

Peer Influence on Smoking: A Review Article

Nazish Shabbir¹, Sidra Mubeen², Ayesha Nowsher³, Bushra Khan⁴, Rumaisa Mehmood⁵,
Saba Khurshid⁶, Faiza Ashfaq⁷, Sumbul Raja⁸, Farhat Nisar⁹, Samia Wasif¹⁰

COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Islamabad,
PAKISTAN.

nippsychologist@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Smoking is a wide spread phenomenon in this world. When we talk about young or adolescents this is more common. Smoking is considered as a social trade mark for the young now- a -days. Adolescents majorly start smoking due to many factors but the important factor is peer influence. The young start smoking to endure conformity to their peer groups. This study is aimed to explore the influence of peers on smoking by reviewing the relevant literature available. It is aimed to know that how teenagers start smoking and this habit stay with them as long as they live. When they start doing it they become chain smokers. When they change their schools, colleges or universities they automatically find that group in which smokers already exist.

Review of the literature was used as the research method and it signifies that really peers influence a lot on smoking habit and it also denotes that peers, best friends and even class mates play an important role in starting of the smoking habit.

Keywords: smoking, peers' influence, conformity to peer groups

INTRODUCTION

Smoking is a practice in which a substance is burned and resulting smoke is inhaled and that smoke entered into bloodstream. Most commonly substance is dried leave of tobacco which has been rolled into a small cylindrical shaped called 'cigarette'. This leaves a relaxing substance into the blood and gives a calm effect for some time. It is the most common drug which is used for recreational purpose.

Peer pressure is the pressure exerts by groups to change the attitudes of individuals. The individual change the behavior or adopt new one to confirm with the group. The person may adopt or change the behavior intentionally or unintentionally.

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL POINT OF VIEW ON SOCIAL INFLUENCES

Social impact is the impact others have on individual and gathering disposition and conduct (Berkman 2000). The conceptualization proposes that social impacts on immature smoking are applied through social connection, interpersonal organizations, and gathering enrollment that work fundamentally on social standards.

Theoretical Model for Social Impacts on Smoking

Social standards are the examples of exact convictions, disposition, and practices (Axelrod 1984; Kameda, Takezawa, and Hastie 2005). Since human improvement happens gradually, people are standardized after some time by family, school, and group and religious foundations as per the predominant social standards. Social standards are impacted by – additionally impact – social connection, bunch participation, and informal communities. The social impact forms that encourage these proportional connections between social standards and social structures are socialization and choice. Quickly, socialization is the inclination for

people's standards and practices to be impacted by the standards and practices of one's gathering and complying with them. Determination, in any case, alludes to the propensity of people to look for our associates with comparable standards and practices (Simons-Morton 2007).

Social connection alludes to the open doors for collaboration and the connections inside which singular cooperation happens (Webster, Freeman, and Aufdemberg 2001). Social connection decides the broadness, degree and nature of interpersonal collaboration and along these lines shapes the translation of social standards. As noted, people are social animals who live in families, dwell in neighborhoods, fit in with religious associations, go to class, and go to work, all social ventures through which most social collaborations happen and which characterize the social setting. Immediate and essential social impact is thought to happen fundamentally inside people's proximal social setting, which incorporates the family and associate gatherings (Dawkins 1989). Our encounters and the data we pick up fit as a fiddle our comprehension of what is regularizing and worthy conduct and train us in social relations (Dawkins 1989)

Bunch participation (e.g., family, religious, school, companion) is an especially effective standardizing knowledge and individuals frequently change their recognitions, suppositions, and conduct to be reliable with guidelines or desires (standards) of the gathering (Forgas and Williams 2001; Kameda, Takezawa, and Hastie 2005). Associate gathering alliance gets to be especially essential and compelling amid puberty (Brown 1989). Being a companion or piece of a bigger gathering, for example, a faction, classroom, evaluation, school, club, or movement; or approximately affiliating with a formless swarm with comparative investments (e.g., sports, music, medications) gives awesome profits of acknowledgement, companionship, and character, however can likewise request similarity (Brown 1989). Bunch individuals have a tendency to impart basic state of mind and conduct and this is especially valid for juvenile associate gatherings (Eiser, Morgan, Gammage, Brooks, and Kirby 1991). Substance utilization is one component about which companions and gatherings of young people have a tendency to come to understanding, prompting gathering homogeneity (Kandel 1978), albeit there may be times of youthfulness when companion impact is most noteworthy (Eckhardt, Woodruff, and Edler 1994; Steinberg and Monahan 2007). Helplessness to associate impacts may change by sexual orientation and race (surveyed in Hoffman, Monge, Chou, and Valente 2007).

In outline, teenagers encounter a scope of social impacts that may give some direct consequences for the probability of substance utilization, including smoking, yet primarily give circuitous impacts through social standards. In this segment, we have introduced social setting, informal communities, and gathering participation as discrete wellsprings of impact; be that as it may, they are very covering and intelligent. As proposed by Bronfenbrenner (1979), it might be valuable to think about the quality of different social impacts as relying upon vicinity and recurrence of contact, where the nearest circles of impact incorporate the individuals with whom youths relate more often than not (family and associates) and whose impact on their conduct, especially smoking.

