

**Attitudes to smokefree bars among a cohort of  
New Zealand bar managers**

*Interim results from surveys conducted one month before  
and five months after the introduction of smokefree bars.*

**Kiri Milne**

**Nigel Guenole**

*Health Sponsorship Council Research and Evaluation Unit*

**Prepared for the Ministry of Health by the Health Sponsorship Council**

September 2005

## **Purpose of study**

The purpose of this study was to assess changes in New Zealand bar managers' attitudes towards smokefree pubs and bars following their introduction in December 2004.

Its specific aims were to find out whether:

1. Approval for smoking bans in pubs and bars has increased amongst bar managers since the introduction of smokefree pubs and bars in December 2004.
2. Bar managers' personal feelings about asking patrons to go outside to smoke have become less negative since the introduction of smokefree pubs and bars in December 2004.
3. Bar managers' belief in workers' and patrons' rights to smokefree environments has increased since the introduction of smokefree pubs and bars in December 2004.
4. Bar managers perceive the introduction of smoking bans in pubs and bars to have had a positive, negative or no economic impact on their venue.
5. Bar managers' self-reported smoking behaviour has decreased since the introduction of smokefree pubs and bars in December 2004.

## **Method**

A telephone survey of 541 New Zealand bar managers was conducted in November 2004, the month prior to the introduction of smoking bans in all indoor workplaces (including bars and pubs). Participants were asked about their knowledge of, and attitudes towards, amendments to the Smoke-free Environments Act (SFEA) that would ban smoking inside all hospitality venues.

Venues were randomly selected from a sample-list of 900 licensed taverns, hotels, chartered clubs and country clubs listed with the Liquor Licensing Authority in October 2004. One bar manager from each participating venue was interviewed.

A participation rate of 76.7% of eligible venues was achieved for the benchmark survey.

The same bar managers were contacted again in May 2005 and asked the same questions. Three-hundred and forty-six of the original 541 bar managers were interviewed, giving a participation rate of 81.6% at the six-month follow-up (78 eligible bar managers either refused to participate or could not be contacted; 117 bar managers were not eligible to participate because they no longer worked at the venue or the venue no longer existed).

Results are reported for the cohort of 346 bar managers who participated in the benchmark survey (November 2004) and the six-month follow-up survey (May 2005).

As shown in Table 1, the majority of bar managers were male (57%), of New Zealand European ethnicity (79%), and aged over 31 years (75%). Most had worked in the hospitality industry for more than two years (87%), around two-fifths were owners of the venue as well as bar managers (44% in May 2005) and around two-fifths reported that they were current smokers (42%).

**Table 1: Characteristics of bar managers (n=346)**

	No.		%	
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	196		57%	
Female	150		43%	
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
New Zealand European	274		79%	
Maori	35		10%	
Indian	23		7%	
Samoan	2		1%	
Niuean	3		1%	
Chinese	2		1%	
Other	5		1%	
Tongan	1		0%	
Cook Island Maori	1		0%	
<b>Age (as reported Nov 04)</b>				
18-30 years	69		20%	
31 years and over	258		75%	
Refused or Unknown	19		5%	
<b>Length of time in hospitality industry (as reported Nov 04)</b>				
Two years or less	28		8%	
More than two years	302		87%	
Unknown	16		5%	
<b>Venue owner as well as bar manager</b>	<b>Nov 04</b>	<b>May 05</b>	<b>Nov 04</b>	<b>May 05</b>
Yes	151	146	44%	42%
No	195	200	56%	58%
<b>Smoking status</b>	<b>Nov 04</b>	<b>May 05</b>	<b>Nov 04</b>	<b>May 05</b>
Never smoked	99	98	29%	28%
Ex-smoker	93	102	27%	29%
	<i>Non-smoker</i>		192	200
	131	135	55%	58%
At least once a day	131	135	38%	39%
At least once a week	12	3	3%	1%
At least once a month	5	6	1%	2%
Less often	6	2	2%	1%
	<i>Smoker</i>		154	146
	154	146	45%	42%

As detailed in Table 2, just over half of venues included in the sample were taverns (51%) and just over one-third were hotels (35%). Most venues were described by bar managers as being located in a rural area (56%) with just under one-third located in urban areas (30%). Two-thirds of venues (64%) allowed smoking in set areas prior to the

implementation of the 2003 amendments to the SFEA, although nearly one in ten reported that smoking was not allowed anywhere inside pre-SFEA changes (9%). The majority of venues had an outdoor area where smoking was allowed prior to implementation of SFEA changes (75%), however, this proportion increased following implementation (89%).

