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## I ntroduction

Tobacco use is the leading cause of preventable death and disease in Texas and the U.S. In 2015, over 23,000 deaths were directly related to chronic conditions caused by tobacco use. ${ }^{1}$ According to the 2015 Texas Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), $15.2 \%$ of Texas adults reported current use of cigarettes and 4.0\% reported current smokeless tobacco use. Among current smokers, $60 \%$ made a quit attempt in the past 12 months. ${ }^{2}$

The Tobacco Prevention and Control Branch (TPCB) within the Health Promotion and Chronic Disease Prevention Section (HPCDPS) at the Texas Department of State Health Services (DSHS) has partnered with Optum to provide tobacco cessation services to Texans through the Texas Tobacco Quit Line (TTQL).

## What is the Texas Tobacco Quit Line?

The TTQL offers free and confidential tobacco cessation counseling services and support to Texas residents 12 years of age and older. The TTQL also provides cessation educational materials and information to healthcare providers, proxies and the general public. ${ }^{3}$

Tobacco users have the option of enrolling in counselling services via phone or web. Callers enrolled via phone services receive tailored multiple call counseling sessions with an assigned Quit Coach. These callers are eligible for two weeks of free nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) if they are uninsured, pregnant (NRT given with physician permission), referred by a healthcare provider, reside in a DSHS funded Tobacco Prevention and Control Coalition (TPCC) county (Angelina, Brazos, Ellis, Galveston, Hidalgo, Lamar, Nacogdoches, Nueces, Red River, Rusk, Waller or Wichita county), a Texas Health and Human Services (HHS) employee and/or report a tobacco-related chronic condition or mental health condition. They also gain access to self-help resources and information about support programs in their community. Callers enrolled in webbased services gain access to a Web Coach, self-help resources and an online community of other tobacco users enrolled in the program. ${ }^{3}$

## How are callers registered or enrolled in TTQL services?

Individuals become registered callers by calling a toll-free Quit Line phone number or being referred by a healthcare provider. Healthcare providers, proxies and members of the general public who contact the TTQL for general information and materials are also considered registered callers.

Registered callers who report tobacco use and enroll in multiple call cessation counseling are considered enrolled callers.

Figure 1. Flow chart explaining the flow of callers through TTQL services.


## Definition of Terms

The following terms will be used throughout the report:

- Pre-registration - period when participants, who are referred by healthcare providers, are contacted to determine if they will accept or decline TTQL services.
- Registered Caller - every unique individual who has incoming and/or outgoing phone contact with the TTQL service provider, Optum. This includes tobacco users, proxies, healthcare providers and members of the general public.
- Enrolled Caller - every unique caller, who reports tobacco use, and enrolls in multiple call tobacco cessation counseling. Proxies, healthcare providers and the general public are not enrolled in counseling services, but provided with tobacco cessation information and materials.
- Call - any incoming and/or outgoing phone contact between the TTQL service provider, Optum, and registered callers. Each unique call is indentified by the call date, call number and call type (ie. registration, assesment, etc.). Unique callers
may have multiple entries in the datasets based on the number of times they have contacted or been contacted by the TTQL.
- Entry Method - the method callers use to enter and receive TTQL services. Callers can enter TTQL through incoming/outgoing phone calls, web registration and healthcare provider referrals.
- Referral Method - the method used by healthcare providers to refer tobacco users to the TTQL.


## Methodology

This report includes de-identified, aggregate data on incoming and outgoing calls to the TTQL. The data is collected by the Tobacco Prevention and Control Branch (TPCB) contractor, Optum. Optum provides the TPCB with the following monthly datasets:

- Quit Line Experience Extract (QEE) ${ }^{4}$ - this dataset includes data from each incoming and outgoing call for all registered callers. Callers are able to make as many calls to the TTQL as needed. Each individual call is captured as a separate observation.
- Quit Line Experience Extract (QEE) Addendum ${ }^{5}$ - this dataset is an addition to the QEE. It includes data on chronic, mental health and substance abuse conditions for each caller identified in the QEE.
- Referral Experience Extract (REE) ${ }^{\mathbf{6}}$ - this dataset includes data on participants who were referred to the TTQL by a healthcare provider. It includes data on all referrals during the pre-registration period.

Monthly QEE, QEE Addendum and REE datasets, from January 2016 to December 2016, were cleaned and combined to create annual datasets. Data from the QEE Addendum was merged with the annual QEE dataset using participant ID and call date. All data cleaning and analysis was performed using SAS 9.4.

## Key Findings

In 2016,

- The TTQL reached its highest number of calls in May $(16,760)$.
- Over $90 \%$ of registered callers were tobacco users. The number of callers enrolled in multiple call counseling peaked in the month of February $(2,447)$.
- Over $83 \%$ of those tobacco users enrolled in multiple call cessation counseling.
- Nearly half of enrolled callers reported having a chronic or mental health/substance abuse condition ( $45.0 \%$ and $46.9 \%$, respectively).
- Over $76 \%$ of enrolled callers entered TTQL through phone calls in English.
- Almost 45\% of enrolled callers heard about TTQL services from television commercials.
- Over $73 \%$ of enrolled callers received a recommendation to use patch NRT to aid in tobacco cessation. There were 5,590 shipments of patch NRT sent to enrolled callers. Each shipment contained a two week supply.
- Over $80 \%$ of enrolled callers, who were recommended NRT, received at least one shipment of NRT.
- There were 10,086 referrals made by healthcare professionals. Among those referred, 2,749 accepted services and 1,296 declined services. All other referrals were made to pre-registrants who had not been reached or contacted.
- Among pre-registrants who were reached, about $83 \%$ were referred via an electronic referral system and $65 \%$ were referred via fax accepted services.


## Quit Line Experience Extract (QEE)

There were 125,232 TTQL calls in 2016, excluding those identified as hang-up, prank, or wrong number.

Figure 2. Number of Calls by Month, 2016


## Figure 2 Interpretation:

Denominator: Total number of calls $(125,232)$.
Texas tobacco media campaigns occurred in August. The CDC "Tips from Former Smokers" media campaign launched nationally in January 2016 and ran until J une 2016. TTQL calls peaked in May 2016, totaling over 16,000 calls. The number of calls was also elevated in March ( 12,950 calls), April ( 14,760 calls), June ( 14,188 calls) and July (12,978 calls).

Table 1. Number and Percent of Registered Callers by Caller Type, 2016

| Caller Type | Number <br> of Callers | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 17,688 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |
| Tobacco User | 16,773 | 94.8 |
| Proxy | 180 | 1.0 |
| Provider | 135 | 0.8 |
| General Public | 600 | 3.4 |

## Table 1 Interpretation:

Denominator: Total number of registered callers $(17,688)$.
In 2016, there were 17,688 registered callers. Nearly $95 \%$ of registered callers selfidentified as tobacco users. Less than $1 \%$ were healthcare providers and $3.4 \%$ were members of the general public.