What are the Theoretical Explanations of How Social Influence Contributes to Adolescent Smoking?

Nobody hypothesis completely clarifies social impact, yet numerous speculations underline that individuals learn through social cooperation. A considerable exchange of hypothesis is past the extent of the present audit, and different papers have exhibited astounding diagrams of hypothesis identifying with immature smoking uptake (Hoffman, Monge, Chou, and Valente 2007; Kobus 2003). Notwithstanding, it might be valuable here to call attention to

the centrality of social standards in the noticeable speculations ordinarily used to outline examine and clarify discoveries on companion gathering impacts. Social cognitive hypothesis (Bandura 1996) accentuates the significance of cognitive representations as desires about social standards that emerge from observational and experiential learning. Contemplated activity (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975) underscores the significance of saw social (subjective) standards on aims. Essential socialization (Oetting and Donnermeyer 1998) and social holding speculations (Hirschi 1969) propose that juvenile associate gathering impacts will be stronger without solid social bonds with family and school. Social personality hypothesis (Terry, Hogg, and White 2000) recommends that youths attempt on different personalities and embrace the standards that are fundamental to the social character of the companion gathering to stay in great standing. Correspondingly, social trade hypothesis (Kelley and Thibaut 1985) contends that companionships and gathering enrollment obliges reasonable trades (correspondence), prompting similarity of conduct in the middle of companions and gathering individuals. Obviously, the nature of the connections of gathering individuals extraordinarily impacts the way of this correspondence (Plickert, Cote, and Wellman 2007). Interpersonal organization hypothesis proposes that social standards are molded by data imparted among individuals from a social framework (Scott 2000; Valente 1995). Standards additionally figure conspicuously in the writing on influence and social promoting (Hastings and Saren 2003). For sure, social impact is the premise for two-stage correspondence methods in which influential interchanges are coordinated not at a definitive target, however at supposition pioneers whose demeanor and conduct impact others in their social gatherings (Rogers, 2003). Urberg et al. (2003) portrayed the two-stage model of social impact as it applies to pre-adult substance utilization.

Each of these hypotheses imparts the viewpoint that nearby (proximal) connections give an essential social impact, while the media and different parts of society give critical however optional impacts. Close connections are most vital in light of the fact that they are diligent, esteemed, and passionate. People connect all the more frequently and invest additional time with close connections, and time spent together gives chances to impact. Each of these hypotheses additionally perceives that teenagers create recognitions about social standards from data imparting (through collaboration or perception) with individuals and gatherings in their social surroundings. In a word, social impact is verifiable or express in numerous psycho-social hypotheses and is a standout amongst the most reliably considered sensation in social brain science and influence (Terry and Hogg 2000).

Peer Group Similarity With Respect to Smoking

To What Extent Does Peer Group Smoking Predict Adolescent Smoking?

The inclination for immature companion bunch individuals to impart regular qualities, for example, smoking, termed then again as associate gathering grouping or homogeneity, has been decently portrayed (Andrews, Tildesley, Hops, and Li 2002; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001; Alexander, Piazza, Mekos, and Valente, 2001). Great proof of this affiliation originates from studies utilizing forthcoming examination plans, which permit the scientist to figure out whether companion utilization predicts future immature utilization, along these lines giving stronger confirmation of causality than cross-sectional affiliations. In reality, exploration utilizing planned outlines evaluate juvenile and associate substance use at pattern (Time 1) and pre-adult substance use at postliminary (Time 2 or at different time focuses), giving a test of the degree to which peer substance utilization predicts possible youthful utilization, while controlling for pre-adult standard utilization. Through standard writing survey systems (as talked about in the presentation), we recognized 40 forthcoming studies distributed since 1999 connecting companion gathering smoking or measures of substance

utilize that incorporate smoking, to future immature utilization.

In spite of an extensive variety of contrasts in systems and populaces examined, everything except one of the papers audited reported positive relationship between companion use at Time 1 and youthful smoking at post luminary, including the accompanying: (a) 23 of 24 papers that analyzed the relationship of companion smoking or smoking as a feature of a measure of substance utilization at Time 1 and smoking or substance use at postliminary; (b) each of the nine papers that inspected the relationship between evaluation level pervasiveness at Time 1 and smoking at postliminary (Bricker, Andersen, Rajan, Sarason, and Peterson 2007; Eisenberg and Forster 2003; Ellickson, Bird, Orlando, Klein, and Mccaffrey 2003; Ellickson, Perlman, and Klein 2003; Epstein, Griffin, and Botvin 2000; McCabe, Schulenberg, Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman, and Kloska 2005; Rodriguez, Romer, and Audrain-McGovern 2007; Spijkerman, van lair Eijnden, and Engels 2005); (c) every one of the five papers that reported both companion and grade level predominance (Epstein, Bang, and Botvin 2007; Gritz, Prokhorov, Hudmon, Jones, Rosenblum, Chang, Chamberlain, Taylor, Johnston, and De Moor 2003; Simons-Morton and Haynie 2003b; Simons-Morton 2002; Smet, Maes, De Clercq, Haryanti, and Winarno 1999);

(d) and each of the three papers that analyzed the impact of companion utilization at Time 1 on pre-adult smoking direction bunches (Abroms, Simons-Morton, Haynie, and Chen 2005; Vitaro, Wanner, Brendgen, Gosselin, and Gendreau 2004; Wills, Resko, Anette, and Mendoza 2004). All past articles analyzed smoking as a particular result, except for the article by Wills et al (2004), which considered smoking as a feature of a substance use composite score. To better delineate the impact of companion smoking on pre-adult smoking, we portray select discoveries in the consequent sections.

