

UC Office of the President

UCOP Previously Published Works

Title

Youth activity spaces and daily exposure to tobacco outlets

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0z61z5h9>

Author

Lipperman-Kreda, Sharon

Publication Date

2015-07-01

Peer reviewed

Youth Activity Spaces and Daily Exposure to Tobacco Outlets

Sharon Lipperman-Kreda^{1*}

Christopher Morrison^{1,2}

Joel, W. Grube¹

Andrew, Gaidus¹

¹ Prevention Research Center, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation

180 Grand Avenue, Suite 1200, Oakland, CA 94612

² Monash University, Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine

99 Commercial Rd, Melbourne, VIC 3004, Australia

* **Correspondence to** Sharon Lipperman-Kreda, Prevention Research Center, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 180 Grand Avenue, Suite 1200, Oakland, CA 94612; email: skreda@prev.org

Word Count: 2,082 words

Key Words: Tobacco outlets; Activity space; Youth tobacco use

ABSTRACT

We explored whether exposure to tobacco outlets in youths' broader activity spaces differs from that obtained using traditional geographic measures of exposure to tobacco outlet within buffers around homes and schools. Youths completed an initial survey, daily text-prompted surveys, and carried GPS-enabled phones for one week. GPS locations were geocoded and activity spaces were constructed by joining sequential points. We calculated the number of tobacco outlets around these polylines and around homes and schools. Results suggest that activity spaces provide a more accurate measure of tobacco outlet exposures than traditional measures. Assessing tobacco outlet exposure within activity spaces may yield significant information to advance the field.

KEY WORDS: Tobacco outlets; Activity space; Youth tobacco use

1. BACKGROUND

Exposure to tobacco outlets may be an important factor in initiation and use of tobacco by adolescents. In particular, such exposure may increase access to tobacco, exposure to tobacco advertising and promotion, and exposure to others who use tobacco. All of these factors are related to youth tobacco use (Botello-Harbaum et al., 2009; Carpenter & Cook, 2008; DiFranza, Savageau, & Fletcher, 2009; Ding, 2003; Henriksen, Feighery, Wang, & Fortmann, 2004; Henriksen, Schleicher, Feighery, & Fortmann, 2010; Lipperman-Kreda, Grube, & Friend, 2012; Wakefield & Chaloupka, 2000). Controls over the number of tobacco outlets and their distance from residential areas or schools are frequently advocated approaches to reduce youth exposure and access to tobacco products and thus their tobacco use.

A modest body of cross-sectional research has investigated the association between exposure to tobacco outlets around schools or residential areas and tobacco use among youths (Chan & Leatherdale, 2011; Henriksen et al., 2008; Leatherdale & Strath, 2007; Lipperman-Kreda et al., 2014b; Lovato, Hsu, Sabiston, Hadd, & Nykiforuk, 2007; McCarthy et al., 2009; Novak, Reardon, Raudenbush, & Buka, 2006; Pokorny, Jason, & Schoeny, 2003; West et al., 2010). Results of these studies are mixed. Some studies have found no or small effects (Leatherdale & Strath, 2007; Lovato et al., 2007; McCarthy et al., 2009; Pokorny et al., 2003) and others have shown stronger associations with youth smoking (Chan & Leatherdale, 2011; Henriksen et al., 2008; Lipperman-Kreda et al., 2014b; Novak et al., 2006; West et al., 2010).

The existing research, however, has considered exposure to tobacco outlets based on defined administrative units (e.g., census tract or ZIP code) or buffers (typically 0.5 to 1 mile) surrounding youths' homes or schools. These approaches fail to capture exposure to tobacco outlets in the broader environment where youths spend their time (i.e., activity spaces). For

example, outlets that sell tobacco to youths may not be located near schools or homes, but rather located on the travel paths from schools to homes or around other important spaces such as community centers, parks, or malls. Exposure to tobacco outlets in these areas would not be captured by traditional measures (Sherman, Spencer, Preisser, Gesler, & Arcury, 2005).

