

**A National Survey Of Metropolitan Australians' Beliefs
About Cancer**

By Robert Donovan, Sandra Jones, Owen Carter & Geoffrey Jalleh

CBRCC Report 030514

May 2003

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	METHODOLOGY	4
2.1	Materials	4
2.1	Procedure	4
2.2	Sample Characteristics	5
3	RESULTS	7
3.1	Replication of 1964 Western Australian Cancer Survey	7
3.1.1	General Beliefs About Cancer	7
3.1.2	Personal experiences with Cancer	8
3.1.3	Attitude towards Cancer	9
3.2	Luck versus Lifestyle for Simple Cancers	10
3.3	Lifestyle and Overall Risk Reduction	14
3.4	Lifestyle and Preventability for Specific Cancers	15
3.5	Regular Screening and Early Treatment on Prevention	19
3.6	Impact of Early Treatment	23
3.7	Survivability of Various Cancers	27
3.8	Genetic Testing	28
3.9	Modern Living Contributors to Cancer	33
3.9.1	High Voltage Powerlines	33
3.8.2	Solariums	35
3.9.3	Other Modern Contributors	36
4	REFERENCES	38

A National Survey Of Metropolitan Australians' Beliefs About Cancer

1 Introduction

Cancer is the most feared illness in Australia, engendering far more concern for the average Australian than AIDS and heart disease combined (Borland, Donaghue & Hill, 1994). However, there is little empirical work on the extent and nature of concerns about cancer (Borland, Donaghue & Hill, 1994) and even less on the Australian public's perceptions and beliefs in relation to causes, prevention and screening for various types of cancer. Pearlman, Clark, Rakowski and Ehrich (1999) found that cancer screening behaviours, for both breast and cervical cancer, were associated with both knowledge of risk factors and perceptions of the survivability of cancer. As such it is essential to understand the extent and determinants of fear of cancer if we are to determine the best way to motivate people to undertake health-promoting actions, including protective behaviours, screening and treatment.

There are very few large-scale population surveys of perceptions of cancer incidence, causation, fatality and risk in the literature. In one of the few such studies, Murray and McMillan (1993) surveyed 700 Irish adults to investigate sex differences in perceptions of cancer. Overall, they found (as did Borland et al., 1994) that cancer was the most feared disease. Further, in their sample, women feared cancer more than men, with men being more concerned about heart disease. The greatest contributor to fear of cancer was its perceived incurability. In relation to the causes of cancer, men felt that lifestyle behaviour was the most important factor whereas women nominated heredity as the major contributor.

A number of smaller-scale surveys have addressed either specific populations or specific cancers. These have identified some serious misperceptions about the causes and outcomes of cancer. For example, whereas statistics show that 50 year old adults have a 1 in 20 chance of developing colorectal cancer (and double that if they have a first-degree relative with the condition), a study of low socio-economic adults found that 25% did not think that bowel cancer was a "common" cancer (Price, 1993). Fontaine and Smith (1995) compared the cancer risk perceptions of American and British adults and found that, while the British perceived both their own and the "average" risk to be lower than did the Americans, both groups assessed their own risk as lower than the "average".

Skinner, Kreuter, Kobrin and Strecher (1998) found that among 1,803 women surveyed in primary care settings, 31% underestimated their personal risk of contracting breast cancer and 26% overestimated their personal risk. Similarly, Wilcox and Stefanick (1999) found that middle-aged and older women overestimated the risk of death from breast cancer, whilst underestimating the risk from lung and colon cancer. Helzlsouer, Ford, Hayward, Midzenski and Perry (1994) found that, among the 506 oncology centre employees they surveyed, the perceived risk of developing cancer was significantly higher than the actual probability for the population. However, they also found that the practice of cancer preventive behaviours was not related to perceived risk. Conversely, an Australian study of prostate cancer found that perceived vulnerability to developing prostate cancer was the only factor associated with intention to have a screening test (Weller, Pinnock, Silagy, Hiller & Marshall, 1998).

Price (1993) found that, among the 500 adults surveyed, 28% incorrectly believed that regular exercise would not affect their chances of developing bowel cancer, 20% that diet was not important, and 30% that it was not hereditary. Conversely, 22% thought that being homosexual increased the risk, and 31% that having haemorrhoids led to increased risk. Misperceptions can be even more extreme amongst certain groups of people. For example, Johnson, Bottorff, Baineaves, Grewal, Bhagat, Hilton and Clarke (1999) found that, among the South Asian women (living in Canada) they surveyed, breast cancer was perceived as caused by, among other things, "careless words, curses or divine power" and that it could be caught from someone else.

Price (1993) also found that fewer than half of the adults he surveyed agreed that pain with bowel movements was a symptom of bowel cancer, and fewer than one-third agreed that regular constipation was a symptom. Pearlman, Clark, Rakowski and Ehrich (1999) found that 20% of the 950 women surveyed did not recognise any of the risk factors for breast and cervical cancers; and only 2% recognised the four major risk factors (i.e. two for breast and two for cervical cancer).

Price (1993) surveyed 500 low SES adults in relation to colorectal cancer and found that 54% believed that this condition is always fatal. Recent qualitative research by Donovan (2000) confirmed that many older people have a fatalistic attitude towards cancer (i.e. they believe that cancer will lead to death; as distinct from heart disease which may or may not lead to death). One reason for this perception which was apparent from the qualitative research was that very few respondents knew people who were living with cancer, but most of them knew of people who had died from it.

The recent qualitative research of Donovan (2000) also found that whilst people expressed acceptance that early detection was better, the benefits were not seen as significant by many respondents. Similarly, Price (1993) found that 90% of the 500 adults surveyed believed that colorectal cancer was incurable, even if detected early, and the majority believed that faecal occult blood tests could not save their lives if they had bowel cancer. The same author stated that, with early detection, the survival rate can be as high as 88% (for localised cancers), 57% (with regional spread), and about 6% if the cancer has spread elsewhere.

Borland, Donaghue and Hill (1994) conducted surveys of Australians in 1986 and 1993 and asked the questions "which one illness would you worry *most* about getting?" and "which one illness would you worry *next most* about getting?". They found that:

- Cancer was the most feared illness (mentioned by more than twice as many respondents as heart disease, the next most feared);
- Women were more likely to express concern about cancer (especially younger women);
- There was a significant increase in mentions of cancer between 1986 and 1993; and
- There was a lack of relationship between cigarette smoking (a major causative factor) and worry about cancer.

Thomas and Clarke (1998) surveyed 1000 Australian men and women aged 40 to 60 years to assess community understanding of colorectal cancer. They found that 28%

of men and 8% of women could not name any symptoms of colorectal cancer, and one-third could not name any treatments.

We were unable to identify any Australian nation-wide surveys of perceptions of cancer incidence, causation, fatality and risk, other than several surveys of women in relation to breast cancer (see Paul, Barratt, Redman, Cockburn & Lowe, 1999, for a review and critique of these studies).

Paul, Barratt, Redman, Cockburn and Lowe (1999) conducted a national survey of over 2,900 Australian women, aged 30 to 69, which measured perceptions of breast cancer incidence, risk and survivability. They found that: two-thirds of the women overestimated the incidence of breast cancer; 38% overestimated and 32% underestimated the fatality rate; and only 5% perceived themselves to be at higher than average risk. Further, they found that the women had a very low awareness of the risk factors for breast cancer, with less than 5% identifying age as a factor (age is the greatest risk factor aside from being female). Borland, Donaghue and Hill (1994) suggested that further research could productively look at developing a more detailed understanding of the Australian population's perceptions of health and illness.

