



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

This is [not] who I am : understanding identity in continued smoking and smoking cessation

Meijer, E.

Citation

Meijer, E. (2017, November 14). *This is [not] who I am : understanding identity in continued smoking and smoking cessation*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/57383>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/57383>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/57383> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Meijer, Eline

Title: This is [not] who I am : understanding identity in continued smoking and smoking cessation

Date: 2017-11-14

CHAPTER

6

A LONGITUDINAL STUDY INTO THE RECIPROCAL EFFECTS OF IDENTITIES AND SMOKING BEHAVIOR: FINDINGS FROM THE ITC NETHERLANDS SURVEY

Eline Meijer, Bas van den Putte, Winifred A. Gebhardt,
Colette van Laar, Zsuzsa Bakk, Arie Dijkstra, Geoffrey T. Fong,
Robert West, and Marc C. Willemsen

ABSTRACT

Identity is important for smoking behavior and cessation. In this longitudinal study we examined the reciprocal relations between identity constructs (i.e., smoker self-identity, quitter self-identity and smoker group-identity), intention to quit and smoking behavior among a large sample of smokers and ex-smokers, using cross-lagged structural equation modeling. Moreover, we tested whether these relations differed between socio-economic status (SES) groups. Results showed that intention to quit and smoking behavior consistently predicted identity change. Quitter self-identity was more important than smoker self- and group-identity in predicting (changes in) smoking behavior and intention to quit. Relationships did not differ between SES-groups. The findings were replicated using a cross validation sample. The results provide important insights into the relationships between identity and smoking cessation. Behavior appears more important for identity change than identity for behavior change. Strengthening identification with quitting is more crucial for quit success than decreasing smoker identities.

Keywords. identity; socio-economic status; smoking cessation; intention to quit; smokers; ex-smokers.

People are motivated to behave in line with their identity. PRIME theory (PRIME stands for plans, responses, impulses, motivation and evaluation) states that identity affects behaviour more strongly than other representations such as specific outcome expectations (West, 2006). Identity can be based on behaviours, such that particular behaviours are important for the way that people perceive themselves (i.e., self-identity). A deeply entrenched identity provides a basis for behavioural stability. In addition to identification with behaviours, the social identity approach states that people may derive an important part of who they are from their memberships in groups or social categories (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), that is, their social identity (or group-identity). People are likely to behave according to the group's social norms when their group identification is strong (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986). People not only hold perceptions of the self in the present, but in addition have views on who they may become in the future (Barreto & Frazier, 2012).

Research on smoking and identity typically examines "self-identity" and "group-identity". Self-identity in relation to smoking refers to the importance of behaviours such as smoking and quitting for how an individual perceives himself (e.g., 'Smoking is important for who I am'). Whereas group-identity is very similar to the construct of social identity, self-identity can be seen as a part of personal identity as defined in the social identity approach (i.e., an individuals' perception of the self as a unique person that is different from others). Self- and group-identities are important for smoking behaviour, but it is unclear whether identities affect smoking behaviour, or vice versa, or that identity and smoking behaviour are reciprocally related.

Most studies on smoking and identity focused on identity as a precursor of behaviour. This work has clearly shown that identity is important for quit intentions (an important predictor of quitting; Smit, Hoving, Schelleman-Offermans, West, & De Vries, 2014; Vangeli, Stapleton, Smit, Borland, & West, 2011) and smoking and quitting behaviour, even when controlling for important factors such as nicotine dependence (Hertel & Mermelstein, 2012; Høie, Moan, Rise, 2010; Meijer, Gebhardt, Dijkstra, Willemsen, & Van Laar, 2015; Meijer, Gebhardt, Van Laar, Kawous, & Beijl, 2016; Moan & Rise, 2005, 2006; Tombor, Shahab, Brown, & West, 2013; Van den Putte, Yzer, Willemsen, & De Bruijn, 2009). Smokers who identify more with smoking as a behaviour or with the group of smokers have weaker quit intentions, are less likely to quit, and may even increase their smoking. Conversely, those who identify more with quitting, non-smoking, or non-smokers have stronger quit intentions and are also more likely to attempt to quit. Importantly, these studies typically focus on smokers, not ex-smokers. In line with the above findings, the Social Identity Model of Cessation Maintenance (Frings & Albery, 2015) and the Social Identity Model of Recovery (Best et al., 2015) propose that stronger (social) identification as 'recovering addict' facilitates recovery from addiction. In sum, previous work suggests that identity affects smoking behaviour (West, 2006).

However, other studies suggest a reversed causal order: people base their self-conceptualizations on behaviours that they frequently engage in, such that the behaviour is perceived to show who they are (Bem, 1972). With regard to smoking, two studies indeed suggest that smoking behaviour affects smoking-related identities. Specifically, after participating in a smoking cessation program, successful ex-smokers came to perceive themselves more as non-smokers and less as smokers (Shadel, Mermelstein, & Borrelli, 1996). Moreover, increases in smoking behaviour are associated with subsequent increases in smoker self-identity among adolescent smokers (Hertel & Mermelstein, 2016).

Finally, retrospective qualitative studies showed that smoking became increasingly less important to the way ex-smokers perceived themselves as they learned to live without smoking (Brown, 1996; Luck & Beagan, 2015; Vangeli & West, 2012), suggesting that identity change and smoking behaviour change go hand in hand (identity shift theory; Kearney & O'Sullivan, 2003). Similarly, identity theory states that people act in line with their identity, but at the same time identity may change to match behaviour (Stets & Burke, 2003). Moreover, the social identity model of recovery (Best et al., 2015) acknowledges that successful behaviour change may reinforce recovery identities.

Evidence suggests that identity dynamics differ with socio-economic status (SES). Another large scale longitudinal study based on the ITC Netherlands Survey showed that lower-SES smokers (vs. middle and higher-SES) and lower-SES ex-smokers (vs. middle-SES) identify more with smoking (Meijer et al., 2017). In addition, higher-SES smokers and ex-smokers move away from smoking and toward quitting more quickly than their lower-SES counterparts. Correspondingly, other work showed that lower-SES smokers have more difficulty picturing themselves as non-smokers than higher-SES smokers, whereas the relation between non-smoker self-identity and quit intention was stronger among lower-SES than higher-SES smokers (Meijer et al., 2015). This suggests that non-smoker self-identities may be particularly key for smoking cessation among lower-SES smokers, although SES did not moderate relations between identity and quit intention in another study (Meijer et al., 2016). In sum, previous work showed that identity is important for smoking behaviour and vice versa, and that other variables such as SES may possibly influence this relationship. However, it is as yet unclear *how* identity changes and behaviour changes over time are associated. In addition, as studies on identity and quit intention are often cross-sectional, it is unknown whether identity precedes behavioural intention or the other way around.

The current longitudinal study examined and compared relations between identity constructs (i.e., smoker self-identity, quitter self-identity and smoker group-identity), quit intention and smoking behaviour among a large sample of smokers and ex-smokers. Cross-lagged structural equation modelling was applied to investigate and compare these relations and cross validation was used to assess generalizability of results. The following research questions were addressed (RQs):

1. Do smoker self-identity, quitter self-identity and smoker group-identity predict changes in smoking behaviour over time (RQ1)?
2. Does smoking behaviour predict changes in smoker self-identity, quitter self-identity and smoker group-identity over time (RQ2)?
3. Do quitter self-identity, smoker self-identity and smoker group-identity predict changes in quit intention over time (RQ3)?
4. Does quit intention predict changes in quitter self-identity, smoker self-identity and smoker group-identity over time (RQ4)?
5. Do identity constructs and quit intention uniquely predict smoking behaviour one year later (RQ5), and are relations between identity (intention) and smoking behaviour mediated by intention (identity; RQ6)?
6. Do associations over time between identity, quit intention, and behaviour differ between lower, middle and higher-SES groups (RQ7)?