Table 2. Number and Percent of Registered Callers by Month, 2016

| Month | Number <br> of Callers | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 17,688 | 100.0 |
|  | 1,255 | 7.1 |
| January | 2,447 | 13.8 |
| February | 2,342 | 13.2 |
| March | 2,149 | 12.2 |
| April | 2,375 | 13.4 |
| May | 1,621 | 9.2 |
| June | 1,460 | 8.3 |
| July | 920 | 5.2 |
| August | 873 | 4.9 |
| September | 819 | 4.6 |
| October | 760 | 4.3 |
| November | 667 | 3.8 |
| December |  |  |

## Table 2 Interpretation:

Denominator: Total number of registered callers $(17,688)$.
The number of registered callers differed by month. Registration peaked in February with 2,447 callers. The number of registered callers was also elevated from March to May ( 2,342 callers, 2,149 callers and 2,375 callers, respectively).

Figure 3. Number of Registered Callers, Who Report Tobacco Use, by Enrollment Status, 2016


Figure 3 Interpretation:
Denominator: Total number of registered callers who report tobacco use $(16,773)$.

Nearly 14,000 registered callers, who reported tobacco use, enrolled in multiple call counseling. The number of tobacco users who enrolled in counseling greatly exceeded that of those who did not enroll for every month during the year 2016.

Table 3. Number and Percent of Registered Callers by Demographic Characteristics and Enrollment Status, 2016

| Demographic Characteristics | Enrolled |  | Did Not Enroll |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Callers | Percent | Number of Callers | Percent |
| Total* | 13,957 | 83.2 | 2,816 | 16.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 5,497 | 84.8 | 982 | 15.2 |
| Female | 8,455 | 86.0 | 1,382 | 14.1 |
| Age (years) |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 29 | 1,546 | 87.1 | 229 | 12.9 |
| 30 to 44 | 3,406 | 86.8 | 518 | 13.2 |
| 45 to 64 | 7,448 | 86.2 | 1,197 | 13.9 |
| 65 and older | 1,538 | 86.7 | 236 | 13.3 |
| Race |  |  |  |  |
| White | 7,983 | 90.6 | 824 | 9.4 |
| Black | 3,242 | 88.9 | 407 | 11.2 |
| Other | 1,926 | 92.6 | 154 | 7.4 |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 2,637 | 92.6 | 209 | 7.4 |
| Not Hispanic | 10,585 | 89.9 | 1,184 | 10.1 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |
| Less than Grade 9 | 816 | 93.2 | 60 | 6.9 |
| Some High School | 2,270 | 91.3 | 217 | 8.7 |
| GED | 1,164 | 89.3 | 140 | 10.7 |
| High School Graduate | 3,332 | 90.3 | 357 | 9.7 |
| Some College | 3,159 | 90.6 | 329 | 9.4 |
| College Graduate | 1,785 | 91.1 | 175 | 8.9 |
| Some Technical/Trade School | 170 | 90.0 | 19 | 10.1 |
| Technical/Trade School Graduate | 397 | 90.0 | 44 | 10.0 |
| Insurance |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Insurance | 2,725 | 86.8 | 415 | 13.2 |
| Medicaid | 2,856 | 85.5 | 485 | 14.5 |
| Medicare | 2,625 | 88.5 | 342 | 11.5 |
| Uninsured | 5,263 | 88.1 | 708 | 11.9 |
| Veteran's Administration | 117 | 92.1 | 10 | 7.9 |
| Language |  |  |  |  |
| English | 12,958 | 82.8 | 2,685 | 17.2 |
| Spanish | 954 | 91.5 | 89 | 8.5 |
| Other | 45 | 51.7 | 42 | 48.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Pregnant | 116 | 93.6 | 8 | 6.5 |
| Planning to Become Pregnant | 97 | 93.3 | 7 | 6.7 |
| Currently Breastfeeding | 21 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Not Pregnant | 3,358 | 83.8 | 648 | 16.2 |
| Chronic Condition |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 6,168 | 88.8 | 777 | 11.2 |
| No | 7,550 | 79.4 | 1,956 | 20.6 |
| Mental Health or Substance Abuse Disorder |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 6,552 | 90.7 | 669 | 9.3 |
| No | 7,405 | 77.5 | 2,147 | 22.5 |

*Total includes participants who may have some demographic data missing. Each category may not add up to the total for that group. Missing values were excluded for calculating percentages.
$\wedge^{\wedge}$ Data collected for female callers under age 50.

## Table 3 Interpretations:

Denominator: Total number of registered callers who report tobacco use $(16,773)$.
About 83\% of registered callers, who report tobacco use, enrolled in multiple call tobacco cessation counseling. There were no large differences in the percentage of callers enrolled in multiple call counseling by gender, race/ethnicity, and age. The percentage of enrolled callers, who reported a chronic condition, was nearly $10 \%$ higher than those who did not have a chronic condition. The percentage of enrolled callers, who reported a mental health/substance abuse condition, was over $13 \%$ higher than those who did not have a mental health/substance abuse condition. About $93 \%$ of pregnant callers and callers planning to become pregnant enrolled in multiple call counseling. All callers who reported current breastfeeding enrolled in multiple call counseling.

## Table 4. Number and Percent of Enrolled Callers by Entry Method, 2016

| Entry Method | Number of <br> Callers | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 13,957 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |
| Phone English | 10,644 | 76.3 |
| Fax Referral | 1,590 | 11.4 |
| Phone Re-enrollment* | 628 | 4.5 |
| Phone Spanish | 535 | 3.8 |
| Electronic Referral | 463 | 3.3 |
| Re-enrollment^ | 30 | 0.2 |
| Other | 27 | 0.2 |
| Web: Program Lookup Tool | 26 | 0.2 |
| Voicemail | 14 | 0.1 |

* Participants who complete all calls in the multiple call counseling program, but re-enroll for additional support
^Participants who opt to re-enroll in services after completing the seven-month follow-up survey


## Table 4 Interpretations:

Denominator: Total number of callers enrolled in multiple call counseling $(13,957)$.
Over 76\% of enrolled callers entered TTQL services through phone calls in English. About $11 \%$ were referred by a healthcare provider using a fax referral system and about $3 \%$ were electronically referred.

