## Restrictions on Smoking in the Workplace

David M. Burns, Thomas G. Shanks, Jacqueline M. Major, Kathryn B. Gower, Donald R. Shopland

**OVERVIEW** One of the most dramatic social changes over the past 30 years has been the change in attitudes about public smoking and the resultant governmental restrictions on where smoking is allowed. Beginning in 1970, with then Surgeon General Jesse Steinfeld's warning that environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) exposure was likely to cause problems for nonsmokers (Steinfeld, 1972), concern about ETS exposure led to 25 years of scientific inquiry. This inquiry culminated in a series of comprehensive reviews con cluding that ETS exposure is a cause of cancer, heart disease, respiratory ill ness, and a host of other problems (U.S.DHEW, 1972, 1977, 1979; U.S.DHHS, 1982 & 1986; NRC, 1986; U.S.EPA, 1992; Cal/EPA, 1997).

Early reaction to this evidence included efforts to provide separate sec tions for smokers and nonsmokers in restaurants and workplaces (NCI, 1993). But with accumulating evidence that ETS exposure was a cause of cancer and other serious diseases, complete bans on smoking in workplaces and public places became more common. In 1986, only 3 percent of work ers nationally reported working in a smoke-free workplace (Gerlach, 1997). By the 1992/93 Current Population Survey (CPS), the fraction of indoor workers reporting a smoke-free workplace had risen to 46.7 percent. Table 3-1 presents data from the 1995/96 CPS and demonstrates that the fraction of workers covered by a 100 percent smoking ban in the workplace has risen to 64.3 percent, including more than half (54.1 percent) of all current smokers.

Males and those who were between ages 18 and 24 were less likely to work in a smoke-free workplace, as were Hispanic and Native American indoor workers (Table 3-1). The likelihood of working in a smoke-free environment increases dramatically with increasing level of education and family income. The fraction of workers who work in a smoke-free workplace varies across states, from a high of 84 percent in Utah and Maryland to a low of 40 percent in Nevada, but only three states (Nevada, Arkansas, and Kentucky) have less than 50 percent of their employees working in smoke-free areas.

The increasing proportion of indoor workers who are employed in smoke-free workplaces has a direct health benefit for nonsmokers due to the decreased exposure to ETS. However, restrictions on where smokers can smoke may also influence the behavior of smokers outside of the workplace. Smokers may quit smoking altogether when a policy restricting smoking in the workplace is implemented (as opposed to refraining from their habit only at work). They may reduce the number of cigarettes that

Nation: Extent of Official Smoking Policy in the Workplace for Self-Respondent Adults Age 18 and Older, 1995/96 Current Population Survey

				Level of	Level of Workplace Smoking Policy	Smoking	Policy				Population	Sample
	Smoke Free	Free	Strong	ng	Moderate	rate	Weak	놀	None	<u>ə</u>	Size	Size
Nation	%	రె	%	ວ	%	రె	%	ᇙ	%	రె	Z	(u)
Total	64.26	0.37	11.21	0.25	9.15	0.22	1.25	60.0	14.13	0.27	84,811,586	80,661
Smoking Status												
Never	67.65	0.48	10.58	0.32	7.83	0.28	1.01	0.10	12.92	0.35	48,086,591	44,818
Current	54.10	08.0	13.27	0.54	12.25	0.52	1.80	0.21	18.59	0.62	20,135,755	19,379
Former	66.73	0.83	10.55	0.54	9.21	0.51	1.29	0.20	12.22	0.58	16,589,240	16,464
Gender												
Male	58.67	0.56	12.04	0.37	11.38	0.36	1.80	0.15	16.11	0.42	40,089,095	33,103
Female	69.26	0.49	10.47	0.33	7.15	0.28	0.76	0.09	12.36	0.35	44,722,491	47,558
Age (Years)												
18–24	55.92	1.03	13.21	0.70	9.67	0.61	1.05	0.21	20.15	0.83	12,050,968	8,640
25-44	64.61	0.50	11.39	0.33	9.33	0.30	1.33	0.12	13.34	0.36	47,056,921	45,350
45–64	67.77	0.69	10.07	0.44	8.69	0.41	1.22	0.16	12.25	0.48	23,906,035	24,670
65+	64.12	2.57	8.35	1.48	6.91	1.36	1.07	0.55	19.55	2.12	1,797,662	2,001
Race/Ethnicity												
Non-Hispanic White	64.45	0.43	11.13	0.28	9.13	0.26	1.27	0.10	14.03	0.31	63,934,697	65,231
Hispanic	61.13	1.76	10.78	1.12	9.48	1.06	1.23	0.40	17.39	1.37	7,318,120	5,153
African-American	64.59	1.1	12.96	0.78	9.45	0.68	1.23	0.26	11.76	0.75	9,737,977	7,135
Asian/Pacific Island	67.72	1.89	8.70	1.14	7.62	1.07	1.07	0.42	14.89	1.44	3,218,613	2,461
Native American	57.65	4.62	10.33	2.85	10.70	2.89	1.48	1.13	19.84	3.73	602,179	681
Education (Years)												
<12 Years	46.29	1.37	15.41	0.99	12.17	0.90	1.60	0.34	24.53	1.18	6,836,863	5,800
12 Years	55.81	0.68	13.19	0.47	11.15	0.43	1.75	0.18	18.11	0.53	27,250,901	26,273
13-15 Years	65.88	0.67	10.89	0.44	9.00	0.41	1.17	0.15	13.06	0.48	25,668,947	24,387
16+ Years	76.68	0.61	8.24	0.39	6.30	0.35	0.71	0.12	8.07	0.39	25,054,875	24,201

Table 3-1 (continued)

				Level of V	Level of Workplace Smoking Policy	Smoking	Policy				Population	Sample
	Smoke Free	Free	Strong	ng	Moderate	ate	Weak	<b>×</b>	None	<u> </u>	Size	Size
Nation (continued)	%	CI	%	CI	%	C	%	C	%	C	(N)	(n)
Household Income (Dollars)	ollars)											
< 10,000	51.97	1.63	13.24	1.1	10.87	1.02	1.31	0.37	22.60	1.37	4,823,326	4,340
10,000–19,999	54.78	1.14	13.67	0.78	10.49	0.70	1.44	0.27	19.62	0.91	9,862,918	9,163
20,000–29,999	59.56	0.99	12.42	99.0	9.53	0.59	1.58	0.25	16.92	0.76	12,674,069	12,132
30,000-49,999	63.87	0.73	11.82	0.49	9.63	0.45	1.27	0.17	13.41	0.52	22,523,682	22,058
50,000–74,999	69.31	0.80	10.08	0.52	8.63	0.49	1.15	0.18	10.83	0.54	17,084,119	16,512
+ 000 +	75.13	0.87	8.15	0.55	7.09	0.52	0.97	0.20	8.66	0.57	12,735,217	11,675
Unknown	63.45	1.53	10.29	96.0	8.74	0.90	1.05	0.32	16.47	1.18	5,108,254	4,781
State*												
Utah	84.21	2.21	4.31	1.23	3.17	1.06	0.42	0.39	7.88	1.63	631,295	1,193
Maryland	84.09	2.26	5.75	1.44	5.09	1.35	0.36	0.37	4.72	1.31	1,893,937	1,038
Vermont	79.22	2.72	5.65	1.55	6.51	1.65	0.59	0.51	8.03	1.82	206,509	947
California	76.88	1.12	6.82	0.67	4.98	0.58	0.70	0.22	10.61	0.82	9,258,735	5,376
District of Columbia	74.92	3.05	8.64	1.98	7.24	1.82	0.78	0.62	8.42	1.95	186,943	846
Washington	73.78	3.03	8.09	1.88	6.78	1.73	1.01	0.69	10.34	2.10	1,694,612	972
Maine	73.53	3.07	7.92	1.88	10.07	5.09	0.85	0.64	7.64	1.85	383,712	874
New Hampshire	73.51	3.08	9.67	5.06	5.34	1.57	1.37	0.81	10.10	2.10	391,078	845
Colorado	72.01	2.80	9.58	1.83	6.33	1.52	0.45	0.42	11.64	2.00	1,313,603	1,312
Massachusetts	71.56	1.82	8.38	1.12	7.67	1.07	0.58	0.31	11.82	1.30	2,117,572	2,340
Idaho	71.11	2.93	5.95	1.53	8.89	1.84	0.80	0.58	13.25	2.19	344,273	1,102
Rhode Island	70.92	3.12	7.92	1.86	6.46	1.69	1.07	0.71	13.63	2.36	326,789	786
Alaska	69.92	2.97	7.81	1.74	8.90	1.85	1.02	0.65	12.35	2.13	183,542	801
New Jersey	68.51	1.71	8.44	1.02	8.23	1.01	1.04	0.37	13.77	1.27	2,707,634	2,741
Minnesota	68.18	2.82	11.01	1.89	8.59	1.70	0.62	0.48	11.59	1.94	1,714,920	1,440
Connecticut	67.78	3.20	10.76	2.12	8.57	1.91	99.0	0.56	12.23	2.24	1,122,583	825
Oregon	67.46	3.17	11.94	2.19	9.14	1.95	0.62	0.53	10.84	2.10	1,001,932	965
Delaware	67.33	3.18	8.68	1.91	8.46	1.89	0.89	0.64	14.64	2.40	234,877	826
Florida	66.79	1.58	9.12	0.97	8.07	0.92	0.76	0.29	15.26	1.21	4,181,997	3,177
Arizona	66.13	3.01	8.73	1.80	9.03	1.82	0.84	0.58	15.26	2.29	1,284,546	1,174

Table 3-1 (continued)

