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Is smoking a communicable disease? Effect of exposure to ever smokers in school tutor groups on the risk of incident smoking in the first year of secondary school

A Molyneux, S Lewis, M Antoniak, R Hubbard, A McNeill, C Godfrey, R Madeley, J Britton

Objective: To estimate the effect of joining a first year secondary school tutor group with a high prevalence of ever smoking on the risk of incident smoking in schoolchildren.

Design: Cross-sectional questionnaire survey.

Setting: 10 randomly selected secondary schools in Notinghamshire, UK.

Participants: Pupils in years (grades) 7–11 (aged 11–16 years).

Main outcome measure: Incident smoking in the first year of secondary education, defined as pupils who reported smoking their first cigarette during year 7.

Results: Of 6522 pupils (75% of those eligible) who completed the questionnaire, 17% were current smokers and 49% had ever smoked, of whom 23% had started smoking in year 7. Incident smoking in year 7 was more common in girls, in children with parents or siblings who smoke, and in more deprived children, and was independently increased in relation to the proportion of ever smokers in the year 7 tutor group joined by the child (adjusted odds ratio of incident smoking for a child joining a year 7 tutor group in the highest relative to the lowest quartile of ever smoking prevalence 1.45, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.11 to 1.89). Exposure to ever smokers in year 7 tutor groups also accounted for most of the increased risk of incident smoking associated with socioeconomic deprivation.

Conclusions: The risk of incident smoking in children entering secondary education is independently increased by exposure to other ever smokers in school tutor groups. Incident smoking in adolescents is thus to some extent a communicable disorder, and may be partly preventable by policies that reduce exposure to smoking at school.

Cigarette smoking is the most important avoidable cause of morbidity and premature death in the developed world. In the UK there are 13 million smokers, half of whom will die prematurely as a result of smoking. The majority of smokers are socioeconomically disadvantaged, and preventing smoking would both improve health and reduce social inequality in health more than any other intervention. It is therefore important to determine why people begin smoking: because most smokers in the UK start smoking soon after starting secondary education, it is especially important to identify the risk factors for incident smoking during this period.

It is well recognised that children who smoke tend to have friends who smoke, but it has never been clear whether this association arises from a causal influence on smoking behaviour, or from peer group selection by smoking children. Adolescent smokers also tend to overestimate smoking among their peers, causing bias in the measurement of peer group smoking. However, when children in the UK move from primary to secondary education they join new secondary school tutor groups of 20–30 pupils (students) that are selected by the school to promote the mixing of children from different areas, academic ability, and friendship groups. Since children stay in these tutor groups for most lessons during the first year of secondary school, they are exposed to new peer groups with different levels of smoking that are additional to their friendships. We hypothesised that if peer group smoking has an independent effect on the individual pupil's risk of starting smoking then the number of ever smokers in these new tutor groups should have an effect on the uptake of smoking during the first year of secondary education (year 7).
those answering positively. Supervising teachers were asked to confirm that each pupil’s name and tutor group had been correctly completed, and that any absentee were asked to complete a questionnaire on a subsequent occasion.

This was a second cross-sectional survey carried out as part of a larger project to study adolescent smoking behaviour and develop smoking cessation interventions for adolescents. Data from this survey have been used as they contained more complete information than the previous survey on the school year in which most smokers smoked their first cigarette.

Regular and occasional smokers were categorised as current smokers. Parental smoking was categorised as neither parent smokes, one parent smokes, or both parents smoke, and sibling smoking was categorised as non-smoking sibling(s), smoking sibling(s), or no siblings (respondents answering no to the question “Do you have any brothers or sisters?”). Social deprivation was estimated for each respondent from the Townsend Material Deprivation Index, an area measure based upon 1991 census data (the most recent available) on unemployment, overcrowding, car and house ownership, expressed as a standardised residual relative to the mean for England and Wales (negative values reflecting lesser and positive values greater degrees of deprivation), and available for each census enumeration district in England and Wales from Manchester Information and Associated Services (MIMAS), Manchester Computing, University of Manchester. Each respondent’s home postcode was converted to a census enumeration district using the PC2ED facility (based on the 1998 Central Postcode Directory, MIMAS, http://census.ac.uk/cdu/Datasets/Lookup_tables/Postal/Postcode_Enumeration_District_Director y.htm#3); this code was used to obtain the Townsend Index from the MIMAS database.

