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Getting started

- Pay attention to meeting specifications
  - Size of poster, orientation, fonts
  - Set up, when to be in attendance
  - Ask about costs – who is paying for this poster?
- Everyone does single panels now
  - Use UCSF templates
- Do not wait until the last minute
  - Everyone starts with too much information
  - Gets expensive
Welcome.

Our brand is the culmination of every impression that helps us – as part of the UCSF community – engage with supporters, patients, advocates, and students. It represents the pride and passion that we have in the work we do, and how we distinguish ourselves as UCSF.

CONTACT INFO

Check out the Templates and Examples section for inspiration. If you can’t find what you’re looking for or need help – email us at identity@ucsf.edu.
Posters & Digital Signage

Promoting an event? Recruiting for a study? We have simple, branded print poster templates and digital signage templates to help you.
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Basic tips

- Use at least 18 point font
- Do not include the abstract unless required
- Title your panels or sections
- Put important stuff at the top
- Structure like an abstract
Space allocation

- Introduction/background – 1 panel
- Subjects/methods – 2 to 4 panels
- Results – 3 to 5 panels
- Limitations – 1 panel
- Conclusions & implications - 1 to 2 panels
Planning the poster
Planning the poster

Title & author banner

Intro
Methods
Methods

Results
Results
Results

Discuss
Limitations
Conclusion
Lorem Ipsum Dolor Sit Amet Consectetuer Adipiscing Elit

Duis autem vel eum iir iure dolot in hendriet in vulpulate velit esse molestie consuset, vel illum dolore eu feugiat nulla facilisi at vero eros et accumsan et justo odio dignissim.

Laoreet dolore magna aliquam eret vulputat

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed diam nonumy eirmod tempor invidunt ut labore dolore magna aliquam eret vulputat.

Dolorete feugait nulla

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed diam nonumy eirmod tempor invidunt ut labore dolore magna aliquam eret vulputat.

Nostrud exerci

Adipiscing elit, sed diam nonumy eirmod tempor invidunt ut labore dolore magna aliquam eret vulputat.

Vulpulate velit esse molestie

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed diam nonumy eirmod tempor invidunt ut labore dolore magna aliquam eret vulputat.

Ut wisi enim ad minim

Ut wisi enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exerci tation ullamcorper suscipit lobortis nial.

Hendriet in vulpulate velit esse molestie

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed diam nonumy eirmod tempor invidunt ut labore dolore magna aliquam eret vulputat.
Introduction/background

- Overall topic of your research
- Previous research in the area
- Problems with past research
- What you did to fix those problems
Methods

- Study design
- Subjects and setting
- Measurements – predictors & outcomes
- Quality – blinding, validity, reliability of measures
- Analysis
Results

- This is the bulk of the poster!
- Use descriptive titles
  - “Most Young Adults Quit Smoking”
  - Not “Results of data analysis”
- Tables and Figures add interest
Discussion

- Begin with the key finding
- Summarize other findings
- What the results mean
- How strongly you believe them
- Compare your results with prior data
Limitations

- Main critique of design or analysis
- Why these limitations are important
- Do not overdo the limitations
Conclusions

- Take home message
- Implications for policy or clinical practice
- Don’t just say “more research is necessary”
  - make specific recommendations
- Don’t repeat results:
  - “In summary, in subjects we studied, we found our findings”
Do not include

- A full copy of your abstract
- References
- …unless the meeting conventions or organizers say otherwise
Pitfalls

- Way too much information and more detail than the reader can absorb in a few seconds as they drift by

- Too much information
  - Layout – large blocks of text
  - Not enough contrast
  - Text too small
  - JAIL (Jargon and inadequate labeling)
Style Tips

- Two simple slides better than one complex
- Max: 5-7 lines/slide, 7 words/line
- Use bullets not blocks of text
- *Avoid italics – not as legible*
- DO NOT USE ALL CAPITAL LETTERS
- Simplify and re-type data tables
Virtual Presentation

- Simplify Poster so visible as one slide
- Try viewing online
- Prepare your 3-5 minute “pitch”
- You may be expected to repeat it
- Possible formats
  - Virtual presentations with one slide
  - Zoom rooms/breakout rooms
Mapping neighborhood tobacco stories: Integrating web-based mapping & interviews

Julia McQuoid¹, Louisa M. Holmes², Antwi Akom³, Aekta Shah⁴, Tessa Cruz⁵, Richard Harvey⁶, Briana Fitch⁷, Pamela Ling⁸, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, USA, ³Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY, USA, ⁴Streetwyze, Oakland, CA, USA, ⁵San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA, USA, ⁶University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA.

