

# FACTORS INFLUENCING CORPORATE ATTITUDES ON WORKPLACE SMOKING: IMPLICATIONS OF A WEST MICHIGAN STUDY

Dr. Vipin Gupta, Dr. Suzanne Crampton, Dr. John Hodge

## ABSTRACT

*In this paper, we provide the background for research on smoking in the workplace. We discuss various approaches firms are using to regulate workplace smoking. We propose a conceptual framework linking diverse approaches to two types of corporate cultures. Thereafter, we identify two factors that influence corporate attitudes towards smoking. We present findings of an empirical study, based on a 2005 survey of 48 companies in western part of Michigan, USA. The implications for Indian organizations are highlighted.*

## Introduction:

### Smoking is Big Business

Worldwide, tobacco companies are selling over five trillion cigarettes each year ("A world hooked," 2000). Approximately one-third of the world's adults (at least 1.1 billion people) are smokers, according to the World Health Organization ("A world hooked," 2000). India is the second largest producer of tobacco in the world. Over 80 billion cigarettes are smoked in India every year (Malik, 1995). There are 250 million users of tobacco in India and five million are children (Bhaskaran, 2003). The tobacco industry in India contributes approximately ten percent of the total excises collected ("Tobacco in," 2005).

Anti-smoking legislation and societal attitudes against

smoking have hardened over recent years. Medical reports have conclusively suggested that passive or second-hand smoking is linked to lung cancer (Gurhieck, 2005) and to more than 25 other life-threatening diseases ("Why quit," 2000). Tobacco-related diseases kill approximately four million people each year, or one person every eight seconds, and if the present trends continue, smoking will be the world's number one cause of death and disability in 20 years ("A world hooked," 2000). Smoking not only hurts the smoker directly but, as previously mentioned, passive smoke is also harmful to nonsmokers. For example, a nonsmoker married to a smoker has a 30-percent greater risk of developing lung cancer than if the person had married a nonsmoker, and children living with smoking parents are more likely to develop pneumonia or bronchitis during their first two years of life compared to children living in homes with nonsmokers ("Why quit," 2000). From an employer's viewpoint, research further suggests that smokers tend to have lower productivity within the workplace, because of extra time taken on smoke breaks and increased health and mortality risks. The annual productivity cost per worker is estimated to be \$1,760 in the United States (Gurhieck, 2005). Many companies are recognizing a need to provide employees with a safe working environment. Therefore, there is now an emerging trend toward banning smoking in workplaces.

Because of the healthcare-related costs to smoking, India, like most governments, attempts to discourage and control the consumption of tobacco. In 1998, the U.S. government sued the four largest tobacco firms, and secured over \$206 billion of compensation over 25 years from them to offset the cost of smoking-related illnesses (Brown, 2001). However, it is estimated that the amount that tobacco companies pay out due to lawsuits is small compared to their multibillion-dollar profits.

In this paper, we provide the background for research on smoking in the workplace. Included in the background will be a discussion of laws that govern smoking in both India and the U.S. We also discuss various approaches firms in India and the U.S. are using to regulate workplace smoking. We propose a conceptual framework linking diverse approaches to two types of corporate cultures. Thereafter, we identify two factors that influence corporate attitudes towards smoking. We then present the findings of an empirical study, based on a survey of 48 West Michigan companies. The implications for Indian organizations are highlighted.

## **Research Background**

### **Smoking Legislation and Workplace Smoking**

In the United States, there is no federal law banning smoking in the workplace. However, there is an Executive Order that prohibits smoking in interior facilities that are owned, rented, or leased by the federal government, except for designated areas. While the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) classified environmental tobacco smoke as a Group A

Carcinogen in 1992—a category that is reserved only for the most dangerous cancer-causing agents in humans—the agency has no authority to regulate indoor air pollution. There are also no Threshold Limit Values for tobacco smoke established, such as those that exist for toxic chemicals like radon, asbestos, arsenic, and benzene that are overseen by the U.S. Federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). However, while there are no federal government regulations concerning smoking in the private workplace, there are several individual states in the U.S. that prohibit workplace smoking other than in designated smoking areas.

