

Youth and Young Adult Awareness of and Perceptions About Tobacco Marketing as a Social Justice Issue

Barbara A. Schillo PhD¹, Joanne D'Silva PhD, MPH², Christopher La Rose PhD³,
Yoonsang Kim PhD, MPH⁴, Sherry Emery PhD⁴

¹Truth Initiative Schroeder Institute, Washington, DC, USA

²Independent Consultant, Columbia, MD, USA

³Social Data Collaboratory, NORC, University of Chicago, Atlanta GA, USA

⁴Social Data Collaboratory, NORC, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

Corresponding Author: Barbara A. Schillo, PhD, Truth Initiative Schroeder Institute; 900 G Street, NW, 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20001, USA. Telephone: 202-454-5757; E-mail: bschillo@truthinitiative.org

Abstract

Introduction: Systemic racism and tobacco-industry targeting contribute to disparities in communities of color. However, understanding tobacco as a social justice issue and the industry's role in perpetuating inequities remains limited. This study explored youth and young adult awareness of tobacco marketing and perceptions of tobacco marketing as a social justice issue.

Aims and Methods: Focus groups were conducted with youth and young adults in 2020 and 2021, including individuals who used tobacco and e-cigarettes and those who did not use either. Online surveys were conducted in 2021 with youth ($n = 1227$) and young adults ($n = 2643$) using AmeriSpeak's nationally representative panel, oversampling for black and Hispanic Americans and people who smoke. Perceptions of flavor bans, social justice, and industry marketing were assessed.

Results: Most (>80%) survey respondents agreed that tobacco companies target youth. However, only 20% saw tobacco as a social justice issue. Focus group participants regardless of their tobacco or e-cigarette use, reported higher prevalence of tobacco advertising in their communities relative to survey respondents but did not view it as targeting communities of color. Black non-Hispanic (20.9%) and Hispanic (21.4%) survey respondents perceived tobacco as a social justice issue more than white non-Hispanic (16.1%) respondents. The majority (>60%) of survey respondents supported bans on menthol and flavored tobacco, regardless of race or ethnicity.

Conclusions: Respondents broadly supported menthol and flavored tobacco bans and recognized tobacco-industry influence on youth. Low awareness of tobacco as a social justice issue highlights the need to raise awareness of the underlying factors driving tobacco-related disparities.

Implications: The majority of young people see the tobacco industry as targeting them. Most young people support bans on menthol and flavored tobacco bans, with support across racial and ethnic groups. While few young respondents perceived tobacco as a social justice issue, some perceived tobacco companies as targeting low-income and communities of color. Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic respondents were more likely to perceive tobacco as a social justice issue than white non-Hispanic respondents. Efforts to raise awareness among young people of tobacco as a social justice issue may be key in addressing tobacco disparities and advancing support for flavor tobacco bans.

Introduction

Social justice is the concept that all individuals should have equal rights and access to opportunities, including the right to a healthy life.¹ Yet, despite successfully reducing tobacco use in the general population, some social groups continue to bear a disproportionate burden of tobacco-related morbidity and mortality.² (Tobacco in this paper refers to commercial tobacco products, including e-cigarettes, that are manufactured and sold for profit, not tobacco that is used for ceremonial, healing, or traditional purposes.) Among researchers and advocates, tobacco has been highlighted as a social justice issue for at least two decades^{2,3}; however, only in recent years with shifting public discourse around social movements for racial equity and growing momentum around advancing equity has this topic been brought to the forefront. Viewing tobacco control through a social justice lens redirects from the notion that smoking is solely an individual “choice” versus a

complex behavior driven and shaped by social, political, and economic forces driven by an industry known for predatory marketing tactics.²

The long-established history of tobacco-industry targeting African Americans and other communities of color, LGBTQ + communities, women, and young people is well documented.^{4–7} This targeting has deadly consequences, with a recent study estimating that menthol cigarettes were responsible for 1.5 million new smokers, 157 000 smoking-related premature deaths, and 1.5 million life-years lost among African Americans over 1980–2018.⁸ In targeting youth with menthol cigarettes, the tobacco industry has created a “starter product” designed specifically to mask the harsh taste of tobacco and increase their appeal.^{9,10} Moreover, the availability of menthol in cigarettes and the appeal of sweet and candy flavors in other tobacco products, including e-cigarettes, has increased initiation among youth and young adults.¹¹ The

Received: January 19, 2023. Revised: July 27, 2023. Accepted: August 4, 2023.

