

July 7, 2009

Smoke-Free Legislation and the Social Climate of Secondhand Smoke in Mississippi

Robert Cameron McMillen, PhD
Nell Valentine, MS
Annaliese Simms, BS
Anna Kathryn Hill, MPA/MPH

Highlights:

- “There is no safe level of exposure to secondhand smoke”
~Surgeon General Carmona
- 28 states, Washington, D.C., and Puerto Rico have enacted comprehensive smoke-free laws for restaurants
- 23 states, Washington, D.C., and Puerto Rico have enacted comprehensive smoke-free laws for bars
- Tennessee, Georgia, and Arkansas have also passed state-wide laws
- 70.8%, nearly two-thirds of the U.S. population, lives in a state or a community that has a comprehensive smoke-free law.
- 9.53% of Mississippians live in a town or community with a comprehensive smoke-free law
- 81.7% of all Mississippi adults support smoke-free indoor air in restaurants
 - 83.6% are Republicans
 - 83.1% are Democrats

Contents

Page 3	Health Burden of Secondhand Smoke
Page 5	Economic Burden of Secondhand Smoke
Page 6	States with Comprehensive Smoke-Free Laws
Page 7	Strong Smoke-Free Laws in the Southeast
Page 8	Economic Impacts of Smoke-Free Laws
Page 10	Impacts on Smoking Behaviors
Page 13	Public Support for Smoke-Free Legislation

This report was updated on 7 July 2009 to include data from the 2008 MS Social Climate Survey of Tobacco Control and the 1 July 2009 release of policy data from the Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation.

This report was produced by scientists at the Social Science Research Center of Mississippi State University. This project is funded by a grant of the Mississippi State Department of Health. Additional support was provided by the Bower Foundation. Any opinions implied or expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Mississippi State Department of Health, the Bower Foundation, or of Mississippi State University.

Health Burden of Secondhand Smoke

Secondhand Smoke

Contains more than 4,000 chemical compounds, of which at least 43 are known carcinogens

According to the Surgeon General's most recent report,

"The health effects of secondhand smoke exposure are more pervasive than we previously thought. The scientific evidence is now indisputable: secondhand smoke is not a mere annoyance. It is a serious health hazard that can lead to disease and premature death in children and nonsmoking adults.

We know that secondhand smoke harms people's health, but many people assume that exposure to secondhand smoke in small doses does not do any significant damage to one's health. However, science has proven that there is NO risk-free level of exposure to secondhand smoke. Let me say that again: there is no safe level of exposure to secondhand smoke."

~ Surgeon General Carmona, June 27, 2006

The California EPA Air Resources Board recently declared secondhand smoke to be a toxic air contaminant, putting this byproduct of cigarette smoking in the same category as diesel exhaust and arsenic. Secondhand smoke contains more than 4,000 chemical compounds. At least 43 of these compounds have been demonstrated to cause cancer in humans and animals (Brownson, Eriksen, Davis, & Warner, 1997). Among these compounds are (TFK):

- Carbon monoxide (auto exhaust)
- Tar (roofing)
- Nicotine (insecticide)
- Acetone (nail polish remover)
- Toluene (industrial solvent)
- Formaldehyde (preservative for dead bodies)
- Phenol (disinfectant)
- Benzene (industrial solvent)
- Benzopyrene (diesel exhaust)
- Hydrogen cyanide (gas chamber poison)
- Arsenic (rat poison)
- DDT (insecticide)

Smoking cigarettes accounts for one out of every five mortalities, making it the leading preventable cause of death in the United States (CDC, 1994). However, the effects of secondhand smoke, while substantial, are not as commonly recognized. Diseases acquired through exposure to secondhand smoke account for over 53,000 deaths of nonsmokers each year (Glantz, & Parmley, 1991). Risks of ETS include, but are not limited to, increased risk among nonsmokers for lung cancer, heart disease, and respiratory illness (California Environmental Protection Agency, 1997; United States Department of Health and Human Services, 1986). While smoking cigarettes is a choice left up to the individual, secondhand smoke is often not presented as a choice for those being exposed, leaving individuals—from babies to seniors—vulnerable not only to the immediate effects of secondhand smoke but also to the health complications it can cause.