On February 27, 2005, a treaty known as the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) became effective that was signed by 168 countries that are members of the World Health Organization, which includes India and the U.S. This treaty spells out steps that countries must take in order to reduce smoking, protect nonsmokers, crack down on smuggling, and encourage legal action against tobacco companies (Action on Smoking and Health, 2005).

Eight countries have already become virtually smoke-free (Bhutan, Cuba, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, and Uganda) and many more have begun requiring greater health warnings (Action on Smoking and Health, 2005). In 2003, India passed an Anti-Smoking Act which banned smoking in public places (Action on Smoking and Health, 2004). Similar to Ireland's ban passed in March 2004, the United Kingdom has also declared its intention to ban smoking indoors in the workplace by the end of 2008, when employers could refuse to hire or may

even dismiss an employee who smokes on or off the company's premises. In the UK, companies have also had to compensate employees who claimed health problems as a result of passive smoke (Nicolle & Bennett, 2005). Many individual states within the U.S. have allowed higher medical insurance premiums to be charged to employees who smoke (Gurhieck, 2005).

Smoking is a difficult habit to quit, not only because it is an addictive drug and is virtually available everywhere, but because we encounter tobacco everyday as the tobacco industry spends almost six billion dollars a year on advertising campaigns that depict smokers as glamorous, active, healthy, and intelligent individuals ("Why quit," 2000). A study commissioned by the World Health Organization (WHO) found that 76% of Indian films showed actors and actresses puffing away and WHO has urged the film industry to eliminate smoking from family movies (Bhaskaran, 2003; Bowes, 2003). In 2001 when India banned smoking indoors in public places and banned advertising and sponsorships by the cigarette industry, the composite media advertising by the cigarette companies totaled about Rs. 4 billion, half of which was accounted by ITC (Business India, 2001). In India, the Tobacco Products Act 2003 currently imposes restrictions on the advertisement of tobacco products, the sale of tobacco products to minors, labeling on packaging and other plethora of measures all aimed at curtailing tobacco consumption ("Tobacco in," 2005).

If Indian movies are pro-smoking, its law enforcers are not much better. Although over 92% of those in

law enforcement agree that smoking is bad for one's health, almost 60% consider the enforcement of smoking laws as minor and something they should not have to do. In fact, over 40% consider their involvement with controlling tobacco use of being of no benefit to them in terms of their job performance rating (Jain, 2004). There are only a few documented examples in India of success in achieving smoke-free environments. For instance, the World Health Organization (WHO India, 2004) reported that at schools that enforce no-smoking policies, teachers smoke less compared to schools having no such policy. One town in Kerala became a tobacco-free town and the ban was considered a success because individuals did not want to be excluded from village life as a penalty.

In the U.S., because there are no federal laws on smoking in the workplace, individual companies have more latitude with regard to establishing and implementing smoking policies. For example, several companies are beginning to introduce policies that refuse to hire workers who smoke. Consider, for example, Schweitzer Engineering Laboratories (SEL) in the state of Washington that introduced such a policy in the early 1990s "to minimize loss of productivity due to smoking-related illness" (Gurhieck, 2005). One company to receive much international attention for its anti-smoking policies is Weyco-a medical insurance benefits administrator based in the state of Michigan in the U.S. In October 2003, the company asked its employees to quit smoking within the next 15 months or quit their jobs; encouraging approximately 20 smoking employees to stop



smoking-not just at work, but anywhere, anytime. The policy was introduced as part of company's disease management and wellness program, with a view to take control of the health care costs of its employees and to improve the health status of its employees (Anderson, 2005). The company's wellness program gives incentives to the employees for keeping fit, but it failed to influence the stopping of smoking by many employees-thus, forcing the company to adopt a harder, more restrictive stance in 2005 by banning employees from smoking even on their own time and submitting employees to random tests to detect if someone has smoked. Employees must also agree to searches of briefcases, purses, and other belongings if there is suspicion that tobacco substances have been brought on-site, and those who smoke may be suspended or fired (Armour, 2005). In the state of Michigan, the policy to refuse to hire smokers or to fire current smokers, even if they commit to smoking only at their homes, is legal, so long as the companies have a clear policy that allows for not hiring or terminating employees who smoke, and that policy is consistently applied (Fair Employment Practices Guidelines, 2005). However, since 1989 there are 29 other states in the U.S. that have passed laws prohibiting employers from making smoking a condition for employment due to privacy concerns, discrimination issues, and to protect smokers' rights (Anderson, 2005).