© The Author(s) 2024. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial reproduction and distribution of the work, in any medium, provided the original work is not altered or transformed in any way, and that the work is properly cited. For commercial re-use, please contact reprints@oup.com for reprints and translation rights for reprints. All other permissions can be obtained through our RightsLink service via the Permissions link on the article page on our site—for further information please contact journals.permissions@oup.com.

FDA exempted menthol from removing all other flavored cigarettes in 2009, and the subsequent delays in removing menthol from the marketplace have had a disproportionate impact on the most vulnerable populations.¹² In April 2022, the U.S. FDA proposed product standards banning menthol cigarettes and flavored cigars.^{13,14} A pro-equity policy, this proposed menthol ban can potentially reduce youth initiation and save thousands of lives, especially among black and African Americans and other priority populations who most commonly use menthol cigarettes.¹⁵ This federal announcement follows years of advocacy at the local, state, and tribal levels to restrict the sales of menthol and flavored tobacco. To date, over 350 state and local jurisdictions across the United States have restricted flavored tobacco sales¹⁶; several countries or jurisdictions, including Canada, the European Union, and the United Kingdom have also banned the sale of menthol cigarettes.¹⁷ In response, the tobacco industry has pursued aggressive efforts to oppose such policies and misdirect public opinion.^{18,19} Industry-sponsored spokespersons assert that these policies are discriminatory while touting unsubstantiated claims that such policies will increase criminalization and interactions between black smokers and police.^{18,19} Yet, the U.S. FDA announcement specifically details that they “cannot and will not enforce against individual consumers for possession or use of menthol cigarettes or flavored cigars,” but rather that enforcement will focus on retailers and manufacturers.²⁰ While previous research has documented broad support for policies banning menthol cigarettes among adults,^{21–23} less is known about youth and young adult perspectives.

This study was designed against the backdrop of the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic and the growing movement for racial justice following the police killing of Mr. George Floyd. It was designed to address: (1) To what extent are young people aware of tobacco-industry targeted marketing?, (2) What is young people’s awareness of policy efforts as they relate to support for passing menthol and flavored tobacco bans?, and (3) To what extent is tobacco perceived as a social justice issue? Findings can potentially inform advocacy and communication strategies to increase support for policies for advancing equity.

Methods

This research employed a mixed-methods design involving focus groups and an online survey with youth and young adults. Before data collection, an advisory body of 20 tobacco control policy advocates, subject matter experts, and thought leaders was convened. This advisory body included adults familiar with tobacco policies affecting youth but did not include youth and young adults. In-depth interviews with the advisory body informed the overarching purpose of the study and prioritized topics for the focus groups and surveys. This advisory body also reviewed the preliminary findings from the focus groups and surveys.

Focus Groups

Four online focus groups were conducted with 22 youth (ages 13–17) and young adults (ages 18–30). Participants were recruited from jurisdictions with and without policies restricting flavored tobacco products. The advisory body facilitated recruitment via outreach to youth-serving organizations. Two focus groups were conducted in November–December 2020, before the fielding of surveys, allowing for

limited cognitive testing of potential survey items on exposure to advertising and policy awareness. The remaining focus groups were conducted with a subset of online survey participants in June of 2021, and focused on interpretation of survey findings. Participants provided informed consent and were informed about the purpose of the study. A semi-structured focus group moderator guide was developed, including questions about participants’ tobacco use, awareness of tobacco marketing, support for menthol and flavored tobacco bans, and issues of social justice. Each focus group lasted about 90 minutes and participants received a \$125 incentive for their time. Skilled moderators and note-takers facilitated each session.

Analysis

Focus group conversations were recorded; notes for each focus group were cross-checked with the recordings for accuracy. The team used a rapid thematic analysis approach to coding the notes to identify major themes. Two team members double-coded each set of notes, with the moderator reviewing the coding and resolving any inconsistencies.

Online Surveys

Sample

Focus group findings and advisory body insights informed questionnaire development for the online surveys with youth ($n = 1227$) and young adults ($n = 2643$). Data collection occurred between March and April 2021.

For this study, a probability-based sample (from the AmeriSpeak Panel²⁴) and a nonprobability sample (Lucid Panel)²⁵ of U.S. adults were combined. Black and Hispanic Americans and people who use tobacco were oversampled. For teens, AmeriSpeak reached out to all active panelists identified as parents of a teen aged 13–17. The parent panelists were briefed about the study and asked to consent for AmeriSpeak to contact their teens. AmeriSpeak then contacted the teen, randomly selected among all eligible within the household, with an invitation to participate in the study. For respondents aged 13–17, Lucid prescreened parent panelists on their panel to get to a teen respondent, who then connected to the survey hosted by AmeriSpeak.

