



My future-self has (not) quit smoking: An experimental study into the effect of a future-self intervention on smoking-related self-identity constructs

Kristell M. Penfornis^{a,b,*}, Winifred A. Gebhardt^a, Ralph C.A. Rippe^c, Colette Van Laar^d, Bas van den Putte^e, Eline Meijer^f

^a Institute of Psychology, Unit Health-, Medical- and Neuropsychology, Leiden University, Leiden, the Netherlands

^b Department of Cardiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands

^c Centre for Child and Family Studies, Leiden University, Leiden, the Netherlands

^d Social and Cultural Psychology, University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

^e Amsterdam School of Communication Research, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

^f Department of Public Health & Primary Care, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Handling editor: Blair T. Johnson

Keywords:

Smoking

Self-identity

Future-self intervention

Psychosocial factors

Longitudinal design

Multilevel analyses

ABSTRACT

Objectives: Envisioning one's (non)smoking future may make (un)desired future identities more accessible, salient, and personally relevant and facilitate smoking cessation. The current study assessed whether a future-self intervention can weaken smoker self-identity and expected identity loss when quitting smoking, and strengthen quitter- and nonsmoker self-identity, while accounting for personal factors—socioeconomic position, nicotine dependence, consideration of future consequences, and clarity of the envisioned future-self. Additionally, it examined the association between smoking-related identity and quitting intention and behavior.

Methods: This longitudinal online experimental study randomized 233 adult smokers to an intervention condition (where they completed mental imagery, visual, and verbal tasks about a future (non)smoking self), or to a passive control condition. Smoker-, quitter-, nonsmoker self-identity and identity loss were measured post-intervention and after one- and three-months. Quit intention and attempts were measured at baseline and after one month.

Results: There was a consistent increase in non-smoker self-identity, and decrease in smoker self-identity and identity loss over a period of six months for all participants, but no significant difference in smoking-related identity between the intervention and control group. While personal factors did not moderate the effect of the intervention, we found that smoking-related identity constructs do vary with nicotine dependence, consideration of future consequences, and clarity of the envisioned future-self. Quitting behavior is primarily associated with non-smoker self-identity.

Conclusions: Although the future-self intervention did not significantly influence smoking-related identity or behavior, identity—in particular, non-smoker self-identity—is important to consider in smoking cessation interventions. More research is needed to find effective operationalizations for identity-based interventions in the context of smoking.

1. Introduction

Identity—a self-perception of who one is—is an important determinant of (smoking) behavior. Identity theories posit that people are more likely to act in line with their identity, and conversely, will try to avoid behaviors that conflict with or even threaten their identity (Berkman et al., 2017; Burke and Stets, 2009; Oyserman et al., 2012). Thus, in a

nutshell, identity acts as a guide for behavior, including smoking and quitting behaviors.

Identity theories distinguish between self- and group identity. Self-identity refers to self-perceptions of ourselves (Burke and Stets, 2009), and group identity refers to self-perceptions of oneself derived from membership in social groups (Burke and Stets, 2009; Tajfel and Turner, 1979). A growing body of evidence recognizes the motivational

Abbreviations: SEP, Socioeconomic position; CCA, Complete case analyses.

* Corresponding author. Research Institute of Psychology, Unit Health and Medical Psychology, Leiden University, Wassenaarseweg 52, 2333AK, Leiden, the Netherlands.

E-mail address: k.m.penfornis@fsw.leidenuniv.nl (K.M. Penfornis).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2023.115667>

Received 7 February 2022; Received in revised form 28 November 2022; Accepted 6 January 2023

Available online 7 January 2023

0277-9536/© 2023 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

mechanisms of self- and group identity on smoking behaviors, yet effects are stronger for self-identity than for group identity (Meijer et al., 2018). Therefore, the current study focuses on self-identity. Both quantitative and qualitative studies have also found that smoking-related identity plays an important role in intention to quit (e.g., Meijer et al., 2018; Smit et al., 2014; Tombor et al., 2013; Van den Putte et al., 2009) and (successful) quit attempts (Meijer et al., 2018; Meijer et al., 2017; Meijer et al., 2015; Van den Putte et al., 2009), even after controlling for relevant variables (e.g., age, gender, heaviness of smoking). These relationships were found to be stronger for quitter self-identity (i.e., identifying as someone who quits smoking) and nonsmoker self-identity (i.e., identifying as someone who does not smoke) than for smoker self-identity (i.e., identifying as someone who smokes) (Meijer et al., 2015; Meijer et al., 2018; Van den Putte et al., 2009). Additionally, prior research shows that ex-smokers who maintain an attraction to smoking are more likely to relapse (Callaghan et al., 2021). In sum, to quit successfully and durably, smokers need to perceive themselves more as nonsmokers or quitters and less as smokers (Callaghan et al., 2021; Meijer et al., 2016, Meijer et al., 2020; Tombor et al., 2015). In the current study, we tested the relationship between self-identity constructs and quit intention and attempts again. We expected that stronger quitter and nonsmoker self-identity would positively relate to intention to quit and new quit attempts, while stronger smoker self-identity and expected identity loss if quitting smoking (see below) would negatively relate to these outcomes (Hypothesis (H1)). Taxonomies of Behavioral Change Techniques (Michie et al., 2011, Michie et al., 2013) recognize identity as a factor capable of influencing behavior, including smoking behaviors. To date, however, an effective operationalization of identity BCTs is still lacking. One interesting route to explore is that of possible/future selves. Possible selves theories (Markus and Nurius, 1986; Turner and Hooker, 2019) advance that current behavior is guided by perceptions of who one wants to become in the future (desired future-self) and of who one fears one might become in the future (undesired future-self). Individuals are not only motivated to engage in behavior that fits and confirms current self-identities, but they are also prone to behaving in ways that help them attain their desired future-self and avoid their undesired future-self (Frazier et al., 2021; Oyserman and James, 2011; Strahan and Wilson, 2006). In a nutshell, according to possible selves theories, future identities color and guide current identities, as individuals are likely to favor and invest in behaviors in the present that bring them closer to a desired identity in the future (Hitlin and Elder, 2007; Turner and Hooker, 2019). Hence, interventions that provide a nudge for future ideal self-views to become the new current self-views—or in other words, nudge a shift in self-identity (Meijer et al., 2020; Vangeli and West, 2012)—may be a promising way to operationalize identity BCTs and facilitate smoking cessation.

While a shift in smoking-related identity seems desirable for successful smoking cessation, adopting a new identity can be a challenge. One may feel that one is losing part of the self in the process. In a study examining narratives of post-partum smoking relapses, Bottorff et al. (2000) found that women who had successfully quit smoking around the time of their pregnancy generally (re)lapsed after having given birth, because they felt they had lost a part of their freer, less inhibited, more relaxed selves by quitting smoking. Findings that identity loss can thwart successful quit attempts have been corroborated more recently by Vangeli and West (2012) and Meijer et al. (2020). Additionally, Meijer et al. (2020) highlighted that expecting to lose part of oneself when quitting (identity loss), can already be sufficient to thwart quit attempts. The main objective of the current study is to test the effect of envisioning one's (non)smoking future on smoking-related identity constructs, including identity loss.

