

RESEARCH PAPER

The Global School Personnel Survey: a cross-country overview

The GTSS Collaborative Group

Tobacco Control 2006;15(Suppl II):ii20-ii30. doi: 10.1136/tc.2006.015693

Teachers and administrators are role models for students, conveyors of tobacco prevention curricula, and key opinion leaders for school tobacco control policies. School teachers and administrators have daily interaction with students and thus represent an influential group for tobacco control. Data collected by the Global School Personnel Survey between 2000 and 2005 have shown that an alarming proportion of school personnel smoke cigarettes and use other forms of tobacco. At the regional level, current cigarette smoking is between 15% and 19% among school personnel included in this report around the world. The scarcity of tobacco-free schools and the high level of smoking on school grounds by school personnel reported in this study indicate how seriously school practice and staff actions undermine the educational messages and other prevention efforts to reduce adolescent smoking prevalence. However, the majority of school personnel in most sites strongly agreed that they should receive specific training to help students avoid or stop using tobacco.

Tobacco use is the leading preventable cause of death in developed countries and is the second leading cause of death globally.¹ *The Global Burden of Disease* predicts that the annual number of deaths from tobacco use will double from 5 million in 2005 to 10 million in 2020.²

Teachers and administrators are role models for students, conveyors of tobacco prevention curricula, and key opinion leaders for school tobacco control policies. The majority of tobacco users first try tobacco in their teens,³ and school is mandatory in most countries through age 15 or 16. School teachers and administrators have daily interaction with students and thus represent an influential group for tobacco control.

The World Health Organization's Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (WHO FCTC) is the world's first public health treaty. The WHO FCTC was unanimously adopted by the World Health Assembly in May 2003, was signed by 168 nations and, at the time of this writing, had been ratified by 116 nations.⁴ The WHO FCTC systematically addresses the challenges of reducing the chronic disease burden associated with tobacco use and smoke exposure. Among the important areas addressed by the WHO FCTC, strengthening public awareness about the dangers of tobacco consumption is a primary focus of Article 12. Educators are specifically mentioned as important vectors of this information.

ARTICLE 12

Each Party shall promote and strengthen public awareness of tobacco control issues,....

to promote broad access to effective and comprehensive educational and public awareness programmes on the

health risks including the addictive characteristics of tobacco consumption and exposure to tobacco smoke; to promote effective and appropriate training or sensitization and awareness programmes on tobacco control addressed to persons such as ... educators.

The WHO FCTC and the Global Tobacco Surveillance System (GTSS) share the same goal of supporting development, implementation, and evaluation of effective tobacco control programmes. The WHO FCTC calls for countries to use consistent methodology to monitor progress in reducing tobacco consumption and exposure to tobacco smoke. The GTSS allows countries to develop an evidence base regarding a variety of tobacco indicators that complements domestic surveillance programmes and international public health research.

This report presents data from the Global School Personnel Survey (GSPS), conducted in 69 sites in 30 countries and the Gaza Strip/West Bank between 2000 and 2005. The report features a cross-country comparison of school personnel regarding tobacco use patterns, knowledge of and attitudes toward tobacco, availability of tobacco control teaching materials and training, and school anti-tobacco policies.

METHODS

The GSPS was designed to collect information on tobacco use, knowledge and attitudes of school personnel toward tobacco, existence and effectiveness of tobacco control policies in schools, and training and materials available for implementing tobacco prevention and control interventions.

Sample

The GSPS is a survey of all personnel working in schools selected to participate in the Global Youth Tobacco Survey (GYTS). The GYTS uses a two-stage cluster sample design to select a representative sample of students. Stage 1 consists of the selection of schools, proportional to school enrolment size. Stage 2 consists of a random sample of classes within each school. All personnel working in the selected schools were eligible to participate in the GSPS.

Data included in this report come from GSPS surveys conducted in 69 sites in 30 countries and the Gaza Strip/West Bank between 2000 and 2005. The GSPS has been conducted in one country in the African Region, five countries in the Region of the Americas, 12 countries and the Gaza Strip and West Bank in the Eastern Mediterranean Region, seven countries in the European Region, two countries in the South-East Asia Region, and three countries in the Western Pacific Region. National-level data have been collected in 18

Abbreviations: AFRO, African Region; AMRO, Region of the Americas; EMRO, Eastern Mediterranean Region; EURO, European Region; FCTC, Framework Convention on Tobacco Control; GSPS, Global School Personnel Survey; GTSS, Global Tobacco Surveillance System; GYTS, Global Youth Tobacco Survey; SEARO, South-East Asia Region; WHO, World Health Organization; WPRO, Western Pacific Region

countries, and subnational data were collected in 51 state, provincial/regional, or city sites in 12 countries and the Gaza Strip/West Bank.

School response rates by site ranged from 64.0–100%, school personnel response rates by site ranged from 56.7–100%, and overall response rates by site ranged from 45.8–100%. In total, over 83 000 school personnel in more than 2800 schools have completed the GSPS.

Data collection

The GSPS used self-administered, anonymous data collection procedures. Names of schools or personnel were not collected and participation was voluntary. The questionnaire was designed with no skip patterns to allow all respondents to answer all questions. Surveys were completed at schools, generally at staff meetings or after school.

Questionnaires consisted of a core set of questions that all countries ask and a set of unique country-specific questions. The final questionnaires are translated into local languages and back-translated into English to check for accuracy. Country research coordinators conducted focus groups to test further the accuracy of the translation and understanding of the questions.

Measures

This report presents measures of tobacco use prevalence (lifetime cigarette use, current cigarette use, current use of tobacco products other than cigarettes, and current use of any tobacco products), percentage who ever smoked on school property, support for and existence of school policies prohibiting tobacco use (percentage who strongly agreed schools should have a policy prohibiting tobacco use among students and school personnel, percentage who reported that their school has a policy prohibiting tobacco use among students and school personnel), percentage who reported that their school enforces its tobacco policy, components of tobacco-related curriculum (percentage of school personnel who had taught students how to avoid tobacco use, had access to teaching and learning materials about tobacco, had received training to prevent youth tobacco use, or had non-classroom programmes to teach about tobacco prevention among students), and attitudes among school personnel regarding several tobacco issues (percentage who are very concerned about youth tobacco use, strongly agreed school personnel should set a good example by not using tobacco, strongly agreed school personnel who use tobacco are less likely to advise students to stop using tobacco, or strongly agreed that school personnel should get specific training to teach students to avoid or stop using tobacco).

Data analysis

The GSPS data are weighted to adjust for sample selection (school) and non-response (school and individual levels). The computer program SUDAAN⁵ was used to compute weighted prevalence estimates and standard errors of the estimates (95% confidence intervals were calculated using the standard errors).

Means for all measures are reported for five WHO Regions including the Region of the Americas (AMRO), the Eastern Mediterranean Region (EMRO), the European Region (EURO), the South-East Asia Region (SEARO), and the Western Pacific Region (WPRO).^{*} No regional means are reported for the African Region (AFRO) because only one site (Niamey, Nigeria) from the Region has conducted the GSPS. Regional aggregations were calculated as means weighted by the population of the sampling frame. In many cases, the sampling frame was the country, but in areas where samples were drawn to be representative of a subnational population, estimates were weighted by the population of the city, state,

or administrative region and included in the regional aggregation. Reported regional means are not representative of the total Region because of limited coverage of GSPS data in many Regions at the time of this report.

RESULTS

Tobacco use prevalence

Lifetime cigarette use ranged from 16.6% in Andhra Pradesh, India to 83.3% in Somaliland, Somalia (table 1). Across the five Regions with multiple survey sites, mean values for lifetime cigarette use ranged from 23–42% (23.5% in WPRO, 24.6% in EMRO, 28.4% in SEARO, 32.5% in AMRO, and 42.4% in EURO). The percentage of school personnel who were current cigarette smokers ranged from 0.8% in Qatar (Girls' Schools) to 45.9% in Bulgaria. Regional mean values for current cigarette smoking ranged from 15–19% (14.7% in WPRO, 15.9% in EMRO, 17.9% in AMRO, 19.3% in EURO, and 19.5% in SEARO).

Current use of tobacco products other than cigarettes ranged from 0.7% in Dominica to 99.1% in Kerala, India. Regional mean values for current tobacco use other than cigarettes ranged from 3–32% (2.6% in EURO, 2.9% in WPRO, 4.6% in AMRO, 10.6% in EMRO, and 32.4% in SEARO). Current use of any tobacco products ranged from 3.2% in Dominica to 99.1% in Kerala, India. Regional mean values of current any tobacco use ranged from 15–37% (15.2% in WPRO, 18.6% in AMRO, 19.8% in EMRO, 20.7% in EURO, and 37.1% in SEARO). Among current smokers, the percentage who had ever smoked on school grounds ranged from 1.0% in Dominica to 43.5% in Somaliland, Somalia.

School policies prohibiting use of tobacco

The percentage of school personnel who strongly agreed that schools should have a rule specifically prohibiting tobacco use among students ranged from 33.5% in Manipur, India to 97.6% in Orissa, India (table 2). Regional mean values ranged from 75–89% (75.0% in WPRO, 76.3% in EURO, 80.6% in AMRO, 86.8% in SEARO, and 89.0% in EMRO). The percentage who strongly agreed that schools should have a rule specifically prohibiting tobacco use among school personnel ranged from 19.4% in Slovakia to 97.2% in Haryana, India. Regional mean values ranged from 45–86% (45.1% in EURO, 61.0% in WPRO, 75.2% in EMRO, 77.3% in AMRO, and 86.2% in SEARO).

The percentage of school personnel who reported their school has a rule prohibiting smoking among students ranged from 0.2% in Bihar, India to 97.4% in Kasur, Pakistan. Regional mean values ranged from 33–82% (32.9% in SEARO, 56.6% in EMRO, 64.5% in AMRO, 77.8% in WPRO, and 81.6% in EURO). The percentage of school personnel who reported their school has a rule prohibiting smoking among school personnel ranged from 0.1% in Bihar, India to 96.8% in Peshawar, Pakistan. Regional mean values ranged from 30–54% (29.6% in SEARO, 40.5% in EMRO, 44.0% in EURO, 45.4% in AMRO, and 54.2% in WPRO). The percentage of school personnel who reported that their school is tobacco-free ranged from 0.1% in Bihar, India to 97.2% in Peshawar, Pakistan. Regional mean values ranged from 28–64% (27.9% in AMRO, 32.7% in SEARO, 42.8% in EMRO, 49.2% in EURO, and 63.7% in WPRO). The percentage of school personnel who reported that their school enforces the tobacco policy ranged from 0.1% in Bihar, India to 83.6% in

^{*}Data from GSPS conducted in 31 countries are included in this report. These countries, by Region, are Nigeria (AFRO); Dominica, Guyana, Mexico, Suriname, Uruguay (AMRO); Gaza Strip/West Bank, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia (EMRO); Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia (EURO); India, Nepal (SEARO); China, Malaysia, and Viet Nam (WPRO).

