UCSF

UC San Francisco Previously Published Works

Title

Cigarette Gifting Among Nonsmokers in China: Findings From the International Tobacco Control China Survey

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8785n0bb

Journal

Nicotine & Tobacco Research, 25(5)

ISSN

1462-2203

Authors

Lyu, Joanne Chen Sung, Hai-Yen Yao, Tingting et al.

Publication Date

2023-04-06

DOI

10.1093/ntr/ntac294

Peer reviewed



Cigarette Gifting Among Nonsmokers in China: Findings From the International Tobacco Control China Survey

Joanne Chen Lyu PhD^{1,}, Hai-Yen Sung PhD^{1,2,}, Tingting Yao PhD^{1,2,}, Nan Jiang PhD³, Anne C. K. Quah PhD⁴, Gang Meng PhD⁴, Yuan Jiang PhD⁵, Geoffrey T. Fong PhD^{4,6,7}, Wendy Max PhD^{1,2}

Corresponding Author: Joanne Chen Lyu, PhD, Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education, University of California, San Francisco, 530 Parnassus Avenue, San Francisco, CA, 94143-1390, USA. Telephone: 1 415 502 4181; Fax: 1 415 514 9345; E-mail: chenjoanne.lyu@ucsf.edu

Abstract

Introduction: Cigarette gifting is commonly practiced in China and has contributed to the social acceptability and high prevalence of cigarette smoking in the country. As a result, nonsmokers in China are particularly susceptible to smoking. While previous studies have examined cigarette gifting behaviors among smokers, little is known about cigarette gifting among nonsmokers.

Aims and Methods: This study aimed to examine the percentage and correlates of giving and receiving cigarettes as gifts among adult nonsmokers in China. We analyzed nonsmokers (*N* = 1813) aged ≥18 years using data from the International Tobacco Control China Wave 5 Survey. Descriptive statistics summarized the characteristics of those who gave and received cigarettes as gifts. Multivariable logistic regression models were used to identify factors associated with the two behaviors.

Results: Among nonsmokers, 9.9% reported giving cigarettes as gifts to family or friends in the last 6 months. A higher level of knowledge about smoking harms was associated with lower adjusted odds of gifting cigarettes. Nonsmokers aged 25–39 years, with middle income, positive attitude toward cigarette gifts, exposure to anti-smoking information, and exposure to smoking promotion, and those who reported receiving cigarettes as gifts from family or friends were more likely to give cigarettes as gifts. A total of 6.6% of nonsmokers reported receiving cigarettes as gifts in the last 6 months. High education, neutral or positive attitude toward cigarette gifts, exposure to anti-smoking information, exposure to smoking promotion, and having smoking friends were associated with receiving cigarettes as gifts.

Conclusions: It is concerning that Chinese cultural norms that support cigarette gifting have extended to giving nonsmokers cigarettes as gifts. Effective anti-smoking messages are needed. Changing the norms around cigarette gifting and increasing knowledge about smoking harms should help reduce cigarette gifting among nonsmokers.

Implications: Easy access to cigarettes received as gifts, along with the wide acceptance of smoking in China, places Chinese nonsmokers in a risky position. More educational campaigns targeting nonsmokers to proactively prevent them from smoking are called for. The ineffectiveness of existing anti-smoking information highlights the need for more effective anti-smoking messages. That attitude toward cigarette gifts is the strongest predictor of giving cigarettes as gifts suggests the need for interventions to reverse the positive attitude about cigarette gifting to decrease the popularity of this activity.

Introduction

China is the largest producer and consumer of tobacco in the world. There are more than 300 million smokers in China, nearly one-third of the world's total, which results in an alarming toll on public health. China ratified the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) in 2005, and implemented it in 2006. Since then, China has adopted a series of national and local rules and regulations for tobacco control such as banning smoking in some public places, health warning labeling, and raising tobacco taxes. However, the implementation of these tobacco control policies in China has not been effective in reducing smoking prevalence. A

According to cross-sectional National Health Service Surveys in China, the prevalence of current smoking among Chinese aged 15 years or older was 26.0% in 2003, 24.9% in 2008, and 25.2% in 2013; for men, the prevalence was 48.4% in 2003, 47.0% in 2008, and 47.2% in 2013.³ According to a more recent China Global Adult Tobacco Survey in 2018, a household survey of persons aged 15 years and above conducted by Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention (China CDC), the prevalence of current smoking was 26.6% and 50.5% of men currently smoked tobacco.⁵ One contributor to the sustained high cigarette consumption in China is the common social practice of cigarette gifting,

¹Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

²Institute for Health & Aging, School of Nursing, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

³Department of Population Health, Grossman School of Medicine, New York University, New York, NY, USA

⁴Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada

⁵National Tobacco Control Office, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Beijing, China

⁶School of Public Health Sciences, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada

⁷Ontario Institute for Cancer Research, Toronto, ON, Canada

which is rarely seen in other cultures.^{6,7} Deeply rooted in the Chinese culture that gifts are a medium for establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships,⁸ gifting cigarettes is commonly practiced in both urban and rural areas and in both daily interpersonal interactions and on special social occasions.^{9–12} It is an important predictor of smoking^{13,14} and has contributed to the normalization and social acceptance of cigarette smoking in Chinese society. Therefore, the practice of cigarette gifting has been identified as a major barrier to tobacco control in China^{6,10} and warrants interventions.

A few studies have estimated the prevalence of cigarette gifting in China. Including only smokers in the study sample, a study using the 2005 National Tobacco Use Survey found that 19.1% of smokers reported receiving cigarette gifts and 9.0% of smokers reported gifting cigarettes to others in the past 3 months. 15 A survey conducted in Jiangsu province in 2010 showed that more than half of the 1200 respondents including smokers and nonsmokers planned to give cigarettes as gifts in the upcoming Chinese New Year Festival¹⁶; another study in Zhejiang Province found that one in seven adults reported their families giving cigarettes to others as a gift in the last year. 17 Three studies estimated the percentage of cigarette gifting among smokers and nonsmokers separately. A survey in a small rural village in Hunan province in 2011 showed that among households with smoking household heads, 73.8% reported gifting and 86.2% reported receiving cigarettes as a gift during the Chinese New Year Festival; whereas among households with nonsmoking household heads, the corresponding prevalence was 72.5% and 70.0%, respectively.18 An online survey of 9818 adults in 2017-2018 found that 89.0% of current smokers and 61.4% of nonsmokers reported having given others cigarettes as gifts, and 92.1% of current smokers and 35.3% of nonsmokers reported having received gifted cigarettes in their lifetime.¹⁹ A survey in two provinces in China found that in the last 12 months, 39.9% of smokers and 12.3% of nonsmokers gave cigarettes as gifts to others, and 35.5% of smokers and 6.3% of nonsmokers received cigarettes as gifts.²⁰

