



**Children, smoking households and exposure to home environmental tobacco smoke in rural Australia – what's the story?**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-003128
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Apr-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Longman, Jo; University of Sydney, Sch of Public Health (University Centre for Rural Health - North Coast) Passey, Megan; University of Sydney, University Centre for Rural Health - North Coast
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	Environmental Tobacco Smoke, Secondhand smoke, Children, Rural, Australia

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

# Children, smoking households and exposure to home environmental tobacco smoke in rural Australia – what’s the story?

---

Jo M Longman<sup>1\*</sup> and Megan E Passey<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University Centre for Rural Health, University of Sydney School of Public Health, PO Box 3074, Lismore, NSW 2480, Australia

\*Corresponding Author: email: [jo.longman@ucr.edu.au](mailto:jo.longman@ucr.edu.au); T:02 66207570; F: 02 66207270

**Keywords:** environmental tobacco smoke; secondhand smoke; children; rural; Australia

**Wordcount:** 3,465

## ARTICLE SUMMARY

### *Focus*

Given that children’s environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) exposure is such an important public health concern, as well as the higher prevalence of smoking in rural areas in Australia, this paper addresses two questions: 1. Are there rural/urban differences in a) smoking within households with children and b) home ETS exposure in children?; and 2. If so, is this due to socioeconomic disadvantage or other factors unique to ‘rurality’?

### *Key Messages*

43.6% of rural households with children contained a smoker. Both household smoking and home ETS exposure were significantly more common for rural children than for urban dwelling children. Rurality remained associated with smoking households but did not remain associated with home ETS, when confounding factors were controlled for. Children’s home ETS exposure is driven by larger household size, low socio-economic status and being a single parent household.

### *Strengths and Limitations*

No previous studies have explored rural/urban differences in smoking in households with children in Australia. This study used data from a representative national household survey to explore the association of rurality with household smoking and with home ETS exposure. The study had limited potential household level confounding variables available for inclusion in the analysis, and was limited by potential response bias leading to a possible under-reporting of household smoking status.

## ABSTRACT

### *Introduction*

Smoking is more prevalent in rural than urban Australia, but few studies have explored rural/urban differences in home environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) exposure and none have explored these differences amongst children in Australia. Both household smoking and home ETS exposure are

1  
2  
3 harmful to children. This paper aimed to explore the association between rurality and a) household  
4 smoking status and b) home ETS exposure, in households with children aged 0-14.

### 6 *Method*

7 Data from the 2010 National Drug Strategy Household survey were analysed to explore prevalence  
8 of household smoking and home ETS exposure in rural and urban households with children.

9 Multivariable logistic regression was used to explore the association of rurality with household  
10 smoking and with home ETS exposure, controlling for potential confounders.

### 13 *Results*

14 Households with children were more likely to be smoking households (35.4%) than households  
15 without children (32.1%) ( $p < 0.001$ ). Both household smoking (43.6% vs 31.4%  $p < 0.001$ ) and  
16 home ETS exposure (8% vs 5.2%  $p < 0.001$ ) were significantly more common for rural children. In  
17 multivariate analyses controlling for confounding factors, rurality remained associated with smoking  
18 households (OR= 1.21 95%CI:1.07, 1.37), whereas it did not remain associated with children's home  
19 ETS exposure (OR=1.07 95%CI:0.85, 1.35). Larger household size, low socio-economic status, and  
20 being a single parent household were the main drivers of home ETS exposure.

### 24 *Conclusion*

25 The proportion of smoking households with children, and the number of children regularly exposed  
26 to home ETS remain important public health concerns. Smoking cessation support and tobacco  
27 control policies might benefit from targeting larger and/or socio-economically disadvantaged  
28 households including single-parent households.

## 32 **BACKGROUND**

33 The negative impact of children's exposure to smoking behaviour and environmental tobacco smoke  
34 (ETS) in their homes is extensive. Due to the higher breathing rates per body weight, and the size  
35 and immaturity of their organs, children are particularly vulnerable to the effects of ETS exposure on  
36 their physical health 1-3. They are also particularly vulnerable to the corollaries of those effects such  
37 as missing more time at school, and compromised academic performance 3. In addition, children  
38 whose parents smoke are more likely to become smokers themselves, growing up with smoking as a  
39 normalised behaviour 4, 5.

42 The site where most ETS exposure in children happens is their home 2, 6. Children are not able to  
43 control their environment to minimise their exposure and are effectively 'trapped' in smoking  
44 environments. Children who live in homes where there is no indoor smoking are afforded some  
45 protection from ETS exposure even when a parent smokes 6, 7. However, for adults, negotiating  
46 smoke-free home environments can be challenging due to the social and familial relationship  
47 aspects of smoking behaviour in the home 2, 8.

50 Whilst it may be considered an infringement of individual civil liberties to legislate against ETS  
51 exposure in the home, the notion of a smoke-free home is an extension of the protection offered  
52 from comprehensive smoke-free legislation. In Australia this began in the mid-1980s, and has  
53 covered public transport, the workplace, public spaces, smoking in cars containing children, and,  
54 most recently, proposed legislation on multi-unit dwellings, supported by an active campaign from  
55 Action on Smoking and Health Australia 3.

1  
2  
3 This legislative environment reflects the importance of protecting the public from ETS exposure.  
4 Efforts to protect children from the effects of ETS exposure respond directly to Article 8 of the WHO  
5 Framework Convention on Tobacco Control requiring smoke-free measures by those countries  
6 ratifying the Treaty, including Australia 9.  
7

8  
9 Educational campaigns focusing on smoke-free homes have been in place since the early 2000s and  
10 continue to form a regular part of tobacco campaigning in Australia. These campaigns have  
11 promoted quitting or smoking outside to protect children from the harms of home ETS exposure  
12 and appear to have been 'moderately helpful' in increasing the number of smoke-free homes 3.  
13 In 2006, 43% of Australian households with smokers reported totally banning smoking indoors 11,  
14 and data from both NSW and Victoria show declines in household indoor smoking over recent years  
15 3. One of the main outcome indicators in Australia's draft National Tobacco Strategy 2004-2009 is  
16 that fewer people will be exposed to home ETS 12.  
17  
18

### 19 **Is there an urban/rural divide in children's exposure to home ETS?**

20 In Australia around one third of the population lives outside major cities, with rural areas more  
21 socio-economically disadvantaged than urban areas 13. The prevalence of tobacco smoking in this  
22 rural population is significantly higher than in urban areas 14. Smoking continues to be  
23 disproportionately represented among socio-economically disadvantaged populations, and these  
24 disparities are increasing over time 15.  
25  
26

27  
28 We identified only three studies exploring the difference between home ETS exposure in children in  
29 rural compared to urban areas 16-18, with none from Australia. Two are American (one showing  
30 higher home ETS exposure in rural areas 18 and one from Alaska showing lower home ETS exposure  
31 in very remote areas 17), and one from Germany reporting lower home ETS exposure in children in  
32 rural areas 16. One study from China describes ETS exposure in respondents' homes (all homes, not  
33 just homes with children) that is higher in rural areas (73%) compared with urban areas (60%) 19.  
34 One further American study focuses on home smoking bans, and reported fewer home smoking  
35 bans in rural households compared to urban households 20.  
36  
37

38  
39 Given that ETS exposure is such an important public health concern, particularly in children, as well  
40 as the higher prevalence of smoking in rural areas in Australia, this paper addresses two questions:  
41 1. Are there rural/urban differences in a) smoking within households with children and b) home ETS  
42 exposure in children?; and 2. If so, is this due to socioeconomic disadvantage or other factors unique  
43 to 'rurality'?  
44  
45

## 46 **METHODS**

### 47 **The 2010 National Drug Strategy Household Survey**

48  
49 The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) the National Drug Strategy Household Survey  
50 (NDSHS) every three years to measure behaviour, knowledge and attitudes towards drugs in  
51 Australia. The 2010 sample was a multi-stage random sample of households stratified by region  
52 with some over-sampling in certain states and territories, representative of the national population.  
53 Respondents were the person aged 12 or older in each household who was next to have a birthday.  
54 Questions were asked via drop and collect self-completion questionnaires. Questions were asked of  
55 the respondent about themselves, e.g. their own smoking status, as well as questions about the  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 household. Data were collected between April and September 2010. The survey has been  
4 conducted on nine previous occasions 21.

5  
6 The NDSHS was chosen because it provided data on household behaviour, rather than just individual  
7 behaviour, as well as the number and age of children within a household. Non-identifiable data were  
8 sourced from the AIHW with a signed agreement to protect the confidentiality and management of  
9 the data.

### 10 11 **Weighting**

12 Weights were applied to the data to adjust for the complex sampling design while not inflating the  
13 overall sample size. Following Gartner et al 15, we proportionally adjusted the absolute weight for  
14 households provided by the AIHW in order to bring the overall number of households down to the  
15 effective sample size.

### 16 17 **Measures**

#### 18 19 **Rurality**

20 The rurality variable was based on the Australian Standard Geographical Classification remoteness  
21 areas. The variable was coded: major cities, inner regional, outer regional and remote/very remote.  
22 We recoded the variable into Urban/Rural (where urban was 'major cities' and rural was a  
23 combination of the remaining categories) as some cells contained small numbers with the initial  
24 categorisation.

#### 25 26 **Households with Children**

27 We defined households with children as those with children 0-14 years old. The questionnaire asked  
28 "*Of all the dependent children, how many are in each of these age categories?*" 22, and offered two-  
29 year blocks up to 12-14 with the last category being 15+. As "*dependent children*" was defined to  
30 include children older than 14 "*who are still financially dependent, such as full-time students*" 22 we  
31 did not include the final category which may have contained substantial numbers of dependent  
32 children over 18.

#### 33 34 **Outcome variables**

##### 35 36 *Smoking households*

37 We defined smoking households as any household containing a smoker regardless of where that  
38 person smoked, i.e. answering "*Yes, inside the home*" or "*No, only smoke outside the home*" to the  
39 question "*In the last 12 months, have you or any other member of your household smoked at least  
40 one cigarette, cigar or pipe of tobacco per day in the home?*". The other response option was "*No-  
41 one at home regularly smokes*" 22.

##### 42 43 *Home ETS exposure*

44 Home ETS exposure is different to smoking households as it is a measure of whether a household  
45 contains a smoker who smokes inside the home. This was determined as those households where  
46 the answer "*Yes, inside the home*" was given to the question "*In the last 12 months, have you or any  
47 other member of your household smoked at least one cigarette, cigar or pipe of tobacco per day in  
48 the home?*" 22. We recoded this into a binary variable: "yes smokes inside the home" or "no does  
49 not smoke inside the home". The "no does not smoke inside the home" category included  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

households answering either “No, only smoke outside the home”, or “no-one at home regularly smokes”.

#### Potential confounders

The data contained limited household level variables. Within these confines, the following variables were considered potential confounders in the association between home ETS exposure and rurality: socio-economic status 2, 15; number of people in the household 15; household structure 3, 16; and main language used in the household 3. These are defined below.

#### *Socio-economic status*

We defined socio-economic status using the area-level socio-economic index for areas (SEIFA) provided in the data (the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage, measured at Census Collection District areas) 23. This index includes variables on: income; education; employment; occupation; housing and other variables such as disability, car ownership, internet access and single parents.

#### *Household size*

The number of people in the household was recoded from 1,2,3,4,5 or more, to 3 categories: 1-2, 3-4 and 5 or more, as some cells contained small numbers with the initial categorisation.

#### *Household structure*

Household structure was coded as single with dependents, couple with dependents, parents with non-dependent children, singles without children, couple without children, and other. We recoded this to single with dependents, couple with dependents, and other (included all other categories).

#### *Main language used in the household*

We maintained the original binary coding for this variable of English, and language other than English.

#### Analysis

Analyses were performed using Stata V9.2. Records with missing data on household smoking status were excluded from the analysis (31 households with children 0-14). Summary statistics of household characteristics were obtained and univariate associations with rurality were examined using the Pearson’s chi-square test. Initial analyses included all households with data on smoking status. Subsequent analyses were restricted to households with children 0-14. Multivariable logistic regression was used to explore the association of rurality with household smoking and with home ETS exposure, controlling for potential confounders. Initially all variables with a p-value <0.25 in the univariate analyses were included in the models, with stepwise removal of variables based on the p-value from the likelihood ratio test, with variables with a p-value <0.1 retained in the model. Rurality was retained in both multivariable models regardless of statistical significance.

## RESULTS

### **The sample**

Weighting the sample to take account of the complex sampling 15, gave a total sample size of 15,978 households (the effective sample size). Household smoking status was recorded for 15,745 of these households, which were included in the analysis.