Table 5. Number and Percent of Enrolled Callers by How They Heard About the TTQL, 2016

| How Caller Heard About TTQL | Number <br> of Callers | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 13,957 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |
| TV/Commercial | 2,255 | 44.8 |
| Health Professional | 1,345 | 20.3 |
| Family/Friend | 704 | 9.6 |
| Other | 628 | 5.0 |
| Outbound Re-Enrollment Offer | 534 | 4.5 |
| Website | 294 | 3.8 |
| Health Department | 257 | 2.1 |
| Community Organization | 253 | 1.8 |
| Radio | 194 | 1.8 |
| Health Insurance | 192 | 1.4 |
| Brochure/Newsletter/Flyer | 123 | 1.4 |
| Employer/Worksite | 103 | 0.9 |
| Does Not Remember | 52 | 0.7 |
| Outdoor Ad | 46 | 0.4 |
| TV/News | 45 | 0.3 |
| Not Collected | 30 | 0.3 |
| Re-enrollment Offer | 23 | 0.2 |
| Newspaper/Magazine | 17 | 0.2 |
| CVS/pharmacy | 12 | 0.1 |
| Refused | 8 | 0.1 |
| Cigarette Pack | 3 | 0.0 |
| QUITNOW Mobile App |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Table 5 Interpretations:

Denominator: Total number of callers enrolled in multiple call counseling $(13,957)$.
Almost 45\% of enrolled callers heard about the program from television ads and commercials. About 1 in 5 enrolled callers (20.3\%) were introduced to the program by a health professional.

Table 6. Number and Percent of Enrolled Callers, Who Received a NRT Recommendation by the Type of NRT Recommended, 2016

| NRT Type | Number <br> of Callers | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 8,568 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |
| Patch | 6,291 | 73.4 |
| Gum | 1,143 | 13.3 |
| Lozenge | 963 | 11.2 |
| Patch Gum | 70 | 0.8 |
| Patch Lozenge | 100 | 1.2 |
| Gum Lozenge | 1 | 0.0 |

## Table 6 Interpretations:

Denominator: Total number of callers enrolled in multiple call counseling, who received a NRT recommendation during a completed intervention/assessment call $(8,568)$.

Note: Participants enrolled in multiple call counseling are asked a series of questions during their assessment call. Based on their responses to these questions, participants are recommended a type of NRT to be used. Enrolled callers who are not eligible for receiving NRT by the TTQL are not given a recommendation.

Out of the total 13,957 enrolled callers (mentioned in Table 3), 8,568 callers received a NRT recommendation during their assessment call. Over $73 \%$ of enrolled callers were recommended nicotine patches to aid in tobacco cessation. Only about 2\% of enrolled callers were recommended combination therapy (use of two or more types of NRT).

Table 7. Number and Percent of NRT Shipments Made to Enrolled Callers by NRT Type, 2016

| NRT Type | Number of <br> Shipments | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 7,792 | 100.0 |
| Patch | 5,590 | 71.7 |
| Gum | 1,118 | 14.3 |
| Lozenge | 1,084 | 13.9 |

Note: Data presented in this table does not count the unique number of enrolled callers who received NRT. Some enrolled callers may have received more than one shipment.
Note: This table displays the number of shipments made to enrolled callers. Some participants may have received more than one shipment.

## Table 7 Interpretations:

Denominator: Total number of NRT shipments made to enrolled callers $(7,792)$.

There were 7,792 shipments of NRT made to enrolled callers. Over $71 \%$ of NRT shipped to enrolled callers were nicotine patches.

Table 8. Number and Percent of Enrolled Callers Who Were Sent NRT by NRT Type, 2016

| NRT Type | Number <br> of Callers | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Total | 7,511 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |
| Patch | 5,412 | 72.0 |
| Gum | 1,080 | 14.4 |
| Lozenge | 1,019 | 13.6 |

## Table 8 Interpretations:

Denominator: Total number of enrolled callers who were sent NRT $(7,511)$.
Out of the 8,568 enrolled callers who received a NRT recommendation (mentioned in Table 6), over $87 \%(7,511)$ received a shipment of NRT from the TTQL. The majority of the NRT sent was in the form of nicotine patches (72\%).

## QEE Dataset Limitations

- The QEE dataset provides a snapshot in time. Some information for callers may be collected in future calls, after data is extracted from the database managed by Optum and sent to the TPCB.
- QEE data tables are not to be compared to REE data tables displayed below. REE data contains referral information during pre-registration. QEE data contains information on callers who are registered. There may be a time-lag in the period where pre-registered referrals become registered callers.
- There is no limit to the number of incoming and outgoing calls made to/from registered callers. Each individual call is captured as a separate observation. De-duplicated registration calls were used to conduct aggregate analysis.
- Callers enrolled in multiple call counseling at registration may not have actively used TTQL services.
- Callers who enrolled in web-based services only are not included in the analysis.


## Referral Experience Extract (REE)

Over 10,000 tobacco users were referred to the TTQL by healthcare providers.
Table 9. Number and Percent of TTQL Referrals made by Healthcare Providers by Referral Method, 2016

| Referral Method | Number of <br> Referrals | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Total | 10,086 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |
| Electronic Referral | 2,005 | 19.9 |
| Fax | 8,066 | 80.0 |
| Manual Electronic Referral | 1 | 0.0 |
| Web | 14 | 0.1 |
| Note: Table only includes referral methods used by healthcare providers. Phone referrals <br> included in REE dataset were excluded from analysis. |  |  |

## Table 9 Interpretations:

Denominator: Total number of electronic, fax and web referrals $(10,086)$.
About 1 in 5 referrals were made using an electronic referral system. Most healthcare providers referred patients using a fax referral system ( $80 \%$ ).

Table 10. Number and Percent of TTQL Referrals by Referral Method and Enrollment Status, 2016

| Referral Method | Total <br> Number of Referrals Reached | Accepted Services |  | Declined Services |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of Referrals | Percent | Number of Referrals | Percent |
| Total | 4,045 | 2,749 | 68.0 | 1,296 | 32.0 |
| Electronic Referral | 721 | 597 | 82.8 | 124 | 17.2 |
| Fax | 3,312 | 2,143 | 64.7 | 1,169 | 35.3 |
| Web | 12 | 9 | 75.0 | 3 | 25.0 |

Note: Table excludes referrals to participants who have not yet been reached (participants with the following enrollment status: active, needs call back, unreachable).

## Table 10 Interpretations:

Denominator: Total number of electronic, fax and web referrals who accepted or declined services $(4,045)$.

Table 10 only includes referrals made to participants who had been reached and either accepted or declined services $(4,045)$. Among the total 2,005 electronic referrals
(mentioned in Table 9), about 36\% ( $\mathrm{N}=721$ ) of participants were reached. Among the total 8,066 fax referrals (mentioned in Table 9), approximately 41\% ( $N=3,312$ ) were reached.

Among referrals reached, nearly 7 out of 10 ( $68.0 \%$ ) accepted a follow-up call for TTQL services. Fax referrals had a higher percentage of participants reached, however electronic referrals had a higher acceptance rate. Among referrals made via an electronic referral system, about $83 \%$ accepted services. Among those referrals made using a fax referral system, about 65\% accepted TTQL services.