Introduction

- Differences in neighborhood-level characteristics, drive tobacco-related health disparities
- Tobacco retail density
- Poverty
- Innovative methods can highlight people-place interactions and elicit community perspectives on tobacco use
- We piloted a multi-method study to elicit perspectives of smokers from different San Francisco Bay Area neighborhoods on tobacco practices and norms

Multi-Method Pilot

Participants (n=8): adult current tobacco users residing in San Francisco and Oakland, CA

Streetwyze online mapping platform:
- Allows residents to share locations, assets, and experiences in their neighborhood

Interactive, semi-structured interviews:
- Discussed where participants smoke or observe tobacco, and areas where they do not smoke or that they consider “anti-tobacco”
- Participants dropped pins on the map, categorized and notated them, and uploaded photos

Diverse Experiences with Neighborhood Smoke Shops

Smoke shops as social resources and retail amenities
My hangout spot... We all stand inside the smoke shop talking and friends that I'll be outside. (MM03)
It has everything that I need in it. Snacks... Everything. Cords for computers and iPhones... it's like a one stop shop. (MM13)

Smoke shops as unsafe places
They call it a danger zone and I guess a lot of people done got killed. They'd be standing out there smoking... But no, I never liked standing there. (MM12)

Norms About Youth & Tobacco

Dollar Voting
All neighborhoods expressed concern about youth buying, selling, and using tobacco. One participant goes to a more distant smoke shop to buy cigarettes.

I don't prefer [that store].
Interviewer: Why don't you prefer it?
The ones that sell tobacco, they seem like they're really too young to be selling... and their patrons are young. (MM12)

Mapping interviews revealed:

- Experiences and perceptions of smoke shops
- Norms of tobacco use and sales
- Smoking to enhance sense of wellbeing
- Enactment of ‘considerate smoker’ identities
- Strategies for negotiating (in)formal smoking bans
- Views of smoking policies

Implications

- This method provides a participant-centered approach to understanding neighborhood-level tobacco disparities
- Neighborhood-level factors can affect implementation and impact of new tobacco policies, like flavored tobacco sales bans
- Consider replacement amenities to fulfill the social and retail functions of smoke shops for local residents
- Future research should further explore people-place relationships that perpetuate neighborhood tobacco disparities

Study area in online mapping platform
Participants viewed the map during interviews, noting tobacco-related places in their neighborhood

Funding: National Cancer Institute U01-CA154240, National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities P60-MD006902
Mapping neighborhood tobacco stories: Integrating web-based mapping & interviews

Julia McQuoid¹, Louisa M. Holmes², Artwi Akom³, Aektta Shah⁴, Tessa Cruz⁵, Richard Harvey⁶, Briana Fitch⁷, Pamela Ling⁸
¹University of CA, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA, ²Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY, USA, ³Streetwyze, Oakland, CA, USA, ⁴San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA, USA, ⁵University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA.

Introduction
- Neighborhood differences drive tobacco-related health disparities
  - Tobacco retail density
  - Poverty
- Innovative methods
  - Highlight people-place interactions
  - Elicit community perspectives
- Purpose: Elicit perspectives of smokers from different San Francisco Bay Area neighborhoods on tobacco practices and norms

Multi-Method Pilot
Participants (n=8): adult current tobacco users in San Francisco and Oakland, CA
Streetwyze online mapping platform:
- Allows residents to share locations, assets, and experiences in their neighborhood
Interactive, semi-structured interviews:
  - Discussed where participants smoke
  - Where they do not smoke or ‘anti-tobacco’ places
  - Participants dropped pins on the map, noted them, and uploaded photos