Table 1 Prevalence (95% confidence intervals) of tobacco use and smoking on school property, Global School Personnel Survey, 2000–2005

Year	Country	Site	Ever smoked a cigarette, even one or two puffs	Currently smoked cigarettes	Currently used tobacco product other than cigarettes	Currently used any tobacco product	Among current smokers, ever smoked on school property
African Region							
2001	Niger	Niamey	26.5 (21.8 to 31.8)	14.6 (11.0 to 19.1)	12.6 (9.2 to 17.1)	15.6 (11.9 to 20.2)	22.3 (18.3 to 27.0)
Region of the Americas							
2004	Dominica	Country	32.5 (27.9 to 37.3)	17.9 (14.0 to 22.8)	4.6 (2.4 to 8.7)	18.6 (15.2 to 23.7)	13.1 (8.0 to 21.1)
2004	Guyana	Country	6.6 (3.5 to 11.9)	2.8 (1.2 to 6.4)	0.7 (0.1 to 3.1)	3.2 (1.4 to 6.8)	1.0 (0.3 to 3.2)
2004	Mexico	Mexico City	9.1 (6.2 to 13.2)	4.0 (2.6 to 6.1)	1.2 (0.5 to 3.0)	5.1 (3.5 to 7.5)	5.6 (4.2 to 7.5)
2004	Suriname	Country	34.1 (29.5 to 39.0)	18.8 (14.8 to 23.6)	4.4 (2.2 to 8.4)	19.3 (15.2 to 24.2)	13.5 (8.1 to 21.9)
2001	Uruguay	Colonia	19.4 (14.9 to 24.7)	13.2 (8.3 to 20.6)	6.7 (4.7 to 9.5)	16.1 (11.2 to 22.5)	15.3 (12.3 to 19.0)
2001	Uruguay	Maldonado	NA	12.7 (4.3 to 31.9)	10.5 (1.4 to 48.7)	17.5 (4.9 to 46.9)	NA
2001	Uruguay	Rivera	NA	24.9 (17.1 to 34.9)	21.2 (16.2 to 27.2)	29.6 (21.7 to 39.0)	NA
Eastern Mediterranean Region							
2001	Gaza Strip-West Bank	West Bank	24.6 (19.5 to 30.9)	15.4 (12.3 to 19.1)	15.5 (10.6 to 22.1)	19.6 (14.0 to 26.6)	NA
2001	Gaza Strip-West Bank	Gaza Strip	36.8 (31.3 to 42.7)	15.9 (11.5 to 22.0)	10.6 (6.9 to 16.7)	19.8 (15.2 to 26.1)	18.4 (10.6 to 25.3)
2003	Jordan	Country	23.3 (16.1 to 32.6)	26.2 (20.9 to 32.3)	17.2 (13.3 to 21.9)	30.2 (24.4 to 36.6)	NA
2001	Kuwait	Country	51.7 (43.4 to 59.8)	23.3 (16.0 to 32.6)	10.9 (7.6 to 15.4)	25.1 (17.6 to 34.4)	NA
2001	Lebanon	Country	35.2 (28.8 to 42.2)	26.2 (19.3 to 34.4)	24.2 (18.6 to 30.8)	34.5 (27.0 to 42.9)	29.4 (22.2 to 37.7)
2001	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Country	76.1 (66.8 to 83.4)	16.4 (12.3 to 21.5)	20.2 (16.1 to 25.1)	23.7 (18.7 to 29.5)	NA
2003	Oman	Country	13.9 (10.6 to 18.1)	35.6 (26.4 to 45.9)	27.3 (17.6 to 39.7)	50.2 (39.9 to 60.5)	NA
2002	Pakistan	Islamabad	7.0 (4.6 to 10.7)	10.6 (8.2 to 13.5)	3.9 (3.1 to 4.8)	12.0 (9.6 to 14.9)	10.7 (7.9 to 14.2)
2004	Pakistan	Lahore	19.5 (12.8 to 28.5)	3.7 (2.3 to 5.7)	0.9 (0.6 to 1.6)	4.3 (2.9 to 6.5)	4.1 (2.6 to 6.5)
2004	Pakistan	Quetta	11.3 (5.4 to 22.2)	19.0 (11.9 to 29.0)	11.8 (6.0 to 21.9)	19.9 (13.2 to 28.9)	10.1 (5.2 to 18.6)
2004	Pakistan	Kasur	14.4 (8.3 to 23.9)	10.1 (4.0 to 23.0)	5.2 (1.7 to 15.1)	11.4 (4.1 to 28.0)	6.4 (2.7 to 14.1)
2004	Pakistan	Peshawar	24.3 (15.7 to 35.5)	13.3 (6.9 to 24.0)	1.9 (1.8 to 26.1)	19.0 (11.0 to 30.7)	9.3 (4.9 to 17.0)
2004	Qatar	Girls' Schools	12.9 (7.5 to 21.2)	17.0 (10.5 to 26.4)	11.9 (7.5 to 18.3)	15.2 (9.8 to 22.9)	10.7 (5.9 to 18.6)
2005	Qatar	Boys' Schools	1.8 (0.9 to 3.8)	10.3 (5.1 to 19.6)	7.9 (3.5 to 17.1)	13.2 (7.3 to 22.7)	9.8 (3.9 to 22.6)
2002	Saudi Arabia	Boys' schools	41.5 (37.3 to 45.9)	0.8 (0.2 to 2.8)	4.5 (2.7 to 7.5)	4.3 (2.7 to 7.0)	1.1 (0.6 to 2.2)
2004	Somalia	Somaland	29.9 (24.6 to 35.7)	21.6 (17.7 to 26.2)	19.3 (14.6 to 25.0)	28.5 (23.6 to 34.0)	20.6 (17.2 to 24.5)
2001	Sudan	Country	44.6 (25.8 to 65.1)	15.3 (10.8 to 21.2)	19.4 (14.9 to 24.8)	22.3 (17.0 to 28.6)	NA
2002	Syrian Arab Republic	Country	10.4 (6.6 to 16.0)	5.1 (2.1 to 13.3)	45.1 (21.3 to 71.3)	65.9 (57.2 to 73.7)	43.5 (23.0 to 66.6)
2001	Tunisia	Country	33.2 (28.9 to 37.9)	23.0 (18.3 to 28.4)	8.7 (6.1 to 12.4)	26.1 (21.7 to 31.1)	NA
2004	Belarus	Country	35.9 (32.5 to 39.4)	27.2 (24.0 to 30.6)	16.6 (13.4 to 20.3)	29.7 (26.5 to 33.2)	NA
2002	Czech Republic	Country	42.4 (37.7 to 44.7)	19.3 (18.2 to 23.2)	2.6 (1.9 to 4.3)	20.4 (19.1 to 24.4)	20.4 (19.8 to 26.2)
2004	Kazakhstan	Country	47.6 *	13.8 *	1.4 *	16.7 *	10.5 *
2002	Russian Federation	Sarov	59.0 (55.7 to 62.3)	45.9 (42.7 to 49.2)	1.8 (1.2 to 2.6)	46.0 (42.8 to 49.1)	42.9 (39.2 to 46.6)
2002	Slovakia	Country	37.0 (32.5 to 41.8)	19.9 (16.8 to 23.3)	5.1 (3.3 to 7.8)	22.2 (18.7 to 26.1)	24.1 (20.0 to 28.8)
2004	Slovenia	Country	25.2 (22.2 to 28.5)	7.2 (5.7 to 9.1)	1.7 (1.1 to 2.5)	8.0 (6.4 to 9.9)	7.4 (5.5 to 10.0)
2002	Slovenia	Country	20.8 (16.7 to 25.6)	13.9 (10.1 to 18.7)	1.6 (1.1 to 2.2)	14.2 (10.2 to 19.3)	9.0 (5.7 to 13.8)
2003	Slovenia	Country	64.8 (62.3 to 67.2)	23.5 (21.2 to 26.0)	3.4 (2.3 to 4.9)	24.1 (21.6 to 26.8)	32.8 (30.1 to 35.7)
2004	Slovenia	Country	52.0 (49.1 to 54.9)	22.3 (20.2 to 24.4)	2.9 (2.1 to 4.1)	23.6 (21.3 to 26.0)	29.2 (26.0 to 32.6)
South-East Asia Region							
2000	India	Calcutta	28.4 (22.7 to 35.0)	19.5 (14.5 to 32.7)	32.4 (27.0 to 38.3)	37.1 (31.5 to 42.9)	3.5 (2.0 to 6.1)
2000	India	Maharashtra	35.1 ** (26.6 to 44.6)	26.3 ** (20.3 to 33.4)	11.4 (8.8 to 14.6)	31.5 (25.3 to 38.4)	NA
2001	India	Nagaland	16.4 ** (12.7 to 20.9)	12.6 ** (10.0 to 15.7)	25.2 (21.5 to 29.3)	27.4 (23.7 to 31.4)	NA
2001	India	Bihar	49.4 ** (40.2 to 58.6)	31.9 ** (24.2 to 40.8)	41.4 (32.1 to 51.3)	48.7 (36.8 to 60.7)	NA
2001	India	Assam	45.7 ** (39.1 to 52.5)	35.6 ** (29.2 to 42.6)	62.0 (53.8 to 69.7)	72.1 (64.4 to 78.8)	NA
2001	India	Manipur	53.1 ** (48.4 to 57.7)	39.0 ** (33.7 to 44.6)	44.6 (37.7 to 51.8)	60.6 (53.4 to 67.3)	NA
2001	India	Meghalaya	48.1 ** (36.3 to 60.1)	44.9 ** (34.3 to 55.9)	71.8 (63.5 to 78.8)	68.0 (51.7 to 80.8)	NA
2001	India	Arunachal Pradesh	45.2 ** (34.6 to 56.2)	31.6 ** (18.4 to 48.6)	50.2 (40.1 to 60.3)	63.0 (45.5 to 77.6)	NA
2001	India	Tripura	40.3 ** (31.6 to 49.7)	25.3 ** (18.2 to 34.0)	44.2 (34.1 to 54.8)	48.5 (39.6 to 57.5)	NA
2001	India	Mizoram	81.0 ** (68.3 to 89.4)	71.4 ** (54.6 to 82.9)	81.4 (68.1 to 89.9)	82.8 (70.3 to 90.8)	NA
2001	India	Sikkim	47.5 ** (34.9 to 60.5)	33.7 ** (25.8 to 42.6)	53.7 (36.7 to 69.8)	55.3 (41.8 to 68.1)	NA
2001	India	Andhra Pradesh	8.3 (5.9 to 11.6)	5.3 (3.6 to 7.8)	4.2 (2.5 to 7.2)	6.5 (4.7 to 9.1)	2.8 (1.5 to 5.1)

