

Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer  
Cancer Control Research Institute  
The Cancer Council Victoria



CBRC  
RESEARCH PAPER SERIES  
No. 32  
June 2008

# Smokefree hospitality venues in Victoria: public approval, patronage and quitting behaviour, 2004–2007

Molly McCarthy  
Sarah Durkin  
Emily Brennan  
Daniella Germain

Prepared for:  
Quit Victoria

Website:  
[www.cancervic.org.au/cbrc](http://www.cancervic.org.au/cbrc)

## ABSTRACT

The data presented in this report are gathered through telephone surveys of randomly sampled Victorian adults conducted in November and December of 2004 (N=2998), 2005 (N=2999), 2006 (N=2996) and 2007 (N=3001). In 2007 the overwhelming majority of Victorian adults and a considerable proportion of Victorian smokers expressed approval for smokefree hospitality venues in Victoria. Approximately 90% of Victorian adults approved of smokefree bars (including 71% of smokers), 90% of adults approved of smoking bans in nightclubs (including 74% of smokers), and 93% of adults approved of smoking bans in gambling venues (including 80% of smokers). These levels of public approval are a significant increase on approval levels in 2006 prior to implementation of the smoking bans. Reported frequency of patronage to hospitality venues since the bans were enforced suggests that they have either made no difference to patronage, or they have increased the frequency of patronage to these venues. Of those who visited bars at least once a month, 14% reported that they now visit bars more often than before the smoking bans, while 5% said they now visit less often, which would suggest an overall increase in patronage of approximately 9%. Correspondingly, those who visited nightclubs at least once a month reported an overall increase in patronage of 4%, and those who visited gambling venues at least once a month reported no change (increase by 0.5%) in patronage. There were also a substantial number (40%) recent quitters who stated that the introduction of the smoking bans had assisted their quit attempt, while 33% of smokers reported a decrease in consumption since the ban was implemented. Overall these findings indicate that the smoking bans in Victoria have proved highly acceptable to the vast majority of Victorian adults, including smokers, with increased public support since their enforcement. The positive consequences of the smoking bans include not only a reduction in exposure to secondhand smoke (SHS) for hospitality workers, but also the potential to reduce smoking prevalence and consumption, with no evidence of a negative effect on patronage to hospitality venues.

### Suggested citation:

McCarthy M, Durkin S, Brennan E, Germain D. *Smokefree hospitality venues in Victoria: public approval, patronage and quitting behaviour, 2004–2007*. CBRC Research Paper Series No. 32. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer, The Cancer Council Victoria, June 2008.

## INTRODUCTION

Secondhand smoke (SHS) was classified in the early 1990s as an environmental carcinogen by the US Environmental Protection Agency.<sup>1</sup> In 2006 the US Surgeon General released a report that extensively detailed the harmful health effects of exposure to SHS, which include cancer and cardiovascular disease in adults, and respiratory problems in both children and adults.<sup>2</sup> The growing body of scientific evidence about the harmful effects of SHS exposure, as well as recent legal decisions in Australia regarding the consequences of SHS exposure among employees of the hospitality industry, have ensured that there is a high level of awareness about the issue within both the Australian media and the general public.<sup>3,4</sup>

In response to concerns about the harmful health effects of SHS exposure, over recent years the Victorian Government has introduced a range of legislative reforms to limit SHS exposure in public places. Through the *Tobacco (Amendment) Act 2000*<sup>5</sup> and the *Tobacco (Further Amendment) Act 2001*,<sup>6</sup> on July 1, 2001, smoking was banned in enclosed restaurants, cafes, and in the dining areas of premises with a general or club licence, and on November 1, 2001, all enclosed shopping centres in Victoria became smokefree.

Restrictions on smoking in hospitality venues were extended under the *Tobacco (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 2002*.<sup>7</sup> As of September 1, 2002, smoking was banned in the gaming machine areas of gambling venues and in bingo centres, and was restricted in indoor areas of licensed venues (such as hotels and clubs). On October 12, 2004, the Victorian Government then announced plans to make hospitality venues in Victoria smokefree.<sup>8</sup> These new laws were implemented on July 1, 2007, and they imposed a complete ban on smoking in indoor areas of all licensed venues (including pubs, bars, nightclubs and gambling venues), and in outdoor areas at these venues if the outdoor area has a roof in place and walls that cover more than 75% of the total notional wall area.<sup>9</sup>

Since 2000, the Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer (CBRC) has regularly collected information about public support for smoking restrictions in Victoria's hospitality venues. Prior to the Government's announcement that hospitality venues would become completely smokefree, public support for smoking restrictions in hospitality venues had increased significantly between 2000 and 2003.<sup>10</sup> The present report provides information about Victorian adults' support for the introduction of smokefree hospitality venues in Victoria, both prior to and following the implementation of the bans in July 2007. The data, collected from 2004 to 2007, details the level of public approval for the smoking bans pre and post implementation, the impact of the bans on the frequency of respondents' visits to hospitality venues, and whether the bans have assisted respondents attempts to quit smoking or reduce consumption.

