. Higher education / Lower education	NS	●	●	▲	NS
9. In control of their destiny / Not in control of their destiny	NS	●	NS	▲	●
10. Afraid of death / Do not worry about death	NS	▲	▲	▲	NS
11. Disciplined / Disorganised	NS	▲	●	▲	NS
12. Rebellious / Follow the rules	NS	▲	●	▲	NS

▲ T-test significant at $P < 0.01$

● T-test significant at $P < 0.05$

NS = Not significant

A = Current scenario (50%)

- **Table C** summarizes the deviations from the current scenario caused by the new increased size options. T-test results associated with these deviations in the total sample were summarized in Table B above.

TABLE C **DEVIATION FROM CURRENT SIZE OF SMOKER**
IMAGE ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS

IN GENERAL, PEOPLE LIKE ME WHO WOULD CONTINUE TO SMOKE CIGARETTES PACKAGED WITH THIS TYPE OF WARNING ARE:

<i>All figures are based on total sample (average ratings on 9-point semantic differential)</i>	Current size	Increased size options		
	A (50%)	B (75%)	C (90%)	D (100%)
1. Risk-takers / Very prudent				
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	4.4*	(0.4)**	(0.6)	(0.8)
▪ Smokers (306)	4.7	(0.4)	(0.6)	(0.7)
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	4.0	(0.4)	(0.5)	(0.9)
2. Concerned for others / Selfish				
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	5.4	0.2	0.3	0.6
▪ Smokers (306)	5.1	0.1	0.2	0.5
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	5.7	0.2	0.5	0.7
3. Health negligent / Health conscious				
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	4.1	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.6)
▪ Smokers (306)	4.5	0.0	(0.2)	(0.5)
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	3.7	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.7)
4. Financially secure / Poor				
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	5.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
▪ Smokers (306)	5.1	0.1	(0.1)	(0.1)
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	5.2	0.1	0.3	0.1
5. Image conscious / Sloppy				
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	5.2	0.1	0.2	0.3
▪ Smokers (306)	5.0	0.2	0.2	0.3
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	5.3	0.2	0.3	0.4
6. Not cool / Very cool				
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	4.6	(0.2)	(0.4)	(0.5)
▪ Smokers (306)	4.9	0.0	(0.3)	(0.3)
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	4.2	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.5)
7. Leader / Follower				
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	5.6	0.0	0.1	0.3
▪ Smokers (306)	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.3
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	5.8	0.1	0.3	0.4

Figures are average ratings on the 9-point semantic differential scales used for rating personality traits. An average lower than 5 indicates the primacy of the left side, and higher than 5 indicates the primacy of the right side of the scale, while 5 is the middle point.

* **Read:** Teenagers gave to current size A an average rating of 4.4 on the 9-point semantic differential scale used for rating the personality trait "Risk-takers / Very prudent" associated with current size A.

** **Read:** Teenagers gave to increased size option B an average rating of 4.0 for rating the personality trait "Risk-takers / Very prudent" associated with this size option. Compared to current size A, it represents a deviation (scale slide) of 0.4.

All figures are based on total sample (average ratings on 9-point semantic differential)	Current size		Increased size options		
	A (50%)		B (75%)	C (90%)	D (100%)
8. Higher education / Lower education					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	5.5		0.0	0.1	0.2
▪ Smokers (306)	5.3		0.0	0.1	0.2
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	5.7		(0.1)	0.2	0.3
9. In control of their destiny / Not in control of their destiny					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	5.4		0.1	0.1	0.3
▪ Smokers (306)	5.1		0.0	0.1	0.2
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	5.6		0.2	0.3	0.4
10. Afraid of death / Do not worry about death					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	6.0		0.0	0.2	0.2
▪ Smokers (306)	5.8		0.0	0.2	0.1
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	6.1		0.1	0.3	0.5
11. Disciplined / Disorganised					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	5.4		0.1	0.3	0.3
▪ Smokers (306)	5.2		0.0	0.2	0.1
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	5.7		0.1	0.3	0.3
12. Rebellious / Follow the rules					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	4.4		(0.1)	(0.3)	(0.3)
▪ Smokers (306)	4.7		(0.2)	(0.4)	(0.3)
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	4.0		0.0	(0.1)	(0.2)

Figures are average ratings on the 9-point semantic differential scales used for rating personality traits. An average lower than 5 indicates the primacy of the left side, and higher than 5 indicates the primacy of the right side of the scale, while 5 is the middle point.

5.10.2 MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Multivariate analysis of the deviations from the current scenario indicated that increasing the size of HWMs had a significant (but minor) generalized negative effect on smoker image¹⁹, starting at option B (75%).
- Increasing the size of warnings had a significant generalized incremental effect on smoker image for each increased size option over its smaller alternative (e.g., option C over B).
 - This means that all incremental effects were significant on smoker image indicators taken as a whole.
 - Univariate analysis revealed that these effects were small and limited in the total sample. What multivariate analysis indicated is that these few individual image effects reflected a more generalized significant impact on the whole smoker image.

¹⁹ Four contrast bases were analyzed by MANOVA to determine if increasing the size of warnings had a generalized effect on smoker image: [A] vs. [B], [B] vs. [C], [C] vs. [D], [A] vs. [C].

-
- Multivariate analysis indicated that there was no significant interaction effect between teenage sub-groups and size options, which confirmed findings from univariate analysis, where no discernable pattern was seen in the magnitude of deviations between teenage sub-groups.

5.10.3 CONCLUSION

- Univariate and multivariate results of this experiment indicated that smoker image was not very sensitive to increased warning size:
 1. In order to achieve significant generalized effects on perceived personality traits associated with smokers, warning size had to be increased to at least 90% (option C). But even at that level, effects were small and limited. Only when warnings occupied the entire surface, substantial generalized effects on smoker image were observed.
 2. Incremental effects of all increased size options over their smaller alternative were significant but quite limited and small.
 3. Observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
 4. Effects were not linear and were proportionally the largest, by far, with option D (100%) i.e., between 90% and 100%.

These findings suggest that increasing the size of current warnings is not very effective for making smoker image less desirable in the eyes of teenagers. HWMs need to occupy the entire surface of the front panel in order to generate sustainable impact on smoker image.

5.11 EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON PRODUCT IMAGE

My impressions of brands of cigarettes sold using this type of warning are...

Effects of the three new increased size options on product image were measured by nine attributes using a 9-point semantic differential.

Effects of each of the three new increased size options are deviations of the ratings on the 9-point scale used from the current scenario and from its smaller alternative (e.g., option D vs. C).

Statistical comparisons against the current scenario and incremental effects of each increased size option were tested with T-tests (univariate) and F-tests (multivariate).

Table 11 in the Summary Tables section summarizes the raw scores received by each of the four size scenarios.

5.11.1 UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Three individual product attributes were significantly affected, but in a very minor way (at the level set for this experiment, i.e., $P < 0.01$) by increasing warning size from 50% (current) to 75% (option B).
 - Across the nine product attributes, increasing the surface occupied by the warnings from 50% to 75% caused an average scale slide of only 0.1 point on the 9-point scale used.
- In order to achieve significant effects on most product attributes, warning size had to be increased to at least 90% (option C). At that size, six of the nine deviations of product attributes were statistically significant, but their magnitude remained small. The largest effects were (+0.4 point on the 9-point scale):
 - *Higher tar content*
 - *Higher nicotine content*
- If warnings would occupy the entire surface (option D) of the principal (front) panel, almost all (eight) product attributes would be significantly affected.
 - Across the nine product attributes, increasing the surface occupied by the warnings from 50% to 100% caused an average scale slide of 0.4 point on the 9-point scale used. With option D, effects on three critical product attributes would be substantial (0.5-0.6 point deviation from current scenario):
 - *Higher tar content*
 - *Higher nicotine content*
 - *Less popular*

- These findings suggest that to observe significant and substantial perceptual effects on product attributes, warnings should be increased to 100% (option D).
- Examination of the magnitude of incremental effects indicated that the effects were not linear and were proportionally the largest with new increased size option D (100%).
- Vulnerable Non-smokers had much more negative impressions of cigarettes as a product, but deviations in both groups of teenagers were in the same direction, with no discernable pattern of magnitude caused by increased size options.
 - The significant observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
- **Table A** below summarizes the statistical testing of the individual deviations of increased size options on product image in the total sample. As can be seen, to affect most product attributes, the size had to be increased to at least 90% (option C).

TABLE A **T-TEST SUMMARY OF THE EFFECTS OF INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS ON PRODUCT IMAGE**

MY IMPRESSIONS OF BRANDS OF CIGARETTES SOLD USING THIS TYPE OF WARNING ARE:

<i>Individual deviations of product image in the total sample</i>	Option B (75%) vs.	Option C (90%) vs.		Option D (100%) vs.	
	A	A	B	A	C
1. Lot of taste / Not much taste	NS	NS	NS	▲	▲
2. High nicotine content / Low nicotine content	▲	▲	●	▲	●
3. High quality standards / Low quality standards	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
4. Sold at standard prices / Sold at lower prices	NS	NS	NS	▲	▲
5. Low tar content / High tar content	▲	▲	●	▲	NS
6. Very popular / Not very popular	▲	▲	NS	▲	▲
7. Addictive / Non addictive	●	▲	NS	▲	NS
8. Dangerous / Safe	NS	▲	▲	▲	NS
9. Toxic / Non toxic	●	▲	NS	▲	NS

▲ T-test significant at $P < 0.01$

● T-test significant at $P < 0.05$

NS = Not significant

A = Current scenario (50%)

- **Table B** summarizes the deviations from the current scenario caused by the new increased size options. T-test results associated with these deviations in the total sample were summarized in Table A above.

TABLE B **DEVIATION FROM CURRENT SIZE OF PRODUCT**

IMAGE ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS

MY IMPRESSIONS OF BRANDS OF CIGARETTES SOLD USING THIS TYPE OF WARNING ARE:

All figures are based on total sample (average ratings on 9-point semantic differential)	Current size		Increased size options		
	A (50%)		B (75%)	C (90%)	D (100%)
1. A lot of taste / Not much taste					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	5.2*		0.0**	0.0	0.2
▪ Smokers (306)	5.0		(0.1)	(0.1)	0.1
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	5.3		0.2	0.2	0.4
2. High nicotine content / Low nicotine content					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	4.1		(0.2)	(0.4)	(0.6)
▪ Smokers (306)	4.4		(0.2)	(0.4)	(0.6)
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	3.8		(0.2)	(0.4)	(0.7)
3. High quality standards / Low quality standards					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	5.0		0.1	0.1	0.1
▪ Smokers (306)	5.0		(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	5.0		0.2	0.2	0.3
4. Sold at standard prices / Sold at lower prices					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	4.5		0.0	0.0	(0.2)
▪ Smokers (306)	4.8		(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.4)
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	4.3		0.0	0.1	0.0
5. Low tar content / High tar content					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	5.8		0.2	0.4	0.5
▪ Smokers (306)	5.6		0.2	0.3	0.3
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	6.0		0.2	0.5	0.7
6. Very popular / Not very popular					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	4.8		0.2	0.3	0.6
▪ Smokers (306)	4.7		0.1	0.3	0.6
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	4.8		0.3	0.4	0.6
7. Addictive / Non addictive					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	3.5		(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.3)
▪ Smokers (306)	3.8		(0.2)	(0.4)	(0.2)
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	3.2		(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.4)
8. Dangerous / Safe					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	3.2		0.0	(0.3)	(0.3)
▪ Smokers (306)	3.6		0.0	(0.3)	(0.2)
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	2.8		0.1	(0.2)	(0.4)
9. Toxic / Non toxic					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)	3.2		(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.3)
▪ Smokers (306)	3.6		(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.3)
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	2.8		(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.4)

Figures are average ratings on the 9-point semantic differential scales used for rating personality traits. An average lower than 5 indicates the primacy of the left side, and higher than 5 indicates the primacy of the right side of the scale, while 5 is the middle point.

* **Read:** Teenagers gave to current size A an average rating of 5.2 on the 9-point semantic differential scale used for rating the product attribute "A lot of taste / Not much taste" associated with current size A.

** **Read:** Teenagers gave to increased size option B an average rating of 5.2 for rating the product attribute "A lot of taste / Not much taste" associated with this size option. Compared to current size A, it represents a deviation (scale slide) of 0.

5.11.2 MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Multivariate analysis on the set of product image criteria²⁰ indicated that a generalized negative effect started to be statistically significant at option B (75%).
- Increasing the size of warnings had a significant generalized effect on product image for all increased size options over their smaller alternative, except from option B (75%) to C (90%).
 - Univariate analysis revealed that only option D (100%) had the ability to generate a substantial impact when compared to current scenario A (50%).
 - These findings mean that it would make little to no difference on product image to increase warning size from 75% to 90%. To observe a meaningful negative impact, HWMs have to occupy the entire surface of the principal panel.
- There was no interaction effect between teenage sub-group and size options.
 - This finding was confirmed by univariate analysis: while product image tended to be more negative among Vulnerable Non-smokers, magnitude of deviations caused by increased size options were similar between teenage sub-groups.

5.11.3 CONCLUSION

- Univariate and multivariate results of this experiment indicated that product image is resistant to increased HWM size, as was smoker image:
 1. In order to achieve significant effects on most product attributes, warning size had to be increased to at least 90% (option C). But even with option C, effects were small. As was also the case for smoker image, warnings needed to occupy the entire surface in order to affect substantially product image.
 2. Incremental effects of increased size options over their smaller alternative were significant with option B (75%) and D (100%) but not significant with option C (90%). In addition, incremental effects were of small magnitude.
 3. Observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
 4. Effects were not linear. Incremental effects were proportionally the largest with option D (100%) i.e., between 90% and 100%.

These findings suggest that increasing the size of current HWMs had little impact on the product image of cigarettes, unless warnings occupy the entire surface of the principal (front) panel.

²⁰ Four contrast bases were analyzed by MANOVA to determine if increasing the size of warnings had a generalized effect on product image: [A] vs. [B], [B] vs. [C], [C] vs. [D], [A] vs. [C].

5.12 EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON EMOTIONAL IMPACT

Would you be disturbed or not disturbed to see this type of warning on the cigarette packages you buy? Would you say...?

Now, tell me how much do you agree or disagree that the following statements describe what you feel when looking at this type of warnings.

Previous quantitative and qualitative studies linked emotional impact with HWM size. Generally, highly emotional warnings are found among the most memorable HWMs and those recognized by smokers as being the most effective. Emotional impact (hard-hitting) is considered an important effectiveness indicator²¹.

Emotional impact of the three new increased size options was measured by three statements using a 4-point agree/disagree scale and one yes/no statement.

By comparing deviations of the new increased size options from the current scenario and from their preceding smaller alternative, we obtained a measurement of the effects of each new option on emotional impact.

As for other effects, statistical significance was tested using T-tests (univariate) and F-tests (multivariate).

Table 12 in the Summary Tables section summarizes the raw scores received by each of the four size scenarios.

5.12.1 UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Increasing the size of warnings had significant individual effects on the emotional impact of HWMs. All individual deviations from the current scenario A (50%) started to be significant at option B (75%).
 - On average, across the four emotional impact indicators, increasing the surface occupied by the warnings from 50% to 75% resulted in an additional 15% of teenagers reporting to be disturbed (12% very shocked) by the warnings.
- If warnings would occupy the entire surface (option D) of the principal panel, the emotional impact would be quite remarkable: increasing the surface occupied by the warnings from 50% to 100% resulted in an additional 23% of teenagers reporting to be disturbed or very shocked by the warnings (67% said they would be disturbed to see warnings with option D on the cigarettes they buy vs. 44% with the current scenario).

²¹ *A previous HC qualitative study testing 50 new picture-based HWMs (POR 298-05 – Créatec -- June 2007) reported that HWMs that worked on emotions rather than on knowledge or beliefs were often acknowledged as 'effective', noticeable and motivated thinking. Findings suggested that emotions of smokers related to the health hazards of using tobacco products are supportive of their thoughts about the risks of their smoking, not the reverse.*

- All incremental effects of each new increased size option over its smaller alternative were significant, except that between option C (90%) and D (100%) more respondents would be shocked but not more disturbed to buy cigarettes with this type of warnings on the package.
- These findings confirmed findings from previous studies that increasing the size of warnings triggers more intense emotions and reinforces the perceived health risks of smoking without requiring a lot of thinking or even attention to messages.
- Examination of the magnitude of incremental effects indicated that the effects on emotional response with option C (90%) were proportionally the smallest.
 - This means that the effects on emotions were not linear: each additional percent of the principal panel occupied by the warnings had the lowest impact when the warning size went from 75% (option B) to 90% (option C).
- All deviations in both teenage sub-groups were in the same direction and generally of the same magnitude.
 - The significant observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
- Note that Vulnerable Non-smokers were generally much more disturbed by warnings on cigarette packages. For example, 53% of Vulnerable Non-smokers said they were disturbed to see warnings with current scenario A (50%) vs. 35% of Smokers.
- **Table A** below summarizes the statistical testing of the individual effects of increased size options on emotional impact in the total sample. As can be seen, all T-tests were significant at $P < 0.01$ when the size was increased from current (50%) to option B (75%).

