

Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., & Pfent, A. M. (in press). Response rates in surveys by the news media and government contractor survey research firms. In J. Lepkowski, B. Harris-Kojetin, P. J. Lavrakas, C. Tucker, E. de Leeuw, M. Link, M. Brick, L. Japac, & R. Sangster (Eds.), Telephone survey methodology. New York: Wiley.

## **The Effects of Beliefs about the Health Consequences of Cigarette Smoking on Smoking Onset and Quitting**

Jon A. Krosnick (corresponding author)  
Stanford University  
434 McClatchy Hall  
450 Serra Mall,  
Stanford, California 94305  
Phone: 650-851-9143  
Email: krosnick@stanford.edu

LinChiat Chang  
Opinion Research Corporation  
600 College Road East  
Princeton, New Jersey 08540  
Phone: 609-452-5400  
Email: Linchiat.chang@opinionresearch.com

Steven J. Sherman  
Department of Psychology  
Indiana University  
1101 E. Tenth St.  
Bloomington, IN 47405  
Phone: 812-855-8163  
Email: sherman@indiana.edu

Laurie Chassin  
Department of Psychology  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, AZ 85287-1104  
Phone: 480-965-1616  
Email: laurie.chassin@asu.edu

Clark Presson  
Department of Psychology  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, AZ 85287-1104  
Phone: 480-965-1617  
Email: presson@asu.edu

September, 2005

Jon Krosnick is University Fellow at Resources for the Future.

# **The Effects of Beliefs about the Health Consequences of Cigarette Smoking on Smoking Onset and Quitting**

## Abstract

Nearly all Americans now recognize that smoking causes lung cancer and other serious diseases, yet cigarette smoking has not yet been eliminated in this country. This might be taken as evidence that beliefs about the health risks of smoking do not influence smoking onset or quitting. In this paper, we report new evidence that perceiving smoking to entail greater health risks reduces the likelihood that a young person will begin to smoke. This evidence suggests that public health campaigns should continue to focus on this theme to bolster resistance to smoking onset about young people.

## **The Effects of Beliefs about the Health Consequences of Cigarette Smoking on Smoking Onset and Quitting**

Beginning in the early 1960s, the public health community waged one of its most successful educational campaigns, to convince Americans that smoking cigarettes increases a person's chances of contracting various serious illnesses. Americans now overwhelmingly recognize that smoking is dangerous. But despite a seemingly endless flow of messages informing the American public about the health risks of cigarette smoking during the last fifty years, more than one fifth of Americans smoke regularly today, and recent trends suggest that this figure will not shrink considerably in the near future (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2003). The health care costs and personal suffering by smokers and their loved ones that results from this behavior continue to be staggeringly huge, especially in light of the fact that the medical risks posed by smoking are now so well understood (e.g., Samet, 2001). The availabilities of pharmacological systems and social programs designed to help people to quit smoking are now so well-developed and widely-available as to suggest that the physiological addictiveness of tobacco can be overcome, even if not easily, giving smokers the ability to quit if they choose to do so. Why, then, do so many smokers choose not to try to quit, and why do young people continue to start smoking at alarming rates?

One possible answer to this question is that beliefs about the health risks of smoking do not motivate people to protect themselves by avoiding cigarette use. Instead, perhaps smoking onset and cessation are driven by a host of other factors, including peer modeling, parental modeling, sibling modeling, the subjective norms created by parents, and more. Interestingly, remarkably little scientific work has explored the question of whether beliefs about the health

risks of smoking actually influence behavior. We help to redress this shortcoming of the literature by offering new evidence here on this issue.

We begin below by describing the findings of past representative sample survey studies assessing Americans' perceptions of the health risks of smoking. Then, we review the available evidence on the causal impact of health beliefs on smoking onset. To complement this evidence, we report the results of new statistical analyses of longitudinal survey data gauging the impact of health risk beliefs on smoking onset among adolescents. Finally, we review the available literature on the effects of perceived health risks on smoking cessation and use national survey data to assess whether greater perceived health risks of smoking are associated with increased probability of quitting smoking among adults. Taken together, this work offers a justification for continued efforts to promote public recognition of the health risks of smoking.

#### Prior Survey Studies of Public Perceptions of the Health Risks of Smoking

Many surveys of nationally representative samples of American adults have been conducted during the last five decades on perceptions of smoking and health issues, sponsored by government agencies, private organizations dedicated to public health promotion, and tobacco companies. These studies indicate that during the 1950s, large portions of Americans failed to assert that smoking had health risks, and this fraction has fallen precipitously. Nonetheless, even today, non-trivial portions of the American public do not recognize that smoking is risky.

One relevant series of surveys was conducted by the Gallup Organization and asked respondents, "Do you think that cigarette smoking is or is not one of the causes of lung cancer?" A second question asked respondents whether smoking is or is not one of the causes of heart disease. A third question asked about throat cancer. In another series of surveys, the Gallup Organization asked more general questions, not mentioning specific diseases: "Do you think

cigarette smoking is or is not harmful to your health?" or "Do you think cigarette smoking is harmful, or not?" The proportions of respondents failing to say that smoking causes a specific disease or that smoking is risky are plotted in Figure 1.

Three principal patterns are apparent in these data. First, all four trend lines manifest consistent decreases over time, meaning that Americans increasingly embraced the views of health professionals on these issues. Second, none of the trend lines reach zero, meaning that a relatively small group of hold-outs continued to resist the view of smoking as entailing health risks. And third, the most general view of risk has been accepted more widely than any specific risk. That is, fewer people denied all health risks than denied risks specific to lung cancer, heart disease, or throat cancer. Thus, there is still progress to be made in educating the public about these specific risks. And according to these figures, more Americans accept the risk of lung cancer than accept the risk of heart disease.

This last point is echoed by the results of a survey conducted for the Office on Smoking and Health of the Centers for Disease Control in 1986. In this survey, respondents were asked "Do you think a person who smokes is any more likely to get heart disease than a person who doesn't smoke?" About 79% of respondents said a smoker is more likely than a non-smoker, and about 21% of respondents said a smoker is not more likely or that they didn't know. In comparable questions, 92% of respondents said the smoker was more likely than the non-smoker to get lung cancer and about 8% of respondents said no or don't know. Thus, 21% and 8% of Americans did not recognize these risks of smoking, and again, more people denied the risks of heart disease than denied the risks of lung cancer.

This finding was echoed as well in a 1992 survey by the Gallup Organization done for the American Lung Association. These respondents were asked: "Which of the following health

problems, if any, have been related to smoking?", and respondents were then read a list of health problems. 96% of respondents said "yes" for lung cancer and 73% said "yes" for cardiovascular disease. Thus, 4% and 27% of respondents, respectively, failed to acknowledge these health effects of smoking.

The same finding was echoed yet again in a 1993 survey done by the Gallup Organization and sponsored by SmithKline Beecham, and this survey identified health effects of smoking that were denied by even larger groups. Respondents were asked: "Does smoking cause or make these conditions worse?", and respondents were then read a list of medical problems. 84% of respondents answered "yes" for lung cancer and 75% answered "yes" for heart disease, comparable to the surveys described above. In addition, 66% answered "yes" for oral cancers and 65% answered "yes" for stroke. Thus, 16%, 25%, 34%, and 35% of respondents, respectively, failed to acknowledge these health effects of smoking.

The surveys reviewed thus far are all somewhat dated. This is because the distributions of opinions on these health issues have become so skewed and so stable that the commercial survey organizations have rarely seen a need to re-ask the perceived risk questions. Nonetheless, they have done so on occasion, but with somewhat different question wordings. Nonetheless, recent surveys suggest that the percentages of people denying health risks has continued to be small but not zero after the ends of the time series shown in Figure 1. For example, in 2001, the Gallup Organization asked a national sample: "Do you feel that cigarette smoking is a major cause of lung cancer, a minor cause, or that science hasn't yet been able to tell just what the relation is between cigarette smoking and lung cancer?" 18% of respondents said either that "science hasn't been able to tell" or "don't know" or "refused." Likewise, two surveys done by Harris Interactive by telephone in 2000 and 2001 found 11% and 12% of respondents,

respectively, saying “no” or “don’t know” in response to more personalized forms of the question: “Do you believe that smoking increases your risk of getting lung cancer?” or “Do you believe that smoking increases your risk of getting lung cancer or not.”

Taken together, these surveys paint a coherent picture. In the 1950s and 1960s, large proportions of Americans did not recognize the health risks of cigarette smoking, and these proportions have been falling during the past four decades. However, very recent surveys show that the proportions of people not recognizing certain risks have not yet fallen to zero.

Are these beliefs behaviorally consequential? Should any effort be devoted to further public education to press the proportions of Americans denying these risks to zero?