Despite evidence that an identity shift from smoker to quitter or nonsmoker may facilitate smoking cessation, experimentally nudging change in smoking-related identity through intervention has, to our knowledge, only been attempted by Meijer et al. (2018). Employing one possible operationalization for a future-self intervention, their study

assessed whether quitter self-identity can be strengthened by writing about a future-self as a quitter. More specifically, participants in the intervention group were asked to write down all positive aspects associated with a mental image of themselves being in the process of quitting smoking. It was expected that by envisioning and writing about quitting in the future, an identity as a quitter would be more accessible, salient, and personally relevant and may encourage a quit attempt. The future-self writing exercise was only marginally successful in strengthening quitter self-identity post-intervention—with no effect on smoking behaviors—compared to a control condition where participants did a similar future-self-writing exercise on unrelated behavior (i.e., washing hands more frequently). Nevertheless, writing exercises about future-selves show potential in influencing smoking-related self-identity and behavior, because they have successfully been used to influence other (health) behaviors and outcomes (e.g., in the context of physical activity and overall well-being—(King, 2001; Layous et al., 2013; Murru and Ginis, 2010; Ouellette et al., 2005; Perras et al., 2016; Rutchick et al., 2018). For this reason, the current study tests the effect of a future-self intervention, operationalized differently, on smoking-related identity again. We expect a weaker smoker self-identity and identity loss, and stronger quitter self-identity and nonsmoker self-identity in the future-self intervention condition than in the control condition (H2).

Prior studies testing future-self writing exercises, such as the one in Murru and Ginis (2010), had positive effects on health behavior up to eight weeks post-intervention, but most did not ascertain outcomes beyond that point. Thus, despite its short-term success, it remains unknown what the effect on identity and behavior of future-self interventions are after several months. That is why the current study ascertains the effect of the future-self intervention directly post-intervention and after three and six months. We expect quitter self-identity and nonsmoker self-identity to be especially strengthened, and smoker self-identity and identity loss especially weakened directly post-intervention (H3).

Meijer et al. (2018) suggested several routes to improve future-self interventions. Achieving the desired future-self and avoiding the undesired future-self may well be facilitated by comparing future-selves with current selves in so-called mental contrasting procedures (Oettingen, 2012; Oyserman et al., 2015). An originally proposed improvement was to have participants envision both their desired (i.e., as sustained quitter) and undesired (i.e., as a continued smoker) possible selves. Second, to account for individual preferences in information processing (Mayer and Massa, 2003), Meijer et al. recommended including a visual task (i.e., finding images associated with the future-self) in addition to the verbal task (i.e., writing about the future-self) in the intervention. Finally, Meijer et al. suggested considering potential moderators of the effect of future-self writing tasks on smoking-related self-identity. Previous research proposes that individuals with lower socioeconomic position (SEP) and individuals with greater nicotine dependence generally see and keep seeing themselves more as smokers (Blondé and Falomir-Pichastor, 2021; Falomir-Pichastor et al., 2020; Meijer et al., 2015; Meijer et al., 2017). Moreover, findings suggest that smoker self-identity is more resistant to change in lower compared to higher SEP individuals (Meijer et al., 2017), that lower SEP smokers have more difficulties envisioning themselves as nonsmokers (Meijer et al., 2015), and that a shift towards nonsmoking is less likely for individuals with stronger dependence to nicotine (Dupont et al., 2015; Falomir-Pichastor et al., 2020; Tombor et al., 2013). Other interesting moderators are clarity of an envisioned future-self, which has been shown to be directly related to the likelihood of endorsing (McElwee and Haugh, 2010; Norman and Aron, 2003) or feeling connected to the future-self (Pozolotina and Olsen, 2019), and one's consideration of the future consequences of current behavior (see Ouellette et al., 2005)—high levels of which have been found to facilitate the formation of future-selves (Stephan et al., 2018; Turner and Hooker, 2019). In summary, prior evidence suggests that smoking-related identity varies based on personal factors, and, therefore, that such factors could moderate the effect of a

future-self intervention. Yet, few studies have looked at the relation between personal factors and smoking-related identity, and none tested the potential moderating effects of such factors in identity-related interventions. The current study further analyzes the matter by considering SEP, nicotine dependence, consideration of consequences, and future-self clarity specifically. We anticipate corroborating prior findings that smokers with a higher SEP, lower nicotine dependence, and greater consideration of consequences and future-self clarity identify more with quitting and nonsmoking and less with smoking—at all times—than smokers with a lower SEP, greater nicotine dependence and lower consideration of consequences and future-self clarity (H4a). Consequently, we expect to find moderation effects for all four factors. More specifically, we foresee smokers with higher SEP, lower nicotine dependence, greater consideration of consequences and future-self clarity to have stronger quitter self-identity and nonsmoker self-identity, and weaker smoker self-identity and identity loss when exposed to a future-self intervention than smokers not exposed to such an intervention (H4b).

1.1. The present study

Extending previous work, the current study aimed to examine the effect—over time—of an online experimental future-self intervention on smoking-related self-identity and identity loss. More specifically, we attempted to strengthen desired self-identities (i.e., quitter self-identity, nonsmoker self-identity) and to weaken undesired self-identity (i.e., smoker self-identity) and identity loss using mental imagery, verbal, and visual tasks. It was inferred that by envisioning desired and undesired future-selves and consolidating these mental images through images and by writing about them, an identity as a quitter or nonsmoker would become more accessible, salient, and personally relevant than an identity as a smoker and may guide behavior toward smoking cessation. The current study also examined the relationship between SEP, nicotine dependence, consideration of future consequences, and future-self clarity with smoking-related identity constructs, and their potential moderating role on the effects of the future-self intervention. Outcomes were measured directly after the future-self intervention in the experimental group, and after one and three months in both the experimental group and a passive control comparison group. Additionally, the present study examined the association between smoking-related self-identity and identity loss on the one hand and intention to quit and new quit attempts on the other.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants and design

This study employed a longitudinal online experimental design with a future-self intervention and waitlist control condition. Participants were recruited in the Netherlands and Dutch-speaking part of Belgium from July 2017 to October 2018. They were recruited through numerous media (e.g., previous research participation, social media such as LinkedIn or Facebook—full list in Supplement 1) to obtain a large and diverse group. Measurements were performed at baseline (T0), directly after the intervention (T1, experimental condition only), and after one (T2) and three months (T3). The intervention took place directly after T0. Based on previously found small to medium effect sizes (Layous et al., 2013; Meijer et al., 2018; Murru and Ginis, 2010), sample sizes were estimated to obtain statistical power at the recommended 0.80 level (Cohen, 1988), with Cohen's $d = 0.40$, $\alpha = 0.05$ and one-tailed testing. This yielded a minimum of 78 participants per condition at T3. The aim was to include 110 participants per condition to allow for attrition. In total, 262 people met inclusion criteria (i.e., aged 18 and over, daily smoking, and intending to quit in the future), of which 233 completed the T0 survey and were randomly assigned to a condition. Of the randomized participants, 157 (67.38%) completed the T2 survey

and 151 (64.38%) the T3 survey (see Supplement 1 for attrition analyses). Supplement 1 includes an overview of the baseline sociodemographic profile of the participants. Significantly more women than men ($\chi^2(1) = 38.734, p < .001$), and more middle SEP than low or high SEP smokers ($\chi^2(2) = 62.043, p < .001$) participated in this study. Two gift coupons of €100 and six of €50 were randomly distributed among participants having completed the T2 and T3 surveys.

