- 6 DiClemente CC, Prochaska JO: Processes and stages of self-change: coping and competence in smoking behavior change. In: Shiffman S, Wills TA, eds. Coping and substance use. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1985.
- 7 CDC: The health benefits of smoking cessation: a report of the Surgeon General, 1990. Rockville, Maryland: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, 1990; DHHS publication no. (CDC)90-8416.
- 8 Public Health Service: Healthy people 2000: national health promotion and disease prevention objectives-full report, with commentary. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, 1991; DHHS publication no. (PHS)91-50212.
- 9 CDC: Cigarette smoking among youth-United States, 1989. MMWR 1991; 40: 712-5.

Cigarette Smoking Among Reproductive-Aged Women—Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 1989

Women who smoke cigarettes are at increased risk not only for chronic diseases (e.g. lung cancer and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) but-if they use oral contraceptives—also for myocardial infarction [1]. In addition, cigarette smoking during pregnancy increases the risk for low birth weight and premature infants, miscarriage, stillbirth, sudden infant death syndrome, and infant mortality [2]. Because of these risks and other health problems associated with cigarette smoking, one of the national health objectives for the year 2000 is to reduce the prevalence of smoking to 12% among reproductive-aged women (18-44 years of age) [3]. This report summarizes data from the 1989 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) on smoking the prevalence of among reproductive-aged women.

In 1989, health departments in 39 participating states and the District of Columbia used a standard questionnaire to conduct telephone interviews of adults aged ≥ 18 years [4]. Current smokers were defined as persons who had smoked at least 100 cigarettes and who reported being a smoker at the time of the interview. Individual responses were weighted to provide estimates representative of the adult population of each participating state. To compare smoking prevalences between states, weighted state-specific prevalences were standardized for the distribution of the 1980 US population by age, race, and educational level. Smoking prevalences for

sub groups (age, race, educational level, and pregnancy status) were standardized by adjusting for the other variables.

In 1989, weighted crude prevalences of cigarette smoking among reproductive-aged women varied from 17% in Utah to 32% in Kentucky and Rhode Island (median: 26.5%) (Table 1). Standardized smoking prevalences ranged from 21% in Texas to 37% in Wisconsin. In general, standardized smoking prevalences were highest in the midwestern states and lowest in the Rocky Mountain and mid-central states.

Older women and women with less than a high school education were more likely to smoke (Table 2). Pregnant women were less likely than nonpregnant women to smoke. Smoking prevalences did not vary substantially between white and black women, the only racial groups for which rates could be calculated because the numbers of respondents of other racial/ethnic groups were too small to provide stable estimates.

Among reproductive-aged women who smoked, 84% smoked fewer than 25 cigarettes per day (Table 3). Women aged 35–44 years tended to be heavier smokers than younger women. Approximately 44% of all women who were current smokers had attempted to quit smoking (i.e. quitting for at least 1 week) in the previous year. Women aged 35–44 years were substantially less likely than younger women to have attempted quitting.

Table 1. Weighted and standardised^a smoking prevalences^b among reproductive-aged women, by state – Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 1989.