Health Burden of Secondhand Smoke

Secondhand smoke harms to the fetus and young children

- Low birth weight
- Spontaneous abortions
- Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS)
- Impairs cognitive development
- ADD
- Lower respiratory tract infections, including bronchitis and pneumonia
- Asthma attacks
- Ear infections
- Abnormal blood pressure
- Dental cavities
- Childhood leukemia
- Lung cancer in later life

Secondhand smoke Harms to adults

- Dizziness and nausea
- Coronary heart disease
- Stroke
- Chronic respiratory conditions, such as emphysema and bronchitis
- Lung cancer
- Breast cancer
- Eye and nasal irritation

Smoke-free laws have improved health of workers and patrons

- Improved respiratory health
- Fewer reports of eye, nose, and throat irritation
- Fewer hospital admissions for heart attacks in Pueblo, CO and Helena, MT

There are greater risks for children because secondhand smoke exposure impacts their health during both their childhood and their subsequent adulthood. Higher rates of low birth weight and birth complications, asthma prevalence and severity, lower-respiratory infections, sudden infant death syndrome, otitis media, and lung cancer as adults, as well as detrimental effects on behavior and cognition, are all associated with secondhand smoke exposure (DiFranza & Lew, 1995; Wakschlag et al., 1997; Weitzman, Gortmaker, & Sobol, 1992; Weitzman, McMillen, Ritchie, Frese, & Cosby, 2001).

Although secondhand smoke exposure is harmful to health, numerous studies have demonstrated that the elimination of exposure can improve health. Examinations of indoor air quality in New York, Delaware, Kentucky, and other places have demonstrated substantial reductions of airborne contaminants after smoke-free laws were implemented. Moreover, improvements in workers' health have followed these improvements in air quality. Comparisons of workers' health before and after the implementation of smoke-free laws revealed significant improvements in respiratory health and fewer instances of eye, nose, and throat irritation.

The risk of heart attacks has also been demonstrated to decrease after the implementation of smoke-free laws. Helena, MT implemented a smoke-free law in September of 2001 for all indoor work places (including restaurants and bars). The rate of heart attacks, as measured by admissions into the only hospital in the area, decreased by 40% during the first six months of this law. The smoke-free law was rescinded after six months due to a legal challenge, and the rate of heart attacks increased to previous levels. This study was replicated in Pueblo, CO. The rate of heart attacks dropped by almost 30% during the 18 months after the city implemented a smoke-free law for indoor work areas (including restaurants and bars).

Economic Burden of Secondhand Smoke

Annual U.S. deaths attributable to exposure to secondhand smoke

- Heart disease: 35,000
- Lung cancer: 3,000
- SIDS: 1,900

Estimated annual diseases attributable to exposure to secondhand smoke in the U.S.

- Low birth weight births: 9,700
- Asthma exacerbation in children: 400,000
- Acute lower respiratory illness: 150,000
- Ear infections: 700,000

Estimated direct costs of exposure to secondhand smoke in the U.S., by morbidity

- Lung cancer: \$191 million
- Cervical cancer: \$14 million
- Asthma: \$773 million
- Ear infections: \$53 million
- Chronic pulmonary disease: \$1.2 billion
- Coronary heart disease: \$2.5 billion
- Low birth weight: \$284 million

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), smoking-attributable expenditures in Mississippi were \$557,500,000 in 2004, and average annual productivity losses exceeded \$1.41 billion (CDC, 2006). However, numerous studies have found that cigarette consumption decreases after the passage of smoke-free legislation (Borland, Chapman, Owen, & Hill, 1990; Farkas, Gilpin, White, & Pierce, 2000).

In addition to the costs of active smoking, there are numerous costs of passive smoking via exposure to secondhand smoke. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate that almost 40,000 deaths each year are attributable to exposure to secondhand smoke. These deaths are due to heart disease, lung cancer, and SIDS. Moreover, more than a millions instances of diseases are attributable to secondhand smoke exposure.