**Statistical analysis**

We used simple cross tabulation to calculate the prevalence of smoking in all respondents, and by school, sex, and school year. We used the school year in which pupils who had ever smoked reported that they had tried their first cigarette to estimate retrospectively the proportion of ever smokers in each tutor group at the beginning of year 7, and to identify those who smoking their first cigarette during year 7 (incident smoking in year 7). Incident smoking in year 7 was then analysed in relation to the school year in which the questionnaire was completed, sex, social deprivation (using Townsend Index stratified into quartiles), parental smoking, sibling smoking, and tutor group ever smoking prevalence (stratified in quartiles) in univariate and multiple logistic regression in the STATA 7.0 statistical package (Stata Corporation, Texas, USA). To take account of the clustered nature of the data we used robust standard errors adjusted for clustering by school, and by class in our multiple logistic regression analysis (the robust cluster(varname) command in STATA). We also looked for interactions between tutor group ever smoking and parental or sibling smoking, using likelihood ratio tests to determine the effect of the addition of these interactions upon the final multivariate regression model, hypothesising that the effect of tutor group ever smoking might be greater upon those pupils from non-smoking families. We used odds ratios from the final multivariate model to estimate population attributable risk fraction (PAF) for selected exposures, using the formula:

$$\text{PAF} = \frac{p \times (RR - 1)}{p \times (RR - 1) + 1}$$

where p is the proportion of the population exposed and RR is the risk ratio of that exposure.

**RESULTS**

All 10 schools in the random sample took part in the study. Of a possible total of 8645 pupils in Years 7–11 on the school roll in these schools, 6522 pupils (75%) returned completed questionnaires, the response rates between schools varying from 53–86%; only one school had a response rate of less than 70% as a result of the loss of a box of completed questionnaires before collection. Of a possible total of 316 tutor groups surveyed, questionnaires were returned from 303 (96%). The age range of respondents was 11–16 years (mean 13.5 years), and 52% were boys. The median Townsend Index of the pupils was −0.82 (range −6.51 to 9.31). Educational achievement in the study schools, measured as the average proportion of children gaining five or more grade A to C General Certificate of Secondary Education results in 2000 was 41% (range 18–74%), which was below the respective averages for Nottinghamshire and England of 44% and 49%.

Forty nine per cent of respondents had ever smoked a cigarette, and 17% were current smokers (12% regular, 5% occasional). Current smoking was more prevalent in girls (20%) than boys (14%), increased with school year from 3% in Year 7 to 30% in Year 11 (table 1), and with quartile of deprivation from 12% in the least deprived to 20% in the most deprived children. Current smoking prevalence varied between schools from 11–33%. The median prevalence of ever smoking in tutor groups at the start of year 7 was 14% (range 0–48%). Of children who had ever smoked, 23% first started smoking in Year 7 and 32% had smoked their first cigarette before year 7. Forty nine per cent of children reported that at least one parent smoked, and 20% at least one sibling.

In univariate analysis, the relative odds of incident smoking during year 7 were significantly increased in relation to sex, parental smoking, sibling smoking, deprivation index, and the proportion of ever smokers in the tutor group at the beginning of year 7 (table 2). All of these univariate effects were confirmed as independent significant predictors of incident smoking in multivariate analysis, though the effect of social deprivation was much reduced, largely by adjustment for the effect of exposure to other ever smokers (table 2). The multivariate model presented used robust standard errors to adjust for clustering by school; adjustment of the model for clustering by class produced similar results. For a non-smoking child joining a tutor group in the highest relative to the lowest

---

**Table 1 Numbers of children in sample and percentage prevalence of smoking, by sex and year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smoking behaviour</th>
<th>Year 7 Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year 8 Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year 9 Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year 10 Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year 11 Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>All boys</th>
<th>All girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Never smoked</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>3366</td>
<td>3156</td>
<td>6522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoked once</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used to smoke</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current smoker</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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for decades. Therefore, while the presence of some pairs of friends in disruptive friendship groups are usually deliberately separated, sometimes be kept together, this is not standard practice and in most cases results in continued smoking and in most cases results in continued smoking. If smoking is to be prevented, it is essential to understand the major determinants of incident smoking during the early years in secondary school. Peer group and family influences are likely to be important in this respect. If smoking is to be prevented, it is essential to understand the major determinants of incident smoking during the early years in secondary school. Peer group and family influences are likely to be important in this respect.

When children move into secondary education in Nottinghamshire they join tutor groups that are selected to promote mixing of children from different geographical areas and of different academic abilities. During the first year of secondary school, children spend the majority of the school day in this tutor group, and thus develop new friendships and experience new peer group pressures from within it. Although in special cases pairs of best friends from a primary school may sometimes be kept together, this is not standard practice and disruptive friendship groups are usually deliberately separated. Therefore, while the presence of some pairs of friends in tutor groups may confound the effect of tutor group ever smoking on incident smoking to some extent, the majority of children will also experience substantial new peer group influence, particularly during their first secondary school year. Our finding that the prevalence of ever smoking in the new tutor group is a significant independent determinant of incident smoking therefore suggests a direct influence of peer group ever smoking on individual smoking risk rather than an effect of peer group selection. In our study this effect, along with the effect of smoking at home, accounted for much of the effect of social deprivation on smoking, suggesting that the high prevalence of smoking in disadvantaged populations is partly self-perpetuating through high levels of exposure to other smokers. The general implication of our findings is that incident smoking in adolescence may be viewed as a communicable behaviour, and that prevention of exposure to smokers by effective policies on smoking at school and elsewhere may be a powerful method of controlling and preventing the uptake of smoking in the general population. Our data were obtained using questions adapted from those used previously in national studies of smoking in UK adolescents, collected as part of a project designed to develop cessation services for female smokers in older school year groups. The socioeconomic status of our sample as measured by the Townsend Material Deprivation Index was slightly higher than the national average, which would lead us to expect a slightly lower than average prevalence of smoking; however, the overall educational achievement of children in the schools we studied was below average and children with low expectations of educational achievement are more likely to smoke. Our findings of a higher prevalence of smoking in girls, and with increasing age and social deprivation, are broadly similar to those reported nationally, and suggest that our findings are likely to reflect those of the national population of teenage smokers attending school in the UK. However, this inference needs to be cautioned by the fact that our