Research on other health behaviors has compared individuals' exposure to risk factors in both residential and non-residential areas. For example, a study in the Seattle, WA area found statistically significant differences in exposure measures associated with dietary and physical activity (e.g., number of fast food restaurants) between home and non-home built environments (Hurvitz & Moudon, 2012). Comparing residential neighborhoods and activity spaces, another study showed greater exposure to supermarkets and farmers' market in activity spaces among women of reproductive age in North Carolina (Crawford, Jilcott Pitts, McGuirt, Keyserling, & Ammerman, 2014). Similarly, a study in Detroit identified associations between activity space environmental exposures (i.e., fast food outlets and supermarket availability) and dietary behaviors using two types of activity space measures (i.e., a standard deviation ellipse and daily path area) (Zenk et al., 2011). No associations were found between residential area exposures and these outcomes. These results suggest that considering individuals' exposures to tobacco outlets in the broader environment may improve our understanding of effects of such exposures on tobacco use. To explore this possibility, we conducted an exploratory study to assess whether exposure to tobacco outlets in youths' broader activity spaces differs from traditional geographic measures of number of tobacco outlet within 800m (i.e., \approx 0.5 mile) around homes and schools.

2. METHODS

2.1. Participants

We recruited a small convenience sample of 11 youths (ages 14-18, 4 males) in 3 California cities in the San Francisco Bay Area. Youths were recruited through flyers distributed to youth organizations. Researchers obtained parental consent for participation in the study followed by assent from the youth. Institutional review board approval was obtained before implementation of the study.

2.2. Procedures

Youths completed an initial brief survey and then met with research staff to get prepaid GPS-enabled smartphones and chargers. Youths were asked to charge the phone nightly and to always carry it with them for one week. During this week, they also completed daily text-prompted surveys. As compensation for their participation, they received \$10 for completing the initial brief survey, \$5 for each daily survey they completed, and \$15 bonus if they completed all surveys. Additionally, they received \$30 for return of the phone at the end of the study and \$10 for return of the charger.

2.3. Measures

2.3.1. *Activity spaces*

Location coordinates (latitude and longitude) and timestamps were identified every 60 seconds by GPS application, which ran automatically in the background and transmitted location data to a secure database. We geocoded these locations and constructed activity spaces by joining sequential points. Because our tobacco outlet data were limited to those within the three study cities (Lipperman-Kreda et al., 2014b), we only considered line segments that fell completely within city boundaries. We also geocoded home address and school address obtained from youths.

2.3.2. *Exposure to tobacco outlets*

Since comprehensive address lists of tobacco outlets in California are not readily available, a physical count of all tobacco outlets in 45 California cities was undertaken as part of a large-scale study (Lipperman-Kreda et al., 2014a). We obtained planning and zoning data from each of these cities. Zoning code definitions were reviewed to indicate which areas could include tobacco retailers and map books of all retail/commercial areas within the city were made. Field observations in the cities were then conducted to document the addresses of tobacco outlets.

Of the 45 cities, we recruited youths from 3 cities in the San Francisco Bay Area. We geocoded the tobacco outlet addresses and used ArcGIS, version 10.1 software (ESRI, 2011) to calculate the number of tobacco outlets using 50m and 100m buffers around activity space polylines and 800m buffers around youth homes and schools (See Figure 1). We selected 50m and 100m buffer size around activity space polylines to more precisely capture the immediate vicinity around travel routes. For comparison with activity spaces we used two approaches to calculate traditional measures of exposure (Oliver, Schuurman, & Hall, 2007). First, home and school locations were geocoded to the street address, and the 800m buffers formed by radii around these points. We calculated counts of outlets within these circular buffers. Because we had tobacco outlet locations only within the cities, we clipped buffers at city boundaries, adjusting our calculations of the land area captured in the buffer accordingly. Second, we calculated counts of outlets within 800m travel distance of homes and schools along the roadway network.

[Figure 1]

2.3.3. Tobacco use

In the initial survey, youths were first asked about lifetime use of (1) cigarettes, (2)

cigars, cigarillos, or little cigars, (3) smokeless tobacco, and (4) any other form of tobacco (other than cigarettes, cigars or smokeless tobacco). Respondents who reported ever use of any of these products were then asked about their frequency of using that product in the past 12 months on a seven-point scale (“Never” to “Every Day”). In the daily surveys, youths were asked about their use of each of these products that day (yes and no).

2.4 Data analysis

We used the weekly and daily data to describe exposure using the different measures and explore the associations between the exposure measures and youth tobacco use. For analyses using daily data, we excluded days in which youths were tracked for less than 360 minutes to better represent *daily* activity spaces. To account for missing data in the time youth spent outside the study cities, we also multiplied the number of tobacco outlets within activity spaces by the proportion of time the youth was within his/her city of residence on that day (Mean=0.87). Daily data included a total of 69 days of GPS data with an average number of 6.3 days per youth (range: 5 to all 7 days). For these 69 days, we had 60 daily surveys (87%) completed by the youths. We used Generalized Estimating Equations with repeated measures to account for the nested design (days within participants).