				Level of	Level of Workplace Smoking Policy	Smoking	Policy				Population	Sample
	Smoke Free	Free	Strong	ng	Moderate	ate	Weak	¥	None	je j	Size	Size
State*	%	S	%	5	%	<sub>C</sub>	%	<u></u>	%	ō	(N)	(n)
New Mexico	65.73	3.33	10.29	2.13	9.59	2.06	0.86	0.65	13.54	2.40	418,678	913
Texas	65.56	1.60	10.43	1.03	8.26	0.93	1.48	0.41	14.26	1.18	5,815,729	3,643
New York	65.14	1.33	9.32	0.81	10.09	0.84	96.0	0.27	14.45	0.98	5,521,615	4,578
Nebraska	63.90	2.92	9.70	1.80	10.46	1.86	0.81	0.54	15.13	2.18	571,872	1,276
Kansas	63.53	3.09	9.76	1.90	11.00	2.01	1.54	0.79	14.17	2.24	862,573	1,218
Virginia	63.09	2.82	12.74	1.95	9.37	1.71	1.22	0.64	13.59	2.01	2,297,995	1,408
South Dakota	62.68	3.04	10.73	1.94	9.26	1.85	0.83	0.57	16.20	2.35	221,591	1,220
Iowa	62.55	3.06	12.27	2.07	8.86	1.79	1.20	69.0	15.12	2.26	967,618	1,208
Wisconsin	62.24	2.87	12.34	1.94	9.49	1.73	0.90	0.56	15.03	2.11	1,972,344	1,521
Hawaii	61.89	3.50	15.34	2.60	12.34	2.37	1.04	0.73	9.39	2.10	346,498	640
Wyoming	61.47	3.55	7.95	1.98	10.99	2.28	1.01	0.73	18.59	2.84	135,107	1,009
Illinois	61.26	1.71	13.59	1.20	10.57	1.08	1.47	0.42	13.11	1.19	4,047,530	3,523
North Dakota	61.22	3.32	7.10	1.75	8.86	1.94	1.36	0.79	21.46	2.80	188,307	1,119
Pennsylvania	60.38	1.72	12.34	1.16	11.07	1.10	1.35	0.41	14.85	1.25	3,835,329	3,640
West Virginia	59.82	3.45	12.95	2.36	11.35	2.23	1.31	0.80	14.57	2.48	457,077	925
South Carolina	59.15	3.08	16.08	2.30	9.74	1.86	1.09	0.65	13.93	2.17	1,257,513	922
Montana	58.90	3.44	9.54	5.06	8.59	1.96	1.63	0.89	21.34	2.87	231,352	1,029
Missouri	58.90	3.04	15.15	2.22	10.85	1.92	1.24	69.0	13.86	2.14	1,911,829	1,178
Oklahoma	58.46	3.21	10.90	2.03	12.78	2.17	1.55	0.80	16.31	2.41	982,605	1,248
Ohio	57.07	1.75	13.79	1.22	10.57	1.09	2.15	0.51	16.41	1.31	3,838,168	3,526
Georgia	57.07	2.81	15.22	2.04	10.37	1.73	0.85	0.52	16.49	2.11	2,492,669	1,401
Louisiana	56.89	3.35	10.77	2.10	10.54	2.08	1.57	0.84	20.24	2.72	1,191,607	844
Alabama	55.73	3.31	14.44	2.34	12.86	2.23	1.69	98.0	15.27	2.40	1,285,003	1,057
North Carolina	55.15	2.08	15.57	1.51	12.16	1.36	1.73	0.54	15.38	1.51	2,449,839	2,779
Mississippi	54.95	3.32	11.26	2.11	7.89	1.80	1.40	0.78	24.52	2.87	796,440	902

Table 3-1 (continued)

				Level of	f Workplace	3 Smoking	1 Policy				Population	Sample
	Smoke Free	Free	Strong	ng	Moderate	rate	Weal	¥	None	<u> </u>	Size	Size
State*	%	రె	%	ర	%	రె	%	రె	%	ច	(N)	(n)
Tennessee	54.08	3.10	16.02	2.28	9.50	1.83	2.05	0.88	18.36	2.41	1,738,759	666
Michigan	53.67	1.81	14.16	1.27	12.55	1.20	2.37	0.55	17.24	1.37	3,276,689	3,294
Indiana	51.44	3.05	15.89	2.23	11.45	1.94	2.86	1.02	18.36	2.36	2,064,806	1,182
Kentucky	49.69	3.33	16.54	2.47	10.59	2.05	2.05	0.94	21.12	2.72	1,138,267	928
Arkansas	48.47	3.25	18.05	2.50	12.34	2.14	2.63	1.04	18.52	2.53	791,438	1,046
Nevada	40.91	3.12	21.04	2.59	17.63	2.42	4.11	1.26	16.31	2.34	523,649	902

\* Listed in descending order of smoke-free status. Note: CI = 95% confidence interval. Source: 1995/96 Current Population Survey.

they smoke per day or may shift from smoking daily to smoking occasional ly, and smokers who work in smoke-free evvironments may make more quit attempts or may be more successful in those quit attempts. Improvement in cessation may be an indirect benefit of the current trend toward smoke-free workplaces.

CHANGES IN SMOKING BEHAVIOR WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF SMOKING RESTRICTIONS Brownson *et al.* (1997) recently reviewed much of the existing evidence on policies to reduce ETS exposure, and this chapter will update that evidence and add analyses conducted using data from the Current

Population Surveys (CPS) and the California Tobacco Surveys (CTS). Changes in workplace smoking rules are often highly visible and are sometimes among the most contested shifts in workplace norms. Employers commonly make substantial efforts to inform and involve their workers as part of the introduction of these changes, and cessation assistance is fre quently made available to smoking workers at the time that the changes in workplace rules are implemented. When the smoking behaviors of workers are followed before and after the implementation of workplace restrictions, many, but not all, studies have demonstrated a fall in smoking prevalence and increased cessation rates (Brownson et al., 1997). Many of the workplaces examined have been in health care settings (Table 3-2), but similar observations are evident in other settings as well (Table 3-3). These experi ences would suggest that the implementation of smoking restrictions in the workplace can trigger smoking cessation attempts among the smokers who work there, particularly if cessation assistance is a prominent part of the implementation process.

A similar picture emerges for changes in the number of cigarettes smoked per day following the implementation of restrictions on smoking in the workplace (Tables 3-2 and 3-3). Modest declines in the number of ciga rettes smoked per day are evident following implementation of workplace smoking restrictions in most of the locations where it has been examined.

Effects of Working in Smoke-free Workplaces on Smoking Behavior Changes in smoking behavior are to be expected when there is a change in workplace restrictions on smoking due to the accompanying shift in workplace norms and

the provision of cessation assistance. However, it is reasonable to expect that there may be longer term effects on smoking behavior as well. Smokers may smoke fewer cigarettes per day if smoking is prohibited in work loca tions, smokers may make more attempts to quit due to a shift in the social norms about smoking, and smokers who do attempt to quit may be more successful because they are less likely to relapse in workplaces that do not allow smoking.

Number of Cigarettes Smoked per Day Multiple studies presented in Tables 3-2 and 3-3 observed reductions in number of cigarettes smoked per day that

persisted for 12-18 months following implementation of a change in smok ing policy. One study found a decline after 6 months, with a return to prior levels of consumption after 18 months (Hudzinski and Sirois, 1994). Emont *et al.* (1992) demonstrated a nonsignificant, but suggestive, relationship between level of smoking restriction from state clean-indoor-air laws and number of cigarettes smoked per day using data from the 1989 CPS.

 Table 3-2

 Impact of Smoke-Free Worksites on Cigarette Consumption and Prevalence: Health Care Worksites

Author	Location	Change in Consumption	Change in Prevalence
Andrews, 1983	Hospital	NA	-8.5% at 20-month follow-up
Rosenstock, 1986	НМО	-2.0 cigarettes/day at 4-month follow-up	No significant change
Biener, 1989	Hospital	-3.9 cigarettes/day at work at 12-month follow-up	No significant change
Becker, 1989	Children's hospital	No change at 6-month follow-up	-1.2% at 6-month follow-up
Hudzinski, 1990	Hospital	25% of smokers no longer smoked at work at 12-month follow-up	NA
Mullooly, 1990	НМО	-1.4 cigarettes/day at work No effect on total daily consumption	No change
CDC, 1990	Psychiatric hospital	<ul><li>-3.5 cigarettes/day at work at 13-month follow-up;</li><li>-1.8 cigarettes/day over 24 hours</li></ul>	-4.0% at 13-month follow-up
Stillman, 1990	Hospital	-3.3 cigarettes/day at 6-month follow-up	-5.5% at 6-month follow-up
Baile, 1991	Hospital	40% of smokers reduced consumption at 4-month follow-up	-1.5 % at 4-month follow-up
Stave, 1991	Medical center	-4.5 cigarettes/day at 9-month follow-up	22.5% of smokers quit at 9-month follow-up
Daughton, 1992	Hospital	-3.1 cigarettes/day at work at 12-month follow-up	No increase in quit rate
Goldstein, 1992	Hospital	57% of smokers reported cutting down	9% of smokers stated that they quit because of the ban
Offard, 1992	Hospital	NA	-2.9% at 30-month follow-up
Hudzinski, 1994	Hospital	Smokers made significant reductions in cigarettes/day at 6 months but returned to prior levels at 18 months	NA
Longo, 1996	Representative sample of hospital employees	-1.1 cigarettes/day	Quit ratio different between intervention and comparison 13% at 60 months

 Table 3-3

 Impact of Smoke-Free Worksites on Cigarette Consumption and Prevalence: Other Worksites

