



Health
Canada Santé
Canada

POR Registration Number: 014-18
PSPC Contract Number: HT372-182802/CY
Contract Award Date: June 29, 2018
Delivery Date: September 10, 2018
Contracted Cost: \$104,214.25 (including HST)

Testing of Relative Risk Statements for Vaping Products

Final Report

Prepared by:
Corporate Research Associates Inc.

Prepared for:
Health Canada

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français.

For more information on this report, please email:
hc.cpab.por-rop.dgcap.sc@canada.ca



Suite 5001, 7071 Bayers Road
Halifax NS B3L 2C2
www.cra.ca
1-888-414-1336

Canada 

Testing of Relative Risk Statements for Vaping Products

Final Report

Prepared for Health Canada

Supplier Name: Corporate Research Associates Inc.

September 2018

This public opinion research report presents the results of focus groups conducted by Corporate Research Associates Inc. on behalf of Health Canada. The research study entailed a total of sixteen focus groups with Canadian 15 to 24 years old between August 1 and 16, 2018.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français sous le titre : Évaluation d'énoncés sur les risques relatifs aux produits de vapotage.

This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes only. Prior written permission must be obtained from Health Canada. For more information on this report, please contact Health Canada at: hc.cpab.por-rop.dgcap.sc@canada.ca or at:

Communications Branch
Health Canada
200 Eglantine Driveway
AL 1915C, Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, ON K1A 0K9

Catalogue Number:

H14-268/2018E-PDF

International Standard Book Number (ISBN):

978-0-660-27842-1

Related publications (registration number: POR-014-18):

Catalogue Number H14-268/2018F-PDF (Final Report, French)

ISBN 978-0-660-27843-8

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of Health, 2018

Table of Contents

Page

Executive Summary	1
Introduction.....	4
Research Methodology	5
Context of Qualitative Research	6
Detailed Analysis	7
General Considerations.....	7
Statement-Specific Comments.....	12
Conclusions and Direction.....	33

Appendices:

Appendix A - Recruitment Screener

Appendix B – Moderator’s Guide

Appendix C – Focus Group Materials

Executive Summary

Corporate Research Associates Inc.
Contract Number: HT372-182802/CY
POR Registration Number: 014-18
Contract Award Date: June 29, 2018
Contracted Cost: \$104,214.25 (including HST)

Background and Objectives

The increasing popularity of vaping products in Canada prompted the federal government to pass Bill S-5, which became law in May 2018 in the form of amendments to the Tobacco Act, now renamed the Tobacco and Vaping Products Act (TVPA). The revised Act allows the government to regulate vaping materials as a separate class of products.

Although vaping emissions are less harmful than those of cigarettes, they still carry health risks. As a result, the Act prohibits promotion of vaping in a manner that conveys the idea that it provides a health benefit to users, or that promotes vaping by comparing it with the use of tobacco. At the same time, the Act allows for regulatory exceptions to this prohibition – including the use of select, scientifically-backed statements that compare the health risks of vaping and tobacco products, but that neither mislead the public about the harm of vaping, nor promote vaping among young people and non-smokers.

Health Canada was interested in conducting qualitative research to support the creation of comparative risk statements that could be authorized for use for vaping products. The objective of these authorized statements is that they do not mislead people about the health hazards of vaping and tobacco use, and do not motivate young people and adult non-smokers to use either product. The relative risk statements that were tested were designed to help consumers make informed choices about their health in the context of vaping. With this in mind, the main objective of this research is to evaluate Canadian vapers, smokers, youth and young adults' perceptions of certain relative risk statements, and potential variations, that may be authorized for use in the commercial promotion of vaping products. Specifically, the relative risk statements were assessed for clarity or messaging, ease of reading, credibility, and inducement risk to youth and young adults who are non-smokers.

The study consisted of a total of sixteen (16) in-person focus groups conducted from August 1st to 16th, 2018. Four English focus groups were conducted in each of Toronto (ON), Vancouver (BC), and Saskatoon (SK), while four French groups were conducted in Montreal (QC). In each location, one group was conducted with each of four audiences: adult vapers (a person that has vaped at least once per week for the last four weeks); adult smokers (a person that has smoked at least once per week for the past four weeks); youth 15 to 19 years old who have never smoked tobacco and have never used a vaping device; and young adults 20 to 24 years old who are not currently smoking or using a vaping device.

Given low participation among youth in Montreal, an online focus group involving a live discussion was conducted with this audience in addition to the in-person focus group. Each focus group included a mix



of age, gender, education level (vaper and smoker groups only), household income, as well as various levels of vaping and smoking frequency (among the vaper and smoker groups). All participants lived in their respective markets for at least two years. Across all groups, a total of 124 participants took part in this research.

This report presents the findings from the study. Caution must be exercised when interpreting the results from this study, as qualitative research is directional only. Results cannot be attributed to the overall population under study, with any degree of confidence.

Political Neutrality Certification

I hereby certify as a Representative of Corporate Research Associates Inc. that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the **Directive on the Management of Communications**. Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.

Signed  _____

Margaret Brigley, President & COO | Corporate Research Associates

Date: September 10, 2018

Key Findings and Conclusions

Findings from the **Testing of Relative Risk Statements for Vaping Products** reveal that most of the seventeen statements tested are effective at communicating that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker. Further, with a few exceptions, they do not mislead consumers about the harms of vaping products.

Although the overarching message of the statements appeared clear to participants, the information provided was considered incomplete or insufficient in many instances. This sentiment is likely a result of consumers looking for confirmed and scientifically-proven information on the health risks of vaping products to inform their choices.

In terms of message clarity, it should be noted that the statement ‘switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users’ exposure to numerous toxic and cancer-causing substances’, though impactful, it confused some as to whether or not vaping products contained carcinogens. In these instances, participants tended to believe that vaping products were harmful. Confusion was also evident in terms of what causes addiction and cancer in the statement ‘e-cigarettes contain nicotine which is addictive but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does’.

The research also revealed that the use of words such as ‘lower’, ‘fraction’, and ‘reduced’, without qualifiers (e.g., ‘significantly’), combined with the use of conditional verbs (e.g., ‘can’, ‘could’, and ‘may’) affected participants’ understanding of the claims made by each statement. For example, saying that ‘vaping can be harmful’ also implies that the opposite is true, (i.e. vaping can *not* be harmful in some



situations). At the same time, saying that ‘vaping is less harmful than smoking’ does not adequately quantify the difference in harms between both, according to participants.

For the most part, the statements do not induce curiosity in vaping products among non-vaper and non-smoker youth and young adults, particularly statements that identify smokers as the intended audience (e.g., using expressions such as ‘switching completely’, ‘completely replacing’, ‘users’, and ‘smokers’), and statements that present vaping as still being harmful. That said, the statements ‘e-cigarettes contain nicotine which is addictive but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does’ and ‘except for nicotine, vaping products typically only contain a fraction of the 7,000 chemicals found in tobacco or tobacco smoke, and at lower levels’ minimize the risks or potential harms of vaping products compared to cigarettes, thus suggesting to readers that vaping may not be very harmful at all. These two statements were also the most unclear in specifying the potential harms of vaping products, creating confusion as to what causes cancer and which toxic substances, and how many, are included in vaping products.

Looking at the sentence structures, findings show that short statements that use simple language and present a single idea were considered most effective at clearly communicating the intended message. In terms of specific wording, ‘less harmful’ is preferred and deemed clearer than ‘not harmless’. ‘Significantly lower’ implies a difference of at least half, and is perceived as greater than ‘much lower’ or ‘much less’. ‘Vaping products’ is felt to be more encompassing and broader than ‘e-cigarettes’ in addition to having less of a negative stigma. The terms, ‘emit’ and ‘release’ were considered equally adequate, and, along with ‘exposure’, they speak of second-hand smoke or vape. To qualify the harms of vaping and smoking, ‘toxic substances’ grabs attention and implies a more serious and noteworthy situation than the expression ‘harmful substances’. Both ‘completely replacing’ and ‘switching completely’ suggested a permanent and total switch from smoking to vaping. Finally, while ‘numerous’ is less commonly used than ‘many’, it conjures scientific knowledge and implies a greater number.

Findings suggest that most of the risk statements tested are suitable to alert consumers of the health risks of vaping in comparison to smoking, while not inducing interest in those types of products among non-users.



Introduction

The increasing popularity of vaping products in Canada prompted the federal government to pass Bill S-5, which became law in May 2018 in the form of amendments to the Tobacco Act, now renamed the Tobacco and Vaping Products Act (TVPA). The revised Act allows the government to regulate vaping materials as a separate class of products.

Although vaping emissions are less harmful than those of cigarettes, they still carry health risks. As a result, the Act prohibits promotion of vaping in a manner that conveys the idea that it provides a health benefit to users, or that promotes vaping by comparing it with the use of tobacco. At the same time, the Act allows for regulatory exceptions to this prohibition – including the use of select, scientifically-backed statements that compare the health risks of vaping and tobacco products, but that neither mislead the public about the harm of vaping, nor promote vaping among young people and non-smokers.

Health Canada was interested in conducting qualitative research to support the creation of such statements to ensure they do not mislead people about the hazards of vaping and tobacco use, and do not motivate young people and adult non-smokers to use either product. The relative risk statements were designed to help consumers make informed choices about their health in the context of vaping.

The main objective of this research is to evaluate Canadian vapers, smokers, youth and young adults' perceptions of certain relative risk statements, and potential variations, that may be authorized for use in the commercial promotion of vaping products.

Specific research objectives included:

- Gathering information on vaping product users, smokers, and youth and young adult non-smokers/non-vapers knowledge of the health hazard of using vaping products;
- Testing relative risk statements for the following;
 - ✓ clarity of the statement,
 - ✓ the main message, and
 - ✓ inducement risk to youth and/or young adult non-smokers.
- Testing the proposed statements for their potential to mislead people about the health hazards of using vaping products.

This report presents the findings from the research. It includes a high level executive summary, the description of the detailed methodology used, the detailed findings of the focus group discussions, and conclusions derived from the analysis of research findings. The working documents are appended to the report, including the recruitment screener and the moderator's guide.



Research Methodology

Target Audiences

There were four target audiences for this study, namely:

- **Vapers:** Adults aged 18 years or older who are currently using, or have been using a vaping device at least once a week for the four weeks prior to recruitment. Vapers included dual users who currently smoke and vape, former smokers who now vape, and those who have never smoked and currently vape.
- **Smokers:** Adults aged 18 years or older who have smoked at least once a week for the past four weeks, but who do not currently vape, or have vaped less than once a week in the past four weeks.
- **Youth:** Youth 15 to 19 years old who have never smoked tobacco and have never used a vaping device.
- **Young Adults:** Young adults 20 to 24 years old who are not currently smoking or using a vaping device, and who may or may not have smoked or vaped in the past.

Each focus group included a mix of age, gender, education level (vaper and smoker groups only), household income, as well as various levels of vaping and smoking frequency (among the vaper and smoker groups). All participants have lived in their respective markets for at least two years.

Research Approach

A total of sixteen (16) traditional, in-person focus groups were conducted in Toronto (August 1-2, 2018), Vancouver (August 8-9, 2018), Montreal (August 13-14, 2018), and Saskatoon (August 15-16, 2018). In each location, one group was conducted with each of four audiences: current vapers 18 years and older; current smokers 18 years and older; non-vapers/non-smokers youth 15-19 years old; and non-vapers/non-smokers young adults 20-24 years old. Groups in Montreal were conducted in French while the discussion in all other locations was held in English. Given the low show rates in Montreal among qualifying youth, an online, real-time focus group was conducted with youth 15-19 years old on August 23, 2018.

A total of ten participants were recruited for each in-person group, and five participants were recruited for the online group, totalling 165 recruits across all groups. Across locations, 124 participants actually attended the discussions. Those who took part in the discussion each received a compensation of \$100 as a token of appreciation for their time, as per market standards. In-person group discussions each lasted 2 hours while the online session lasted 90 minutes.



The following provides a summary of participation in each location:

Location	Language	Date	Audience	Time	Participants
Toronto, ON	English	August 1, 2018	Vapers	6:00 PM	6
			Smokers	8:00 PM	6
		August 2, 2018	Youth	6:00 PM	6
			Young Adults	8:00 PM	8
Vancouver, BC	English	August 8, 2018	Vapers	6:00 PM	8
			Smokers	8:00 PM	9
		August 9, 2018	Youth	6:00 PM	7
			Young Adults	8:00 PM	9
Montreal, QC	French	August 13, 2018	Vapers	6:00 PM	9
			Smokers	8:00 PM	7
		August 14, 2018	Youth	6:00 PM	6
			Young Adults	8:00 PM	5
August 23, 2018	Youth (online group)	5:30 PM	5		
Saskatoon, SK	English	August 15, 2018	Vapers	6:00 PM	8
			Smokers	8:00 PM	8
		August 16, 2018	Youth	6:00 PM	8
			Young Adults	8:00 PM	9
Total participants:					124

All participants were recruited per industry guidelines and per the recruitment specifications for the Government of Canada. Recruitment was conducted through qualitative panels stored on Canadian servers, with follow up calls to confirm the details provided and to ensure quotas were met. An additional confirmation call was done approximately one day prior to each focus group. Participants were also asked to sign a consent form upon their arrival to the focus group. In each location, participants were asked to show a piece of ID to confirm their identity.

Context of Qualitative Research

Qualitative discussions are intended as moderator-directed, informal, non-threatening discussions with participants whose characteristics, habits and attitudes are considered relevant to the topic of discussion. The primary benefits of individual or group qualitative discussions are that they allow for in-depth probing with qualifying participants on behavioural habits, usage patterns, perceptions and attitudes related to the subject matter. This type of discussion allows for flexibility in exploring other areas that may be pertinent to the investigation. Qualitative research allows for more complete understanding of the segment in that the thoughts or feelings are expressed in the participants' "own language" and at their "own levels of passion." Qualitative techniques are used in marketing research as a means of developing insight and direction, rather than collecting quantitatively precise data or absolute measures. As such, results are directional only and cannot be projected to the overall population under study.



Detailed Analysis

The following section provides an overview of the findings from the focus group discussions. Where appropriate, differences in opinions are outlined by each of the key audiences under study.

General Considerations

The following provides an overview of general findings from the group discussions that apply across multiple risk statements.

Defining Vaping Products and E-Cigarettes

‘Vaping products’ is considered to be a broader term than ‘e-cigarettes’, and one that is well recognized.

For the most part, participants considered the terms ‘vaping products’ and ‘e-cigarettes’ to refer to different things. E-cigarettes were generally believed to be smaller, shaped like a traditional cigarette, and thought to be something for smokers to use if trying to quit. ‘Vaping products’ were most commonly viewed as referring to larger devices with a container for e-liquid refills and to encompass a broader selection of types of devices. In some instances, this term was also viewed as referring to a broader variety of vaping devices, including e-cigarettes, as well as enabling the use of various types of liquids (e.g., e-liquids with and without nicotine, cannabis, and shisha in a few instances). In general, there was less stigma attached to the term ‘vaping products’ and it was felt to be something that is more ‘fun’ and ‘glamorous’ to use than an e-cigarette. It should be noted, however, that the action word of ‘vaping’ or ‘vape’ was more commonly referenced and familiar than the term ‘vaping products’ to speak about this topic. This was most notably the case among French-speaking participants in Montreal.

“I don’t think of e-cigarettes as vaping. They’re two separate things.” Toronto young adults

Definite Statements

Statements that are worded in a more definitive manner (i.e., using ‘will’ or ‘is’) and avoid the use of ‘but’ are considered clearest.

Across groups and locations, statements that use the conditional tense provided less clarity about the statements. The terms ‘can’, ‘may’, or ‘could’ were all seen as introducing varying levels of uncertainty in what the statements are saying, and as such, lessened the clarity of the message for participants’. Further, these words implied to participants that the opposite of what the statement is saying is also possible or true. For example, where it is suggested that ‘vaping can be harmful’, many participants were left with the impression that the wording implies that vaping can also be harmless in some situations. Across all three of these terms, there is a perceived hierarchy of certainty, from ‘can’ being more definite than ‘may’, or ‘could’. By contrast, statements that are more definitive by using the



present or future tenses, such as 'will' or 'is', tend to be clearer to participants. These findings were consistent among the French-speaking groups, with verb tenses such as 'peut' and 'pourrait' being less certain than using the verb 'is' (or 'est' in French).

While the overall understanding of the statements' message was not compromised by the use of 'can', 'may', and 'could', participants were left with doubts regarding the completeness and openness of what is being communicated. Participants expressed a desire for statements to provide answers to their questions about vaping.

At the same time, a few participants believed that designing two-part statements that are separated by the word 'but' should be carefully considered. Findings show that the use of the word 'but' in a sentence was seen as reducing the impact of the initial part of the statement, suggesting that the latter part of the statement overrides the first idea.



Quantifying Amounts or Levels

Terms such as ‘lower’, ‘fraction’, and ‘reduced’ generated questions and a desire for quantified information.

Some statements tested included qualifiers to speak of changes in amounts or levels of substances or likelihood of harms (e.g. ‘lower’, ‘reduce’, and ‘fraction’). That being said, participants widely expressed a preference for statements that present information on vaping compared to smoking to include specific numbers or percentages rather than using qualifiers. It was believed that numbers and percentages would strengthen the statements’ appeal and trust in the information being communicated. Indeed, to them, the use of numbers implies factual and verified information. Nonetheless, either qualifying or quantifying differences were deemed important (i.e., using numbers or qualifiers) to provide scope.