There are, however, many U.S. companies that are taking actions against employees who smoke off duty-a trend that many consider troubling. There are concerns whether a policy to regulate the life of people is really fair and what the limits are for the regulation

by companies. As recently reported by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), their member organizations have developed a variety of policies to control smoking (Armour, 2005). The prevalence of some of these smoking policies, as reported by SHRM, is outlined below (Armour, 2005).

#### Smoking Policies-Percentage of Employers that have:

- Designated smoking areas: 72%
- Cessation programs: 32%
- Policies limiting the number of daily breaks: 27%
- Banned smoking: 19%
- Policies stating smoking in undesignated areas may result in termination: 17%

Evidence concerning the effects of smoking bans and restrictions on smoking consumption is mixed. However, a study in India suggests that the effect of smoke-free workplace policies tends to encourage 29% of the smokers to quit or reduce their consumption (WHO India, 2004). Similar research in the U.S. and Canada also suggests that in workplaces where smoking is banned, there tends to be fewer daily smokers (18%) compared to workplaces with no restrictions (40%), and that comparing smoking consumption of the smokers is also less in non-smoking environments (15.4 cigarettes averaged daily per smoker) compared with work environments with no smoking restrictions (20 cigarettes averaged daily) (Personnel Today, 2004).

The evidence suggests that, although difficult, smoking can be managed. The evidence also suggests that since smoking is such a part of life in both India and the U.S., effective management must include a variety of strategies. To this end, our review has identified the following strategies that are commonly used to deal with smoking in the workplace:

- a) banning smoking only in places where hazardous materials are stored;
- b) putting up non-smoking signs indoors;
- c) banning smoking indoors;
- d) creating designated smoking places or rooms indoors;
- e) banning smoking on company property, whether indoors or outdoors;
- f) discouraging people who have been smoking in the previous two hours from entering a building and bringing some of the haze in with them;
- g) refusing to hire employees who smoke, even if it is at their homes;
- h) encouraging employees to quit smoking, by having them take smoking cessation classes or using the quit-smoking patches; and
- i) charging higher medical insurance premiums for employees who smoke.

These policies range from what might be classified as a soft approach to a hard approach. Based on these approaches, we have identified two types of corporate cultures:

- a) **Soft cultures:** We identify companies with soft cultures as ones oriented towards self-regulation. In these companies, the core values recognize the rights of the smokers, as well as of the non-smokers. They may have formal policies or informal norms on smoking, but may not specifically restrict smokers from smoking only at certain places (e.g., specific parts of the building, or outside the building, or outside the company premises) or at certain times (e.g., during breaks). Yet, these companies tend not to be permissive of smoking behavior, and may encourage smokers to be self-concerned about the rights of the non-smokers. They may also have support programs that help employees quit smoking through positive habitual change. Examples of some of the soft approaches that might be used from our above list would be banning smoking only in places where hazardous materials are stored, creating designated smoking places or rooms indoors, or encouraging employees to quit smoking via smoking cessation classes or no-smoking patches.
- b) **Hard cultures:** We identify companies with hard cultures as ones oriented towards mandated regulation. In these companies, the core values are more oriented towards the rights of the non-smokers and the healthcare costs, and the effect smokers may have on workplace productivity. These companies are more likely to rely on formal policies, and these policies are likely to restrict smoking rights. Whether a candidate smokes may influence decisions to hire new employees, even

if the firm does not have an explicit policy barring smokers from employment. Furthermore, when the culture is hardening, cliques may form amongst employees, with separate friendship groups and informal social circles of the smoking and non-smoking employees. Examples of some of the hard approaches that might be used from our above list would be banning smoking indoors, refusing to hire employees who smoke anytime (including in their home), or charging higher medical insurance premiums for employees who smoke.

### **Factors Influencing Corporate Attitudes on Workplace Smoking**

Two major factors that may influence corporate cultures and attitudes towards smoking are work-time concerns and corporate workplace smoking policies.