NORC calculated panel weights for the completed AmeriSpeak and nonprobability samples, and then the two samples were blended using NORC’s TruthNorth calibration^{26,27} to minimize potential bias from the nonprobability sample. Weight calculation incorporated probability of selection, household- and person-level nonresponses, and adjustments to Current Population Survey demographic benchmarks.

The weighted AAPOR Response Rate 3 cumulative response rate was 3.7%,^{28,29} which was calculated following the definition recommended by AAPOR, incorporating recruitment, household retention, and survey completion rates. This study was reviewed and approved by NORC’s IRB.

Measures

Sociodemographics.

Race and ethnicity, gender, age, highest parental level of education (for youth), and level of education (for young adults) were assessed.

Tobacco Product Use.

People who have used tobacco in the past 30 days were categorized as (1) e-cigarette only (e-cigarettes and/or heat-not-burn products), (2) combustible or smokeless tobacco only (cigarettes, hookah, cigars, little cigars, and cigarillos (LCCs), loose tobacco, pipe, roll-your-own tobacco (RYO), and/or smokeless tobacco), and (3) poly use (two or more products). Participants who use e-cigarettes and the participants who smoke were asked whether the products they used were usually flavored.

Exposure to Advertising.

Participants reported whether they saw ads for menthol cigarettes or flavored e-cigarettes that use someone's social or cultural identity (eg, race, age, gender, social class, etc.) to target specific consumers. Respondents were also asked where they saw these ads (eg, on social media, public transportation, internet, events, billboards, and where they buy their tobacco). Those who reported seeing such ads on social media were asked if these posts were made by friends or acquaintances, influencers or celebrities, or others.

Policy Awareness and Exposure.

Respondents were asked about their awareness of a national ban on the sale of flavored disposable vaporizer products; a local ban on flavored e-cigarettes; and a local ban on menthol cigarettes. They were also asked to report their knowledge of what levels of government currently have a ban on flavored tobacco products. We coded whether survey respondents lived in a jurisdiction with or without bans on menthol cigarettes.

Policy Support.

Support for bans on menthol cigarettes, menthol flavored e-cigarettes, flavored e-cigarettes, and all flavored tobacco (including menthol cigarettes, flavored cigars, little cigars, cigarillos, hookah/waterpipe, and e-cigarettes) were assessed with response options strongly agree/agree versus disagree/strongly disagree.

Perceived Policy Impact.

Respondents were asked about potential effects of flavored e-cigarette bans and menthol cigarette bans in their neighborhoods and one of the following options: (1) More police interaction with underage users, (2) More use of physical force by law enforcement against underage users, (3) More criminal penalties or fines for businesses that sell tobacco to youth, (4) No change, or (5) Less police interaction with underage users, less use of physical force by law enforcement, and fewer criminal penalties for tobacco product sales to youth.

Perceptions of Social Justice.

Respondents were asked whether they believed tobacco use is a social justice issue and why. Respondents also indicated how much they agreed with the statement: Tobacco companies try to get young people to start using their products (strongly agree/agree vs. disagree/strongly disagree).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed accounting for survey weights using SAS version 9.4. Descriptive statistics were used to examine sample characteristics and tobacco use patterns. Analyses

were limited to the groups with the greatest representation in our sample: (1) Hispanic, (2) white, non-Hispanic, and (3) black, non-Hispanic. Rao-Scott Chi-square tests and 95% confidence intervals were used to examine differences in exposure to advertising and awareness, support, and perceived impact of policy by race and ethnicity.

Results

Focus group participants were predominantly female and black or African American and the remainder identified as Asian, Hispanic, white, or multiracial. Almost all focus group participants reported using tobacco or e-cigarettes. The mean age for the youth focus group participants was 15 years old, and for the young adult participants, 22 years old.

Demographics of survey respondents are presented in [Table 1](#). Among survey respondents, 16.0% of youth and 21.6% of young adults used any tobacco product in the past 30 days. One in 10 (9.2) of young adults reported poly use with slightly lower (8.5%) rates of youth reporting using more than one tobacco product in the past 30 days. Among young adults, white non-Hispanic (10.5%, 95% CI: 7.5, 13.5) and black non-Hispanic (8.8%, 95% CI: 6.0, 11.5) respondents were more likely to use more than two tobacco products than were Hispanic (5.0%, 95% CI: 3.5, 6.5) respondents ($p < .0001$). There were no differences by race/ethnicity for polyuse among youth. E-cigarette was the most commonly used tobacco product and most youth (83.4%) and young adults (86.3%) who use e-cigarettes reported using flavored e-cigarettes. Among cigarette smokers, 58.4% of youth and 44.9% of young adults reported smoking menthol/mint-flavored cigarettes.

