

**SMOKING
POLICIES IN
LARGE
CORPORATIONS**

87705485

**SMOKING
POLICIES ^{IN}
LARGE
CORPORATIONS**

HUMAN
RESOURCES
POLICY
CORPORATION

1279 CASIANO ROAD
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90049

LEWIS C. SOLMON President

87705486

In late 1984, the Human Resources Policy Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif., surveyed 1100 of the nation's largest and fastest growing companies to determine the nature and extent of their workplace smoking policies. Results of this survey, completed in May 1985, challenge the widely reported trend toward restrictive workplace smoking policies in major corporations.

The Human Resources Policy Corporation sent an eight-page questionnaire to *Fortune* 1000 service and industrial companies, and to *Inc.* magazine's 100 fastest growing companies. Surveys were sent to the chief executive officer or the vice president for human resources.

The survey questioned respondents on the existence of corporate smoking policies and reasons for implementation. Results are based on responses from 445 companies. The 40 percent response rate is acceptable, given the sensitive nature of the data. The responses are representative of the full population when analyzed by region and industry type. Among the results:

Workplace smoking policies are not a trend among major companies.

Most respondents (63.8 percent) do not have a formal smoking policy, but rather encourage their employees to use common sense and courtesy to solve problems among themselves.

Companies in the north central region (28.1 percent) and the south (22.1 percent) are less likely to have a smoking policy than those in the west (44.7 percent).

Employees can work problems out for themselves.

Of the 63.8 percent of companies without smoking policies, 35 percent reported considering and rejecting one.

Of the companies that considered but rejected a smoking policy, most (59.3 percent) said they did not believe a policy would be accepted well by employees. When a smoking problem arises, 70.8 percent of all respondents said they encourage employees to work problems out for themselves. Fewer than one percent said the supervisor orders the employee to stop smoking.

Most workplace smoking policies that are in place apply only to certain employees.

The general company workplace policy prohibits some employees from smoking while working. This occurs most frequently with employees who deal with hazardous substances, sensitive machinery and equipment, or food. Few companies prohibit all employees from smoking while on company premises (2.5 percent) nor do they prohibit all employees from smoking while working (2.9 percent).

Most policies are initiated by management for safety reasons.

Virtually no companies reported implementing smoking policies to increase productivity or reduce costs.

The majority of workplace smoking policies have not been established because of increased public pressures or legislation.

Since public pressure for restrictive workplace smoking legislation has come about in the past three to five years, most company smoking policies cannot be attributed to this factor because most have been in effect for longer than five years.

Only nine percent of respondents said they had implemented a policy within the last year. Companies in the west (22.4 percent), followed by the northeast (10.4 percent) were most likely to have implemented policies within the past year. These regions of the country are facing the greatest number of legislative workplace restriction proposals.

Most companies do not consider smoking to be a factor in hiring.

Eighty-five point four percent of companies said they never consider whether a job applicant smokes and 81.1 percent never ask about an applicant's smoking habits. Only four percent always ask.

Ninety-nine point one percent said they hire smokers. Only four of the 445 respondents said they refused to hire smokers.

Companies do not want to segregate their workers or make major changes in the workplace.

Most (87.4 percent) do not assign employees to work areas or offices according to whether they smoke and 40.7 percent said they do not modify the work environment to accommodate nonsmokers.

87705487

Over the past several years there has been considerable debate over the need for legislation to restrict smoking in the workplace. Proponents of legislation claim a trend toward workplace smoking policies among major companies.

There is no trend. This comprehensive survey by the Human Resources Policy Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif., of the nation's largest and fastest growing companies reveals less than one-third have some form of smoking policy.

In most instances, the policy prohibits some employees from smoking while working with hazardous materials or sensitive equipment. These policies are generally accompanied by other safety regulations that are necessary because of the hazardous nature of the work. Most workplace smoking policies have been in effect for more than five years, long before employee smoking legislation came into vogue.

Companies are not instituting radical changes to accommodate nonsmokers. Few companies consider smoking behavior in their hiring practices and virtually no companies refuse to hire smokers.

Companies will provide adequate ventilation, post signs or even rearrange certain work areas to accommodate nonsmokers. But few are willing to construct new partitions or to segregate smokers from nonsmokers. Most companies simply encourage employees to work out problems among themselves.

Companies rarely consider cost savings, profit increases or employee morale when they consider a smoking policy. Policies usually are implemented by management because of safety factors. When companies reject smoking policies it is usually because of the difficulty of implementing a policy, the fact that employees would object, or the belief that any problems can be worked out among employees.

Companies in certain regions of the country, particularly the west, and in certain industries, usually where smoking may pose a safety hazard, are more likely than others to have a workplace smoking policy. However, most policies have simply formalized safety practices that have existed for years.

This survey clearly demonstrates that employers have and will continue to handle responsibly the issue of workplace smoking. State or local legislation concerning the issue is not needed. Employers place high confidence in the ability of their employees to work out any problems among themselves.

The Sample

In 1984, the Human Resources Policy Corporation of Los Angeles, Calif., surveyed the nation's largest and fastest growing companies to determine the nature and extent of their workplace smoking policies.