“What does ‘significantly lower’ mean? By what percentage is it lower?” Toronto smoker

When looking at various ways to qualify amounts, the term ‘significantly’ was considered appropriate in English statements to speak of a large difference. The qualifier ‘significantly’ in the context of tested statements clearly implied a difference of at least half in what is being compared. In contrast, ‘much lower’ and ‘much less’ had less impact and implied a smaller difference or gap between what is being compared. Other words, such as ‘extremely’ or ‘strongly’ were considered as similar in scope to ‘significantly’.

“How much is significantly? How much lower is that? With significantly, I would think at least 50 percent more.” Saskatoon smoker

In French, ‘considérablement’ or ‘nettement’ were considered equally appropriate, and more impactful than ‘beaucoup moins’ or ‘bien moins’, and generally refer to a difference of at least fifty percent. The term ‘significativement’ was not liked, as it is difficult to pronounce. One participant in Montreal suggested using the qualifier ‘largement’ to replace the others.

Qualifying Harm

The expression ‘toxic and cancer-causing substances’ is considered more severe and precise than ‘harmful substances’.

When speaking of the potential harms of vaping compared to smoking, the terms ‘toxic substances’ and ‘cancer-causing substances’ were considered more effective than the term ‘harmful substances’ at grabbing attention and heightening the severity of the situation. Perceptions regarding the harms of vaping compared to smoking cigarettes will likely be influenced by the terms used to define those harms. Using words such as ‘toxic’ or ‘cancer-causing’ were seen as positioning smoking as far less healthy than vaping, more so than when referring to ‘harmful substances’. That being said, the term ‘toxic’ implied to participants a potential for death if the product is consumed, thus leading some participants to question the safety of using vaping products in any amount.



Harmful Versus Harmless

The use of the expressions, ‘less harmful’ and ‘not harmless’ should be carefully considered.

Findings show some tension in statements that contain both the words ‘less harmful’ and ‘not harmless’ as participants generally considered them contradictory or confusing if used in the same statement. At the same time, the term, ‘not harmless’ was considered a double negative which was deemed confusing by many. Some also indicated that at a glance, the term ‘not’ may be missed, thus leaving the reader with the impression that the statement claimed that vaping was ‘harmless’.

In French, the expression ‘ne sont pas sans danger’ appears most appropriate to speak of vaping products, as well as being most effective at grabbing attention. In fact, using the expression ‘ne sont pas sans danger’ in French to say that vaping can be harmful is considered impactful because of the use of the word ‘danger’. By contrast, ‘ne sont pas inoffensif’ appeared to participants as being weaker, while ‘ne sont pas sans méfait’ was considered inappropriate in this context. The term ‘méfait’ most notably referred to a wrongdoing or mischief rather than an ill effect to one’s health, and as such, was not considered appropriate to convey the intended message. One participant suggested to use the expression, ‘sont tout de même dangereux’.

“En disant, ‘en danger’, c’est plus fort. C’est plus transparent. N’être pas inoffensif, ça peut dire autre chose.” (Saying that it is not harmful is stronger. Saying that it is not harmless is saying something else.) Montreal vaper

Positioning Vaping Against Smoking

Statements that position smoking as far more harmful than vaping through strong imagery are seen as minimizing the negative health risks of vaping.

Using words or expressions that evoke strong imagery, such as ‘toxic’, ‘cancer-causing’ and ‘7,000 chemical substances’, was considered impactful and attention grabbing. That said, this approach was seen as presenting smoking in such a negative light compared to vaping in that it presents the latter as ‘not a bad choice’ in comparison. Participants believed that the worse smoking seems based on what the statement is saying, the more it makes vaping seem like an acceptable alternative.

At the same time, statements that presented a single idea using simple language were considered more attention-grabbing and were more understandable, assuming they are sufficiently detailed. Although there was a desire for statements that are factual and specific, those that presented too much information using complex language (e.g., ‘Switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users’ exposure to numerous toxic and cancer-causing substances’) lead readers to focus on deciphering the wording rather than the message itself. A few participants also mentioned having lost interest mid-way through reading this particular statement, thus suggesting that these kinds of statements would have less impact than simpler, more direct ones. At the same time, while they place importance on simplicity, participants voiced a preference for statements that present interesting



and notable facts. Vague or generic statements were considered less interesting and less effective at informing the public.

Risk of Vaping Inducement

Very few statements offer a high risk of inducement for non-smoking and non-vaping youth and young adults.

Findings show that the statements tested are unlikely to induce curiosity or interest in trying vaping products among non-users, as for the most part, they presented vaping products as having potential negative health effects or they identified smokers as the message's target audience. Indeed, it was believed that unless someone had already shown interest for these products, the statements on their own were generally not likely to induce this kind of thought process.

That being said, statements that do not clearly identify switching from cigarettes– those that position vaping as being less harmful than smoking without any explanation, and statements that clearly illustrated significant differences between the health risks of vaping and smoking, were most likely seen as positioning vaping in a favourable light. Participants' opinions on the inducement potential of each statement is discussed in more details later in this report.

Target Audience of Statements

Statements with a clear reference to smoking or smokers garner less interest about vaping for non-smokers.

Statements that use words such as 'switching completely', 'completely replacing', and 'if you are a smoker' imply a message that was considered to clearly identify cigarette smokers as the statement's target audience, and therefore seemed less attention-grabbing and irrelevant to non-smokers.

There was split preference between the terms 'switching completely' and 'completely replacing' to speak of ceasing the use of tobacco smoking or cigarettes, permanently. Both terms were considered to communicate a permanent and complete replacement of smoking with vaping, with personal preferences for one or another. By comparison, the expression 'complete substitute' was less preferred, as it does not imply the same level of permanence as the other two expressions.

Those statements that refer to smokers or the action of switching from smoking to vaping were considered as positioning vaping as having less health risks than smoking, only if you are a smoker. By contrast, statements that did not use terms such as 'current smoker', 'switching completely', 'completely replacing', or 'if you are a smoker', but rather which compared the risks of vaping products or e-cigarettes to those of cigarettes, were considered to be targeting a broader audience.



Statement-Specific Comments

The following section presents participants' reactions to each of the statements tested. The focus groups included a more in-depth discussion on the five main statements, with limited time spent reviewing each of the alternative versions.

Theme Statement A

STATEMENT A: Vaping can be harmful, but is much less harmful than smoking / Le vapotage peut être nocif, mais considérablement moins nocif que le tabagisme.

Message

In general, statements in this series were considered too vague to educate or inform the public about vaping products. They did not grab attention and provided information that was considered too vague to be of value.

"It's extremely vague." Toronto vaper

Across locations, participants noted that this statement clearly communicates that vaping is a safer alternative to smoking, though it does not effectively convey the risks associated with vaping. It left participants wondering why vaping is 'much less' harmful than smoking, and the extent to which it is a better alternative. The qualifier 'much' suggested to many that there were clear benefits to choosing vaping over smoking, though participants expressed a desire for more precise information.

*"This is very vague. What exactly is less harmful about vaping? Is it 10 percent, is it 20?"
Vancouver smoker*

Nonetheless, it was believed that the statement communicates that there is still harm associated with vaping, although less so than with smoking. While the simplicity of the statement was appreciated, it was felt that it lacks sufficient details to effectively inform or guide the public in this form.

"Ça dit que le vapotage peut être nocif, mais pas autant que le tabagisme." (It says that vaping can be harmful, but not as much as smoking.) Montreal Vaper

"This one says vaping is harmful, so to the average person, it may come across as saying that vaping isn't exactly healthy." Vancouver vaper

At the same time, participants believed that the use of expressions such as 'can be', implied uncertainty in the claim being made, creating doubt in their minds. Indeed, if vaping 'can be' harmful, it also suggests that there are situations where vaping is not harmful. There were also some questions around the claim that vaping is less harmful than smoking given the perception that there is limited research available to support this claim.



“It’s just very ambiguous. They say it ‘can be harmful’ but they don’t say what the harm is. The words ‘much less’ imply that it’s very safe.” Toronto young adult

“This statement makes it seem like there are no consequences to vaping. I think there needs to be more emphasis on how it is addictive.” Vancouver youth

“I don’t think vaping has been around long enough to know this. There’s not enough evidence to support the claim, yet.” Toronto smoker.

Nonetheless, the shortness of the sentence, the few ideas being communicated, and the use of a comma to separate ideas contributed to the statement’s perceived simplicity and ease of understanding.

“This gets right to the point. It really stands out and is easy to read.” Saskatoon vaper

Clarity

Despite the overall clarity of the statement, it was suggested to specify that vaping was being compared to ‘tobacco smoking’ so as not to confuse it with shisha or marijuana.

“Less harmful than “smoking”- what? Smoking cigarettes? Smoking pot?” Saskatoon young adult

French-speaking participants suggested to replace the word ‘tabagisme’ with ‘cigarettes’ for simplicity and added clarity.

Audience

In all locations but Saskatoon, it was believed that it positions vaping as a good alternative to smoking.

“For a smoker trying to quit, I think this makes vaping sound like a good alternative.” Vancouver smoker

Potential for Inducement

Perhaps as a result of the statement being perceived as broad, there was a sense that it presents vaping as a safer option to smoking in general, and not only if you are a smoker. Despite the statement positioning vaping products as relatively safe compared to smoking, the statement itself was generally seen as insufficient on its own to spur curiosity in vaping among youth and young adults. Indeed, it was considered too vague and still presented vaping as an unhealthy option. That being said, a few youth believed that this statement may make young people curious about vaping, if they were already considering this option.



Statement-Specific Wording Options

English-speaking participants were asked to comment on the expression, ‘is not harmless’ in contrast to the expression ‘can be harmful’. As mentioned earlier in this report, the double negative (‘not’ and ‘harmless’) proved confusing for many, and made the statement unclear. In addition, at a glance, the use of the term ‘harmless’ focused on the lack of harm which, when looked at quickly, focuses on the absence of harm.

French-speaking participants were asked to compare wording such as ‘pas sans danger’, ‘pas sans méfait’ and ‘pas inoffensif’. In general, ‘pas sans danger’ elicited the greatest attention and clearly conveyed the situation’s seriousness in a clear manner.

Suggestions for Rewording

A few suggestions for rewording the statement were provided by participants, to improve clarity and readability, as follows:

- Vaping is much less harmful than smoking.
- Vaping can be much less harmful than smoking.
- Vaping can be harmful to some people, but much less harmful than smoking.
- Le vapotage est considérablement moins nocif que le tabagisme.

Alternative Statements

Three alternative statements were discussed in comparison to the original statement. In general, it was believed that all four statements within this series communicated the same message, though in a different manner.

“It’s the same sentence, just the placement of the words are switched around.” Toronto vaper

That being said, the statement A1, as identified below, was considered as targeting smokers given that this audience is identified in the statement itself, while the other two alternative statements were considered as having a wider audience.

In Saskatoon, a few participants felt that all four statements in this series were worded in a way to promote vaping rather than inform of the risks associated with these kinds of products. These participants felt that as a result, the statements sounded almost like an invitation to consider replacing cigarettes with vaping devices, thus targeting smokers.

The following alternative statements were briefly discussed:

STATEMENT A1: If you are a smoker, vaping is a less harmful option than smoking, if you switch completely / Si vous fumez, le vapotage est une option bien moins nocive que le tabagisme, pourvu que vous remplacez complètement vos cigarettes par un produit de vapotage.



In this statement, the target audience was understood to be current smokers. In fact, most non-smokers felt that they would pay little attention as it is clearly addressed to smokers from the beginning. Overall, the statement was considered straight forward, clear, and specific and suggested that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you switch from smoking.

*“The first one is definitely directed towards smokers, whereas the other two aren’t.”
Saskatoon youth*

“It gives the message clearly...it just about says it all.” Vancouver smoker

“Ils disent ‘si vous fumer’; je lis ça et j’arrête de lire. Je ne fume pas, je ne vais pas continuer de lire ce qui est écrit.” (It says ‘if you are a smoker’. I read that first and I will stop reading because I don’t smoke.) Montreal young adult

French-speaking participants noted that the term ‘pourvu que’ felt awkward and should be changed for ‘du moment que’ or ‘à condition de’ which were considered more grammatically correct.

Suggestions to reword this statement were made, including:

- If you are a smoker and if you switch completely, vaping is a less harmful option than smoking.
- If you are a smoker and you switch completely to vaping, it is a less harmful option.
- If you are a smoker and switch completely to vaping, it is less harmful than smoking.
- If you are a smoker, vaping is a less harmful option than smoking only if you switch completely.

STATEMENT A2: Vaping is much less harmful than smoking, but can still be harmful / Le vapotage est considérablement moins nocif que le tabagisme, mais demeure tout de même nocif.

Very few specific comments were made about this alternative version. In general, it was considered similar to other statements from the same series in terms of meaning, though it is not as clearly identifying smokers as the target audience. One participant suggested rephrasing to: ‘Vaping is much less harmful than smoking, but can still cause health problems’ for added clarity.

STATEMENT A3: Vaping is much less harmful than smoking, but is not harmless / Le vapotage est considérablement moins nocif que le tabagisme, mais n’est pas sans danger.

This statement generally implied the same information or message than the other statements in this series, although targeting a broader audience than just smokers. That being said, a number of participants across locations found that the use of the expressions ‘less harmful’ and ‘not harmless’ in the same sentence negatively impacted the message’s clarity. Reasons for this sentiment were discussed earlier in this report. A suggestion was made to reword the statement to: ‘Vaping is harmful, but is significantly less harmful than smoking’.

“It appeals to a broader audience. The first one definitely targets smokers.” Vancouver smoker



An analysis of individual ratings shows that along with the original statement in this series this statement was considered the most clear and easy to understand of all three alternative versions, most clearly communicated that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker, and most clearly communicated that there are still harms associated with vaping.

Theme Statement B

STATEMENT B: Vaping products emit toxic substances but the amount is significantly lower than in tobacco smoke / Les produits de vapotage émettent des substances toxiques, mais en quantité nettement moins importante que dans la fumée du tabac.

Message

In general, this statement was considered vague and broadly implying that vaping is less harmful than tobacco smoking. That said, it emphasized that there are harmful chemicals in vaping products that can have negative health effects for users of these products, as well as for those around them. Indeed, the use of the words ‘emit’ and ‘smoke’ introduced the concept of second-hand smoke/vape for participants.

*“When I read this, I think of second-hand smoke. That’s what I get from the ‘emit’ part.”
Saskatoon smoker*

This statement communicated that vaping is less harmful than smoking, while still not being harmless as it emits toxic substances. That said, many participants felt that the suggestion that vaping products includes toxic substances implied that its health risks are similar or just slightly less than those of cigarette smoking, despite qualifying the difference as ‘significantly lower’. Clarification was not sought during the discussions as to why the term ‘significantly lower’ did not imply a difference of at least half as it did when the expression was discussed on its own. That said, the severe imagery conjured by the expression ‘toxic substances’ which was at time evocative of deadly substances, may have diminished the impact of the term ‘significantly lower’ in this statement.

“When I first started vaping I thought it was a lot healthier than smoking. This says vaping is only a little bit healthier, which I find kind of surprising.” Vancouver vaper

“Prior to walking in here, I thought vaping was less harmful...according to this, you are still putting toxic substances into your system.” Toronto vaper

“That’s a heavy word, ‘toxic’. It really grabs people’s attention.” Vancouver smoker

To a few, the fact that the statement did not specifically refer to the action of smoking or vaping, but rather focused on the emissions, made the message less personable and impactful.



Clarity

In general, the statement was considered easy to understand, short, and to-the-point despite being seen as incomplete. While it provided a clear portrayal of vaping as being harmful, though less so than smoking, it did not explain the reasons why it is so, which toxic substances are included in vaping products, and the extent to which vaping is less harmful than smoking. In addition, a few participants questioned if vaping products are harmful only to users, or if they are also harmful to others.

“We’re emitting toxic substances – whether it’s into the air or into my body, I have no idea.” Toronto Youth

Some participants across audiences indicated that while the term ‘toxic chemicals’ implies a harmful substance, it does not provide sufficient information regarding the types of substances included, and how these may be harmful to people’s health.

“The statement is clear, it’s just – what is the toxic substance?” Toronto vaper

Audience

For the most part, it was believed that because the statement compares vaping to smoking tobacco, it is directed at those who currently smoke.

“This statement is directed at smokers. It says while the dangers are still there with vaping, they’re still significantly lower than tobacco.” Saskatoon vaper

In Montreal, some believed, however, that as the statement is speaking of the harm resulting from second-hand smoke or vape, the message would be directed at everyone, regardless of current smoking or vaping behaviours.

Potential for Inducement

This statement appeared to youth and young adults as being effective at highlighting the risks of vaping, notably the inclusion of toxic substances. As such, youth and young adults generally felt that it would not induce their curiosity in looking into vaping or trying these kinds of products.

Statement-Specific Wording Options

Participants were asked for their thoughts on the use of the word ‘release’ instead of the word ‘emit’ in this statement. In general, both terms were considered interchangeable in the context of the statement, as they are both referring to emissions. The same can be said of the words ‘émettent’ and ‘dégagent’ in French.