Are Adolescents Influenced (Socialized) By their Friends or Do Adolescents Select Friends With Similar Interests (Selection) With Respect To Smoking?

The procedures by which associate impact prompts companion bunch similarity of conduct are socialization and determination. Socialization is the propensity for state of mind and conduct to be impacted by the real or saw demeanor and conduct (e.g., standards) of one's' companions and the acclimating properties of gathering participation. Choice, then again, is the propensity to offshoot and creates fellowships with the individuals who have comparative disposition and normal hobbies (Simons-Morton 2007).

Peer Socialization

Peer socialization is the impact of existing social connections on the arrangement of social standards. With socialization, the gathering acknowledges a youthful taking into account imparted qualities. To be acknowledged, the youthful tackles the disposition and practices of the gathering (Evans, Powers, Hersey, and Renaud 2006). Peer socialization can be obvious, as in companion weight, or saw, where the pre-adult acknowledges or changes mentality and conduct in light of saw gathering standards that could possibly be genuine. Standardizing methods that encourage the uptake of youthful smoking can likewise debilitate use (Stanton, Lowe, and Gillespie 1996).

Peer socialization is regularly alluded to as associate weight, a term that proposes that youths straightforwardly convince their companions to fit in with their conduct. Notwithstanding, associate weight is stand out part of socialization. While there is proof that teenagers do offer their companions cigarettes and that smoking is regularly started in the setting of associates (Kirke 2004; Lucas and Lloyd 1999; Robinson, Dalton, and Nicholson 2006), a large portion of the confirmation demonstrates that socialization is mostly a regularizing methodology and not one of plain companion weight. In reviews, youth report that plain associate weight is not

a variable for their smoking, yet report that they once in a while experience inner weight to smoke in the vicinity of different teenagers who are smoking, a confirmation for the impact of saw social standards instead of obvious companion weight (Nichter, Nichter, Vuckovic, Quintero, and Ritenbaugh 1997). These discoveries recommend that apparent social standards apply a standardizing impact.

Social standards require just be seen to impact conduct. It has been demonstrated that young people in some cases see that the predominance of smoking is higher among their companions than they are in reality (Bauman and Ennett 1996; Iannotti, Bush, and Weinfurt 1996), which may be because of a few conceivable elements. Youths might mentally extend their own particular smoking conduct onto others, along these lines overestimating smoking commonness (Miller, Monin, and Prentice 2000). Youths might likewise add to a false agreement that one's disposition and conduct are standardizing when they are not (Berkowitz 2004).

Generally, it appears that socialization happens fundamentally through aberrant weight to accommodate through genuine or saw social standards. Albeit immediate and clear associate weight probably works, there is considerably less observational confirmation of its significance contrasted and the roundabout impact on social standards.

Peer Selection

Dissimilar to socialization, where the individual fits in with gathering standards, choice happens when an individual looks for or partners with a companion or gathering with regular disposition, practices, or different qualities. Determination methods incorporate de-choice. At the point when a few individuals from a companion gathering start smoking or exploring different avenues regarding different substances, different individuals from the associate gathering can react by dropping out of the gathering (de-choice), complying with the new amass standard (socialization), gambling gathering dissatisfaction, or living with the discord between their standards and the bunch's (Andrews, Tildesley, Hops, and Li 2002).

Choice may be dynamic and inner, when an individual associates with others by relating to them or with what they speak to, instead of affiliating on the premise of detectable practices. Case in point, young people may relate to gatherings as per musical inclination, notoriety, or hobbies (terBogt, Engels, and Dubas 2006). Such affiliations may be exceedingly transient among youths. Choice likewise includes genuine association and, inside the points of confinement of their interpersonal organization, individuals incline toward people or gatherings who impart their diversions and values, and give a steady connection to their own perspectives and conduct (Urberg, Degirmencioglu, and Tolson 1998). Young people who are occupied with smoking, for instance, may choose as companion's teenagers with comparative investments in smoking (Ennett and Bauman 1994), albeit smoking may be only one appearance of a star grouping of social standards prompting social determination.

Are Best Friends, Close Friends, or Crowd Affiliations More Important?