**Table 2: Characteristics of venues (n=346)**

	<b>No.</b>		<b>%</b>	
<b>Venue type</b>				
Hotel	115		33%	
Tavern	176		51%	
Chartered club	45		13%	
Country club	3		1%	
Unknown	7		2%	
<b>Venue locality</b>				
Urban	103		30%	
Semi-urban	49		14%	
Rural	194		56%	
<b>Smoking restrictions pre-SFEA changes</b>				
Smoking allowed anywhere inside	93		27%	
Smoking allowed in set areas inside	221		64%	
Smoking not allowed anywhere inside	32		9%	
<b>Outdoor area</b>	<b>Nov 04</b>	<b>May 05</b>	<b>Nov 04</b>	<b>May 05</b>
Yes	259	307	75%	89%
No	87	39	25%	11%

## Results

Significance was reported at a 95% level of confidence in the results reported below.

### A. Approval for smoking bans

Participants were asked whether they approved or disapproved of banning smoking in enclosed areas of pubs and bars, using a four-point response scale ranging from strongly approve through to strongly disapprove. Prior to smokefree bars coming into effect, 44% of bar managers approved or strongly approved of smoking bans in enclosed areas of pubs and bars and this increased significantly to 60% following the introduction of smokefree bars ( $p < 0.05$ , 95% CI 10-23%).

Table 3 depicts bar manager approval for smoking bans in enclosed areas of pubs and bars, as reported in the six-month follow-up survey. Bar managers were significantly more likely to approve of smoking bans five months after their introduction if they were non-smokers rather than smokers (68% compared with 51%,  $p < 0.05$ ), managers only instead of owner/managers (69% compared with 49%,  $p < 0.05$ ) and from urban instead of rural venues (64% compared with 52%,  $p < 0.05$ ). Bar managers were significantly less

likely to approve of smoking bans if, prior to their implementation, they had expected smoking bans to have a permanent economic impact on their venue instead of a short-term impact (33% compared with 71%,  $p<0.05$ ) or no impact at all (33% compared with 84%,  $p<0.05$ ). Similarly, bar managers were less likely to approve of smoking bans if, following their implementation, they perceived the economic impact of the bans to be negative instead of non-existent (37% compared with 93%,  $p<0.05$ ) or positive (37% compared with 79%,  $p<0.05$ ). Approval levels for smoking bans in pubs and bars were similar regardless of whether or not the venue had an outdoor area where smoking was allowed.

**Table 3: Approval for smoking bans in enclosed areas of pubs and bars, at six-month follow-up (n=346)**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Approve / Strongly Approve</b>	<b>LB</b>	<b>UB</b>	<b>Disapprove / Strongly Disapprove</b>	<b>LB</b>	<b>UB</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>LB</b>	<b>UB</b>
All participants	60%	55%	66%	18%	14%	22%	22%	17%	26%
<b>Bar manager smoking status</b>									
Non-smokers	68%	61%	74%	16%	10%	21%	17%	11%	22%
Smokers	51%	43%	59%	21%	14%	27%	28%	21%	35%
<b>Venue owner as well as bar manager</b>									
Bar owner/managers	49%	41%	57%	28%	21%	35%	23%	16%	30%
Bar managers only	69%	63%	76%	10%	6%	15%	21%	15%	26%
<b>Venue locality</b>									
Urban	64%	57%	71%	15%	10%	20%	21%	15%	27%
Semi-urban	63%	50%	77%	10%	2%	19%	27%	14%	39%
Rural	52%	43%	62%	27%	19%	36%	20%	13%	28%
<b>Existence of outdoor area</b>									
Outdoor area	61%	55%	67%	18%	13%	23%	20%	16%	25%
No outdoor area	57%	47%	68%	17%	9%	25%	25%	16%	34%
<b>Expectations of economic impact of smoking bans on venue (as reported Nov 04)</b>									
No economic impact	84%	72%	96%	8%	-1%	17%	8%	-1%	17%
Short-term economic impact	71%	64%	78%	9%	5%	13%	20%	14%	26%
Permanent economic impact	33%	24%	43%	40%	30%	50%	27%	18%	36%
Not sure	55%	40%	69%	16%	5%	27%	30%	16%	43%
<b>Perceptions of economic impact of smoking bans on venue (as reported May 05)</b>									
No economic impact	93%	88%	98%	2%	-1%	5%	5%	1%	10%
Negative economic impact	37%	30%	44%	30%	24%	37%	33%	26%	39%
Positive economic impact	79%	68%	90%	6%	-1%	12%	15%	6%	25%
Not sure	71%	49%	92%	12%	-4%	27%	18%	0%	36%