Clearly, an enhanced understanding of Australians' awareness (and fear) of cancer, as well as perceived causes, prevention, detection, treatment and survivability of cancer, would assist in the development of appropriate education and communication programs to increase participation in health-promoting behaviours - resulting in an overall decline in cancer mortality.

The Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer Control (CBRCC) was awarded a research grant by the Cancer Foundation of Western Australia Incorporated (CFWA) in 2001 to conduct such a national survey of perceptions of cancer in the Australian population. The aim of the survey was to: develop a database of the Australian population's perceptions of cancer incidence, causation, prevention, screening and survivability in order to gather invaluable baseline data for tracking changes in the population's perceptions of cancer and for evaluating the impact of cancer awareness and education programs. The applied purpose of the study was to determine the extent, and nature, of misperceptions in the Australian community with a view to informing the development of appropriate educational and communication materials.

The results of the survey will be reported and discussed in detail in a series of journal articles (e.g. Donovan et al., submitted 2003; Carter et al., submitted 2003; Slevin et al., submitted 2003). This report presents the closed-ended results without comment in an effort to disseminate the results in a more timely fashion.

2 Methodology

2.1 Materials

A structured, computer-assisted telephone survey was designed for the national cancer survey. The questionnaire consisted of 124 items including a combination of open-ended, five-point scale and dichotomous variables and was designed to cover the following issues:

- Awareness and perceptions of the incidence of the ten most common cancers;
- Experiences with cancer, for the self, immediate family, extended family and others;
- important causative and preventive (where relevant) factors, including the relative influence of "lifestyle" versus "luck";
- relevant signs and symptoms;
- existence and reliability of screening tools;
- value of early diagnosis; and
- survivability/life expectancy.

In order to introduce a level of economy to the survey, four versions of the questionnaire were developed with varied combinations of the 124 items. As such all participants were asked some questions, but only a portion of the others, hence the numbers for some items will be less than the total sample number. Each interview took an average of fifteen minutes to complete.

1.1 Procedure

Professional telephone interviewers made contact with respondents via random telephone digit dialling. Three attempts were made to contact each selected telephone number. Upon successful contact, the interviewers introduced themselves and said they were calling on behalf of the Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer Control at Curtin University in Western Australia and that they would like to ask an adult member of the household a few questions about their views on cancer. It was stated that participation would take about fifteen minutes. The interviewers then read out each question and entered responses on to a computer database. All close-ended questions were coded immediately. The majority of open-ended questions were coded in a predetermined manner but allowance was made for unanticipated responses to also be recorded in full. Open-ended responses not coded at the time of the interview were coded by the researchers at a later date, before final analysis of the database took place. Data were analysed using SPSS v.11 with all results being rounded to 100% for reporting purposes.

1.2 Sample Characteristics

The sample was recruited via random telephone digit dialling and comprised of equivalent numbers of males (n=1,250) and females (n=1,251). Based upon the reported postcodes of participants, the final sample for the survey comprised of 2,501 participants from the regions as outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Sample breakdown by region

Population Centre	Subtotal	Total
Perth		995
Interstate Australia		
Sydney	319	
Melbourne	281	
Brisbane	202	
Adelaide	170	
Hobart	40	1,012
Rural Western Australia		
Kimberley	110	
Albany	110	
Geraldton	107	
Southwest	99	
Kalgoorlie	68	494
TOTAL		2,501

For the national metropolitan report, participants from rural Western Australian centres were not included, reducing the number of participants to 2,007: consisting of 1,009 males (50.3%) and 998 females (49.7%). The age ranges for participants from each city are outlined in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Age ranges for participants from each Australian city

Metropolitan Region	18 to 29 years	30 to 49 years	50 to 69 years	70 years or more	Total
Sydney (n=319)	17.2%	47.0%	25.7%	10.0%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=281)	18.1%	45.9%	24.9%	11.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=202)	20.3%	37.1%	32.7%	9.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=995)	16.1%	43.5%	31.6%	8.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=170)	14.7%	37.6%	39.4%	8.2%	100.0%
Hobart (n=40)	15.0%	45.0%	37.5%	2.5%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=2,007)	16.9%	42.7%	32.0%	8.4%	100.0%

The data were weighted by region according to Australian Bureau of Statistics population data from the 2001 Australian census (ABS, 2002) as outlined in Table 3.

Table 3: Regional weightings based upon 2001 Australian Census Data

Population Centre	Census Count	Proportion of Metropolitan Australia
Sydney	4,309,268	36.19%
Melbourne	3,366,542	28.27%
Brisbane	1,627,535	13.67%
Perth	1,339,993	11.25%
Adelaide	1,072,585	9.01%
Hobart	191,169	1.61%
Remainder of Australia	7,065,258	-
Total	18,972,350	100.00%

The sample differed slightly from that of the Australian population along a number of measures as suggested by the 2001 Australian census data.

Table 4: Demographic Comparison of Survey Sample to General Population

Variable	Weighted Survey Sample	ABS 2001 Census	Difference
<u>Background</u>			
Born in Australia	69.7%	72.6%	-2.9
Indigenous Australian	1.0%	2.2%	-1.2
<u>Employment</u>			
Vocationally qualified	47.2%	34.7%	+12.5
Unemployed	4.5%	7.4%	-2.9
<u>Health</u>			
Have regular GP	83.5%	-	-
Seen GP in last year	87.3%	-	-
Private Health Insurance	64.2%	45.1%	+19.1
<u>Other</u>			
Married	55.3%	50.7%	+4.6

Table 4 suggests that there was a level of selection bias in the sample with those agreeing to participate in the survey having higher levels of education and private health insurance, implying that the sample is from higher than average socio-economic circumstances.

3 Results

3.1 Replication of 1964 Western Australian Cancer Survey

The present study included a series of items to replicate an investigation conducted by Richardson (1964) on Western Australians' general beliefs about cancer for the Cancer Council of Western Australia. It surveyed individuals in the Perth metropolitan area on their beliefs and attitudes towards cancer, and included the items in Tables 5 to 13.

3.1.1 General Beliefs About Cancer

Table 5: Do you think that cancer is contagious?

	Yes	No	Sometimes or unsure	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	3.2%	96.1%	0.6%	0.0%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	0.7%	97.9%	0.7%	0.7%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	3.0%	95.0%	0.0%	2.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	1.6%	96.8%	1.2%	0.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	1.1%	98.9%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	2.0%	96.8%	0.8%	0.4%	100.0%

Table 6: Do you think that cancer can be inherited?

	Yes	No	Sometimes or unsure	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	76.8%	16.1%	7.1%	0.0%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	72.1%	12.9%	14.3%	0.7%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	67.3%	17.8%	14.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	70.9%	14.2%	14.0%	0.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	68.5%	15.2%	15.2%	1.1%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	68.8%	6.3%	18.8%	6.3%	100.2%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	72.7%	14.8%	12.0%	0.5%	100.0%

Table 7: Do you think cancer can be cured?

	Not curable	Sometimes curable	Completely curable	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	5.2%	83.9%	10.3%	0.6%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	4.3%	91.4%	4.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	3.0%	88.1%	8.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	5.0%	82.4%	12.4%	0.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	5.4%	84.8%	9.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	12.5%	81.3%	6.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	4.9%	82.0%	12.8%	0.3%	100.0%

Table 8: Do you think a delay of one month in treatment lessens the chance of a cure?