	Location/		
Author	Study Population	Change in Consumption	Change in Prevalence
Petersen, 1988	Insurance co.	-5.6 cigarettes/day at follow-up	-1.6% at 12-month follow-up
Scott, 1989	Insurance co.	22.5% of smokers decreased consumption at 7-month follow-up	-5.1% at 7-month follow-up
Gottlieb, 1990	Government agency	-12% reduction in consumption of 15 or more cigarettes/day	-3.4% at 6 months
Borland, 1990	Public service	-7.9 cigarettes/day in smokers of 25 or more cigarettes/day at 6-month follow-up	-1.0% at 6-month follow-up
Sorensen, 1991	Telephone co.	NA	21% of smokers quit at 20-month follow-up
Borland, 1991	Telecommunications co.	-3.5 cigarettes/day at 18-month follow-up	-3.1% at 18-month follow-up
Brenner, 1992	National random sample	<ul><li>-1.8 cigarettes/day in men,</li><li>-1.4 cigarettes/day in women</li></ul>	Quit ratio of 30%
Wakefield, 1992	Representative sample	-5 cigarettes/day on work days vs leisure days	NA
Phillip Morris, 1992	Cohort of 22,500-28,000 employed smokers in companies Product Opinion Lab database followed between 1987 and 1991	-11% cigarettes/day	Quitting rates: Total database 1.00 No restrictions 0.75 Designated 0.92 Smoke-free 1.84*
Woodruff, 1993	CA Population Survey	296 packs per year in smoke-free worksites vs 341 packs per year with no restrictions	Prevalence was 13.7% in smoke-free worksites vs 20.6% with no restrictions
Jeffery, 1994	Diverse workplaces	-1.2 cigarettes/ day	-2% at 24-months follow-up
Brenner, 1994	Cross-section of Telecommunications co.	20.5 cigarettes/day without restrictions to 13.2 cigarettes/day with ban	Prevalence lower in workplaces with restrictions

Continued	
0	2
7	1
C	
٥	2
Table	

	Location/		
Author	Study Population	Change in Consumption	Change in Prevalence
Etter, 1999	University Students and staff	Total cigarettes/day increased in intervention group from 11.4 to 11.7 (p 0.06) and in comparison group from 11.4 to 12.0 (p 0.002)	Increased among intervention group 24.7 % to 25.1 % (p 1.0)
		Cigarettes/day in university buildings increased from 5.5 to 5.7 among intervention group (p 0.14), but decreased from 5.5 to 5.0 among comparison group (p 0.11)	Decreased among comparison group 27.2 % to 26.7 % (p 0.80)

\*According to this document, the quit rate is based only on those smokers who returned questionnaires and should therefore be considered understated.

Analyses of data from a 5-year longitudinal follow-up of 8,271 employed adult smokers conducted as a part of the COMMIT trial exam ined the change in number of cigarettes smoked per day as reported by the same individuals in two surveys conducted 5 years apart (Glasgow *et al.*, 1997). Using multiple linear regression techniques, they demonstrated a sta tistically significant greater reduction in number of cigarettes smoked per day over the 5-year period among those who worked in workplaces where smoking was restricted to designated areas (OR = -1.17), and an even greater reduction for those who worked in workplaces where smoking was banned (OR = -2.78).

An internal tobacco industry study (Heironimus, 1992) of the effects of restrictions on smoking in the workplace using a tracking database of smok ers demonstrated that smokers who work in smoke-free environments con sumed 11-15 percent fewer cigarettes per day compared to smokers who work where there are no restrictions. Lesser restrictions, such as allowing smoking only in designated sections, had little effect on consumption.

Table 3-4 presents analyses of the 1992/93 and 1995/96 CPS for those who were daily cigarette smokers 1 year prior to the survey, currently smoked some days or every day, were age 25-64, and worked in an indoor environment. When smokers who worked in smoke-free workplaces are compared to those with lesser or no restrictions, there is a statistically sig nificant (p < 0.001) shift in the categorical distribution of cigarettes smoked per day toward smoking fewer cigarettes per day.

The CPS did not ask a question on the number of cigarettes smoked per day 1 year prior to the survey, and therefore these analyses are limited to examination of the cross-sectional distribution of current number of ciga rettes smoked per day in relation to workplace restrictions on smoking. As a result, the analyses in Table 3-4 cannot identify whether the difference in number of cigarettes smoked per day by smokers working under different workplace smoking restrictions is due to a reduction in number of cigarettes smoked per day produced by the workplace restriction or due to workplace restrictions being more difficult to implement where there are greater num bers of heavy smokers.

The 1990 and 1996 California Tobacco Surveys (CTS) recorded the num ber of cigarettes smoked per day both at the time of the survey and for 1 year prior to the survey. Table 3-5 compares the current number of ciga rettes smoked per day by those current cigarette smokers who work indoors with that reported for 1 year prior to the survey, and the results are stratified by the level of workplace restrictions on smoking. In the 1990 CTS, smokers who worked in workplaces with no restrictions on smoking were more likely to report smoking 25 or more cigarettes per day both at the time of the survey and for 12 months prior to the survey than were workers employed in workplaces where there were at least some restrictions. Workers who smoked 25 or more cigarettes per day 1 year prior to the survey were also significantly more likely to report reducing the number of cigarettes that they currently smoked if they worked in areas where smoking was banned than if they worked in areas where there were no restrictions.

Table 3-4
Percentage of Current Smokers who Smoke Various Numbers of Cigarettes per Day among Indoor Workers with Different Levels of Restriction on Smoking in the Workplace

Cigarettes			Level of Work	place Smoki	ng Restriction	ns
Smoked	Work Area:	Ban	Ban	Restricted	Restricted	No
per Day	Public Area:	Ban	No Ban	Ban	Restricted	Restrictions
1992/93 CPS*						
Occasional Sm	noking	3.91	2.85	3.40	2.15	2.25
1–4	_	2.95	1.97	2.16	0.49	1.76
5-14		28.20	21.49	18.11	16.16	17.84
15–24		48.75	53.21	48.37	40.66	48.75
25+		16.19	20.48	27.96	40.53	29.41
1995/96 CPS**						
Occasional Sm	noking	3.34	2.48	2.04	3.11	2.13
1–4	· ·	2.47	1.39	1.88	0.63	2.37
5–14		27.58	19.71	17.16	15.14	17.72
15-24		50.20	51.49	50.97	40.67	48.14
25+		16.41	24.93	27.95	40.45	29.64

<sup>\* 1992/93</sup> CPS. Chi-Square = 453.3; degrees of freedom = 16; probability < 0.001; N = 14,787; chi-square based on weighted sample normalized to sample size.

Note: Current smokers were also daily smokers 1 year prior to the survey and between ages 25 and 64 years.

We also used these CTS data to develop a logistic regression model of the effect of working in a workplace where smoking was restricted on the likelihood of current daily smokers having reduced the number of cigarettes they reported smoking per day during the period between 12 months prior to the survey and the time of the survey. Co-variates controlled for in the analyses were gender, age, race/ethnicity, education level, family income level, and number of cigarettes smoked per day 1 year prior to the survey. Current daily smokers who worked in areas where there were some smoking restrictions were more likely to have reduced the number of cigarettes smoked per day when compared to smokers who worked in areas where there were no restrictions (OR = 1.44, 95% CI = 1.06-1.96). The effect for current daily smokers working in areas where smoking was banned was even more robust (OR = 1.54, 95% CI = 1.10-2.16). Data for the 1996 CTS are also presented in Table 3-5, but the small number of smokers who work in areas that are not smoke-free (state law requires smoke-free workplaces in California) makes meaningful comparison difficult; however, there appears to be a similar trend in the 1996 CTS. These data suggest that the trend toward a reduction in number of cigarettes smoked per day among workers who work where smoking is restricted demonstrated for the CPS data is due to the effect of the smoking restrictions on smoking behavior, rather than being due to smoking restrictions being easier to implement in workplaces where there are fewer heavy smokers.

These data taken as a whole suggest that a smoke-free workplace policy results in a reduction in the number of cigarettes smoked per day by con tinuing smokers.

<sup>\*\*1995/96</sup> CPS. Chi-square\* = 386.8; degrees of freedom = 16; probability < 0.001; N = 12,669; chi-square based on weighted sample normalized to sample size.

110

Ban	Level of Cigs. Smoked Smoking Daily 1 Year Ban before Survey	% 5	# Cil	# Cigarettes Smoked per Day at Time of Survey  15–24  Cl  Cl  Cl  Cl  Cl  Cl  Cl  Cl  Cl  C	Smoked p	er Day at 5-	t Time of Si 5-14 Cl	, i	14 C	Population Size (N)	
Э	lotal 25+	29.73 88.30	3.94 3.05	45.40 8.56	3.72 2.76	20.33	4.04 2.05	4.54 0.38	2.78 0.62	533,544 163,554	
uo	15–24	4.36	2.00	90.88	5.69	4.62	1.92	0.14	0.28	239,644	
N	5–14	3.33	4.48	9.05	3.67	79.39	7.60	8.27	6.73	112,651	
	4			1.44	3.19					17,695	
	Total	24.09	3.08	49.86	3.51	22.93	2.89	3.12	1.37	507,500	
	25+	73.76	6.18	18.81	5.48	96.9	2.08	0.45	0.57	155,672	
шо — Э 9	15–24	3.07	1.83	88.78	3.17	7.58	2.52	0.57	0.67	241,848	
	5–14			8.54	3.79	90.00	3.83	1.46	2.25	96,295	
	4			6.02	12.37	3.86	8.10			13,685	
	Total	19.66	3.16	46.20	4.61	31.26	5.25	2.88	1.97	397,712	
	25+	76.31	6.20	18.04	5.85	5.39	3.13	0.26	0.50	91,684	
IΙΑ	15–24	4.01	2.98	85.85	5.98	9.84	4.56	0.30	0.48	190,605	
	5–14	0.26	0.52	2.66	2.36	95.98	2.98	1.09	1.33	104,350	
	14	2 75	60	7 13	15 12	7 21	000			11 073	

Table 3-5 (continued)

vel of	evel of Cigs. Smoked		; ;	# Cigarettes Smoked per Day at Time of Survey	moked p	er Day at	Time of S	urvey		Population	Sample
Smoking	y Daily 1 Year		25+	15	15–24		5-14		4	Size	Size
Ban	before Survey	%	ID	%	ວ	%	S	%	S	(N)	(n)
_	Total	29.60	7.25	41.21	7.38	27.41	7.96	1.79	2.76	84,289	173
ə	25+	84.88	12.31	13.89	12.15	1.23	2.45			27,575	61
uo	15–24	4.67	4.41	85.50	8.82	9.83	8.19			33,034	72
N	5–14			12.00	15.67	88.00	15.67			22,176	38
	4-1									1,505	α
	Total	20.30	09.9	39.56	9.63	36.36	10.60	3.78	4.43	69,664	144
	25+									15,616	37
աc 	15–24	4.18	90.3	75.49	12.84	16.09	11.59	4.25	8.42	31,231	70
_	5–14			5.80	08.9	94.20	08.9			20,851	34
	4-1									1,967	က
	Total	15.76	2.12	44.37	2.92	35.65	2.91	4.21	0.97	1,041,596	2,343
	25+	78.74	4.54	16.70	4.10	4.22	1.84	0.34	0.67	194,965	434
ΠA	15–24	1.88	0.77	84.88	2.48	12.69	2.31	0.56	0.45	486,926	1,165
	5–14	0.28	0.39	4.92	1.63	92.30	2.18	2.50	1.37	319,701	999
_	1–4	1.46	2.89	1.55	1.99	15.65	16.73	81.34	16.50	40,003	79

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval; "." = insufficent data. Source: 1990 and 1996 California Tobacco Surveys.