METHOD

Participants

This study is part of the International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Project (www.itcproject.org) (Fong et al., 2006). Data used for the current study were collected annually in the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Netherlands Survey from 2009 to 2014 (from now waves 1-6, respectively). Participants were aged 16 or older, and were smokers or ex-smokers at enrollment. Participants who smoked at least monthly and had smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their lifetime were considered as smokers, and those who had smoked monthly and had smoked at least 100 cigarettes but were now abstinent were considered as ex-smokers. Participants could participate in subsequent waves regardless of smoking status. Participants who dropped out of the study were replaced, from the same sampling frame, in order to maintain sample size. Surveys were administered online or by telephone by a research firm. The ITC Netherlands Surveys were cleared for ethics by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Waterloo. The sample is representative of the Dutch smokers population (Nagelhout et al., 2010, 2016).

Initial analyses

For the initial analyses, data from 2012 and 2014 (waves 4-6) were used. Given changes in antismoking regulation in the Netherlands over time, these data were considered more relevant than less recent data. The initial findings were cross validated using data from waves 1-3. Wave 4 had 2,022 participants (1,604 smokers), wave 5 had 1,970 participants (1,531 smokers) and wave 6 had 2,008 participants (1,569 smokers). For the analyses the 1,389 participants who participated in all three waves were used (69% of wave 4

participants). Responders (i.e., wave 4 participants who also completed waves 5 and 6) and drop-outs (i.e., those who did not complete waves 5 and 6) did not differ significantly on SES, smoking status, identity constructs, quit intention, cigarettes per day and quit success at wave 4. Responders were more likely to be female and were older than drop-outs (see Appendix A). Participants were included in the analyses if they had full data for all variables in the respective model (see Statistical Analyses; see Appendix B for participant characteristics).

Cross validation.

The models were cross validated using data from 2009 to 2011 (waves 1-3), with 2,012 participants at wave 1 (1,763 smokers), 2,060 participants at wave 2 (1,723 smokers), and 2,101 participants at wave 3 (1,672 smokers). Of the 2,012 participants at wave 1, 1,104 (55%) also participated in waves 2 and 3. Responders and drop-outs did not differ significantly on smoking status (smoker/ex-smoker), age, identity constructs, quit intention and quit success at wave 1. Responders were more likely to be female, to have lower SES, and to smoke more cigarettes per day than drop-outs (see Appendix C). Of the participants who were included in the initial samples for Model 1 and 2, 400 (39%) and 255 (33%), respectively, were also included in the cross-validation samples for these models.

Measures

Identity constructs and quit success were measured among smokers and ex-smokers, and quit intention was measured among smokers only.

Identity (waves 4-6).

Variables were recoded such that higher scores indicated stronger identity. Scales were made for each identity construct and wave by averaging scores on the individual items.

Smoker self-identity.

Smoker self-identity was measured with two items for smokers and ex-smokers: 'To [continue smoking/start smoking again] would fit with who you are' and 'To [continue smoking/start smoking again] would fit with how you want to live', with answers ranging from [1] 'strongly agree' to [5] 'strongly disagree' ($r = .82, .85$ and $.85$ at waves 4, 5 and 6, respectively). Smoker self-identity was missing for 89, 86 and 87 participants at waves 4, 5 and 6, respectively.

Quitter self-identity.

Similarly, quitter self-identity was measured with two items for smokers and ex-smokers, e.g. 'To [quit smoking/stay quit] within the next six months would fit with who you are',

with answers ranging from [1] 'strongly agree' to [5] 'strongly disagree' ($r = .83, .84,$ and $.83$ at waves 4, 5 and 6, respectively). Quitter self-identity was missing for 114, 134 and 138 participants at waves 4, 5 and 6, respectively.

Smoker group-identity.

Smoker group-identity was measured with two items, i.e. for smokers: 'You feel connected to other (omitted for ex-smokers) smokers' and 'You feel at home in the company of other (omitted for ex-smokers) smokers', with answers ranging from [1] 'strongly agree' to [5] 'strongly disagree' ($r = .62, .63,$ and $.64$ at waves 4, 5 and 6, respectively). Smoker group-identity was missing for 61, 58 and 62 participants at waves 4, 5 and 6, respectively.

Quit success (waves 4-6).

Smoking behaviour was measured as quit success. Participants were asked whether they had attempted to quit in the last year, and if so, whether they were smoking again. Participants who had not attempted to quit or had relapsed were asked whether they smoked daily, at least weekly, or at least monthly. Participants who were abstinent were asked when their current quit attempt had started. This information was used to calculate the quit success variable, with [1] 'daily smoker', [2] 'weekly smoker', [3] 'monthly smoker', [4] 'quit in the last month', [5] 'quit one to six months ago', [6] 'quit more than six months ago', and [7] 'abstinent since last survey'. Quit success had no missing values. Results for Model 1 and Model 2 (see Statistical analyses) were very similar when quit success was recoded into [1] daily smoker, [2] weekly/monthly smoker, and [3] quit in the last months/one to six months ago/more than six months ago, or abstinent since last survey. Quit success was not analyzed separately as smoking frequency (smokers) and abstinence duration (ex-smokers), because this precludes analysis of transitions from smoking to abstinence.

Quit intention (waves 4 and 5).

Quit intention was measured with one item, i.e., 'Are you planning to quit smoking within the next 6 months?' Answer categories ranged from [1] 'very likely' to [5] 'very unlikely'. This variable was recoded, such that higher scores indicated stronger quit intention. Quit intention had 23 and 18 missing values at waves 4 and 5, respectively, among participants who smoked at both waves.

SES (wave 4).

Highest attained educational level was used to measure SES (Schaap & Kunst, 2009). Answer categories ranged from [1] 'no degree' to [7] 'university master', and [8] 'do not know/do not want to say' (recoded as missing). In accordance with other ITC papers,

SES was converted into lower (no degree, lower pre-vocational secondary education), middle (middle pre-vocational education, secondary education second stage) and higher SES (senior general secondary education and pre-university education, higher professional education and university bachelor, university master). SES was missing for 15 participants at wave 4.

Statistical Analyses

Analyses were performed in R statistical software (R Core Team, 2014), using the sem function of the lavaan package version 0.5-20 (Rosseel, 2012). As some variables were not normally distributed, robust maximum likelihood estimation (MLR) was used. In addition, fixed.x was set to false to incorporate covariances between exogenous variables. For the remainder, the default settings of the lavaan sem function were used.

Two separate models were fitted, using data from waves 4-6. First, cross-lagged relations between identity constructs and quit success were examined in Model 1 (see Figure 1 for the final model; RQ1 and RQ2). Identity constructs and quit success were measured at waves 4, 5 and 6. In addition, cross-lagged relations between identity constructs and quit intention were examined in Model 2, which is shown as the cross-lagged part in Figure 2 (final model; RQ3 and RQ4). Moreover, in the prediction part of Model 2, identity constructs and quit intention were used to predict quit success (RQ5) and the significance of indirect paths was tested (i.e., mediation; RQ6). Mediation was not tested in Model 1 because there was no outcome variable. For Model 2 identity constructs and quit intention from waves 4 and 5 were used, and quit success from wave 6. Quit intention was measured among smokers only, such that only participants who smoked at waves 4 and 5 were included in this model. Participants could be smokers or ex-smokers at wave 6.