## METHOD

The data presented in this report are from telephone surveys of randomly sampled Victorian adults (aged 18 years and over) conducted in November and December of 2004 (N=2998), 2005 (N=2999), 2006 (N=2996), and 2007 (N=3001). These annual population surveys are commissioned by CBRC and are conducted by a market research company that interviews a representative sample of Victorians by telephone each year. The questions, designed by CBRC, are asked in an eight- to sixteen-minute interview conducted on weekends and weeknights.

The standard tobacco use question<sup>11</sup> was used to determine smoking status. In this report, 'current smokers' are those respondents who reported smoking daily, weekly or less than weekly at the time of the survey. 'Former smokers' are those respondents who did not currently smoke, but had smoked at

least 100 cigarettes or a similar amount of tobacco over their lifetime. 'Never smokers' are those respondents who had either never smoked or had not smoked 100 cigarettes over their lifetime.

In this report, respondents who smoke less than weekly are included in the 'current smoker' category, with the daily and at-least-weekly smokers, rather than being separated from the regular smokers as is commonly done in reports on smoking prevalence.<sup>12</sup> This method of categorisation is to account for the fact that beliefs and behaviours related to SHS exposure are more likely to be influenced by whether or not a person smokes at all, rather than by how frequently they smoke. For instance, it is likely that when many less-than-weekly smokers smoke, they do so in a social context. Therefore, they may be less inclined to support the restriction of smoking in hospitality venues than are former or never smokers. These irregular smokers may also be less concerned by SHS exposure than is someone who does not smoke at all. For these reasons, all respondents who reported that they currently smoke tobacco products at all are treated as smokers for the purpose of this report.

We also collected information about respondents' demographic characteristics, including their sex, age and education level, and about current smokers' daily cigarette consumption. Cigarette consumption is classified as 'light' (less than 15 cigarettes per day); 'medium' (15 - 24 cigarettes per day); or 'heavy' (more than 25 cigarettes per day).

The 2004 and 2005 surveys were both conducted after the Victorian government had announced their plans to implement total indoor smoking bans in hospitality venues. In the 2004 survey, respondents were informed that the Victorian Government had 'recently announced plans to introduce total smoking bans in pubs, gaming venues, clubs and all licensed premises.' They were then asked 'Do you approve or disapprove of the Government's plans to introduce total smoking bans in gaming venues; hotel bars and licensed bars; nightclubs?' In the 2005 survey, respondents were simply asked whether they approved or disapproved of the Government's plans to implement total smoking bans in each of the venue types, while in 2006, the wording of the preamble to the question changed slightly: 'As of July 1<sup>st</sup> next year, smoking will be banned in all indoor hospitality venues. Do you approve or disapprove of the government's plans to introduce total smoking bans in gaming venues; hotel bars and licensed bars; nightclubs?' The 2006 survey was conducted just over six months prior to the implementation of these bans. Responses to these three questions were all grouped into one of four categories: 'approve' (strongly approve and somewhat approve); 'neither approve nor disapprove'; 'disapprove' (strongly disapprove and somewhat disapprove); and 'don't know/can't say'. The 2007 survey was conducted approximately 4 months following the introduction of the bans, and the preamble was changed to reflect this. Respondents were asked 'As of July this year, smoking has been banned in all indoor hospitality venues. Do you approve or disapprove of the total smoking bans in gaming venues; hotel bars and licensed bars; nightclubs?'. Responses were grouped according to the 2006 categories.

Respondents were asked several questions about their patronage of hospitality venues. They were firstly asked how often they currently go to gaming venues; hotel or licensed bars; nightclubs. Responses were categorised as 'at least once a month' or 'less than once a month'. In previous surveys respondents have been asked to indicate if, when total smoking bans are introduced, they would be likely to go to gaming venues; hotels or licensed bars; nightclubs more often or less often than they do now, or if the bans would make no difference to how often they visit these venues. In the 2007 surveys respondents were asked 'Since the total smoking bans were introduced have you visited gaming venues; hotel or licensed bars; nightclubs: more often, less often, about the same or don't know/can't say'.

In the 2007 survey, current smokers were asked if they were smoking 'less than they used to', 'more than they used to' or 'about the same' since the smoking bans were enforced. Those respondents who had quit in the previous twelve months were asked to what extent the bans had helped them to quit smoking ('helped a great deal', 'helped somewhat', 'did not help at all', 'don't know/can't say'). These were then grouped to form three categories: 'helped to quit', 'did not help to quit', and 'don't know/can't say'.

A range of demographic information has also been examined in relation to approval of the smoking bans, including age, sex, education level and socio-economic status. In the current report, the Socio-Economic Index for Areas (SEIFA), developed by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), was used to measure socio-economic status. The SEIFA indices classify respondents into socio-economic groups based on Census data of the area in which they live.<sup>11</sup> In this report, the Index of Socio-Economic Disadvantage (one of five SEIFA indices) was used, which is based on respondents' residential postcodes. This index ranks areas on a continuum of disadvantage (from most disadvantaged to least disadvantaged), taking into consideration characteristics that may enhance or reduce socio-economic conditions of the area, such as income, education, occupation and housing (for example). For the purpose of analysis we have grouped respondents into three groups based on this scale:

1. the first group (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quintiles) comprises people who live in areas with a SEIFA score in the bottom 40% of Victoria's distribution (this represents a higher level of disadvantage relative to the other two groups);
2. the second group (2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> quintiles) includes people whose SEIFA score lies between 41% and 80% of the distribution;
3. the third group (5<sup>th</sup> quintile) includes those whose SEIFA score is 81% or above (reflecting the lowest level of disadvantage relative to the other groups).<sup>13</sup>

## Statistical analysis

A comparison of the sample socio-demographic characteristics with the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Census data for the Victorian population,<sup>13</sup> revealed that women and older people were over-represented in the telephone survey samples. To adjust for this, the data from all years were weighted by age and sex according to ABS final estimates of the Victorian population, from the 2001 Census.<sup>14</sup> As the sample was weighted, and therefore some of sample sizes are fractional, the sub-samples for categories of respondent may not add to the total sample size due to rounding up of the decimal places.