### The Effects of Beliefs About the Health Consequences of

#### Smoking on Smoking Onset and Quitting

##### Review of Existing Evidence

The social science literature includes a number of studies that can be used to address the question of whether believing that smoking is less risky enhances the chances that a non-smoker will begin to smoke cigarettes. For example, if health beliefs are indeed causes of smoking onset, then people who smoke should, on average, believe that smoking is less risky than people who do not smoke. And indeed, many studies show that, as compared to people who do not smoke cigarettes, people who do smoke are less likely to believe that smoking causes health problems for people in general (e.g., American Cancer Society, 1969-1970; Bauman & Chenoweth, 1984; Beaglehole et al., 1978; Benthin, Slovic, & Severson, 1993; Bewley & Bland, 1977; Boyle, 1968; Brownson et al., 1992; Burns & Williams, 1995; Cannell & MacDonald, 1956; Cartwright et al., 1960; Cartwright & Martin, 1958; Cecil, Evans, & Stanley, 1996; Chapman et al., 1993; Crowe et al., 1994; Dawley et al., 1985; Eiser, Reicher, & Podpadec, 1995; Eiser, Sutton, and

Wober, 1979; Fodor et al., 1968; Greenlund et al., 1997; Grønhaug & Kangun, 1979; Halpern & Warner, 1994; Hansen & Malotte, 1986; Harrison et al., 1996; Hill & Gray, 1984; Jamieson & Romer, 2001; Kelson et al., 1975; Klesges et al., 1988a; Lawton & Goldman, 1961; Levitt & Edwards, 1970; Loken, 1982; McCoy et al., 1992; Murray & Cracknell, 1980; Murry, Swan, Johnson, & Bewley, 1983; Murray et al., 1994; Pervin & Yatko, 1965; Pyke, 1955; Reppucci et al., 1991; Romer & Jamieson, 2001; Roper Organization, 1978; Rudolph & Borland, 1976; Saad & O'Brien, 1998; Salber et al., 1963; Slovic, 1998, 2000a; Stacy et al., 1994; Steptoe et al., 1995; Swinehart, 1966; Tipton & Riebsame, 1987; Wang et al., 1995; Wang et al., 1998; Warner, Halpern, & Giovino, 1994; Williams & Clarke, 1997; Zagona & Zurcher, 1965; for a review, see Weinstein, 2001). And Charris, Corty, Presson, Olshavsky, Bensenberg, and Sherman (1981) and Presson, Chassin, Sherman, Olshavsky, Bensenberg, and Corty (1984) found that people who believed that smoking has less adverse impact on health were more likely to say they intended to smoke cigarettes in the future. Only four studies found no difference between smokers and non-smokers in the extent to which they believed smoking causes undesirable health effects (Burns & Williams, 1995; Grube, McGree, & Morgan, 1986; McKenna et al. 1993; Schneider & Vanmastrigt, 1974).

Weinstein (1980, 1982, 1987, 1998) has done and catalogued a great deal of research showing that people typically believe that they are less at risk personally of experiencing an undesirable life circumstance than are other people. This highly robust finding makes clear the importance of recognizing the distinction between people's beliefs about the health risks of smoking to people in general (on which we have focused thus far) and their beliefs about the health risks of smoking for themselves personally. In principle, smokers may be less likely than non-smokers to acknowledge the health effects of smoking on others, but smokers and non-



smokers may be equivalent in perceiving the impact of smoking on their own personal health. But a series of studies contradict this claim, showing that smokers were less likely to believe that smoking would cause undesirable health effects for them personally than were non-smokers (Benthin, Slovic, & Severson, 1993; Grønhaug & Kangun, 1979; Hansen & Malotte, 1986; Leventhal et al., 1987; Marshall, 1990; McCoy et al., 1992; Murray et al., 1994; Urberg & Robbins, 1984, Virgili, Owen, & Severson, 1991). These findings are therefore consistent with the notion that these personalized health beliefs partly determine smoking behavior.

Another set of relevant evidence comes from studies that asked non-smokers why they don't smoke. In studies by Levitt (1971) and Kahn and Edwards (1970), the most frequently given reason was to avoid the undesirable health effects of smoking. This, too, is consistent with the claim that perceptions of the health effects of smoking are important determinants of whether a person does or does not smoke.

Yet another finding of relevance here involves the strength of people's beliefs about the health effects of smoking. Even if a person is completely convinced that smoking substantially increases his or her risk of experiencing health problems, this belief may have no impact on his or her smoking behavior if he or she attaches no personal importance to those health effects (see, e.g., Petty & Krosnick, 1995). Therefore, attaching greater importance to health effects of smoking, coupled with the belief that smoking is deleterious, should lead to less smoking. Consistent with this logic, Mettlin (1973) reported that people who attached more importance to the effects of smoking on health were indeed less likely to smoke.

One very robust finding at first appears to challenge the general conclusion that beliefs about the health effects of smoking are partial causes of smoking behavior. Gerrard et al. (1996), Harrison et al. (1996), Lee (1989), McKenna et al. (1993), McMaster and Lee (1991), Pervin and

Yatko (1965), Strecher et al. (1995), Swinehart (1966), Weinstein (1987), and Williams and Clarke (1997) found that smokers were more likely than non-smokers to say that they themselves would get a smoking-related disease during their lifetimes. Likewise, Hurd and McGarry (1995) and Schoenbaum (1997) found that smokers were less likely to believe they would live to ages 75 and 85 than non-smokers said of themselves. And Greening and Dollinger (1991) reported that smokers said "a person like them" was more likely to die of cancer, stroke, or emphysema than did non-smokers. At first glance, these results seem to conflict with the ones reported previously, showing that smokers think the health risks of smoking are less than non-smokers do.

But it is important to recognize that the questions used to measure beliefs about likelihood of experiencing illnesses and life expectancy in these studies did not mention cigarettes or smoking. That is, these questions did not measure people's perceptions of the impact of smoking on their own health or likelihood of death. And it turns out that smokers do not in fact see themselves to be more likely to experience smoking-related diseases uniquely. Instead, smokers perceive themselves to be more likely than non-smokers perceive themselves to experience a wide range of undesirable physical conditions, including ones clearly unrelated to smoking. For example, Swinehart (1966) found that smokers said they were more likely than did non-smokers to get the flu. Harrison et al. (1996) found that smokers said they were more likely to "have an accident" or develop arthritis than non-smokers said of themselves. And McKenna et al. (1993) found that smokers were more likely than non-smokers to say they would get arthritis, become sterile, get venereal disease, and develop cirrhosis of the liver.

It appears that these perceptions are grounded in observable real-life events and general risk factors. For example, smokers report having had more recent hospitalizations, more recent visits to doctors, more chronic health conditions, and more restricted physical activity than do

non-smokers (Halpern & Warner, 1994). And smokers perceive themselves as having higher levels of risk factors other than smoking. For example, Reppucci et al. (1991) found that smokers reported experiencing more stress than did non-smokers. Thus, although the rates at which smokers report experiencing health problems and expect to experience health problems exceed the rates reported by non-smokers, this is not confined to smoking-related health problems.

### Ambiguity in This Evidence

The bulk of the evidence just reviewed is consistent with the claim that beliefs about health risks of smoking are determinants of smoking onset. Most important among this evidence is the correlation between health beliefs and smoking behavior, which is consistent with the notion that the former cause the latter. However, there is a theoretical basis for expecting that at least some of the correlation between health beliefs and smoking behavior is not in fact due to causal impact of beliefs on behavior. Rather, this correlation may be due to post-hoc rationalization of smoking behavior. As Festinger (1957) argued in his original statement of cognitive dissonance theory, cigarette smokers are likely to find it very uncomfortable to hold simultaneously the beliefs that they smoke cigarettes regularly and that smoking cigarettes regularly is damaging to their health. One way to reduce the discomfort associated with holding these beliefs simultaneously is to deny or underestimate the health risks of smoking. Therefore, if a person begins to smoke for a reason unrelated to health considerations (e.g., an adolescent is especially anxious in social settings and believes smoking will help him or her relax or be viewed acceptably by his or her peers), he or she may subsequently reduce the extent to which he or she believes that smoking causes health problems.

Festinger's (1957) idea may well be true and may be partly responsible for the robust correlation observed between smoking/non-smoking status and belief in the health effects of

smoking. However, evidence reported by McMaster and Lee (1991) suggests that smokers may reduce this cognitive dissonance by a different cognitive mechanism that Festinger (1957) also identified: downplaying the importance of the health risk by believing that health problems caused by smoking can be caught early and cured and that other risks posed in life are more threatening. Likewise, Loken (1982) found that smokers perceived the health consequences of smoking to be less undesirable than did non-smokers. Thus, it appears that smokers cope with their cognitive dissonance at least partly by this mechanism, though they may also strategically downplay their perceptions of the likelihood of undesirable health consequences following from smoking.

Regardless of whether or how smokers cope with their cognitive dissonance, it is also possible that pre-existing differences between smokers and non-smokers in their beliefs about the health consequences of smoking may partly determine whether or not these individuals subsequently become smokers or not. In order to test this idea directly, it is necessary to collect data from a group of non-smokers repeatedly over time, initially measuring their beliefs about the health effects of smoking, and then assessing whether these beliefs predict who later becomes a smoker. This is considered very strong evidence of causal impact of one factor on another (Finkel, 1995; Kessler & Greenberg, 1981).