Table 1 Continued

Year	Country	Site	Ever smoked a cigarette, even one or two puffs	Currently smoked cigarettes	Currently used tobacco product other than cigarettes	Currently used any tobacco product	Among current smokers, ever smoked on school property
2001	India	Delhi	19.8** (14.6 to 26.3)	9.1** (6.2 to 13.1)	4.3 (2.4 to 7.5)	11.1 (7.8 to 15.6)	NA
2001	India	Tamil Nadu	14.7** (10.5 to 20.1)	6.4 (4.4 to 9.2)	3.0 (2.0 to 4.6)	8.2 (6.0 to 11.1)	NA
2002	India	Orissa	47.3** (37.3 to 57.6)	31.3** (20.9 to 44.0)	38.4 (26.7 to 51.6)	42.1 (31.4 to 53.6)	NA
2002	India	Uttar Pradesh	34.7** (28.9 to 40.9)	24.4** (19.1 to 30.5)	27.3 (22.3 to 33.0)	31.1 (26.1 to 36.5)	NA
2002	India	Uttaranchal	35.0** (29.5 to 41.0)	22.3** (16.5 to 29.5)	31.5 (25.8 to 37.8)	32.7 (26.7 to 39.3)	NA
2002	India	Rajasthan	37.4** (27.7 to 48.2)	22.8** (13.0 to 36.8)	25.6 (17.6 to 35.6)	31.5 (22.7 to 41.9)	NA
2004	India	Gujarat	20.6** (14.7 to 28.1)	12.7** (8.0 to 19.6)	33.5 (25.2 to 42.9)	37.7 (29.9 to 46.1)	NA
2004	India	Haryana	30.5** (17.4 to 47.7)	17.8 (8.0 to 35**.0)	85.4 (74.2 to 92.2)	83.4 (71.9 to 90.9)	NA
2004	India	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	23.0** (19.3 to 27.1)	8.0** (5.9 to 10.7)	21.2 (16.5 to 26.9)	23.5 (18.9 to 28.9)	NA
2004	India	Kerala	9.3** (6.6 to 12.9)	4.1** (2.5 to 6.6)	99.1 (97.9 to 99.6)	99.1 (97.9 to 99.6)	NA
2005	India	Kashmir & Jammu	16.6 (11.1 to 24.2)	11.9 (7.9 to 17.7)	9.5 (5.4 to 16.2)	15.5 (10.5 to 22.3)	8.8 (5.5 to 13.6)
2001	Nepal	Biratnagar	20.4 (15.2 to 26.8)	16.1 (11.1 to 22.9)	21.1 (14.5 to 29.7)	22.3 (16.2 to 29.8)	NA
2003	Nepal	Mahendranagar and Dhangad	28.3 (23.1 to 34.0)	20.6 (15.0 to 27.8)	32.6 (26.5 to 39.4)	35.8 (30.0 to 42.1)	NA
2004	China	Puyang	23.5 (19.9 to 27.6)	14.7 (11.7 to 18.4)	2.9 (1.4 to 6.1)	15.2 (12.2 to 18.9)	14.3 (10.9 to 18.6)
2004	China	Shanghai	24.6 (19.0 to 31.2)	21.8 (16.7 to 27.9)	1.7 (0.6 to 4.6)	22.5 (16.9 to 29.3)	24.9 (19.6 to 31.0)
2004	China	Tianjin	24.5 (20.5 to 29.0)	19.0 (16.2 to 22.2)	3.2 (2.0 to 4.9)	23.7 (19.3 to 28.8)	23.7 (19.3 to 28.8)
2004	China	Zhuhai	17.4 (12.6 to 23.5)	14.6 (10.1 to 20.7)	2.7 (0.9 to 7.6)	15.3 (10.6 to 21.7)	16.7 (10.4 to 25.6)
2004	China	Chouhai	24.9 (20.6 to 29.7)	20.1 (16.3 to 24.7)	4.7 (3.6 to 6.0)	21.8 (17.7 to 26.5)	21.1 (16.8 to 26.1)
2004	Malaysia	Malaysia	26.2 (23.2 to 29.4)	12.0 (9.7 to 14.9)	2.9 (1.3 to 6.3)	12.7 (10.2 to 15.7)	7.8 (6.1 to 10.0)
2003	Viet Nam	Hochiminh	21.2 (17.9 to 25.0)	18.5 (15.4 to 22.1)	NA	NA	17.7 (14.1 to 22.0)
2003	Viet Nam	Tuenquang	16.0 (10.6 to 23.4)	12.6 (7.7 to 20.1)	NA	NA	9.3 (6.0 to 14.2)
2003	Viet Nam	Danang	18.6 (15.0 to 22.8)	15.5 (12.0 to 19.9)	NA	NA	14.1 (11.1 to 17.7)
2003	Viet Nam	Haiphong	15.9 (12.7 to 19.8)	12.5 (9.8 to 15.7)	NA	NA	13.3 (9.7 to 18.1)
2003	Viet Nam	Hanoi	14.4 (11.1 to 18.3)	11.2 (7.4 to 16.5)	NA	NA	15.7 (12.4 to 19.7)

*No CI calculated.

**The definition of current smoker in all Indian sites except Andhra Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir included multiple forms of smoked tobacco including cigarettes and bidis. This differs from the core definition of current smoker used in all other sites which included current cigarette smoking only.

NA, not asked.

Table 2 School policies (95% CI) prohibiting use of tobacco, Global School Personnel Survey, 2000–2005