Table 3-6 Current Smoking Status among Indoor Workers with Different Levels of Restriction on Smoking in the Workplace, Age 18+

	Workplace		Percentage of	f Smokers		
	Restrictions	Daily	Occasional	Former	Never	
CTS 1996	100% Smoking Ban	12.21	5.23	22.09	58.47	
	Some Restrictions	14.76	5.68	23.61	54.09	
	No Restrictions	23.62	7.45	21.73	45.53	
CPS 1992/93	100% Smoking Ban	15.33	4.50	21.91	58.26	
	Some Restrictions	23.70	4.99	20.03	51.29	
	No Restrictions	25.85	4.99	19.10	50.06	
CPS 1995/96	100% Smoking Ban	15.97	4.02	20.31	59.70	
	Some Restrictions	25.17	4.83	19.05	50.95	
	No Restrictions	26.43	4.80	16.91	51.86	

Source: 1996 California Tobacco Survey; 1992/93 and 1995/96 Current Population Surveys.

## Cross-sectional data from California and the CPS demonstrate **CESSATION** that the prevalence of smoking is substantially lower among workers who are employed in smoke-free workplaces. However, the difference in current smoking prevalence across workplaces with different levels of smoking restrictions is largely due to a higher prevalence of never smokers rather 6). This would suggest that the difference in smoking prevalence may be

than former smokers in those workplaces with greater restrictions (Table 3due to smokers moving to workplaces where smoking was allowed or greater ease in successfully implementing smoke-free workplaces in sites where there are fewer smokers rather than an effect of smoking restrictions on cessation.

The effect of smoking restrictions on cessation has been examined directly, however, and an effect of restrictions on cessation has been demonstrated. Data from a 5-year longitudinal follow-up of 8,271 employed adult smokers conducted as a part of the COMMIT trial examined cessation attempts and cessation success reported by the same individuals in two sur veys conducted 5 years apart (Glasgow et al., 1997). Using multiple logistic regression techniques, they demonstrated a statistically significant 25 percent greater likelihood of making a cessation attempt over the 5-year period among those who worked in workplaces where smoking was banned, and workers in these workplaces had a 25 percent greater rate of having successfully quit during the 5-year period as well.

Emont et al. (1992) demonstrated a statistically significant relationship between the level of state clean-indoor-air laws and a higher fraction of ever smokers who were former smokers (quit ratio) using data from the 1989 CPS. An internal tobacco industry study (Heironimus, 1992) of a tracking database of smokers suggested that smokers in a smoke-free workplace quit at a rate that is 84 percent higher than smokers who work in locations where smoking is allowed. Lower levels of smoking restriction had much less effect on cessation.

Tables 3-7 and 3-8 present the results of multivariate logistic regression analyses of several measures of cessation (see Chapter 2) by level of workplace restriction of smoking for the 1992/93 CPS (Table 3-7) and the 1995/96 CPS (Table 3-8). The cessation measures are estimated for all those who were daily smokers 1 year prior to the survey, worked indoors, and were between ages 25 and 64 at the time of the survey. The results are controlled for age, gender, race/ethnicity, education and income levels, and number of cigarettes smoked per day. A term is also added to the regression that represents the average level of workplace restriction for the state in which the individual lives. This term is used to control for the influences of general environmental restrictions on smoking and of different social norms about smoking present in the environment. The intent is to remove these influences from an analysis of the effect of the specific level of restric tion present in the workplace where the individual is employed. The preva lence of each cessation measure by level of workplace restriction and by demographic characteristics of the population is included in Tables 3-9 and 3-10.

The 1992/93 CPS (Table 3-7) shows no relationship between working in a smoke-free environment and either making a cessation attempt or becoming an occasional smoker; however, there is a significant relationship between working in a smoke-free area and becoming a former smoker (OR = 1.18) or having been quit for 3 or more months (OR = 1.39). There is also a smaller, but statistically significant, effect of the average level of workplace smoking restriction present in the state on being a former smoker of 3+ months' duration, suggesting that there may be an effect of environmental norms about smoking as well as a direct effect of the level of restriction where the smoker works.

The 1995/96 CPS (Table 3-8) analyses show similar results, with the addition of small effects of a smoke-free workplace on cessation attempts and any cessation change. Similar effects are also noted for the average level of workplace restriction in the state as a measure of the general environ mental norms on smoking restrictions.

These data suggest that there is an effect of restricting smoking in the workplace on smoking cessation, with a small increase in the number of cessation attempts when a 100-percent ban on smoking is present in the workplace. The effect is not evident for lower levels of workplace restriction. There is no effect of smoking restrictions in the workplace on becoming an occasional smoker, but there is a modest effect of the average level of workplace restriction for the state on becoming an occasional smoker. This result suggests that the general environmental norms may be more important for becoming an occasional smoker, and that the effect of individual experience with workplace restrictions is on cessation. The principal effect of restricting smoking in the workplace appears to be an increase in the success rate of those smokers who are attempting to quit. The modest effect on cessation attempts, with a much larger effect on 3+ month cessation success, suggests that the effect of a smoke-free workplace may be to prevent

Table 3-7

Multivariate Logistic Regression Analyses of Measures of Cessation by Level of Workplace Restriction for Those who were Current Daily Smokers 1 Year prior to the Survey and who Worked Indoors, Age 25-64 Years, 1992/93 Current Population Survey

		•		,		`			•	
	Cessat	Cessation Activity	Cessation	Cessation Attempt	000	Occasional	Former	Former (any length)	Former	Former, 3+ Months
	Odds	•	SppO		SppO		Odds		odds	
	Ratio	95% CI	Ratio	95% CI	Ratio	95% CI	Ratio	95% CI	Ratio	95% CI
Worksite Level of Ban										
Lesser Restrictions	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
Total Work Ban	1.02	(0.95 - 1.09)	1.01	(0.94 - 1.09)	1.07	(0.88 - 1.29)	1.18	(1.04 - 1.33)	1.39	(1.20 - 1.62)
State % Total Ban*										
Same Ban Level	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
State Ban +5%	1.02	(1.00 - 1.03)	1.01	(0.99 - 1.03)	1.05	(0.99 - 1.10)	1.02	(0.99 - 1.06)	1.06	(1.01 - 1.10)
Gender										
Male	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
Female	1.00	(0.94 - 1.07)	0.98	(0.92 - 1.05)	1.35	(1.11 - 1.63)	1.05	(0.93 - 1.19)	1.16	(1.00 - 1.34)
Age (Years)										
25-44	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00					
45–64	0.80	(0.74 - 0.85)	0.80	(0.75 - 0.86)	0.76	(0.61 - 0.94)	1.02	(0.90 - 1.16)	1.01	(0.86 - 1.18)
Race/Ethnicity										
Non-Hispanic White	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
Hispanic	0.82	(96.0 - 69.0)	0.79	(0.67 - 0.94)	1.24	(0.81 - 1.90)	1.03	(0.76 - 1.38)	1.09	(0.76 - 1.57)
African-American	1.17	(1.05 - 1.31)	1.16	(1.03 - 1.30)	1.22	(0.91 - 1.63)	0.87	(0.70 - 1.08)	1.07	(0.83 - 1.39)
Other	0.84	(0.68 - 1.03)	0.84	(0.68 - 1.04)	0.91	(0.52 - 1.60)	0.73	(0.49 - 1.10)	0.76	(0.46 - 1.25)
Education (Years)										
< 12	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
12	1.36	(1.21 - 1.52)	1.33	(1.18 - 1.49)	1.74	(1.14 - 2.64)	1.57	(1.24 - 1.99)	1.32	(0.99 - 1.75)
13–15	1.64	(1.46 - 1.85)	1.59	(1.40 - 1.79)	2.36	(1.54 - 3.61)	1.70	(1.33 - 2.17)	1.48	(1.10 - 1.98)
16+	1.68	(1.46 - 1.92)	1.58	(1.38 - 1.82)	3.07	(1.95 - 4.82)	2.17	(1.67 - 2.82)	1.77	(1.29 - 2.43)
<del>-</del> -			5.	(20.1 - 00.1)	5	:	4.02)		. (0:1)	(20.7 - (0.1)

Table 3-7 (continued)

	Cessation A	ion Activity	Cessati	Sessation Attempt	000	Occasional	Former	Former (any length)	Former	3+ Months
	Odds		Odds		Odds		Odds		Odds	Odds
	Ratio	95% CI	Ratio	95% CI	Ratio	95% CI	Ratio	95% CI	Ratio	95% CI
Income (Dollars)										
<10,000	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
10,000–19,999	1.10	(0.95 - 1.27)	1.10	(0.95 - 1.28)	0.95	(0.61 - 1.48)	1.45	(1.05 - 2.00)	1.36	(0.91 - 2.02)
20,000–29,999	1.35	(1.17 - 1.56)	1.34	(1.16 - 1.56)	1.29	(0.84 - 1.97)	1.51	(1.10 - 2.08)	1.63	(1.10 - 2.40)
30,000-49,999	1.46	(1.27 - 1.67)	1.47	(1.27 - 1.69)	1.14	(0.75 - 1.73)	1.94	(1.44 - 2.63)	1.89	(1.30 - 2.75)
50,000–74,999	1.52	(1.31 - 1.76)	1.52	(1.30 - 1.77)	1.36	(0.87 - 2.10)	1.97	(1.44 - 2.71)	2.10	(1.42 - 3.11)
75,000+	1.82	(1.51 - 2.18)	1.81	(1.50 - 2.19)	1.45	(0.87 - 2.43)	2.06	(1.44 - 2.95)	2.38	(1.54 - 3.68)
Cigarettes Smoked	oer Day									
1-4	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
5–14 0.85	0.85		0.84	(0.68 - 1.04)	1.01	(0.62 - 1.65)	0.51	(0.38 - 0.70)	0.51	(0.35 - 0.76)
15–24	0.55		0.56	(0.45 - 0.69)	0.59	(0.36 - 0.96)	0.48	(0.35 - 0.64)	0.55	(0.38 - 0.80)
25+	0.47	(0.38 - 0.58)	0.48	(0.38 - 0.59)	0.54	(0.32 - 0.92)	69.0	(0.51 - 0.95)	0.86	(0.59 - 1.27)

\*Effect of a 5% difference between states of the average ban level for the state. Source: 1992/93 Current Population Survey.