1  
2  
3 In all households i.e. those with children and those without children, 33% contained a smoker. Rural  
4 households were significantly more likely to contain a smoker than urban households (36.5% versus  
5 31.4%;  $p < 0.001$ ), and were significantly more likely to contain a smoker who smoked indoors  
6 (home ETS exposure) (11.7% versus 9.2%,  $p < 0.001$ ). Households with children 0-14 years were more  
7 likely to be smoking households (35.4%) than households without children (32.1%) ( $p < 0.001$ ).  
8  
9

10 For all subsequent reported analyses, we selected only those households with children aged 0-14  
11 years. This provided a sample of 4,669 households.  
12

### 13 **Smoking households with children**

14 Table 1 presents the demographic and smoking behaviour characteristics of households with  
15 children aged 0-14.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1– Demographic characteristics and smoking behaviour in households with children, by rurality

	Rural n= 1515  n (%)	Urban n= 3154  n (%)	P value
Smoking households	661 (43.6)	989 (31.4)	<0.001
Home ETS exposure	121 (8.0%)	163 (5.2%)	<0.001
Socio-economic status (SEIFA quintile):			<0.001
1 (lowest)	437 (28.8%)	376 (11.9%)	
2	458 (30.2%)	416 (13.2%)	
3	342 (22.6%)	590 (18.7%)	
4	225 (14.8%)	855 (27.1%)	
5 (highest)	54 (3.6%)	917 (29.1%)	
Household size:			0.022
1-2	901 (59.5%)	1939 (61.5%)	
3-4	528 (34.9%)	991 (31.4%)	
5+	86 (5.7%)	225 (7.1%)	
Household structure <sup>a</sup> :			<0.001
Single with dependents	190 (12.6%)	259 (8.3%)	
Couple with dependents	1028 (68.1%)	2281 (72.8%)	
Other	291 (19.3%)	593 (18.9%)	
Main language <sup>b</sup> :			<0.001
English	1487 (98.3%)	2729 (86.8%)	
Language other than English	25 (1.7%)	416 (13.2%)	

<sup>a</sup> 1509 rural observations and 3133 urban; <sup>b</sup> 1512 rural observations and 3145 urban

Note: Results may not add up to totals because of the adjustment of the effective sample size calculation

Overall, 35.4% of households with children were smoking households, and 6.1% of households with children contained a smoker who smoked inside the home (home ETS exposure). The proportion of households which were smoking households was greater in rural (43.6%) than urban (31.4%) areas ( $p<0.001$ ). The proportion of households with home ETS exposure was also significantly greater in rural (8.0%) than urban (5.2%) households with children ( $p<0.001$ ).

Rural and urban households were also different on all potential confounders: the proportion of households in each SEIFA quintile ( $p<0.001$ ); household size, with rural households having a smaller proportion of larger households ( $p=0.022$ ); household structure, with rural households having a larger proportion of households with a single adult with dependent children ( $p<0.001$ ); and main language with a much lower proportion of rural households speaking a language other than English ( $p<0.001$ ) than urban households.

### Associations of smoking behaviour with rurality

#### Household smoking

Table 2 reports the results of the logistic regression model exploring the association of rurality with smoking households among households with children 0-14, controlling for potential confounders.



Table 2 – Logistic regression model of factors significantly associated with smoking households among households with children

Variable	OR (95% CI)
Rurality:	
Urban	1.00
Rural	1.21 (1.07, 1.37)
Socio-economic status (SEIFA quintile):	
1 (lowest)	1.00
2	0.70 (0.59, 0.84)
3	0.56 (0.47, 0.67)
4	0.47 (0.40, 0.57)
5 (highest)	0.28 (0.23, 0.34)
Household size:	
1-2 people	1.00
3-4 people	1.20 (1.06, 1.36)
5+ people	1.36 (1.08, 1.72)
Household structure:	
Single with dependents	1.00
Couple with dependents	0.47 (0.40, 0.56)
Other	0.70 (0.56, 0.87)

Amongst households with children, rurality continued to be associated with being a smoking household when socio-economic status, household size and household structure were controlled for. Main language used in the household was not retained in the model.

#### Home ETS exposure

Results of the logistic regression model to explore the association between rurality and home ETS exposure in households with children, controlling for potential confounders are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Logistic regression model of factors associated with home ETS exposure among households with children

Variable	OR (95% CI)
Rurality:	
Urban	1.00
Rural	1.07 (0.85, 1.35)
Socio-economic status (SEIFA quintile):	
1 (lowest)	1.00
2	0.55 (0.41, 0.74)
3	0.52 (0.38, 0.70)
4	0.27 (0.19, 0.38)
5 (highest)	0.25 (0.17, 0.37)
Household size:	
1-2 people	1.00
3-4 people	1.83 (1.42, 2.35)
5+ people	2.71 (1.84, 4.00)
Household structure:	
Single with dependents	1.00
Couple with dependents	0.25 (0.19, 0.33)
Other	0.52 (0.38, 0.73)

In households with children, home ETS exposure was not significantly associated with rurality once other factors were controlled for. Socio-economic status, household size and household structure remained strongly associated with home ETS exposure. Main language used in the household was not retained in the model.

## DISCUSSION

One third of all Australian households were smoking households. In univariate analysis both smoking households and home ETS exposure were significantly more common for rural households with children than for urban households with children. In a multivariate analysis among households with children, rurality remained associated with smoking households when confounding factors were controlled for, whereas rurality did not remain associated with home ETS exposure after controlling for potential confounders.

### Smoking households

Overall, smoking prevalence is in decline in Australia, estimated at 15.9% of adults smoking daily in 2010.<sup>3</sup> Given this, it is surprising that 33% of all Australian households contain a daily smoker. Smoking is even more common in households containing children with 35.4% of households with children aged 0-14 containing a smoker, rising to 43.6% of rural households with children ( $p < 0.001$ ).

It is possible that a focus on individual smoking behaviour and not on household behaviours, children and/or rurality has masked recognition of this high proportion of rural households with

1  
2  
3 children containing a smoker. The exploration of smoking at household level is supported by the  
4 importance of the social and relational environment for smoking, and smoking cessation 24.  
5

6 In households with children, rurality continued to be associated with smoking households when  
7 other factors were controlled for. This suggests there might be something particular about rural  
8 smoking households that warrants further investigation, and that support for smoking cessation  
9 might be rurally targeted.  
10

### 11 **Home ETS exposure**

12 Home ETS exposure was significantly more common for rural (8%) than urban (5.2%  $p < 0.001$ )  
13 households with children. Using the NDSHS data, this equates to 54,123 rural households with at  
14 least one child containing a daily smoker who smokes inside the home. The few studies of children's  
15 home ETS exposure in rural compared to urban areas provide a mixed picture, and comparison is  
16 compromised by differences in defining home ETS. A German study 16 exploring rural-urban  
17 comparisons of home ETS in households with children reported higher levels of home ETS in urban  
18 areas. This probably reflects the higher prevalence of smoking in urban than rural areas in European  
19 countries<sup>25</sup>, the reverse of Australia, Canada and China. One American study of states containing  
20 Appalachian counties used a similar definition of home ETS exposure to our own, and reports rural  
21 home ETS exposure of children (under 18) as 12.5% compared to urban exposure of 6.5% 18. By  
22 contrast, urban Alaskan households have higher levels of home ETS exposure than the most  
23 extremely rural regions 17.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 The main drivers of home ETS exposure for children in rural households were the same as for urban  
30 i.e. low socio-economic status, larger household size and being a single parent household. Home ETS  
31 exposure is highest for children from disadvantaged families as their parents are more likely to  
32 smoke and smoke heavily 2, and to smoke in the home 16. The NDSHS data highlight the stark  
33 contrast between rural and urban households in terms of their socio-economic status, with only  
34 3.6% of rural households in the least disadvantaged SEIFA category compared to 29.1% of urban  
35 households.  
36  
37

38 Another factor driving the higher prevalence of home ETS exposure in rural households compared to  
39 urban households is the significantly greater proportion of single parent families in rural areas. The  
40 finding of higher home ETS exposure among single parent families has been reported in Australia  
41 previously 26. Given single parenthood is closely intertwined with disadvantage 3 we must continue  
42 with efforts to address smoking in lower SES populations groups.  
43  
44

45 Our finding that home ETS does not remain associated with rurality once confounders are adjusted  
46 for matches the Alaskan study described earlier 17. Whilst rurality does not remain associated with  
47 home ETS exposure in households with children once other factors are controlled for, rural children  
48 experience more home ETS exposure because of these factors which place them at additional  
49 disadvantage (low socioeconomic status and single parent households). Socio-economic status and  
50 household structure were the strongest drivers of both household smoking and home ETS.  
51  
52

53 Given the progressive adoption of smoke-free public places legislation in Australia and other high  
54 income countries, the relative importance of home ETS exposure is increasing. As living in a smoke-  
55 free home offers children some protection from home ETS exposure, continuing the decline in  
56 homes with smokers who smoke inside the house is key. However, one Swedish study of young  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 children demonstrated that 'smoking outdoors' even with the door shut resulted in higher urinary  
4 cotinine levels when compared to an age-matched non-smoking household control group 7. These  
5 findings are supported by a UK study which reported children from smoking parents in households  
6 which were smoke-free had less salivary cotinine than children with smoking parents in households  
7 which were not smoke-free, but more than children with non-smoking parents in smoke-free  
8 households 6. Therefore, whilst living in a household with no indoor smoking offers children some  
9 protection, children from households without smokers are the most protected.  
10  
11

12 The data explored in this study did not include children's ETS exposure outside their own home, for  
13 example in cars, visiting other families, social outings etc. but as rural children are more likely to live  
14 in a smoking household (even if the smoker/s smoke outside the home), we would anticipate it is  
15 likely that they are also more frequently exposed to ETS in other non-home settings. In a study of  
16 infants in urban NSW Australia for example, Daly et al report that 10% were exposed in the home,  
17 and 22% at a friend or relative's house 26.  
18  
19

### 20 **Limitations of this study**

21 This study has several limitations.  
22  
23

24 The NDSHS is subject to response bias from self-report. Whilst there is some evidence  
25 demonstrating self-report of smoking in the home is moderately correlated to environmental and  
26 biomedical markers 27, it remains an inferior replacement for such measures 26. It is likely that  
27 home ETS exposure from this survey is therefore a conservative estimate.  
28  
29

30 In addition to respondents under-reporting what is clearly a socially undesirable behaviour (smoking  
31 indoors in a household with children), there have been several studies exploring what people  
32 actually mean when they talk about household smoking rules i.e. how people define (to themselves  
33 and others) 'smoke indoors' and 'smoke outdoors' 2, 28. These qualitative studies suggest that  
34 defining smoking outdoors might be a somewhat varied and fluctuating category, possibly  
35 contributing to further underestimation of home ETS. At present we do not know how defining  
36 home smoking status is played out in Australia, or if there are any rural/urban differences in this  
37 regard. Gaining an understanding of what people know about children's home ETS exposure, what  
38 is meant by smoking outside the home, and what their home smoking behaviour actually is in  
39 Australia would both illuminate the findings of this study and contribute to understanding how best  
40 to support people in either quitting or making their home smoke-free.  
41  
42  
43

44 A limited number of potential household level confounders were available in this dataset and there  
45 are other important confounders at household level, such as the ages of people in the household, or  
46 the number of smokers in the household, that we were unable to control for.  
47  
48

49 As our analysis was conducted at household level, we did not use data on individuals and therefore  
50 did not control for potential individual-level confounders known to be associated with smoking  
51 prevalence such as mental health 3. We did not control for Aboriginal status as although there were  
52 (very limited) data available, Aboriginal status is nonsensical as a household-level variable, although  
53 an important individual-level confounder given the smoking prevalence amongst Aboriginal  
54 Australians is more than twice that of non-Aboriginal Australians 29. SEIFA is an area level variable.  
55 At Census Collection District area (around 100 houses) this may not always apply to individual  
56 households.  
57  
58  
59  
60

## CONCLUSION

The proportion of smoking households with children remains an important public health concern. The finding that rurality remains associated with smoking households when other factors such as socio-economic status are controlled for, suggests we need to understand more about the context of smoking in rural Australia to provide support targeted to rural households in quitting.

Significant numbers of children continue to be exposed to home ETS and to suffering the lifelong consequences on their physical health, academic performance and their own smoking behaviour in the future. Socio-economic disadvantage continues to be a significant driver of differences in children's home ETS exposure in rural compared to urban areas. Further efforts to support smokers who smoke inside their homes containing children to quit or avoid smoking in the home would benefit these children. Understanding the smoking rules and behaviours inside smoking households, and people's knowledge of children's home ETS exposure, should provide better evidence to support those efforts.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our thanks to Dr Coral Gartner for her advice about handling the weighting of the data, and to Dr Judy Singer for her support with the background research for this study.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Dr Passey receives research grant funding from Pfizer Australia, through an Australian Research Council Linkage Grant. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## WHAT THIS PAPER ADDS

No previous Australian studies have looked at children's home environmental tobacco smoke exposure (ETS) in rural compared to urban areas. We found that 44% of rural households with children in Australia contained a smoker (higher than in urban areas), and that a higher proportion of households exposed children to home ETS in rural households compared to urban households. The drivers of these differences were rurality, household size, socio-economic status, and household structure.

## COPYRIGHT

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, a worldwide licence to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above.

## CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

Jo Longman obtained, organised and analysed the data, and drafted and revised the paper. Megan Passey designed the study analysed the data and revised the paper.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**DATA SHARING STATEMENT**

There is no additional data available

For peer review only

## References

- 1 Royal College of Physicians. Passive smoking and children. A report by the Tobacco Advisory Group. London, UK: Royal College of Physicians 2010.
- 2 Jones LL, Atkinson O, Longman J, *et al*. The motivators and barriers to a smoke-free home among disadvantaged caregivers: identifying the positive levers for change. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2011;**13**:479-486.
- 3 Scollo M, Winstanley M. *Tobacco in Australia: Facts and Issues*. 2012. <http://www.tobaccoinaustralia.org.au> (accessed February 2013).
- 4 Goldade K, Choi K, Bernat DH, *et al*. Multilevel predictors of smoking initiation among adolescents: Findings from the Minnesota Adolescent Community Cohort (MACC) study. *Prev Med* 2012.
- 5 de Leeuw R, Engels R, Scholte R. Parental smoking and pretend smoking in young children. *Tob Control* 2010;**19**:201-205.
- 6 Jarvis MJ, Mindell J, Gilmore A, *et al*. Smoke-free homes in England: prevalence, trends and validation by cotinine in children. *Tob Control* 2009;**18**:491-495.
- 7 Johansson A, Hermansson G, Ludvigsson J. How should parents protect their children from environmental tobacco-smoke exposure in the home? *Pediatrics* 2004;**113**:e291-e295.
- 8 Bottorff JL, Johnson JL, Carey J, *et al*. A family affair: Aboriginal women's efforts to limit second-hand smoke exposure at home. *Can J Public Health* 2010;**101**:32-35.
- 9 World Health Organization. WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2003. *World Health Organization The world health report 2002*.
- 10 Borland R, Mullins R, Trotter L, *et al*. Trends in environmental tobacco smoke restrictions in the home in Victoria, Australia. *Tob Control* 1999;**8**:266-271.
- 11 Borland R, Yong H, Cummings K, *et al*. Determinants and consequences of smoke-free homes: findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *Tob Control* 2006;**15**:iii42-iii50.
- 12 Commonwealth Government of Australia. *Draft for consultation of the National Tobacco Strategy 2012-2018*. 2012. <http://www.nationaldrugstrategy.gov.au/internet/drugstrategy/publishing.nsf/Content/draft-nts-12-18-callsubs> (accessed March 2013).
- 13 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Rural, regional and remote health: indicators of health*. 2005. <http://www.aihw.gov.au/publication-detail/?id=6442467718> (accessed February 2013).
- 14 Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Tobacco smoking in Australia: A snapshot (4831.055.001)*. 2006. <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4831.0.55.001> (accessed February 2013).
- 15 Gartner CE, Hall WD. Is the socioeconomic gap in childhood exposure to secondhand smoke widening or narrowing? *Tob Control* 2012:Available online.
- 16 Bolte G, Fromme H. Socioeconomic determinants of children's environmental tobacco smoke exposure and family's home smoking policy. *The European Journal of Public Health* 2009;**19**:52-58.
- 17 Dent C, Maher J, Pizacani B, *et al*. Secondhand smoke exposure in Alaskan households with children. *Rural Remote Health* 2010;**10**.

- 1  
2  
3 18 Wiener RC. Secondhand and thirdhand tobacco smoke exposure in children living in states  
4 containing Appalachian counties: A surveillance. *Journal of Rural and Tropical Public Health*  
5 2011;**10**:111-118.  
6
- 7 19 Xiao L, Yang Y, Li Q, *et al.* Population-based survey of secondhand smoke exposure of  
8 children in China. *Biomed Environ Sci* 2010;**23**:430-436.  
9
- 10 20 McMillen R, Breen J, Cosby AG. Rural-Urban Differences in the Social Climate Surrounding  
11 Environmental Tobacco Smoke: A Report From the 2002 Social Climate Survey of Tobacco Control.  
12 *The Journal of Rural Health* 2006;**20**:7-16.  
13
- 14 21 Roy Morgan Research. National Drug Strategy Household Survey 2010 Final Technical  
15 Report. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and Department of Health and Ageing,  
16 2011.  
17
- 18 22 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Australian Data Archive - National Drug Strategy*  
19 *Household Survey Questionnaire, 2010*. 2010. <http://www.ada.edu.au/social-science/01237>  
20 (accessed January 2013).  
21
- 22 23 Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASCG):*  
23 *Socio-economic indexes for areas (SEIFA) - Technical Paper 2006*. 2006.  
24 <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/2039.0.55.001> (accessed January 2013).  
25
- 26 24 Siahpush M, Borland R, Scollo M. Factors associated with smoking cessation in a national  
27 sample of Australians. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2003;**5**:597-602.  
28
- 29 25 Idris BI, Giskes K, Borrell C, *et al.* Higher smoking prevalence in urban compared to non-  
30 urban areas: time trends in six European countries. *Health Place* 2007;**13**:702-712.  
31
- 32 26 Daly JB, Wiggers JH, Considine RJ. Infant exposure to environmental tobacco smoke: a  
33 prevalence study in Australia. *Aust NZ J Public Health* 2001;**25**:132-137.  
34
- 35 27 Rumchev K, Jamrozik K, Stick S, *et al.* How free of tobacco smoke are 'smoke-free' homes?  
36 *Indoor Air* 2008;**18**:202-208.  
37
- 38 28 Robinson J, Kirkcaldy AJ. Disadvantaged mothers, young children and smoking in the home:  
39 mothers' use of space within their homes. *Health Place* 2007;**13**:894-903.  
40
- 41 29 Hudson L, White A, Roseby R. Tobacco smoke exposure in hospitalised Aboriginal children in  
42 Central Australia. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2009;**45**:224-227.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found <b>Yes</b>
<b>Introduction</b>		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported <b>Yes</b>
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses <b>Yes</b>
<b>Methods</b>		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper <b>Yes</b>
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection <b>Yes</b>
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants <b>Yes</b>
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable <b>Yes</b>
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group <b>Yes</b>
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias <b>Yes</b>
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at <b>Yes</b>
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why <b>Yes</b>
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding <b>Yes</b> (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy <b>Yes</b> (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
<b>Results</b>		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed <b>Yes</b> (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders <b>Yes</b> (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest <b>Yes</b>
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures <b>Yes</b>
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included <b>Yes</b> (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized

(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period

Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses
<b>Discussion</b>		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives <b>Yes</b>
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias <b>Yes</b>
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence <b>Yes</b>
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results <b>Yes</b>
<b>Other information</b>		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based <b>Yes</b>

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).



**Children, smoking households and exposure to secondhand smoke in the home in rural Australia – analysis of a national cross-sectional survey**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-003128.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	04-Jun-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Longman, Jo; University of Sydney, Sch of Public Health (University Centre for Rural Health - North Coast) Passey, Megan; University of Sydney, University Centre for Rural Health - North Coast
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Smoking and tobacco
Keywords:	Environmental Tobacco Smoke, Secondhand smoke, Children, Rural, Australia

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

# Children, smoking households and exposure to secondhand smoke in the home in rural Australia – analysis of a national cross-sectional survey.

---

Jo M Longman<sup>1\*</sup> and Megan E Passey<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University Centre for Rural Health, University of Sydney School of Public Health, PO Box 3074, Lismore, NSW 2480, Australia

\*Corresponding Author: email: [jo.longman@ucr.edu.au](mailto:jo.longman@ucr.edu.au); T:02 66207570; F: 02 66207270

**Keywords:** environmental tobacco smoke; secondhand smoke; children; rural; Australia

**Wordcount:** 3753

## ARTICLE SUMMARY

### *Focus*

Given that children's exposure to secondhand smoke is such an important public health concern, as well as the higher prevalence of smoking in rural areas in Australia, this paper addresses two questions: 1. Are there rural/urban differences in a) smoking within households with children and b) home secondhand smoke exposure in children?; and 2. If so, is this due to socioeconomic disadvantage or other factors unique to 'rurality'?

### *Key Messages*

43.6% of rural households with children contained a smoker. Both household smoking and home secondhand smoke exposure were significantly more common for rural children than for urban dwelling children. Rurality remained associated with smoking households but did not remain associated with home secondhand smoke exposure, when confounding factors were controlled for. Children's home secondhand smoke exposure was driven by larger household size, low socio-economic status and being a single parent household.

### *Strengths and Limitations*

No previous studies have explored rural/urban differences in smoking in households with children in Australia. This study used data from a representative national household survey to explore the association of rurality with household smoking and with home secondhand smoke exposure. The study had limited potential household level confounding variables available for inclusion in the analysis, and was limited by potential response bias leading to a possible under-reporting of household smoking status.

## ABSTRACT

### *Introduction*

Smoking is more prevalent in rural than urban Australia, but few studies have explored rural/urban differences in home secondhand smoke exposure and none have explored these differences amongst children in Australia. Both household smoking and home secondhand smoke exposure are

1  
2  
3 harmful to children. This paper aimed to explore the association between rurality and a) household  
4 smoking status and b) home secondhand smoke exposure, in households with children aged 0-14.

### 6 *Method*

7 Data from the 2010 National Drug Strategy Household survey were analysed to explore prevalence  
8 of household smoking and home secondhand smoke exposure in rural and urban households with  
9 children. Multivariable logistic regression was used to explore the association of rurality with  
10 household smoking and with home secondhand smoke exposure, controlling for potential  
11 confounders.  
12

### 14 *Results*

15 Households with children were more likely to be smoking households (35.4% 95%CI:34.2%, 36.5%)  
16 than households without children (32.1% 95%CI:31.3%, 32.8%). Both household smoking (43.6%  
17 (95%CI:41.5%, 45.7%) vs 31.4% (95%CI:30.0%, 32.8%)) and home secondhand smoke exposure  
18 (8.0% (95%CI:6.8%, 9.1%) vs 5.2% (95%CI:4.5%, 5.8%)) were significantly more common for rural  
19 children. In multivariate analyses controlling for confounding factors, rurality remained associated  
20 with smoking households (OR= 1.21 95%CI:1.07, 1.37), whereas it did not remain associated with  
21 children's home secondhand smoke exposure (OR=1.07 95%CI:0.85, 1.35). Larger household size,  
22 low socio-economic status, and being a single parent household were the main drivers of home  
23 secondhand smoke exposure.  
24  
25  
26

### 27 *Conclusion*

28 The proportion of smoking households with children, and the number of children regularly exposed  
29 to secondhand smoke in their homes remain important public health concerns. Smoking cessation  
30 support and tobacco control policies might benefit from targeting larger and/or socio-economically  
31 disadvantaged households including single-parent households.  
32  
33  
34  
35

## 36 **BACKGROUND**

37 The negative impact of children's exposure to smoking behaviour and to secondhand smoke in their  
38 homes is extensive. Due to the higher breathing rates per body weight, and the size and immaturity  
39 of their organs, children are particularly vulnerable to the effects of secondhand smoke exposure on  
40 their physical health 1-3. They are also particularly vulnerable to the corollaries of those effects such  
41 as missing more time at school, and compromised academic performance 3. In addition, children  
42 whose parents smoke are more likely to become smokers themselves, growing up with smoking as a  
43 normalised behaviour 4, 5.  
44  
45

46 The site where most secondhand smoke exposure in children happens is their home 2, 6. Children  
47 are not able to control their environment to minimise their exposure and are effectively 'trapped' in  
48 smoking environments. Children who live in homes where there is no indoor smoking are afforded  
49 some protection from secondhand smoke exposure even when a parent smokes 6, 7. However, for  
50 adults, negotiating smoke-free home environments can be challenging due to the social and familial  
51 relationship aspects of smoking behaviour in the home 2, 8.  
52  
53

54  
55 Whilst it may be considered an infringement of individual civil liberties to legislate against  
56 secondhand smoke exposure in the home, the notion of a smoke-free home is an extension of the  
57 protection offered from comprehensive smoke-free legislation. In Australia this began in the mid-  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1980s, and has covered public transport, the workplace, public spaces, smoking in cars containing  
4 children, and, most recently, proposed legislation on multi-unit dwellings, supported by an active  
5 campaign from Action on Smoking and Health Australia 3.  
6

7 This legislative environment reflects the importance of protecting the public from secondhand  
8 smoke exposure. Efforts to protect children from the effects of secondhand smoke exposure  
9 respond directly to Article 8 of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control requiring  
10 smoke-free measures by those countries ratifying the Treaty, including Australia 9.  
11  
12

13 Educational campaigns focusing on smoke-free homes have been in place since the early 2000s and  
14 continue to form a regular part of tobacco campaigning in Australia. These campaigns have  
15 promoted quitting or smoking outside to protect children from the harms of home secondhand  
16 smoke exposure 10 and appear to have been 'moderately helpful' in increasing the number of  
17 smoke-free homes 3. In 2006, 43% of Australian households with smokers reported totally banning  
18 smoking indoors 11, and data from both NSW and Victoria show declines in household indoor  
19 smoking over recent years 3. One of the main outcome indicators in Australia's draft National  
20 Tobacco Strategy 2004-2009 is that fewer people will be exposed to secondhand smoke in their  
21 homes 12.  
22  
23  
24