Diverse Experiences with Neighborhood Smoke Shops

Smoke shops as social resources and retail amenities
My hangout spot… We all stand inside the smoke shop talking and friends that’ll be outside. (MM03)
It has everything that I need in it. Snacks… Everything. Cords for computers and iPhones… It’s like a one stop shop. (MM13)

Smoke shops as unsafe places
They call it like a danger zone and I guess a lot of people don’t get killed. They’d be standing out there smoking… But no, I never liked standing there. (MM12)

Norms About Youth & Tobacco
All neighborhood residents expressed concern about youth buying, selling, and using tobacco. One participant goes to a more distant smoke shop to buy cigarettes:

I don’t prefer [that store].
Interviewer: Why don’t you prefer it?
The ones that sell [tobacco], they seem like they’re really too young to be selling… [and] their patrons are young. (MM12)

Mapping-interviews revealed:
- Experiences and perceptions of smoke shops
- Norms of tobacco use and sales
- Smoking to enhance sense of wellbeing
- Enactment of ‘considerate smoker’ identities
- Strategies for negotiating (in)formal smoking bans
- Views of smoking policies

Implications
- Participant-centered approach to understanding neighborhood-level disparities
- Neighborhood factors affect impact of new tobacco policies like flavored tobacco sales bans
- Consider replacement amenities to fulfill the social and retail functions of smoke shops
- Future research: explore people-place relationships that perpetuate tobacco disparities

Study area in online mapping platform
Participants viewed the map during interviews, noting tobacco-related places in their neighborhood

Funding: National Cancer Institute U01-CA154240, National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities P60-MD006902
Presenting your poster

- Double check logistics
- Be present on time
- Offer to present data
- Prepare to network – bring cards or handouts
- People take photos of your poster now
Remember, this is the setting!
Final thoughts

- Plan ahead
- Salesmanship
- Legibility trumps detail
- View from far away
- Second opinions help
- Less is more
Poster Printers

- Cardiology – free! But temporarily unavailable
- **Cheaper: www.makesigns.com
  - handy tips and templates
- ReproGraphics, UCSF ($8-13.50/sq ft)
- www.postersession.com
- “Just say no” to Kinko’s

- Beware: “print and pick up at the conference”
  - Hidden charges to hold your poster
You know science, we know printing.

At MakeSigns, we have been printing scientific posters for 15+ years and have seen it all. We will make sure you get your poster on time and with no surprises.

ORDER MY POSTER

Intuitive Ordering
Our straightforward website makes it quick and simple to order your poster.

Precision Printing
Our team of experts examines every poster to ensure everything meets our perfect print promise.

Unforgettable Service
Our on-site customer service team is happy to answer questions and offer guidance at every step.
Fabric Scientific Posters

Perfect for the traveling research presenter! Attend conferences with ease by utilizing our wrinkle, fade, and tear resistant fabric posters. Say goodbye to the stress of an extra carry-on item. You have done all the hard work, make it easy on yourself and present in style. Your presentation will be vibrant, clear, and impressive. Printed and shipped same day when ordered M-F by noon (CT).

Available in sizes up to 96".

Pricing

56" x 36"  $109.79
Poster Examples
USING TOBACCO INDUSTRY PSYCHOGRAPHIC MEASURES TO DESCRIBE COLLEGE SMOKERS AND NONSMokers

Pamela M. Ling MD MPH, Larry An MD, Emily Lim

1. Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education, Department of Medicine, Divisions of General Internal Medicine and Cardiology, University of California, San Francisco and 2. Department of Medicine, University of Minnesota

Background:
The tobacco industry has developed sophisticated marketing research questionnaires to gain insight into young adult smokers over the past 30 years. Their methods may be used to target young adult tobacco control interventions.

Methods:
Analysis of tobacco industry documents
- Sources: Legacy Tobacco Documents Library (http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu), tobacco industry run websites
- Search terms included: young adult, market*, YAFS (Young Adult Female Smokers), YAMS (Young Adult Male Smokers)
- Philip Morris’s questionnaires from 1994-1997 assessing young adult “psychographics” (attitudes, self-descriptors, and goals) were collected and reviewed.