Just a few participants in Saskatoon felt that both of those terms had slightly different meaning. In those instances, the word ‘emit’ referred to something that is constant, while something that was ‘released’



needed a trigger to activate it. A few suggestions were provided for alternative words, including ‘produce’ and ‘contain’ in English.

Participants were also asked to compare the expressions ‘toxic substances’ and ‘harmful substances’. In general, the former is considered much more serious than the latter, as it is often used to describe poisonous substances, or those that may be deadly. While the term ‘toxic’ was most appreciated in this statement for implying there are serious health risks to vaping, some of the smokers indicated that as a result, it does not make vaping an appealing alternative to smoking.

“The word ‘toxic’ is kind of bold for this sentence. It just screams, this is bad. It’s more descriptive than ‘harmful’.” Toronto youth

“[The word] ‘harmful; is something you see on almost every warning package – food at McDonald’s can be harmful – it’s not a serious word at all. [The word] ‘toxic’ sounds much more serious.” Vancouver youth

“[The word] ‘toxic’ is a really strong word. For me it’s like seeing a ‘skull and crossbones’ [image] on a product.” Saskatoon vaper

“[The word] ‘toxic’ means it’s really bad for me and I should avoid it. Whereas ‘harmful’ means it’s not good for me, but I can have it occasionally.” Saskatoon young adult

When referring to the volume of toxic chemicals, the term ‘amount’ generally suggested to participants the number of chemicals, while the expression ‘level’ referred to the percentage or quantity of each chemical. In general, the term ‘amount’ was preferred. Only a few participants felt that both terms could be used interchangeably.

(re: replacing ‘amount is significantly lower’ with ‘lower levels’) “[With the word] ‘amount’, you can measure, but [with the word] ‘level’, you can’t, so how do you know what level means?” Toronto Smoker

Suggestions for Rewording

A few suggestions for rewording the statement were provided by participants, to improve clarity and readability, as follow:

- Vaping products emit certain toxic substances but the amount is significantly lower than in tobacco smoke.
- Studies have shown that vaping can emit toxic substances, but at lower levels than in tobacco smoke.



Alternative Statements

Three alternative statements were discussed in comparison to the original statement. The message of all four statements was considered similar, though the version labelled 'B3' was deemed more specific as it references numbers.

"[All four statements in this series] are saying the same thing, except for number three, which gives you more numbers." Toronto vaper

The following alternative statements were briefly discussed:

STATEMENT B1: Vaping products release much lower levels of harmful substances than tobacco smoke, but are not completely harmless / Les produits de vapotage émettent des substances nocives en quantité bien moins importante que dans la fumée du tabac, mais ces produits ne sont pas sans danger.

This statement was considered similar in meaning to the original one in this series (statement B), generally implying that vaping is less harmful than smoking, though still has some health risks. A suggestion was made to reword the statement to say, 'Vaping releases much lower amounts of harmful substances than using tobacco, but is not completely harmless'. In addition, this statement was more likely to be considered to clearly communicate that there are still harms associated with vaping compared to the other two alternative versions in this series.

"Ça dit que c'est nocif quand même et pour moi, je ne veux pas ça." (It still says that vaping is harmful and I don't want that for me.) Montreal young adult

STATEMENT B2: Vaping products release much lower amounts of harmful substances than tobacco smoke, but still release some harmful substances / Les produits de vapotage émettent des substances nocives en quantité bien moins importante que dans la fumée du tabac, mais en émettent tout de même.

Very few specific comments were made regarding this statement, as for the most part, it was considered almost identical to the Statement B1.

STATEMENT B3: Except for nicotine, vaping products typically only contain a fraction of the 7,000 chemicals found in tobacco or tobacco smoke, and at lower levels/ À l'exception de la nicotine, les produits de vapotage ne contiennent généralement qu'une fraction des 7 000 produits chimiques se trouvant dans le tabac ou la fumée du tabac et à des concentrations moins importantes.

This statement elicited a lot of reactions from participants in all locations. Of all of the statements presented and discussed, this one appeared as providing more precise and specific information regarding the risks of vaping compared to those of smoking tobacco. It was most frequently considered to be completely clear and easy to understand and clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker.



In general, this statement positioned vaping as being much less harmful than smoking. Indeed, the term ‘a fraction’ implied to participants a very small proportion, even as low as traceable amounts. To some, the mathematical nature of the word ‘fraction’ implies a scientific context, thus bringing some credibility to the claim. Raised on an unprompted basis, quoting numbers of chemicals also enhanced the credibility of the statement, as participants were left with the impressions that facts are being communicated rather than impressions. Yet, there still was a desire among many participants to have more specific information regarding the amount of chemicals included in vaping.

“I want to know how much of the fraction? You can’t just put a word like fraction in there. What percentage? A small fraction, a large fraction?” Toronto vaper

“I like the statement where they put the 7,000. I think that number will really get people, it really warns you, it will get people’s attention.” Saskatoon youth

“It’s a bit reassuring. It’s less vague, [but] the fraction is still vague. Is it an eighth? Or a third?” Vancouver vaper

It should be noted that, to a few participants, the statement implied that vaping included all of the same 7,000 chemicals as smoking, though in much lower quantities.

The manner in which the statement implied that vaping products contain nicotine also felt awkward to some participants. Starting the statement by ‘except for nicotine’ appeared irrelevant to them, and they did not understand the link with the chemicals referred to later in the statement. In essence, why nicotine was isolated from the other chemicals referenced in the statement was unclear to them.

A few suggestions were made to improve the statement. Specifically, it was suggested a few times to move the word ‘only’ after ‘contain’ (‘except for nicotine, vaping products typically contain only a fraction of the 7,000 chemicals found in tobacco or tobacco smoke, and at lower levels’) to improve the flow.

Few participants indicated any of the three alternative statements would encourage them to try or switch completely to vaping products. That said, participants were more likely to hold this opinion with regards to the statement ‘vaping products typically only contain a fraction of the 7,000 chemicals found in tobacco or tobacco smoke, and at lower levels’, as it presents vaping as far less harmful than smoking.

Theme Statement C

STATEMENT C: Switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users’ exposure to numerous toxic and cancer-causing substances / Remplacer complètement l’usage de cigarettes de tabac combustibles par l’utilisation exclusive des cigarettes électroniques réduit l’exposition à plusieurs substances chimiques et cancérigènes.



Message

This statement was generally considered too wordy and requiring close attention to be well understood. In addition, the statement was believed to present too many ideas, which caused confusion and made it difficult to understand. Nonetheless, after reading the statement a few times, participants felt it communicated that vaping is less harmful than smoking, both for users and those around them.

“Too many words. It’s overwhelming, especially if English isn’t your first language. Use simple language please ... What I read is, blah, blah, blah, something cancer.” Toronto smoker

“If I was a smoker, I’d be inclined to switch to e-cigarettes, because they sound like they’re better.” Vancouver young adults

The statement implied that vaping still causes exposure to cancer-causing substances, though to a lesser extent than when smoking tobacco.

“I’m smoking garbage and chemicals and crap, and to find out I can take in a lot less, interests me.” Vancouver smoker

In Montreal, the reference to reducing exposure to toxic and cancer-causing substances gave the impression to some participants that the statement was referring to second-hand smoke/vape in addition to the effect of vaping and smoking on the users. As such, it suggested that vaping is a better alternative for users themselves, and non-users around them.

The word ‘exposure’ in the context of the statement generally implied a contact with the substances referred to, by inhaling or breathing in those substances. A French-speaking participant suggested replacing the word ‘exposure’ with the French word, ‘contact’.

Clarity

The manner in which the statement is constructed, using less commonly-known and more complex terminology (e.g., combustible tobacco, numerous, cancer-causing) affected its perceived clarity. Some felt that as a result, the main message – that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you switch – was lost.

Audience

Because the statement starts by referring to switching from tobacco smoking to vaping, it was considered as effectively suggesting that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker. In addition, the word ‘users’ further identified to participants that the target audience as being smokers. At the same time, it was considered as clearly implying that there may be benefits for vapers only if they completely stop smoking tobacco.



Potential for Inducement

Because the statement clearly identifies smokers as the target audience, it did not elicit interest or curiosity for vaping among youth and young adults who are not current smokers. At the same time, the statement clearly suggested that there is potential harm to vaping, thus making it unattractive to those who do not currently vape or smoke.

“Il y a quand même des risques d’inhaler des produits chimiques et cancérigènes [avec le vapotage].” (There are still risks from inhaling chemical and cancer-causing substances when vaping.) Montreal young adult

Statement-Specific Wording Options

The expression ‘switching completely’ and ‘completely replacing’ were generally considered as having a similar meaning. That said, some participants felt that ‘switching completely’ implied stopping doing something, as well as not doing two things at the same time (smoking and vaping). To some, ‘switching’ implied an improvement (going from a ‘bad’ to a ‘good’ option – in this case from smoking to vaping), while ‘replacing’ implied changing for something similar. Yet, smokers in Saskatoon were more likely to believe that ‘switching completely’ implied the possibility to go back and forth from smoking to vaping. By contrast, some participants felt that ‘completely replacing’ is more likely to imply using one method rather than the other. For them, the term ‘replacing’ meant ‘discarding’.

Participants generally felt that the words ‘switching’ or ‘replacing’ needed the qualifier ‘completely’ to clearly imply that the reduced health risks would only apply if someone ceased smoking and only vaped.

There is a general preference for referencing ‘toxic and cancer-causing substances’ rather than ‘harmful substances’, as it catches attention and more precisely identifies the potential health consequences of vaping and smoking (e.g., cancer).

*“I like this because rather than just saying ‘harmful substances’, they’re actually saying what it is that’s so bad. ‘Toxic and cancer causing’, that you’re putting into your body.”
Saskatoon smoker*

Mixed opinions were offered with respect to whether ‘numerous’ or ‘many’ should be used to define the toxic and cancer-causing substances. Some liked the seriousness and scientific tone of the term ‘numerous’, while others preferred the simplicity of the word ‘many’. To a few in Saskatoon, ‘numerous’ referred to the number of substances and implied a greater quantity than the word ‘many’. Those who preferred ‘numerous’ also mentioned that the term ‘many’ does not have the same impact, as it is overused. Suggestions were made to consider other terms, including ‘multiple’ and ‘several’. In Montreal, there was a general preference for the use of the term ‘plusieurs’ for its familiarity, over the term ‘de multiples’. That being said, ‘plusieurs’ generally referred to fewer than ‘de multiples’.



It was generally felt that the statement could be simplified by removing the reference to ‘combustible tobacco’ and keeping only ‘cigarettes’. To some smokers in Saskatoon, the statement would remain as clear, although the term ‘combustible’ positioned cigarettes as being bad for your health.

“You don’t need the word ‘combustible’. We all know what a cigarette is, we don’t need to be told that you set it on fire.” Vancouver youth

“Why [do] they need to use the word ‘combustible’, as opposed to just ‘smoking’ or ‘tobacco’, I don’t understand.” Saskatoon vaper

A number of Montreal participants across audiences mentioned that using both ‘switching completely’ (‘remplacer complètement’) and ‘exclusive’ (‘exclusivement’) was redundant and unnecessary.

Suggestions for Rewording

A few suggestions for rewording the statement were provided by participants, which they believed improved the clarity and readability, as follows:

- Switching completely from smoking tobacco to e-cigarettes significantly reduces the exposure to toxic and cancer-causing substances.
- Switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users’ exposure to numerous toxic ingredients and cancer-causing substances.
- Switching completely from cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces exposure to toxic and cancer-causing substances.
- Arrêter l’usage de cigarettes par l’utilisation exclusive des cigarettes électroniques réduit l’exposition à plusieurs substances chimiques et cancérigènes.
- Vapoter plutôt que fumer réduit l’exposition à plusieurs substances chimiques et cancérigènes.
- Vapoter exclusivement au lieu de fumer réduit l’exposition à plusieurs substances chimiques et cancérigènes.

Alternative Statements

Three alternative statements were discussed in comparison to the original statement. The following alternative statements were briefly discussed:

STATEMENT C1: Completely replacing your cigarette with a vaping product will reduce your exposure to many harmful substances / Le fait de remplacer complètement vos cigarettes par des produits de vapotage réduira considérablement votre niveau d’exposition à plusieurs substances nocives.

The use of ‘your’ was appreciated for personalizing the message to smokers. At the same time, using the future progressive tense (e.g., ‘will’) was deemed precise, and somewhat suggested that claims made are supported by research.



In Montreal, a few participants questioned the use of the expression ‘le fait de’, suggesting that it weighs down the sentence without adding anything to its meaning. A few questioned the extent of the reduced exposure, with the expression ‘réduire le niveau d’exposition’ providing little information on what exposure levels were being referenced and what reduction should be anticipated when switching to vaping.

STATEMENT C2: By switching completely to vaping products, cigarette smokers will reduce their exposure to many harmful substances / En remplaçant complètement l’usage des cigarettes par l’utilisation exclusive des produits de vapotage, les fumeurs réduiront leur niveau d’exposition à plusieurs substances nocives.

Many participants who liked this statement felt that how it begins, namely ‘by switching completely’, clearly identified the intended audience (smokers), as well as introducing an element of responsibility. Indeed, the word ‘by’ in this context implied to them that action was required on the part of smokers in order to reduce harms to their health. It suggested to them that by consciously deciding to switch, there would be benefits to their health.

Interestingly, a few vapers in Saskatoon were under the impression that this statement was less judgemental toward smokers than other statements in this stream.

French-speaking participants suggested to add a qualifier before the word reduce (‘réduiront’), such as significantly, to highlight the extent to which switching from smoking to vaping would provide benefits. Doing so would also highlight the difference between the health risks of smoking compared to vaping.

STATEMENT C3: Use of vaping products as a complete substitute for current cigarette smoking will reduce exposure to many harmful substances / Remplacer complètement les cigarettes par les produits de vapotage réduira le niveau d’exposition à plusieurs substances nocives.

Among the three alternative statements, participants were generally less likely to strongly consider this version as clear and easy to understand, as clearly communicating that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker, and as clearly communicating that there are still harms associated with vaping. In addition, as mentioned earlier in this report, the word ‘substitute’ did not convey the permanent action of switching from smoking to vaping.

That said, quite a few participants across locations liked the statement’s affirmative tone, which implied a greater level of certainty regarding the risks and effects of vaping compared to smoking. In Montreal, a number of young adults mentioned that the message’s target audience is unclear, as it does not identify smokers or refer to switching.

In general, the three alternative statements were considered as clearly speaking to those who currently smoke tobacco because of references to switching or replacing cigarettes and the use of words such as ‘your’, ‘smokers’, and ‘users’. Overall, the three alternative statements were considered as communicating a similar message, one that is close to that communicated by the original statement.



“They’re all saying the same thing, just different wording.” Toronto vaper

Participants were unlikely to indicate any of the alternative statements would encourage them to try or completely switch to vaping products. Opinions were relatively consistent across audiences and locations.

Theme Statement D

STATEMENT D: Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes can reduce harms to your health / Remplacer complètement l’usage de la cigarette par l’utilisation exclusive des cigarettes électroniques peut réduire les effets nocifs sur la santé.

Message

This statement was considered vague and lacking actionable or informative insights. In general, it suggested that vaping is less harmful than smoking for those who completely switch, though the extent of the benefit from switching was unclear. At the same time, the types of harms referred to in the statement were unclear to many participants.

“It says that vaping is the least of two evils.” Toronto vaper

“(Because of the words ‘can’ and ‘reduce’) This statement says, we’re not certain about anything.” Toronto smoker

“This one is super vague. It doesn’t provide any details.” Vancouver smoker

“This doesn’t tell you much about what harms exactly are being reduced. I guess it means any risks at all that come from smoking.” Saskatoon smoker

“I don’t know what harms means here. And I don’t know how much it’s reducing by. It’s too vague.” Saskatoon youth

Further, the statement was not perceived as clearly conveying that vaping is a safer alternative to smoking, as it uses the conditional tense (e.g., ‘can’), thus implying that vaping may be harmful to one’s health. As such, it implied there are health risks to vaping. To some in Montreal, it also implied that vaping could be a good transition method for those who wish to stop smoking tobacco.

“This would be a better sentence if they replaced the word ‘can’ with ‘will’. ‘Can’ can mean anything.” Vancouver vaper

The concept of ‘reduced harms’ suggested to participants that vaping still has harms, but to some, the severity of harms would be reduced, while for others, this expression implied that there may be fewer types of harms resulting from vaping. Yet others understood the expression to speak of the reduced



chances of harms (risks) resulting from vaping. A few also suggested that the statement could imply that the same types of harms could happen, but that it may take longer for them to develop.

“It says if you get cancer, it won’t be as bad.” Toronto vaper

The term ‘harms’ was considered awkward in this context by some participants, as it is not a word typically used to refer to illnesses or diseases. Nonetheless, in the context of the study, it implied health effects typically caused by tobacco smoking, such as cancer, respiratory and heart conditions or diseases, as well as teeth and finger yellowing. It was suggested to reword ‘reduce harms to your health’ to ‘reduce harmful effects to your health’.

In the French statement, the expressions ‘switching completely’ (‘remplacer complètement’) and ‘exclusive’ were considered repetitive. While some felt this strengthens the idea, others considered it makes the statement overly complex.