Almost half of youth survey respondents (48.5%) and 41.6% of young adults reported exposure to tobacco ads that use social or cultural identity in their messaging; there were no significant differences by race/ethnicity in exposure to such ads ([Supplementary Table 1](#)). Focus group participants noted that while tobacco advertising is more prevalent in their communities, they did not view this as targeted at communities of color, but rather felt this marketing is directed towards low-income communities and young people regardless of race. "I think it's messed up they're taking advantage of younger people. It's not fair to them especially kids don't know what's going on, they just see someone do it and they just go ahead and do it. They don't know what's right and what's wrong. They haven't been taught much about it." (Participant currently using tobacco, age 17 years).

Overall 35.4% of youth and 41.9% of young adult survey respondents indicated exposure to menthol cigarette ads and this type of exposure was also noted by focus group participants. "It's [marketed] in poor communities, and people of color in different neighborhoods. Where I live in, and it is marketed that way here. If you go to a local convenience store you see nothing but posters for menthol cigarettes." (Participant currently using tobacco, age 15 years).

The surveys indicated that the most commonly reported sources of exposure were social media (30.6%) followed by the internet (29.4%). Nearly 4 in 10 (37.0%) youth and 28.3% of young adults indicated seeing menthol cigarette ads in social media, with no significant difference by race/ethnicity. Among those who reported exposure to menthol cigarette ads on social media, more than 60% saw posts made by influencers or celebrities. Among those who reported

Table 1. Demographics and Tobacco Use Characteristics Among Youth and Young Adults in the Online Survey Sample ($n = 3870$; Weighted Percentages)

Variables	Overall		Youth (ages 13–17)		Young adults (ages 18–30)	
	n^1	% ²	n^1	% ²	n^1	% ²
<i>Demographics</i>						
Gender						
Female	2088	49.1	619	49.9	1469	48.9
Male	1782	50.9	608	50.1	1174	51.1
Race/ethnicity						
Hispanic	1638	23.0	549	25.8	1089	22.0
White, non-Hispanic	981	53.4	320	50.3	661	54.4
Black, non-Hispanic	866	13.3	294	12.9	572	13.5
Other/multi-race, non-Hispanic	385	10.3	64	10.9	321	10.1
Parental education (youth)/education (YA)						
Less than high school			223	8.1	201	10.2
High school graduate			163	19.0	586	29.4
Voc/tech/some college			320	26.7	1041	37.2
College degree			266	20.9	627	17.7
Postgrad study/professional degree			255	25.3	188	5.4
<i>Tobacco use characteristics</i>						
Past 30-day tobacco use (product type)						
Any product	1342	20.1	299	16.0	1043	21.6
E-cigarette	701	13.4	268	13.5	433	13.3
Cigarette	474	8.9	158	8.2	316	9.2
Cigar, cigarillo, and little cigar	485	8.1	129	6.3	356	8.8
Hookah	320	4.0	127	3.8	193	4.1
Pipe	192	2.9	67	1.8	125	3.3
Heat not burn	244	3.1	110	4.2	134	2.6
Smokeless	139	2.4	58	2.7	81	2.3
Past 30-day tobacco use (category)						
People who use more than 2 tobacco products	526	8.7	200	9.2	326	8.5
Combustible or smokeless only	289	5.5	41	3.8	248	6.0
E-cigarette only	198	4.4	73	4.4	125	4.4
Non-user	2857	81.5	913	82.6	1944	81.1

¹unweighted frequency.²weighted percentage.

exposure to flavored e-cigarette ads on social media, 59.3% saw posts made by influencers or celebrities. Among focus group participants, marketing for menthol tobacco was seen on TV, in magazines, and on social media. Several focus group participants also described seeing celebrities promoting tobacco products.