While considerable data exists on the autonomous impacts of closest companions and companion aggregates on immature smoking, couple of studies has inspected the differential effect of these connections. Building a nearby association with one companion and fitting in with an associate gathering are thought to be pretty much just as essential for teenagers and both sorts of connections may encourage crucial formative assignments, for example, the building of social aptitudes, character arrangement, and social bolster (Giordano 2003). Yet, closest companions and associate gatherings may not just as impact young people's conduct. In the event that impact results from needing to please companions, then closest companions would be relied upon to be more powerful. Notwithstanding, if impact gets from the yearning

to adjust to the gathering standards, then associate gathering impact would be relied upon to supersede the impact of one nearby companion (Urberg, Degirmencioglu, and Pilgrim 1997).

Just four studies were distinguished that inspected whether best fellowships and companion gatherings work diversely to influence pre-adult smoking and other substance utilization. A few discoveries rose up out of these studies. To start with, the impact of a closest companion when contrasted with the impact of a gathering of companions fluctuated relying upon the conduct under thought (closest companion's impact was most prominent for practices that are illicit), and the phase of utilization (closest companions anticipated initiation while the associate gathering anticipated move to current utilization) (Urberg, Degirmencioglu, and Pilgrim 1997). Second, best kinships and associate gatherings communicated to better anticipate youthful utilization (Hussong 2002). For instance, young people with substance-utilizing closest companions demonstrated a diminished danger for substance use in the event that they had other close companions who were not high substance-clients. In any case, the impact of a closest companion was demonstrated to be autonomous of associate gatherings in another examination (Alexander, Piazza, Mekos, and Valente, 2001). At long last, youths with proportional kinships inside a gathering were less impacted by the general level of smoking among the gathering than teenagers with no corresponding companionships (Aloise-Young, Graham, and Hansen 1994).

Swarm connection has been recognized as another wellspring of impact on youthful smoking (Engels, Scholte, van Lieshout, de Kemp, and Overbeek 2006; Michell 1997; Michell and Amos 1997; Urberg, Shyu, and Liang 1990). Every swarm has a notoriety that permits youths to perceive youth who offer comparative convictions, mentality and practices. As youths offshoot with particular swarms, they have a tendency to grasp the practices of the swarm, maybe as a consequence of their view of the swarm's notoriety, instead of direct associate weight from swarm individuals (Kobus 2003).

The commonness of smoking differs impressively between youth swarms. Swarms that are seen as "freak" or offbeat, are prone to have the most elevated smoking rates (La Greca, Prinstein, and Fetter 2001; Schofield, Pattison, Hill, and Borland 2003; Verkooijen, de Vries, and Nielsen 2007). Purposes behind smoking likewise change crosswise over swarms, and can extend from the upkeep of high economic wellbeing to the need to scale in the chain of importance (Michell and Amos 1997). The relationship between swarm participation and smoking can best be clarified by social character hypothesis, which stresses the significance of gathering enrollment for youths' identity toward oneself. As needs be, teenagers subsidiary with a swarm are liable to be impacted by the swarm's standards and will have a tendency to receive the swarm's regularizing practices (Verkooijen, de Vries, and Nielsen 2007).

In outline, closest companions, associate gatherings and social swarms all seem to influence teenagers' smoking and other substance utilization. While couple of studies have inspected whether their belongings are autonomous or intelligent, results recommend that impacts are reliant on (1) the particular substance utilized; (2) the phase of utilization; and (3) relationship qualities (e.g., immature is individual from the gathering however not fundamental to it). More research is expected to clear up the instruments through which these impact procedures happen, especially utilizing national examples, to consider the concurrent assessment of the impacts of closest companions, companion gatherings and social swarms over a scope of substances and for diverse demographic subgroups.

CONCLUSION

In this literature review we provide enough support for the topic selected. At the end we come to be more confident in saying that peers do influence regarding smoking. When the

young start doing it frenzy started and they cannot stop it. They do it and become more and more involved in it.

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This research paper will provide an authentic approach for the readers on peer influence regarding smoking. It is suggested that research on associate impacts on immature smoking would profit from further examination of the relative impacts of closest companion, close companions and general companion bunch, particularly among juvenile subgroups (for e.g., by sexual orientation, age, race/ethnicity). Further, looking at the impacts of socialization and choice merits proceeded with consideration, as methodological advances (e.g., informal organization investigations programming) and more refined study outlines (e.g., longitudinal studies catching up youths and their associate gathering) encourage the separation of these two methods. The other researchers can do research on gender comparison in various age groups, cultural perspectives, sub cultural perspectives, SES and exposure to media.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abroms, L., Simons-Morton, B., Haynie, D. L., & Chen, R. S. (2005). Psychosocial predictors of smoking trajectories during middle and high school. *Addiction, 100*, 852–861. [PubMed]
- [2] Alexander, C., Piazza, M., Mekos, D., & Valente, T. (2001). Peers, schools, and adolescent cigarette smoking. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 29*(1), 22–30. [PubMed]
- [3] Aloise-Young, P. A., Graham, J. W., & Hansen, W. B. (1994). Peer Influence on Smoking Initiation during Early Adolescence - A Comparison of Group Members and Group Outsiders. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 281–287. [PubMed]
- [4] Andrews, J. A., Tildesley, E., Hops, H., & Li, F. (2002). The influence of peers on young adult substance use. *Health Psychology, 21*, 349–357. [PubMed]
- [5] Arnett, J. J. (2007). The myth of peer influence in adolescent smoking initiation. *Health Education and Behavior, 34*, 594–607. [PubMed]
- [6] Audrain-McGovern, J., Rodriguez, D., Tercyak, K. P., Neuner, G., & Moss, H. B. (2006). The impact of self-control indices on peer smoking and adolescent smoking progression. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 31*, 139–151. [PubMed]
- [7] Avenevoli, S., & Merikangas, K. R. (2003). Familial influences on adolescent smoking. *Addiction, 98*, 1–20. [PubMed]
- [8] Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- [9] Bandura, A. (1996). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [10] Bauman, K. E., & Ennett, S. T. (1996). On the importance of peer influence for adolescent drug use: commonly neglected considerations. *Addiction, 91*, 185–198. [PubMed]
- [11] Berkman, L. F. (2000). Social support, social networks, social cohesion and health. *Social Work in Health Care, 31*:3–14. [PubMed]
- [12] Berkowitz, A. D. (2004). *An overview of the social norms approach*. In: Lederman L, Stewart L, Goodhart F, Laitman L, (Eds.), *Changing the culture of college drinking: A socially situated prevention campaign*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