Year	Country	Site	Strongly agreed schools should have a policy or rule specifically prohibiting tobacco use among students	Strongly agreed schools should have a policy or rule specifically prohibiting tobacco use among school personnel	School had a policy or rule specifically prohibiting tobacco use among students	School had a policy specifically prohibiting tobacco use among school personnel	School had a policy declaring it tobacco free	School enforced its tobacco policy
African Region								
2001	Niger	Niamey	93.0 (90.0 to 95.2)	66.3 (62.6 to 69.7)	52.5 (42.1 to 62.7)	13.6 (8.1 to 21.9)	12.0 (9.3 to 15.3)	62.2 (54.4 to 69.5)
Region of the Americas								
2004	Dominica	Country	80.6 (77.0 to 83.7)	77.3 (71.3 to 82.4)	64.5 (59.5 to 69.0)	45.4 (29.7 to 61.7)	27.9 (21.8 to 35.0)	60.6 (51.4 to 69.1)
2004	Dominica	Country	90.9 (88.2 to 93.1)	50.0 (43.3 to 56.7)	61.4 (43.3 to 71.2)	19.4 (14.3 to 25.8)	25.3 (19.5 to 32.1)	56.8 (45.8 to 67.2)
2004	Guyana	Country	93.8 (90.5 to 96.0)	72.6 (68.4 to 76.4)	62.5 (53.6 to 70.7)	29.4 (24.5 to 34.9)	20.1 (15.3 to 25.9)	55.9 (49.2 to 62.4)
2004	Mexico	Mexico City	78.1 (76.2 to 82.7)	78.1 (72.0 to 83.2)	64.3 (60.1 to 68.4)	46.7 (30.3 to 63.8)	28.0 (22.4 to 34.5)	61.6 (52.6 to 69.8)
2004	Suriname	Country	87.2 (83.6 to 90.1)	66.6 (62.7 to 70.3)	62.7 (51.6 to 72.5)	22.5 (16.1 to 30.6)	34.0 (27.4 to 47.8)	45.9 (34.0 to 58.3)
2001	Uruguay	Colonia	84.6 (72.5 to 91.9)	81.1 (69.7 to 88.9)	81.2 (52.0 to 94.5)	66.9 (44.3 to 83.7)	40.4 (17.2 to 68.9)	53.6 (18.1 to 85.8)
2001	Uruguay	Maldonado	80.7 (75.0 to 85.4)	65.5 (59.6 to 70.9)	74.7 (64.0 to 83.1)	48.8 (26.7 to 71.4)	23.9 (6.0 to 60.7)	48.5 (35.5 to 61.6)
2001	Uruguay	Rivera	82.4 (69.9 to 90.5)	76.4 (64.7 to 85.1)	65.2 (57.4 to 72.3)	51.5 (37.4 to 65.4)	27.3 (18.6 to 38.2)	42.5 (32.5 to 53.2)
2001	Uruguay	Rivera	89.0 (83.6 to 92.8)	75.2 (69.7 to 79.9)	56.6 (50.0 to 63.0)	40.5 (35.0 to 46.3)	42.8 (37.2 to 48.2)	58.7 (51.6 to 65.1)
Eastern Mediterranean Region								
2001	Bank	West Bank	87.0 (85.2 to 88.6)	61.6 (57.8 to 65.3)	50.3 (43.1 to 57.5)	15.8 (13.1 to 18.9)	8.9 (6.8 to 11.5)	66.0 (59.0 to 72.3)
Gaza Strip-West								
2001	Bank	Gaza Strip	92.6 (90.4 to 94.3)	73.5 (67.2 to 79.1)	46.0 (41.2 to 50.9)	18.2 (13.7 to 23.8)	14.2 (11.0 to 18.0)	74.0 (67.6 to 79.6)
2003	Jordan	Country	86.0 (81.6 to 89.5)	69.5 (64.3 to 74.3)	48.2 (40.1 to 56.4)	30.9 (21.6 to 42.1)	27.9 (18.0 to 40.5)	60.8 (50.0 to 70.6)
2001	Kuwait	Country	83.0 (80.3 to 85.3)	75.0 (71.5 to 78.2)	55.9 (50.5 to 61.1)	40.4 (37.2 to 43.7)	37.7 (33.9 to 41.7)	60.8 (56.2 to 65.2)
2001	Lebanon	Country	88.1 (79.0 to 93.5)	65.7 (57.5 to 73.0)	55.2 (47.1 to 62.9)	24.7 (14.3 to 39.3)	10.4 (6.6 to 15.8)	61.2 (44.2 to 75.9)
Libyan Arab								
2003	Jamahiriyah	Country	92.9 (89.8 to 95.1)	81.8 (78.3 to 84.8)	54.3 (48.8 to 59.7)	33.6 (28.9 to 38.7)	33.5 (29.5 to 37.8)	42.8 (37.8 to 48.0)
2002	Oman	Country	91.0 (88.1 to 93.2)	86.5 (82.0 to 90.1)	48.9 (43.1 to 54.7)	46.2 (39.6 to 52.9)	50.9 (42.8 to 58.9)	57.5 (48.3 to 66.2)
2004	Pakistan	Islamabad	91.4 (87.5 to 94.2)	90.0 (84.1 to 93.9)	94.1 (89.6 to 96.8)	93.3 (87.8 to 96.4)	94.6 (89.4 to 97.3)	67.5 (60.6 to 73.7)
2004	Pakistan	Lahore	92.6 (89.7 to 95.6)	92.6 (87.2 to 95.8)	95.8 (90.6 to 97.3)	95.8 (90.6 to 97.0)	91.9 (80.2 to 97.0)	69.0 (56.2 to 79.5)
2004	Pakistan	Quetta	93.9 (91.8 to 95.4)	91.6 (89.3 to 93.5)	94.7 (85.4 to 98.2)	94.6 (92.1 to 96.3)	96.3 (93.6 to 97.9)	83.6 (77.9 to 88.0)
2004	Pakistan	Kasur	91.2 (78.6 to 96.7)	80.9 (72.8 to 87.1)	97.4 (87.4 to 99.5)	95.7 (87.1 to 98.7)	96.4 (87.9 to 99.0)	56.5 (40.4 to 71.3)
2004	Pakistan	Peshawar	95.8 (92.6 to 97.7)	91.5 (91.0 to 97.4)	97.1 (95.4 to 98.2)	96.8 (91.9 to 98.2)	97.2 (94.0 to 98.7)	75.6 (64.5 to 84.1)
2005	Qatar	Girls' Schools	94.0 (90.5 to 96.2)	92.3 (88.5 to 95.0)	45.3 (38.9 to 51.9)	46.7 (41.2 to 52.3)	49.5 (43.9 to 55.1)	51.0 (45.8 to 56.1)
2005	Qatar	Boys' Schools	90.6 (86.9 to 93.3)	78.6 (72.9 to 83.4)	74.2 (66.4 to 80.7)	64.5 (57.4 to 71.1)	54.8 (48.6 to 60.8)	66.6 (59.3 to 73.3)
2002	Saudi Arabia	Boys' Schools	89.9 (85.8 to 92.9)	78.7 (73.1 to 83.5)	65.5 (56.8 to 73.3)	50.6 (39.8 to 61.4)	66.6 (58.7 to 73.6)	74.0 (65.3 to 81.1)
2004	Somalia	Somaliland	52.0 (30.1 to 73.2)	61.4 (39.6 to 79.3)	31.7 (17.4 to 50.6)	39.0 (25.5 to 54.3)	41.0 (27.6 to 55.8)	66.0 (51.4 to 78.1)
2001	Sudan	Country	91.0 (83.6 to 95.3)	80.2 (74.4 to 85.0)	58.7 (52.1 to 65.1)	43.8 (39.0 to 48.8)	51.7 (46.3 to 57.0)	53.3 (47.8 to 58.8)
Syrian Arab								
2002	Republic	Country	89.1 (85.6 to 91.8)	68.9 (65.4 to 72.3)	51.7 (45.2 to 58.1)	25.5 (21.4 to 30.0)	27.0 (23.7 to 30.6)	62.8 (57.8 to 67.5)
2001	Tunisia	Country	90.2 (88.6 to 91.6)	59.3 (55.1 to 63.4)	38.8 (34.6 to 43.2)	24.2 (20.4 to 28.6)	20.0 (16.6 to 23.7)	52.4 (48.1 to 56.8)
2001	Tunisia	Country	76.3 (72.9 to 79.4)	45.1 (41.7 to 48.7)	81.6 (78.7- 84.3)	44.0 (37.8 to 50.7)	49.2 (43.6 to 54.9)	57.1 (52.4 to 61.5)
2004	Belarus	Country	85.4 *	48.2 *	91.0 *	53.0 *	62.5 *	43.0 *
2002	Bulgaria	Country	77.9 (75.2 to 80.5)	45.0 (41.9 to 48.2)	61.8 (58.1 to 65.4)	36.7 (32.2 to 41.3)	37.3 (33.5 to 41.2)	78.1 (74.4 to 81.5)
2002	Bulgaria	Country	58.6 (54.2 to 62.8)	28.0 (22.8 to 33.9)	79.2 (74.7 to 83.0)	22.4 (15.7 to 31.0)	31.0 (23.2 to 40.1)	75.9 (68.4 to 82.2)
2004	Czech Republic	Country	83.2 (79.3 to 86.5)	62.5 (59.8 to 65.2)	88.5 (86.3 to 90.5)	58.3 (53.3 to 63.1)	65.9 (60.9 to 70.5)	38.1 (34.0 to 42.4)
2002	Kazakhstan	Country	90.2 (86.7 to 92.8)	55.5 (51.1 to 59.8)	90.5 (85.3 to 94.0)	40.3 (35.6 to 45.3)	60.7 (53.2 to 67.8)	43.3 (38.4 to 48.4)
2003	Russian Federation	Sarav	74.8 (71.7 to 77.6)	19.4 (17.0 to 22.1)	84.3 (80.6 to 87.4)	34.9 (28.9 to 41.4)	28.8 (24.1 to 34.0)	75.2 (69.3 to 80.3)
2004	Slovenia	Country	68.5 (64.9 to 71.9)	55.9 (52.7 to 59.1)	63.2 (58.2 to 68.1)	55.6 (49.2 to 61.8)	50.2 (44.1 to 56.4)	45.8 (40.8 to 50.8)
South-East Asia Region								
2000	India	Calcutta	86.8 (81.4 to 90.6)	86.2 (80.4 to 90.6)	32.9 (25.5 to 40.9)	29.6 (22.6 to 37.2)	32.7 (25.2 to 40.8)	36.7 (29.7 to 43.6)
2000	India	Maharashtra	84.3 (80.5 to 87.6)	67.0 (61.8 to 71.9)	32.2 (25.1 to 40.2)	18.0 (11.2 to 27.7)	21.3 (15.9 to 28.0)	81.3 (72.9 to 87.6)
2001	India	Nagaland	95.7 (93.5 to 97.1)	89.9 (84.6 to 93.5)	43.7 (38.0 to 49.5)	43.2 (35.1 to 51.7)	57.6 (49.0 to 65.8)	45.6 (36.7 to 54.8)
2001	India	Bihar	71.2 (61.5 to 79.2)	58.9 (49.2 to 66.4)	49.8 (40.8 to 58.8)	46.9 (38.1 to 55.9)	27.4 (20.2 to 36.0)	54.8 (44.6 to 64.7)
2001	India	Assam	90.5 (86.0 to 93.7)	94.0 (90.2 to 96.4)	18.4 (13.1 to 25.3)	0.1 (0.0 to 1.0)	0.1 (0.0 to 0.5)	0.1 (0.0 to 1.0)
2001	India	Assam	64.2 (58.2 to 69.8)	62.5 (55.7 to 68.9)	18.4 (13.1 to 25.3)	19.5 (14.1 to 26.3)	19.5 (13.1 to 28.1)	39.6 (29.9 to 50.1)
2001	India	Manipur	33.5 (20.0 to 50.3)	31.1 (17.1 to 49.7)	24.5 (11.9 to 43.9)	33.5 (19.7 to 50.9)	20.4 (8.1 to 42.7)	44.8 (23.2 to 68.6)