Most survey respondents lived in areas with no current ban on menthol cigarettes. Overall, 40.0% of youth and young adults reported awareness of the proposed national flavored e-cigarette ban. Young adults focus group participants living in comprehensive ban locations were aware of flavor bans while those not living in areas without a ban were not. For example, one young adult noted that, where they lived, there were “not really any restrictions. [They are] trying to crack down on people buying a whole 5-pack one. You can’t buy a single Backwood. They are trying to cut down on flavors - grape swishers, honey back woods.” (Participant currently using tobacco, age 21 years) However, another participant noted that “Honestly I don’t really know what the restrictions

are. Just have friends get them for me.” (Participant currently using tobacco, non-ban area, age 19 years)

Responses to support for a menthol cigarette ban, menthol flavored e-cigarette ban, a flavored e-cigarette ban and a ban on all flavored tobacco products are presented in [Supplementary Table 1](#). Greater than 75% of youth and 60% of young adult survey respondents supported these policies, with no significant difference by race/ethnicity. Among focus group participants, the majority of which were people who use tobacco, youth, and young adults were typically not interested in supporting anti-tobacco/vaping efforts because they perceived most people who use these products as unwilling to quit. They were therefore unreceptive and felt that bans were ineffective: “if somebody wants something they are going to get it.” (Participant currently using tobacco, comprehensive ban area, age 21 years).

When asked about the policy impact, some focus group participants were skeptical: “I don’t think there would be a lot of change. I don’t see it being enforced really or anything

currently in place being enforced, so not sure how a different ban would be different.” (Participant formerly using tobacco, age 16 years).

When asked about potential unintended consequences almost half (47.8%) of youth and young adult survey respondents believed there would be no change in police interaction with people who use or sell tobacco (Supplementary Table 1). Fewer than a third believed there would be additional consequences such as more use of physical force by law enforcement, or criminal penalties for businesses resulting from flavored e-cigarette bans and menthol cigarette bans. There was no significant difference in these perceptions by age or by race/ethnicity. Many focus group participants said that the ban would not increase police interactions in communities of color, while others reported feeling blasé about bans and their effects. One young adult expressed frustration that tobacco companies labeled increased police interaction due to bans a tobacco issue instead of a policing issue. “I’m mad they’re making this a tobacco issue and not a police issue . . . Black people are incarcerated at far higher rates than white people, but they don’t smoke more. Black people don’t smoke more weed than white people, but are incarcerated more than white people. So why are we making it [a] marijuana or tobacco issue rather than a police issue. And we’re not looking at the right problem. Tobacco companies don’t care.” (Participant currently using tobacco, age 24 years). Others described potential unequal application of legislation by the police against communities of color, also positioning the issue as a police and racism issue.

Most (>80%) survey respondents agreed that tobacco companies target young people; however, fewer than 20% of youth and young adults agreed with the statement that tobacco use is a social justice issue. This is illustrated in the words of a focus group participant who reported, “I don’t see it as a social justice issue at all. They’ve been marketing cigarettes for years even before me but it’s something they’ve been doing but it’s more aimed towards kids now. My grandma used to send my mom to the store at 11 or 12 and not get in trouble for it. It has always been going on so it’s not a social justice issue.” (Participant currently using tobacco, age 15 years).

Black non-Hispanic (20.9%) and Hispanic (21.4%) respondents were more likely to perceive tobacco as a social justice issue than white non-Hispanic (16.1%) respondents, with these differences presenting marginal significance ($p = .07$). Reasons cited for why respondents believe tobacco is a social justice issue include tobacco-industry marketing that is targeted toward minorities and youth, perceiving the tobacco industry as unethical corporations, societal or peer pressure, discrimination of users based on race, as well as health impacts of tobacco-related disease and disparities among minorities. In focus group discussions, most youth and young adults did not recognize tobacco as a social justice issue. When asked to define social justice, many youth defined social justice as “standing up for what you believe in,” and “getting the word out.” One youth noted that “I would say pretty much standing up what you believe in. BLM situation, LGBT communities, standing up for what you believe in. But cigarettes? Menthol? I don’t see people rioting trying to do anything about this.” (Participant currently using tobacco, age 15 years).

Some young adult focus group respondents noted that the target demographic for tobacco was poor communities

and acknowledged that people of color tend to fall in that demographic. “It is my perception that tobacco companies target low-income and communities of color for advertising in hope of getting people addicted and buying their products. You don’t see billboards for cigarettes in neighborhood associations or fancy white neighborhoods.” (Participant currently using tobacco, age 21 years). Others noted that products were not targeted to any particular demographic, but to everyone to support company profits.

