APPENDIX

The Comprehensiveness Index of State Laws

To permit comparisons over time, an index of the comprehensiveness of each State's smoking law was created. Laws were classified on the basis of the number and nature of places where smoking was restricted or prohibited. The overall principle was that stronger measures are those that reduce exposure to ETS to the greatest degree. More comprehensive laws were considered to be those that restrict smoking in a larger number of public places, extend to privately owned facilities, and cover places where individuals spend a large amount of time.

Laws regulating smoking in private worksites were considered to be the most comprehensive, and States with such laws were assigned the extensive category. Because individuals spend more time at work than in any other place outside the home, worksite legislation has the potential for marked reductions in public exposure to involuntary smoking. Worksite laws also represent an extension of legislation to the private sector, considered a further evidence of their comprehensiveness. Nine States are categorized as having extensive restrictions, the average number of public places covered by their legislation was 11.0.

The next most stringent category, moderate, was assigned to States that regulated smoking in restaurants. Restaurants were chosen because they represent privately owned public places and because laws covering them have been controversial to enact. It was felt that States regulating restaurants but not the private workplace had moderately comprehensive restrictions. The 10 States in this category also regulated smoking in a large number of public places (9.5).

The last two categories, nominal and basic, were defined for States that did not regulate smoking in restaurants or in the private workplace. They differed in the number of public places covered. States restricting smoking in one to three public places were considered to have nominal restrictions. Those restricting smoking in four or more public places were classified as basic.
This number of public places covered by smoking restrictions increases with increasing comprehensiveness of categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of States</th>
<th>Mean number of public places covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the calculation of the comprehensiveness index, categories were weighted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No policy</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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