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ABSTRACT

Introduction Aotearoa New Zealand (NZ) plans to introduce a smoke-free generation (SFG) policy, alongside denicotinisation and reducing the availability of tobacco products. The SFG has a clear rationale, yet we know little about how young people, those the policy targets, perceive it. To inform policy design, communication and implementation, we explored how NZ youth perceived the SFG.

Methods We undertook in-depth interviews with a sample of 20 youth aged 17 or 18 and explored their knowledge of the SFG, and how they perceived its individual and societal implications. We interpreted the data using a reflexive thematic analysis approach.

Results We identified two overarching themes. The first theme, ‘societal good and protection from harm’, reflected benefits participants associated with the SFG, which outweighed perceptions of lost freedoms. The second theme, ‘privileging personal choice’, corresponded to two small groups within the sample. The first preferred measures they considered less restrictive, such as increasing the purchase age, and some came to support the SFG as they rationalised their views. The second subgroup expressed more entrenched opposition and felt the SFG deprived them of a choice.

Conclusions Young people’s deep reflection on the SFG led most to view it as liberating rather than restrictive. Communications that avoid prompting heuristic-based responses could encourage youth to reflect on the policy and elicit strong support from the group the SFG aims to benefit.

INTRODUCTION

To achieve tobacco endgame goals, which aim to decrease smoking prevalence to minimal levels by a specified date, some countries have proposed reducing the addictiveness and widespread availability of tobacco products.1,2 While these measures will accelerate smoking cessation, governments must also prevent tobacco companies from recruiting youth as ‘replacement smokers’ who ensure their future profitability.3,4 Mass media campaigns,5 reducing exposure and access to tobacco products6,7 and tobacco’s decreasing affordability8,9 have seen youth smoking prevalence fall to historically low levels.10 However, evidence that prevalence varies inequitably across population groups and rises as youth become young adults has prompted calls for measures that will end smoking among all young people.11-15

The smoke-free generation (SFG) policy stops the sale of tobacco products to people born after a specified year and creates a cohort that may never legally be sold tobacco.16 It addresses a limitation of age restrictions (eg, R18 or R21 measures), where each year young people ‘graduate’ beyond the protection these afford.16-18 Over time, and in combination with other endgame measures (eg, denicotinised tobacco), the SFG would see smoking uptake virtually end.16-17 We summarise the SFG’s history in online supplemental file 1.

The SFG policy addresses two important criticisms levelled at age restriction policies: first, that these measures implicitly frame tobacco use as an adult behaviour, which may create ‘rite of passage perceptions’16,18,19; second, that age restrictions incorrectly imply tobacco use after a specified age is accepted or safe, given the protections no longer apply.16,17 Furthermore, the SFG challenges industry depictions of smoking as a right available to people over a certain age who can allegedly make ‘informed choices’ to smoke.20,21 The SFG recognises that tobacco use is never safe, dismantles perceptions of smoking as a rite or right, and creates what van der Eijk described as a ‘norm cascade’ that establishes smoking as an outdated practice.16,17,19,22,23 By recognising tobacco as innately harmful, the SFG
also draws on consumer safety arguments and advances young people’s right to protection from a product that kills two-thirds of long-term users prematurely.\textsuperscript{24}

To date, only Balanga city (Philippines) and Brookline (USA) have introduced SFG policies prohibiting the sale of tobacco products to anyone born after 1 January 2000, though both have faced challenges.\textsuperscript{23, 26} Courts have upheld pre-emption objections raised by the Philippine Tobacco Institute, which receives industry support; despite city advocates exploring further options, they may lack the financial resources to fund litigation.\textsuperscript{26} The Massachusetts Attorney General rejected similar arguments from Brookline retailers in July 2021, and policy implementation began in September 2021; however, a further case is pending in the Massachusetts Superior Court.\textsuperscript{25}

Tasmania considered an SFG policy, but the proposal lapsed when Parliament was prorogued.\textsuperscript{27} Finland did not proceed with the SFG because of concerns the measure may be perceived as inequitable and thus represent a constitutional breach.\textsuperscript{28} Despite these setbacks, other nations have recently announced SFG plans. New Zealand (NZ) proposes implementing an SFG policy that will apply to young people born after 2008.\textsuperscript{29, 30} The Khan review proposed England consider developing an SFG,\textsuperscript{31} and Malaysia and Denmark plan to end sales of all nicotine products to anyone born after 2005 and 2010, respectively.\textsuperscript{32, 33}

NZ modelling research predicted the SFG could halve smoking prevalence within 14 years among people aged 45 and under (relative to those over 45) and reduce inequities in smoking prevalence, although more slowly than denicotinisation.\textsuperscript{34, 35} This work also estimated that the SFG will have a greater impact on projected adult smoking prevalence than reducing tobacco availability by 95\% overall or increasing excise taxes by 10\% annually until 2025.\textsuperscript{34} A Singaporean study that compared increasing the minimum age, introducing a SFG policy, increasing taxes and legalising e-cigarettes found the SFG and large tax increases are the most effective individual policies for reducing smoking prevalence, though noted the effects were longer term.\textsuperscript{36}

Public support for the SFG has been high, irrespective of age or smoking status. In Tasmania, 75\% of the public and 66\% of young people (ie, those who would be affected), supported a SFG policy.\textsuperscript{37} Public opinion surveys in Singapore found both smokers and non-smokers (60.0\% and 72.7\%, respectively) strongly supported an SFG;\textsuperscript{38} NZ surveys reported strong support (>75\%) for an SFG policy among people who smoke or who are strongly supported an SFG.\textsuperscript{18} NZ youth perceived the proposed SFG policy’s likely impact on freedoms and well-being and probed how they rationalised their views.

**METHODS**

**Study design**

We used a qualitative approach to explore how New Zealanders aged 17–18 years viewed the SFG, which we asked them to assume would come into effect in 2022. Those aged 17 would not be able to purchase tobacco, while those aged 18 would, thus enabling us to probe how those on either side of the ‘boundary’ perceived the policy. We drew on a social constructionist epistemology, which aligned with our interest in participants’ perceptions and anticipated experience of the policy.\textsuperscript{41}

**Sample**

JH and EL recruited participants using social media, community and personal networks, and snowball sampling (ie, where participants passed on study details within their networks). People registered their interest by phone or email or directly via an online survey (see online supplemental file 2), where we collected details of their ethnicity, gender, smoking susceptibility and history, which we used to structure the sample. As recruitment proceeded, we used snowball sampling to promote ethnic diversity and recruit people with varied smoking experience. We offered participants a $30 voucher to recognise any costs they incurred participating in the study.

**Interviews**

JH and EL undertook in-depth interviews using a semistructured guide to explore participants’ knowledge and perceptions of the SFG policy, and their views on how an SFG policy would affect freedom, choices and protection from harm (see online supplemental file 3). We conducted online or in-person interviews (depending on participants’ preference) between November 2021 and January 2022; these lasted between 58 and 74 min. Discussions began to converge after 17 interviews, and we conducted three further interviews to establish information sufficiency (ie, when additional participants did not raise new ideas). With participants’ permission, we recorded the interviews and used an online service (Rev.com) to transcribe these into anonymous verbatim records that we checked for accuracy.

**Data analysis**

JH and EL used a reflexive thematic analysis approach to interpret the transcripts; we followed the six-stage process Braun and Clarke outlined,\textsuperscript{42, 43} including reading and rereading the transcripts several times, and using a line-by-line approach to review and code the data, and identify common metaphors. We wrote field notes memos to record participant and process-related reflections, and used analytical memos to draw comparisons between interviews, record recurring metaphors, and review ideas expressed within and across interviews. JH and EL first independently reviewed and then compared three transcripts and relevant notes to develop an initial coding framework, which we reviewed while coding the remaining transcripts. We met regularly to contrast our interpretations and
develop abstracted themes. LT reviewed a sample of transcripts to consider differences between Māori and non-Māori participants, and how these should be reported. We also reflected on our own positions as non-smokers working in public health and the difference between our world experiences and those of our participants.

## RESULTS

We outline our sample’s characteristics before presenting overarching themes we identified: striving for societal well-being and privileging personal choices. We use participants’ comments to illustrate these themes and provide additional quotations in online supplemental file 4; we have assigned all participants pseudonyms and report their age, ethnicity (M=Maori; NZE=NZ European; A=Asian ethnicity; O=other ethnicity) and smoking status.

Our sample comprised 20 participants; 10 identified as male; eight as Māori and five as Pacific, and six reported currently (five) or formerly (one) smoking (online supplemental file 5 outlines the recruitment process). Table 1 outlines the sample’s demographic profile. We did not observe differences in participants’ views according to their gender or smoking status, but report some differences by ethnicity.

### Societal good and protection from harm

Most participants, particularly those who identified as Māori, supported government intervention to promote community well-being. They valued societal protection above preserving ‘choices’ some thought illusory, and envisaged future generations free from addiction and exposure to secondhand smoke. Several prioritised a longer-term perspective that considered the ‘bigger picture’ and looked beyond their own interests. Marama argued:

> ...It’s better for everyone in the long run on... the wider scale and for the future... people should be... open to thinking about those... wider implications. Marama, 17 (M/P, NS)

These participants recognised that freedom had (or should have) limits and noted that functional societies relied on rules and were willing to forgo some choices in pursuit of a greater good. Eddy explained:

> I don’t really think that’s a really important freedom at all, because I mean, okay, it is important, but banning, I feel like banning smoking has many more benefits, rather than saying, “Oh, it’s freedom, so we should have it, we should keep it.” Eddy, 18 (A, NS)

Several contrasted government intervention with addiction and the long-term effects of smoking and concluded that, because addiction removed choice, the government should intervene. Tipene explained the government had good reason to take away the choice to smoke:

> It is kind of taking their choice away from them, but it is for a good cause, it is a good reason to do it. Tipene, 18 (M/NZE, NS)

Some went further and saw the ‘good cause” as a government responsibility. Pera noted:

> The government essentially is supposed to keep you safe, and they’re not supposed to... make things readily available that are gonna actively harm you. Pera, 18 (M/NZE, NS)

These participants’ focus on the greater good, deep dissatisfaction with the slow declines in smoking prevalence and belief that governments had a responsibility to protect people led some to demand new approaches to address health inequalities and protect young people. Hinemoa stated:

> I think we kinda owe it to our young people, especially our Māori and Pasifika ones. We need better health outcomes... Like 40% of our Māori and Pasifika smoke... Hinemoa, 17 (M/NZE, NS)