TABLE A **T-TEST SUMMARY OF THE EFFECTS OF INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS ON EMOTIONAL IMPACT**

<i>Individual deviations of emotional impact in the total sample</i>	Option B (75%) vs.	Option C (90%) vs.		Option D (100%) vs.	
	A	A	B	A	C
1. Would be disturbed to see this type of warnings on the cigarette packages purchased (Yes/No)	▲	▲	▲	▲	NS
2. You had waves of strong feelings when looking at these warnings (Agree/Disagree)	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
3. It would be difficult to hide or control your feelings so that nobody would know what you really feel about these warnings (Agree/Disagree)	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
4. These warnings shocked you (Agree/Disagree)	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

▲ T-test significant at $P < 0.01$

● T-test significant at $P < 0.05$

NS = Not significant

A = Current scenario (50%)

- **Table B** summarizes the deviations from the current scenario associated with each increased size option. T-test results associated with these deviations in the total sample were summarized in Table A above.

TABLE B **DEVIATION FROM CURRENT SIZE OF EMOTIONAL IMPACT ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS**

<i>All figures are based on total sample</i>		Current size	Increased size options		
		A (50%)	B (75%)	C (90%)	D (100%)
A4 Would you be disturbed or not disturbed to see this type of warnings on the cigarette packages you buy? Would you say...?					
[% 'yes']					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)		44*	14**	22	23
▪ Smokers (306)		35	12	22	22
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)		53	16	22	25
A5.1 You had waves of strong feelings when looking at these warnings					
[Average score on Agree/Disagree scale]					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)		46	14	22	25
▪ Smokers (306)		38	3	21	25
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)		55	15	22	25
A5.2 It would be difficult to hide or control your feelings so that nobody would know what you really feel about these warnings					
[Average score on Agree/Disagree scale]					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)		36	5	9	17
▪ Smokers (306)		29	5	10	18
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)		41	6	9	19
A5.3 These warnings shocked you					
[Average score on Agree/Disagree scale]					
▪ Total Teenagers (746)		39	12	17	22
▪ Smokers (306)		31	11	15	20
▪ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)		47	13	20	23

Average ratings on Agree/Disagree scale were calculated as follows: totally agree (+2), somewhat agree (+1), somewhat disagree (-1), totally disagree (-2) and can't say (0).

* **Read:** 44% of teenagers said that current size A would disturb them if on their cigarette packs.

** **Read:** 58% of teenagers said that increased size option B would disturb them if on their cigarette packs. Compared to current size A, it represents a deviation (scale slide) of 14 points.

5.12.2 MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Multivariate analysis of the deviations from the current scenario indicated that increasing the size of warnings had a significant generalized effect on the emotional impact of HWMs²²:
 - Increasing the size of warnings, even at the smallest increased size option B (75%), had a significant generalized effect on the emotional response in the total sample, as well as in both teenage sub-groups.
- All incremental effects of each increased size option over its smaller alternative (e.g., option C over B) were significant.
 - These findings confirmed those of the individual univariate analyses where each increased size option was statistically significant on all indicators.
- Vulnerable Non-smokers were much more shocked and disturbed by warnings on cigarette packages than Smokers. However, there was no significant interaction effect between teenage sub-groups and size options: increasing the size of current warnings resulted in reactions of similar magnitude in both teenage sub-groups.
 - Univariate analysis confirmed that increased warning size options affected emotions of Vulnerable Non-smokers and Smokers quite in the same way.

5.12.3 CONCLUSION

- Results of this experiment confirmed that HWM size influences emotional response. A positive relationship between HWM size and emotional impact among teenagers was observed.
 1. The effects on teenagers' emotional response to HWMs were already significant at the smaller increased size option B (75%) on all four scales used. However, option C (90%) was required for effects to be substantial.
 2. The incremental effects of each new increased size option were also significant.
 3. Observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
 4. The effects were not linear: each percent of the surface occupied by warnings had proportionally the smallest effects with option C (90%) i.e., from 75% to 90%.

These findings suggest that the larger the warnings, the stronger their emotional impact.

²² Four contrast bases were analyzed by MANOVA to determine if increasing the size of warnings had a generalized effect on emotional impact: [A] vs. [B], [B] vs. [C], [C] vs. [D], [A] vs. [C].

5.13 EFFECTS OF INCREASING WARNING SIZE ON PACKAGING ATTRACTIVENESS

Using a 9-point semantic differential 'not attractive vs. attractive', respondents were asked to rate each size scenario, in rotated order.

Deviations from the current scenario and from its smaller alternative option of the three new increased size options were tested for statistical significance using T-tests (univariate). Multivariate testing was not used because only one indicator measured packaging attractiveness.

Table 13 in the Summary Tables section summarizes the raw ratings related to packaging attractiveness.

5.13.1 UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Increasing the size of warnings made cigarette packages significantly less attractive than in their current state.

Deviations from the current scenario started to be significant only at option C (90%). Increasing the surface occupied by warnings from 50% to 75% caused a scale slide of 0.2 point on the 9-point scale used²³ and 0.5 point from 50% to 90% (option C). Option D (100%) caused a scale slide of 0.6 point.

- Only the incremental effect from option B (75%) to C (90%) was significant.
- Examination of the magnitude of incremental effects indicated that the effects on packaging attractiveness were proportionally the largest with option C (90%), and that option D (100%) made little difference over option C (90%).
 - This means that the effects on packaging attractiveness were not linear: each additional percent increase had the most impact between option B (75%) and C (90%).
- Deviations in both teenage sub-groups were in the same direction and generally larger for Smokers (cigarette packaging was already much less attractive to Vulnerable Non-smokers than to Smokers).
 - The significant observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.

²³ Note that other findings of this study showed that respondents underestimated the current size of HWMs on cigarette packages.

- **Table A** below summarizes the statistical testing of individual effects of increased size options on packaging attractiveness in the total sample. As can be seen, T-test started to be significant only at option C (90%), and only the incremental effect from option B (75%) to C (90%) was significant at the level set for this experiment ($P < 0.01$).

TABLE A **T-TEST SUMMARY OF THE EFFECTS OF INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS ON PACKAGING ATTRACTIVENESS**

OVERALL THIS PACKAGE IS NOT ATTRACTIVE / IS ATTRACTIVE.

<i>Individual deviations of packaging attractiveness in the total sample</i>	Option B (75%) vs.	Option C (90%) vs.		Option D (100%) vs.	
	A	A	B	A	C
Overall attractiveness	●	▲	▲	▲	NS

▲ T-test significant at $P < 0.01$

● T-test significant at $P < 0.05$

NS = Not significant

A = Current scenario (50%)

- **Table B** summarizes the deviations in packaging attractiveness from the current scenario associated with each increased size option. T-test results associated with these deviations in the total sample were summarized in Table A above.

TABLE B **DEVIATION FROM CURRENT SIZE OF PACKAGING ATTRACTIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASED SIZE OPTIONS**

OVERALL THIS PACKAGE IS NOT ATTRACTIVE / IS ATTRACTIVE.

<i>All figures are based on total sample (average ratings on 9-point semantic differential scale)</i>	Current size	Increased size options		
	A (50%)	B (75%)	C (90%)	D (100%)
■ Total Teenagers (746)	4.0*	(0.3)**	(0.5)	(0.7)
■ Smokers (306)	4.4	(0.2)	(0.7)	(0.7)
■ Vulnerable Non-smokers (440)	3.5	(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.6)

Figures are average ratings on the 9-point semantic differential scale used for rating package attractiveness. An average lower than 5 indicates the package is NOT attractive, and higher than 5 indicates the package IS attractive, while 5 is the middle point.

* **Read:** Teenagers gave to current size A an average rating of 4.0 on the 9-point scale used for rating its attractiveness.

** **Read:** Teenagers gave to increased size option B an average rating of 3.7 for rating its attractiveness. Compared to current size A, it represents a deviation (scale slide) of 0.3.

5.13.2 MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

- Multivariate analysis of packaging attractiveness was not applicable because it contained only one indicator to analyze.

5.13.3 CONCLUSION

- This experiment indicated that:
 1. The effects on packaging attractiveness from current scenario A (50%) to increased size option B (75%) were not significant. To achieve significant and substantial effects, HWMs had to cover at least 90% of the front panel.
 2. Incremental effects of all increased size options were small and significant only with option C (90%).
 3. Observed effects in the total sample were corroborated in both teenage sub-groups.
 4. Effects were not linear: each percent of the surface occupied by warnings had proportionally larger effects between option B (75%) and C (90%).



6.

SUMMARY TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1	PROFILE OF THE TEENAGE WEIGHTED SAMPLE	64
TABLE 2	UNAIDED RECALL OF CURRENT HWMS ON CIGARETTE PACKS.....	67
TABLE 3	KNOWLEDGE OF CURRENT SIZE OF HWMS ON CIGARETTE PACKS	68
TABLE 4	PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT OF HWMS ON CIGARETTE PACKS.....	69
TABLE 5	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT	70
TABLE 6	PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH CURRENT HWM.....	71
TABLE 7	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PERSUASIVENESS	76
TABLE 8	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH 6 SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS.....	77
TABLE 9	PERSONALITY TRAITS ASSOCIATED WITH SMOKERS.....	79
TABLE 10	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON SMOKER IMAGE	80
TABLE 11	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PRODUCT IMAGE	83
TABLE 12	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON THEIR EMOTIONAL IMPACT	85
TABLE 13	RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PACKAGING ATTRACTIVENESS.....	86

TABLE 1

PROFILE OF THE TEENAGE WEIGHTED SAMPLE

<i>All figures are based on total sample</i>	Total Teenagers (746) 100%	Smokers (306) 100%	Vulnerable non-smokers (440) 100%	English speaking (515) 100%	French speaking (231) 100%
Age					
▪ 14	8	5	10	6	12
▪ 15	6	4	9	6	7
▪ 16	48	49	47	50	42
▪ 17	38	41	35	38	39
Gender					
▪ Male	51	57	45	51	52
▪ Female	49	43	55	49	48
Education					
▪ Partial or completed elementary	2	2	3	2	2
▪ Partial high school	89	88	90	91	83
▪ Completed high school	6	8	4	5	12
▪ Partial or completed college / Cegep	1	<1	1	<1	3
▪ Dk/Na	1	1	1	1	0
Base: self-declared current smokers	(306)	(306)	(0)	(202)	(104)
Tried to quit in past 12 months					
▪ Yes	49	49		49	49
▪ No	49	49		49	49
Intention to quite smoking in next 12 months					
▪ Definitely or probably	45	45		44	46
▪ Definitely or probably not (or can't say)	56	56		55	53
Days a cigarette was smoked over the past 30 days					
▪ 1-10 days	14	14		15	7
▪ 11-29 days	18	18		22	7
▪ Every day	67	67		62	83
▪ Dk/Na	1	1		1	2

<i>Base: self-declared current smokers</i>	Total Teenagers (306) 100%	Smokers (306) 100%	Vulnerable non-smokers (0) 100%	English speaking (202) 100%	French speaking (104) 100%
Usual daily number of cigarettes smoked					
▪ 5 or less	35	35		39	23
▪ 6-10	30	30		29	35
▪ 11-15	14	14		13	17
▪ 16-20	7	7		6	11
▪ 21-25	6	6		5	9
▪ More than 25	5	5		6	4
▪ Dk/Na	1	1		1	1
How long has been a smoker					
▪ Less than a year	22	22		24	15
▪ 1-5 years	67	67		65	69
▪ More than 5 years	11	11		10	14
▪ Dk/Na	1	1		1	2
Regular brand of cigarettes					
▪ du Maurier	18	18		24	2
▪ Players	10	10		12	6
▪ Export 'A'	20	20		20	21
▪ Other	50	50		43	71
▪ Dk/Na	2	2		2	1
Secondary brand of cigarettes					
▪ No secondary brand	29	29		32	19
▪ du Maurier	6	6		8	1
▪ Players	10	10		13	1
▪ Export 'A'	15	15		14	20
▪ Other	38	38		31	60
▪ Dk/Na	2	2		2	0

Base: self-declared current smokers	Total Teenagers (306) 100%	Smokers (306) 100%	Vulnerable non-smokers (0) 100%	English speaking (202) 100%	French speaking (104) 100%
Usual pack size of regular brand					
▪ King size	46	46		47	44
▪ Regular	51	51		50	54
▪ Other	2	2		2	0
▪ Dk/Na	1	1		1	1
Label on regular brand					
▪ Regular	68	68		65	78
▪ Light or Mild	26	26		28	15
▪ Ultra / Extra Light or Mild	3	3		4	0
▪ Other	2	2		2	3
▪ Dk/Na	2	2		1	4
Average weekly amount spent for smoking					
▪ \$10 or less	25	25		24	29
▪ \$11-\$20	31	31		30	35
▪ \$21-\$30	14	14		14	14
▪ More than \$30	23	23		26	15
▪ Dk/Na	6	6		6	7
▪ Average amount (\$)	\$26.6	\$26.6		\$28.1	\$21.8

N.B. Reading down columns, the percentages add to 100%. Some totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 2

UNAIDED RECALL OF CURRENT HWMS ON CIGARETTE PACKS

Q1 As you already know, on each package of cigarettes there is a health warning message. Please, tell me all the current warnings you know, by describing me the picture and/or telling me the phrase written on top of each package. PROBE: ANY OTHERS? (WRITE IN)

<i>All figures are based on total sample</i>	Total Teenagers (746) %	Smokers (306) %	Vulnerable non-smokers (440) %	English speaking (515) %	French speaking (231) %
1. Cigarettes are highly addictive	7*	6	8	7	4
2. Children see, children do	18	21	15	18	19
3. Cigarettes hurt babies	34	36	32	32	42
4. Tobacco use can make you impotent	19	26	11	19	15
5. Don't poison us	14	17	12	15	14
6. Tobacco smoke hurts babies	24	26	21	25	20
7. Cigarettes cause strokes	12	13	11	12	12
8. Cigarettes cause mouth diseases	62	61	63	61	64
9. Each year the equivalent of a small city dies from tobacco use	5	7	4	5	6
10. Cigarettes leave you breathless	6	8	4	7	3
11. Cigarettes are a heart breaker	17	21	13	17	14
12. Cigarettes cause lung cancer (patient)	3	4	1	3	<1
13. Cigarettes cause lung cancer (lungs)	42	38	46	42	42
14. Idle but deadly	0	0	0	0	0
15. Where there's smoke, there's hydrogen cyanide	4	5	3	4	2
16. You're not the only one smoking this cigarette	23	24	22	20	34
<i>Average number of current HWMs recalled (entirely or partially)</i>	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.5

* **Read:** 7% of teenagers recalled this HWM without prompting.

N.B. Reading down the columns, the percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

TABLE 3

KNOWLEDGE OF CURRENT SIZE OF HWMS ON CIGARETTE PACKS

Q2 Here is an exact drawing of a king size and a regular package of cigarettes. I would like you to show me the line which outlines or best describes the size currently occupied by the warning (SHOW DRAWINGS WITH GRIDS IN PLASTIC SHEET / IF THE RESPONDENT SAYS "I DON'T KNOW", INSIST FOR HIS/HER BEST APPROXIMATION / RECORD ANSWER).

<i>All figures are based on total sample</i>	Total Teenagers (746) 100%	Smokers (306) 100%	Vulnerable non-smokers (440) 100%	English speaking (515) 100%	French speaking (231) 100%
KING SIZE PACK					
▪ Under-estimated	60	58	61	59	60
▪ Exact size (50%)	28	28	28	27	30
▪ Over-estimated	13	14	11	13	10
Average size of warning:	46	48	44	46	45
REGULAR PACK					
▪ Under-estimated	66	62	70	65	69
▪ Exact size (50%)	26	30	22	26	25
▪ Over-estimated	8	7	9	9	6
Average size of warning:	43	45	40	43	40

N.B. Reading down columns, the percentages add to 100%. Some totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 4

PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT OF HWMS ON CIGARETTE PACKS

Q3 To what extent do you think that health warnings on each package of cigarettes are effective? We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 "Very much".

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point scales)</i>	Total Teenagers (746) 100%	Smokers (306) 100%	Vulnerable non-smokers (440) 100%	English speaking (515) 100%	French speaking (231) 100%
1. In informing the public about the risks of smoking					
▪ Effective (7-9)	34	33	35	36	30
▪ More or less effective (4-6)	42	42	41	41	45
▪ Not effective (1-3)	24	25	23	24	26
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.3	5.2
2. In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking					
▪ Effective (7-9)	29	27	30	30	24
▪ More or less effective (4-6)	46	47	46	46	47
▪ Not effective (1-3)	25	26	24	24	29
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.2	4.9
3. In increasing the number of smokers who quit smoking					
▪ Effective (7-9)	23	24	22	23	24
▪ More or less effective (4-6)	43	43	43	43	41
▪ Not effective (1-3)	34	33	35	34	36
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5
4. In discouraging people from starting to smoke					
▪ Effective (7-9)	43	40	46	42	45
▪ More or less effective (4-6)	35	39	31	36	31
▪ Not effective (1-3)	22	21	24	22	24
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.6	5.6
5. In reinforcing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings					
▪ Effective (7-9)	38	28	48	37	41
▪ More or less effective (4-6)	40	47	34	41	39
▪ Not effective (1-3)	21	25	18	22	20
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	5.6	5.1	6.0	5.5	5.8

N.B. Reading down columns, the percentages add to 100%. Some totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 5

RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION IMPACT

A3 I think that warnings presented this way are effective? (USE A SCALE FROM 1 TO 9, 1 MEANING "NOT AT ALL" AND 9 "VERY MUCH"
- CIRCLE ONE NUMBER PER SCALE)

All figures are based on total sample (9-point scales)	Total Teenagers (746)	Smokers (306)	Vulnerable non-smokers (440)	English speaking (515)	French speaking (231)
1. In informing the public about the risks of smoking					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.0*	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8
▪ B increased (75%)	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.6	5.8
▪ C increased (90%)	6.2	6.1	6.3	6.2	6.4
▪ D increased (100%)	6.7	6.5	6.9	6.6	7.1
2. In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9
▪ B increased (75%)	5.6	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.6
▪ C increased (90%)	6.0	5.9	6.2	6.0	6.1
▪ D increased (100%)	6.5	6.2	6.7	6.4	6.7
3. In increasing the number of smokers who would stop smoking					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6
▪ B increased (75%)	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.4
▪ C increased (90%)	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.6	6.0
▪ D increased (100%)	6.0	6.0	6.1	5.9	6.5
4. In discouraging people from starting to smoke					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.2	5.1	5.2	5.2	5.0
▪ B increased (75%)	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.9
▪ C increased (90%)	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.4
▪ D increased (100%)	6.7	6.6	6.8	6.6	7.0
5. In increasing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.1	4.9	5.2	5.1	4.8
▪ B increased (75%)	5.7	5.4	5.9	5.7	5.6
▪ C increased (90%)	6.1	5.8	6.3	6.0	6.1
▪ D increased (100%)	6.5	6.0	6.9	6.4	6.7

* **Read:** Teenagers gave an average rating of 5.0 on the 9-point scale used to assess the communication impact of current size A 'In informing the public about the risks of smoking'.

