

Adolescents' Neural Response to Tobacco Prevention Messages and Sharing Engagement



Rui Pei, MA,¹ Ralf Schmäzle, PhD,^{1,2} Elissa C. Kranzler, PhD,¹ Matthew B. O'Donnell, PhD,¹
Emily B. Falk, PhD¹

Introduction: Interpersonal communication can reinforce media effects on health behavior. Recent studies have shown that brain activity in the medial prefrontal cortex during message exposure can predict message-consistent behavior change. Key next steps include examining the relationship between neural responses to ads and measures of interpersonal message retransmission that can be collected at scale.

Methods: Neuroimaging, self-report, and automated linguistic measures were utilized to investigate the relationships between neural responses to tobacco prevention messages, sharing engagement, and smoking-relevant belief changes. Thirty-seven adolescent nonsmokers viewed 12 ads from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's "The Real Cost" campaign during a functional magnetic resonance imaging scan session (2015–2016). Data were analyzed between 2016 and 2017. The extent that participants talked in detail about the main message of the ads, or sharing engagement, was measured through transcripts of participants' subsequent verbal descriptions using automated linguistic coding. Beliefs about the consequences of smoking were measured before and after the main experiment using surveys.

Results: Increased brain activation in self- and value-related subregions of the medial prefrontal cortex during message exposure was associated with subsequent sharing engagement when participants verbally talked about the ads. In addition, sharing engagement was significantly associated with changes in participants' beliefs about the social consequences of smoking.

Conclusions: Neural activity in self- and value-related subregions of the medial prefrontal cortex during exposure to "The Real Cost" campaign was associated with subsequent sharing engagement, which in turn was related to social belief change. These results provide new insights into the link between neurocognitive responses to ads, the content of interpersonal sharing, and downstream health-relevant outcomes.

Supplement information: This article is part of a supplement entitled Fifth Anniversary Retrospective of "The Real Cost," the Food and Drug Administration's Historic Youth Smoking Prevention Media Campaign, which is sponsored by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

Am J Prev Med 2019;56(2S1):S40–S48. © 2018 American Journal of Preventive Medicine. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

INTRODUCTION

Cigarette smoking is the leading preventable cause of disease and death in the U.S.¹ The vast majority of smokers initiate before age 18 years,¹ making smoking prevention during adolescence a crucial and cost-effective means for decreasing the prevalence of

From the ¹Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and ²College of Communication Arts and Sciences, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

Address correspondence to: Rui Pei, MA, and Emily B. Falk, PhD, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania, 3620 Walnut Street, Philadelphia PA 19104. E-mail: rui.pei@asc.upenn.edu, falk@asc.upenn.edu.

0749-3797/\$36.00

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2018.07.044>

smoking. Tobacco prevention mass media campaigns targeting adolescents strive to strengthen targeted health beliefs and antismoking attitudes,^{2,3} which have been identified as key determinants of behavior.⁴ Recent research also highlights the importance of interpersonal communication as a means for extending the reach of campaigns and reinforcing campaign messages.^{5–11} These studies suggest that anticipating and engaging in discussions about the campaign messages may lead to favorable campaign outcomes, such as encouraging anti-smoking attitudes and behaviors.

Previous neuroimaging studies have shown that neural measures taken during health message exposure provide information about the persuasive effects of messaging^{12–22} and the likelihood that health news is shared.^{23,24} Most consistently, message-evoked neural activity in subregions of the medial prefrontal cortex (MPFC) has been associated with message-consistent behavioral outcomes^{12,13,17,25–27} and message sharing.^{23,24} Two subprocesses served by the MPFC, namely self-related processing and positive valuation, are thought to be critical to the success of persuasive messages and their sharing decisions.^{26,28}

First, a person is more likely to be persuaded by and to share a message if they think the message has high personal relevance and high personal value.²⁸ For example, messages that are tailored to an individual^{13,29} and messages that increase beliefs about personal risks^{30,31} are more effective than messages that do not make the receiver feel that the message content is personally relevant. Within the MPFC, studies have identified subclusters that are particularly activated during a range of self-related processes, such as retrieval of autobiographical memories,^{32,33} explicit self-relatedness judgments,^{34–36} and implicit self-referential thinking.^{37,38} In addition, activity within these specific subregions has been associated with increased sharing of health news content.^{23,24} The present study extends this prior work by examining whether messages that engage these forms of self-related processing are more likely to be shared in depth by adolescents.

In parallel, when people view ideas or actions as being more subjectively valuable (or positive valuation), they are more likely to act on that information^{39–41} or share it with others.⁴² This view is consistent with prominent theories of persuasion and behavior change, such as the reasoned action approach⁴ and the elaboration likelihood model,⁴³ which emphasize the importance of the subjective, expected outcomes in determining behavior. Across hundreds of neuroimaging studies of subjective valuation, a different set of subregions of the MPFC is consistently engaged by diverse types of rewards, and by both the expectation

and receipt of valuable outcomes.^{44–46} Given that this portion of the MPFC also plays an important role in persuasion²⁶ and message retransmission,^{23,24} the current study examines this role of the MPFC as a second antecedent to message sharing.

