



OKLAHOMA TOBACCO
RESEARCH CENTER

Research Study: Court-Ordered Corrections of Tobacco Industry Racketeering National Poll Shows Strong Support for Policies and Rejection of Tobacco Industry Influences

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2006, a federal court found Altria, R.J. Reynolds Tobacco, Lorillard, and Phillip Morris USA to be in violation of civil racketeering (RICO) laws, subsequently ordering them to disseminate through newspapers, television, package inserts and corporate websites “corrective statements” about addiction, health effects of smoking, health effects of exposure to secondhand smoke, nicotine enhancement, and light and low tar cigarettes. Though delayed by the tobacco companies’ extensive legal appeals, the corrective statements are now expected to be published starting Sunday, November 26.

A cross-sectional survey of 2,010 U.S. adults conducted in May 2017 used the web-enabled GfK KnowledgePanel, a probability-based panel that is representative of the U.S. population. The survey assessed awareness of the corrective statements and major court findings and simulated their likely impact on public attitudes towards tobacco control policies, tobacco industry influences, and lawmakers’ trust in tobacco companies or tobacco company lobbyists. Survey results include the following:

- Of the 18 corrective statements and 10 major court findings, public awareness is lowest for the court findings that the companies violated racketeering laws (23.1%), committed fraud (32.1%), and are likely to continue to commit fraud (37.0%). Only about half of U.S. adults are aware that the companies intentionally designed cigarettes to make them more addictive (47.4%), denied secondhand smoke harms nonsmokers (49.8%), and that “low tar” and “light” cigarette smokers inhale essentially the same amount of tar and nicotine as they would from regular cigarettes (45.5%). Because the survey used an aided awareness design, actual levels of public awareness may be lower.
- There is strong public support for each of the 12 tobacco control policies surveyed, including requiring large graphic warning labels on cigarette packs (74.3%), banning smoking inside all public places and workplaces (82.6%), increasing taxes on cigarettes (65.9%), raising the minimum age to buy cigarettes to age 21 (72.4%), and reducing nicotine in cigarettes to a level that is not addictive (76.2%). Greater public awareness of the statements and court findings will likely increase overall public support for some policies and increase the intensity of support for others.
- Only about one in four (27.4%) U.S. adults think “lawmakers should trust tobacco company lobbyists to provide accurate information on tobacco issues” and only about one in three (32.4%) think “lawmakers should trust tobacco companies as much as they trust other companies.” Exposure to the statements and court findings will likely reduce the extent to which the public thinks lawmakers should trust tobacco companies or tobacco company lobbyists.
- Public support is strong for lawmakers to reject potential tobacco industry influences. Nearly three-fourths of U.S. adults think lawmakers should refuse meals or other gifts from tobacco company lobbyists (74.4%) or campaign contributions from tobacco company lobbyists (72.7%). Only one in five (19.7%) think lawmakers should allow tobacco companies or tobacco company lobbyists to help write laws. Greater awareness of the statements and findings may increase the intensity of support for lawmakers’ rejection of potential tobacco industry influences.
- When asked what lawmakers should do if a tobacco-related law was written or influenced by a tobacco company or tobacco company lobbyist, only one in 20 U.S. adults (5.0%) think lawmakers should “leave the law as it is” while about two-thirds think lawmakers should either “revise the law” (30.1%) or “remove the law and start over” (35.3%).
- Only a small proportion of U.S. adults (10.0%) think tobacco companies are now taking responsibility for the harm caused by smoking. With greater public awareness of the statements and court findings, even fewer may think this.