TABLE 6

PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH CURRENT HWM

Q4 Now, I will show you various health warnings that are found on the packages of cigarettes sold in Canada. For each warning, I will show you, I will ask you to what extent you think it convinces you, personally, to stay away from smoking. We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 meaning "Very much". (SHOW WARNINGS ONE AT A TIME IN ROTATION) Would you say that this warning convinces you to stay away from smoking? (START FIRST CHECKED SECTION AND START WITH FIRST ITEM CHECKED)

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point scales)</i>	Total Teenagers (746) 100%	Smokers (306) 100%	Vulnerable non-smokers (440) 100%	English speaking (515) 100%	French speaking (231) 100%
1. Cigarettes are highly addictive					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	29	30	28	25	43
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	29	26	31	30	25
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	42	44	41	45	32
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.4	5.4
2. Children see, children do					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	40	37	43	37	52
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	35	36	34	35	36
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	25	27	23	29	12
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	5.5	5.4	5.6	5.3	6.3
3. Cigarettes hurt babies					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	65	61	70	60	83
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	25	29	21	28	13
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	9	11	8	11	3
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	6.9	6.7	7.2	6.7	7.9
4. Tobacco use can make you impotent					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	35	36	34	35	36
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	36	33	38	35	38
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	29	31	28	30	26
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.4

N.B. Reading down columns, the percentages add to 100%. Some totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 6

PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH CURRENT HWM

Q4 Now, I will show you various health warnings that are found on the packages of cigarettes sold in Canada. For each warning, I will show you, I will ask you to what extent you think it convinces you, personally, to stay away from smoking. We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 meaning "Very much". (SHOW WARNINGS ONE AT A TIME IN ROTATION) Would you say that this warning convinces you to stay away from smoking? (START FIRST CHECKED SECTION AND START WITH FIRST ITEM CHECKED)

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point scales)</i>	Total Teenagers (746) 100%	Smokers (306) 100%	Vulnerable non-smokers (440) 100%	English speaking (515) 100%	French speaking (231) 100%
5. Don't poison us					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	48	43	52	45	57
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	35	35	34	36	30
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	18	21	14	19	13
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	6.0	5.7	6.3	5.8	6.5
6. Tobacco smoke hurts babies					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	73	68	77	69	87
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	21	25	18	24	12
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	6	7	5	8	2
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	7.4	7.2	7.5	7.2	8.1
7. Cigarettes cause strokes					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	62	56	69	62	65
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	27	32	21	27	25
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	11	12	9	11	10
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	6.7	6.4	7.0	6.7	6.8
8. Cigarettes cause mouth diseases					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	67	59	75	67	66
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	25	31	19	25	24
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	8	11	6	8	10
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	7.0	6.6	7.3	7.0	6.9

N.B. Reading down columns, the percentages add to 100%. Some totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 6

PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH CURRENT HWM

Q4 Now, I will show you various health warnings that are found on the packages of cigarettes sold in Canada. For each warning, I will show you, I will ask you to what extent you think it convinces you, personally, to stay away from smoking. We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 meaning "Very much". (SHOW WARNINGS ONE AT A TIME IN ROTATION) Would you say that this warning convinces you to stay away from smoking? (START FIRST CHECKED SECTION AND START WITH FIRST ITEM CHECKED)

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point scales)</i>	Total Teenagers (746) 100%	Smokers (306) 100%	Vulnerable non-smokers (440) 100%	English speaking (515) 100%	French speaking (231) 100%
9. Each year the equivalent of a small city dies from tobacco use					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	42	38	46	40	50
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	33	36	30	34	30
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	25	25	24	26	19
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	5.6	5.4	5.8	5.5	6.0
10. Cigarettes leave you breathless					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	35	33	38	31	52
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	39	38	39	41	31
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	26	28	23	28	17
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	5.4	5.2	5.6	5.1	6.2
11. Cigarettes are a heart breaker					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	51	46	56	47	62
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	35	38	31	37	25
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	15	16	14	15	13
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	6.2	6.0	6.4	6.1	6.7
12. Cigarettes cause lung cancer (patient)					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	65	60	70	60	81
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	25	28	22	29	13
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	10	12	8	11	5
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	6.8	6.6	7.1	6.6	7.6

N.B. Reading down columns, the percentages add to 100%. Some totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 6

PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH CURRENT HWM

Q4 Now, I will show you various health warnings that are found on the packages of cigarettes sold in Canada. For each warning, I will show you, I will ask you to what extent you think it convinces you, personally, to stay away from smoking. We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 meaning "Very much". (SHOW WARNINGS ONE AT A TIME IN ROTATION) Would you say that this warning convinces you to stay away from smoking? (START FIRST CHECKED SECTION AND START WITH FIRST ITEM CHECKED)

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point scales)</i>	Total Teenagers (746) 100%	Smokers (306) 100%	Vulnerable non-smokers (440) 100%	English speaking (515) 100%	French speaking (231) 100%
13. Cigarettes cause lung cancer (lungs)					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	64	59	69	60	81
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	26	30	21	30	12
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	9	9	9	10	7
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	6.9	6.7	7.1	6.7	7.6
14. Idle but deadly					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	35	30	40	30	54
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	37	41	33	38	32
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	28	28	27	31	14
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	5.2	5.1	5.4	4.9	6.4
15. Where there's smoke, there's hydrogen cyanide					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	28	28	28	26	38
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	34	33	35	34	33
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	38	39	36	40	29
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.5	5.1

N.B. Reading down columns, the percentages add to 100%. Some totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 6

PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH CURRENT HWM

Q4 Now, I will show you various health warnings that are found on the packages of cigarettes sold in Canada. For each warning, I will show you, I will ask you to what extent you think it convinces you, personally, to stay away from smoking. We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 meaning "Very much". (SHOW WARNINGS ONE AT A TIME IN ROTATION) Would you say that this warning convinces you to stay away from smoking? (START FIRST CHECKED SECTION AND START WITH FIRST ITEM CHECKED)

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point scales)</i>	Total Teenagers (746) 100%	Smokers (306) 100%	Vulnerable non-smokers (440) 100%	English speaking (515) 100%	French speaking (231) 100%
16. You're not the only one smoking this cigarette					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	36	34	38	30	54
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	31	33	29	32	25
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	33	34	33	37	21
<i>Average rating (1-9)</i>	5.1	5.0	5.2	4.8	6.2
OVERALL AVERAGE (combined ratings of all 16 current HWMs)					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	48.4	44.9	52.1	45.3	60.1
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	30.8	32.8	28.5	32.2	25.3
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	20.8	22.2	19.3	22.4	14.6
<i>Overall average rating (1-9)</i>	5.9	5.8	6.1	5.8	6.6

N.B. Reading down columns, the percentages add to 100%. Some totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 7

RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PERSUASIVENESS

Q5 I would like your views on what you think might happen if all cigarettes in Canada were packaged with new health warnings. I will show you a selection of these new warnings. The warnings you will see, will look exactly the same. However, below the warnings, where the word 'cigarettes' is written, the brand identification will vary from one brand to another, as is the case currently. If cigarettes were available only in packages like this one, to what extent do you think it would keep people like you from smoking? We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 meaning "Very much". (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER / SHOW PACKAGES ONE AT A TIME EXACTLY IN THE SAME ORDER AS BELOW)

IF CIGARETTES WERE AVAILABLE ONLY IN PACKAGES LIKE THIS ONE, TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK IT WOULD KEEP PEOPLE LIKE YOU FROM SMOKING?

All figures are based on total sample (9-point scales)	Total Teenagers (746) %	Smokers (306) %	Vulnerable non-smokers (440) %	English speaking (515) %	French speaking (231) %
A -- Current size (50%)					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	24*	20	28	25	22
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	44	44	44	44	43
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	32	36	28	31	34
Average rating (1-9)	4.7	4.3	5.0	4.7	4.6
B -- Increased size (75%)					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	43	33	52	43	42
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	38	43	34	38	39
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	19	23	14	19	18
Average rating (1-9)	5.7	5.3	6.1	5.7	5.7
C -- Increased size (90%)					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	61	52	71	61	61
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	25	30	20	24	27
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	13	18	9	14	11
Average rating (1-9)	6.5	6.0	7.1	6.5	6.7
D -- Increased size (100%)					
▪ Convincing (7-9)	69	60	79	68	73
▪ More or less convincing (4-6)	18	23	14	19	18
▪ Not convincing (1-3)	12	18	7	13	9
Average rating (1-9)	7.0	6.4	7.5	7.0	7.3

* **Read:** 24% of teenagers gave at least a 7 on the 9-point scale used to assess the persuasive value of current size A.

TABLE 8 RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH 6 SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS

PIC Now I will show you pictures of people who currently smoke and packages of cigarettes with the warnings you just saw. Please take a careful look at them. For each picture I show you, I will ask you to what extent do you think it would keep this person from smoking. We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 "Very much". (WRITE IN NUMBER 1-9 / SHOW PACKAGES ONE AT A TIME EXACTLY IN THE SAME ORDER AS BELOW. ROTATE PICTURES AS CHECKED)

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK IT WOULD KEEP THIS PERSON FROM SMOKING?

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point scale)</i>	Total Teenagers (746)	Smokers (306)	Vulnerable non-smokers (440)	English speaking (515)	French speaking (231)
1. Business man					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.5*	4.3	4.8	4.6	4.2
▪ B increased (75%)	5.4	5.3	5.6	5.5	5.2
▪ C increased (90%)	6.1	5.8	6.4	6.0	6.2
▪ D increased (100%)	6.5	6.2	6.8	6.4	7.0
2. Teenage boy					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.0
▪ B increased (75%)	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
▪ C increased (90%)	5.5	5.3	5.7	5.4	5.7
▪ D increased (100%)	6.1	5.9	6.3	6.0	6.4
3. Sporty girl					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.9	5.7	6.1	5.6	6.8
▪ B increased (75%)	6.4	6.2	6.7	6.2	7.3
▪ C increased (90%)	7.0	6.7	7.2	6.7	7.9
▪ D increased (100%)	7.3	7.1	7.5	7.1	8.3

* **Read:** Teenagers gave an average rating of 4.5 on the 9-point scale used to assess the persuasive value of current size A associated with 'Business man' style smokers.

TABLE 8 RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PERSUASIVENESS ASSOCIATED WITH 6 SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS

PIC Now I will show you pictures of people who currently smoke and packages of cigarettes with the warnings you just saw. Please take a careful look at them. For each picture I show you, I will ask you to what extent do you think it would keep this person from smoking. We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 "Very much". (WRITE IN NUMBER 1-9 / SHOW PACKAGES ONE AT A TIME EXACTLY IN THE SAME ORDER AS BELOW. ROTATE PICTURES AS CHECKED)

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK IT WOULD KEEP THIS PERSON FROM SMOKING?

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point scale)</i>	Total Teenagers (746)	Smokers (306)	Vulnerable non-smokers (440)	English speaking (515)	French speaking (231)
4. Biker man					
▪ A current size (50%)	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.8	1.9
▪ B increased (75%)	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.2	2.2
▪ C increased (90%)	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.6	2.8
▪ D increased (100%)	3.9	3.8	3.9	4.1	3.1
5. Young woman					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.3	5.2	5.4	5.2	5.6
▪ B increased (75%)	6.0	6.0	6.1	6.0	6.2
▪ C increased (90%)	6.7	6.7	6.6	6.6	6.9
▪ D increased (100%)	7.1	7.0	7.2	7.0	7.6
6. Fisherman					
▪ A current size (50%)	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
▪ B increased (75%)	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.6
▪ C increased (90%)	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.8	5.2
▪ D increased (100%)	5.4	5.3	5.4	5.3	5.8
OVERALL AVERAGE (all 6 social styles combined)					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4
▪ B increased (75%)	5.0	4.9	5.1	5.0	5.1
▪ C increased (90%)	5.6	5.4	5.7	5.5	5.8
▪ D increased (100%)	6.1	5.9	6.2	6.0	6.4

TABLE 9

PERSONALITY TRAITS ASSOCIATED WITH SMOKERS

Q6 *I'd like you to fill out the next part of the survey on your own. Here are the questions and a pencil. I will wait right here for you to finish this part, then we can go on with a few more interview questions. If you have any questions as you are going along, please ask me about them.*

Below is a statement about people like you who smoke cigarettes. Complete the sentence to describe your own impressions of people like you who smoke cigarettes by circling a number from 1 to 9 on each of the scales listed after the statement. (EXPLAIN SCALE IF NECESSARY)

<i>All figures are average ratings based on total sample (9-point semantic differential scales)</i>	Total Teenagers (746)	Smokers (306)	Vulnerable non-smokers (440)	English speaking (515)	French speaking (231)
1. Risk-takers / Very prudent	4.1*	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0
2. Concerned for others / Selfish	5.1	4.8	5.5	5.1	5.0
3. Health negligent / Health conscious	4.2	4.4	3.9	4.3	3.7
4. Financially secure / Poor	4.9	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.5
5. Image conscious / Sloppy	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.7
6. Not cool / Very cool	4.7	5.1	4.4	4.8	4.4
7. Leader / Follower	5.4	5.0	5.7	5.4	5.3
8. Higher education / Lower education	5.3	5.1	5.5	5.4	5.1
9. In control of their destiny / Not in control of their destiny	5.0	4.8	5.4	5.0	5.1
10. Afraid of death / Do not worry about death	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.9	6.2
11. Disciplined / Disorganised	5.4	5.2	5.6	5.5	5.0
12. Rebellious / Follow the rules	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.3	4.4

N.B. Osgood's semantic differential was designed to measure the connotative meaning of concepts. The respondent is asked to choose where his or her position lies, on a scale between two bipolar words, or a range of words ranging across a bipolar position. All figures are average ratings on the 9-point semantic differential scales used to assess personality traits associated with smokers. On each of these scales, lower ratings (1-4) give primacy to the left side and higher ratings (6-9) to the right side of the bipolar scale, while a score of 5 is the middle point.

* **Read:** Teenagers gave an average rating of 4.1 on the 9-point semantic differential scale used to assess the association of the trait 'Risk-takers/Very prudent' with smokers.

TABLE 10

RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON SMOKER IMAGE

A1 In general, people like me who would continue to smoke cigarettes packaged with this type of warning are:

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point semantic differential scales)</i>	Total Teenagers (746)	Smokers (306)	Vulnerable non-smokers (440)	English speaking (515)	French speaking (231)
1. Risk-takers / Very prudent					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.4*	4.7	4.0	4.4	4.1
▪ B increased (75%)	4.0	4.3	3.6	4.0	3.9
▪ C increased (90%)	3.8	4.1	3.5	3.8	3.6
▪ D increased (100%)	3.6	4.0	3.1	3.6	3.5
2. Concerned for others / Selfish					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.4	5.1	5.7	5.5	5.1
▪ B increased (75%)	5.6	5.2	5.9	5.7	5.3
▪ C increased (90%)	5.7	5.3	6.2	5.8	5.3
▪ D increased (100%)	6.0	5.6	6.4	6.1	5.7
3. Health negligent / Health conscious					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.1	4.5	3.7	4.2	4.0
▪ B increased (75%)	4.0	4.5	3.6	4.1	3.7
▪ C increased (90%)	3.9	4.3	3.5	4.0	3.7
▪ D increased (100%)	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.4
4. Financially secure / Poor					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.1	5.1	5.2	5.2	4.8
▪ B increased (75%)	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.4	4.8
▪ C increased (90%)	5.2	5.0	5.5	5.4	4.7
▪ D increased (100%)	5.2	5.0	5.3	5.2	4.8

N.B. Osgood's semantic differential was designed to measure the connotative meaning of concepts. The respondent is asked to choose where his or her position lies, on a scale between two bipolar words, or a range of words ranging across a bipolar position. All figures are average ratings on 9-point semantic differential scales used to assess personality traits associated with smokers who would continue to smoke cigarettes packaged with certain sizes of HWMs. On each scale, lower ratings (1-4) give primacy to the left side and higher ratings (6-9) to the right side of the bipolar scale, while a score of 5 is the middle point.