- [13] Bricker, J. B., Andersen, M. R., Rajan, K. B., Sarason, I. G., & Peterson, A. V. (2007). The role of schoolmates' smoking and non-smoking in adolescents' smoking transitions: a longitudinal study. *Addiction, 102*, 1665–1675. [PubMed]
- [14] Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- [15] Brook, J. S., Pahl, K., & Ning, Y. M. (2006). Peer and parental influences on longitudinal trajectories of smoking among African Americans and Puerto Ricans. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research, 8*, 639–651. [PubMed]
- [16] Brown, B. B. (1989). *The role of peer groups in adolescents' adjustment to secondary school*. In: Berndt TJ, Ladd GW, editors. *Peer relationships in child development* (pp. 188–215). New York: Wiley.
- [17] Chen et al. (2006). Perceived smoking norms, socio environmental factors, personal attitudes and adolescent smoking in China: a mediation analysis with longitudinal data. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 38*, 359–368. [PubMed]
- [18] Cleveland, H. H., Wiebe, R. P., & Rowe, D. C. (2005). Sources of exposure to smoking and drinking friends among adolescents: A behavioral-genetic evaluation. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 166*, 153–169. [PubMed]
- [19] Cohen, S., & Syme, S. L. (1985). *Social support and health*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- [20] Dawkins, R. (1989). *The selfish gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [21] De Vries, H., Candel, M., Engels, R., & Mercken, L. (2006). Challenges to the peer influence paradigm: results for 12–13 year olds from six European countries from the European Smoking Prevention Framework Approach study. *Tobacco Control, 15*, 83–89. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
- [22] De Vries, H., Engels, R., Kremers, S., Wetzels, J., & Mudde, A. (2003). Parents' and friends' smoking status as predictors of smoking onset: findings from six European countries. *Health Education Research, 18*, 627–636. [PubMed]
- [23] Dielman, T. E., Butchart, A. T., & Shope, J. T. (1993). Structural equation model tests of patterns of family interaction, peer alcohol use, and intrapersonal predictors of adolescent alcohol use and misuse. *Journal of Drug Education, 23*, 273–316. [PubMed]
- [24] Dishion, T. J., & Andrew, D. W. (1995). Preventing escalation in problem behaviors with high-risk young adolescents: immediate and 1-year outcomes. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63*, 538–548. [PubMed]
- [25] Eckhardt, L., Woodruff, S. I., & Edler, J. P. (1994). A Longitudinal Analysis of Adolescent Smoking and Its Correlates. *Journal of School Health, 64*, 67–72. [PubMed]
- [26] Eisenberg, M. E., & Forster, J. L. (2003). Adolescent smoking behavior - Measures of social norms. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 25*, 122–128. [PubMed]
- [27] Eiser, J. R., Morgan, M., Gammage P., Brooks, N., & Kirby, R. (1991). Adolescent health behaviour and similarity-attraction: friends share smoking habits (really), but much else besides. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 339–348. [PubMed]
- [28] Ellickson, P. L., Bird, C. E., Orlando, M., Klein, D. J., & Mccaffrey, D. E. (2003). Social context and adolescent health behavior: Does school-level smoking prevalence