Drawing on their own experiences, these participants imagined how the SFG could offer others better futures. Leila saw ending the inter-generational transmission of smoking as transformational:

> ...parents teach you not to smoke when you grow up. But then, yeah... you go and watch them smoking. So, you’re like, ‘I want to be like Mum... or Dad.’ One of my sisters goes, ‘I want to be like my parents and...’ Yeah, I feel bad for my sister ‘cause... I know she smokes ‘cause we all smoke in the house. Leila, 18 (M/NZE, S)

By protecting young people from pressures inherent in their daily lives, Amy believed the SFG could prevent smoking uptake:

> ...I really got pressured into it, ‘cause people that were around my age had a hold of it. And that would stop all of the opportunities for people to have it and be pressured into it, ‘cause I feel like majority of the people that smoke were... pressured into it... Amy, 18 (NZE, S)

Participants also recognised how cognitive heuristics under- mined free choices. Anahera noted the challenge of comprehending long-term outcomes when making in-the-moment decisions; she explained:

> not many people know the disadvantages so it’ll take them a really long time... to find out for themselves. So I think definitely stopping them is a big option just because it takes [so] long to realise the disadvantages of it. Anahera, 17 (P/NZE, NS)

### Table 1  Participant characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicities (identification with multiple ethnicities possible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking status*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current smoker</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former smoker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-smoker</td>
<td>14 (13 non-susceptible and 1 susceptible)†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Island</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Island</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Current smoker: smoked at least monthly (one participant smoked daily); two smoked weekly; two smoked monthly; Former smoker: previously a current smoker but no longer smoking; Non-smoker: had not previously smoked at least monthly. †Assessed using Pierce’s susceptibility measure.64

---
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Rather than view smoking as a human right that merited protection, they saw it as antithetical to freedom and requiring regulation:

...this is not freedom. This is giving them a product that damages their health... It's not something good to do. Ivan, 18 (A, NS)

Viewing the SFG unambiguously as 'solely about protection', these participants argued it was not 'really taking away any human rights or anything' (June, 17, A, NS). Those with lived experience of smoking rejected claims it was a 'choice':

Whether it's the government taking the choice or you being addicted to smokes. You've got no choice either way. If you're addicted to smoking it's not like you are choosing to go buy smokes, you're going, 'Oh, I needed a packet of smokes this week'. Leila, 18 (M/NZE, S)

Offering protection from a product that removed choice led some participants to envisage multiple societal benefits. Fetu, who initially saw the SFG as unfair, revised his views, saw benefits amplifying across each new generation, and came to view the measure as utopian:

...it [the SFG] would just change the world in a few years. Like, if you stop... the young, the next generation will stop. Then when they're the leaders of their generation, or generations below them... it just will get better and better and better, the younger they go. Fetu, 17 (P, S)

Privileging personal choices

Participants who presented personal choice arguments either proposed what they saw as more proportionate measures or fundamentally opposed the SFG. The former argued that raising the minimum purchase age, increasing excise taxes or providing more education would allow people to make decisions when they were less vulnerable to social pressures, and thus balancing protection and freedom more appropriately. Kevin supported limiting rather than removing choice:

I think limiting people’s freedom is good. Taking it away isn’t... less choice would be better than no choice at all... it would still give people a choice to do it later in life, but earlier in life... more people are around you and trying to pressure you to do things, and you trying to fit in with, like, groups and stuff... Kevin, 17 (NZE, NS)

Participants who favoured ‘middle ground’ measures thought these would reduce the risk of maladaptive responses and foresaw a risk of ‘forbidden fruit’ behaviours as people asserted their agency:

It's just sometimes the more you restrict something the more people want to try it. Ben, 17 (NZE, NS)

A minority complained the SFG would reduce their autonomy and rationalised smoking as an individual choice and entitlement, not a societal problem requiring government intervention. While they thought governments should protect people from harms inflicted by others, they believed individuals should remain free to make choices about themselves, even when these could lead to harmful outcomes. Mikaere explained:

I think we should be protected... We shouldn't... worry about people... coming in our house and killing us, that kinda thing... But I don't think we should be protected from... ourselves by laws... [or that] you should be protected from yourself, from addiction, from all that by the government... That's up to you. Mikaere, 18 (M/NZE, S).

Because they believed young people had access to information about smoking’s risks, these participants argued choices should reside with them:

you shouldn't be protected from your environment. You should have the information and the knowledge behind you, but you should still experience it yourself. Mikey, 18 (O, FS)

All participants reflected deeply on how to balance individual rights and societal well-being, and some who initially opposed the SFG moderated their views, acknowledged collective rights and looked beyond themselves. Sara illustrates these internal debates:

I think it’s fine, as long as it’s… reasonable, well balanced; but that’s also a very big statement. I think if it’s… communal health, if it’s something that could affect others, then I think it’s okay for the government to take that into their own hands... but people who’ve formed opinions about wanting to try it, they would feel more restricted… I feel like we should be considerate of them .... it’s really hard to balance their freedoms with what the majority of people agree with. Sara, 17 (NZE, NS)

Only a small minority consistently and strongly opposed the SFG. These participants thought people had access to information about smoking’s risks and resented the Government ‘making a choice for them’ (Teuila, 17, M/P, NS). They felt the SFG drew arbitrary distinctions, risked infantilising those affected and replaced individual agency with central authority. They prioritised loss avoidance and envisioned a world without this choice as dystopian:

...it comes down to the idea it’s a utopia (but) the utopia is nothing if you can’t live your life the way you wanna live. Ben, 18, (NZE, NS)

DISCUSSION

Most participants supported the SFG policy and some drew on their own experiences to imagine a future where others would never face the addiction they battled. They thought eliminating access to harmful products would preserve choices and freedoms, and explained how young people’s predisposition to heuristic-based thinking made truly informed choices impossible. They prioritised collective gain and societal well-being above any personal inconvenience the SFG could cause.

Others’ views evolved as the interviews proceeded. Some moved from opposing to supporting the SFG, while others created middle-ground positions as they reflected on how to balance individual and collective rights. Only a small minority valued the ‘freedom’ to purchase tobacco above the future benefit of freedom from addiction. These participants argued that people could easily access information about smoking’s harms and felt they should source and use this information to assess the short-term gains and longer-term costs of smoking.

Freedom and choice metaphors featured prominently in participants’ discourse; most drew on positive freedom concepts and demonstrated a sophisticated ability to weigh up individual loss and collective gain. Although prospect theory suggests rapid processing will emphasise loss aversion,69 thus predisposing a negative freedom perspective, few participants consistently privileged the status quo. Instead, most engaged in an internal debate, with some revising their initial position, and later embracing a positive freedom perspective and endorsing the SFG. Our findings illustrate young people’s capacity to reflect deeply on policies that will profoundly change their environment. Involving young people as study participants helps bring their voices to
the policy table, and incorporating their expertise in policy design, implementation and communication may help enhance the SFG’s acceptability.

We anticipated that younger participants (ie, those aged 17 and who we asked to imagine being affected by the policy) would be less supportive than their older counterparts, but did not find age-related differences, although a larger survey may detect these. Future research could also explore perceptions held by those aged 16 and under, particularly whether and how they would obtain tobacco products if an SFG policy applied. In general, we found Māori participants more likely than non-Māori to perceive and value the collective benefits an SFG policy could deliver. This finding may reflect important Māori cultural concepts and highlights the need for kaupapa Māori research to explore perspectives that may be unique to rangatahi (youth) Māori.

Participants’ evolving views may reflect the COVID-19 context and interview experience; data collection took place shortly after intense COVID-19 restrictions were lifted, and our intensive probing encouraged deep reflection. Our findings suggest the SFG’s framing and communication should stimulate reflective thinking that avoids instinctive, heuristic-based responses. Given brain development continues into adulthood, communications could promote longer-term outcomes that young people may not otherwise consider. Outlining how the SFG will create intergenerational benefits, enhance well-being and support a more equitable society could encourage deep reflection; positive freedom and liberation metaphors may pre-empt industry claims, such as nanny-state interference.

Our findings highlight a growing tension between tobacco companies’ transformation rhetoric, including statements that young people should not smoke, and the SFG. Logically, the tobacco industry should endorse a policy to end youth smoking, which would demonstrate their commitment to ‘unsmoking’ the world. However, BAT(NZ) opposed the SFG and claimed access to tobacco is an ‘important freedom’ that supports young people’s ‘right to autonomy’. Given the constraint and harm that nicotine addiction causes, these richly ironic claims question the sincerity of transformation rhetoric. Policy makers and civil society should hold tobacco companies to account for discrepancies between their past statements and current behaviour, and rigorously implement FCTC Article 5.3 guidelines to limit their influence on policy making.

While we cannot generalise our findings, they provide few grounds to support tobacco companies’ arguments that youth will find the SFG unacceptable. Nor should arguments that the SFG is not feasible deter policy makers. Despite concerns over retailer non-compliance and increased social supply (eg, via peers or family networks), countries that raised the minimum purchase age for tobacco report good compliance, particularly when accompanied by strong surveillance and enforcement, and penalties. Furthermore, as the age gap between those who have or do not have legal access to tobacco increases, social supply opportunities will decrease; denicotinisation, which will rapidly decrease smoking prevalence, will further reduce social supply. Nonetheless, monitoring smoking prevalence and access remains important to assess whether social access routes persist and detect policy loopholes.

Like all studies, ours has strengths and limitations. We recruited a diverse rather than representative sample; while diversity is a known strength of qualitative work, estimating the prevalence of perceptions identified requires quantitative studies. Although we enhanced external validity by asking participants to imagine the SFG would come into effect in 2022, the actual policy will not come into effect for several years (and will affect a more diverse age range than the group sampled). Nonetheless, comments on perceived loss suggest participants interpreted the policy timing as requested.

Our findings also raise new questions. Future work could explore the increased age restrictions some participants proposed, and more far-reaching measures, such as the nicotine-free generation policy called for by Māori leaders and proposed by Denmark and Malaysia. Rising vaping prevalence, particularly among rangatahi Māori, suggests NZ should also examine this approach.

Despite the limitations noted, our findings provide rich insights into how young people perceive the SFG and its impact, and could guide the policy’s implementation. In particular, challenging industry depictions of the SFG as a ban and reframing it as a conduit to freedom could foster reflection, clarify the policy’s benefits, and elicit even stronger support from the cohort the SFG aims to benefit.