State	Sample size	Weighted prevalence		Standardized prevalence		State	Sample size	Weighted prevalence		Standardized prevalence	
		%	(95% CI ^d)	%	(95% CI)			%	(95% CI ^d	%	(95% CI)
Alabama	549	23.4	(± 3.9)	29.2	(±4.3)	New Hampshire	444	26.7	(±4.7)	31.9	(± 5.0)
Arizona	500	26.1	(± 4.5)	31.0	(± 5.7)	New Mexico	370	22.2	(± 4.7)	24.7	(± 5.3)
California	793	20.8	(± 3.1)		(± 4.4)	New York	426	26.9	(± 5.1)	30.5	(± 6.5)
Connecticut	446	30.3	(± 4.8)	34.8	(± 5.5)	North Carolina	553	26.4	(± 4.2)	28.9	(± 4.5)
District of					` ′	North Dakota	470	20.8	(± 3.7)	25.0	(± 5.0)
Columbia	513	24.9	(± 4.8)	21.8	(± 6.8)	Ohio	461	28.0	(± 4.7)	30.0	(± 4.6)
Florida	466	28.7	(± 4.5)	29.6	(± 4.7)	Oklahoma	348	26.7	(± 5.5)	28.9	(± 5.6)
Georgia	565	23.0	(± 3.8)	28.1	(± 4.5)	Oregon	499	25.3	(± 4.1)	29.9	(± 4.6)
Hawaii	566	20.6	(± 3.6)	22.3	(± 6.2)	Pennsylvania	544	30.4	(± 4.2)	32.4	(± 4.3)
Idaho	539	21.0	(± 3.5)	22.7	(± 3.6)	Rhode Island	523	32.1	(± 4.5)	34.4	(± 4.3)
Illinois	533	26.8	(± 4.1)	32.6	(± 5.1)	South Carolina	518	22.4	(± 3.9)	28.1	(± 4.6)
Indiana	611	30.0	(± 4.0)	33.8	(± 4.0)	South Dakota	513	23.3	(± 4.0)	24.4	(± 4.8)
Iowa	324	29.0	(± 5.5)	35.0	(± 6.9)	Tennessee	732	30.0	(± 3.6)	31.4	(± 3.5)
Kentucky	556	32.1	(± 4.5)	33.2	(± 4.4)	Texas	486	21.9	(± 4.0)	21.2	(± 4.4)
Maine	387	31.0	(± 5.3)	36.0	(± 5.3)	Utah	617	17.1	(± 3.5)	24.2	(± 4.0)
Maryland	582	22.4	(± 3.9)	27.5	(± 5.0)	Virginia	530	24.2	(± 4.4)	26.2	(± 4.5)
Massachusetts	384	26.7	(± 4.9)	31.7	(± 5.3)	Washington	461	26.8	(± 4.3)	31.8	(± 5.2)
Michigan	746	28.2	(± 3.4)	32.5	(± 3.9)	Wisconsin	380	30.0	(± 5.0)	36.7	(± 5.0)
Minnosota	1073	24.0	(± 2.8)	33.4	(± 3.5)	West Virginia	475	29.8	(± 5.4)		(± 4.7)
Missouri	460	27.1	(± 4.6)		(± 5.1)	_					
Montana	332	18.8	(± 4.3)		(± 5.3)						
Nebraska	399	24.2	(± 4.5)		(± 5.1)	Median		26.5		30.0	

^aWeighted to provide estimates representative of the adult population of each participating state. Standardized for the distribution of the 1980 U.S. population by age, race, and educational level to allow comparisons between states. ^bPercentage of women who had smoked at least 100 cigarettes and who reported being a smoker at the time of the

interview.

Editorial Note: In this report, the state-tostate variations of smoking prevalences among reproductive-aged women may reflect differences in sociodemographic characteristics (e.g. age, race, and educational level) of state populations. However, because these variations persisted after standardization to adjust for these differences, other factors (e.g. occupation, employment status, and family income) may affect state-specific smoking prevalences. These variations may also reflect differences in the intensity of cigarette advertising and in the effectiveness of statewide smoking-control interventions [2,5]. In addition, reasons for the lower prevalences of smoking among certain groups could include (1) declining smoking initiation rates in younger cohorts of women (a trend observed previously for white and Hispanic women [6]); (2) decreasing smoking-initiation and increasing smoking-cessation rates over time among women with higher educational levels

^cAged 18-44 years.

dConfidence interval.

Table 2. Weighted and standard^a smoking prevalences^b among reproductive-aged women^c, by age, race, educational level, and pregnancy status – Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 1989.

Characteristic	_	thted alence	Standardized prevalence		Characteristic	Weig preva	hted alence	Standardized prevalence	
	%	(95% CI ^d)	<u>%</u>	(95% CI)		%	(95% CI ^d)	%	(95% CI)
Age (years)					Educational level				
18-24 ^e	23.3	(± 2.0)	20.6	$(\pm 3.2)^{f}$	Less than high	43.1	(± 3.5)	43.9	(± 3.5)
25-34	28.1	$(\pm 1.4)^{f}$	31.4	$(\pm 2.6)^{f}$	school				
35-44	27.9	$(\pm 1.5)^{f}$		$(\pm 3.1)^{f}$	High school	33.4	$(\pm 1.7)^{f}$	33.3	$(\pm 1.7)^{f}$
Raceg		,		,	More than high	19.5	$(\pm 1.1)^{f}$	19.0	$(\pm 1.2)^{f}$
Black	25.2	(± 2.7)	30.4	(± 3.3)	school		,		, ,
White	27.0	(± 1.0)	32.4	(± 1.5)	Pregnant				
		. ,		,	Noe	27.2	(± 1.0)	30.2	(± 1.2)
					Yes	17.7	$(\pm 4.5)^{f}$	19.0	$(\pm 4.4)^{f}$

^aWeighted to provide estimates representative of the adult population of each participating state. Standardized by adjusting for other sociodemographic variables in the 1980 U.S. population (e.g. age was standardized for race and educational level). Pregnancy status was standardized for age, race, and educational level.

