

The impact of the point-of-sale tobacco display ban on young people in Scotland: before-and-after study

Sally Haw,^{1*} Dorothy Currie,² Douglas Eadie,³ Jamie Pearce,⁴ Andy MacGregor,⁵ Martine Stead,³ Amanda Amos,⁶ Catherine Best,¹ Michael Wilson,¹ Mark Cherrie,⁴ Richard Purves,³ Gozde Ozakinci⁷ and Anne Marie MacKintosh³

¹Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport, University of Stirling, Stirling, UK

²Centre for Adolescent and Child Health Research, School of Medicine, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, UK

³Institute for Social Marketing, Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport, University of Stirling, Stirling, UK

⁴Institute of Geography, School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

⁵ScotCen Social Research, Edinburgh, UK

⁶Usher Institute of Population Health Sciences and Informatics, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

⁷School of Medicine, Medical & Biological Sciences, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, UK

*Corresponding author s.j.haw@stir.ac.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: none

Disclaimer: This report contains transcripts of interviews conducted in the course of the research and contains language that may offend some readers.

Published January 2020

DOI: 10.3310/phr08010

Scientific summary

The DISPLAY study

Public Health Research 2020; Vol. 8: No. 1

DOI: 10.3310/phr08010

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Scientific summary

Background

Among young people, exposure to tobacco promotions at point of sale has been shown to increase the perceived ease of purchasing tobacco, estimated smoking prevalence, smoking susceptibility and smoking initiation. Among adults, images of tobacco packs elicit craving in smokers, while tobacco displays prompt impulse purchasing in smokers and urges to start smoking in recent ex-smokers.

Legislation that prohibits tobacco displays at point of sale has been implemented in a number of countries, including Thailand, Canada, Ireland, Norway, Australia, Finland, New Zealand, England, Wales and Northern Ireland. In Scotland, a ban on point-of-sale tobacco displays was introduced in large stores (i.e. those > 280 m²) in April 2013. The ban was extended to small retailers in April 2015.

The aims of the current study (henceforth referred to as the DISPLAY study) were to determine the impact of the Scottish point-of-sale legislation on young people's exposure to tobacco advertising, their attitudes towards smoking and their smoking behaviour; and to identify any 'unintended consequences' of the legislation.

Methods

The study had a multimodal before-and-after design and used mixed methods to collect data in four purposively selected communities. For the purposes of the study, community was defined as the catchment areas of four secondary schools selected for study. Schools were selected to reflect two levels of urbanisation (large urban vs. other urban/small town) and two levels of deprivation (high vs. medium to low) and were located in the central belt of mainland Scotland.

The study had the following four main components.

Mapping and spatial analysis of the location and density of tobacco retail outlets

Data (address and full postcode) for all tobacco retail outlets in Scotland were downloaded from the *Register of Tobacco and Nicotine Vapour Product Retailers* at baseline (January 2013) and then annually until 2017. Data on tobacco retailers located in the four study communities were then extracted. The retail outlets selected were restricted to large supermarkets and small retailers, including off-licences; confectioners, tobacconists and newsagents; small grocers (including licensed); petrol stations; and fish and chip shops. The retail outlets identified were then verified through field visits and integrated into a Geographical Information System for analysis.

Marketing audits of tobacco retail outlets most used by young people

Researchers visited all retail outlets in the study communities in pairs to record brief information about the visibility and placement of tobacco products in the store; how tobacco products were displayed; how tobacco products were actively promoted for sale (both externally and internally); the branding of display units and pack sizes available; the most prominent brand, if any; the communication and visibility of pricing information; and tobacco control signage. The audits were discreet and did not require retailer co-operation. Data collection was by making a token purchase in each retail outlet to gain access to the tobacco counter. Observers also devised techniques to accurately recall and unobtrusively record information.

A panel of 24 retailers was also recruited from four communities matched with our main study areas. Researchers visited these retail outlets annually between July and August from 2013 to 2017 to collect observational data on point-of-sale advertising and marketing strategies and to conduct in-depth interviews with retail managers/owners from each outlet.