To report the data, descriptive techniques such as percentages have been used. When testing for the significance of relationships between variables, bivariate logistic regression and multinomial logistic regression analyses have been used. Details of the statistical tests of significance are not included in the report text. Where relationships between variables are reported, the p-value was less than 0.01. This indicates that the probability of obtaining a result at least as big as the one observed, assuming that there is no relationship, is less than 1 in 100. Where trends towards a relationship between variables are reported, the p-value was less than 0.05, indicating that the probability of obtaining a result at least as big as the one observed, assuming that there is no relationship, is less than 1 in 20.

## RESULTS

### Approval of smokefree bars, 2004–2007

In 2007, the majority of Victorian adults (90%) indicated that they approved of hotel and licensed bars becoming smokefree. This current level of approval was a significant increase from approval levels in 2004 (78%), 2005 (77%) and 2006 (86%) (Table 1).

Table 1:  
Approval of smokefree bars, 2004–2007

Response	2004 (N=2998) %	2005 (N=2999) %	2006 (N=2996) %	2007 (N=3001) %
Approve	78.0	77.4	85.5	90.1
Neither approve nor disapprove	4.5	5.0	2.7	1.7
Disapprove	16.1	16.2	10.6	7.7
Don't know / Can't say	1.4	1.4	1.3	0.6

Note. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

In 2007, current smokers were significantly less likely to approve of smokefree bars than were both former smokers and never smokers (71% compared with 93% and 96%, respectively). Former smokers were also less likely to approve than were never smokers (Table 2).

However, the proportion of current smokers who approve of smokefree bars has increased since the introduction of the bans (Table 2). In 2006, 61% of all smokers approved of smokefree bars, and this rose to an approval rating of 71% in 2007.

Table 2:  
Approval of smokefree bars, by smoking status, 2004–2007

Smoking status	Response	2004 (N=2998) %	2005 (N=2999) %	2006 (N=2996) %	2007 (N=3001) %
Smokers	Approve	47.6	46.9	60.9	71.1
	Neither approve nor disapprove	6.6	7.5	4.6	3.9
	Disapprove	44.1	43.0	32.2	24.5
	Don't know / Can't say	1.6	2.7	2.3	0.5
Former smokers	Approve	81.6	81.0	87.4	92.7
	Neither approve nor disapprove	4.6	5.3	3.0	1.7
	Disapprove	12.3	12.7	8.7	5.0
	Don't know / Can't say	1.5	1.0	0.9	0.6
Never smokers	Approve	88.7	87.0	93.6	95.5
	Neither approve nor disapprove	3.6	4.0	1.8	0.8
	Disapprove	6.5	7.9	3.5	3.0
	Don't know / Can't say	1.2	1.1	1.1	0.6

Note. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

The likelihood of approving of smokefree bars differed according to a smokers' daily cigarette consumption (Table 3). In 2007, light smokers (less than 15 cigarettes per day; 78%) were more likely to approve of smokefree bars, than both medium (between 15 to 24 cigarettes per day; 67%) and heavy smokers (more than 25 cigarettes per day; 50%). Medium smokers tended to be more likely to approve of smokefree bars than heavy smokers.

Table 3:  
Approval of smokefree bars among current smokers, by daily cigarette consumption, 2007

Response	Light (<15 cigs per day) (n=264)	Medium (15 – 24 cigs per day) (n=165)	Heavy (>25 cigs per day) (n=82)
	%	%	%
Approve	78.3	66.7	49.9
Neither approve nor disapprove	2.9	3.7	9.1
Disapprove	18.6	28.9	39.9
Don't know / Can't say	0.3	0.7	1.1

*Note.* Sample sizes do not include those respondents who didn't know or couldn't say, or refused to state how many cigarettes they smoke per day. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

### Patronage of bars since they have become smokefree, 2007

To examine the impact on patronage of bars following the introduction of the smokefree legislation, respondents who indicated that they currently visit bars at least once a month (n=1258; 42% of all respondents) were asked how the smokefree laws had affected the frequency with which they patronise bars. Respondents were asked if they were visiting bars more often, less often, or about the same since the bans.

Table 4:  
Patronage of licensed bars following introduction of smokefree legislation, by smoking status, 2007<sup>a</sup>

Response	Total Sample (N=1258) %	Current smokers (n=281) %	Former smokers (n=334) %	Never smokers (n=644) %
More often	13.6	2.1	13.3	18.8
Less often	5.0	12.7	3.3	2.4
No difference	80.8	85.2	83.0	77.7
Don't know / Can't say	0.6	0.0	0.3	1.0

*Note.* In the multinomial logistic regressions, the responses of 'more often' and 'less often' are compared to the reference group 'no difference'. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

<sup>a</sup> Among those who currently visit bars at least once a month.