Table 3-8

Multivariate Logistic Regression Analyses of Measures of Cessation by Level of Workplace Restriction for Those who were Current Daily (0.56 - 1.38) (0.54 - 1.10) (0.72 - 1.07)(1.10 - 1.63)(0.99 - 1.08)(0.64 - 0.93)(0.73 - 1.82)(0.78 - 1.58)(0.90 - 1.86)(1.06 - 2.31)Former, 3+ Months 95% CI Odds Ratio 1.34 1.03 1.00 1.00 0.88 0.77 1.16 1.11 1.30 1.56 1.00 1.00 1.00 Smokers 1 Year prior to the Survey and who Worked Indoors, Age 25-64 Years, 1995/96 Current Population Survey (0.56 - 1.00)(1.04 - 1.42)(1.01 - 1.08)(0.70 - 0.96)(9.69 - 69.0)(0.51 - 1.10)(0.71 - 1.52)(0.75 - 1.32)(0.98 - 1.75)(1.07 - 2.01)ormer (any length: 95% CI Odds Ratio 1.00 1.04 1.00 1.00 0.75 0.75 1.04 1.00 1.00 1.21 9. 0.81 (1.01 - 1.12)(0.89 - 1.39)(0.72 - 1.15)(0.97 - 2.41)(0.90 - 1.42)(0.70 - 1.66)(0.59 - 1.22)(0.45 - 1.42)(0.69 - 1.54)(1.13 - 2.52)95% CI Occasional Odds Ratio 1.00 1.13 1.06 1.00 1.00 0.91 1.08 0.85 1.03 1.69 1.53 9. 9. (1.00 - 1.18)(1.02 - 1.06)(0.82 - 0.96)(0.78 - 0.92)(0.65 - 0.94)(1.02 - 1.33)(0.94 - 1.21)(0.94 - 1.42)(1.19 - 1.57)(1.11 - 1.53)**Cessation Attempt** 95% CI Ratio Odds 1.09 1.00 0.78 1.00 1.04 1.00 1.07 1.16 1.17 1.36 1.00 (1.01 - 1.18)(1.02 - 1.06)(0.83 - 0.97)(0.78 - 0.92)(0.67 - 0.96)(0.92 - 1.19)(1.02 - 1.33)(1.23 - 1.61)(0.92 - 1.38)(1.14 - 1.56)**Cessation Activity** 95% CI Odds Ratio 1.09 1.00 1.04 0.90 1.00 0.85 0.80 1.05 1.00 1.17 1.40 Worksite Level of Ban Non-Hispanic White Lesser Restrictions State % Total Ban\* African-American Same Ban Level Education (Years) Total Work Ban State Ban +5% Race/Ethnicity Age (Years) Hispanic Female 45-64 13-15 25-44 Other Gender Male < 12 12

Table 3-8 (continued)

	Cessation A	ion Activity	Cessati	Cessation Attempt	000	Occasional	Former	ormer (any length)	Former	; 3+ Months
	Odds	ò	Odds	ì	Odds	ò	Odds	i di	Odds	Odds
	Катіо	32% CI	Катіо	32% CI	Катіо	95% CI	Катю	32% CI	Hatio	95% CI
Income (Dollars)										
<10,000	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
10,000–19,999	0.87	(0.74 - 1.04)	0.90	(0.75 - 1.07)	0.69	(0.43 - 1.11)	1.00	(0.68 - 1.48)	1.00	(0.62 - 1.61)
20,000–29,999	0.85	(0.72 - 1.00)	0.86	(0.73 - 1.02)	0.75	(0.47 - 1.18)	0.99	(0.68 - 1.44)	96.0	(0.60 - 1.53)
30,000–49,999	0.99	(0.85 - 1.16)	1.00	(0.85 - 1.18)	0.87	(0.57 - 1.33)	1.31	(0.92 - 1.88)	1.27	(0.82 - 1.97)
50,000-74,999	1.01	(0.85 - 1.20)	1.02	(0.86 - 1.22)	0.84	(0.53 - 1.33)	1.38	(0.95 - 2.01)	1.21	(0.76 - 1.92)
75,000+	1.03	(0.85 - 1.25)	1.06	(0.87 - 1.29)	0.74	(0.43 - 1.26)	1.82	(1.22 - 2.71)	1.85	(1.14 - 3.00)
Cigarettes smoked	oer day									
1–4	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
5–14	0.76		0.89	(0.70 - 1.14)	0.35	(0.24 - 0.52)	0.74	(0.49 - 1.12)	0.68	(0.42 - 1.11)
15–24	0.50		09.0	(0.47 - 0.76)	0.19	(0.13 - 0.28)	0.55	(0.37 - 0.83)	0.51	(0.31 - 0.82)
25+ 0.36	0.36	(0.28 - 0.45)	0.43	(0.34 - 0.55)	0.13	(0.08 - 0.21)	0.70	(0.46 - 1.08)	0.68	(0.41 - 1.12)

\*Effect of a 5% difference between states of the average ban level for the state. Source: 1995/96 Current Population Survey.

relapse after a cessation attempt rather than to increase the number of smokers who try to quit. It may well be that if you cannot smoke at work, it is more difficult to relapse at work.

SUMMARY There has been a dramatic increase in the fraction of the working population protected by total bans on smoking in the workplace, increasing from 3 percent in 1986 to 64 percent in 1996. These restrictions have two effects on smokers as they are implemented. They increase the rate at which smokers attempt to quit, and they reduce the number of cigarettes smoked per day. Once restrictions on smoking in the workplace have been successfully implemented, they continue to have the effect of reducing the num ber of cigarettes smoked per day, and they increase the success rate of smok ers who are attempting to quit. There may also be a small effect of increasing the frequency with which smokers attempt to quit.

THE FOLLOWING PAGES CONTAIN
TABLES 3-9 AND 3-10

Nation: Current Smoking Status among Indoor Worker Self-respondent Adults Who Were Daily Smokers 1 Year Ago, Age 25 and Older, 1992/93 Current Population Survey

				Curre	Current Smoking Status	ing Statu	S					
. –	Daily Smokers No Quit Attempts	okers	Daily Smokers w/Quit Attempts	nokers ttempts	Occasional Smokers	onal ers	Former Smokers <3 Months	mokers nths	Former Smokers 3+ Months	mokers	Population Size	Sample Size
Nation	%	ਠ	%	ᇹ	%	ರ	%	ರ	%	5	2	(u)
Total	61.29	0.93	27.96	0.86	2.88	0.32	2.84	0.32	5.04	0.42	12,575,808	16,041
Workplace Smoking Rules, listed as: Work Area Level Public Areas Level	Rules, list ublic Area	ed as:										
Ban [Ban]	58.93	1.54	28.62	1.42	3.50	0.58	2.63	0.50	6.33	0.76	4,661,981	5,916
Ban [No Ban]	63.48	2.04	27.01	1.89	2.61	0.68	2.82	0.70	4.08	0.84	2,537,189	3,303
Restrict [Ban]	58.66	2.22	31.06	2.09	3.12	0.78	2.92	0.76	4.24	0.91	2,250,384	2,832
Restrict [Restrict]	62.33	6.03	27.24	5.54	1.97	1.73	2.37	1.89	60.9	2.97	295,478	388
No Restricions	65.19	1.91	25.32	1.75	2.03	0.57	3.16	0.70	4.30	0.82	2,830,777	3,602
Age (Years)												
25-44	29.66	1.12	29.58	1.04	3.12	0.40	2.78	0.38	4.86	0.49	8,733,235	11,023
45–64	64.99	1.65	24.27	1.48	2.34	0.52	2.96	0.58	5.44	0.78	3,842,573	5,018
Race/Ethnicity												
Non-Hispanic White	61.76	1.02	27.37	0.93	2.76	0.34	2.99	0.36	5.13	0.46	10,463,533	13,965
Hispanic	64.58	5.86	24.74	5.29	3.21	2.16	2.65	1.97	4.83	2.62	565,382	492
African-American	55.52	3.08	34.31	2.95	3.71	1.17	1.84	0.83	4.63	1.30	1,216,283	1,145
Other	62.01	5.78	28.70	5.38	3.17	2.08	2.04	1.68	4.08	2.36	330,610	439
Education (Years)												
<12	71.82	2.46	22.26	2.28	1.38	0.64	1.36	0.63	3.19	96.0	1,526,453	1,883
12	62.98	1.37	27.14	1.26	2.38	0.43	2.88	0.47	4.61	0.59	5,691,190	7,428
13–15	57.22	1.78	31.02	1.67	3.50	99.0	2.78	0.59	5.48	0.82	3,527,323	4,522
16+	55.07	2.49	29.34	2.28	4.51	1.04	4.04	0.98	7.03	1.28	1,830,843	2,208
Cigarettes Smoked per Day	er Day											
1–4	49.66	2.97	32.67	2.60	4.77	2.54	4.80	2.55	8.10	3.26	321,024	360
5–14	52.61	1.97	35.41	1.88	4.46	0.81	3.06	0.68	4.46	0.81	2,948,752	3,594
15–24	63.13	1.30	27.46	1.20	2.46	0.42	2.46	0.42	4.49	0.56	6,321,567	8,258
25+	67.20	1.84	21.14	1.60	2.02	0.55	3.21	69.0	6.43	96.0	2,984,466	3,829

