Published in final edited form as:

Drug Alcohol Depend. 2017 June 01; 175: 55–59. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2017.01.038.

Adolescent Smoking Experimentation as a Predictor of Daily Cigarette Smoking

James D. Sargent, MD¹, Joy Gabrielli, PhD², Alan Budney, PhD³, Samir Soneji, PhD, and Thomas Wills, PhD⁴

¹C Everett Koop Institute, Norris Cotton Cancer Center, Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth

²Department of Data Science, Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth

³Center for Technology and Behavioral Health, Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth

⁴Cancer Prevention in the Pacific Program, University of Hawaii Cancer Center

Abstract

Objective—The utility of studying substance use during early adolescence depends on how well indices of lower-level experimentation predict the development of substance use problems. We examined associations between experimental cigarette use at T1, recanting of use 8 months later (T2), and daily smoking at 2 years (T4).

Methods—Longitudinal telephone survey of 6522 US youth aged 10–14, examining lifetime cigarette smoking (none, just puffing, 1–19, 20–100, >100) and recanting (i.e., reporting lifetime use at T1, denying ever using at T2) as predictors of T4 daily smoking using multivariable logistic regression. Covariates included sociodemographics, friend/family smoking, school performance, and personality characteristics.

Results—The sample was 51% male, 18% Black, 17% Hispanic, with 70% retained at T2. At T1, 407 (8.9%) adolescents reported some smoking, of whom 85 (20.9%) recanted at T2. At T4, 970 reported any smoking, of whom 88 (9.1%) were daily smokers. Any T1 experimentation identified two-thirds of T4 daily smokers (sensitivity = 66.7%) with a false positive rate of 7.8%. T1 lifetime smoking categories were associated with the following adjusted odds ratios for T4

Corresponding Author: James D. Sargent MD, Rubin 8, Norris Cotton Cancer Center, Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth, Lebanon, NH 03756, james.d.sargent@dartmouth.edu, 603-653-9025.

The authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

All authors had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Conflict of Interest No conflict declared

The funding organizations had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; or preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript.

Author Disclosures

Role of Funding Source Nothing declared.

Contributors All authors had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

daily smoking (vs. never smokers): 2.7 for recanters (95% confidence interval 0.82, 8.5), 3.5 for few puffs (1.7, 7.0), 9.6 for 1–19 cigarettes (4.1, 22.3), 3.8 for 20–100 cigarettes (1.0, 14.3), and 30.1 for >100 cigarettes (8.1, 111).

Conclusions—In this sample experimentation with cigarettes predicted future daily smoking with high utility. The findings provide a rationale for monitoring and reporting any experimentation cigarettes as a tobacco surveillance outcome.

Keywords

Adolescent; smoking; tobacco; cigarette; initiation; longitudinal

INTRODUCTION

Cigarette smoking is one of the most addictive of behaviors; any experience with smoking is a strong predictor of who will become an established smoker (Choi et al., 1997; Doubeni et al., 2010). Daily smoking is one of the most accepted indices of being an established smoker; longitudinal studies have consistently demonstrated that adolescent daily smokers (Saddleson et al., 2016) are highly likely to sustain smoking through adulthood—making daily smoking a clear adolescent outcome we wish to both predict and prevent.

Predictive studies of smoking have primarily focused on higher levels of early smoking (e.g., smoking 50–100 or > 100 cigarettes) as predictors of outcomes (Choi et al., 2001). Recently, some behavioral scientists have cast doubt on the validity of studying outcomes like trying cigarettes (Hajek and Bauld, 2015), arguing that most triers do not go on to daily addicted smoking. The primary issue remains in how well lower levels of experimentation predict eventual daily cigarette smoking.

The fact that anywhere between 10 to 30% of youths who report trying smoking at will deny ever trying at follow up (Fendrich and Rosenbaum, 2003; Percy et al., 2005; Siddiqui et al., 1999; Simon et al., 1996; Stanton et al., 2007; Stueve and O'Donnell, 2000)—termed recanting—is another underemphasized aspect of early experimentation. Recanting most often occurs at the following survey (Fendrich and Rosenbaum, 2003). On the face of it, recanting would seem to undercut the value of self-report of early experimentation as a predictor of future daily smoking; yet, the predictive validity of starting smoking then subsequently recanting on future use has not been tested.