To date, no prior research has linked the neurocognitive mechanisms at play during message exposure to the content of what people share, and subsequent belief changes indicative of persuasion in sharers. The current study used neuroimaging methods to measure brain activity during message exposure, and examined associations between message-induced brain activity and subsequent sharing engagement. The sharing task captures the extent to which participants elaborated on specific message themes when later sharing the ideas with friends (referred to here as “sharing engagement”). The aims of this study are to examine (1) whether neural activation in two subregions of the MPFC implicated in self-relevance³⁵ and valuation⁴⁴ during message exposure is each positively associated with sharing engagement; and (2) whether sharing engagement is positively associated with subsequent changes in the sharers’ smoking-relevant beliefs.

METHODS

Study Sample

Forty-three adolescents were recruited from the greater Philadelphia area. All participants provided informed assent and parental consent in accordance with the procedures of the IRB at the University of Pennsylvania. Participants were required to meet standard functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) eligibility, age (14–17 years) and nonsmoking (defined as past 30-day non-use and lifetime history of <100 cigarettes) eligibilities. Six participants were excluded because of discomfort in scanner ($n=1$); failed attention check ($n=1$); or recording technology failure ($n=4$). The remaining 37 participants included 18 females. Given that the target population of “The Real Cost” campaign includes nonsmokers who are susceptible to initiation,⁴⁷ nonsmokers were recruited and high-sensation seeking adolescents were oversampled as they are at greater risk of smoking initiation.⁴⁸ Sensation seeking was measured with the Brief Sensation Seeking Scale (BSSS-4).⁴⁹ Eligible participants were recruited until a cap was met for each subgroup (low-moderate and high sensation seekers). The current sample includes 17 high sensation seekers defined by an average rating of three or higher to the BSSS-4 questions on a four-point scale, and 20 low to moderate sensation seekers with an average BSSS-4 rating of less than three. In addition, the baseline survey assessed participants’ intention to smoke in the next 6 months and their self-efficacy related to saying no to smoking in various situations. On average, participants rated that they were not likely to smoke in the next 6 months (mean=1.19 on a 4-point scale, where 1 denotes definitely will not and 4 denotes definitely will, SD=0.40). Similarly, with regard to self-efficacy ratings, participants reported that they were mostly sure they could say no to smoking (mean=4.54 on a 5-point scale,

where 1 denotes *not at all sure* and 5 denotes *completely sure*, $SD=0.84$).

Measures

The stimulus messages were 12 advertisements (ads) from “The Real Cost” campaign, a national youth smoking prevention media campaign launched by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.⁴⁷ Each 30-second ad aims to educate youth about smoking harms, in particular, the loss of control because of addiction, the dangerous chemicals contained in cigarettes, and the negative health and cosmetic consequences that result from smoking.⁴⁷ Appendix Table 3 (available online) provides short descriptions and web links for the ad stimuli used in this study.

The 12 “Real Cost” messages were preceded by a 3-second countdown and followed by a response screen that asked participants of their intention to share the message, which served as an attention check manipulation. The message exposure task lasted about 10 minutes. The 12 ads were presented in random order to account for potential fatigue effects associated with repeated message exposure. This study solely focuses on neural response during message exposure.


The message-sharing task followed the message exposure task and was designed to capture the content of interpersonal communication about the messages while participants were in the fMRI scanner. After being exposed to all 12 messages in the message exposure task, participants were shown three screenshots of each message and were asked to freely talk about the message as if talking with their peers (Figure 1A). Participants were aware that the study staff could hear them talking. The message-sharing task was about 6 minutes in length. The instructions given to the participants were: *You will have 30 seconds to talk about each video. You may talk about anything you like, as if you were discussing it with a friend.*

Participants’ descriptions of the messages in the message-sharing task were transcribed and analyzed using the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) English dictionary,⁵⁰ which counts the proportion of words in a text that belong to a range of psychologically-relevant categories. Specifically, message

engagement was operationalized along two dimensions: (1) the extent to which the participants talked about thoughts central to the main theme of negative consequences of smoking (theme relevance); and (2) the level of detail of their language (specificity; Figure 1B shows an example transcript). Theme relevance was operationalized by counting the percentage of words most related to the antismoking theme of “The Real Cost” ads within the LIWC dictionary, which were found in the “biological processes” category; this category contained words that are key when describing cigarette smoking and its consequences, such as “smoking,” “lung,” and “inhale.” The specificity of each participant’s language was measured as the percentage of words belonging to the “relativity” category, which contained words that are used to describe details of position, time, and action. The level of concrete details included in the participants’ ad description was considered an indicator of their level of cognitive processing of the ad.⁵¹ The topic-relevance score and the specificity score were combined into an overall sharing engagement score as an indication of individual cognitive processing of the main theme for each message during the message-sharing task (Appendix Table 4 [available online] shows example transcripts and the corresponding sharing engagement scores).