Survey Research
28 items that distinguished Philip Morris’s young adult market segments were administered in an internet survey to undergraduate students at a Minnesota university. Factor analyses and K-means Cluster analysis were used to describe naturally occurring segments of this population. Respondents were compared to Philip Morris’s market segment data.

Results:
Overall survey response rate was 27% (801/3000); 95% of respondents completed the psychographic questionnaire.

Overall differences in self-image between Minnesota and Philip Morris data:

Comparing four Minnesota student smoker segments to Philip Morris smoker segments

Comparing Philip Morris’s “50’s Threwbacks” to Minnesota male smoker cluster #4

Conclusions:
- Minnesota college students are less likely to describe themselves as rebellious, cool, street smart, adventurous, quick tempered, tough or average compared to other young adult smokers
- Some Philip Morris smoker segments can be found in the college student population
- Despite a more conservative profile overall, some segments of college smokers are distinctly rebellious (e.g. female Mavericks)
- Minnesota college smokers and nonsmokers report different goals are important
- Goals, attitudes, and self descriptors may assist in developing targeted interventions for different subgroups of college smokers
Psychographic Segments based on Attitudes about Secondhand Smoke and Lifestyle in Vietnamese Adolescents

Pamela M. Ling MD MPH, Torsten B. Neilands, PhD, and Celia P. Kaplan, DrPH
Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education, Center for AIDS Prevention Studies, Department of Medicine
Divisions of General Internal Medicine and Cardiology, University of California, San Francisco

Introduction:
- "Psychographics" – a system to measure beliefs, opinions, interests of consumer targets
- Commonly used in market research and segmentation studies
- Tobacco companies conduct
- Psychographic studies for marketing
- Studies of public opinion about secondhand smoke
- Can we combine psychographics with attitudes about secondhand smoke?
- Are secondhand smoke measures useful in ethnic specific studies?

Methods:
Questions from Philip Morris 1998 Study of Smoking Attitudes adapted for 2003 follow up of an existing cohort study of Vietnamese adolescents N=411 (52% of original cohort remained)

Measures:
- Jessie's Health Behavior Questionnaire
  - Future aspirations, friends behavior, extracurricular activities
  - What are the chances that you will have done things well? Problems with friends?
  - How many of your friends smoke?
  - How often were you smokers or steered because of...
  - Your grades?
  - Diet and Nutrition: how important is it
    - To exercise regularly
    - To be in good physical shape
  - Attitudes about smoking and secondhand smoke (agree/disagree)
    - I think smoking is a bad habit
    - I don't like people smoking
  - Smoking behavior (Pierce measures)
    - Have you ever tried smoking, even one or two puffs?
    - Current smokers have smoked 100 cigarettes in last month
  - Are you planning to quit smoking or reduce smoking?
  - Are you planning to cut down smoking?

K-means cluster analysis
- Compare responses to questions that best differentiate segments

Results: sample characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental-status: single</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live with Parents</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age (std dev)</td>
<td>18.5 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never tried smoking</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never tried smoking</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: Cluster analysis

Stressed Pessimists:
- Future: Feel unlikely to finish college, have high pay, or happy family life
- Friends: in trouble with law, get into fights
- Worried more about violence, money, gangs
- Fitness: not important at all
- Activities: less likely to do any
- Smoking: Don't care if friends smoke, support ventilation, doubt that Secondhand smoke is dangerous
- 45% female

Bad Influence:
- Future: Feels they'll finish college
- Friends: More likely to drink, be in trouble with law, try drugs, have sex, fight, date, bad grades
- Worried more about social life, personal money
- Fitness: Very important to have energy, be in shape, control food, exercise
- Activities: Go to bars and clubs
- Smoking: Agree Secondhand smoke is dangerous, negative image of smokers, accept ventilation
- 49% female