**Work-time concerns:** In general, the growing work-time concerns are likely to induce companies that do have workplace smoking policies to be more focused on implementing such policies, and to adopt a non-permissive attitude. Work-time concerns-or concern about employees' smoking during company time-arise largely from the concerns about the effects of passive smoking at the workplace.

**Corporate workplace smoking policies:** Once formulated, corporate policies on smoking, in turn, may increase the salience of smoking issues in the workplace, especially among companies that have restrictive attitudes towards smoking. When such policies are in place, companies may show concern not only with the issue of passive smoking, but also

with the issue of lower productivity and increased health care costs of smokers. The workplace smoking policies are, therefore, likely to induce firms with restrictive attitudes to develop hard corporate cultures, as manifested in behaviors such as banning smoking indoors as well as at the entire workplace and asking new hires about their smoking habits.

### **Empirical Study**

In 2005, we surveyed human resource managers from 48 companies in the West Michigan area in the USA. The questionnaire included several questions in Yes=1/No=0 format. Of these, eight are of particular interest:

1. **POLICY:** Does the company have any policy regarding smoking?
2. **ENFORCE:** Does the company actually enforce non-smoking behaviors?
3. **HIRING:** Does the company ask potential applicants about their smoking habits?
4. **INDOOR:** Does the company restrict smoking entirely in its buildings?
5. **WORKPLACE:** Does the company restrict smoking everywhere on its property?
6. **WORK-TIME:** Does the company care, in any way, if employees smoke during company time?
7. **PERMISSIVE:** Do you believe your company has a more permissive attitude toward smoking compared to other companies?
8. **RESTRICTIVE:** Do you believe your company has a more restrictive attitude toward smoking compared to other companies?

Table 1 provides mean averages and standard deviations on the above variables.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics-Smoking at the Workplace

	Mean (proportion of companies saying YES)	Standard Deviation
POLICY	0.71	0.459
ENFORCE	0.75	0.438
HIRING	0.15	0.357
INDOOR	0.71	0.459
WORKPLACE	0.19	0.394
WORK-TIME	0.73	0.449
PERMISSIVE	0.46	0.504
RESTRICTIVE	0.23	0.425

As seen in Table 1, 71% of the respondents report their company has a policy on smoking; 75% report their company enforces non-smoking behaviors; and 73% report their company looks down upon smoking during work-time. While 71% report their company restricts smoking entirely in its buildings, only 19% report they restrict smoking everywhere in the workplace, and only 15% report asking applicants about their smoking habits during the hiring process. Finally, 23% consider their company's smoking attitudes to be restrictive, 46% report the attitudes to be permissive, and the remaining 31% may be taken to have moderate attitudes.

Based on our conceptual framework, we are interested in investigating the following:

- 1. EFFECT OF WORK-TIME CONCERNS:** Do the concerns about smoking during work-time have any influence on whether companies (a) enforce non-smoking behaviors, and (b) adopt a non-permissive attitude towards smoking?

- 2. EFFECT OF NON-SMOKING POLICY:** Does having a smoking policy make any difference in the likelihood of companies with restrictive attitudes towards smoking to (a) ask potential employees about their smoking habits, and to restrict smoking on their properties, (b) indoors, or (c) the entire workplace?

### Findings

#### Effect of Work-Time Concerns on Corporate Attitudes

Table 2a presents a three-way cross tabulation of the companies that have a policy on smoking, that have concerns about smoking during work-time, and that do enforce non-smoking behaviors. Table 2b presents a three-way cross tabulation of the companies that have a policy on smoking, that have concerns about smoking during work-time, and that have permissive attitudes towards smoking.



**Table 2a: Policy X Work-time X Enforce**

		NOT ENFORCED	ENFORCED	Total
NO POLICY	NO WORK-TIME CONCERNS	4 (2.5)	1 (2.5)	5
	WORK-TIME CONCERNS	3 (4.5)	6 (4.5)	9
POLICY	NO WORK-TIME CONCERNS	3 (1.2)	5 (6.8)	8
	WORK-TIME CONCERNS	2 (3.8)	24 (22.2)	26
<b>Total</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>48</b>

Note: Expected values are given in brackets

As seen in Table 2a, among the companies that do not have any non-smoking policy, the companies with work-time concerns have a somewhat greater tendency to actually enforce non-smoking behaviors (ch sq=2.800, p=0.0.094). However, even among

companies that do have a smoking policy, the companies with work-time concerns are more likely to enforce non-smoking behaviors (ch sq=4.333; p=0.037).