* **Read:** Teenagers gave an average rating of 4.4 on the scale used to assess the association of the trait 'Risk-takers/Very prudent' with smokers who would continue to smoke cigarettes packaged with current size A.

TABLE 10

RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON SMOKER IMAGE

A1 In general, people like me who would continue to smoke cigarettes packaged with this type of warning are:

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point semantic differential scales)</i>	Total Teenagers (746)	Smokers (306)	Vulnerable non-smokers (440)	English speaking (515)	French speaking (231)
5. Image conscious / Sloppy					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.2	5.0	5.3	5.3	4.9
▪ B increased (75%)	5.3	5.2	5.5	5.4	5.2
▪ C increased (90%)	5.4	5.2	5.6	5.5	5.1
▪ D increased (100%)	5.5	5.3	5.7	5.5	5.3
6. Not cool / Very cool					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.6	4.9	4.2	4.6	4.4
▪ B increased (75%)	4.4	4.9	3.9	4.4	4.3
▪ C increased (90%)	4.2	4.6	3.9	4.3	4.1
▪ D increased (100%)	4.1	4.6	3.7	4.2	4.1
7. Leader / Follower					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.6	5.3	5.8	5.7	5.3
▪ B increased (75%)	5.6	5.3	5.9	5.7	5.3
▪ C increased (90%)	5.7	5.3	6.1	5.8	5.5
▪ D increased (100%)	5.9	5.6	6.2	6.0	5.4
8. Higher education / Lower education					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.5	5.3	5.7	5.6	5.2
▪ B increased (75%)	5.5	5.3	5.6	5.6	5.0
▪ C increased (90%)	5.6	5.4	5.9	5.7	5.3
▪ D increased (100%)	5.7	5.5	6.0	5.8	5.3
9. In control of their destiny / Not in control of their destiny					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.4	5.1	5.6	5.4	5.2
▪ B increased (75%)	5.5	5.1	5.8	5.4	5.5
▪ C increased (90%)	5.5	5.2	5.9	5.6	5.4
▪ D increased (100%)	5.7	5.3	6.0	5.7	5.5

TABLE 10

RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON SMOKER IMAGE

A1 In general, people like me who would continue to smoke cigarettes packaged with this type of warning are:

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point semantic differential scales)</i>	Total Teenagers (746)	Smokers (306)	Vulnerable non-smokers (440)	English speaking (515)	French speaking (231)
10. Afraid of death / Do not worry about death					
▪ A current size (50%)	6.0	5.8	6.1	6.0	6.1
▪ B increased (75%)	6.0	5.8	6.2	6.0	6.1
▪ C increased (90%)	6.2	6.0	6.4	6.2	6.3
▪ D increased (100%)	6.2	5.9	6.6	6.3	6.1
11. Disciplined / Disorganised					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.4	5.2	5.7	5.5	5.2
▪ B increased (75%)	5.5	5.2	5.8	5.6	5.3
▪ C increased (90%)	5.7	5.4	6.0	5.8	5.3
▪ D increased (100%)	5.7	5.3	6.0	5.8	5.3
12. Rebellious / Follow the rules					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.4	4.7	4.0	4.3	4.7
▪ B increased (75%)	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.2	4.4
▪ C increased (90%)	4.1	4.3	3.9	4.0	4.3
▪ D increased (100%)	4.1	4.4	3.8	4.1	4.2

TABLE 11

RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PRODUCT IMAGE

A2 My impressions of brands of cigarettes sold using this type of warning are:

<i>All figures are based on total sample (9-point semantic differential scales)</i>	Total Teenagers (746)	Smokers (306)	Vulnerable non-smokers (440)	English speaking (515)	French speaking (231)
1. Lot of taste / Not much taste					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.2*	5.0	5.3	5.1	5.3
▪ B increased (75%)	5.2	4.9	5.5	5.1	5.5
▪ C increased (90%)	5.2	4.9	5.5	5.1	5.6
▪ D increased (100%)	5.4	5.1	5.7	5.2	5.9
2. High nicotine content / Low nicotine content					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.1	4.4	3.8	4.2	3.8
▪ B increased (75%)	3.9	4.2	3.6	3.9	3.6
▪ C increased (90%)	3.7	4.0	3.4	3.7	3.6
▪ D increased (100%)	3.5	3.8	3.1	3.5	3.4
3. High quality standards / Low quality standards					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9
▪ B increased (75%)	5.1	4.9	5.2	5.1	5.0
▪ C increased (90%)	5.1	4.9	5.2	5.0	5.1
▪ D increased (100%)	5.1	4.9	5.3	5.1	5.2
4. Sold at standard prices / Sold at lower prices					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.5	4.8	4.3	4.6	4.3
▪ B increased (75%)	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.4
▪ C increased (90%)	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.4
▪ D increased (100%)	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4

N.B. Osgood's semantic differential was designed to measure the connotative meaning of concepts. The respondent is asked to choose where his or her position lies, on a scale between two bipolar words, or a range of words ranging across a bipolar position. All figures are average ratings on 9-point semantic differential scales used to assess product attributes associated with cigarettes packaged with certain sizes of HWMs. On each scale, lower ratings (1-4) give primacy to the left side and higher ratings (6-9) to the right side of the bipolar scale, while a score of 5 is the middle point.

* **Read:** Teenagers gave an average rating of 5.2 on the scale used to assess taste associated with cigarettes packaged with current size A.

TABLE 11

RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PRODUCT IMAGE

A2 My impressions of brands of cigarettes sold using this type of warning are:

All figures are based on total sample (9-point semantic differential scales)	Total Teenagers (746)	Smokers (306)	Vulnerable non-smokers (440)	English speaking (515)	French speaking (231)
5. Low tar content / High tar content					
▪ A current size (50%)	5.8	5.6	6.0	5.8	5.9
▪ B increased (75%)	6.0	5.8	6.2	5.9	6.2
▪ C increased (90%)	6.2	5.9	6.5	6.2	6.0
▪ D increased (100%)	6.3	5.9	6.7	6.3	6.5
6. Very popular / Not very popular					
▪ A current size (50%)	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8
▪ B increased (75%)	5.0	4.8	5.1	5.0	4.7
▪ C increased (90%)	5.1	5.0	5.2	5.1	5.0
▪ D increased (100%)	5.4	5.3	5.4	5.3	5.6
7. Addictive / Non addictive					
▪ A current size (50%)	3.5	3.8	3.2	3.5	3.3
▪ B increased (75%)	3.3	3.6	3.1	3.5	2.9
▪ C increased (90%)	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.2	3.1
▪ D increased (100%)	3.2	3.6	2.8	3.3	3.0
8. Dangerous / Safe					
▪ A current size (50%)	3.2	3.6	2.8	3.3	3.0
▪ B increased (75%)	3.2	3.6	2.9	3.3	2.8
▪ C increased (90%)	2.9	3.3	2.6	2.9	2.8
▪ D increased (100%)	2.9	3.4	2.4	3.0	2.5
9. Toxic / Non toxic					
▪ A current size (50%)	3.2	3.6	2.8	3.3	2.9
▪ B increased (75%)	3.0	3.4	2.7	3.1	2.7
▪ C increased (90%)	2.9	3.3	2.6	3.0	2.7
▪ D increased (100%)	2.9	3.3	2.4	2.9	2.6

TABLE 12

RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON THEIR EMOTIONAL IMPACT

A4 Would you be disturbed or not disturbed to see this type of warning on the cigarette packages you buy? Would you say...?

A5 Now, tell me how much do you agree or disagree that the following statements describe what you feel when looking at this type of warning. To give your answer, we will use the following scale: totally agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, totally disagree. (DO NOT READ OUT "CAN'T SAY")

<i>All figures are based on total sample</i>	Total Teenagers (746) %	Smokers (306) %	Vulnerable non-smokers (440) %	English speaking (515) %	French speaking (231) %
Would be disturbed to see this type of warnings on the cigarette packages purchased (Yes/No)					
▪ A current size (50%) – (%) 'disturbed'	44*	35	53	47	32
▪ B increased (75%)	58	47	69	62	44
▪ C increased (90%)	66	57	75	68	58
▪ D increased (100%)	67	57	78	69	63
You had waves of strong feelings when looking at these warnings (Agree/Disagree)					
▪ A current size (50%) – (%) 'agree' **	46	38	55	50	34
▪ B increased (75%)	60	51	70	62	50
▪ C increased (90%)	68	59	77	70	61
▪ D increased (100%)	71	63	80	74	64
It would be difficult to hide or control your feelings so that nobody would know what you really feel about these warnings (Agree/Disagree)					
▪ A current size (50%) – (%) 'agree'	36	29	41	38	27
▪ B increased (75%)	41	34	47	44	31
▪ C increased (90%)	45	39	50	45	41
▪ D increased (100%)	53	47	60	55	49
These warnings shocked you (Agree/Disagree)					
▪ A current size (50%) – (%) 'agree'	39	31	47	40	30
▪ B increased (75%)	51	42	60	53	41
▪ C increased (90%)	56	46	67	59	47
▪ D increased (100%)	61	51	70	63	54

* **Read:** 44% of teenagers said 'Yes' they would be disturbed if their cigarette packs showed warnings with current size A.

** **Agree:** Combined percentage of totally and somewhat agree.

TABLE 13

RATINGS OF WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS ON PACKAGING ATTRACTIVENESS

OVERALL THIS PACKAGE IS NOT ATTRACTIVE / IS ATTRACTIVE.

All figures are based on total sample (9-point semantic differential scale)	Total Teenagers (746)	Smokers (306)	Vulnerable non-smokers (440)	English speaking (515)	French speaking (231)
▪ A current size (50%)	4.0*	4.4	3.5	4.0	3.9
▪ B increased (75%)	3.7	4.2	3.3	3.7	3.9
▪ C increased (90%)	3.5	3.7	3.2	3.4	3.6
▪ D increased (100%)	3.3	3.7	2.9	3.3	3.4

N.B. Osgood's semantic differential was designed to measure the connotative meaning of concepts. The respondent is asked to choose where his or her position lies, on a scale between two bipolar words, or a range of words ranging across a bipolar position.

* **Read:** Teenagers gave an average rating of 4.0 on the scale used to assess packaging attractiveness with current size A.

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE

SCREENER

Project: 574-069
January, 2008
POR 254-07

INTERVIEW	RESPONDENT
DATE: _____ February, 2008 START: _____ pm ☐ am ☐ FINISH: _____ pm ☐ am ☐	Tel.: _____ Name: _____
INTERVIEWER:	

Hi, we are doing a study on cigarette smoking on behalf of the Government of Canada. This survey involves people aged 14 or more, smokers as well as some non smokers. We would like you to participate. While your participation is voluntary, your answers will be kept confidential. If you fit into one of the categories we need to include in the study and if you complete the interview, we would offer you \$10 in cash as a way of thanking you for your help. You will be asked to rate the look of different packages of cigarettes on several scales.

This survey is registered with the National survey registration system.

IF ASKED: *The registration system has been created by the Canadian survey research industry to allow the public to verify that a survey is legitimate, get information about the survey or register a complaint. The registration system toll-free telephone number is 1-800-554-9996.*

IF RESPONDENT ACCEPTS, PROCEED WITH SCREENING. IF REFUSES, RECORD AS REFUSAL.

(A) How old are you?

- 13 or under ☐ **TERMINATE**
- 14 years old ☐
- 15 years old ☐ **GTQ (B)**
- 16 years old ☐
- 17 years old ☐
- 18 or over ☐ **GTQ (E)**

(B) Have you ever smoked one puff or more of a cigarette, never smoked or are you currently a smoker, even on an occasional basis?

- Current smoker... ☐ **TEENS GR. 1
GTQ (G)**
- Former smoker... ☐
- Never smoked ... ☐ **CONTINUE**

(C) At any time during the end of this year do you think that you will smoke one puff or more of a cigarette?

- Definitely yes ☐ **TEENS GR. 2
GTQ (G)**
- Probably yes ☐
- Probably not ☐ **CONTINUE**
- Definitely not ☐

(D) What are some reasons that might encourage you to start smoking? (DO NOT READ LIST) (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY) Can you tell me them now so that I can record them on the questionnaire?

- | | |
|---|--|
| • No, I will never smoke | ☐ TERMINATE |
| • If all my friends smoked..... | ☐ |
| • If my friends pressured me to smoke | ☐ TEENS GR. 2 |
| • If the price was reduced | ☐ |
| • If they found a cure for cancer..... | ☐ GTQ (G) |
| • Others (please specify)..... | ☐ |

(E) Have you ever smoked a cigarette, never smoked or are you currently a smoker, even on an occasional basis?

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| • Current smoker..... | ☐ CONTINUE | • Former smoker ... | ☐ |
| | | • Never smoked..... | ☐ TERMINATE |

(F) In the next 12 months, do you think you will quit smoking? (READ)

- | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| • Definitely yes | ☐ ADULTS GR. 1 | • Probably not | ☐ ADULTS GR. 2 |
| • Probably yes..... | ☐ | • Definitely not..... | ☐ |

(G) **INTERVIEWER : RECORD GENDER OF RESPONDENT:**

- Male..... ☐ • Female..... ☐

TEENS (14-17): INTERVIEW IF RESPONDENT IS A SMOKER OR MIGHT START FOR ANY REASON. PROCEED WITH PARENTAL CONSENT IF AGED 14 OR 15.

ADULTS (18+): PROCEED WITH INTERVIEW IF RESPONDENT IS A SMOKER, CONSIDERING OR NOT CONSIDERING QUITTING.

(H) We would like to interview you as part of our study – this involves an interview right here in the mall. The interview will take about 30 minutes. We will be interviewing a large number of teenagers and adults across Canada and will be only reporting about what you say as part of this larger group. We would offer you \$10 in cash as a way of thanking you for your help. Will you participate in our study?

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| • Yes | ☐ PROCEED WITH INTERVIEW |
| • No | ☐ THANK & RECORD REFUSAL |

INTERVIEWER:

IF RESPONDENT IS NOT ALONE: WE WOULD LIKE FRANK ANSWERS AND OPINIONS. THEREFORE WE NEED TO INTERVIEW HIM/HER WITHOUT ANOTHER PERSON ASSISTING, SINCE DIFFERENT PERSONS MAY HAVE DIFFERENT VIEWS.

IF RESPONDENT OR ANY MEMBERS OF HIS/HER FAMILY WORKS FOR ORGANIZATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS: THANK & TERMINATE:

- Tobacco industry
- Department of Health
- A marketing or survey research, or a public relations firm or an advertising agency

QUESTIONNAIRE

Project: 574-069

January, 2008

POR 254-07

24/01/2008 11:00 AM

AWARENESS OF CURRENT WARNINGS

We are now ready to begin the actual interview. We'd first like to talk with you about the Health Canada health warning messages that are found on every package of cigarettes in Canada.

Q1 As you already know, on each package of cigarettes there is a health warning message. Please, tell me all the current warnings you know, by describing me the picture and/or telling me the phrase written on top of each package. **PROBE: ANY OTHERS? (WRITE IN)**

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____

Q2 Here is an exact drawing of a king size and a regular package of cigarettes. I would like you to show me the line which outlines or best describes the size currently occupied by the warning (**SHOW DRAWINGS WITH GRIDS IN PLASTIC SHEET / IF THE RESPONDENT SAYS "I DON'T KNOW", INSIST FOR HIS/HER BEST APPROXIMATION / RECORD ANSWER**).

RECORD GRID LEVEL KING SIZE: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

RECORD GRID LEVEL REGULAR SIZE: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

PERSUASIVENESS OF CURRENT WARNINGS

Q3 To what extent do you think that health warnings on each package of cigarettes are effective? We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 "Very much". (**CIRCLE ONE NUMBER**)

READ AND ROTATE		Not at all					Very much			
1.	In informing the public about the risks of smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2.	In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3.	In increasing the number of smokers who quit smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4.	In discouraging people from starting to smoke	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5.	In reinforcing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

- Q4** Now, I will show you various health warnings that are found on the packages of cigarettes sold in Canada. For each warning, I will show you, I will ask you to what extent you think it convinces you, personally, to stay away from smoking. We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 meaning "Very much". **(SHOW WARNINGS ONE AT A TIME IN ROTATION)** Would you say that this warning convinces you to stay away from smoking? **(START FIRST CHECKED SECTION AND START WITH FIRST ITEM CHECKED)**

☐ 1) Start first with this section if checked. **(IF NOT, GO TO SECTION 2 below)**

WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS WARNING CONVINCES YOU TO STAY AWAY FROM SMOKING?

READ AND ROTATE		Not at all					Very much			
1.	Cigarettes are highly addictive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2.	Children see, children do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3.	Cigarettes hurt babies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4.	Tobacco use can make you impotent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5.	Don't poison us	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6.	Tobacco smoke hurts babies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7.	Cigarettes cause strokes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8.	Cigarettes cause mouth diseases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

☐ 2) Start first with this section if checked. **(IF NOT, GO TO SECTION 1 above)**

WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS WARNING CONVINCES YOU TO STAY AWAY FROM SMOKING?