	Yes, lessens the chance of a cure	May lessen the chance of a cure	No, does not lessen the chance of a cure	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	55.5%	31.6%	8.4%	4.5%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	62.9%	23.6%	8.6%	5.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	62.4%	31.7%	3.0%	3.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	63.3%	21.8%	11.2%	3.6%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	57.6%	27.2%	9.8%	5.4%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	50.0%	31.3%	12.5%	6.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	62.5%	23.4%	10.7%	3.4%	100.0%

3.1.2 Personal experiences with Cancer**Table 9: Have you ever known anyone personally who was cured of cancer?**

	No	Yes	Temporary cure	Total
Sydney (n=155)	47.1%	41.9%	11.0%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	50.0%	39.3%	10.7%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	30.7%	59.4%	9.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	45.5%	43.3%	11.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	44.6%	37.0%	18.5%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	43.8%	43.8%	12.5%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	45.8%	42.9%	11.3%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 10: Have you ever had a cancer check up?

	Yes	No	Total
Sydney (n=155)	69.7%	30.3%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	65.0%	35.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	63.4%	36.6%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	74.1%	25.9%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	71.7%	28.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	81.3%	18.8%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	69.7%	30.3%	100.0%

3.1.3 Attitude towards Cancer

Table 11: Would you be willing to go for a cancer check up even in you had no obvious symptoms?

	Yes	No	Not sure	Total
Sydney (n=155)	87.1%	8.4%	4.5%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	82.1%	13.6%	4.3%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	82.2%	11.9%	5.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	85.0%	12.2%	2.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	80.4%	13.0%	6.5%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	93.8%	6.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	84.6%	11.3%	4.1%	100.0%

3.2 Luck versus Lifestyle for Simple Cancers

Participants were read out a list of cancers and asked to indicate for each how much sheer luck plays in the risk of getting the cancer, versus how much is caused by lifestyle.

For each of the following cancers, please indicate how much sheer luck plays in your risk of getting the cancer, versus how much is caused by your lifestyle. Would you say “mainly luck”, “luck and lifestyle”, or “mainly your lifestyle”?

Table 12a: Lung Cancer: Luck versus Lifestyle

Lung Cancer	Mainly luck	Luck and lifestyle equally	Mainly lifestyle	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	4.9%	17.1%	77.4%	0.6%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	3.5%	14.2%	82.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	1.0%	14.9%	84.2%	0.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	6.7%	11.7%	81.3%	0.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	2.6%	16.7%	80.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	0.0%	16.7%	79.2%	4.2%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	4.7%	14.5%	80.4%	0.3%	100.0%

Table 12b: Melanoma: Luck versus Lifestyle

Melanoma	Mainly luck	Luck and lifestyle equally	Mainly lifestyle	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	14.0%	13.4%	71.3%	1.2%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	10.6%	17.7%	69.5%	2.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	10.9%	16.8%	71.3%	1.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	6.5%	16.3%	77.0%	0.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	3.8%	12.8%	83.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	4.2%	12.5%	83.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	10.2%	15.6%	73.2%	1.0%	100.0%

Table 12c: Other Skin Cancer: Luck versus Lifestyle

Other Skin Cancer	Mainly luck	Luck and lifestyle equally	Mainly lifestyle	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	14.0%	20.7%	62.8%	2.4%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	7.8%	24.1%	67.4%	0.7%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	5.0%	18.8%	74.3%	2.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	10.5%	19.0%	68.3%	2.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	10.3%	25.6%	57.7%	6.4%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	20.8%	20.8%	58.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	10.6%	21.0%	66.3%	2.1%	100.0%

Table 12d: Bowel Cancer: Luck versus Lifestyle

Bowel Cancer	Mainly luck	Luck and lifestyle equally	Mainly lifestyle	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	28.7%	33.5%	34.1%	3.7%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	34.8%	28.4%	31.9%	5.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	18.8%	36.6%	41.6%	3.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	23.4%	35.3%	39.3%	2.0%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	34.6%	32.1%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	12.5%	29.2%	50.0%	8.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	27.8%	33.1%	35.9%	3.2%	100.0%

Table 12e: Leukaemia: Luck versus Lifestyle

Leukaemia	Mainly luck	Luck and lifestyle equally	Mainly lifestyle	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	79.9%	13.2%	6.3%	0.6%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	84.8%	11.4%	3.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	83.5%	10.3%	6.2%	0.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	84.3%	10.8%	4.6%	0.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	85.1%	5.4%	9.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	62.5%	20.8%	12.5%	4.2%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	82.8%	11.5%	5.3%	0.4%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 12f: Breast Cancer: Luck versus Lifestyle

Breast Cancer	Mainly luck	Luck and lifestyle equally	Mainly lifestyle	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	66.5%	22.0%	7.9%	3.7%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	70.2%	17.0%	7.1%	5.7%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	70.3%	16.8%	9.9%	3.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	72.8%	18.1%	7.5%	1.6%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	64.1%	20.5%	14.1%	1.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	58.3%	20.8%	16.7%	4.2%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	69.5%	19.2%	8.0%	3.3%	100.0%

Table 12g: Cervical Cancer: Luck versus Lifestyle

Cervical Cancer	Mainly luck	Luck and lifestyle equally	Mainly lifestyle	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	47.0%	25.6%	16.5%	11.0%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	61.7%	18.4%	11.3%	8.5%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	47.5%	32.7%	10.9%	8.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	57.7%	23.4%	13.7%	5.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	56.4%	26.9%	12.8%	3.8%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	37.5%	33.3%	29.2%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	54.1%	23.9%	13.9%	8.1%	100.0%

Table 12h: Prostate Cancer: Luck versus Lifestyle

Prostate Cancer	Mainly luck	Luck and lifestyle equally	Mainly lifestyle	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	61.6%	20.1%	11.0%	7.3%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	61.7%	17.7%	16.3%	4.3%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	59.4%	21.8%	10.9%	7.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	62.7%	18.1%	15.9%	3.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	61.5%	19.2%	16.7%	2.6%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	66.7%	12.5%	20.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	61.8%	19.0%	14.0%	5.2%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 12i: Stomach Cancer: Luck versus Lifestyle

Stomach Cancer	Mainly luck	Luck and lifestyle equally	Mainly lifestyle	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	30.5%	32.3%	32.3%	4.9%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	28.4%	24.8%	41.8%	5.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	24.8%	27.7%	43.6%	4.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	25.6%	29.2%	43.3%	1.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	30.8%	30.8%	35.9%	2.6%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	12.5%	37.5%	45.8%	4.2%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	28.0%	29.2%	39.0%	3.8%	100.0%

Table 12j: Bone Cancer: Luck versus Lifestyle

Bone Cancer	Mainly luck	Luck and lifestyle equally	Mainly lifestyle	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	68.9%	13.4%	13.4%	4.3%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	75.9%	10.6%	7.1%	6.4%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	72.3%	10.9%	8.9%	7.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	69.0%	16.3%	10.5%	4.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	75.6%	10.3%	10.3%	3.8%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	58.3%	16.7%	20.8%	4.2%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	71.0%	13.4%	10.6%	5.0%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 13: Ten Cancers: Luck versus Lifestyle

Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	Mainly lifestyle	Luck and lifestyle equally	Mainly luck	Don't know	Total
1. Lung Cancer	80.4%	14.5%	4.7%	0.3%	100.0%
2. Melanoma	73.2%	15.6%	10.2%	1.0%	100.0%
3. Other Skin Cancer	66.3%	21.0%	10.6%	2.1%	100.0%
4. Stomach Cancer	39.0%	29.2%	28.0%	3.8%	100.0%
5. Bowel Cancer	35.9%	33.1%	27.8%	3.2%	100.0%
6. Prostate Cancer	14.0%	19.0%	61.8%	5.2%	100.0%
7. Cervical Cancer	13.9%	23.9%	54.1%	8.1%	100.0%
8. Bone Cancer	10.6%	13.4%	71.0%	5.0%	100.0%
9. Breast Cancer	8.0%	19.2%	69.5%	3.3%	100.0%
10. Leukaemia	5.3%	11.5%	82.8%	0.4%	100.0%

3.3 Lifestyle and Overall Risk Reduction

Participants were asked how much they believed that they could personally reduce their risk of getting cancer by their own actions or behaviours. Responses were recorded along a five-point scale.