Though a few studies on cigarette gifting examined nonsmokers separately, 18-20 little other than the percentage, has been known. To the best of our knowledge, there was only one study that used non-probability, internet-based recruitment methods to conduct an online survey to examine the correlates of nonsmokers' cigarette gifting behavior, and the covariates in the model were confined to demographic variables. 19 However, a more in-depth understanding of the practice of cigarette gifting among nonsmokers is important. Past studies and commentary on gifting and sharing cigarettes in China have found that cigarette gifting behaviors both promote smoking initiation and impede cessation among smokers. 10 Although an important part of tobacco control is to help current smokers quit smoking, given the documented challenges of cessation among smokers²¹⁻²³ and easy relapse among quitters in China,24-26 taking a precautionary approach to prevent nonsmokers from smoking is also crucial to reduce smoking in China. Social influence theory indicates that people are more likely to do whatever they see as being the norm and have a tendency to change their behavior to comply with those around them.^{27,28} Given persistent high smoking rates²⁹ and high social acceptance of smoking in China, 10,30 nonsmokers may be more susceptible to smoking than their counterparts in many other countries. Additionally, the easy access to cigarettes caused by cigarette

gifting may augment the social influence of smoking and make it easier for nonsmokers to smoke. Moverover, the status of tobacco as social currency¹⁰ makes cigarettes, especially premium cigarettes, desirable among not only smokers but also nonsmokers. Drawing on a probability-sample population-based survey in China, this study was designed to examine the percentage of and the demographic and non-demographic correlates of giving and receiving cigarettes as gifts among nonsmokers, for whom receiving cigarettes as gifts is an alarming indication of the widespread acceptability of smoking.

Methods

Study Sample

Data are from the latest International Tobacco Control (ITC) China Wave 5 Survey, a longitudinal, face-to-face house-hold interview survey completed in July 2015. Based on the consideration of "breadth and diversity with respect to geographic region, economic development, reliance on a tobacco economy, and tobacco use," five cities (Beijing, Guangzhou, Kunming, Shanghai, and Shenyang) and five rural areas (Changzhi, Huzhou, Tongren, Yichun, and Xining) were surveyed. A stratified multi-stage cluster sampling design was used to produce representative samples of adults aged ≥18 years within each city/rural area. The information collected in the survey included individuals' tobacco use patterns and cessation, knowledge and beliefs about smoking, and opinions about tobacco control policies. More details about the survey can be found elsewhere. More details about the survey can be found elsewhere.

This study focused on adult nonsmokers (N = 2063). Those with complete data on outcome variables and covariates were included in the analyses. The final study sample comprised 1813 adult nonsmokers.

Outcome Variables

Two outcome variables were examined: giving cigarettes as gifts and receiving cigarettes as gifts. Giving cigarettes as gifts was measured by asking: "In the last 6 months, have you GIVEN cigarettes as a gift to a family member or friend? If yes, how often?" Receiving cigarettes as gifts was measured by the question: "In the last 6 months, have you RECEIVED cigarettes as a gift from a family member or friend? If yes, how often?" For each outcome, respondents were dichotomized as "yes" (for those who answered "once," "2–5 times," "6–10 times," or "more than 10 times") or "no" (for those who answered "none"). Respondents who answered "refused" or "don't know" were assigned a missing value.

Covariates

Based on previous studies,^{15,34} the covariates included sociodemographic characteristics, attitude toward cigarette gifts, knowledge about smoking harms, exposure to anti-smoking information, exposure to smoking promotion, and having smoking friends. Receiving cigarettes as gifts, one of the outcome variables described above was included as a covariate in the model of giving cigarettes as gifts. Sociodemographic characteristics included gender (male and female), age (18–24, 25–39, 40–54, and ≥55 years), education (low [≤elementary school], medium [junior high or high school], and high [≥college/university]), income level (low [≤3000 RMB or ≤\$465 USD monthly], middle [3001–5000 RMB or \$465-775 USD monthly], high [≥5001 RMB or

≥\$775 USD monthly], and not stated), and residence (urban area and rural area).

Attitude Toward Cigarette Gifts

was assessed by asking the extent to which participants agree or disagree with the statement "Cigarettes are very good gifts for family or friends" using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Responses were categorized into: (1) negative attitude ("strongly disagree" and "disagree"), (2) neutral attitude ("neither disagree nor agree"), and (3) positive attitude ("agree" and "strongly agree").

Knowledge About Smoking Harms

was assessed by three questions: "Do you think smoking causes stroke?", "Do you think smoking causes lung cancer in smokers?", and "Do you think smoking causes coronary heart disease?" Respondents who answered "yes" to all three items were coded "high knowledge," and otherwise were coded "low knowledge".

Exposure to Anti-smoking Information

was assessed by the question: "In the last 6 months, have you ever seen advertising or information that talks about the harmfulness of smoking, or encourages quitting?" with response options "never," "once in a while," and "often."

Exposure to Smoking Promotion

was assessed by the question: "In the last 6 months, how often have you noticed things that are designed to encourage smoking or which make you think about smoking? (things like advertising and pictures of smoking, television or movies etc.)" with response options "never," "once in a while," and "often." We combined the latter two options into a single group as "ever."

Having Smoking Friends

was assessed by the question: "Of the five closest friends or acquaintances (not including family members) that you spend time with on a regular basis, how many of them are smokers?". Responses were dichotomized as "yes" (for those responses who answered 1 or more) or "no" (for those who answered "none").

Statistical Analysis

We weighted the data to estimate the percentage of each outcome in the final study sample and the subgroups stratified by each covariate. We used a chi-squared test to determine whether there was any difference in the percentage of the outcome variable across all subgroups of each covariate. A multivariable logistic regression model was estimated to determine significant factors associated with each outcome after controlling for other covariates. SPSS version 26 was used to conduct all analyses. A two-tailed *p*-value <.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Sample Characteristics

Among the final study sample, 65.2% were females, 39.2% were aged 40–54 years, 55.6% had medium education, 40.0% were in the middle-income group, 53.7% lived in urban areas, 88.1% had a negative attitude toward cigarette gifts, 52.0%

had low knowledge about smoking harms, 43.4% were exposed to anti-smoking information "once in a while" in the last 6 months, 80.0% reported no exposure to smoking promotion in the last 6 months, and 71.0% reported having smoking friends (Table 1).

Percentage and Correlates of Giving Cigarettes as Gifts

Among nonsmokers, 9.9% reported giving cigarettes as gifts in the last 6 months (Table 2). Bivariate analyses show that the percentage of giving cigarettes as gifts were significantly different by all covariates except residence and income level.

Multivariable logistic regression results show that the odds of reporting giving cigarettes as gifts among nonsmokers were significantly higher among nonsmokers aged 25-39 years (adjusted odds ratio [AOR] = 3.13; 95% confidence interval [CI] = 1.18, 8.35) than those aged 18–24 years, among those with middle income than those with low income (AOR = 2.07; 95% CI = 1.14, 3.74), among those who had a positive attitude toward cigarette gifts (AOR = 6.57; 95% CI = 4.07, 10.62) than those who had a negative attitude, among those who were exposed to anti-smoking information "once in a while" (AOR = 2.01; 95% CI = 1.25, 3.21) or "often" (AOR = 4.90;95% CI = 2.99, 8.04) than those without exposure, among those who were exposed to smoking promotion than those without exposure (AOR = 1.96; 95% CI = 1.35, 2.85), and among those who reported receiving cigarettes as gifts in the last 6 months than those who did not (AOR = 5.91; 95% CI = 3.72, 9.39). In contrast, the odds of reporting giving cigarettes as gifts were found to be significantly lower among those with high knowledge about smoking harms than those with low knowledge (AOR = 0.52; 95% CI = 0.36, 0.75).