- affect students' subsequent smoking behavior? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 44, 525–535. [PubMed]
- [29] Ellickson, P. L., Perlman, M., & Klein, D. J. (2003). Explaining racial/ethnic differences in smoking during the transition to adulthood. *Addictive Behaviors*, 28, 915–931. [PubMed]
- [30] Engels, R. C., Scholte, R. H., van Lieshout, C. F., de Kemp, R., & Overbeek, G. (2006). Peer group reputation and smoking and alcohol consumption in early adolescence. *Addictive Behaviors*, 31, 440–449. [PubMed]
- [31] Engels Rutger, C. M. E., & van der Vorst, H. (2003). The Roles of Parents in Adolescent and Peer Alcohol Consumption. *The Netherlands Journal of Sociology*, 39, 53–68.
- [32] Ennett, S. T., & Bauman, K. E. (1994). The contribution of influence and selection to adolescent peer group homogeneity: the case of adolescent cigarette smoking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 653–663. [PubMed]
- [33] Ennett, S. T., Bauman, K. E., & Koch, G. G. (1994). Variability in cigarette smoking within and between adolescent friendship cliques. *Addictive Behaviors*, 19, 295–305. [PubMed]
- [34] Epstein, J. A., Bang, H., & Botvin, G. J. (2007). Which psychosocial factors moderate or directly affect substance use among inner-city adolescents? *Addictive Behaviors*, 32, 700–713. [PubMed]
- [35] Epstein, J. A., Griffin, K. W., & Botvin, G. J. (2000). A model of smoking among inner-city adolescents: The role of personal competence and perceived social benefits of smoking. *Preventive Medicine*, 31, 107–114. [PubMed]
- [36] Evans, W. D., Powers, A., Hersey, J., & Renaud, J. (2006). The influence of social environment and social image on adolescent smoking. *Health Psychology*, 25, 26–33. [PubMed]
- [37] Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- [38] Forgas, J. P., & Williams, K. D. (2001). *Social influence: direct and indirect processes*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- [39] Forrester, K., Biglan, A., Severson, H. H., & Smolkowski, K. (2007). Predictors of smoking onset over two years. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, 9, 1259–1267. [PubMed]
- [40] Giordano, P. C. (2003). Relationships in adolescence. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 257–281.
- [41] Griffin, K. W., Botvin, G. J., Doyle, M. M., Diaz, T., & Epstein, J. A. (1999). A six-year follow-up study of determinants of heavy cigarette smoking among high-school seniors. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 22, 271–284. [PubMed]
- [42] Gritz et al. (2003). Predictors of susceptibility to smoking and ever smoking: A longitudinal study in a triethnic sample of adolescents. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, 5, 493–506. [PubMed]
- [43] Haegerich, T. M., & Tolan, P. H. (2008). Core competencies and the prevention of adolescent substance use. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, 122, 47–60. [PubMed]

- [44] Hall, J. A., & Valente, T. W. (2007). Adolescent smoking networks: The effects of influence and selection on future smoking. *Addictive Behaviors*, 32, 3054–3059. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
- [45] Hastings, G., & Saren, M. (2003). The Critical Contribution of Social Marketing: Theory and Application. *Marketing Theory*, 3, 305–322.
- [46] Henry, D. B., Schoeny, M. E., Deptula, D. P., & Slavick, J. T. (2007). Peer selection and socialization effects on adolescent intercourse without a condom and attitudes about the costs of sex. *Child Development*, 78, 825–838. [PubMed]
- [47] Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- [48] Hoffman, B. R., Monge, P. R., Chou, C. P., & Valente, T. W. (2007). Perceived peer influence and peer selection on adolescent smoking. *Addictive Behaviors*, 32, 1546–1554. [PubMed]
- [49] Hussong, A. M. (2002). Differentiating peer contexts and risk for adolescent substance use. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31, 207–220.
- [50] Iannotti, R. J., Bush, P. J., & Weinfurt, K. P. (1996). Perception of friends' use of alcohol, cigarettes, and marijuana among urban schoolchildren: A longitudinal analysis. *Addictive Behaviors*, 21, 615–632. [PubMed]
- [51] Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2007). *Monitoring the future: national survey results on adolescent drug use: Overview of key findings, 2006*. Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- [52] Kameda, T., Takezawa, M., & Hastie, R. (2005). Where do social norms come from? The example of communal sharing. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 331–334.
- [53] Kandel, D. B. (1978). Similarity in real-life adolescent friendship pairs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 306–312.
- [54] Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1985). Self-Interest, Science, and Cynicism. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 3, 26–32.
- [55] Kirke, D. M. (2004). Chain reactions in adolescents' cigarette, alcohol, and drug use: similarity through peer influence or the patterning of ties in peer networks. *Social Networks*, 26, 3–28.
- [56] Kobus K. (2003). Peers and adolescent smoking. *Addiction*.98:37–55. [PubMed]
- [57] La Greca, A. M., Prinstein, M. J., & Fetter, M. D. (2001). Adolescent peer crowd affiliation: Linkages with health-risk behaviors and close friendships. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 26, 131–143. [PubMed]
- [58] Larson, N. I., Neumark-Sztainer, D., Hannan, P. J., & Story, M. (2007). Family meals during adolescence are associated with higher diet quality and healthful meal patterns during young adulthood. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 107, 1502–1510. [PubMed]
- [59] Leatherdale, S. T., Cameron, R., Brown, K. S., Jolin, M. A., & Kroeker, C. (2006). The influence of friends, family, and older peers on smoking among elementary school students: Low-risk students in high-risk schools. *Preventive Medicine*, 42(3), 218–222. [PubMed]