To assess smoking-relevant beliefs, participants answered questions about the consequences of smoking tobacco cigarettes. Belief items were drawn from a national telephone survey of youth and young adults’ beliefs and behaviors relevant to tobacco use.⁵² Beliefs were assessed as part of the baseline questionnaire (within 1 week prior to the fMRI scan session) and again after the fMRI scan as part of the post-scan questionnaire. To minimize social desirability bias, participants completed the online baseline questionnaire at home, and the post-scan questionnaire alone in a test room. They were assured confidentiality of their responses. The belief questionnaire assessed various tobacco-related beliefs, including those broadly targeted by “The Real Cost” campaign (health risks, dangerous chemicals, and loss of control). Though not one of the three key message pillars for “The Real Cost” campaign, belief items also assessed social concerns related to smoking. Participants’ beliefs on the social consequences of smoking were measured through two items: *If I smoke every day, I will look*

(A)



(B)

“Uh this one was that one where it looks like this kids trying his first time **smoking**. So he sits out behind the house, and a bunch of these crazy alien-looking things run out of the woods, and when they are right about to hit them they all funnel themselves into a **breath** and enter the guy’s **mouth**. And then he **coughs** it back up as it was the **cigarette smoke**. Uh sort of showing all the **toxic** and dangerous things that are going in every **time** you take a **breath** of the **cigarette**, and it was pretty creepy as well”

Figure 1. (A) An illustration of the message-sharing task; (B) an example transcript in which the participant talks about one of the “Real Cost” ads.

Note: Words in bold are from the LIWC biological process category, indicating message theme relevance, and words that are underlined are from the LIWC relativity category, indicating level of detail in the description.

LIWC, Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count.

uncool; If I smoke every day, I will be a turnoff to other people. Participants rated on a 4-point scale, where 1 indicates *strong disagreement* and 4 indicates *strong agreement* with the statement. The additional items used in the belief questionnaire are listed in [Appendix Table 5](#) (available online).

Statistical Analysis

One-sample *t*-tests were conducted to determine whether changes in participants' belief ratings between pre- and post-scan measurements were significantly different from zero across participants. With the brain data, a region-of-interest (ROI) approach was adopted to investigate the relationship between MPFC neural activation during message exposure and sharing engagement in the subsequent message-sharing task. Based on previous literature on neuroscience of persuasion and information sharing,^{12,23,25,26} two a priori hypothesized ROIs in the MPFC were selected: one from a meta-analysis on self-related processes (self ROI; [Figure 2A](#))³⁵ and one from a meta-analysis on valuation processes (value ROI; [Figure 2B](#)).⁴⁴ To examine the relationship between neural activation in the specified ROIs and sharing engagement, two separate multilevel mixed effects regression models were constructed.^{53,54} Both models used brain activity in each hypothesized ROI (self ROI or value ROI) as the independent variable, and the sharing engagement score from the message-sharing task as the dependent variable. As the data were nested both within participants (there were multiple data points for each participant) and within ads (there were multiple data points for each ad), participants and ads were treated as random effects. Intercepts and slopes were allowed to vary randomly, thereby accounting for nonindependence in the data from these two sources. The associations between ROI activity and sharing engagement were also assessed at the individual level using ordinary least squares regressions, for which data were averaged across ads for each participant.^a Statistical analyses were carried out between 2016 and 2017 in R statistical software, version 3.3.3, using *lme4* (1.1–15) and *lmerTest* (2.0–36) packages to perform linear mixed effects modeling. In addition to the ROI analyses, a whole brain parametric search was also conducted to examine regions outside of the hypothesized ROIs associated with sharing engagement ([Appendix](#), available online). Finally, ordinary least squares regressions were used to examine the association between sharing engagement and belief changes on health risks, loss of control, dangerous chemicals, and social concerns, respectively.

RESULTS

Sharing engagement of “The Real Cost” ads was operationalized using automated linguistic coding of the participants' verbal descriptions of the ads, indicating the theme relevance and specificity of the participants' talk. In the message-sharing task, participants produced an average of 73.21 words (SD=16.12). Across all ads, the average engagement score was 13 (SD=5.6), indicating that, on

average, 13% of total words were related to either the biological process of smoking or details of the message.

Smoking-relevant beliefs were measured before and after exposure to the ads. In general, participants agreed with belief statements concerning the harmful consequences of smoking. Participants' mean belief ratings on the baseline survey were 3.08 (SD=0.42) for health risks; 3.51 (SD=0.56) for loss of control; 3.81 (SD=0.40) for dangerous chemicals; and 3.4 (SD=0.71) for social concerns. There were no significant group-level belief changes when comparing participants' smoking-relevant belief ratings before and after the main experiment for belief items regarding health risks (mean_{end}=3.15, SD_{end}=0.42, $t_{[36]}=1.4$, $p=0.2$)^b; loss of control (mean_{end}=3.38, SD_{end}=0.59, $t_{[36]}=-1.3$, $p=0.2$); harmful chemicals (mean_{end}=3.73, SD_{end}=0.45, $t_{[36]}=-0.9$, $p=0.4$); or social concerns (mean_{end}=3.28, SD_{end}=0.69, $t_{[36]}=-1.2$, $p=0.2$). However, there was person-to-person variability, which is the focus of the current analysis.