Percentage and Correlates of Receiving Cigarettes as Gifts

Table 3 shows that 6.6% of nonsmokers reported receiving cigarettes as gifts in the last 6 months. Bivariate analyses show that the percentage of receiving cigarettes as gifts were significantly different by all covariates except gender, residence, and knowledge about smoking harms.

Multivariable logistic regression results show that the odds of reporting receiving cigarettes as gifts were significantly higher among nonsmokers with high education than those with low education (AOR = 2.45; 95% CI = 1.18, 5.06), among those who had a neutral attitude toward cigarette gifts (AOR = 2.41; 95% CI = 1.28, 4.54) or positive attitude toward cigarette gifts (AOR = 1.96; 95% CI = 1.03, 3.72) than those who had a negative attitude, among those who were exposed to anti-smoking information "once in a while" (AOR = 1.96; 95% CI = 1.17, 3.27) or "often" (AOR = 2.66, 95% CI = 1.50, 4.70) than those without such exposure, among those who were exposed to smoking promotion than those without such exposure (AOR = 2.14; 95% CI = 1.42, 3.23), and among those with smoking friends than those without smoking friends (AOR = 1.76; 95% CI = 1.07, 2.88).

Discussion

This study found that 9.9% of nonsmokers reported giving cigarettes as gifts to a family member or friend in the last 6 months. While this is of concern, it is more concerning that 6.6% of nonsmokers reported receiving cigarettes as gifts from a family member or friend in the last 6 months. Our

Table 1. Sample Characteristics of Nonsmokers by Covariates, International Tobacco Control China Wave 5 Survey (N = 1813)

Characteristics		N	Column %
Total		1813	100.0%
Gender	Male	631	34.8
	Female	1182	65.2
Age	18–24	103	5.7
	25–39	371	20.5
	40–54	710	39.2
	≥55	629	34.7
Education	Low	420	23.2
	Medium	1008	55.6
	High	385	21.2
Income level	Low	306	16.9
	Middle	725	40.0
	High	541	29.8
	Not stated	241	13.3
Residence	Urban area	973	53.7
	Rural area	840	46.3
Attitude toward cigarette gifts	Negative	1597	88.1
	Neural	115	6.3
	Positive	101	5.6
Knowledge about smoking harms	Low	943	52.0
	High	870	48.0
Exposure to anti-smoking information	Never	707	39.0
	Once in a while	786	43.4
	Often	320	17.7
Exposure to smoking promotion	Never	1451	80.0
	Ever	362	20.0
Having smoking friends	No	525	29.0
	Yes	1288	71.0

estimates are much lower than a previous online survey which found that 61.4% of nonsmokers reported giving cigarettes to others and 35.3% reported receiving gifted cigarettes in their lifetime.¹⁹ One of the reasons for the discrepancy is the difference in the time frame (last 6 months vs. lifetime). Note that in our study, because the ITC China Wave 5 survey covers more than one year, the last 6 months before the interview date may not necessarily include the Chinese New Year when a great deal of gifting and receiving cigarettes occurred in China. Other reasons may include nuances in defining givers/receivers of cigarette gifts (family and friends vs. others), recall issues, etc. Even so, these two studies conveyed the same message that the engagement of nonsmokers with cigarette gifting is not uncommon in China. This message, on one hand, may imply that it is so acceptable to gift cigarettes in China that even those who do not smoke choose cigarettes as appropriate gifts for others; on the other hand, it might be that giving cigarettes as gifts to family or friends is a way to deal with the cigarettes that nonsmokers received as gifts.

Our study also found that receiving cigarettes as gifts was significantly associated with giving cigarettes as gifts. Although the survey did not allow us to determine whether having received cigarettes as gifts predict giving out the same cigarettes as gifts subsequently, our finding potentially supports the cigarette re-gifting hypothesis among nonsmokers that have never been tested in the literature. While this hypothesis implies that

nonsmokers may not necessarily have smoked the cigarettes they received as gifts, the possible behavior of re-gifting cigarettes and simply giving cigarettes as gifts by nonsmokers would reinforce the existing social norm around smoking, and fuel the cigarette gifting culture. Meanwhile, the easy access to cigarettes received as gifts and wide social acceptance of smoking could possibly increase the likelihood of smoking uptake of never smokers and relapse of former smokers who would otherwise not smoke again. 10 Future research is needed to formally test the hypothesis of cigarette re-gifting behavior among nonsmokers and to elucidate the mechanism through which the possible cigarette gifting-related smoking uptake and relapse happen in the non-smoker group. Nonetheless, our finding that one in 15 nonsmokers reported receiving cigarettes as gifts is disturbing and calls for more educational campaigns targeting nonsmokers to prevent them from

Our study identified several sociodemographic characteristics that are associated with giving and receiving cigarettes as gifts. We found significantly higher odds of giving cigarettes as gifts among nonsmokers aged 25–39 years than those aged 18–24 years. This aligns with another survey that found nonsmokers aged ≥35 years were more likely to gift cigarettes to others than 18–34-year-old smokers, ¹⁹ suggesting that relatively older groups should be a high-priority group for targeted cigarette gifting interventions. Also, we found that

Table 2. Percentage of and Multivariable Regression Analysis on Reporting Giving Cigarettes as Gifts to a Family Member or Friend Among Nonsmokers, International Tobacco Control (ITC) China Wave 5 Survey (N = 1813)