This study examines a telephone-based sample of US youths who were surveyed in 2003 (when cigarettes were the primary tobacco product used by youth), then again 8 months later to evaluate recanting of any smoking, and again at 2 years after baseline to evaluate their level of current (past 30-day) tobacco use. The goal is to empirically assess the performance of early experimentation in predicting future daily smoking.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

A detailed description of the recruitment methods for study participants was published previously (Sargent et al., 2005). Between June and October 2003, we conducted a random-digit-dial telephone survey of 6522 US adolescents aged 10 to 14 years. The institutional review board at Dartmouth College approved all aspects of the study. The completion rate for the survey at baseline was 66% and the response rate was 32%.

Procedures

After baseline, three follow-up surveys were conducted at 8-month intervals; this study uses responses from T2 to assess recanting and responses from T4 (24 months after baseline) to assess current smoking status. Interviewers were trained to administer the survey in English or Spanish, and participants indicated their answers to sensitive questions by pressing numbers on the telephone.

Measures

Current Daily Cigarette Smoking at T4 (Dependent Variable)—At T4, current daily smoking was ascertained of all respondents who indicated ever smoking through the following question, “During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes? Your choices are none, 1–10 days, 11–29 days, or every day.”

Lifetime Cigarette Smoking at T1 and recanting at T2 (Independent Variable)—At each survey, ever smoking was ascertained through the question, “Have you ever tried smoking, even just a puff?” (Yes/No response). Among ever smokers, lifetime smoking was ascertained at each wave through the question, “How many cigarettes have you smoked in your life? Your choices are just a few puffs, 1 to 19 cigarettes, 20 to 100 cigarettes or more than 100 cigarettes.” Recanters were defined as respondents who indicated that they had ever smoked at T1, and then at T2 indicated that they had never smoked.

Covariates—Experimentation with smoking could be a marker for confounding influences – other risk factors that are correlated with early experimentation and also increase risk for established smoking. To assess socioeconomic status, we used parent reports on their education and household income to create a standardized variable (mean 0.00, std dev 0.79, Cronbach’s alpha = 0.68, full baseline sample). Personality variables included sensation seeking (e.g., “I like to do scary things”; “I like to do dangerous things”, 4 items [Cronbach’s alpha = 0.59] (Sargent et al., 2010)), rebelliousness (e.g., “I do things my parents wouldn’t want me to”, “I argue a lot with other kids”, 7 items, alpha = 0.73 (Sargent et al., 2001)), and self-esteem (e.g., “I like myself the way I am”, “I am happy with how I look”, 8 items, alpha = 0.74 (Sargent et al., 2001)). Any smoking by friends, siblings, or either parent was also assessed. School performance was assessed through the question, “How would you describe your grades in school?” Also assessed were maternal parenting responsiveness (e.g., “She listens to what I have to say”, “She makes me feel better when I’m upset”, 4 items, alpha = 0.77) and maternal rule making (e.g., “She has rules that I must

follow”, “She makes sure I go to bed on time”, 4 items, $\alpha = 0.60$) (Jackson et al., 1994; Jackson et al., 1998; Sargent et al., 2001).

Statistical Analyses

We examined the relation between study variables and sample attrition or lifetime smoking using chi square tests for dichotomous and ordinal variables, and linear regression for continuous variables. Logistic regression was used to examine sensitivity and specificity of lifetime smoking at T1 as a predictor of daily smoking at T4 using the “lsens” command in Stata 14.0. Sensitivity is the proportion of daily smokers at T4 identified by any smoking at T1; specificity is the proportion of those who are not daily smokers at T4 identified by no smoking at T1. Multivariable logistic regression was used to examine the independent relation between level of lifetime smoking at T1 and daily smoking at T4, controlling for T1 covariates. Ordinal and categorical variables were modeled using dummy variable analysis and continuous variables were entered such that the odds ratio reflected a 1-point increase in the variable. In a sensitivity analysis, the multivariable model was rerun as an ordinal logistic regression to test how well lifetime smoking at T1 predicted higher frequency of current smoking at T4.

RESULTS

Sample of Participants and their Smoking Status at T1 and T4

Of the baseline sample, 70.1% were retained in the study 2 years later. Loss to follow up was significantly higher among older and lower-SES adolescents, minorities, those with friends or family that smoked, who smoked themselves, had poorer school performance, had higher sensation seeking scores, and among those with lower scores for parental rule making.