2.2. Procedure

Surveys in Dutch were presented to participants using Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com). Smokers interested in participating received an e-mail containing the link to the T0 survey.

Directly before the T0 survey, participants were informed about the study aim (i.e., investigating how smokers think about smoking, quitting, themselves, and the future), the inclusion criteria (see above) and that participation was voluntary, and provided digital informed consent. Participants were not informed that the study included future-self tasks. E-mail addresses were used to match post- and follow-up surveys to the correct participant and then removed from the dataset. Data were analyzed anonymously. After the assessment of baseline measures (T0), participants were randomized 1:1 to an experimental condition. Participants in the control condition were then automatically redirected to a public non-identity-related smoking cessation website (www.ikstopnu.nl). Participants in the future-self intervention condition completed a visual and verbal future-self task about their desired- and undesired future-self (see details below), completed T1, and were also redirected to the website. All participants were invited to complete the T2 and T3 measurements after one and three months. After the T3 measurement, all participants were debriefed and participants from the control condition were given the chance to take part in the intervention if desired. The procedure was approved by the Ethical Board of Leiden University's Department of Psychology (CEP17-0505/192) and pilot tested on five smokers.

2.2.1. Future-self tasks

Participants in the intervention condition were first asked to imagine themselves in a future where they successfully quit smoking (i.e., desired future-self). Then, in a counterbalanced order, participants were asked to write about this image (verbal task) and to upload self-selected pictures that matched this image (visual task). Next, participants were asked to provide five keywords that summarized the image of themselves when they quit smoking successfully. The procedure was repeated for the undesired future-self. For this task, participants were asked to think about a future as a continued smoker, to upload pictures, and to write about and summarize how such a future did not fit with how they viewed themselves.

One day later, participants received an automatic e-mail containing their self-generated images, narratives, and keywords, and were asked to place these materials somewhere where they could easily access and/or view them.

2.3. Measures

This study is part of a larger project for which more variables were measured (see Meijer et al. (2022)). Variables used in the current study are described below.

2.3.1. Background characteristics

Participants were asked at T0 to report their *sex*, *year of birth*, *age at smoking onset*, *number of smoking years*, and *previous quit attempts* [y/n].

2.3.2. Intention to quit

At T0 and T2, participants were asked for an intended timeline to quit smoking. Answer categories were: 'I intend to quit [1] within 1 month; [2] within 6 months; [3] within 2 years; [4] within 5 years; [5]

within 10 years; [6] sometime ever, but not within 10 years; [7] always to remain smoking, but smoke less; or [8] always to remain smoking, and not less' (Dijkstra et al., 1997; previously used in Meijer et al., 2018). Participants choosing answer categories seven and eight were categorized as 'non-intenders'. Before data analysis, this variable was recoded such that higher scores indicated a stronger intention to quit.

2.3.3. New quit attempt

Were measured at T2 with one item requiring a yes/no answer (i.e., 'Have you made a quit attempt which lasted at least 24 h since completing the first questionnaire?').

2.3.4. Smoking-related self-identity

At T0, T2, and T3, the strength of *smoker self-identity*, *quitter self-identity*, and *nonsmoker self-identity* were measured using respectively eight ($\alpha = 0.81$), seven ($\alpha = 0.72$) and seven ($\alpha = 0.80$) items (cf. Meijer et al., 2016) adapted from the Smoker Self-Concept Scale and the Abstainer Self-Concept Scale (Shadel and Mermelstein, 1996) and work by Tombor et al. (2013) and Van den Putte et al. (2009) (e.g., '[smoking/quitting/nonsmoking] is part of who I am', [1] strongly disagree—[5] strongly agree). Previous work has shown that these three scales are reliable (Meijer et al., 2016). To limit the length of the survey, at T1, *smoker self-identity*, *quitter self-identity*, and *nonsmoker self-identity* were each measured using three items from the baseline ($\alpha = 0.71$, 0.82, and 0.87 respectively): 'I see myself as [smoker/quitter/nonsmoker]', '[Sustained smoking/quitting/not smoking] is part of who I am', '[Sustained smoking/quitting/not smoking] fits with how I want to live', [1] strongly disagree—[5] strongly agree.

2.3.5. Expected identity loss

Identity loss was assessed at T0, T2, and T3 using four items ($\alpha = 0.83$) from the Smoker's Identity Scale (Dupont et al., 2015) (e.g., 'If I quit smoking, I will have to give up a part of myself', [1] strongly disagree—[5] strongly agree).

2.3.6. Socioeconomic position

Participants were asked for their highest attained education level at T0. This served as an indicator of *socio-economic position* (as in Meijer et al., 2015; Schaap and Kunst, 2009). Answer categories ranged from [1] 'no education' to [8] 'university'. For the analyses, SEP was recoded into three categories, namely lower (no education, only primary school, pre-vocational secondary education or lower-level vocational education), middle (middle-level vocational education and senior higher secondary education), and higher SEP (polytechnic or university level).

2.3.7. Nicotine dependence and cigarettes per day

Measured at T0, T1, T2, and T3 using the Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence (Heatherton et al., 1991), which contains an item ascertaining the number of *cigarettes per day*.

2.3.8. Consideration of future consequences

Measured with the fourteen-item Consideration of Future Consequence Scale (Strathman et al., 1994), translated into pre-vocational/general secondary education level Dutch (Rappange et al., 2009; $\alpha = 0.79$) (e.g., 'I consider how things might be in the future, and try to influence those things with my day to day behavior').

2.3.9. Future-self thought clarity

Assessed with the three items ($\alpha = 0.68$) from the 'Clarity' subscale in McElwee and Haugh (2010) (e.g., 'When I picture myself in the future, I see clear and vivid images', [1] does not apply to me at all—[5] strongly applies to me).

2.3.10. Compliance with intervention instructions

It was assessed whether the future-self tasks were performed as intended, that is, in compliance with the intervention instructions.

Participants who either uploaded no image or used fewer than ten characters to describe one of their future-selves were considered non-compliers to at least one task and categorized as non-complier.

2.4. Statistical analyses

2.4.1. Attrition and preliminary analyses

Independent sample *t*-tests, Welch *t*-tests, and χ^2 (goodness of fit) tests were performed to test for baseline differences between the participants in the two conditions, between responders and drop-outs, and between compliers and non-compliers on the future-self tasks. Pearson's and Spearman's correlation coefficients were computed between the variables used in the main analyses. Next, simple and multiple linear and binomial regressions were conducted to examine whether T0 smoker self-identity, quitter self-identity, nonsmoker self-identity, and identity loss were associated with quit intention at T2. Simple and hierarchical binomial logistic regressions were conducted to assess whether, after controlling for condition (Step 1), baseline smoker self-identity, quitter self-identity, nonsmoker self-identity, and identity loss (Step 2) were associated with new quit attempts at T2. Bonferroni corrected results are reported and used for interpretations of effects and significance.