A recent report from the Society of Actuaries concluded that the direct medical costs of exposure to secondhand smoke per year for the U.S. are almost five billion dollars. This estimate includes costs from lung cancer, cervical cancer, asthma, ear infections, pulmonary disease, coronary heart disease, and low birth weight births. The estimated economic value of lost wages per year for the U.S. population (excluding infants) for these diseases is greater than \$4.6 billion.

Secondhand smoke places also several potential economic burdens on the hospitality industry: 1) maintenance costs to clean smoke damage; 2) insurance premiums related to workers' comp, liability, and fire risks; and 3) decreased productivity and increased absenteeism (Tobacco Scam, 2005).

Comprehensive Smoke-Free Laws

as of July 1, 2009

Comprehensive State Smoke-free Laws

Many states have passed comprehensive smoke-free laws. These laws prohibit smoking in 100% of all indoor public places. Specifically, there are no provisions for exemptions for certain types of businesses or certain business hours. As of July 1, 2009, twenty-eight states have enacted comprehensive smoke-free laws for restaurants and twenty-three states have enacted comprehensive smoke-free laws for bars. Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia have also enacted comprehensive smoke-free laws.

Comprehensive Local Smoke-free Laws

In addition to the states with comprehensive smoke-free laws, 351 communities have a comprehensive smoke-free ordinance that prohibits smoking in workplaces, restaurants, and bars. Currently, more than two-thirds (70.8%) of the U.S. population lives in a state or a community that has a comprehensive smoke-free law.

Smoke-free Workplaces

- Arizona
- Delaware
- Florida
- Hawaii
- Illinois
- Iowa
- Louisiana
- Maryland
- Massachusetts
- Minnesota
- Montana
- Nebraska
- Nevada
- New Jersey
- New York
- North Dakota
- Ohio
- Oregon
- Pennsylvania
- Puerto Rico
- Rhode Island
- South Dakota
- Utah
- Vermont
- Washington
- Washington, DC
- *Maine (effective September 2009)*
- *Wisconsin (effective July 2010)*

Smoke-Free Restaurants

- Arizona
- California
- Colorado
- Connecticut
- Delaware
- Florida
- Hawaii
- Idaho
- Illinois
- Iowa
- Louisiana
- Maine
- Maryland
- Massachusetts
- Minnesota
- Montana
- Nebraska
- Nevada
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- New Mexico
- New York
- Ohio
- Oregon
- Puerto Rico
- Rhode Island
- Utah
- Vermont
- Washington
- Washington, DC
- *North Carolina (effective January 2010)*
- *Wisconsin (effective July 2010)*
- *South Dakota (effective November 2010)*

Smoke-free Bars

- Arizona
- California
- Colorado
- Connecticut
- Delaware
- Hawaii
- Iowa
- Illinois
- Maine
- Maryland
- Massachusetts
- Minnesota
- Nebraska
- New Hampshire
- New Mexico
- New Jersey
- New York
- Ohio
- Oregon
- Puerto Rico
- Rhode Island
- Utah
- Vermont
- Washington
- Washington, DC
- *Montana (effective October 2009)*
- *North Carolina (effective January 2010)*
- *Wisconsin (effective July 2010)*
- *South Dakota (effective November 2010)*

Strong smoke-free laws in the southeastern U.S.