### 25 **Is there an urban/rural divide in children's exposure to home secondhand smoke ?**

26 In Australia around one third of the population lives outside major cities, with rural areas more  
27 socio-economically disadvantaged than urban areas 13. The prevalence of tobacco smoking in this  
28 rural population is significantly higher than in urban areas 14. Smoking continues to be  
29 disproportionately represented among socio-economically disadvantaged populations, and these  
30 disparities are increasing over time 15.  
31  
32

33 We identified only three studies exploring the difference between home secondhand smoke  
34 exposure in children in rural compared to urban areas 16-18, with none from Australia. Two are  
35 North American (one showing higher home secondhand smoke exposure in rural areas 18 and one  
36 from Alaska showing lower home secondhand smoke exposure in very remote areas 17), and one  
37 from Germany reporting lower home secondhand smoke exposure in children in rural areas 16.  
38 One study from China describes secondhand smoke exposure in respondents' homes (all homes, not  
39 just homes with children) that is higher in rural areas (73%) compared with urban areas (60%) 19.  
40 One further North American study focuses on home smoking bans, and reports fewer home smoking  
41 bans in rural households compared to urban households 20.  
42  
43  
44

45 Given that secondhand smoke exposure is such an important public health concern, particularly in  
46 children, as well as the higher prevalence of smoking in rural areas in Australia, this paper addresses  
47 two questions: 1. Are there rural/urban differences in a) smoking within households with children  
48 and b) home secondhand smoke exposure in children?; and 2. If so, is this due to socioeconomic  
49 disadvantage or other factors unique to 'rurality'?  
50  
51  
52

## 53 **METHODS**

### 54 **The 2010 National Drug Strategy Household Survey**

55 The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) conducts the National Drug Strategy  
56 Household Survey (NDSHS) every three years to measure behaviour, knowledge and attitudes  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 towards drugs in Australia. The 2010 sample was a multi-stage random sample of households  
4 stratified by region with some over-sampling in certain states and territories, representative of the  
5 national population. Respondents were the person aged 12 or older in each household who was  
6 next to have a birthday. Questions were asked via drop and collect self-completion questionnaires.  
7 Questions were asked of the respondent about themselves, e.g. their own smoking status, as well as  
8 questions about the household. Data were collected between April and September 2010. The  
9 survey has been conducted on nine previous occasions 21.

10  
11  
12 The NDSHS was chosen because it provided data on household behaviour, rather than just individual  
13 behaviour, as well as the number and age of children within a household. Non-identifiable data were  
14 sourced from the AIHW with a signed agreement to protect the confidentiality and management of  
15 the data.

### 16 17 18 **Weighting**

19 Weights were applied to the data to adjust for the complex sampling design while not inflating the  
20 overall sample size. Weights for each household record were provided by the AIHW to adjust the  
21 number of households in the dataset to the number of households in the Australian population.  
22 Applying these rates would have overinflated the sample size for statistical analyses. Following  
23 Gartner et al 15, we proportionally adjusted the absolute weight for households provided by the  
24 AIHW in order to bring the overall number of households down to the effective sample size. Each  
25 weight provided by the AIHW was multiplied by an adjustment factor, and then applied to the data,  
26 to bring the total number of households down to the effective sample size provided by the AIHW.

### 27 28 29 **Measures**

#### 30 31 32 **Rurality**

33 The rurality variable was based on the Australian Standard Geographical Classification remoteness  
34 areas 22. This classification was designed to facilitate quantitative comparison between 'city' and  
35 'country' Australia, and is based on distance to services and goods. The variable was coded: major  
36 cities, inner regional, outer regional and remote/very remote. The inner regional code includes  
37 locations close to major cities e.g. Port Stephens, an hour's drive away from Newcastle (a major  
38 city), and outer regional includes locations such as Biloela in Queensland, 550km away from the  
39 nearest major city (Brisbane). For more information please see the map of Australia at  
40 <http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/D3310114.nsf/home/remoteness+structure#Anchor2e>  
41 illustrating the remoteness structure. This classification system is recommended by the Australian  
42 Government's Institute of Health and Welfare (a statutory body established to report to the nation  
43 on health), particularly for use at aggregated national level 23, and is widely used in the academic  
44 literature, for example Kelly et al 24. We recoded the variable into Urban/Rural where urban was  
45 'major cities' and rural was a combination of the remaining categories, as some cells contained  
46 small numbers with the initial categorisation.

#### 47 48 49 **Households with Children**

50 We defined households with children as those with children 0-14 years old. The questionnaire asked  
51 "Of all the dependent children, how many are in each of these age categories?" 25, and offered two-  
52 year blocks up to 12-14 with the last category being 15+. As "dependent children" was defined to  
53 include children older than 14 "who are still financially dependent, such as full-time students" 25 we  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 did not include the final category which may have contained substantial numbers of dependent  
4 children over 18.

5  
6 Outcome variables

7  
8 *Smoking households*

9 We defined smoking households as any household containing a smoker regardless of where that  
10 person smoked, i.e. answering “Yes, inside the home” or “No, only smoke outside the home” to the  
11 question “In the last 12 months, have you or any other member of your household smoked at least  
12 one cigarette, cigar or pipe of tobacco per day in the home?”. The other response option was “No-  
13 one at home regularly smokes” 25.

14  
15  
16 *Home secondhand smoke exposure*

17 Home secondhand smoke exposure is different to smoking households as it is a measure of whether  
18 a household contains a smoker who smokes inside the home. This was determined as those  
19 households where the answer “Yes, inside the home” was given to the question “In the last 12  
20 months, have you or any other member of your household smoked at least one cigarette, cigar or  
21 pipe of tobacco per day in the home?” 25. We recoded this into a binary variable: “yes smokes  
22 inside the home” or “no does not smoke inside the home”. The “no does not smoke inside the  
23 home” category included households answering either “No, only smoke outside the home”, or “no-  
24 one at home regularly smokes”.

25  
26  
27  
28 Potential confounders

29 The data contained limited household level variables. Within these confines, the following variables  
30 were considered potential confounders in the association between home secondhand smoke  
31 exposure and rurality: socio-economic status 2, 15; number of people in the household 15;  
32 household structure 3, 16; and main language used in the household 3. These are defined below.

33  
34  
35 *Socio-economic status*

36 We defined socio-economic status using the area-level socio-economic index for areas (SEIFA)  
37 provided in the data (the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage, measured  
38 at Census Collection District areas) 26. This index includes variables on: income; education;  
39 employment; occupation; housing and other variables such as disability, car ownership, internet  
40 access and single parents.

41  
42  
43 *Household size*

44 The number of people in the household was recoded from 1,2,3,4,5 or more, to 3 categories: 1-2, 3-  
45 4 and 5 or more, as some cells contained small numbers with the initial categorisation.

46  
47  
48 *Household structure*

49 Household structure was coded as single with dependents, couple with dependents, parents with  
50 non-dependent children, singles without children, couple without children, and other. We recoded  
51 this to single with dependents, couple with dependents, and other (included all other categories).

52  
53  
54 *Main language used in the household*

55 We maintained the original binary coding for this variable of English, and language other than  
56 English.  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Analysis

Analyses were performed using Stata V9.2. Records with missing data on household smoking status were excluded from the analysis (31 households with children 0-14). Summary statistics of household characteristics were obtained and univariate associations with rurality were examined using the Pearson's chi-square test. Initial analyses included all households with data on smoking status. Subsequent analyses were restricted to households with children 0-14. Multivariable logistic regression was used to explore the association of rurality with household smoking and with home secondhand smoke exposure, controlling for potential confounders. Initially all variables with a p-value <0.25 in the univariate analyses were included in the models, with stepwise removal of variables based on the p-value from the likelihood ratio test, with variables with a p-value <0.1 retained in the model. Rurality was retained in both multivariable models regardless of statistical significance.

## RESULTS

### The sample

Weighting the sample to take account of the complex sampling 15, gave a total sample size of 15,978 households (the effective sample size). Household smoking status was recorded for 15,745 of these households, which were included in the analysis.

In all households i.e. those with children and those without children, 33% (95%CI:32.4%, 33.7%) contained a smoker. Rural households were significantly more likely to contain a smoker than urban households (36.5% (95%CI:35.4%, 37.5%) versus 31.4% (95%CI:30.6%, 32.1%), and were significantly more likely to contain a smoker who smoked indoors (home secondhand smoke exposure) (11.7% (95%CI:11.0%, 12.5%) versus 9.2% (95%CI:8.7%, 9.6%). Households with children 0-14 years were more likely to be smoking households (35.4%; 95%CI:34.2%, 36.5%) than households without children (32.1%; 95%CI:31.3%, 32.8%).

For all subsequent reported analyses, we selected only those households with children aged 0-14 years. This provided a sample of 4,669 households.

### Smoking households with children

Table 1 presents the demographic and smoking behaviour characteristics of households with children aged 0-14.

Table 1– Demographic characteristics and smoking behaviour in households with children, by rurality

	Rural n= 1515 n (%)	Urban n= 3154 n (%)	P value
Smoking households	661 (43.6)	989 (31.4)	<0.001
Home secondhand smoke exposure	121 (8.0%)	163 (5.2%)	<0.001
Socio-economic status (SEIFA quintile):			<0.001
1 (lowest)	437 (28.8%)	376 (12.0%)	
2	458 (30.2%)	416 (13.2%)	
3	342 (22.6%)	590 (18.7%)	
4	225 (14.9%)	855 (27.1%)	
5 (highest)	54 (3.6%)	917 (29.1%)	
Household size:			0.022
1-2	901 (59.5%)	1939 (61.4%)	
3-4	528 (34.8%)	991 (31.5%)	
5+	86 (5.7%)	225 (7.1%)	
Household structure <sup>a</sup> :			<0.001
Single with dependents	190 (12.7%)	259 (8.3%)	
Couple with dependents	1028 (67.9%)	2281 (72.6%)	
Other	291 (19.4%)	593 (19.0%)	
Main language <sup>b</sup> :			<0.001
English	1487 (98.3%)	2729 (86.8%)	
Language other than English	25 (1.7%)	416 (13.2%)	

<sup>a</sup> 1509 rural observations and 3133 urban; <sup>b</sup> 1512 rural observations and 3145 urban

Note: Results may not add up to totals because of the adjustment of the effective sample size calculation

Overall, 35.4% (95%CI:34.2%, 36.5%) of households with children were smoking households, and 6.1% (95%CI:5.5%, 6.7%) of households with children contained a smoker who smoked inside the home (home secondhand smoke exposure). The proportion of households which were smoking households was greater in rural (43.6% 95%CI: 41.5%, 45.7%) than urban (31.4% 95%CI:30.0%, 32.8%) areas. The proportion of households with home secondhand smoke exposure was also significantly greater in rural (8.0% 95%CI:6.8%, 9.1%) than urban (5.2% 95%CI:4.5%, 5.8%) households with children.

Rural and urban households were also different on all potential confounders: the proportion of households in each SEIFA quintile ( $p<0.001$ ); household size, with rural households having a smaller proportion of larger households ( $p=0.022$ ); household structure, with rural households having a larger proportion of households with a single adult with dependent children ( $p<0.001$ ); and main language with a much lower proportion of rural households speaking a language other than English ( $p<0.001$ ) than urban households.

### Associations of smoking behaviour with rurality

#### Household smoking

Table 2 reports the results of the logistic regression model exploring the association of rurality with smoking households among households with children 0-14, controlling for potential confounders.

Table 2 – Logistic regression model of factors significantly associated with smoking households among households with children

Variable	OR (95% CI)
Rurality:	
Urban	1.00
Rural	1.21 (1.07, 1.37)
Socio-economic status (SEIFA quintile):	
1 (lowest)	1.00
2	0.70 (0.59, 0.84)
3	0.56 (0.47, 0.67)
4	0.47 (0.40, 0.57)
5 (highest)	0.28 (0.23, 0.34)
Household size:	
1-2 people	1.00
3-4 people	1.20 (1.06, 1.36)
5+ people	1.36 (1.08, 1.72)
Household structure:	
Single with dependents	1.00
Couple with dependents	0.47 (0.40, 0.56)
Other	0.70 (0.56, 0.87)

Amongst households with children, rurality continued to be associated with being a smoking household when socio-economic status, household size and household structure were controlled for. Main language used in the household was not retained in the model.

#### Home secondhand smoke exposure

Results of the logistic regression model to explore the association between rurality and home secondhand smoke exposure in households with children, controlling for potential confounders are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Logistic regression model of factors associated with home secondhand smoke exposure among households with children

Variable	OR (95% CI)
Rurality:	
Urban	1.00
Rural	1.07 (0.85, 1.35)
Socio-economic status (SEIFA quintile):	
1 (lowest)	1.00
2	0.55 (0.41, 0.74)
3	0.52 (0.38, 0.70)
4	0.27 (0.19, 0.38)
5 (highest)	0.25 (0.17, 0.37)
Household size:	
1-2 people	1.00
3-4 people	1.83 (1.42, 2.35)
5+ people	2.71 (1.84, 4.00)
Household structure:	
Single with dependents	1.00
Couple with dependents	0.25 (0.19, 0.33)
Other	0.52 (0.38, 0.73)

In households with children, home secondhand smoke exposure was not significantly associated with rurality once other factors were controlled for. Socio-economic status, household size and household structure remained strongly associated with home secondhand smoke exposure. Main language used in the household was not retained in the model.

## DISCUSSION

One third of all Australian households were smoking households. In univariate analysis both smoking households and home secondhand smoke exposure were significantly more common for rural households with children than for urban households with children. In a multivariate analysis among households with children, rurality remained associated with smoking households when confounding factors were controlled for, whereas rurality did not remain associated with home secondhand smoke exposure after controlling for potential confounders.

### Smoking households

Overall, smoking prevalence is in decline in Australia, estimated at 15.9% of adults smoking daily in 2010<sup>3</sup>. Given this, it is surprising that 33% of all Australian households contain a daily smoker. Smoking is even more common in households containing children with 35.4% of households with children aged 0-14 containing a smoker, rising to 43.6% of rural households with children ( $p < 0.001$ ).

It is possible that a focus on individual smoking behaviour and not on household behaviours, children and/or rurality has masked recognition of this high proportion of rural households with

1  
2  
3 children containing a smoker. The exploration of smoking at household level is supported by the  
4 importance of the social and relational environment for smoking, and smoking cessation 27.  
5

6 In households with children, rurality continued to be associated with smoking households when  
7 other factors were controlled for. This suggests there might be something particular about rural  
8 smoking households that warrants further investigation, and that support for smoking cessation  
9 might be rurally targeted.  
10

### 11 **Home secondhand smoke exposure**

12 Home secondhand smoke exposure was significantly more common for rural (8%) than urban (5.2%  
13  $p < 0.001$ ) households with children. Using the NDSHS data, this equates to 54,123 rural households  
14 with at least one child containing a daily smoker who smokes inside the home. The few studies of  
15 children's home secondhand smoke exposure in rural compared to urban areas provide a mixed  
16 picture, and comparison is compromised by differences in defining home secondhand smoke. A  
17 German study 16 exploring rural-urban comparisons of home secondhand smoke in households  
18 with children reported higher levels of home secondhand smoke in urban areas. This probably  
19 reflects the higher prevalence of smoking in urban than rural areas in European countries<sup>28</sup>, the  
20 reverse of Australia, Canada and China. One North American study of states containing Appalachian  
21 counties used a similar definition of home secondhand smoke exposure to our own, and reports  
22 rural home secondhand smoke exposure of children (under 18) as 12.5% compared to urban  
23 exposure of 6.5% 18. By contrast, urban Alaskan households have higher levels of home secondhand  
24 smoke exposure than the most extremely rural regions 17.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 The main drivers of home secondhand smoke exposure for children in rural households were the  
31 same as for urban i.e. low socio-economic status, larger household size and being a single parent  
32 household. Home secondhand smoke exposure is highest for children from disadvantaged families  
33 as their parents are more likely to smoke and smoke heavily 2, and to smoke in the home 16. The  
34 NDSHS data highlight the stark contrast between rural and urban households in terms of their socio-  
35 economic status, with only 3.6% of rural households in the least disadvantaged SEIFA category  
36 compared to 29.1% of urban households.  
37  
38

39 Another factor driving the higher prevalence of home secondhand smoke exposure in rural  
40 households compared to urban households is the significantly greater proportion of single parent  
41 families in rural areas. The finding of higher home secondhand smoke exposure among single  
42 parent families has been reported in Australia previously 29. Given single parenthood is closely  
43 intertwined with disadvantage 3 we must continue with efforts to address smoking in lower SES  
44 populations groups.  
45  
46  
47

48 Our finding that home secondhand smoke does not remain associated with rurality once  
49 confounders are adjusted for matches the Alaskan study described earlier 17. Whilst rurality does  
50 not remain associated with home secondhand smoke exposure in households with children once  
51 other factors are controlled for, rural children experience more home secondhand smoke exposure  
52 because of these factors which place them at additional disadvantage (low socioeconomic status and  
53 single parent households). Socio-economic status and household structure were the strongest  
54 drivers of both household smoking and home secondhand smoke.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Given the progressive adoption of smoke-free public places legislation in Australia and other high  
4 income countries, the relative importance of home secondhand smoke exposure is increasing. As  
5 living in a smoke-free home offers children some protection from home secondhand smoke  
6 exposure, continuing the decline in homes with smokers who smoke inside the house is key.  
7 However, one Swedish study of young children demonstrated that 'smoking outdoors' even with  
8 the door shut resulted in higher urinary cotinine levels when compared to an age-matched non-  
9 smoking household control group 7. These findings are supported by a UK study which reported  
10 children from smoking parents in households which were smoke-free had less salivary cotinine than  
11 children with smoking parents in households which were not smoke-free, but more than children  
12 with non-smoking parents in smoke-free households 6. Therefore, whilst living in a household with  
13 no indoor smoking offers children some protection, children from households without smokers are  
14 the most protected.  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 The data explored in this study did not include children's secondhand smoke exposure outside their  
20 own home, for example in cars, visiting other families, social outings etc. but as rural children are  
21 more likely to live in a smoking household (even if the smoker/s smoke outside the home), we would  
22 anticipate it is likely that they are also more frequently exposed to secondhand smoke in other non-  
23 home settings. In a study of infants in urban NSW Australia for example, Daly et al report that 10%  
24 were exposed in the home, and 22% at a friend or relative's house 29.  
25  
26

### 27 **Limitations of this study**

28 This study has several limitations.  
29

30 The NDSHS is subject to response bias from self-report. Whilst there is some evidence  
31 demonstrating self-report of smoking in the home is moderately correlated to environmental and  
32 biomedical markers 30, it remains an inferior replacement for such measures 29. It is likely that  
33 home secondhand smoke exposure from this survey is therefore a conservative estimate.  
34  
35

36 In addition to respondents under-reporting what is clearly a socially undesirable behaviour (smoking  
37 indoors in a household with children), there have been several studies exploring what people  
38 actually mean when they talk about household smoking rules i.e. how people define (to themselves  
39 and others) 'smoke indoors' and 'smoke outdoors' 2, 31. These qualitative studies suggest that  
40 defining smoking outdoors might be a somewhat varied and fluctuating category, possibly  
41 contributing to further underestimation of home secondhand smoke exposure. At present we do  
42 not know how defining home smoking status is played out in Australia, or if there are any  
43 rural/urban differences in this regard. Gaining an understanding of what people know about  
44 children's home secondhand smoke exposure, what is meant by smoking outside the home, and  
45 what their home smoking behaviour actually is in Australia would both illuminate the findings of this  
46 study and contribute to understanding how best to support people in either quitting or making their  
47 home smoke-free.  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 A limited number of potential household level confounders were available in this dataset and there  
53 are other important confounders at household level, such as the ages of people in the household, or  
54 the number of smokers in the household, that we were unable to control for.  
55

56 As our analysis was conducted at household level, we did not use data on individuals and therefore  
57 did not control for potential individual-level confounders known to be associated with smoking  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 prevalence such as mental health 3. We did not control for Aboriginal status as although there were  
4 (very limited) data available, Aboriginal status is nonsensical as a household-level variable, although  
5 an important individual-level confounder given the smoking prevalence amongst Aboriginal  
6 Australians is more than twice that of non-Aboriginal Australians 32. SEIFA is an area level variable.  
7 At Census Collection District area (around 100 houses) this may not always apply to individual  
8 households.  
9  
10

## 11 12 **CONCLUSION**

13 The proportion of smoking households with children remains an important public health concern.  
14 The finding that rurality remains associated with smoking households when other factors such as  
15 socio-economic status are controlled for, suggests we need to understand more about the context of  
16 smoking in rural Australia to provide support targeted to rural households in quitting.  
17  
18

19 Significant numbers of children continue to be exposed to secondhand smoke in their homes and to  
20 suffering the lifelong consequences on their physical health, academic performance and their own  
21 smoking behaviour in the future. Socio-economic disadvantage continues to be a significant driver  
22 of differences in children's home secondhand smoke exposure in rural compared to urban areas.  
23 Further efforts to support smokers who smoke inside their homes containing children to quit or  
24 avoid smoking in the home would benefit these children. Understanding the smoking rules and  
25 behaviours inside smoking households, and people's knowledge of children's home secondhand  
26 smoke exposure, should provide better evidence to support those efforts.  
27  
28  
29  
30

## 31 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

32 Our thanks to Dr Coral Gartner for her advice about handling the weighting of the data, and to Dr  
33 Judy Singer for her support with the background research for this study.  
34  
35  
36

## 37 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

38 Dr Passey receives research grant funding from Pfizer Australia, through an Australian Research  
39 Council Linkage Grant. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.  
40  
41  
42

## 43 **WHAT THIS PAPER ADDS**

44 No previous Australian studies have looked at children's home secondhand smoke exposure in rural  
45 compared to urban areas. We found that 44% of rural households with children in Australia  
46 contained a smoker (higher than in urban areas), and that a higher proportion of households  
47 exposed children to home secondhand smoke in rural households compared to urban households.  
48 The drivers of these differences were rurality, household size, socio-economic status, and household  
49 structure.  
50  
51

## 52 **COPYRIGHT**

53 The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of  
54 all authors, a worldwide licence to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats  
55 and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display  
56 and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the  
4 Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all  
5 subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to  
6 third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of  
7 the above.  
8  
9

#### 10 **CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT**

11 Jo Longman obtained, organised and analysed the data, and drafted and revised the paper. Megan  
12 Passey designed the study analysed the data and revised the paper.  
13

#### 15 **DATA SHARING STATEMENT**

16 There are no additional data available.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## References

- 1 Royal College of Physicians. Passive smoking and children. A report by the Tobacco Advisory Group. London, UK: Royal College of Physicians 2010.
- 2 Jones LL, Atkinson O, Longman J, *et al*. The motivators and barriers to a smoke-free home among disadvantaged caregivers: identifying the positive levers for change. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2011;**13**:479-486.
- 3 Scollo M, Winstanley M. *Tobacco in Australia: Facts and Issues*. 2012. <http://www.tobaccoinaustralia.org.au> (accessed February 2013).
- 4 Goldade K, Choi K, Bernat DH, *et al*. Multilevel predictors of smoking initiation among adolescents: Findings from the Minnesota Adolescent Community Cohort (MACC) study. *Prev Med* 2012.
- 5 de Leeuw R, Engels R, Scholte R. Parental smoking and pretend smoking in young children. *Tob Control* 2010;**19**:201-205.
- 6 Jarvis MJ, Mindell J, Gilmore A, *et al*. Smoke-free homes in England: prevalence, trends and validation by cotinine in children. *Tob Control* 2009;**18**:491-495.
- 7 Johansson A, Hermansson G, Ludvigsson J. How should parents protect their children from environmental tobacco-smoke exposure in the home? *Pediatrics* 2004;**113**:e291-e295.
- 8 Bottorff JL, Johnson JL, Carey J, *et al*. A family affair: Aboriginal women's efforts to limit second-hand smoke exposure at home. *Can J Public Health* 2010;**101**:32-35.
- 9 World Health Organization. WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2003. *World Health Organization The world health report 2002*.
- 10 Borland R, Mullins R, Trotter L, *et al*. Trends in environmental tobacco smoke restrictions in the home in Victoria, Australia. *Tob Control* 1999;**8**:266-271.
- 11 Borland R, Yong H, Cummings K, *et al*. Determinants and consequences of smoke-free homes: findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *Tob Control* 2006;**15**:iii42-iii50.
- 12 Commonwealth Government of Australia. *Draft for consultation of the National Tobacco Strategy 2012-2018*. 2012. <http://www.nationaldrugstrategy.gov.au/internet/drugstrategy/publishing.nsf/Content/draft-nts-12-18-callsubs> (accessed March 2013).
- 13 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Rural, regional and remote health: indicators of health*. 2005. <http://www.aihw.gov.au/publication-detail/?id=644246718> (accessed February 2013).
- 14 Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Tobacco smoking in Australia: A snapshot (4831.055.001)*. 2006. <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4831.0.55.001> (accessed February 2013).
- 15 Gartner CE, Hall WD. Is the socioeconomic gap in childhood exposure to secondhand smoke widening or narrowing? *Tob Control* 2012:Available online.
- 16 Bolte G, Fromme H. Socioeconomic determinants of children's environmental tobacco smoke exposure and family's home smoking policy. *The European Journal of Public Health* 2009;**19**:52-58.
- 17 Dent C, Maher J, Pizacani B, *et al*. Secondhand smoke exposure in Alaskan households with children. *Rural Remote Health* 2010;**10**.
- 18 Wiener RC. Secondhand and thirdhand tobacco smoke exposure in children living in states containing Appalachian counties: A surveillance. *Journal of Rural and Tropical Public Health* 2011;**10**:111-118.
- 19 Xiao L, Yang Y, Li Q, *et al*. Population-based survey of secondhand smoke exposure of children in China. *Biomed Environ Sci* 2010;**23**:430-436.
- 20 McMillen R, Breen J, Cosby AG. Rural-Urban Differences in the Social Climate Surrounding Environmental Tobacco Smoke: A Report From the 2002 Social Climate Survey of Tobacco Control. *The Journal of Rural Health* 2006;**20**:7-16.

- 1  
2  
3 21 Roy Morgan Research. National Drug Strategy Household Survey 2010 Final Technical  
4 Report. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and Department of Health and Ageing,  
5 2011.
- 6 22 Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC)*  
7 *Remoteness Structure (RA) Digital Boundaries, Australia, 2006* 2006.  
8 [http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DirClassManualsbyTopic/9A784FB979765947CA25738](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DirClassManualsbyTopic/9A784FB979765947CA25738C0012C5BA)  
9 [C0012C5BA](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DirClassManualsbyTopic/9A784FB979765947CA25738C0012C5BA) (accessed May 2012).
- 10 23 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Remoteness Classifications*.  
11 <http://www.aihw.gov.au/rural-health-remoteness-classifications/> (accessed May 2013).
- 12 24 Kelly BJ, Stain HJ, Coleman C, *et al*. Mental health and well-being within rural communities:  
13 The Australian Rural Mental Health Study. *Aust J Rural Health* 2010;**18**:16-24.
- 14 25 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Australian Data Archive - National Drug Strategy*  
15 *Household Survey Questionnaire, 2010*. 2010. <http://www.ada.edu.au/social-science/01237>  
16 (accessed January 2013).
- 17 26 Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC):*  
18 *Socio-economic indexes for areas (SEIFA) - Technical Paper 2006*. 2006.  
19 <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/2039.0.55.001> (accessed January 2013).
- 20 27 Siahpush M, Borland R, Scollo M. Factors associated with smoking cessation in a national  
21 sample of Australians. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2003;**5**:597-602.
- 22 28 Idris BI, Giskes K, Borrell C, *et al*. Higher smoking prevalence in urban compared to non-  
23 urban areas: time trends in six European countries. *Health Place* 2007;**13**:702-712.
- 24 29 Daly JB, Wiggers JH, Considine RJ. Infant exposure to environmental tobacco smoke: a  
25 prevalence study in Australia. *Aust NZ J Public Health* 2001;**25**:132-137.
- 26 30 Rumchev K, Jamrozik K, Stick S, *et al*. How free of tobacco smoke are 'smoke-free' homes?  
27 *Indoor Air* 2008;**18**:202-208.
- 28 31 Robinson J, Kirkcaldy AJ. Disadvantaged mothers, young children and smoking in the home:  
29 mothers' use of space within their homes. *Health Place* 2007;**13**:894-903.
- 30 32 Hudson L, White A, Roseby R. Tobacco smoke exposure in hospitalised Aboriginal children in  
31 Central Australia. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2009;**45**:224-227.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Children, smoking households and exposure to  
4 secondhand smoke in the home in rural Australia –  
5 analysis of a national cross-sectional survey.  
6  
7 ~~Children, smoking households and exposure to~~  
8 ~~home environmental tobacco smoke in rural~~  
9 ~~Australia – what’s the story?~~  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

---

15  
16  
17 Jo M Longman<sup>1\*</sup> and Megan E Passey<sup>1</sup>

18  
19 <sup>1</sup> University Centre for Rural Health, University of Sydney School of Public Health, PO Box  
20 3074, Lismore, NSW 2480, Australia

21  
22 \*Corresponding Author: email: [jo.longman@ucr.edu.au](mailto:jo.longman@ucr.edu.au); T:02 66207570; F: 02 66207270

23  
24 **Keywords:** environmental tobacco smoke; secondhand smoke; children; rural; Australia

25  
26 **Wordcount:** 3,465,753

27  
28  
29 **ARTICLE SUMMARY**

30  
31 *Focus*

32 Given that children’s ~~exposure to environmental tobacco smoke (ETSsecondhand smoke)~~ exposure  
33 is such an important public health concern, as well as the higher prevalence of smoking in rural areas  
34 in Australia, this paper addresses two questions: 1. Are there rural/urban differences in a) smoking  
35 within households with children and b) home ~~ETSsecondhand smoke~~ exposure in children?; and 2. If  
36 so, is this due to socioeconomic disadvantage or other factors unique to ‘rurality’?  
37  
38

39 *Key Messages*

40 43.6% of rural households with children contained a smoker. Both household smoking and home  
41 ~~ETSsecondhand smoke~~ exposure were significantly more common for rural children than for urban  
42 dwelling children. Rurality remained associated with smoking households but did not remain  
43 associated with home ~~ETSsecondhand smoke exposure~~, when confounding factors were controlled  
44 for. Children’s home ~~ETSsecondhand smoke~~ exposure ~~was~~ driven by larger household size, low  
45 socio-economic status and being a single parent household.  
46  
47

48 *Strengths and Limitations*

49 No previous studies have explored rural/urban differences in smoking in households with children in  
50 Australia. This study used data from a representative national household survey to explore the  
51 association of rurality with household smoking and with home ~~ETSsecondhand smoke~~ exposure.  
52 The study had limited potential household level confounding variables available for inclusion in the  
53 analysis, and was limited by potential response bias leading to a possible under-reporting of  
54 household smoking status.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

### *Introduction*

Smoking is more prevalent in rural than urban Australia, but few studies have explored rural/urban differences in home ~~environmental tobacco smoke (ETS)~~secondhand smoke exposure and none have explored these differences amongst children in Australia. Both household smoking and home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure are harmful to children. This paper aimed to explore the association between rurality and a) household smoking status and b) home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure, in households with children aged 0-14.

### *Method*

Data from the 2010 National Drug Strategy Household survey were analysed to explore prevalence of household smoking and home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure in rural and urban households with children. Multivariable logistic regression was used to explore the association of rurality with household smoking and with home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure, controlling for potential confounders.

### *Results*

Households with children were more likely to be smoking households (35.4% 95%CI:34.2%, 36.5%) than households without children (32.1% 95%CI:31.3%, 32.8%) ( $p<0.001$ ). Both household smoking (43.6% (95%CI:41.5%, 45.7%) vs 31.4% (95%CI:30.0%, 32.8%)  $p<0.001$ ) and home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure (8.0% (95%CI:6.8%, 9.1%) vs 5.2%  $p<0.001$  (95%CI:4.5%, 5.8%)) were significantly more common for rural children. In multivariate analyses controlling for confounding factors, rurality remained associated with smoking households (OR= 1.21 95%CI:1.07, 1.37), whereas it did not remain associated with children's home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure (OR=1.07 95%CI:0.85, 1.35). Larger household size, low socio-economic status, and being a single parent household were the main drivers of home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure.

### *Conclusion*

The proportion of smoking households with children, and the number of children regularly exposed to secondhand smoke in their homes ETS remain important public health concerns. Smoking cessation support and tobacco control policies might benefit from targeting larger and/or socio-economically disadvantaged households including single-parent households.

## BACKGROUND

The negative impact of children's exposure to smoking behaviour and ~~environmental tobacco smoke (ETS)~~to secondhand smoke in their homes is extensive. Due to the higher breathing rates per body weight, and the size and immaturity of their organs, children are particularly vulnerable to the effects of ETSsecondhand smoke exposure on their physical health 1-3. They are also particularly vulnerable to the corollaries of those effects such as missing more time at school, and compromised academic performance 3. In addition, children whose parents smoke are more likely to become smokers themselves, growing up with smoking as a normalised behaviour 4, 5.

The site where most ETSsecondhand smoke exposure in children happens is their home 2, 6. Children are not able to control their environment to minimise their exposure and are effectively 'trapped' in smoking environments. Children who live in homes where there is no indoor smoking

1  
2  
3 are afforded some protection from [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure even when a parent smokes 6,  
4 7. However, for adults, negotiating smoke-free home environments can be challenging due to the  
5 social and familial relationship aspects of smoking behaviour in the home 2, 8.  
6

7  
8 Whilst it may be considered an infringement of individual civil liberties to legislate against  
9 [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure in the home, the notion of a smoke-free home is an extension of  
10 the protection offered from comprehensive smoke-free legislation. In Australia this began in the  
11 mid-1980s, and has covered public transport, the workplace, public spaces, smoking in cars  
12 containing children, and, most recently, proposed legislation on multi-unit dwellings, supported by  
13 an active campaign from Action on Smoking and Health Australia 3.  
14

15  
16 This legislative environment reflects the importance of protecting the public from [ETSsecondhand](#)  
17 [smoke](#) exposure. Efforts to protect children from the effects of [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure  
18 respond directly to Article 8 of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control requiring  
19 smoke-free measures by those countries ratifying the Treaty, including Australia 9.  
20

21  
22 Educational campaigns focusing on smoke-free homes have been in place since the early 2000s and  
23 continue to form a regular part of tobacco campaigning in Australia. These campaigns have  
24 promoted quitting or smoking outside to protect children from the harms of home [ETSsecondhand](#)  
25 [smoke](#) exposure 10 and appear to have been 'moderately helpful' in increasing the number of  
26 smoke-free homes 3. In 2006, 43% of Australian households with smokers reported totally banning  
27 smoking indoors 11, and data from both NSW and Victoria show declines in household indoor  
28 smoking over recent years 3. One of the main outcome indicators in Australia's draft National  
29 Tobacco Strategy 2004-2009 is that fewer people will be exposed to [secondhand smoke in their](#)  
30 [homes](#) [ETS](#)-12.  
31  
32

### 33 **Is there an urban/rural divide in children's exposure to home [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) ?**

34 In Australia around one third of the population lives outside major cities, with rural areas more  
35 socio-economically disadvantaged than urban areas 13. The prevalence of tobacco smoking in this  
36 rural population is significantly higher than in urban areas 14. Smoking continues to be  
37 disproportionately represented among socio-economically disadvantaged populations, and these  
38 disparities are increasing over time 15.  
39  
40

41  
42 We identified only three studies exploring the difference between home [ETSsecondhand smoke](#)  
43 exposure in children in rural compared to urban areas 16-18, with none from Australia. Two are  
44 [North](#) American (one showing higher home [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure in rural areas 18 and  
45 one from Alaska showing lower home [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure in very remote areas 17),  
46 and one from Germany reporting lower home [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure in children in rural  
47 areas 16. One study from China describes [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure in respondents' homes  
48 (all homes, not just homes with children) that is higher in rural areas (73%) compared with urban  
49 areas (60%) 19. One further [North](#) American study focuses on home smoking bans, and reports  
50 [sed](#) fewer home smoking bans in rural households compared to urban households 20.  
51  
52

53  
54 Given that [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure is such an important public health concern, particularly  
55 in children, as well as the higher prevalence of smoking in rural areas in Australia, this paper  
56 addresses two questions: 1. Are there rural/urban differences in a) smoking within households with  
57  
58  
59  
60

children and b) home ~~ETS~~secondhand smoke exposure in children?; and 2. If so, is this due to socioeconomic disadvantage or other factors unique to 'rurality'?

## METHODS

### The 2010 National Drug Strategy Household Survey

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) conducts the National Drug Strategy Household Survey (NDSHS) every three years to measure behaviour, knowledge and attitudes towards drugs in Australia. The 2010 sample was a multi-stage random sample of households stratified by region with some over-sampling in certain states and territories, representative of the national population. Respondents were the person aged 12 or older in each household who was next to have a birthday. Questions were asked via drop and collect self-completion questionnaires. Questions were asked of the respondent about themselves, e.g. their own smoking status, as well as questions about the household. Data were collected between April and September 2010. The survey has been conducted on nine previous occasions <sup>21</sup>.

The NDSHS was chosen because it provided data on household behaviour, rather than just individual behaviour, as well as the number and age of children within a household. Non-identifiable data were sourced from the AIHW with a signed agreement to protect the confidentiality and management of the data.

### Weighting

Weights were applied to the data to adjust for the complex sampling design while not inflating the overall sample size. Weights for each household record were provided by the AIHW to adjust the number of households in the dataset to the number of households in the Australian population. Applying these rates would have overinflated the sample size for statistical analyses. Following Gartner et al <sup>15</sup>, we proportionally adjusted the absolute weight for households provided by the AIHW in order to bring the overall number of households down to the effective sample size. Each weight provided by the AIHW was multiplied by an adjustment factor, then applied to the data, to bring the total number of households down to the effective sample size provided by the AIHW.

### Measures

#### Rurality

The rurality variable was based on the Australian Standard Geographical Classification remoteness areas <sup>22</sup>. This classification was designed to facilitate quantitative comparison between 'city' and 'country' Australia, and is based on distance to services and goods. The variable was coded: major cities, inner regional, outer regional and remote/very remote. The inner regional code includes locations close to major cities e.g. Port Stephens, an hour's drive away from Newcastle (a major city), and outer regional includes locations such as Biloela in Queensland, 550km away from the nearest major city (Brisbane). For more information please see the map of Australia at <http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/D3310114.nsf/home/remoteness+structure#Anchor2e> illustrating the remoteness structure. This classification system is recommended by the Australian Government's Institute of Health and Welfare (a statutory body established to report to the nation on health), particularly for use at aggregated national level <sup>23</sup>, and is widely used in the academic literature, for example Kelly et al <sup>24</sup>. We recoded the variable into Urban/Rural (where urban was



1  
2  
3 | 'major cities' and rural was a combination of the remaining categories),<sup>2</sup> as some cells contained  
4 small numbers with the initial categorisation.  
5

#### 6 Households with Children

7 We defined households with children as those with children 0-14 years old. The questionnaire asked  
8 "*Of all the dependent children, how many are in each of these age categories?*"<sup>25</sup>, and offered two-  
9 year blocks up to 12-14 with the last category being 15+. As "*dependent children*" was defined to  
10 include children older than 14 "*who are still financially dependent, such as full-time students*"<sup>25</sup> we  
11 did not include the final category which may have contained substantial numbers of dependent  
12 children over 18.  
13  
14

#### 15 Outcome variables

##### 16 Smoking households

17 We defined smoking households as any household containing a smoker regardless of where that  
18 person smoked, i.e. answering "*Yes, inside the home*" or "*No, only smoke outside the home*" to the  
19 question "*In the last 12 months, have you or any other member of your household smoked at least*  
20 *one cigarette, cigar or pipe of tobacco per day in the home?*". The other response option was "*No-*  
21 *one at home regularly smokes*"<sup>25</sup>.  
22  
23  
24  
25

##### 26 Home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure

27 Home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure is different to smoking households as it is a measure of  
28 whether a household contains a smoker who smokes inside the home. This was determined as  
29 those households where the answer "*Yes, inside the home*" was given to the question "*In the last 12*  
30 *months, have you or any other member of your household smoked at least one cigarette, cigar or*  
31 *pipe of tobacco per day in the home?*"<sup>25</sup>. We recoded this into a binary variable: "yes smokes  
32 inside the home" or "no does not smoke inside the home". The "no does not smoke inside the  
33 home" category included households answering either "*No, only smoke outside the home*", or "*no-*  
34 *one at home regularly smokes*".  
35  
36  
37

##### 38 Potential confounders

39 The data contained limited household level variables. Within these confines, the following variables  
40 were considered potential confounders in the association between home ETSsecondhand smoke  
41 exposure and rurality: socio-economic status<sup>2</sup>,<sup>15</sup>; number of people in the household<sup>15</sup>;  
42 household structure<sup>3</sup>,<sup>16</sup>; and main language used in the household<sup>3</sup>. These are defined below.  
43  
44

##### 45 Socio-economic status

46 We defined socio-economic status using the area-level socio-economic index for areas (SEIFA)  
47 provided in the data (the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage, measured  
48 at Census Collection District areas)<sup>26</sup>. This index includes variables on: income; education;  
49 employment; occupation; housing and other variables such as disability, car ownership, internet  
50 access and single parents.  
51  
52

##### 53 Household size

54 The number of people in the household was recoded from 1,2,3,4,5 or more, to 3 categories: 1-2, 3-  
55 4 and 5 or more, as some cells contained small numbers with the initial categorisation.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *Household structure*

Household structure was coded as single with dependents, couple with dependents, parents with non-dependent children, singles without children, couple without children, and other. We recoded this to single with dependents, couple with dependents, and other (included all other categories).

### *Main language used in the household*

We maintained the original binary coding for this variable of English, and language other than English.

### Analysis

Analyses were performed using Stata V9.2. Records with missing data on household smoking status were excluded from the analysis (31 households with children 0-14). Summary statistics of household characteristics were obtained and univariate associations with rurality were examined using the Pearson's chi-square test. Initial analyses included all households with data on smoking status. Subsequent analyses were restricted to households with children 0-14. Multivariable logistic regression was used to explore the association of rurality with household smoking and with home ~~ETS~~secondhand smoke exposure, controlling for potential confounders. Initially all variables with a p-value <0.25 in the univariate analyses were included in the models, with stepwise removal of variables based on the p-value from the likelihood ratio test, with variables with a p-value <0.1 retained in the model. Rurality was retained in both multivariable models regardless of statistical significance.

## RESULTS

### **The sample**

Weighting the sample to take account of the complex sampling 15, gave a total sample size of 15,978 households (the effective sample size). Household smoking status was recorded for 15,745 of these households, which were included in the analysis.

In all households i.e. those with children and those without children, 33% (95%CI:32.4%, 33.7%) contained a smoker. Rural households were significantly more likely to contain a smoker than urban households (36.5% (95%CI:35.4%, 37.5%) versus 31.4% (95%CI:30.6%, 32.1%;  $p<0.001$ ), and were significantly more likely to contain a smoker who smoked indoors (home ~~ETS~~secondhand smoke exposure) (11.7% (95%CI:11.0%, 12.5%) versus 9.2%, (95%CI:8.7%, 9.6%;  $p<0.001$ ). Households with children 0-14 years were more likely to be smoking households (35.4%; 95%CI:34.2%, 36.5%) than households without children (32.1%; 95%CI:31.3%, 32.8%) ( $p<0.001$ ).

For all subsequent reported analyses, we selected only those households with children aged 0-14 years. This provided a sample of 4,669 households.

### **Smoking households with children**

Table 1 presents the demographic and smoking behaviour characteristics of households with children aged 0-14.



Table 1– Demographic characteristics and smoking behaviour in households with children, by rurality

	Rural n= 1515 n (%)	Urban n= 3154 n (%)	P value
Smoking households	661 (43.6)	989 (31.4)	<0.001
Home <del>ETS</del> secondhand smoke exposure	121 (8.0%)	163 (5.2%)	<0.001
Socio-economic status (SEIFA quintile):			<0.001
1 (lowest)	437 (28.8%)	376 (12.0%)	
2	458 (30.2%)	416 (13.2%)	
3	342 (22.6%)	590 (18.7%)	
4	225 (14.9%)	855 (27.1%)	
5 (highest)	54 (3.6%)	917 (29.1%)	
Household size:			0.022
1-2	901 (59.5%)	1939 (61.4%)	
3-4	528 (34.8%)	991 (31.5%)	
5+	86 (5.7%)	225 (7.1%)	
Household structure <sup>a</sup> :			<0.001
Single with dependents	190 (12.7%)	259 (8.3%)	
Couple with dependents	1028 (67.9%)	2281 (72.6%)	
Other	291 (19.4%)	593 (19.0%)	
Main language <sup>b</sup> :			<0.001
English	1487 (98.3%)	2729 (86.8%)	
Language other than English	25 (1.7%)	416 (13.2%)	

<sup>a</sup> 1509 rural observations and 3133 urban; <sup>b</sup> 1512 rural observations and 3145 urban

Note: Results may not add up to totals because of the adjustment of the effective sample size calculation

Overall, 35.4% (95%CI:34.2%, 36.5%) of households with children were smoking households, and 6.1% (95%CI:5.5%, 6.7%) of households with children contained a smoker who smoked inside the home (home ~~ETS~~secondhand smoke exposure). The proportion of households which were smoking households was greater in rural (43.6% 95%CI: 41.5%, 45.7%) than urban (31.4% 95%CI:30.0%, 32.8%) areas ( $p<0.001$ ). The proportion of households with home ~~ETS~~secondhand smoke exposure was also significantly greater in rural (8.0% 95%CI:6.8%, 9.1%) than urban (5.2% 95%CI:4.5%, 5.8%) households with children ( $p<0.001$ ).

Rural and urban households were also different on all potential confounders: the proportion of households in each SEIFA quintile ( $p<0.001$ ); household size, with rural households having a smaller proportion of larger households ( $p=0.022$ ); household structure, with rural households having a larger proportion of households with a single adult with dependent children ( $p<0.001$ ); and main language with a much lower proportion of rural households speaking a language other than English ( $p<0.001$ ) than urban households.

### Associations of smoking behaviour with rurality

Household smoking

Table 2 reports the results of the logistic regression model exploring the association of rurality with smoking households among households with children 0-14, controlling for potential confounders.

Table 2 – Logistic regression model of factors significantly associated with smoking households among households with children

Variable	OR (95% CI)
Rurality:	
Urban	1.00
Rural	1.21 (1.07, 1.37)
Socio-economic status (SEIFA quintile):	
1 (lowest)	1.00
2	0.70 (0.59, 0.84)
3	0.56 (0.47, 0.67)
4	0.47 (0.40, 0.57)
5 (highest)	0.28 (0.23, 0.34)
Household size:	
1-2 people	1.00
3-4 people	1.20 (1.06, 1.36)
5+ people	1.36 (1.08, 1.72)
Household structure:	
Single with dependents	1.00
Couple with dependents	0.47 (0.40, 0.56)
Other	0.70 (0.56, 0.87)

Amongst households with children, rurality continued to be associated with being a smoking household when socio-economic status, household size and household structure were controlled for. Main language used in the household was not retained in the model.

Home [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure

Results of the logistic regression model to explore the association between rurality and home [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure in households with children, controlling for potential confounders are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Logistic regression model of factors associated with home **ETSsecondhand smoke** exposure among households with children

Variable	OR (95% CI)
Rurality:	
Urban	1.00
Rural	1.07 (0.85, 1.35)
Socio-economic status (SEIFA quintile):	
1 (lowest)	1.00
2	0.55 (0.41, 0.74)
3	0.52 (0.38, 0.70)
4	0.27 (0.19, 0.38)
5 (highest)	0.25 (0.17, 0.37)
Household size:	
1-2 people	1.00
3-4 people	1.83 (1.42, 2.35)
5+ people	2.71 (1.84, 4.00)
Household structure:	
Single with dependents	1.00
Couple with dependents	0.25 (0.19, 0.33)
Other	0.52 (0.38, 0.73)

In households with children, home **ETSsecondhand smoke** exposure was not significantly associated with rurality once other factors were controlled for. Socio-economic status, household size and household structure remained strongly associated with home **ETSsecondhand smoke** exposure. Main language used in the household was not retained in the model.

## DISCUSSION

One third of all Australian households were smoking households. In univariate analysis both smoking households and home **ETSsecondhand smoke** exposure were significantly more common for rural households with children than for urban households with children. In a multivariate analysis among households with children, rurality remained associated with smoking households when confounding factors were controlled for, whereas rurality did not remain associated with home **ETSsecondhand smoke** exposure after controlling for potential confounders.

### Smoking households

Overall, smoking prevalence is in decline in Australia, estimated at 15.9% of adults smoking daily in 2010<sup>3</sup>. Given this, it is surprising that 33% of all Australian households contain a daily smoker. Smoking is even more common in households containing children with 35.4% of households with children aged 0-14 containing a smoker, rising to 43.6% of rural households with children ( $p < 0.001$ ).

It is possible that a focus on individual smoking behaviour and not on household behaviours, children and/or rurality has masked recognition of this high proportion of rural households with

1  
2  
3 children containing a smoker. The exploration of smoking at household level is supported by the  
4 importance of the social and relational environment for smoking, and smoking cessation 27.  
5

6 In households with children, rurality continued to be associated with smoking households when  
7 other factors were controlled for. This suggests there might be something particular about rural  
8 smoking households that warrants further investigation, and that support for smoking cessation  
9 might be rurally targeted.  
10

### 11 **Home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure**

12 Home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure was significantly more common for rural (8%) than urban  
13 (5.2%  $p < 0.001$ ) households with children. Using the NDSHS data, this equates to 54,123 rural  
14 households with at least one child containing a daily smoker who smokes inside the home. The few  
15 studies of children's home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure in rural compared to urban areas  
16 provide a mixed picture, and comparison is compromised by differences in defining home  
17 ETSsecondhand smoke. A German study 16 exploring rural-urban comparisons of home  
18 ETSsecondhand smoke in households with children reported higher levels of home ETSsecondhand  
19 smoke in urban areas. This probably reflects the higher prevalence of smoking in urban than rural  
20 areas in European countries<sup>28</sup>, the reverse of Australia, Canada and China. One North American  
21 study of states containing Appalachian counties used a similar definition of home ETSsecondhand  
22 smoke exposure to our own, and reports rural home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure of children  
23 (under 18) as 12.5% compared to urban exposure of 6.5% 18. By contrast, urban Alaskan  
24 households have higher levels of home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure than the most extremely  
25 rural regions 17.  
26

27 The main drivers of home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure for children in rural households were the  
28 same as for urban i.e. low socio-economic status, larger household size and being a single parent  
29 household. Home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure is highest for children from disadvantaged  
30 families as their parents are more likely to smoke and smoke heavily 2, and to smoke in the home  
31 16. The NDSHS data highlight the stark contrast between rural and urban households in terms of  
32 their socio-economic status, with only 3.6% of rural households in the least disadvantaged SEIFA  
33 category compared to 29.1% of urban households.  
34

35 Another factor driving the higher prevalence of home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure in rural  
36 households compared to urban households is the significantly greater proportion of single parent  
37 families in rural areas. The finding of higher home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure among single  
38 parent families has been reported in Australia previously 29. Given single parenthood is closely  
39 intertwined with disadvantage 3 we must continue with efforts to address smoking in lower SES  
40 populations groups.  
41