## B. Asking patrons to go outside to smoke makes job harder

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement ‘*having to ask people to go outside to smoke makes my job a lot harder*’. Participants responded on a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Prior to smokefree bars coming into effect, 18% of bar managers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the assertion that asking people to go outside to smoke makes their job harder and disagreement increased significantly to 43% following the introduction of smokefree bars ( $p<0.05$ , 95% CI 20-31%).

Table 4 shows proportions of bar managers who disagreed with the assertion that asking patrons to smoke outside made their job harder, as reported in the six-month follow-up survey. Bar managers were significantly more likely to disagree with this statement if they were from urban instead of rural venues (51% compared with 28%,  $p<0.05$ ) and if they perceived the economic impact of the bans to be negative instead of non-existent (30% compared with 2%,  $p<0.05$ ) or positive (30% compared with 6%,  $p<0.05$ ). Bar managers’ perceptions of whether enforcing a smoking ban would make their job harder did not seem to be largely influenced by whether the bar manager was a smoker or a non-smoker, whether or not they were an owner as well as a bar manager and whether the venue had an outdoor area where smoking was allowed.

**Table 4: Asking patrons to smoke outside makes bar manager job harder, at six-month follow-up (n=346)**

Group	Agree / Strongly Agree			Disagree / Strongly Disagree			Don't Know			
	LB	UB	LB	UB	LB	UB	LB	UB		
All participants	47%	42%	52%	43%	38%	48%	10%	7%	13%	
<b>Bar manager smoking status</b>										
Non-smokers	43%	36%	50%	46%	39%	53%	11%	7%	15%	
Smokers	52%	44%	60%	40%	32%	47%	8%	4%	13%	
<b>Venue owner as well as bar manager</b>										
Bar owner/managers	55%	47%	63%	36%	29%	44%	9%	4%	13%	
Bar managers only	41%	34%	48%	48%	41%	55%	11%	6%	15%	
<b>Venue locality</b>										
Urban	39%	32%	46%	51%	43%	58%	10%	6%	15%	
Semi-urban	49%	35%	63%	43%	29%	57%	8%	0%	16%	
Rural	61%	52%	71%	29%	20%	38%	10%	4%	15%	
<b>Existence of outdoor area</b>										
Outdoor area	46%	40%	52%	45%	39%	51%	9%	5%	12%	
No outdoor area	51%	40%	61%	37%	27%	47%	13%	6%	20%	
<b>Perceptions of economic impact of smoking bans on venue (as reported May 05)</b>										
None	93%	88%	98%	2%	-1%	5%	5%	1%	10%	
Negative	37%	30%	44%	30%	24%	37%	33%	26%	39%	

Positive	79%	68%	90%	6%	-1%	12%	15%	6%	25%
Unsure	71%	49%	92%	12%	-4%	27%	18%	0%	36%

### C. Belief in workers' rights to smokefree environment

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement '*workers in pubs and bars have the right to work in an environment free of second-hand smoke*'. Participants responded on a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Prior to smokefree bars coming into effect, 55% of bar managers agreed or strongly agreed that workers in pubs and bars have the right to work in an environment free of second-hand smoke and this increased significantly to 62% following the introduction of smokefree bars ( $p < 0.05$ , 95% CI 0-14%).

Table 5 depicts proportions of bar managers who agreed that workers in pubs and bars have the right to work in a smokefree environment, as reported in the six-month follow-up survey. Bar managers were more likely to agree with this statement if they were non-smokers instead of smokers (71% compared with 50%,  $p < 0.05$ ), bar managers only instead of owner/managers (70% compared with 51%,  $p < 0.05$ ), and if they perceived the economic impact of smoking bans on their venue to be non-existent or positive instead of negative (82% and 79%, respectively, compared with 46%,  $p < 0.05$ ). There was no significant difference between bar managers' beliefs about workers' rights based on whether their venue was urban or rural and whether or not their venue had an existing outdoors area.