READ AND ROTATE		Not at all					Very much			
9.	Each year the equivalent of a small city dies from tobacco use	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10.	Cigarettes leave you breathless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11.	Cigarettes are a heart breaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12.	Cigarettes cause lung cancer (patient)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
13.	Cigarettes cause lung cancer (lungs)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14.	Idle but deadly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15.	Where there's smoke, there's hydrogen cyanide	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
16.	You're not the only one smoking this cigarette	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

REACTIONS TO PACKAGE OPTIONS

- Q5** I would like your views on what you think might happen if all cigarettes in Canada were packaged with new health warnings. I will show you a selection of these new warnings. The warnings you will see, will look exactly the same. However, below the warnings, where the word 'cigarettes' is written, the brand identification will vary from one brand to another, as is the case currently. If cigarettes were available only in packages like this one, to what extent do you think it would keep people like you from smoking? We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 meaning "Very much". **(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER / SHOW PACKAGES ONE AT A TIME EXACTLY IN THE SAME ORDER AS BELOW)**

IF CIGARETTES WERE AVAILABLE ONLY IN PACKAGES LIKE THIS ONE, TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK IT WOULD KEEP PEOPLE LIKE YOU FROM SMOKING?

PACKAGES	Not at all					Very much				
A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
B	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
C	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
D	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

PIC Now I will show you pictures of people who currently smoke and packages of cigarettes with the warnings you just saw. Please take a careful look at them. For each picture I show you, I will ask you to what extent do you think it would keep this person from smoking. We will use a scale from 1 to 9, 1 meaning "Not at all" and 9 "Very much". **(WRITE IN NUMBER 1-9 / SHOW PACKAGES ONE AT A TIME EXACTLY IN THE SAME ORDER AS BELOW. ROTATE PICTURES AS CHECKED)**

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK IT WOULD KEEP THIS PERSON FROM SMOKING?

PACKAGES	PEOPLE					
	1. Business man	2. Teenage boy	3. Sporty girl	4. Biker man	5. Young woman	6. Fisherman
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
A						
B						
C						
D						

Q6 I'd like you to fill out the next part of the survey on your own. Here are the questions and a pencil. I will wait right here for you to finish this part, then we can go on with a few more interview questions. If you have any questions as you are going along, please ask me about them.

Below is a statement about people like you who smoke cigarettes. Complete the sentence to describe your own **impressions** of people like you who smoke cigarettes by circling a number from 1 to 9 on each of the scales listed after the statement. **(EXPLAIN SCALE IF NECESSARY)**

In general, people like me who smoke cigarettes are? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER PER ITEM)										
Risk-takers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very prudent
Concerned for others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Selfish
Health negligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Health conscious
Financially secure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Poor
Image conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sloppy
Not cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very cool
Leader	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Follower
Higher education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Lower education
In control of their destiny	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not in control of their destiny
Afraid of death	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Do not worry about death
Disciplined	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Disorganised
Rebellious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Follow the rules

RESPONDENT: RETURN QUESTIONNAIRE TO INTERVIEWER.

INTERVIEWER: CHECK FOR COMPLETENESS.

Q7 The government is thinking of making cigarette companies sell cigarettes using new types of warnings. Below is a statement about people like you who smoke cigarettes. Complete the sentence to describe your own **impressions** of people like you who would continue to smoke cigarettes by circling a number from 1 to 9 on each of the scales listed after the statement.

SHOW PACKAGE A / LEAVE IN VIEW, SELF COMPLETE

A1 In general, people like me who would continue to smoke cigarettes packaged with this type of warning are:

PACKAGE A											
A1.1	Risk-takers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very prudent
A1.2	Concerned for others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Selfish
A1.3	Health negligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Health conscious
A1.4	Financially secure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Poor
A1.5	Image conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sloppy
A1.6	Not cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very cool
A1.7	Leader	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Follower
A1.8	Higher education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Lower education
A1.9	In control of their destiny	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not in control of their destiny
A1.10	Afraid of death	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Do not worry about death
A1.11	Disciplined	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Disorganised
A1.12	Rebellious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Follow the rules
A1.13	Overall, this package is not attractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Overall, this package is attractive

A2 My impressions of brands of cigarettes sold using this type of warning are:

PACKAGE A											
A2.1	A lot of taste	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not much taste
A2.2	High nicotine content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Low nicotine content
A2.3	High quality standards	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Low quality standards
A2.4	Sold at standard prices	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sold at lower prices
A2.5	Low tar content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	High tar content
A2.6	Very popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not very popular
A2.7	Addictive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non addictive
A2.8	Dangerous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Safe
A2.9	Toxic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non toxic

A3 I think that warnings presented this way are effective? (USE A SCALE FROM 1 TO 9, 1 MEANING "NOT AT ALL" AND 9 "VERY MUCH" - CIRCLE ONE NUMBER PER SCALE)

PACKAGE A		Not at all					Very much				
A3.1	In informing the public about the risks of smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
A3.2	In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
A3.3	In increasing the number of smokers who would stop smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
A3.4	In discouraging people from starting to smoke	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
A3.5	In increasing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

RESPONDENT: RETURN QUESTIONNAIRE TO INTERVIEWER.
INTERVIEWER: CHECK FOR COMPLETENESS. THEN REMOVE PACK.

A4 Would you be disturbed or not disturbed to see this type of warning on the cigarette packages you buy? Would you say...?

- Disturbed ☐
- Not disturbed ☐

A5 Now, tell me how much do you agree or disagree that the following statements describe what you feel when looking at this type of warning. To give your answer, we will use the following scale: totally agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, totally disagree. **(DO NOT READ OUT “CAN’T SAY”)**

READ AND ROTATE	Totally agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Totally disagree	Can't say
A5.1. You had waves of strong feelings when looking at these warnings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
A5.2. It would be difficult to hide or control your feelings so that nobody would know what you really feel about these warnings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
A5.3. These warnings shocked you	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SHOW PACKAGE B / LEAVE IN VIEW, SELF COMPLETE

B1 In general, people like me who would continue to smoke cigarettes packaged with this type of warning are:

PACKAGE B											
B1.1	Risk-takers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very prudent
B1.2	Concerned for others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Selfish
B1.3	Health negligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Health conscious
B1.4	Financially secure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Poor
B1.5	Image conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sloppy
B1.6	Not cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very cool
B1.7	Leader	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Follower
B1.8	Higher education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Lower education
B1.9	In control of their destiny	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not in control of their destiny
B1.10	Afraid of death	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Do not worry about death
B1.11	Disciplined	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Disorganised
B1.12	Rebellious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Follow the rules
B1.13	Overall, this package is not attractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Overall, this package is attractive

B2 My impressions of brands of cigarettes sold using this type of warning are:

PACKAGE B											
B2.1	A lot of taste	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not much taste
B2.2	High nicotine content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Low nicotine content
B2.3	High quality standards	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Low quality standards
B2.4	Sold at standard prices	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sold at lower prices
B2.5	Low tar content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	High tar content
B2.6	Very popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not very popular
B2.7	Addictive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non addictive
B2.8	Dangerous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Safe
B2.9	Toxic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non toxic

B3 I think that warnings presented this way are effective? (USE A SCALE FROM 1 TO 9, 1 MEANING "NOT AT ALL" AND 9 "VERY MUCH" - CIRCLE ONE NUMBER PER SCALE)

PACKAGE B		Not at all					Very much				
B3.1	In informing the public about the risks of smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
B3.2	In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
B3.3	In increasing the number of smokers who would stop smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
B3.4	In discouraging people from starting to smoke	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
B3.5	In increasing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

**RESPONDENT: RETURN QUESTIONNAIRE TO INTERVIEWER.
INTERVIEWER: CHECK FOR COMPLETENESS. THEN REMOVE PACK.**

B4 Would you be disturbed or not disturbed to see this type of warning on the cigarette packages you buy? Would you say...?

- Disturbed ☐
- Not disturbed ☐

B5 Now, tell me how much do you agree or disagree that the following statements describe what you feel when looking at this type of warning. To give your answer, we will use the following scale: totally agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, totally disagree. **(DO NOT READ OUT “CAN’T SAY”)**

READ AND ROTATE	Totally agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Totally disagree	Can't say
B5.1. You had waves of strong feelings when looking at these warnings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B5.2. It would be difficult to hide or control your feelings so that nobody would know what you really feel about these warnings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B5.3. These warnings shocked you	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SHOW PACKAGE C / LEAVE IN VIEW, SELF COMPLETE

C1 In general, people like me who would continue to smoke cigarettes packaged with this type of warning are:

PACKAGE C											
C1.1	Risk-takers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very prudent
C1.2	Concerned for others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Selfish
C1.3	Health negligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Health conscious
C1.4	Financially secure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Poor
C1.5	Image conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sloppy
C1.6	Not cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very cool
C1.7	Leader	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Follower
C1.8	Higher education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Lower education
C1.9	In control of their destiny	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not in control of their destiny
C1.10	Afraid of death	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Do not worry about death
C1.11	Disciplined	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Disorganised
C1.12	Rebellious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Follow the rules
C1.13	Overall, this package is not attractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Overall, this package is attractive

C2 My impressions of brands of cigarettes sold using this type of warning are:

PACKAGE C											
C2.1	A lot of taste	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not much taste
C2.2	High nicotine content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Low nicotine content
C2.3	High quality standards	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Low quality standards
C2.4	Sold at standard prices	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sold at lower prices
C2.5	Low tar content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	High tar content
C2.6	Very popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not very popular
C2.7	Addictive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non addictive
C2.8	Dangerous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Safe
C2.9	Toxic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non toxic

C3 I think that warnings presented this way are effective? (USE A SCALE FROM 1 TO 9, 1 MEANING "NOT AT ALL" AND 9 "VERY MUCH" - CIRCLE ONE NUMBER PER SCALE)

PACKAGE C		Not at all					Very much				
C3.1	In informing the public about the risks of smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
C3.2	In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
C3.3	In increasing the number of smokers who would stop smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
C3.4	In discouraging people from starting to smoke	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
C3.5	In increasing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

**RESPONDENT: RETURN QUESTIONNAIRE TO INTERVIEWER.
INTERVIEWER: CHECK FOR COMPLETENESS. THEN REMOVE PACK.**

C4 Would you be disturbed or not disturbed to see this type of warning on the cigarette packages you buy? Would you say...?

- Disturbed ☐
- Not disturbed ☐

C5 Now, tell me how much do you agree or disagree that the following statements describe what you feel when looking at this type of warning. To give your answer, we will use the following scale: totally agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, totally disagree. **(DO NOT READ OUT “CAN’T SAY”)**

READ AND ROTATE	Totally agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Totally disagree	Can't say
C5.1. You had waves of strong feelings when looking at these warnings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C5.2. It would be difficult to hide or control your feelings so that nobody would know what you really feel about these warnings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C5.3. These warnings shocked you	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SHOW PACKAGE D / LEAVE IN VIEW, SELF COMPLETE

D1 In general, people like me who would continue to smoke cigarettes packaged with this type of warning are:

PACKAGE D											
D1.1	Risk-takers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very prudent
D1.2	Concerned for others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Selfish
D1.3	Health negligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Health conscious
D1.4	Financially secure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Poor
D1.5	Image conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sloppy
D1.6	Not cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very cool
D1.7	Leader	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Follower
D1.8	Higher education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Lower education
D1.9	In control of their destiny	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not in control of their destiny
D1.10	Afraid of death	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Do not worry about death
D1.11	Disciplined	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Disorganised
D1.12	Rebellious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Follow the rules
D1.13	Overall, this package is not attractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Overall, this package is attractive

D2 My impressions of brands of cigarettes sold using this type of warning are:

PACKAGE D											
D2.1	A lot of taste	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not much taste
D2.2	High nicotine content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Low nicotine content
D2.3	High quality standards	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Low quality standards
D2.4	Sold at standard prices	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sold at lower prices
D2.5	Low tar content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	High tar content
D2.6	Very popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Not very popular
D2.7	Addictive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non addictive
D2.8	Dangerous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Safe
D2.9	Toxic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non toxic

D3 I think that warnings presented this way are effective? (USE A SCALE FROM 1 TO 9, 1 MEANING "NOT AT ALL" AND 9 "VERY MUCH" - CIRCLE ONE NUMBER PER SCALE)

PACKAGE D		Not at all					Very much				
D3.1	In informing the public about the risks of smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
D3.2	In increasing the number of people who disapprove of smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
D3.3	In increasing the number of smokers who would stop smoking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
D3.4	In discouraging people from starting to smoke	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
D3.5	In increasing your personal belief in the message conveyed by the warnings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

RESPONDENT: RETURN QUESTIONNAIRE TO INTERVIEWER.
INTERVIEWER: CHECK FOR COMPLETENESS. THEN REMOVE PACK.

D4 Would you be disturbed or not disturbed to see this type of warning on the cigarette packages you buy? Would you say...?

- Disturbed ☐
- Not disturbed ☐

D5 Now, tell me how much do you agree or disagree that the following statements describe what you feel when looking at this type of warning. To give your answer, we will use the following scale: totally agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, totally disagree. **(DO NOT READ OUT "CAN'T SAY")**

READ AND ROTATE	Totally agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Totally disagree	Can't say
D5.1. You had waves of strong feelings when looking at these warnings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D5.2. It would be difficult to hide or control your feelings so that nobody would know what you really feel about these warnings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D5.3. These warnings shocked you	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

USAGE

IF RESPONDENT IS NOT A CURRENT SMOKER (SEE [Qb] TEENS), GO TO Q18.

Q8 You told me at the beginning that you were smoking. On how many of the last 30 days did you smoke one or more cigarettes? **(READ)**

- 1-5 days..... ☐
- 6-10 days..... ☐
- 11-20 days..... ☐
- 21-29 days..... ☐
- Everyday..... ☐
- Dk/Na..... ☐

Q9 On those days that you smoked, how many cigarettes did you usually smoke? **(READ)**

- 5 or less cigarettes ☐
- 6-10 cigarettes..... ☐
- 11-15 cigarettes..... ☐
- 16-20 cigarettes..... ☐
- 21-25 cigarettes..... ☐
- More than 25 cigarettes ☐
- Dk/Na..... ☐

Q10 What is your regular brand of cigarettes, that is the one you smoke most of the time? **(DO NOT READ / SPECIFY BRAND NAME ENTIRELY)**

- | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Belvedere (Regular) | ☐ | 16. Export "A" Medium | ☐ |
| 2. Belvedere Extra Mild | ☐ | 17. Export "A" Mild | ☐ |
| 3. Benson & Hedges (Regular) | ☐ | 18. Export "A" Light..... | ☐ |
| 4. Benson & Hedges Deluxe Ultra Light.... | ☐ | 19. Export "A" Ultra Light | ☐ |
| 5. Benson & Hedges Deluxe Ultra Light | | 20. Matinee (Regular) | ☐ |
| Menthol..... | ☐ | | |
| 6. Craven "A" (Regular) | ☐ | 21. Matinee Extra Mild | ☐ |
| 7. Craven "A" Light | ☐ | 22. Matinee Slims | ☐ |
| 8. Craven "A" Menthol | ☐ | 23. Player's (Regular / Filter) | ☐ |
| 9. DuMaurier (Regular)..... | ☐ | 24. Player's Light | ☐ |
| 10. DuMaurier Light..... | ☐ | 25. Player's Extra Light..... | ☐ |
| 11. DuMaurier Extra Light | ☐ | 26. Rothmans (Regular) | ☐ |
| 12. DuMaurier Ultra Light | ☐ | 27. Rothmans Special Mild | ☐ |
| 13. DuMaurier Special..... | ☐ | • Other (specify) | ☐ |
| 14. DuMaurier Special 100..... | ☐ | • No regular brand..... | ☐ |
| 15. Export "A" (Regular) | ☐ | • Dk/Na | ☐ |

Q11 Is that...? **(READ)**

- Regular size..... ☐
- King size- Other..... ☐
- Dk/Na..... ☐

Q12 Is that...? **(READ)**

- Regular- Ultra Mild.....|- Light- Extra Mild.....

| |
|- Mild- Other (**do not read**).....

|- Ultra Light.....- Dk/Na

|- Extra Light.....-

Q13 For how long have you been smoking (**ANSWER OF Q10**)? (**READ**)

- Less than a year ☐
- 1-2 years..... ☐
- 3-5 years..... ☐
- More than 5 years ☐
- Dk/Na..... ☐

IF DK/NA AT Q10, GO TO Q16

Q14 From time to time, do you smoke another brand of cigarettes?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐
- Dk/Na..... ☐ **GTQ Q16**

Q15 Which other brand of cigarettes do you smoke from time to time? (**DO NOT READ / SPECIFY BRAND NAME ENTIRELY**)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Belvedere (Regular) ☐ | 16. Export "A" Medium ☐ |
| 2. Belvedere Extra Mild ☐ | 17. Export "A" Mild ☐ |
| 3. Benson & Hedges (Regular) ☐ | 18. Export "A" Light ☐ |
| 4. Benson & Hedges Deluxe Ultra Light.... ☐ | 19. Export "A" Ultra Light ☐ |
| 5. Benson & Hedges Deluxe Ultra Light
Menthol ☐ | 20. Matinee (Regular) ☐ |
| 6. Craven "A" (Regular) ☐ | 21. Matinee Extra Mild ☐ |
| 7. Craven "A" Light ☐ | 22. Matinee Slims ☐ |
| 8. Craven "A" Menthol ☐ | 23. Player's (Regular / Filter) ☐ |
| 9. DuMaurier (Regular)..... ☐ | 24. Player's Light ☐ |
| 10. DuMaurier Light ☐ | 25. Player's Extra Light ☐ |
| 11. DuMaurier Extra Light ☐ | 26. Rothmans (Regular) ☐ |
| 12. DuMaurier Ultra Light ☐ | 27. Rothmans Special Mild ☐ |
| 13. DuMaurier Special..... ☐ | • Other (specify) ☐ |
| 14. DuMaurier Special 100..... ☐ | • No regular brand ☐ |
| 15. Export "A" (Regular) ☐ | • Dk/Na ☐ |

Q16 Have you tried to quit smoking in the past 12 months?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐
- Dk/Na..... ☐

Q17 How much do you spend for smoking in a typical week? (**WRITE IN**)

_____ \$

IF ADULT (18+) GO TO Q19

Q18 In the next 12 months, do you think you will quit smoking?