In 2007, 81% of all respondents said that the introduction of smokefree legislation had made no difference to their patronage of hotel bars and licensed bars, while 14% said that they were now patronising bars more often (Table 4). Of current smokers, 85% said the smoking bans had made no difference to their patronage, while 2% had said they were visiting bars more often. Former smokers and never smokers were more likely than current smokers to state that they were visiting licensed bars more often (13% and 19% compared with 2%, respectively) since the introduction of the smokefree legislation.

There was also a trend towards never smokers being more likely than former smokers to state they had visited bars *more often* since they have been smokefree (Table 4). Correspondingly, current smokers were more likely than both never and former smokers to say that they had visited bars *less often* since they had become smokefree, than 'make no difference' (13% compared with less than 2% and less than 3%, respectively). Overall these figures suggest that patronage of licensed bars is likely to have increased by approximately 9% (i.e. 14% reporting more often, minus 5% reporting less often) since the introduction of smokefree laws in Victoria, and this increase is mainly accounted for by an increase in patronage by former and never smokers.

## Approval of smokefree nightclubs, 2004–2007

In addition to an increasing level of public support for smokefree bars following implementation of the smoking bans, there has also been an increase in the level of public support for smokefree nightclubs in Victoria. In 2007 the majority of Victorian adults (90%) expressed support for the introduction of smokefree nightclubs in Victoria (Table 5), which was an increase from the previous approval levels found in 2006 (84%).

Table 5:  
Approval of smokefree nightclubs, 2004 – 2007

Response	2004 (N=2998) %	2005 (N=2999) %	2006 (N=2996) %	2007 (N=3001) %
Approve	79.3	77.5	84.3	89.7
Neither approve nor disapprove	5.9	5.6	3.3	2.3
Disapprove	12.3	14.2	9.7	6.2
Don't know / Can't say	2.5	2.7	2.7	1.9

Note. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

In 2007, respondents who currently smoked cigarettes were significantly less likely to approve of smokefree nightclubs, than were both former smokers and never smokers (74% compared with 92% and 94%, respectively). Former smokers tended to be less likely to approve than were never smokers (Table 6).

Table 6:  
Approval of smokefree nightclubs, by smoking status, 2004–2007

Smoking status	Response	2004 (N=2998) %	2005 (N=2999) %	2006 (N=2996) %	2007 (N=3001) %
Smokers	Approve	53.8	52.2	63.6	73.5
	Neither approve nor disapprove	8.0	8.1	5.1	4.9
	Disapprove	34.8	35.9	27.5	19.8
	Don't know / Can't say	3.4	3.9	3.7	1.8
Former smokers	Approve	81.4	78.4	85.7	92.0
	Neither approve nor disapprove	7.5	6.8	4.0	2.5
	Disapprove	8.9	12.5	7.6	4.0
	Don't know / Can't say	2.3	2.3	2.8	1.5
Never smokers	Approve	88.8	86.7	91.2	94.4
	Neither approve nor disapprove	4.2	4.0	2.3	1.2
	Disapprove	4.8	6.8	4.2	2.4
	Don't know / Can't say	2.2	2.5	2.3	2.1

Note. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

There has also been an increase in the proportion of smokers who approve of smokefree nightclubs (Table 6). In 2007, 74% of current smokers approved of nightclubs becoming smokefree, compared with approval levels of 64% prior to the introduction of the bans.



Among current smokers in 2007, light smokers and medium smokers were more likely to approve of smokefree nightclubs than heavy smokers (77% and 73% respectively compared with 55%), however there was no significant difference in approval levels between light and medium smokers (Table 7).

Table 7:  
Approval of smokefree nightclubs among current smokers, by daily cigarette consumption, 2007

Response	Light (<15 cigs per day) (n=263)	Medium (15 – 24 cigs per day) (n=165)	Heavy (>25 cigs per day) (n=82)
	%	%	%
Approve	77.1	72.7	54.8
Neither approve nor disapprove	3.1	4.7	13.1
Disapprove	17.3	20.9	31.0
Don't know / Can't say	2.5	1.7	1.1

Note. Sample sizes do not include those respondents who didn't know or couldn't say, or refused to state how many cigarettes they smoke per day. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

## Patronage of nightclubs since they have become smokefree, 2007

In 2007, approximately 13% of respondents who reported that they currently visit nightclubs at least once a month (n=330; 11% of all respondents) said that they have visited nightclubs *more often* since the introduction of the smoking bans in Victoria. Over three-quarters (78%) of these respondents said the bans have made no difference to their frequency of patronage (Table 8). In addition, 80% of current smokers reported that the bans have made no difference to their patronage of nightclubs.