Table 2 Continued

Year	Country	Site	Strongly agreed schools should have a policy or rule specifically prohibiting tobacco use among students	Strongly agreed schools specifically prohibiting tobacco use among school personnel	School had a policy or rule specifically prohibiting tobacco use among students	School had a policy specifically prohibiting tobacco use among school personnel	School had a policy declaring it tobacco free	School enforced its tobacco policy
2001	India	Meghalaya	48.5 (30.0 to 67.4)	40.7 (25.5 to 57.9)	26.3 (17.7 to 37.2)	26.3 (20.6 to 32.8)	15.1 (8.0 to 26.5)	55.9 (43.5 to 67.6)
2001	India	Arunchal Pradesh	71.3 (58.3 to 81.6)	60.8 (48.2 to 72.0)	31.2 (21.2 to 43.2)	33.3 (25.5 to 42.1)	21.3 (14.2 to 30.6)	50.5 (40.0 to 61.0)
2001	India	Tripura	66.3 (57.4 to 74.3)	62.7 (51.2 to 72.8)	28.5 (21.8 to 36.2)	35.9 (29.4 to 43.0)	20.8 (13.5 to 30.7)	65.4 (53.5 to 75.6)
2001	India	Mizoram	49.5 (37.4 to 61.7)	59.3 (50.3 to 67.7)	20.6 (11.0 to 35.3)	17.3 (9.5 to 29.5)	11.3 (4.7 to 24.7)	48.0 (36.0 to 60.2)
2001	India	Sikkim	60.4 (43.6 to 75.1)	50.8 (35.3 to 66.2)	36.8 (27.3 to 47.4)	20.9 (14.3 to 29.6)	21.9 (13.2 to 34.1)	59.5 (44.1 to 73.3)
2001	India	Andhra Pradesh	78.5 (73.2 to 82.9)	84.0 (79.2 to 87.9)	25.4 (20.6 to 30.9)	34.5 (24.8 to 45.6)	46.0 (30.9 to 61.9)	63.3 (55.2 to 70.6)
2001	India	Delhi	91.4 (89.3 to 93.1)	90.1 (87.8 to 92.0)	47.8 (40.6 to 55.1)	44.2 (38.5 to 50.1)	45.2 (39.5 to 51.0)	58.0 (50.6 to 65.1)
2001	India	Tamil Nadu	83.5 (80.5 to 86.2)	76.6 (73.0 to 79.8)	26.2 (21.2 to 31.9)	18.1 (14.5 to 22.3)	22.4 (18.6 to 26.7)	66.6 (59.3 to 73.2)
2002	India	Orissa	97.6 (95.8 to 98.7)	96.5 (94.0 to 98.0)	39.1 (27.2 to 52.4)	25.2 (18.1 to 34.0)	31.1 (23.2 to 40.3)	24.9 (17.3 to 34.5)
2002	India	Uttar Pradesh	90.0 (84.0 to 93.9)	90.4 (83.7 to 94.5)	28.3 (20.2 to 38.1)	15.8 (11.8 to 20.9)	18.0 (13.3 to 23.8)	9.7 (6.8 to 13.7)
2002	India	Uttaranchal	73.4 (61.4 to 82.8)	72.9 (62.6 to 81.1)	34.5 (25.8 to 44.4)	24.9 (18.4 to 32.8)	24.7 (18.0 to 33.0)	17.1 (13.0 to 22.1)
2002	India	Rajasthan	83.7 (77.0 to 88.7)	85.8 (78.7 to 90.8)	51.3 (39.8 to 62.7)	49.7 (37.2 to 62.3)	44.9 (32.8 to 57.7)	50.5 (41.9 to 59.0)
2004	India	Gujarat	80.8 (70.4 to 88.2)	78.0 (66.3 to 86.5)	60.4 (47.2 to 72.3)	53.8 (41.3 to 65.8)	47.7 (35.4 to 60.3)	54.6 (39.1 to 69.3)
2004	India	Haryana	92.9 (78.9 to 97.9)	97.2 (90.1 to 99.3)	64.8 (42.7 to 82.0)	67.8 (46.9 to 83.4)	74.9 (61.0 to 85.1)	53.0 (36.5 to 68.9)
2004	India	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	88.2 (84.4 to 91.1)	81.0 (74.6 to 86.1)	44.7 (38.9 to 50.6)	40.6 (35.3 to 46.1)	32.6 (27.8 to 37.9)	72.2 (65.0 to 78.4)
2004	India	Kerala	89.8 (87.5 to 91.7)	89.4 (86.5 to 91.7)	31.4 (25.0 to 38.6)	47.6 (39.6 to 55.8)	50.3 (42.5 to 58.0)	46.3 (40.7 to 51.9)
2005	India	Kashmir & Jammu	NA	NA	63.4 (48.0 to 76.5)	61.1 (41.8 to 77.5)	38.6 (26.9 to 51.9)	74.6 (56.7 to 86.9)
2001	Nepal	Biratnagar	79.6 (75.2 to 83.4)	69.5 (64.1 to 74.4)	55.4 (49.7 to 61.0)	43.8 (38.4 to 49.3)	53.4 (45.0 to 61.5)	39.8 (32.3 to 47.7)
2003	Nepal	Mahendranagar and Dhangad	93.2 (89.3 to 95.8)	86.9 (82.8 to 90.2)	51.9 (42.8 to 61.0)	39.3 (30.8 to 48.4)	39.2 (30.3 to 49.0)	44.3 (36.6 to 52.3)
Western Pacific Region			75.0 (71.2 to 78.3)	61.0 (57.5 to 64.5)	77.8 (72.4 to 82.3)	54.2 (45.0 to 63.5)	63.7 (54.4 to 72.4)	33.5 (27.4 to 40.2)
2004	China	Puyang	72.4 (66.7 to 77.5)	57.5 (47.4 to 67.1)	68.6 (61.6 to 74.8)	45.3 (35.6 to 55.2)	51.6 (43.8 to 59.4)	39.7 (32.4 to 47.6)
2004	China	Shanghai	69.0 (64.8 to 72.8)	49.2 (44.6 to 53.9)	58.8 (51.8 to 65.5)	31.1 (21.3 to 42.9)	48.6 (35.3 to 62.1)	48.8 (40.0 to 57.7)
2004	China	Tianjin	71.0 (63.3 to 77.7)	51.9 (47.3 to 56.4)	74.0 (62.9 to 82.6)	53.1 (31.8 to 73.3)	62.2 (42.4 to 78.7)	32.7 (19.6 to 49.2)
2004	China	Zhuhai	72.5 (68.4 to 76.2)	45.6 (40.7 to 50.6)	68.8 (61.9 to 75.0)	36.7 (25.6 to 49.4)	53.0 (41.3 to 64.3)	42.9 (35.7 to 50.4)
2004	Malaysia	Country	79.5 (77.4 to 81.4)	70.5 (68.1 to 72.9)	86.6 (84.1 to 88.8)	66.9 (63.1 to 70.5)	72.5 (69.0 to 75.8)	25.7 (23.6 to 27.9)
2003	Viet Nam	Hochiminh	NA	NA	95.8 (79.2 to 90.5)	50.8 (37.5 to 64.1)	61.2 (51.3 to 70.2)	NA
2003	Viet Nam	Tuenquang	NA	NA	83.1 (89.8 to 95.3)	77.0 (69.0 to 83.4)	80.8 (74.4 to 85.8)	NA
2003	Viet Nam	Danang	NA	NA	93.4 (91.0 to 95.1)	75.6 (68.1 to 81.8)	79.9 (72.4 to 85.7)	NA
2003	Viet Nam	Haiphong	NA	NA	91.5 (87.2 to 94.5)	42.5 (30.7 to 55.2)	55.4 (42.1 to 68.0)	NA
2003	Viet Nam	Hanoi	NA	NA	94.4 (91.7 to 96.2)	56.5 (43.9 to 68.2)	65.0 (55.7 to 73.2)	NA

*No CI calculated; NA, not asked.

Table 3 Tobacco-related curriculum (95% CI), Global School Personnel Survey, 2000–2005