Both models (i.e., Model 1 and 2) were estimated in several steps (Martens & Haase, 2006) in order to find the best fitting model. First, baseline models were fitted with autoregressions and covariances (between variables assessed at the same wave only; Model A), autoregressions and covariances plus cross-lagged paths from identity to quit success/intention (Model B), autoregressions and covariances plus cross-lagged paths from quit success/intention to identity (Model C), and with autoregressions and covariances plus reciprocal cross-lagged paths from quit success/intention to identity, and vice versa (Model D). The inclusion of autoregressive effects allowed for prediction of *change* in one construct by another construct. To examine whether model fit differed significantly between the models χ^2 -difference tests were used. AIC values were used to compare the models, with lower AIC values indicating better fit. Moreover, the significance of model parameters and χ^2 , CFI, RMSEA, SRMR, and AIC were examined to assess model fit. Chi-square, CFI and RMSEA values were robust values (SRMR and AIC are not corrected when robust estimation is used). Non-significant model χ^2 -values indicate that




Figure 1. Graphic representation of final Model 1 (quit success and identity) with standardized coefficients ($N = 1036$). All paths are significant at $p < .05$. For ease of presentation, covariances at waves 5 and 6 are not shown.

the model does not deviate significantly from the data, although χ^2 -values are often significant in large samples. In addition, according to Hu and Bentler (1999), CFI values $\geq .95$, SRMR values $\leq .08$, and RMSEA values $\leq .06$ indicate good fit.

Second, the best fitting model (i.e., Model A, B, C or D) was selected and non-significant regression paths and covariances were removed to make the model more parsimonious,




Figure 2. Graphic representation of final Model 2 (quit intention, identity and smoking behavior) with standardized coefficients ($N = 768$). All paths are significant at $p < .05$. For ease of presentation, covariances at wave 5 are not shown.

using a p -value of .20 as the cut-off value (Burkholder & Harlow, 2003). Third, to further increase parsimony, in Model 1 it was tested whether autoregressive and cross-lagged parameters could be restricted to be equal across waves (Meyers, Van Woerkom, De Reuver, Bakk, & Oberski, 2015). This was not applicable for Model 2 because autoregressive and cross-lagged paths were estimated between two waves. As before, χ^2 -difference tests were used to examine whether restrictions could be applied without decreasing model fit. Models were fitted using unstandardized data. The figures show standardized regression coefficients, which may differ slightly despite being restricted to be equal across waves (see Appendices D and E for non-standardized regression coefficients). Finally, if model fit was still unsatisfactory, additional regression paths were included based on modification indices, until adequate model fit was obtained. Only predictions of variables by variables that were measured at an earlier wave were included (e.g., wave 6 predicted by wave 5). Importantly, adding parameters based on modification indices may decrease generalizability beyond the specific sample (e.g., Burkholder & Harlow, 2003). Generalizability was therefore estimated by cross validating both final models (i.e., Model 1 and 2), using data from waves 1-3.

To test RQ7, multiple-group analyses were performed on Models 1 and 2 to examine whether relations between identity, quit intention and quit success differed with SES. First, a model without any equality restrictions on model parameters between groups (i.e. configural invariance) was fitted, and regression coefficients were subsequently restricted to be equal between SES-groups. AIC values and χ^2 -difference tests were used to compare the models. Non-significant χ^2 -difference tests indicated that regression coefficients did not differ significantly between the groups.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Correlations between the variables that were used in the models were examined first (see Appendix F; see Table 1 for means and standard deviations). Almost all correlations were significant and in the expected direction. Smoker self- and group-identity correlated positively, and both smoker identity constructs correlated negatively with quitter self-identity. Furthermore, quit success -where higher scores indicate longer abstinence- correlated negatively with smoker identities and positively with quitter self-identity. Stronger quit intention was related to weaker smoker self- and group-identities, stronger quitter self-identities and more successful quitting.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of variables used in Model 1 and 2.

	<i>M (SD)</i>					
	Model 1 (N = 1036)			Model 2 (N = 768)		
	<i>Wave 4</i>	<i>Wave 5</i>	<i>Wave 6</i>	<i>Wave 4</i>	<i>Wave 5</i>	<i>Wave 6</i>
Smoker self-identity	2.74 (1.08)	2.68 (1.10)	2.63 (1.15)	3.10 (.91)	3.09 (.93)	
Quitter self-identity	3.17 (1.13)	3.23 (1.15)	3.27 (1.20)	2.79 (.95)	2.80 (.96)	
Smoker group-identity	3.33 (.81)	3.33 (.83)	3.31 (.90)	3.46 (.77)	3.47 (.78)	
Quit success	1.99 (1.72)	2.20 (1.88)	2.86 (2.60)			1.55 (1.45)
Intention to quit				2.55 (1.11)	2.60 (1.15)	

Model 1 (RQ1, RQ2 and RQ7)

Model selection and specification.

Model C (i.e., only cross-lagged paths predicting identity from quit success) was selected as the best fitting model. Specifically, Model B (i.e., only cross-lagged paths predicting quit success from identity), Model C (i.e., only cross-lagged paths predicting identity from behaviour) and Model D (i.e., cross-lagged paths predicting identity from behaviour and vice versa) all had significantly better fit than model A (i.e., only autoregressions and covariances; see Table 2A). Model fit did not differ significantly between Models C and D ($p = .08$). Model C was selected as the best model because it was more parsimonious than Model D, and contained no non-significant regression coefficients. Next, the non-significant covariance between quitter self-identity and smoker group-identity at wave 5 was removed ($-.02, p = .33$). Further analyses showed that the autoregressive paths for smoker group-identity and the cross-lagged paths predicting smoker group-identity from quit success could be set equal across waves. That is, the strength of the relationships between these variables between waves 4 and 5 did not differ significantly from the strength of the associations between waves 5 and 6. Finally, regression paths were added based on modification indices to improve model fit.

Final model.

The final model had adequate fit and is shown in Figure 1 (see Table 2A for fit indices, and Appendix D for model parameters). Model χ^2 was significant, but this is common in large samples ($\chi^2(30) = 153.46, p < .001$). Average identity and quit success were relatively stable over time, as indicated by relatively strong autoregressive effects. In addition, the stability of smoker group-identity was equal across waves. Furthermore, quit success predicted identity, such that those who were lower at quit success (at wave 4 or 5) had increased smoker self-identities, decreased quitter self-identities and increased smoker group-identities one year later (at wave 5 or 6, respectively). Furthermore, stronger quitter self-identity at wave 5 predicted quit success at wave 6, but other

identity constructs did not predict quit success. Finally, quitter self-identity and smoker self-identity predicted each other. Specifically, stronger smoker self-identity (at wave 4) predicted decreased quitter self-identity one year later (at wave 5), and stronger quitter self-identity (at wave 5) predicted decreased smoker self-identity one year later (at wave 6).

Multiple-group analyses.

Multiple-group analyses showed that regression coefficients did not differ significantly between lower, middle and higher-SES groups (RQ7). Specifically, the χ^2 -difference test was non-significant when the baseline multiple-group model without between-group equality restrictions was compared with the multiple-group model with regression coefficients set equal between SES-groups ($\chi^2(38) = 44.98, p = .20$).

Cross validation.

The final model was cross validated using data from 828 participants from waves 1-3. The cross validated model had satisfactory fit according to the CFI (.948) and SRMR (.073), but the RMSEA was slightly higher than considered acceptable (.083). Model χ^2 was significant, but this is common in large samples ($\chi^2(30) = 199.82, p < .001$). All paths of the final model, including the paths that were added based on the modification indices, were significant in the cross validated model.