3. RESULTS

Six youths reported past year tobacco use on the initial survey. On average, there were 18.5 and 22.4 tobacco outlets in the 50m and 100m buffers around activity spaces, respectively, compared with an average of 3.9 outlets within 800m of both youth homes and schools using the circular buffers and an average of 2.0 and 1.6 outlets within 800m travel distance along the roadway network. The average number of outlets within 50m and 100m of activity spaces among past year tobacco users was 22 and 25.7, respectively, compared with 15 and 18.4 within

50m and 100m of activity spaces of non-users. Using traditional exposure measures of 800m buffers around youth homes and schools, these differences were less pronounced. Specifically, among past year tobacco users, the average number of outlets within 800m of homes and schools was 2.4 and 4.7, respectively, and 0.0 and 1.8 within 800m travel distance. The average number was 5.7 and 3.0 within 800m circular buffers and 4.4 and 1.4 within 800m travel distance of homes and schools among non-users.

Three of the six past year tobacco using youths reported tobacco use on the daily surveys and two additional youths who did not report yearly use on the initial survey reported using tobacco on the daily surveys. We used Generalized Estimating Equations with repeated measures to examine the relationship between daily tobacco use and daily exposure to tobacco outlets in activity spaces. We found significant positive associations between daily tobacco use and exposure to tobacco outlets in the 50m (Wald Chi-Square=3.9, $p \leq .05$) and 100m activity spaces (Wald Chi-Square=4.4, $p \leq .05$). On average, there were 6.0 and 7.6 tobacco outlets within 50m and 100m activity spaces on days when youths reported tobacco use compared with 3.4 and 4.2 outlets, respectively, on days when no tobacco use was reported.

4. DISCUSSION

Previous research investigating the association between environmental exposure to tobacco outlets and youth tobacco use has focused on tobacco outlets around adolescents' schools or homes. However, during adolescence, youths experience increased mobility, increased autonomy, and increased involvement in extended social networks that often extend beyond school or home neighborhoods (Browning & Soller, 2014; Wrzus, Hanel, Wagner, & Neyer, 2013). The existing research, then, may not fully account for where a youth spends his/her daily life and the exposures to tobacco outlets found in those areas. Results of our exploratory study

suggest that traditional measures of exposure to tobacco outlets around homes and schools may underestimate youth exposure to tobacco outlets in their environment.

Results also provide preliminary evidence of an association between exposure to tobacco outlets in activity spaces and youth tobacco use. Specifically, we found a greater exposure to tobacco outlets in the activity spaces on days when tobacco using youths reported tobacco use compared with days when they did not. As discussed by Chaix et al. (2013), such associations may result from the fact that youths visited outlets to make tobacco purchases (i.e., “selective daily mobility”). Even so, although a youth will probably visit only a single store to purchase tobacco, the difference in exposure between days when youths reported tobacco use and those when they did not report tobacco use was substantially greater than a single outlet. Since we had no data about places specifically visited to buy tobacco, we cannot further examine this possible explanation. This issue should be considered in future, more comprehensive, research

Activity spaces are defined as all of the locations an individual personally experiences as a result of his or her daily activities (Miller, 1991). They consist of the locations that an individual has visited and the routes and areas they have travelled through (Schönfelder & Axhausen, 2003). Research shows that the type of locations in which youths spend their time are varied and geographically dispersed, and are not captured by traditional geographical boundaries such as census tract, home neighborhood, or block group (Mason, Cheung, & Walker, 2004; Mason & Mennis, 2010). In particular, research suggests that youth activity spaces are larger and encompass more and different locations than spaces captured by home or school buffers. Moreover, since tobacco outlets are not spatially distributed equally (Mayers, Wiggins, Fulghum, & Peterson, 2012; Rodriguez, Carlos, Adachi-Mejia, Berke, & Sargent, 2013; Schneider, Reid, Peterson, Lowe, & Hughey, 2005; Yu, Peterson, Sheffer, Reid, & Schnieder, 2010), exposure to

tobacco outlets may change across youth activity spaces. Activity spaces may then provide a better measure of tobacco outlet exposures than traditional measures, and therefore assessing activity spaces could yield significant information to advance the field.

Highlights

- ▶ Results suggest that traditional geographic measures of exposure to tobacco outlets around homes and schools misrepresent youth exposure to tobacco outlets in their environment.
- ▶ Activity spaces may provide a better measure of tobacco outlet exposures than traditional measures.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by funds provided by the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE). The opinions expressed in this article are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily Represent those of PIRE.

