Overview

- Why remove tobacco products from open display in stores?
  - Retailing as a promotional medium

- Outline of new policy implementation in New Zealand
  - Process and outcome

- Support for policy post-implementation
  - Implications for other countries

Tobacco Retailing

- Marketing focusses on two key principles:
  - Visibility and accessibility

- Retailing puts these principles into practice

History of retailing in NZ

- Few legal limits on:
  - Where tobacco is sold
  - Who can sell tobacco

- Display of tobacco products unregulated until 1990:
  - Prohibited the display of tobacco products within a shop if this could be seen from outside

  - 1997 saw limits on the types of notices within shops about the sale of tobacco products
Merchandising amok!

Smoke-free Environments Amendment Act 2003
- Originally proposed banning POS displays
  - Watered down to restrict number of brand facings (two per brand allowed)
  - Displays could contain up to 100 packs per cash register
- Industry responded by proliferating brand variants and pack sizes
  - Created large visual brand blocks – “powerwalls”

Work continued
- Strong advocacy campaign by Cancer Society
  - Focussed on providing protection to children
  - Resonated strongly with NZ public
Work continued!

- 2007 Cancer Society petition calling on government to require removal of tobacco from open display
- Beginning of a long and initially unsuccessful process
  - Public consultation – strong support for POS ban
- Change in government
  - Insufficient evidence!

Māori Affairs Select Committee Inquiry

- 2011 report offered several recommendations
  - We recommend to the Government that all retail displays of tobacco products be prohibited
- Further round of consultation
  - Research evidence now sufficient!
- 2011 Smoke free Environments (Controls and Enforcement) Amendment Act

New Law

- Much wailing and gnashing of teeth among retail front groups
  - Came into effect in late July 2012

Current Study

- Investigated responses to the policy removing tobacco from open display
  - Explored:
    - Support for new policy
    - Perceived benefits
- On-line survey of 364 smokers and 402 non-smokers
  - Quotas by age, gender and smoking status
Sample smoking prevalence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male (n=359)</th>
<th>Female (n=407)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Smokers</td>
<td>34% (n=269)</td>
<td>41% (n=260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional smokers</td>
<td>13% (n=75)</td>
<td>7% (n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Smokers</td>
<td>7% (n=62)</td>
<td>9% (n=36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Smokers</td>
<td>46% (n=289)</td>
<td>43% (n=281)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>NZ European/Other (n=658)</th>
<th>Māori &amp; Pacific (n=51)</th>
<th>Asian (n=57)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Smokers</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional smokers</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Smokers</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Smokers</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>15 to 24 (n=79)</th>
<th>25 to 44 (n=287)</th>
<th>45 to 64 (n=268)</th>
<th>65+ (n=132)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Smokers</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional smokers</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Smokers</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Smokers</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (n=766) 38% 10% 8% 44%

Support for new policy

Removing tobacco products from view in shops

Effect of Policy on Ease of Quitting

Effect of Policy on Smokers’ Ease of Quitting
Key findings

- Strong support for new policy and many perceived benefits including:
  - Reduced initiation AND reduced access among youth
  - Occasional smokers more likely to believe POS removal made it easier for them to quit [OR 3.10 (p<.1)]
  - Quit intenders more likely to believe POS removal made quitting easier [OR 12.97 (p<.05)]
  - Easier for quitters to remain smokefree
Conclusions

Removing tobacco from open display in stores:
- Has strong public support
- Further denormalises tobacco and smoking
- Seen as very likely to reduce youth initiation and access
- Supports quitters

On-going evaluations required to assess effects on youth initiation and cessation success
- Early evidence suggests policy likely to reduce smoking initiation and increase successful quitting
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