- Yes definitely ☐
- Yes probably..... ☐
- No probably not ☐
- No definitely not..... ☐
- Dk/Na..... ☐

Q19 What is your age? **(READ IF NECESSARY)**

- | | |
|--|--|
| • 14-17 years old..... ☐ | • 45-54 years old..... ☐ |
| • 18-19 years old..... ☐ | • 55-64 years old..... ☐ |
| • 20-24 years old..... ☐ | • 65 years old and over..... ☐ |
| • 25-34 years old..... ☐ | • Dk/Na..... ☐ |
| • 35-44 years old..... ☐ | |

Q20 Do you earn any money of your own?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐ **GTQ Q22**

Q21 On average, how much money do you make per week? **(IF DON'T KNOW, OBTAIN BEST GUESS)**

_____ \$

Q22 What is the highest level of education that you have completed? **(READ IF NECESSARY)**

- | | |
|--|--|
| • Partial elementary ☐ | • Completed college / Cegep ☐ |
| • Completed elementary ☐ | • Some university ☐ |
| • Partial high school ☐ | • Completed university ☐ |
| • Completed high school..... ☐ | • Other ☐ |
| • Some college / Cegep ☐ | • Dk/Na ☐ |

IF TEEN (14-17) : END OF INTERVIEW

RECORD TEEN ALONE ☐ WITH FRIENDS ONLY ☐ WITH ADULTS ☐

Q23 Do you have currently a **(READ)** paid job?

- | | |
|---|--|
| • Full time ☐ | • No ☐ GTQ 25 |
| • Part time ☐ | • Dk/Na ☐ |

Q24a What is your occupation, the type of work you do? **WRITE IN:** _____

Q24b For what type of company? **WRITE IN:** _____

Q25 What is your marital status? **(READ IF NECESSARY)**

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| • Married or living common law..... ☐ | • Other ☐ |
| • Single / living alone ☐ | • Dk/Na ☐ |

Q26 Do you have children? **(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)**

0 1 2 3 4 +

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PARTICIPATING, THAT COMPLETES THE INTERVIEW.

SÉLECTION

Projet : 574-069
Janvier 2008
POR 254-07

ENTREVUE	RÉPONDANT
DATE : _____ Février 2008 DÉBUT : _____ pm ☐ am ☐ FIN : _____ pm ☐ am ☐	Tél. : _____ Nom : _____
INTERVIEWEUR :	

Dans toutes les questions, le masculin comprend le féminin.

Bonjour (Bonsoir). Nous effectuons une étude sur la cigarette pour le compte du gouvernement du Canada. L'étude vise la population de 14 ans et plus, aussi bien les fumeurs que certains non-fumeurs. Nous aimerions que vous y participiez. La participation est volontaire mais toutes vos réponses resteront entièrement confidentielles. Si vous correspondez à des groupes que nous recherchons et que vous complétez l'entrevue, vous recevrez 10\$ en argent en guise de remerciement. On vous demandera d'évaluer l'apparence de différents paquets de cigarettes sur plusieurs échelles.

Cette enquête est enregistrée auprès du système national d'inscription des sondages.

SI DEMANDÉ : Le système national d'inscription des sondages a été créé par l'industrie canadienne de la recherche par sondage pour permettre au public de vérifier la légitimité d'un sondage, obtenir des renseignements sur le sondage ou de déposer une plainte. Le numéro de téléphone sans frais du système d'inscription est le 1-800-554-9996.

SI LE RÉPONDANT ACCEPTE, CONTINUER AVEC LA SÉLECTION. SI REFUSE, INSCRIRE COMME REFUS.

(A) Quel âge avez-vous? (As-tu?)

- 13 ans ou moins.. ☐ **TERMINER**
- 14 ans ☐
- 15 ans ☐ **PAQ (B)**
- 16 ans ☐
- 17 ans ☐
- 18 ans ou plus ☐ **PAQ (E)**

(B) As-tu déjà fumé une ou plusieurs bouffées d'une cigarette, jamais fumé ou fumes-tu présentement, ne serait-ce qu'à l'occasion?

- Fumeur actuel ☐ **JEUNES GR. 1**
PAQ (G)
- Déjà fumé ☐ **CONTINUEZ**
- Jamais fumé ☐

(C) Crois-tu que tu fumeras une ou plusieurs bouffées de cigarette d'ici la fin de l'année?

- Certainement..... ☐ **JEUNES GR. 2**
- Probablement..... ☐ **PAQ (G)**
- Probablement pas..... ☐ **CONTINUEZ**
- Certainement pas ☐

(D) Quelles sont les raisons qui pourraient t'encourager à commencer à fumer? (NE LISEZ PAS LA LISTE) (ENCERCLEZ TOUTES LES RÉPONSES PERTINENTES). Peux-tu me les nommer maintenant afin que je les inscrive sur le questionnaire.

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Je ne fumerai jamais | ☐ TERMINER |
| • Si tous mes amis fumaient | ☐ |
| • Si mes amis m'incitaient à fumer | ☐ JEUNES GR. 2 |
| • Si le prix des cigarettes baissait | ☐ |
| • S'il existait un remède contre le cancer | ☐ PAQ (G) |
| • Autres (veuillez préciser) | ☐ |

(E) Avez-vous déjà fumé la cigarette dans votre vie, jamais fumé ou êtes-vous fumeur présentement, ne serait-ce qu'à l'occasion?

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| • Fumeur actuel | ☐ CONTINUEZ | • Déjà fumé | ☐ |
| | | • Jamais fumé | ☐ TERMINER |

(F) Au cours des 12 prochains mois, croyez-vous que vous arrêterez de fumer? (LIRE)

- | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| • Certainement | ☐ ADULTES | • Probablement pas | ☐ ADULTES |
| • Probablement | ☐ GR. 1 | • Certainement pas | ☐ GR. 2 |

(G) **INTERVIEWEUR : SEXE DU RÉPONDANT**

- Masculin ☐ • Féminin ☐

JEUNES (14-17) : FAIRE L'ENTREVUE SI LE RÉPONDANT FUME OU EST UN FUMEUR POTENTIEL, QUELLE QU'EN SOIT LA RAISON. SI ÂGÉ DE 14 OU 15 ANS, DEMANDER LE CONSENTEMENT PARENTAL.

ADULTES (18+) : FAIRE L'ENTREVUE SI LE RÉPONDANT EST UN FUMEUR, QU'IL SONGE À ARRÊTER OU PAS.

(H) Nous aimerions vous (t')interviewer dans le cadre de notre sondage - ici même, dans le centre commercial. L'entrevue durera environ 30 minutes. Nous interrogerons un grand nombre d'adolescents et d'adultes partout au Canada et les réponses feront partie d'un rapport basé sur les résultats globaux. Nous vous (t')offrons 10\$ en argent comptant en guise de remerciement. Acceptez-vous (acceptes-tu) de participer à notre sondage?

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| • Oui | ☐ ENTREVUE |
| • Non | ☐ MERCI ET INSCRIVEZ REFUS |

INTERVIEWEUR :

SI LE RÉPONDANT EST ACCOMPAGNÉ : NOUS AIMERIONS QUE LES RÉPONSES À CETTE ÉTUDE SOIENT FRANCHES. C'EST POURQUOI L'ENTREVUE SE DÉROULERA SANS QUE PERSONNE N'ÉCOUTE CAR LES OPINIONS PEUVENT ÊTRE DIFFÉRENTES.

SI LE RÉPONDANT OU UN MEMBRE DE SA FAMILLE TRAVAILLE POUR UNE ORGANISATION DANS LES DOMAINES SUIVANTS : REMERCIER ET TERMINER :

- **Industrie du tabac**
- **Ministère de la santé**
- **Une firme de marketing ou de sondage, ou une firme en relations publiques ou une agence de publicité**

QUESTIONNAIRE

CONNAISSANCE DES AVERTISSEMENTS ACTUELS

Nous pouvons maintenant commencer l'entrevue. J'aimerais d'abord parler avec vous (toi) sur les messages de mise en garde de Santé Canada qu'on retrouve sur tous les paquets de cigarettes vendus au Canada.

Q1 Comme vous le savez (tu le sais) sans doute, sur chaque paquet de cigarettes, il y a un message de mise en garde. Pourriez-vous (pourrais-tu) me nommer tous les avertissements que vous connaissez (que tu connais) en me décrivant les images et/ou en me parlant des phrases écrites en haut de chaque paquet. **SONDEZ : Y EN A-T-IL D'AUTRES? (INSCRIRE)**

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____

Q2 Voici un dessin précis d'un paquet de cigarettes king size et régulier. Pourriez-vous (pourrais-tu) me montrer la ligne qui délimite ou décrit le mieux la grandeur occupée par les mises en garde actuelles (**MONTREZ LES DESSINS SUR LA FEUILLE PLASTIFIÉE / SI LE RÉPONDANT DIT « JE NE SAIS PAS », INSISTEZ POUR SA MEILLEURE APPROXIMATION / INSCRIRE SA RÉPONSE**).

INSCRIRE LE NIVEAU KING SIZE : 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

INSCRIRE LE NIVEAU RÉGULIER : 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

CRÉDIBILITÉ DES AVERTISSEMENTS ACTUELS

Q3 Dans quelle mesure diriez-vous (dirais-tu) que les mises en garde qu'on retrouve sur chaque paquet de cigarettes sont efficaces? Nous utiliserons une échelle de 1 à 9, 1 veut dire « Pas du tout » et 9 « Très efficaces ». (**ENCERCLEZ UN NOMBRE**)

LIRE EN ROTATION		Pas du tout					Très efficaces			
1.	Pour informer le public sur les risques de fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2.	Pour accroître le nombre de gens qui désapprouvent ceux qui fument	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3.	Pour accroître le nombre de fumeurs qui arrêteraient de fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4.	Pour décourager les gens de commencer à fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5.	Pour renforcer la crédibilité que vous accordez à ce que disent les avertissements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Q4 Maintenant, je vais vous (te) montrer plusieurs mises en garde qu'on retrouve sur les paquets de cigarettes vendues au Canada. Pour chaque avertissement, dites (dis)-moi dans quelle mesure il réussit à vous (te) convaincre de ne pas fumer. Nous utiliserons une échelle de 1 à 9, 1 voulant dire « Pas du tout » et 9 « Beaucoup ». **(MONTREZ LES AVERTISSEMENTS UN À LA FOIS EN ROTATION)** DIRIEZ-VOUS (DIRAIS-TU) QUE CET AVERTISSEMENT RÉUSSIT À VOUS (TE) CONVAINCRE DE NE PAS FUMER **(COMMENCER EN PREMIER AVEC LA SECTION COCHÉE ET DÉBUTER AVEC LE PREMIER ITEM COCHÉ)**

- ☐ 1) Commencez en premier avec cette section si cochée. **(SI NON, PASSEZ À SECTION 2 ci-dessous)**

DIRIEZ-VOUS (DIRAIS-TU) QUE CET AVERTISSEMENT RÉUSSIT À VOUS (TE) CONVAINCRE DE NE PAS FUMER?

LIRE EN ROTATION		Pas du tout						Beaucoup		
1.	La cigarette crée une très forte dépendance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2.	Vos enfants vous imitent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3.	La cigarette nuit aux bébés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4.	Le tabagisme peut vous rendre impuissant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5.	De l'air s'il vous plaît!	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6.	La fumée du tabac nuit aux bébés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7.	La cigarette causes des accidents cérébrovasculaires	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8.	La cigarette cause des maladies de la bouche	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

- ☐ 2) Commencez en premier avec cette section si cochée. **(SI NON, PASSEZ À SECTION 1 ci-dessus)**

DIRIEZ-VOUS (DIRAIS-TU) QUE CET AVERTISSEMENT RÉUSSIT À VOUS (TE) CONVAINCRE DE NE PAS FUMER?

LIRE EN ROTATION		Pas du tout						Beaucoup		
9.	Chaque année, l'équivalent de la population d'une petite ville meurt des suites du tabagisme	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10.	La cigarette vous coupe le souffle	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11.	La cigarette, ça brise le cœur!	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12.	La cigarette cause le cancer du poumon (patient)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
13.	La cigarette cause le cancer du poumon (poumons)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14.	Mortelle même si on ne la fume pas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15.	Qui dit fumée dit acide cyanhydrique	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
16.	Vous n'êtes pas seul à fumer cette cigarette	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

RÉACTIONS AUX OPTIONS D'EMBALLAGE

Q5 J'aimerais avoir votre (ton) point de vue sur ce qui pourrait se produire si toutes les cigarettes vendues au Canada étaient empaquetées avec ce nouveau genre de mises en garde. Je vais vous (te) montrer des exemples de ces nouveaux avertissements. Les avertissements que vous allez (tu vas) voir, seront exactement les mêmes. Cependant, en dessous des avertissements, là où le mot 'cigarettes' est écrit, l'identification de la marque variera d'une marque à l'autre, comme c'est le cas actuellement. Si les cigarettes étaient vendues seulement dans des paquets comme celui-ci, dans quelle mesure pensez-vous (penses-tu) que ça découragerait les gens comme vous (comme toi) de fumer? Nous utiliserons une échelle de 1 à 9, 1 voulant dire « Pas du tout » et 9 « Beaucoup ». **(ENCERCLEZ UN NOMBRE / MONTREZ LES PAQUETS UN À LA FOIS EXACTEMENT SELON L'ORDRE CI-DESSOUS)**

SI LES CIGARETTES ÉTAIENT VENDUES SEULEMENT DANS DES PAQUETS COMME CELUI-CI, DANS QUELLE MESURE PENSEZ-VOUS (PENSES-TU) QUE ÇA DÉCOURAGERAIT LES GENS COMME VOUS (COMME TOI) DE FUMER?

PAQUETS	Pas du tout						Beaucoup			
A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
B	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
C	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
D	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

PIC Je vais vous (te) montrer des photos de personnes qui fument présentement et des paquets de cigarettes avec les avertissements que nous venons de voir. Examinez(examine)-les attentivement. Pour chaque photo que je vais vous (te) montrer, dites(dis)-moi dans quelle mesure vous pensez (tu penses) que ça découragerait cette personne de fumer. Nous utiliserons une échelle de 1 à 9, 1 voulant dire « Pas du tout » et 9 « Beaucoup ». **(INSCRIRE UN NOMBRE 1-9 / MONTREZ LES PAQUETS UN À LA FOIS EXACTEMENT DANS L'ORDRE CI-DESSOUS. COMMENCER LA ROTATION AVEC LA PHOTO COCHÉE)**

DANS QUELLE MESURE VOUS PENSEZ (TU PENSES) QUE ÇA DÉCOURAGERAIT CETTE PERSONNE DE FUMER?

PAQUETS	PERSONNE					
	1. Homme d'affaires	2. Garçon ado	3. Fille sportive	4. Motard	5. Jeune femme	6. Pêcheur
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
A						
B						
C						
D						

Q6 J'aimerais que vous remplissiez (tu remplisses) vous (toi)-même la prochaine partie du questionnaire. Voici le questionnaire et un crayon. J'attendrai ici que vous finissiez (tu finisses) cette partie, puis nous continuerons avec quelques questions supplémentaires. Si vous avez (tu as) des questions à me poser, n'hésitez (n'hésite) pas à le faire.

Voici des énoncés concernant des gens comme vous (toi) qui fument des cigarettes. Complétez (complète la phrase afin de décrire vos (tes) propres **impressions** des personnes qui fument des cigarettes en encerclant un nombre de 1 à 9 sur chacun des items qui suivent l'énoncé. **(EXPLIQUEZ L'ÉCHELLE SI NÉCESSAIRE)**

En général, les gens comme moi qui fument des cigarettes sont? (ENCERCLEZ UN NOMBRE PAR ITEM)										
Aiment le risque	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Très prudents
Tiennent compte des autres	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Égoïstes
Négligent leur santé	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Font attention à leur santé
À l'aise financièrement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Démunis
Conscients de leur image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Peu soigneux
Pas cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Très cool
Meneurs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Suiveurs
Très scolarisés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ont peu d'études
En contrôle de leur destin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas en contrôle de leur destin
Ont peur de la mort	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ne sont pas préoccupés par la mort
Disciplinés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Désorganisés
Rebelles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Suivent les règles

RÉPONDANT : RETOURNEZ LE QUESTIONNAIRE À L'INTERVIEWEUR.
INTERVIEWEUR : VÉRIFIEZ SI COMPLET.

Q7 Le gouvernement pense obliger les fabricants de cigarettes à les vendre empaquetées avec de nouveaux avertissements. Voici une liste d'énoncés concernant des gens comme vous (toi) qui fument des cigarettes. Complétez (complète) la phrase afin de décrire vos (tes) propres **impressions** des gens qui continueraient à fumer des cigarettes en encerclant un nombre de 1 à 9 pour chaque item qui suit l'énoncé.