Table 3-9 (continued)

				Curr	Current Smoking Status	ring Statu	Sr					
. <del></del>	Daily Smoker	nokers \ttempts	Daily Smokers w/Quit Attempts	mokers	Occasiona Smokers	ional	Former Smokers <3 Months	mokers	Former Smokers 3+ Months	mokers	Population Size	Sample Size
Nation	%	ర	%	ᇹ	%	ਠ	%	ច	%	ਠ	(N)	(n)
Household Income (Dollars	ollars)											
<10,000	68.94	3.21	24.62	2.99	2.25	1.03	1.50	0.84	5.69	1.12	949,892	1,214
10,000–19,999	66.52	2.11	25.08	1.94	2.17	0.65	2.54	0.70	3.69	0.84	2,284,478	2,978
20,000–29,999	61.64	2.07	28.43	1.92	3.15	0.74	2.19	0.62	4.59	0.89	2,523,179	3,285
30,000–49,999	59.51	1.67	28.80	1.54	2.75	0.56	3.49	0.62	5.45	0.77	3,962,812	5,061
50,000–74,999	58.06	2.31	28.86	2.12	3.52	98.0	3.22	0.83	6.34	1.14	2,087,777	2,577
75,000 +	53.06	3.85	32.28	3.61	3.87	1.49	3.06	1.33	7.74	2.06	767,670	926
States												
Alabama	62.08	8.67	29.47	8.15	1.39	2.10	2.80	2.95	4.25	3.61	193,329	203
Alaska	64.03	7.61	28.50	7.15	3.02	2.71	0.94	1.53	3.51	2.92	27,314	206
Arizona	61.78	8.16	26.63	7.42	3.83	3.22	1.65	2.14	6.11	4.02	170,232	147
Arkansas	69.30	7.46	21.05	6:29	1.75	2.12	3.74	3.07	4.17	3.23	136,381	240
California	58.20	3.84	27.20	3.46	3.07	1.34	2.64	1.25	8.89	2.21	945,027	202
Colorado	61.06	8.53	24.42	7.51	4.75	3.72	2.28	2.61	7.49	4.60	169,028	190
Connecticut	60.82	8.15	27.31	7.44	0.41	1.07	5.01	3.64	6.45	4.10	191,794	181
District of Columbia	61.62	10.91	26.06	9.84	90.5	4.92	1.85	3.02	5.40	5.07	20,919	87
Delaware	71.31	7.32	18.37	6.26	2.61	2.58	2.22	2.38	5.50	3.69	40,213	141
Florida	63.44	3.84	28.55	3.60	2.33	1.20	1.70	1.03	3.98	1.56	639,167	646
Georgia	57.51	7.82	32.29	7.39	2.39	2.42	3.82	3.03	3.98	3.09	347,525	177
Hawaii	61.77	9.54	30.56	9.04	3.61	3.66	1.59	2.45	2.48	3.05	40,394	102
Idaho	60.25	8.08	27.00	7.33	4.48	3.42	2.01	2.32	6.25	4.00	47,008	200
Illinois	61.09	3.96	27.96	3.65	3.12	1.41	3.21	1.43	4.61	1.70	658,778	710
Indiana	65.78	7.08	24.36	6.40	0.83	1.35	4.76	3.18	4.27	3.02	353,669	240
lowa	60.72	7.47	28.79	6.92	3.02	2.62	2.98	2.60	4.49	3.17	158,397	284
Kansas	71.98	6.46	19.20	2.67	1.66	1.84	2.41	2.20	4.75	3.06	152,500	288
Kentucky	71.39	7.02	21.24	6.35	2.01	2.18	2.49	2.42	2.87	2.59	218,011	218
Louisiana	64.51	9.22	27.72	8.62	2.05	2.73	1.01	1.93	4.72	4.08	167,709	138
Maine	64.20	6.94	28.29	6.52	2.67	2.33	1.75	1.90	3.09	2.51	80,702	225

Table 3-9 (continued)

				Curre	Current Smoking Status	ing Statı	Sr					
	Daily Smokers No Quit Attempts	nokers \ttempts	Daily Smokers w/Quit Attempts	mokers	Occasiona Smokers	onal ers	Former Smokers <3 Months	mokers nths	Former Smokers 3+ Months	mokers nths	Population Size	Sample Size
State	%	5	%	ᄗ	%	5	%	5	%	5	(N)	(u)
Maryland	55.26	7.94	29.91	7.31	6.85	4.03	4.94	3.46	3.04	2.74	270,841	169
Massachusetts	55.21	4.14	31.99	3.89	2.75	1.36	4.06	1.64	5.99	1.98	316,111	602
Michigan	56.46	3.80	33.61	3.62	2.03	1.08	2.28	1.14	5.62	1.77	583,695	833
Minnesota	58.82	7.42	28.63	6.81	5.56	3.46	1.82	2.05	5.17	3.34	271,791	253
Mississippi	62.00	8.90	29.48	8.36	1.57	2.28	2.17	2.67	4.78	3.91	112,968	208
Missouri	62.41	7.55	25.98	6.84	3.61	2.91	3.62	2.91	4.38	3.19	304,815	242
Montana	70.42	8.07	18.30	6.83	2.95	2.99	3.46	3.23	4.87	3.81	36,596	221
North Carolina	67.05	3.45	24.37	3.15	2.57	1.16	3.03	1.26	2.99	1.25	416,294	812
North Dakota	58.18	8.48	31.22	7.96	5.40	3.88	2.97	2.92	2.24	2.54	27,882	211
Nebraska	58.13	7.94	33.21	7.58	1.21	1.76	2.10	2.31	5.35	3.62	74,191	232
Nevada	65.35	6.63	28.40	6.28	0.44	0.93	1.43	1.66	4.37	2.85	87,270	241
New Hampshire	63.68	8.32	24.06	7.40	4.09	3.43	2.95	2.93	5.21	3.85	61,072	135
New Jersey	60.71	4.29	28.26	3.96	2.05	1.25	2.38	1.34	6.61	2.18	349,012	545
New Mexico	67.94	8.72	23.31	7.90	2.90	3.14	1.33	2.14	4.52	3.88	57,657	139
New York	58.99	3.39	28.14	3.10	3.09	1.19	4.41	1.41	5.38	1.55	772,360	886
Ohio	61.82	3.64	27.69	3.35	2.91	1.26	1.90	1.02	2.67	1.73	669,072	870
Oklahoma	59.04	7.74	28.19	7.08	1.74	5.06	4.30	3.19	6.72	3.94	173,599	223
Oregon	61.03	8.92	30.72	8.44	3.28	3.26	1.53	2.25	3.43	3.33	133,926	166
Pennsylvania	59.35	3.99	29.93	3.72	2.90	1.36	2.16	1.18	2.66	1.87	618,303	739
Rhode Island	61.29	8.51	25.34	7.60	3.21	3.08	3.46	3.19	6.70	4.37	50,910	143
South Carolina	65.95	6.61	23.90	5.95	2.99	2.38	3.16	2.44	3.99	2.73	209,182	256
South Dakota	61.87	7.59	25.41	6.80	3.91	3.03	1.96	2.16	6.85	3.95	33,751	257
Tennessee	60.83	7.35	30.99	96.9	2.11	2.16	3.76	2.86	2.31	2.26	280,697	241
Texas	61.75	4.50	29.49	4.22	3.05	1.59	2.27	1.38	3.46	1.69	762,515	637
Utah	69.01	8.77	22.25	7.89	3.37	3.42	0.95	1.84	4.42	3.90	59,725	134

Table 3-9 (continued)

					Julielli Silloniily Status	שוט לווו	us					
	Daily Smokers	nokers	Daily Sr	nokers	Occasional	onal	Former S	ormer Smokers	Former Smoker	mokers	Population	Sample
	No Quit Attempt	ttempts	w/Quit A	ttempts	Smokers	ers	<3 Mo	<b>Months</b>	3+ Months	nths	Size	Size
State	%	C	%	C	%	Ö	%	Ö	%	5	2	(u)
Vermont	59.75	7.62	28.89	7.04	3.26	2.76	2.79	2.56	5.30	3.48	37,915	177
Virginia	62.94	6.57	27.19	6.05	2.36	2.06	3.17	2.38	4.34	2.77	371,310	268
Washington	56.37	8.16	29.79	7.52	3.83	3.16	3.12	2.86	6.88	4.16	246,885	176
West Virginia	73.80	7.45	19.33	69.9	2.79	2.79	0.84	1.54	3.23	3.00	93,929	210
Wisconsin	60.18	06.9	27.64	6.30	5.87	3.31	2.35	2.14	3.96	2.75	310,824	338
Wyoming	58.11	9.42	31.58	8.87	2.85	3.18	3.13	3.32	4.33	3.88	22,609	149

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval. \*Source: 1992/93 Current Population Survey.