**Table 5: Belief in workers' rights to smokefree environment, at six-month follow-up (n=346)**

Group	Agree / Strongly Agree			Disagree / Strongly Disagree			Don't Know			
		LB	UB		LB	UB		LB	UB	
All participants	62%	56%	67%	15%	11%	19%	23%	19%	28%	
<b>Bar manager smoking status</b>										
Non-smokers	71%	64%	77%	10%	6%	14%	19%	14%	25%	
Smokers	50%	42%	58%	21%	15%	28%	29%	21%	36%	
<b>Venue owner as well as bar manager</b>										
Bar owner/managers	51%	43%	59%	21%	14%	27%	28%	21%	36%	
Bar managers only	70%	63%	76%	11%	6%	15%	19%	14%	25%	
<b>Venue locality</b>										
Urban	63%	57%	70%	14%	9%	19%	23%	17%	29%	
Semi-urban	63%	50%	77%	4%	-1%	10%	33%	20%	46%	
Rural	57%	48%	67%	22%	14%	30%	20%	13%	28%	
<b>Existence of outdoor area</b>										
Outdoor area	63%	57%	68%	16%	11%	20%	22%	17%	27%	
No outdoor area	63%	52%	73%	16%	8%	24%	22%	13%	30%	
<b>Perceptions of economic impact of smoking bans on venue (as reported May 05)</b>										

None	82%	75%	90%	3%	0%	7%	15%	8%	22%
Negative	46%	39%	54%	24%	18%	31%	29%	23%	36%
Positive	79%	68%	90%	4%	-1%	9%	17%	7%	28%
Unsure	53%	29%	77%	18%	0%	36%	29%	8%	51%

#### D. Belief in patrons' rights to smokefree environment

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement '*all patrons are entitled to smokefree bars and pubs*'. Participants responded on a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Prior to smokefree bars coming into effect, 53% of bar managers agreed or strongly agreed that patrons are entitled to smokefree bars and pubs and this increased significantly to 65% following the introduction of smokefree bars ( $p < 0.05$ , 95% CI 4-20%).

Table 6 shows proportions of bar managers who agreed that patrons are entitled to smokefree pubs and bars, as reported in the six-month follow-up survey. Bar managers were more likely to agree with this statement if they were bar managers only instead of owner/managers (71% compared with 56%,  $p < 0.05$ ), and if they perceived the economic impact of smoking bans on their venue to be non-existent or positive instead of negative (82% and 83%, respectively, compared with 53%,  $p < 0.05$ ). There was no significant difference between bar managers' beliefs about patrons' rights whether the bar manager was a smoker or a non-smoker, whether the venue was urban or rural and whether or not the venue had an existing outdoors area.

**Table 6: Belief in patrons' rights to smokefree environment, at six-month follow-up (n=346)**

Group	Agree / Strongly Agree			Disagree / Strongly Disagree			Don't Know			
		LB	UB		LB	UB		LB	UB	
All participants	65%	60%	70%	20%	16%	24%	15%	12%	19%	
<b>Bar manager smoking status</b>										
Non-smokers	69%	62%	75%	19%	13%	24%	13%	8%	17%	
Smokers	60%	52%	67%	21%	15%	28%	19%	13%	25%	
<b>Venue owner as well as bar manager</b>										
Bar owner/managers	56%	48%	64%	24%	17%	31%	20%	14%	26%	
Bar managers only	71%	65%	78%	17%	12%	22%	12%	7%	16%	
<b>Venue locality</b>										
Urban	68%	61%	75%	18%	13%	23%	14%	9%	19%	
Semi-urban	63%	50%	77%	22%	11%	34%	14%	4%	24%	
Rural	59%	50%	69%	22%	14%	30%	18%	11%	26%	
<b>Existence of outdoor area</b>										
Outdoor area	67%	61%	73%	19%	14%	24%	14%	9%	18%	
No outdoor area	57%	47%	68%	22%	13%	31%	21%	12%	29%	
<b>Perceptions of economic impact of smoking bans on venue (as reported May 05)</b>										

None	82%	75%	90%	4%	0%	8%	14%	7%	20%
Negative	53%	46%	60%	28%	22%	35%	19%	13%	24%
Positive	83%	72%	93%	12%	3%	20%	6%	-1%	12%
Unsure	53%	29%	77%	29%	8%	51%	18%	0%	36%

### E. Expectations of economic impact of SFEA on venue, pre-smokefree bars

In the benchmark survey (November 2004) participants were asked whether they expected changes to the SFEA to have no economic impact on their venue, a short-term economic impact or a permanent economic impact. Just over half of bar managers expected changes to the SFEA to have a short-term economic impact on their venue (51%) and around one-quarter thought the economic impact would be permanent (26%). There were few significant differences between bar manager subpopulations (see Table 7), although, non-smoking bar managers were slightly more likely to expect the SFEA to have no economic impact on their venue than bar managers who were smokers (15% compared with 6%,  $p < 0.051$ ).