The majority of the baseline sample (91.1%) were never smokers; more than half of triers (4.7% of the total) had only puffed on a cigarette and only 0.4% had smoked more than 100 cigarettes. At T2 follow up, 85 of T1 lifetime smokers (20.9%) indicated they had never smoked cigarettes, and these were labeled as recanters; their distribution on T1 lifetime smoking was just a few puffs 88.2%, 1–19 cigarettes 9.4%, 20–100 cigarettes 2.4% and >100 cigarettes 0%. At the T4 follow up, there were 970 ever smokers, of whom 314 (34.2%) were current smokers. Among current smokers, 178 (56.7%) had smoked 1–10 days, 48 (15.3%) had smoked 11–29 days, and 88 (28.0%) had smoked every day in the past month.

Compared to never-smokers, all categories of lifetime smoking at T1 were associated with all categories of current smoking at T4. For example, compared to never smokers, for whom 2.9% went on to smoke 1–10 days of the past 30 at T4, percentages for smoking 1–10 days were 14.1% for recanters, 16.0% for puffers, 10.1% for those who had smoked 1–19 cigarettes, 13.6% for 20–100 cigarettes, and 5.6% for >100 cigarettes. All covariates except gender were associated with lifetime smoking at T1.

Lifetime Smoking as a Predictor of Cigarette Smoking at Follow-up

Figure 1 shows results for lifetime smoking status at baseline as a predictor of daily smoking 2 years later. All categories of smoking behavior were strongly predictive of daily smoking at follow up, regardless of whether the respondent subsequently recanted after smoking at T1. Among never smokers at T1, only 29 (0.7%) were daily smokers at T4, whereas daily smoking prevalence for recanters, lifetime categories of puffer, 1–19, 20–100, >100 cigarettes respectively. Any lifetime smoking at T1, regardless of recanting, correctly identified two-thirds of future daily smokers (sensitivity 66.7%) and had a false positive rate of only 7.8% (or a specificity of 92.2%).

As shown in Table 1, compared with T1 never smokers, after adjusting for covariates, higher levels of T1 lifetime smoking were associated with the following AORs for daily smoking: 2.7 for recanters (95% confidence interval 0.82, 8.5), 3.5 for few puffs (1.7, 7.0), 9.6 for 1–19 cigarettes (4.1, 22.3), 3.8 for 20–100 cigarettes (1.0, 14.3), 30.1 for >100 cigarettes (8.1, 111.2). Other risk factors associated with daily smoking included Hispanic ethnicity (AOR 0.20 compared to White), friend smoking (AOR 1.7), parent smoking (AOR 4.2), school performance and sensation seeking. Neither gender nor parental SES were predictors of daily smoking in the parsimonious multivariate model.

A sensitivity analysis used ordered logistic regression to model T1 lifetime smoking and recanting as a predictor of higher T4 current smoking, and included covariates in the parsimonious model. Compared with T1 never smokers, higher levels of T1 lifetime smoking were associated with the following adjusted proportional odds ratios for having a higher level of current smoking at T4: 3.1 for recanters (95% confidence interval 1.7, 5.6), 3.7 for few puffs (2.5, 5.4), 6.6 for 1–19 cigarettes (3.7, 11.9), 8.6 for 20–100 cigarettes (3.4, 21.3), and 31.4 for >100 cigarettes (10.0, 98.1).

DISCUSSION

In this study, experimentation with cigarette smoking during ages 10–14 years predicted daily smoking two years later, independent of other cigarette smoking risk factors. The association was moderately strong (adjusted odds ratios of 3 or more in most cases), regardless of the level of experimentation, or whether the adolescent subsequently recanted early smoking. The association was sensitive and specific: by itself, any experimentation identified two-thirds of future regular smokers and had a false positive rate of less than 8 percent. Along with others, this study emphasizes the public health significance of assessing and reporting any cigarette smoking in adolescent prevalence surveys as a threshold of behavioral concern. The present study also supports the idea that even adolescents who report smoking, then recant, have higher risk for smoking in the future compared to non-smokers.

The present multivariate analysis clarifies that just puffing on cigarettes independently predicts daily use of that product, over-and-above the other demographic, social and personality factors that characterize the risk prone adolescent (Jessor and Jessor, 1977). Demonstrating that lower levels of early experimentation independently predict maintenance and progression of that behavior is an important part of defining the role of early

engagement with a product as it relates to future use. Prospective studies of new tobacco product use may also allow researchers to compare these products on appeal and abuse liability. Products for which early experimental stages better predict later daily use are, by that metric, more appealing. Assessments of product-specific craving may help determine the degree to which higher appeal is a function of higher abuse liability. Thus, prospective studies that assess multiple tobacco products should include measures of early experimentation, such as lifetime smoking (even just trying smoking), in addition to items that assess craving for each product.