- [60] Livaudais, J. C., Napoles-Springer, A., Stewart, S., & Kaplan, C. P. (2007). Understanding Latino adolescent risk behaviors: Parental and peer influences. *Ethnicity & Disease, 17*, 298–304. [PubMed]
- [61] Lucas, L., & Lloyd, B. (1999). Starting smoking: girls' explanations of the influence of peers. *Journal of Adolescence, 22*, 647–655. [PubMed]
- [62] Maxwell, K. A. (2002). Friends: the role of peer influence across adolescent risk behaviors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31*, 267–277.
- [63] McCabe, S. E., Schulenberg, J. E., Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Kloska, D. D. (2005). Selection and socialization effects of fraternities and sororities on US college student substance use: a multi-cohort national longitudinal study. *Addiction, 100*, 512–524. [PubMed]
- [64] McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology, 27*, 415–444.
- [65] Mercken, L., Candel, M., Willems, P., & De Vries, H. (2007). Disentangling social selection and social influence effects on adolescent smoking: the importance of reciprocity in friendships. *Addiction, 102*, 1483–1492. [PubMed]
- [66] Michell, L. (1997). Loud, sad or bad: Young people's perceptions of peer groups and smoking. *Health Education Research, 12*, 1–14. [PubMed]
- [67] Michell, L., & Amos, A. (1997). *Girls, pecking order and smoking. Social Science & Medicine, 44*(12), 1861–1869 [PubMed]
- [68] Miller, D. T., Monin, B., & Prentice, D. A. (2000). *Pluralistic ignorance and inconsistency between private attitudes and public behaviors*. In: Terry DJ, Hogg M. A., (Eds.). *Attitudes, behavior and social context: The role of norms and group membership* (pp. 95–114). Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- [69] Mounts, N. S., & Steinberg, L. (1995). An Ecological Analysis of Peer Influence on Adolescent Grade-Point Average and Drug-Use. *Developmental Psychology, 31*, 915–922.
- [70] Nichter, M., Nichter, M., Vuckovic, N., Quintero, G., & Ritenbaugh, C. (1997). Smoking experimentation and initiation among adolescent girls: qualitative and quantitative findings. *Tobacco Control, 6*, 285–295. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
- [71] O'Loughlin, J., Paradis, G., Renaud, L., & Gomez, L. S. (1998). One-year predictors of smoking initiation and of continued smoking among elementary schoolchildren in multiethnic, low-income, inner-city neighbourhoods. *Tobacco Control, 7*, 268–275. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
- [72] Oetting, E. R., & Donnermeyer, J. F. (1998). Primary socialization theory: The etiology of drug use and deviance. I. *Substance Use & Misuse, 33*(4), 995–1026. [PubMed]
- [73] Pierce, J. P., & Gilpin, E. A. (1995). A Historical-Analysis of Tobacco Marketing and the Uptake of Smoking by Youth in the United-States - 1890–1977. *Health Psychology, 14*, 500–508. [PubMed]
- [74] Plickert, G., Cote, R. R., & Wellman, B. (2007). It's not who you know, it's how you know them: Who exchanges what with whom? *Social Networks, 29*, 405–429.
- [75] Robinson, L. A., Dalton, W. T., & Nicholson, L. M. (2006). Changes in adolescents' sources of cigarettes. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 39*, 861–867. [PubMed]

- [76] Robinson, L. A., Murray, D. M., Alfano, C. M., Zbikowski, S. M., Blitstein, J. L., & Klesges, R. C. (2006). Ethnic differences in predictors of adolescent smoking onset and escalation: A longitudinal study from 7th to 12th grade. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, 8, 297–307. [PubMed]
- [77] Rodriguez, D., & Romer, D., (2007). Audrain-McGovern J. Beliefs about the risks of smoking mediate the relationship between exposure to smoking and smoking. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 69, 106–113. [PubMed]
- [78] Schofield, P. E., Pattison, P. E., Hill, D. J., & Borland, R. (2003). Youth culture and smoking: Integrating social group processes and individual cognitive processes in a model of health-related behaviours. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 8, 291–306. [PubMed]
- [79] Scott, J. (2000). Social network analysis: A handbook. London: Saga Publications.
- [80] Simons-Morton, B. (2007). Social influences adolescent substance use. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 31, 672–684. [PubMed]
- [81] Simons-Morton, B., & Chen, R. (2005). Latent growth curve analyses of parent influences on drinking progression among early adolescents. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 66(1), 5–13. [PubMed]
- [82] Simons-Morton, B., Chen, R., Abroms, L., & Haynie, D. L. (2004). Latent growth curve analyses of peer and parent influences on smoking progression among early adolescents. *Health Psychology*.23:612–621. [PubMed]
- [83] Simons-Morton, B., & Chen, R. S. (2006). Over time relationships between early adolescent and peer substance use. *Addictive Behaviors*, 31, 1211–1223. [PubMed]
- [84] Simons-Morton, B., & Haynie, D. (2003a). *Center for Child Well-being. Growing up drug free: A developmental challenge*. In: Bornstein MH, Davidson L, Keyes CLM, Moore K. A., (Eds.). *Well-being: Positive Development across the Life Course* (pp. 109–122). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [85] Simons-Morton, B., Haynie, D. L., Crump, A. D., Eitel, P., & Saylor, K. E. (2001). Peer and parent influences on smoking and drinking among early adolescents. *Health Education & Behavior*, 28, 95–107. [PubMed]
- [86] Simons-Morton, B. G. (2004). The protective effect of parental expectations against early adolescent smoking initiation. *Health Education Research*, 19, 561–569. [PubMed]
- [87] Simons-Morton, B. G., & Haynie, D. L. (2003b). Psychosocial predictors of increased smoking stage among sixth graders. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 27, 592–602. [PubMed]
- [88] Simons-Morton, B. G. (2002). Prospective analysis of peer and parent influences on smoking initiation among early adolescents. *Prevention Science*, 3, 275–283. [PubMed]
- [89] Smet, B., Maes, L., De Clercq, L., Haryanti, K., & Winarno, R. D. (1999). Determinants of smoking behaviour among adolescents in Semarang, Indonesia. *Tobacco Control*, 8(2), 186–191. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
- [90] Spijkerman, R., van den Eijnden, R. J. J. M., & Engels, R. C. M. E. (2005). Self-comparison processes, prototypes, and smoking onset among early adolescents. *Preventive Medicine*, 40, 785–794. [PubMed]