Figure 4. 2016 Referring Clinic Locations and 2015 Smoking Prevalence by Public Health Region (PHR), Texas


[^0]
## REE Dataset Limitations

- Frequencies presented in Tables 8 and 9 represent the number of TTQL referrals, not the number of patients referred. There is no limit to the number of times a patient can be referred to the TTQL, therefore data included in the tables are not de-duplicated.
- Data is dependent on information provided by healthcare providers at the time of referral.
- Clinic location information was not provided for many referrals. Referral clinic locations in Figure 4 are under-estimated.
- Clinic referral locations in Figure 4 are geocoded using zip codes. Several referring clinics could possibly be present in the same zip code.
- Referrals who accept services may not have actively used TTQL services.
- REE data tables are not to be compared to QEE data tables. REE data contains referral information during pre-registration. QEE data contains information about callers who are registered. There may be a time-lag in the period where pre-registered referrals become registered callers.


## TTQL Follow-up Survey Evaluation

The TPCB contracted Optum to conduct a 7-month follow-up survey of callers enrolled in multiple call counseling. Data from this survey is used to evaluate the effectiveness of TTQL services and participants' progress toward tobacco cessation.

## Evaluation Design

Optum attempted to contact a total of 1,555 callers who were enrolled in multiple call counseling between November 1, 2015 and October 31, 2016. All outcomes were measured seven months after each participant's registration date. If consent was provided, participants were first contacted by email to complete a web-based survey. Participants who did not respond to the web-based survey were then contacted by phone. Multiple attempts were made to reach participants over an approximate four-week period.

## Inclusion Criteria

Participants recruited to participate in the 7-month follow-up survey met the following criteria:

- Tobacco user at intake
- Received tobacco cessation counseling from TTQL
- 18 years of age or older
- Have a valid method of contact (phone/email)
- The only registrant in a household

Proxies, healthcare providers and member of the general public were excluded from the survey.

## Methodology

This section includes aggregate 7-month follow-up survey data. Participants who reported lesbian, gay, bisexual, homosexual, transgender, other or does not know (LGBTQ) as their sexual orientation were oversampled. To account for oversampling of the LGBTQ population, data were weighted. The weighted data represents all callers selected to participate. Weighted analysis has been used throughout the report to account for the oversample and survey design. Unweighted data tables can be found in the Appendix. A successful "quit" was defined as participants who reported being tobacco free for the last 30 days or more at the time of the 7 -month survey. All analyses were conducted using SAS 9.4.

## Survey Sample

A total of 599 participants completed the 7-month follow-up survey.

Table 11. Number and Percent of 7-month Follow-up Survey Participants by Demographic Characteristics

| Demographic Characteristics | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% Confidence I nterval |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper <br> Limit |
| Total | 599 | 100.0 |  |  |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 377 | 63.0 | 58.6 | 67.5 |
| Male | 221 | 37.0 | 32.5 | 41.4 |
| Age (years) |  |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 22 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 4.1 |
| 25-40 | 125 | 18.2 | 14.7 | 21.8 |
| 41-60 | 328 | 54.7 | 50.1 | 59.4 |
| >60 | 124 | 24.4 | 20.4 | 28.4 |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 152 | 26.3 | 22.2 | 30.5 |
| Hispanic | 102 | 16.7 | 13.2 | 20.2 |
| Other | 21 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 4.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 310 | 54.3 | 49.6 | 59.0 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |


| Less than high school | 107 | 19.1 | 15.4 | 22.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GED | 55 | 10.2 | 7.4 | 13.1 |
| High school diploma | 143 | 25.0 | 20.9 | 29.1 |
| Greater than high school | 276 | 45.7 | 41.0 | 50.3 |
| Insurance |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial | 121 | 22.2 | 18.3 | 26.1 |
| Medicaid | 112 | 17.5 | 14.0 | 21.0 |
| Medicare | 141 | 22.9 | 19.0 | 26.8 |
| Uninsured | 212 | 37.4 | 32.9 | 42.0 |
| Sexual Orientation |  |  |  |  |
| Heterosexual | 381 | 94.4 | 93.3 | 95.5 |
| Bisexual/Homosexual/Transgender/ Does Not Know/ Other | 190 | 5.6 | 4.5 | 6.7 |
| Chronic Condition |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 268 | 57.7 | 52.5 | 62.9 |
| No | 184 | 42.3 | 37.1 | 47.5 |
| Mental Health/Substance Abuse Condition |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 300 | 45.6 | 41.0 | 50.2 |
| No | 299 | 54.4 | 49.8 | 59.0 |

*Total includes participants who may have some demographic data missing. Each category may not add up to the total for that group. Missing values were excluded for calculating percentages.

## Table 11 Interpretations:

There were significantly more females ( $63.0 \%$ ) who completed the survey than males $(37.0 \%)$. Most survey participants were between the ages of 41 and 60 years (54.7\%), self-reported white (54.3\%), highest level of education was greater than a high school diploma ( $45.7 \%$ ), heterosexual ( $94.4 \%$ ), and uninsured ( $37.4 \%$ ). Over half of the participants reported having a chronic condition and nearly $46 \%$ reported having a mental health or substance abuse condition.

## Outcomes Among Participants Who Completed the 7-month Followup Survey

The following tables (Table 12 to Table 15) and figures (Figure 5 and Figure 6) will display the motivation and confidence of participants who completed the follow-up survey at registration by quit status and TTQL utilization.

Table 12. Number and Percent of Participants by Motivation Level Reported at Registration

| Motivation | Number of <br> Participants | Weighted <br> Percent | 95\% Confidence <br> Intervals |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total |  | 100.0 |  | Lower <br> Limit |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 4 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| 2 | 2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| 3 | 5 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| 4 | 2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| 5 | 24 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 6.7 |
| 6 | 18 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 5.6 |
| 7 | 54 | 12.5 | 9.0 | 15.9 |
| 8 | 100 | 21.1 | 16.9 | 25.3 |
| 9 | 58 | 12.6 | 9.1 | 16.0 |
| 10 | 217 | 43.5 | 38.3 | 48.6 |

## Table 12 Interpretations:

Participants ranked their motivation to no longer use tobacco on a scale of one to ten, with one being not motivated and ten being highly motivated, at registration. Over 43\% of participants ranked their motivation to quit ten. Participants were least likely to report a score of two ( $0.1 \%$ ).

Figure 5. Number of Participants by Motivation Level Reported at Registration and Quit Status at 7-month Follow-up


Figure 5 Interpretations:
Out of 217 participants who reported being very motivated (ten on a scale of one to ten), $34 \%$ were able to quit ( 74 participants) at 7-month follow-up. Participants who ranked their motivation a one or two on a scale of ten, did not quit using tobacco at follow-up.