This study aimed to examine whether MPFC neural activation during message exposure was associated with the extent to which participants talked about the central theme of the message in detail during the message-sharing task. As such, two multilevel models were constructed using neural activity in the self or value ROI, respectively, as an independent variable and the sharing engagement score as the dependent variable. Participants' sharing engagement scores were significantly associated with their neural activity in the self ROI ($\beta=1.63$, 95% CI=0.59, 2.66, $p=0.008$) and value ROI ($\beta=1.36$, 95% CI=0.43, 2.28, $p=0.004$) during message exposure. In other words, accounting for individual differences across people in their tendencies to elaborate when sharing, greater neural activation in the self, and value MPFC ROIs during message viewing was respectively associated with participants later showing greater theme-relevant engagement when talking about the ads.

Whether mean levels of sharing engagement were associated with mean neural activity in hypothesized ROIs across all 12 ads was also tested at the individual level. At the individual level, mean neural signal across all ads in the self ROI correlated with mean engagement scores ($\beta=2.62$, $t_{[33]}=2.65$, $p=0.012$; [Figure 2A](#)). Similarly, mean neural activation in the value ROI correlated with mean engagement scores ($\beta=1.87$, $t_{[33]}=2.08$, $p=0.045$; [Figure 2B](#)). These results suggest that participants with higher neural activity in the MPFC while viewing ads subsequently showed more sharing engagement across ads. Results of a whole brain search confirmed that brain activity in the MPFC; ventral striatum (a brain region

^aNote that the sharing engagement score is a composite score of theme relevance and specificity. The [Appendix](#) includes additional analyses that separately examine the relationship between MPFC ROI activity and each subcategory score of sharing.

^bAll the *p*-values reported in this study reflect results from two-tailed tests.




Figure 2. Neural activity during message viewing predicts subsequent sharing engagement. The sharing engagement score is plotted against percentage signal change in activity from the (A) self ROI ($\beta=2.62$, $t_{[33]}=2.65$, $p=0.012$); and (B) value ROI ($\beta=1.87$, $t_{[33]}=2.08$, $p=0.045$).

MPFC, medial prefrontal cortex; ROI, region-of-interest.

implicated in value processing)^{44,55}; and posterior cingulate cortex (a brain region implicated in self-related processing and autobiographical memory)^{35,56,57} were robustly associated with sharing engagement (Appendix, available online).

The extent to which participants elaborated on the main theme of the health messages they were exposed to may have downstream effects on changes in their cigarette-related beliefs. To that end, the correlation between participants' mean levels of sharing engagement and their changes in tobacco-relevant beliefs at the individual level was investigated. There was a significant correlation between participants' overall sharing engagement scores and changes in beliefs relevant to the social consequences of smoking, controlling for age, sex, and baseline belief ratings ($\beta=0.065$, $t_{[32]}=2.16$, $p=0.038$; Figure 3).^c This indicated that participants who engaged more with “The Real Cost” messages overall in the message-sharing task were more likely to change their beliefs about the

social consequences of smoking. Similar associations were not found between message engagement and belief change concerning health risks, loss of control, or dangerous chemicals (Table 1).

DISCUSSION

The persuasive effect of mass media campaigns is facilitated by interpersonal channels, as campaign messages can be spread to a larger audience through conversations.^{5,8,9} Further, anticipation of conversations and actual elaboration in discussions may amplify the effects of discussion on campaign message effectiveness.^{6,7,10,11} Yet, the neurocognitive mechanisms that lead to sharing about mass media messages have not been studied extensively,^{28,58} nor is it clear how these processes might relate to the sharer's own belief change.⁵⁹ This study reports that neural activity in subregions of the MPFC implicated in self-related processing and positive valuation is associated with subsequent sharing engagement in a message-sharing task. In turn, engaging with the message theme during message sharing is associated with

^cThe association between sharing engagement scores and social belief changes was also significant without controlling for demographic variables (age and sex) and baseline belief ratings ($\beta=0.067$, $t_{[35]}=2.04$, $p=0.049$).




Figure 3. At the individual level, mean sharing engagement across all ads predicts participants’ changes in beliefs about the social consequences of smoking between baseline and post-scan questionnaires, controlling for age, sex, and baseline social belief ratings ($\beta=0.065$, $t_{[32]}=2.16$, $p=0.038$).

changes in the same participants’ beliefs about the social consequences of smoking.