Limitations

This study was conducted in 2003–5, when cigarettes were the primary tobacco product used by youths, and when cigarette experimentation was much higher than it is today. Although the transitions we report to daily smoking are partly product specific (even though the cigarette has not changed much as a delivery device), we cannot be sure how well they still apply to the current multiple product use environment, which needs to be confirmed with contemporary longitudinal studies. Attrition was associated with most of the smoking predictors as well as the behavior itself, so the result of the analysis should be applied with caution to certain groups, such as minority adolescents, for whom loss to follow-up was particularly high.

CONCLUSIONS

This study provides a rationale for monitoring and reporting all levels of experimentation with cigarettes because of high predictive validity for future daily smoking. Any experimentation also effectively identifies a relatively small group of adolescents for prevention messaging, among whom lie the majority of future daily smokers.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the following support from the National Institutes of Health: National Cancer Institute (R01-CA077023, Sargent PI), NIDA (T42-DA037202, Postdoctoral fellowship, Gabrielli), and NIDA (R01-DA032243, PI Budney).

References

- Choi WS, Gilpin EA, Farkas AJ, Pierce JP. Determining the probability of future smoking among adolescents. *Addiction*. 2001; 96:313–323. [PubMed: 11182877]
- Choi WS, Pierce JP, Gilpin EA, Farkas AJ, Berry CC. Which adolescent experimenters progress to established smoking in the United States. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 1997; 13:385–391. [PubMed: 9315272]
- Doubeni CA, Reed G, Difranza JR. Early course of nicotine dependence in adolescent smokers. *Pediatrics*. 2010; 125:1127–1133. [PubMed: 20439592]
- Fendrich M, Rosenbaum DP. Recanting of substance use reports in a longitudinal prevention study. *Drug and alcohol dependence*. 2003; 70:241–253. [PubMed: 12757962]
- Hajek, P., Bauld, L. Expert reaction to study on e-cigarette use and subsequent smoking in US teenagers. Science Media Centre; 2015.
- Jackson C, Bee-Gates DJ, Henriksen L. Authoritative parenting, child competencies, and initiation of cigarette smoking. *Health education quarterly*. 1994; 21:103–116. [PubMed: 8188487]

- Jackson C, Henriksen L, Foshee VA. The Authoritative Parenting Index: predicting health risk behaviors among children and adolescents. *Health education & behavior: the official publication of the Society for Public Health Education*. 1998; 25:319–337. [PubMed: 9615242]
- Jessor R, Jessor SL. Problem behavior and psychosocial development: A longitudinal study of youth. 1977
- Percy A, McAlister S, Higgins K, McCrystal P, Thornton M. Response consistency in young adolescents' drug use self-reports: a recanting rate analysis. *Addiction*. 2005; 100:189–196. [PubMed: 15679748]
- Saddleson ML, Kozlowski LT, Giovino GA, Homish GG, Mahoney MC, Goniewicz ML. Assessing 30-day quantity-frequency of U.S. adolescent cigarette smoking as a predictor of adult smoking 14 years later. *Drug and alcohol dependence*. 2016; 162:92–98. [PubMed: 26987520]
- Sargent JD, Beach ML, Adachi-Mejia AM, Gibson JJ, Titus-Ernstoff LT, Carusi CP, Swain SD, Heatherton TF, Dalton MA. Exposure to movie smoking: its relation to smoking initiation among US adolescents. *Pediatrics*. 2005; 116:1183–1191. [PubMed: 16264007]
- Sargent JD, Beach ML, Dalton MA, Mott LA, Tickle JJ, Ahrens MB, Heatherton TF. Effect of seeing tobacco use in films on trying smoking among adolescents: cross sectional study. *Bmj*. 2001; 323:1394–1397. [PubMed: 11744562]
- Sargent JD, Tanski S, Stoolmiller M, Hanewinkel R. Using sensation seeking to target adolescents for substance use interventions. *Addiction*. 2010; 105:506–514. [PubMed: 20402995]
- Siddiqui O, Mott JA, Anderson TL, Flay BR. Characteristics of inconsistent respondents who have "ever used" drugs in a school-based sample. *Substance use & misuse*. 1999; 34:269–295. [PubMed: 10069753]
- Simon TR, Sussman S, Dent CW, Stacy AW, Burton D, Flay BR. Predictors of misreporting cigarette smoking initiation among adolescents. *Evaluation review*. 1996; 20:552–567. [PubMed: 10183261]
- Stanton CA, Papandonatos G, Lloyd-Richardson EE, Niaura R. Consistency of self-reported smoking over a 6-year interval from adolescence to young adulthood. *Addiction*. 2007; 102:1831–1839. [PubMed: 17784897]
- Stueve A, O'Donnell L. Inconsistencies over time in young adolescents' self-reports of substance use and sexual intercourse. *Substance use & misuse*. 2000; 35:1015–1034. [PubMed: 10847220]