Covariates		Adul	ts who gave ci	garettes as gifts			e regression model of giving cigarettes as	
		N	Weighted column %#	Weighted percentage of giving cigarettes as gifts#	Chi-square statistic#; p-value	Adjusted OR	(95% CI)	p-value
All		176	100.0%	9.9%		N/A		
Gender	Male	71	50.0%	12.6%	9.21**; p = .002	Referent		
	Female	105	50.0%	8.2%		0.74	(0.51, 1.06)	.099
Age	18-24	7	2.8%	4.2%	11.46**; p = .009	Referent		
	25-39	63	25.4%	13.8%		3.13	(1.18, 8.35)*	.022
	40-54	66	40.9%	10.3%		2.50	(0.96, 6.51)	.062
	55+	40	30.9%	8.6%		2.13	(0.79, 5.75)	.135
Education	Low	28	18.7%	8.1%	14.18**; p = .001	Referent		
	Me- dium	94	50.0%	8.8%		1.08	(0.66, 1.78)	.751
	High	54	31.3%	15.1%		1.61	(0.87, 2.99)	.130
Income level	Low	23	19.3%	11.2%	.81; $p = .848$	Referent		
	Middle	72	38.7%	9.6%		2.07	(1.14, 3.74)*	.016
	High	57	29.8%	9.8%		1.33	(0.85, 2.08)	.219
	Not stated	24	12.2%	9.2%		1.26	(0.66, 2.41)	.488
Residence	Urban area	101	56.6%	10.6%	0.88; p = .349	Referent		
	Rural area	75	43.4%	9.3%		0.83	(0.53, 1.29)	.403
Attitude toward cigarette gifts	Nega- tive	127	67.0%	7.6%	103.17***; p < .001	Referent		
	Neural	19	9.3%	17.3%		1.80	(0.95, 3.41)	.072
	Positive	30	23.6%	35.2%		6.57	(4.07, 10.62)***	<.001
Knowledge about	Low	107	65.0%	12.5%	13.95***; p < .001	Referent		
smoking harms	High	69	35.0%	7.3%		0.52	(0.36, 0.75)**	.001
Exposure to anti-	Never	33	16.5%	4.3%	62.08***; <i>p</i> < .001	Referent		
smoking information	Once in a while	80	46.7%	10.8%	71	2.01	(1.25, 3.21)**	.004
	Often	63	36.8%	19.8%		4.90	(2.99, 8.04)***	<.001
Exposure to smok-	Never	118	61.0%	7.6%	42.88***; <i>p</i> < .001	Referent		
ing promotion	Ever	58	39.0%	19.0%	• •	1.96	(1.35, 2.85)***	<.001
Having smoking	No	29	20.3%	6.7%	9.21**; p = .002	Referent		
friends	Yes	147	79.7%	11.3%	71	1.47	(0.95, 2.25)	.082
Receiving cigarettes	No	112	73.1%	7.8%	135.02***; <i>p</i> < .001	Referent		
as gifts	Yes	64	26.9%	40.5%		5.91	(3.72, 9.39)***	<.001

p < .05; p < .01; p < .001; p < .001.

nonsmokers with high education were more likely to receive cigarettes as gifts than those with lower education. This is consistent with literature that cigarettes were often gifted to those with high education and social status, such as doctors and people working in a government agency. ^{10,15,35} While our study did not find a significant association between education and giving cigarettes as gifts, an online survey found higher odds of giving cigarettes as gifts among nonsmokers with high education. ¹⁹ This discrepancy may be explained by different educational compositions in study samples: 86.5% of their

nonsmoker sample had a college or higher degree¹⁹ compared to 21.2% in our study sample which included a broader representation of educational backgrounds.

In addition, it was observed that several sociodemographic predictors of cigarette gifting behavior among smokers did not predict gifting among nonsmokers. First, we did not find significant differences in giving or receiving cigarettes as gifts between low-income and higher-income nonsmokers except for receiving cigarettes as gifts between low-income and middle-income groups, while a previous study focusing on

^{*}Calculation was based on rescaled weights in the ITC China Wave 5 Survey data.

[&]amp;The model includes all the covariates listed in the first column.

Table 3. Percentage of and Multivariable Regression Analysis on Reporting Receiving Cigarettes as Gifts From a Family Member or Friend Among Nonsmokers, International Tobacco Control (ITC) China Wave 5 Survey (N = 1813)