Discussion

This mixed-methods study adds to the literature by focusing on youth and young adult perspectives on tobacco-industry marketing and menthol and flavored tobacco bans. Our results indicate that youth and young adults continue to be exposed to menthol marketing, with the greatest exposure appearing in pop culture (ie, social media and movies/tv/music) compared to physical locations such as public transportation, bus stops, billboards, or places of purchase. Hispanic and black respondents were more likely to report seeing menthol ads in physical locations than white respondents, which aligns with documented evidence of the tobacco-industry’s targeted marketing practices in communities of color.³⁰ Survey and focus group respondents also described the involvement of influencers and celebrities in tobacco promotions on social media, reflecting current tobacco-industry tactics to use social media to promote tobacco products to young people,³¹ specifically circumventing restrictions on tobacco advertising through engaging influencers to make undisclosed posts.³¹ While the tobacco industry has clearly leveraged social media and popular culture to promote their products,^{32–35} these same strategies represent a potent opportunity for health communication campaigns to bolster support for menthol tobacco bans and provide a competing narrative to the industry’s oppositional tactics.

Our study found broad support for proposed bans on menthol and flavored tobacco among youth and young adults, with no differences by race and ethnicity. These results complement previous research examining policy support among adults in the United States.^{21,23} However, more recent surveys suggest the need to continue building support for these policies, particularly among menthol smokers.²¹ It was also encouraging to note that few respondents across both the focus groups and online surveys reported concern about increased police interaction, more use of physical force, more criminal penalties, or fines for businesses because of potential bans. The tobacco industry has a long record of strategic efforts to position the menthol ban as discriminatory and leading to increased police interactions.³⁶ While extensive evidence strongly contradicts these ideas,^{37–39} it will be important to continue to monitor public opinion related to policing and the bans to assess and counter industry tactics.

Although we found high awareness of tobacco-industry influence on young people, few respondents viewed tobacco as a social justice issue, regardless of race and ethnicity. These findings may reflect that tobacco-industry influence is not considered a high-priority social justice issue, given the backdrop of police brutality and health inequities stemming from the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic at the time of the study. These findings underscore an opportunity for strategies to increase public awareness about the underlying social, political, and economic factors that drive

tobacco-related disparities. The unprecedented events of 2020 and ongoing social movements for racial equity allow public health advocates to capitalize on the current public discourse to inform the public not only about the role of tobacco industry in addicting their communities but also actively working against policies intended to ameliorate disparities.^{18,19} As one focus group participant suggested, more social media engagement is needed to connect the dots between tobacco use, tobacco promotions, and social justice for young people.

Limitations

Given the project resources, we were able to recruit relatively large, nationally representative samples of youth and young adults (1227 youth and 2643 young adults), oversampling for black and Hispanic respondents, as well as for people who use tobacco; thus, our analyses focused on Hispanic, white, non-Hispanic, and black, non-Hispanic groups. Unfortunately, even with these efforts to ensure diverse representation among our respondents, there was insufficient power to conduct analyses on other racial and ethnic subgroups along with tests for subgroup differences beyond race and ethnicity. Additionally, focus group findings provide meaning and context to the qualitative findings, but are not intended to be generalizable to the larger population.

Our findings may also have been constrained by our approach in asking about tobacco as a social justice issue, without defining the term or providing context. While we tested the concept of social justice in our early focus group research, we did not provide more detailed operational definitions of the meaning of social justice in the context of our survey questions. Additionally, the second set of focus groups occurred up to 7 months after first focus groups, when issues of equity and social justice may have been experienced differently by participants. Further research is needed to better understand how youth and young adults conceptualize social justice across various issues, including tobacco, to inform advocacy and communication strategies.

Conclusions

Most youth and young adults see the tobacco industry as targeting them and many report exposure to tobacco product advertising that uses social or cultural identity in their messaging. Nonetheless, few youth and young adults perceived this targeting as a problem; rather, they considered it standard practice, against which there is no recourse. Furthermore, many compared tobacco use to other social justice and public health inequities, noting that tobacco use and the menthol ban were far less important to address, in comparison. This perception of a trade-off between broad social inequities and specific efforts to reduce tobacco-industry-induced inequities represents another potential opportunity for crafting communication campaign strategies. Most young people supported bans on menthol and flavored tobacco across all racial and ethnic groups but few respondents perceived tobacco as a social justice issue—one shaped by larger societal forces and driven in large part by the predatory marketing of the industry. Findings suggest an opportunity to raise awareness among young people of tobacco as a social justice issue to mobilize support for menthol and flavored tobacco bans among those most targeted by the industry.

Supplementary Material

A Contributorship Form detailing each author's specific involvement with this content, as well as any supplementary data, are available online at <https://academic.oup.com/ntr>.