**Table 2b: Policy X Work-time X Permissive**

		NOT PERMISSIVE	PERMISSIVE	Total
NO POLICY	NO WORK-TIME CONCERNS	1 (2.9)	4 (2.1)	5
	WORK-TIME CONCERNS	7 (5.1)	2 (3.9)	9
POLICY	NO WORK-TIME CONCERNS	3 (4.2)	5 (3.8)	8
	WORK-TIME CONCERNS	15 (13.8)	11 (12.2)	26
<b>Total</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>48</b>

Note: Expected values are given in brackets



As seen in Table 2b, among the companies that do not have any non-smoking policy, the companies with work-time concerns have a somewhat greater tendency not to be permissive ( $\chi^2=4.381$ ,  $p=0.036$ ). However, among the companies that do have a smoking policy, the companies with work-time concerns are not associated with permissive attitudes ( $\chi^2=1.001$ ;  $p=0.317$ ).

#### Effect of Smoking Policy on Corporate Attitudes

Table 3a presents a three-way cross tabulation of the

companies that have a policy on smoking, that have restrictive attitudes towards smoking, and that ask potential hires about their smoking habits. Table 3b presents a three-way cross tabulation of the companies that have a policy on smoking, that have restrictive attitudes towards smoking, and that restrict smoking indoors. Table 3c presents a three-way cross tabulation of the companies that have a policy on smoking, that have restrictive attitudes towards smoking, and that restrict smoking in the entire workplace/company properties.

**Table 3a: POLICY X RESTRICTIVE X HIRING**

		HIRES NOT ASKED ABOUT SMOKING	HIRES ASKED ABOUT SMOKING	Total
NO POLICY	ATTITUDES NOT RESTRICTIVE	9 (9.3)	1 (0.7)	10
	RESTRICTIVE	4 (3.7)	0 (0.3)	4
POLICY	ATTITUDES NOT RESTRICTIVE	25 (22.2)	2 (4.8)	27
	RESTRICTIVE	3 (5.8)	4 (1.2)	7
<b>Total</b>		<b>41</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>48</b>

Note: Expected values are given in brackets

As seen in Table 3a, among the companies that do not have any non-smoking policy, a restrictive attitude towards smoking is not related with asking about smoking habits during the hiring process (ch sq=0.431, p=0.512). Among the companies that

As seen in Table 3b, among the companies that do not have any non-smoking policy, a restrictive attitude towards smoking is positively related with indoor smoking restrictions (ch sq=4.200, p=0.040). Among the companies that do not have a non-

**Table 3b: POLICY X RESTRICTIVE X INDOOR**

		ALLOW INDOOR SMOKING	BAN INDOOR SMOKING	Total
NO POLICY	ATTITUDES NOT RESTRICTIVE	6 (4.3)	4 (5.7)	10
	RESTRICTIVE	0 (1.7)	4 (2.3)	4
POLICY	ATTITUDES NOT RESTRICTIVE	8 (6.4)	19 (20.6)	27
	RESTRICTIVE	0 (1.6)	7 (5.4)	7
<b>Total</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>48</b>

Note: Expected values are given in brackets

have a non-smoking policy, however, a restrictive attitude towards smoking is positively related with asking about smoking habits during the hiring process (ch sq=9.462; p=0.002).

smoking policy, a restrictive attitude towards smoking is not related with indoor smoking restrictions (ch sq=2.712; p=0.100).