Nerds:
- Future: Think they will finish college
- Friends: Get good grades, don't get into trouble, fight, drink, gangs, date
- Worried: A little more about friends, health
- Fitness: Not important at all
- Activities: Average except unlikely to go to bars
- Smoking: Strongly prefer non-smokers, negative image of smokers, don't accept ventilation
- 70% female

Superachievers:
- Future: Sure they will have happy family, friends, high pay, own home, finish college
- Friends: Get good grades, exercise no sex, drugs, alcohol or trouble with law
- Not worried about money, grades, social life
- Fitness: Energy, exercise, weight very important
- Activities: Do all activities except going to bars
- Smoking: Prefer non-smokers, don't accept ventilation, believe secondhand smoke is harmful
- 57% female

Implications:
- Two high risk segments, different profiles suggest anti-smoking messages could be tailored
  - Bad Influence
    - More image and body conscious
    - Peer influenced
    - Believe SHS is dangerous
    - More negative view of smokers
    - Go to bars and clubs
  - Stressed Pessimists
    - Competing priorities
    - Don't care about future, physical fitness, activities
    - Knowledge deficit around dangers of SHS

Both high risk segments contain relatively fewer females – consider gender tailored messages
Future research to examine whether similar segments exist in other populations

Funding: Flight Attendant Medical Research Institute Young Clinical Scientist Award, UCSF Comprehensive Cancer Center Stewart Trust Research Award, National Cancer Institute, American Cancer Society
Tobacco initiation with flavors: Identifying sociodemographic predictors and effects on cigarette smoking among youth and young adults

Shannon Lea Watkins | Wendy Max

**Motivation**
- 3.9 million middle and high school students use at least one tobacco product
- Non-cigarette products are increasingly popular and often flavored
- The tobacco industry uses menthol and other flavors to target youth and young adults, people of color, and women
- Among smokers, menthol cigarette use is higher among women, people of color, and sexual minority individuals
- Patterns of tobacco product initiation with other flavors are unknown
- The effects of initiation with flavored tobacco on future smoking are understudied

**Data & Methods**
- Data: Population Assessment of Tobacco and Health (PATH) Study
  - Wave 1 (2013-2014)
  - Youth (ages 12-17; n=2,869)
  - Young adults (18-25; n=7,950)
- Population: Ever users of [product]
- Flavored Initiation: At age of tobacco initiation, first use of all products initiated that year was flavored variety
- Outcomes and predictors:
  - Q1: Flavored initiation + gender, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation
  - Q2: past 30-day cigarette use + flavored [product] initiation
- Logistic regression:
  - Q1: adjusted for gender, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, age
  - Q2: adjusted for Q1 covariates + urban, summer interview, lived with cigarette-smoker child, other tobacco ever use - weighted using PATH survey weights

**Results**
- Q1: % flavored initiation of ever (product) users, by gender, race & ethnicity, and sexual orientation
- Youth
  - Gender
  - Race and ethnicity
  - Sexual orientation
- Young adults
  - Gender
  - Race and ethnicity
  - Sexual orientation

**Central Findings**
- Flavored tobacco initiation was...
  - More likely for female ever users for all products
  - More likely for racial and ethnic minority ever users of tobacco, cigarettes, and non-cigarette combustibles
  - Less likely for racial and ethnic minority ever users of hookah and smokeless
  - More likely for LGB young adult e-cigarette ever users
- Flavored tobacco products and current smoking
  - Initiation with flavored cigarettes predicted current smoking
  - Initiation with flavored non-cigarette tobacco products did not predict higher past 30-day smoking
  - There were some negative associations between flavored [product] initiation and current smoking

**Conclusions**
- Patterns of initiation with flavors vary across products
- Female and racial and ethnic minority young people are more likely to initiate with flavors for many products
- Local flavored tobacco bans (Chicago, IL; San Francisco, CA) are likely to benefit female and racial and ethnic minority young people
- Analysis did not reveal systematic positive effect of flavors on future smoking
- Limitations: Unable to establish causal pathway from non-cigarette use to cigarette use
  - samples include respondents who tried cigarettes first
  - individuals perhaps less likely to use flavored [product] if already smoking cigarettes
- Future work will address sequencing issues