Some past studies have involved conducting of such analyses (Bauman & Chenoweth, 1984; Chassin, Presson, Pitts, & Sherman, 2000; Chassin, Presson, Sherman, & Edwards, 1991; Collins et al., 1987). Some of these studies reported that people who initially believed smoking was more dangerous to their health were more likely to initiate smoking onset later (e.g., Bauman & Chenoweth, 1984; Chassin, Presson, Pitts, & Sherman, 2000). But other studies found mixed evidence of such lagged effects in some tests but not others (e.g., Chassin, Presson,

Sherman, & Edwards, 1991), and still other investigations found no impact of health beliefs on subsequent onset at all (Collins et al., 1987).

However, the results of those studies are problematic for a number of reasons. Most importantly, all of these studies' measures of respondents' beliefs about the health consequences of smoking did not assess the perceived increase in risk due to smoking. For example, Collins et al. (1987) averaged responses to three questions asking, "If you smoke cigarettes will you get lung disease?", "If you smoke cigarettes, will you have heart trouble?", and "If you smoke cigarettes, will you be out of breath?" Although these items may be viewed as assessing the perceived probabilities of experiencing various health problems given smoking, no measures were taken of the perceived probabilities of those health problems given not smoking, so these measures did not permit the assessment of the perceived increase in risk associated with smoking. All of the measures of health beliefs analyzed by Bauman and Chenoweth (1984) were similarly worded, as were most of the measures of health beliefs used by Chassin and colleagues (Chassin, Presson, Pitts, & Sherman, 2000; Chassin, Presson, Sherman, & Edwards, 1991; e.g., "If I smoke cigarettes, I will live a long time."). Given the wording of all of these items, their associations with subsequent smoking onset could be attributable to an acquiescent response bias (yielding reports of higher perceived probability of undesirable health outcomes) or general life pessimism (which would yield more pessimistic answers to all questions, regardless of whether they were specifically addressed to smoking or not).

Other items used in these investigations to measure health beliefs did not explicitly and specifically ask about perceptions of the health effects of smoking at all (e.g., "If you are young and healthy, cigarette smoking is not dangerous." or "The anti-smoking ads twist the facts to make cigarette smoking look worse for your health than it really is."). And the measure of

smoking onset used by Collins et al. (1987) was computed by standardizing and averaging responses to a variety of questions asking about how many cigarettes one has smoked in his or her lifetime, how long it has been since the respondent last smoked a cigarette, how long it will be before he or she thinks he or she might smoke again, how much he or she currently smokes, and more. Thus, it is difficult to interpret analyses predicting this measure as offering straightforward empirical assessments of the predictors of smoking onset.

### New Longitudinal Evidence on Health Beliefs and Smoking Onset

#### Overview

In light of the ambiguities inherent in existing longitudinal evidence, we set out to generate more compelling tests of the hypothesis that health beliefs play a role in determining smoking onset among adolescents. To do so, we revisited the surveys conducted by Chassin, Presson, Sherman, and their colleagues (e.g., Chassin, Presson, Pitts, & Sherman, 2000; Chassin, Presson, Sherman, & Edwards, 199; Chassin 1990; Rose, Chassin, Presson, & Sherman, 1996) to reanalyze those data. We (1) built a measure of health beliefs using questions that explicitly gauged perceptions of the causal impact of smoking on health and controlled for acquiescence response bias, (2) used a measure of the value respondents placed on health to test interactions between beliefs about the health effects of smoking and value placed on health (e.g., Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), (3) built an array of measures of other suspected causes of smoking onset among adolescents, and (4) used longitudinal panel data to assess the impact of health beliefs on smoking onset controlling for other potential causes.

Each year from 1980 through 1983, 6<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> graders attending public schools in a Midwestern county completed self-administered questionnaires in school. Students who graduated at the end of the 1980, 1981, or 1982 school years were mailed questionnaires to be

completed each post-graduation year between 1980 and 1983 (for details on the data collection, see Chassin 1990; Rose, Chassin, Presson, & Sherman, 1996). Each questionnaire included a wide array of measures, tapping smoking status as well as many potential predictors of it.

### Analysis Strategy

The dataset allowed us to identify the predictors of smoking onset during three time intervals: between wave 1 (1980) and wave 2 (1981), between wave 2 and wave 3 (1982), and between wave 3 and wave 4 (1983). Therefore, for each of the first three waves, we created a set of variables representing the posited antecedent conditions of smoking onset between that wave and the next one. We focused only on respondents who were non-smokers at the time of an initial wave in an adjacent pair, so we predicted smoking onset; respondents who were smokers at an initial wave were dropped from these analyses. Then, we stacked the data from the three adjacent wave pairs to yield one large dataset combining all available documentations of transitions to smoking or failures to make such a transition.<sup>1</sup>

2,264 respondents provided suitable data for only one of the three wave pairs (e.g., people who were non-smokers at two consecutive waves and provided no data for the third or fourth waves; people who were non-smokers in 1980, became smokers in 1981, and remained smokers in 1982 and 1983). Another 1,155 respondents provided data for two wave pairs (e.g., people who were non-smokers in 1980 and 1981 and were smokers in 1982 and 1983). And another 752 respondents provided data for all three wave pairs (e.g., people who were non-smokers in 1980, 1981, and 1982, and became smokers in 1983).

---

<sup>1</sup> This introduces some non-independence into the dataset that we used for our initial analyses. To assess the impact of this non-independence, we repeated all of our analyses using only one wave of data per respondent. To do so, we randomly selected one wave for each respondent who had two or three waves of data suitable for our analyses. Those analyses yielded similar results to those reported in the text.

Logistic regressions were conducted separately for each gender, predicting smoking onset from variables measured in the first wave of the adjacent wave pair. Predictors included: a main effect of health beliefs, the interaction between health beliefs and value placed on health, main effects of friends' smoking, friends' subjective norm, motivation to comply with friends, parents' smoking, parents' subjective norm, motivation to comply with parents, older siblings' smoking, dummy variables for absent mother, absent father, and absent older siblings, and age of the respondent. Some two-way interactions were also tested: friends' smoking x motivation to comply with friends, friends' subjective norm x motivation to comply with friends, parents' smoking x motivation to comply with parents, and parents' subjective norm x motivation to comply with parents. Of these interactions, only parents' smoking x motivation to comply with parents exerted a significant effect on smoking onset. All the other interaction terms were not significant predictors of smoking onset and were therefore excluded from the regressions we report.<sup>2</sup>

### Measures

Health beliefs. Three pairs of questions were used to build an index of beliefs about the health consequences of smoking. The first pair was "If I smoke cigarettes, I will live for a long time" and "If I do NOT smoke cigarettes, I will live for a long time", the second pair was "If I smoke cigarettes, I will get lung cancer" and "If I do NOT smoke cigarettes, I will get lung cancer", and the third pair was "If I smoke cigarettes, I will get heart disease" and "If I do NOT smoke cigarettes, I will get heart disease." On all six items, the response choices "strongly

---

<sup>2</sup> Among boys, the following 2-way interaction effects were not significant: friends' smoking x motivation to comply with friends ( $b=-1.75$ ,  $p>.10$ ), friends' subjective norm x motivation to comply with friends ( $b=-.79$ ,  $p>.50$ ), and parents' subjective norm x motivation to comply with parents ( $b=-1.11$ ,  $p>.50$ ). Among girls, the following 2-way interaction effects were not significant: friends' smoking x motivation to comply with friends ( $b=-.84$ ,  $p>.60$ ), friends' subjective norm x motivation to comply with friends ( $b=-.81$ ,  $p>.70$ ), and parents' subjective norm x motivation to comply with parents ( $b=2.23$ ,  $p>.50$ ). These interactions were thus removed from the regression model.



agree,” “agree,” “neutral,” “disagree,” and “strongly disagree” were coded 1, .75, .5, .25, and 0, respectively. A difference score was computed for each corresponding pair of items such the responses to the “If I do NOT smoke cigarettes” item was subtracted from the “If I smoke cigarettes” item. The average of the heart disease and the lung cancer difference scores was multiplied by  $-1$ , then averaged with the difference score for the long life items. This was done so that the items about negative health consequences would have the same weight as the positively-worded item about longevity. In this health belief index, higher scores imply less endorsement of the negative consequences of smoking.