Table 14: Overall, how much do you believe that you can personally reduce your risk of getting cancer by your own actions or behaviours?

	Not reduce at all	Slightly reduce	Moderately reduce	Greatly reduce	Completely eliminate	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	3.2%	12.9%	46.5%	34.2%	1.3%	1.9%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	4.3%	15.7%	42.1%	33.6%	1.4%	2.9%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	5.0%	14.9%	37.6%	35.6%	3.0%	4.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	4.0%	9.6%	40.1%	40.3%	2.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	6.5%	18.5%	41.3%	31.5%	2.2%	0.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	6.3%	6.3%	62.5%	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	4.0%	12.9%	42.5%	36.0%	2.0%	2.6%	100.0%

* weighted

3.4 Lifestyle and Preventability for Specific Cancers

Participants were then read a list of cancers and asked how preventable they thought each was in terms of lifestyle choices and actions.

How preventable do you think the following list of cancers are? By preventable, we mean there are certain behaviours or actions which you can take, other than screening, to reduce the risk of getting cancer.

Table 15a: Lung cancer: Role of Lifestyle

Lung Cancer	Not at all or slightly preventable	Moderately or very preventable	Completely preventable	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	9.7%	77.4%	11.0%	1.9%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	12.9%	77.9%	7.1%	2.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	14.9%	76.2%	7.9%	1.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	13.0%	76.6%	8.0%	2.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	12.0%	78.3%	7.6%	2.2%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	6.3%	75.0%	12.5%	6.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	9.7%	79.2%	9.0%	2.1%	100.0%

Table 15b: Melanoma: Role of Lifestyle

Melanoma	Not at all or slightly preventable	Moderately or very preventable	Completely preventable	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	7.1%	77.4%	14.2%	1.3%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	9.3%	76.4%	9.3%	5.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	9.9%	73.3%	11.9%	5.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	10.4%	77.8%	10.4%	1.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	7.6%	84.8%	6.5%	1.1%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	0.0%	93.8%	6.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	6.6%	79.3%	11.6%	2.5%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 15c: Other Skin Cancer: Role of Lifestyle

Other Skin Cancer	Not at all or slightly preventable	Moderately or very preventable	Completely preventable	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	6.5%	78.1%	12.9%	2.6%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	7.1%	79.3%	5.7%	7.9%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	16.8%	71.3%	9.9%	2.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	8.0%	77.0%	9.4%	5.6%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	9.8%	77.2%	7.6%	5.4%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	6.3%	75.0%	6.3%	12.5%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	4.5%	80.4%	10.0%	5.0%	100.0%

Table 15d: Bowel Cancer: Role of Lifestyle

Bowel Cancer	Not at all or slightly preventable	Moderately or very preventable	Completely preventable	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	38.7%	47.7%	5.2%	8.4%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	40.7%	44.3%	3.6%	11.4%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	38.6%	48.5%	5.0%	7.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	40.5%	46.9%	2.8%	9.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	38.0%	55.4%	1.1%	5.4%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	43.8%	56.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	33.0%	52.4%	4.3%	10.4%	100.0%

Table 15e: Leukaemia: Role of Lifestyle

Leukaemia	Not at all or slightly preventable	Moderately or very preventable	Completely preventable	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	74.8%	7.7%	2.6%	14.8%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	73.6%	8.6%	0.7%	17.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	68.3%	18.8%	0.0%	12.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	68.5%	10.8%	1.2%	19.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	76.1%	7.6%	0.0%	16.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	75.0%	18.8%	0.0%	6.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)	80.3%	6.9%	1.0%	11.8%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 15f: Breast Cancer: Role of Lifestyle

Breast Cancer	Not at all or slightly preventable	Moderately or very preventable	Completely preventable	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	58.7%	29.0%	6.5%	5.8%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	55.0%	37.1%	2.1%	5.7%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	59.4%	31.7%	3.0%	5.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	54.7%	36.7%	3.8%	4.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	60.9%	34.8%	0.0%	4.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	63.7%	28.4%	3.4%	4.5%	100.0%

Table 15g: Cervical Cancer: Role of Lifestyle

Cervical Cancer	Not at all or slightly preventable	Moderately or very preventable	Completely preventable	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	53.5%	29.0%	6.5%	11.0%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	49.3%	30.7%	0.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	52.5%	32.7%	5.9%	8.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	46.7%	38.1%	3.6%	11.6%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	55.4%	35.9%	0.0%	8.7%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	43.8%	43.8%	6.3%	6.3%	100.2%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	55.1%	29.8%	3.4%	11.7%	100.0%

Table 15h: Prostate Cancer: Role of Lifestyle

Prostate Cancer	Not at all or slightly preventable	Moderately or very preventable	Completely preventable	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	56.8%	28.4%	3.9%	11.0%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	50.7%	35.0%	0.0%	14.3%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	53.5%	25.7%	2.0%	18.8%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	51.5%	34.3%	2.8%	11.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	66.3%	26.1%	0.0%	7.6%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	31.3%	62.5%	0.0%	6.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	60.4%	27.1%	2.0%	10.6%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 15i: Stomach Cancer: Role of Lifestyle

Stomach Cancer	Not at all or slightly preventable	Moderately or very preventable	Completely preventable	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	48.4%	33.5%	3.9%	14.2%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	48.6%	36.4%	0.7%	14.3%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	51.5%	35.6%	3.0%	9.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	49.7%	36.5%	1.4%	12.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	58.7%	26.1%	1.1%	14.1%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	43.8%	50.0%	0.0%	6.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	49.2%	35.3%	2.2%	13.4%	100.0%

Table 15j: Bone Cancer: Role of Lifestyle

Bone Cancer	Not at all or slightly preventable	Moderately or very preventable	Completely preventable	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	74.2%	11.6%	2.6%	11.6%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	65.0%	14.3%	0.0%	20.7%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	63.4%	12.9%	0.0%	23.8%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	70.3%	14.2%	1.0%	14.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	81.5%	5.4%	0.0%	13.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	68.8%	18.8%	0.0%	12.5%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	78.1%	9.5%	0.9%	11.5%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 16: Ten Cancers: Role of Lifestyle

Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	Not at all or slightly preventable	Moderately or very preventable	Completely preventable	Don't know	Total
1. Leukaemia	80.3%	6.9%	1.0%	11.8%	100.0%
2. Bone Cancer	78.1%	9.5%	0.9%	11.5%	100.0%
3. Breast Cancer	63.7%	28.4%	3.4%	4.5%	100.0%
4. Prostate Cancer	60.4%	27.1%	2.0%	10.6%	100.0%
5. Cervical Cancer	55.1%	29.8%	3.4%	11.7%	100.0%
6. Stomach Cancer	49.2%	35.3%	2.2%	13.4%	100.0%
7. Bowel Cancer	33.0%	52.4%	4.3%	10.4%	100.0%
8. Lung Cancer	9.7%	79.2%	9.0%	1.9%	100.0%
9. Melanoma	6.6%	79.3%	11.6%	2.5%	100.0%
10. Other Skin Cancer	4.5%	80.4%	10.0%	5.0%	100.0%

3.5 Regular Screening and Early Treatment on Prevention

Participants were read a list of cancers and asked which of them can be prevented by regular “screening” and early treatment.

Which of the following cancers can be detected at an early stage by regular “screening” and treated before they become life threatening?

