

Support for smoke-free policies in the Cyprus hospitality industry

LAZURAS, Lambros <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5075-9029>>, SAVVA, Christos S., TALIAS, Michael A. and SOTERIADES, Elpidoforos S.

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/10925/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

LAZURAS, Lambros, SAVVA, Christos S., TALIAS, Michael A. and SOTERIADES, Elpidoforos S. (2015). Support for smoke-free policies in the Cyprus hospitality industry. *International Journal of Public Health*, 60 (8), 911-917.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

International Journal of Public Health

Support for Smoke-free Policies in the Cyprus Hospitality Industry

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	IJPH-D-14-00642R4	
Full Title:	Support for Smoke-free Policies in the Cyprus Hospitality Industry	
Article Type:	Original article	
Keywords:	smoke-free policies; hospitality industry; policy support; Cyprus	
Corresponding Author:	Lambros Lazuras, PhD Thessaloniki, UNITED KINGDOM	
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:		
Corresponding Author's Institution:		
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:		
First Author:	Lambros Lazuras, PhD	
First Author Secondary Information:		
Order of Authors:	Lambros Lazuras, PhD	
	Christos Savva, PhD	
	Michael Talias, PhD	
	Elpidoforos S Soteriades, MD, PhD	
Order of Authors Secondary Information:		
Funding Information:	Republic of Cyprus and the European Regional Development Fund through the Cyprus Research Promotion Foundation	Christos Savva
Abstract:	<p>Objectives: The present study used attitudinal and behavioural indicators to measure support for smoke-free policies among employers and employees in the hospitality industry in Cyprus.</p> <p>Methods: A representative sample of 600 participants (95% response rate) completed anonymous structured questionnaires on demographic variables, smoking status, exposure to second-hand smoke at work and related health beliefs, social norms, and smoke-free policy support.</p> <p>Results: Participants were predominantly males (68.3%), with a mean age of 40 years (SD = 12.69), and 39.7% were employers/owners of the hospitality venue. Analysis of variance showed that employers and smokers were less supportive of smoke-free policies, as compared to employees and non-smokers. Linear regression models showed that attitudes towards smoke-free policy were predicted by smoking status, SHS exposure and related health beliefs, and social norm variables. Logistic regression analysis showed that willingness to confront a policy violator was predicted by SHS exposure, perceived prevalence of smoker clients, and smoke-free policy attitudes.</p> <p>Conclusions: SHS exposure and related health beliefs, and normative factors should be targeted by interventions aiming to promote policy support in the hospitality industry in Cyprus.</p>	

Abstract

Objectives: The present study used attitudinal and behavioural indicators to measure support for smoke-free policies among employers and employees in the hospitality industry in Cyprus.

Methods: A representative sample of 600 participants (95% response rate) completed anonymous structured questionnaires on demographic variables, smoking status, exposure to second-hand smoke at work and related health beliefs, social norms, and smoke-free policy support.

Results: Participants were predominantly males (68.3%), with a mean age of 40 years ($SD = 12.69$), and 39.7% were employers/owners of the hospitality venue. Analysis of variance showed that employers and smokers were less supportive of smoke-free policies, as compared to employees and non-smokers. Linear regression models showed that attitudes towards smoke-free policy were predicted by smoking status, SHS exposure and related health beliefs, and social norm variables. Logistic regression analysis showed that willingness to confront a policy violator was predicted by SHS exposure, perceived prevalence of smoker clients, and smoke-free policy attitudes.

Conclusions: SHS exposure and related health beliefs, and normative factors should be targeted by interventions aiming to promote policy support in the hospitality industry in Cyprus.

Keywords: Smoke-free policies; hospitality industry; policy support; Cyprus

1
2 **Support for Smoke-free Policies in the Cyprus Hospitality Industry**
3
4
5

6 Lambros Lazuras¹, Christos S. Savva,² Michael A. Talias,³

7
8 Elpidoforos S. Soteriades ^{4,5}
9

10
11
12
13 ¹South East European Research Centre (SEERC), Thessaloniki, Greece
14

15 ²Cyprus University of Technology, Department of Commerce, Finance and Shipping, Limassol, Cyprus
16

17 ³Open University of Cyprus, Postgraduate Healthcare Management Program, Nicosia, Cyprus
18

19 ⁴Cyprus Institute of Biomedical Sciences (CIBS), Department of Occupational and Environmental Medicine,
20 Nicosia, Cyprus
21
22

23 ⁵Harvard School of Public Health, Department of Environmental Health, Environmental and Occupational
24 Medicine and Epidemiology (EOME), Boston, MA, USA
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Correspondence to:

34 Dr Lambros Lazuras

35 T: 0030 2310 224 521

36 F: 0030 2310 269 095

37 M: l.lazuras@sheffield.ac.uk
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

Objectives: The present study used attitudinal and behavioural indicators to measure support for smoke-free policies among employers and employees in the hospitality industry in Cyprus.