Table 13. Number and Percent of Participants by Motivation Level Reported at Registration and Number of Completed Calls

| Motivation | < 3 Completed Calls |  |  |  | $\geq 3$ Completed Calls |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |
| Total | 449 | 75.4 | 71.4 | 79.3 | 150 | 24.6 | 20.7 | 28.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 3 | 67.8 | 16.2 | 100.0 | 1 | 32.2 | 0.0 | 83.8 |
| 2 | 1 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3 | 3 | 65.5 | 15.4 | 100.0 | 2 | 34.5 | 0.0 | 84.6 |
| 4 | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 5 | 21 | 81.2 | 62.2 | 100.0 | 3 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 37.8 |
| 6 | 17 | 92.1 | 77.2 | 100.0 | 1 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 22.8 |
| 7 | 43 | 76.7 | 64.1 | 89.2 | 11 | 23.3 | 10.8 | 35.9 |
| 8 | 90 | 88.8 | 81.6 | 95.9 | 10 | 11.2 | 4.1 | 18.4 |
| 9 | 48 | 81.2 | 69.8 | 92.7 | 10 | 18.8 | 7.3 | 30.2 |

## Table 13 Interpretations:

Almost one in four participants completed three or more tobacco cessation counseling calls. Over $18 \%$ of participants, who ranked their motivation a ten, completed three or more counseling calls. There were no significant differences in participants' motivation reported at registration and the number of completed counseling sessions.

Table 14. Number and Percent of Participants by Confidence Level Reported at Registration

| Confidence | Number of <br> Participants | Weighted <br> Percent | 95\% Confidence <br> Limits |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | 100.0 |  | Lower <br> Limit |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 17 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 4.6 |
| 2 | 11 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 3.2 |
| 3 | 13 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 2.9 |
| 4 | 17 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 4.9 |
| 5 | 65 | 12.4 | 9.2 | 15.6 |
| 6 | 35 | 6.2 | 3.8 | 8.5 |
| 7 | 66 | 11.3 | 8.3 | 14.4 |
| 8 | 94 | 17.7 | 14.0 | 21.4 |
| 9 | 49 | 8.6 | 5.9 | 11.3 |
| 10 | 186 | 34.1 | 29.5 | 38.6 |

## Table 14 Interpretations:

Participants ranked their confidence in no longer using tobacco on a scale of one to ten, with one being not confident and ten being very confident, at registration. Participants were significantly more likely to rank their confidence in quitting a ten (34.1\%) than any other number on the scale. Participants were least likely to rank their confidence in quitting a three ( $1.7 \%$ ) in comparison to all categories, with the exception of rankings one, two and four.

Figure 6. Number of Participants by Confidence Reported at Registration and Quit Status at 7-month Follow-up


## Figure 6 Interpretations:

Out of 186 participants who reported being very confident (ten on a scale of one to ten) in quitting, about $37 \%$ ( 68 participants) no longer used tobacco at 7 -month follow-up. All participants who ranked their confidence in quitting a one continued to use tobacco at follow-up.

Table 15. Number and Percent of Participants by Confidence Reported at Registration and Number of Completed Calls

| Confidence | < 3 Completed Calls |  |  |  | $\geq 3$ Completed Calls |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  | Participants |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |
| Total | 449 | 75.4 | 71.4 | 79.3 | 150 | 24.6 | 20.7 | 28.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 14 | 81.9 | 60.3 | 100.0 | 3 | 18.1 | 0.0 | 39.7 |
| 2 | 9 | 97.1 | 92.6 | 100.0 | 2 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 7.4 |
| 3 | 13 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 13 | 75.2 | 51.7 | 98.8 | 4 | 24.8 | 1.2 | 48.3 |
| 5 | 51 | 76.9 | 65.2 | 88.5 | 14 | 23.1 | 11.5 | 34.8 |
| 6 | 27 | 85.4 | 72.2 | 98.6 | 8 | 14.6 | 1.4 | 27.8 |
| 7 | 49 | 71.9 | 58.9 | 84.8 | 17 | 28.1 | 15.2 | 41.1 |
| 8 | 66 | 70.2 | 59.6 | 80.7 | 28 | 29.8 | 19.3 | 40.4 |
| 9 | 34 | 68.9 | 53.6 | 84.1 | 15 | 31.1 | 15.9 | 46.4 |
| 10 | 143 | 78.6 | 71.8 | 85.4 | 43 | 21.4 | 14.6 | 28.2 |

## Table 15 Interpretations:

About one in five participants, who ranked their confidence a ten, completed three or more tobacco cessation counseling calls. Participants who ranked their confidence a two or three were significantly less likely to complete three or more calls in comparison to any other rankings on the scale.

The following tables (Table 16 to Table 24) will display the quit status of participants who completed the follow-up survey by various TTQL utilization factors and participant characteristics.

Table 16. Number and Percent of Callers Who Reported Quitting and Not Quitting by Demographic Characteristics

| Demographics | Quit |  |  |  | Did Not Quit |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | $\quad 95 \%$ Lower Limit | CI Upper Limit | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | $\square$ <br> 95\% <br> Lower Limit | CI Upper Limit |
| Total* | 168 | 27.6 | 23.4 | 31.7 | 431 | 72.4 | 68.3 | 76.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 98 | 27.2 | 22.0 | 32.4 | 279 | 72.8 | 67.6 | 78.0 |
| Male | 70 | 28.2 | 21.4 | 35.1 | 151 | 71.8 | 64.9 | 78.6 |
| Age (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 7 | 14.6 | 0.0 | 31.8 | 15 | 85.4 | 68.2 | 100.0 |
| 25-40 | 32 | 27.1 | 17.5 | 36.6 | 93 | 72.9 | 63.4 | 82.5 |
| 41-60 | 92 | 28.8 | 23.1 | 34.4 | 236 | 71.2 | 65.6 | 76.9 |
| >60 | 37 | 26.7 | 18.3 | 35.0 | 87 | 73.3 | 65.0 | 81.7 |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 45 | 31.2 | 22.6 | 39.7 | 107 | 68.8 | 60.3 | 77.4 |
| Hispanic | 27 | 25.9 | 15.9 | 35.9 | 75 | 74.1 | 64.1 | 84.1 |
| Other | 6 | 53.6 | 25.9 | 81.2 | 15 | 46.4 | 18.8 | 74.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 87 | 25.4 | 19.8 | 30.9 | 223 | 74.6 | 69.1 | 80.2 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than high school | 35 | 27.3 | 17.7 | 36.8 | 72 | 72.7 | 63.2 | 82.3 |
| GED | 6 | 12.0 | 2.3 | 21.7 | 49 | 88.0 | 78.3 | 97.7 |
| High school diploma | 47 | 35.8 | 26.8 | 44.9 | 96 | 64.2 | 55.1 | 73.2 |
| Greater than high school | 76 | 26.9 | 20.8 | 33.1 | 200 | 73.1 | 66.9 | 79.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial | 79 | 68.4 | 59.1 | 77.6 | 42 | 31.6 | 22.4 | 40.9 |
| Medicaid | 31 | 23.9 | 14.5 | 33.3 | 81 | 76.1 | 66.7 | 85.5 |
| Medicare | 32 | 23.0 | 14.8 | 31.2 | 109 | 77.0 | 68.8 | 85.2 |
| Uninsured | 60 | 29.6 | 22.6 | 36.6 | 152 | 70.4 | 63.4 | 77.4 |
| Sexual Orientation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heterosexual | 103 | 27.0 | 22.6 | 31.5 | 278 | 73.0 | 68.5 | 77.4 |
| Bisexual/Homosexual/Transgender/ Does Not Know/Other | 55 | 26.7 | 19.9 | 33.5 | 135 | 73.3 | 66.5 | 80.1 |
| Chronic Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 69 | 24.0 | 18.1 | 29.8 | 199 | 76.0 | 70.2 | 81.9 |
| No | 66 | 36.8 | 29.0 | 44.6 | 118 | 63.2 | 55.4 | 71.0 |
| Mental Health/Substance Abuse Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 68 | 21.4 | 15.9 | 27.0 | 232 | 78.6 | 73.0 | 84.1 |
| No | 100 | 32.7 | 26.8 | 38.6 | 199 | 67.3 | 61.4 | 73.2 |