The large sample included *Fortune* 1000 service and industrial companies and *Inc.* magazine's 100 fastest growing companies. Chief executive officers or human resource vice presidents of each company received an eight-page questionnaire asking about the existence of corporate smoking policies and reasons for implementation.

Four hundred forty-five of the 1100 companies surveyed responded. This 40 percent response rate is acceptable given the sensitive nature of the data. If anything, companies having policies are likely to be overrepresented in the number of respondents, as they would be more likely to take time to complete the questionnaire. These responses are representative of the full population when analyzed by industry type (see *Table 1*).

Responses also are representative of industry by region (see *Table 2*). Overall, 17.1 percent of respondents are located in an area with workplace smoking legislation. Sixteen point nine percent of respondents are located in an area in which workplace smoking legislation is being considered.

Aims of the Study

In conducting the study, Human Resources Policy Corporation wanted to determine and understand formal smoking policies and other practices as they relate to employee smoking in large corporations. The study attempts to establish the extent and nature of smoking policies, what type of companies have them, why they were implemented, and how long they have been in effect. In addition, the study examines the relationship of smoking to company hiring practices, and how companies deal with smoking complaints.

The study tests several assumptions such as the "trend" toward workplace smoking restrictions and that smokers are finding it increasingly difficult to find employment. The results are presented in the hope that any corporate or public policy decision-making concerning smoking in the workplace will be based on factual information.

Research Director

Lewis C. Solmon, economist, dean of the graduate school of education at UCLA, and president of Human Resources Policy Corporation, developed and supervised the survey. Human Resources Policy Corporation is a social science and economic research organization. The survey was sponsored by The Tobacco Institute.

87705488

THE SURVEY IN DETAIL

Most companies do not have smoking policies.

Contrary to the widely reported trend toward restrictive workplace smoking policies, most companies (63.8 percent) do not have a formal policy. Companies least likely to have a smoking policy are those located in the south (22.1 percent) and north central region (28.1 percent). Not surprisingly, companies most likely to have policies are in areas where a workplace smoking law is in effect (59.2 percent) and in the west (44.7 percent).

Industries least likely to have a policy are mining (11.1 percent), metals (16.1 percent) and diversified services (18.5 percent). Industries most likely to have a policy are pharmaceuticals (57.1 percent), insurance (56.0 percent), and finance (51.5 percent). *See Table 3.*

Companies have considered and rejected smoking policies.

Twenty-four point three percent of all respondents said they have considered and rejected a workplace smoking policy. Respondents said they rejected policies because employees would not accept a policy (59.3 percent), because employees can handle problems on their own (58.3 percent), or because a policy would be too difficult to implement (38.9 percent). Nineteen point eight percent of respondents said they believed a smoking ban would decrease employee morale. *See Table 4.*

Policies are rejected most frequently in the north central region (28.1 percent) and the south (24.2 percent). Policies are rejected less frequently in the west (22.4 percent) and the northeast (21.5 percent). *See Table 5.*

Companies encourage employees to work problems out for themselves.

When a smoking problem arises, most companies (70.8 percent) encourage employees to work problems out for themselves with common courtesy. Virtually no respondents (.9 percent) said they order an employee to discontinue smoking. *See Table 6.*

Twenty-two point five percent of respondents said they will encourage an employee to reduce smoking when a complaint arises. Nine point seven percent said they do nothing when a complaint arises.

Most workplace smoking policies apply only to certain workers.

Virtually no companies (only 2.5 percent) prohibit all employees from smoking on the premises nor do they prohibit smoking while working (2.9 percent). Thirty-four point eight percent of respondents said they prohibit certain employees from smoking while working. *See Table 7.*

Fifteen point seven percent of respondents said they restrict smoking for employees holding certain jobs. Those most likely to be prohibited from smoking are those employees who work with dangerous substances, sensitive machinery and food.

Smoking is most frequently restricted or prohibited in areas where there are sensitive chemicals, supplies and equipment as well as in food processing areas.

Companies post signs, inform employees individually, or distribute a policy manual to let employees know about their policy.

Increased public pressure is not a factor in establishment of workplace smoking policies.

Only nine percent of respondents said a workplace smoking policy was initiated within the last year. Most companies (20 percent) responded that their policy has been in effect for over five years. Only 3.6 percent of the policies have been in effect for between three and five years. *See Table 8.*

Since public pressure for restrictive workplace smoking legislation has come about in the past three to five years, most company smoking policies cannot be attributed to this factor—most have been in effect for more than five years.

Workplace smoking policies are more likely attributed to the realities and dangers in the workplace that have existed for many years. This is demonstrated by the fact that industries most likely to have had a policy for over five years are food (48.3 percent), pharmaceuticals (35.7 percent) and chemicals (31.8 percent). And 39.9 percent of companies where there are hazardous materials or sensitive machinery have had smoking policies for over five years. *See Table 9.*

Companies located in an area with a workplace smoking law (29 percent) and the west (22.4 percent) are most likely to have implemented a policy within the last year. Industries most likely to have implemented a policy within the last year are insurance, finance and scientific equipment.