Nation: Current Smoking Status among Indoor Worker Self-respondent Adults who were Daily Smokers 1 Year Ago, Age 25 and Older, 1995/96 Current Population Survey

				Curre	ent Smok	Current Smoking Status	s					
. ~	Daily Smokers No Quit Attempts	nokers	Daily Smokers w/Quit Attempts	nokers ttempts	Occasional Smokers	onal	Former Smokers <3 Months	mokers	Former Smokers 3+ Months	mokers	Population Size	Sample Size
Nation	%	రె	%	<u>5</u>	%	రె	%	5	%	రె	(N)	(n)
Total	67.5	6.0	24.2	8.0	2.7	0.3	2.0	0.3	3.6	0.4	13,184,031	13,422
Workplace Smoking Rules, listed as:	Rules, lis	ted as:										
Work Area Level [Public Areas Le	ublic Are	as Level										
Ban [Ban]	65.3	6.	25.2	1.2	3.1	0.5	2.1	9.4	4.2	0.5	7,200,542	7,392
Ban [No Ban]	20.8	2.4	22.7	2.2	2.4	8.0	9.1	0.7	5.6	8.0	1,786,388	1,779
Restrict [Ban]	0.89	2.6	24.1	2.4	1.9	8.0	5.6	6.0	3.4	1.0	1,679,520	1,720
Restrict [Restrict]	9.79	8.9	25.5	6.3	3.0	2.5	1.6	<del>6</del> .	2.3	2.2	245,711	239
No Restrictions	71.5	2.1	22.0	2.0	2.0	0.7	1.6	9.0	2.9	8.0	2,271,869	2,292
Age (Years)												
25-44	66.1	<del>-</del> -	25.2	1.0	2.8	4.0	2.2	9.4	3.7	0.5	8,884,812	8,931
45–64	70.4	1.6	22.0	4.1	2.4	0.5	1.7	9.4	3.5	9.0	4,299,219	4,491
Race/Ethnicity												
Non-Hispanic White	68.2	1.0	23.4	6.0	5.6	0.3	2.1	0.3	3.7	9.0	10,839,373	11,541
Hispanic	68.1	5.7	23.5	5.2	3.8	2.3	1.3	1.4	3.3	2.2	641,866	494
African-American	63.6	3.1	29.5	2.9	2.9	<del>[</del> -	1.5	8.0	2.8	<del>-</del> -	1,277,602	983
Other	60.5	5.4	29.9	5.1	2.5	1.7	2.1	1.6	2.0	2.4	425,189	404
Education (Years)												
<12	73.4	5.6	20.5	2.3	1.9	8.0	1.6	0.7	5.6	6.0	1,537,128	1,473
12	2.69	4.1	23.7	1.3	2.0	4.0	1.5	9.4	3.1	0.5	5,816,058	6,014
13–15	63.9	1.7	26.0	1.6	3.6	0.7	2.5	9.0	3.9	0.7	3,959,563	4,074
16+	63.6	2.5	24.8	2.3	3.4	1.0	2.7	6.0	5.4	1.2	1,871,281	1,861
Cigarettes Smoked per Day	er Day											
1-4	52.7	6.2	28.4	5.6	10.9	3.9	2.4	1.9	9.5	2.8	336,446	318
5–14	58.4	2.0	31.0	1.8	4.1	8.0	2.3	9.0	4.1	8.0	3,229,042	3,248
15–24	6.89	1.3	24.0	1.2	2.1	4.0	1.8	4.0	3.1	0.5	6,689,405	6,885
25+	76.1	1.8	16.6	1.6	4.	0.5	2.0	9.0	4.0	0.8	2,929,138	2,971

Table 3-10 (continued)

				Curre	ent Smo	Current Smoking Status	Sr					
. <del>-</del>	Daily Smoker No Quit Attemp	mokers Attempts	Daily S w/Quit A	Daily Smokers w/Quit Attempts	Occasional Smokers	ional	ō	mer Smokers	Former Smokers 3+ Months	mokers	Population Size	Sample Size
Nation	%	చ	%	ᇹ	%	రె	%	రె	%	రె	(N)	(n)
Household Income (Dollars	ollars)											
<10,000	0.79	3.6	25.9	3.3	3.0	1.3	4.1	6.0	2.7	1.2	890,140	922
10,000–19,999	69.7	2.3	23.8	2.1	2.3	0.7	1.5	9.0	2.8	0.8	2,035,953	2,100
20,000–29,999	70.2	2.0	22.9	1.9	2.5	0.7	1.6	9.0	2.8	0.7	2,563,182	2,637
30,000-49,999	6.99	1.7	24.4	1.5	2.8	9.0	2.1	0.5	3.9	0.7	4,117,727	4,253
50,000-74,999	65.5	2.2	25.0	2.0	3.0	9.0	2.7	0.7	3.8	6.0	2,394,938	2,394
75,000 +	64.5	3.2	23.9	2.8	2.7	1.1	2.7	1.1	6.2	1.6	1,182,091	1,116
State												
Alabama	67.4	8.3	28.3	8.0	1.8	2.3	1.2	1.9	1.3	2.0	182,677	161
Alaska	63.0	7.6	30.4	7.2	2.1	2.3	9.0	1.2	3.9	3.0	31,231	138
Arizona	63.0	7.8	25.9	7.1	2.9	2.7	5.6	3.7	2.7	5.6	197,215	197
Arkansas	75.2	6.4	20.2	5.9	1.9	2.0			2.7	2.4	153,177	207
California	62.4	4.0	26.4	3.6	4.0	1.6	2.4	1.3	4.9	1.8	964,676	289
Colorado	61.7	7.8	25.4	7.0	3.2	2.8	4.1	3.2	5.7	3.7	198,247	206
Connecticut	67.4	8.9	27.2	8.5	1.6	2.4	<del>-</del> -	2.0	2.7	3.1	144,552	108
District of Columbia	67.1	10.2	27.6	9.7	3.0	3.7	1.2	2.4	1.0	2.2	19,597	87
Delaware	70.0	7.5	18.8	6.4	4.4	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.3	2.9	40,305	149
Florida	68.4	3.9	23.3	3.5	2.4	1.3	2.0	1.2	3.9	1.6	672,955	539
Georgia	73.6	6.7	21.2	6.2			3.0	2.6	2.2	2.2	348,989	212
Hawaii	68.7	9.2	21.2	8.1	5.6	3.2	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.7	45,482	98
Idaho	64.9	8.1	22.2	7.1	2.0	3.7	2.5	5.6	5.4	3.8	50,023	165
Illinois	9.89	4.1	23.5	3.7	2.8	1.4	1.8	1.2	3.4	1.6	648,422	601
Indiana	75.3	5.9	19.4	5.4			0.8	1.3	4.4	2.8	405,977	248
Iowa	70.4	6.9	20.7	6.1	3.5	2.8	1.4	1.8	3.9	2.9	168,848	221
Kansas	75.6	6.5	18.5	5.9	1.8	2.0	1.5	1.9	2.5	2.4	154,920	228
Kentucky	69.2	7.0	25.5	9.9	1.3	1.7	1.	1.6	5.9	2.5	222,143	197
Louisiana	77.1	7.3	14.1	0.9	2.0	2.4	2.0	2.4	4.8	3.7	182,864	136
Maine	2.99	7.7	27.5	7.3	0.8	1.4	1.6	2.0	3.5	3.0	69,418	163

Table 3-10 (continued)

				Curr	Current Smoking Status	sing Statu	Sr					
	Daily S	Daily Smokers	Daily S	Daily Smokers	Occasional Smokers	ional	Former (	Former Smokers	Former §	Former Smokers 3+ Months	Population Size	Sample Size
State	%	ਠ	%	5	%	5	%	ច	%	5	(S)	(u)
Maryland	62.4	8.2	27.3	7.5	4.9	3.7	1.6	2.1	3.7	3.2	253,032	146
Massachusetts	55.9	5.3	32.7	5.0	3.2	1.9	3.2	1.9	2.0	2.3	302,728	350
Michigan	62.6	4.0	29.4	3.8	2.3	1.2	2.1	1.2	3.7	1.6	622,882	649
Minnesota	63.4	7.3	24.7	6.5	5.1	3.3	3.6	2.8	3.1	5.6	274,423	243
Mississippi	65.0	8.0	27.3	7.5	<del>-</del> :	1.8	3.2	2.9	3.3	3.0	126,519	151
Missouri	0.99	6.7	24.9	6.1	3.7	2.7	1.0	4.1	4.3	2.9	361,678	234
Montana	67.4	8.0	27.1	7.5	2.4	5.6	0.5	1.1	2.6	2.7	39,296	183
North Carolina	70.7	4.6	21.1	4.1	5.6	1.6	2.7	1.6	2.9	1.7	426,357	207
North Dakota	74.2	7.3	20.4	6.8	1.3	1.9	3.1	2.9	1.0	1.7	31,021	195
Nebraska	70.7	7.2	21.8	9.9	2.2	2.3	3.5	2.9	1.8	2.1	83,923	195
Nevada	0.79	7.0	25.6	6.5	3.9	2.9	1.1	1.6	2.4	2.3	95,940	171
New Hampshire	58.8	8.0	31.0	7.5	3.3	2.9	2.9	2.7	4.0	3.2	72,494	166
New Jersey	69.2	4.5	21.5	4.0	1.3	<del>-</del> -	4.0	6.	4.1	1.9	380,038	395
New Mexico	64.7	8.4	24.8	7.6	4.5	3.6	2.4	2.7	3.6	3.2	67,139	154
New York	64.5	3.7	25.8	3.3	3.1	1.3	1.6	1.0	5.0	1.7	742,585	644
Ohio	73.4	3.6	19.4	3.3	2.7	1.3	1.9	1.1	2.6	1.3	707,330	681
Oklahoma	68.5	7.0	24.8	6.5	4.1	3.0	1.8	2.0	0.8	 6.	181,739	238
Oregon	72.8	7.9	20.3	7.1	2.0	2.5			4.9	3.8	146,569	151
Pennsylvania	2.99	4.0	24.5	3.6	3.4	1.5	0.7	0.7	4.7	<del>.</del> 6	669,981	658
Rhode Island	61.5	7.9	31.2	7.5	1.6	2.0	2.3	2.4	3.4	2.9	59,114	145
South Carolina	77.0	6.1	17.2	5.4	2.1	2.1	1.7	1.8	2.1	2.0	237,363	182
South Dakota	62.1	7.5	26.3	8.9	5.1	3.4	5.6	2.5	3.9	3.0	36,583	210
Tennessee	72.5	6.4	21.0	5.8	2.7	2.3	1.0	1.4	2.9	2.4	327,339	204
Texas	67.3	4.1	25.7	3.9	5.6	4.1	1.8	1.2	5.6	1.4	847,183	226
Utah	68.3	9.1	21.2	8.0	5.9	4.6	4.1	2.3	3.2	3.4	60,579	120

Table 3-10 (continued)