Supplement Sponsorship

This article appears as part of the supplement “Achieving Equity in Policies Restricting Flavors in Nicotine/Commercial Tobacco Products by Addressing Racial and Social Justice,” sponsored by the University of California, Office of the President, Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program.

Funding

This work was supported by a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

Author Contributions

Barbara Schillo (Conceptualization [Equal], Formal analysis [Equal], Project administration [Equal], Supervision [Lead], Writing—original draft [Equal], Writing—review & editing [Equal]), Joanne D'Silva (Writing—original draft [Equal]), Christopher La Rose (Formal analysis [Equal], Investigation [Equal], Writing—original draft [Equal], Writing—review & editing [Equal]), Yoonsang Kim (Formal analysis [Equal], Writing—original draft [Equal], Writing—review & editing [Equal]), and Sherry Emery (Conceptualization [Lead], Data curation [Lead], Formal analysis [Lead], Investigation [Lead], Methodology [Lead], Writing—original draft [Equal], Writing—review & editing [Equal]).

Data Availability

The data and analytic code underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

References

1. Social Justice and Health. American Public Health Association. Accessed January 17, 2023. <https://www.apha.org/what-is-public-health/generation-public-health/our-work/social-justice>
2. Heaton C, Nelson K. Reversal of misfortune: viewing tobacco as a social justice issue. *Am J Public Health*. 2004;94(2):186–191.
3. Lew R, Tanjasiri SP. Slowing the epidemic of tobacco use among Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. *Am J Public Health*. 2003;93(5):764–768.
4. Gardiner PS. The African Americanization of menthol cigarette use in the United States. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2004;6(suppl_1):S55–S65.
5. Smith EA, Thomson K, Offen N, Malone RE. “If You Know You Exist, It’s Just Marketing Poison”: meanings of tobacco industry targeting in the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community. *Am J Public Health*. 2008;98(6):996–1003.
6. Hendlin YH, Small S, Ling PM. “No-Barriers” tobacco product? Selling smokeless tobacco to women, people of colour and the LGBTQ+ community in the USA. *Tob Control*. 2021;32(3):330–337.
7. Cummings KM, Morley CP, Horan JK, Steger C, Leavell NR. Marketing to America’s youth: evidence from corporate documents. *Tob Control*. 2002;11(suppl 1):ii5–i17.
8. Mendez D, Le TTT. Consequences of a match made in hell: the harm caused by menthol smoking to the African American population over 1980–2018. *Tob Control*. 2022;31(4):569–571.