Value placed on health. Four items measured the extent to which respondents valued health and longevity, all asking whether a series of life outcomes would be “very bad,” “bad,” “not good or bad,” “good,” or “very good.” Two life outcomes were desirable (“If I live for a long time, that will be...” and “If I live a healthy life, that will be...”), and responses to these items were coded to range from 0 (meaning “very good”) to 1 (meaning “very bad”). The other two life outcomes were undesirable (“If I get lung cancer, that will be...” and “If I get heart disease, that will be...”), and responses to these items were coded to range from 0 (meaning “very bad”) to 1 (meaning “very good”). Responses to the four items were then averaged to yield an index score which ranged from 1 (meaning placing maximal value on health and longevity) to 0 (meaning placing minimal value on health and longevity). This index was dichotomized such that all data points from .8 through 1 were recoded as 1 (meaning “high value placed on health”), and all lesser values were recoded as 0 (meaning “low value placed on health”).<sup>3</sup>

Smoking onset. Respondents read six sentences and selected the one that best described their smoking behavior: “I have never smoked a cigarette, not even a few puffs”; “I have smoked

---

<sup>3</sup> This cut-point was necessary to capture the shape of non-linear moderation that we observed in the data. The majority of respondents (92%) were clustered in the high value group.

one cigarette or a few cigarettes just to try, but I have not smoked in the past month”; “I no longer smoke but in the past I was a regular smoker”; “I smoke regularly but no more than one cigarette a month”; “I smoke regularly but no more than one cigarette a week”; “I smoke more than one cigarette a week.” People who said “never smoked,” “have not smoked in the past month,” or “no longer smoke” were coded 0 to identify them as non-smokers, and people who said “smoke regularly but no more than one cigarette a month,” “smoke regularly but no more than one cigarette a week,” or “smoke more than one cigarette a week” were coded 1 to identify them as current smokers.

Fewer than 2% of respondents said that they “smoke regularly but no more than one cigarette a month” (1.5% in wave 1; 1.4% in wave 2; 1.1% in wave 3; and 1.1% in wave 4) or “smoke regularly but no more than one cigarette a week” (1.3% in wave 1; 1.5% in wave 2; 1.1% in wave 3; and 1.1% in wave 4), so the vast majority of people classified as current smokers were those who said they smoked more than one cigarette a week. Among respondents classified as non-current smokers, a small minority said they no longer smoked but were a regular smoker in the past (6.2% in wave 1; 5.5% in wave 2; 5.1% in wave 3; and 4.2% in wave 4), these respondents were excluded from analysis.<sup>4</sup> Most people classified as non-current smokers had never smoked before or smoked just once or twice to try.

For each of the first three waves, we created a variable coded 0 for people who were non-smokers at that wave and the subsequent wave and coded 1 for people who were non-smokers at that wave and became smokers by the subsequent wave. This dichotomous variable measuring smoking onset constituted the core dependent variable used in the present analyses to study the predictors of smoking onset.

Friends' smoking status. Respondents were asked how many of their 5 closest friends smoked cigarettes. Responses were coded 1 (meaning all 5 friends smoked), .8 (meaning 4 friends smoked), .6 (meaning 3 friends smoked), .4 (meaning 2 friends smoked), .2 (meaning 1 friend smoked), and 0 (meaning no friend smoked).

Motivation to comply with friends. Respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statement "Most of the time when my friends want me to do something, I go along with it." Responses were coded 1 (strongly agree) or 0 (agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree).

Friends' subjective norm. Respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed that "My friends think that I should smoke cigarettes" and "My friends think that I should not smoke cigarettes." Responses to the latter item (coded to range from .5, meaning strong disagreement, to 0, meaning strong agreement) were subtracted from responses to the former item (coded to range from .5, meaning strong agreement, to 0, meaning strong disagreement). The resulting index ranged from 1 (meaning a strong norm favoring smoking) to 0 (meaning a strong norm against smoking).

Parents' smoking status. Respondents were asked whether their mother smoked cigarettes and whether their father smoked cigarettes. Offered response options included "yes," "no," or "I have no mother/father." A dichotomous variable was created, coded 1 for respondents whose mothers smoked and 0 for respondents whose mothers did not smoke or who had no mother. A second dichotomous variable was coded 1 for respondents whose fathers smoked and 0 for respondents whose fathers did not smoke or who had no father.

---

<sup>4</sup> A very small number of respondents transitioned from being a regular smoker at one wave to being a non-smoker at the next wave (only .8% from wave 1 to wave 2, .9% from wave 2 to wave 3, and .6% from wave 3 to wave 4), so we were not able to study the predictors of smoking cessation.

To control for the effect of having a parent who did not smoke from the effect of not having a parent, another pair of dummy variables was created: one to identify respondents who did not have mothers (coded 1 for people with no mother and 0 for people with a mother present), and another to identify respondents who did not have fathers (coded 1 for people with no father and 0 for people with a father present).

Motivation to comply with parents. Motivation to comply with parents was measured by the extent of agreement or disagreement with the statement, “Most of the time when my parents want me to do something, I go along with it.” Responses were coded 1 (strongly agree) or 0 (agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree).

Parents’ subjective norm. Respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed that “My parents think that I should smoke cigarettes” and “My parents think that I should not smoke cigarettes.” Responses to the latter item (coded to range from .5, meaning strong disagreement, to 0, meaning strong agreement) were subtracted from responses to the former item (coded to range from .5, meaning strong agreement, to 0, meaning strong disagreement). The resulting index ranged from 1 (meaning a strong norm favoring smoking) to 0 (meaning a strong norm against smoking).

Older siblings’ smoking status. Respondents were asked whether their older brother smoked cigarettes and whether their older sister smoked cigarettes (response choices: “yes,” “no,” or “I have no older brother/sister”). A dichotomous variable was coded 1 for respondents with an older brother who smoked and 0 for respondents whose older brothers did not smoke or who had no older brother. Similarly, a dichotomous variable was coded 1 for respondents with an older sister who smoked and 0 for respondents whose older sisters did not smoke or who had no older sister.

To control for the effect of not having older siblings, a pair of dummy variables was created: one to identify respondents who did not have older brothers (coded 1 for people with no older brother and 0 for people with an older brother), and another to identify respondents who did not have older sisters (coded 1 for people with no older sister and 0 for people with an older sister).

Age. Respondents reported their date of birth, which was used to compute age. Data from respondents who were aged 11 through 18 at the first wave in each wave pair were included in our analyses. Age was coded to represent age at the time of the second wave in each wave pair, ranging from 0 to 1, with 0 meaning age 12 and 1 meaning age 18.<sup>5</sup>

## Results

The first two columns of Table 1 show parameter estimates for regressions conducted separately with boys and girls. The last column shows parameter estimates for a regression using both genders combined together, testing the significance of coefficient differences between the genders. Specifically, the last 19 rows of coefficients test interactions of gender with each of the other predictors in the model.

The parameter estimates are largely as would be expected based upon conventional understandings of the instigators of smoking onset, beginning first with peer influence. The more of a person's peers who smoked, the more likely subsequent smoking onset was (boys:  $b=4.87$ ,  $p<.01$ ; girls:  $b=4.20$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Respondents whose friends believed they should smoke were more likely to manifest onset than respondents whose friends thought they should not smoke, more so for girls ( $b=4.49$ ,  $p<.01$ ) than for boys ( $b=2.62$ ,  $p<.01$ ; gender difference:  $b=-1.87$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

---

<sup>5</sup> Data from respondents who were aged 19 (2%) and 20 (.1%) were not included in our analyses.

Parental influence also appeared, in textured ways. Girls whose mothers and fathers smoked were more likely to manifest onset, but only if they were high in motivation to comply with their parents (girls:  $b=1.57$ ,  $p<.05$ ; boys:  $b=1.60$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Although mothers' smoking had no statistically significant impact on boys, either as a main effect ( $b=.07$ , n.s.) or in interaction with motivation to comply ( $b=1.53$ , n.s.), the interactions of gender with these two effects are not significant (main effect:  $b=.16$ , n.s.; interaction:  $b=-.04$ , n.s.; see column 3 of Table 1). Therefore, it is most appropriate to conclude that the main effects and two-way interaction for mothers' smoking in the large regression apply to boys as well, meaning that boys also were especially likely to begin smoking if either of their parents smoked and if they were highly motivated to comply with their parents. Parents' wishes about respondents' smoking behavior had no impact on onset for either gender (boys:  $b=-.68$ , n.s.; girls:  $b=.55$ , n.s.).

Siblings also influenced smoking onset. Having older brothers who smoked instigated smoking onset among boys ( $b=1.05$ ,  $p<.01$ ) but not among girls ( $b=.07$ , n.s.; gender difference:  $b=.98$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Having older sisters who smoked instigated smoking onset among girls ( $b=.59$ ,  $p<.10$ ) but not among boys ( $b=-.32$ , n.s.; gender difference:  $b=-.91$ ,  $p<.10$ ).

Controlling for all of these effects, beliefs about the health consequences of smoking also had impact on onset, though differently for boys and girls. For boys, believing that smoking was more likely to cause health problems inhibited smoking onset ( $b=1.81$ ,  $p<.05$ ). But among girls, health effect beliefs and value placed on health interacted: the conjunction of believing that smoking was more likely to cause health problems and attaching substantial value to health inhibited onset ( $b=3.46$ ,  $p<.05$ ). The main effect of health effect beliefs was significantly stronger among boys than among girls ( $b=3.49$ ,  $p<.05$ ), and the interaction of health effect beliefs with value placed on health was marginally significantly stronger among girls than

among boys ( $b=-2.92$ ,  $p<.10$ ). This constitutes very strong evidence of causal impact of health beliefs on smoking onset and suggests that the process operates slightly differently for boys than for girls.

