

Table 1: Description of the sample (N=3,698).

Age (N=3,424)	n	%
14	386	11.3
15	307	9.0
16	646	18.9
17	586	17.1
18	665	19.4
19	464	13.6
20	370	10.8
Gender (N=3,382)		
Wahine/tamahine/woman/girl	1,817	55.7
Tane/tama/man/boy	1,251	38.3
Transgender, agender, non-binary, intersex, something else	195	6.0
Ethnicity (N=3,365)		
Māori	851	25.6
Pākehā or NZ European	1,552	46.7
Pasifika (Samoan, Cook Islands, Tongan, Niuean, Fijian)	215	6.5
Other	704	21.2
Perceived socio-economic status (N=3,136)		
Not well off at all	153	4.1
Not particularly well off	501	13.5
Fairly well off	1,154	31.2
Rather well off	734	19.8
Very well off	192	5.2
Prefer not to say	402	10.9
Sexuality (N=3,309)		
Straight (heterosexual)	2,236	67.6
Gay/lesbian	117	3.6
Bisexual	440	13.3
Queer, pansexual, asexual, something else	250	7.5
Takatāpui	12	0.4

Table 1 (continued): Description of the sample (N=3,698).

Not sure yet	170	5.1
Prefer not to say	84	2.5
Place of residence (N=3,196)		
Major city	1,743	54.5
Other city	426	13.3
Town	525	16.4
Small town	306	9.6
In the country	196	6.1

Table 2: Binary logistic regression showing differences in vaping history by age, gender, ethnicity and socio-economic status (SES).

	Adjusted odds ratio	95% CI for odds ratio		p-value
		Lower	Upper	
Age¹ 18–20 vs 14–17 years	2.26	1.86	2.74	<0.001
Gender				0.007
Female vs male	1.38	1.13	1.69	0.002
Female vs other	1.21	0.83	1.78	0.324
Ethnicity				<0.001
Māori vs Pākehā	1.84	1.43	2.35	<0.001
Māori vs Pasifika	1.34	0.83	2.16	0.227
Māori vs Other	2.89	2.16	3.86	<0.001
Pasifika vs Pākehā	1.90	1.20	3.00	0.006
Pasifika vs Other	2.47	1.49	4.08	<0.001
Socio-economic status (SES)				0.067
Low vs middle SES	1.35	1.04	1.74	0.022
Low vs high SES	1.28	0.98	1.67	0.073

¹Coding: Vaping history 1 = yes, 0 = no. For all category contrasts in the predictor variables, the left-hand category = 1 and the right-hand category = 0. This coding favours odds ratios greater than 1 for ease of interpretation.

Table 3: Binary logistic regression showing differences in exposure to vape product advertising on social media by age, gender, ethnicity and socio-economic status (SES).

	Adjusted odds ratio	95% CI for odds ratio		p-value
		Lower	Upper	
Age¹ 18–20 vs 14–17 years	0.74	0.62	0.89	0.002
Gender				0.758
Female vs male	1.04	0.85	1.26	0.713
Female vs other	0.90	0.62	1.30	0.578
Ethnicity				<0.001
Māori vs Pākehā	1.47	1.16	1.85	0.001
Māori vs Pasifika	0.85	0.54	1.34	0.474
Māori vs Other	1.72	1.31	2.26	<0.001
Pasifika vs Pākehā	1.73	1.12	2.69	0.014
Pasifika vs Other	2.03	1.28	3.23	0.002
Socio-economic status (SES)				0.084
Low vs middle SES	1.26	0.99	1.61	0.061
Low vs high SES	1.32	1.02	1.70	0.033

¹Coding: Vape advertising exposure 1 = yes, 0 = no. For all category contrasts in the predictor variables, the left-hand category = 1 and the right-hand category = 0. This coding favours odds ratios greater than 1 for ease of interpretation.

Table 4: Binary logistic regression showing differences in engagement with vape marketing by age, gender, ethnicity and socio-economic status (SES).

	Adjusted odds ratio	95% CI for odds ratio		p-value
		Lower	Upper	
Age¹ 18–20 vs 14–17 years	1.21	.97	1.50	0.084
Gender				0.403
Female vs male	1.17	0.93	1.47	0.191
Female vs other	0.99	0.65	1.51	0.950
Ethnicity				<0.001
Māori vs Pākehā	1.85	1.43	2.40	<0.001
Māori vs Pasifika	0.98	0.61	1.57	0.925
Māori vs Other	2.41	1.74	3.34	<0.001

Table 4 (continued): Binary logistic regression showing differences in engagement with vape marketing by age, gender, ethnicity and socio-economic status (SES).

Pasifika vs Pākehā	1.90	1.20	3.00	0.006
Pasifika vs Other	2.47	1.49	4.10	<0.001
Socio-economic status (SES)				0.005
Low vs middle SES	1.30	0.99	1.70	0.056
Low vs high SES	1.62	1.21	2.17	0.001

¹Coding: Vape marketing engagement 1 = yes, 0 = no. For all category contrasts in the predictor variables, the left-hand category = 1 and the right-hand category = 0. This coding favours odds ratios greater than 1 for ease of interpretation.