Cross-sectional school surveys of pupils, with embedded pupil cohorts

The school survey had a repeat cross-sectional design with embedded pupil cohorts. Data collection took place between February and March 2013 (baseline) in all study communities, with longitudinal follow-up for 4 years. In 2013 and 2014, all Secondary 2 (13-year-olds) and Secondary 4 (15-year-olds) pupils were surveyed. Between 2015 and 2016 the survey included all pupils in Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 (12- to 17-year-olds). Data were collected using an anonymous self-complete questionnaire administered by class teachers under exam conditions. The questionnaire included questions on sociodemographics; pupil smoking behaviours and attitudes; family and peer smoking behaviours and attitudes; access to tobacco products; brand awareness; frequency of visits to large supermarkets and small shops; and exposure to tobacco marketing and advertising. Questions on patterns of e-cigarette use were included from 2014 onwards; on exposure to e-cigarette marketing from 2015 onwards; and on awareness of standardised packs in 2017.

Focus group discussions with purposive samples of pupils

Four single-sex focus groups were conducted annually with Secondary 2 and Secondary 4 pupils in each study community. Focus group participants were recruited, with the help of teachers in the study schools, to include young people who were smokers or were thought to be most at risk of smoking. In order that the focus group discussions did not influence questionnaire responses, the focus groups were conducted 1–2 weeks after the school survey and audio-recorded with the permission of group participants. Groups lasted between 30 and 50 minutes and included discussions about the community; leisure time activities; local smoking behaviours and cultures; access to tobacco products, including direct, indirect/proxy and black-market; awareness of and views on tobacco promotion, including point of sale, packaging and branding; awareness and perceptions of the impact of the legislation; and views about preventing youth smoking. The subject of e-cigarettes arose spontaneously in three of the focus groups in 2013 and was included as a topic from 2014 onwards.

Results

Retailers' implementation of and compliance with point-of-sale legislation

Before the implementation of the legislation, tobacco displays were highly visible in small shops, placed at customer eye-level, and often next to products of particular interest to children, most notably confectionery. The majority of young people in the 2013 school survey (80%) recalled seeing tobacco displays both in supermarkets and in smaller shops, with young people from the least affluent backgrounds more likely to recall seeing them.

Compliance with the legislation was high when assessed by the marketing audit 2 weeks after the implementation deadlines in both supermarkets (in early May 2013) and small shops (in April 2015). A few instances of non-compliance were observed and these were mostly minor and temporary.

Although compliance with the legislation was found to be high, tobacco as a generic product continued to maintain a strong visible presence. Storage units were still clearly visible, with most located in a prominent position behind the service counter and most continuing to carry large generic signage promoting tobacco availability.

Small retailers' perspectives on the implementation and impact of point-of-sale legislation

Retailers expressed some concerns before the point-of-sale legislation was implemented in small shops, but the majority found that implementation was straightforward. Concerns that transaction times would increase proved to be unfounded, and there was no evidence of an increase in shoplifting or trade in black-market tobacco. Retailers had mixed views regarding the potential impact on consumer behaviour and tobacco sales, with some perceiving no difference and others perceiving a drop in sales, although this was not solely attributed to the point-of-sale legislation.

It is notable that the use of retailer incentives by tobacco company representatives persisted even after tobacco gantries were covered up. Retailers continued to be rewarded for product placement, availability and sales, and there was evidence that retailers were also incentivised to promote products verbally to customers.

The impacts of point-of-sale legislation on exposure to tobacco products in the retail environment

The number of retail outlets selling tobacco in the study communities remained stable, with only a small number of openings and closures over the course of the study. High levels of compliance with the Scottish point-of-sale display ban led to a considerable reduction in exposure to tobacco products in the study communities. However, the point-of-sale legislation has had very little impact on the visibility of tobacco storage units. Furthermore, at an individual level, there was evidence of an increase in socioeconomic inequalities: the decline in retailer density, when weighted by product visibility, was restricted to young people in the highest Family Affluence Scale tertile.

At a national level, tobacco retailer density fell across all deprivation quintiles between 2013 and 2015, but less so in the most deprived neighbourhoods. This was followed by a modest increase in 2016 and 2017. By the end of the study period the overall number of retailers had reduced and was similar to the number at baseline. The increase in retailer density was largely driven by an increase in the number of tobacco retailers in the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods of one-fifth of local authorities, resulting in an increase in inequality of tobacco availability.