87705489

Workplace smoking policies are initiated by management.

Most workplace smoking policies were initiated by management (37.3 percent). Only 13.3 percent of respondents said the policy was initiated because of a state or local ordinance. See *Table 10*.

Virtually no companies implemented smoking policies to increase employee productivity or to reduce costs. See *Table 11*. Safety was the reason most often cited for initiating the policy (25.4 percent).

Most companies do not segregate smokers from nonsmokers.

Most companies (87.4 percent) do not assign employees to work areas or offices according to whether they smoke. See *Table 12*. Rearrangement of work areas to segregate smokers from nonsmokers is least likely in the south (16.8 percent) and north central regions (22.3 percent). It is most likely in areas where a workplace smoking law is in effect (53.9 percent) and in the west (40.8 percent).

Industries least likely to rearrange work areas to segregate smokers from nonsmokers (See *Table 13*) are food (10.3 percent), mining/petroleum refining (11.1 percent) and consumer goods (13.3 percent). Industries most likely to do so are insurance (48 percent), finance (38.2 percent) and scientific equipment (35.1 percent).

Companies do not want to make major changes in the workplace.

Forty point seven percent of respondents said they do not modify the workplace to accommodate smokers and nonsmokers. Companies in the south are least likely to modify the workplace. Companies in the west and in areas where a workplace smoking law is in effect are most likely to modify.

Industries least likely to modify are mining/petroleum refining, petrochemical and diversified services. Industries most likely to do so are pharmaceuticals, chemicals and insurance.

The most frequent modifications to accommodate nonsmokers are provision of adequate ventilation (40.4 percent), posting of signs (27.0 percent) and ventilation improvement (26.5 percent). The most unlikely changes are new partitions (4.3 percent) and separate offices for smokers and nonsmokers (4.0 percent).

Practically all companies hire smokers.

Contrary to anti-smoking literature, smokers are not finding it difficult to secure employment. Virtually all (99.1 percent) respondents said they hire smokers.

Only four (.9 percent) of the 445 respondents said they refuse to hire smokers (See *Table 14*). Even in the west, only 1.3 percent of respondents said they had such a policy.

Eighty-one point one percent of respondents never ask about a job applicant's smoking, while four percent said they always ask. Companies in utilities (90.5 percent), food (89.7 percent) and paper/publishing (89.5 percent) are least likely to ask (See *Table 15*). Even those industries most likely to question an applicant about smoking—pharmaceuticals, metals and transportation—did so only 14.3, 9.7 and 9.1 percent of the time, respectively.

Eighty-five point four percent of respondents said they never consider whether a job applicant smokes. Only 2.2 percent take smoking history into account. The retailing and transportation services industry (92.9 percent) is least likely to take this into account. The scientific equipment industry (8.1 percent), with its highly sensitive machinery, is most likely to take smoking into consideration.

Only 4.3 percent of respondents said they do not hire smokers for certain jobs. This is more likely to be the case in highly regulated companies where employees deal with sensitive machinery, hazardous substances and food. When dangers exist in the workplace, smoking is either regulated or smokers are precluded from those jobs altogether. Even those industries most likely not to hire smokers for certain jobs—diversified services, metals and utilities—did so only 11.1, 9.7 and 9.5 percent of the time, respectively.

Most companies do not assume the cost of smoking cessation programs.

Although 42.9 percent of respondents said they offer a smoking cessation program, only 29.0 percent of those companies assume the cost (See *Table 16*). Only 15.7 percent of respondents said they allow employees to participate on company time.

87705490

**TABLE 1
THE SAMPLE**

| | Sample Number | % Sample | Responses | % Responses |
|---|---------------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| Industry | | | | |
| Food | 79 | 7.1 | 29 | 6.9 |
| Food | | | | |
| Beverages | | | | |
| Chemicals | 52 | 4.3 | 22 | 4.5 |
| Mining/Petroleum | 68 | 5.9 | 27 | 5.9 |
| Petroleum Refining | | | | |
| Mining, Crude Oil Production | | | | |
| Metals | 64 | 4.7 | 31 | 5.6 |
| Metal Manufacturing | | | | |
| Metal Products | | | | |
| Consumer Goods | 75 | 6.4 | 30 | 6.6 |
| Electronics, Appliances | | | | |
| Musical Instruments, Toys | | | | |
| Apparel | | | | |
| Transportation Products | 93 | 7.0 | 44 | 8.1 |
| Shipbuilding, Railroads, Transportation | | | | |
| Motor Vehicles | | | | |
| Industrial Farm Equipment | | | | |
| Aerospace | | | | |
| Scientific Equipment | 73 | 5.1 | 37 | 6.4 |
| Office Equipment, Computers | | | | |
| Measurement, Scientific & Photo Equipment | | | | |
| Finance | 183 | 16.4 | 68 | 16.0 |
| Commercial Banks | | | | |
| Diversified Finance | | | | |
| Insurance | 49 | 3.4 | 25 | 4.3 |
| Diversified Services | 99 | 10.3 | 27 | 8.6 |
| Utilities | 51 | 4.3 | 21 | 4.5 |
| Petrochemical Products | 41 | 2.6 | 23 | 3.6 |
| Textiles, Vinyl Flooring | | | | |
| Rubber, Plastics | | | | |
| Glass, Concrete, Gypsum | | | | |
| Pharmaceuticals | 32 | 2.6 | 14 | 2.8 |
| Pharmaceuticals | | | | |
| Soaps, Cosmetics | | | | |
| Retailing | 46 | 4.6 | 14 | 4.0 |
| Transportation Services | 51 | 5.3 | 14 | 4.5 |
| Paper/Publishing | 52 | 4.7 | 19 | 4.5 |
| Publishing, Printing | | | | |
| Paper, Fiber, Wood | | | | |
| Region | | | | |
| Northeast | 378 | 31.0 | 138 | 33.0 |
| South | 259 | 20.9 | 93 | 22.6 |
| North Central | 322 | 31.0 | 138 | 28.1 |
| West | 186 | 17.1 | 76 | 16.2 |