9. Carpenter CM, Wayne GF, Pauly JL, Koh HK, Connolly GN. New cigarette brands with flavors that appeal to youth: tobacco marketing strategies. *Health Aff Proj Hope*. 2005;24(6):1601–1610.
10. Carpenter CM, Wayne GF, Connolly GN. The role of sensory perception in the development and targeting of tobacco products. *Addiction*. 2007;102(1):136–147.
11. Villanti AC, Johnson AL, Ambrose BK, et al. Flavored tobacco product use in youth and adults: findings from the first wave of the PATH Study (2013–2014). *Am J Prev Med*. 2017;53(2):139–151.
12. Delnevo CD, Giovenco DP, Villanti AC. Assessment of menthol and nonmenthol cigarette consumption in the US, 2000 to 2018. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(8):e2013601.
13. Tobacco Product Standard for Menthol in Cigarettes. Federal Register. 2022. Accessed January 17, 2023. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/05/04/2022-08994/tobacco-product-standard-for-menthol-in-cigarettes?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery
14. Tobacco Product Standard for Characterizing Flavors in Cigars. Federal Register. 2022. Accessed January 17, 2023. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/05/04/2022-08993/tobacco-product-standard-for-characterizing-flavors-in-cigars?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery
15. Levy DT, Meza R, Yuan Z, et al. Public health impact of a US ban on menthol in cigarettes and cigars: a simulation study. *Tob Control*. 2021;32(e1):e37–e44.
16. Truth Initiative. Flavored tobacco policy resource center. Accessed September 27, 2022. <https://truthinitiative.org/flavored-tobacco-policy-resource-center>
17. Flavoured and Menthol Tobacco. TobaccoTactics. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://tobaccotactics.org/wiki/flavoured-and-menthol-tobacco/>
18. Bosma LM, D’Silva J, Moze J, Matter C, Kingsbury JH, Brock B. Restricting sales of menthol tobacco products: lessons learned from policy passage and implementation in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth, Minnesota. *Health Equity*. 2021;5(1):439–447.
19. Mills SD, McGruder CO, Yerger VB. The African American Tobacco control leadership council: advocating for a menthol cigarette ban in San Francisco, California. *Tob Control*. 2021;30(e2):e150–e153.
20. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA proposes rules prohibiting menthol cigarettes and flavored cigars to prevent youth initiation, significantly reduce tobacco-related disease and death. 2022. Accessed January 17, 2023. <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-proposes-rules-prohibiting-menthol-cigarettes-and-flavored-cigars-prevent-youth-initiation>
21. Czaplicki L, Schillo B, Rose SW, Zhou Y, Vallone D. National support for a menthol cigarette sales ban. *Public Health Rep Wash DC* 1974. 2021;136(2):183–191.
22. Denlinger-Apte RL, Lockhart DE, Strahley AE, et al. “I think it’s a good idea for the people that’s young, the kids, but for someone like me it’s a bad idea.” – Interviews about a U.S. menthol cigarette ban with people who smoke menthol cigarettes. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2022;232:109293.
23. Rath JM, Greenberg M, Pitzer L, et al. The association between menthol perceptions and support for a policy ban among US smokers. *Ethn Dis*. 2018;28(3):177–186.
24. Panel Design. AmeriSpeak. Accessed January 17, 2023. <https://amerispeak.norc.org/us/en/amerispeak/about-amerispeak/panel-design.html>
25. Coppock A, McClellan OA. Validating the demographic, political, psychological, and experimental results obtained from a new source of online survey respondents. *Res Polit*. 2019;6(1):205316801882217.
26. Ganesh N, Pineau V, Chakraborty A, Dennis JM. Combining probability and non-probability samples using small area estimation. 2017. Accessed January 17, 2023. <http://www.asasrms.org/Proceedings/y2017/files/593906.pdf>
27. Yang M, Ganesh N, Mulrow E, Pineau V. Estimation methods for nonprobability samples with a companion probability sample. 2018. Accessed January 17, 2023. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/with-Yang-Ganesh/6a6d47f1237d83e2b714739a7d2aa3de06c9bf28>
28. Standard Definitions - AAPOR. *American association for public opinion research*. Accessed January 17, 2023. <https://aapor.org/standards-and-ethics/standard-definitions/>
29. The American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2023 Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. 10th edition. AAPOR. <https://aapor.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Standards-Definitions-10th-edition.pdf>
30. Lee JGL, Henriksen L, Rose SW, Moreland-Russell S, Ribisl KM. A systematic review of neighborhood disparities in point-of-sale tobacco marketing. *Am J Public Health*. 2015;105(9):e8–18.
31. Where There’s Smoke | Big Tobacco want to create the next generation of tobacco users. Where There’s Smoke. Accessed January 17, 2023. <https://www.takeapart.org/wherethersmoke/>
32. O’Brien EK, Hoffman L, Navarro MA, Ganz O. Social media use by leading US e-cigarette, cigarette, smokeless tobacco, cigar and hookah brands. *Tob Control*. 2020;29(e1):e87e97.
33. Alpert JM, Jaisle A, Chen H. A content analysis of the promotional strategies employed by e-cigarette brands on Twitter. *Health Mark Q*. 2019;36(4):307–321.
34. Lee J, Suttiratana SC, Sen I, Kong G. E-Cigarette marketing on social media: a scoping review. *Curr Addict Rep*. 2023;10(1):29–37.
35. Silver NA, Bertrand A, Kucherlapaty P, Schillo BA. Examining influencer compliance with advertising regulations in branded vaping content on Instagram. *Front Public Health*. 2023;10:1001115. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2022.1001115>. Accessed May 15, 2023.
36. Baumgaertner E, Stockton B, Lindsay R. How big tobacco used george floyd and eric garner to stoke fear among black smokers. *Los Angeles Times*. 2022. Accessed January 17, 2023. <https://www.latimes.com/world-nation/story/2022-04-25/inside-big-tobaccos-strategy-to-stoke-fear-among-black-smokers-facing-menthol-bans>
37. National Research Council. *Understanding the U.S. Illicit Tobacco Market: Characteristics, Policy Context, and Lessons from International Experiences*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2015.
38. Le TT, Mendez D. An estimation of the harm of menthol cigarettes in the United States from 1980 to 2018. *Tob Control*. 2022;31(4):564–568.
39. Delnevo CD, Ganz O, Goodwin RD. Banning menthol cigarettes: a social justice issue long overdue. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2020;22(10):1673–1675.