Table 8:  
Patronage of nightclubs when they become smokefree, by smoking status, 2007<sup>a</sup>

Response	Total (N=330) %	Current smokers (n=89) %	Former smokers (n=55) %	Never smokers (n=186) %
More often	12.6	3.6	10.3	17.6
Less often	8.8	16.9	5.8	5.8
No difference	78.1	79.5	84.0	75.7
Don't know / Can't say	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.9

Note. In the multinomial logistic regressions, the responses of 'more often' and 'less often' are compared to the reference group 'no difference'. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

<sup>a</sup> Among those who currently visit nightclubs at least once a month.

Never smokers were more likely than current smokers to say that they have visited nightclubs *more often* since nightclubs have become smokefree (18% compared with 4%) (Table 8). Former and never smokers did not differ in their likelihood of reporting that they have visited nightclubs more or less often following the change. Correspondingly, current smokers tended to be more likely than never smokers, to state that they had visited nightclubs *less often* (17% compared with 6%). Overall, these results suggest that patronage of nightclubs is likely to have increased by approximately 4% (i.e. 13% reporting 'more often' minus 9% reporting 'less often') since these venues have become smokefree.

## Approval of smokefree gambling venues, 2004–2007

In 2007, the vast majority (93%) of Victorian adults approved of the introduction of smokefree gambling venues in Victoria (Table 9). This level of approval was an increase on the high approval levels reported in 2006 (91%), prior to the introduction of smoking bans in these venues.

Table 9:  
Approval of smokefree gambling venues, 2004–2007

Response	2004 (N=2998) %	2005 (N=2999) %	2006 (N=2996) %	2007 (N=3001) %
Approve	84.7	86.0	91.2	93.3
Neither approve nor disapprove	4.7	4.7	2.5	1.8
Disapprove	9.5	8.3	5.6	4.3
Don't know / Can't say	1.1	0.9	0.7	0.7

Note. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

In 2007, although more than three-quarters of current smokers approved of smokefree gambling venues, these respondents were significantly less likely to express approval than were both former smokers and never smokers (80% compared with 95% and 97%, respectively) (Table 10). However, over the past four years, the proportion of current smokers who approve of gambling venues becoming smokefree has increased, from 66% in 2004 to the current approval level of 80%, though the increase in approval from 2006 to 2007 was not significant.

Table 10:  
Approval of smokefree gambling venues, by smoking status, 2004–2007

Smoking Status	Response	2004 (N=2998) %	2005 (N=2999) %	2006 (N=2996) %	2007 (N=3001) %
Smokers	Approve	66.3	68.3	75.9	80.4
	Neither approve nor disapprove	6.7	7.5	6.1	4.5
	Disapprove	25.3	22.7	16.3	14.2
	Don't know / Can't say	1.7	1.5	1.7	1.0
Former smokers	Approve	86.4	86.9	92.6	94.8
	Neither approve nor disapprove	5.2	5.7	2.3	1.5
	Disapprove	7.2	6.5	4.8	2.9
	Don't know / Can't say	1.2	0.8	0.3	0.8
Never smokers	Approve	91.5	92.3	96.1	97.1
	Neither approve nor disapprove	3.6	3.2	1.3	0.9
	Disapprove	4.2	3.8	2.1	1.4
	Don't know / Can't say	0.7	0.8	0.5	0.6

Note. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

In 2007, the level of approval for the introduction of smokefree gambling venues in Victoria was influenced by a smokers' daily cigarette consumption. Light smokers and medium smokers were more likely to approve of smokefree gambling venues than were heavy smokers (85% and 79% compared with 63%, respectively) (Table 11). There was no significant difference in approval levels between light and medium smokers.

Table 11:  
Approval of smokefree gambling venues among current smokers, by daily cigarette consumption, 2007

Response	Light (<15 cigs per day) (n=263)	Medium (15–24 cigs per day) (n=164)	Heavy (>25 cigs per day) (n=83)
	%	%	%
Approve	84.8	78.7	62.7
Neither approve nor disapprove	3.8	4.9	9.6
Disapprove	10.6	15.9	26.5
Don't know / Can't say	0.8	0.6	1.2

Note. Sample sizes do not include those respondents who didn't know or couldn't say, or refused to state how many cigarettes they smoke per day. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

## Patronage of gambling venues since they have become smokefree, 2007

Of those respondents who reported that they currently visit gambling venues at least once a month (n=312; 10% of all respondents), the majority (83%) indicated that the implementation of smokefree gambling venues had not changed the frequency with which they were visiting these venues. A high proportion of former smokers (96%) and never smokers (95%) reported that the change had made no difference to how often they visit gambling venues, or that they had frequented these venues more often. For current smokers 80% said the change had either made no difference or had increased their frequency of patronage of gambling venues.

Current smokers were more likely to say that they had attended gambling venues *less often* than both former smokers and never smokers (20% compared with 4% and 3% respectively). There were no other significant differences between the groups in terms of increases or decreases in patronage of gambling venues following smokefree legislation. These results suggest that the patronage of regular visitors to gambling venues will have remained largely unchanged, with an increase of 0.5% (i.e. 8.5% reporting 'more often' minus 8% reporting 'less often'), following the introduction of smokefree legislation.