Clarity

Although lacking in details for some participants, the statement clearly stated that vaping is less harmful than smoking, while still having potential health risks. The sentence structure and word selection were considered adequate and easy to understand.

Audience

The reference to ‘switching completely’, especially when positioned at the beginning of the statement, clearly identified smokers as potentially benefiting from replacing cigarettes with vaping products.

“This only appeals to people who are already smokers.” Vancouver smoker

Potential for Inducement

Participants widely believed that this statement does not pose a risk for inducing curiosity in vaping among those who do not smoke, as it clearly identifies the message’s target audience as being smokers (e.g., ‘switching completely’ and ‘your health’). At the same time, a few youth and young adults mentioned that the statement’s reference to a reduction in harm suggests that there are potential harms to vaping, thus making this habit unattractive to them.

Suggestions for Rewording

A few suggestions for rewording the statement were provided by participants, to improve clarity and readability, as follows:

- Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes can reduce harmful effects to your health.
- Using e-cigarettes as an alternative to smoking can reduce harms to your health.
- Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes reduces harms to your health.



Alternative Statements

Three alternative statements were discussed in comparison to the original statement. While the underlying message of presenting vaping as less harmful than smoking was consistent across statements, this series was considered as presenting more variations in the secondary messages presented in each statement.

The following alternative statements were briefly discussed:

STATEMENT D1: Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes could reduce certain short-term harms to your health / Remplacer complètement l'usage de la cigarette par l'utilisation exclusive des cigarettes électroniques pourrait réduire à court terme les dommages à votre santé.

This statement was considered to be different than the others from this series, notably because of the reference to 'short-term harms'. Indeed, focusing on short-term consequences confused many participants across locations, leaving them to wonder if the benefits from switching to vaping were only evident in the short-term. As such, a number of them were left with the impression that long-term harms from vaping were similar to those from smoking tobacco. In addition, the time-frame referenced by the expression 'short-term' was unclear to most participants.

"The first one is confusing. What do you mean by 'certain' and 'short term'?" Toronto smoker

"Short-term doesn't really mean anything." Vancouver vaper

*"Le 'court terme' suggère que ce [le vapotage] n'est pas une solution à long-terme."
('Short-term' suggests that vaping isn't a long-term solution.) Montreal youth*

At the same time, as discussed earlier in this report, the use of the conditional tense in the word 'could' introduced uncertainty.

"I got quite a difference because of the 'could', I did not like that. A bus could hit you tomorrow, but it probably won't. 'Could' introduces uncertainty." Vancouver smoker

STATEMENT D2: By switching completely to vaping products, cigarette smokers can reduce harms to their health / En remplaçant l'usage de la cigarette par l'utilisation exclusive de produits de vapotage, les fumeurs de cigarettes peuvent réduire les dommages à leur santé.

This statement was considered concise and easy to understand. In addition, a few participants liked that it speaks directly to smokers ('switching completely') and engages their involvement in the process ('by'). That said, other participants felt that speaking in the third person ('their') disengages smokers personally.

"It's easy to read and I understand it." Saskatoon young adult



Of the three alternative statements, participants were most likely to completely agree that this one is clear and easy to understand, clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker, clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping, and that it would encourage them to completely switch to vaping products, if they are a smoker.

STATEMENT D3: Use of vaping products as a complete substitute for current cigarette smoking can reduce harms to your health / L'utilisation de produits de vapotage en remplacement total de la cigarette peut réduire les dommages à votre santé.

This statement was considered as directed at those who smoke tobacco right now ('current cigarette smoking'), encouraging them to switch to vaping products. Of note, a number of smokers viewed the tone as non-judgemental towards smokers compared to the other statements in this series, as the statement does not instruct them to switch. Nonetheless, the use of the term 'complete substitute' still generally clarifies that to benefit from lower risks, smokers would need to completely switch to vaping. For many participants, a 'complete substitute' suggested a complete switch from smoking to vaping. That said, to a few, the expression did not imply permanency, thus suggesting that the reduced health risks to smokers would still be evident if they were to switch back and forth from smoking to vaping.

"I like three. It's a complete substitute – something about the wording I like." Toronto vaper

One participant suggested rewording the statement to say: 'Vaping as a complete substitute for cigarette smoking can reduce harms to your health'.

French-speaking participants were asked their preference between the word 'total' and 'complet' to speak of vaping substitution. There was no clear preference between both words, though it was believed that this type of qualifier is essential as part of the statement to stress that switching completely is necessary to benefit from reduced risks. It was mentioned by a few participants that the term 'total' used in this context sounded like an anglicism.

Theme Statement E

STATEMENT E: E-cigarettes contain nicotine which is addictive but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does / Les cigarettes électroniques contiennent de la nicotine, une substance qui crée une dépendance; la nicotine n'est pas cancérigène comme d'autres substances chimiques présentes dans la fumée du tabac.

Message

This statement was considered too narrowly-focused, while not providing sufficient information to clearly communicate facts about the health risks and potential reduced harm of vaping. The only certainty about this claim was considered to be that e-cigarettes and tobacco cigarettes both contain nicotine, and to a lesser extent, that nicotine is addictive. What causes cancer, however, was somewhat unclear, whether it be cigarettes, e-cigarettes, or nicotine.



Nonetheless, the statement caused some confusion. Indeed, some participants were under the impression that the statement claimed that e-cigarettes did not cause cancer. Many of those participants were doubtful of this claim, given their perception of limited scientific evidence regarding the long-term effects of vaping.

“Does not cause cancer? That’s a huge statement to make. Have they done research to be able to say for sure that e-cigarettes do not cause cancer?” Toronto vaper

“It’s a big thing to say you won’t get cancer if you smoke e-cigarettes. Wait a few years. We don’t know that yet. If you’re going to say that, you better be right.” Toronto youth

*“This makes it sounds like there are no ingredients in e-cigarettes that cause cancer. Nicotine might not cause cancer, but what about everything else in there that might?”
Saskatoon young adult*

As the statement also focused on only one component of vaping products and cigarettes, namely nicotine, it suggested to many participants that the worst harm vaping could do is addiction, without specifying that addiction may have negative health effects. In essence, participants felt that it minimized the harms or health effects resulting from addiction.

“It suggests that the worst thing that can happen with vaping is that it’s addictive. But if it’s addictive, it could be harmful to you mentally.” Toronto youth

“This doesn’t really tell us anything about what is harmful about vaping, except that it is addictive.” Vancouver vaper

Many participants in each group felt that the claim made in the statement is incorrect as not all e-cigarettes contain nicotine. In addition, a few participants mentioned that the statement implied that e-cigarettes included the same amount of nicotine as cigarettes, which is something they were unsure of. They believed that vaping products that contain lower levels of nicotine may not have the same addictive qualities as cigarettes, thus questioning the statement’s accuracy.

*“I don’t like the fact that it says e-cigarettes contain nicotine, because not all do.”
Saskatoon vaper*

In addition, a few participants indicated that the statement does not clearly specify why addiction is bad. Comparisons were made to sugar or coffee (caffeine) which were seen as ‘addictive’, although being perceived as less harmful than nicotine. One Montreal participant mentioned that having the sole focus on nicotine suggested that there are no other harmful chemicals present in vaping products.

Clarity

This statement elicited the greatest level of confusion regarding what causes cancer; nicotine or e-cigarettes. For some, the claim implied that e-cigarettes may cause cancer even though the nicotine it



contains only causes addiction. Others, however, believed that the statement implies that nicotine does not cause cancer, but that e-cigarette may, the same way that tobacco smoking does.

“I think it’s misleading. ‘Does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does’. What does that mean? Does it cause cancer in other ways?” Vancouver smoker

“I’m puzzled about this one. I can’t figure out what it means.” Toronto smoker

“This one glorifies vaping the most. It takes cancer out of the equation. It flat out says there’s no chance of you getting cancer.” Vancouver youth

Clarifying what causes cancer was considered important, especially given the limited knowledge non-smokers and non-vapers have in this regard.

“I was kind of surprised to see that nicotine does not cause cancer, and I’m not sure that is true.” Vancouver youth

“This gives almost a false sense of hope that nicotine is OK. Like shopping is addictive, but it doesn’t cause cancer.” Vancouver young adult

“This says the only harm of vaping is that it’s addictive. Is that really true?” Saskatoon young adult

Among French-speaking participants, the term ‘fumée de tabac’ was somewhat unclear. Suggestions were made to reference ‘fumée secondaire’ instead.

Audience

As the statement does not speak of switching from smoking to vaping, nor does it clearly identify smokers as the target audience, participants generally felt that the message was targeted at the general public. Indeed, the claim does not reference the action of smoking or vaping, but rather focuses on product attributes.

Potential for Inducement

This statement poses some risk of inducing curiosity in vaping products among youth and young adults, as it suggested to them that the worst that can happen when vaping is becoming addicted to it. Because the idea of addiction is sometimes used lightly to describe a craving (sugar, for example), it was seen to minimize the potential negative consequences it may have when it relates to vaping. In essence, participants felt that if becoming addicted is the worst that can happen when vaping, then perhaps those products are not so bad after all.

“Out of all the statements, this is the one that would make we want to try e-cigarettes.” Toronto youth



“If younger people in high school have been thinking of vaping or trying it, I think this could undermine the physical health risks of vaping.” Toronto young adults

That being said, there were still quite a few young people across locations who indicated they do not wish to develop an addiction, and thus would not be compelled to look into vaping products after reading this statement.

A few cigarette smokers indicated that the statement would make them think about vaping as an option to smoking cigarettes.

“This one would encourage me (to stop smoking) most of all. What it sounds like is, you can get your nicotine fix without the bad stuff. Basically, they’re telling you here you’re not going to get cancer.” Vancouver smoker

Statement-Specific Wording Options

Participants in Vancouver, Saskatoon, and Montreal were asked if dividing the statement into two sentences would provide greater clarity (that is: ‘E-cigarettes contain nicotine. Nicotine is addictive, but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does’). Overall, across the English-speaking locations, splitting the statement in two sentences appears to clarify the ideas presented, namely that ‘nicotine is addictive’, ‘e-cigarettes contain nicotine’, and that ‘nicotine does not cause cancer’. As such, it implies that e-cigarettes can be addictive. In Montreal, the original statement clearly presented those ideas, thus splitting the statement into two sentences was not deemed an improvement.

Suggestions for Rewording

A few suggestions for rewording the statement were provided by participants, to improve clarity and readability, as follows:

- Nicotine does not cause cancer nor does e-cigarettes.
- Some e-cigarettes contain nicotine which is addictive but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does.
- E-cigarettes do not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does, but they contain nicotine which is addictive.
- E-cigarettes contain nicotine, among other things, which is addictive but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does.
- E-cigarettes contain nicotine that can be addictive, but does not trigger cancer like tobacco smoking does.
- E-cigarettes do not cause cancer like smoking tobacco, but they may contain nicotine which is addictive.
- La cigarette électronique qui contient de la nicotine crée de la dépendance mais sans être cancérogène.



- Les cigarettes électroniques contiennent entre autres de la nicotine, une substance qui crée une dépendance; la nicotine n'est pas cancérigène comme d'autres substances chimiques présentes dans la fumée du tabac.



Conclusions and Direction

The following conclusions are drawn from the analysis of focus group discussions to address the study's objectives.

- ***With a few exceptions, the statements tested do not mislead consumers about the harms of vaping products.***

In general, the statements' conciseness and use of simple language helped convey the main message that vaping is less harmful than smoking, when switching completely from smoking to vaping. While the statements were considered as only providing general information on the possible risks of vaping compared to those of smoking, they were for the most part not viewed as misleading participants about the specific harms of vaping.

There were, however, a few exceptions to this general finding. The statement 'switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users' exposure to numerous toxic and cancer-causing substances' conveyed to some people that vaping causes cancer. Similarly, the statement 'e-cigarettes contain nicotine which is addictive but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does' caused some confusion in terms of the causes of addiction and cancer; nicotine or e-cigarettes.

- ***Short statements that use simple language are considered most effective at clearly communicating the message that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker.***

In terms of clarity, most statements that are short, present a single idea, and use simple words were considered easier to understand and most effective at communicating the main message that vaping is less harmful than smoking. That said, statements that position smoking as far more harmful than vaping through strong imagery are seen as minimizing the negative health risks of vaping. These include 'except for nicotine, vaping products typically only contain a fraction of the 7,000 chemicals found in tobacco or tobacco smoke, and at lower levels' and 'Switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users' exposure to numerous toxic and cancer-causing substances'.

- ***Select terminology is preferred over others, to ensure statements remain effective, credible, and send a clear message.***

Findings from the study provide clear direction on which wording should be used to convey the intended message:

- 'Vaping products' was considered to be a broader term than 'e-cigarettes', and one that is well recognized.



- The expression ‘toxic and cancer-causing substances’ was considered more severe and precise than ‘harmful substances’, although its use in statements should be carefully considered to ensure it does not suggest that vaping is cancer-causing.
 - ‘Switching completely’ and ‘completely replacing’ were deemed similar in implying ceasing smoking totally and permanently, more clearly than speaking of ‘substitution’.
 - ‘Emit’ and ‘release’ were considered as similar, and, along with the word ‘exposure’, they introduce the notion of second-hand smoke or vape.
 - While the word ‘many’ was considered more familiar, ‘numerous’ was seen as more precise, implying a greater number or quantity, and more commonly used in scientific documentation.
 - The use of the expressions, ‘less harmful’ and ‘not harmless’ in the same statement should be carefully considered, as they appear contradictory. The double negative in ‘not harmless’ and its focus on the word ‘harmless’ suggest the lack of harm could also prove confusing.
- ***Given limited knowledge about vaping products and a perception of limited scientific evidence regarding the harms or health effects of vaping, consumers are more likely to trust precise statements with a definitive tone.***

The research shows there is a desire for more information about vaping products to inform consumers’ choices. Across audiences, there was a clear recognition that research is not readily available on the health risks posed by vaping products, and, as such, they look for reassuring messages from the government. During the focus groups, consumers valued statements that presented information in a definite manner by using verbs in a present or future tense (e.g., ‘is’, ‘will’) rather than those using conditional tense (e.g., ‘can’, ‘could’, ‘may’). At the same time, terms such as ‘lower’, ‘fraction’, and ‘reduced’ used in statements generated questions and a desire for more quantified information. Finally, where ‘but’ was used to separate opposite ideas, it placed the focus on the second part of the statement while somewhat discounting what the first part said.

- ***Statements that make a clear reference to smokers or to switching from smoking to vaping are considered the least likely to induce curiosity in vaping products among non-smokers.***

Very few statements offer a high risk of inducement for non-smoking and non-vaping youth and young adults. Moreover, statements with a clear reference to smoking or smokers garner less interest about vaping for non-smokers. Using expressions such as ‘switching completely’, ‘completely replacing’, ‘smoker’, and ‘users’ positions statements as being directed to those who currently smoke. At the same time, statements that clearly present vaping as having potential for serious harms make those kinds of products unattractive to non-vapers and non-smokers.



Appendix A:

Recruitment Screener

Testing of Relative Risk Statements for Vaping Products Study Screener – FINAL

Name: _____

Daytime phone: _____ Evening phone: _____

Email: _____

Group 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16

FOCUS GROUPS:

Toronto, ON (ENGLISH)

Date: Wednesday, August 1, 2018**Location:** CRC Toronto**Time:** Group 1 – 6:00 pm – Vapers
Group 2 – 8:00pm – Smokers5075 Yonge Street
Suite 600**Date:** Thursday, August 2, 2018**Location:** CRC Toronto**Time:** Group 3 – 6:00 pm – Youth (Aged 15-19)
Group 4 – 8:00pm – Young Adults (Aged 20-24)5075 Yonge Street
Suite 600

Vancouver, BC (ENGLISH)

Date: Wednesday, August 8, 2018**Location:** Vancouver Focus**Time:** Group 5 – 6:00 pm – Vapers
Group 6 – 8:00pm – Smokers1080 Howe Street
Suite 503**Date:** Thursday, August 9, 2018**Location:** Vancouver Focus**Time:** Group 7 – 6:00 pm – Youth (Aged 15-19)
Group 8 – 8:00pm – Young Adults (Aged 20-24)1080 Howe Street
Suite 503

Montreal, QC (FRENCH)

Date: Monday, August 13, 2018**Location:** CRC Montreal**Time:** Group 9 – 6:00 pm – Vapers
Group 10 – 8:00pm – Smokers1610 Ste-Catherine St W
Bureau 411**Date:** Tuesday, August 14, 2018**Location:** CRC Montreal**Time:** Group 11 – 6:00 pm – Youth (Aged 15-19)
Group 12 – 8:00pm – Young Adults (Aged 20-24)1610 Ste-Catherine St W
Bureau 411

Saskatoon, SK (ENGLISH)

Date: Wednesday, August 15, 2018**Location:** Insignitrix**Time:** Group 13 – 6:00 pm – Vapers
Group 14 – 8:00pm – Smokers3223 Millar Avenue
Suite 1**Date:** Thursday, August 16, 2018**Location:** Insignitrix**Time:** Group 15 – 6:00 pm – Youth (Aged 15-19)
Group 16 – 8:00pm – Young Adults (Aged 20-24)3223 Millar Avenue
Suite 1

Specification Summary

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sixteen (16) groups in total • Twelve (12) English focus groups, namely four in each of Toronto, Vancouver and Saskatoon; • Four (4) French (first language) focus groups in Montreal • Groups 1, 5, 9, 13: In each market, one group will include Vapers (a person that has vaped at least once per week for the last four weeks, but not who exclusively vapes cannabis products). Vapers can be dual users who currently smoke and vape, former smokers who vape and those who have never smoked but vape. Mix of vaping frequency in each group however they must have vaped at least once in the last 4 weeks. • Groups 2, 6, 10, 14: In each market, one group will include Smokers (a person that has smoked at least once per week for the past four weeks) but who do not currently vape, or has vaped less than once a week in the past four weeks. Mix of smoking frequency in each group however they must have smoked at least once per week for the last 4 weeks. • Groups 3, 7, 11, 15: In each market, one group will include Youth (aged 15-19) who have never smoked tobacco and have never used a vaping device • Groups 4, 8, 12, 16: In each market, one group will include Young Adults (aged 20-24) who have never smoked tobacco and have never used a vaping device | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mix of age, gender, education, and household income in each group • All have lived in their respective market for at least two years • Recruit 10 participants per group • Incentive: \$100 per participant |
|--|--|

INTRODUCTION – For Youth Groups (Aged 15-17):

Hello/Bonjour, my name is _____ and I am with Corporate Research Associates, a market research company. We are conducting a study on behalf of the Government of Canada, specifically for Health Canada, and we are looking for people to take part in a small group discussion. We would like to speak with a parent or guardian of a child aged 15-17 regarding group discussions we are conducting with youth. Would that be you? IF NO, ASK TO SPEAK WITH SOMEONE ELSE AND REPEAT INTRO

Would you prefer that I continue in English or in French? Préférez-vous continuer en français ou en anglais? **[IF FRENCH, CONTINUE IN FRENCH OR ARRANGE CALL BACK WITH FRENCH INTERVIEWER: Nous vous rappellerons pour mener cette entrevue de recherche en français. Merci. Au revoir.**

The purpose of the study and the small group discussions is to hear young people's views on ***certain relative risk statements that may be authorized for use in the commercial promotion of vaping products***. Youth that are selected would take part in a small group discussion that includes up to 10 youth their age. The focus group discussion would last 2 hours and would be facilitated by a professional moderator. The focus group will be held on **[DATE]** at **[TIME]** at an office location in the city. Each participant will receive **\$100** after the focus group in appreciation for their time.