Twitter Jude Ball @JudeBall7
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Supplementary File 1: Genesis of the Smokefree (or Tobacco-free) Generation Proposal

The Smokefree or Tobacco-Free Generation proposal (SFG) aims to eliminate the many harms caused by smoking. First proposed by Jon Berrick, a mathematics professor based in Singapore,[1] and promoted by HN Koong,[2] a Singaporean surgeon, the SFG aims to end smoking uptake and thus the long-term addiction and premature death that smoking so often causes. The proposal disallows the sale of tobacco products to anyone born on or after a designated date, thus creating a cohort of young people who are never legally be able to be sold tobacco products.

The policy has stimulated considerable debate in Singapore, where advocates have organised youth activities, such as creating promotional videos, hosting events, and fostering a social movement where millennials view themselves as a generation of non-smokers. The Singaporean Parliament discussed a SFG proposal in 2016, when making amendments to the Tobacco (Control of Advertisements and Sale) Act, though saw challenges in implementation and enforcement.

New Zealand’s decision to introduce a smokefree generation has stimulated further debate in Singapore, with the Senior Minister of State for Health, Dr Koh Poh Koon, advising that Singapore was open to this idea and describing it as: "an attractive proposal" that prevented uptake while not restricting older people who smoke. However, he noted the need to address rising vaping and explained that measures penalising from older to younger people would be required.
TFG Recruitment survey

Start of Block: Introduction

Q1.1 Thank you very much for your interest in our study.

Before we get in touch with you to send you more information about the study, we would like you to complete a few short questions.

We would like to recruit diverse participants and your answers will help us create a sample of people with different behaviours and characteristics.

If you have any questions, please contact me at janet.hoek@otago.ac.nz or phone 03 479 7692

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Demographics

Q2.1 What is your date of birth?

Please include the day, month and year in your answer (e.g., 23 March 2003)

________________________________________________________________

Q2.2 Which of the following best describes you?

- I am male  (1)
- I am female  (2)
- I am non-binary  (3)
- I prefer not to answer this question  (4)
Q2.3 Which ethnic group or groups do you belong to?

Please tick the box or boxes that apply to you

- New Zealand European (1)
- Māori (2)
- Samoan (3)
- Cook Island Māori (4)
- Tongan (5)
- Nuiean (6)
- Chinese (7)
- Indian (8)
- Other (e.g., Dutch, Japanese, Tokelauan) Please indicate: (9)

Page Break

End of Block: Demographics

Start of Block: Smoking Screen 1

Q3.1 Which of the following best describes you?

- I have never smoked (1) Routed to question 4.1
- I used to smoke but I do not currently smoke (2) Routed to question 4.1
- I currently smoke (3) Routed to question 6.1

End of Block: Smoking Screen 1
Start of Block: Susceptibility

Q4.1 Do you think you will try a cigarette soon?

☐ Definitely yes (1)
☐ Probably yes (2)
☐ Probably not (3)
☐ Definitely not (4)

Q4.2 If one of your best friends were to offer you a cigarette, would you smoke it?

☐ Definitely yes (1)
☐ Probably yes (2)
☐ Probably not (3)
☐ Definitely not (4)

Q4.3 Do you think you will be smoking cigarettes one year from now?

☐ Definitely yes (1)
☐ Probably yes (2)
☐ Probably not (3)
☐ Definitely not (4)

End of Block: Susceptibility Routed to Question 6
Q5.1 How often do you smoke?

- I smoke every day (1)
- I do not smoke every day but I smoke at least once a week (2)
- I do not smoke at least once a week but I smoke at least once a month (3)

End of Block: Smoking Routed to Question 6

Q6 Thank you very much for completing these questions. We will be in touch to let you know if you are eligible to take part in our study and to send you an information sheet with more details about our work. So we can get in touch with you, please write your email and phone number below.

- Email (1) ________________________________________________
- Phone number (2) __________________________________________

End of Block: End Screen
Supplementary File 3: Interview Guides

The Smokefree Generation:
A qualitative analysis of young adult New Zealanders’ views

Interview Guide: People who do not smoke

Introduction
Kia ora / Hello – I’ve arranged to talk to you about some research I’m doing into how young people interpret the Smokefree Generation proposal.

Before we start, I’d like to show you some information about the session and check to see whether you have any questions about my work. Here’s another copy of the information sheet we sent you when you indicated you were interested in the project; please take a few moments to look through this sheet.

- **Provide participants with an Information Sheet and relevant Consent Form and outline the key points in this. ALLOW TIME TO READ THE INFORMATION SHEET.**

Do you have any questions about the study?
- **Explain recording of the interview and participants’ rights in relation to these recordings.**
- **ONCE PARTICIPANTS HAVE AGREED TO INTERVIEW BEING RECORDED, TURN RECORDER ON AND NOTE THAT IT IS NOW ON.**

READ OUT WHILE RECORDER/ZOOM RECORDING IS ON:
As participants in the research, you have the right to ask questions at any time, to decide if you would prefer not to answer some questions, to receive a copy of the findings, and to withdraw from the study at any time up to the end of this interview with no penalty to yourself.

- **Check again whether participant(s) have any questions about the interview**
- **If no questions, ask the participant(s) to sign and date the Consent Form**
- **Give participant koha and obtain signed koha forms**

Your responses will be confidential to the research team members. We will assign you a pseudonym, a fake name that is different to your real name, and we will use that name if we report any quotes from this interview. We won’t ever use your real name in any publication or other public document.

We use an online service called Rev.com to listen to the audio files and type up our conversation word-for-word. Rev.com transcribers are located around the world and we do not know who will transcribe the audio file from this interview. There is a very small possibility that someone could transcribe the file and recognise your voices.

ARE YOU HAPPY FOR ME TO START THE INTERVIEW NOW? Check participants has had their questions answered.
Supplementary File 3: Interview Guides

**General experiences of smoking**

I’d like to start by asking you some questions about any experiences you may have had with smoking.

1. When you hear the word, smoking, what comes to mind? **Probe: Explore comments fully.** When you see someone you know smoking, what do you think?
2. Do you have family members or friends who smoke? **Probe: What do you think when you see them smoke?**
3. When you’re out at a café or bar, how do you feel when people around you are smoking? **Probe:** Explore comments fully. May be important to note whether they have been drinking (could be more tolerant of smoking when they are drinking than when not drinking).
4. Have you been in situations where you’ve been offered cigarettes? **Probe: IF YES: What did you do? IF NO: What would you do if you were offered cigarettes?** Explore their experiences and their reasons for accepting/not accepting.
5. What do you think the main reasons that young people start smoking? **Probe: Explore possible peer pressure, functional reasons (relieve stress or boredom), any benefits?**

**Knowledge and Perception of Smokefree 2025 goal**

6. Have you heard that Aotearoa / New Zealand has a Smokefree 2025 goal? **Probe: Where did you hear about the goal?**
7. What do you think the goal means? **Probe: Explore all interpretations offered.** Ask how they would feel if their interpretation (e.g., that smoking would be banned) was correct.

I’d like to read you the Smokefree 2025 goal [provide paper with goal written out and read information to participant]

“The Smokefree 2025 goal aims to reduce smoking levels to less than five percent and as close to zero percent as possible in all population groups by December 2025.”

8. What do you think the implications of having a goal like this are? **Probe: What do you think would need to happen to realise the goal? How do you feel about that?**
9. What do you think would be the main benefits of achieving this goal? **Probe: Explore benefits stated and the impact these would have (who would benefit).**
10. Do you see any downsides to the goal? What do you think these are? **Probe: Explore downsides stated (e.g., possible black market) what impact do you think that would have? Who would be disadvantaged?
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Perception of TFG proposal
The Government has been thinking about different things it could do to achieve the Smokefree 2025 goal and I’d like to ask you about one of these. It’s called the Smokefree Generation policy.

11. Have you ever heard of this idea? Probe: What do you think it means? Who do you think it would apply to?

I’d like to show you an example of what the Smokefree Generation idea would look like. Basically, it sets a date, and people born after that date will never legally be able to buy tobacco. Here is how it might work. [provide paper with goal written out and read information to participant]

A smokefree generation policy would mean that tobacco could not be sold or given to people born after a certain date. For example, if a new law started on 1 January 2022, then people who were born after 1 January 2004 would never be able to legally buy tobacco. As a result, over time, sales of tobacco would phase out completely.

12. What are your thoughts on this idea if it was introduced? PROBE: what do you think would happen with your peers/family members who smoke? Thinking about young people you know who smoke, if they really wanted tobacco, how do you think they would get it? Explore quitting, movement to vaping, other alternatives

13. What about young people who smoke but want to be smokefree, what would this measure mean for them? PROBE: What makes you say that?

14. What do you think the main benefits of the proposal would be? PROBE: Explore benefits stated and the impact these would have (who would benefit most). How would the proposal affect younger people’s smoking or attitudes towards smoking?

15. What about any downsides of the proposal, do you see any problems? What are they? Probe: Explore downsides stated.

16. Thinking about the benefits and downsides you mentioned, what’s your overall view of this idea? Probe: Can you tell me more about that?

17. What would it be like to be part of a generation where no one smokes? Probe: What makes you say that?

Implementation process
I’d now like to ask you about the best way to implement this idea, if the government goes ahead with it.

18. What do you think of the following ideas?

- The Government sets up a group of young people to advise them on how to implement the Smokefree Generation idea. PROBE: What sort of young people should be on the group? How much influence should they have?
- The Government introduces fines for retailers who still sell tobacco to young people? PROBE: How effective would that be?
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- The Government runs a social marketing campaign to let people know about the policy. PROBE: What would be the most important messages? Who should communicate these? Should there be different strategies for different groups? What would the differences be?

19. What do you think the key challenges to the Smokefree Generation idea will be? Probe: How can these be managed?

Perception of Smokefree Generation proposal (freedom, choice and protection from harm)
As we discussed, one of the main reasons to introduce a Smokefree Generation policy is to protect young people from smoking.

20. How important do you think it is that the Government tries to protect young people from smoking? Probe: What makes you say that? Can you tell me more about that?

21. Who, if anyone, do you think should be responsible for reducing smoking in young people? Probe: What role do you think health services, tobacco companies, community groups, iwi or hapū should play? Are there other groups that you think should be responsible? What groups are they?

22. How do you think we should balance protecting young people while still giving them freedom? PROBE: What sort of balance do you think is important?