Table 12:  
Patronage of gambling venues when they become smokefree, by smoking status, 2007<sup>a</sup>

Response	Total (N=312) %	Current smokers (n=92) %	Former smokers (n=89) %	Never smokers (n=132) %
More often	8.5	3.7	12.2	9.3
Less often	8	19.9	3.8	2.6
No difference	82.7	76.4	84.1	86.1
Don't know / Can't say	0.9	0.0	0.0	2.1

Note. In the multinomial logistic regressions, the responses of 'more often' and 'less often' are compared to the reference group 'no difference'. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

<sup>a</sup> Among those who currently visit gambling venues at least once a month.

## Quitting and consumption following the implementation of smokefree hospitality venues in Victoria, 2007

All respondents who had reported quitting in the past 12 months were asked about the extent to which the implementation of smoking bans in hospitality venues had assisted their quit attempt. Approximately 40% of all recent quitters stated that the introduction of smokefree legislation had helped them to quit. Among those who had quit in the past 6 months, 41% reported that the smoking

bans had helped them quit, while 40% of those who had quit in the previous 7 to 12 months reported that the impending smoking ban had helped them to quit. For those who had quit in the previous 7 to 12 months this would suggest that the introduction of the smokefree legislation may have also played a role in assisting them to stay quit. There was also a trend towards young people being more likely to report that the ban helped them to quit, with 56% of those aged 18-29 stating that the ban had helped them to quit compared with 30% of those 30 years and older. There was no significant difference according to highest level of education.

**Table 13:**  
Recent quitters' views on extent to which the smokefree legislation in hospitality venues helped them to quit, by demographics, 2007

Response	Ban helped to quit %	Ban did not help to quit %	Don't know/can't say %
Total ( <i>N</i> =88)	40.0	55.9	4.1
<b>Sex</b>			
Males ( <i>N</i> =41)	42.1	55.3	2.6
Females ( <i>N</i> =47)	38.2	56.4	5.5
<b>Time of quit attempt</b>			
Quit in past 6 months ( <i>n</i> =41)	40.8	57.0	2.2
Quit in past 7-12 months ( <i>n</i> =47)	39.3	54.9	5.8
<b>Age</b>			
18 to 29 years ( <i>N</i> =33)	56.2	43.8	0.0
30 years and over ( <i>N</i> =55)	30.4	63.0	6.6
<b>Education</b>			
Up to year 12 education ( <i>N</i> =53)	42.9	53.3	3.7
Post year 12 education ( <i>N</i> =35)	35.7	59.6	4.7

Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

*Note.* In the logistic regression analysis, the 'don't know/can't say' responses were removed due to insufficient cell sizes. The age variable was collapsed into two categories to preserve cell size. Analysis of SEIFA groups was not conducted due to small cell sizes.

In 2007, 33% of current smokers (*n*=190) reported that they had reduced the amount they smoked following the introduction of smokefree hospitality venues in July 2007.

Younger smokers' cigarette consumption appeared to be more influenced by the smoking bans, with more 18-29 year olds reporting that they are smoking less following the bans than they used to compared with 30 to 49 year olds and those 50 years and older (45% compared with 32% and 24% respectively) (Table 14). Socio-economic status as measured by highest level of education also appeared to influence consumption following the bans, with significantly more of those respondents with up to year 12 education stating that they have been smoking less since the enforcement of the smoking bans, compared with those who had post year 12 qualifications (40% compared with 24%). There were no significant differences in consumption following the ban between men and women, or by the SEIFA Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage.

Table 14:  
Current smokers' reported consumption following introduction of smokefree legislation in hospitality venues, by demographics, 2007

Demographic characteristic		More than used to	Less than used to	About the same
		%	%	%
Total	( <i>N=573</i> )	2.1	33.2	64.7
<b>Sex</b>				
Males	( <i>n=305</i> )	2.2	32.1	65.7
Females	( <i>n=268</i> )	2.1	34.4	63.5
<b>Age</b>				
18 – 29	( <i>n=146</i> )	3.3	44.9	51.7
30 – 49	( <i>n=286</i> )	1.9	31.7	66.3
50+	( <i>n=140</i> )	1.3	23.8	74.9
<b>Education</b>				
Up to year 12 education	( <i>n=323</i> )	2.2	40.2	57.6
Post year 12 education	( <i>n=249</i> )	2.1	24.0	73.9
<b>SEIFA Disadvantage<sup>1</sup></b>				
1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> quintiles	( <i>n=283</i> )	2.2	35.9	61.9
3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> quintiles	( <i>n=193</i> )	1.8	29.9	68.3
5 <sup>th</sup> quintile	( <i>n=97</i> )	2.5	31.7	65.8

<sup>1</sup> ABS Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage, 1<sup>st</sup> quintile represents highest level of disadvantage

Note. In the multinomial logistic regressions, the responses of 'more often' and 'less often' are compared to the reference group 'about the same'. Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

## DISCUSSION

On July 1, 2007 the Victorian government introduced legislation to make all of the indoor areas of hospitality venues in Victoria smokefree. Following the implementation of this legislation, there has been a significant increase in public support among the Victorian adults for smoking bans in hospitality venues. In 2007, 9 out of 10 adults (90%) approved of smokefree bars (including 71% of smokers), 90% approved of smoking bans in nightclubs (including 74% of smokers), and 93% approved of smoking bans in gambling venues (including 80% of smokers). The approval levels for smokefree bars, nightclubs and gambling venues in 2007 were all a significant increase on 2006 approval levels, indicating a high level of acceptability of the bans amongst the Victorian public.