Table 17a: Lung Cancer: Preventability by Regular Screening

Lung Cancer	Yes	No	Sometimes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	62.6%	19.4%	7.1%	11.0%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	65.0%	13.6%	12.1%	9.3%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	77.2%	7.9%	9.9%	5.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	67.7%	16.0%	8.8%	7.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	69.6%	14.1%	12.0%	4.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	56.3%	12.5%	0.0%	31.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	66.3%	15.8%	9.2%	8.7%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 17b: Melanoma: Preventability by Regular Screening

Melanoma	Yes	No	Sometimes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	92.3%	0.6%	2.6%	4.5%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	90.0%	3.6%	2.1%	4.3%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	95.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	91.0%	2.4%	4.6%	2.0%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	90.2%	0.0%	5.4%	4.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	93.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	91.5%	2.0%	3.1%	3.4%	100.0%

Table 17c: Other Skin Cancer: Preventability by Regular Screening

Other Skin Cancer	Yes	No	Sometimes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	93.5%	0.6%	1.3%	4.5%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	86.4%	1.4%	2.9%	9.3%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	93.1%	0.0%	2.0%	5.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	88.8%	2.2%	3.8%	5.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	87.0%	1.1%	6.5%	5.4%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	93.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	90.0%	1.3%	2.8%	5.9%	100.0%

Table 17d: Bowel Cancer: Preventability by Regular Screening

Bowel Cancer	Yes	No	Sometimes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	71.0%	14.2%	6.5%	8.4%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	65.0%	12.9%	7.9%	14.3%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	63.4%	13.9%	10.9%	11.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	62.3%	15.4%	9.2%	13.0%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	68.5%	14.1%	7.6%	9.8%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	81.3%	6.3%	6.3%	6.3%	100.2%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	66.1%	14.2%	8.1%	11.6%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 17e: Leukaemia: Preventability by Regular Screening

Leukaemia	Yes	No	Sometimes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	36.1%	27.1%	12.3%	24.5%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	47.1%	23.6%	6.4%	22.9%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	55.4%	15.8%	11.9%	16.8%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	41.5%	25.5%	9.2%	23.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	37.0%	27.2%	14.1%	21.7%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	43.8%	25.0%	12.5%	18.8%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	41.9%	24.9%	10.0%	23.2%	100.0%

Table 17f: Breast Cancer: Preventability by Regular Screening

Breast Cancer	Yes	No	Sometimes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	94.8%	1.3%	3.2%	0.6%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	94.3%	2.1%	1.4%	2.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	93.1%	2.0%	4.0%	1.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	96.6%	1.2%	1.6%	0.6%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	96.7%	0.0%	2.2%	1.1%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	95.2%	1.4%	2.3%	1.0%	100.0%

Table 17g: Cervical Cancer: Preventability by Regular Screening

Cervical Cancer	Yes	No	Sometimes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	89.0%	1.9%	1.9%	7.1%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	84.3%	3.6%	0.7%	11.4%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	86.1%	2.0%	3.0%	8.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	85.0%	2.6%	3.6%	8.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	91.3%	2.2%	0.0%	6.5%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	93.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	86.5%	2.5%	2.2%	8.8%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 17h: Prostate Cancer: Preventability by Regular Screening

Prostate Cancer	Yes	No	Sometimes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	87.7%	4.5%	1.3%	6.5%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	85.7%	3.6%	2.9%	7.9%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	79.2%	5.0%	5.0%	10.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	86.8%	3.2%	4.2%	5.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	88.0%	4.3%	4.3%	3.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	81.3%	0.0%	6.3%	12.5%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	86.3%	3.9%	3.0%	6.8%	100.0%

Table 17i: Stomach Cancer: Preventability by Regular Screening

Stomach Cancer	Yes	No	Sometimes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	42.6%	27.1%	8.4%	21.9%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	43.6%	21.4%	7.9%	27.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	41.6%	20.8%	12.9%	24.8%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	37.1%	22.6%	13.4%	26.9%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	33.7%	29.3%	8.7%	28.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	31.3%	18.8%	18.8%	31.3%	100.2%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	40.5%	24.0%	10.3%	25.2%	100.0%

Table 17j: Bone Cancer: Preventability by Regular Screening

Bone Cancer	Yes	No	Sometimes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	29.0%	36.8%	6.5%	27.7%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	32.9%	30.0%	8.6%	28.6%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	30.7%	34.7%	8.9%	25.7%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	31.7%	31.7%	9.6%	27.1%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	34.8%	34.8%	6.5%	23.9%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	43.8%	25.0%	0.0%	31.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	31.2%	33.3%	8.1%	27.4%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 18: Ten Cancers: Preventability by Regular Screening

Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	Yes	No	Sometimes	Don't know	Total
1. Breast Cancer	95.2%	1.4%	2.3%	1.0%	100.0%
2. Melanoma	91.5%	2.0%	3.1%	3.4%	100.0%
3. Other Skin Cancer	90.0%	1.3%	2.8%	5.9%	100.0%
4. Cervical Cancer	86.5%	2.5%	2.2%	8.8%	100.0%
5. Prostate Cancer	86.3%	3.9%	3.0%	6.8%	100.0%
6. Lung Cancer	66.3%	15.8%	9.2%	8.7%	100.0%
7. Bowel Cancer	66.1%	14.2%	8.1%	11.6%	100.0%
8. Leukaemia	41.9%	24.9%	10.0%	23.2%	100.0%
9. Stomach Cancer	40.5%	24.0%	10.3%	25.2%	100.0%
10. Bone Cancer	31.2%	33.3%	8.1%	27.4%	100.0%

3.6 Impact of Early Treatment

Participants were read a list of cancers and asked how much difference it would make to survival if each cancer was treated in the early stages rather than a later stage.

If you treated the following cancers in the early stage rather than a later stage, how much difference would it make to how long you'd live?

Table 19a: Lung Cancer: Prognosis with early detection

Lung Cancer	No difference	Slight or some difference	A great deal of difference	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	4.3%	50.0%	45.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	7.1%	43.3%	47.5%	2.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	6.9%	39.6%	52.5%	1.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	9.0%	39.7%	50.0%	1.3%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	8.7%	47.0%	44.2%	0.2%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	6.1%	44.7%	47.6%	1.6%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	4.2%	33.3%	62.5%	0.0%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 19b: Melanoma: Prognosis with early detection

Melanoma	No difference	Slight or some difference	A great deal of difference	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	1.8%	22.0%	75.0%	1.2%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	1.4%	17.0%	78.7%	2.8%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	0.0%	16.8%	82.2%	1.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	2.0%	15.3%	82.5%	0.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	1.3%	17.9%	79.5%	1.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	0.0%	12.5%	87.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	1.4%	17.4%	80.3%	1.0%	100.0%

Table 19c: Other Skin Cancer: Prognosis with early detection

Other Skin Cancer	No difference	Slight or some difference	A great deal of difference	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	1.8%	18.9%	76.8%	2.4%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	0.7%	21.3%	75.9%	2.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	0.0%	15.8%	82.2%	2.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	1.4%	19.6%	77.8%	1.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	1.3%	10.3%	88.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	0.0%	12.5%	87.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	1.0%	18.3%	79.2%	1.4%	100.0%

Table 19d: Bowel Cancer: Survivability with early detection

Bowel Cancer	No difference	Slight or some difference	A great deal of difference	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	2.4%	36.0%	61.6%	0.0%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	2.1%	31.9%	63.1%	2.8%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	2.0%	32.7%	63.4%	2.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	2.2%	40.1%	57.1%	0.6%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	2.6%	35.9%	60.3%	1.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	4.2%	29.2%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	2.4%	36.2%	60.2%	1.2%	100.0%