87705491

**TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY REGION,
INDUSTRY AND EXISTENCE OF LAW**

| | Northeast | South | North Central | West |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------|---------------|------|
| Law In Effect | 15.6 | 5.3 | 18.0 | 32.9 |
| Law Being Discussed | 14.8 | 15.8 | 7.9 | 38.2 |
| Food | 27.6 | 20.7 | 44.8 | 6.9 |
| Chemicals | 36.4 | 36.4 | 22.7 | 4.5 |
| Mining/Petroleum | 22.2 | 51.9 | 14.8 | 11.1 |
| Metals | 38.7 | 12.9 | 38.7 | 9.7 |
| Consumer Goods | 30.0 | 20.0 | 26.7 | 23.3 |
| Transportation Products | 20.5 | 15.9 | 52.3 | 11.4 |
| Scientific Equipment | 35.1 | 8.1 | 18.9 | 37.8 |
| Finance | 36.8 | 20.6 | 22.1 | 20.6 |
| Insurance | 48.0 | 8.0 | 36.0 | 8.0 |
| Diversified Services | 18.5 | 25.9 | 25.9 | 29.6 |
| Utilities | 9.5 | 38.1 | 47.6 | 4.8 |
| Petrochemical Products | 43.5 | 26.1 | 26.1 | 4.3 |
| Pharmaceuticals | 64.3 | 0 | 21.4 | 14.3 |
| Retailing | 14.3 | 21.4 | 57.1 | 7.1 |
| Transportation Services | 0 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 42.9 |
| Paper | 26.3 | 15.8 | 26.3 | 31.6 |

**TABLE 3
EXISTENCE AND TYPE OF POLICY
(by industry)**

| | Food | Chemicals | Mining Petroleum Refining | Metals | Consumer Goods | Trans- portation Products | Scientific Equipment | Finance |
|-------------------------------------|------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Company Has Smoking Policy | 31.0 | 31.8 | 11.1 | 16.1 | 13.3 | 29.5 | 29.7 | 51.5 |
| No Smoking While Working For All | 6.9 | 9.1 | 7.4 | 0 | 3.3 | 0 | 2.7 | 1.5 |
| No Smoking While Working For Some | 37.9 | 31.8 | 11.1 | 25.8 | 23.3 | 38.6 | 43.2 | 41.2 |
| No Smoking On Premises For All | 3.4 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 0 | 3.3 | 0 | 5.4 | 1.5 |
| No Smoking On Premises For Some | 0 | 4.5 | 11.1 | 6.5 | 0 | 9.1 | 16.2 | 5.9 |
| Restrict Smoking By Job Description | 34.5 | 13.6 | 3.7 | 12.9 | 20.0 | 18.2 | 13.5 | 8.8 |
| Restrict Smoking For All | 27.6 | 27.3 | 22.2 | 9.7 | 10.0 | 22.7 | 32.4 | 42.6 |

| | Insurance | Diversified Services | Utilities | Petro- chemical Products | Pharma- ceuticals | Retailing | Trans- portation Services | Paper/ Publishing |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Company Has Smoking Policy | 56.0 | 18.5 | 28.6 | 34.8 | 57.1 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 42.1 |
| No Smoking While Working For All | 0 | 3.7 | 0 | 8.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.3 |
| No Smoking While Working For Some | 40.0 | 29.6 | 33.3 | 47.8 | 50.0 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 36.8 |
| No Smoking On Premises For All | 0 | 3.7 | 0 | 4.3 | 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 5.3 |
| No Smoking On Premises For Some | 4.0 | 7.4 | 14.3 | 17.4 | 0 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 5.3 |
| Restrict Smoking By Job Description | 8.0 | 14.8 | 19.0 | 21.7 | 28.6 | 21.4 | 14.3 | 15.8 |
| Restrict Smoking For All | 52.0 | 25.9 | 38.1 | 30.4 | 42.9 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 52.6 |