Year	Country	Site	During this school year, taught students in this school how to avoid tobacco use	Had access to teaching and learning materials about tobacco use and how to prevent its use among youth	Ever received training to prevent youth tobacco use	School had non-classroom programmes or activities (such as an assembly) used to teach tobacco use prevention to students
African Region						
2001	Niger	Niamey	26.4 (20.0 to 33.9)	7.8 (5.7 to 10.5)	6.7 (4.5 to 9.9)	13.5 (10.0 to 18.0)
Region of the Americas						
2004	Dominica	Country	65.5 (58.1 to 70.6)	38.9 (28.8 to 50.0)	26.5 (18.1 to 37.0)	35.7 (30.4 to 35.7)
2004	Guyana	National	34.5 (29.8 to 39.6)	20.1 (14.9 to 26.4)	8.0 (4.7 to 13.6)	33.5 (23.6 to 45.1)
2004	Mexico	Mexico City	41.9 (35.8 to 48.3)	19.7 (14.5 to 26.2)	10.0 (6.6 to 14.9)	33.6 (25.2 to 43.1)
2004	Suriname	Country	66.9 (60.6 to 72.6)	40.8 (30.1 to 52.4)	28.4 (19.5 to 39.4)	37.3 (32.1 to 42.7)
2001	Uruguay	Colonia	100.0	7.0 (5.0 to 9.7)	3.8 (2.3 to 6.2)	5.8 (3.5 to 9.5)
2001	Uruguay	Maldonado	22.3 (7.6 to 49.8)	52.0 (38.6 to 65.2)	13.1 (3.0 to 42.6)	18.7 (7.0 to 41.2)
2001	Uruguay	Rivera	21.1 (12.9 to 32.5)	41.8 (29.5 to 55.2)	16.4 (13.0 to 20.5)	15.7 (5.1 to 39.2)
2001	Uruguay	Rivera	27.1 (18.0 to 38.7)	41.9 (37.1 to 46.8)	17.4 (13.0 to 22.9)	15.6 (9.5 to 24.7)
Eastern Mediterranean Region						
2001	Gaza Strip- West Bank	West Bank	39.1 (30.8 to 47.3)	30.7 (25.0 to 36.9)	11.0 (7.8 to 15.4)	27.3 (21.1 to 34.8)
2001	Gaza Strip- West Bank	Gaza Strip	NA	25.2 (22.5 to 28.2)	7.8 (6.4 to 9.3)	15.0 (12.4 to 18.2)
2003	Jordan	Country	48.0 (43.7 to 52.3)	33.4 (29.6 to 37.3)	15.4 (11.7 to 19.9)	28.7 (24.8 to 32.9)
2001	Kuwait	Country	NA	28.4 (24.6 to 32.5)	12.6 (9.3 to 16.8)	24.5 (21.0 to 28.3)
2001	Lebanon	Country	36.2 (24.8 to 49.3)	22.2 (16.3 to 29.4)	4.2 (1.3 to 12.6)	4.5 (1.9 to 10.3)
2003	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Country	53.4 (47.4 to 59.4)	25.6 (22.8 to 28.7)	14.7 (10.2 to 20.7)	30.5 (25.3 to 36.1)
2002	Oman	Country	49.7 (44.6 to 54.8)	30.9 (25.5 to 36.9)	8.2 (6.0 to 10.9)	40.5 (37.9 to 43.3)
2004	Pakistan	Islamabad	56.9 (47.6 to 65.8)	23.5 (16.9 to 31.7)	16.8 (12.1 to 23.0)	20.0 (14.0 to 27.8)
2004	Pakistan	Lahore	58.6 (43.7 to 72.1)	60.9 (47.4 to 72.8)	18.1 (12.3 to 25.8)	25.7 (14.2 to 41.8)
2004	Pakistan	Quetta	39.9 (27.5 to 53.8)	79.7 (70.6 to 86.5)	16.6 (13.0 to 21.0)	16.1 (10.1 to 24.8)
2004	Pakistan	Kasur	78.4 (62.0 to 89.0)	86.4 (77.6 to 92.1)	23.6 (11.8 to 41.5)	38.5 (26.4 to 52.3)
2004	Pakistan	Peshawar	59.7 (48.5 to 69.9)	84.1 (78.0 to 88.7)	14.1 (8.2 to 23.1)	21.6 (13.2 to 33.2)
2002	Saudi Arabia	Boys' Schools	NA	34.3 (29.1 to 39.8)	12.0 (9.3 to 15.2)	50.9 (42.8 to 58.8)
2005	Qatar	Girls' Schools	26.3 (22.3 to 30.8)	25.5 (21.1 to 30.4)	10.3 (7.8 to 13.5)	12.7 (9.5 to 16.7)
2005	Qatar	Boys' Schools	51.9 (48.1 to 55.8)	35.1 (30.8 to 39.7)	14.0 (11.0 to 17.8)	33.8 (26.9 to 41.5)
2004	Somalia	Somaliland	57.5 (23.5 to 85.6)	22.2 (15.1 to 31.3)	20.7 (14.5 to 28.5)	37.4 (19.3 to 59.9)
2001	Sudan	Country	NA	33.6 (26.7 to 41.2)	9.0 (5.8 to 13.6)	30.2 (22.4 to 39.4)
2002	Syrian Arab Republic	Country	32.8 (26.9 to 39.4)	18.5 (14.5 to 23.3)	11.0 (8.9 to 13.6)	25.0 (21.4 to 28.9)
2001	Tunisia	Country	11.7 (9.2 to 14.6)	19.9 (17.0 to 23.1)	8.2 (6.3 to 10.7)	16.8 (14.1 to 19.8)
European Region						
2004	Belarus	Country	74.1 (69.6 to 78.1)	53.8 (50.3 to 57.2)	19.9 (16.1 to 24.7)	53.6 (50.1 to 57.2)
2002	Bulgaria	Country	84.4 *	67.1 *	16.8 *	88.6 *
2002	Czech Republic	Country	51.8 (47.9 to 55.7)	30.6 (26.8 to 34.7)	20.5 (17.8 to 23.5)	29.5 (25.1 to 34.3)
2002	Kazakhstan	Country	63.6 (56.1 to 70.5)	57.4 (53.3 to 61.4)	16.2 (13.3 to 19.6)	18.2 (14.6 to 22.4)
2004	Russian Federation	Sarov	83.7 (80.4 to 86.5)	58.6 (55.2 to 61.9)	25.0 (21.6 to 28.8)	78.5 (75.2 to 81.5)
2002	Slovakia	Country	72.0 (62.5 to 79.8)	58.5 (53.6 to 63.3)	15.9 (11.7 to 21.3)	76.7 (69.9 to 82.3)
2003	Slovenia	Country	90.5 (88.4 to 92.2)	47.0 (43.0 to 51.1)	21.3 (18.7 to 24.3)	31.9 (26.5 to 37.7)
2004	Slovenia	Country	44.8 (40.1 to 49.5)	39.2 (35.8 to 42.7)	9.7 (7.9 to 11.7)	24.0 (20.4 to 28.0)
South-East Asia Region						
2000	India	Calcutta	63.4 (59.2 to 67.4)	16.9 (11.7 to 24.5)	6.5 (3.9 to 11.1)	23.2 (18.1 to 29.5)
2000	India	Maharashtra	NA	18.9 (16.2 to 21.9)	4.9 (3.2 to 7.5)	12.2 (8.4 to 17.4)
2001	India	Nagaland	NA	10.4 (7.2 to 14.8)	6.3 (4.9 to 7.9)	35.5 (30.5 to 41.0)
2001	India	Bihar	NA	29.0 (22.4 to 36.6)	13.6 (10.8 to 16.8)	38.7 (25.6 to 53.7)
2001	India	Assam	NA	1.2 (0.2 to 6.2)	1.0 (0.1 to 7.0)	1.0 (0.1 to 6.9)
2001	India	Manipur	NA	8.0 (5.8 to 10.9)	2.0 (0.9 to 4.4)	38.9 (32.0 to 46.3)
2001	India	Meghalaya	NA	11.8 (6.4 to 21.0)	3.7 (1.1 to 11.7)	23.4 (10.0 to 45.7)
2001	India	Arunachal Pradesh	NA	14.2 (9.3 to 21.0)	5.8 (2.9 to 11.3)	22.4 (13.3 to 35.4)
2001	India	Tripura	NA	23.3 (17.8 to 30.0)	3.5 (2.3 to 5.5)	32.2 (24.7 to 40.8)
2001	India	Mizoram	NA	25.5 (18.1 to 34.7)	6.3 (4.2 to 9.3)	14.9 (10.1 to 21.4)
2001	India	Sikkim	NA	10.3 (5.2 to 19.3)	3.6 (1.5 to 8.3)	12.6 (5.3 to 26.9)
2001	India	Andhra Pradesh	NA	15.6 (11.3 to 21.2)	4.8 (1.4 to 15.8)	27.8 (20.0 to 37.1)
2001	India	Delhi	59.5 (55.3 to 63.6)	9.5 (4.4 to 19.0)	7.8 (5.2 to 11.3)	10.6 (6.9 to 15.9)
2001	India	Tamil Nadu	NA	28.8 (23.7 to 34.5)	7.4 (5.3 to 10.1)	41.1 (33.6 to 49.0)
2001	India	Orissa	NA	32.2 (29.5 to 34.9)	6.4 (4.7 to 8.8)	20.8 (17.7 to 24.3)
2002	India	Uttar Pradesh	NA	49.4 (41.7 to 57.0)	12.0 (7.1 to 19.5)	22.7 (14.5 to 33.8)
2002	India	Uttanchal	NA	15.0 (9.0 to 24.0)	1.4 (0.7 to 2.7)	9.0 (6.4 to 12.6)
2002	India	Rajasthan	NA	25.4 (19.8 to 32.0)	3.7 (2.1 to 6.2)	4.9 (2.9 to 8.1)
2002	India	Gujarat	NA	16.2 (10.2 to 24.7)	12.0 (6.2 to 22.0)	24.4 (19.2 to 30.4)
2004	India	Haryana	NA	20.2 (10.6 to 35.0)	6.5 (3.5 to 11.8)	54.7 (43.0 to 65.8)
2004	India	Haryana	NA	44.5 (24.3 to 66.6)	40.4 (17.4 to 68.6)	64.7 (45.2 to 80.3)
2004	India	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	NA	32.7 (23.8 to 43.0)	7.4 (4.4 to 12.1)	37.5 (31.9 to 43.6)
2004	India	Kerala	NA	8.8 (6.6 to 11.7)	10.1 (7.7 to 13.3)	50.6 (41.9 to 59.3)
2005	India	Jammu and Kashmir	91.9 (87.5 to 94.8)	37.4 (25.6 to 51.0)	14.2 (8.0 to 24.1)	49.4 (41.5 to 57.4)
2001	Nepal	Biratnagar	NA	23.3 (18.4 to 29.0)	8.5 (5.8 to 12.3)	32.1 (26.2 to 38.7)
2003	Nepal	Mahendranagar and Dhangad	NA	24.4 (19.4 to 30.3)	11.6 (7.6 to 17.4)	37.7 (31.1 to 44.9)
Western Pacific Region						
2004	China	Puyang	49.8 (43.2 to 56.0)	39.0 (34.6 to 43.6)	13.9 (10.1 to 19.1)	39.5 (33.0 to 46.6)
2004	China	Puyang	75.3 (66.3 to 82.6)	38.4 (31.8 to 45.4)	18.9 (12.4 to 27.7)	42.8 (37.2 to 48.7)

Table 3 Continued

Year	Country	Site	During this school year, taught students in this school how to avoid tobacco use	Had access to teaching and learning materials about tobacco use and how to prevent its use among youth	Ever received training to prevent youth tobacco use	School had non-classroom programmes or activities (such as an assembly) used to teach tobacco use prevention to students
2004	China	Shanghai	49.6 (43.1 to 56.2)	32.4 (26.9 to 38.3)	8.7 (5.9 to 12.7)	22.4 (16.0 to 30.4)
2004	China	Tianjin	66.6 (52.0 to 78.6)	36.5 (31.6 to 41.8)	16.0 (9.1 to 26.7)	41.6 (32.0 to 51.8)
2004	China	Zhuhai	74.4 (67.9 to 80.0)	41.4 (35.3 to 47.8)	13.0 (9.8 to 17.0)	40.9 (31.8 to 50.8)
2004	Malaysia	Country	40.7 (37.5 to 44.0)	40.8 (37.9 to 43.8)	14.3 (11.9 to 17.0)	47.2 (42.2 to 52.3)
2003	Viet Nam	Hochiminh	53.5 (43.0 to 63.7)	46.8 (39.4 to 54.3)	18.1 (10.4 to 29.6)	33.0 (25.0 to 42.3)
2003	Viet Nam	Tuenquang	84.4 (76.0 to 90.2)	63.3 (51.4 to 73.8)	25.7 (16.3 to 38.0)	56.2 (46.9 to 65.1)
2003	Viet Nam	Danang	65.6 (56.1 to 74.1)	58.9 (51.0 to 66.4)	22.9 (17.4 to 29.6)	60.0 (51.7 to 67.9)
2003	Viet Nam	Haiphong	69.5 (63.7 to 74.7)	50.7 (44.9 to 56.5)	14.4 (10.5 to 19.3)	49.0 (36.3 to 61.9)
2003	Viet Nam	Hanoi	66.5 (58.4 to 73.8)	52.3 (44.4 to 60.0)	27.5 (20.1 to 36.3)	45.7 (38.7 to 52.9)

*No CI calculated; NA, not asked.

Quetta, Pakistan. Regional mean values ranged from 33–61% (33.5% in WPRO, 36.7% in SEARO, 57.1% in EURO, 58.7% in EMRO, and 60.6% in AMRO).

Tobacco-related curriculum

The percentage of school personnel who had taught students about the dangers of smoking in the past year ranged from 11.7% in Tunisia to 100% in Suriname (table 3). Regional mean values ranged from 39–74% (39.1% in EMRO, 49.8% in WPRO, 63.4% in SEARO, 65.5% in AMRO, and 74.1% in EURO). The percentage of school personnel who had access to teaching materials about tobacco ranged from 1.2% in Bihar, India to 86.4% in Kasur, Pakistan. Regional mean values ranged from 17–54% (16.9% in SEARO, 30.7% in EMRO, 38.9% in AMRO, 39.0% in WPRO, and 53.8% in EURO). The percentage of school personnel who had ever received training to prevent youth tobacco use ranged from 1.0% in Bihar, India to 40.4% in Haryana, India. Regional mean values ranged from 7–27% (6.5% in SEARO, 11.0% in EMRO, 13.9% in WPRO, 19.9% in EURO, and 26.5% in AMRO). The percentage of school personnel who reported that their school had non-classroom activities to teach about tobacco use and prevention ranged from 1.0% in Bihar, India to 88.6% in Belarus. Regional mean values ranged from 23–54% (23.2% in SEARO, 27.3% in EMRO, 35.7% in AMRO, 39.5% in WPRO, 53.6% in EURO).

Attitudes toward tobacco control

The percentage of school personnel who were very concerned about youth tobacco use ranged from 19.7% in Manipur, India to 94.4% in Tuenquang, Viet Nam (table 4). Regional mean values ranged from 59–66% (58.6% in WPRO, 59.5% in AMRO, 63.1% in EURO, 65.3% in EMRO, and 65.9% in SEARO). The percentage of school personnel who strongly agreed that they should set an example for students by not using tobacco ranged from 33.5% in Manipur, India to 96.6% in Qatar (girls' schools). Regional mean values ranged from 73–89% (73.3% in EURO, 77.9% in AMRO, 81.0% in WPRO, 87.5% in EMRO, and 89.1% in SEARO). The percentage of school personnel who strongly agreed that school personnel who smoke are less likely to advise their students to stop using tobacco ranged from 24.2% in Puyang, China to 93.7% in Novaday, India. Regional mean values ranged from 37–69% (37.5% in EURO, 38.3% in WPRO, 55.9% in AMRO, 59.6% in EMRO, and 69.1% in SEARO). The percentage of school personnel who strongly agreed that they should get specific training to help students avoid or stop tobacco use ranged from 21.9% in the Czech Republic to 87.0% in Bihar, India. Regional mean values ranged from 38–85% (38.2% in EURO, 52.3% in WPRO, 73.6% in EMRO, 82.2% in SEARO, and 84.6% in AMRO).