**Table 3c: POLICY X RESTRICTIVE X WORKPLACE**

		ALLOW WORKPLACE SMOKING	BAN WORKPLACE SMOKING	Total
NO POLICY	ATTITUDES NOT RESTRICTIVE	10 (9.3)	0 (0.7)	10
	RESTRICTIVE	3 (3.7)	1 (0.3)	4
POLICY	ATTITUDES NOT RESTRICTIVE	24 (20.6)	3 (6.4)	27
	RESTRICTIVE	2 (5.4)	5 (1.6)	7
<b>Total</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>48</b>

Note: Expected values are given in brackets

As seen in Table 3c, among the companies that do not have any non-smoking policy, a restrictive attitude towards smoking is not related with smoking restrictions in the workplace (ch sq=2.692, p=0.101). Among the companies that have a non-smoking policy, however, a restrictive attitude towards smoking is positively related with smoking restrictions in the workplace (ch sq=11.24; p=0.001).

#### Discussion

Our findings, using a sample of 48 firms in West Michigan, suggest that companies with work-time concerns are more likely to enforce non-smoking

behaviors, and they are likely to do so whether or not they have policies on smoking. In addition, companies with work-time concerns are also more likely not to have permissive behaviors, in conditions where the company does not have a policy on smoking. Put differently, work-time concern appears to be a stronger factor than the policy on smoking, in so far as regulating smoking behavior is concerned.

However, the policy on smoking also plays an important role in influencing corporate attitudes towards smoking. Our findings suggest that companies with a restrictive attitude towards smoking are more likely to ask potential hires about their

smoking habits, when they have a policy on smoking. Furthermore, such companies are more likely to restrict smoking entirely in buildings indoors when they do not have a policy on smoking. Finally, these companies are more likely to restrict smoking everywhere on their property, when they do have a policy on smoking.

In summary, being aware of work-time concerns appears to make companies more conscious about regulating smoking, by actually enforcing no-smoking norms and by other ways that discourage permissive behaviors. This soft culture approach may be salient particularly in companies that have not formulated a formal policy on smoking.

On the other hand, having a policy on smoking appears to make companies with restrictive attitudes develop harder cultures towards smoking, such as possibly restricting employment for those who smoke and restricting smoking everywhere on company property.

### **Conclusions**

We began this paper by reviewing the growing international trend towards regulation of smoking in public places, and the recent initiatives in primarily the U.S. and India to regulate smoking in the workplace. As a result of these initiatives, there has been an increased awareness about two types of effects of smoking: passive smoking and direct smoking. Passive smoking has now been conclusively linked to lung cancer. Direct smoking results in not only greater health and mortality risks, but also possibly lower productivity as the smokers take frequent time off for

smoking and have higher rates of sickness and absenteeism compared to non-smokers. In addition, with escalating health care costs, companies have become concerned about paying the higher health care costs of the smokers, and about passing on some of these smoking-related health costs to the non-smokers under a group-wide common corporate health care plan.

We proposed a conceptual framework indicating how companies may develop either soft cultures or hard cultures for regulating smoking in the workplace, and articulated the practices that are likely to be associated with each of these cultures. We also identified two factors that influence corporate attitudes towards smoking: workplace concerns and smoking policies.

Our findings suggest that companies that are aware of the emergent workplace concerns associated with smoking are more likely to try regulating smoking by enforcing no-smoking norms or otherwise discouraging permissive behaviors. Such soft culture approaches may be particularly attractive to companies that have not yet formulated formal policies on smoking.

Once companies formulate formal policies on smoking, a restrictive attitude towards smoking may harden, and companies may develop a propensity, for instance, to restrict employment for smokers and to restrict smoking everywhere on their property (as opposed to just indoors).

Another interpretation of our findings may be that the companies with hard attitudes towards smoking may be the ones to formulate formal policies on



smoking, primarily motivated by the legal issues. Formal policies protect companies from potential lawsuits, by ensuring and authenticating consistency in the decisions such as firing smokers or not hiring smokers.

Our findings are limited by the fact that the sample was restricted to West Michigan companies. Michigan does not have laws limiting discrimination against smokers by corporations, especially if the firms have policies that are implemented consistently and without discrimination with regard to other factors such as race, gender, age, income, and ethnicity. Furthermore, in Michigan, work-time concerns may be particularly salient because of the extensive decline in employment in the automotive, office furniture, and other manufacturing sectors that are home to the state. With declining employment, there is a greater sensitivity about the health benefits cost escalating and the productivity diminishing factors such as smoking.