Competing Interests

None of the authors have a conflict of interest

REFERENCES

- Botello-Harbaum, M. T., Haynie, D. L., Iannotti, R. J., Wang, J., Gase, L., & Simons-Morton, B. (2009). Tobacco control policy and adolescent cigarette smoking status in the United States. *Nicotine Tob Res, 11*(7), 875-885. doi: 10.1093/ntr/ntp081
- Browning, C. R., & Soller, B. (2014). Moving Beyond Neighborhood: Activity Spaces and Ecological Networks As Contexts for Youth Development. *Cityscape, 16*(1), 165-196.
- Carpenter, C., & Cook, P. J. (2008). Cigarette taxes and youth smoking: new evidence from national, state, and local Youth Risk Behavior Surveys. *J Health Econ, 27*(2), 287-299. doi: 10.1016/j.jhealeco.2007.05.008
- Chaix, B., Meline, J., Duncan, S., Merrien, C., Karusisi, N., Perchoux, C., . . . Kestens, Y. (2013). GPS tracking in neighborhood and health studies: a step forward for environmental exposure assessment, a step backward for causal inference? *Health Place, 21*, 46-51. doi: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2013.01.003
- Chan, W. C., & Leatherdale, S. T. (2011). Tobacco retailer density surrounding schools and youth smoking behaviour: a multi-level analysis. *Tob Induc Dis, 9*(1), 9. doi: 10.1186/1617-9625-9-9
- Crawford, T. W., Jilcott Pitts, S. B., McGuirt, J. T., Keyserling, T. C., & Ammerman, A. S. (2014). Conceptualizing and comparing neighborhood and activity space measures for food environment research. *Health Place, 30*, 215-225. doi: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2014.09.007
- DiFranza, J. R., Savageau, J. A., & Fletcher, K. E. (2009). Enforcement of underage sales laws as a predictor of daily smoking among adolescents: a national study. *BMC Public Health, 9*, 107. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-9-107

Ding, A. (2003). Youth are more sensitive to price changes in cigarettes than adults. *Yale J Biol Med*, 76(3), 115-124.

ESRI. (2011). *ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10.1*. Redlands, CA: Environmental Systems Research Institute.

Henriksen, L., Feighery, E. C., Schleicher, N. C., Cowling, D. W., Kline, R. S., & Fortmann, S. P. (2008). Is adolescent smoking related to the density and proximity of tobacco outlets and retail cigarette advertising near schools? *Prev Med*, 47(2), 210-214. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2008.04.008

Henriksen, L., Feighery, E. C., Wang, Y., & Fortmann, S. P. (2004). Association of retail tobacco marketing with adolescent smoking. *Am J Public Health*, 94(12), 2081-2083.

Henriksen, L., Schleicher, N. C., Feighery, E. C., & Fortmann, S. P. (2010). A longitudinal study of exposure to retail cigarette advertising and smoking initiation. *Pediatrics*, 126(2), 232-238. doi: 10.1542/peds.2009-3021

Hurvitz, P. M., & Moudon, A. V. (2012). Home versus nonhome neighborhood: quantifying differences in exposure to the built environment. *Am J Prev Med*, 42(4), 411-417. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2011.11.015

Leatherdale, S. T., & Strath, J. M. (2007). Tobacco retailer density surrounding schools and cigarette access behaviors among underage smoking students. *Ann Behav Med*, 33(1), 105-111. doi: 10.1207/s15324796abm3301_12

Lipperman-Kreda, S., Grube, J. W., & Friend, K. B. (2012). Local tobacco policy and tobacco outlet density: associations with youth smoking. *J Adolesc Health*, 50(6), 547-552. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2011.08.015