Methods: A representative sample of 600 participants (95% response rate) completed anonymous structured questionnaires on demographic variables, smoking status, exposure to second-hand smoke at work and related health beliefs, social norms, and smoke-free policy support.

Results: Participants were predominantly males (68.3%), with a mean age of 40 years ($SD = 12.69$), and 39.7% were employers/owners of the hospitality venue. Analysis of variance showed that employers and smokers were less supportive of smoke-free policies, as compared to employees and non-smokers. Linear regression models showed that attitudes towards smoke-free policy were predicted by smoking status, SHS exposure and related health beliefs, and social norm variables. Logistic regression analysis showed that willingness to confront a policy violator was predicted by SHS exposure, perceived prevalence of smoker clients, and smoke-free policy attitudes.

Conclusions: SHS exposure and related health beliefs, and normative factors should be targeted by interventions aiming to promote policy support in the hospitality industry in Cyprus.

Keywords: Smoke-free policies; hospitality industry; policy support; Cyprus

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Support for Smoke-free Policies in the Cyprus Hospitality Industry

Introduction

Tobacco use is the single most important cause of preventable death in developed and developing countries, accounting for about 5.4 million deaths annually. Unless preventive action is taken, the death toll of tobacco use is expected to almost double within the next 15 years (Mathers and Loncar 2006; WHO 2009). Non-smokers exposed to second-hand smoke (SHS) are also at risk for smoking-related disease and mortality (Laumbach and Kipen, 2014). A recent analysis of the global burden of disease showed that SHS exposure was amongst the leading 3 causes of death in the world (Lim et al. 2013). Another study found that SHS exposure accounted for 10.9 million lost disability-adjusted-life-years (DALYs) in both children and adults (Öberg et al. 2011). Scientific evidence is also accumulating about the toxicity and health compromising effects of exposure to third-hand smoke (THS). THS comprises residual pollutants that remain on surfaces and/or dust even in the absence of active smoking, and are re-emitted in the air, or react with other compounds to produce secondary environmental pollutants (Hang et al. 2013; Matt et al. 2011). Smoke-free policies in public settings are effective ways to de-normalize tobacco use, reduce smoking among current smokers, and protect non-smokers from passive exposure to SHS and THS (Borland et al. 2006; Callinan et al. 2010; Matt et al. 2011).

Culture plays an important role in smoke-free policy implementation. Relevant research from Greece – a European country with comparably high smoking rates and lower support for smoke-free policies in public places – attests to that (Lazuras et al. 2009). In particular, Tamvakas and Amos (2011) showed that young people aged 14-16 years old in Greece viewed tobacco use and exposure to SHS as a normal part of their culture. Importantly, the “right” to smoke in public places was seen as more fundamental and important than the right for smoke-free air, and smoke-free policies were viewed as meaningless and unfeasible. Accordingly, compared to UK smokers, Greek smokers were more likely to actively oppose smoke-free policies, offered a wide range of self-justifying arguments for opposing smoke-free policies, viewed smoke-free policies as “racism” against smokers, and adopted a “libertarian” view with regards to protecting smokers’ rights to smoke (Louka et al. 2006). More recent studies have shown that the majority of Greek non-smokers, although bothered by exposure to SHS at work, were less likely to ask smoking colleagues not to smoke – even if smoking at work constituted a policy violation (Sivri et al. 2013).

Findings from Greece could potentially inform research in similar cultural settings where smoking is still seen as a normative behaviour and smoke-free policies are opposed or not fully implemented. In this respect, Cyprus shares a similar cultural setting with Greece, has one of the highest prevalence rates of adult smoking in Europe, and exposure to SHS at home and in public settings is common (Karekla et al. 2009). Although a strict smoke-free legislation for public places was introduced in January of 2010 in Cyprus, a recent report on the progress of tobacco control policies in European countries (Joosens and Raw, 2013) showed that Cyprus moved “downwards” by eight places in the rank on the Tobacco Control Scale. Specifically, as of January 2014 Cyprus had a very low average score, which was equal to that of Greece, for smoke-free policy implementation in hospitality venues, such as bars and restaurants.

The present study used attitudinal and behavioural indicators to measure support for smoke-free policies among employers and employees in the hospitality industry in Cyprus. The hospitality industry in Cyprus was selected as a target of the current study because the tobacco industry has often targeted this business

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

sector in order to foster opposition against smoke-free policies (Gonzalez and Glantz 2013), and because both employers and employees in hospitality venues can regulate the implementation of smoke-free policies (e.g., through the use/removal of tobacco signage, ashtrays etc.), and discourage policy violators (e.g., by confronting smokers who smoke in non-designated areas). Two important indicators of policy support were evaluated. The first indicator reflected employers and employees' attitudes towards smoke-free policies, that is, the expected benefits and losses from the implementation of smoke-free policies in hospitality venues. The second indicator included participants' willingness to confront smoke-free policy violations by smokers.

Methods

Participants/Design

A representative sample of 600 participants (95% response rate) including both owners/employers and employees were recruited from hospitality venues (i.e., restaurants, café/bars, and hotels) across all districts of Cyprus. Details about the sample distribution by each district are presented in Table 2. A multistage, random selection process was used for sample selection, which was broken down by district according to the actual population distribution. At the first stage, 600 hospitality venues were randomly selected. We ensured that the selected venues were in operation before 2010 so that we could get valid data about changes in smoke-free policy. At the second stage, one respondent per venue was selected. The manager of the venue was requested to complete the survey, and where the manager was not available an employee who had been working there before 2010 was asked to complete the survey. Participants were predominantly males (68.3%), with a mean age of 40 years ($SD = 12.69$), and 39.7% were employers/owners of the hospitality venue. The survey lasted for 3 months. Data collection was based on structured face-to-face interviews. Following ethical standards in behavioural research, all participants were informed about the aims and purposes of the study and their participation rights (i.e., anonymity and confidentiality of the data, voluntary participation, and the right to withdraw from the study without consequences). The study was approved by the Cyprus National Ethics Committee.

Measures

A battery of anonymous structured questionnaires was used for data collection. Preliminary pilot testing was conducted in order to evaluate the overall survey and identify any deficiencies and/or practical problems with survey completion. The pilot study was administered to a small sample ($n=30$) of target group participants (employers and employees) from cafeterias and bars, restaurants and hotels over all five districts of Cyprus. Following their comments and feedback, relevant revisions and linguistic adjustments were made for better comprehension of survey items and response options. The questionnaire variables are presented in Table 1.

Smoking status was measured with a single question "Do you smoke" followed by four distinct response options "No, I have never smoked", "No, but I am a former smoker", "Yes, I smoke, but not every day", and "Yes, I smoke at least once a day". Former smokers were asked to indicate the year they quit smoking, and occasional smokers (i.e., those who reported smoking but not on a daily basis) were further asked to indicate how many days per week they smoked, and how many cigarettes/cigars they smoked on those days. For reasons of further analyses, we collapsed response categories and created a binary variable comprising current non-smokers (i.e., never and former smokers), and current smokers (i.e., occasional and daily smokers).

Job status was assessed with a single item asking participants to denote if they were owners or co-owners/employers/partners, permanent or temporary employees. Educational status was also assessed with a

1 single item asking participants to select their highest academic achievement among several different response
2 options.

3 Exposure to SHS at work was assessed with a single item asking participants to report if they were
4 exposed to the smoke of others during the week prior to the survey on a five-point scale (not at all, a little,
5 moderately, a lot, very much). Higher scores reflected greater SHS exposure at the workplace.

6 Health beliefs about SHS exposure were also assessed with the mean of three items reflecting three
7 different health risks of SHS exposure (respiratory problems, lung cancer, and cardiovascular disease). A stem
8 proposition describing the term of SHS exposure was used, and respondents were asked to indicate the
9 likelihood that SHS exposure could lead to the stated health risks. Responses were coded on a five-point Likert
10 scale (1 = definitely not, 5 = definitely yes), and higher scores reflected greater perceived health risks from SHS
11 exposure (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.93$).

12 Changes in policy implementation were assessed with two items. The first item referred to the tobacco
13 control policy in the venue before the introduction of the smoke-free legislation, and the second item was about
14 the tobacco control policy in the venue after the introduction of the smoke-free legislation in Cyprus in October
15 of 2010. It is noteworthy that the smoke-free policy included exceptions since it allowed smoking in outdoors
16 areas of public buildings, therefore, giving the opportunity to cafeterias, bars, restaurants and hotels to create
17 smoking designated areas in their outdoor premises. The outdoor smoking designated areas in many occasions
18 were adjacent to the indoor areas, thereby allowing smoke to enter into the indoor environment. For this reason,
19 we had included specific questions in our study questionnaire in order to address the above issue as evaluate
20 whether the policy of each venue participating in the study survey was 100% prohibitive or had loopholes,
21 which could allow smokers or employees to circumvent the spirit of the new law. Responses in both items were
22 categorical and included four options: "smoking is prohibited in all indoor areas" denoting a complete ban on
23 smoking indoors; "smoking is allowed in certain *indoor area*" denoting partial ban, "smoking is allowed only in
24 outdoor areas/sitting places" denoting a total ban on indoor smoking but no restriction for smoking in outdoor
25 areas of the venue; finally, "smoking is allowed in all areas, both indoors and outdoors" denoted no smoking
26 restriction in the hospitality venue.

27 Attitudes towards smoke-free policies in hospitality venues were assessed with a 12-item questionnaire,
28 comprising both negative and positive outcome expectancies. Negative outcome expectancies reflected concerns
29 about the negative financial impact of smoke-free policies in the hospitality industry and the rights of smokers,
30 whereas positive outcome expectancies reflected on the health of the public (i.e., protecting clients and
31 employees from SHS exposure), and financial benefits (i.e., reduced costs for cleaning and repairing damage
32 caused by burning cigarettes) of smoke-free policies. Response options were coded on a typical 5-point Likert
33 scale, 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, and the internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.81$).

34 Willingness to confront smoke-free policy violators was assessed with a single-itemed implementation
35 intention hypothetical scenario. Implementation intentions are considered a proximal predictor of actual
36 behaviour (see Gollwitzer and Sheeran 2006 for a meta-analysis), and can be seen as a direct context-specific
37 behavioural tendency. Implementation intention measures include an "if" situation, followed by specific "then"
38 response. In this study, the "if" part reflected a situation whereby a smoker client smoked in a smoke-free area
39 (non-designated for smoking), and the "then" part included four hypothetical options: a) ask the client politely to
40 put out the cigarette and not light another one, b) call the police, c) do nothing, and d) other (open-ended
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

response option). For reasons of further analysis we collapsed response options and created a new binary variable (1= would take action against the policy violation, and 2 = I would remain passive/not take any action against the policy violation).

Social norms concerning the smoke-free policy were assessed with 5 items. However, each item reflected different dimensions of social norms, thus, the items could not be averaged in a single mean score. More specifically, two items assessed descriptive norms, namely, the perceived prevalence of clients who were smoking, and the perceived prevalence of smokers in Cyprus. Responses were coded on an open-ended format (from 0 – 100%). Accordingly, three items assessed social norms concerning policy implementation: frequency of regulatory control by the respective authorities, frequency of clients who complained about the smoke-free policy of the venue, and frequency of non-smoker clients complaining about smoke-free policy violations.

Results

Demographic characteristics and smoking status

Almost half of the respondents (48.4%, $n = 293$) had a university degree either at an undergraduate or postgraduate level, about 39% ($n = 294$) completed secondary education, and 2.2% ($n = 13$) had completed only primary education. A large percentage 36.7% ($n = 220$) reported that they never smoked, 19% ($n = 114$) were former smokers, 9.2% ($n = 55$) were occasional smokers, and 35.2% ($n = 211$) were daily smokers. Analysis of frequencies with Pearson's chi-square showed that there were no differences in smoking status by educational level and job status, but there were statistically significant gender differences ($\chi^2 = 10.37$, $p = .001$), with more males being current smokers.