**Table 7: Expectations of economic impact of SFEA on venue, at benchmark (n=346)**

Group	None	LB	UB	Short-term	LB	UB	Permanent	LB	UB	Unsure	LB	UB
All participants	11%	7%	14%	51%	45%	56%	26%	21%	31%	13%	9%	16%
<b>Bar manager smoking status</b>												
Non-smokers	15%	10%	20%	52%	44%	59%	21%	16%	27%	13%	8%	17%
Smokers	6%	2%	10%	49%	41%	57%	32%	24%	39%	13%	8%	18%
<b>Venue owner as well as bar manager</b>												
Bar owner/managers	12%	7%	17%	42%	34%	50%	34%	26%	41%	13%	7%	18%
Bar managers only	10%	6%	14%	57%	50%	64%	20%	14%	26%	13%	8%	18%
<b>Venue locality</b>												
Urban	11%	6%	15%	54%	47%	61%	24%	18%	30%	11%	6%	15%
Semi-urban	12%	3%	21%	53%	39%	67%	18%	8%	29%	16%	6%	27%
Rural	10%	4%	15%	43%	33%	52%	33%	24%	42%	15%	8%	21%
<b>Existence of outdoor area</b>												
Outdoor area	12%	8%	16%	53%	46%	59%	23%	18%	28%	12%	8%	16%
No outdoor area	6%	1%	11%	45%	34%	55%	36%	26%	46%	14%	7%	21%

### F. Perceptions of economic impact of SFEA on venue, post-smokefree bars

In the six-month follow-up survey (May 2005) participants were asked whether they perceived changes to the SFEA to have had no economic impact on their venue, a negative economic impact or a positive economic impact. Just over half of bar managers thought that changes to the SFEA had had a negative economic impact on their venue (52%), nearly one-third thought the changes had had no economic impact (28%) and 15% thought the economic impact on their venue had been positive. As Table 8 shows, bar managers were significantly more likely to perceive the economic impact of changes to the SFEA as being negative if they were smokers instead of non-smokers (62% compared

with 44%,  $p<0.05$ ), bar owner/managers instead of bar managers only (61% compared with 46%,  $p<0.05$ ), and if their venue was located in a rural area instead of an urban area (63% compared with 47%,  $p<0.05$ ).

**Table 8: Perceptions of economic impact of SFEA on venue, at six-month follow-up (n=346)**

Group	None			Negative			Positive			Unsure		
	LB	UB	UB	LB	UB	UB	LB	UB	UB	LB	UB	
All participants	28%	23%	32%	52%	47%	58%	15%	11%	19%	5%	3%	7%
<b>Bar manager smoking status</b>												
Non-smokers	35%	28%	42%	44%	37%	51%	16%	10%	21%	5%	2%	8%
Smokers	19%	13%	25%	62%	55%	70%	14%	9%	20%	5%	1%	8%
<b>Venue owner as well as bar manager</b>												
Bar owner/managers	23%	16%	30%	61%	53%	69%	13%	7%	18%	3%	0%	6%
Bar managers only	31%	25%	38%	46%	39%	53%	17%	12%	22%	6%	3%	10%
<b>Venue locality</b>												
Urban	33%	26%	40%	47%	40%	54%	15%	10%	21%	5%	2%	8%
Semi-urban	31%	18%	44%	51%	37%	65%	16%	6%	27%	2%	-2%	6%
Rural	17%	9%	24%	63%	54%	72%	14%	7%	20%	7%	2%	12%
<b>Existence of outdoor area</b>												
Outdoor area	30%	24%	35%	49%	43%	56%	16%	11%	20%	5%	2%	8%
No outdoor area	22%	13%	31%	61%	51%	71%	13%	6%	20%	5%	0%	9%

### G. Bar manager smoking behaviour

As shown in Table 1, the proportion of bar manager participants who reported that they were current smokers remained stable from benchmark to six-month follow-up survey, with a non-significant 3% change in smokers versus non-smokers (proportion of smokers decreased from 45% to 42% and the proportion of non-smokers increased from 55% to 58%).

**KEY CONTACT:**  
 Kiri Milne  
 Tel. 04 472 5777  
 Email. [kiri@hsc.org.nz](mailto:kiri@hsc.org.nz)