				Curr	<b>Current Smoking Status</b>	ing Stat	ns					
	Daily Sr	Daily Smokers	Daily Si	aily Smokers	Occasional	onal	Former 5	Former Smokers	Former 5	Former Smokers	Population	Sample
	No Quit Attemp	Attempts	w/Quit A	ttempts	Smokers	ers	<3 Mc	<3 Months	3+ Mc	3+ Months	Size	Size
State	%	ਠ	%	ਠ	%	ច	%	ច	%	ច	(N)	(u)
Vermont	65.8	7.5	27.2	7.1	1.4	1.9	1.4	1.9	4.2	3.2	36,771	176
Virginia	69.5	8.9	22.8	6.2	1.6	9.	2.5	2.3	3.7	2.8	362,169	241
Washington	59.2	8.8	30.6	8.3	4.1	2.1	3.8	3.4	2.0	3.9	248,779	152
West Virginia	70.8	7.4	21.9	6.8	3.3	2.9	<del>-</del> -	1.7	2.9	2.7	84,774	185
Wisconsin	65.5	6.5	26.7	0.9	3.6	5.6	1.0	1.3	3.3	2.4	370,648	299
Wyoming	71.2	9.7	21.0	6.9	1.9	2.3	1.0	1.7	4.8	3.6	25,339	203

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval; "." = insufficient data. \*Source: 1995/96 Current Population Survey.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, J.L., Jr. Reducing smoking in the hospital. An effective model program. Chest 84:206–209, 1983.
- Baile, W.F., Gilbertini, M., Ulschak, F., Snow-Antle, S., Hann, D. Impact of a hospital smoking ban: changes in tobacco use and employee attitudes. *Addictive Behavior* 16:419–426, 1991.
- Becker, D.M., Conner, H.F., Waranch, R., Stillman, F., Pennington, L., et al. The impact of a total ban on smoking in the Johns Hopkins Children's Center. Journal of the American Medical Association 262:799–802, 1989.
- Biener, L., Abrams, D.B., Follick, M.J., Dean, L. A comparative evaluation of a restrictive smoking policy in a general hospital. *American Journal of Public Health* 79:192–195, 1989.
- Borland, R., Chapman, S., Owen, N., Hill, D. Effects of workplace smoking bans on cigarette con sumption. American Journal of Public Health 80:178–180, 1990.
- Borland, R., Owen, N., Hocking, B. Changes in smoking behavior after a total workplace smok ing ban. *Australian Journal of Public Health* 15(2):130–134, 1991.
- Brenner, H., Fleischle, B. Smoking regulations at the workplace and smoking behavior: a study from southern Germany. *Preventive Medicine* 23(2):230–234, 1994.
- Brenner, H., Mielck, A. Smoking prohibition in the workplace and smoking cessation in the Federal Republic of Germany. *Preventive Medicine* 21:252–261, 1992.
- Brownson, R.C., Eriksen, M.P., Davis, R.M., Warner, K.E. Environmental tobacco smoke: health effects and policies to reduce exposure. *Annual Review of Public Health* 18:163–185, 1997.
- California Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. Health Effects of Exposure to Environmental Tobacco Smoke Final Report, September 1997.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Evaluation of an employee smoking policy—Pueblo, Colorado, 1989–90. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 39:673–676, 1990.
- Daughton D.M., Andrews, C.E., Orona, C.P., Patil, K.D., Rennard, S.I. Total indoor smoking ban and smoker behavior. *Preventive Medicine* 21:670–676, 1992.
- Emont, S.L., Choi, W.S., Novotny, T.E., Giovina, G.A. Clean indoor air legislation, taxation, and smok ing behavior in the United States: an ecological analysis. *Tobacco Control* 2:13–17, 1992.
- Etter, J.F., Ronchi, A., Perneger, T.V. Short-term impact of a university based smoke free cam paign. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 53:710-715, 1999.

- Gerlach, K., Shopland, D., Hartman, A., Gibson, J., Pechacek, T. Workplace smoking policies in the United States: results from a national survey of more than 100,000 workers. *Tobacco Control* 6(3):199–206, 1997.
- Glasgow, R.E., Cummings, K.M., Hyland, A. Relationship of worksite smoking policy to changes in employee tobacco use: findings from COMMIT. *Tobacco Control* 6(suppl 2):S44-48, 1997.
- Goldstein, A.O., Westbrook, W.R., Howell, R.E., Fischer, P.M. Hospital efforts in smoking con trol: remaining barriers and challenges. *Journal of Family Practice* 34(6):729–734, 1992.
- Gottlieb, N.H., Eriksen, M.P., Lovato, C.Y., Weinstein, R.P., Green, L.W. Impact of a restric tive work site smoking policy on smoking behav ior, attitudes, and norms. *Journal of Occupational Medicine* 32(1):16–23, 1990.
- Heironimus, J. *Impact of Workplace Restrictions on Consumption and Incidence*. Inter-Office Correspondence. Philip Morris Document #2045447779. www.pmdocs.com Jan 21, 1992.
- Hudzinski, L.G., Frohlich, E.D. One-year longitudi nal study of a no-smoking policy in a medical institution. *Chest* 97:1198–1202, 1990.
- Hudzinski, L.G., Sirois, P.A. Changes in smoking behavior and body weight after implementation of a no-smoking policy in the workplace. Southern Medical Journal 87(3):322–327, 1994.
- Jeffery, R.W., Kelder, S.H., Forster, J.L., French, S.A., Lando, H.A., Baxter, J.E. Restrictive smoking policies in the workplace: effects on smoking prevalence and cigarette consumption. *Preventive Medicine* 23:78–82, 1994.
- Longo, D.R., Brownson, R.C., Johnson, J.C., Hewett, J.E., Kruse, R.L., Novotny, T.E., Logan, R.A. Hospital smoking bans and employee smoking behavior: results of a national survey. *Journal of American Medical Association* 275:1252–1257,1996.
- Mullooly, J.P., Schuman, K.L., Steents, V.J., Glasgow, R.E., Vogt, T.M. Smoking behavior and attitudes of employees of a large HMO before and after a work site ban on cigarette smoking. *Public Health Reports* 105(6):623-628, 1990.
- National Cancer Institute. *Major Local Smoking Ordinances in the United States. Smoking and Tobacco control Monograph 3.* Pertschuk M., Shopland D.R. (editors). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service. National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute. NIH Publication No. 93-3532, 1993.

- National Research Council. Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology, Committee on Passive Smoking. Environmental Tobacco Smoke. Measuring Exposures and Assessing Health Effects. Washington, DC: Natl. Acad. Press, 1986.
- Offard, K.P., Hurt, R.D., Berge, K.G., Frusti, D.K., Schmidt, L. Effects of the implementation of a smoke-free policy in a medical center. *Chest* 102:1531–1536, 1992.
- Petersen, L.R., Helgerson, S.D., Gibbons, C.M., Calhoun, C.R., Ciacco, K.H., Pitchford, K.C. Employee smoking behavior changes and atti tudes following a restrictive policy on worksite smoking in a large company. *Public Health Representative* 103(2):115–120, 1988.
- Phillip Morris Tobacco Company. *Impact of workplace restrictions on consumption and incidence*. Phillip Morris, U.S.A. Interoffice Correspondence from John Heironimus to Louis Suwarna, January 21, 1992a. 28 pp. http://www.pmdocs.com/
- Phillip Morris Tobacco Company. *Progression of work-place restrictions—POL database*. Phillip Morris, U.S.A. Interoffice Correspondence from John Heironimus to Dave Beran, February 26, 1992b. 8 pp. <a href="http://www.pmdocs.com/">http://www.pmdocs.com/</a>
- Rosenstock, I.M., Stergachis, A., Heaney, C. Evaluation of smoking prohibition policy in a health maintenance organization. *American Journal of Public Health* 76:1014–1015, 1986.
- Scott, C.J., Gerberich, S.G. Analysis of a smoking policy in the workplace. *American Association of Occupational Health Nurses Journal* 37(7):265–273, 1989.
- Sorensen, G., Rigotti, N.A., Rosen, A., Pinney, J., Prible, R. Effects of a workshop nonsmoking policy: evidence for increased cessation. *American Journal of Public Health* 81:202–204, 1991.
- Stave, G.M., Jackson, G.W. Effect of a total work-site smoking ban on employee smoking and atti tudes. *Journal of Occupational Medicine* 33:884–890, 1991.
- Steinfeld, J.L. The Public's Responsibility: A bill of rights for the non-smoker. *Rhode Island Medical Journal* 55(4):124–126, 1972.
- Stillman, F.A., Becker, D.M., Swank, R.T., Hantula, D., Moses, H., Glantz, S., Waranch, H.R. Ending smoking at The Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions. *Journal of American Medical* Association 264:1565–1569, 1990.

- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *The Health Consequences of Smoking: Cancer.* U.S. Dept of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Office on Smoking and Health. DHHS Publication No (PHS) 82-50179, 1982.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *The Health Consequences of Smoking: Involuntary Smoking*. U.S. Dept of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Office on Smoking and Health. DHHS Publication No (PHS) 87-8398, 1986
- U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare. *The Health Consequences of Smoking*. A Report of the Surgeon General: 1972. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, DHEW Publication No. (HSM) 72-7516, 1972.
- U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare. The Health Consequences of Smoking: 1975. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Center for Disease Control, DHEW Publication No. (CDC) 77-8704, 1977.
- U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare. The Health Consequences of Smoking: a report of the Surgeon General. U.S. Dept of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Office on Smoking and Health. DHEW Publication No (PHS) 79-50066, 1979.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *Respiratory Health Effects of Passive Smoking: Lung Cancer and Other Disorders*. Washington, DC:
  EPA/600/6–90/006F, 1992.
- Wakefield, M.A., Wilson, D., Owen, N., Esterman, A., Roberts, L. Workplace smoking restrictions, occupational status, and reduced cigarette con sumption. *Journal of Occupational Medicine* 34:693–697, 1992.
- Woodruff, T.J., Rosbrook, B., Pierce, J., Glantz, S.A. Lower levels of cigarette consumption found in smoke-free workplaces in California. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 153:1485–1493, 1993.