87705492

TABLE 3
EXISTENCE AND TYPE OF POLICY
 (by industry)

| | Food | Chemicals | Mining Petroleum Refining | Metals | Consumer Goods | Trans- portation Products | Scientific Equipment | Finance |
|-------------------------------------|------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Company Has Smoking Policy | 31.0 | 31.8 | 11.1 | 16.1 | 13.3 | 29.5 | 29.7 | 51.5 |
| No Smoking While Working For All | 6.9 | 9.1 | 7.4 | 0 | 3.3 | 0 | 2.7 | 1.5 |
| No Smoking While Working For Some | 37.9 | 31.8 | 11.1 | 25.8 | 23.3 | 38.6 | 43.2 | 41.2 |
| No Smoking On Premises For All | 3.4 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 0 | 3.3 | 0 | 5.4 | 1.5 |
| No Smoking On Premises For Some | 0 | 4.5 | 11.1 | 6.5 | 0 | 9.1 | 16.2 | 5.9 |
| Restrict Smoking By Job Description | 34.5 | 13.6 | 3.7 | 12.9 | 20.0 | 18.2 | 13.5 | 8.8 |
| Restrict Smoking For All | 27.6 | 27.3 | 22.2 | 9.7 | 10.0 | 22.7 | 32.4 | 42.6 |

| | Insurance | Diversified Services | Utilities | Petro- chemical Products | Pharma- ceuticals | Retailing | Trans- portation Services | Paper/ Publishing |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Company Has Smoking Policy | 56.0 | 18.5 | 28.6 | 34.8 | 57.1 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 42.1 |
| No Smoking While Working For All | 0 | 3.7 | 0 | 8.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.3 |
| No Smoking While Working For Some | 40.0 | 29.6 | 33.3 | 47.8 | 50.0 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 36.8 |
| No Smoking On Premises For All | 0 | 3.7 | 0 | 4.3 | 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 5.3 |
| No Smoking On Premises For Some | 4.0 | 7.4 | 14.3 | 17.4 | 0 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 5.3 |
| Restrict Smoking By Job Description | 8.0 | 14.8 | 19.0 | 21.7 | 28.6 | 21.4 | 14.3 | 15.8 |
| Restrict Smoking For All | 52.0 | 25.9 | 38.1 | 30.4 | 42.9 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 52.6 |

TABLE 4
WHY SMOKING POLICIES ARE REJECTED
 (overall percentage, by region, by workplace smoking law)

| | Overall | Region | | | | Workplace Smoking Law | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------|-------|------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------|
| | | North- east | South | North Central | West | In Effect | Being Discussed | Neither |
| Too Costly To Implement | 4.6 | 0 | 13.0 | 5.1 | 0 | 0 | 9.7 | 3.4 |
| Too Difficult To Implement | 38.9 | 31.0 | 47.8 | 51.3 | 11.8 | 26.3 | 45.2 | 39.7 |
| Not Accepted By Employees | 59.3 | 69.0 | 60.9 | 64.1 | 29.4 | 57.9 | 45.2 | 67.2 |
| Not Accepted By Clients | 10.2 | 13.8 | 8.7 | 12.8 | 0 | 15.8 | 0 | 13.8 |
| Employees Can Handle On Own | 58.3 | 65.5 | 65.2 | 43.6 | 70.6 | 42.1 | 51.6 | 67.2 |
| No Complaints About Smoking | 28.7 | 20.7 | 30.4 | 23.1 | 52.9 | 15.8 | 29.0 | 32.8 |

87705493

TABLE 5
REJECTION OF SMOKING POLICIES

(overall percentage, by region, by workplace smoking law)

| | Overall | Region | | | | Workplace Smoking Law | | |
|--|---------|------------|-------|---------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|
| | | North-east | South | North Central | West | In Effect | Being Discussed | Neither |
| Policy Considered For Company But Rejected | 24.3 | 21.5 | 24.2 | 28.1 | 22.4 | 25.0 | 41.3 | 19.7 |

TABLE 6
COMPLAINT PROCEDURES

(overall percentage, by region, by workplace smoking law)

| | Overall | Region | | | | Workplace Smoking Law | | |
|--|---------|------------|-------|---------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|
| | | North-east | South | North Central | West | In Effect | Being Discussed | Neither |
| Encourage Employees To Work Out Problems | 70.8 | 69.6 | 78.9 | 66.2 | 71.1 | 71.1 | 73.3 | 70.1 |
| Complainer Moved To New Area | 6.3 | 5.2 | 6.3 | 5.8 | 9.2 | 10.5 | 6.7 | 5.1 |
| Try To Get Smoker Moved To New Area | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 3.9 | 6.6 | 5.3 | 2.0 |
| Try To Get Smoker To Reduce Smoking | 22.5 | 17.0 | 24.2 | 21.6 | 31.6 | 28.9 | 29.3 | 19.0 |
| Order Smoker To Discontinue Smoking | .9 | .7 | 0 | 2.2 | 0 | 1.3 | 0 | 1.0 |
| Nothing Is Done | 9.7 | 11.1 | 10.5 | 9.4 | 6.6 | 0 | 5.3 | 13.3 |
| Other Measures Taken | 3.1 | 2.2 | 0 | 2.9 | 9.2 | 6.6 | 2.7 | 2.4 |