### Table 2 Unadjusted and adjusted risk factors for incident smoking in year 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factor</th>
<th>Unadjusted OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p (χ² tests)</th>
<th>Adjusted OR*</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p (likelihood ratio tests)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of questionnaire completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.04 to 4.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.85 to 4.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.61 to 5.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.42 to 5.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3.66 to 7.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2.89 to 6.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.12 to 6.24</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.62 to 5.65</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.36 to 1.86</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.31 to 1.88</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental smoking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither parent smokes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only father or mother smokes</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.29 to 1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.09 to 1.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents smoke</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.00 to 3.00</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.59 to 2.56</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling smoking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-smoking sibling(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking sibling(s)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.69 to 3.85</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.85 to 2.78</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No siblings</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.67 to 1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.60 to 1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer smoking: quartiles of proportion of classmates who had smoked at the beginning of year 7 (range)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest (0–7.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (7.7–13.0%)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.08 to 1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.92 to 1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (13.3–19.2%)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.22 to 1.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.08 to 1.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest (20.0–48.0%)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.17 to 1.87</td>
<td>0.002†</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.11 to 1.89</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social deprivation: quartiles of Townsend Index (range)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived (-6.51 to –3.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (~3.12 to ~0.84)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.02 to 1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.92 to 1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (~0.82 to 1.55)</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.10 to 1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.86 to 1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived (1.55 to 9.31)</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.39 to 2.25</td>
<td>&lt;0.001†</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.94 to 1.59</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mutually adjusted for all other variables in the table, using robust standard errors to adjust for clustering by school.
†Tests for linear trend.
CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio.
measure of the school year when smokers reported that they had tried their first cigarette was retrospective and as such may be subject to recall bias. Ideally this study now needs to be repeated in a longitudinal design, with additional measures of smoking in friendship groups.

The aetiology and natural history of smoking in adolescence is complex, and factors other than school or home smoking exposure are clearly important in determining the onset and continuation of smoking. Previous researchers have suggested that the mechanism by which peers effect adolescent smoking is not a direct result of pressure from peers who smoke, but rather a combination of modelling and normative influences in which peers who smoke do not encourage smoking, but do not provide any discouragement from smoking. Others have found that those outside friendship groups are more likely to smoke than those within. Pupils who were ever smokers in year 7 include current and past smokers as well as some who may have only experimented with cigarettes. Considerable movement into and out of smoking has been observed during school years, so it seems likely that during year 7 there would have some shifting with cigarettes. Considerable movement into and out of smokers as well as some who may have only experimented with cigarettes. Considerable movement into and out of smoking has been observed during school years, so it seems likely that during year 7 there would have some shifting with cigarettes.

Our finding in relation to exposure of other ever smokers at school has important legal and health implications, since parents and pupils are entitled to expect that schools will not permit exposure of children to significant health hazards. Although some exposure may well have taken place out of school (suggesting the need for policies in other places young people frequent), it seems likely that at this age, school exposure may be of greater importance. To date, exposure to environmental tobacco smoke has been recognised as an occupational or school health issue in relation to the direct adverse effects of smoking on individual health, but the effect on the environmental tobacco smoke has been recognised as an occupational or school health issue in relation to the direct adverse effects of smoking on individual health, but the effect on the psychological and social well-being of pupils is less well understood. Although smoking is not a direct result of pressure from peers who smoke, but rather a combination of modelling and normative influences in which peers who smoke do not encourage smoking, but do not provide any discouragement from smoking. Others have found that those outside friendship groups are more likely to smoke than those within.

Our suggestion that preventing exposure to smoking in school could have an important impact on adolescent smoking incidence is supported by evidence that restriction of exposure to smokers in other locations can reduce smoking prevalence. Although schools based smoking prevention programmes that focus on developing children’s individual social skills in resisting peer pressure have to date been of limited value, a recent study has shown that schools with strong, strictly enforced smoking policies tend to have a lower prevalence of smoking than schools with weaker or poorly enforced smoking policies. Our findings suggest that a further benefit of effective non-smoking policies at school may be to reduce smoking not only in established smokers, but also to delay or possibly prevent incident smoking in young people.
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