For further information contact: Shannon Lea Watkins
University of California, San Francisco Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education
Shannon.Watkins@ucsf.edu

Sponsored in part by the National Cancer Institute (NCI #HPO1-11). The contents of this publication do not necessarily represent the views of the NCI or FTA. The funding agencies played no role in the selection of the project or preparation of the manuscript. The authors report no conflicts of interest related to this research.
**Introduction:** Smoking prevention efforts have almost entirely concentrated on primary prevention in adolescents. In contrast, the tobacco industry has made young adults a top priority for decades. Effective interventions to decrease young adult tobacco use will need to understand and effectively counter the opposition: the tobacco industry's marketing efforts that target young adults.

**Methods:** Analysis of tobacco industry documents.
- Sources: Legacy Tobacco Documents Library (http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu), tobacco industry websites (such as Philip Morris, RJR, Lorillard) and full text searches on Tobacco Documents Online
- Search terms included: young adult, smoker, YAFS (Young Adult Female Smokers), YAMS (Young Adult Male Smokers)
- Searches extended using names, dates, project titles, Bates (reference) numbers, locations
- Research memos were reviewed by multiple researchers to develop common themes, questions/conflicts resolved by gathering more data

**Results:**

Why smoking prevention limited to youth fails:

Young adults are in transition: smoking choices still take place

Young adults also exert social pressure not to smoke

**Social Smoking**

Philip Morris, 2000, Bates #208208779A/7801

**Values, Attitudes and Lifestyle**

Philip Morris, 2000, Bates #208208779A/7801

Young Adult Male Smokers are not the homogenous group. Lifestyle and attitudes difference organically from socially and smoking attitudes and brand attitudes before this segmentation. Don't use indications about YAMS in general. Need to be more specifics in problem identification and solution development.

- **Media Admittance:**
  - Checkbox, ad placement, upper insert
  - Checkbox, ad placement in lower insert
  - Checkbox for snack
  - Checkbox for magazine
  - Checkbox for radio
  - Checkbox for television

- **Marketing Efforts:**
  - Marketing efforts are aligned with the marketing population
  - Marketing efforts are not aligned with the marketing population

**Global targeting by attitude & lifestyle**

- Basic values for young adults to Europe and the U.S. are similar if not identical
- The targeting values for both markets vary: individuals, institutions, communication, authority
- As a result, comparable lifestyles have developed across markets

- Lee et al. 1991, Young Adult Sults in Japan. Philip Morris. Bates #208208779A/7801

**Conclusions:**

- Young adults are an important target
- Values, attitudes, and lifestyles define targets
- Young adult marketing encourages social smoking
- Young adults are more sensitive to social pressures against smoking
- Secondhand smoke messages reinforce social pressure
- Sophisticated marketing plans targeting young adults were extended globally at least 10 years ago
Messages to Discourage Dual Tobacco Product Use Among Smokers in the USA

Background:
• Smokeless tobacco products have been aggressively promoted to smokers in the USA.
• Smokeless tobacco now sold with cigarette brand names.
• Smokeless advertising emphasizes use in smoke-free environments.
• Smokers perceive smokeless products as a temporary substitute.

Research Question: What messages might discourage smokers from adding smokeless tobacco to their existing cigarette use?

Methods and Participants:
• Twelve message concepts to discourage dual use were developed.
• Current and recently former (quit within past 2 years) smokers recruited from a nationally representative panel maintained by Knowledge Networks.
• Eight online “focus groups” each viewed at least 4 concepts (N=76).
• 91% current (past month) smokers.
• 71% of smokers were daily smokers.
• Responses coded and organized by common themes connected to ads.

Results: Tobacco Industry
Prompt: What is this advertising you?
“Tobacco companies are very sneaky and will do anything to keep smokers from quitting smoking.”
“I think the focus is showing the tobacco companies for what they are and their non-purpose is a great idea and should really be expanded [sic] in.”

Defending the tobacco industry: “They’re just capitalizing the rates of supply and demand, they’re not addicted, they’re just capitalizing.”