Age Gooder Action of Salaria (1938) All Gooder Age (1938) Age Gooder Beard (1938) Age Gooder Beard (1938) Age Gooder Beard (1938) Age Gooder Beard (1938) Age Age (1938) Age Age (1938) Age Age (1938) Age Age (1938) Age (1938)	Covariates		Adults	Adults who received cigarettes as gifts	ettes as gifts		Multivariabl likelihood of	Multivariable regression model on the likelihood of receiving cigarettes gifts #^&	the fts #,&
Male 139 100.00% 6.6% 0.97; p = .324 N/A Female 84 56.2% 6.1% 0.97; p = .324 Referent 18-34 8 56.2% 6.1% 0.97; p = .324 Referent 18-34 8 7.4% 7.5% 14.94**; p = .002 Referent 18-34 8 7.4% 7.5% 14.94**; p = .002 Referent 40-34 56 41.3% 6.9% 1.45 1.55 10w 22 12.4% 4.9***; p = .002 1.65 10.34, 1.75 10w 22 12.4% 3.6% 24.19***; p = .003 1.18 10.34, 1.75 10w 22 12.4% 3.6% 24.19***; p = .003 1.18 10.34, 1.25 10w 22 12.4% 3.5% 24.19***; p = .003 Referent 11.18, 5.06* 10w 23 3.2% 3.5% 3.2% 3.419***; p = .003 1.18 1.18 10w 36 3.2% 3.2% 3.2% <th></th> <th></th> <th>z</th> <th>Weighted column %#</th> <th>Weighted percentage of receiving cigarettes as gifts*</th> <th>Chi-square statistic#; p-value</th> <th>Adjusted OR</th> <th>(95% CI)</th> <th>p-value</th>			z	Weighted column %#	Weighted percentage of receiving cigarettes as gifts*	Chi-square statistic#; p-value	Adjusted OR	(95% CI)	p-value
Male 55 43.8% 7.3% 0.97. p = .324 Referent 18.24 8 7.4% 7.5% 14.94**; p = .002 Referent 25.39 1 7.4% 7.5% 14.94**; p = .002 Referent 25.39 1 2.8% 10.5% 1.49.4**; p = .002 Referent 40.54 3.6 3.4 4.1% 3.4% 0.73, 3.73 Medium 7 12.4% 3.6% 24.19***; p < .001	All		139	100.0%	%9'9		N/A		
Franke 84 56.2% 6.1% 14.94**, p = .002 0.97 (0.64,146) 18.44 8 7.4% 7.3% 14.94**, p = .002 165 1.65 1.53.9 41.2 28.9% 10.5% 1.21 (0.73, 3.73) 40.54 56 41.3% 6.9% 3.4 1.21 (0.53, 2.68) 55.4 12 1.24% 3.6% 24.19***, p < .001	Gender	Male	55	43.8%	7.3%	0.97; $p = .324$	Referent		
18-24 8 7.4% 7.5% 14.94**; p = .002 Referent 25.39 41 28.9% 10.5% 14.94**; p = .002 1.65 1.65 10.54, 2.68 25.34 54 41.3% 6.9% 10.5% 1.21 1.21 10.54, 2.68 25.4 21.3% 41.3% 6.9% 24.19***; p < .001 Referent 1.21 10.54, 2.68 Low 22 12.4% 3.6% 24.19***; p < .001 Referent 1.30 1.1.75 Low 21 12.4% 3.6% 24.19***; p < .001 Referent 1.30 1.30 Middle 49 31.4% 5.2% 1.9% 8.38*; p = .035 Referent Middle 49 31.4% 5.2% 1.30; p = .234 Referent 1.48, 3.64 High 47 36.4% 8.0% 1.30; p = .234 Referent 1.49, 1.16 Not stated 22 19.0% 9.6% 1.30; p = .234 Referent Rural area 36 41.7% 5.9% 1.30; p = .234 Referent Nomeral 10 76.9% 5.8% 1.30; p = .234 Referent Rural area 36 41.7% 1.43 1.43 Author smoking harms 1.4% 1.43 1.43 1.43 Author smoking information 1.4 33.3% 8.2% 1.30 1.44 1.45 1.32 Author smoking promotion 1.4 33.3% 8.2% 1.30 1.44 1.45 1.32 Bore 2.19 2.2 2.2 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 Bore 3 6.2 2.2 2.2 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 Bore 3 6.2 2.2 2.2 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 Bore 3 6.2 2.2 2.2 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 Bore 3 6.2 2.2 2.2 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 Bore 3 6.2 2.2 2.2 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 Bore 3 6.2 2.2 2.2 2.4 2		Female	84	56.2%	6.1%		0.97	(0.64, 1.46)	998.
5.5.9 41 28.9% 10.5% 1.65 (0.73, 3.73) 40.54 56 41.3% 6.9% 1.21 (0.54, 2.68) 5.5 3.4 5.6 41.3% 6.9% 1.21 (0.54, 2.68) Low 2.2 1.2.4% 3.6% 0.73 0.73 (0.31, 1.75) High 45 3.2.4% 1.9% 8.58*; p = .035 Referent 0.74, 2.59) Middle 49 3.1.4% 5.2.% 8.58*; p = .035 Referent 0.74, 1.16) Middle 49 3.1.4% 5.2.% 8.0% 8.74 1.18, 5.0% High 47 3.6.% 8.0% 8.5.% 1.18, 5.0% 1.41 1.41, 1.16) Novarida read 56 41.7% 5.9% 1.34 8.64, 1.13 1.83 1.54 1.41, 1.16) Novarida sinformation 10 7.69% 5.8% 0.16, p = .54 1.41, 1.13 1.96 1.14, 1.14 1.14, 1.15 1.96 1.13 1.14, 1.15 1.14	Age	18-24	8	7.4%	7.5%	14.94*; $p = .002$	Referent		
40.54 56 41.3% 6.9% 1.21 1.21 (0.54,2.68) 55+ 34 3.2% 41.3% 6.9% 24.19***, p < .001		25-39	41	28.9%	10.5%		1.65	(0.73, 3.73)	.226
55+ 34 22.3% 41% 24.19***; p < .001 Referent 0.73 (0.31,1.75) Low 22 12.4% 3.6% 24.19***; p < .001		40-54	26	41.3%	%6.9		1.21	(0.54, 2.68)	.648
Low 22 12.4% 3.6% 24.19***, p < 0.01 Referent Medium 72 50.4% 5.9% 24.19***, p < 0.01		55+	34	22.3%	4.1%		0.73	(0.31, 1.75)	.481
Medium 72 50.4% 5.9% 1.38 (0.74,2.5) High 45 37.2% 11.9% 8.58*; p = .035 Referent 2.45 (1.18,5.06)* Low 21 13.2% 5.1% 8.58*; p = .035 Referent 0.71 (0.44,1.12) Middle 47 36.4% 8.0% 0.37 (0.44,1.15) 0.44,1.15) High 47 36.4% 8.0% 1.30; p = .254 Referent 0.44,1.16) Nortal area 83 58.3% 7.2% 1.30; p = .254 Referent 0.87,3.05) Nortal area 84 11.6% 14.3% 0.93 0.56,1.53) 0.56,1.53) ard cigarette gifts Nortal 15 11.6% 14.3% 0.16; p = .690 Referent 1.28,4.54)** Nortal 15 11.6% 11.5% 0.16; p = .690 Referent 1.03,3.72)* About smoking promotion Nore to a while 74 53.3% 1.2% 2.2.14***; p < .001	Education	Low	22	12.4%	3.6%	24.19***; <i>p</i> < .001	Referent		
High 45 37.2% 11.9% 8.58*; p = .035 Referent Low 21 13.2% 5.1% 8.58*; p = .035 Referent Middle 49 3.14% 5.2% 8.58*; p = .035 Referent High 47 3.4% 8.0% 0.37 0.44, 1.16 Nor stared 22 19.0% 9.6% 1.30; p = .254 Referent Urban area 83 58.3% 7.2% 1.30; p = .254 Referent Rural area 56 41.7% 5.9% 0.93 0.56, 1.53) ard cigarette gifts Negrive 104 7.2% 1.5% 0.93 0.56, 1.53) ard cigarette gifts Negrive 104 7.6% 5.8% 0.16; p = .090 Referent Neural 11.6% 11.5% 11.5% 0.16; p = .690 Referent About smoking harms 1.6% 14.3% 6.8% 0.16; p = .690 Referent High 68 46.3% 6.4% 0.16; p = .690 <		Medium	72	50.4%	5.9%		1.38	(0.74, 2.59)	.311
Low 21 13.2% 5.1% 8.58*, p = .035 Referent Middle 49 31.4% 5.2% 0.87 0.44,1.72) High 47 36.4% 8.0% 0.87 0.44,1.16) Not stated 22 19.0% 9.6% 1.30; p = .254 Referent 0.44,1.16) Aural area 58 41.7% 5.9% 1.30; p = .254 Referent 0.87,3.05) Aural area 56 41.7% 5.9% 1.58 1.63 0.56,1.53) and cigarette gifts Neural 15 11.6% 11.5% 1.58 1.38 0.56,1.53) bout smoking harms Low 71 53.7% 6.8% 0.16; p = .690 Referent 1.10,3,3.72)* bout smoking information Never 29 18.9% 8.2% 0.14***; p < .001		High	45	37.2%	11.9%		2.45	(1.18, 5.06)*	.016
Middle 49 31.4% 5.2% 0.87 (0.44,1.12) High 47 36.4% 8.0% 0.71 (0.44,1.16) Not stated 22 19.0% 9.6% 1.30; p = .254 Referent (0.87, 3.05) Urban area 36 41.7% 5.9% 1.30; p = .254 Referent (0.87, 3.05) Negative 104 76.9% 5.8% 15.84**; p < .001 Referent 1.33, (0.56, 1.53) Neural 11 11.6% 11.5% 0.16; p = .690 Referent 1.34, 54)** Low 21 53.7% 6.8% 0.16; p = .690 Referent 1.03, 3.72)* High 68 46.3% 6.4% 0.16; p = .690 Referent 1.03, 3.72)* Once in a while 74 53.3% 8.2% 2.14***; p < .001 Referent 1.36 1.17, 3.27)* Often 36 27.9% 10.0% 2.46**; p < .001 Referent 1.26 1.33, 3.23* 2.14 1.42, 3.233*** No	Income level	Low	21	13.2%	5.1%	8.58*; $p = .035$	Referent		
High 47 36.4% 8.0% 0.71 (0.44,1.16) Not stated 22 19.0% 9.6% 1.30; p = .254 Referent 1.63 (0.87, 3.05) Urban area 36 41.7% 5.9% 1.30; p = .254 Referent 0.87, 3.05) Negative 104 76.9% 5.8% 15.84***; p < .001		Middle	49	31.4%	5.2%		0.87	(0.44, 1.72)	.685
Not stated 12 19.0% 9.6% 1.30; p = .254 Referent (0.87, 3.05) Urban area 56 41.7% 5.9% 1.30; p = .254 Referent 0.93 (0.56, 1.53) Negative 104 76.9% 5.8% 15.84***; p < .001		High	47	36.4%	8.0%		0.71	(0.44, 1.16)	.171
Urban area 83 58.3% 7.2% 1.30; p = .254 Referent Rural area 56 41.7% 5.9% 15.84**; p < .001		Not stated	22	19.0%	%9.6		1.63	(0.87, 3.05)	.131
Rural area 56 41.7% 5.9% 0.93 (0.56, 1.53) Negative 104 76.9% 5.8% 15.84***, p < .001	Residence	Urban area	83	58.3%	7.2%	1.30; $p = .254$	Referent		
Negative 104 76.9% 5.8% 15.84***; $p < .001$ Referent Neural 15 11.6% 14.3% 2.41 (1.28, 4.54)*** Positive 20 11.6% 11.5% 0.16; $p = .690$ Referent (1.03, 3.72)* Low 71 53.7% 6.8% 0.16; $p = .690$ Referent (1.03, 3.72)* High 68 46.3% 6.4% 0.16; $p = .690$ Referent 0.06 (1.04, 1.43) Never 29 18.9% 3.3% 22.14***; $p < .001$ Referent 1.96 (1.17, 3.27)* Often 36 27.9% 10.0% 24.63***; $p < .001$ Referent 1.50, 4.70)** No 23 19.0% 4.2% 7.66**; $p = .006$ Referent 1.74, 3.23)*** No 23 19.0% 4.2% 7.66**; $p = .006$ Referent Yes 116 81.0% 7.7% 1.76 1.75, 2.88*		Rural area	26	41.7%	5.9%		0.93	(0.56, 1.53)	99/.
Neural 15 14.3% 14.3% 2.41 (1.28, 4.54)** Positive 20 11.6% 11.5% 0.16; p = .690 Referent Low 71 53.7% 6.8% 0.16; p = .690 Referent High 68 46.3% 6.4% 0.16; p = .690 Referent Never 29 18.9% 3.3% 22.14***; p < 001	Attitude toward cigarette gifts	Negative	104	%6.9%	5.8%	15.84**; $p < .001$	Referent		
Positive 20 11.6% 11.5% 11.5% 11.6% 11.5% 11.6% 11.6% 11.33.72)* Low 71 53.7% 6.8% 0.16; p = .690 Referent 0.96 (0.64, 1.43) High 68 46.3% 5.3% 5.2.14***; p < 001		Neural	15	11.6%	14.3%		2.41	(1.28, 4.54)**	900.
Low 71 53.7% 6.8% 0.16; p = .690 Referent High 68 46.3% 6.4% 0.96 (0.64, 1.43) Never 29 18.9% 3.3% 22.14***; p < 001		Positive	20	11.6%	11.5%		1.96	(1.03, 3.72)*	.039
High 68 46.3% 6.4% 0.96 (0.64,1.43) Never 29 18.9% 3.3% 22.14***; p < 001	Knowledge about smoking harms	Low	71	53.7%	%8.9	0.16; p = .690	Referent		
Never 29 18.9% 3.3% 22.14***; p < 001 Referent Once in a while 74 53.3% 8.2% 1.96 (1.17, 3.27)* Often 36 27.9% 10.0% 2.66 (1.50, 4.70)** Never 83 62.0% 5.2% 24.63***; p < .001		High	89	46.3%	6.4%		96.0	(0.64, 1.43)	.829
Once in a while 74 53.3% 8.2% 1.96 (1.17,3.27)* Often 36 27.9% 10.0% 24.63***; p < .001	Exposure to anti-smoking information	Never	29	18.9%	3.3%	22.14**; $p < 001$	Referent		
Often 36 27.9% 10.0% $24.63***; p < .001$ Referent 62.0% 5.2% 10.0% $24.63***; p < .001$ Referent 12.3% 12.3% 19.0% 4.2% $7.66**; p = .006$ Referent 1.76 $1.07, 2.88)*$		Once in a while	74	53.3%	8.2%		1.96	(1.17, 3.27)*	.010
omotion Never 83 62.0% 5.2% 24.63***; \$\rho < .001\$ Referent 5.2% 5.2% 24.63***; \$\rho < .001\$ Referent 7.14 (1.42, 3.23)*** < No 2.3 19.0% 4.2% 7.66**; \$\rho = .006\$ Referent 7.56**; \$\rho = .006\$ Referent 7.7% 1.07, 2.88)*		Often	36	27.9%	10.0%		2.66	(1.50, 4.70)**	.001
Ever 56 38.0% 12.3% 2.14 (1.42, 3.23)*** < No 23 19.0% 4.2% 7.66**; p = .006 Referent Yes 116 81.0% 7.7% (1.07, 2.88)*	Exposure to smoking promotion	Never	83	62.0%	5.2%	24.63***; p < .001	Referent		
No 23 19.0% 4.2% 7.66**; $p = .006$ Referent Yes 116 81.0% 7.7% 1.7% 1.76 (1.07, 2.88)*		Ever	99	38.0%	12.3%		2.14	(1.42, 3.23)**	<.001
116 81.0% 7.7% 1.76 $(1.07, 2.88)*$	Having smoking friends	No	23	19.0%	4.2%	7.66**; p = .006	Referent		
		Yes	116	81.0%	7.7%		1.76	(1.07, 2.88)*	.026