### Discussion

The analyses reported here are relatively unusual in the smoking literature: lagged effects using longitudinal survey data have rarely been estimated, so evidence of causal influence has often been inferred from covariation. Most often, researchers have offered cross-sectional correlations and made assumptions about the direction of causality at work. But we have shown here that it is possible to yield clearer support for a particular direction of causality using survey data collected on multiple occasions from the same individuals, many of whom are experiencing transitions out of the non-smoking category and into the category of smokers (see also Tucker, Ellickson, & Klein, 2003; Wang Fitzhugh, Green, Turner, Eddy, & Westerfield, 1999).

This evidence yielded some findings reinforcing presumptions widely-held among health professionals about the primary instigators of smoking onset early in the life-cycle. Peers, both via their behavior and subjective norms, are the most powerful instigators of smoking onset. But family forces are not irrelevant during this time period. Parents who smoked inspired their children to begin smoking, and parents' expressed (or unexpressed) desires regarding child behavior were apparently ignored. That is, children acted as if parents instructed: "Do as I do, not as I say."

Our evidence on parental influence may offer an explanation for the puzzle addressed by Avenevoli and Merikangas (2003): "Why is the effect of parental smoking weak?" (p. 13). We found that parental smoking behavior itself was not directly related to child smoking. Impact of parental smoking behavior was only apparent in light of the interaction involving motivation to

comply with parents. Parental smoking was consequential among children who wished to comply with their parents but not among those who lacked such motivation. Most past studies reviewed by Avenevoli and Merikangas (2003) failed to measure and test interactions involving motivation to comply with parents when examining the effect of parental smoking. Perhaps taking this interaction into account will reveal more consistently powerful parental influence in future studies.

Siblings also inspired smoking onset, but in a gender-specific fashion. Boys were induced to start smoking by older brothers, and girls were induced to start smoking by older sisters. These findings are consistent with evidence from cross-sectional analyses showing the same gender specificity: boys' smoking status was associated only with older brothers' smoking, and girls' smoking status was associated only with older sisters' smoking (e.g., Wang et al., 1995).

The gender specificity in the causal impact of older sibling's behavior may occur partly because of gender segregation in sharing of material goods. For example, if two same-gender siblings share a bedroom, it may be easier for the younger sibling to borrow the older sibling's cigarettes. Sharing bedrooms seems less likely for opposite gender siblings during adolescence. Thus, sibling influence may occur partly because of simple practicalities regarding obtaining cigarettes. But the gender-specific nature of this influence may also occur because younger boys and girls look up to older same-gender siblings as role models, so the process of behavior adoption may be driven by the desire to emulate specific other family members of the same gender.

Controlling for all of these social influences, we found evidence consistent with the conclusion that beliefs about health consequences are causes of cigarette smoking onset as well.



Believing that smoking is less damaging to health apparently allowed a young person to begin smoking more readily. But this process unfolded differently for boys and girls. For girls, beliefs about health effects were an insulating factor only when coupled with high value placed on health. Some girls place much more value on their health than others. Among those who valued their health, believing that smoking entailed health risks inhibited smoking onset. But among girls who did not value their health at all, beliefs about health risks had no effect at all on onset.

Boys manifested a simpler reasoning process. Beliefs about health effects were an insulating factor, in and of themselves. Believing that smoking entailed health risks lowered the likelihood of smoking onset regardless of value placed on health. The failure of this interaction to appear is not an artifactual result of no variance in value placed on health among boys. So future research might usefully investigate the reasons why value placed on health seems inconsequential in this domain and that beliefs about the health risks of smoking are fairly universally insulating for boys.

Our results have a number of interesting implications for health communication strategies that might be implemented in the future. First, according to the national survey data we reviewed, the belief that smoking cigarettes entails health risks is not held universally by American adults. And beliefs that smoking entails specific risks involving lung cancer, heart disease, and throat cancer are even less widely held.

The same pattern is apparent among our respondents, whose scores on the health effect beliefs measures are shown in Table 2: although most respondents have scores less than zero (meaning that cigarettes cause health problems), the strength of these perceived health effects are well above -1.0 (the most alarmist views) for most respondents. Thus, there is plenty of room to move these young people's beliefs in the direction of endorsing problematic health consequences

of smoking. Because these beliefs appear to inhibit smoking onset, it seems worthwhile to continue to educate the public (especially the young public) about the state of evidence on these health risks.

Recent years have seen a substantial change in the role tobacco companies have played in this educational process. In contrast to decades during which these firms questioned the convincingness of research evidence on health risks of smoking, they now publicly endorse the view of most health professionals. For example, as of September, 2005, the Philip Morris website stated: “Philip Morris USA agrees with the overwhelming medical and scientific consensus that cigarette smoking causes lung cancer, heart disease, emphysema and other serious diseases in smokers. Smokers are far more likely to develop serious diseases, like lung cancer, than non-smokers ([http://www.philipmorrisusa.com/en/health\\_issues/cigarette\\_smoking\\_and\\_disease.asp](http://www.philipmorrisusa.com/en/health_issues/cigarette_smoking_and_disease.asp)).” And in countries such as Canada and the United Kingdom, as well as the U.S., cigarette packages or cartons universally contain large warning messages warning of the health effects.

However, these messages are not necessarily reaching non-smokers before they consider smoking or just before they begin to smoke. Therefore, it may not be sensible to assume that the public has been sufficiently convinced of the health risks of smoking. Especially among young people, efforts at convincingly illustrating the health risks of smoking may yield valuable payoffs in terms of decreased onset rates. Some of the currently implemented health education campaigns focused on smoking (e.g., sponsored by the Legacy Foundation) have chosen not to emphasize beliefs about the health risks of smoking and have instead focused on other phenomena. Our evidence suggests that added attention to fostering accurate health risk beliefs may be worthwhile.

But even more can be done, according to our evidence. Our results suggest that the

impact of health risk beliefs on smoking onset depends upon the value a girl places on her health. Among girls who value their health, establishing the belief that smoking entails health risks will put into place a powerful inhibitor of smoking onset. But among girls who do not place value on their health, efforts at fostering belief in health risks are likely to have no payoff in terms of reduced onset. Therefore, it would be worthwhile for health communication efforts to promote placing value on health in general. Any attempts to do so would be most effective if informed by a large literature documenting the causes of value placed on health. Therefore, our findings suggest additional work along these lines and the application of that work in public education campaigns, especially focused on young girls.

Another potential implication of our findings has to do with the gender-matching apparent in sibling influence. As we suggested above, older same-gender siblings may facilitate smoking onset by providing behavioral opportunities. But teenage girls and boys may also be especially powerfully influenced by the behaviors and values of older same-gender role models. This reinforces the notion that educational messages might be best segregated by gender, having girls provide messages to girls and boys provide messages to boys. This can be done in classroom settings by having single-gender groups of students participate in health promotion exercises. And gender segregation can also be accomplished via the mass media, by placing ads featuring attractive same-gender sources in magazines that are read primarily either by girls or by boys.

It is interesting to note one other statistically significant effect in our regressions that has action implications. Among both boys and girls, motivation to comply with parents had significant negative impact on smoking onset (boys:  $b=-1.78$ ,  $p<.05$ ; girls:  $b=-1.75$ ,  $p<.05$ ). This effect was independent of parental smoking behavior and parents' desires regarding their child's

smoking behavior. That is, simply being highly motivated to comply with parents' wishes reduced smoking onset. Perhaps this is because most of the things parents hope their children will do are incompatible with smoking behavior, so compliance-motivated children are busy doing other things that minimize deleterious social contact and available time, thus reducing smoking onset as an unintentional byproduct. This finding suggests that public education campaigns designed to enhance motivation to comply with parents in particular (and with adults in general) might be another route to successful inhibition of smoking onset.

Another implication of our findings has to do with future research on the causes of smoking behavior. It is not uncommon to see publications of research predicting smoking status using an array of predictors (e.g., Alexander, Piazza, Mekos, & Valente, 2001; Epstein, Botvin, & Spoth, 2003). But it is also not uncommon to see such regression equations fail to include measures of the perceived health risk of smoking (e.g., Alexander et al., 2001; Epstein et al., 2003). Given the risk of spuriousness in such regressions, it is important to control for all other possible causes of the dependent variable. The present research findings suggest that health risk beliefs should always be among these control variables.

### Conclusion

Public health efforts to encourage Americans to more accurately recognize the health consequences of smoking seem likely to have been consequential in shaping smoking behavior, leading to a reduction in the nation's smoking rate and a consequent reduction in smoking-related morbidity and mortality.

### References

Ahluwalia, J. S., Resnicow, K., & Clark, W. S. (1998). Knowledge about smoking, reasons for smoking, and reasons for wishing to quit in inner-city African Americans. Ethnicity Dis., 8, 385-393.

Alexander C., Piazza M., Mekos D., Valente T. (2001). Peers, schools, and adolescent cigarette smoking. Journal of Adolescent Health, 29, 22–30.