[^1]
## Table 16 Interpretations:

More than one in four ( $27.6 \%$ ) of participants, who completed the 7 -month follow-up survey, reported no tobacco use in the past 30 days. There were no significant differences in the percentage of participants who reported no tobacco use by sex, age, race/ethnicity and sexual orientation. However, the percentage of participants between the ages 41-60 who reported quitting was about two times higher than those between the ages 18-24. About one in two participants who reported black as their race/ethnicity had not used tobacco in the past 30 days. Participants with a GED were significantly less likely to report tobacco cessation in comparison to those with a high school diploma. Participants with commercial health insurance were significantly more likely to report no tobacco use at follow-up than those who were uninsured, covered by Medicaid or Medicare. Tobacco cessation was lower among participants with a mental health or chronic condition.

Table 17. Number and Percent of Participants, Who Report Tobacco Cessation, by NRT Recipient Status and Insurance Type

| NRT Weeks Provided | Commercial |  |  |  | Medicaid |  |  |  | Medicare |  |  |  | Uninsured |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Callers | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Callers | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Callers | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Callers | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |
| Total | 121 | 22.2 | 18.3 | 26.1 | 112 | 17.5 | 14.0 | 21.0 | 141 | 22.9 | 19.0 | 26.8 | 212 | 37.4 | 32.9 | 42.0 |
| NRT Recipient | 73 | 19.7 | 15.2 | 24.2 | 24 | 6.7 | 3.8 | 9.5 | 99 | 21.9 | 17.3 | 26.6 | 203 | 51.7 | 46.0 | 57.3 |
| NRT Nonrecipient | 48 | 27.7 | 20.1 | 35.3 | 88 | 42.2 | 33.9 | 50.6 | 42 | 25.1 | 17.7 | 32.5 | 9 | 4.9 | 1.3 | 8.6 |

## Table 17 Interpretations:

More than one in three (37.4\%) participants were uninsured. Participants who received NRT from TTQL were significantly more likely to be uninsured. Medicaid provides NRT to their beneficiaries, hence they are not eligible for NRT provided by TTQL. However, 24 participants may have received the NRT from TTQL due to qualifying under some different eligibility criteria.

Table 18. Number and Percent of Participants, Who Report Tobacco Cessation, by NRT Weeks Provided and Insurance Type

| NRT <br> Weeks <br> Provided | Commercial |  |  |  | Medicaid |  |  |  | Medicare |  |  |  | Uninsured |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Callers | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Callers | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Callers | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Callers | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |
| Total | 121 | 22.2 | 18.3 | 26.1 | 112 | 17.5 | 14.0 | 21.0 | 141 | 22.9 | 19.0 | 26.8 | 212 | 37.4 | 32.9 | 42.0 |
| 0 weeks | 48 | 27.7 | 20.1 | 35.3 | 88 | 42.2 | 33.9 | 50.6 | 42 | 25.1 | 17.7 | 32.5 | 9 | 4.9 | 1.3 | 8.6 |
| 2 weeks | 69 | 19.3 | 14.7 | 23.9 | 20 | 5.9 | 3.2 | 8.6 | 97 | 22.3 | 17.6 | 27.1 | 197 | 52.5 | 46.7 | 58.2 |
| 4 weeks | 3 | 27.0 | 0.9 | 53.1 | 2 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 40.6 | 2 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 40.6 | 5 | 37.0 | 8.7 | 65.2 |
| 8 weeks | 1 | 32.2 | 0.0 | 83.8 | 2 | 35.7 | 0.0 | 87.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1 | 32.2 | 0.0 | 83.8 |

## Table 18 Interpretations:

Over half of participants who received two weeks of NRT from TTQL were uninsured. About $37 \%$ of participants who received four weeks of NRT were also uninsured.

Table 19. Number and Percent of Survey Participants by NRT Recipient Status and Quit Status

| Recipient Status | Quit |  |  |  | Did Not Quit |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower <br> Limit | Upper <br> Limit |  |  | Lower <br> Limit | Upper <br> Limit |
| Total | 168 | 27.6 | 23.4 | 31.7 | 431 | 72.4 | 68.3 | 76.6 |
| NRT <br> Recipient | 107 | 26.8 | 21.8 | 31.8 | 296 | 73.2 | 68.2 | 78.2 |
| NRT Nonrecipient | 61 | 29.3 | 21.8 | 36.7 | 135 | 70.7 | 63.3 | 78.2 |

Table 19 Interpretations:

The prevalence of tobacco cessation among participants who received NRT from the TTQL was $26.8 \%$. There were no significant differences in the percent of callers who quit by NRT recipient status. It is likely that the participants may have used NRT on their own as well, regardless of receiving or not receiving it from the TTQL.

Table 20. Number and Percent of Survey Participants by the Number of NRT Weeks Provided and Quit Status

| Weeks of NRT Provided | Quit |  |  |  | Did Not Quit |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower <br> Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower <br> Limit | Upper Limit |
| Total | 168 | 27.6 | 23.4 | 31.7 | 431 | 72.4 | 68.3 | 76.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 weeks | 61 | 29.3 | 21.8 | 36.7 | 135 | 70.7 | 63.3 | 78.2 |
| 2 weeks | 100 | 26.0 | 21.0 | 31.0 | 287 | 74.0 | 69.0 | 79.0 |
| 4 weeks | 5 | 45.0 | 15.8 | 74.2 | 7 | 55.0 | 25.8 | 84.2 |
| 8 weeks | 2 | 35.7 | 0.0 | 87.5 | 2 | 64.3 | 12.5 | 100.0 |

## Table 20 Interpretations:

Among participants who did not receive NRT from the TTQL (zero weeks), $29.3 \%$ reported no tobacco use in the past 30 days. There were no significant differences in the amount of NRT provided and quit status at 7-month follow-up. However, as mentioned above it is likely that the participants may have used NRT on their own regardless they received it from the TTQL.