Model 2 (RQ3-RQ7)

Model selection and specification.

Results for Model 2 showed that Model D (i.e., reciprocal cross-lagged paths from identity to quit intention) fitted the data significantly better than Model A, B and C (see Table 2B). Two non-significant cross-lagged regression paths (p -values $> .20$) were removed to make the model more parsimonious: quit intention (w5) regressed on smoker group-identity (w4; $\beta = .00, p = .99$), and quit intention (w5) regressed on smoker self-identity (w4; $\beta = -.05, p = .24$). In addition, three non-significant regression paths were removed from the prediction part, predicting quit success (w6) from quit intention (w5; $\beta = .03, p = .51$), smoker self-identity (w5; $\beta = .02, p = .74$) and smoker group-identity (w5; $\beta = -.01, p = .86$). Finally, the covariances between quitter self-identity (w5) and smoker group-identity (w5; $.01, p = .78$), and between quit intention (w5) and smoker group-identity (w5; $-.02, p = .36$) were removed. One regression path, predicting quitter self-identity (w5) from smoker self-identity (w4), was added to improve model fit.

Final model.

The final model had adequate fit (see Table 2B and Figure 2; see Appendix E for model parameters). Model χ^2 was again significant, but this is common in large samples ($\chi^2(15)$

Table 2A. Model 1: Fit of models for quit success and identity (*N* = 1036).

Model	Description	Fit Measures						χ ² -difference tests	
		df	χ ²	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	AIC	Model comparison	χ ² statistic
1A	Autoregressions and covariances	40	803.08	.845	.136	.194	33017.42		
1B	Cross-lagged paths: identity to behavior	34	757.72	.853	.143	.178	32998.68	1B vs. 1A	χ ² (6) = 30.63, <i>p</i> < .001
1C	Cross-lagged paths: behavior to identity	34	574.75	.890	.124	.117	32767.92	1C vs. 1A	χ ² (6) = 234.90, <i>p</i> < .001
1D	Bidirectional cross-lagged paths	28	547.57	.894	.134	.108	32768.48	1D vs. 1A	χ ² (12) = 257.71, <i>p</i> < .001
								1D vs. 1C	χ ² (6) = 11.39, <i>p</i> = .08
Final	Trimmed model 1C + additional paths	30	153.46	.975	.063	.060	32273.27	Final vs. 1C	χ ² (4) = 351.44, <i>p</i> < .001

Table 2B. Model 2: Fit of models for intention to quit, identity and smoking behavior (*N* = 768).

Model	Description	Fit Measures						χ ² -difference tests	
		df	χ ²	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	AIC	Model comparison	χ ² statistic
1A	Autoregressions and covariances	16	156.35	.906	.107	.093	16663.79		
1B	Cross-lagged paths: identity to behavior	13	116.83	.930	.102	.068	16626.56	1B vs. 1A	χ ² (3) = 41.47, <i>p</i> < .001
1C	Cross-lagged paths: behavior to identity	13	90.56	.948	.088	.051	16586.81	1C vs. 1A	χ ² (3) = 60.00, <i>p</i> < .001
1D	Bidirectional cross-lagged paths	10	71.49	.959	.089	.040	16573.42	1D vs. 1A	χ ² (6) = 84.74, <i>p</i> < .001
								1D vs. 1B	χ ² (3) = 43.05, <i>p</i> < .001
								1D vs. 1C	χ ² (3) = 18.77, <i>p</i> < .001
Final	Trimmed model 1D + additional path	15	50.72	.976	.056	.031	16534.87	Final vs. 1D	χ ² (5) = 28.83, <i>p</i> < .001

= 50.72, $p < .001$). Results showed that identity constructs and quit intention were relatively stable between wave 4 and 5. Stronger quitter self-identity at wave 4 predicted increased quit intention at wave 5, and stronger quit intention at wave 4 predicted increased quitter self-identity, and decreased smoker self- and group-identity at wave 5. Stronger smoker self-identity at wave 4 predicted weaker quitter self-identity at wave 5. Furthermore, stronger quitter self-identity at wave 5 predicted quit success at wave 6. Analysis of indirect effects showed that stronger quit intention (w4) predicted more quit success (w6) through stronger quitter self-identity (w5), $\beta = .03$, $p < .01$. Moreover, quitter self-identity (w4) predicted quit success (w6) through quitter self-identity (w5), $\beta = .05$, $p < .01$. Finally, smoker self-identity (w4) predicted quit success (w6) through quitter self-identity, such that weaker smoker self-identity at wave 4 was associated with stronger quitter self-identity at wave 5, which in turn predicted quit success at wave 6, $\beta = -.02$, $p < .01$.

Multiple-group analyses.

Multiple-group analyses examined whether regression coefficients differed with SES (RQ7). The non-significant χ^2 difference test showed that the model without between-group restrictions did not differ significantly from the model with regression coefficients restricted to be equal ($\chi^2(20) = 24.053$, $p = .24$). This shows that regression coefficients did not differ significantly between SES-groups.

Cross validation.

The final model was cross validated using data from 681 participants from waves 1-3. The model deviated from the data, but this is common in large samples ($\chi^2(15) = 71.83$, $p < .001$). CFI (.961) and SRMR (.038) values indicated good fit, but the RMSEA value was slightly higher than considered acceptable (.075). Almost all significant regression coefficients remained significant in the cross validated model, except for smoker group-identity (w2) regressed on quit intention (w1). All indirect effects were significant.

DISCUSSION

This large-scale longitudinal study examined relations between identity, quit intention and quit success among smokers and ex-smokers, and tested whether these relations differ with socio-economic status (SES). Cross-lagged structural equation modelling was used as an advanced statistical technique, and cross validation was used to assess generalizability of the findings. Importantly, results held up very well in the cross validation sample, thereby replicating the findings and confirming generalizability beyond the sample.

The results provide new insights in the direction of relations between identity, quit intention and quit success, and show that quit success and intention consistently predict identity change. Specifically, quit success predicts changes in identity one year later, such that quit success is associated with decreased smoker self- and group-identity and increased quitter self-identity (Model 1). Moreover, stronger quit intention is associated with increased quitter self-identity and decreased smoker self-identity one year later (Model 2). These findings were replicated using the cross validation data. Stronger quit intention is also associated with decreased smoker group-identity one year later in the initial sample (Model 2), but not in the cross validation sample. In addition, quitter self-identity seems to be more important for quit intention and smoking behaviour than smoker identities. Specifically, cross-lagged paths show that stronger quitter self-identity predicts more quit success (Model 1) and increased quit intention (Model 2) beyond autoregressive effects (e.g., the effect of quit success at T-1 on quit success at T), while smoker identities do not. Furthermore, stronger quitter self-identity directly predicts quit success one year later, but smoker identities (and quit intention) do not (Model 2).

Results thus suggest that behaviour and identity are reciprocally related (Kearney & O'Sullivan, 2003; Stets & Burke 2003). Quit intention and quit success predict changes in all three identity constructs (i.e., quitter self-identity and smoker self- and group-identity), and quitter self-identity predicts changes in quit intention and quit success. This possibly suggests that behaviour is more important for changes in identity than the other way around. Correspondingly, previous work by Hertel and Mermelstein (2016) and Shadel and colleagues (1996) showed that behaviour is related to subsequent smoking identities. If this finding will be replicated in future work on smoking and (health) behaviour more broadly, this has theoretical implications. That is, the impact of behaviour on identity may then be explicitly incorporated in theories about identity that focus on the importance of identity for behaviour, such as the social identity approach (Turner et al., 1987) and PRIME Theory (West, 2006). However, the simultaneous inclusion of the three identity constructs in the current analyses might have decreased the ability of each individual identity construct to predict intention and behaviour, whereas this was not the case for reversed relationships (i.e., intention/behaviour as predictor of each identity construct).