MONTREZ LE **PAQUET A** / LAISSEZ-LE EN VUE, AUTO-ADMINISTRER

A1 En général, les gens comme moi qui continueraient à fumer des cigarettes dans des paquets avec ce genre d'avertissement sont :

PAQUET A											
A1.1	Aiment le risque	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Très prudents
A1.2	Tiennent compte des autres	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Égoïstes
A1.3	Négligent leur santé	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Font attention à leur santé
A1.4	À l'aise financièrement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Démunis
A1.5	Conscients de leur image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Peu soigneux
A1.6	Pas cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Très cool
A1.7	Meneurs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Suiveurs
A1.8	Très scolarisés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ont peu d'études
A1.9	En contrôle de leur destin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas en contrôle de leur destin
A1.10	Ont peur de la mort	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ne sont pas préoccupés par la mort
A1.11	Disciplinés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Désorganisés
A1.12	Rebelles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Suivent les règles
A1.13	Dans l'ensemble, ce paquet n'est pas attrayant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Dans l'ensemble, ce paquet est attrayant

A2 Mes impressions sur les marques de cigarettes vendues avec ce genre d'avertissement :

PAQUET A											
A2.1	Beaucoup de goût	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas beaucoup de goût
A2.2	Contenu en nicotine élevé	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Contenu en nicotine faible
A2.3	Normes de qualité élevées	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Normes de qualité faibles
A2.4	Vendues à prix régulier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Vendues à prix économique
A2.5	Contenu en goudron faible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Contenu en goudron élevé
A2.6	Très populaire	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas très populaire
A2.7	Crée une dépendance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ne crée pas une dépendance
A2.8	Dangereux	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sans danger
A2.9	Toxique	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non toxique

A3 Je pense que les avertissements présentés de cette façon sont efficaces? (UTILISEZ UNE ÉCHELLE DE 1 À 9, 1 VEUT DIRE « PAS DU TOUT » ET 9 « TRÈS EFFICACES » - ENCERCLEZ UN NOMBRE PAR ITEM)

PAQUET A		Pas du tout					Efficaces				
A3.1	Pour informer le public sur les risques de fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
A3.2	Pour accroître le nombre de gens qui désapprouvent ceux qui fument	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
A3.3	Pour accroître le nombre de fumeurs qui arrêteraient de fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
A3.4	Pour décourager les gens de commencer à fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
A3.5	Pour renforcer la crédibilité que vous accordez à ce que disent les avertissements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

**RÉPONDANT : RETOURNEZ LE QUESTIONNAIRE À L'INTERVIEWEUR.
INTERVIEWEUR : VÉRIFIEZ SI COMPLET. PUIS ENLEVEZ LE PAQUET.**

A4 Seriez-vous dérangé ou pas dérangé de voir ce type d'avertissements sur les paquets de cigarettes que vous achetez? Diriez-vous...?

- Dérangé..... ☐
- Pas dérangé..... ☐

A5 Maintenant, dites-moi dans quelle mesure vous êtes en accord ou en désaccord que les énoncés suivants décrivent ce que vous ressentez lorsque vous regardez ce type d'avertissements. Pour donner votre réponse, nous utiliserons l'échelle suivante : tout à fait en accord, plutôt en accord, plutôt en désaccord ou tout à fait en désaccord. **(NE PAS LIRE « NE PEUT DIRE »)**

LIRE EN ROTATION	Tout à fait en accord	Plutôt en accord	Plutôt en désaccord	Tout à fait en désaccord	Ne peut dire
A5.1. Vous avez eu des vagues d'émotions fortes en regardant ces avertissements	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
A5.2. Il serait difficile de cacher ou de contrôler vos émotions afin que personne ne découvre ce que vous ressentez réellement à propos de ces avertissements	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
A5.3. Ces avertissements vous ont bouleversé	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

MONTREZ LE **PAQUET B** / LAISSEZ-LE EN VUE, AUTO-ADMINISTRER

B1 En général, les gens comme moi qui continueraient à fumer des cigarettes dans des paquets avec ce genre d'avertissement sont :

PAQUET B											
B1.1	Aiment le risque	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Très prudents
B1.2	Tiennent compte des autres	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Égoïstes
B1.3	Négligent leur santé	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Font attention à leur santé
B1.4	À l'aise financièrement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Démunis
B1.5	Conscients de leur image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Peu soigneux
B1.6	Pas cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Très cool
B1.7	Meneurs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Suiveurs
B1.8	Très scolarisés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ont peu d'études
B1.9	En contrôle de leur destin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas en contrôle de leur destin
B1.10	Ont peur de la mort	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ne sont pas préoccupés par la mort
B1.11	Disciplinés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Désorganisés
B1.12	Rebelles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Suivent les règles
B1.13	Dans l'ensemble, ce paquet n'est pas attrayant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Dans l'ensemble, ce paquet est attrayant

B2 Mes impressions sur les marques de cigarettes vendues avec ce genre d'avertissement :

PAQUET B											
B2.1	Beaucoup de goût	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas beaucoup de goût
B2.2	Contenu en nicotine élevé	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Contenu en nicotine faible
B2.3	Normes de qualité élevées	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Normes de qualité faibles
B2.4	Vendues à prix régulier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Vendues à prix économique
B2.5	Contenu en goudron faible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Contenu en goudron élevé
B2.6	Très populaire	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas très populaire
B2.7	Crée une dépendance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ne crée pas une dépendance
B2.8	Dangereux	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sans danger
B2.9	Toxique	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non toxique

B3 Je pense que les avertissements présentés de cette façon sont efficaces? (UTILISEZ UNE ÉCHELLE DE 1 À 9, 1 VEUT DIRE « PAS DU TOUT » ET 9 « TRÈS EFFICACES » - ENCERCLEZ UN NOMBRE PAR ITEM)

PAQUET B		Pas du tout					Efficaces				
B3.1	Pour informer le public sur les risques de fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
B3.2	Pour accroître le nombre de gens qui désapprouvent ceux qui fument	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
B3.3	Pour accroître le nombre de fumeurs qui arrêteraient de fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
B3.4	Pour décourager les gens de commencer à fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
B3.5	Pour renforcer la crédibilité que vous accordez à ce que disent les avertissements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

**RÉPONDANT : RETOURNEZ LE QUESTIONNAIRE À L'INTERVIEWEUR.
INTERVIEWEUR : VÉRIFIEZ SI COMPLET. PUIS ENLEVEZ LE PAQUET.**

B4 Seriez-vous dérangé ou pas dérangé de voir ce type d'avertissements sur les paquets de cigarettes que vous achetez? Diriez-vous...?

- Dérangé..... ☐
- Pas dérangé..... ☐

B5 Maintenant, dites-moi dans quelle mesure vous êtes en accord ou en désaccord que les énoncés suivants décrivent ce que vous ressentez lorsque vous regardez ce type d'avertissements. Pour donner votre réponse, nous utiliserons l'échelle suivante : tout à fait en accord, plutôt en accord, plutôt en désaccord ou tout à fait en désaccord. **(NE PAS LIRE « NE PEUT DIRE »)**

LIRE EN ROTATION	Tout à fait en accord	Plutôt en accord	Plutôt en désaccord	Tout à fait en désaccord	Ne peut dire
B5.1. Vous avez eu des vagues d'émotions fortes en regardant ces avertissements	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B5.2. Il serait difficile de cacher ou de contrôler vos émotions afin que personne ne découvre ce que vous ressentez réellement à propos de ces avertissements	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B5.3. Ces avertissements vous ont bouleversé	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

MONTREZ LE **PAQUET C** / LAISSEZ-LE EN VUE, AUTO-ADMINISTRER

C1 En général, les gens comme moi qui continueraient à fumer des cigarettes dans des paquets avec ce genre d'avertissement sont :

PAQUET C											
C1.1	Aiment le risque	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Très prudents
C1.2	Tiennent compte des autres	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Égoïstes
C1.3	Négligent leur santé	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Font attention à leur santé
C1.4	À l'aise financièrement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Démunis
C1.5	Conscients de leur image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Peu soigneux
C1.6	Pas cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Très cool
C1.7	Meneurs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Suiveurs
C1.8	Très scolarisés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ont peu d'études
C1.9	En contrôle de leur destin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas en contrôle de leur destin
C1.10	Ont peur de la mort	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ne sont pas préoccupés par la mort
C1.11	Disciplinés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Désorganisés
C1.12	Rebelles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Suivent les règles
C1.13	Dans l'ensemble, ce paquet n'est pas attrayant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Dans l'ensemble, ce paquet est attrayant

C2 Mes impressions sur les marques de cigarettes vendues avec ce genre d'avertissement :

PAQUET C											
C2.1	Beaucoup de goût	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas beaucoup de goût
C2.2	Contenu en nicotine élevé	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Contenu en nicotine faible
C2.3	Normes de qualité élevées	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Normes de qualité faibles
C2.4	Vendues à prix régulier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Vendues à prix économique
C2.5	Contenu en goudron faible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Contenu en goudron élevé
C2.6	Très populaire	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas très populaire
C2.7	Crée une dépendance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ne crée pas une dépendance
C2.8	Dangereux	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sans danger
C2.9	Toxique	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non toxique

C3 Je pense que les avertissements présentés de cette façon sont efficaces? (UTILISEZ UNE ÉCHELLE DE 1 À 9, 1 VEUT DIRE « PAS DU TOUT » ET 9 « TRÈS EFFICACES » - ENCERCLEZ UN NOMBRE PAR ITEM)

PAQUET C		Pas du tout					Efficaces				
C3.1	Pour informer le public sur les risques de fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
C3.2	Pour accroître le nombre de gens qui désapprouvent ceux qui fument	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
C3.3	Pour accroître le nombre de fumeurs qui arrêteraient de fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
C3.4	Pour décourager les gens de commencer à fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
C3.5	Pour renforcer la crédibilité que vous accordez à ce que disent les avertissements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

**RÉPONDANT : RETOURNEZ LE QUESTIONNAIRE À L'INTERVIEWEUR.
INTERVIEWEUR : VÉRIFIEZ SI COMPLET. PUIS ENLEVEZ LE PAQUET.**

C4 Seriez-vous dérangé ou pas dérangé de voir ce type d'avertissements sur les paquets de cigarettes que vous achetez? Diriez-vous...?

- Dérangé..... ☐
- Pas dérangé..... ☐

C5 Maintenant, dites-moi dans quelle mesure vous êtes en accord ou en désaccord que les énoncés suivants décrivent ce que vous ressentez lorsque vous regardez ce type d'avertissements. Pour donner votre réponse, nous utiliserons l'échelle suivante : tout à fait en accord, plutôt en accord, plutôt en désaccord ou tout à fait en désaccord. (**NE PAS LIRE « NE PEUT DIRE »**)

LIRE EN ROTATION	Tout à fait en accord	Plutôt en accord	Plutôt en désaccord	Tout à fait en désaccord	Ne peut dire
C5.1. Vous avez eu des vagues d'émotions fortes en regardant ces avertissements	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C5.2. Il serait difficile de cacher ou de contrôler vos émotions afin que personne ne découvre ce que vous ressentez réellement à propos de ces avertissements	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C5.3. Ces avertissements vous ont bouleversé	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

MONTREZ LE **PAQUET D** / LAISSEZ-LE EN VUE, AUTO-ADMINISTRER

D1 En général, les gens comme moi qui continueraient à fumer des cigarettes dans des paquets avec ce genre d'avertissement sont :

PAQUET D											
D1.1	Aiment le risque	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Très prudents
D1.2	Tiennent compte des autres	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Égoïstes
D1.3	Négligent leur santé	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Font attention à leur santé
D1.4	À l'aise financièrement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Démunis
D1.5	Conscients de leur image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Peu soigneux
D1.6	Pas cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Très cool
D1.7	Meneurs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Suiveurs
D1.8	Très scolarisés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ont peu d'études
D1.9	En contrôle de leur destin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas en contrôle de leur destin
D1.10	Ont peur de la mort	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ne sont pas préoccupés par la mort
D1.11	Disciplinés	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Désorganisés
D1.12	Rebelles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Suivent les règles
D1.13	Dans l'ensemble, ce paquet n'est pas attrayant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Dans l'ensemble, ce paquet est attrayant

D2 Mes impressions sur les marques de cigarettes vendues avec ce genre d'avertissement :

PAQUET D											
D2.1	Beaucoup de goût	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas beaucoup de goût
D2.2	Contenu en nicotine élevé	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Contenu en nicotine faible
D2.3	Normes de qualité élevées	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Normes de qualité faibles
D2.4	Vendues à prix régulier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Vendues à prix économique
D2.5	Contenu en goudron faible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Contenu en goudron élevé
D2.6	Très populaire	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Pas très populaire
D2.7	Crée une dépendance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ne crée pas une dépendance
D2.8	Dangereux	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Sans danger
D2.9	Toxique	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Non toxique

D3 Je pense que les avertissements présentés de cette façon sont efficaces? (UTILISEZ UNE ÉCHELLE DE 1 À 9, 1 VEUT DIRE « PAS DU TOUT » ET 9 « TRÈS EFFICACES » - ENCERCLEZ UN NOMBRE PAR ITEM)

PAQUET D		Pas du tout					Efficaces				
D3.1	Pour informer le public sur les risques de fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
D3.2	Pour accroître le nombre de gens qui désapprouvent ceux qui fument	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
D3.3	Pour accroître le nombre de fumeurs qui arrêteraient de fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
D3.4	Pour décourager les gens de commencer à fumer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
D3.5	Pour renforcer la crédibilité que vous accordez à ce que disent les avertissements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

**RÉPONDANT : RETOURNEZ LE QUESTIONNAIRE À L'INTERVIEWEUR.
INTERVIEWEUR : VÉRIFIEZ SI COMPLET. PUIS ENLEVEZ LE PAQUET.**

D4 Seriez-vous dérangé ou pas dérangé de voir ce type d'avertissements sur les paquets de cigarettes que vous achetez? Diriez-vous...?

- Dérangé..... ☐
- Pas dérangé..... ☐

D5 Maintenant, dites-moi dans quelle mesure vous êtes en accord ou en désaccord que les énoncés suivants décrivent ce que vous ressentez lorsque vous regardez ce type d'avertissements. Pour donner votre réponse, nous utiliserons l'échelle suivante : tout à fait en accord, plutôt en accord, plutôt en désaccord ou tout à fait en désaccord. **(NE PAS LIRE « NE PEUT DIRE »)**

LIRE EN ROTATION	Tout à fait en accord	Plutôt en accord	Plutôt en désaccord	Tout à fait en désaccord	Ne peut dire
D5.1. Vous avez eu des vagues d'émotions fortes en regardant ces avertissements	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D5.2. Il serait difficile de cacher ou de contrôler vos émotions afin que personne ne découvre ce que vous ressentez réellement à propos de ces avertissements	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D5.3. Ces avertissements vous ont bouleversé	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

USAGE

SI LE RÉPONDANT N'EST PAS FUMEUR ACTUELLEMENT (VOIR [Qb] ADO), PAQ 18

Q8 Vous m'avez (tu m'as) dit au début de l'entrevue que vous étiez (tu étais) fumeur. Au cours des 30 derniers jours, quel est le nombre de jours où vous avez (tu as) fumé au moins une cigarette? **(LIRE)**

- 1-5 jours..... ☐
- 6-10 jours..... ☐
- 11-20 jours..... ☐
- 21-29 jours ☐
- Tous les jours ☐
- Nsp/Nrp ☐

Q9 Les jours où vous avez (tu as) fumé, combien de cigarettes avez-vous (as-tu) fumé habituellement? **(LIRE)**

- 5 cigarettes ou moins ☐
- 6-10 cigarettes..... ☐
- 11-15 cigarettes..... ☐
- 16-20 cigarettes..... ☐
- 21-25 cigarettes..... ☐
- Plus de 25 cigarettes..... ☐
- Nsp/Nrp ☐

Q10 Quelle est votre (ta) marque de cigarette régulière, c'est à dire celle que vous fumez (tu fumes) la plupart du temps? **(NE PAS LIRE / PRÉCISER LE NOM EN ENTIER)**

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Belvedere (Régulier)..... ☐ | 16. Export "A" Medium ☐ |
| 2. Belvedere Extra Douce..... ☐ | 17. Export "A" Douce..... ☐ |
| 3. Benson & Hedges (Régulier)..... ☐ | 18. Export "A" Légère..... ☐ |
| 4. Benson & Hedges Deluxe Ultra Légère... ☐ | 19. Export "A" Ultra Légère ☐ |
| 5. Benson & Hedges Deluxe Ultra Légère
Menthol ☐ | 20. Matinée (Régulier)..... ☐ |
| 6. Craven "A" (Régulier)..... ☐ | 21. Matinée Extra Douce..... ☐ |
| 7. Craven "A" Légère ☐ | 22. Matinée Slims..... ☐ |
| 8. Craven "A" Menthol..... ☐ | 23. Player's (Régulier / Filtre)..... ☐ |
| 9. DuMaurier (Régulier) ☐ | 24. Player's Légère..... ☐ |
| 10. DuMaurier Légère ☐ | 25. Player's Extra Légère ☐ |
| 11. DuMaurier Extra Légère..... ☐ | 26. Rothmans (Régulier) ☐ |
| 12. DuMaurier Ultra Légère ☐ | 27. Rothmans Spécial Douce..... ☐ |
| 13. DuMaurier Spécial ☐ | • Autre (Préciser) ☐ |
| 14. DuMaurier Spécial 100 ☐ | • Pas de marque régulière ☐ |
| 15. Export "A" (Régulier) ☐ | • Nsp/Nrp ☐ |

Q11 Est-ce dans le format...? **(LIRE)**

- Régulier ☐
- King size ☐
- Autre ☐
- Nsp/Nrp ☐

Q12 Est-ce une cigarette...? **(LIRE)**

- Régulière ☐
- Légère ☐
- Douce ☐
- Ultra Légère..... ☐
- Extra Légère..... ☐
- Ultra Douce ☐
- Extra Douce..... ☐
- Autre (**ne pas lire**)..... ☐
- Nsp/Nrp ☐

Q13 Depuis combien de temps fumez-vous (fumes-tu) (**RÉPONSE DE Q10**)? (**LIRE**)

- Moins d'un an ☐
- 1-2 ans..... ☐
- 3-5 ans..... ☐
- Plus de 5 ans..... ☐
- Nsp/Nrp ☐

SI NSP/NRP À Q10, PAQ 16

Q14 Vous arrive-t-il de fumer une autre marque de cigarette de temps à autre?