DISCUSSION

The findings in this report are subject to at least three limitations. First the GSPS sample design uses schools selected for the GYTS. Thus, GSPS is not an independent sample of schools and is dependent on the success of the GYTS. Fortunately, the GSPS school response rate has been greater than 80% in all but one GSPS site. Second, the GSPS school personnel response rate was less than 70% in seven of 69 sites. School personnel participation was voluntary. Third, findings are based on self-reports from school personnel who may under- or over-report their behaviour and their knowledge of school policies. GSPS does not include independent validation of school policies and enforcement of school tobacco control policies.

School personnel can play an important role in tobacco control because of their status as role models in their communities and frequent contact with children. This potential can be limited if school personnel use tobacco, especially in the presence of students on school property.

Data collected by the GSPS between 2000 and 2005 have shown that an alarming proportion of school personnel smoke cigarettes and use other forms of tobacco. At the Regional level, current cigarette smoking is between 15–19% among school personnel included in this report around the world (table 1). In parts of the world where other forms of tobacco are common, such as the South-East Asia Region and Eastern Mediterranean Region, a similar or higher proportion of school personnel reported using these products compared to smoking cigarettes.

In addition to reducing exposure of students and school personnel to secondhand smoke, the strength and mostly the enforcement of school policy restricting smoking are associated with a lower level of tobacco consumption and prevalence among pupils.^{6–10} In addition, policy restricting smoking among school personnel must be applied to all indoor and outdoor areas of the school because visibility of adult smoking including outdoor areas increases the likelihood of regular smoking among students¹¹ and decreases the support for smoke-free environments among students that smoke.¹² The scarcity of tobacco-free schools and the high level of smoking on school grounds by school personnel reported in this study indicate how seriously school practice and staff actions undermine the educational messages and other prevention efforts to reduce adolescent smoking prevalence.

Achieving a broader application of school tobacco-free policies should not be a problem because, despite widespread tobacco use among school personnel, support for tobacco-free policies for both students and personnel in school was generally high (table 2). More than half of school personnel

Table 4 Attitudes toward tobacco control, Global School Personnel Survey, 2000–2005

Year	Country	Site	Very concerned about youth tobacco use	Strongly agreed school personnel should set a good example by not using tobacco	Strongly agreed school personnel who use tobacco are less likely to advise their students to stop using tobacco	Strongly agreed that school personnel should get specific training to be able to teach students how to avoid or stop using tobacco
African Region						
2001	Niger	Niamey	70.8 (65.4 to 75.8)	90.2 (87.2 to 92.6)	80.0 (75.9 to 83.5)	82.2 (78.4 to 85.4)
Region of the Americas						
2004	Dominica	Country	59.5 (44.3 to 73.2)	77.9 (71.1 to 83.5)	55.9 (38.1 to 72.4)	84.6 (77.5 to 89.5)
2004	Guyana	National	57.7 (50.5 to 64.5)	80.8 (72.8 to 86.9)	63.6 (53.4 to 72.7)	48.9 (41.9 to 55.9)
2004	Mexico	Mexico City	74.7 (69.6 to 79.2)	89.5 (85.0 to 92.8)	58.6 (52.9 to 64.0)	67.3 (62.9 to 71.4)
2004	Suriname	Country	58.4 (42.1 to 73.0)	76.9 (70.1 to 82.5)	55.7 (36.7 to 73.1)	87.3 (80.0 to 92.2)
2001	Uruguay	Colonia	69.7 (67.4 to 71.9)	92.0 (88.8 to 94.3)	65.2 (58.6 to 71.4)	48.0 (43.0 to 53.1)
2001	Uruguay	Maldonado	62.8 (47.2 to 76.1)	82.5 (52.8 to 95.2)	45.3 (25.4 to 66.8)	56.8 (50.1 to 63.3)
2001	Uruguay	Rivera	61.4 (54.1 to 68.2)	74.9 (68.2 to 80.6)	43.4 (35.2 to 51.9)	59.7 (51.2 to 67.7)
2001	Uruguay		66.9 (61.0 to 72.4)	83.8 (70.6 to 91.7)	54.3 (45.7 to 62.7)	74.0 (69.9 to 77.7)
Eastern Mediterranean Region						
2001	Gaza Strip-West Bank	West Bank	65.3 (60.7 to 91.0)	87.5 (82.4 to 91.0)	59.6 (52.7 to 65.9)	73.6 (67.7 to 78.5)
2001	Gaza Strip-West Bank	Gaza Strip	82.9 (80.1 to 85.4)	83.6 (80.6 to 86.3)	50.9 (48.3 to 53.4)	57.5 (55.1 to 59.8)
2003	Jordan	Country	86.9 (83.8 to 89.4)	90.4 (87.5 to 92.7)	53.8 (49.0 to 58.5)	65.3 (61.0 to 69.3)
2001	Kuwait	Country	60.3 (55.8 to 64.6)	78.6 (75.1 to 81.7)	39.2 (34.2 to 44.5)	62.2 (57.8 to 66.4)
2001	Lebanon	Country	66.4 (64.2 to 68.6)	88.3 (85.9 to 90.4)	48.7 (45.2 to 52.2)	66.5 (62.7 to 70.2)
2003	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Country	58.4 (55.2 to 61.6)	72.8 (67.6 to 77.5)	32.3 (27.2 to 37.8)	88.9 (83.0 to 93.0)
2002	Oman	Country	71.2 (66.3 to 75.7)	92.5 (90.5 to 94.1)	69.9 (64.1 to 75.2)	84.4 (81.2 to 87.1)
2004	Pakistan	Islamabad	66.0 (61.9 to 69.8)	95.1 (93.7 to 96.3)	67.3 (61.4 to 72.7)	70.0 (65.4 to 74.2)
2004	Pakistan	Lahore	82.7 (78.2 to 86.5)	88.1 (82.2 to 92.2)	55.4 (49.4 to 61.1)	84.5 (78.5 to 89.1)
2004	Pakistan	Quetta	88.9 (84.5 to 92.2)	92.2 (87.3 to 95.3)	66.7 (56.3 to 75.7)	86.0 (78.7 to 91.1)
2004	Pakistan	Kasur	78.9 (73.8 to 83.2)	90.8 (87.5 to 93.2)	65.4 (56.5 to 73.3)	88.4 (84.3 to 91.5)
2004	Pakistan	Peshawar	83.8 (72.3 to 91.1)	85.7 (77.9 to 91.1)	64.4 (53.5 to 73.9)	79.4 (67.6 to 87.7)
2005	Qatar	Girls' Schools	90.5 (84.5 to 94.4)	94.4 (89.3 to 97.1)	56.8 (48.2 to 65.0)	90.3 (84.5 to 94.1)
2005	Qatar	Boys' Schools	61.6 (56.3 to 66.6)	96.6 (95.4 to 97.6)	42.0 (36.1 to 48.2)	81.5 (75.7 to 86.1)
2002	Saudi Arabia	Boys' Schools	65.4 (61.0 to 69.6)	86.8 (80.0 to 91.6)	49.5 (42.4 to 56.5)	62.7 (58.2 to 67.0)
2004	Somalia	Somaliland	71.3 (68.2 to 74.2)	90.6 (85.9 to 93.9)	45.1 (28.0 to 63.4)	61.8 (56.3 to 67.0)
2001	Sudan	Country	72.8 (54.5 to 85.7)	59.0 (37.8 to 77.4)	78.0 (69.8 to 84.5)	67.1 (52.0 to 79.4)
2002	Syrian Arab Republic	Country	68.3 (63.2 to 73.0)	92.8 (85.9 to 96.5)	43.9 (39.1 to 48.9)	78.2 (71.0 to 84.0)
2001	Tunisia	Country	53.3 (50.1 to 56.4)	84.3 (81.5 to 86.8)	42.4 (38.0 to 46.8)	69.1 (64.3 to 73.5)
2004	Belarus	Country	40.5 (37.8 to 43.3)	82.9 (80.4 to 85.1)	37.5 (34.2 to 41.0)	64.7 (61.3 to 68.0)
2002	Bulgaria	Country	63.1 (58.6 to 67.3)	73.3 (70.3 to 76.1)	40.3*	38.2 (34.7 to 41.9)
2002	Czech Republic	Country	77.4*	84.6*	40.3*	42.9*
2004	Kazakhstan	Country	33.4 (30.5 to 36.4)	59.4 (56.3 to 62.4)	34.5 (31.2 to 37.8)	38.4 (35.2 to 41.7)
2002	Russian Federation	Sarav	70.1 (65.8 to 74.1)	61.9 (57.7 to 66.0)	30.6 (27.0 to 34.6)	21.9 (18.8 to 25.3)
2003	Slovakia	Country	71.4 (66.1 to 76.1)	89.0 (86.8 to 90.9)	47.7 (44.8 to 50.7)	53.8 (50.5 to 57.1)
2004	Slovenia	Country	80.5 (77.3 to 83.4)	85.4 (82.5 to 87.9)	45.5 (39.6 to 51.6)	53.4 (47.6 to 59.1)
2004	South-East Asia Region	Country	57.6 (54.0 to 61.0)	53.0 (49.2 to 56.8)	25.0 (22.5 to 27.7)	17.1 (14.5 to 20.0)
2000	India	Calcutta	21.0 (18.6 to 23.5)	64.5 (61.8 to 67.1)	26.5 (24.5 to 28.6)	37.2 (34.2 to 40.4)
2000	India	Maharashtra	65.9 (59.3 to 72.0)	89.1 (84.0 to 92.7)	69.1 (61.5 to 75.7)	82.2 (76.4 to 86.6)
2000	India	Nagaland	49.6 (44.1 to 55.1)	80.2 (76.0 to 83.8)	55.0 (49.6 to 60.4)	70.5 (65.0 to 75.5)
2001	India	Bihar	32.7 (28.1 to 37.7)	94.9 (91.7 to 96.8)	55.5 (49.7 to 61.2)	88.7 (84.7 to 91.8)
2001	India	Assam	81.5 (77.3 to 85.1)	73.7 (62.9 to 82.2)	83.3 (75.4 to 89.1)	66.6 (57.0 to 75.0)
2001	India	Manipur	35.4 (27.2 to 44.7)	65.5 (58.9 to 71.5)	40.3 (32.6 to 48.5)	63.9 (56.6 to 70.7)
2001	India	Meghalaya	19.7 (7.4 to 42.7)	33.5 (19.7 to 50.9)	29.4 (16.0 to 47.8)	30.9 (16.9 to 49.5)
2001	India	Arunachal Pradesh	32.9 (22.3 to 45.6)	48.9 (31.6 to 66.5)	40.3 (26.9 to 55.3)	43.5 (27.5 to 60.9)
2001	India	Tripura	45.7 (36.3 to 55.4)	66.4 (55.0 to 76.2)	51.3 (43.5 to 59.1)	67.6 (54.5 to 78.4)
2001	India	Mizoram	37.5 (30.5 to 45.1)	86.1 (77.6 to 91.6)	58.4 (47.3 to 68.6)	62.5 (54.4 to 69.9)
2001	India	Sikkim	43.4 (36.5 to 50.6)	70.1 (60.5 to 78.2)	48.2 (40.0 to 56.4)	49.2 (37.2 to 61.3)
2001	India	Andhra Pradesh	37.6 (25.1 to 52.1)	50.4 (44.6 to 56.2)	55.7 (50.5 to 60.8)	64.1 (58.1 to 69.7)
2001	India			94.6 (89.5 to 97.3)	58.4 (47.2 to 68.8)	62.3 (56.4 to 67.9)