Importantly, results suggest that quitter self-identity is more relevant for quitting than smoker identities. This is in line with previous work among smokers suggesting that identification the 'possible self' (see Markus & Nurius, 1986) as a quitter or non-smoker is more important for quitting than the 'current self' as a smoker (Meijer et al., 2015, 2016). However, it appears to contradict other previous work among smokers that showed that smoker identity is related to intention and subsequent behaviour (e.g., Hertel & Mermelstein, 2012; Høie et al., 2010; Moan & Rise, 2005, 2006; Tombor et al., 2013; Van

den Putte et al., 2009). An explanation is that most previous studies showing effects of smoker identity did not take quitter identity into account, such that smoker identity might not have been predictive if quitter identity had been controlled for. One study that included both smoker and quitter self-identity showed that smoker self-identity predicted quit attempts, whereas quitter self-identity predicted quit attempts and quit intention (Van den Putte et al., 2009).

The current results provide interesting ground for future work. Notably, the current study included both smokers and ex-smokers, and whereas the identity as a quitter is a possible self for smokers, ex-smokers are more likely to hold a quitter identity as a current self. Conversely, the identity as a smoker is a current self for smokers whereas it is more likely to be a past or (undesired) possible self for ex-smokers, although ex-smokers may still identify with smoking (Vangeli, Stapleton, & West, 2010). Work on possible selves has shown that possible selves provide a strong guide for current behaviour, such that people are motivated to behave in ways that help to avoid undesired possible selves and achieve desired possible selves (e.g., Barreto & Frazier, 2012; Markus & Nurius, 1986). In addition, people are motivated to hold a positive current identity and to behave in line with important aspects of how they perceive themselves in the present (e.g., West, 2006). Possible selves and current selves affect behaviour in different ways, and smoker and quitter identities therefore are likely to play different roles for smokers and ex-smokers. Similarly, whereas smokers are likely to perceive other smokers as in-group members, ex-smokers are more likely to categorize smokers as part of an out-group. As with self-identity, people are motivated to maintain a positively valued group identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986), and respond differently to social groups depending on whether they perceive themselves as part of these groups or not (e.g., Wenzel, Mummendey, & Walzus, 2007). Future research is needed to further examine the roles of possible and current selves as well as in-group and out-group identities in smokers and ex-smokers.

The finding that quit intention does not directly predict quit success (when identity constructs were controlled for) is interesting to examine in future research. Importantly, previous work has shown that whereas quit intention predicts quit attempts, other factors such as self-efficacy and nicotine dependence are more relevant for successful maintenance of quitting (e.g., Smit et al., 2014; Vangeli et al., 2011). This may potentially explain the finding in the current research, as the measure of quit success more strongly resembles maintenance than initiation of quitting. In that case, identity seems more relevant than quit intentions for continued quitting. Moreover, the results show that quit intention indirectly relates to quit success through quitter self-identity. However, a meta-analysis on self-identity (in relation to various health behaviours) and the theory of planned behaviour suggested a contrary mediational effect with quit intention mediating the relation between identity and behaviour (Rise, Sheeran, & Hukkelberg, 2010). As quit intention did not directly predict quit success in our model, mediation of the

relation between quitter self-identity and quit success through quit intention was not examined. Unexpectedly, the relations between identity, intention and behaviour did not differ with SES. This contrasts one study that showed moderation of the relation between non-smoker self-identity and quit intention by SES (Meijer et al., 2015). However, this previous study did not find moderation for quit attempts, and another study did not find moderation effects of SES on the association between identity and intention (Meijer et al., 2016).

The current study has limitations. First, although the longitudinal design allowed for examination of relations between identity, quit intention and quit success across many years, the one-year between waves prevented analyses of subtle changes, which are likely to occur as part of quitting (e.g., Hughes, Keely, Fagerstrom, & Callas, 2005). Future research may use weekly or daily measurements to capture these finer-grained changes, for example by mobile phones (Scholz et al., 2016). Second, several identity constructs were included and compared, but the number of items to measure each was small. Unfortunately, comprehensive measurement of many constructs is impossible in large-scale longitudinal studies on representative samples. Relatedly, our measure of group-identity represented ties with smokers, but it may be useful to also include other aspects of group-identification, such as ingroup affect or centrality (Cameron, 2004; Høie et al., 2010; Meijer et al., 2016). In addition, the ITC Netherlands Surveys did not measure quitter group-identity, or other identity aspects (e.g., non-smoker identities) that previous research showed are important (Meijer et al., 2015; 2016). More comprehensive measurement and the inclusion of other identity constructs may show different results, although the importance of identification with quitting is in line with findings from studies that used comprehensive identity measurements (Meijer et al., 2015, 2016). Third, the samples used for the initial analysis and cross validation might not have been fully representative due to (selective) attrition. However, the samples at individual waves were very representative of the Dutch smokers population (Nagelhout et al., 2010; 2016). Furthermore, Model 2 included only continuing smokers at waves 4 and 5, because quit intention was not measured among ex-smokers, possibly reducing variance in quit intention. Fourth, 400 (39%) and 255 (33%) of the participants included in the initial samples for Model 1 and 2 were also included in the cross-validation samples, such that, in part, the same participants were modeled. However, measurements were taken three years apart and the majority of participants in the cross-validation samples were not included in the initial samples. Importantly, a model that includes waves 1 to 6 would have led to loss of many participants. Finally, other analyses were of course possible (e.g., latent growth curve modelling, using change scores), but these would not have answered the current research questions. Latent growth curve modelling has been used elsewhere to examine identity change processes (Meijer et al., 2017).

The results have important implications. The finding that behaviour may be more important for identity than vice versa, if replicated, may call for additions to identity theories. Moreover, changing smoking behavior may be a vehicle to change smoking-related identity, for example through smoking cessation counseling. Furthermore, quitter self-identity appeared more important for quit intentions and smoking behaviour than smoker identities. Future research should therefore investigate ways to strengthen identification with quitting among smokers and ex-smokers, for example through narratives (McAdams & McLean, 2013; Meijer, Gebhardt, Van Laar, Van den Putte, & Evers, 2017; Parry, Fowkes, & Thomson, 2001; Pennebaker, 2004, 2010) or avatars (Song, Kim, Kwon, & Jung, 2013). Narratives and avatars have successfully been used to strengthen identity in the past. The development of such identity-focused interventions is likely to help more smokers and ex-smokers to move toward quitting smoking and to remain abstinent.

In sum, this study provided important new insights into the longitudinal relationships between identity and smoking cessation, using a large sample of smokers and ex-smokers. Intention and behaviour appear to be more important for identity change than the other way around, but identity remains important in relation to intention and behaviour. Moreover, strengthening identification with quitting among smokers and ex-smokers seems more important for smoking cessation than decreasing identification with smoking or smokers.