Table 19e: Leukaemia: Prognosis with early detection

Leukaemia	No difference	Slight or some difference	A great deal of difference	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	12.8%	49.4%	36.0%	1.8%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	9.2%	51.1%	36.9%	2.8%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	5.0%	50.5%	39.6%	5.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	7.9%	49.8%	39.7%	2.6%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	14.1%	38.5%	42.3%	5.1%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	8.3%	41.7%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	8.3%	48.6%	39.8%	3.2%	100.0%

Table 19f: Breast Cancer: Survivability with early detection

Breast Cancer	No difference	Slight or some difference	A great deal of difference	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	0.0%	12.8%	86.6%	0.6%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	0.0%	12.1%	86.5%	1.4%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	1.0%	18.8%	79.2%	1.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	0.8%	15.1%	84.1%	0.0%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	0.0%	15.4%	84.6%	0.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	0.0%	20.8%	79.2%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	0.7%	15.0%	83.9%	0.4%	100.0%

Table 19g: Cervical Cancer: Prognosis with early detection

Cervical Cancer	No difference	Slight or some difference	A great deal of difference	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	1.8%	20.1%	75.6%	2.4%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	0.0%	23.4%	69.5%	7.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	1.0%	24.8%	70.3%	4.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	1.2%	20.0%	77.0%	1.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	2.6%	15.4%	80.8%	1.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	4.2%	20.8%	75.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	1.3%	19.8%	76.0%	2.9%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 19h: Prostate Cancer: Prognosis with early detection

Prostate Cancer	No difference	Slight or some difference	A great deal of difference	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	3.0%	18.3%	75.0%	3.7%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	1.4%	24.1%	71.6%	2.8%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	1.0%	29.7%	67.3%	2.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	1.2%	23.0%	75.2%	0.6%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	1.3%	25.6%	73.1%	0.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	4.2%	29.2%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	1.9%	22.6%	74.0%	1.5%	100.0%

Table 19i: Stomach Cancer: Prognosis with early detection

Stomach Cancer	No difference	Slight or some difference	A great deal of difference	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	3.0%	48.8%	45.7%	2.4%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	4.3%	45.4%	46.8%	3.5%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	2.0%	52.5%	40.6%	5.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	5.2%	45.4%	48.0%	1.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	5.1%	39.7%	53.8%	1.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	8.3%	29.2%	62.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	4.2%	45.4%	48.2%	2.2%	100.0%

Table 19j: Bone Cancer: Prognosis with early detection

Bone Cancer	No difference	Slight or some difference	A great deal of difference	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=164)	14.6%	49.4%	34.1%	1.8%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	12.8%	48.9%	31.2%	7.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	13.9%	48.5%	31.7%	5.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	11.3%	51.2%	33.9%	3.6%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	14.1%	43.6%	42.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	8.3%	33.3%	58.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	11.6%	49.7%	35.1%	3.6%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 20: Ten Cancers: Prognosis with early detection

Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	No difference	Slight or some difference	A great deal of difference	Don't know	Total
1. Breast Cancer	0.7%	15.0%	83.9%	0.4%	100.0%
2. Melanoma	1.4%	17.4%	80.3%	1.0%	100.0%
3. Other Skin Cancer	1.0%	18.3%	79.2%	1.4%	100.0%
4. Cervical Cancer	1.3%	19.8%	76.0%	2.9%	100.0%
5. Prostate Cancer	1.9%	22.6%	74.0%	1.5%	100.0%
6. Lung Cancer	4.2%	33.3%	62.5%	0.0%	100.0%
7. Bowel Cancer	2.4%	36.2%	60.2%	1.2%	100.0%
8. Stomach Cancer	4.2%	45.4%	48.2%	2.2%	100.0%
9. Leukaemia	8.3%	48.6%	39.8%	3.2%	100.0%
10. Bone Cancer	11.6%	49.7%	35.1%	3.6%	100.0%

3.7 Survivability of Various Cancers

Participants were read out a list of cancers and asked which they thought had the highest or lowest survival rates.

I am going to read out a list of cancers. I would like you to tell me which one you think is the most survivable, and the next most survivable, and the next most survivable.

Table 21: Top Three Most Survivable Cancers

	Sydney (n=155)	Melbourne (n=140)	Brisbane (n=101)	Adelaide (n=92)	Perth (n=499)	Hobart (n=16)	Metro Australia (n=1,003)*
1. Other Skin cancer	69.0%	77.9%	71.3%	71.7%	73.7%	62.5%	72.5%
2. Breast Cancer	65.2%	59.3%	67.3%	71.7%	67.5%	50.0%	64.4%
3. Melanoma	47.1%	52.1%	56.4%	52.2%	55.5%	75.0%	51.7%
4. Prostate Cancer	38.1%	34.3%	33.7%	35.9%	36.7%	37.5%	36.0%
5. Cervical Cancer	30.3%	22.9%	26.7%	28.3%	24.2%	31.3%	26.9%
6. Bowel cancer	25.2%	19.3%	9.9%	14.1%	15.2%	12.5%	19.1%
7. Leukaemia	9.0%	14.3%	10.9%	15.2%	10.4%	12.5%	11.5%
8. Stomach Cancer	8.4%	9.3%	11.9%	3.3%	6.0%	12.5%	8.5%
9. Lung Cancer	3.2%	7.9%	6.9%	4.3%	6.0%	6.3%	5.5%
10. Bone Cancer	4.5%	2.9%	5.0%	3.3%	4.6%	0.0%	3.9%

* weighted

I am going to read out a list of cancers. I would like you to tell me which one you think is the least survivable, and which is the next least survivable, and the next most survivable.

Table 22: Top Three Least Survivable Cancers

	Sydney (n=164)	Melbourne (n=141)	Brisbane (n=101)	Adelaide (n=78)	Perth (n=496)	Hobart (n=24)	Metro Australia (n=1,004)*
1. Lung Cancer	50.0%	63.1%	62.4%	61.5%	59.5%	45.8%	57.4%
2. Bone Cancer	52.4%	56.7%	51.5%	52.6%	49.0%	54.2%	53.2%
3. Leukaemia	47.6%	41.1%	43.6%	46.2%	43.1%	50.0%	44.6%
4. Stomach Cancer	37.8	41.8%	43.6%	37.2%	42.3%	54.2%	40.5%
5. Bowel cancer	34.1%	34.0%	35.6%	26.9%	37.1%	33.3%	34.0%
6. Melanoma	22.0%	17.0%	18.8%	28.2%	22.4%	29.2%	20.9%
7. Breast Cancer	23.2%	14.2%	15.8%	11.5%	18.8%	16.7%	18.0%
8. Cervical Cancer	17.7%	13.5%	12.9%	12.8%	13.9%	4.2%	14.8%
9. Prostate Cancer	12.2%	13.5%	11.9%	20.5%	11.5%	8.3%	13.1%
10. Other Skin cancer	3.0%	5.0%	4.0%	2.6%	2.4%	4.2%	3.6%

3.8 Genetic Testing

Participants were asked whether or not they had ever heard of genetic testing for cancer. The question and responses are displayed in Table 23 below.

Genetic testing means seeing if people have genes that make them more likely or less likely than average to get certain types of cancer. Have you heard of genetic testing for cancer?

Table 23: Participants who have you heard of genetic testing for cancer

	Yes	No	Total
Sydney (n=164)	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	61.0%	39.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	59.4%	40.6%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	59.5%	40.5%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	64.1%	35.9%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	54.2%	45.8%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	58.2%	41.8%	100.0%

* weighted

Participants were then asked to imagine that if there *was* a low cost, painless genetic test for a series of specific cancers, how likely it would be for them to decide to have the test for each of the cancers. Results are displayed in Tables 22a to 22j below.

If there was a low cost, painless genetic test for each of the following cancers, would you decide to have the test?