HIGHLIGHTS

- The utility of smoking research in youth rests on early predictors of later smoking behavior.
- Trying smoking in early adolescence identified two-thirds of later daily smokers (sensitivity 66.6%).
- Trying smoking had a false positive rate of only 7.8% (specificity of 92.2%).
- All levels of T1 lifetime smoking increased risk of daily smoking 2 years later.

Figure 1.
Lifetime smoking status as a predictor of daily smoking two years later.

Table 1
Association between T1 lifetime cigarette smoking and daily cigarette smoking two years later (T4).

	Unadjusted		Multivariate Models			
			Parsimonious		Full Model*	
Variable	Odds Ratio	(95% CI)	Odds Ratio	(95% CI)	Odds Ratio	(95% CI)
Lifetime smoking W1						
Never	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Just a few puffs	14.0	(7.7, 25.4)	3.5	(1.7, 7.0)	3.8	(1.9, 7.6)
1–19 cigarettes	50.4	(26.3, 96.4)	9.6	(4.1, 22.3)	10.8	(4.5, 25.8)
20–100 cigarettes	42.0	(14.5, 121.4)	3.8	(1.0, 14.3)	3.8	(1.0, 14.8)
More than 100 cigarettes	285.4	(100.3, 812.1)	30.1	(8.1, 111.2)	36.3	(9.0, 145.9)
Recant W2	7.1	(2.4, 20.5)	2.7	(0.82, 8.5)	3.0	(0.92, 10.0)
Age						
10	Ref		Ref		Ref	
11	5.5	(0.66, 45.8)	4.1	(0.49, 35.5)	4.3	(0.50, 36.7)
12	9.2	(1.2, 71.7)	4.7	(0.58, 37.8)	4.8	(0.59, 38.7)
13	29.5	(4.0, 215.7)	8.5	(1.1, 64.4)	8.6	(1.1, 65.4)
14	42.1	(5.6, 307.0)	5.9	(0.74, 46.0)	5.8	(0.73, 45.6)
Gender						
Female	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Male	1.1	(0.69, 1.61)	1.4	(0.84, 2.4)	1.4	(0.81, 2.5)
Race						
White	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Black	0.3	(0.11, 1.1)	0.5	(0.14, 1.6)	0.4	(0.13, 1.5)
Hispanic	0.3	(0.12, 0.76)	0.2	(0.06, 0.66)	0.2	(0.06, 0.65)
Mixed/other	1.4	(0.77, 2.7)	1.3	(0.62, 2.9)	1.3	(0.61, 2.9)
Friend smoking						
No	Ref		Ref		Ref	

	Unadjusted		Multivariate Models			
			Parsimonious		Full Model*	
	Odds Ratio	(95% CI)	Odds Ratio	(95% CI)	Odds Ratio	(95% CI)
Yes	7.1	(5.3, 9.4)	1.7	(1.0, 2.7)	1.7	(1.0, 2.8)
Parent smoking						
No	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Yes	11.1	(6.2, 19.7)	4.3	(2.2, 8.1)	4.3	(2.2, 8.2)
School performance						
Excellent	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Good	2.1	(1.0, 4.5)	1.3	(0.55, 3.2)	1.3	(0.56, 3.3)
Average/below average	7.2	(3.7, 14.3)	2.6	(1.1, 6.1)	2.8	(1.2, 6.7)
Parent SES	0.6	(0.50, 0.83)	0.8	(0.53, 1.1)	0.8	(0.52, 1.1)
Sensation seeking	1.5	(1.4, 1.6)	1.2	(1.1, 1.3)	1.2	(1.1, 1.3)
Maternal rulemaking	0.8	(0.79, 0.87)	0.9	(0.83, 0.96)	0.9	(0.84, 0.97)

* Covariates not listed in the full model also include self-regulation, self-esteem, rebelliousness, and maternal responsiveness, none of which had a statistically significant multivariate relation with the dependent variable