Despite concerns from the Australian Hoteliers Association (AHA) that making hospitality venues completely smokefree would reduce patronage<sup>15-17</sup>, the findings of this report indicate that bars, nightclubs and gambling venues may have seen an overall increase in patronage since enforcement of the bans. Amongst those who visit these venues at least once a month, respondents reported an overall 8% increase in patronage of bars, an overall 4% increase in nightclub patronage, and no change in reported patronage of gambling venues following implementation of the bans. Additionally, while up to one-fifth of smokers said they had visited these venues less (bars: 13%; nightclubs: 17%; gambling venues 20%) the majority of smokers said that the smokefree laws had made no difference to their patronage of these hospitality venues (bars: 85%; nightclubs: 80%; gambling venues: 76%).

Consequently it appears the bans are not likely to have had an overall detrimental impact on frequency of patronage to bars, nightclubs and gambling venues, and instead are likely on average to have increased patronage, a trend which may result in increased revenue for the hospitality industry. A potential increase in revenue for the Victorian hospitality industry would be entirely consistent with previous research on the impact of smokefree laws in California, Ireland and Texas, which demonstrate

that smokefree laws have either no substantial impact or a positive impact on hospitality industry revenue.<sup>18-22</sup>

The findings of this report also suggest that the introduction of the smokefree laws have contributed to quit attempts and decreased consumption amongst Victorian smokers, with 40% of recent quitters reporting that the ban had helped them quit, and additionally 33% of current smokers reporting a decrease in consumption following the ban. These findings are supported by previous research, which demonstrates that the introduction of smokefree legislation to workplaces<sup>23-25</sup> or hospitality venues<sup>26, 27</sup> can encourage and support large numbers of smokers to either quit smoking or reduce their consumption.

Overall these results suggest that the implementation of smoking bans in hospitality venues throughout Victoria is overwhelmingly supported by Victorians (including smokers). In addition there appear to be a number of positive consequences of the bans. Hospitality workers are now protected from exposure to SHS while at work, a substantial proportion of recent quitters report that the bans have helped them to quit, and a considerable number of smokers report that they are smoking less following the introduction of the bans. There also appears to be no detrimental effect on reported patronage to hospitality venues, with respondents reporting an overall increase in patronage of bars and nightclubs, and no change in patronage of gambling venues, contrary to predictions of reduced patronage and revenue by the AHA.<sup>15-17</sup>