Table 24a: Lung Cancer: Likelihood of Submitting to Genetic Test

Lung Cancer	Definitely would	Probably would or not sure	Probably or definitely wouldn't	Total
Sydney (n=164)	54.3%	26.2%	19.5%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	52.5%	19.1%	28.4%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	59.4%	24.8%	15.8%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	53.2%	22.8%	24.0%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	50.0%	23.1%	26.9%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	53.7%	23.3%	23.0%	100.0%

Table 24b: Melanoma: Likelihood of Submitting to Genetic Test

Melanoma	Definitely would	Probably would or not sure	Probably or definitely wouldn't	Total
Sydney (n=164)	56.7%	26.8%	16.5%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	53.2%	22.7%	24.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	59.4%	28.7%	11.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	59.3%	24.8%	15.9%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	48.7%	34.6%	16.7%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	37.5%	41.7%	20.8%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	56.6%	25.7%	17.7%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 24c: Other Skin Cancer: Likelihood of Submitting to Genetic Test

Other Skin Cancer	Definitely would	Probably would or not sure	Probably or definitely wouldn't	Total
Sydney (n=164)	56.7%	25.6%	17.7%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	48.9%	22.0%	29.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	58.4%	31.7%	9.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	55.6%	25.8%	18.5%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	50.0%	30.8%	19.2%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	29.2%	54.2%	16.7%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	54.4%	25.6%	20.0%	100.0%

Table 24d: Bowel Cancer: Likelihood of Submitting to Genetic Test

Bowel Cancer	Definitely would	Probably would or not sure	Probably or definitely wouldn't	Total
Sydney (n=164)	57.3%	29.3%	13.4%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	58.9%	22.0%	19.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	59.4%	31.7%	8.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	62.9%	25.2%	11.9%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	55.1%	26.9%	17.9%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	33.3%	45.8%	20.8%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	59.5%	26.5%	14.1%	100.0%

Table 24e: Leukaemia: Likelihood of Submitting to Genetic Test

Leukaemia	Definitely would	Probably would or not sure	Probably or definitely wouldn't	Total
Sydney (n=164)	54.9%	25.0%	20.1%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	51.8%	22.0%	26.2%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	55.4%	30.7%	13.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	55.8%	25.2%	19.0%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	52.6%	25.6%	21.8%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	54.4%	24.9%	20.7%	100.0%

Table 24f: Breast Cancer: Likelihood of Submitting to Genetic Test

Breast Cancer	Definitely would	Probably would or not sure	Probably or definitely wouldn't	Total
Sydney (n=164)	65.9%	25.0%	9.1%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	73.4%	17.2%	9.4%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	73.9%	21.7%	4.3%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	71.3%	17.8%	10.9%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	68.6%	25.7%	5.7%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	56.3%	25.0%	18.8%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	69.8%	20.9%	9.3%	100.0%

Table 24g: Cervical Cancer: Likelihood of Submitting to Genetic Test

Cervical Cancer	Definitely would	Probably would or not sure	Probably or definitely wouldn't	Total
Sydney (n=164)	64.8%	22.7%	12.5%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	67.2%	20.3%	12.5%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	73.9%	17.4%	8.7%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	70.0%	17.0%	13.0%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	62.9%	28.6%	8.6%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	62.5%	25.0%	12.5%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	67.5%	20.2%	12.2%	100.0%

Table 24h: Prostate Cancer: Likelihood of Submitting to Genetic Test

Prostate Cancer	Definitely would	Probably would or not sure	Probably or definitely wouldn't	Total
Sydney (n=164)	59.2%	26.3%	14.5%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	61.0%	20.8%	18.2%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	65.5%	25.5%	9.1%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	67.5%	21.7%	10.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	60.5%	23.3%	16.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	62.8%	23.3%	13.8%	100.0%

Table 24i: Stomach Cancer: Likelihood of Submitting to Genetic Test

Stomach Cancer	Definitely would	Probably would or not sure	Probably or definitely wouldn't	Total
Sydney (n=164)	51.8%	27.4%	20.7%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	54.6%	26.2%	19.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	60.4%	30.7%	8.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	56.0%	27.6%	16.3%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	51.3%	30.8%	17.9%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	33.3%	45.8%	20.8%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	54.4%	27.7%	17.9%	100.0%

Table 24j: Bone Cancer: Likelihood of Submitting to Genetic Test

Bone Cancer	Definitely would	Probably would or not sure	Probably or definitely wouldn't	Total
Sydney (n=164)	53.7%	22.0%	24.4%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=141)	48.2%	24.8%	27.0%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	63.4%	23.8%	12.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=496)	56.3%	25.4%	18.3%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=78)	51.3%	30.8%	17.9%	100.0%
Hobart (n=24)	37.5%	33.3%	29.2%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	53.9%	24.2%	21.9%	100.0%

Table 25: Ten Cancers: Likelihood of Submitting to Genetic Test

Metropolitan Australia (n=1,004)*	Definitely would	Probably would or not sure	Probably or definitely wouldn't	Total
1. Breast Cancer	69.8%	20.9%	9.3%	100.0%
2. Cervical Cancer	67.5%	20.2%	12.2%	100.0%
3. Prostate Cancer	62.8%	23.3%	13.8%	100.0%
4. Bowel Cancer	59.5%	26.5%	14.1%	100.0%
5. Melanoma	56.6%	25.7%	17.7%	100.0%
6. Stomach Cancer	54.4%	27.7%	17.9%	100.0%
7. Other Skin Cancer	54.4%	25.6%	20.0%	100.0%
8. Leukaemia	54.4%	24.9%	20.7%	100.0%
9. Bone Cancer	53.9%	24.2%	21.9%	100.0%
10. Lung Cancer	53.7%	23.3%	23.0%	100.0%

3.9 Modern Living Contributors to Cancer

3.9.1 High Voltage Powerlines

Participants were asked a series of questions in regards to their beliefs about the contribution of high voltage powerlines to a person's risk of developing cancer. Results are displayed in Tables 26 to 28 below.

Table 26: Do you think that high voltage powerlines contribute to the risk of developing cancer?

High voltage powerlines	Definitely or probably do not contribute	Probably contribute	Definitely contribute	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	22.6%	54.8%	18.7%	3.9%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	20.0%	57.9%	18.6%	3.6%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	25.7%	48.5%	19.8%	5.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	21.2%	50.9%	20.4%	7.4%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	22.8%	50.0%	17.4%	9.8%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	25.0%	56.3%	18.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	21.8%	53.5%	19.3%	5.4%	100.0%

* weighted

Table 27: *To what extent do you believe that living within 200 metres of high voltage powerlines increases a person's risk of cancer?*

	No effect	Increases the risk slightly	Increases the risk quite a bit	Increases the risk a great deal	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	10.3%	49.0%	22.6%	16.1%	1.9%	10.3%
Melbourne (n=140)	10.7%	43.6%	17.9%	24.3%	3.6%	10.7%
Brisbane (n=101)	19.8%	41.6%	22.8%	12.9%	3.0%	19.8%
Perth (n=499)	9.4%	46.1%	23.4%	18.0%	3.0%	9.4%
Adelaide (n=92)	13.0%	47.8%	23.9%	10.9%	4.3%	13.0%
Hobart (n=16)	12.5%	37.5%	31.3%	18.8%	0.0%	12.5%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	11.0%	46.2%	21.9%	18.1%	2.8%	11.0%

Table 28: *To what extent do you believe that your own risk of cancer has been increased by your exposure to powerlines?*

	No effect	Increased the risk slightly	Increased the risk quite a bit or a great deal	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	56.1%	31.0%	9.7%	3.2%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	50.7%	37.9%	7.9%	3.6%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	56.4%	29.7%	10.9%	3.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	56.7%	33.1%	7.4%	2.8%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	56.5%	37.0%	2.2%	4.3%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	56.3%	31.3%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	55.1%	33.4%	8.3%	3.2%	100.0%

3.8.2 Solariums

Participants were asked a series of questions regarding their experience of solariums and beliefs about the contribution of such to cancer.