2.4.2. Main analyses for outcome variables

Multilevel analyses incrementally comparing nested models (see Supplement 2) through likelihood ratio tests were performed to answer all three hypotheses. Multilevel analyses were chosen over RM ANOVA because they can deal with an unbalanced number of measurements between conditions, handle missing values implicitly (through maximum likelihood estimation) while retaining maximum power, and deal with unequal time intervals between measurements. Moderate levels of between-participant variance were found for all outcomes (60% for smoker self-identity, 64% for quitter self-identity, 63% for nonsmoker self-identity, and 67% for identity loss), warranting the use of multilevel modeling (Koo and Li, 2016). Analyses were performed in R version 4.02 using the lmer and merTools packages. The ANOVA function from merTools was used for nested model comparisons, observing an alpha level of 5%. Bonferroni corrections (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2014) were applied for each outcome separately to correct for multiple testing (i.e., the four moderators included in the models).

The present study evaluated the same multilevel models using multiple imputed data, to verify the robustness of the maximum likelihood-based complete case analyses (CCAs). Multiple imputations were generated conditionally for each intervention condition in 100 separate datasets using mice. A custom predictor matrix was specified and the imputation method was specific and separate for each variable. The maximum number of iterations was set to 25. The multilevel results were pooled using the mitml package. Also, for robustness purposes, it was assessed whether reporting no intention to quit smoking on the survey item (despite having indicated intending to quit on the informed consent), and non-compliance to at least one future-self task affected the study results. To this end, the multilevel models were run again, respectively removing non-intenders and non-compliers, yielding minimal differences in results. Bonferroni corrected CCAs are reported and used for interpretations of effects and significance, because removing non-intenders and non-compliers from the analyses yielded too low statistical power at T2 and T3, and analyses with multiple imputations included numerous estimations.

3. Results

Descriptive statistics of the outcomes and correlations between study variables are presented in Supplement 3.

3.1. Attrition analyses

There was significantly more drop-out in the experimental condition

than in the control condition at both T2 and T3 (see Supplement 1). Drop-outs did not differ significantly from responders on background characteristics (all $ps > .05$).

3.2. Preliminary analyses

There were no significant baseline differences between the conditions on background characteristics (see Supplement 1). Twenty-eight participants (12.02%) were categorized as non-compliers to at least one visual or verbal future-self task. Non-compliers were significantly more likely to have a lower SEP ($\chi^2(2) = 11.31, p = .004, V = 0.36$), be older ($t(44) = -3.87, p < .001, d = -0.89$), have been smoking for longer ($t(44) = -3.53, p = .001, d = -0.81$) and be more heavily dependent on nicotine ($t(85) = -2.71, p = .008, d = -0.62$).

3.2.1. Smoking-related identity constructs in relation to intention to quit (T2) and new quit attempts (between T0 and T2) (H1a)

Simple linear regressions showed that, regardless of condition, smoker self-identity at T0 was negatively associated, while quitter self-identity and nonsmoker self-identity at T0 were positively associated with intention to quit at T2. Regardless of condition, identity loss at T0 was not significantly associated with intention to quit at T2. Multiple regression showed that smoker self-identity, nonsmoker self-identity, and identity loss at T0 were each uniquely associated with intention to quit at T2 (see Table 1).

Simple hierarchical binomial regressions showed that, regardless of condition, stronger smoker self-identity at T0 was negatively associated, and stronger nonsmoker self-identity at T0 was positively associated with new quit attempts between T0 and T2. Multiple hierarchical regression showed that, regardless of condition, only nonsmoker self-identity was uniquely associated with new quit attempts between T0 and T2 (see Table 1).

3.3. Multilevel analyses

3.3.1. Effect of the future-self intervention: comparison between conditions (H2)

Against expectations, there was no significant difference in the

strength of smoker self-identity ($p = .721$), quitter self-identity ($p = .349$) or nonsmoker self-identity ($p = .725$), or identity loss ($p = .405$) between the two conditions at T1, T2 or T3. These results were robust in analyses without non-intenders and non-compliers, and analyses with imputed data (see Table 2 and Supplement 4, Condition and Condition \times Time).

3.3.2. Evolution of smoking-related identity constructs over time (H3)

As anticipated, results showed a significantly more pronounced decrease in smoker self-identity directly post-intervention compared to follow-ups ($p = .003$), although this applied to the entire sample and not only to the intervention condition. The decline in smoker self-identity was also significantly more pronounced directly post-intervention when removing non-intenders ($p = .007$), but not when removing non-compliers ($p = .024$) or when using analyses with data imputations ($p = .127$) (See Table 2 and Supplement 4, Time (linear) and Time (quadratic)). Contrary to our forecasts, however, there was a stable decrease in identity loss ($p = .009$), a stable significant increase of nonsmoker self-identity ($p = .006$), and no significant change in quitter self-identity ($p = .988$) over time for the entire sample. Against expectations, there were no changes in quitter self-identity over time ($p = .988$). These results were robust in analyses without non-intenders and non-compliers. Only the results of analyses with imputed data differed from results with CCAs in that they showed only a marginal change in nonsmoker self-identity ($p = .074$) and no change in identity loss ($p = .242$) over time (See Table 2 and Supplement 4, Time (linear) and Time (quadratic)).

3.3.3. Influence of personal factors on smoking-related self-identity constructs (H4a)

See Table 2 and Supplement 4, Moderator for detailed results.

Socioeconomic position. Unexpectedly, SEP was not significantly related to the strength of smoker self-identity ($p = .668$), quitter self-identity ($p = .864$), nonsmoker self-identity ($p = .625$), or identity loss ($p = .668$) at any time point. Findings were robust in analyses without non-intenders, non-compliers and in analyses with imputed data.

Nicotine dependence. In line with expectations, results from all analyses consistently showed that the higher the nicotine dependence, the

Table 1

Summary of Simple and Multiple ((Hierarchical) Binomial Logistic) Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Intention to Quit at T2 (N = 135–155) and New Quit Attempts between T0 and T2 (N = 154–156).

Predictor		Intention to quit (T2)					
		Simple linear regressions			Multiple linear regression ^a		
		b (se)	β	p	b (se)	β	p
Step 1	Condition	0.12 (.31)	.03	.698	0.11 (.27)	.03	.687
Step 2	Smoker identity	-0.77 (.21)	-.30	> .001	-0.71 (.25)	-.28	.006
	Quitter identity	1.28 (.23)	.43	> .001	0.55 (.34)	.19	.108
	Nonsmoker identity	1.29 (.22)	.46	> .001	0.87 (.33)	.31	.009
	Identity loss	-0.22 (.18)	-.11	.222	0.53 (.20)^b	.26	.010
Predictor		New quit attempt (between T0 and T2)					
		Simple hierarchal logistic regressions			Multiple hierarchal logistic regression ^c		
		b (se)	OR [95% CI]	p	b (se)	OR [95% CI]	p
Step 1	Condition	0.06 (.34)	0.94 [.48, 1.84]	.866	-0.06 (.37)	1.06 [.52, 2.15]	.876
Step 2	Smoker identity	0.59 (.26)	1.80 [1.09, 2.98]	.025	0.60 (.35)	1.83 [.93, 3.59]	.086
	Quitter identity	-0.11 (.28)	0.89 [.51, 1.55]	.695	0.85 (.54)	2.33 [.98, 5.55]	.062
	Nonsmoker identity	-0.68 (.28)	0.51 [.29, .87]	.016	-1.14 (.45)	0.32 [.13, .76]	.013
	Identity loss	0.16 (.20)	1.18 [.81, 1.72]	.399	-0.19 (.27)	0.83 [.49, 1.39]	.479

Notes. Bold-face indicates significant associations after Bonferroni corrections. New quit attempt between T0 and T2: 0 = yes, 1 = no. For intention to quit, the higher the scores, the stronger the intention to quit.