Table 21. Number and Percent of Survey Participants by Number of Counseling Calls Completed and Quit Status

| Number of Completed Calls | Quit |  |  |  | Did Not Quit |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper <br> Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |
| Total | 168 | 27.6 | 23.4 | 31.7 | 431 | 72.4 | 68.3 | 76.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Call | 78 | 23.9 | 18.5 | 29.2 | 257 | 76.1 | 70.8 | 81.5 |
| 2 Calls | 30 | 25.9 | 17.2 | 34.6 | 84 | 74.1 | 65.4 | 82.8 |


| 3 Calls | 19 | 28.5 | 15.5 | 41.4 | 41 | 71.5 | 58.6 | 84.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 Calls | 19 | 44.7 | 27.9 | 61.5 | 26 | 55.3 | 38.5 | 72.1 |
| $\geq 5$ Calls | 22 | 42.1 | 24.7 | 59.5 | 23 | 57.9 | 40.5 | 75.3 |

## Table 21 Interpretations:

Almost half of the survey participants ( $44.7 \%$ ) who completed four counseling calls reported no longer using tobacco in the past 30 days at 7 -month follow-up. In general, the percent of participants quitting tobacco increased with an increase in number of counseling calls they completed.

Table 22. Number and Percent of Survey Participants by Entry Method and Quit Status

| Entry Method | Quit |  |  |  | Did Not Quit |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower <br> Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower <br> Limit | Upper Limit |
| Total | 168 | 27.6 | 23.4 | 31.7 | 431 | 72.4 | 68.3 | 76.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phone | 147 | 28.8 | 24.3 | 33.2 | 377 | 71.2 | 66.8 | 75.7 |
| Fax Referral | 16 | 24.1 | 10.8 | 37.4 | 36 | 75.9 | 62.6 | 89.2 |
| Electronic Referral | 5 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 20.2 | 18 | 91.4 | 79.8 | 100.0 |

## Table 22 Interpretations:

A majority of the participants entered the TTQL by phone either self or reverse calling by the TTQL. About 29\% of participants who entered into TTQL services via phone reported no longer using tobacco for the past 30 days. Approximately one in four participants ( $24.1 \%$ ) referred by a healthcare provider using a fax referral system reported tobacco cessation for the past 30 days. There were no significant differences in cessation by entry method.

Table 23. Number and Percent of Participants by How They Heard About TTQL Services and Quit Status

| How Heard About | Quit |  |  |  | Did Not Quit |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower <br> Limit | Upper <br> Limit |
| Total | 168 | 27.6 | 23.4 | 31.7 | 431 | 72.4 | 68.3 | 76.6 |
| TV/Commercial | 65 | 28.6 | 21.9 | 35.4 | 183 | 71.4 | 64.6 | 78.1 |
| Health Professional | 37 | 22.9 | 14.6 | 31.2 | 92 | 77.1 | 68.8 | 85.4 |
| Family/Friend | 23 | 38.2 | 24.1 | 52.4 | 36 | 61.8 | 47.6 | 75.9 |
| Re-enrollment Offer | 10 | 29.7 | 13.6 | 45.8 | 26 | 70.3 | 54.2 | 86.4 |
| Other | 9 | 36.3 | 15.5 | 57.2 | 18 | 63.7 | 42.8 | 84.5 |
| Health Insurance | 5 | 50.0 | 18.9 | 81.1 | 5 | 50.0 | 18.9 | 81.1 |
| Brochure/ Newsletter/Flyer | 4 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 12 | 95.9 | 91.3 | 100.0 |
| Employer/Worksite | 4 | 57.1 | 20.4 | 93.9 | 3 | 42.9 | 6.1 | 79.6 |
| Website | 4 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 29.0 | 18 | 86.7 | 71.0 | 100.0 |
| Community Organization | 2 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 40.7 | 7 | 84.6 | 59.3 | 100.0 |
| Health Department | 1 | 45.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 3 | 54.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Outdoor Ad | 1 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 4 | 96.6 | 89.2 | 100.0 |
| QUITNOW Mobile App | 1 | 90.1 | 65.4 | 100.0 | 1 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 34.6 |
| TV/News | 1 | 32.2 | 0.0 | 83.8 | 3 | 67.8 | 16.2 | 100.0 |
| CVS/Pharmacy | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Newspaper/Magazine | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Radio | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

## Table 23 Interpretations:

Smokers heard about the TTQL services mostly via TV commercials, healthcare professionals, and family or friends. About $38 \%$ of participants who heard about the program from a family member or friend reported 30 -day tobacco cessation at follow-up. Nearly $23 \%$ of participants who heard about the program from a health professional reported 30 -day tobacco cessation at follow-up. There were no significant differences in quit rates by how each participant heard about the program.

Table 24. Number and Percent of Participants by the Type of NRT Used Since Their First Counseling Call and Number of NRT Weeks Provided by TTQL

| NRT Type | 0 weeks |  |  |  | 2 weeks |  |  |  | 4 weeks |  |  |  | 8 weeks |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Callers | Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Callers | Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Callers | Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Callers | Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |
| Total | 196 | 31.4 | 27.1 | 35.7 | 387 | 65.3 | 60.9 | 69.7 | 12 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 4.1 | 4 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Nicotine Patches | 46 | 18.8 | 13.5 | 24.2 | 216 | 77.1 | 71.4 | 82.9 | 7 | 3.0 | 0.7 | 5.4 | 2 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 |
| Nicotine Gum | 22 | 21.9 | 12.6 | 31.3 | 78 | 73.9 | 63.9 | 83.9 | 2 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 6.6 |  | 1.4 | 0.0 | 4.1 |
| Nicotine Lozenges | 17 | 17.1 | 7.7 | 26.5 | 60 | 77.7 | 67.2 | 88.2 | 3 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 10.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Nicotine Inhaler | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Nicotine Nasal Spray | 1 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 3 | 96.5 | 88.8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Zyban/Bupropion/ Wellbutrin | 12 | 40.8 | 17.8 | 63.8 | 15 | 59.2 | 36.2 | 82.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Chantix/Varenicline | 17 | 37.5 | 21.4 | 53.7 | 27 | 59.5 | 43.1 | 75.8 | 1 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 1 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 3 | 95.1 | 84.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| None | 105 | 51.1 | 42.9 | 59.3 | 81 | 45.9 | 37.8 | 54.1 | 3 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 2.2 |

## Table 24 Interpretation:

Overall, $68.6 \%$ of participants who completed the follow-up survey received NRT from the TTQL. Among participants who reported using nicotine patches since their first counseling call, $18.8 \%$ did not receive NRT from the TTQL. Over half of participants who, did not receive NRT from the TTQL, had not used any NRT since their first counseling call.