87705494

TABLE 7
EXISTENCE AND TYPE OF POLICIES
 (overall percentage, by region, by workplace smoking law)

| | Overall | Region | | | | Workplace Smoking Law | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------|------------|-------|---------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|
| | | North-east | South | North Central | West | In Effect | Being Discussed | Neither |
| Company Has Smoking Policy | 31.9 | 35.6 | 22.1 | 28.1 | 44.7 | 59.2 | 22.7 | 27.2 |
| No Smoking While Working For All | 2.9 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 6.6 | 2.6 | 0 | 3.7 |
| No Smoking While Working For Some | 34.8 | 37.0 | 36.8 | 34.5 | 28.9 | 48.7 | 30.7 | 32.3 |
| No Smoking On Premises For All | 2.5 | 1.5 | 0 | 2.9 | 6.6 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 2.7 |
| No Smoking On Premises For Some | 7.9 | 5.9 | 9.5 | 7.9 | 9.2 | 13.2 | 8.0 | 6.5 |
| Restrict Smoking By Job Description | 15.7 | 14.8 | 17.9 | 19.4 | 7.9 | 18.4 | 13.3 | 15.6 |
| Restrict Smoking For All | 30.1 | 32.6 | 21.1 | 25.9 | 44.7 | 53.9 | 24.0 | 25.5 |

TABLE 8
TIME SMOKING POLICY IN EFFECT
 (overall percentage, by region, by workplace smoking law)

| | Overall | Region | | | | Workplace Smoking Law | | |
|------------------------|---------|------------|-------|---------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|
| | | North-east | South | North Central | West | In Effect | Being Discussed | Neither |
| Less Than Six Months | 3.4 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 9.2 | 13.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| Six Months To One Year | 5.6 | 6.7 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 13.2 | 15.8 | 5.3 | 3.1 |
| One To Three Years | 8.1 | 12.6 | 5.3 | 4.3 | 10.5 | 14.5 | 10.7 | 5.8 |
| Three To Five Years | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 5.8 | 1.3 | 7.9 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| Over Five Years | 20.0 | 14.8 | 23.2 | 25.2 | 15.8 | 18.4 | 12.0 | 22.4 |
| No Policy/Do Not Know | 59.3 | 59.3 | 64.2 | 61.2 | 50.0 | 30.3 | 68.0 | 64.6 |

87705495

TABLE 9
TIME SMOKING POLICY IN EFFECT
 (by industry)

| | Food | Chemicals | Mining Petroleum Refining | Metals | Consumer Goods | Trans- portation Products | Scientific Equipment | Finance |
|------------------------|------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Less Than Six Months | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.3 | 6.8 | 2.7 | 5.9 |
| Six Months To One Year | 0 | 0 | 7.4 | 0 | 0 | 4.5 | 8.1 | 8.8 |
| One To Three Years | 0 | 9.1 | 3.7 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 14.7 |
| Three To Five Years | 6.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.7 | 5.9 |
| Over Five Years | 48.3 | 31.8 | 7.4 | 12.9 | 16.7 | 11.4 | 16.2 | 19.1 |
| No Policy/Do Not Know | 44.8 | 59.1 | 81.5 | 80.6 | 73.3 | 65.9 | 59.5 | 45.6 |

| | Insurance | Diversified Services | Utilities | Petro- chemical Products | Pharma- ceuticals | Retailing | Trans- portation Services | Paper/ Publishing |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Less Than Six Months | 8.0 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.5 |
| Six Months To One Year | 8.0 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 14.3 | 0 | 14.3 | 15.8 |
| One To Three Years | 12.0 | 7.4 | 9.5 | 0 | 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 10.5 |
| Three To Five Years | 4.0 | 7.4 | 14.3 | 8.7 | 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Over Five Years | 28.0 | 14.8 | 4.8 | 26.1 | 35.7 | 21.4 | 7.1 | 31.6 |
| No Policy/Do Not Know | 40.0 | 63.0 | 61.9 | 60.9 | 35.7 | 78.6 | 78.6 | 31.6 |

TABLE 10
SMOKING POLICY ORIGINATION
 (overall percentage; by region, by workplace smoking law)

| | Overall | Region | | | | Workplace Smoking Law | | |
|--------------------------|---------|----------------|-------|------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------|
| | | North- east | South | North Central | West | In Effect | Being Discussed | Neither |
| State/Local Ordinances | 13.3 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 9.4 | 22.4 | 59.3 | 10.2 | 30.5 |
| Employee Plebiscite | .7 | .7 | 0 | .7 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | .3 |
| Employee Union | .9 | 1.5 | 0 | 1.4 | 0 | 0 | 2.7 | .7 |
| Management | 37.3 | 41.5 | 32.6 | 36.7 | 36.8 | 53.9 | 24.0 | 36.4 |
| Medical/Health Personnel | 12.1 | 19.3 | 9.5 | 11.5 | 3.9 | 19.7 | 13.3 | 9.9 |
| Legal Staff | 3.1 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 5.0 | 3.9 | 10.5 | 1.3 | 11.7 |
| Other | 6.3 | 6.7 | 3.2 | 5.0 | 11.8 | 6.6 | 10.7 | 5.1 |

