Smoke responsibly: Student and staff beliefs about smoking in further education settings. Qualitative findings from a process evaluation.
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**Background**
Preventing young people from taking up smoking is vital to maintain and accelerate recent declines in smoking rates. Most prevention efforts have focused on schools with almost no research conducted in Further Education (FE) settings, despite 44% of regular smokers indicating they started smoking aged between 16-19 years.

We present data collected during the process evaluation of a smoking prevention feasibility trial in FE settings. It aims to explore young people’s beliefs and behaviour regarding smoking and smoking prevention in FE contexts.

**Methods**
Eleven student (n=69) and six staff (n=19) focus groups (FGs) were conducted in three FE institutions (two colleges, one school sixth form) in Wales between May and September 2015. FGs included between 2 and 13 participants selected using convenience sampling. FGs covered: views on student smoking behaviour; perceptions of the intervention; perceived impact on student and staff smoking behaviours. FGs were recorded, transcribed verbatim and analysed in NVivo 10. All transcripts were coded line by line using a framework developed and tested by MW and RL derived *a priori* from research questions and emergent indicative codes.

**Findings**
Students and staff expressed liberal, non-interventionist views about smoking. While smoking was recognised as harmful, it was seen as a personal choice which should not be infringed and students felt jaded by anti-smoking messages.

Students used smoking behaviours to signify successful transition to adulthood; not by appearing grown-up, but by demonstrating their understanding of appropriate, responsible smoking behaviour e.g. protecting minors from second-hand smoke, being considerate to non-smokers.

Staff commitment to fostering student autonomy conflicted with their perceived duty of care and institutional rules. For example, one institution banned smoking, causing tension between students and staff who tried to respect student autonomy while enforcing the rules.

**Interpretation**

Our findings highlight students’ liminal identities and tensions that can manifest as FE staff and institutions attempt to safely accommodate and nurture young people’s transition to adulthood. Smoking is denormalised among this population and students may be desensitised to smoking prevention messages in this setting. Interventions in FE must be sensitive to the transitions young people experience.
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