Results: Cost Savings
Smokers feel financial pressure:
“Sure I wish we were here, but my husband wants 300 and I can’t find $500 either.”

People who smoke, dip, drink, whatever are not going to stop until they want to or are ready to. Money applies sooner than later.”

Some negative responses:
“People who smoke need some help, they need some help.”

Results: Health Risks
Prompt: What is this advertising you?
“Smokeless tobacco is not as safe as cigarettes.”

Some argue that smokeless tobacco is less harmful than cigarettes:
“If you want to do good, let people to stop smoking and just dip. The health risk is a second hand issue.”

Most who go to “smokeless” are already addicted, one way or another. So why not have them from the safest to cigarettes? Yeah, that makes sense.”

Results: Addiction
Recognizing addiction:
“Nicotine is addictive, any type, once you’re hooked you’re hooked.”

“You and this is all hurting because my reason for using it to get away from the addiction.”

Denial or minimizing addiction:
“I’ve never become addicted, I smoke socially and just have to have one for the night at a time.”

“Yeah I smoke and I get saying things but I am the only one that is allowed to do what I want.”

Conclusions:
Anti-smokeless tobacco messages evolved divergent and sometimes conflicting responses:
• Health risk messages reinforced beliefs in smokeless tobacco harms, but some felt they encouraged smoking.
• Tobacco industry messages to keep smokeless advertisers were understood, but some defended the industry.
• Cost savings was recognized, but seen as a smoking cessation message, not anti-smoking.
• Addiction was recognized by some, but also evoked feelings of denial and frustration.

No single message works for all smokers: Different messages will appeal to different subgroups.
Abstracts! The basics and secrets of success
Elements of an abstract

- Title
- Introduction (Background)
- Objectives/Hypothesis – Question/Problem
- Materials and Methods
- Results (Major findings)
- Conclusions/Significance

**Word limits**
Title

- Accurately tells your story
- Include the key elements
- Commands attention but DO NOT get too “cute”
- Main factor on if people read your abstract!
- Be succinct, specific, use active voice
Introduction

- The introductory sentence(s) sets the stage for the project
- The why! The rationale! Answer “so what”
- Not a history lesson!
- “it's never been done before” is NOT a rationale for a study
Objectives/Hypothesis  Question/Problem

- Clearly state your hypothesis and/or your research question (i.e., your purpose, goal, aim)
  - I mean clearly

- It is not imperative that it be written as a hypothesis
  - Ironically #1 reason for abstracts not getting accepted!
  - Some societies don’t even use Doctors to weed this mistake out!
Materials & Methods

- Essential, but NOT were reads spend time

- How was the study conducted? (be brief)

- Follow with a sentence or two that BRIEFLY describes the experimental approach

- Pertinent information concerning the methods without providing details – animal model, cell model, chemical manipulation, duration of the study, etc.
Results

- What were your results? (may not have all but that’s OK)

- Only include the most pertinent findings & that defend your conclusion

- The amount of detail you provide will vary with discipline so get mentors to read it
Conclusion/Significance

- Provide a concluding sentence that emphasizes the significance or implications (interpretation) of the finding
  - A sentence that highlights the major finding of your project and its impact

- What is the “take home” message?

- Speculate if data is inconclusive

- Be HUMBLE
Why abstracts get rejected

- Dull Topics (lots of previous research)
- No context (the Why & so-what is not clear)
- Small n (! Can be rescued)
- No data (maybe ok in humanities, not in science)
- All data, no words (same as above, “so-what” missing)
- Structure issues (too short, grammar, spelling)
- Arrogance (over concluding, saying “data will be presented…”)
- Readability (use “respectively” but not more than twice)
Tips when writing an abstract

- Don’t get fancy in the language
- Think of reader experience (if you are running out of breath reading it, it’s a bad sign)
- “KISS: Keep It Simple Stupid”
- If you don’t “believe it” then don’t say it!!!!
- Acronyms, use them well
- Have other people read your abstract
- Edit Edit Edit Proofread proofread proofread proofread
  - Spelling mistakes? Grammer issues?
Adnan Alseidi MD EdM
Adnan.alseidi@ucsf.edu