23. Do you think it is better to protect young people from harmful products like tobacco or let them find out for themselves? PROBE: What if finding out for themselves means they get addicted and can’t quit?

24. Sometimes we accept that the Government should take actions that are best for people overall. That’s why we have had pandemic lockdowns and why some people are told to be vaccinated against COVID. What do you think about measures that might limit people’s personal freedom because they protect society in general?

Conclusion
These are all the questions I wanted to ask you. Do you have any other comments you’d like to make?

Thank you very much for your time and participation.

Ensure each participant who has received a $30 koha has signed the gift voucher receipt.
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The Smokefree Generation:
A qualitative analysis of young adult New Zealanders’ views

Interview Guide: People who smoke or formerly smoked

Introduction
Kia ora / Hello – I’ve arranged to talk to you about some research I’m doing into how young people interpret the Smokefree Generation proposal.

Before we start, I’d like to show you some information about the session and check to see whether you have any questions about my work. Here’s another copy of the information sheet we sent you when you indicated you were interested in the project; please take a few moments to look through this sheet.

- Provide participants with an Information Sheet and relevant Consent Form and outline the key points in this. ALLOW TIME TO READ THE INFORMATION SHEET.

Do you have any questions about the study?

- Explain recording of the interview and participants’ rights in relation to these recordings.
- ONCE PARTICIPANTS HAVE AGREED TO INTERVIEW BEING RECORDED, TURN RECORDER ON AND NOTE THAT IT IS NOW ON.

READ OUT WHILE RECORDER/ZOOM RECORDING IS ON:
As participants in the research, you have the right to ask questions at any time, to decide if you would prefer not to answer some questions, to receive a copy of the findings, and to withdraw from the study at any time up to the end of this interview with no penalty to yourself.

- Check again whether participant(s) have any questions about the interview
- If no questions, ask the participant(s) to sign and date the Consent Form
- Give participant koha and obtain signed koha forms

Your responses will be confidential to the research team members. We will assign you a pseudonym, a fake name that is different to your real name, and we will use that name if we report any quotes from this interview. We won’t ever use your real name in any publication or other public document.

We use an online service called Rev.com to listen to the audio files and type up our conversation word-for-word. Rev.com transcribers are located around the world and we do not know who will transcribe the audio file from this interview. There is a very small possibility that someone could transcribe the file and recognise your voices.

ARE YOU HAPPY FOR ME TO START THE INTERVIEW NOW? Check participants has had their questions answered.
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General experiences of smoking
I’d like to start by asking you some questions about any experiences you may have had with smoking.

25. Can you tell me about your smoking history? Probe: Do you remember how old you were when you had your first cigarette? Where did you get it? Who were you with? What was it like?

26. And what happened with your smoking since you first tried tobacco? PROBE: How many cigarettes a day would you have (or have had for ex-smokers)?

Ex-smokers: Probe: How long has it been since you quit? What made you decide to quit?

27. What are the main reasons you smoke (or used to smoke)? Probe: Explore comments fully.

Knowledge and Perception of Smokefree 2025 goal

28. Have you heard that Aotearoa / New Zealand has a Smokefree 2025 goal? Probe: How did you hear about the goal?

29. What do you think the goal means? Probe: Explore all interpretations offered. Ask how they would feel if their interpretation (i.e. that smoking would be banned) was correct.

I’d like to read you the Smokefree 2025 goal [provide paper with goal written out and read information to participant]

“The Smokefree 2025 goal aims to reduce smoking levels to less than five percent and as close to zero percent as possible in all population groups by December 2025.”

30. What do you think the implications of having a goal like this are? Probe: What do you think would need to happen to realise the goal? How do you feel about that?

31. What do you think would be the main benefits of achieving this goal? Probe: Explore benefits stated and the impact these would have (who would benefit).

32. Do you see any downsides to the goal? What do you think these are? Probe: Explore downsides stated (e.g., possible black market) what impact do you think that would have? Who would be disadvantaged?

Perception of TFG proposal

The Government has been thinking about different things it could do to achieve the Smokefree 2025 goal and I’d like to ask you about one of these. It’s called the Smokefree Generation policy.

33. Have you ever heard of this idea? Probe: What do you think it means? Who do you think it would apply to?

I’d like to show you an example of what the Smokefree Generation idea would look like. Basically, it sets a date, and people born after that date will never legally be able to buy tobacco. Here is how it might work. [provide paper with goal written out and read information to participant]
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A smokefree generation policy would mean that tobacco could not be sold or given to people born after a certain date. For example, if a new law started on 1 January 2022, then people who were born after 1 January 2004 would never be able to legally buy tobacco. As a result, over time, sales of tobacco would phase out completely.

34. What would you do if this idea was introduced? PROBE: what do you think would happen with your smoking? Explore quitting, movement to vaping, other alternatives.

35. Thinking about young people you know who smoke, if they really wanted tobacco, how do you think they would get it? PROBE: Explore alternative ways they might access tobacco, such as social supply from older family members, friends.

36. What about young people who smoke but want to be smokefree, what would this measure mean for them? PROBE: What makes you say that?

37. What do you think the main benefits of the proposal would be? PROBE: Explore benefits stated and the impact these would have (who would benefit most). How would the proposal affect younger people’s smoking or attitudes towards smoking?

38. What about any downsides of the proposal, do you see any problems? What are they? Probe: Explore downsides stated.

39. Thinking about the benefits and downsides you mentioned, what’s your overall view of this idea? Probe: Can you tell me more about that?

40. What would it be like to be part of a generation where no one smokes? Probe: What makes you say that?

Implementation process

I’d now like to ask you about the best way to implement this idea, if the government goes ahead with it.

41. What do you think of the following ideas?

- The Government sets up a group of young people to advise them on how to implement the Smokefree Generation idea. PROBE: What sort of young people should be on the group? How much influence should they have?

- The Government introduces fines for retailers who still sell tobacco to young people? PROBE: How effective would that be?

- The Government runs a social marketing campaign to let people know about the policy. PROBE: What would be the most important messages? Who should communicate these? Should there be different strategies for different groups? What would the differences be?

42. What do you think the key challenges to the Smokefree Generation idea will be? Probe: How can these be managed?
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Perception of Smokefree Generation proposal (freedom, choice and protection from harm)

As we discussed, one of the main reasons to introduce a Smokefree Generation policy is to protect young people from smoking.

43. How important do you think it is that the Government tries to protect young people from smoking? **Probe:** What makes you say that? Can you tell me more about that?

44. Who, if anyone, do you think should be responsible for reducing smoking in young people? **Probe:** What role do you think health services, tobacco companies, community groups, iwi or hapū should play? Are there other groups that you think should be responsible? What groups are they?

45. How do you think these groups should balance protecting young people while still giving them freedom? **PROBE:** What sort of balance do you think is important?

46. Do you think it is better to protect young people from harmful products like tobacco or let them find out for themselves? **PROBE:** What if finding out for themselves means they get addicted and can’t quit?

47. Sometimes we accept that the Government should take actions that are best for people overall. That’s why we have had pandemic lockdowns and why some people are told to be vaccinated against COVID. What do you think about measures that might override people’s personal freedom because they protect society in general?

Conclusion
These are all the questions I wanted to ask you. Do you have any other comments you’d like to make?

Thank you very much for your time and participation.

Ensure each participant who has received a $30 koha has signed the gift voucher receipt.
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Initial contacts

67 total contacts
- 53 via social media
- 11 snowball
- 3 personal network

Eligible contacts

48 eligible to be interviewed
- 34 social media
- 11 snowball
- 3 personal network

Eligible and willing to be interviewed

43 eligible to be interviewed
- 31 social media
- 9 snowball
- 3 personal network

Invited to interview

- 16 social media
- 3 snowball
- 3 personal network

Completed interview

- 14 social media
- 3 snowball
- 3 personal network

- 9 provided no contact details
- 6 were not in NZ
- 1 did not meet age criterion

- 3 declined after information sheet sent
- 2 did not respond to contact after information sheet sent

- 2 did not attend booked interview and could not be followed up

- 21 eligible participants not contacted as data sufficiency achieved
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| Societal good and protection from harm | I think it's fine. As long as it's like, within reasonable, well balanced, but that's also a very big statement. I think if it's like um, communal health, if it's something that could affect others, then I think it's okay for the government to take that into their own hands. (Teuila)  
I think if people realised that it's not just about them. Like, it's for other people too and to help. I think they'd be more understanding of it. Whereas, I think most people think about other people more than they think about themselves. (Leila)  
When you're a kid you think about having a family and stuff, so... you look at... yeah, you put into a perspective where your kids can grow up safer and stuff, and their kids could grow up safer. I think they'd probably come around to agreeing with it. (Leila; also intergenerational transmission)  
Um, you know, it's that kind of their personal want or their desire to smoke, but, um, with no, um, understanding of how bad it could be or the effects of people around them from second hand smoking. (Derek)  
It removes the chance of us ever smoking but the impact for everyone is obviously way more significant than ourselves. Um, so kinda like that greater good scenario. I think it's a very reasonable mindset to have. (Derek)  
The government can't look at that. If they have to look at the whole societal picture as well... But they [other people] have to see about the whole big, bigger picture, not just about themselves too much. ... There'll always be the minority, but you can't reach everyone. So, you forget about them.... And you just keep on going with your plan. If it makes a difference to the majority and overwhelming population, which it does, then absolutely. Yeah. (Ivan)  
I think it's all about protection. So you can't say that they're taking away a choice if they're trying to better the whole community. (June)  
If they do protect society in general then, then it's good.... There shouldn't be like, conflict around it if it's for the protection of the people. Yeah. (Marama) |