- Florida enacted a state-wide smoke-free law in 2002 that applies to restaurants, attached bars to restaurants, and workplaces
- Twenty Georgia communities have enacted comprehensive smoke-free laws that apply to all restaurants, including Athens, Decatur, Gainesville
- Louisiana has enacted a comprehensive smoke-free law for all workplaces and restaurants.
- In Mississippi, Aberdeen, Amory, Clinton, Collins, Corinth, Ecu, Flora, Greenwood, Grenada, Hattiesburg, Hernando, Kosciusko, Laurel, Mantachie, Metcalfe, Mayersville, Oxford, Petal, Pontotoc, Ridgeland, Starkville, Summit, Tupelo, and West have enacted comprehensive smoke-free laws for all indoor public places, including restaurants and bars
- Twenty-nine cities in Alabama have enacted smoke-free laws for restaurants: Alexander City, Auburn, Atmore, Bay Minette, Bayou La Batre, Birmingham, Citronelle, Cottonwood, Daphne, Decatur, East Brewton, Fairfield, Fairhope, Flomaton, Foley, Fort Payne, Gulf Shores, Headland, Homewood, Luverne, Northport, Opelika, Opp, Orange Beach, Oxford, Phenix City, Prichard, Robertsdale and Talladega.

Estimated direct costs of exposure to secondhand smoke, by morbidity

- Lung cancer: \$191 million
- Cervical cancer: \$14 million
- Asthma: \$773 million
- Ear infections: \$53 million
- Chronic pulmonary disease: \$1.2 billion
- Coronary heart disease: \$2.5 billion
- Low birth weight: \$284 million

Strong Smoke-Free Laws in the Southeast

Much of the southeastern U.S. has passed strong smoke-free laws over the past several years. Mississippi has not passed any state-wide legislation that would apply to indoor work areas, restaurants, or bars. Presently, state legislation on smoking is limited to two laws; 1) smoking is not allowed on school grounds and 2) smoking is not allowed in government-owned buildings. Twenty-four Mississippi communities have enacted comprehensive smoke-free ordinances including Hattiesburg, Oxford, Starkville, and Tupelo. Based on the 2000 US Census estimates, about nine and a half percent of Mississippians live in a community with a strong or comprehensive smoke-free law.

Jackson, the capital of Mississippi, recently passed a smoke-free ordinance banning smoking in restaurants. This ordinance took effect on February 1, 2009. However, smoking is still allowed in bars, with a bar defined as a business that serves alcohol where food receipts make up 25 percent or less of gross sales.

Brookhaven, McComb, Greenville, Picayune, and Walls have also passed smoke-free ordinances. However, these ordinances do not provide comprehensive protection from secondhand smoke. Gulfport has passed similar ordinances which exempt bars and casinos. Madison has not passed an ordinance, but all restaurants are voluntarily smoke-free.

Economic Impacts of Smoke-Free Laws

Objective economic indicators

- Aggregate sales tax revenue
- Liquor licenses issued
- Restaurant employee statistics
- Compliance/complaint files

Case studies which found no negative impacts on the hospitality industry

- Massachusetts
- New York
- Florida
- California

The economic experience of states and communities with smoke-free laws provides insight into the expected economic impacts in Mississippi of similar legislation.

Numerous studies and reports from states and communities that have already passed comprehensive smoke-free legislation provide insight into the expected economic impacts of smoke-free legislation on restaurants and other hospitality venues in Mississippi. These studies are based on several objective outcomes which are examined before and after passage of comprehensive smoke-free legislation, including the following:

- 1) Aggregate sales tax revenue
- 2) Liquor licenses issued
- 3) Restaurant employee statistics
- 4) Compliance/complaint files

A recent review of these studies concluded that the best-designed studies which included these objective measures, rather than subjective self-reports or predictions of business owners, revealed no impact or positive impacts on sales tax revenue and employment in the hospitality industry (Scollo, Lal, Hyland, & Glantz, 2003). Moreover, the only studies that detected negative impacts did not include adjustments for economic conditions and/or relied on subjective measures rather than objective, economic indicators.

To illustrate, Bartosch and Pope (2002) examined the economic effects of local smoke-free ordinances in Massachusetts from 1992 to 1998. A comparison to communities without smoke-free ordinances demonstrated that smoke-free ordinances did not impact restaurant sales tax revenue.