87705496

TABLE 11
REASONS FOR ORIGINATING POLICY
(overall percentage, by region, by workplace smoking law)

| | Overall | Region | | | | Workplace Smoking Law | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|------------|-------|---------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|
| | | North-east | South | North Central | West | In Effect | Being Discussed | Neither |
| Legal Mandates | 16.0 | 15.6 | 9.5 | 15.1 | 26.3 | 53.9 | 9.3 | 7.8 |
| Safety Regulations | 25.4 | 27.4 | 29.5 | 25.2 | 17.1 | 26.3 | 18.7 | 26.9 |
| Health Reasons | 19.6 | 27.4 | 9.5 | 18.0 | 21.1 | 32.9 | 20.0 | 16.0 |
| Employee Preference | 15.5 | 20.0 | 10.5 | 12.9 | 18.4 | 23.7 | 20.0 | 12.2 |
| Increase Employee Productivity | 2.0 | .7 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 4.0 | 1.4 |
| Reduce Costs And Increase Profits | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 5.3 | 6.7 | 1.0 |
| Annoyance To Customers | 7.4 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 7.2 | 3.9 | 11.8 | 6.7 | 6.5 |
| Management Opposes Smoking | 4.5 | 2.2 | 4.2 | 2.9 | 11.8 | 5.3 | 6.7 | 3.7 |

TABLE 12
WORKPLACE MODIFICATION
(overall percentage, by region, by workplace smoking law)

| | Overall | Region | | | | Workplace Smoking Law | | |
|---|---------|------------|-------|---------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|
| | | North-east | South | North Central | West | In Effect | Being Discussed | Neither |
| No Segregation In Work Areas | 87.4 | 91.9 | 87.4 | 89.9 | 75.0 | 77.6 | 86.7 | 90.1 |
| Smokers And Nonsmokers In Different Offices | 4.0 | 5.2 | 1.1 | 3.6 | 6.6 | 10.5 | 5.3 | 2.0 |
| Separate Work Areas | 25.6 | 26.7 | 16.8 | 22.3 | 40.8 | 53.9 | 37.3 | 15.3 |
| Existing Partitions To Segregate | 16.4 | 10.4 | 10.5 | 18.0 | 31.6 | 42.1 | 16.0 | 9.9 |
| Construct New Partitions | 4.3 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 6.5 | 5.3 | 9.2 | 6.7 | 2.4 |
| Provision of Adequate Ventilation | 40.4 | 38.5 | 35.8 | 44.6 | 42.1 | 60.5 | 44.0 | 34.4 |
| Improvement Of Ventilation | 26.5 | 25.2 | 22.1 | 31.7 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 24.0 | 21.1 |
| Provision Of Smoke Removal Devices | 22.7 | 17.0 | 18.9 | 23.7 | 35.5 | 42.1 | 22.7 | 17.7 |
| Posting Of Signs | 27.0 | 31.1 | 22.1 | 20.1 | 38.2 | 63.2 | 24.0 | 18.4 |
| Work Environment Not Modified | 40.7 | 41.5 | 46.3 | 43.9 | 26.3 | 13.2 | 33.3 | 49.7 |

87705497

TABLE 13
WORKPLACE MODIFICATION
 (by industry)

| | Food | Chemicals | Mining Petroleum Refining | Metals | Consumer Goods | Trans- portation Products | Scientific Equipment | Finance |
|---|------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| No Segregation In Work Areas: Smokers And Nonsmokers | 82.8 | 77.3 | 92.6 | 96.8 | 96.7 | 84.1 | 75.7 | 86.8 |
| In Different Offices | 3.4 | 0 | 7.4 | 0 | 3.3 | 4.5 | 18.9 | 2.9 |
| Separate Work Areas | 10.3 | 18.2 | 11.1 | 16.1 | 13.3 | 25.0 | 35.1 | 38.2 |
| Existing Partitions To Segregate | 6.9 | 13.6 | 14.8 | 3.2 | 10.0 | 20.5 | 21.6 | 23.5 |
| Construct New Partitions | 3.4 | 9.1 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 0 | 9.1 | 8.1 | 1.5 |
| Provision Of Adequate Ventilation | 27.6 | 45.5 | 29.6 | 41.9 | 30.0 | 43.2 | 43.2 | 39.7 |
| Improvement Of Ventilation | 10.3 | 13.6 | 25.9 | 22.6 | 10.0 | 25.0 | 32.4 | 27.9 |
| Provision Of Smoke Removal Devices | 24.1 | 31.8 | 7.4 | 9.7 | 20.0 | 22.7 | 21.6 | 38.2 |
| Posting Of Signs | 17.2 | 50.0 | 18.5 | 16.1 | 20.0 | 29.5 | 35.1 | 22.1 |
| Work Environment Not Modified | 51.7 | 22.7 | 59.3 | 51.6 | 46.7 | 45.5 | 37.8 | 30.9 |