## REFERENCES

1. US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA). *Respiratory effects of passive smoking: lung cancer and other disorders*. Washington, DC: Office of Research and Development, 1992.
2. US Department of Health and Human Services. *The Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Coordinating Center for Health Promotion, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 2006.
3. Wakefield M, Clegg Smith K, Chapman S. *Framing of news coverage about the Marlene Sharp legal judgement: a tipping point for smoke-free public places in Australia?* ImpacTeen Research Paper Series, No. 28. Chicago: Health Research and Policy Centers, University of Illinois at Chicago, 2003.
4. Durkin S, Wakefield M, McLeod K, Germain D, Durrant R. *Tobacco in the news: an analysis of newspaper coverage of tobacco issues in Australia, 2001 – 2005*. Presentation at the 13<sup>th</sup> World Conference on Tobacco or Health, Washington DC, July 2006.
5. Tobacco (Amendment) Act 2000. Parliament of Victoria Act number 43/2000. Retrieved on 28 March 2007 from:  
[http://www.dms.dpc.vic.gov.au/Domino/Web\\_Notes/LDMS/PubStatbook.nsf/f932b66241ecf1b7ca256e9200e23be/F1D6219209D64A7DCA256E5B00213E5A/\\$FILE/00-043a.pdf](http://www.dms.dpc.vic.gov.au/Domino/Web_Notes/LDMS/PubStatbook.nsf/f932b66241ecf1b7ca256e9200e23be/F1D6219209D64A7DCA256E5B00213E5A/$FILE/00-043a.pdf)
6. Tobacco (Further Amendment) Act 2001. Parliament of Victoria Act number 28/2001. Retrieved on 28 March 2007 from:  
[http://www.dms.dpc.vic.gov.au/Domino/Web\\_Notes/LDMS/PubStatbook.nsf/f932b66241ecf1b7ca256e9200e23be/469198B823669079CA256E5B00213EFE/\\$FILE/01-028a.pdf](http://www.dms.dpc.vic.gov.au/Domino/Web_Notes/LDMS/PubStatbook.nsf/f932b66241ecf1b7ca256e9200e23be/469198B823669079CA256E5B00213EFE/$FILE/01-028a.pdf)
7. Tobacco (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 2002. Parliament of Victoria Act number 31/2002. Retrieved on 28 March 2007 from:  
[http://www.dms.dpc.vic.gov.au/Domino/Web\\_Notes/LDMS/PubStatbook.nsf/f932b66241ecf1b7ca256e9200e23be/9A1BC9036DF65265CA256E5B0021400C/\\$FILE/02-031a.pdf](http://www.dms.dpc.vic.gov.au/Domino/Web_Notes/LDMS/PubStatbook.nsf/f932b66241ecf1b7ca256e9200e23be/9A1BC9036DF65265CA256E5B0021400C/$FILE/02-031a.pdf)
8. Quit Victoria website. Accessed on 28 March 2007 from: <http://www.quit.org.au> and follow links to *Community activity / Entertainment venues*.
9. Tobacco (Amendment) Act 2005. Parliament of Victoria Act number 45/2005. Retrieved on 28 March 2007 from:  
[http://www.dms.dpc.vic.gov.au/Domino/Web\\_Notes/LDMS/PubStatbook.nsf/f932b66241ecf1b7ca256e9200e23be/55B5BBE3746510FCCA25705F0020F82D/\\$FILE/05-045a.pdf](http://www.dms.dpc.vic.gov.au/Domino/Web_Notes/LDMS/PubStatbook.nsf/f932b66241ecf1b7ca256e9200e23be/55B5BBE3746510FCCA25705F0020F82D/$FILE/05-045a.pdf)
10. Durkin S, Letcher T, Lipscomb J. *Public opinion about smokefree policies in bars, nightclubs and gambling venues, 2000–2003*. CBRC Research Paper Series No. 6. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer, The Cancer Council Victoria, March 2004.
11. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). *National Health Data Dictionary*. Version 8.0. AIHW Catalogue No. HWI 18. Canberra: AIHW, 1999.
12. Germain D, Wakefield M, Siahpush M, Durkin S. *Smoking prevalence and consumption in Victoria: key findings from the 1998–2005 population surveys*. CBRC Research Paper Series No. 22. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer, The Cancer Council Victoria, December 2006.
13. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). *Information paper: 2001 census of population and housing – socio-economic indexes for areas*. Catalogue No. 2039.0. Canberra, ACT: ABS, 2003.
14. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). *Population by age and sex, Australian States and Territories*. Catalogue No. 3201.0. Canberra: ABS, 2001.
15. Lucas C, Houston C. ‘Pubs rush on outdoor areas to beat smoking ban’. *The Age*, 15 January 2007. Retrieved on 28 March 2007 from:  
[http://www.theage.com.au/news/national/pubs-rush-to-beat-smoking-ban/2007/01/14/1168709615851.html?page=fullpage-contentSwap1Clay Lucas and Cameron Houst](http://www.theage.com.au/news/national/pubs-rush-to-beat-smoking-ban/2007/01/14/1168709615851.html?page=fullpage-contentSwap1Clay+Lucas+and+Cameron+Houst)
16. Thorpe J. My Say: Smoking bans in pubs and clubs – an industry perspective. *ADCA News*, 23 November 2004. Retrieved on 28 March 2007 from:  
[http://www.adca.org.au/publications/news/Issue\\_23\\_November\\_04.pdf](http://www.adca.org.au/publications/news/Issue_23_November_04.pdf)
17. ABC Victoria. Unions, hoteliers disagree over smoking ban. ABC Victoria, 12 October, 2004. Retrieved on 28 March 2007 from:

<http://www.abc.net.au/victoria/news/200410/s1218485.htm>

18. Huang P, McCusker ME. Impact of a smoking ban on restaurant and bar revenues – El Paso, Texas, 2002. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 2004; 53(7): 150–152. Retrieved on 11 April 2007 from: <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/PDF/wk/mm5307.pdf>
19. Glantz SA. Effect of smokefree bar law on bar revenues in California. *Tobacco Control* 2000; 9: 111–112.
20. Howell F. Smoke-free bars in Ireland: a runaway success. *Tobacco Control* 2005; 14: 73–74.
21. Scollo M, Lal A, Hyland A, Glantz S. Review of the quality of studies on the economic effects of smoke-free policies on the hospitality industry. *Tobacco Control* 2003; 12: 13–20.
22. Lal A, Siahpush M, Scollo M. (Letter to Editor) The economic impact of smoke-free legislation on sales turnover in restaurants and pubs in Tasmania. *Tobacco Control* 2004; 13: 454–455.
23. Chapman S, Borland R, Scollo M, Brownson RC, Dominello A, Woodward S. The impact of smoke-free workplaces on declining cigarette consumption in Australia and the United States. *American Journal of Public Health* 1999; 89 (7): 1018–1023.
24. Fichtenberg CM, Glantz SA. Effect of smoke-free workplaces on smoking behaviour: systematic review. *British Medical Journal* 2002; 325: 188–194.
25. Bauer JE, Hyland A, Li Q, Steger C, Cummings KM. A longitudinal assessment of the impact of smoke-free worksite policies on tobacco use. *American Journal of Public Health* 2005; 95 (6): 1024–1029.
26. Fong GT, Hyland A, Borland R, Hammond D, Hastings G, McNeill A, Anderson S, Cummings KM, Allwright S, Mulcahy M, Howell F, Clancy L, Thompson ME, Connolly G, Driezen P. Reductions in tobacco smoke pollution and increases in support for smoke-free public places following the implementation of comprehensive smoke-free workplace legislation in the Republic of Ireland: findings from the ITC Ireland/UK Survey. *Tobacco Control* 2006; 15: 51–58.
27. Philpot SJ, Ryan SA, Torre LE, Wilcox HM, Jalleh G, Jomrozik K. Effect of smoke-free policies on the behaviour of social smokers. *Tobacco Control* 1999; 8: 278–281.