American Cancer Society. (1969-1970). Teenage smoking, New ACS study shows young people's beliefs and behavior. Cancer News, 23, 3-7.

Armstrong, J., Denniston, W., & Gordon, M. (1975). The use of the decomposition principle in making judgments. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 14, 257-263.

Avenevoli, S., & Merikangas, K. R. (2003). Familial influences on adolescent smoking. Addiction, 98, 1-20.

Babbie, E. (1990). Survey research methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bauman, K. E., & Chenoweth, R. L. (1984). The relationship between the consequences adolescents expect from smoking and their behavior: a factor analysis with panel data. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 14, 28-41.

Beaglehole, R., Eyles, E., & Harding, W. (1978). Cigarette smoking habits, attitudes and associated social factors in adolescents. New Zealand Medical Journal, 87, 239-242.

Benthin, A., Slovic, P., & Severson, H. (1993). A psychometric study of adolescent risk perception. Journal of Adolescence, 16, 153-168.

Bewley, B. R., & Bland, J. M. (1977). Academic performance and social factors related to cigarette smoking by schoolchildren. British Journal of Preventive and Social Medicine, 31, 18-24.

Bewley, B. R., Bland, J. M., & Harris R. (1974). Factors associated with the starting of cigarette smoking by primary school children. British Journal of Preventive and Social Medicine, 28, 37-44.

Borland, R. (1997a). Tobacco health warnings and smoking-related cognitions and behaviors. Addiction, 92, 1427-1435.

Boyle, C. M. (1968). Some factors affecting the smoking habits of a group of teenagers. Lancet, 2 (7581), 1287-1289.

Brase, G. L., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (1998). Individuation, counting, and statistical inference: The role of frequency and whole-object representations in judgment under uncertainty. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 127, 1-19.

Brownson, R.C., Thompson, J., Wilkerson, J. C., Davis, J. R., Owens, N. W., & Fisher, E. B. (1992). Demographic and socioeconomic differences in beliefs about the health effects of smoking. American Journal of Public Health, 82, 99-103.

Bruine de Bruin, W., Fischhoff, B., Millstein, S. G., & Halpern-Felsher, B. L. (2000). Verbal and numerical expressions of probability: "It's a fifty-fifty chance." Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81, 115-131.

Burns, J. C., & Williams, J. N. (1995). A survey to determine the knowledge of military members about the hazards of tobacco use, and a resulting tobacco-hazard education project. Journal of Cancer Education, 10, 37-40.

Cannell, C. F., & MacDonald, J. C. (1956). The impact of health news on attitudes and behavior. Journalism Quarterly, 33, 315-323.

Cartwright, A., & Martin, F. M. (1958). Some popular beliefs concerning the causes of cancer. British Medical Journal, 2, 592.

Cartwright, A., Thomson, J. G., et al. (1960). An attitude study among schoolchildren, touching also on parental influence. British Journal of Preventive and Social Medicine, 14, 28-34.

Cecil, H., Evans, R. I., & Stanley, M. A. (1996). Perceived believability among adolescents of health warning labels on cigarette packs. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26, 502-519.

Center for Disease Control and Prevention (1982). Smoking and Cancer. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 31, 77-80.

Center for Disease Control and Prevention (2003). Cigarette Smoking Among Adults - United States. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 52, 953-956.

Chapman, S., Wong, W., & Smith, W. (1993). Self-exempting beliefs about smoking and health: differences between smokers and ex-smokers. American Journal of Public Health, 83, 215-219.

Chassin, L., Presson, C. C., Pitts, S. C., & Sherman, S. J. (2000). The natural history of cigarette smoking from adolescence to adulthood in a Midwestern community sample: multiple trajectories and their psychosocial correlates. Health Psychology, 19, 223-231.

Chassin, L., Presson, C. C., & Sherman, S. J. (1984). Cognitive and social influence factors in adolescent smoking cessation. Addictive Behaviors, 9, 383-390.

Chassin, L., Presson, C. C., Sherman, S. J., & Edwards, D. A. (1991). Four pathways to young-adult smoking status: adolescent social-psychological antecedents in a Midwestern community sample. Health Psychology, 10, 409-418.

Chassin, L., Presson, C.C., Sherman, S.J., & Edwards, D. (1990). The natural history of smoking: Predicting young adult smoking outcomes from adolescent smoking patterns. Health

Psychology, 9, 701-716.

Cialdini, R. B. (1993). Influence: Science and practice. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Collins, L. M., Sussman, S., Rauch, J. M., Dent, C. W., Johnson, C., Hansen W. B., & Flay, B. R. (1987). Psychosocial predictors of young adolescent cigarette smoking: a sixteen-month, three-wave longitudinal study. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17, 554-573.

Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (1996). Are humans good intuitive statisticians after all?: Rethinking some conclusions of the literature on judgment under uncertainty. Cognition, 58, 1-73.

Crowe, J. W., Torabi, M. R., & Nakornkhet, N. (1994). Cross-cultural study of samples of adolescents' attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors related to smoking. Psychological Reports, 75, 1155-1161.

Curry, S., Grothaus, L. C., & Wagner, E. H. (1990). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for smoking cessation. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58, 310-316.

Dappen, A., Schwartz, R. H., & O'Donnell, R. (1996). A survey of adolescent smoking patterns. Journal of the American Board of Family Practice, 9, 7-13.

Dawley, H. H., Fleischer, B. J., & Dawley, L. T. (1985). Attitudes toward smoking and smoking rate: implications for smoking discouragement. International Journal of the Addictions, 20, 483-488.

Dozois, D. N., Farrow, J. A., & Miser, A. (1995). Smoking patterns and cessation motivations during adolescence. International Journal of the Addictions, 30, 1485-1498.

Duncan, C. L., Cummings, S. R., Hudes, E. S., Zahnd, E., & Coates, T. J. (1992). Quitting smoking: reasons for quitting and predictors of cessation among medical patients. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 7, 398-404.



Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1975). An attributional analysis of the effect of communicator characteristics on opinion change: The case of communicator attractiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 136-144.

Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., Chaiken, S. (1978). Causal inferences about communicators and their effect on opinion change. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 424-435.

Eagly, A. H., Chaiken, S., & Wood, W. (1981). An attributional analysis of persuasion. In J. Harvey, W. Ickes, & R. Kidd (Eds.), New directions in attribution research (Vol. 3). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eiser, J. R., Reicher, S. D., & Podpadec, T. J. (1995). Smokers' and non-smokers' estimates of their personal risk of cancer and of the incremental risk attributable to cigarette smoking. Addiction Research, 3, 221-229.

Eiser, J. R., Sutton, S. R., & Wober, M. (1979). Smoking, seat-belts, and beliefs about health. Addictive Behaviors, 4, 331-338.

Epstein, J. A., Botvin, G. J., Spoth, R. (2003). Predicting smoking among rural adolescents: Social and cognitive processes. Nicotine and Tobacco Research, 5, 485-491.

Feather, N. T. (1962). Cigarette smoking and lung cancer: A study of cognitive dissonance. Australian Journal of Psychology, 14, 55-64.

Farrow, L., Taylor, W. C., & Arnold, R. M. (1992). Absolutely relative: How research results are summarized can affect treatment decisions. The American Journal of Medicine, 92, 121-124.

Feather, N. T. (1963). Cognitive dissonance, sensitivity, and evaluation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66, 157-163.

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford, CA: Stanford University

Press.

Fiedler, K. (1988). The dependence of the conjunction fallacy on subtle linguistic factors. Psychological Research, 50, 123-129.

Finkel, S. E. 1995. Causal analysis with panel data. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fischhoff, B., & Bruine de Bruin, W. (1999). Fifty-fifty = 50%? Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 12, 149-163.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Fodor, J. T., Glass, L. H., & Weiner, J. M. (1968). Smoking behavior, cognitive skills and educational implications. Journal of School Health, 38, 94-98.

Gerrard, M., Gibbons, F. X., Benthin, A. C., & Hessling, R. M. (1996). A longitudinal study of the reciprocal nature of risk behaviors and cognitions in adolescents: What you do shapes what you think, and vice versa. Health Psychology, 15, 344-354.

Gigerenzer, G. (1991). How to make cognitive illusions disappear: Beyond heuristics and biases. European Review of Social Psychology, 2, 83-115.

Gigerenzer, G., & Hoffrage, U. (1995). How to improve Bayesian reasoning without instruction Frequency formats. Psychological Review, 102, 684-704.

Gigerenzer, G., Hoffrage, U., & Kleinbölting, H. (1991). Probabilistic mental models: A Brunswickian theory of confidence. Psychological Review, 98, 506-528.

Greening, L., & Dollinger, S. J. (1991). Adolescent smoking and perceived vulnerability to smoking-related causes of death. Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 16, 687-699.

Greenlund, K. J., Johnson, C. C., Webber, L. S., & Berenson, G. S. (1997). Cigarette smoking attitudes and first use among third-through sixth-grade students: the Bogalusa heart

study. American Journal of Public Health, 87, 1345-1348.