Table 29: To what extent does using solariums contribute to cancer?

Solariums	Definitely or probably does not contribute	Probably contributes	Definitely contributes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	20.0%	65.8%	8.4%	5.8%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	25.7%	55.0%	12.1%	7.1%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	26.7%	57.4%	12.9%	3.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	23.0%	59.3%	11.0%	6.6%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	22.8%	58.7%	10.9%	7.6%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	37.5%	62.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	23.0%	60.3%	10.6%	6.2%	100.0%

Table 31: Reported Solarium Behaviours

	Yes	No	Total
<i>Have you ever been to a solarium to get your skin tanned? (n=1,004)*</i>	9.4%	90.6%	100.0%
	Mean	Median	Range
<i>How many times have you been to a solarium to get your skin tanned? (n=94)*</i>	13.7	6.0	1-200
<i>How many times have you been to a solarium in the past twelve months to get your skin tanned? (n=94)*</i>	1.1	3.0	0-25
<i>How long [in minutes] do you usually stay in the solarium? (n=94)*</i>	17.2	15.0	3-120

* weighted

3.9.3 Other Modern Contributors

Participants were read a list of other features of modern life and asked to what extent they believed each contributed to the development of cancer. Results are displayed in Tables 30a to 30e.

Do you think that the following contribute to the risk of developing cancer?

Table 31a: Mobile Telephone Towers: contribution to cancer

Phone Towers	Definitely or probably do not contribute	Probably contribute	Definitely contribute	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	25.2%	51.0%	12.3%	11.6%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	32.9%	47.1%	11.4%	8.6%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	22.8%	58.4%	11.9%	6.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	27.9%	48.5%	14.4%	9.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	25.0%	50.0%	12.0%	13.0%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	31.3%	62.5%	6.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	27.6%	49.9%	12.7%	9.8%	100.0%

Table 31b: Mobile Telephones: contribution to cancer

Mobile Phones	Definitely or probably do not contribute	Probably contribute	Definitely contribute	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	87.1%	7.1%	2.6%	3.2%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	85.0%	11.4%	0.7%	2.9%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	85.1%	8.9%	1.0%	5.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	83.4%	11.0%	0.4%	5.2%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	84.8%	8.7%	0.0%	6.5%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	87.5%	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	85.2%	9.6%	1.2%	4.1%	100.0%

Table 31c: Asbestos: contribution to cancer

Asbestos	Definitely or probably does not contribute	Probably contributes	Definitely contributes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	16.8%	53.5%	22.6%	7.1%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	10.0%	52.9%	29.3%	7.9%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	17.8%	53.5%	22.8%	5.9%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	15.0%	54.7%	23.2%	7.0%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	12.0%	52.2%	30.4%	5.4%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	18.8%	50.0%	18.8%	12.5%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	14.5%	53.7%	24.7%	7.1%	100.0%

Table 31d: Toxic Chemicals: contribution to cancer

Toxic Chemicals	Definitely or probably does not contribute	Probably contributes	Definitely contributes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	0.0%	0.6%	38.7%	58.7%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	0.0%	1.4%	45.7%	51.4%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	1.0%	3.0%	32.7%	62.4%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	2.2%	1.1%	38.0%	56.5%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	1.0%	2.4%	29.5%	66.7%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	0.0%	6.3%	50.0%	43.8%	100.0%
Metropolitan Australia (n=1,003)*	0.5%	1.6%	36.8%	59.8%	100.0%

Table 31e: Car Exhaust Fumes: contribution to cancer

Car Exhaust Fumes	Definitely or probably does not contribute	Probably contributes	Definitely contributes	Don't know	Total
Sydney (n=155)	3.2%	12.9%	81.9%	1.9%	100.0%
Melbourne (n=140)	3.6%	19.3%	74.3%	2.9%	100.0%
Brisbane (n=101)	5.0%	22.8%	70.3%	2.0%	100.0%
Perth (n=499)	1.8%	14.0%	83.6%	0.6%	100.0%
Adelaide (n=92)	3.3%	15.2%	80.4%	1.1%	100.0%
Hobart (n=16)	12.5%	12.5%	75.0%	0.0%	100.0%

* weighted

4 REFERENCES

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2002) *Australia: 2001 Census Basic Community Profile and Snapshot*. URL: <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats> [accessed 30-4-2003].
- Borland, R., Donaghue, N. & Hill, D. (1994) Illnesses that Australians most feared in 1986 and 1993, *Australian Journal of Public Health*, 18(4), 366-369.
- Carter, O., Donovan, R., Jalleh, G. and Jones, S. (submitted 2003) Metropolitan Australians' Perception of Genetic Testing for Cancer. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*
- Donovan, R., Carter, O., Jalleh, G. and Jones, S. (submitted 2003) Changes in Western Australian's Beliefs about Cancer: 1964 to 2001. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*.
- Donovan, R. (2000) *Virtual Colonoscopy Project: Group discussions with men and women aged 50 to 69*. Unpublished report. Curtin University: CBRCC.
- Fontaine, K. & Smith, S.(1995) Optimistic bias in cancer risk perception: A cross-national study, *Psychological Reports*, 77, 143-146.
- Helzlsouer, K., Ford, D., Hayward, R., Midzenski, M. & Perry, H. (1994) Perceived risk of cancer and practice of cancer prevention behaviors among employees in an oncology centre, *Preventive Medicine*, 23, 302-308.
- Johnson, J., Bottorff, J., Balneaves, L., Grewal, S., Bhagat, R., Hilton, B. & Clarke, H. (1999) South Asian womens' views on the causes of breast cancer: Images and explanations, *Patient Education & Counseling*, 37(3), 243-254.
- Murray, M. & Mc Millan, C. (1993) Gender differences in perceptions of cancer, *Journal of Cancer Education*, 8(1),53-62.
- Paul, C., Barratt, A., Redman, S., Cockburn, J. & Lowe, J.(1999) Knowledge and perceptions about breast cancer incidence, fatality and risk among Australian women, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 23(4), 396-400.
- Pearlman, D., Clark, M., Rakowski, W. & Ehrich, B. (1999) Screening for breast and cervical cancers: The importance of knowledge and perceived cancer survivability, *Women & Health*, 28(4), 93-112.
- Price, J. (1993) Perceptions of colorectal cancer in a socioeconomically disadvantaged population, *Journal of Community Health*, 18(6), 347-362.
- Richardson, A. (1965) *Research Report on A Social Survey of Community Attitudes to Cancer: Metropolitan Area of Perth Western Australia*. The University of Western Australia, Department of Psychology prepared for Cancer Council of Western Australia.

- Rossiter, J. & Percy, L. *Advertising Communications & Promotion Management*, Second edition, New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill.
- Skinner, C., Kreuter, M., Kobrin, S. & Strecher, V. (1998) Perceived and actual breast cancer risk: Optimistic and pessimistic biases, *Journal of Health Psychology*, 3(2), 181-193.
- Thomas, R. & Clarke, V. (1998) Community (mis)understandings of colorectal cancer treatment, *Australia & New Zealand Journal of Surgery*, 68, 328-330.
- Weller, D., Pinnock, C., Silagy, C., Hiller, J. & Marshall, V. (1998) Prostate cancer testing in SA men: Influence of sociodemographic factors, health beliefs and LUTS, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 22(3), 400-402.
- Wilcox, S. & Stefanick, M. (1999) Knowledge and perceived risk of major diseases in middle-aged and older women, *Health Psychology*, 18(4), 346-353