Economic Impacts of Smoke-Free Laws

Local smoke-free ordinances in the Southeast had no negative economic impacts

- Lexington, KY
- Fayetteville, AR

Within Mississippi, the smoke-free ordinances in Starkville has had no negative economic impacts

- The ordinance went into effect on 20 May 2006
- Sales tax revenue data are available from 1995 through July 2007
- These data demonstrate continued growth in the restaurant industry in the period after enacting the smoke-free ordinance

The state of Florida implemented the statewide Clean Indoor Act on July 1, 2003. This act applied to most workplaces, including restaurants and bars attached to restaurants. An examination of objective, economic indicators in Florida from January 1990 to April 2004 failed to reveal adverse impacts on the hospitality industry (Dai, Denslow, Hyland, & Lotfinia (2004). In fact, restaurant revenue increased after the smoke-free act was implemented. Similar studies of objective data from California and New York also demonstrated no adverse economic impacts on the hospitality industry following the implementation of state-wide smoke-free acts.

The economic research on the impacts of local smoke-free ordinances also demonstrates no adverse economic impacts. Within the Southeast, researchers have investigated the economic impact of smoke-free laws on restaurants in Lexington, KY and Fayetteville, AR. The recently enacted smoke-free law in Lexington had no economic impact on bars and restaurants. However, public support for these laws increased after the smoke-free law went into effect. A study of Fayetteville economic data demonstrated that there had not been any negative economic impact on hospitality revenues following the enactment of smoke-free laws.

It should be noted that most of these studies share one limitation. These objective data are collected in a consistent, uniform manner (Hyland, 2002) and are typically released in the aggregate to protect the privacy of restaurants, bars, and other hospitality industries. The limitation of aggregate-level data is that it can obscure trends in subsets (e.g., small restaurants or music venues). However, the State of California examined the effects of smoke-free legislation by size of restaurant and bar and concluded that there were no negative economic impacts for even the smallest of restaurants (Tobacco Scam, 2005).

Impacts on Smoking Behaviors

Effects on Adult Smoking

- Decreased daily cigarette consumption among smokers
- More quit attempts
- Higher rates of successful quit attempts
- Reductions in prevalence of smoking

Effects on Youth Smoking

- Lower rates of smoking initiation
- Lower prevalence of smoking
- More quit attempts
- Higher rates of successful quit attempts
- Lower consumption rates among continuing smokers

Numerous studies have found a relationship between smoke-free policies and smoking behavior. Although this research literature is not as developed as that of the health and economic impacts of cigarette price, comprehensive smoke-free policies have been found to be associated with increased quit attempts, decreased daily consumption, and decreased smoking initiation.

Smoke-free ordinances and laws impact smoking behaviors through two processes. First, these restrictions on smoking simply make it more difficult for a person to smoke. Second, smoke-free legislation reinforces social norms against smoking. Psychological research on social norms reveals that people tend to infer that certain behaviors are deviant and socially unacceptable based on the absence of that behavior in others (Cialdini, Reno, & Kallgren, 1990). To illustrate, Borland, Chapman, Owen, and Hill (1990) found decreased levels of cigarette smoking with the introduction of a workplace smoking ban for the Australian Public Service. This smoke-free workplace policy led to a 5.7% decrease in smoking prevalence and a 14% decrease in cigarette consumption. Further research demonstrated that provisions for smoking areas at work reduced these effects by half (Farrelly, Evans, & Sfekas, 1999).

Farkas et al. (1999) found that current smokers were more likely to smoke fewer cigarettes if they lived or worked in a tobacco-free environment. Their study revealed that attempts at cessation were more likely for those who had a smoking ban at home or at work. Further, that those seeking smoking cessation while under a home or work ban had an increased likelihood of a successful quit attempt than those without smoking bans.

Impacts on Smoking Behaviors

Most research to date on the impacts of smoke-free policies on smoking behaviors focuses on work and home smoking bans as they relate to adult smoking behaviors (Borland et al., 1990; Farkas, Gilpin, Distefan, & Pierce, 1999; Farrelly et al., 1999; Heloma, Jaakkola, Kahkonen, & Reijula, 2001; Norman, Ribisl, Howard-Pitney, Howard, & Unger, 2000). Due to the lower time and economic costs of studying adults, there is a substantially larger body of evidence documenting the impacts of smoke-free policies on adult smoking behavior than on adolescent behavior.