May I ask you a few quick questions to see if your child is the type of participant we are looking for to take part in this small group discussion? This will take about 6 or 7 minutes. Thank you.

The information you provide will remain completely anonymous and confidential and you are free to opt out at any time. Note that your child's and your personal information are collected, used, retained and disclosed by **[NAME OR RECRUITER]** and Corporate Research Associates in accordance with the applicable provincial privacy legislation or the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA).

THANK & TERMINATE WHERE REQUIRED IN THE SCREENER: Unfortunately, we will not be able to include your child in this study. We already have enough participants who have a similar profile to theirs. Thank you for your time today.

1. To begin, are you or anyone in your household currently employed or have ever been employed in any of the following sectors?

Marketing/Market Research.....	1
Public relations, communications, graphic design, or creative agency.....	2
Advertising or media (TV, Radio, Newspaper).....	4
Health sector	6
Government department, federal, provincial or municipal that is responsible for health or public health	7
An association, organization or company which activities relate in any way to tobacco, smoking or vaping.....	8

IF YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE, THANK AND TERMINATE

2. To confirm, are you the parent or guardian of at least one child aged 15 to 17 years old living with you all or most of the time?

Yes.....	1 CONTINUE
No.....	2 THANK AND TERMINATE

3. How old is your child living with you all or most of the time?

[RECORD AND RETAIN FOR QUOTAS MARKED AFTER QUESTION 3a]:

4. Is your child who would be participating in the focus group...?

Male	1	} RECRUIT EVEN MIX
Female; or	2	
Other	3	
		CONSIDER
VOLUNTEERED		
Prefer not to answer	4	CONSIDER

Thank you for your responses. We would like to ask your child a few questions before inviting them to take part in the focus group discussion. Your child's participation in the focus group would be voluntary. She or he does not have to answer any questions that feel uncomfortable. I'd also like to remind you that the focus group discussion is anonymous and that the information your child provides during the group discussion will not be linked with his or her name on any document.

5. Are you comfortable with your child taking part in this focus group if he or she qualifies?

Yes.....	1
No.....	2
	THANK AND TERMINATE

[GROUPS 3, 7, 11, 16 ONLY – ONLY FOR THOSE AGED 15] Before we speak to your child, if they are invited to participate in the discussion, we would need your written consent for their participation. They will need to bring a signed consent form when you drop them off for the focus group. May we have your email address to send the consent form?

[RECORD EMAIL] _____
[Note to Recruiter: Once recorded, re-read back to confirm]

Finally, I would like to inform you that the discussion your child would be taking part in will be recorded so that the focus group moderator can pay full attention during the discussion. What your child says during the focus group is confidential. Their last name will not be used during the focus group or included in any reports we write about the focus group.

6. May we speak with your child to ask a few additional questions to see if they qualify to participate in our study? Specifically, we will need to ask if your child has ever smoked cigarettes or used a vaping device.

Yes.....	1
No.....	2
	THANK AND TERMINATE OR
	SCHEDULE CALL BACK

Introduction for speaking to child:

Hello, my name is ___ and I am with Corporate Research Associates, a market research company. We are conducting a study on behalf of the Government of Canada, specifically for Health Canada, and we are looking for people aged 15-17 to take part in a small group discussion regarding **health-related issues that affect Canadians**. We have just spoken to your **[parent/guardian]** who has given us permission to ask you a few questions to see if you qualify to participate. Each participant will receive \$100 after the focus group in appreciation for their time. May I ask you a few quick questions to see if you would qualify to participate?

SKIP TO Q4

INTRODUCTION – For 18+:

Hello/Bonjour, my name is _____ and I am with Corporate Research Associates, a market research company. We are conducting a study on behalf of the Government of Canada, specifically for Health Canada, and we are looking for people to take part in a small group discussion. We would like to speak with someone in your household who is at least 18 years old. Would that be you? **IF NO, ASK TO SPEAK WITH SOMEONE ELSE AND REPEAT INTRO**

Would you prefer that I continue in English or in French? Préférez-vous continuer en français ou en anglais? **[IF FRENCH, CONTINUE IN FRENCH OR ARRANGE CALL BACK WITH FRENCH INTERVIEWER:]** Nous vous rappellerons pour mener cette entrevue de recherche en français. Merci. Au revoir.

The purpose of the study and the small group discussions is to hear people's views on health-related issues that affect Canadians. Those who qualify and participate in the group discussion will receive \$100 in appreciation for their effort.

May I ask you a few quick questions to see if you are the type of participant we are looking for to take part in this small group discussion? This will take about 6 or 7 minutes. The information you provide will remain completely confidential and you are free to opt out at any time. The information collected will be used for research purposes only and handled according the Privacy Act of Canada. *Thank you.

**IF ASKED: The personal information you provide is protected in accordance with the Privacy Act and is being collected under the authority of section 4 of the Department of Health Act. The information you provide will not be linked with your name on any document including the consent form or the discussion form. In addition to protecting your personal information, the Privacy Act gives you the right to request access to and correction of your personal information. You also have the right to file a complaint with the Office of the Privacy Commissioner if you feel your personal information has been handled improperly. For more information about these rights, or about our privacy practices, please contact Health Canada's Privacy Coordinator at 613-948-1219 or privacy-vie.privee@hc-sc.gc.ca.*

THANK & TERMINATE WHERE REQUIRED IN THE SCREENER: Unfortunately, we will not be able to include you in this study. We already have enough participants who have a similar profile to yours. Thank you for your time today.

Gender (By Observation):

Female 1 **Recruit 5 per group**
 Male 2 **Recruit 5 per group**

1. To begin, how many years have you been living in **[MARKET]**? **[RECORD # of Years: _____]**

Less than 2 years..... 1 **THANK AND TERMINATE**
 At least 2 years or more..... 2

2. Do you, or does anyone in your household currently work or have ever worked in any of the following areas?

Marketing/Market Research..... 1
 Public relations, communications, graphic design, or creative agency..... 2
 Advertising or media (TV, Radio, Newspaper)..... 4
 Health sector 6

- Government department, federal, provincial or municipal that is responsible for health or public health 7
- An association, organization or company which activities relate in any way to tobacco, smoking or vaping..... 8

IF YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE, THANK AND TERMINATE

3. In which of the following age groups do you fall? Are you...?

- Less than 18 1 **ASK TO SPEAK TO PARENT/GUARDIAN AND GO TO TOP**
- 18-24 2
- 25 – 29 3
- 30-39 4
- 40-49 5
- 50-59 6
- 60-69 7
- Over 70..... 8 **Recruit max 2 per group**

3a. **ASK IF AGED 18 – 24:** As we're looking to ensure we include people across a wide range of ages, how old are you specifically?

- 18 1
- 19 2
- 20 3
- 21 4
- 22 5
- 23 6
- 24 7

AGE QUOTAS

YOUTH GROUPS: Recruit (2) 15 year olds; (2) 16 year olds (2) 17 year olds; (2) 18 year olds; (2) 19 year olds

YOUNG ADULT GROUPS: Recruit (2) 20 year olds; (2) 21 year olds; (2) 22 year olds; (2) 23 year olds; (2) 24 year olds

VAPERS GROUPS: Recruit (2-3) aged 18-29; (2-3) aged 30-39; (2-3) aged 40-49; (1-2) aged 50-59; (1-2) aged 60-69; Max 2 aged 70+

SMOKERS GROUPS: Recruit (2-3) aged 18-29; (2-3) aged 30-39; (2-3) aged 40-49; (1-2) aged 50-59; (1-2) aged 60-69; Max 2 aged 70+

ASK ALL....

4. At the present time, do you...

a. Use electronic cigarettes, also known as e-cigarettes or a vaping device?

- Yes..... 1
- No..... 2

b. Smoke cigarettes?

- Yes..... 1
- No..... 2

NOTE TO RECRUITER:

YOUTH & YOUNG ADULT: IF Q4A=NO AND Q4B=NO - CONSIDER FOR GROUPS 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16- CONTINUE
VAPER ONLY: IF Q4A=YES AND Q4B=NO - CONSIDER FOR GROUPS 1, 5, 9, 13 - SKIP TO Q4E
COMBO SMOKER & VAPER: IF Q4A=YES AND Q4B=YES - CONSIDER FOR GROUPS 1, 5, 9, 13 first - SKIP TO Q4E
SMOKER ONLY: IF Q4A=NO AND Q4B=YES - CONSIDER FOR GROUPS 2, 6, 10, 14 - SKIP TO Q8

4c. **[ASK IF Q4A=NO (YOUTH & YOUNG ADULT)]** Have you ever tried using e-cigarettes or a vaping device?

Yes.....1 **THANK AND PUT ON HOLD IF YOUTH (15 – 19), CONTINUE IF YOUNG ADULT (20+)**

No..... 2 **CONTINUE**

4d. **[ASK IIF Q4B=NO (YOUTH & YOUNG ADULT)]** Have you ever tried smoking cigarettes?

Yes.....1 **THANK AND PUT ON HOLD IF YOUTH (15 – 19), CONTINUE IF YOUNG ADULT (20+)**

No..... 2 **SKIP TO Q12**

4e. **[ASK IF Q4A=YES (VAPERS)]** How often, if at all, do you use the following in your e-cigarette or vaping device? **READ AND RANDOMIZE STATEMENTS A-C**

- i. Vape fluids containing nicotine
- ii. Nicotine-free vape fluids
- iii. Vape fluids containing marijuana/cannabis/THC

Would you say...?

Never..... 1

Sometimes; or..... 2

Always..... 3

VOLUNTEERED

Don't know..... 8

NOTE TO RECRUITER:

CONSIDER FOR VAPER GROUPS 1, 5, 9, 13 IF:

- **USE VAPE FLUIDS CONTAINING NICOTINE OR NICOTINE-FREE EITHER SOMETIMES OR ALWAYS**

CONSIDER FOR SMOKER GROUPS 2, 6, 10, 14 IF:

- **NEVER USE VAPE FLUIDS CONTAINING NICOTINE OR NICOTINE-FREE (NEVER TO BOTH Q4ei AND Q4eii). THANK AND TERMINATE IF NON-SMOKER (NO AT Q4B) AND NEVER TO BOTH Q4ei AND Q4eii.**
- **IF DON'T KNOW TO ALL THREE (Q4ci; Q4cii; AND Q4ciii) – CONSIDER FOR SMOKER GROUPS 2, 6, 10, 14. THANK AND TERMINATE IF NON-SMOKER (NO AT Q4B) AND NEVER TO BOTH Q4ei AND Q4eii.**

5. **[ASK IF Q4A=YES (VAPERS)]** Which of the following statements best describes your use of e-cigarettes....?

I use e-cigarettes every day 1

I have used e-cigarettes at least once a week in the last 4 weeks 2

I have used e-cigarettes less than once a week in the last 4 weeks... 3

I have tried an e-cigarette once 4

NOTE TO RECRUITER:

SMOKERS: IF Q4B=YES AND CODE 3 OR 4 IN Q5 GO TO Q8

**VAPERS: IF Q4A=YES AND CODE 1 OR 2 IN Q5 – RECRUIT MIX IN GROUPS 1, 5, 9, 13
IF Q4B=NO (NON-SMOKER) AND CODE 3 OR 4 IN Q5 SELECTED – THANK AND TERMINATE**

6. [ASK IF Q4A=YES AND CODE 1 OR 2 IN Q5 (VAPE DAILY OR AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK IN PAST 4 WEEKS)] How long have you been using e-cigarettes?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| Less than 1 year | 1 | } | Recruit mix for Groups 1, 5, 9, 13 |
| 1 to 3 years | 2 | | |
| 4 years or longer | 3 | | |

7. [ASK IF Q4A=YES (VAPER) AND Q4B=NO (NON-SMOKER)] Have you ever smoked cigarettes?

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| Yes..... | 1 | } | Recruit mix for Groups 1, 5, 9, 13 |
| No..... | 2 | | |

8. [ASK IF Q4B=YES (SMOKER)] Do you smoke cigarettes every day, frequently, or occasionally?

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|------------------|
| Every day..... | 1 | GO TO Q10 |
| Frequently..... | 2 | |
| Occasionally | 3 | |

9. [ASK IF Q8=FREQUENTLY OR OCCASIONALLY] In the past 4 weeks, did you smoke a cigarette at least once a week?

- | | | |
|----------|---|---|
| Yes..... | 1 | Recruit max 3 per Group 2, 6, 10, 14 |
| No..... | 2 | |

IF Q4A=NO (NON-VAPER) & Q9=NO (DOES NOT SMOKE AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK), THANK & TERMINATE

10. [ASK IF Q4B=YES (SMOKER)] How long have you been smoking?

- | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|--|
| Less than 2 years..... | 1 | } | Recruit mix for Groups 2, 6, 10, 14 |
| 2-5 years | 2 | | |
| 6-10 years | 3 | | |
| 11-20 years | 4 | | |
| Over 20 years..... | 5 | | |

11. [ASK IF Q4B = YES (SMOKER) and IF Q4A=NO (NON-VAPER)] Have you vaped more than once per week in the past 4 weeks?

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----------------------------|
| Yes..... | 1 | } | THANK AND TERMINATE |
| No..... | 2 | | |

The next few questions will ensure that we include a variety of participants in each group.

12. What is your employment status? Are you currently ... ? READ RESPONSES IN ORDER-CODE ONE ONLY

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| Employed full-time | 1 | } |
| Employed part-time..... | 2 | |
| Self-employed..... | 3 | |
| Unemployed | 4 | |
| Student | 5 | |

- Stay at home parent 6 **Max 5 per group for smoker and vaper groups only**
- Retired 7
- VOLUNTEERED**
- Refused 8

13. **IF EMPLOYED, ASK:** What is your current occupation?

_____ **TERMINATE IF SIMILAR OCCUPATIONS AS IN Q2**

14. **IF RETIRED, ASK:** What was your occupation before you retired?

_____ **TERMINATE IF SIMILAR OCCUPATIONS AS IN Q2**

15. **[SKIP FOR GROUPS 3, 7, 11 & 15]** We would like to invite a good cross section of people of different income levels. To the best of your knowledge, which of the following best describes your total household income **before taxes** last year? Would you say...? **READ RESPONSES IN ORDER—CODE ONE ONLY**

- Less than \$30,000 1
 - At least \$30,000 but less than \$50,000 2
 - At least \$50,000 but less than \$75,000 3
 - At least \$75,000 but less than \$100,000 4
 - \$100,000 or more 5
- } **Recruit a good mix in each group**

VOLUNTEERED

- DNK 6
- Refused 7

16. **[SKIP FOR GROUPS 3, 7, 11 & 15]** What is the highest level of education you have finished?