Table 4 Continued

Year	Country	Site	Very concerned about youth tobacco use	Strongly agreed school personnel should set a good example by not using tobacco	Strongly agreed school personnel who use tobacco are less likely to advise their students to stop using tobacco	Strongly agreed that school personnel should get specific training to be able to teach students how to avoid or stop using tobacco
2001	India	Delhi	69.3 (63.9 to 74.3)	93.7 (91.5 to 95.4)	60.9 (54.7 to 66.8)	84.6 (81.4 to 87.3)
2001	India	Tamil Nadu	82.5 (78.9 to 85.5)	92.1 (88.8 to 94.5)	72.5 (68.6 to 76.2)	63.6 (58.9 to 68.2)
2002	India	Orissa	74.1 (65.8 to 81.0)	95.9 (93.4 to 97.5)	84.9 (77.0 to 90.4)	90.4 (85.8 to 93.7)
2002	India	Uttar Pradesh	84.7 (78.8 to 89.2)	91.3 (86.1 to 94.7)	87.0 (81.1 to 91.2)	88.4 (82.4 to 92.5)
2002	India	Uttanchal	66.6 (60.2 to 72.6)	73.9 (63.4 to 82.2)	72.3 (62.1 to 80.7)	69.3 (57.8 to 78.8)
2002	India	Rajasthan	51.7 (37.7 to 65.3)	81.2 (73.5 to 87.1)	39.3 (32.6 to 46.4)	86.0 (77.6 to 91.6)
2004	India	Gujarat	70.4 (62.7 to 77.0)	89.9 (79.9 to 95.3)	64.2 (48.6 to 77.3)	85.4 (76.1 to 91.5)
2004	India	Haryana	55.8 (39.6 to 70.9)	90.0 (81.1 to 94.9)	66.1 (50.7 to 78.7)	74.0 (61.5 to 83.5)
2004	India	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	47.0 (42.1 to 52.0)	88.8 (83.3 to 92.6)	60.7 (56.7 to 64.6)	84.2 (79.7 to 87.8)
2004	India	Kerala	91.8 (89.3 to 93.8)	75.9 (70.3 to 80.7)	80.5 (77.5 to 83.2)	92.1 (90.3 to 93.6)
2005	India	Kashmir & Jammu	50.0 (35.0 to 65.0)	NA	NA	NA
2001	Nepal	Biratnagar	65.7 (55.4 to 74.6)	89.1 (84.8 to 92.3)	77.1 (65.5 to 85.7)	84.2 (78.8 to 88.3)
2003	Nepal	Mahendranagar and Dhangad	38.1 (31.7 to 45.0)	94.3 (91.7 to 96.2)	33.9 (31.2 to 36.8)	77.9 (73.0 to 82.1)
2004	Western Pacific Region	Puyang	58.6 (53.3 to 63.8)	81.0 (77.4 to 84.1)	38.3 (33.2 to 43.7)	52.3 (47.8 to 56.6)
2004	China	Puyang	63.7 (55.3 to 71.3)	85.2 (81.5 to 88.3)	24.2 (17.7 to 32.2)	56.9 (48.2 to 65.2)
2004	China	Shanghai	33.4 (27.8 to 39.5)	72.3 (68.8 to 75.6)	44.6 (40.9 to 48.3)	47.4 (41.8 to 53.1)
2004	China	Tianjin	46.7 (37.9 to 55.8)	78.1 (71.9 to 83.3)	46.0 (35.6 to 56.8)	49.2 (43.3 to 55.0)
2004	China	Zhuhai	50.8 (46.2 to 55.5)	72.6 (68.2 to 76.6)	44.5 (40.6 to 48.5)	48.4 (43.3 to 53.5)
2004	Malaysia	Country	70.4 (67.0 to 73.6)	85.3 (83.0 to 87.3)	31.0 (27.3 to 35.0)	53.8 (50.6 to 57.0)
2003	Viet Nam	Hochiminh	81.2 (74.3 to 86.6)	83.8 (78.4 to 88.1)	45.3 (38.7 to 52.1)	55.0 (52.3 to 57.6)
2003	Viet Nam	Tuenquang	94.4 (92.2 to 96.0)	95.6 (91.8 to 97.7)	44.1 (38.8 to 49.6)	77.3 (73.3 to 80.9)
2003	Viet Nam	Danang	87.5 (83.0 to 91.0)	92.0 (89.6 to 93.9)	40.3 (36.2 to 44.4)	65.3 (59.2 to 70.9)
2003	Viet Nam	Haiphong	85.3 (79.4 to 89.7)	93.3 (90.6 to 95.2)	40.3 (33.8 to 47.1)	67.3 (58.5 to 75.0)
2003	Viet Nam	Hanoi	80.4 (71.0 to 87.3)	88.5 (79.6 to 93.8)	53.4 (48.0 to 58.7)	70.2 (64.6 to 75.2)

*No CI calculated; NA, not asked.

in the majority of sites supported prohibiting tobacco use on school property.

Access to appropriate educational materials is an important element of an effective curriculum to prevent and reduce tobacco use among students. Although some teachers reported having access to these materials, the majority of teachers in most sites reported that they do not have adequate teaching materials to support tobacco reduction and prevention curricula.

Tobacco use prevention and reduction among students requires a comprehensive approach involving teachers, administrators, and parents. School personnel that participated in GSPS show general willingness to assist in this effort. The majority in most sites reported that they think school personnel should set an example for students by not using tobacco. Teachers' ability to convey effective anti-tobacco information to students can be diminished if they have not received training to provide tobacco-related information to students or do not have access to adequate teaching materials to support anti-tobacco curricula. However, the majority of school personnel in most sites strongly agreed that they should receive specific training to help students avoid or stop using tobacco.

Conclusion

Tobacco use starts in the adolescent years, when school personnel act as important role models. To plan effective interventions, it is essential to have information on the extent and the type of tobacco use among school personnel, their attitudes toward tobacco control, and the existence of school health policies about tobacco. The GSPS provides countries with this information and can address several provisions of the WHO FCTC that relate to the role of school personnel in tobacco control. Health and education professionals can use these data to plan, implement, and revise programmes to reduce tobacco use among school personnel, improve tobacco control information dissemination to students, and provide school personnel with the resources they need to complement a comprehensive tobacco control programme.

Competing interests: none declared

Correspondence to: Charles W Warren, PhD, Office on Smoking and Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 4770 Buford Hwy NE, MS-K50, Atlanta GA 30341-3717, USA; wcw1@cdc.gov

REFERENCES

- 1 **Majid E**, Lopez AD, Rodgers A, Vander Hoorn S, Murray CJL and the Comparative Risk Assessment Collaborating Group. Selected major risk factors and global and regional burden of disease. *Lancet* 2002;**360**:1347–60.

What this paper adds

Teachers and administrators are role models for students, conveyors of tobacco prevention curricula, and key opinion leaders for school tobacco control policies. School teachers and administrators have daily interaction with students and thus represent an influential group for tobacco control.

Data collected by the Global School Personnel Survey between 2000 and 2005 have shown that an alarming proportion of school personnel smoke cigarettes and use other forms of tobacco. At the Regional level, current cigarette smoking is between 14–16% among school personnel included in this report around the world. The scarcity of tobacco-free schools and the high level of smoking on school grounds by school personnel reported in this study indicate how seriously school practice and staff actions undermine the educational messages and other prevention efforts to reduce adolescent smoking prevalence.

- 2 **Peto R**, Lopez Ad, Boreham J, *et al*. Mortality from smoking in developed countries 1950–2000. *Indirect estimation from National Vital Statistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- 3 **US Department of Health and Human Services**. *Reducing the health consequences of smoking: 25 years of progress. A report of the Surgeon General, 1989*. Rockville, Maryland: Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, Office on Smoking and Health, 1989. (DHHS Publication No (CDC) 89-8411.)
- 4 **World Health Organization**. <http://www.who.int/tobacco/framework/countrylist/en/index.html> (Accessed Jan 9, 2005).
- 5 **Shah BV**, Barnwell BG, Bieler GS. *SUDAAN: software for the statistical analysis of correlated data: user's manual. Release 7.5*. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, 1997.
- 6 **Pentz MA**, Brannon BR, Charlin VL, *et al*. The power of policy: the relationship of smoking policy to adolescent smoking. *Am J Public Health* 1989;**79**:857–62.
- 7 **Wakefield MA**, Chaloupka FJ, Kaufman NJ, *et al*. Effect of restrictions on smoking at home, at school, and in public places on teenage smoking: cross sectional study. *BMJ* 2000;**321**:333–7.
- 8 **Moore L**, Roberts C, Tudor-Smith C. School smoking policies and smoking prevalence among adolescents: multilevel analysis of cross-sectional data from Wales. *Tob Control* 2001;**10**:117–23.
- 9 **Griesbach D**, Inchley J, Currie C. More than words? The status and impact of smoking policies in Scottish schools. *Health Promotion International* 2002;**17**:31–41.
- 10 **Wald B**, Torsheim T, Currie C, *et al*. National and school policies on restrictions of teacher smoking: a multilevel analysis of student exposure to teacher smoking in seven European countries. *Health Educ Res* 2004;**19**:217–26.
- 11 **Poulsen LH**, Osler M, Roberts C, *et al*. Exposure to teachers smoking and adolescent smoking behaviour: analysis of cross sectional data from Denmark. *Tob Control* 2002;**11**:246–51.
- 12 **Trinidad DR**, Gilpin EA, Pierce JP. Compliance and support for smoke-free school policies. *Health Educ Res* 2005;**20**:466–75.