Recent studies have reinforced that self- and value-related brain activity during health message exposure can play an important role in persuasion and behavior change.^{26,28} The finding that neural activity in subregions of the MPFC implicated in self-related processing and valuation is associated with subsequent sharing engagement brings together previously disconnected findings that highlight the importance of interpersonal communication about mass media campaigns,^{8,9,59,60} and research showing that brain activity within the MPFC during message exposure is related to subsequent behavior change.^{12–15,28,61}

Prior neuroimaging studies have identified subregions of the MPFC that are preferentially engaged during various types of self-related tasks, including the retrieval of autobiographical memories^{32,33} and engagement in

explicit and implicit self-referential thoughts.^{34–38} Recent research has also shown that brain activity in these same regions is implicated in intentions to share health news in young adults,^{23,24} suggesting that self-relevance may be one important antecedent to decisions to share.²⁶ Findings from the current study bring these two sets of studies together and extend this work by examining the actual content of what adolescents share in response to health campaign messages. These findings suggest that messages that initially elicit greater self-related processing in the brain are encoded more deeply and later shared with greater theme-relevant details.

In parallel, a large body of research shows that subregions of the MPFC are implicated in a wide range of valuation processes, including the expectation and receipt of both primary and secondary rewards.^{44–46} Likewise, brain activity in these same regions is implicated in intentions to share health news in young adults,^{23,24} suggesting a critical role of positively valuing content during initial exposure as one potential antecedent of subsequent sharing elaboration.

The present findings highlight the role of self- and value-related processes as important psychological antecedents of interpersonal message sharing. This account shares theoretic underpinnings with major theories of behavior change that suggest self-relevance and subjective valuation are precursors to behavioral outcomes.⁴ This account is also consistent with the idea that a common set of psychological processes may take hold during message receipt that are associated with later sharing engagement, as well as health-relevant belief and behavior change.^{9,25} This is one of the first studies to investigate the neural processes that are associated with adolescent interpersonal sharing. Future studies in this area could explore other relevant domains, using appropriately adapted measures of sharing engagement.

Notably, these findings suggest that sharing engagement is associated with changes in social beliefs but not health-, control-, or chemical-related beliefs. Social concerns were operationalized through participants’ self-report ratings of whether they agreed that smoking would make them look uncool or make them a turn-off to their friends. Two factors may underlie the lack of

Table 1. Results From Ordinary Least Square Regressions Linking Sharing Engagement and Belief Change, Controlling for Age, Sex, and Baseline Belief Ratings

Variable	β (95% CI)	t (df)	p-value
Health risks	0.0029 (–0.032, 0.037)	0.17 (32)	0.87
Harmful chemicals	0.0018 (–0.051, 0.054)	0.07 (32)	0.94
Loss of control	–0.0045 (–0.072, 0.063)	–0.14 (32)	0.89
Social concerns	0.065 (0.0038, 0.13)	2.16 (32)	0.038

association between sharing engagement and health-, control-, and chemical-related belief changes. First, the fact that sharing engagement is measured in a task that mimics interpersonal sharing might position it to better capture participants' thoughts and cognitions on the social consequences of smoking. Second, consequences related to loss of control, chemicals, health, and cosmetic effects arguably have social consequences. Thus, it may be the case that the social concern belief questions are more general and may capture more variance than belief ratings on health, chemicals, and loss of control specifically. Given that participants filled out the baseline questionnaire at home and post-scan questionnaire in the absence of study staff, and were assured confidentiality of their responses, there should be minimal social desirability bias in their responses.

An important methodologic innovation of the current work is the combination of brain imaging with the use of a message-sharing task to capture the content of interpersonal communication. Specifically, natural language processing analysis was used to capture the theme relevance and specificity of participants' talk. This approach brings the potential for automated analysis of message engagement at large scales (e.g., with language scraped from online discussions that would not be feasible to code by hand). Other often-used natural language processing techniques include supervised machine learning and topic modeling, both of which require a relatively large corpus of texts. By comparison, LIWC dictionary coding is applicable to both small and large bodies of texts. Furthermore, given that health campaigns targeted toward adolescents increasingly employ Internet-based platforms, the combined use of brain imaging during message receipt with this form of scalable, semantically rich verbal elaborations of the same messages has great potential to enhance understanding of how adolescents' social media engagement contributes to behavior change, and to inform models of sharing across levels of analysis (i.e., to link processes that are typically measured in small numbers of people in the lab with large-scale outcomes that are usually measured with natural language processing at scale).⁶²

Limitations

Although the novel use of neuroimaging methods in the current study can unobtrusively measure neural and cognitive processes during health message exposure, it also brought several limitations. The sample size for this study ($n=37$) is relatively small, limiting the ability to draw group-level inferences. The current analyses are also subject to the constraints of reverse inference⁶³ in that the observed neural activity could be related to psychological processes or personal attributes other than

the ones hypothesized in this study. However, the strong theoretic foundation on which this study was developed and the use of meta-analytically defined subregions of the MPFC mitigate these concerns. Future studies that directly manipulate these processes can provide stronger causal links between the psychological processes proposed, activation of MPFC, and message effects. Additionally, the message-sharing task was developed to measure aspects of interpersonal communication, but the extent to which this laboratory task generalizes to real-life situations has not yet been assessed. Future work could improve this task by having participants post or share messages to real-world social media directly from the scanner, or by instructing participants to engage in in-person conversations with peers at study sessions.

Furthermore, although high-sensation seeking adolescents were oversampled in this study, participants in the study sample generally reported low intention to smoke and strong antismoking beliefs at baseline. Therefore, generalizations cannot be made to adolescents with high intention to smoke. Future studies in this area could consider assessing smoking risk with other criteria (e.g., measures of smoking intention).

Finally, the current study used LIWC dictionary coding to index the extent to which participants talked about the main theme of "The Real Cost" campaign messages. The use of LIWC dictionary coding is dependent on the specific construct of interest, the context, and the characteristics of the texts being coded. Further validation of the LIWC dictionary method in related contexts on more diverse types of texts will be useful.

CONCLUSIONS

Findings demonstrate that self- and value-related neural signals during adolescents' exposure to health messages were associated with subsequent sharing engagement when participants were asked to talk about the messages as if speaking to their peers. In turn, sharing engagement was significantly associated with changes in the same participants' beliefs about the social consequences of smoking, shedding new light on the interrelationships between message exposure, interpersonal sharing, and belief change.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Publication of this article was supported by the Center for Tobacco Products at the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). This publication represents the views of the authors and does not represent FDA position or policy.

This research was supported by a NIH Innovator Award 1 DP2DA035156-01, NIH/National Cancer Institute and FDA

Grant P50CA179546, and the U.S. Army Research Laboratory (including work under Cooperative Agreement Number W911NF-10-2-0022). We thank past and current members of the Communication Neuroscience Lab and Penn Tobacco Center of Regulatory Science for their helpful feedback, including Nicole Cooper, Elizabeth Beard, Jennifer Henrichsen, Robert Hornik, and Angeline Sangalang.

No financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper.

SUPPLEMENT NOTE

This article is part of a supplement entitled Fifth Anniversary Retrospective of “The Real Cost,” the Food and Drug Administration’s Historic Youth Smoking Prevention Media Campaign, which is sponsored by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Supplemental materials associated with this article can be found in the online version at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2018.07.044>.

REFERENCES

- HHS. *The Health Consequences of Smoking—50 Years of Progress: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, GA: HHS, CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; 2014.
- Farrelly M C, Niederdeppe J, Yarsevich J. Youth tobacco prevention mass media campaigns: past, present, and future directions. *Tobacco Control*. 2003;12(suppl 1):i35–i47. https://doi.org/10.1136/tc.12.suppl_1.i35.
- Pechmann C, Reibling ET. Planning an effective anti-smoking mass media campaign targeting adolescents. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. 2000;6(3):80–94. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00124784-200006030-00013>.
- Fishbein M, Ajzen I. *Predicting and Changing Behavior: The Reasoned Action Approach*. Hoboken, NJ: Taylor & Francis, 2011.
- Valente TW, Saba WP. Campaign exposure and interpersonal communication as factors in contraceptive use in Bolivia. *J Health Commun*. 2001;6(4):303–322. <https://doi.org/10.1080/108107301317140805>.
- Brennan E, Durkin SJ, Wakefield MA, Kashima Y. Talking about anti-smoking campaigns: what do smokers talk about, and how does talk influence campaign effectiveness? *J Health Commun*. 2016;21(1):33–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2015.1039675>.
- Jeong M, Tan ASL, Brennan E, Gibson L, Hornik RC. Talking about quitting: interpersonal communication as a mediator of campaign effects on smokers’ quit behaviors. *J Health Commun*. 2015;20(10):1196–1205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2015.1018620>.
- Katz E, Lazarsfeld PF. *Personal Influence, the Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications*. New York, NY: Free Press, 1966.
- Southwell BG, Yzer MC. When (and why) interpersonal talk matters for campaigns. *Commun Theory*. 2009;19(1):1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2008.01329.x>.
- van den Putte B, Yzer M, Southwell BG, de Bruijn G-J, Willemsen MC. Interpersonal communication as an indirect pathway for the effect of antismoking media content on smoking cessation. *J Health Commun*. 2011;16(5):470–485. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2010.546487>.
- Hwang Y. Social diffusion of campaign effects. *Commun Res*. 2010;39(1):120–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650210389029>.
- Falk EB, Berkman ET, Whalen D, Lieberman MD. Neural activity during health messaging predicts reductions in smoking above and beyond self-report. *Health Psychol*. 2011;30(2):177–185. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022259>.
- Chua HF, Ho SS, Jasinska AJ, et al. Self-related neural response to tailored smoking-cessation messages predicts quitting. *Nat Neurosci*. 2011;14(4):426–427. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2761>.
- Owens MM, MacKillop J, Gray JC, Hawkshead BE, Murphy CM, Sweet LH. Neural correlates of graphic cigarette warning labels predict smoking cessation relapse. *Psychiatry Res Neuroimaging*. 2017;262:63–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2017.02.005>.
- Riddle PJ, Newman-Norlund RD, Baer J, Thrasher JF. Neural response to pictorial health warning labels can predict smoking behavioral change. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci*. 2016;11(11):1802–1811. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw087>.
- Wang A-L, Ruparel K, Loughhead JW, et al. Content matters: neuroimaging investigation of brain and behavioral impact of televised anti-tobacco public service announcements. *J Neurosci*. 2013;33(17):7420–7427. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3840-12.2013>.
- Falk EB, O’Donnell MB, Cascio CN, et al. Self-affirmation alters the brain’s response to health messages and subsequent behavior change. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2015;112(7):1977–1982. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1500247112>.
- Imhof MA, Schmäzle R, Renner B, Schupp HT. How real-life health messages engage our brains: shared processing of effective anti-alcohol videos. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci*. 2017;12(7):1188–1196. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsx044>.
- Ramsay IS, Yzer MC, Luciana M, Vohs KD, MacDonald AW. Affective and executive network processing associated with persuasive anti-drug messages. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2013;25(7):1136–1147. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00391.
- Vezech IS, Katzman PL, Ames DL, Falk EB, Lieberman MD. Modulating the neural bases of persuasion: why/how, gain/loss, and users/non-users. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci*. 2017;12(2):283–297. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw113>.
- Weber R, Huskey R, Mangus JM, Westcott-Baker A, Turner BO. Neural predictors of message effectiveness during counterarguing in anti-drug campaigns. *Commun Monogr*. 2015;82(1):4–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2014.971414>.
- Huskey R, Mangus JM, Turner BO, Weber R. The persuasion network is modulated by drug-use risk and predicts anti-drug message effectiveness. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci*. 2017;12(12):1902–1915. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsx126>.
- Baek EC, Scholz C, O’Donnell MB, Falk EB. The value of sharing information: a neural account of information transmission. *Psychol Sci*. 2017;28(7):851–861. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617695073>.
- Scholz C, Baek EC, O’Donnell MB, Kim HS, Cappella JN, Falk EB. A neural model of valuation and information virality. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2017;114(11):2881–2886. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1615259114>.
- Cacioppo JT, Cacioppo S, Petty RE. The neuroscience of persuasion: a review with an emphasis on issues and opportunities. *Soc Neurosci*. 2018;13(2):129–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2016.1273851>.
- Cooper N, Tompson S, Brook O’Donnell M, Emily BF. Brain activity in self- and value-related regions in response to online antismoking messages predicts behavior change. *J Media Psychol*. 2015;27(3):93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000146>.
- Falk EB, Berkman ET, Mann T, Harrison B, Lieberman MD. Predicting persuasion-induced behavior change from the brain. *J Neurosci*. 2010;30(25):8421–8424. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0063-10.2010>.
- Falk E, Scholz C. Persuasion, influence, and value: perspectives from communication and social neuroscience. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2018;69:329–356. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011821>.
- Noar SM, Benac CN, Harris MS. Does tailoring matter? Meta-analytic review of tailored print health behavior change interventions.

- Psychol Bull.* 2007;133(4):673–693. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.4.673>.
30. Morton TA, Duck JM. Communication and health beliefs: mass and interpersonal influences on perceptions of risk to self and others. *Communic Res.* 2001;28(5):602–626. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365001028005002>.
 31. Weinstein ND. The precaution adoption process. *Health Psychol.* 1988;7(4):355–386. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.7.4.355>.
 32. Cabeza R, St Jacques P. Functional neuroimaging of autobiographical memory. *Trends Cogn Sci.* 2007;11(5):219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2007.02.005>.
 33. Svoboda E, McKinnon MC, Levine B. The functional neuroanatomy of autobiographical memory: a meta-analysis. *Neuropsychologia.* 2006;44(12):2189–2208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.05.023>.
 34. Jenkins AC, Mitchell JP. Medial prefrontal cortex subserves diverse forms of self-reflection. *Soc Neurosci.* 2011;6(3):211–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2010.507948>.
 35. Murray RJ, Schaer M, Debbané M. Degrees of separation: a quantitative neuroimaging meta-analysis investigating self-specificity and shared neural activation between self- and other-reflection. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2012;36(3):1043–1059. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.12.013>.
 36. Schmitz TW, Johnson SC. Self-appraisal decisions evoke dissociated dorsal-ventral AMPFC networks. *Neuroimage.* 2006;30(3):1050–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.10.030>.
 37. Rameson LT, Satpute AB, Lieberman MD. The neural correlates of implicit and explicit self-relevant processing. *Neuroimage.* 2010;50(2):701–708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.12.098>.
 38. Seitz RJ, Franz M, Azari NP. Value judgments and self-control of action: the role of the medial frontal cortex. *Brain Res Rev.* 2009;60(2):368–378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainresrev.2009.02.003>.
 39. Bryan CJ, Yeager DS, Hinojosa CP, et al. Harnessing adolescent values to motivate healthier eating. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2016;113(39):10830–10835. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1604586113>.
 40. Darke PR, Chaiken S. The pursuit of self-interest: self-interest bias in attitude judgment and persuasion. *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 2005;89(6):864–883. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.864>.
 41. O’Keefe DJ. The relative persuasiveness of different forms of arguments-from-consequences: a review and integration. *Ann Int Commun Assoc.* 2013;36(1):109–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2013.11679128>.
 42. Scholz C, Falk EB. The neuroscience of information sharing. In: *Handbook of Communication in the Networked Age*. http://cn.asc.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/The_Neuroscience_of_Information_Sharing_revision_FINAL-1.pdf. Published 2017. Accessed August 21, 2018.
 43. Petty RE, Cacioppo JT. The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In: *Communication and Persuasion. Springer Series in Social Psychology*. New York, NY: Springer New York; 1986:1–24
 44. Bartra O, McGuire JT, Kable JW. The valuation system: a coordinate-based meta-analysis of BOLD fMRI experiments examining neural correlates of subjective value. *Neuroimage.* 2013;76:412–427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.02.063>.
 45. Levy DJ, Glimcher PW. The root of all value: a neural common currency for choice. *Curr Opin Neurobiol.* 2012;22(6):1027–1038. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2012.06.001>.
 46. Smith DV, Hayden BY, Truong T-K, Song AW, Platt ML, Huettel SA. Distinct value signals in anterior and posterior ventromedial prefrontal cortex. *J Neurosci.* 2010;30(7):2490–2495. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3319-09.2010>.
 47. Duke JC, Alexander TN, Zhao X, et al. Youth’s awareness of and reactions to The Real Cost national tobacco public education campaign. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(12):e0144827. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0144827>.
 48. Sargent JD, Tanski S, Stoolmiller M, Hanewinkel R. Using sensation seeking to target adolescents for substance use interventions. *Addiction.* 2010;105(3):506–514. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02782.x>.
 49. Stephenson MT, Hoyle RH, Palmgreen P, Slater MD. Brief measures of sensation seeking for screening and large-scale surveys. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2003;72(3):279–286. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2003.08.003>.
 50. Pennebaker JW, Chung CK, Ireland ME, Gonzales AL, Booth RJ. The development and psychometric properties of LIWC2007. <http://www.liwc.net/LIWC2007LanguageManual.pdf>. Published 2007. Accessed August 21, 2018.
 51. Craik FIM, Lockhart RS. Levels of processing: a framework for memory research. *J Verbal Learning Verbal Behav.* 1972;11(6):671–684. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(72\)80001-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(72)80001-X).
 52. Hornik RC, Lerman C. Information and misleading information about tobacco products in the “new” and “old” public communication environment: measuring its presence, estimating its effects, recommending regulatory responses. Grant funded by the Food and Drug Administration and NIH. Published 2013.
 53. Judd CM, Westfall J, Kenny DA. Treating stimuli as a random factor in social psychology: a new and comprehensive solution to a pervasive but largely ignored problem. *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 2012;103(1):54–69. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028347>.
 54. Magezi DA. Linear mixed-effects models for within-participant psychology experiments: an introductory tutorial and free, graphical user interface (LMMgui). *Front Psychol.* 2015;6:2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00002>.
 55. O’Doherty JP, Buchanan TW, Seymour B, Dolan RJ. Predictive neural coding of reward preference involves dissociable responses in human ventral midbrain and ventral striatum. *Neuron.* 2006;49(1):157–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2005.11.014>.
 56. Leech R, Sharp DJ. The role of the posterior cingulate cortex in cognition and disease. *Brain.* 2014;137(pt 1):12–32. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awt162>.
 57. Northoff G, Heinzel A, de Greck M, Bormpohl F, Dobrowolny H, Panksepp J. Self-referential processing in our brain—a meta-analysis of imaging studies on the self. *Neuroimage.* 2006;31(1):440–457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.12.002>.
 58. Scholz C, Falk EB. The neuroscience of viral ideas. In: *Handbook of Communication in the Networked Age*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 2017.
 59. Jeong M, Bae RE. The effect of campaign-generated interpersonal communication on campaign-targeted health outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Health Commun.* 2018;336(8):988–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2017.1331184>.
 60. Southwell BG, Yzer MC. The roles of interpersonal communication in mass media campaigns. *Ann Int Commun Assoc.* 2007;31(1):420–462. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2007.11679072>.
 61. Falk EB, Berkman ET, Lieberman MD. From neural responses to population behavior neural focus group predicts population-level media effects. *Psychol Sci.* 2012;23(5):439–445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611434964>.
 62. O’Donnell MB, Falk EB. Linking neuroimaging with functional linguistic analysis to understand processes of successful communication. *Commun Methods Meas.* 2015;9(1–2):55–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2014.999751>.
 63. Poldrack RA. Inferring mental states from neuroimaging data: from reverse inference to large-scale decoding. *Neuron.* 2011;72(5):692–697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.11.001>.