Grønhaug, K., & Kangun, N. (1979). Exploring generalized and personalized beliefs among smokers and non-smokers: a first look. Advances in Consumer Research, 6, 184-190.

Grube, J. W., McGree, S., & Morgan, M. (1986). Beliefs related to cigarette smoking among Irish college students. International Journal of the Addictions, 21, 701-706.

Haaga, D., Gillis, M. M., & McDermut, W. (1993). Lay beliefs about the causes and consequences of smoking cessation maintenance. International Journal of the Addictions, 28, 369-375.

Halpern, M. T., & Warner, K. E. (1993). Motivations for smoking cessation: a comparison of successful quitters and failures. Journal of Substance Abuse, 5, 247-256.

Halpern, M. T., & Warner, K. E. (1994). Differences in former smokers' beliefs and health status following smoking cessation. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 10, 31-37.

Hansen, W. B., & Malotte, C. K. (1986). Perceived personal immunity: the development of beliefs about susceptibility to the consequences of smoking. Preventive Medicine, 15, 363-372.

Harrison, A., Qasmool, A., Suweidi, E., Sabet, K. K., Al-Mansouri, K., Al-Darmaki, M. Al-Marzouqi, M., & Al-Taire, Y. (1996). The reactions of patients and doctors in the United Arab Emirates towards smoking. Journal of Addictive Diseases, 15, 75-92.

Hill, D., & Gray, N. (1984). Australian patterns of tobacco smoking and health related beliefs in 1983. Community Health Studies, 8, 307-316.

Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Carson, R. T., & Mitchell, R.C. (2000). Violating conversational conventions disrupts cognitive processing of attitude questions. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36, 465-494.

Hurd, M. D., McGarry, K. (1995). Evaluation of the subjective probabilities of survival in the health and retirement study. Journal of Human Resources, 30, 268-292.

Hux, J. E., & Naylor, C. D. (1995). Communicating the benefits of chronic preventive therapy: Does the format of efficacy data determine patients' acceptance of treatment? Medication Decision Making, 15, 152-157.

Jamieson, P., & Romer, D. (2001). What do young people think they know about the risks of smoking? In P. Slovic (Ed.), Smoking: Risk, perception, and policy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kahn, E. B., & Edwards, C. N. (1970). Smoking and youth: contributions to the study of smoking behavior in high school students. Journal of School Health, 40, 561-562.

Kaufert, J. M., Rabkin, S. W., Syrotuik, J., Boyko, E., & Shane, F. (1986). Health beliefs as predictors of success of alternate modalities of smoking cessation: Results of a controlled trial. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 9, 475-489.

Kelson, S. R., Pullella, J. L., Otterland, A. (1975). A survey of smoking habits and attitudes toward smoking among students in grades 7 through 12 in Toledo and Lucas County (Ohio) public schools-1964 and 1971. American Journal of Public Health, 65, 923-938.

Kessler, R. C., & Greenberg, D. F. (1981). Linear panel analysis: Models of quantitative change. New York: Academic Press.

Klesges, R. C., Somes, G., Pascale, R. W., Klesges, L. M., Murphy, M., Brown, K., & Williams, E. (1988a). Knowledge and beliefs regarding the consequences of cigarette smoking and their relationships to smoking status in a biracial sample. Health Psychology, 7, 387-401.

Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (forthcoming). Designing great questionnaires: Insights from psychology. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lawton, M. P., & Goldman, A. E. (1961). Cigarette smoking and attitude toward the etiology of lung cancer. Journal of Social Psychology, 54, 235-248.

Lee, C. (1989). Perceptions of immunity to disease in adult smokers. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 12, 267-277.

Lee, C., & McMaster, C. (1991). Cognitive dissonance in tobacco smokers. Addictive Behaviors, 16, 349-353.

Leventhal, H., Glynn, K., & Fleming, R. (1987). Effect of smoking risk factors on smoking beliefs. Journal of the American Medical Association, 257, 3373-3376.

Levitt, E. E. (1971). Reasons for smoking and not smoking given by school children. Journal of School Health, 41, 101-105.

Levitt, E. E., & Edwards, J. A. (1970). A multivariate study of correlative factors in youthful cigarette smoking. Developmental Psychology, 2, 5-11.

Lichtenstein, E., & Cohen, S. (1990). Prospective analysis of two modes of unaided smoking cessation. Health Education Research, 5, 63-72.

Loken, B. (1982). Heavy smokers', light smokers', and nonsmokers' beliefs about cigarette smoking. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 616-622.

Malenka, D. J., Baron, J. A., Johansen, S., Wahrenberger, J. W., & Ross, J. M. (1992). The framing effect of relative and absolute risk. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 8, 543-548.

Marshall, P. (1990). "Just one more...!" A study into the smoking attitudes and behavior of patients following first Myocardial infarction. International Journal of Nursing Studies, 27, 375-387.

Mausner, J. S., & Bahn, J. K. (1974). Epidemiology: An introductory text. Philadelphia:

Saunders.

McCoy, S., Gibbons, F. X., Reis, T. J., Gerrard, M., Luus, C. A., & Sufka, A. (1992). Perceptions of smoking risk as a function of smoking status. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 15, 469-488.

McKenna, F. P., Warburton, D. M., & Winwood, M. (1993). Exploring the limits of optimism: the case of smokers' decision making. British Journal of Psychology, 84, 389-394.

McMaster, C., & Lee, C. (1991). Cognitive dissonance in tobacco smokers. Addictive behaviors, 16 349-353.

Meltzer, D., & Egleston, B. (2000). How patients with diabetes perceived their risk for major complications. Effective Clinical Practice, 3, 7-15.

Mettlin, C. (1973). Smoking as behavior: applying a social psychological theory. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 14, 144-152.

Morabia, A. (2001). Risky concepts: Methods in cancer research. American Journal of Public Health, 91, 355-357.

Murray, D. M., Prokhorov, A. V., & Harty, K. C. (1994). Effects of a statewide antismoking campaign on mass media messages and smoking beliefs. Preventive Medicine, 23, 54-60.

Murray, M., & Cracknell, A. (1980). Adolescents' views on smoking. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 24, 243-251.

Murray, M., Swan, A. V., Johnson, M. R. D., & Bewley, B. R. (1983). Some factors associated with increased risk of smoking by children. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 24, 223-232.

Pervin, L. A., & Yanko, R. J. (1965). Cigarette smoking and alternative methods of

reducing dissonance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 30-36.

Petty, R. E., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Presson, C. C., Chassin, L., Sherman, S., Olshavsky, R., Bensenberg, M., & Corty, E. (1984). Predictors of adolescents' intentions to smoke: age, sex, race, and regional differences. International Journal of the Addictions, 19, 504-519.

Pyke, D. A. (1955). Cigarette smoking and bronchial carcinoma: Effect of the association upon smoking habits of a group of doctors. British Medical Journal, 1, 1115-1116.

Reppucci, J. D., Revenson, T. A., Aber, M., & Reppucci, N. D. (1991). Unrealistic optimism among adolescent smokers and nonsmokers. Journal of Primary Prevention, 11, 227-236.

Romer, D., & Jamieson, P. (2001). The role of perceived risk in starting and stopping smoking. In P. Slovic (Ed.), Smoking: Risk, perception, and policy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Roper Organization, The. (1978). A study of public attitudes toward cigarette smoking and the tobacco industry in 1978. New York, NY: The Roper Organization.

Rose, J. S., Chassin, L., Presson, C. C., & Sherman, S. J. (1996). Prospective predictors of quit attempts and smoking cessation in young adults. Health Psychology, 15, 261-268.

Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1978). Interpersonal expectancy effects: The first 345 studies. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 1, 377-415.

Rubin, D. B. (1987). Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys. New York: Wiley.

Rudolph, J. P., & Borland, B. L. (1976). Factors affecting the incidence and acceptance of cigarette smoking among high school students. Adolescence, 11, 519-525.

Saad, L., & O'Brien, S. (1998). The tobacco industry summons polls to the witness stand: A review of public opinion on the risks of smoking. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, St. Louis, MO.

Salber, E., Reed, R. B., Harrison, S. V., & Green, J. H. (1963). Smoking behavior, recreational activities and attitudes toward smoking among newton secondary school children. Pediatrics, *33*, 911-918.

Samet, J. M. (2001). The risks of active and passive smoking. In P. Slovic (Ed.), Smoking: Risk, perception, and policy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schafer, J. L. (1997). Analysis of incomplete multivariate data. London: Chapman & Hall.

Schafer, J. L. & Olsen, M. K. (1998). Multiple imputation for multivariate missing-data problems: A data analyst's perspective. Unpublished manuscript.

Schneider, F. W., & Vanmastrigt, L. A. (1974). Adolescent-preadolescent differences in beliefs and attitudes about cigarette smoking. Journal of Psychology, *87*, 71-81.

Schneider, S. J. (1984). Who quits smoking in a behavioral treatment program? Addictive Behaviors, *9*, 373-381.

Schoenbaum, M. (1997). Do smokers understand the mortality effects of smoking? Evidence form the health and retirement survey. American Journal of Public Health, *87*, 755-759.