- Elementary..... 1
 - Some High School/Professional Training 2
 - Completed High School..... 3
 - Some College / Technical Training 4
 - Completed College / Technical Training 5
 - Some University..... 6
 - Completed University 7
- } **Recruit a good mix in vaper and smoker groups**

17. And finally, have you ever attended a small group discussion for which you received a sum of money?

- Yes..... 1 **CONTINUE – Max of 5 per group**
- No 2 **Go To Invitation**

How many group discussions have you attended in the past 5 years? _____

What was the subject of all of the group discussions you have ever attended? _____

When was the last time you attended a group discussion? _____

**IF THEY HAVE BEEN TO A GROUP IN THE PAST 6 MONTHS - THANK & TERMINATE,
 IF THEY HAVE BEEN TO 3 OR MORE GROUPS IN THE PAST 5 YEARS - THANK & TERMINATE
 IF PARTICIPATED IN A PAST GROUP ON SMOKING OR VAPING – THANK & TERMINATE**

INVITATION

Based on your responses, it looks like you have the profile we are looking for. I would like to invite you to participate in a small group discussion, called a focus group, we are conducting at ___ PM, on **[DATE]**, at **[LOCATION]**. As you may know, focus groups are used to gather information on a particular subject matter; in this case, the discussion will be on **health-related issues that affect Canadians**. The discussion will consist of 8 to 10 people and will be very informal. It will last approximately **two** hours, refreshments will be served and you will receive \$100 as a thank you for your time.

Are you interested and available to attend?

Yes..... 1
 No 2 **THANK & TERMINATE**

The discussion you will be participating in will be audio and video recorded for use by the research team only to analyze the findings. Please be assured your comments and responses are strictly confidential. Are you comfortable with the discussion being recorded?

Yes..... 1
 No 2 **THANK & TERMINATE**

The discussion will take place in a room that is equipped with a one-way mirror for observation, allowing Government of Canada employees who are involved in this research to observe the discussion without disturbing it. Some people may also be observing the discussion remotely **[SPECIFY ONLY IF ASKED: via web streaming, through the use of a secure online portal]**. Your participation will be anonymous and only your first name will be given to these people. Would this be acceptable to you?

Yes..... 1
 No 2 **THANK & TERMINATE**

During the group discussion, participants will be asked to read materials and write out detailed responses. Is it possible for you to take part in these activities in English without assistance?

Yes..... 1
 No 2 **THANK & TERMINATE**

Terminate if person gives a reason such as verbal ability, sight, hearing, or related to reading/writing ability.

Since participants in focus groups are asked to express their thoughts and opinions freely in an informal setting with others, we'd like to know how comfortable you are with such an exercise. Would you say you are...?

Very comfortable 1
 Comfortable 2
 Not very comfortable..... 3 **THANK & TERMINATE**
 Not at all comfortable..... 4 **THANK & TERMINATE**

To participate in the focus group, you will need to bring with you a signed copy of a consent form. May we have your email address to send you the consent form? Your participation in this research will not influence any interactions or day to day activities you have with the Government of Canada.

RECORD EMAIL: _____ ONCE RECORDED – READ BACK TO CONFIRM

Thank you. Just a reminder that the group discussion will be held on **[DATE]** from **[TIME]** to **[TIME]** at **[LOCATION]**. To make sure that the discussion begins on time, we ask that you arrive 15 minutes before the start. We will not be able to include you if you arrive late and you will not receive the financial incentive.

Please bring your glasses if you need them to read, and anything else you need to take part in the group discussion. Also, everyone is asked to bring a piece of I.D, picture if possible.

Someone from our company will call you back one or two days before the group discussion. To do that, we will need your contact information. **RECORD**

As these are small groups and with even one person missing, the overall success of the group may be affected, I would ask that once you have decided to attend that you make every effort to do so. If something comes up and you are unable to attend, please call _____ (collect) at _____ as soon as possible so we can find a replacement.

Thank you, and we look forward to hearing your thoughts during the group discussion.

Attention Recruiters

1. Recruit 10 per group
2. CHECK QUOTAS
3. Ensure participant has a good speaking (overall responses) ability-If in doubt, DO NOT INVITE
4. Do not put names on profile sheet unless you have a firm commitment.
5. Repeat the date, time and location before hanging up.

Confirming – ONE OR TWO DAYS BEFORE GROUP

1. Confirm in person with the participant the day prior to the group – do not leave a message unless necessary
2. Confirm all key qualifying questions
3. Verify time and location (ask if they are familiar)
4. Verify that they have received emailed consent form and remind them to bring a signed copy with them (printed copies will be available at the facility)
5. Remind them to arrive 15 minutes before the start
6. Ask them to bring reading glasses or anything else they need to read and/or take part in the discussion (such as hearing aid)

LE QUESTIONNAIRE DE RECRUTEMENT SUIVANT A ÉTÉ UTILISÉ POUR RECRUTER DES PARTICIPANTS À UN GROUPE DE DISCUSSION EN FRANÇAIS ET N'EST DONC DISPONIBLE QUE DANS CETTE LANGUE.

Questionnaire de recrutement pour l'étude de mise à l'essai d'énoncés sur les risques relatifs des produits de vapotage – VERSION FINALE

Nom : _____
 N° de téléphone de jour : _____ N° de téléphone de soir : _____
 Adresse électronique : _____
 Groupe 1

GROUPES DE DISCUSSION :

Montréal (Québec) (FRANÇAIS)

Date : Jeudi 23 août 2018

Emplacement : Netfocus

Heure : Groupe 11a. – 17h30 – Adolescents (de 15 à 19 ans)

Sommaire des exigences

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Un (1) groupe de discussions en français (langue maternelle) en ligne. • Groupe 11a. : Un groupe en ligne sera composé d'adolescents (de 15 à 19 ans) qui n'ont jamais fumé de tabac et qui n'ont jamais utilisé d'appareil de vapotage. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mélange d'âges, de sexes, de niveau de scolarité et de niveaux de revenus du foyer pour chaque groupe • Tous les participants habitent dans leur marché respectif depuis au moins deux ans • Recrutement de 5 participants • Récompense : 100 \$ par participant |
|--|---|

INTRODUCTION – pour les groupes d'adolescents (de 15 à 17 ans) :

Bonjour, je m'appelle ____ et je travaille pour Corporate Research Associates, une société d'études de marché. Nous menons aujourd'hui une étude au nom du gouvernement du Canada, plus précisément pour Santé Canada, et nous recherchons des personnes qui pourraient participer à un petit groupe de discussion. Nous souhaitons parler au parent ou tuteur d'un enfant âgé de 15 à 17 ans à propos de discussions de groupes que nous menons avec des jeunes. Êtes-vous parent ou tuteur d'un tel enfant? SINON, DEMANDER À PARLER À QUELQU'UN D'AUTRE ET RÉPÉTER L'INTRODUCTION.

Would you prefer that I continue in English or in French? Préférez-vous continuer en français ou en anglais? **[SI ANGLAIS, POURSUIVEZ EN ANGLAIS OU ORGANISEZ UN RAPPEL AVEC UN INTERVIEWEUR ANGLOPHONE :]** We will call you back in order to give this interview in English. Thank you. Good bye.

L'étude dans son ensemble et les petits groupes de discussion ont pour objectif de découvrir ce que pensent les adolescents de **différents énoncés sur les risques relatifs de certains produits de vapotage, lesquels seraient autorisés pour leur promotion**. Les adolescents choisis prendront part à une discussion en petit groupe qui comprendra jusqu'à 10 personnes de leur âge. Le groupe de discussion durera 2 heures et se déroulera avec un animateur professionnel. Il aura lieu le **[DATE]** à **[HEURE]** dans un bureau situé dans la ville. Chaque participant recevra **100 \$** une fois la discussion terminée en guise de remerciement pour son temps.

Puis-je vous poser quelques petites questions pour voir si votre enfant fait partie des types de participants que nous recherchons pour les groupes? Cela prendra 6 ou 7 minutes. Merci.

Je tiens à vous préciser que les renseignements que vous fournissez demeureront entièrement anonymes et confidentiels, et que vous êtes libre de refuser de participer en tout temps. Prenez note aussi que vos renseignements personnels et ceux de votre enfant sont recueillis, utilisés, conservés et divulgués par [NOM OU RECRUTEUR] et Corporate Research Associates conformément à la loi provinciale applicable en matière de protection des renseignements personnels ou à la *Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels et les documents électroniques* (LPRPDE).

REMERCIER ET TERMINER AU MOMENT REQUIS DU QUESTIONNAIRE DE RECRUTEMENT :
Malheureusement, nous ne serons pas en mesure d'inclure votre enfant à cette étude. Nous avons déjà un nombre suffisant de participants possédant un profil semblable au sien. Je vous remercie du temps que vous nous avez accordé aujourd'hui.

7. Pour commencer, parmi les membres de votre foyer, y compris vous-même, y a-t-il quelqu'un qui travaille ou a déjà travaillé dans un des secteurs suivants?

Marketing ou études de marché 1
 Relations publiques, communications, design graphique ou agence de création .. 2
 Publicité ou médias (télévision, radio, journaux) 4
 Domaine de la santé 6
 Ministère d'une administration fédérale, provinciale ou municipale responsable
 en matière de santé ou de santé publique 7
 Une association, un organisme ou une entreprise dont l'activité est liée d'une façon ou d'une autre
 au tabac, au tabagisme ou au vapotage 8

SI LA RÉPONSE À L'UNE DES OPTIONS CI-DESSUS EST « OUI », REMERCIER LA PERSONNE ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE

8. Pouvez-vous me confirmer que vous êtes le parent ou le tuteur d'un enfant âgé de 15 à 17 ans qui vit avec vous en tout temps ou la plupart du temps?

Oui1 **CONTINUER**
 Non2 **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE**

9. Quel âge a cet enfant qui vit avec vous en tout temps ou la plupart du temps?

[NOTER ET CONSERVER POUR COMPARER AUX QUOTAS INSCRITS APRÈS LA QUESTION 3a] :

10. Votre enfant qui participerait au groupe de discussion est-il de sexe...?

Masculin1
 Féminin.....2 } **RECRUTER UN MÉLANGE ÉGAL**
 Autre3 } **À CONSIDÉRER**

RÉPONSE DONNÉE SPONTANÉMENT

Préfère ne pas répondre..... 4 } **À CONSIDÉRER**

Merci de vos réponses. Nous aimerions maintenant poser quelques questions à votre enfant pour l'inviter à participer à notre groupe de discussion. Notez que sa participation au groupe sera volontaire. Il ou elle n'est pas tenu(e) de répondre aux questions avec lesquelles il ou elle n'est pas à l'aise. Je souhaite également vous rappeler que le groupe de discussion est anonyme et que les renseignements que fournira votre enfant pendant la séance de groupe ne seront associés à son nom sur aucun document.

11. Êtes-vous à l'aise à l'idée que votre enfant participe à ce groupe de discussion s'il ou elle y est admissible?

Oui1

Non2 **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE**

[GROUPES 3, 7, 11, 16 SEULEMENT – SEULEMENT POUR LES ENFANTS DE 15 ANS] Avant de parler à votre enfant, je vous prie de noter que s'il ou elle est invité(e) à participer à la discussion, nous aurons besoin de votre consentement écrit à cet effet. Il ou elle devra donc apporter un formulaire de consentement signé lorsqu'il se joindra au groupe. Puis-je avoir votre adresse électronique afin de vous envoyer le formulaire de consentement?

[INSCRIRE L'ADRESSE ÉLECTRONIQUE] _____

[Note au recruteur : relire l'adresse à voix haute pour la confirmer]

Finalement, je tiens à vous informer que la discussion à laquelle votre enfant participera sera enregistrée afin que l'animateur du groupe puisse porter toute son attention à la discussion. Ce qu'il ou elle dira pendant le groupe de discussion demeurera toutefois confidentiel. Son nom de famille ne sera ni prononcé pendant la discussion de groupe ni inséré dans les rapports que nous rédigeons au sujet du groupe de discussion.

12. Pouvons-nous parler à votre enfant pour lui poser quelques questions supplémentaires afin de vérifier s'il ou elle est admissible à participer à notre étude? Plus précisément, nous devons lui demander s'il ou elle a déjà fumé des cigarettes ou utilisé un appareil de vapotage.

Oui1

Non2 **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE OU
PLANIFIER UN RAPPEL**

Introduction de la conversation avec l'enfant :

Bonjour, je m'appelle ____ et je travaille pour Corporate Research Associates, une société d'études de marché. Nous menons une étude au nom du gouvernement du Canada, plus précisément pour Santé Canada, et nous recherchons des personnes de 15 à 17 ans qui pourraient participer à une discussion en petit groupe sur **des enjeux du domaine de la santé qui intéressent les Canadiens**. Nous venons de parler avec votre **[parent/tuteur]** qui nous a donné la permission de vous poser quelques questions pour vérifier si vous êtes admissible à participer. Chaque participant recevra 100 \$ une fois la discussion terminée en guise de remerciement pour son temps. Puis-je vous poser quelques questions pour déterminer si vous êtes admissible ou non?

PASSER À LA Q. 4

INTRODUCTION – Pour les participants de 18 ans et plus :

Bonjour, je m'appelle ____ et je travaille pour Corporate Research Associates, une société d'études de marché. Nous menons aujourd'hui une étude au nom du gouvernement du Canada, plus précisément pour Santé Canada, et nous recherchons des personnes qui pourraient participer à un petit groupe de discussion. J'aimerais discuter avec une personne de votre foyer qui a au moins 18 ans. Est-ce votre cas? **SINON, DEMANDER À PARLER À QUELQU'UN D'AUTRE ET RÉPÉTER L'INTRODUCTION.**

6. Would you prefer that I continue in English or in French? Préférez-vous continuer en français ou en anglais? **[SI ANGLAIS, POURSUIVEZ EN ANGLAIS OU ORGANISEZ UN RAPPEL AVEC UN INTERVIEWEUR ANGLOPHONE :]** We will call you back in order to give this interview in English. Thank you. Good bye.

L'objectif de l'étude et du petit groupe de discussion est d'entendre les opinions des gens sur des enjeux du domaine de la santé qui intéressent les Canadiens. Les personnes admissibles qui participeront au groupe de discussion recevront 100 \$ en guise de remerciement.

Puis-je vous poser quelques petites questions pour voir si vous faites partie des types de participants que nous recherchons? Cela devrait prendre 6 ou 7 minutes. Les renseignements que vous fournissez demeureront entièrement confidentiels et vous êtes libre de refuser de participer en tout temps. Les renseignements recueillis seront utilisés uniquement pour les besoins de la recherche et seront traités de façon conforme à la *Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels* du Canada*. Merci.

** SI LA QUESTION EST POSÉE : Les renseignements personnels que vous fournissez sont protégés conformément à la Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels et sont recueillis en vertu de l'article 4 de la Loi sur le ministère de la Santé. Les renseignements que vous fournissez ne seront associés à votre nom sur aucun document, pas même le formulaire de consentement ou le formulaire de discussion. En plus de protéger vos renseignements personnels, la Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels vous donne le droit de demander de consulter vos renseignements personnels et de les corriger. Vous avez également le droit de déposer une plainte auprès du Commissariat à la protection de la vie privée si vous estimez que des renseignements personnels vous concernant ont été traités de façon inappropriée. Pour en savoir plus sur ces droits ou sur nos pratiques en matière de protection des renseignements personnels, veuillez communiquer avec le coordonnateur de la protection des renseignements personnels de Santé Canada au 613-948-1219 ou au privacy-vie.privee@hc-sc.gc.ca.*

REMERCIER ET TERMINER AU MOMENT REQUIS DU QUESTIONNAIRE DE RECRUTEMENT :
Malheureusement, nous ne serons pas en mesure de vous inclure dans cette étude. Nous avons déjà un nombre suffisant de participants possédant un profil semblable au vôtre. Je vous remercie du temps que vous nous avez accordé aujourd'hui.

Sexe (par observation) :

Femme 1 **Recruter 5 répondantes par groupe**
 Homme 2 **Recruter 5 répondants par groupe**

Pour commencer, depuis combien d'années habitez-vous à [MARCHÉ]? [INSCRIRE le nombre d'années : _____]

Moins de 2 ans 1 **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE**
 2 ans ou plus 2

Parmi les membres de votre foyer, y compris vous-même, y a-t-il quelqu'un qui travaille actuellement ou qui a déjà travaillé dans l'un des secteurs suivants?

Marketing ou études de marché 1
 Relations publiques, communications, design graphique ou agence de création .. 2
 Publicité ou médias (télévision, radio, journaux) 4
 Domaine de la santé 6
 Ministère d'une administration fédérale, provinciale ou municipale responsable en matière de santé ou de santé publique 7
 Une association, un organisme ou une entreprise dont l'activité est liée d'une façon ou d'une autre au tabac, au tabagisme ou au vapotage 8

SI LA RÉPONSE À L'UNE DES OPTIONS CI-DESSUS EST « OUI », REMERCIER LA PERSONNE ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE

Dans laquelle des catégories d'âge suivantes vous situez-vous? Avez-vous...

Moins de 18 ans.....	1	DEMANDER À PARLER AVEC UN PARENT / TUTEUR, PUIS CONSULTER LA SECTION PRÉCÉDENTE
Entre 18 et 24 ans.....	2	
Entre 25 et 29 ans.....	3	
Entre 30 et 39 ans.....	4	
Entre 40 et 49 ans.....	5	
Entre 50 et 59 ans.....	6	
Entre 60 et 69 ans.....	7	
Plus de 70 ans.....	8	Recruter 2 personnes au maximum par groupe

3 a. **SI LA PERSONNE A ENTRE 18 ET 24 ANS** : Nous désirons inclure dans notre étude des gens de différents âges et aimerions à cet effet savoir quel âge vous avez exactement.