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .01; ***p < .001.
*Calculation was based on rescaled weights in the ITC China Wave 5 Survey data.
*The model includes all the covariates listed in the first column.

smokers reported that the higher the smokers' income level, the more likely they were to receive and give cigarettes as gifts. Second, our study did not find any significant difference in giving or receiving cigarettes as gifts between urban and rural nonsmokers, in contrast to a study showing that urban smokers were less likely to give cigarettes than rural smokers but more likely to receive cigarettes as gifts. Third, we found that gender was not associated with either giving or receiving cigarettes as gifts among nonsmokers, while a previous study found that male smokers were less likely than female smokers to receive cigarette gifts. These overall differences between nonsmokers and smokers warrant future research to comprehensively understand the perceptions and behavior of cigarette gifting among different sociodemographic and smoking groups.

Our study contributes to the literature by also identifying several non-sociodemographic risk factors of cigarette gifting among nonsmokers. We found that nonsmokers with a negative attitude toward cigarette gifts were less likely to give and receive cigarettes as gifts and those with high knowledge of smoking harms were less likely to give cigarettes as gifts. These findings have important implications for future interventions. First, to reduce the practice of cigarette gifting, more efforts should be taken to combat the positive attitude toward cigarette gifts. A study on e-cigarette gifting in China found that a positive attitude toward cigarette gifts was also associated with a greater likelihood of giving e-cigarettes as gifts.³⁶ Taken together, this implies that changing social norms around cigarette gifting may be an important factor in decreasing the popularity of gifting tobacco products. Second, educational programs emphasizing the harms of smoking may help prevent nonsmokers from giving cigarettes as gifts and further contribute to tobacco control.