Slovic, P. (1998). Do adolescent smokers know the risks? Duke Law Journal, *47*, 1133-1141.

Slovic, P. (2000a). What does it mean to know a cumulative risks? Adolescents' perceptions of short-term and long-term consequences of smoking. Journal of Behavioral



Decision Making, 13, 259-266.

Slovic, P. (2001). Cigarette smokers: rational actors or rational fools In P. Slovic (Ed.), Smoking: Risk, perception, and policy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stacy, R. D., Greer, D. L., Haas, S., & Hellbusch, J. (1994). Beliefs of pregnant women about smoking and maternal and infant health. Health Values, 18, 13-18.

Step toe, A., Wardle, J., Smith, H., Kopp, M., Skrabski, A., Vinck, J., & Zotti, A. M. (1995). Tobacco smoking in young adults from 21 European countries: association with attitudes and risk awareness. Addiction, 90, 571-582.

Stone, S. L., & Kristeller, J. L. (1992). Attitudes of adolescents toward smoking cessation. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 8, 221-225.

Strecher, V. J., Kreuter, M. W., & Kobrin, S. C. (1994). Do cigarette smokers have unrealistic perceptions of their heart attack, cancer, and stroke risks? Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 18, 45-54.

Swenson, I., & Dalton, J. A. (1983). Reasons for smoking cessation among a random sample of North Carolina nurses. Women and Health, 8, 33-41.

Swinehart, J. W. (1966). Changes over time in student reactions to the surgeon general's report on smoking and health. American Journal of Public Health, 56, 2023-2027.

Tipton, R. M. (1988). The effects of beliefs about smoking and health on smoking cessation. Journal of Psychology, 122, 313-321.

Tipton, T. M., & Riebsame, W. E. (1987). Beliefs about smoking and health: their measurement and relationship to smoking behavior. Addictive Behaviors, 12, 217-223.

Tucker, J.S., Ellickson, P.L., & Klein, D.J. (2003). Predictors of the transition to regular smoking during adolescence and young adulthood. Journal of Adolescent Health. 32,

314-324.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1983). Extensional versus intuitive reasoning: The conjunction fallacy in probability judgment. Psychological Review, 90, 293-315.

Urberg, K., & Robbins, R. (1984). Perceived vulnerability in adolescents to the health consequences of cigarette smoking. Preventive Medicine, 13, 367-376.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Reducing the Health Consequences of Smoking 25 Years of Progress: A Report of the Surgeon General. Rockville, MD: 1989.

Virgili, M., Owen, N., Severson, H. H. (1991). Adolescents' smoking behavior and risk perceptions. Journal of Substance Abuse, 3, 315-324.

Viscusi, W. K. (1992). Smoking: Making the risky decision. New York: Oxford University Press.

Walster, E., Aronson, E., & Abrahams, D. (1966). On increasing the persuasiveness of a low prestige communicator. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 2, 325-342.

Wang, M. Q., Fitzhugh, W. C., Cowdery, J. W., & Trucks, J. (1995). Developmental influences of attitudes and beliefs on adolescents smoking. Psychological Reports, 76, 399-402.

Wang, M. Q., Fitzhugh, W. C., Eddy, J. M., & Westerfield, R. C. (1998). School dropouts' attitudes and beliefs about smoking. Psychological Reports, 82, 984-986.

Wang, M. Q., Fitzhugh, E. C., Green, B. L., Turner, L. W., Eddy, J. M., Westerfield, R. C. (1999). Prospective social-psychological factors of adolescent smoking progression. Journal of Adolescent Health, 24, 2-9.

Warner, K. E. (1977). The effects of the anti-smoking campaign on cigarette consumption. American Journal of Public Health, 67, 645-650.

Warner, K. E. (1981). Cigarette smoking in the 1970's: The impact of the antismoking

campaign on consumption. Science, 211, 729-731.

Warner, K. E. (1989). Effects of the antismoking campaign: An update. American Journal of Public Health, 79, 144-151.

Warner, K. E., Halpern, M. T., & Giovino, G. A. (1994). Differences by education in smoker/non-smoker beliefs about the dangers of smoking. Health Education Research, 9, 139-143.

Warner, K. E., & Murt, H. A. (1982). Impact of the antismoking campaign on smoking prevalence: A cohort analysis. Journal of Public Health Policy, 3, 374-390.

Weinstein, N. D. (1980). Unrealistic optimism about future life events. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 806-820.

Weinstein, N. D. (1982). Unrealistic optimism about susceptibility to health problems. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 5, 441-460.

Weinstein, N. D. (1987). Unrealistic optimism about susceptibility to health problems: conclusions from a community-wide sample. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 10, 481-500.

Weinstein, N. D. (1998). Accuracy of smokers' risk perceptions. Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 20, 135-140.

Weinstein, N. D. (2001). Smokers' recognition of their vulnerability to harm. In P. Slovic (Ed.), Smoking: Risk, perception, and policy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Weisberg, H. F., Krosnick, J. A., & Bowen, B. D. (1996). An introduction to survey research, polling, and data analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Williams, T., & Clarke, V. A. (1997). Optimistic bias in beliefs about smoking. Australian Journal of Psychology, 106-112.

Windschitl, P. D. (2002). Judging the accuracy of a likelihood judgment: The case of

smoking risk. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 15, 19-35.

Zagona, S. V., & Zurcher, L. A. (1965). An analysis of some psycho-social variables associated with smoking behavior in a college sample. Psychological Reports, 17, 967-978.

Table 1:

## Logistic Regression Coefficients Predicting Smoking Onset in Boys and Girls

Predictor	Boys	Girls	Model with Interactions
Friends' smoking	4.87**	4.20**	4.20**
Friends' subjective norm	2.62**	4.49**	4.49**
Mother's smoking	.07	-.09	-.09
Mother's smoking x Motivation to comply with parents	1.53	1.57*	1.57*
Father's smoking	-.03	.07	.07
Father's smoking x Motivation to comply with parents	.35	1.60*	1.60*
Parents' subjective norm	-.68	.55	.55
Older brother's smoking	1.05**	.07	.07
Older sister's smoking	-.32	.59 <sup>+</sup>	.59 <sup>+</sup>
Health beliefs	1.81*	-1.68	-1.68
Value placed on health	.24	.84	.84
Health beliefs x Value placed on health	.53	3.46*	3.46*
Motivation to comply with parents	-1.78*	-1.75*	-1.75*
Motivation to comply with friends	.19	-.42	-.42
No mother	-.55	1.47 <sup>+</sup>	1.47 <sup>+</sup>
No father	-.15	.17	.17
No older brother	.22	.42	.42
No older sister	-.07	.12	.12
Age of respondent	.79 <sup>+</sup>	2.18**	2.18**
Gender of respondent	-	-	2.16*
Gender x Friends' smoking	-	-	.66
Gender x Friends' subjective norm	-	-	-1.87*
Gender x Mother's smoking	-	-	.16
Gender x Mother's smoking x Motivation to comply with parents	-	-	-.04
Gender x Father's smoking	-	-	-.09
Gender x Father's smoking x Motivation to comply with parents	-	-	-1.25
Gender x Parents' subjective norm	-	-	-1.23
Gender x Older brother's smoking	-	-	.98*
Gender x Older sister's smoking	-	-	-.91 <sup>+</sup>
Gender x Health beliefs	-	-	3.49*
Gender x Value placed on health	-	-	-.60
Gender x Health beliefs x Value placed on health	-	-	-2.92 <sup>+</sup>
Gender x Motivation to comply with parents	-	-	-.03
Gender x Motivation to comply with friends	-	-	.61
Gender x No mother	-	-	-2.02
Gender x No father	-	-	-.32
Gender x No older brother	-	-	-.21
Gender x No older sister	-	-	-.19
Gender x Age of respondent	-	-	-1.39*
R <sup>2</sup>	.16	.17	.16
N	3,061	3,316	6,377

<sup>+</sup>p<.10; \*p<.05; \*\*p<.01

Table 2:

## Distributions of Health Effects Beliefs among Boys and Girls

<u>Score</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Boys</u>
-1.00	3.4%	4.8%
-.94	.4	.5
-.88	2.5	2.9
-.81	.4	.7
-.75	5.1	4.7
-.69	.9	1.3
-.63	5.7	5.9
-.56	1.5	1.7
-.50	10.7	9.9
-.44	2.4	2.4
-.38	10.2	9.6
-.31	2.6	2.9
-.25	15.2	12.7
-.19	2.5	2.7
-.13	13.6	12.2
-.06	1.5	2.0
.00	18.1	18.0
.06	.3	1.0
.13	1.6	1.7
.19	.1	.5
.25	.7	.8
.31	.1	.2
.38	.1	.2
.44	0	.0
.50	.2	.3
.56	0	.0
.63	0	.1
.69	0	.0
.75	0	.0
.81	0	.0
1.00	0	.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Figure 1:

Proportions of Americans Who Failed to Assert That Smoking Is Dangerous to Human Health:

Gallup Organization Surveys