Outcomes for young people

Previous research has suggested that point-of-sale legislation might lead to a reduction in brand awareness, perceived accessibility of tobacco products, perceived smoking prevalence, pro-smoking attitudes, smoking susceptibility and smoking initiation in young people.

Prior to implementation of the point-of-sale display ban, young people reported that tobacco displays were very eye-catching, colourful and attractive, and the number of tobacco brands they were aware of was positively associated with both regularly visiting small shops (adjusted relative rate ratio 1.19, 95% confidence interval 1.01 to 1.40; $p < 0.01$) and noticing point-of-sale displays in large supermarkets (adjusted relative rate ratio 1.15, 95% confidence interval 1.01 to 1.30; $p < 0.01$) and small shops (adjusted relative rate ratio 1.24, 95% confidence interval 1.03 to 1.51; $p < 0.01$). Brand awareness fell both after the partial ban (Secondary 2 pupils only) and after the comprehensive ban (Secondary 1 pupils only), but only among younger pupils.

Crude trends in the perceived accessibility of tobacco products and pro-smoking attitudes increased over time. However, after controlling for sociodemographics and a range of smoking-related covariates, implementation of both the partial and the comprehensive point-of-sale display bans was associated with a reduction in the perceived accessibility of tobacco (partial ban: adjusted odds ratio 0.80, 95% confidence interval 0.64 to 0.99, $p < 0.01$; comprehensive ban: adjusted odds ratio 0.72, 95% confidence interval 0.57 to 0.90, $p < 0.001$) and a reduction in pro-smoking attitudes after the comprehensive ban (adjusted odds ratio 0.67, 95% confidence interval 0.49 to 0.91; $p < 0.001$). However, it should be noted that significant reductions occurred only after e-cigarette use was included as a covariate.

Young people in the study overestimated smoking prevalence among young people by a factor of six and among adults by a factor of 2.5. Mean estimates of youth smoking prevalence fell by 3.4 percentage points (95% confidence interval -4.82 to -2.06 ; $p < 0.001$) after the partial ban and by 2.9 percentage points (95% confidence interval -4.34 to -1.47 ; $p < 0.001$) after the comprehensive ban (compared with baseline). Mean estimates of adult smoking prevalence also fell significantly but only after implementation of the comprehensive ban (1.7%, 95% confidence interval -3.0 to 0.40 ; $p < 0.01$). Again, when models were adjusted for e-cigarette use, the reduction in estimated smoking decreased.

A key objective of the point-of-sale display legislation was to reduce smoking susceptibility and the risk of smoking initiation in young people. Risk of smoking susceptibility in young people was significantly lower after the implementation of both the partial ban (adjusted hazard ratio 0.57, 95% confidence interval 0.46 to 0.72; $p < 0.001$) and the comprehensive ban (adjusted hazard ratio 0.44, 95% confidence interval 0.32 to 0.61; $p < 0.001$) (compared with baseline). Risk of smoking initiation also fell after the partial ban (hazard ratio 0.60, 95% confidence interval 0.46 to 0.79; $p < 0.001$) and continued to fall after the comprehensive ban (adjusted hazard ratio 0.27, 95% confidence interval 0.17 to 0.42; $p < 0.001$). Including e-cigarettes as a covariate had only a marginal effect on the risk of smoking susceptibility and smoking initiation. We found no evidence of differential impact of the legislation on Family Affluence Scale tertiles.

This study has found significant positive relationships between the implementation of point-of-sale legislation in Scotland and a range of smoking-related outcomes in young people. Using path analysis, the underlying mechanisms for two of these outcomes – perceived smoking prevalence and brand awareness – were explored. It was found that, prior to the implementation of any tobacco display ban, tobacco retailer density had a direct effect on perceived smoking prevalence, but this disappeared after implementation of a partial point-of-sale ban. The analysis also demonstrated that, after the implementation of the partial point-of-sale ban in large supermarkets, tobacco retailer density had an indirect effect on brand awareness through family smoking but not after implementation of the comprehensive ban. This suggests that the point-of-sale ban has disrupted the links between tobacco retailer density and brand awareness and between tobacco retailer density and perceived youth smoking prevalence.