Surprisingly, we found that both exposure to antismoking information and exposure to smoking promotion information were significantly associated with higher odds of giving and receiving cigarettes as gifts among nonsmokers. These findings suggest that smoking promotion information is impactful in promoting cigarette gifting practice but anti-smoking information is not effective in addressing cigarette gifting norms. The latter implication is consistent with a report from the 2015 China Adult Tobacco Survey (conducted almost at the same time as the ITC China Wave 5 Survey), stating that anti-smoking messages about the harms of cigarette smoking and the health benefits of quitting were insufficient in China.³⁷ In that situation, anti-smoking messages in China were primarily delivered to the public through warning labels on cigarette packages.²³ Therefore, it is possible that the nonsmokers who reported exposure to anti-smoking information saw the information from the warning labels on the cigarette packages at hand. However, the text-only warning labels with the vague message "smoking harms your health" could not play an effective role in providing warning³⁸ and therefore were unlikely to inhibit nonsmokers from engaging in cigarette gifting. Our findings suggest the need for delivering more effective anti-smoking messages such as pictorial warning labels that meet the requirement of the WHO FCTC.4 Messages in the "Giving Cigarettes is Giving Harm" mass media campaign that have been empirically found to be effective in increasing smokers' knowledge of smoking harms and de-normalizing that "cigarettes

are good gifts,"39 could also be a good reference for future message development.

Our study found that having smoking friends also significantly increased the odds of receiving cigarettes as gifts among nonsmokers. Research on the Chinese gifting culture suggests that the personal preference and value system of gift givers (ie, giver orientation) are important factors influencing the choice of gifts.⁴⁰ Thus, it is reasonable to assume that nonsmokers with smoking friends may be more likely to receive cigarette gifts from smoking friends than those without smoking friends. However, we have no information about whether the cigarettes received as gifts by nonsmokers were from their smoking friends due to data availability. In our study, "friends" referred to the closest friends or acquaintances that the nonsmokers spent time with on a regular basis. Thus, our finding is consistent with the social influence theory that those nearby have strong effects on people²⁷; and having smoking friends or acquaintances may mean nonsmokers have more access to cigarettes due to receiving cigarette gifts and this will make them more susceptible to smoking. In addition, 11.3% of nonsmokers with smoking friends reported giving cigarettes as gifts. Given the regular stay with "friends" as defined in this study, if nonsmokers gifted cigarettes to their smoking friends rather than other friends, the possibility of nonsmokers' exposure to secondhand smoke may increase.

This study is subject to several limitations. First, cross-sectional data prohibits causal inferences. Second, the measures of giving and receiving cigarettes as gifts in this study were confined to family members and friends. Thus, the percentages of gifting cigarettes in China in our study are likely underestimates, since they do not include the extensive cigarette gifting that is known to occur in business and social situations. Third, the smoking status of spouses or partners may be associated with cigarette gifting but was not examined by this study due to a lack of available data. Fourth, survey studies are limited in addressing why nonsmokers engaged in cigarette gifting; a qualitative study is highly recommended to provide insight into this question.

Conclusions

Nonsmokers in China give and receive cigarettes as gifts, which may perpetuate the normalization of smoking. The easy access to cigarettes that nonsmokers received as gifts, together with the high social acceptance of smoking, may increase the likelihood of smoking initiation of never smokers and relapse of former smokers. Changing the norms around cigarette gifting, increasing knowledge about smoking harms, and delivering more effective anti-smoking messages to the public may help reduce cigarette gifting among nonsmokers in China.

Funding

This study was supported by the National Cancer Institute Grant T32 CA 113710 (JCL). The ITC 2013–2015 China Wave 5 Survey was supported by grants from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (MOP-115016), and the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Additional support to GTF, GM, and ACKQ was provided by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research Foundation Grant (FDN-148477). GTF is also supported by a Senior

Investigator Grant from the Ontario Institute for Cancer Research (IA-004).

Declaration of Interests

GTF has been an expert witness or a consultant defending their country's policies or regulations in litigation and has served as a paid expert consultant to the Ministry of Health of Singapore in reviewing the evidence of plain/standardized packaging. All other authors have no conflicts of interests to declare.

Acknowledgments

Not applicable.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

The survey protocols and all materials for the Wave 5 of the ITC China Survey, including the survey questionnaires, were cleared for ethics by the Office of Research Ethics, University of Waterloo, Canada (REB#15305 and REB#17014/30105); Cancer Council Victoria, International Review Board, Australia (IRB IER0803); Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention International Review Board, China (IRB201325). The data analyzed in this study are de-identified secondary survey data per the policy of Institutional Review Boards (IRB) of University of California, San Francisco, IRB review has been exempted.

Consent for Publication

Not applicable.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: JCL, H-YS, TY, and WM. Data collection: ACKQ, YJ, and GTF. Data analysis: JCL, H-YS, TY, GM, and WM. Manuscript drafting: JCL. Manuscript review and editing: H-YS, TY, NJ, ACKQ, GM, GTF, and WM. All authors reviewed and approved the submitted version of the manuscript.

Data Availability

In each country participating in the international Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation (ITC) Project, the data are jointly owned by the lead researcher(s) in that country and the ITC Project at the University of Waterloo. Data from the ITC Project are available to approved researchers 2 years after the date of issuance of cleaned data sets by the ITC Data Management Centre. Researchers interested in using ITC data are required to apply for approval by submitting an International Tobacco Control Data Repository (ITCDR) request application and subsequently to sign an ITCDR Data Usage Agreement. The criteria for data usage approval and the contents of the Data Usage Agreement are described online (http://www.itcproject.org). The authors of this paper obtained the data following this application process. They did not have any special access privileges. Others would be able to access these data in the same manner as the authors.