| Protects society / collective well-being / greater good/ future focus |  |

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom has limits</th>
<th>For those types of things, as well as for the wider community, because obviously, um, if we're healthier as a population that's better for everyone... (laughs) It's better for everyone. (Pera)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't really think this is as much an issue of freedom because, um... I guess people are free to harm themselves in a way, but they're not just harming themselves. They're causing a cost to the like health system for everyone that's like in there. Because if there is someone else that's kind of not getting the care and with, the health system. (Pera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't want anyone to feel like they're having rights taken away from them. But I think, I mean, change is a reality of life and things are gonna happen. And um- um, I guess you've gotta think about the bigger picture and the future generations. (Pera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You should definitely be able to do what you want to do, but if it, if it affects others, and people around you I feel like then there should be rules against it, because, um, if it's just, if it's only affecting yourself, I guess, it does- it doesn't matter too much- but if smoking is, er, affects, it does have a big impact on people around you, that cultural, that atmosphere that it creates.... I guess, you could think, well, yeah, and be saying, &quot;Ah, it's the freedom of others that are around you that are exposed to you- you that exposed to other than the ind- the individual smoking (Eddy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You know, I think the societal benefits outweigh freedom of choice. (Tamati)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So maybe we need to restrict our freedoms a little bit just to make sure that we are helping everyone in society and I think people using their freedoms can often lessen other people’s freedoms and sometimes lesson our own freedoms in turn. Like if I decide to go out, even though I'm sick, I'm risking to someone else's freedom to go and enjoy like that open environment without a worry of getting sick. Mm. So it's just quite a slippery balance. (Ben, opposed SFG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... there's always like, you know, there's traffic laws and everything else there. So, you can't do everything you want. And this is a very bad thing. The evidence shows that it's bad. So, I don't think there should be a big issue. I think freedom is not a big issue. (Ivan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I mean, everybody has the right to do what they want, but making it, making it that they, so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addiction removes choice/ protect people from addiction and consequences</th>
<th>You don’t have a choice once you’re addicted (Leila)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove the chance for addiction before it begins (Derek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving people the option is kind of pointless... giving people no chance to try it is probably the best option (June)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People should have freedom but at the same time, why would you be wanting to make a choice?... I made that choice but why would you be wanting to make a choice to start an unhealthy addiction? Like, it’s better for them to push it in the direction for them, leading, like putting them down a path to not smoke than to do it, I think. (Amy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m guessing, like any sort of human will think of they’ll be like “Oh I never got to try this or experience it but like, not the addiction. I think they would be pretty pleased that they don’t have an expensive addiction that’s slowly like degrading your health (Amy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding out for themselves, they will probably already be too late because they’re addicted (Eddy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissatisfaction with status quo</th>
<th>It’s been shown not to be good for you and that you shouldn’t ... be doing it anyway and it’s more important to stop people from endangering their bodies and stuff rather than their choice sometimes. (Kevin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m all for people trying things and finding their way but, for something that we know for sure has all those risks, it’s not worth it. (Pera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect them, definitely... if they find out for themselves, they will regret it...[it’s] saving them from having all of these health conditions in the future. (Amy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s more important to stop people from endangering their bodies and stuff, rather than their choice, sometimes. (Kevin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For me I would care way more about protecting young people. I'll lean way more to that side, instead of freedom of choice.... they're just trying to protect you and stuff instead of making you have that choice. (Fetu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending inter-generational transmission of smoking</td>
<td>We've seen what's happened over the past years that they've had that choice and it's not worked. If it was working, then we wouldn't be doing anything about it. So, I think the government has to step up there. (Ivan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preventing kids from getting any type of addiction’s probably a good start. Addiction’s not a fun thing to have... I've watched both my parents struggle with addiction so I’d prefer not to watch kids grow up with an addiction to something they can't help. (Leila)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents teach you not to smoke when you grow up but then, yeah, you go and watch them smoking so you’re like “I want to be like mum or dad”. One of my sisters goes “I want to be like my parents” and... yeah, I feel bad for my sister cause I know she smokes cause we all smoke in the house so we have to take on some of that responsibility. (Leila)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would see it more as they're just doing it to protect us and the younger generation. (Fetu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It'd take away the, like, the stress of my siblings starting to smoke. (Fiona)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Um, you know, the idea of smoking passed down to, to your child, and if that child during the smoke regeneration is, um, will never smoked, never had a temptation to smoke to pass that onto them keeps going on. And then as I said, the, the culture dies out, the temptation is just not there anymore. (Derek)

[I think] effects on people around you, will probably be quite a big one, because it will make people think about their actions affecting other people around them, and affecting people for further generations. Future generations as well, affecting them. (Kevin)

I think it just mean that they've got less of like a thing on the smoke, people smoking and it's not such a cool thing, and stuff. The less people do it, then they less likely to start, and it'll keep going like that. (Kevin)

[When they] have children, that's, I feel like that's, that will be the major turning point, that will, you know, s- have a big decrease in cigarette use, because the kids who are let's say born in 2020, 2022, will have parents that, I mean, no, in 2030, for example.. will have parents that don't smoke, right... so, they'll be less exposed, and they'll thus be less likely to smoke in general, so I feel like that will be the major, you know, turning, turning point where people will not smoke. (Eddy)

Pressure on youth to smoke supports protecting them from uptake

Younger people ...have more people around them trying to influence them to start smoking so I think protecting younger people would stop some people from starting in the first place. (Kevin).

Protect them. I think that younger generations have a lot of influence from other people... rather than thinking for themselves... I don't think any child actually goes “Oh, I want to smoke cause I want to smoke”... it's more because “Oh, my friends are smoking, I want to try that”. (Leila)

Younger people have a lot of influence from other people... rather than thinking for themselves. (Leila)

Like we wouldn't have like such a culture where I guess it's normal to do something like that to your body. (Teuila)

It would be less peer pressure for smoking. It will be less peer pressure for smoking because less available. (Tamati)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I think it's good for if they wanna be smoke-free, the- they'll just hang out, you know, like 'cause all their friends won't be smoking. So, there won't be like pressure to it. That's good.</strong> (Mikaere)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Youth lack foresight**              | I don’t think... when you’re young and stuff, you don’t really think about effects. You think about what your friends are going to think is cool. Government having some sort of say in it and like being able to protect the ones that are going to listen, yeah, it’s quite cool. (Leila)  
Young people don’t really have the foresight to really see that they could become addicted... we’re thinking of let’s enjoy this time with our friends. (Ben)  
I think it’s important to protect everyone from it but especially the young people because they are not as wise as the older people that have gotten themselves into this in the years down the track just regretting it like “Oh, I wish I never picked it up”. (Amy) |
| **Government’s protective role**      | The government essentially is supposed to keep you safe, and they’re not supposed to, um, make things readily available that are gonna actively harm you. Like it’s why we have control over guns and like, yeah. Um, why there's like restrictions on alcohol and like you can... And why you have to get driver's licenses because it's designed to keep everyone safe. And the... Just, this ban is just deciding to keep everyone safe. (Pera)  
It's the government's responsibility to do that. Um, leadership can't tell us, if you're in a position of being a leader, you can't make everyone happy, you just gotta do what benefits the majority of the people and yeah, um, vaccine is another, is a good example, um, I guess, forcing it upon people, it is indeed against rights, but because it's against rights, saying that, "Yeah, it's okay if you don't get vaccinated," um, isn't right either, because not getting vaccinated affects people around you, right? So it- it should be, it should be a community effort, it should, it should be done altogether. (Eddy) |
| **Maintains free choice**             | I think to a point you still have the freedom of choice with government protecting you, especially with this law. (Leila)  
You smoke because you want to... but then you get addicted so you have no choice to stop smoking and the government’s trying to protect that. (Leila) |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smoothing a special category so merits special measures</th>
<th>So it’s not really exactly taking away their rights, it’s just making it better for your health than you having that choice, and that freedom to mess up your health, like it’s pretty silly. (Amy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Way more positive than negative, like, people can just finally break free from the addiction and live a healthier life and people could live for longer. (Amy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is definitely some truth in them saying that it’s taking away their right, I guess, and yeah, there’s a lot of things that are already bad for you but there aren’t any restrictions on them. But… with smoking in general, those, like, negative effects are more , can be more serious... more... damaging to yourself. (Marama)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For things where we’ve got a real certainty around like scientific supported evidence from worldwide sources, like we know that smoking has harms associated with it, therefore I think it’s okay to push a policy like this... for things that are unproven then I’m obviously like “No”. (Pera)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Prioritising personal choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Searching for a middle ground</th>
<th>You have to fine a very fine line in trying to figure out how to protect people Yeah. Still give them the choice without feeling that they're being... impeded on. (Derek)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Searching for a middle ground – age restrictions</td>
<td>Instead of completely banning something, you just try and slow it down over time because it’s probably mainly work much better...I think they should still get the choice when they get older if they want to start or not because I think it should be not as much when you’re 18, it should be more like increasing the legal smoking age to, like, 30. (Kevin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It [increased age restrictions] lets them decide more and like, look forward to that age, like if they really wanted to try it but at the same time, but the time they do turn that age, they’ll be like, agm yeah, whatever. (Amy; later changed her view to supporting the SFG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for a middle ground – price</td>
<td>I think not completely banning it but, you know, the price raising was a good idea. So maybe just making it a bit harder to get them. (Sara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for a middle ground – allowing people to “learn”/ providing education</td>
<td>I feel like it needs to go down to almost a restriction of what’s in what and how much they can sell of this instead of just completely cut it off... a lot of people only really learn from their mistake by making it. (Fiona; ambivalent about SFG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education is the main thing and then I think restriction is quite important but I think it’s very important for us to feel as though we are becoming adults and we do need to start making responsible choices for ourselves. We don’t want to feel like we are being protected by mum and dad. (Ben)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was brought up to believe you shouldn’t be protected from your environment, you should have the information and the knowledge behind you, but you should still experience it yourself... just let them do it, but you just need to give them all the information you can. (Mikey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As long as they have the education, they should know not to do something themselves (Mikaere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have them be informed and let them find out for themselves if they wanna carry on. (Mikaere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk - creating a forbidden fruit</td>
<td>For the first coming on generations... they would still want to smoke... especially if they can’t. (Mikaere)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It sort of just feels like they’re having their choice taken away and then, um, the youth will be more likely to do it if they’re not explained with proper evidence, proper reasoning why.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’m just saying that some rules will always just be broken anyway regardless. (Teuila)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it becomes like, illegal, then they might think it’s cooler to smoke, because they’re trying to be cool. (laughs). (Sara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The view I have, um, if you can’t have something and you want it-um, feel like it’s quite widespread, yeah. I think it’s like a lot of us, it’s was like, “Oh, we can’t do it. That’s dumb. Let’s do it.” (laughs). (Mikaere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it was illegal and stuff, and I couldn’t get my family or older cousins or friends to get it, you know, I would try... Oh, being the person I am, I would probably try and find loopholes or money. (Fetu)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opposing arguments - loss of freedom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>That’s the thing I’m worried about… is limiting people’s freedom. Very little good comes from that in the end. (Fiona, supports SFG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You can’t take away something and give something freedom. It’s still the freedom of decision... if the government actually makes that decision [it will be hard not] to feel like they’re not stealing this decision from my generation. (Fiona, supports SFG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of it, I think if should come down to yourself really. If you don’t wanna smoke, you shouldn’t smoke if you wanna smoke, go for it... as long as you know the consequences, I feel like that should be enough (Mikaere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it’s less accessible then, of course, potentially not. But it could work the other way. If it’s least accessible, then I want to go into it. So, it depends on the individual, I think. (Ivan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opposing arguments - nanny state**

| I think it is very hard thing to not make the government seem like this kind of, we know best type figure (Ben) |
Supplementary File 1: Genesis of the Smokefree (or Tobacco-free) Generation Proposal

The Smokefree or Tobacco-Free Generation proposal (SFG) aims to eliminate the many harms caused by smoking. First proposed by Jon Berrick, a mathematics professor based in Singapore,[1] and promoted by HN Koong,[2] a Singaporean surgeon, the SFG aims to end smoking uptake and thus the long-term addiction and premature death that smoking so often causes. The proposal disallows the sale of tobacco products to anyone born on or after a designated date, thus creating a cohort of young people who are never legally be able to be sold tobacco products.