^a There were three studentized deleted residuals greater than ± 3 standard deviations and five leverage values greater than 0.5. The analysis was run with and without these points, with similar results.

^b This effect was not considered meaningful since the predictor was not significantly associated with quit intention in the simple regression analysis. We suspect the presence of a suppression effect in the context of the other identity variables, given substantial correlations among the predictors (see Supplement 5).

^c There was one standardized residual with a value of -2.06 standard deviations, which was kept in the analysis.

Table 2
Overview of the Best Fitted Model for Each Combination of Outcome and Personal Factors using Complete Case Analyses (N = 233–246).

Parameters	Smoker identity	Quitter identity	Nonsmoker identity	Identity loss		Smoker identity	Quitter identity	Nonsmoker identity	Identity loss
Fixed effects	<i>b</i> (<i>se</i>)	<i>b</i> (<i>se</i>)	<i>b</i> (<i>se</i>)	<i>b</i> (<i>se</i>)		<i>b</i> (<i>se</i>)	<i>b</i> (<i>se</i>)	<i>b</i> (<i>se</i>)	<i>b</i> (<i>se</i>)
$R^2_{GLMM(c)}^a$	0.640	0.599	0.591	0.664		0.651	^b	0.602	0.656
Intercept	2.67 (0.16)***	3.44 (0.04)***	3.84 (0.24)***	2.15 (0.05)***	Intercept	3.40 (0.29)***	2.90 (0.29)***	2.70 (0.29)***	3.49 (0.36)***
Time (linear)	-3.92 (1.01)***		7.63 (3.03)*	-1.88 (0.72)**	Time (linear)	-3.94 (1.01)***	0.82 (3.67)*	2.01 (0.92)*	-1.17 (1.11)
Time (quadratic)	1.61 (0.56)**		1.27 (0.55)*	0.18 (0.66)	Time (quadratic)	1.60 (0.54)**	0.28 (0.52)	1.29 (0.54)*	0.16 (0.65)
Condition	0.01 (0.08)		-0.65 (0.31)*		Condition	0.02 (0.09)	0.04 (0.08)	-0.03 (0.08)	-0.11 (0.11)
Time × Condition	-0.00 (0.08)		-0.01 (0.001)+		Time × Condition	-0.00 (0.001)	0.00 (0.001)	-0.00 (0.001)	-0.00 (0.001)
SEP	-0.10 (0.06)		-0.07 (0.10)		CFC	-0.29 (0.09)**	0.23 (0.09)**	0.25 (0.87)**	-0.39 (0.11)***
SEP × Time			0.00 (0.001)		CFC × Time		-0.00 (0.001)*		
SEP × Condition			0.28 (0.13)*		CFC × Condition				
Time × Condition × SEP			-0.00 (0.001)+		Time × Condition × CFC				
$R^2_{GLMM(c)}^a$	0.715	0.599	0.585	0.715		0.652	^b	0.593	0.660
Intercept	2.27 (0.07)***	3.44 (0.04)***	3.51 (0.04)***	1.89 (0.10)***	Intercept	3.00 (0.21)***	2.81 (0.20)***	2.81 (0.21)***	2.68 (0.20)***
Time (linear)	-1.53 (0.92)		1.76 (0.63)**	-0.02 (1.08)	Time (linear)	-3.93 (1.01)***	0.54 (0.80)	2.00 (0.92)*	-1.11 (1.11)
Time (quadratic)	1.33 (0.56)*		1.30 (0.55)*	-0.42 (0.65)	Time (quadratic)	1.60 (0.55)**	0.27 (0.53)	1.27 (0.54)*	0.15 (0.65)
Condition	0.03 (0.08)			-0.11 (0.11)	Condition	0.57 (0.30)+	0.63 (0.28)*	0.71 (0.29)*	-0.12 (0.11)
Time × Condition	-0.00 (0.001)			-0.00 (0.001)	Time × Condition	-0.00 (0.001)	0.00 (0.001)	-0.00 (0.001)	-0.00 (0.001)
ND	0.08 (0.01)***			0.12 (0.02)***	FSC	-1.93 (0.07)**	0.21 (0.07)**	0.25 (0.07)***	-0.17 (0.06)**
ND × Time					FSC × Time				
ND × Condition					FSC × Condition	2.09 (0.10)*	-0.21 (0.10)*	-0.26 (0.10)**	
Time × Condition × ND					Time × Condition × FSC				

Note. Bold-face indicates significant associations after Bonferroni corrections. Dependent variables are listed under model description. Time: 1 = baseline, 2 = post-test, 3 = one-month follow-up, 4 = three-months follow-up. Condition: 0 = control, 1 = intervention. Socioeconomic position (SEP), Nicotine dependence (ND), Consideration of future consequences (CFC), Future-self clarity (FSC): 1 = low, 2 = average, 3 = high. Empty fields = not applicable, variable was not included in the model.

⁺ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

^a Conditional R^2 , variance explained by both fixed and random effects. Determined as in Norman and Aron (2003).

^b Could not be estimated due to convergence problems.

higher the smoker self-identity ($p = .001$) and identity loss ($p \leq .001$). Against expectations, however, nicotine dependence did not significantly influence quitter self-identity ($p = .942$) and nonsmoker self-identity ($p = .198$). These results were robust in analyses without non-intenders and non-compliers and analyses with imputed data.

Consideration of future consequences. As anticipated, results from all analyses showed that, at all times, the higher the consideration of consequences, the weaker the smoker self-identity ($p = .005$), the stronger the quitter self-identity ($p = .007$), and the nonsmoker self-identity ($p = .004$), and the lower the identity loss ($p = .25$).

Future-self thought clarity. As expected, all analyses showed that, at all times, having a clearer vision of oneself in the future was associated with weaker smoker self-identity ($p = .006$) and identity loss ($p = .039$), as well as stronger quitter self-identity ($p = .002$) and nonsmoker self-identity ($p \leq .001$).

3.3.4. Influence of moderators on the effect of the future-self intervention (H4b)

Effects of the intervention on smoker self-identity, quitter self-identity, and identity loss were not moderated by SEP, nicotine dependence, consideration of consequences, or future-self clarity, regardless of the set of analyses used. CCAs did, however, show that when future-self clarity was low, nonsmoker self-identity was significantly and consistently higher in the future-self intervention condition than in the control condition. However, when future-self clarity was high, participants in the intervention condition consistently held weaker nonsmoker self-identity than participants in the control condition. These findings applied to all analyses (see Table 2 and Supplement 4, Moderator \times condition).

4. Discussion

The current study was the first to examine whether desired-undesired future-self tasks can weaken smoker self-identity and expected identity loss if quitting (identity loss), and strengthen quitter- and nonsmoker self-identity, while accounting for personal factors—socioeconomic position (SEP), nicotine dependence, consideration of future consequences and future-self clarity.