| | Insurance | Diversified Services | Utilities | Petro- chemical Products | Pharma- ceuticals | Retailing | Trans- portation Services | Paper/ Publishing |
|---|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| No Segregation In Work Areas: Smokers And Nonsmokers | 92.0 | 88.9 | 71.4 | 95.7 | 92.9 | 100.0 | 85.7 | 89.5 |
| In Different Offices | 4.0 | 3.7 | 0 | 0 | 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Separate Work Areas | 48.0 | 14.8 | 33.3 | 26.1 | 21.4 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 26.3 |
| Existing Partitions To Segregate | 20.0 | 11.1 | 19.0 | 17.4 | 14.3 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 15.8 |
| Construct New Partitions | 4.0 | 7.4 | 9.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.3 |
| Provision Of Adequate Ventilation | 68.0 | 25.9 | 47.6 | 30.4 | 71.4 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 36.8 |
| Improvement Of Ventilation | 52.0 | 14.8 | 38.1 | 39.1 | 28.6 | 21.4 | 35.7 | 36.8 |
| Provision Of Smoke Removal Devices | 28.0 | 18.5 | 14.3 | 13.0 | 35.7 | 21.4 | 0 | 31.6 |
| Posting Of Signs | 40.0 | 7.4 | 28.6 | 17.4 | 57.1 | 35.7 | 21.4 | 47.4 |
| Work Environment Not Modified | 24.0 | 51.9 | 42.9 | 56.5 | 14.3 | 28.6 | 42.9 | 31.6 |

TABLE 14
SMOKER HIRING POLICIES
 (overall percentage, by region, by workplace smoking law)

| | Overall | Region | | | | Workplace Smoking Law | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|----------------|-------|------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------|
| | | North- east | South | North Central | West | In Effect | Being Discussed | Neither |
| Always Consider Smoking | 2.2 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 1.4 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 0 | 3.1 |
| Never Consider Smoking | 85.4 | 90.4 | 83.2 | 90.6 | 69.7 | 84.2 | 82.7 | 86.4 |
| Always Ask About Smoking | 4.0 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 4.8 |
| Never Ask About Smoking | 81.1 | 85.2 | 78.9 | 88.5 | 63.2 | 75.0 | 78.7 | 83.3 |
| Policy Prevents Hiring Smokers | .9 | .7 | 1.1 | .7 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0 | 1.0 |
| No Smokers For Certain Jobs | 4.3 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 2.9 | 7.9 | 2.6 | 8.0 | 3.7 |

87705498

TABLE 15
SMOKER HIRING POLICIES
 (by industry)

| | Food | Chemicals | Mining Petroleum Refining | Metals | Consumer Goods | Trans- portation Products | Scientific Equipment | Finance |
|--------------------------------|------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Always Consider Smoking | 3.4 | 0 | 7.4 | 3.2 | 0 | 4.5 | 8.1 | 0 |
| Never Consider Smoking | 89.7 | 86.4 | 88.9 | 80.6 | 86.7 | 86.4 | 78.4 | 91.2 |
| Always Ask About Smoking | 3.4 | 4.5 | 7.4 | 9.7 | 0 | 9.1 | 8.1 | 0 |
| Never Ask About Smoking | 89.7 | 81.8 | 81.5 | 83.9 | 80.0 | 79.5 | 75.7 | 80.9 |
| Policy Prevents Hiring Smokers | 0 | 0 | 3.7 | 0 | 0 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 0 |
| No Smokers For Certain Jobs | 3.4 | 4.5 | 0 | 9.7 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 8.1 | 0 |

| | Insurance | Diversified Services | Utilities | Petro- chemical Products | Pharma- ceuticals | Retailing | Trans- portation Services | Paper/ Publishing |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Always Consider Smoking | 0 | 0 | 4.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Never Consider Smoking | 84.0 | 74.1 | 90.5 | 82.6 | 78.6 | 92.9 | 92.9 | 78.9 |
| Always Ask About Smoking | 0 | 0 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 14.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Never Ask About Smoking | 80.0 | 74.1 | 90.5 | 82.6 | 57.1 | 85.7 | 78.6 | 89.5 |
| Policy Prevents Hiring Smokers | 0 | 3.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No Smokers For Certain Jobs | 0 | 11.1 | 9.5 | 8.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.3 |

TABLE 16
SMOKING CESSATION PROGRAMS
 (overall percentage, by region, by workplace smoking law)

| | Overall | Region | | | | Workplace Smoking Law | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|----------------|-------|------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------|
| | | North- east | South | North Central | West | In Effect | Being Discussed | Neither |
| Smoking Cessation Programs | 42.9 | 51.1 | 33.7 | 43.2 | 39.5 | 56.6 | 45.3 | 38.8 |
| Percent With Two Or More Programs | 49.7 | 54.8 | 46.3 | 48.9 | 46.1 | 57.9 | 50.7 | 47.3 |
| Participation On Company Time | 15.7 | 17.8 | 14.7 | 12.2 | 19.7 | 22.4 | 24.0 | 11.9 |
| Paid With Company Funds | 29.0 | 31.1 | 24.2 | 28.8 | 31.6 | 39.5 | 33.3 | 25.2 |
| Incentives To Stop Smoking | 8.5 | 9.6 | 10.5 | 7.9 | 5.3 | 10.5 | 5.3 | 8.8 |

87705499

87705500