The policy has stimulated considerable debate in Singapore, where advocates have organised youth activities, such as creating promotional videos, hosting events, and fostering a social movement where millennials view themselves as a generation of non-smokers. The Singaporean Parliament discussed a SFG proposal in 2016, when making amendments to the Tobacco (Control of Advertisements and Sale) Act, though saw challenges in implementation and enforcement.

New Zealand’s decision to introduce a smokefree generation has stimulated further debate in Singapore, with the Senior Minister of State for Health, Dr Koh Poh Koon, advising that Singapore was open to this idea and describing it as: "an attractive proposal" that prevented uptake while not restricting older people who smoke. However, he noted the need to address rising vaping and explained that measures penalising from older to younger people would be required.
TFG Recruitment survey

Start of Block: Introduction

Q1.1 Thank you very much for your interest in our study.

Before we get in touch with you to send you more information about the study, we would like you to complete a few short questions.

We would like to recruit diverse participants and your answers will help us create a sample of people with different behaviours and characteristics.

If you have any questions, please contact me at janet.hoek@otago.ac.nz or phone 03 479 7692

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Demographics

Q2.1 What is your date of birth?
*Please include the day, month and year in your answer (e.g., 23 March 2003)*

Q2.2 Which of the following best describes you?

- [ ] I am male (1)
- [ ] I am female (2)
- [ ] I am non-binary (3)
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question (4)
Q2.3 Which ethnic group or groups do you belong to?

Please tick the box or boxes that apply to you

- [ ] New Zealand European (1)
- [ ] Māori (2)
- [ ] Samoan (3)
- [ ] Cook Island Māori (4)
- [ ] Tongan (5)
- [ ] Nuiean (6)
- [ ] Chinese (7)
- [ ] Indian (8)
- [ ] Other (e.g., Dutch, Japanese, Tokelauan) Please indicate: (9)

Page Break

End of Block: Demographics

Start of Block: Smoking Screen 1

Q3.1 Which of the following best describes you?

- [ ] I have never smoked (1) Routed to question 4.1
- [ ] I used to smoke but I do not currently smoke (2) Routed to question 4.1
- [ ] I currently smoke (3) Routed to question 6.1

End of Block: Smoking Screen 1
Start of Block: Susceptibility

Q4.1 Do you think you will try a cigarette soon?

- Definitely yes (1)
- Probably yes (2)
- Probably not (3)
- Definitely not (4)

Q4.2 If one of your best friends were to offer you a cigarette, would you smoke it?

- Definitely yes (1)
- Probably yes (2)
- Probably not (3)
- Definitely not (4)

Q4.3 Do you think you will be smoking cigarettes one year from now?

- Definitely yes (1)
- Probably yes (2)
- Probably not (3)
- Definitely not (4)

End of Block: Susceptibility Routed to Question 6
Q5.1 How often do you smoke?

- I smoke every day (1)
- I do not smoke every day but I smoke at least once a week (2)
- I do not smoke at least once a week but I smoke at least once a month (3)

End of Block: Smoking Routed to Question 6

Q6 Thank you very much for completing these questions. We will be in touch to let you know if you are eligible to take part in our study and to send you an information sheet with more details about our work. So we can get in touch with you, please write your email and phone number below.

- Email (1) ________________________________________________
- Phone number (2) ________________________________________________

End of Block: End Screen
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The Smokefree Generation:
A qualitative analysis of young adult New Zealanders’ views

Interview Guide: People who do not smoke

Introduction
Kia ora / Hello – I’ve arranged to talk to you about some research I’m doing into how young people interpret the Smokefree Generation proposal.

Before we start, I’d like to show you some information about the session and check to see whether you have any questions about my work. Here’s another copy of the information sheet we sent you when you indicated you were interested in the project; please take a few moments to look through this sheet.

- Provide participants with an Information Sheet and relevant Consent Form and outline the key points in this. ALLOW TIME TO READ THE INFORMATION SHEET.

Do you have any questions about the study?
- Explain recording of the interview and participants’ rights in relation to these recordings.
- ONCE PARTICIPANTS HAVE AGREED TO INTERVIEW BEINGRecorded, TURN RECORDER ON AND NOTE THAT IT IS NOW ON.

READ OUT WHILE RECORDER/ZOOM RECORDING IS ON:
As participants in the research, you have the right to ask questions at any time, to decide if you would prefer not to answer some questions, to receive a copy of the findings, and to withdraw from the study at any time up to the end of this interview with no penalty to yourself.

- Check again whether participant(s) have any questions about the interview
- If no questions, ask the participant(s) to sign and date the Consent Form
- Give participant koha and obtain signed koha forms

Your responses will be confidential to the research team members. We will assign you a pseudonym, a fake name that is different to your real name, and we will use that name if we report any quotes from this interview. We won’t ever use your real name in any publication or other public document.

We use an online service called Rev.com to listen to the audio files and type up our conversation word-for-word. Rev.com transcribers are located around the world and we do not know who will transcribe the audio file from this interview. There is a very small possibility that someone could transcribe the file and recognise your voices.

ARE YOU HAPPY FOR ME TO START THE INTERVIEW NOW? Check participants has had their questions answered.
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**General experiences of smoking**

I’d like to start by asking you some questions about any experiences you may have had with smoking.

1. When you hear the word, smoking, what comes to mind? **Probe:** Explore comments fully. When you see someone you know smoking, what do you think?
2. Do you have family members or friends who smoke? **Probe:** What do you think when you see them smoke?
3. When you’re out at a café or bar, how do you feel when people around you are smoking? **Probe:** Explore comments fully. May be important to note whether they have been drinking (could be more tolerant of smoking when they are drinking than when not drinking).
4. Have you been in situations where you’ve been offered cigarettes? **Probe:** IF YES: What did you do? IF NO: What would you do if you were offered cigarettes? Explore their experiences and their reasons for accepting/not accepting.
5. What do you think the main reasons that young people start smoking? **Probe:** Explore possible peer pressure, functional reasons (relieve stress or boredom), any benefits?

**Knowledge and Perception of Smokefree 2025 goal**

6. Have you heard that Aotearoa / New Zealand has a Smokefree 2025 goal? **Probe:** Where did you hear about the goal?
7. What do you think the goal means? **Probe:** Explore all interpretations offered. Ask how they would feel if their interpretation (e.g., that smoking would be banned) was correct.

I’d like to read you the Smokefree 2025 goal [provide paper with goal written out and read information to participant]

“**The Smokefree 2025 goal aims to reduce smoking levels to less than five percent and as close to zero percent as possible in all population groups by December 2025.”**

8. What do you think the implications of having a goal like this are? **Probe:** What do you think would need to happen to realise the goal? How do you feel about that?
9. What do you think would be the main benefits of achieving this goal? **Probe:** Explore benefits stated and the impact these would have (who would benefit).
10. Do you see any downsides to the goal? What do you think these are? **Probe:** Explore downsides stated (e.g., possible black market) what impact do you think that would have? Who would be disadvantaged?
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Perception of TFG proposal
The Government has been thinking about different things it could do to achieve the Smokefree 2025 goal and I’d like to ask you about one of these. It’s called the Smokefree Generation policy.

11. Have you ever heard of this idea? Probe: What do you think it means? Who do you think it would apply to?

I’d like to show you an example of what the Smokefree Generation idea would look like. Basically, it sets a date, and people born after that date will never legally be able to buy tobacco. Here is how it might work.

[provide paper with goal written out and read information to participant]

A smokefree generation policy would mean that tobacco could not be sold or given to people born after a certain date. For example, if a new law started on 1 January 2022, then people who were born after 1 January 2004 would never be able to legally buy tobacco. As a result, over time, sales of tobacco would phase out completely.

12. What are your thoughts on this idea if it was introduced? PROBE: what do you think would happen with your peers/family members who smoke? Thinking about young people you know who smoke, if they really wanted tobacco, how do you think they would get it? Explore quitting, movement to vaping, other alternatives

13. What about young people who smoke but want to be smokefree, what would this measure mean for them? Probe: What makes you say that?

14. What do you think the main benefits of the proposal would be? PROBE: Explore benefits stated and the impact these would have (who would benefit most). How would the proposal affect younger people’s smoking or attitudes towards smoking?

15. What about any downsides of the proposal, do you see any problems? What are they? Probe: Explore downsides stated.

16. Thinking about the benefits and downsides you mentioned, what’s your overall view of this idea? Probe: Can you tell me more about that?

17. What would it be like to be part of a generation where no one smokes? Probe: What makes you say that?

Implementation process
I’d now like to ask you about the best way to implement this idea, if the government goes ahead with it.

18. What do you think of the following ideas?

- The Government sets up a group of young people to advise them on how to implement the Smokefree Generation idea. PROBE: What sort of young people should be on the group? How much influence should they have?
- The Government introduces fines for retailers who still sell tobacco to young people? PROBE: How effective would that be?
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- The Government runs a social marketing campaign to let people know about the policy. **PROBE:** What would be the most important messages? Who should communicate these? Should there be different strategies for different groups? What would the differences be?

19. What do you think the key challenges to the Smokefree Generation idea will be? **Probe:** How can these be managed?

**Perception of Smokefree Generation proposal (freedom, choice and protection from harm)**

As we discussed, one of the main reasons to introduce a Smokefree Generation policy is to protect young people from smoking.

20. How important do you think it is that the Government tries to protect young people from smoking? **Probe:** What makes you say that? Can you tell me more about that?