It was anticipated that stronger quitter and nonsmoker self-identity would be positively related to quitting intentions and new quit attempts, while stronger smoker self-identity and identity loss would negatively relate to these outcomes (H1). Not fully in line with these expectations, results showed weaker smoker self-identity, stronger nonsmoker self-identity, and weaker identity loss to be important for intention to quit, and nonsmoker self-identity to be important for renewed quit attempts. These findings are in line with prior research showing that self-identity constructs are important determinants of quit intention and attempts (Meijer et al., 2015; Meijer et al., 2017; Meijer et al., 2018; Smit et al., 2014; Tombor et al., 2013; Van den Putte et al., 2009), and advocate for the development of effective identity-related smoking cessation interventions. Compared to prior findings (Meijer et al., 2016; Meijer et al., 2018; Van den Putte et al., 2009) the strength of nonsmoker self-identity seems to be most important for quitting behaviors, that is, more so than quitter self-identity. However, these previous studies did not take all three self-identities, or both self-identities and identity loss into account. As such, it is plausible that in these previous studies, the strength of quitter self-identity would have been found less important if other self-identity constructs had been controlled for. Identity-related interventions may need to focus primarily on strengthening nonsmoker self-identity when attempting to increase intention to stop and encourage quit attempts.

Other expectations included that after a future-self intervention, smoker self-identity and identity loss would be weaker, and quitter self-identity and nonsmoker self-identity stronger in the intervention condition compared to the control condition (H2). The future-self intervention did, however, not have significant effects on smoking-related

identity constructs. These findings do not resonate with findings from Meijer et al. (2018)—who observed a marginally significantly stronger quitter self-identity in smokers who wrote about their future-self as a quitter—or with recently published (Priebe et al., 2020) and past (Layous et al., 2013; Murru and Ginis, 2010; Ouellette et al., 2005; Perras et al., 2016) successes of writing about one's future-selves in changing health behavior. One possible explanation for these findings is that future-self interventions may not work as effectively in the context of smoking, for example, because smoking is an addictive behavior. As such, other identity-related interventions should be explored. Alternatively, future-self interventions might be more helpful when behavior change is already ongoing because abstinence could reinforce the new desired identity (Meijer et al., 2018).

Smokers with a short-term quit intention might also benefit more than smokers who intend to quit someday because the (un)desired future-self may be more accessible, salient, and personally relevant. This expectation could not be tested in the current study as the sample was too diverse for such a subgroup analysis but would be an interesting path to explore in future research. Nevertheless, the current results do show trends in the expected direction. Although not statistically significant, smokers in the intervention condition, compared to those in the control condition, reported stronger follow-up quitter self-identity and nonsmoker self-identity, and weaker smoker self-identity and identity loss (see Supplement 3). Despite improvements from the future-self intervention in Meijer et al. (2018), a sufficiently effective operationalization still has not been found and further improvements are needed. Because the current and previous studies (Meijer et al., 2018; Meijer et al., 2017; Meijer et al., 2015; Van den Putte et al., 2009) have shown identity to be important for quitting intentions and behaviors—once operationalized successfully—we do believe that identity-related interventions have the potential to enhance the effectiveness of multi-component smoking cessation interventions. As a first improvement, we recommend expanding the future-self intervention. This could be done by repeating the future-self tasks and/or making the mental visualization last longer, approaches that have been adopted in studies successfully changing other health behaviors (King, 2001; Murru and Ginis, 2010; Ouellette et al., 2005; Perras et al., 2016; Priebe et al., 2020). Another possible expansion could be to include future vs. current self-contrasting and action plan formulation. Possible selves facilitate comparison between the future and current self and allow one to take steps towards achieving or avoiding the future self (Markus and Nurius, 1986; Turner and Hooker, 2019). A second recommendation would be to let smokers think about themselves in a closer future first and then in a more distant future, because individuals tend to feel closer to future-selves that are psychologically closer to the present (Strahan and Wilson, 2006). Third, given that 12% of participating smokers did not follow instructions for the future-self tasks as intended, it may be necessary in the future to 1) verify that instructions are clear, and 2) encourage participants to carry out tasks as intended (e.g., through a pop-up notification). Last but not least, human support appears beneficial to digital (health promotion) interventions (Beishuizen et al., 2016), and interventions involving human interaction are most effective (Hartmann-Boyce et al., 2018), future-self interventions may be better suited for real-life or hybrid settings than for online settings.

We expected smoker self-identity and identity loss in the intervention condition to be especially weakened, and quitter self-identity and nonsmoker self-identity to be particularly strengthened directly post-intervention (H3). While there was a stable decrease in smoker self-identity and identity loss and a stable increase in nonsmoker self-identity over six months, these changes applied to the entire group of participants, regardless of whether they partook in the intervention or not. In line with previous findings, this illustrates that smoking-related identity is not static, but can evolve with time (Berkman et al., 2017; Burke and Stets, 2009; Kearney and O'Sullivan, 2003; Rutchick et al., 2018). It is unlikely that these findings are the byproduct of attrition given that CCAs and analyses with data imputations show the same

patterns over time and that those with nonsmoker self-identity were more likely to drop out. A possible explanation for these findings is the survey as an intervention phenomenon, or, in other words, that the relatively long and extensive surveys triggered participants to critically think about their smoking and change how they perceived themselves (Godin et al., 2010). It is also possible that for smokers intending to quit, visiting a smoking cessation website providing information on how to durably quit also reinforced their nonsmoker self-identity and weakened their identification with smoking. Alternatively, as visitors accessing the website are asked to categorize themselves as ‘someone who wants to quit smoking’ or ‘someone who wants to remain abstinent’, participating smokers may have felt the urge to distance themselves from smoking to fit with the target group of the website.

In line with previous work, the current study was expected to show that smoking-related identity constructs vary depending on SEP, nicotine dependence, consideration of consequences, and future-self clarity (H4a), and to add to current knowledge by looking at whether these personal factors moderate the effect of a future-self intervention targeting smoking-related identity (H4b). While there was no moderation effect of the studied personal factors on the effect of a future-self intervention, results do corroborate that smoking-related identity varies depending on personal factors. For example, as expected from prior findings (McElwee and Haugh, 2010; Norman and Aron, 2003; Ouellette et al., 2005; Pozolotina and Olsen, 2019), the higher the consideration of consequences and future-self clarity, the weaker the smoker self-identity, the weaker the identity loss if quitting, and the stronger the quitter and nonsmoker self-identity. Similarly, smokers with higher nicotine dependence reported stronger expectations of identity loss if quitting, and, in line with Blondé and Falomir-Pichastor (2021) and Falomir-Pichastor et al. (2020), the higher the nicotine dependence, the more smokers identified with smoking. Finally, although smoking-related identity was not significantly related to SEP, trends in the current results do suggest that smokers with higher SEP may identify more with nonsmoking than their middle or lower SEP counterparts (as in Meijer et al., 2017). In light of the above findings, it may be important for interventions attempting to weaken smoker self-identity and/or strengthen quitter self-identity or nonsmoker self-identity to intervene on modifiable personal factors first or in parallel. For example, starting nicotine replacement therapy—one of the most efficient smoking cessation aids (Hartmann-Boyce et al., 2018)—before an identity-related intervention may allow smokers to consider their (non) smoking future with reduced interference from (anticipated) nicotine withdrawal symptoms. Additionally, future identity-related interventions employing mental imagery could tailor the intervention to the smoker (Bol et al., 2020), for example, by having more repetitions of the future-self tasks, or a greater level of detail or audiotaped instructions (see Wynd, 2005) for smokers with higher nicotine dependence, lower consideration of consequences and lower future-self clarity.