- Oui ☐
- Non ☐
- Nsp/Nrp ☐ **PAQ Q16**

Q15 Quelle autre marque de cigarette fumez-vous de temps à autre? (**NE PAS LIRE / PRÉCISER LE NOM EN ENTIER**)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Belvedere (Régulier) ☐ | 16. Export "A" Medium ☐ |
| 2. Belvedere Extra Douce ☐ | 17. Export "A" Douce..... ☐ |
| 3. Benson & Hedges (Régulier) ☐ | 18. Export "A" Légère ☐ |
| 4. Benson & Hedges Deluxe Ultra Légère... ☐ | 19. Export "A" Ultra Légère ☐ |
| 5. Benson & Hedges Deluxe Ultra Légère
Menthol ☐ | 20. Matinée (Régulier) ☐ |
| 6. Craven "A" (Régulier)..... ☐ | 21. Matinée Extra Douce ☐ |
| 7. Craven "A" Légère ☐ | 22. Matinée Slims ☐ |
| 8. Craven "A" Menthol..... ☐ | 23. Player's (Régulier / Filtre)..... ☐ |
| 9. DuMaurier (Régulier) ☐ | 24. Player's Légère..... ☐ |
| 10. DuMaurier Légère ☐ | 25. Player's Extra Légère ☐ |
| 11. DuMaurier Extra Légère..... ☐ | 26. Rothmans (Régulier) ☐ |
| 12. DuMaurier Ultra Légère ☐ | 27. Rothmans Spécial Douce..... ☐ |
| 13. DuMaurier Spécial ☐ | • Autre (Préciser) ☐ |
| 14. DuMaurier Spécial 100 ☐ | • Pas de marque régulière ☐ |
| 15. Export "A" (Régulier) ☐ | • Nsp/Nrp ☐ |

Q16 Au cours des 12 derniers mois, avez-vous déjà essayé d'arrêter de fumer?

- Oui ☐
- Non ☐
- Nsp/Nrp ☐

Q17 Habituellement, combien dépensez-vous au cours d'une semaine pour fumer? (**INSCRIRE**)

_____ \$

SI ADULTE (18+), PAQ 19

Q18 Au cours des 12 prochains mois, croyez-vous que vous arrêterez de fumer?

- Oui certainement ☐
- Oui probablement..... ☐
- Non probablement pas..... ☐
- Non certainement pas ☐
- Nsp/Nrp ☐

Q19 Quel est votre âge? (**LIRE SI NÉCESSAIRE**)

- | | |
|--|--|
| • 14-17 ans..... ☐ | • 45-54 ans ☐ |
| • 18-19 ans..... ☐ | • 55-64 ans ☐ |
| • 20-24 ans..... ☐ | • 65 ans et plus ☐ |
| • 25-34 ans..... ☐ | • Nsp/Nrp ☐ |
| • 35-44 ans..... ☐ | |

Q20 Avez-vous (as-tu) un revenu personnel, de l'argent que vous gagnez (tu gagnes) vous-même (toi-même)?

- Oui ☐
- Non ☐ **PAQ Q22**

Q21 En moyenne, combien d'argent gagnez-vous (gagnes-tu) par semaine? (**SI NE SAIT PAS, DEMANDER UNE APPROXIMATION**)

_____ \$

Q22 Quel degré de scolarité avez-vous complété? (**LIRE SI NÉCESSAIRE**)

- | | |
|---|--|
| • Partie élémentaire ☐ | • Collège / cégep complété ☐ |
| • Élémentaire complété..... ☐ | • Partie universitaire ☐ |
| • Partie secondaire ☐ | • Université complétée ☐ |
| • Secondaire complété..... ☐ | • Autre ☐ |
| • Partie collège / cégep..... ☐ | • Nsp/Nrp ☐ |

SI ADO (14-17) : FIN DE L'ENTREVUE.

ENREGISTREZ ADO SEUL ☐ AVEC DES AMIS UNIQUEMENT ☐ AVEC DES ADULTES ☐

Q23 Occupez-vous présentement un emploi...? (**LIRE**)

- | | |
|---|---|
| • À temps plein..... ☐ | • Non ☐ |
| • À temps partiel ☐ | • Nsp/Nrp ☐ PAQ 25 |

Q24a Quel genre d'emploi occupez-vous? **INSCRIRE :** _____

Q24b Pour quel genre d'entreprise? **INSCRIRE :** _____

Q27 Quel est votre statut matrimonial? (**LIRE SI NÉCESSAIRE**)

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| • Marié ou vivant en couple ☐ | • Autre ☐ |
| • Célibataire / vivant seul(e) ☐ | • Nsp/Nrp ☐ |

Q28 Avez-vous des enfants? (**ENCERCLEZ UN NOMBRE**)

0 1 2 3 4 +

MERCI BEAUCOUP D'AVOIR PARTICIPÉ, C'EST TERMINÉ. MERCI!

APPENDIX 2

SOCIAL STYLES OF SMOKERS













APPENDIX 3

WARNING SIZE SCENARIOS

MHWM_GP_50

CIGARETTES



AVERTISSEMENT

LA CIGARETTE CAUSE DES MALADIES DE LA BOUCHE

La fumée de cigarette cause le cancer
buccal, des maladies de gencives et la
perte de dents.

Santé Canada

CIGARETTES

*Toxic emissions / unit: - "Tar" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.9 mg,
Carbon monoxide 13 - 32 mg, Formaldehyde 0.056 - 0.18 mg,
Hydrogen cyanide 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzene 0.042 - 0.088 mg,
-Emissions toxiques / unité: - "Goudron" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.9 mg,
Monoxyde de carbone 13 - 32 mg, Formaldehyde 0.056 - 0.18 mg,
Acide cyanhydrique 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzène 0.042 - 0.088 mg



WARNING

CIGARETTES CAUSE MOUTH DISEASES

Cigarette smoke causes oral cancer,
gum diseases and tooth loss.

Health Canada

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

WTSHW_GP_50

CIGARETTES

AVERTISSEMENT
QUI DIT FUMÉE
DIT ACIDE
CYANHYDRIQUE

La fumée du tabac contient de l'acide cyanhydrique. Ce produit peut causer des maux de tête, des étourdissements, de la fatigue, des nausées, des vertiges et des maux d'estomac chez les fumeurs et les non-fumeurs.

Santé Canada

Toxic emissions / unit: "Tar" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.8 mg, Carbon monoxide 13 - 32 mg, Formaldehyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg, Hydrogen cyanide 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzene 0.042 - 0.088 mg
Emissions toxiques / unité: "Goudron" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.8 mg, Monoxyde de carbone 13 - 32 mg, Formaldéhyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg, Acide cyanhydrique 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzène 0.042 - 0.088 mg

WARNING
WHERE
THERE'S SMOKE
THERE'S
HYDROGEN
CYANIDE

Tobacco smoke contains hydrogen cyanide. It can cause headaches, dizziness, weakness, nausea, vertigo and stomach aches in smokers and non-smokers.

Health Canada

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

MHWM_GP_75

CIGARETTES



CIGARETTES



CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

*Toxic emissions / unit: "Tar" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.9 mg,
Carbon monoxide 13 - 32 mg, Formaldehyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg,
Hydrogen cyanide 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzene 0.042 - 0.088 mg,
Emissions toxicologiques / unité: "Goudron" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.9 mg,
Monoxyde de carbone 13 - 32 mg, Formaldéhyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg,
Acide cyanhydrique 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzène 0.042 - 0.088 mg

WTSHW_GP_75

CIGARETTES

AVERTISSEMENT QUI DIT FUMÉE DIT ACIDE CYANHYDRIQUE

La fumée du tabac contient de l'acide cyanhydrique. Ce produit peut causer des maux de tête, des étourdissements, de la fatigue, des nausées, des vertiges et des maux d'estomac chez les fumeurs et les non-fumeurs.

Santé Canada

CIGARETTES

"Toxic emissions / unit:" "Tar" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.9 mg, Carbon monoxide 13 - 32 mg, Formaldehyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg, Hydrogen cyanide 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzene 0.042 - 0.088 mg, "Emissions toxiques / unité:" "Goudron" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.9 mg, Monoxyde de carbone 13 - 32 mg, Formaldéhyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg, Acide cyanhydrique 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzène 0.042 - 0.088 mg

WARNING WHERE THERE'S SMOKE THERE'S HYDROGEN CYANIDE

Tobacco smoke contains hydrogen cyanide. It can cause headaches, dizziness, weakness, nausea, vertigo and stomach aches in smokers and non-smokers.

Health Canada

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

MHWM_GP_90

CIGARETTES



CIGARETTES



CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

*Total emissions / unit: "Tar" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.9 mg.
Carbon monoxide 13 - 32 mg, Formaldehyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg,
Hydrogen cyanide 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzene 0.042 - 0.089 mg.
*Emissions totales / unité: "Goudron" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.9 mg,
Monoxyde de carbone 13 - 32 mg, Formaldéhyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg,
Acide cyanhydrique 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzène 0.042 - 0.089 mg.

WTSHW_GP_90

CIGARETTES

AVERTISSEMENT
QUI DIT FUMÉE
DIT ACIDE
CYANHYDRIQUE

La fumée du tabac contient de l'acide cyanhydrique. Ce produit peut causer des maux de tête, des étourdissements, de la fatigue, des nausées, des vertiges et des maux d'estomac chez les fumeurs et les non-fumeurs.

Santé Canada

CIGARETTES

"Toxic emissions / unit:" Tar* 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.8 mg, Carbon monoxide 13 - 32 mg, Formaldehyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg, Hydrogen cyanide 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzene 0.042 - 0.088 mg, "Emissions toxiques / unité:" "Goudron" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.9 mg, Monoxyde de carbone 13 - 32 mg, Formaldéhyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg, Acide cyanhydrique 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzène 0.042 - 0.088 mg.

WARNING
WHERE
THERE'S
SMOKE
THERE'S
HYDROGEN
CYANIDE

Tobacco smoke contains hydrogen cyanide. It can cause headaches, dizziness, weakness, nausea, vertigo and stomach aches in smokers and non-smokers.

Health Canada

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

MHWM_GP_100

CIGARETTES



*Toxic emissions / unit: "tar" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.1 - 2.9 mg.
Carbon monoxide 13 - 32 mg, Formaldehyde 0.086 - 0.18 mg,
Hydrogen cyanide 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzene 0.042 - 0.089 mg.
Emissions totales / unité: "Goudron" 12 - 33 mg, Nicotine 1.1 - 2.9 mg,
Monoxyde de carbone 13 - 32 mg, Formaldéhyde 0.086 - 0.18 mg,
Acide cyanhydrique 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzène 0.042 - 0.089 mg.



CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

WTSHW_GP_100

CIGARETTES

AVERTISSEMENT

QUI DIT FUMÉE DIT ACIDE CYANHYDRIQUE

La fumée du tabac contient de l'acide cyanhydrique. Ce produit peut causer des maux de tête, des étourdissements, de la fatigue, des nausées, des vertiges et des maux d'estomac chez les fumeurs et les non-fumeurs.

Santé Canada

"Toxic emissions / unit": "Tar" 12 - 13 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.9 mg, Carbon monoxide 13 - 32 mg, Formaldehyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg, Hydrogen cyanide 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzene 0.042 - 0.098 mg, "Emissions toxiques / unité": "Goudron" 12 - 13 mg, Nicotine 1.3 - 2.9 mg, Monoxyde de carbone 13 - 32 mg, Formaldéhyde 0.066 - 0.18 mg, Acide cyanhydrique 0.11 - 0.31 mg, Benzène 0.042 - 0.098 mg

WARNING

WHERE THERE'S SMOKE THERE'S HYDROGEN CYANIDE

Tobacco smoke contains hydrogen cyanide. It can cause headaches, dizziness, weakness, nausea, vertigo and stomach aches in smokers and non-smokers.

Health Canada

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES

APPENDIX 4

EXAMPLE OF SPSS MANOVA RESULTS

EFFECTS ON THE 12 PERSONALITY TRAITS OF SMOKERS

INCREASED SIZE OPTION B (75%) VS. CURRENT SCENARIO A (50%).

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE * *

698 cases accepted.
 0 cases rejected because of out-of-range factor values.
 42 cases rejected because of missing data.
 8 non-empty cells.

1 design will be processed.

Page 179

SPSS/PC+

5/27/ 8

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

EFFECT .. GENDER BY LANGUAGE

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 5 , N = 338 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.01766	1.01711	12.00	679.00	.431
Hotellings	.01798	1.01711	12.00	679.00	.431
Wilks	.98234	1.01711	12.00	679.00	.431
Roys	.01766				

Page 180

SPSS/PC+

5/27/ 8

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

EFFECT .. YSMOKER BY LANGUAGE

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 5 , N = 338 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.02621	1.52289	12.00	679.00	.111
Hotellings	.02691	1.52289	12.00	679.00	.111
Wilks	.97379	1.52289	12.00	679.00	.111
Roys	.02621				

Page 181

SPSS/PC+

5/27/ 8

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

EFFECT .. YSMOKER BY GENDER

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 5 , N = 338 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
-----------	-------	-----------	------------	----------	-----------

Pillais	.02073	1.19762	12.00	679.00	.280
Hotellings	.02117	1.19762	12.00	679.00	.280
Wilks	.97927	1.19762	12.00	679.00	.280
Roys	.02073				

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.05295	3.16333	12.00	679.00	.000
Hotellings	.05591	3.16333	12.00	679.00	.000
Wilks	.94705	3.16333	12.00	679.00	.000
Roys	.05295				

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.00705	.40159	12.00	679.00	.963
Hotellings	.00710	.40159	12.00	679.00	.963
Wilks	.99295	.40159	12.00	679.00	.963
Roys	.00705				

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.09305	5.80497	12.00	679.00	.000
Hotellings	.10259	5.80497	12.00	679.00	.000
Wilks	.90695	5.80497	12.00	679.00	.000
Rois	.09305				

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

EFFECT .. CONSTANT

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 5 , N = 338 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.96477	1549.39611	12.00	679.00	.000
Hotellings	27.38255	1549.39611	12.00	679.00	.000
Wilks	.03523	1549.39611	12.00	679.00	.000
Roys	.96477				

- - - - -

Page 186 SPSS/PC+ 5/27/ 8

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

Tests involving 'SIZE' Within-Subject Effect.

Mauchly sphericity test, W = .37969
Chi-square approx. = 664.12693 with 77 D. F.
Significance = .000

Greenhouse-Geisser Epsilon = .83721
Huynh-Feldt Epsilon = .85918
Lower-bound Epsilon = .08333

AVERAGED Tests of Significance that follow multivariate tests are equivalent to univariate or split-plot or mixed-model approach to repeated measures. Epsilons may be used to adjust d.f. for the AVERAGED results.

Page 187 SPSS/PC+ 5/27/ 8

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

EFFECT .. YSMOKER BY GENDER BY LANGUAGE BY SIZE

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 5 , N = 338 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.00947	.54069	12.00	679.00	.889
Hotellings	.00956	.54069	12.00	679.00	.889
Wilks	.99053	.54069	12.00	679.00	.889
Roys	.00947				

- - - - -

Page 188 SPSS/PC+ 5/27/ 8

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

EFFECT .. GENDER BY LANGUAGE BY SIZE

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 5 , N = 338 1/2)

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

EFFECT .. GENDER BY SIZE

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 5 , N = 338 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.01188	.68039	12.00	679.00	.771
Hotellings	.01202	.68039	12.00	679.00	.771
Wilks	.98812	.68039	12.00	679.00	.771
Roys	.01188				

- - - - -

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

EFFECT .. YSMOKER BY SIZE

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 5 , N = 338 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.00804	.45885	12.00	679.00	.938
Hotellings	.00811	.45885	12.00	679.00	.938
Wilks	.99196	.45885	12.00	679.00	.938
Roys	.00804				

- - - - -

* * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- DESIGN 1 * *

EFFECT .. SIZE

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 5 , N = 338 1/2)

Test Name	Value	Approx. F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	Sig. of F
Pillais	.04402	2.60524	12.00	679.00	.002
Hotellings	.04604	2.60524	12.00	679.00	.002
Wilks	.95598	2.60524	12.00	679.00	.002
Roys	.04402				

- - - - -

91992 BYTES OF WORKSPACE NEEDED FOR MANOVA EXECUTION.