



The documents below consider issues related to standard of living/quality of life. Read them **both** in order to answer **all** the questions on the paper.

**Document 1:** adapted from *Smoking, Plain Packaging and Public Health*, an online article written by Julian Morris in 2014. The author is vice-president of research at Reason Foundation, a US-based think-tank which works towards a society based on liberty and individual choice.

Everyone would agree that smoking cigarettes is one of the leading preventable causes of death in the world and it reduces the quality of life through smoking-related diseases. Fortunately in most wealthy countries, smoking has been declining for many years. Most of this can be traced to smokers' better understanding of the risks of smoking, largely as the result of public information campaigns leading to an informed choice to stop smoking cigarettes.

Despite this, public health experts and anti-smoking groups have for many years argued that restrictions to advertising are the better way forward. In response, governments in wealthy countries have banned cigarette advertising on television, at sports events and in magazines. Now, many public health champions are calling for further restrictions to advertising through the plain packaging of cigarettes. They suggested prohibiting logos and colours on cigarette packs which identify brands, and cited limited experimental research which claimed that without brand identifiers such plain packs would be less attractive to smokers.

So in 2012, Australia's government introduced legislation that cigarettes should be sold in plain packages with only the brand name, health warnings and tax paid stamps. Studies were carried out to assess the impact, such as an analysis of calls to a smoking quitline, and a survey of outdoor smoking habits. These suggested that plain packaging had indeed made cigarettes less desirable and increased smokers' thoughts of quitting.

Despite this effort, evidence is that restrictions on advertising have had little influence on the decline in smoking. An online survey of smokers was conducted a month before and two months after the introduction of the plain packaging rules. Results suggested that the impact on the tendency to quit was probably small. This finding was confirmed by another survey that found that in the year to July 2013 the proportion of smokers in Australia had not declined since the introduction of plain packaging.

A study looking at discarded empty cigarette packs and other data suggested that consumption of cigarettes in 2012 and 2013 remained the same. However, the proportion of illicit cigarettes (i.e. branded cigarettes smuggled into Australia without duties being paid) had increased substantially. This is confirmed by the most recent Annual Report of Australia's Customs and Border Protection Service, which indicates that the number of illicit cigarettes entering Australia has indeed risen dramatically in the past three years. The discarded pack study concluded that illicit cigarettes now account for about 7.5% of cigarette sales. As most of this increase occurred in the past 18 months, the plain packaging rules are partly to blame.

The wide availability of illicit cigarettes in Australia means it is highly likely that adolescents now have greater access to branded cigarettes than previously and at lower prices, with no health warnings. As plain packaging in Australia has contributed to the rise of illicit cigarettes, it seems reasonable to conclude that the policy has been counter-productive. So it would seem that public education informing choice, rather than trying to restrict advertising, is the better way forward.

**Document 2:** adapted from *Why plain packaging is reducing the number of smokers in Australia*, an article written by Professor David Currow in 2014 in the Sydney Morning Herald. The author is Chief Executive Officer of the Cancer Institute New South Wales (NSW), Australia.

The recent debate over plain packaging in the Australian media is alarming. There were two objectives for the public health policy. The first was to reduce the attractiveness of colourful logos to young smokers, as most smokers begin smoking before their mid-20s. The second was to increase the visibility of graphic health warnings on the packets, because smoking reduces the quality of life and is one of the greatest causes of death. These objectives were very clear.

Also, there is no debate about the initial evidence. The critics' argument that this policy is 'experimental' is simply false, as there was comprehensive research giving the policy a strong evidence base to go ahead. In 2009, the Australian National Preventative Health Taskforce report showed that improving cigarette packaging design increases its appeal to young people. This powerfully misleads them about the harmful effects of tobacco on the quality of life. Following this, Cancer Council Victoria, Australia, reviewed the evidence and concluded that a plain packaging policy would effectively counteract this appeal. Extensive research by the Australian government then found that smokers did not like the look of plain packaging, as it made them feel less comfortable about their habit and think more about quitting.

Finally, since the introduction of plain packaging in 2012, there has been solid evidence of its effectiveness. A study, which our team at the Cancer Institute NSW undertook with the University of Sydney, reported that smokers were taking direct action to quit, with a significant increase in people calling the Quitline after the introduction of plain packaging.

Melanie Wakefield, another researcher, collected responses from 536 cigarette smokers, some using a plain pack and others a branded pack. The early indication is that only those smoking from plain packs 'perceived their cigarettes to be less satisfying than a year ago' and were more likely to have 'thought about quitting at least once a day in the past week' and to 'rate quitting as a higher priority in their lives'. The research, recorded in the British Medical Journal, concluded that plain packaged cigarettes increased smokers' urgency to quit. A further study observed a decline in smoking rates and how smokers now 'hide' their packs rather than taking pride in their preferred brand.

Additionally, figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics showed tobacco sales were at their lowest in history in 2013, at \$3.4 billion. This was a fall of 3.4% in the year following the introduction of the plain packaging policy.

On the other side of the debate, the tobacco industry claims that the number of cigarettes sold increased by 59 million cigarettes. However, we are yet to see their published data. The increase they claim is still a marked reduction *per person* because of population growth.

So, it is clear that we are actually seeing smoking rates drop and this reduction is not by accident. It is because more people are quitting as a result of plain packaging. We should not lose sight of how difficult quitting is, even after an educated decision. We should support these difficult decisions by continuing with the plain packaging policy.

**BLANK PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced online in the Cambridge International Examinations Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at [www.cie.org.uk](http://www.cie.org.uk) after the live examination series.

Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.