REFERENCES

- Barreto, M. L., & Frazier, L. D. (2012). Coping with life events through possible selves. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*, 1785–1810. DOI:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00918.x.
- Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-perception theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 6*, 1-62. DOI: 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60024-6.
- Best, D., Beckwith, M., Haslam, C., Alexander Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J., Mawson, E., & Lubman, D. I. (2015). Overcoming alcohol and other drug addiction as a process of social identity transition: The Social Identity Model of Recovery (SIMOR). *Addiction Research & Theory, 1*-13. DOI:10.3109/16066359.2015.1075980.
- Brown, J. M. (1996). Redefining smoking and the self as a non-smoker. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 18*(4), 414-428. DOI:10.1177/019394599601800404.
- Burkholder, G. J., & Harlow, L. L. (2003). An illustration of a longitudinal cross-lagged design for larger structural equation models. *Structural Equation Modeling, 10*(3), 465-486. DOI:10.1207/S15328007SEM1003_8.
- Cameron, J. E. (2004). A three factor model of social identity. *Self and Identity, 3*, 239–262. DOI:10.1080/13576500444000047.
- Fong, G. T., Cummings, K. M., Borland, R., Hastings, G., Hyland, A., Giovino, G. A., ... & Thompson, M. E. (2006). The conceptual framework of the International Tobacco Control (ITC) policy evaluation project. *Tobacco Control, 15*(suppl 3), iii3-iii11.
- Frings, D., & Albery, I. P. (2015). The Social Identity Model of Cessation Maintenance: Formulation and initial evidence. *Addictive Behaviours, 44*, 35-42. DOI:10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.10.023.
- Hertel, A. W., & Mermelstein, R. J. (2012). Smoker identity and smoking escalation among adolescents. *Health Psychology, 31*(4), 467-475. DOI:10.1037/a0028923.
- Hertel, A. W., & Mermelstein, R. J. (2016). Smoker identity development among adolescents who smoke. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviours*. Advance online publication. DOI:10.1037/adb0000171.
- Høie, M., Moan, I. S., & Rise, J. (2010). An extended version of the theory of planned behaviour: Prediction of intentions to quit smoking using past behaviour as moderator. *Addiction Research and Theory, 18*(5), 572-585. DOI:10.3109/16066350903474386.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1-55. DOI:10.1080/10705519909540118.
- Hughes, J. R., Keely, J. P., Fagerstrom, K. O., & Callas, P. W. (2005). Intentions to quit smoking change over short periods of time. *Addictive Behaviours, 30*(4), 653-662. DOI:10.1016/j.addbeh.2004.08.011.
- Kearney, M. H. & O'Sullivan, J. (2003). Identity shifts as turning points in health behaviour change. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 25*(2), 134-152. DOI:10.1177/0193945902250032.
- Luck, K., & Beagan, B. (2014). Occupational transition of smoking cessation in women: "You're restructuring your whole life". *Journal of Occupational Science, 22*(2), 183-196. DOI:10.1080/14427591.2014.887418.
- Markus, H. & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist, 41*,954-969. DOI:10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954.
- Martens, M. P., & Haase, R. F. (2006). Advanced applications of structural equation modeling in counseling psychology research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*(6), 878-911. DOI:10.1177/0011000005283395.
- McAdams, D. P., & McLean, K. C. (2013). Narrative identity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 22*(3), 233-238. DOI:10.1177/0963721413475622.

- Meijer E., Gebhardt W. A., Dijkstra A., Willemsen M. C. & Van Laar C. (2015). Quitting smoking: The importance of non-smoker identity in predicting smoking behaviour and responses to a smoking ban, *Psychology & Health* 30(12): 1387-1409. DOI:10.1080/08870446.2015.1049603.
- Meijer, E. Gebhardt, W. A., Van Laar, C., Kawous, R., & Beijk, S. C. A. M. (2016). Socio-economic status in relation to smoking: The role of (expected and desired) social support and quitter identity. *Social Science & Medicine*, 162, 41-49. DOI:10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.06.022.
- Meijer, E., Gebhardt, W. A., Van Laar, C., Van den Putte, B., & Evers, A. W. M. (2017). Strengthening quitter self-identity: An experimental study. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Meijer, E., Van Laar, C., Gebhardt, W. A., Fokkema, M., Van den Putte, B., Dijkstra, A., ... & Willemsen, M. C. (2017). Identity change among smokers and ex-smokers: Findings from the ITC Netherlands Survey. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. Online first. DOI: 10.1037/adb0000281
- Meyers, M. C., van Woerkom, M., de Reuver, R. S., Bakk, Z., & Oberski, D. L. (2015). Enhancing psychological capital and personal growth initiative: working on strengths or deficiencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 62(1), 50-62. DOI:10.1037/cou0000050.
- Moan, I. S. & Rise, J. (2005). Quitting smoking: Applying an extended version of the theory of planned behaviour to predict intention and behaviour. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioural Research*, 10(1), 39-68. DOI:10.1111/j.1751-9861.2005.tb00003.x.
- Moan, I. S. & Rise, J. (2006). Predicting smoking reduction among adolescents using an extended version of the theory of planned behaviour. *Psychology and Health*, 21(6), 717-738. DOI:10.1080/14768320600603448.
- Nagelhout, G. E., Heijndijk, S. M., Cummings, K. M., Willemsen, M. C., Van den Putte, B., Heckman, B. W., ... & Borland, R. (2016). E-cigarette advertisements, and associations with the use of e-cigarettes and disapproval or quitting of smoking: Findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Netherlands Survey. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 29, 73-79.
- Nagelhout, G. E., Willemsen, M. C., Thompson, M. E., Fong, G. T., Van den Putte, B., & De Vries, H. (2010). Is web interviewing a good alternative to telephone interviewing? Findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Netherlands Survey. *BMC Public Health*, 10(1), 1-10. DOI:10.1186/1471-2458-10-351.
- Parry, O., Fowkes, F. G. R. & Thomson, C. (2001). Accounts of quitting among older ex-smokers with smoking-related disease. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 6, 481-493. DOI:10.1177/135910530100600502.
- Pennebaker, J. W. (2004). Theories, therapies, and taxpayers: On the complexities of the expressive writing paradigm. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 11, 138-142. DOI:10.1093/clipsy.bph063.
- Pennebaker, J. W. (2010). Expressive writing in a clinical setting. *The Independent Practitioner*, 30, 23-25.
- R Core Team (2014). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Rise, J., Sheeran, P., & Hukkelberg, S. (2010). The role of self-identity in the Theory of Planned Behaviour: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40(5), 1085-1105. DOI:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00611.x.
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1-36.
- Schaap, M. M., & Kunst, A. E., (2009). Monitoring of socio-economic inequalities in smoking: Learning from the experiences of recent scientific studies. *Public Health*, 123, 103-109. DOI:10.1016/j.puhe.2008.10.015.
- Scholz, U., Stadler, G., Ochsner, S., Rackow, P., Hornung, R., & Knoll, N. (2016). Examining the relationship between daily changes in support and smoking around a self-set quit date. *Health Psychology*, 35(5), 514-517. DOI:10.1037/hea0000286.

