



# Tobacco Control Collaborating Centre

A division of Public Management Associates  
13 Old Square • Warwick • CV34 4RA

t 01926 490190 f 01926 490111 e [tcc@tobaccocontrolcentre.org.uk](mailto:tcc@tobaccocontrolcentre.org.uk)

## **MONITORING FOR COMPLIANCE**

### **South East Report**

**September 2007**

# Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>METHODOLOGY</b> .....	1
<b>Questionnaires</b> .....	1
<b>Personal sampling</b> .....	1
<b>PARTICIPANTS</b> .....	2
<b>Businesses</b> .....	2
<b>Business owners/ managers</b> .....	2
<b>Employees</b> .....	2
<b>Customers</b> .....	2
<b>FINDINGS</b> .....	3
<b>Compliance</b> .....	3
<b>Signage</b> .....	3
<b>Attitudes</b> .....	3
<b>Compliance</b> .....	3
<b>Impact on Trade</b> .....	3
<b>Staff Health</b> .....	3
<b>Smoking</b> .....	4
<b>Second hand smoke exposure</b> .....	4
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	4

## **INTRODUCTION**

This report presents the preliminary results of Monitoring for Compliance, a project monitoring the impacts of the Smokefree legislation on attitudes, compliance, employee exposure to second hand smoke, and air quality in businesses of the hospitality and leisure industry. The project was sponsored by Cancer Research UK and undertaken by the Tobacco Control Collaborating Centre (TCCC) in collaboration with Regional Tobacco Policy Managers and local services.

## **METHODOLOGY**

Trained fieldworkers visited businesses in six regions in England, including the East and West Midlands, the North East, South West, East of England and the South East. A range of establishments were selected for the project, such as pubs, bars, bingo halls, private member bars, clubs, cafes and betting shops. Site visits took place in June, before the legislation was introduced, and again in August when the legislation had been in effect for a month. In each business, nine individuals were recruited to participate in the project: one business owner or manager, four employees and four customers.

### **Questionnaires**

Fieldworkers used interviewer-administered questionnaires to assess business owner, employee and customer attitudes toward the legislation, compliance and enforcement, exposure to second hand smoke and smoke free businesses.

In addition, they conducted site observations to verify whether businesses actually complied with the legislation. Items on the checklist included the display of no-smoking signs, smoking on the premises, litter and the existence of smoking shelters.

### **Personal sampling**

To determine employee exposure to second hand smoke in the workplace, personal samples of exhaled carbon monoxide and salivary cotinine were collected from two non-smoking employees per site. Only employees who reported that they had no significant exposure to second hand smoke elsewhere (e.g., not living with a smoker) were selected for testing.

Carbon monoxide is a toxic gas found in high levels in cigarette smoke. Exposure to CO reduces the blood's ability to carry oxygen. Breath Carbon Monoxide monitors were used to measure the amount of carbon monoxide in the employees' blood stream.

Cotinine is a by-product of nicotine and can be found in saliva. Since cotinine can only be made from nicotine and since nicotine enters the body with cigarette smoke, cotinine measurements can show how much cigarette smoke has entered the body. Saliva samples were taken from the employees with citric-flavored salivettes and then analysed by ABS Labs Ltd. in London.

## **PARTICIPANTS**

### **Businesses**

Four businesses participated in the pre-test in June and 4 participated in the post-test in August.

Two businesses were located in urban areas, 1 in a city centre and 1 in a town centre. Three of the businesses were private member clubs and one business was a bar. Two businesses had less than 10 employees and two had between 10 and 49 employees.

### **Business owners/ managers**

Four business owners were interviewed in June and 4 were interviewed in August. In businesses where the owner was not available on the premises at the time of the visit, the shift manager was interviewed instead. One business owner was a smoker, one was an ex-smoker and two business owners had never smoked.

### **Employees**

Sixteen employees participated in the pre-test in June and 17 employees participated in the post-test in August. Of these, 36 were interviewed in June and 32 were interviewed in August. Almost half of employees were smokers (45.5%), 15.2% were ex-smokers and 39.4% had never smoked. About half of employees (48.5%) were male and 51.5% were female, and almost half of the employees (48.5%) were under 34 years old.

### **Customers**

Seventeen customers were interviewed during the pre-test in June and 16 customers were interviewed during the post-test in August. About three quarters were male (72.2%) and one third was female (27.3%). Almost half of them (48.5%) were 45 years or older. About half of the interviewed customers were smokers (51.5%), 30.3% were ex-smokers and 18.2% had never smoked.

## FINDINGS

### Compliance

#### Signage

The site observation in August showed that three of the four businesses had compliant no-smoking signs displayed on their premises. In June, none of the visited businesses had correct signs installed.

### Attitudes

#### Compliance

The majority of business owners and employees said that from their experience over the past month, customers abide by the law. All four business owners and 88.2% of employees said all customers have complied; the remaining 11.8% of employees said most customers have complied.

Two of the business owners and the majority of employees (88.2%) said they had managed to go completely smoke free since the law was introduced. The two other business owners and 11.8% of employees reported some difficulty.

Only one month on, over half of customers (62.5%) thought that the Smokefree law was a good idea.

#### Impact on Trade

Two of the business owners and over half of employees (58.8%) said that the law has had a positive or no impact on their trade since it became effective. The two other business owners and 41.2% of employees said the legislation had a negative impact on their business.

The **majority of customers (81.3%) said they frequent businesses as often or more often** since the law has become effective. Even when looking at **customers who smoke** the majority (62.5%) said they **come as often as before**.

#### Staff Health

The majority of employees (88.2%) thought that exposure to second hand smoke at work put their health at risk. About a third (35.3%) already believes their health is better as a result of the Smokefree law.

Interestingly, **customer perception** of improvement in employee health is much higher, with **12.5% thinking that employee health is much better and 87.5% thinking employee health is somewhat better**.

## Smoking

**12.5% of customers** said they are **smoking less** since the law came into effect and **6.3% said they had given up smoking**.

## Second hand smoke exposure

Three individuals were tested for salivary cotinine in June (pre-legislation) and again in August (post-legislation).

The results of the matched analyses show that the salivary cotinine results reduced by 1.8 ng/ml, from 2.5 ng/ml in June to 0.6 ng/ml in August. This difference represents a **75% reduction in cotinine levels** from June to August.

Based on the June results, it was estimated that the **employees' salivary cotinine levels could be compared with an annual cigarette consumption of approximately 134 cigarettes** per year. Based on a mean level of 0.6 ng/ml, the results from the cotinine testing in August suggest that bar workers participating in this study would have an annual cigarette consumption of approximately 34 cigarettes per year.

## CONCLUSION

Monitoring for Compliance was conducted to monitor the short-term impacts of the Smokefree legislation on businesses of the hospitality and leisure industry. The findings illustrate that one month after the legislation came into effect it has had some impact on attitudes, behaviours and employee exposure in the visited businesses. However, given the small number of businesses (N=4) participating in the project, these results should be interpreted with caution.