21. Who, if anyone, do you think should be responsible for reducing smoking in young people? **Probe:** What role do you think health services, tobacco companies, community groups, iwi or hapū should play? **Are there other groups that you think should be responsible? What groups are they?**

22. How do you think we should balance protecting young people while still giving them freedom? **PROBE:** What sort of balance do you think is important?

23. Do you think it is better to protect young people from harmful products like tobacco or let them find out for themselves? **PROBE:** What if finding out for themselves means they get addicted and can’t quit?

24. Sometimes we accept that the Government should take actions that are best for people overall. That’s why we have had pandemic lockdowns and why some people are told to be vaccinated against COVID. What do you think about measures that might limit people’s personal freedom because they protect society in general?

**Conclusion**

These are all the questions I wanted to ask you. Do you have any other comments you’d like to make?

Thank you very much for your time and participation.

**Ensure each participant who has received a $30 koha has signed the gift voucher receipt.**
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The Smokefree Generation:
A qualitative analysis of young adult New Zealanders’ views

Interview Guide: People who smoke or formerly smoked

Introduction
Kia ora / Hello – I’ve arranged to talk to you about some research I’m doing into how young people interpret the Smokefree Generation proposal.

Before we start, I’d like to show you some information about the session and check to see whether you have any questions about my work. Here’s another copy of the information sheet we sent you when you indicated you were interested in the project; please take a few moments to look through this sheet.

- Provide participants with an Information Sheet and relevant Consent Form and outline the key points in this. ALLOW TIME TO READ THE INFORMATION SHEET.

Do you have any questions about the study?
- Explain recording of the interview and participants’ rights in relation to these recordings.
- ONCE PARTICIPANTS HAVE AGREED TO INTERVIEW BEING RECORDED, TURN RECORDER ON AND NOTE THAT IT IS NOW ON.

READ OUT WHILE RECORDER/ZOOM RECORDING IS ON:
As participants in the research, you have the right to ask questions at any time, to decide if you would prefer not to answer some questions, to receive a copy of the findings, and to withdraw from the study at any time up to the end of this interview with no penalty to yourself.

- Check again whether participant(s) have any questions about the interview
- If no questions, ask the participant(s) to sign and date the Consent Form
- Give participant koha and obtain signed koha forms

Your responses will be confidential to the research team members. We will assign you a pseudonym, a fake name that is different to your real name, and we will use that name if we report any quotes from this interview. We won’t ever use your real name in any publication or other public document.

We use an online service called Rev.com to listen to the audio files and type up our conversation word-for-word. Rev.com transcribers are located around the world and we do not know who will transcribe the audio file from this interview. There is a very small possibility that someone could transcribe the file and recognise your voices.

ARE YOU HAPPY FOR ME TO START THE INTERVIEW NOW? Check participants has had their questions answered.
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General experiences of smoking
I’d like to start by asking you some questions about any experiences you may have had with smoking.

25. Can you tell me about your smoking history? Probe: Do you remember how old you were when you had your first cigarette? Where did you get it? Who were you with? What was it like?

26. And what happened with your smoking since you first tried tobacco? PROBE: How many cigarettes a day would you have (or have had for ex-smokers)?
Ex-smokers: Probe: How long has it been since you quit? What made you decide to quit?

27. What are the main reasons you smoke (or used to smoke)? Probe: Explore comments fully.

Knowledge and Perception of Smokefree 2025 goal

28. Have you heard that Aotearoa / New Zealand has a Smokefree 2025 goal? Probe: How did you hear about the goal?

29. What do you think the goal means? Probe: Explore all interpretations offered. Ask how they would feel if their interpretation (i.e. that smoking would be banned) was correct.

I’d like to read you the Smokefree 2025 goal [provide paper with goal written out and read information to participant]

“The Smokefree 2025 goal aims to reduce smoking levels to less than five percent and as close to zero percent as possible in all population groups by December 2025.”

30. What do you think the implications of having a goal like this are? Probe: What do you think would need to happen to realise the goal? How do you feel about that?

31. What do you think would be the main benefits of achieving this goal? Probe: Explore benefits stated and the impact these would have (who would benefit).

32. Do you see any downsides to the goal? What do you think these are? Probe: Explore downsides stated (e.g., possible black market) what impact do you think that would have? Who would be disadvantaged?

Perception of TFG proposal

The Government has been thinking about different things it could do to achieve the Smokefree 2025 goal and I’d like to ask you about one of these. It’s called the Smokefree Generation policy.

33. Have you ever heard of this idea? Probe: What do you think it means? Who do you think it would apply to?

I’d like to show you an example of what the Smokefree Generation idea would look like. Basically, it sets a date, and people born after that date will never legally be able to buy tobacco. Here is how it might work. [provide paper with goal written out and read information to participant]
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A smokefree generation policy would mean that tobacco could not be sold or given to people born after a certain date. For example, if a new law started on 1 January 2022, then people who were born after 1 January 2004 would never be able to legally buy tobacco. As a result, over time, sales of tobacco would phase out completely.

34. What would you do if this idea was introduced? PROBE: what do you think would happen with your smoking? Explore quitting, movement to vaping, other alternatives

35. Thinking about young people you know who smoke, if they really wanted tobacco, how do you think they would get it? PROBE: Explore alternative ways they might access tobacco, such as social supply from older family members, friends.

36. What about young people who smoke but want to be smokefree, what would this measure mean for them? PROBE: What makes you say that?

37. What do you think the main benefits of the proposal would be? PROBE: Explore benefits stated and the impact these would have (who would benefit most). How would the proposal affect younger people’s smoking or attitudes towards smoking?

38. What about any downsides of the proposal, do you see any problems? What are they? Probe: Explore downsides stated.

39. Thinking about the benefits and downsides you mentioned, what’s your overall view of this idea? Probe: Can you tell me more about that?

40. What would it be like to be part of a generation where no one smokes? Probe: What makes you say that?

Implementation process

I’d now like to ask you about the best way to implement this idea, if the government goes ahead with it.

41. What do you think of the following ideas?

- The Government sets up a group of young people to advise them on how to implement the Smokefree Generation idea. PROBE: What sort of young people should be on the group? How much influence should they have?
- The Government introduces fines for retailers who still sell tobacco to young people? PROBE: How effective would that be?
- The Government runs a social marketing campaign to let people know about the policy. PROBE: What would be the most important messages? Who should communicate these? Should there be different strategies for different groups? What would the differences be?

42. What do you think the key challenges to the Smokefree Generation idea will be? Probe: How can these be managed?
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**Perception of Smokefree Generation proposal (freedom, choice and protection from harm)**

As we discussed, one of the main reasons to introduce a Smokefree Generation policy is to protect young people from smoking.

43. How important do you think it is that the Government tries to protect young people from smoking? **Probe:** What makes you say that? Can you tell me more about that?

44. Who, if anyone, do you think should be responsible for reducing smoking in young people? **Probe:** What role do you think health services, tobacco companies, community groups, iwi or hapū should play? Are there other groups that you think should be responsible? What groups are they?

45. How do you think these groups should balance protecting young people while still giving them freedom? **PROBE:** What sort of balance do you think is important?

46. Do you think it is better to protect young people from harmful products like tobacco or let them find out for themselves? **PROBE:** What if finding out for themselves means they get addicted and can’t quit?

47. Sometimes we accept that the Government should take actions that are best for people overall. That’s why we have had pandemic lockdowns and why some people are told to be vaccinated against COVID. What do you think about measures that might **override people’s personal freedom because they protect society in general**?

**Conclusion**

These are all the questions I wanted to ask you. Do you have any other comments you’d like to make?

Thank you very much for your time and participation.

Ensure each participant who has received a $30 koha has signed the gift voucher receipt.
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Initial contacts

67 total contacts
- 53 via social media
- 11 snowball
- 3 personal network

Eligible contacts

48 eligible to be interviewed
- 34 social media
- 11 snowball
- 3 personal network

- 9 provided no contact details
- 6 were not in NZ
- 1 did not meet age criterion

Eligible and willing to be interviewed

43 eligible to be interviewed
- 31 social media
- 9 snowball
- 3 personal network

- 3 declined after information sheet sent
- 2 did not respond to contact after information sheet sent

Invited to interview

- 16 social media
- 3 snowball
- 3 personal network

- 2 did not attend booked interview and could not be followed up

Completed interview

- 14 social media
- 3 snowball
- 3 personal network

- 21 eligible participants not contacted as data sufficiency achieved

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s).
### Societal good and protection from harm

| Protects society / collective well-being / greater good / future focus | I think it's fine. As long as it's like, within reasonable, well balanced, but that's also a very big statement. I think if it's like um, communal health, if it's something that could affect others, then I think it's okay for the government to take that into their own hands. (Teuila)  
I think if people realised that it's not just about them. Like, it's for other people too and to help. I think they'd be more understanding of it. Whereas, I think most people think about other people more than they think about themselves. (Leila)  
When you're a kid you think about having a family and stuff, so... you look at... yeah, you put into a perspective where your kids can grow up safer and stuff, and their kids could grow up safer. I think they'd probably come around to agreeing with it. (Leila; also intergenerational transmission)  
Um, you know, it's that kind of their personal want or their desire to smoke, but, um, with no, um, understanding of how bad it could be or the effects of people around them from second hand smoking. (Derek)  
It removes the chance of us ever smoking but the impact for everyone is obviously way more significant than ourselves. Um, so kinda like that greater good scenario. I think it's a very reasonable mindset to have. (Derek)  
The government can't look at that. If they have to look at the whole societal picture as well... But they [other people] have to see about the whole big, bigger picture, not just about themselves too much. ... There'll always be the minority, but you can't reach everyone. So, you forget about them.... And you just keep on going with your plan. If it makes a difference to the majority and overwhelming population, which it does, then absolutely. Yeah. (Ivan)  
I think it's all about protection. So you can't say that they're taking away a choice if they're trying to better the whole community. (June)  
If they do protect society in general then, then it's good.... There shouldn't be like, conflict around it if it's for the protection of the people. Yeah. (Marama) |