- Shadel, W. G., Mermelstein, R., & Borrelli, B. (1996). Self-concept changes over time in cognitive-behavioural treatment for smoking cessation. *Addictive Behaviours, 21*(5), 659-663. DOI:10.1016/0306-4603(95)00088-7.
- Smit, E. S., Hoving, C., Schelleman-Offermans, K., West, R., & de Vries, H. (2014). Predictors of successful and unsuccessful quit attempts among smokers motivated to quit. *Addictive Behaviours, 39*(9), 1318-1324. DOI:10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.04.017.
- Song, H., Kim, J., Kwon, R. J., & Jung, Y. (2013). Anti-smoking educational game using avatars as visualized possible selves. *Computers in Human Behaviour, 29*(5), 2029-2036. DOI:10.1016/j.chb.2013.04.008.
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2003). A sociological approach to self and identity. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 128-152). New York: Guilford.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In Worchel, S. & Austin, W. G. (Eds.), *The psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tombor, I., Shahab, L., Brown, J., & West, R. (2013). Positive smoker identity as a barrier to quitting smoking: Findings from a national survey of smokers in England. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 133*, 740-745. DOI:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2013.09.001.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Van den Putte, B., Yzer, M., Willemsen, M. C., & De Bruijn, G. (2009). The effects of smoking self-identity and quitting self-identity on attempts to quit smoking. *Health Psychology, 28*(5), 535-544. DOI:10.1037/a0015199.
- Vangeli, E., Stapleton, J., Smit, E. S., Borland, R., & West, R. (2011). Predictors of attempts to stop smoking and their success in adult general population samples: a systematic review. *Addiction, 106*(12), 2110-2121. DOI:10.1111/j.1360-0443.2011.03565.x.
- Vangeli, E., Stapleton, J., & West, R. (2010). Residual attraction to smoking and smoker identity following smoking cessation. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research, 12*(8), 865-869. DOI: 10.1093/ntr/ntq104.
- Vangeli, E., & West, R. (2012). Transition towards a 'non-smoker' identity following smoking cessation: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 17*, 171-184. DOI:10.1111/j.2044-8287.2011.02031.x.
- Wenzel, M., Mummendey, A., & Waldzus, S. (2007). Superordinate identities and intergroup conflict: The ingroup projection model. *European Review of Social Psychology, 18*(1), 331-372. DOI:10.1080/10463280701728302.
- West, R. (2006). *Theory of addiction*. Oxford: Blackwell, Addiction Press.

APPENDIX A. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ‘DROP-OUTS’ AND ‘RESPONDERS’ IN BACKGROUND VARIABLES (MAIN SAMPLE): CHI-SQUARE TEST AND ONE-WAY ANOVAS.

<i>Characteristic</i>		<i>Drop-outs</i>	<i>Responders</i>	<i>χ² statistic</i>
		<i>(n=497-633)</i>	<i>(n=1070-1389)</i>	
		<i>Frequency (Expected count)</i>		
Gender ^a	Female	285 (307)	694 (673)	$\chi^2(1) = 4.25, p = .04$
	Male	348 (327)	695 (717)	
SES	Low	184 (181)	395 (398)	$\chi^2(2) = .38, p = .83$
	Middle	286 (283)	617 (620)	
	High	158 (163)	362 (356)	
Smoking status	Smoker	510 (502)	1094 (1102)	$\chi^2(1) = .87, p = .35$
	Ex-smoker	123 (131)	295 (287)	
		<i>M (SD)</i>		<i>t statistic</i>
Age		38.80 (15.14)	43.67 (16.14)	$t(1298.27) = -6.57, p < .001, d = .31$
Smoker self-identity		2.83 (1.04)	2.73 (1.06)	$t(1897) = 1.93, p = .054, d = .10$
Quitter self-identity		3.14 (1.12)	3.17 (1.12)	$t(1853) = -.53, p = .60, d = .03$
Smoker group-identity		3.35 (.79)	3.31 (.81)	$t(1927) = .94, p = .35, d = .05$
Quit intention		2.61 (1.19)	2.61 (1.12)	$t(1565) = -.06, p = .96, d = .00$
Cigarettes per day		11.29 (9.48)	11.26 (9.40)	$t(1984) = .07, p = .95, d = .00$
Quit success		1.87 (1.62)	1.92 (1.69)	$t(2020) = -.62, p = .54, d = .03$

Note. ‘Responders’ were defined as those who completed waves 4-6, and ‘drop-outs’ were those who completed wave 4 but did not complete wave 5 and/or 6.

APPENDIX B. CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS INCLUDED IN MODEL 1 (N = 1036) AND MODEL 2 (N = 768).

<i>Characteristic</i>		<i>Frequency (%)</i>					
		<i>Model 1</i>			<i>Model 2</i>		
		<i>Wave 4</i>	<i>Wave 5</i>	<i>Wave 6</i>	<i>Wave 4</i>	<i>Wave 5</i>	<i>Wave 6</i>
Gender	Female	517 (50%)			375 (49%)		
	Male	519 (50%)			393 (51%)		
SES	Low	269 (26%)			229 (30%)		
	Middle	463 (46%)			370 (48%)		
	High	291 (28%)			168 (22%)		
Smoking status	Smoker	795 (77%)	753 (73%)	712 (69%)	728 (100%)	728 (100%)	693 (90%)
	Ex-smoker	241 (23%)	283 (27%)	324 (31%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	75 (10%)
		<i>M (SD)</i>					
		<i>Model 1</i>			<i>Model 2</i>		
		<i>Wave 4</i>	<i>Wave 5</i>	<i>Wave 6</i>	<i>Wave 4</i>	<i>Wave 5</i>	<i>Wave 6</i>
Age							
Smoker self-identity		2.74 (1.08)	2.68 (1.10)	2.63 (1.15)	3.10 (.91)	3.09 (.93)	3.07 (.98)
Quitter self-identity		3.17 (1.13)	3.23 (1.15)	3.27 (1.20)	2.79 (.95)	2.80 (.96)	2.84 (1.04)
Smoker group-identity		3.33 (.81)	3.33 (.83)	3.31 (.90)	3.45 (.77)	3.47 (.78)	3.49 (.83)
Quit intention ^a		2.62 (1.15)	2.65 (1.19)	2.54 (1.16)	2.55 (1.11)	2.60 (1.15)	2.46 (1.11)
Cigarettes per day ^a		11.10 (9.53)	10.38 (10.01)	9.55 (9.57)	14.75 (8.18)	14.66 (8.52)	13.05 (8.83)
Quit success		1.99 (1.72)	2.20 (1.88)	2.86 (2.60)	1.09 (.36)	1.10 (.38)	1.55 (1.45)

Note. a = only measured among smokers.

Of the participants included in Model 1 636 (61%) were smokers at all waves; 180 (17%) were ex-smokers at all waves; 69 (7%) were smokers at waves 4 and 5 and ex-smokers at wave 6; 58 (6%) were smokers at wave 4 and ex-smokers at waves 5 and 6; 32 (3%) were smokers at wave 4, ex-smokers at wave 5 and smokers at wave 6; 31 (3%) were ex-smokers at wave 4 and smokers at waves 5 and 6; 17 (2%) were ex-smokers at wave 4, smokers at wave 5 and ex-smokers at wave 6; and 13 (1%) were ex-smokers at waves 4 and 5 and smokers at wave 6.

APPENDIX C. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN 'DROP-OUTS' AND 'RESPONDERS' IN BACKGROUND VARIABLES (CROSS VALIDATION SAMPLE): CHI-SQUARE TEST AND ONE-WAY ANOVAS.