E-cigarettes

E-cigarettes emerged as an important contextual issue during the study. The proportion of pupils (Secondary 1 to Secondary 6) who had tried e-cigarettes rose from 19.4% in 2015 to 33.7% in 2017. Thus, by 2017, a greater proportion of young people had tried an e-cigarette than had tried smoking cigarettes (21.1%).

Young people reported that e-cigarettes were prominent and ubiquitous in the retail environment, and recall of seeing e-cigarettes for sale in small shops (adjusted odds ratio 1.49, 95% confidence interval 1.07 to 1.80; $p < 0.01$) and on the internet (adjusted odds ratio 1.35, 95% confidence interval 1.01 to 1.80; $p < 0.01$) was positively associated with young people trying e-cigarettes. In young 'never-smokers', the use of e-cigarettes was positively associated with smoking initiation both 1 year and 2 years later. The transition from e-cigarette use in 2015 to smoking initiation in 2017 was mediated by an increase in the number of smokers in friendship groups and in pro-smoking attitudes.

The rapid growth in e-cigarette use during the study is notable, and our findings suggest that the use of e-cigarettes may have disrupted the impact of the point-of-sale legislation on a number of the smoking-related outcomes. The evidence is strongest with respect to the impact of the point-of-sale legislation on perceived accessibility and acceptability of smoking. Further research is required to explore this in greater detail.

Conclusions

The Scottish legislation that bans point-of-sale tobacco displays has been successful in reducing exposure to tobacco products at both a community and an individual level. This has been accompanied by significant reductions in brand awareness (in younger pupils only), perceived accessibility of tobacco products, perceived smoking prevalence, pro-smoking attitudes, smoking susceptibility and smoking initiation in young people from the study communities.

However, even after tobacco storage units have been covered up, the storage units themselves continue to be prominent in retail outlets. Thus, the point-of-sale display ban has not fully eliminated tobacco as a generic product from the retail environment in Scotland. Cues that tobacco is for sale are still highly visible in many shops. The continuing existence of these cues in the retail environment was observed, particularly in areas of deprivation, where inequalities in storage visibility have widened since the point-of-sale ban was implemented. Furthermore, the availability and density of tobacco retailers has remained high across Scotland, with greater availability in more disadvantaged neighbourhoods. The regulation of the number of tobacco retail outlets, the size, design and position of storage units, and the use of generic signage to indicate tobacco availability are all likely to contribute to reducing these inequalities. The recent emergence of e-cigarettes may also have disrupted the impact of point-of-sale legislation.

This study suggests that further research is needed to examine the longitudinal relationships between tobacco outlet availability and product visibility and inequalities; the impact of generic tobacco cues in the retail environment on smoking behaviour; the development of social norms about the use of e-cigarettes among school leavers; and the impact of e-cigarettes and standardised packaging on smoking initiation and prevalence.

Funding

This project was funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Public Health Research programme and will be published in full in *Public Health Research*; Vol. 8, No. 1. See the NIHR Journals Library website for further project information.

Public Health Research

ISSN 2050-4381 (Print)

ISSN 2050-439X (Online)

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full PHR archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/phr. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the *Public Health Research* journal

Reports are published in *Public Health Research* (PHR) if (1) they have resulted from work for the PHR programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Public Health Research* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

PHR programme

The Public Health Research (PHR) programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), is the leading UK funder of public health research, evaluating public health interventions, providing new knowledge on the benefits, costs, acceptability and wider impacts of non-NHS interventions intended to improve the health of the public and reduce inequalities in health. The scope of the programme is multi-disciplinary and broad, covering a range of interventions that improve public health.

For more information about the PHR programme please visit the website: <https://www.nihr.ac.uk/explore-nihr/funding-programmes/public-health-research.htm>

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the PHR programme as project number 10/3000/07. The contractual start date was in January 2012. The final report began editorial review in November 2018 and was accepted for publication in September 2019. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The PHR editors and production house have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the final report document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the PHR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the PHR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Haw *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

Editor-in-Chief of *Public Health Research* and NIHR Journals Library

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor John Powell Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief of HTA and EME journals. Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK, and Senior Clinical Researcher, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals

Professor Matthias Beck Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Consultant Advisor, Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Director, NIHR Dissemination Centre, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Martin Underwood Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk