## Community Mobilization When Coordinated with Additional Interventions

### Summary Evidence Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Intervention and comparison elements</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Effect measure</th>
<th>Reported baseline</th>
<th>Reported effect</th>
<th>Value used in summary</th>
<th>Follow-up time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Author (Year):** Altman et al. (1991) | **Location:** 7 towns in Santa Clara County, CA  
**Intervention:** Community mobilization plus retailer education  
**Sample Size:** N = 442 stores and vending machines | **Study Population:** Retailers selling tobacco products | Proportion of retailers selling tobacco on youth test purchase attempts | 74% | 59% | −18 pct points  
95% CI (−4, −31) | 12 mo |
| **Study Period:** 1988 | **Design Suitability:** Moderate  
**Design:** Time series  
**Quality of Execution:** Fair (3 limitations)  
**Evaluation Setting:** Community-wide | **Location:** Monterey County, CA  
**Intervention:** Community mobilization plus retailer education  
**Sample Size:** N = 1274 (median [eligible] students per grade)  
**Comparison:** Usual care | 1) Student self-reported tobacco use in the previous 30 days (mail survey)  
**Study Population:** A: Students in grades 7, 9, and 11 | I = 13% C = 15%  
I = 18% C = 15%  
I = 24% C = 10% | I = 25% C = 27%  
I = 17% C = 19%  
I = 27% C = 25% | 0 pct points  
−5 pct points  
−2 pct points (11th gr post only comp) | 34 mo |
| **Study Period:** 1991–1994 | **Design Suitability:** Greatest  
**Design:** Group randomized trial  
**Quality of Execution:** Fair (3 limitations)  
**Evaluation Setting:** Community-wide | **Location:** Monterey County, CA  
**Intervention:** Community mobilization plus retailer education  
**Sample Size:** N = NR  
**Comparison:** Usual care | 2) Student self-reported purchase of tobacco products in previous 3 mo (mail survey)  
**Study Population:** B: Retailers selling tobacco products | I = 10.1% C = 10.8%  
I = 18.6% C = 8.7%  
I = 19% C = 8.8% | I = 15% C = 19.5%  
I = 7.6% C = 16%  
I = 29.4% C = 23% | −3.8 pct points  
−3.1 pct points  
−4.1 pct points (11th gr post only comp) | 34 mo |
| | | | 3) Proportion of retailers selling | I = 75% C = 64% | I = 0% C = 39% | | |
| **Author (Year):** Biglan et al. (2000; 1995; 1996) | **Location:** 16 communities in Oregon  
**Intervention:** Community mobilization plus retailer education plus school-based education  
**Comparison:** School-based education only  
**Study Population and Sample Size:**  
A: Rural communities in OR  
N = 16  
B: 7th and 9th grade students (~2100 students in each grade per annual survey)  
**Study Period:** 1991–1995  
**Design Suitability:** Greatest  
**Design:** Group randomized trial  
**Quality of Execution:** Fair (3 limitations)  
**Evaluation Setting:** Community-wide  
**Note:** Biglan 1995 was time series comparison (moderate suitability)  
**tobacco on youth test purchase attempts** | **p <0.001** | **–50 pct points** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Student self-reported tobacco use measured as a weekly smoking index</strong></td>
<td>I = 10.5% C = 8.0%</td>
<td>I = 12.0% C = 3.9%</td>
<td>−3.8 pct points 95% CI (0.2, 7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) Student self-reported awareness of efforts to prevent illegal sales</strong></td>
<td>NR (negative slope)</td>
<td>NR (positive slope)</td>
<td>p = 0.0026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **3) Parent’s perceived community support for tobacco access restrictions** | NR | NR | p = 0.006 (yr 4)  
p = NS (yr 5) |  |
| **Biglan 1995:**  
**4) Proportion of retailers willing to sell tobacco products on youth test purchase attempts** | 62% | 24% | −38 pct points 95% CI (8, 50) |  |

| **Author (Year):** Chapman et al. (1994) | **Location:** 6 suburbs in Sydney, Australia  
**Intervention:** Community mobilization plus retailer education  
**Comparison:** Community mobilization  
**Study Population and Sample Size:** Retailers selling tobacco products (note: study group restricted to subset who sold cigarettes to minors at BL)  
**Sample Siz:** N = 99  
I: n = 50  
C: n = 49  
**Study Period:** 1992–1993  
**Design Suitability:** Greatest  
**Design:** Other design with a concurrent comparison group  
**Quality of Execution:**  
**Proportion of retailers selling cigarettes on youth test purchase attempts**  
Note: Test minors 12–13 yrs of age  
**χ² = 8.14 (1df)**  
p = 0.004 | **p = 0.038** | **−29 pct points 95% CI (8, 50)** | 3 mo |
<p>| Evaluation Setting: Community-wide | Location: 4 communities in northern California | Study Population and Sample Size: A: Suburban communities in CA N = 4 B: Tobacco-selling retailers N = 104 in F/U sample | Proportion of retailers selling tobacco on youth test purchase attempts A: mobilization plus education B: mobilization plus education plus active enforcement Note: Active enforcement was added to the program following the initial intervention evaluation | 77% | 65% | –12 pct points 95% CI (1, –24) p &gt;0.05 (NS) | Fair (4 limitations) | 4 mo |
| Evaluation Setting: Community-wide | Location: 4 communities in northern California | Study Population and Sample Size: A: Suburban communities in CA N = 4 B: Tobacco-selling retailers N = 104 in F/U sample | Proportion of retailers selling tobacco on youth test purchase attempts A: mobilization plus education B: mobilization plus education plus active enforcement Note: Active enforcement was added to the program following the initial intervention evaluation | 75% | 35% | –40 pct points, 95% CI (–26, –55) p &lt;0.0001 | Fair (3 limitations) | 2 yrs |
| Location: 14 rural communities in Minnesota | Study Population: A: communities in MN | Proportion of youth test purchase attempts that were successful | | I = 21.5% C = 20% | I = 24.9% C = 29% | –6.7 pct points 95% CI (–15, +1.5) | Fair (3 limitations) | 32 mo |
| Intervention: Community mobilization plus city ordinances plus enforcement | Sample Size: N = 14 (randomized to condition) B: Students in grades 8–10 N = 6014 at BL N = 6269 at F/U | Proportion of youth test purchase attempts that were successful | | I = (M) 28.5% (W) 17.3% C = (M) 24% (W) 18% | I = (M) 19.5%; (W) 14.3% C = (M) 27.2% (W) 20.5% | Men: –12.2 pct pts 95% CI (–21.4, –3.0) Women: –5.5 pct pt 95% CI (–15, +3.8) | Fair (3 limitations) | 32 mo |
| Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations) | Evaluation Setting: Community-wide | Proportion of youth test purchase attempts that were successful | | I = 79.8% C = 80.1% | I = 77.2% C = 83.9% | –6.4 pct points 95% CI (–13.6, –0.1) | Fair (3 limitations) | 32 mo |
| Design: Group randomized trial | Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations) | Proportion of youth test purchase attempts that were successful | | I = 38.8% C = 41.9% | I = 4.9% C = 12.5% | –4.5 pct points 95% CI (–18.7, 9.7) | Fair (3 limitations) | 32 mo |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Study Population and Study Sample</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Study Population</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Study Population and Sample Size</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Proportion of retailers selling tobacco on youth test purchase attempts</th>
<th>Proportion of retailers selling cigarettes on youth test purchase attempts by level of enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason et al. (1996a)</td>
<td>Woodbridge, IL</td>
<td>City ordinance plus community mobilization plus retailer education plus enforcement</td>
<td>B: 7–8th grade students in one local school</td>
<td>Before-and-after</td>
<td>A: Tobacco-selling retailers N = 19–30</td>
<td>B: 680 at BL N = 639 at F/U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16% 79%</td>
<td>Proportion of retailers selling tobacco on youth test purchase attempts 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junck et al. (1997)</td>
<td>Manley, Australia</td>
<td>Community mobilization plus retailer education</td>
<td>Before-and-after</td>
<td>All tobacco-selling retailers in Manley</td>
<td>N = 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Proportion of retailers selling cigarettes on youth test purchase attempts by level of enforcement 14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildey et al. (1995)</td>
<td>6 communities in San Diego, CA</td>
<td>Community mobilization plus retailer education</td>
<td>Community mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Communities N = 6</td>
<td>B: Tobacco-selling retailers in study communities N = 292 at BL</td>
<td>I = 69.9% C = 65%</td>
<td>I = 32%  p &lt;0.001 C = 56%</td>
<td>-28.9 pct points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Execution:</td>
<td>Fair (3 limitations)</td>
<td>N = 236 at F/U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Execution:</td>
<td>Community-wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a This is the value used to summarize the evidence and to develop the recommendation. We converted measurements of “retailers refusing to sell” to measurements of “retailers willing to sell” for consistency.

**Abbreviations**

BL, baseline
C, control or comparison group
CI, confidence interval
cigs, cigarettes
comp, comparison
edu, education
F/U, follow-up
gr, grade
I or int, intervention
M, men
max, maximum

min, minimum
mo, month(s)
NR, not reported
NS, not significant
OR, odds ratio
ovrl btwn grp diff, overall between group difference
pct points, percentage points
pop, populations
W, women
yrs, years