- Lipperman-Kreda, S., Grube, J. W., & Friend, K. B. (2014). Contextual and community factors associated with youth access to cigarettes through commercial sources. *Tob Control*, 23(1), 39-44. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050473
- Lipperman-Kreda, S., Mair, C., Grube, J. W., Friend, K. B., Jackson, P., & Watson, D. (2014). Density and proximity of tobacco outlets to homes and schools: relations with youth cigarette smoking. *Prev Sci*, 15(5), 738-744. doi: 10.1007/s11121-013-0442-2
- Lovato, C. Y., Hsu, H. C., Sabiston, C. M., Hadd, V., & Nykiforuk, C. I. (2007). Tobacco Point-of-Purchase marketing in school neighbourhoods and school smoking prevalence: a descriptive study. *Can J Public Health*, 98(4), 265-270.
- Mason, M. J., Cheung, I., & Walker, L. (2004). Substance use, social networks, and the geography of urban adolescents. *Subst Use Misuse*, 39(10-12), 1751-1777.
- Mason, M. J., & Mennis, J. (2010). An exploratory study of the effects of neighborhood characteristics on adolescent substance use. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 18(1), 33-50. doi: 10.3109/16066350903019897
- Mayers, R. S., Wiggins, L. L., Fulghum, F. H., & Peterson, N. A. (2012). Tobacco outlet density and demographics: a geographically weighted regression analysis. *Prev Sci*, 13(5), 462-471. doi: 10.1007/s11121-011-0273-y
- McCarthy, W. J., Mistry, R., Lu, Y., Patel, M., Zheng, H., & Dietsch, B. (2009). Density of tobacco retailers near schools: effects on tobacco use among students. *Am J Public Health*, 99(11), 2006-2013. doi: 10.2105/ajph.2008.145128
- Miller, H. J. (1991). Modelling accessibility using space-time prism concepts within geographical information systems. *International Journal of Geographical Information Systems*, 5(3), 287-301. doi: 10.1080/02693799108927856

- Novak, S. P., Reardon, S. F., Raudenbush, S. W., & Buka, S. L. (2006). Retail tobacco outlet density and youth cigarette smoking: a propensity-modeling approach. *Am J Public Health, 96*(4), 670-676. doi: 10.2105/ajph.2004.061622
- Oliver, L.N., Schuurman, N., & Hall, A.W. (2007). Comparing circular and network buffers to examine the influence of land use on walking for leisure and errands. *Int J Health Geogr, 6*(41), 41-51. doi:10.1186/1476-072X-6-41
- Pokorny, S. B., Jason, L. A., & Schoeny, M. E. (2003). The relation of retail tobacco availability to initiation and continued smoking. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol, 32*(2), 193-204. doi: 10.1207/s15374424jccp3202_4
- Rodriguez, D., Carlos, H. A., Adachi-Mejia, A. M., Berke, E. M., & Sargent, J. D. (2013). Predictors of tobacco outlet density nationwide: a geographic analysis. *Tob Control, 22*(5), 349-355. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2011-050120
- Schneider, J. E., Reid, R. J., Peterson, N. A., Lowe, J. B., & Hughey, J. (2005). Tobacco outlet density and demographics at the tract level of analysis in Iowa: implications for environmentally based prevention initiatives. *Prev Sci, 6*(4), 319-325. doi: 10.1007/s11121-005-0016-z
- Schönfelder, S., & Axhausen, K. W. (2003). Activity spaces: measures of social exclusion? *Transport Policy, 10*(4), 273-286. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2003.07.002>
- Sherman, J. E., Spencer, J., Preisser, J. S., Gesler, W. M., & Arcury, T. A. (2005). A suite of methods for representing activity space in a healthcare accessibility study. *Int J Health Geogr, 4*, 24. doi: 10.1186/1476-072x-4-24
- Wakefield, M., & Chaloupka, F. (2000). Effectiveness of comprehensive tobacco control programmes in reducing teenage smoking in the USA. *Tob Control, 9*(2), 177-186.

- West, J. H., Blumberg, E. J., Kelley, N. J., Hill, L., Sipan, C. L., Schmitz, K. E., . . . Hovell, M. F. (2010). Does proximity to retailers influence alcohol and tobacco use among Latino adolescents? *J Immigr Minor Health, 12*(5), 626-633. doi: 10.1007/s10903-009-9303-2
- Wrzus, C., Hanel, M., Wagner, J., & Neyer, F. J. (2013). Social network changes and life events across the life span: a meta-analysis. *Psychol Bull, 139*(1), 53-80. doi: 10.1037/a0028601
- Yu, D., Peterson, N. A., Sheffer, M. A., Reid, R. J., & Schnieder, J. E. (2010). Tobacco outlet density and demographics: analysing the relationships with a spatial regression approach. *Public Health, 124*(7), 412-416. doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2010.03.024
- Zenk, S. N., Schulz, A. J., Matthews, S. A., Odoms-Young, A., Wilbur, J., Wegrzyn, L., . . . Stokes, C. (2011). Activity space environment and dietary and physical activity behaviors: a pilot study. *Health Place, 17*(5), 1150-1161. doi: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2011.05.001

Figure 1. An adolescent's activity space and exposure to tobacco outlets within activity space and around school and home