- [91] Stanton, W. R., Lowe, J. B., & Gillespie, A. M. (1996). Adolescents' experiences of smoking cessation. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 43, 63–70. [PubMed]
- [92] Steinberg, L., & Monahan, K. C. (2007). Age differences in resistance to peer influence. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 1531–1543. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
- [93] terBogt, T. F. M., Engels, R. C. M. E., & Dubas, J. S. (2006). Party people: Personality and MDMA use of house party visitors. *Addictive Behaviors*, 31(7), 1240–1244. [PubMed]
- [94] Terry, D. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). *Attitudes, behaviors, and social context: The role of norms and group membership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [95] Terry, D. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). *White Katherine M. Attitude-behavior relations: Social identity and group membership*. In: Terry Deborah J, Hogg Michael A., (Eds.), *Attitudes, behavior and social context: The role of norms and group membership* (pp. 67–94). Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- [96] Tucker, J. S., Klein, D. J., & Elliott, M. N. (2004). Social control of health behaviors: a comparison of young, middle-aged, and older adults. *Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences & Social Sciences*, 59(4), 147–150. [PubMed]
- [97] Tucker, J. S., Martinez, J. F., Ellickson, P. L., & Edelen, M. O. (2008). Temporal associations of cigarette smoking with social influences, academic performance, and delinquency: A four-wave longitudinal study from ages 13 to 23. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 22(1), 1–11. [PubMed]
- [98] Tyas, S. L., & Pederson, L. L. (1998). Psychosocial factors related to adolescent smoking: a critical review of the literature. *Tobacco Control*, 7, 409–420. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
- [99] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2000). *Healthy people 2010: Understanding and improving health*. Washington, DC: US: Government printing office 2000.
- [100] Urberg, K. A., Degirmencioglu, S. M., & Pilgrim, C. (1997). Close friend and group influence on adolescent cigarette smoking and alcohol use. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(5), 834 – 844. [PubMed]
- [101] Urberg, K. A., Degirmencioglu S. M., & Tolson, J. M. (1998). Adolescent friendship selection and termination: the role of similarity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15, 703–710.
- [102] Urberg, K. A., Degirmencioglu, S. M., & Pilgrim, C. (2003). A two-stage model of peer influence in adolescent substance use: individual and relationship-specific differences in susceptibility to influence. *Addictive Behaviors*, 28, 1243–1256. [PubMed]
- [103] Urberg, K. A., Shyu, S. J., & Liang, J. (1990). Peer Influence in Adolescent Cigarette-Smoking. *Addictive Behaviors*, 15, 247–255. [PubMed]
- [104] Valente, T. W. (1995). *Network models of the diffusion of innovations*. Cresskill, NH: Hampton Press.
- [105] Valente, T. W., Gallaher, P., & Mouttapa, M. (2004). Using social networks to understand and prevent substance use: A trans disciplinary perspective. *Substance Use and Misuse*, 39, 1685–1712. [PubMed]
- [106] Verkooijen, K. T., de Vries, N. K., & Nielsen, G. A. (2007). Youth crowds and

- substance use: The impact of perceived group norm and multiple group identification. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 21, 55–61. [PubMed]
- [107] Vitaro, F., Wanner, B., Brendgen, M., Gosselin, C., & Gendreau, P. L. (2004). Differential contribution of parents and friends to smoking trajectories during adolescence. *Addictive Behaviors*, 29, 831–835. [PubMed]
- [108] Wilcox, P. (2003). An ecological approach to understanding youth smoking trajectories: *problems and prospects*. *Addiction*, 98, 57–77. [PubMed]
- [109] Wills, T. A., & Cleary, S. D. (1999). Peer and adolescent substance use among 6th-9th graders: latent growth analyses of influence versus selection mechanisms. *Health Psychology*, 18, 453–463. [PubMed]
- [110] Wills, T. A., Resko, J. A., Ainette, M. G., & Mendoza, D. (2004). Role of parent support and peer support in adolescent substance use: A test of mediated effects. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 18, 122–134. [PubMed]