Table 25. Number and Percent of Participants, Who Did Not Receive NRT from TTQL, by NRT Use Status Since Their First Counseling Call and Quit Status

| NRT Use Status | Quit |  |  |  | Did Not Quit |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower <br> Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower <br> Limit | Upper Limit |
| Total | 61 | 29.3 | 21.7 | 36.8 | 135 | 70.7 | 63.2 | 78.3 |
| Used <br> NRT | 31 | 38.5 | 26.5 | 50.5 | 55 | 61.5 | 49.5 | 73.5 |
| Did Not Use NRT | 29 | 22.3 | 12.9 | 31.7 | 76 | 77.7 | 68.3 | 87.1 |

## Table 25 Interpretations:

A total of 196 participants did not receive NRT from TTQL. Participants may use NRT on their own regardless of TTQL providing it. 29.3\% of those 196 participants, reported tobacco cessation at 7 -month follow-up. About $38.5 \%$ of those who used NRT were able to quit vs. $22.3 \%$ who did not use NRT. However, this difference was not statistically significant.

Table 26. Number and Percent of Participants, Who Did Not Receive NRT from TTQL, Type of NRT Used Since Their First Counseling Call and Quit Status

| NRT Type | Quit |  |  |  | Did Not Quit |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper <br> Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper <br> Limit |
| Total | 61 | 29.3 | 21.7 | 36.8 | 135 | 70.7 | 63.2 | 78.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nicotine Patches | 20 | 45.6 | 29.8 | 61.4 | 26 | 54.4 | 38.6 | 70.2 |
| Nicotine Gum | 6 | 26.8 | 5.2 | 48.3 | 16 | 73.2 | 51.7 | 94.8 |
| Nicotine Lozenges | 4 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 47.6 | 13 | 77.5 | 52.4 | 100.0 |
| Nicotine Nasal Spray | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Zyban/Bupropion/ Wellbutrin | 5 | 61.7 | 26.9 | 96.5 | 7 | 38.3 | 3.5 | 73.1 |
| Chantix/Varenicline | 5 | 25.7 | 1.9 | 49.4 | 12 | 74.3 | 50.6 | 98.1 |
| Other | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| None | 29 | 22.3 | 12.9 | 31.7 | 76 | 77.7 | 68.3 | 87.1 |

## Table 26 Interpretations:

Among those who did not receive NRT from TTQL, $29.3 \%$ were able to quit. Close to half of those reported using nicotine patches were able to quit ( $45.6 \%$ ). $77.7 \%$ of the TTQL callers who did not use NRT since their first counseling call were unable to stop using tobacco.

Table 27. Number and Percent of Participants, Who Report Tobacco Cessation, by the Number of NRT Weeks Provided by the TTQL and Calls Completed

| NRT Weeks Provided | < 3 Completed Calls |  |  |  | $\geq 3$ Completed Calls |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
|  |  |  | Lower <br> Limit | Upper Limit |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |
| Total | 108 | 66.8 | 58.5 | 75.1 | 60 | 33.2 | 24.9 | 41.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 weeks | 42 | 70.0 | 56.2 | 83.9 | 19 | 30.0 | 16.1 | 43.8 |
| 2 weeks | 63 | 66.5 | 56.0 | 77.1 | 37 | 33.5 | 22.9 | 44.0 |
| 4 weeks | 3 | 60.0 | 16.9 | 100.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 83.1 |
| 8 weeks | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

## Table 27 Interpretations:

Among participants who reported tobacco cessation, $66.8 \%$ completed less than three counseling calls and $33.2 \%$ completed more than three counseling calls. $70 \%$ of the participants who received zero weeks of NRT completed less than three counseling calls.

## Successes Among Participants Who Did Not Quit

About 72\% of participants (431 participants) who completed the 7-month follow-up survey were unable to quit smoking. However, nearly $72 \%$ of these participants ( 254 participants) were able to make at least one quit attempt since first calling the TTQL.

Table 28. Number and Percent of Participants, Who Did Not Quit, by Select Cigarette Use Behaviors

| Cigarette Use Behaviors | Number of Participants | Weighted Percent | 95\% CI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |
| Total | 431 | 100.0 |  |  |
| Quit Attempts |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 254 | 71.9 | 66.5 | 77.2 |
| No | 101 | 28.1 | 22.8 | 33.5 |
| Planning to Quit in next 30 days |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 77 | 22.1 | 17.1 | 27.2 |
| No | 273 | 77.9 | 72.8 | 82.9 |
| Cigarettes per Day |  |  |  |  |
| Fewer than baseline |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 190 | 59.5 | 53.3 | 65.6 |
| No | 132 | 40.5 | 34.3 | 46.7 |
| $\geq 25 \%$ reduction from baseline |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 170 | 52.9 | 46.6 | 59.2 |
| No | 152 | 47.1 | 40.8 | 53.4 |
| $\geq 50 \%$ reduction from baseline |  |  |  |  |


| Yes | 100 | 31.5 | 25.6 | 37.3 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| No | 222 | 68.5 | 62.7 | 74.4 |

About one in four participants (22.1\%) were planning to quit in the next 30 days. Nearly $60 \%$ of participants reported smoking fewer cigarettes per day at follow-up. Almost 53\% of the participants were able to reduce the number of cigarettes used per day by at least $25 \%$. About $32 \%$ of participants reduced the number of cigarettes used per day by at least $50 \%$. This data shows that even though not entirely successful at quitting smoking, many participants made good progress towards the goal.

## Annual Evaluation Dataset Limitations

- All outcomes explored rely on self-reported data.
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[^0]:    Data Classification: Quantiles.
    Data Source: 2015 Texas Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2016 Texas Tobacco QuitLine Experience Extract. 2016 Texas Tobacco QuitLine Referral Experience Extract.
    Note: Number of callers includes participants who identify as tobacco users and are registered for TTQL services. Registration includes participants seeking multiple call counseling, one call counseling, general questions, materials or transfers.
    *In 2016 there were 10,086 referrals made by healthcare facilities or providers in Texas. 8,516 of those referrals included location information and are shown on the map by ZIP code.
    TPCB, Tobacco Prevention and Control Branch

[^1]:    *Total includes participants who may have some demographic data missing. Each category may not add up to the total for that group. Missing values were
    excluded for calculating percentages.