Table 3. Smoking quantity and quit attempt^a prevalences among reproductive-aged women smokers, by age – Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 1989.

Age (yrs)	Numb	er of cigaretes	Quit attempts						
	1-4		15–24		≥25			past year	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	
18-24°	52.0	(±4.8)	38.7	(±4.7)	9.3	(± 2.8)	53.7	(±4.8)	
25-34	43.3	$(\pm 2.9)^{d}$	41.1	$(\pm 2.9)^{d}$	15.7	$(\pm 2.1)^{d}$	44.6	$(\pm 2.9)^{d}$	
35-44	31.8	$(\pm 3.0)^d$	47.5	$(\pm 3.3)^d$	20.8	$(\pm 2.6)^d$	36.7	$(\pm 3.1)^d$	
Total	41.3	(± 2.0)	42.7	(± 2.0)	16.0	(±1.4)	43.9	(± 2.0)	

^aQuitting for a least 1 week in the year preceding the survey.

^bPercentage of women who had smoked at least 100 cigarettes and who reported being a smoker at the time of the interview.

^cAged 18-44 years.

^dConfidence interval.

eReferent group.

Prevalence of smoking is significantly different from that of the referent group (P < 0.05).

⁸Information for standardizing rates was available only for blacks and whites.

^bConfidence interval.

cReferent group.

^dSignificantly different than the referent group (P < 0.05).

[7]; and (3) the effect of higher smoking-cessation rates for pregnant women [8].

The BRFSS findings regarding amounts of smoking and attempts to quit are consistent with previous reports [2,5]. However, the proportion of women who attempted to quit smoking for at least 1 week in the year preceding the survey (44%) was substantially higher than that estimated in 1987 for the proportion of all women in the general US population who had attempted to quit for at least 1 day (32%) [5]. Therefore, smoking-cessation education for reproductive-aged women may be more successful than for women aged ≥45 years because reproductive-aged women appear to be more willing to attempt to quit smoking.

The 1989 BRFSS determined that the median prevalence of current smoking was 26.5% among reproductive-aged women in the states surveyed; accordingly, nearly all states will require concerted efforts to reduce prevalence of smoking among reproductive-aged women to 12% by the year 2000 [3]. Efforts to reduce smoking initiation among adolescent girls and to target young women for smoking-cessation interventions are important priorities to accomplish this objective [2,5].

References

- Sharpiro S, Slone D, Rosenberg L, et al: Oral contraceptive use in relation to myocardial infarction. Lancet 1979;
 743-7.
- 2 CDC: Reducing the health consequences of smoking: 25 years of progress a report of the Surgeon General. Rockville, Maryland: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, 1989; DHHS publication no. (CDC) 89-8411.
- 3 Public Health Service: Healthy people 2000: national health promotion and disease prevention objectives — full report, with commentary. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, 1991; DHHS publication no. (PHS) 91-50212.
- 4 Remington PL, Smith MY, Williamson DF, Anda RF, Gentry EM, Hogelin GC: Design, characteristics, and usefulness of state-based behavioral risk factor surveillance: 1981-1987. Publ Health Rep 1988; 103: 363-75.
- 5 CDC: The health benefits of smoking cessation: a report of the Surgeon General. Rockville, Maryland: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, 1989; DHHS publication no. (CDC) 90-8416.
- 6 Escobedo LG, Remington PL, Anda RF: Long-term secular trends in initiation of cigarette smoking among Hispanics in the United States. Publ Health Rep 1989; 104: 583-7.
- Pierce JP, Fiore MC, Novotny TE, Hatziandreu EJ, Davis RM: Trends in cigarette smoking in the United States: educational differences are increasing. J Am Med Assoc 1989; 261: 56-60.
- 8 Williamson DF, Serdula MD, Kendrick JS, Binkin NJ: Comparing the prevalence of smoking in pregnant and nonpregnant women, 1985 to 1986. J Am Med Assoc 1989; 261: 70-4.