18 ans.....	1
19 ans.....	2
20 ans.....	3
21 ans.....	4
22 ans.....	5
23 ans.....	6
24 ans.....	7

QUOTAS D'ÂGE

GROUPES D'ADOLESCENTS : Recruter (2) participants de 15 ans; (2) de 16 ans; (2) de 17 ans; (2) de 18 ans; (2) de 19 ans.

GROUPES DE JEUNES ADULTES : Recruter (2) participants de 20 ans; (2) de 21 ans; (2) de 22 ans; (2) de 23 ans; (2) de 24 ans.

GROUPES DE VAPOTEURS : Recruter (2 ou 3) participants de 18 à 29 ans; (2 ou 3) de 30 à 39 ans; (2 ou 3) de 40 à 49 ans; (1 ou 2) de 50 à 59 ans; (1 ou 2) de 60 à 69 ans; max. 2 de 70 ans et plus.

GROUPES DE FUMEURS : Recruter (2 ou 3) participants de 18 à 29 ans; (2 ou 3) de 30 à 39 ans; (2 ou 3) de 40 à 49 ans; (1 ou 2) de 50 à 59 ans; (1 ou 2) de 60 à 69 ans; max. 2 de 70 ans et plus.

DEMANDER À TOUS LES PARTICIPANTS

À l'heure actuelle, est-ce que vous...

b. Utilisez des cigarettes électroniques ou appareils de vapotage?

Oui..... 1

Non 2

b. Fumez des cigarettes?

Oui..... 1

Non 2

REMARQUE POUR LE RECRUTEUR :

GROUPES D'ADOLESCENTS ET DE JEUNES ADULTES : SI NON À LA Q4A ET NON À LA Q4B, CONSIDÉRER POUR LES GROUPES 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16 – CONTINUER

VAPOTEUR SEULEMENT : SI OUI À LA Q4A ET NON À LA Q4B, CONSIDÉRER POUR LES GROUPES 1, 5, 9, 13 – PASSER À LA Q4E

À LA FOIS FUMEUR ET VAPOTEUR : SI OUI À LA Q4A ET OUI À LA Q4B, CONSIDÉRER POUR LES GROUPES 1, 5, 9, 13 D'ABORD – PASSER À LA Q4E

FUMEUR SEULEMENT : SI NON À LA Q4A ET OUI À LA Q4B, CONSIDÉRER POUR LES GROUPES 2, 6, 10, 14 – PASSER À LA Q8

4c. **[SI NON À LA Q4A (ADOLESCENTS ET JEUNES ADULTES)]** Avez-vous déjà essayé d'utiliser une cigarette électronique ou un appareil de vapotage?

Oui.....1 **S'IL S'AGIT D'UN ADOLESCENT (DE 15 À 19 ANS), LE REMERCIER ET LE METTRE EN ATTENTE; S'IL S'AGIT D'UN JEUNE ADULTE (20 ANS ET +), CONTINUER**

Non 2 **CONTINUER**

4d. **[SI NON À LA Q4B (ADOLESCENTS ET JEUNES ADULTES)]** Avez-vous déjà essayé de fumer des cigarettes?

Oui.....1 **S'IL S'AGIT D'UN ADOLESCENT (DE 15 À 19 ANS), LE REMERCIER ET LE METTRE EN ATTENTE; S'IL S'AGIT D'UN JEUNE ADULTE (20 ANS ET +), CONTINUER**

Non 2 **PASSER À LA Q12**

4e. **[SI LA RÉPONSE À LA Q4A = OUI (VAPOTEURS)]** À quelle fréquence, s'il y a lieu, utilisez-vous les liquides suivants avec vos cigarettes électroniques ou vos appareils de vapotage? **LIRE LES ÉNONCÉS EN EN ALTERNANT L'ORDRE**

- i. Des liquides de vapotage avec nicotine
- ii. Des liquides de vapotage sans nicotine
- iii. Des liquides de vapotage contenant de la marijuana, du cannabis ou du THC

Diriez-vous...?

Jamais..... 1

Parfois 2

Toujours 3

RÉPONSE DONNÉE SPONTANÉMENT

Ne sait pas..... 8

REMARQUE POUR LE RECRUTEUR :

CONSIDÉRER POUR LES GROUPES DE VAPOTEURS 1, 5, 9, 13 SI :

- LA PERSONNE UTILISE PARFOIS OU TOUJOURS DES LIQUIDES DE VAPOTAGE AVEC OU SANS NICOTINE

CONSIDÉRER POUR LES GROUPES DE FUMEURS 2, 6, 10, 14 SI :

- LA PERSONNE N'UTILISE JAMAIS DE LIQUIDES DE VAPOTAGE AVEC OU SANS NICOTINE (ELLE RÉPOND JAMAIS À LA FOIS À LA Q4ei ET À LA Q4eii). REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE SI LA PERSONNE NE FUME PAS (NON À LA Q4B) ET SI ELLE RÉPOND JAMAIS À LA FOIS À LA Q4ei ET À LA Q4eii.
- SI LA PERSONNE DIT NE PAS SAVOIR POUR LES TROIS QUESTIONS (Q4ej; Q4cei; ET Q4eiii), LA CONSIDÉRER POUR LES GROUPES DE FUMEURS 2, 6, 10, 14. REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE SI LA PERSONNE NE FUME PAS (NON À LA Q4B) ET SI ELLE RÉPOND JAMAIS À LA FOIS À LA Q4ei ET À LA Q4eii.

[SI OUI À LA Q4A (VAPOTEURS)] Lequel des énoncés suivants décrit le mieux votre usage des cigarettes électroniques?

J'utilise des cigarettes électroniques tous les jours 1

J'ai utilisé des cigarettes électroniques au moins une fois par semaine dans les 4 dernières semaines 2

J'ai utilisé des cigarettes électroniques moins qu'une fois par semaine dans les 4 dernières semaines..... 3

J'ai essayé une fois la cigarette électronique 4

REMARQUE POUR LE RECRUTEUR :**FUMEURS : SI OUI À LA Q4B ET CODE 3 OU 4 À LA Q5, PASSER À LA Q8****VAPOTEURS : SI OUI À LA Q4A ET CODE 1 OU 2 À LA Q5 – RECRUTER UN MÉLANGE DANS LES GROUPES 1, 5, 9, 13
SI NON À LA Q4B (NON-FUMEUR) ET CODE 3 OU 4 À LA Q5 – REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE**

[SI OUI À LA Q4A ET CODE 1 OU 2 À LA Q5 (VAPOTE QUOTIDIENNEMENT OU AU MOINS UNE FOIS PAR SEMAINE DANS LES 4 DERNIÈRES SEMAINES)] Depuis combien de temps utilisez-vous des cigarettes électroniques?

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Moins d'un an | 1 | } Recruter un mélange pour les groupes 1, 5, 9, 13 |
| Entre 1 et 3 ans | 2 | |
| 4 ans et plus | 3 | |

[SI OUI À LA Q4A (VAPOTEUR) ET NON À LA Q4B (NON-FUMEUR)] Avez-vous déjà fumé des cigarettes?

- | | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| Oui..... | 1 | } Recruter un mélange pour les groupes 1, 5, 9, 13 |
| Non | 2 | |

[SI OUI À LA Q4B (FUMEUR)] Fumez-vous des cigarettes tous les jours, fréquemment, ou occasionnellement?

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Tous les jours | 1 | PASSER À LA Q10 |
| Fréquemment | 2 | |
| Occasionnellement | 3 | |

[SI FRÉQUEMMENT OU OCCASIONNELLEMENT À LA Q8] Dans les 4 dernières semaines, avez-vous fumé une cigarette au moins une fois par semaine?

- | | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| Oui..... | 1 | En recruter maximum 3 pour chacun des groupes 2, 6, 10, 14 |
| Non | 2 | |

**SI NON À LA Q4A (NON-VAPOTEUR) ET NON À LA Q9 (NE FUME PAS AU MOINS UNE FOIS PAR SEMAINE),
REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE**

[SI OUI À LA Q4B (FUMEUR)] Depuis combien de temps fumez-vous?

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| Moins de 2 ans | 1 | } Recruter un mélange pour les groupes 2, 6, 10, 14 |
| Entre 2 et 5 ans | 2 | |
| Entre 6 et 10 ans | 3 | |
| Entre 11 et 20 ans | 4 | |
| Plus de 20 ans | 5 | |

[SI OUI À LA Q4B (FUMEUR) ET NON À LA Q4A (NON-VAPOTEUR)] Avez-vous vapoté plus d'une fois par semaine au cours des 4 dernières semaines?

- | | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| Oui..... | 1 | } REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE |
| Non | 2 | |

Les prochaines questions ont pour but de nous assurer que nous incluons différents types de participants dans chaque groupe.

Quelle est votre situation professionnelle? Êtes-vous actuellement... **LIRE LES RÉPONSES DANS L'ORDRE – CODER UNE SEULE RÉPONSE**

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Employé à plein temps..... | 1 | } Maximum de 5 par groupe, uniquement pour les groupes de fumeurs et de vapoteurs |
| Employé à temps partiel | 2 | |
| Travailleur autonome..... | 3 | |
| Sans emploi | 4 | |
| Étudiant..... | 5 | |
| Parent au foyer..... | 6 | |
| Retraité..... | 7 | |
| RÉPONSE DONNÉE SPONTANÉMENT | | |
| Refus..... | 8 | |

SI LE RÉPONDANT EST UN EMPLOYÉ, DEMANDER : Quelle est votre profession actuelle?

_____ **TERMINER L'ENTREVUE SI LA PROFESSION EST SEMBLABLE À L'UNE DE CELLES DE LA Q2**

SI LE RÉPONDANT EST RETRAITÉ, DEMANDER : Quelle était votre profession avant de prendre votre retraite?

_____ **TERMINER L'ENTREVUE SI LA PROFESSION EST SEMBLABLE À L'UNE DE CELLES DE LA Q2**

Les discussions en groupe dans le cadre de ce projet se fera *par téléphone et en ligne* et nécessitera l'utilisation d'un ordinateur de bureau ou d'un ordinateur portable. L'utilisation d'une tablette ou d'un téléphone intelligent **n'est pas possible**. Avez-vous accès à un ordinateur portable ou un ordinateur de bureau doté d'une connexion Internet haute vitesse pour prendre part à la discussion?

- | | | |
|----------|---|---|
| Oui..... | 1 | REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE |
| Non..... | 2 | |

À quel point vous sentez-vous à l'aise avec un ordinateur? Êtes-vous....

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| Très à l'aise..... | 1 | REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE |
| Plutôt à l'aise..... | 2 | |
| Plutôt mal à l'aise..... | 3 | REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE |
| Très mal à l'aise..... | 4 | |

Lorsque vous serez en ligne pour une discussion en groupe, vous devrez également participer à une conférence téléphonique pour prendre part à la discussion. Avez-vous accès à un téléphone séparé de votre ordinateur pour participer à la discussion qui durera une heure et demi?

- | | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| Oui | 1 | REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE |
| Non..... | 2 | |

Pour terminer, avez-vous déjà participé à un petit groupe de discussion pour lequel vous avez été rémunéré(e)?

- | | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| Oui | 1 | CONTINUER – Maximum de 5 par groupe |
| Non | 2 | Passer à l'invitation |

À combien de discussions de groupe avez-vous participé au cours des 5 dernières années? _____

Quels étaient les sujets de tous les groupes de discussion auxquels vous avez participé? _____

À quand remonte votre dernière participation à un groupe de discussion? _____

SI LA PERSONNE A PARTICIPÉ À UN GROUPE DE DISCUSSION AU COURS DES SIX DERNIERS MOIS, LA REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE.

SI LA PERSONNE A PARTICIPÉ À TROIS GROUPE DE DISCUSSION OU PLUS AU COURS DES CINQ DERNIÈRES ANNÉES, LA REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE.

SI LA PERSONNE A DÉJÀ PARTICIPÉ À UN GROUPE DE DISCUSSION SUR LE TABAGISME OU LE VAPOTAGE, LA REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE.

INVITATION

Selon vos réponses, votre profil semble correspondre à ce que nous recherchons. J'aimerais vous inviter à participer à une petite discussion de groupe qui sera tenue par téléphone et par Internet le **[INSÉRER LA DATE]** de **[INSÉRER L'HEURE]** à **[INSÉRER L'HEURE]**. Cette conférence téléphonique nous permettra de recueillir vos commentaires et votre opinion sur *des enjeux du domaine de la santé qui intéressent les Canadiens*. Vous n'aurez qu'à ouvrir une session sur un site Web sécurisé depuis votre ordinateur, soit chez vous, soit au travail, et à vous joindre à la discussion dans une conférence téléphonique en même temps. De cinq personnes participeront à la discussion, qui sera très informelle. La discussion durera environ une heure et demi et vous recevrez 100 \$ en guise de remerciement pour votre temps.

Pouvez-vous et aimeriez-vous y participer?

Oui..... 1

Non 2 **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE**

La discussion à laquelle vous participerez sera enregistrée aux fins d'utilisation des membres d'une équipe de recherche uniquement. Soyez assuré que vos commentaires et réponses demeureront strictement confidentiels. Êtes-vous à l'aise avec le fait que la discussion soit enregistrée?

Oui..... 1

Non 2 **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE**

Certains observateurs du gouvernement du Canada pourraient également écouter la discussion pour des fins de recherche. Ils n'auront cependant pas accès au nom de famille des participants. Êtes-vous à l'aise avec la présence d'observateurs?

Oui..... 1

Non 2 **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE**

Les participants devront lire des textes et écrire des réponses courtes à l'ordinateur pendant la discussion de groupe. Est-il possible pour vous de prendre part à ces activités en français sans aide?

Oui 1

Non..... 2 **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L'ENTREVUE**

TERMINER SI LE RÉPONDANT FAIT PART D'UNE RAISON TELLE QU'UN PROBLÈME D'OUÏË, DE VUE OU DE LANGAGE ÉCRIT OU VERBAL, D'UNE CRAINTE DE NE POUVOIR ÊTRE CAPABLE DE COMMUNIQUER EFFICACEMENT, OU SI VOUS-MÊME AVEZ UNE PRÉOCCUPATION.

Pourriez-vous nous confirmer votre adresse électronique afin que nous puissions vous envoyer des instructions précises sur la façon de participer à la conférence téléphonique de votre groupe?

Noter l'adresse électronique (et la vérifier) : _____.

Nous vous enverrons les instructions au moins un jour avant la discussion. Nous vous prions de vous joindre à la session **15** minutes avant le début afin d'avoir le temps nécessaire pour installer les modules nécessaires. Si vous êtes en retard, nous ne pourrions pas vous inclure dans la discussion ni vous verser le montant d'argent.

Comme nous vous l'avons mentionné, nous aurons le plaisir de remettre à tous les participants 100 \$, que vous pourrez recevoir soit par chèque, soit par PayPal. Veuillez noter que vous devrez allouer de deux à trois semaines après la participation pour recevoir un chèque et de cinq à sept jours pour recevoir le paiement par PayPal. Si vous optez pour le paiement par PayPal, vous devrez avoir un compte PayPal.

[AU BESOIN : Pour en apprendre davantage au sujet de PayPal ou pour vous créer un compte, consultez le site Web www.paypal.ca]. Voulez-vous recevoir cette somme par PayPal ou par chèque?

PayPal 1

Chèque..... 2

SI LE RÉPONDANT CHOISIT PAYPAL :

Quelques jours après la discussion de groupe, vous recevrez un courriel de la part de Corporate Research Associates vous avisant que votre récompense en argent est prête. Vous n'aurez qu'à ouvrir votre compte PayPal afin que l'argent soit crédité à votre solde. Une fois dans votre compte, vous pourrez cliquer sur « Virer de l'argent » pour voir comment vous pouvez retirer votre argent.

SI LE RÉPONDANT CHOISIT LE VERSEMENT PAR CHÈQUE :

Pourrais-je avoir l'adresse postale où vous aimeriez que ce chèque soit envoyé après votre participation?

Adresse postale : _____

Ville : _____

Province : _____ Code postal : _____

Veuillez également confirmer l'orthographe de votre nom : _____

Puisqu'il s'agit de très petits groupes, le succès pourrait être compromis si une des personnes invitées manquait à l'appel. C'est pourquoi je vous demande, si vous avez décidé de participer, de faire tout votre possible pour y assister. Si vous êtes dans l'impossibilité d'être présent à la discussion de groupe, veuillez communiquer avec _____ (appel à frais virés) au _____ le plus tôt possible afin que nous puissions trouver une autre personne pour vous remplacer.

Merci. Nous avons hâte de connaître vos pensées et vos opinions lors de la discussion.

Avis aux recruteurs :

1. Recruter 5 personnes.
2. VÉRIFIER LES QUOTAS.
3. S'assurer que chaque participant a de bonnes habiletés d'expression orale selon l'ensemble de ses réponses (dans le doute, NE PAS L'INVITER).
4. Ne pas inscrire les noms sur la feuille de profils à moins d'avoir obtenu un engagement ferme.