A limited number of studies have investigated the effects of smoke-free policies on youth smoking. Research by Farkas, Gilpin, White, and Pierce (2000) indicates that smoke-free home and workplaces are associated with decreased rates of youth smoking prevalence. Further, these policies have the most impact when smoking is prohibited in all indoor areas rather than restricted to certain indoor areas.

Melanie Wakefield and her colleagues examined data from more than 17,000 high school students. This study demonstrated that students who lived in communities that restricted smoking in public places were less likely to smoke cigarettes and those who did smoke were more likely to be at an earlier stage of smoking uptake (Wakefield, Chaloupka, Kaufman, Orleans, Barker, & Ruel, 2000).

Another large study examined more than 17,000 U.S. adolescents ages 15-17. Using survey data collected by the US Census and adjusting for demographic factors, the researchers concluded that youth who work in smoke-free places were 68% as likely to smoke as those who worked in places that did not restrict smoking (Farkas, Gilpin, White, & Pierce, 2000).

Longitudinal research has also demonstrated that adolescents are less likely to become established smokers if they live in communities with local ordinances that prohibit smoking in indoor areas of restaurants. Siegel et al. (2005) surveyed a cohort of 12-17 year old Massachusetts adolescents. After a two year period, the researchers found that those adolescents who lived in communities with smoke-free ordinances were less than half as likely to progress to established smoking (i.e., having smoked at least 100 cigarettes in their lifetime). This study included statistical controls for potential individual, household, and town level confounding factors.

Public Support for Smoke-Free Legislation

Support for smoke-free indoor work areas

- 76.1% of all Mississippi adults
- 80% of Mississippi Republicans
- 74.5% of Mississippi Democrats

Support for smoke-free indoor areas in restaurants

- 81.7% of all Mississippi adults
- 83.6% of Mississippi Republicans
- 83.1% of Mississippi Democrats


Information about smoking bans and levels of support for smoking bans was collected from the Social Climate Survey of Tobacco Control, which was administered by the Social Science Research Center at Mississippi State University. The Social Climate Survey of Tobacco Control was conducted in the summer of 2008 through telephone interviews of Mississippi adults. The survey utilized the CATI facilities of the Survey Research Unit at the Social Science Research Center. Stratified RDD sampling procedures were used to collect 3,007 household interviews. The sampling error (binomial questions with 50/50 split) was no larger than +/-1.8 percent (95% confidence interval). The study was carried out by a research group led by Robert McMillen, PhD, at the Social Science Research Center at Mississippi State University and was sponsored by the Office of Tobacco Control, Mississippi State Department of Health.

Around 80 percent of Mississippi adults believe that restaurants should be completely smoke-free, while 76 percent believe that indoor work areas should be completely smoke-free. Results from the Social Climate Survey also revealed that smoke-free public places are an issue with substantial bipartisan support among Mississippi adults. The majority of Republicans and Democrats stated that these public places should be smoke-free.

Figure 1. Percent of Mississippi Adults who Report that Smoking is not Allowed in Indoor Places.¹



Figure 2. Percent of Mississippi Adults who were not exposed to Secondhand Smoke in the Past Seven Days.



¹ Source: 2008 Mississippi Social Climate Survey of Tobacco Control

Figure 3. Percent of Mississippi Parents who Report that their Children were not exposed to Secondhand Smoke in the Past Seven Days.