References

- 1. World Health Organization. *Tobacco in China* 2021. https://www.who.int/china/health-topics/tobacco. Accessed October 29, 2021.
- Yang G, Wang Y, Wu Y, Yang J, Wan X. The road to effective tobacco control in China. *Lancet*. 2015;385(9972):1019–1028.
- Wang M, Luo X, Xu S, et al. Trends in smoking prevalence and implication for chronic diseases in China: Serial national cross-sectional surveys from 2003 to 2013. Lancet Respir Med. 2019;7(1):35–45.
- International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Project. ITC China Project Report: Findings from the Wave 1 to 5 Surveys (2006-2015); 2017. https://itcproject.org/findings/reports/itc-china-project-report-waves-1-to-5-2006-2015-october-2017/. Accessed September 11, 2020.
- Global Tobacco Surveillance System Data (GTSSData). Global Adult Tobacco Survey Fact Sheet China 2018: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2018. https://nccd.cdc.gov/ GTSSDataSurveyResources/Ancillary/DataReports.aspx?CAID=1. Accessed November 1, 2022.
- Hu T-W, Lee AH, Mao Z. WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control in China: Barriers, challenges and recommendations. Glob Health Promot. 2013;20(4):13–22.
- Kohrman M. Depoliticizing tobacco's exceptionality: male sociality, death and memory-making among chinese cigarette smokers. China J. 2007;58:85–109. doi:10.1086/tci.58.20066308.
- 8. Yang M. Gifts, Favors, and Banquets: The Art of Social Relationships in China. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press; 1994.
- Chu A, Jiang N, Glantz SA. Transnational tobacco industry promotion of the cigarette gifting custom in China. *Tob Control*. 2011;20(4):e3–e3.
- 10. Rich ZC, Xiao S. Tobacco as a social currency: cigarette gifting and sharing in China. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2012;14(3):258–263.
- 11. Trimble DG, Yu L, Welding K, *et al.* Analysis of wedding appeals on cigarette packs in China. *Tob Control.* 2021;31:770–772. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2020-056189.
- Institute for Global Tobacco Control. Cigarette Gift Giving Practices in China: A Descriptive Analysis [Fact Sheet]. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health; 2018. https://www.globaltobaccocontrol.org/en/resources/cigarette-gift-giving-practices-china-descriptive-analysis. Accessed November 23, 2022.
- 13. Mao R, Li X, Stanton B, *et al.* Psychosocial correlates of cigarette smoking among college students in China. *Health Educ Res.* 2009;24(1):105–118.
- 14. Pan Z. Socioeconomic predictors of smoking and smoking frequency in urban China: evidence of smoking as a social function. *Health Promot Int.* 2004;19(3):309–315.
- Zhang X, Lin S, Hu TW. The epidemic of cigarette gifting: a social barrier to tobacco control in China. In: Hu TW, ed. *Economics* of Tobacco Control in China. Hackensack, NJ: World Scientific; 2016:129–146. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789813108721_0008. Accessed November 23, 2022.
- Shan J. Cigarettes Top New Year Gift List: Poll: China Daily; 2010 [updated Feb 5]. https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2010-02/05/ content_9431234.htm. Accessed November 19, 2021.
- 17. Xu Y, Xu SY, Wu QQ, Guo YJ. Association between second-hand smoke exposure at home and cigarette gifting and sharing in Zhejiang, China: a repeat cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open.* 2016;6(3):e010058.
- 18. Rich ZC, Hu M, Xiao S. Gifting and sharing cigarettes in a rural Chinese village: a cross-sectional study. *Tob Control*. 2014;23(6):496–500.
- Liao Y, Tang J, McNeill A, et al. Impact of cigarette package warnings on attitudes towards sharing and gifting cigarettes in China: a nationwide study of smokers and non-smokers. Tob Control. 2022;31:750–753. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocont rol-2020-056160.

20. Wu D, Jiao G, Hu H, *et al*. Cigarette sharing and gifting in China: patterns, associated factors, and behavioral outcomes. *Tob Induc Dis*. 2022;20(8):1–12. doi: 10.18332/tid/144054.

- Zhang J-Y, Chan SS-C, Fong DY-T, et al. The social context of smoking cessation in China: an exploratory interview study. Tob Control. 2012;21(1):57.
- 22. Bai X, Chen JY, Fang Z, et al. Motivations, challenges and coping strategies for smoking cessation: based on multi-ethnic pregnant couples in far western China. *Huazhong Univ Sci Technol Med Sci.* 2017;37(3):439–445. doi:10.1007/s11596-017-1754-4.
- 23. Jiang Y, Elton-Marshall T, Fong GT, et al. Quitting smoking in China: findings from the ITC China Survey. Tob Control. 2010;19(Suppl 2):i12–i17. doi: 10.1136/tc.2009.031179
- Yang T, Fisher KJ, Li F, et al. Attitudes to smoking cessation and triggers to relapse among Chinese male smokers. BMC Public Health. 2006;6(1):65.
- Wang J, Shen H. Review of cigarette smoking and tuberculosis in China: intervention is needed for smoking cessation among tuberculosis patients. BMC Public Health. 2009;9(1):292.
- Yang G, Ma J, Chen A, et al. Smoking cessation in China: findings from the 1996 national prevalence survey. Tob Control. 2001;10(2):170.
- 27. Kelman HC. Compliance, identification, and internalization three processes of attitude change. *J Conflict Resolut.* 1958;2(1):51–60.
- Kelman HC. Processes of opinion change. Public Opin Q. 1961;25(1):57–78.
- 29. World Health Organization (WHO). Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS): Fact sheet China 2018; 2019. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/wpro---documents/countries/china/2018-gats-china-factsheet-cn-en.pdf?sfvrsn=3f4e2da9_2. Accessed March 22, 2022.
- World Health Organization. The Bill China Cannot Afford: Health, Economic and Social Costs of China's Tobacco Epidemic. Manila: WHO Regional Office for the Western Pacific; 2017. http://iris.wpro.who.int/handle/10665.1/13566. Accessed March 22, 2022.

- Wu C, Thompson ME, Fong GT, et al. Methods of the International Tobacco Control (ITC) China Survey. Tob Control. 2010;19(Suppl 2):i1. doi: 10.1136/tc.2009.029900.
- Wu C, Thompson ME, Fong GT, et al. Methods of the International Tobacco Control (ITC) China Survey: Waves 1, 2 and 3. Tob Control. 2015;24(Suppl 4):iv1. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-052025.
- ITC Project. ITC China Wave 5 Technical Report (2013-2015);
 https://itcproject.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/documents/ ITC_China_Wave_5_Tech_Report_April_5_2017_F.pdf. Accessed October 31, 2021.
- 34. Huang L-L, Thrasher JF, Jiang Y, et al. Incidence and correlates of receiving cigarettes as gifts and selecting preferred brand because it was gifted: findings from the ITC China Survey. BMC Public Health. 2012;12(1):996.
- Ceraso M, McElroy JA, Kuang X, et al. Smoking, barriers to quitting, and smoking-related knowledge, attitudes, and patient practices among male physicians in China. Prev Chronic Dis. 2009;6(1):A06.
- Lyu JC, Sung H-Y, Yao T, et al. Receiving and giving electronic cigarettes as gifts in China: findings from International Tobacco Control China Survey. Prev Med Rep. 2022;27:101763. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2022.101763.
- Hu H. 2015 China Adult Tobacco Survey Report: Chinese Smokers Smoke an Average of 15.2 Cigarettes per Day, and Second-Hand Smoke Exposure has Improved. Xinhua News Agency; 2015. http://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2015-12/28/content_5028569.htm. Accessed November 3, 2022.
- Lyu N. WHO urges China to Use Large Graphic Health Warnings on Cigarette Packs. Xinhua News Agency; 2014 [updated April 8, 2014]. http://politics.people.com.cn/n/2014/0409/c70731-24853840.html. Accessed November 3, 2022.
- Huang LL, Thrasher JF, Jiang Y, et al. Impact of the 'Giving Cigarettes is Giving Harm' campaign on knowledge and attitudes of Chinese smokers. Tob Control. 2015;24(4):iv28–34. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-051475.
- 40. Qian W, Abdur Razzaque M, Ah Keng K. Chinese cultural values and gift-giving behavior. *J Consum Mark*. 2007;24(4):214–228.