5. Confirmer la date, l'heure et l'endroit avant de raccrocher.

Confirmer – UN OU DEUX JOURS AVANT LE GROUPE

1. Confirmer directement avec le participant le jour avant le groupe de discussion – ne pas laisser de message, sauf si cela s'avère absolument nécessaire.
2. Confirmer toutes les questions clés d'admissibilité.
3. Confirmer l'heure et l'endroit (demander aux participants s'ils connaissent l'endroit).
4. Vérifier qu'ils ont reçu le formulaire de consentement par courriel et leur rappeler qu'ils doivent en apporter une copie signée (des exemplaires imprimés sont disponibles dans les locaux).
5. Leur rappeler d'arriver avec 15 minutes d'avance.
6. Leur demander d'apporter leurs lunettes ou tout ce dont ils pourraient avoir besoin pour lire ou pour participer à la discussion (comme une prothèse auditive).

Appendix B:

Moderator's Guide

Moderator's Guide – FINAL

Testing Relative Risks Statements for Vaping Products

Objectives (not to be shared)

The main objective of this research is to evaluate Canadian vapers', smokers', and non-smokers and non-vapers' understanding of the proposed relative risk statements, and potential variations, that may be authorized for use in the commercial promotion of vaping products. More specific objectives include:

- To ensure the statements do not mislead participants about the harms of vaping products
- To test relative risk statements for the following;
 - ✓ clarity of the statement,
 - ✓ the main message
 - ✓ ease of reading the message
 - ✓ credibility, and
 - ✓ inducement risk to youth and/or young adult non-smokers.

Introduction

10 minutes

- **Welcome:** Introduction of self and role as moderator (encourage participation/guide discussions)
- **Discussion topic:** look at relative risks statements that may be authorized for use in the commercial promotion of vaping products
- **Sponsor:** Government of Canada, specifically Health Canada
- **Length:** Our discussion should last about two hours, without a break
- **Process:** All opinions are important and welcomed; looking to understand agreement and disagreement; talk one at a time; interested in hearing from everyone
- **Logistic:** Audio/video taping; observation from Government of Canada (in-person and/or remote)
- **Confidentiality:** Participation is voluntary; comments are anonymous; no names in reports. I'd ask that you keep our discussion today confidential, and not share its content with others. Please don't provide any personal or identifiable information about yourself and others such as your full name, to protect your privacy.
- **Participant introduction:** First name, who lives in your home, and....
 - *Current and past vapers:* how long you have/had been vaping
 - *Smokers:* if you currently or have ever vaped or used e-cigarettes
 - *Youth and young adults:* favourite pastime / hobby (i.e. how do you spend your spare time? And finally, what genre of music do you listen to?)

Awareness of health hazards – ask for youth and young adult only

5 minutes

To begin, let's talk briefly about vaping in general...

- Have you ever tried vaping?
 - If so, what was the situation?
 - How old were you at the time?
 - What did you think of it?

Review of Themes**75 minutes (15 min per original statement)**

As I mentioned earlier, I'd like to show you different statements that are currently being considered for vaping products. These statements could be made available to vaping product manufacturers and retailers (e.g. vape shops) to use in their advertising, including on posters in stores, on billboards, on package labels, or in advertising through any other kind of media. The use of these statements will not be mandatory, so manufacturers and retailers will decide if they wish to use these statements, and which ones they will include in their advertising labels.

The main purpose of these statements is to provide valid and accurate information that does not mislead the public about health hazards from the use of a vaping product or its emissions relative to those of a tobacco product. These statements are based on scientific evidence and as such, we are going to focus on how the message is being communicated more so than the facts themselves. These statements can be updated by Health Canada to keep up to date with the available evidence. Only statements developed and approved by Health Canada would be allowed for use.

The statements I will show you tonight are grouped by themes. For the first part of our discussion, we will focus on five statements that each present a different idea. We will begin by reading them together.

EXERCISE #1 (2 MIN) – Before we discuss your reactions, take a moment to indicate your opinion of the statements' clarity and ease of understanding, their ability to communicate certain things, and how each one influences your liking or interest in vaping products.

Statements:

- A. *Vaping can be harmful, but is much less harmful than smoking*
- B. *Vaping products emit toxic substances but the amount is significantly lower than in tobacco smoke*
- C. *Switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users' exposure to numerous toxic and cancer-causing substances*
- D. *Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes can reduce harms to your health*
- E. *E-cigarettes contain nicotine which is addictive but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does*

Let's talk about each statement one at a time.

ROTATE ORDER OF THEMES – 10 MIN DISCUSSION PER THEME**FOR EACH STATEMENT, ASK: [MODERATOR TO REFER TO PARTICULAR WORDS WITHIN EACH FROM THE EXERCISE SHEET]****Message:**

- What does this statement suggest about the potential health effects or risks of vaping or using e-cigarettes?
 - To what extent does it clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking? **ASK FOR EXERCISE RATING**
 - Does the statement clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking in general or is ONLY if you are already a smoker?

- **IF NOT MENTIONED:** Does it give the impression that vaping has no harms? (i.e. Does it communicate that vaping can still be harmful)

Clarity/Credibility:

- Is anything unclear or difficult to understand?
- Is anything misleading?
 - To what extent, if at all, is it misleading about the harms of vaping products? **ASK FOR EXERCISE RATING** If large extent... what particularly is misleading?
 - **IF NOT MENTIONED:** Does it imply a health or therapeutic benefit from vaping? How so? Which word / words does that?

Outcome:

- To what extent, if at all, does it increase the appeal of vaping products? If increased appeal... what particularly increases the appeal?
- **YOUTH/YOUNG ADULTS:** To what extent does this statement make you curious about vaping? More interested in trying it or not? Why?

Relevance:

- Are you surprised by what it says, or did you know this already? What surprised you?

Questions Related to Multiple Statements:

- In some instances, statements use the word “may” while in other instances they use the word “can”. What difference does it make if any? **IF NOT MENTIONED:** In terms of statement meaning
- Some of the statements use the term “vaping” while others refer to “e-cigarette”. Do they refer to the same or different things? If different, how are they different?
- Many of the statements use the word “significantly”. What does it mean? And what does “much less” mean?
 - Do these words influence how much attention you place on what the statement is saying? How so?
 - Do these words impact your intentions to do something in any way? How so?
 - **ASK YOUTH NON-SMOKERS:** Do these words increase the appeal of vaping products?
 - At what age do you / your peers consider vaping?

Statement Specific Probes:

- I’d like your thoughts on some of the wording used in this statement. In some instances, I’d like to know how replacing some of the words might affect what the statement means and the clarity of the message conveyed. Let’s have a look at each one individually:

Statement A: *Vaping can be harmful, but is much less harmful than smoking*

- Explore differences between ‘much less harmful than smoking’ and ‘not harmless’
- Explore differences between ‘much less harmful than smoking’ and ‘not completely harmless’

Statement B: *Vaping products emit toxic substances but the amount is significantly lower than in tobacco smoke*

- Replace ‘emit’ with ‘release’
- Replace ‘toxic substances’ with ‘harmful substances’

- This statement implies that toxic substances emitted by vaping products are significantly lower. How much lower would you expect them to be based on what this says, compared to tobacco smoke?
- Replace ‘significantly lower’ with ‘much lower’
- Replace ‘amount is significantly lower’ with ‘lower levels’

Statement C: *Switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users’ exposure to numerous toxic and cancer-causing substances*

- What does the word “exposure” mean in this context?
- What is implied by “switching completely”? What does this concept refer to?
- Replace ‘switching completely’ with ‘completely replacing’
- Replace ‘combustible tobacco cigarette’ with ‘cigarette’
- Replace ‘toxic and cancer-causing substances’ with ‘harmful substances’
- Replace ‘numerous’ with ‘many’

Statement D: *Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes can reduce harms to your health*

- Replace ‘can’ with ‘could’
- What does the word “harm” refer to in this context? What kinds of harms are you thinking of?
- What does “reduced harms” mean in this context? Why is that?

Statement E: *E-cigarettes contain nicotine which is addictive but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does*

- How do you feel about it saying “addictive”?
- How do you feel about it saying “not causing cancer”?
- What is the statement saying specifically about nicotine?
- And what is it saying about e-cigarettes?
- **[Moderator to show on flip chart:**
 - **E-cigarettes contain nicotine. Nicotine is addictive, but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does.]** What would you think if the statement were divided like this? Is it clearer or less clear?

Review of Alternative Statements

35 minutes

I’d like to show you alternative statements for each of the five original statements we just looked at. There are quite a few so we will look at them a few at a time. Let’s begin with the first set. **ROTATE ORDER OF THEMES AND ORDER OF STATEMENTS – SHOW AND DISCUSS ALL STATEMENTS WITHIN THE SAME THEME BEFORE MOVING TO NEXT THEME – EACH EXERCISE PAGE INCLUDES ALL STATEMENTS WITHIN A SINGLE THEME – EXERCISE ESTIMATED TO TAKE 5 MIN PER THEME**

EXERCISE #3 – Before we discuss your reactions together, take a moment to indicate your opinions of the statements’ clarity and ease of understanding, their ability to communicate certain things, and how each one influences your liking or interest in vaping products.

EXERCISE #4 – Then, rank each statement from 1 to 4/5 according to their ability to clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking. Each statement will have a unique ranking number. You will notice that the original statement (theme) we discussed earlier is also included in the list.

Let's have a look at all of the variations of the original statement. To help with our discussion, let's also reference the original statement, or theme, for which these phrases are alternatives.

FOR ALL STATEMENTS WITHIN EACH THEME – 4 MIN DISCUSSION PER THEME:

- Do each of the statements say the same thing about the possible health risks or effects of vaping? If no, how are they different?
- Is anything unclear or confusing in any of those statements? Is anything misleading?
YOUTH/YOUNG ADULTS: To what extent do the alternative statements make you curious about vaping? More interested in trying it or not? Why?

EXERCISE #5 - Before we finish up, I'd like you to complete an exercise. Read through all of the statements we have discussed tonight (looking at the listings from exercise #4 and the last statement from exercise #1) and place a checkmark next to those that:

VAPERS: are most likely to catch your attention as a vaper.

SMOKERS: would make you consider vaping as an alternative to smoking cigarettes.

YOUTH/YOUNG ADULTS: make vaping an attractive option to non-vapers, like you.

I will give you a few minutes to do so. ***MODERATOR TO CHECK BACK WITH CLIENTS TO CONFIRM IF THERE ARE ANY MORE QUESTIONS.***

Thanks & Closure

That ends our discussion. Thank you for your time and comments. ***Direct them to the hostess to receive the incentive***

Appendix C:

Focus Group Material

Appendix C1:

Vaper Groups

Exercise #1

Vaping can be harmful, but is much less harmful than smoking

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Vaping products emit toxic substances but the amount is significantly lower than in tobacco smoke

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users' exposure to numerous toxic and cancer-causing substances

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes can reduce harms to your health

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

E-cigarettes contain nicotine which is addictive but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Exercise #3A

If you are a smoker, vaping is a less harmful option than smoking, if you switch completely

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Vaping is much less harmful than smoking, but can still be harmful

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Vaping is much less harmful than smoking, but is not harmless

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Exercise #4A

Rank the statements in order from the most (ranking of 1) to the least (ranking of 4) likely to:

Most clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker

	Ranking (1 to 4)
If you are a smoker, vaping is a less harmful option than smoking, if you switch completely	
Vaping is much less harmful than smoking, but can still be harmful	
Vaping is much less harmful than smoking, but is not harmless	
Vaping can be harmful, but is much less harmful than smoking	

Exercise #3B

Vaping products release much lower amounts of harmful substances than tobacco smoke, but are not completely harmless

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Vaping products release much lower amounts of harmful substances than tobacco smoke, but still release some harmful substances

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Except for nicotine, vaping products typically only contain a fraction of the 7,000 chemicals found in tobacco or tobacco smoke, and at lower levels

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Exercise #4B

Rank the statements in order from the most (ranking of 1) to the least (ranking of 4) likely to:

Most clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker

	Ranking (1 to 4)
Vaping products release much lower amounts of harmful substances than tobacco smoke, but are not completely harmless	
Vaping products release much lower amounts of harmful substances than tobacco smoke, but still release some harmful substances	
Except for nicotine, vaping products typically only contain a fraction of the 7,000 chemicals found in tobacco or tobacco smoke, and at lower levels	
Vaping products emit toxic substances but the amount is significantly lower than in tobacco smoke	

Exercise #3C

Completely replacing your cigarette with a vaping product will reduce your exposure to many harmful substances

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

By switching completely to vaping products, cigarette smokers will reduce their exposure to many harmful substances

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Use of vaping products as a complete substitute for current cigarette smoking will reduce exposure to many harmful substances

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Exercise #4C

Rank the statements in order from the most (ranking of 1) to the least (ranking of 4) likely to:

Most clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker

	Ranking (1 to 4)
Completely replacing your cigarette with a vaping product will reduce your exposure to many harmful substances	
By switching completely to vaping products, cigarette smokers will reduce their exposure to many harmful substances	
Use of vaping products as a complete substitute for current cigarette smoking will reduce exposure to many harmful substances	
Switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users' exposure to numerous toxic and cancer-causing substances	

Exercise #3D

Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes could reduce certain short-term harms to your health

	Not at all					Completely				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

By switching completely to vaping products, cigarette smokers can reduce harms to their health

	Not at all					Completely				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Use of vaping products as a complete substitute for current cigarette smoking can reduce harms to your health

	Not at all					Completely				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to completely switch to vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Exercise #4D

Rank the statements in order from the most (ranking of 1) to the least (ranking of 4) likely to:

Most clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker

	Ranking (1 to 4)
Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes could reduce certain short-term harms to your health	
By switching completely to vaping products, cigarette smokers can reduce harms to their health	
Use of vaping products as a complete substitute for current cigarette smoking can reduce harms to your health	
Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes can reduce harms to your health	

Appendix C2:

Non-Vaper Groups

Exercise #1

Vaping can be harmful, but is much less harmful than smoking

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Vaping products emit toxic substances but the amount is significantly lower than in tobacco smoke

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users' exposure to numerous toxic and cancer-causing substances

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes can reduce harms to your health

	Not at all						Completely			
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

E-cigarettes contain nicotine which is addictive but does not cause cancer like tobacco smoking does

	Not at all						Completely			
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Exercise #3A

If you are a smoker, vaping is a less harmful option than smoking, if you switch completely

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Vaping is much less harmful than smoking, but can still be harmful

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Vaping is much less harmful than smoking, but is not harmless

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Exercise #4A

Rank the statements in order from the most (ranking of 1) to the least (ranking of 4) likely to:

Most clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker

	Ranking (1 to 4)
If you are a smoker, vaping is a less harmful option than smoking, if you switch completely	
Vaping is much less harmful than smoking, but can still be harmful	
Vaping is much less harmful than smoking, but is not harmless	
Vaping can be harmful, but is much less harmful than smoking	

Exercise #3B

Vaping products release much lower amounts of harmful substances than tobacco smoke, but are not completely harmless

	Not at all							Completely		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Vaping products release much lower amounts of harmful substances than tobacco smoke, but still release some harmful substances

	Not at all							Completely		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Except for nicotine, vaping products typically only contain a fraction of the 7,000 chemicals found in tobacco or tobacco smoke, and at lower levels

	Not at all							Completely		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Exercise #4B

Rank the statements in order from the most (ranking of 1) to the least (ranking of 4) likely to:

Most clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker

	Ranking (1 to 4)
Vaping products release much lower amounts of harmful substances than tobacco smoke, but are not completely harmless	
Vaping products release much lower amounts of harmful substances than tobacco smoke, but still release some harmful substances	
Except for nicotine, vaping products typically only contain a fraction of the 7,000 chemicals found in tobacco or tobacco smoke, and at lower levels	
Vaping products emit toxic substances but the amount is significantly lower than in tobacco smoke	

Exercise #3C

Completely replacing your cigarette with a vaping product will reduce your exposure to many harmful substances

	Not at all							Completely		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

By switching completely to vaping products, cigarette smokers will reduce their exposure to many harmful substances

	Not at all							Completely		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Use of vaping products as a complete substitute for current cigarette smoking will reduce exposure to many harmful substances

	Not at all							Completely		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Exercise #4C

Rank the statements in order from the most (ranking of 1) to the least (ranking of 4) likely to:

Most clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker

	Ranking (1 to 4)
Completely replacing your cigarette with a vaping product will reduce your exposure to many harmful substances	
By switching completely to vaping products, cigarette smokers will reduce their exposure to many harmful substances	
Use of vaping products as a complete substitute for current cigarette smoking will reduce exposure to many harmful substances	
Switching completely from combustible tobacco cigarettes to e-cigarettes reduces users' exposure to numerous toxic and cancer-causing substances	

Exercise #3D

Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes could reduce certain short-term harms to your health

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

By switching completely to vaping products, cigarette smokers can reduce harms to their health

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Use of vaping products as a complete substitute for current cigarette smoking can reduce harms to your health

	Not at all						Completely			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This is clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This clearly communicates that there are still harms associated with vaping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
This would encourage me to try vaping products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Exercise #4D

Rank the statements in order from the most (ranking of 1) to the least (ranking of 4) likely to:

Most clearly communicate that vaping is less harmful than smoking if you are a smoker

	Ranking (1 to 4)
Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes could reduce certain short-term harms to your health	
By switching completely to vaping products, cigarette smokers can reduce harms to their health	
Use of vaping products as a complete substitute for current cigarette smoking can reduce harms to your health	
Switching completely from smoking to e-cigarettes can reduce harms to your health	