Figure 4. Public Support for Smoke-free Policies in Mississippi



References

- American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation (2005). *Summary of United States population protected by 100% smokefree laws*. <http://www.no-smoke.org>
- Borland, R., Chapman, S., Owen, N., & Hill, D. (1990). Effects of workplace smoking bans on cigarette consumption. *American Journal of Public Health, 80*, 178-180.
- Brownson, R., Eriksen, M., Davis, R., Warner, K. (1997). Environmental tobacco smoke: health effects and policies to reduce exposure. *Annual Review of Public Health, 18*, 163-185.
- California Environmental Protection Agency (1997). Health effects of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke. *Tobacco Control, 6*, 346-353.
- Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids (2004). A broken promise to our children: The 1998 State Tobacco Settlement six years later.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (1994). Medical-care expenditures attributable to cigarette smoking—United States, 1983. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 43*, 469-472.
- DiFranza, J. & Lew, R. (1995). Effect of maternal cigarette smoking on pregnancy complications and sudden infant death syndrome. *Journal of Family Practice, 40*, 385-394.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2005). *Tobacco Control Highlights Report*. <http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov>
- Farkas, A. J., Gilpin, E. A., Distefan, J. M., & Pierce, J. P. (1999). The effects of household and workplace smoking restrictions on quitting behaviors. *Tobacco Control, 8*, 261-265.
- Farkas, A. J., Gilpin, E. A., White, M. M., & Pierce, J. P. (2000). Association between household and workplace smoking restrictions and adolescent smoking. *The Journal of the American Medical Association, 284*, 717-722.
- Farrelly, M. C., Evans, W. N., & Sfekas, A. E. S. (1999). The impact of workplace smoking bans: Results from a national survey. *Tobacco Control, 8*, 272-277.
- Glantz, S & Parmley, W. (1991). Passive smoking and heart disease: epidemiology, physiology, and biochemistry. *Circulation, 83*, 1-12.
- Heloma, A., Jaakkola, M. S., Kahkonen, E., & Reijula, K. (2001). The short-term impact of national smoke-free workplace legislation on passive smoking and tobacco use. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*, 1416-1418.
- Hyland, A. (2002). Economic impact of smoke-free policies on restaurants and bars. TC Online Presentations. <http://www.tobaccocontrol.com>
- McMillen, R., Valentine, N., Gresham, K., Sabbatini, E., Frese, W. & Cosby, A. (2006). *The Mississippi social climate of tobacco control, 2000-2005*. Mississippi State University, Social Science Research Center.
- Norman, G. J., Ribisl, K. M., Howard-Pitney, B., Howard, K. A., & Unger, J. B. (2000). The relationship between home smoking bans and exposure to state tobacco control efforts and smoking behaviors. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 15*, 81-88.
- Scollo, M., Lal, A., Hyland, A, & Glantz, S. (2003). Review of the quality of studies on the economic effects of smoke-free policies on the hospitality industry. *Tobacco Control, 12*, 13-20.
- Tobacco Scam (2005). *Economics*. <http://www.tobaccoscam.uscf.edu>
- United States Department of Health and Human Services (2006). *The health consequences of involuntary smoking: A report of the Surgeon General*. Rockville, MD: Centers for Disease Control, Center for Health Promotion and Education, Office on Smoking and Health.
- Wakefield, M. A., Chaloupka, F. J., Kaufman, N. J., Orleans, C. T., Barker, D. C., & Ruel, E. E. (2000). Effect of restrictions on smoking at home, at school, and in public places on teenage smoking: Cross sectional study. *British Medical Journal, 321*, 333-337.
- Wakschlag, L., Lahey, B., Loeber, R., Green, S., Gordon, R., & Leventhal, B. (1997). Maternal smoking during pregnancy and the risk of conduct disorder in boys. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 54*, 670-676.
- Weitzman, M., Gortmaker, S., & Sobol, A. (1992) Maternal smoking and behavior problems of children. *Pediatrics, 90*, 342-349.
- Weitzman, M., McMillen, R., Ritchie, L., Frese, W., & Cosby, A. (2001). *Could we achieve a smoke free environment for our children?* The 2001 Fall Meeting of the Center for Child Health Research; September 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT

Robert McMillen
robert.mcmillen@ssrc.msstate.edu

Social Science Research Center, www.ssrc.msstate.edu
Mississippi State University, www.msstate.edu

One Research Park, Suite 103
Starkville, MS 39759

Phone: 662.325.7127
Fax: 662.325.7966

Mississippi State University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability, or veteran status.

For more information visit: mstobaccodata.org