---

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For those types of things, as well as for the wider community, because obviously, um, if we’re healthier as a population that’s better for every... (laughs) It’s better for everyone. (Pera)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t really think this is as much an issue of freedom because, um... I guess people are free to harm themselves in a way, but they’re not just harming themselves. They’re causing a cost to the like health system for everyone that’s like in there. Because if there is someone else that’s kind of not getting the care and with, the health system. (Pera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t want anyone to feel like they’re having rights taken away from them. But I think, I mean, change is a reality of life and things are gonna happen. And um- um, I guess you’ve gotta think about the bigger picture and the future generations. (Pera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You should definitely be able to do what you want to do, but if it, if it affects others, and people around you I feel like then there should be rules against it, because, um, if it’s just, if it’s only affecting yourself, I guess, it does- it doesn’t matter too much- but if smoking is, er, affects, it does have a big impact on people around you, that cultural, that atmosphere that it creates.... I guess, you could think, well, yeah, and be saying,&quot;Ah, it’s the freedom of others that are around you that are exposed to you- you that exposed to other than the ind- the individual smoking (Eddy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know, I think the societal benefits outweigh freedom of choice. (Tamati)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So maybe we need to restrict our freedoms a little bit just to make sure that we are helping everyone in society and I think people using their freedoms can often lessen other people’s freedoms and sometimes lesson our own freedoms in turn. Like if I decide to go out, even though I’m sick, I’m risking to someone else’s freedom to go and enjoy like that open environment without a worry of getting sick. Mm. So it’s just quite a slippery balance. (Ben, opposed SFG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom has limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... there’s always like, you know, there’s traffic laws and everything else there. So, you can’t do everything you want. And this is a very bad thing. The evidence shows that it’s bad. So, I don’t think there should be a big issue. I think freedom is not a big issue. (Ivan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mean, everybody has the right to do what they want, but making it, making it that they, so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiction removes choice/ protect people from addiction and consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove the chance for addiction before it begins (Derek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People should have freedom but at the same time, why would you be wanting to make a choice?... I made that choice but why would you be wanting to make a choice to start an unhealthy addiction? Like, it’s better for them to push it in the direction for them, leading, like putting them down a path to not smoke than to do it, I think. (Amy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding out for themselves, they will probably already be too late because they’re addicted (Eddy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Supplementary File 5: Code Book Excerpts**

| Dissatisfaction with status quo | We’ve seen what’s happened over the past years that they’ve had that choice and it’s not worked. If it was working, then we wouldn’t be doing anything about it. So, I think the government has to step up there. (Ivan) |
| Ending inter-generational transmission of smoking | Preventing kids from getting any type of addiction’s probably a good start. Addiction’s not a fun thing to have... I’ve watched both my parents struggle with addiction so I’d prefer not to watch kids grow up with an addiction to something they can’t help. (Leila) |
|  | Parents teach you not to smoke when you grow up but then, yeah, you go and watch them smoking so you’re like “I want to be like mum or dad”. One of my sisters goes “I want to be like my parents” and... yeah, I feel bad for my sister cause I know she smokes cause we all smoke in the house so we have to take on some of that responsibility. (Leila) |
|  | I would see it more as they’re just doing it to protect us and the younger generation. (Fetu) |
|  | It’d take away the, like, the stress of my siblings starting to smoke. (Fiona) |

It’s been shown not to be good for you and that you shouldn’t ... be doing it anyway and it’s more important to stop people from endangering their bodies and stuff rather than their choice sometimes. (Kevin)

I’m all for people trying things and finding their way but, for something that we know for sure has all those risks, it’s not worth it. (Pera)

Protect them, definitely... if they find out for themselves, they will regret it...[it’s] saving them from having all of these health conditions in the future. (Amy)

It’s more important to stop people from endangering their bodies and stuff, rather than their choice, sometimes. (Kevin)

For me I would care way more about protecting young people. I'll lean way more to that side, instead of freedom of choice.... they're just trying to protect you and stuff instead of making you have that choice. (Fetu)
### Supplementary File 5: Code Book Excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Um, you know, the idea of smoking passed down to, to your child, and if that child during the smoke regeneration is, um, will never smoked, never had a temptation to smoke to pass that onto them keeps going on. And then as I said, the, the culture dies out, the temptation is just not there anymore. (Derek)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[I think] effects on people around you, will probably be quite a big one, because it will make people think about their actions affecting other people around them, and affecting people for further generations. Future generations as well, affecting them. (Kevin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it just mean that they've got less of like a thing on the smoke, people smoking and it's not such a cool thing, and stuff. The less people do it, then they less likely to start, and it'll keep going like that. (Kevin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[When they] have children, that's, I feel like that's, that will be the major turning point, that will, you know, s- have a big decrease in cigarette use, because the kids who are let's say born in 2020, 2022, will have parents that, I mean, no, in 2030, for example.. will have parents that don't smoke, right... so, they'll be less exposed, and they'll thus be less likely to smoke in general, so I feel like that will be the major, you know, turning, turning point where people will not smoke. (Eddy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pressure on youth to smoke supports protecting them from uptake | Younger people ...have more people around them trying to influence them to start smoking so I think protecting younger people would stop some people from starting in the first place. (Kevin). |
| Protect them. I think that younger generations have a lot of influence from other people... rather than thinking for themselves... I don't think any child actually goes “Oh, I want to smoke cause I want to smoke”... it’s more because “Oh, my friends are smoking, I want to try that”. (Leila) |
| Younger people have a lot of influence from other people... rather than thinking for themselves. (Leila) |
| Like we wouldn't have like such a culture where I guess it's normal to do something like that to your body. (Teuila) |
| It would be less peer pressure for smoking. It will be less peer pressure for smoking because less available. (Tamati) |
### Supplementary File 5: Code Book Excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excerpt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Youth lack foresight          | I don’t think... when you’re young and stuff, you don’t really think about effects. You think about what your friends are going to think is cool. Government having some sort of say in it and like being able to protect the ones that are going to listen, yeah, it’s quite cool. (Leila)  
Young people don’t really have the foresight to really see that they could become addicted... we’re thinking of let’s enjoy this time with our friends. (Ben)  
I think it’s important to protect everyone from it but especially the young people because they are not as wise as the older people that have gotten themselves into this in the years down the track just regretting it like “Oh, I wish I never picked it up”. (Amy) |
| Government’s protective role  | The government essentially is supposed to keep you safe, and they’re not supposed to, um, make things readily available that are gonna actively harm you. Like it’s why we have control over guns and like, yeah. Um, why there's like restrictions on alcohol and like you can... And why you have to get driver's licenses because it's designed to keep everyone safe. And the... Just, this ban is just deciding to keep everyone safe. (Pera)  
It's the government's responsibility to do that. Um, leadership can't tell us, if you're in a position of being a leader, you can't make everyone happy, you just gotta do what benefits the majority of the people and yeah, um, vaccine is another, is a good example, um, I guess, forcing it upon people, it is indeed against rights, but because it's against rights, saying that, "Yeah, it's okay if you don't get vaccinated," um, isn't right either, because not getting vaccinated affects people around you, right? So it- it should be, it should be a community effort, it should, it should be done altogether. (Eddy) |
| Maintains free choice          | I think to a point you still have the freedom of choice with government protecting you, especially with this law. (Leila)  
You smoke because you want to... but then you get addicted so you have no choice to stop smoking and the government’s trying to protect that. (Leila) |
## Supplementary File 5: Code Book Excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So it’s not really exactly taking away their rights, it’s just making it better for your health than you having that choice, and that freedom to mess up your health, like it's pretty silly. (Amy)</td>
<td>Way more positive than negative, like, people can just finally break free from the addiction and live a healthier life and people could live for longer. (Amy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking a special category so merits special measures</td>
<td>There is definitely some truth in them saying that it’s taking away their right, I guess, and yeah, there’s a lot of things that are already bad for you but there aren’t any restrictions on them. But... with smoking in general, those, like, negative effects are more, can be more serious... more... damaging to yourself. (Marama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For things where we’ve got a real certainty around like scientific supported evidence from worldwide sources, like we know that smoking has harms associated with it, therefore I think it’s okay to push a policy like this... for things that are unproven then I’m obviously like “No”. (Pera)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Prioritising personal choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Searching for a middle ground</th>
<th>You have to fine a very fine line in trying to figure out how to protect people. Yeah. Still give them the choice without feeling that they’re being impeded on. (Derek)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Searching for a middle ground – age restrictions | Instead of completely banning something, you just try and slow it down over time because it’s probably mainly work much better...I think they should still get the choice when they get older if they want to start or not because I think it should be not as much when you’re 18, it should be more like increasing the legal smoking age to, like, 30. (Kevin)  
It [increased age restrictions] lets them decide more and like, look forward to that age, like if they really wanted to try it but at the same time, but the time they do turn that age, they’ll be like, agm yeah, whatever. (Amy; later changed her view to supporting the SFG) |
| Searching for a middle ground – price | I think not completely banning it but, you know, the price raising was a good idea. So maybe just making it a bit harder to get them. (Sara) |
| Searching for a middle ground – allowing people to “learn”/ providing education | I feel like it needs to go down to almost a restriction of what’s in what and how much they can sell of this instead of just completely cut it off... a lot of people only really learn from their mistake by making it. (Fiona; ambivalent about SFG)  
Education is the main thing and then I think restriction is quite important but I think it’s very important for us to feel as though we are becoming adults and we do need to start making responsible choices for ourselves. We don’t want to feel like we are being protected by mum and dad. (Ben)  
I was brought up to believe you shouldn’t be protected from your environment, you should have the information and the knowledge behind you, but you should still experience it yourself... just let them do it, but you just need to give them all the information you can. (Mikey)  
As long as they have the education, they should know not to do something themselves (Mikaere)  
Have them be informed and let them find out for themselves if they wanna carry on. (Mikaere) |
| Risk - creating a forbidden fruit | For the first coming on generations... they would still want to smoke... especially if they can’t. (Mikaere) |
### Supplementary File 5: Code Book Excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposing arguments - loss of freedom</th>
<th>That’s the thing I’m worried about... is limiting people’s freedom. Very little good comes from that in the end. (Fiona, supports SFG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You can’t take away something and give something freedom. It’s still the freedom of decision... if the government actually makes that decision [it will be hard not] to feel like they’re not stealing this decision from my generation. (Fiona, supports SFG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At the end of it, I think if should come down to yourself really. If you don’t wanna smoke, you shouldn’t smoke if you wanna smoke, go for it... as long as you know the consequences, I feel like that should be enough (Mikaere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If it’s less accessible then, of course, potentially not. But it could work the other way. If it’s least accessible, then I want to go into it. So, it depends on the individual, I think. (Ivan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposing arguments - nanny state</td>
<td>I think it is very hard thing to not make the government seem like this kind of, we know best type figure (Ben)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>