42 Our finding that home ETSsecondhand smoke does not remain associated with rurality once  
43 confounders are adjusted for matches the Alaskan study described earlier 17. Whilst rurality does  
44 not remain associated with home ETSsecondhand smoke exposure in households with children once  
45 other factors are controlled for, rural children experience more home ETSsecondhand smoke  
46 exposure because of these factors which place them at additional disadvantage (low socioeconomic  
47 status and single parent households). Socio-economic status and household structure were the  
48 strongest drivers of both household smoking and home ETSsecondhand smoke.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Given the progressive adoption of smoke-free public places legislation in Australia and other high  
4 income countries, the relative importance of home [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure is increasing.  
5 As living in a smoke-free home offers children some protection from home [ETSsecondhand smoke](#)  
6 exposure, continuing the decline in homes with smokers who smoke inside the house is key.  
7 However, one Swedish study of young children demonstrated that 'smoking outdoors' even with  
8 the door shut resulted in higher urinary cotinine levels when compared to an age-matched non-  
9 smoking household control group 7. These findings are supported by a UK study which reported  
10 children from smoking parents in households which were smoke-free had less salivary cotinine than  
11 children with smoking parents in households which were not smoke-free, but more than children  
12 with non-smoking parents in smoke-free households 6. Therefore, whilst living in a household with  
13 no indoor smoking offers children some protection, children from households without smokers are  
14 the most protected.  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 The data explored in this study did not include children's [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure outside  
20 their own home, for example in cars, visiting other families, social outings etc. but as rural children  
21 are more likely to live in a smoking household (even if the smoker/s smoke outside the home), we  
22 would anticipate it is likely that they are also more frequently exposed to [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) in  
23 other non-home settings. In a study of infants in urban NSW Australia for example, Daly et al report  
24 that 10% were exposed in the home, and 22% at a friend or relative's house 29.  
25  
26

### 27 **Limitations of this study**

28 This study has several limitations.

29  
30 The NDSHS is subject to response bias from self-report. Whilst there is some evidence  
31 demonstrating self-report of smoking in the home is moderately correlated to environmental and  
32 biomedical markers 30, it remains an inferior replacement for such measures 29. It is likely that  
33 home [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure from this survey is therefore a conservative estimate.  
34  
35

36 In addition to respondents under-reporting what is clearly a socially undesirable behaviour (smoking  
37 indoors in a household with children), there have been several studies exploring what people  
38 actually mean when they talk about household smoking rules i.e. how people define (to themselves  
39 and others) 'smoke indoors' and 'smoke outdoors' 2, 31. These qualitative studies suggest that  
40 defining smoking outdoors might be a somewhat varied and fluctuating category, possibly  
41 contributing to further underestimation of home [ETSsecondhand smoke exposure](#). At present we  
42 do not know how defining home smoking status is played out in Australia, or if there are any  
43 rural/urban differences in this regard. Gaining an understanding of what people know about  
44 children's home [ETSsecondhand smoke](#) exposure, what is meant by smoking outside the home, and  
45 what their home smoking behaviour actually is in Australia would both illuminate the findings of this  
46 study and contribute to understanding how best to support people in either quitting or making their  
47 home smoke-free.  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 A limited number of potential household level confounders were available in this dataset and there  
53 are other important confounders at household level, such as the ages of people in the household, or  
54 the number of smokers in the household, that we were unable to control for.  
55

56 As our analysis was conducted at household level, we did not use data on individuals and therefore  
57 did not control for potential individual-level confounders known to be associated with smoking  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 prevalence such as mental health 3. We did not control for Aboriginal status as although there were  
4 (very limited) data available, Aboriginal status is nonsensical as a household-level variable, although  
5 an important individual-level confounder given the smoking prevalence amongst Aboriginal  
6 Australians is more than twice that of non-Aboriginal Australians 32. SEIFA is an area level variable.  
7 At Census Collection District area (around 100 houses) this may not always apply to individual  
8 households.  
9

## 10 11 12 **CONCLUSION**

13 The proportion of smoking households with children remains an important public health concern.  
14 The finding that rurality remains associated with smoking households when other factors such as  
15 socio-economic status are controlled for, suggests we need to understand more about the context of  
16 smoking in rural Australia to provide support targeted to rural households in quitting.  
17

18  
19 | Significant numbers of children continue to be exposed to secondhand smoke in their homes ~~ETS~~  
20 and to suffering the lifelong consequences on their physical health, academic performance and their  
21 own smoking behaviour in the future. Socio-economic disadvantage continues to be a significant  
22 driver of differences in children's home ~~ETS~~secondhand smoke exposure in rural compared to urban  
23 areas. Further efforts to support smokers who smoke inside their homes containing children to quit  
24 or avoid smoking in the home would benefit these children. Understanding the smoking rules and  
25 behaviours inside smoking households, and people's knowledge of children's home ~~ETS~~secondhand  
26 smoke exposure, should provide better evidence to support those efforts.  
27  
28  
29

## 30 31 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

32 Our thanks to Dr Coral Gartner for her advice about handling the weighting of the data, and to Dr  
33 Judy Singer for her support with the background research for this study.  
34  
35

## 36 37 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

38 Dr Passey receives research grant funding from Pfizer Australia, through an Australian Research  
39 Council Linkage Grant. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.  
40  
41

## 42 43 **WHAT THIS PAPER ADDS**

44 | No previous Australian studies have looked at children's home environmental tobacco smoke  
45 exposure (~~ETS~~secondhand smoke ~~) exposure~~ in rural compared to urban areas. We found that 44%  
46 of rural households with children in Australia contained a smoker (higher than in urban areas), and  
47 that a higher proportion of households exposed children to home ~~ETS~~secondhand smoke in rural  
48 households compared to urban households. The drivers of these differences were rurality,  
49 household size, socio-economic status, and household structure.  
50  
51

## 52 **COPYRIGHT**

53 The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of  
54 all authors, a worldwide licence to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats  
55 and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display  
56 and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the  
4 Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all  
5 subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to  
6 third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of  
7 the above.  
8  
9

#### 10 **CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT**

11 Jo Longman obtained, organised and analysed the data, and drafted and revised the paper. Megan  
12 Passey designed the study analysed the data and revised the paper.  
13

#### 15 **DATA SHARING STATEMENT**

16 There is no additional data available  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## References

- 1 Royal College of Physicians. Passive smoking and children. A report by the Tobacco Advisory Group. London, UK: Royal College of Physicians 2010.
- 2 Jones LL, Atkinson O, Longman J, *et al*. The motivators and barriers to a smoke-free home among disadvantaged caregivers: identifying the positive levers for change. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2011;**13**:479-486.
- 3 Scollo M, Winstanley M. *Tobacco in Australia: Facts and Issues*. 2012. <http://www.tobaccoinaustralia.org.au> (accessed February 2013).
- 4 Goldade K, Choi K, Bernat DH, *et al*. Multilevel predictors of smoking initiation among adolescents: Findings from the Minnesota Adolescent Community Cohort (MACC) study. *Prev Med* 2012.
- 5 de Leeuw R, Engels R, Scholte R. Parental smoking and pretend smoking in young children. *Tob Control* 2010;**19**:201-205.
- 6 Jarvis MJ, Mindell J, Gilmore A, *et al*. Smoke-free homes in England: prevalence, trends and validation by cotinine in children. *Tob Control* 2009;**18**:491-495.
- 7 Johansson A, Hermansson G, Ludvigsson J. How should parents protect their children from environmental tobacco-smoke exposure in the home? *Pediatrics* 2004;**113**:e291-e295.
- 8 Bottorff JL, Johnson JL, Carey J, *et al*. A family affair: Aboriginal women's efforts to limit second-hand smoke exposure at home. *Can J Public Health* 2010;**101**:32-35.
- 9 World Health Organization. WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2003. *World Health Organization The world health report 2002*.
- 10 Borland R, Mullins R, Trotter L, *et al*. Trends in environmental tobacco smoke restrictions in the home in Victoria, Australia. *Tob Control* 1999;**8**:266-271.
- 11 Borland R, Yong H, Cummings K, *et al*. Determinants and consequences of smoke-free homes: findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *Tob Control* 2006;**15**:iii42-iii50.
- 12 Commonwealth Government of Australia. *Draft for consultation of the National Tobacco Strategy 2012-2018*. 2012. <http://www.nationaldrugstrategy.gov.au/internet/drugstrategy/publishing.nsf/Content/draft-nts-12-18-callsubs> (accessed March 2013).
- 13 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Rural, regional and remote health: indicators of health*. 2005. <http://www.aihw.gov.au/publication-detail/?id=644246718> (accessed February 2013).
- 14 Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Tobacco smoking in Australia: A snapshot (4831.055.001)*. 2006. <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4831.0.55.001> (accessed February 2013).
- 15 Gartner CE, Hall WD. Is the socioeconomic gap in childhood exposure to secondhand smoke widening or narrowing? *Tob Control* 2012:Available online.
- 16 Bolte G, Fromme H. Socioeconomic determinants of children's environmental tobacco smoke exposure and family's home smoking policy. *The European Journal of Public Health* 2009;**19**:52-58.
- 17 Dent C, Maher J, Pizacani B, *et al*. Secondhand smoke exposure in Alaskan households with children. *Rural Remote Health* 2010;**10**.
- 18 Wiener RC. Secondhand and thirdhand tobacco smoke exposure in children living in states containing Appalachian counties: A surveillance. *Journal of Rural and Tropical Public Health* 2011;**10**:111-118.
- 19 Xiao L, Yang Y, Li Q, *et al*. Population-based survey of secondhand smoke exposure of children in China. *Biomed Environ Sci* 2010;**23**:430-436.
- 20 McMillen R, Breen J, Cosby AG. Rural-Urban Differences in the Social Climate Surrounding Environmental Tobacco Smoke: A Report From the 2002 Social Climate Survey of Tobacco Control. *The Journal of Rural Health* 2006;**20**:7-16.



- 1  
2  
3 21 Roy Morgan Research. National Drug Strategy Household Survey 2010 Final Technical  
4 Report. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and Department of Health and Ageing,  
5 2011.
- 6 22 Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC)*  
7 *Remoteness Structure (RA) Digital Boundaries, Australia, 2006* 2006.  
8 [http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DirClassManualsbyTopic/9A784FB979765947CA25738](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DirClassManualsbyTopic/9A784FB979765947CA25738C0012C5BA)  
9 [C0012C5BA](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DirClassManualsbyTopic/9A784FB979765947CA25738C0012C5BA) (accessed May 2012).
- 10 23 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Remoteness Classifications*.  
11 <http://www.aihw.gov.au/rural-health-remoteness-classifications/> (accessed May 2013).
- 12 24 Kelly BJ, Stain HJ, Coleman C, *et al*. Mental health and well-being within rural communities:  
13 The Australian Rural Mental Health Study. *Aust J Rural Health* 2010;**18**:16-24.
- 14 25 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Australian Data Archive - National Drug Strategy*  
15 *Household Survey Questionnaire, 2010*. 2010. <http://www.ada.edu.au/social-science/01237>  
16 (accessed January 2013).
- 17 26 Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC):*  
18 *Socio-economic indexes for areas (SEIFA) - Technical Paper 2006*. 2006.  
19 <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/2039.0.55.001> (accessed January 2013).
- 20 27 Siahpush M, Borland R, Scollo M. Factors associated with smoking cessation in a national  
21 sample of Australians. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2003;**5**:597-602.
- 22 28 Idris BI, Giskes K, Borrell C, *et al*. Higher smoking prevalence in urban compared to non-  
23 urban areas: time trends in six European countries. *Health Place* 2007;**13**:702-712.
- 24 29 Daly JB, Wiggers JH, Considine RJ. Infant exposure to environmental tobacco smoke: a  
25 prevalence study in Australia. *Aust NZ J Public Health* 2001;**25**:132-137.
- 26 30 Rumchev K, Jamrozik K, Stick S, *et al*. How free of tobacco smoke are 'smoke-free' homes?  
27 *Indoor Air* 2008;**18**:202-208.
- 28 31 Robinson J, Kirkcaldy AJ. Disadvantaged mothers, young children and smoking in the home:  
29 mothers' use of space within their homes. *Health Place* 2007;**13**:894-903.
- 30 32 Hudson L, White A, Roseby R. Tobacco smoke exposure in hospitalised Aboriginal children in  
31 Central Australia. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2009;**45**:224-227.
- 32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found <b>Yes</b>
<b>Introduction</b>		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported <b>Yes</b>
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses <b>Yes</b>
<b>Methods</b>		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper <b>Yes</b>
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection <b>Yes</b>
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants <b>Yes</b>
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable <b>Yes</b>
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group <b>Yes</b>
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias <b>Yes</b>
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at <b>Yes</b>
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why <b>Yes</b>
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding <b>Yes</b> (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy <b>Yes</b> (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
<b>Results</b>		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed <b>Yes</b> (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders <b>Yes</b> (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest <b>Yes</b>
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures <b>Yes</b>
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included <b>Yes</b> (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized

(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period

Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses
<b>Discussion</b>		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives <b>Yes</b>
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias <b>Yes</b>
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence <b>Yes</b>
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results <b>Yes</b>
<b>Other information</b>		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based <b>Yes</b>

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).