Characteristic		Drop-outs (n=523-908)	Responders (n=964-1104)	χ^2 statistic
		Frequency (Expected count)		
Gender ^a	Female	389 (425)	553 (517)	$\chi^2(1) = 10.52, p < .001$
	Male	519 (483)	551 (587)	
SES	Low	240 (286)***	395 (349)***	$\chi^2(1) = 20.66, p < .001$
	Middle	407 (384)**	444 (467)**	
	High	247 (224)**	249 (272)**	
Smoking status	Smoker	785 (796)	978 (967)	$\chi^2(1) = 2.09, p = .15$
	Ex-smoker	123 (112)	126 (137)	
		M (SD)		t statistic
Age		38.18 (15.91)	39.15 (15.30)	$t(2010) = -1.40, p = .16, d = .06$
Smoker self-identity		2.97 (.94)	2.99 (.98)	$t(1632) = -.56, p = .58, d = .02$
Quitter self-identity		3.01 (.99)	2.94 (1.05)	$t(1573) = 1.41, p = .16, d = .07$
Smoker group-identity		3.43 (.75)	3.45 (.78)	$t(1662) = -.39, p = .70, d = .03$
Quit intention		2.66 (1.13)	2.63 (1.28)	$t(1489) = .55, p = .58, d = .02$
Cigarettes per day		14.00 (8.09)	14.97 (8.24)	$t(1736) = -2.45, p = .01, d = .12$
Quit success		1.64 (1.45)	1.58 (1.41)	$t(2010) = .93, p = .35, d = .04$

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (deviations from expected cell counts).

Note. 'Responders' were defined as those who completed waves 1-3, and 'drop-outs' were those who completed wave 1 but did not complete wave 2 and/or 3.

a. Although χ^2 was significant, no significant differences were found between counts and expected counts.

APPENDIX D. MODEL 1: PATHS IN THE FINAL MODEL FOR QUIT SUCCESS AND IDENTITY (N = 1036).

	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	β
Autoregressive paths		
<i>Initial paths</i>		
Smoker self-identity (w4) → Smoker self-identity (w5)	.55 (.03)***	.55***
Smoker self-identity (w5) → Smoker self-identity (w6)	.33 (.04)***	.31***
Quitter self-identity (w4) → Quitter self-identity (w5)	.32 (.03)***	.32***
Quitter self-identity (w5) → Quitter self-identity (w6)	.45 (.04)***	.43***
Smoker group-identity (w4) → Smoker group-identity (w5) ^a	.44 (.02)***	.45***
Smoker group-identity (w5) → Smoker group-identity (w6) ^a	.44 (.02)***	.40***
Quit success (w4) → Quit success (w5)	.66 (.03)***	.61***
Quit success (w5) → Quit success (w6)	.67 (.05)***	.48***
<i>Additional paths</i>		
Smoker self-identity (w4) → Smoker self-identity (w6)	.12 (.03)***	.12***
Smoker group-identity (w4) → Smoker group-identity (w6)	.30 (.03)***	.28***
Quit success (w4) → Quit success (w6)	.38 (.05)***	.25***
Cross-lagged paths		
<i>Initial paths</i>		
Quit success (w4) → Smoker self-identity (w5)	-.09 (.02)***	-.15***
Quit success (w4) → Quitter self-identity (w5)	.09 (.02)***	.14***
Quit success (w4) → Smoker group-identity (w5) ^b	-.06 (.01)***	-.13***
Quit success (w5) → Smoker self-identity (w6)	-.10 (.02)***	-.16***
Quit success (w5) → Quitter self-identity (w6)	.09 (.02)***	.15***
Quit success (w5) → Smoker group-identity (w6) ^b	-.06 (.01)***	-.13***
<i>Additional paths</i>		
Quitter self-identity (w5) → Quit success (w6)	.32 (.06)***	.14***
Smoker self-identity (w4) → Quitter self-identity (w5)	-.30 (.04)***	-.28***
Smoker self-identity (w5) → Quitter self-identity (w6)	-.23 (.04)***	-.21***
Quitter self-identity (w5) → Smoker self-identity (w6)	-.26 (.04)***	-.26***

*** $p < .001$.

Note. Paths with the same superscript were restricted to be equal across waves.

APPENDIX E. MODEL 2: PATHS IN THE FINAL MODEL FOR QUIT INTENTION, IDENTITY AND QUIT SUCCESS (N = 768).

	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	β
Autoregressive paths		
Smoker self-identity (w4) → Smoker self-identity (w5)	.53 (.04)***	.53***
Quitter self-identity (w4) → Quitter self-identity (w5)	.34 (.05)***	.34***
Smoker group-identity (w4) → Smoker group-identity (w5)	.52 (.03)***	.52***
Quit intention (w4) → Quit intention (w5)	.49 (.04)***	.47***
Cross-lagged paths		
<i>Initial paths</i>		
Quitter self-identity (w4) → Quit intention (w5)	.21 (.05)***	.17***
Quit intention (w4) → Smoker self-identity (w5)	-.13 (.03)***	-.15***
Quit intention (w4) → Quitter self-identity (w5)	.18 (.04)***	.21***
Quit intention (w4) → Smoker group-identity (w5)	-.04 (.02) ⁺	-.06 ⁺
<i>Additional paths</i>		
Smoker self-identity (w4) → Quitter self-identity (w5)	-.19 (.04)***	-.18***
Regressions on quit success		
Quitter self-identity (w5) → Quit success (w6)	.20 (.06)***	.13***
Indirect effects		
Quitter self-identity (w4) → Quitter self-identity (w5) → Quit success (w6)	.07 (.02)**	.05**
Quit intention (w4) → Quitter self-identity (w5) → Quit success (w6)	.04 (.01)**	.03**
Smoker self-identity (w4) → Quitter self-identity (w5) → Quit success (w6)	-.04 (.01)**	-.02**

⁺ $p < .10$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

APPENDIX F. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN VARIABLES USED IN MODEL 1 (N = 1036).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Smoker self-identity (w4)	1										
2. Smoker self-identity (w5)	.66**	1									
3. Smoker self-identity (w6)	.60**	.68**	1								
4. Quitter self-identity (w4)	-.75**	-.59**	-.57**	1							
5. Quitter self-identity (w5)	-.61**	-.71**	-.65**	.65**	1						
6. Quitter self-identity (w6)	-.53**	-.61**	-.81**	.57**	.67**	1					
7. Smoker group-identity (w4)	.44**	.35**	.33**	-.29**	-.24**	-.23**	1				
8. Smoker group-identity (w5)	.33**	.45**	.35**	-.25**	-.22**	-.27**	.54**	1			
9. Smoker group-identity (w6)	.36**	.37**	.46**	-.31**	-.27**	-.30**	.55**	.57**	1		
10. Quit success (w4) ^a	-.53**	-.43**	-.47**	.53**	.46**	.42**	-.28**	-.25**	-.28**	1	
11. Quit success (w5) ^a	-.44**	-.54**	-.54**	.45**	.57**	.51**	-.24**	-.25**	-.28**	.67**	1
12. Quit success (w6) ^a	-.45**	-.50**	-.65**	.44**	.52**	.60**	-.25**	-.23**	-.31**	.66**	.76**

** $p < .01$

a. Spearman correlations instead of Pearson correlations.

APPENDIX F (CONT.). CORRELATIONS BETWEEN VARIABLES USED IN MODEL 2 (N = 768).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Smoker self-identity (w4)	1								
2. Smoker self-identity (w5)	.64**	1							
3. Quitter self-identity (w4)	-.64**	-.51**	1						
4. Quitter self-identity (w5)	-.55**	-.60**	.62**	1					
5. Smoker group-identity (w4)	.37**	.29**	-.18**	-.14**	1				
6. Smoker group-identity (w5)	.28**	.37**	-.15**	-.10**	.55**	1			
7. Quit intention (w4)	-.55**	-.43**	.68**	.54**	-.15**	-.14**	1		
8. Quit intention (w5)	-.46**	-.51**	.51**	.67**	-.14**	-.13**	.58**	1	
10. Quit success (w6) ^a	-.10**	-.12**	0.07	.14**	-.10**	-0.05	.08*	.12**	-.62**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

a. Spearman correlations instead of Pearson correlations.