4.1. Limitations

Upon inclusion, participants confirmed they intended to quit smoking in the future. Nonetheless, 13 participants reported having no quit intention on the baseline survey. A first limitation is, therefore, uncertainty as to the participants’ true quit intentions. Nonetheless, non-intenders were equally distributed across conditions—6 and 7, respectively, in the control and intervention conditions—and robustness analyses without non-intenders showed no differences from the main analyses. As such, we do not foresee a major impact of quit intention incongruency on our findings. We do advise future studies to consider including fail safes for measurement errors (e.g., attention check questions).

Finally, data time stamps showed that most of the intervention group, after completing the future-self tasks, temporarily left during the completion of the post-intervention survey, and then returned to

complete it. Thus, it is unclear whether measured identity constructs reflect the intervention, the activity undertaken in the meantime, or both. An online intervention was, nonetheless, the most efficient way to reach a large and varied group of smokers. Regardless, future studies administering online identity-related interventions may want to encourage participants to fully complete a survey wave before engaging in other activities.

5. Conclusions

Identity constructs—especially when accounting for personal factors—offer an interesting target for interventions trying to facilitate smoking cessation. However, more research is needed in order to find an effective operationalization of identity-related interventions. Suggestions are made to improve future-self interventions in the context of smoking and to intervene on personal factors of smokers in parallel to or before identity-related smoking cessation interventions.

Author contributions

Kristell Penforinis: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Visualization, Project administration. Winnie Gebhardt: Conceptualization, Methodology, Resources, Investigation, Writing – review & editing, Supervision. Ralph Rippe: Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Resources, Writing – review & editing, Visualization. Colette van Laar: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing. Bas van den Putte: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing. Eline Meijer: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Resources, Data curation, Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition.

Funding

This study was funded by a poster award received from CAHAG (Dutch general Practitioner advisory group for COPD and asthma) to Dr. E. Meijer. CAHAG had no involvement in the study.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available at <https://doi.org/10.34894/9GZFTX>.

Acknowledgements

We thank Danai Thanopoulou for pilot testing the future-self tasks and Naomi Hoogerdijk for her help with data collection and data cleaning.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2023.115667>.

References

- Beishuizen, C.R., Stephan, B.C., van Gool, W.A., Brayne, C., Peters, R.J., Andrieu, S., Kivipelto, M., Soininen, H., Busschers, W.B., Moll van Charante, E.P., Richard, E., 2016. Web-based interventions targeting cardiovascular risk factors in middle-aged