An additional limitation of our study is its cross-sectional design, which implies that any causal and dynamic interpretations must be treated with caution until an explicitly longitudinal design is utilized to validate the relationships.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the study has important implications for Indian organizations. The Indian government has moved to regulate smoking in public places, as mandated under the WHO convention on non-smoking that she has signed. However, most Indian companies do not have any formal policies on smoking. The awareness about workplace concerns associated with smoking is also relatively limited in India, and even where the

awareness does exist, organizations have taken few steps. In a nation where 60% of adult males consume tobacco, and where banning smoking has encouraged people to move to other even more injurious ways of consuming tobacco-such as chewing tobacco-firms would need to develop some creative ways to help all their employees be productive.

## References

- "A world hooked on smoking." (March 22, 2000). Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania. [On-line] Available: [www.watchtower.org/library/g/2000/3/22/article\\_01.htm](http://www.watchtower.org/library/g/2000/3/22/article_01.htm)
- Action on Smoking and Health (May 2, 2004). "India begins workplace smoking ban." [On-line] Available: <http://www.no-smoking.org/may04/05-03-04-1.html>
- Action on Smoking and Health (2005). "World smoking treaty effective Feb. 27th is already revolutionizing antismoking progress," [On-line] Available: <http://www.no-smoking.org/feb05/02-24-05-1.html>
- Anderson, T. (2005). "Smoking policy sparks debate over wellness programs," *Employee Benefit News*, 19(4): 1,43.
- Armour, S. (May 11, 2005). "Trend: You smoke? You're fired!" *USA Today*, p. 1.
- Bhaskaran, G. (March 9, 2003). "Tinsel world smoking out lives?" *The Hindu*. [On-line] Available: [www.thehindu.com/thehindu/2003/03/09/stories/2003030904760800.htm](http://www.thehindu.com/thehindu/2003/03/09/stories/2003030904760800.htm)
- Bowes, E. (2003). "India to ban tobacco advertising," *Advertising Age*, 74(9): 20.

Brown, E. (2001). "The world health organization takes on big tobacco (but don't hold your breath)," *Fortune (Europe)*, 144(5): 61-64.

*Business India* (February 19, 2001). "Trouble in tobaccoland."

Fair Employment Practices Guidelines (March 1, 2005). "Smokers Need Not Apply." 598: 4-5.

Gurhieck, K. (2005). "Study: Smoking Ban Improved Air," *HR Magazine*, 50(1): 34-36.

Jain, V. (October, 2004). "Blowing back the smoke." *India Together*. [On-line] Available: <http://www.indiatogether.org/2004/oct/hlt-tobacco.htm>

Malik, O. P. (1995). "The worlds tobacco marketers think 20 million Indians can't be wrong," *Brandweek*, 36(38): 46-47.

Nicolle, R. & Bennett, R. (2005). "Sending the right smoke signals," *Lawyer*, 19(8): 23-24.

*Personnel Today* (November 23, 2004). "Workplace bans encourage smokers to quit," p 6-8.

"Tobacco in India." (February, 2005). *Euromonitor International*. [On-line] Available: [www.euromonitor.com/Tobacco\\_in\\_India](http://www.euromonitor.com/Tobacco_in_India)

WHO India. (November 25, 2004). "Tobacco control: What works? Community interventions: smoke-free public places." *World Health Organization*. [On-line] Available: <http://www.whoindia.org/SCN/Tobacco/Report/03-Chapter-07.8.pdf>

"Why quit smoking." (March 22, 2000). *Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania*. [On-line] Available: [www.watchtower.org/library/g/2000/3/22/article\\_02.htm](http://www.watchtower.org/library/g/2000/3/22/article_02.htm)

*Dr. Vipin Gupta is Professor of Strategy School of Management, Simmons College, Boston, USA*

*Email: gupta05@gmail.com*

*Dr. Suzanne Crampton, is a Associate Professor at Seidman College of Business, Grand Valley State University, USA*

*Email: crampton@gvsu.edu*

*Dr. John Hodge is a Management Professor at Seidman College of Business, Grand Valley State University, USA*

*Email: hodgej@gvsu.edu*