- and older people: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Med. Internet Res.* 18, e55. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.5218>.
- Berkman, E.T., Livingston, J.L., Kahn, L.E., 2017. Finding the “self” in self-regulation: the identity-value model. *Psychol. Inq.* 28, 77–98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2017.1323463>.
- Blondé, J., Falomir-Pichastor, J.-M., 2021. Tobacco dependence and motivation to quit smoking: an identity-based framework. *Int. J. Soc. Psychol.* 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02134748.2021.1882224>.
- Bol, N., Smit, E.S., Lustria, M.L.A., 2020. Tailored health communication: opportunities and challenges in the digital era. *Digit. Health* 6. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2055207620958913>.
- Bottoff, J.L., Johnson, J.L., Irwin, L.G., Ratner, P.A., 2000. Narratives of smoking relapse: the stories of postpartum women. *Res. Nurs. Health* 23, 126–134. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-240X\(200004\)23<126::AID-NUR5>3.0.CO;2-2](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-240X(200004)23<126::AID-NUR5>3.0.CO;2-2).
- Burke, P.J., Stets, J.E., 2009. *Identity Theory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, NY.
- Callaghan, L., Yong, H.-H., Borland, R., Cummings, K.M., Hitchman, S.C., Fong, G.T., 2021. What kind of smoking identity following quitting would elevate smokers relapse risk? *Addict. Beyond Behav.* 112, 106654. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106654>.
- Cohen, J., 1988. In: *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, second ed. L. Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, N.J.
- Dijkstra, A., Bakker, M., De Vries, H., 1997. Subtypes within a sample of precontemplating smokers: a preliminary extension of the stages of change. *Addict. Behav.* 22, 327–337. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4603\(96\)00054-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4603(96)00054-8).
- Dupont, P., Tack, V., Blecha, L., Reynaud, M., Benyamina, A., Amirouche, A., Aubin, H.-J., 2015. Smoker’s identity scale: measuring identity in tobacco dependence and its relationship with confidence in quitting. *Am. J. Addict.* 24, 607–612. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajad.12272>.
- Falomir-Pichastor, J.M., Blondé, J., Desrichard, O., Felder, M., Riedo, G., Folly, L., 2020. Tobacco dependence and smoking cessation: the mediating role of smoker and ex-smoker self-concepts. *Addict. Beyond Behav.* 102, 106200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2019.106200>.
- Frazier, L.D., Schwartz, B.L., Metcalfe, J., 2021. The MAPS Model of Self-Regulation: Integrating Metacognition, Agency, and Possible Selves. *Metacognition Learn.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-020-09255-3>.
- Godin, G., Sheeran, P., Conner, M., Delage, G., Germain, M., Bélanger-Gravel, A., Naccache, H., 2010. Which survey questions change behavior? Randomized controlled trial of mere measurement interventions. *Health Psychol.* 29, 636–644. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021131>.
- Hartmann-Boyce, J., Fanshawe, T.R., Lindson, N., Livingstone-Banks, J., Ordóñez-Mena, J.M., Aveyard, P., 2018. Behavioural interventions for smoking cessation: an overview and network meta-analysis. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD013229>.
- Heatherton, T.F., Kozlowski, L.T., Frecker, R.C., Fagerstrom, K.-O., 1991. The fagerstrom test for nicotine dependence: a revision of the fagerstrom tolerance questionnaire. *Br. J. Addict.* 86, 1119–1127. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.1991.tb01879.x>.
- Hitlin, S., Elder, G.H., 2007. Time, self, and the curiously abstract concept of agency. *Socio. Theor.* 25, 170–191. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2007.00303.x>.
- Kearney, M.H., O’Sullivan, J., 2003. Identity shifts as turning points in health behavior change. *West. J. Nurs. Res.* 25, 134–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193945902250032>.
- King, L.A., 2001. The health benefits of writing about life goals. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 27, 798–807. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201277003>.
- Koo, T.K., Li, M.Y., 2016. A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability research. *J. Chiropr. Med.* 15, 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012>.
- Layous, K., Katherine Nelson, S., Lyubomirsky, S., 2013. What is the optimal way to deliver a positive activity intervention? The case of writing about one’s best possible selves. *J. Happiness Stud.* 14, 635–654. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-012-9346-2>.
- Markus, H., Nurius, P., 1986. Possible selves. *Am. Psychol.* 41, 954–969. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954>.
- Mayer, R.E., Massa, L.J., 2003. Three facets of visual and verbal learners: cognitive ability, cognitive style, and learning preference. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 95, 833–846. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.4.833>.
- McElwee, R.O., Haugh, J.A., 2010. Thinking clearly versus frequently about the future self: exploring this distinction and its relation to possible selves. *Self Ident.* 9, 298–321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298860903054290>.
- 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. *Psychol. Health* 30, 1387–1409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2015.1049603>.
- Meijer, E., Gebhardt, W.A., van Laar, C., Chavannes, N.H., van den Putte, B., 2022. Identified or conflicted: A latent class and regression tree analysis explaining how identity constructs cluster within smokers. *BMC Psychol.* 10, 231. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-022-00937-y>.
- 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. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 162, 41–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.06.022>.
- Meijer, E., Gebhardt, W.A., van Laar, C., van den Putte, B., Evers, A.W.M., 2018. Strengthening quitter self-identity: an experimental study. *Psychol. Health* 33, 1229–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2018.1478976>.
- Meijer, E., Van den Putte, B., Gebhardt, W.A., Van Laar, C., Bakk, Z., Dijkstra, A., Fong, G.T., West, R., Willemsen, M.C., 2018. A longitudinal study into the reciprocal effects of identities and smoking behaviour: findings from the ITC Netherlands Survey. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 200, 249–257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.12.006>.
- Meijer, E., van Laar, C., Gebhardt, W.A., Fokkema, M., van den Putte, B., Dijkstra, A., Fong, G.T., Willemsen, M.C., 2017. Identity change among smokers and ex-smokers: findings from the ITC Netherlands Survey. *Psychol. Addict. Beyond Behav.* 31, 465–478. <https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000281>.
- Meijer, E., Vangeli, E., Gebhardt, W.A., van Laar, C., 2020. Identity processes in smokers who want to quit smoking: a longitudinal interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Health* 24, 493–517. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363459318817923>.
- Michie, S., Hyder, N., Walia, A., West, R., 2011. Development of a taxonomy of behaviour change techniques used in individual behavioural support for smoking cessation. *Addict. Behav.* 36, 315–319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2010.11.016>.
- Michie, S., Richardson, M., Johnston, M., Abraham, C., Francis, J., Hardeman, W., Eccles, M.P., Cane, J., Wood, C.E., 2013. The behavior change technique taxonomy (v1) of 93 hierarchically clustered techniques: building an international consensus for the reporting of behavior change interventions. *Ann. Behav. Med.* 46, 81–95. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-013-9486-6>.
- Murru, E.C., Ginis, K.A.M., 2010. Imagining the possibilities: the effects of a possible selves intervention on self-regulatory efficacy and exercise behavior. *J. Sport Exerc. Psychol.* 32, 537–554. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.32.4.537>.
- Norman, C.C., Aron, A., 2003. Aspects of possible self that predict motivation to achieve or avoid it. *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 39, 500–507. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031\(03\)00029-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00029-5).
- Oettingen, G., 2012. Future thought and behaviour change. *Eur. Rev. Soc. Psychol.* 23, 1–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2011.643698>.
- Ouellette, J.A., Hessler, R., Gibbons, F.X., Reis-Bergan, M., Gerrard, M., 2005. Using images to increase exercise behavior: prototypes versus possible selves. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 31, 610–620. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271589>.
- Oyserman, D., Destin, M., Novin, S., 2015. The context-sensitive future self: possible selves motivate in context, not otherwise. *Self Ident.* 14, 173–188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2014.965733>.
- Oyserman, D., Elmore, K., Smith, G., 2012. Self, self-concept, and identity. In: *Handbook of Self and Identity*, pp. 69–104.
- Oyserman, D., James, L., 2011. Possible selves. In: *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*. Springer, New York, NY, pp. 117–145.
- Perras, M.G.M., Strachan, S.M., Fortier, M.S., 2016. Possible selves and physical activity in retirees: the mediating role of identity. *Res. Aging* 38, 819–841. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027515606191>.
- Pozolotina, T., Olsen, S.O., 2019. Consideration of immediate and future consequences, perceived change in the future self, and health behavior. *Health Market. Q.* 36, 35–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07359683.2019.1567003>.
- Priebe, C.S., Beauchamp, M., Wunderlich, K., Faulkner, G., 2020. I’m a runner not a smoker”: changes in identity as predictors of smoking cessation and physical activity. *Psychol. Sport Exerc.* 49, 101702. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2020.101702>.
- Rappange, D.R., Brouwer, W.B.F., van Exel, N.J.A., 2009. Back to the consideration of future consequences scale: time to reconsider? *J. Soc. Psychol.* 149, 562–584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540903232324>.
- Rutchick, A.M., Slepian, M.L., Reyes, M.O., Pleskus, L.N., Hershfield, H.E., 2018. Future self-continuity is associated with improved health and increases exercise behavior. *J. Exp. Psychol. Appl.* 24, 72–80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000153>.
- Schaap, M.M., Kunst, A.E., 2009. Monitoring of socio-economic inequalities in smoking: learning from the experiences of recent scientific studies. *Publ. Health* 123, 103–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2008.10.015>.
- Shadel, W.G., Mermelstein, R., 1996. Individual differences in self-concept among smokers attempting to quit: Validation and predictive utility of measures of the smoker self-concept and abstinence self-concept. *Ann. Behav. Med.* 18, 151–156. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02883391>.
- 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. *Addict. Beyond Behav.* 39, 1318–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.04.017>.
- Stephan, E., Shidlovski, D., Sedikides, C., 2018. Self-prospection and energization: the joint influence of time distance and consideration of future consequences. *Self Ident.* 17, 22–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2017.1314319>.
- Strahan, E.J., Wilson, A.E., 2006. Temporal comparisons, identity, and motivation: the relation between past, present, and possible future selves. In: *Possible Selves: Theory, Research and Applications*. Nova Science Publishers, Hauppauge, NY, US, pp. 1–15.
- Strathman, A., Gleicher, F., Boninger, D.S., Edwards, C.S., 1994. The consideration of future consequences: weighing immediate and distant outcomes of behavior. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 66, 742–752. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.4.742>.
- Tabachnick, B.G., Fidell, L.S., 2014. *Using Multivariate Statistics*, Pearson new international edition, sixth ed. Always learning. Pearson, Harlow.
- Tajfel, H., Turner, J.C., 1979. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In: Austin, W. G., Worchel, S. (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Monterey, CA, pp. 33–47.
- Tombar, I., Shahab, L., Brown, J., Notley, C., West, R., 2015. Does non-smoker identity following quitting predict long-term abstinence? Evidence from a population survey in England. *Addict. Behav.* 45, 99–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.01.026>.
- Tombar, 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 Alcohol Depend.* 133, 740–745. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2013.09.001>.

- Turner, S., Hooker, K., 2019. Possible selves theory. In: Gu, D., Dupre, M.E. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Gerontology and Population Aging*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69892-2_106-1.
- Van den Putte, B., Yzer, M., Willemsen, M.C., de Bruijn, G.-J., 2009. The effects of smoking self-identity and quitting self-identity on attempts to quit smoking. *Health Psychol.* 28, 535–544. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015199>.
- Vangeli, E., West, R., 2012. Transition towards a ‘non-smoker’ identity following smoking cessation: an interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Br. J. Health Psychol.* 17, 171–184. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8287.2011.02031.x>.
- Wynd, C.A., 2005. Guided health imagery for smoking cessation and long-term abstinence. *J. Nurs. Scholarsh.* 37, 245–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2005.00042.x>.