Changes in smoke-free policy implementation in hospitality venues

In Nicosia, 68.4% ($n = 80$) public venues allowed smoking in all areas of the venue prior to the introduction of the law, but this rate was decreased to 8.9% ($n = 11$) after the law was introduced in 2010. Accordingly, 43.5% ($n = 91$) hospitality and tourist venues in Limassol allowed smoking everywhere before 2010, but only 4.6% ($n = 10$) did so after the law was passed. In Larnaca, almost half of the visited venues (48.2% or $n = 53$) allowed smoking everywhere before the smoke-free law, but this rate was reduced to 2.6% ($n = 3$) when the study took place. Perhaps the largest decrease was observed in Paphos where 67.4% ($n = 60$) venues used to allow smoking everywhere, but only 1.1% (only one venue) allowed smoking after 2010. Lastly, venues that allowed smoking everywhere in the Famagusta district were reduced from 30.9% ($n = 17$) to 3.6% (only two venues) after the smoke-free law was passed. Collectively, these findings show that the introduction of the smoke-free law in Cyprus was followed by significant reductions in public smoking in hospitality and tourist venues.

Attitudes towards smoke-free policies

Univariate analysis of variance was used to assess the main and interaction effects of job status (employers vs. employees) and current smoking status (smoker vs. non-smoker) on attitudes towards the smoke-free policy in hospitality venues. The results showed that the main effects of smoking status and job status were statistically significant, but there was no significant interaction between these two variables. Current smokers ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 0.64$) were significantly less supportive of the smoke-free policy compared to non-smokers ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 0.64$, $F = 85.04$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .125$). Accordingly, owners/employers ($M = 2.98$, $SD = 0.68$) were less supportive of smoke-free policies, as compared to employees ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.66$, $F = 28.72$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .046$).

1 Linear regression was used to assess the predictors of attitudes towards smoke-free policies. Predictor
2 variables included job status (employers vs. employees), educational level, smoking status (current smoker vs.
3 non-smoker), exposure to SHS at work/in the venue, health beliefs about SHS exposure, and the normative
4 variables (perceived prevalence of smoking clients and of smokers in Cyprus, frequency of regulatory control
5 from inspection authorities, complaints from smokers against policy implementation, and complaints from non-
6 smokers for policy violations). Unstandardized regression coefficients (B) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs)
7 indicated the regression coefficient for each predictor (i.e., how much the dependent variable will change if the
8 predictor changed by one unit), and standardized beta coefficients (β) indicated the relative strength of each
9 predictor variable in the model. The regression model predicted 39.1% (Adjusted R^2) of the variance in attitudes
10 towards smoke-free policies. More positive attitudes towards smoke-free policies were associated with being an
11 employee (vs. employer), being a non-smoker (vs. smoker), being less frequently exposed to SHS at work and
12 perceiving greater health risk from SHS exposure, having less control from regulatory authorities, fewer
13 complaints from smokers against the smoke-free policy, more complaints from non-smoking clients for policy
14 violations, and believing that smokers clients are the minority – yet, the near-zero value in the regression
15 coefficient (B) suggests that this variable may have a non-significant effect on policy attitudes. The findings
16 from the regression analysis are summarized in Table 3.

24 Willingness to confront smoke-free policy violations

25 When asked how they would react to a smoking client who violated the smoke-free policy in their
26 venue, the majority of respondents (88.5% or $n = 510$) said that they would take action, instead of remaining
27 passive. Logistic regression analysis was used to assess the predictors of willingness to confront smokers who
28 violated the smoke-free policy. The same set of predictor variables that was used in the linear regression models
29 was employed again. In addition, we included attitudes towards smoke-free policies as a predictor variable. The
30 findings showed that the overall model was statistically significant (Omnibus $\chi^2 = 52.07$, $df = 11$, $p < .001$,
31 Nagelkerke $R^2 = 16.3\%$), but only three parameters significantly predicted willingness to confront smoke-free
32 policy violations: being less frequently exposed to SHS at work (OR = 0.78, 95% CI = 0.62 to 0.99), perceiving
33 fewer smoking clients (OR = 0.96, 95% CI = 0.95 to 0.98), and holding more positive attitudes towards smoke-
34 free policies (OR = 1.77, 95% CI = 1.09 to 2.87).

41 Discussion

42 The present study assessed attitudinal and behavioural indicators of smoke-free policy support among
43 hospitality industry professionals in Cyprus. The results showed that, overall, there were significant
44 improvements in smoke-free policy implementation, with the vast majority (>90%) of the visited venues
45 prohibiting smoking in indoor areas after the smoke-free law was passed in 2010. This is in line with research
46 showing that once hospitality venues become smoke-free, staff and clients gradually adjust to this change and
47 support the smoke-free policy (Borland et al. 2006; Li et al. 2010). However, smokers and employers/owners
48 were less supportive as compared to non-smokers and employees toward the smoke-free policy in hospitality
49 venues. This finding could be explained in terms of the expected costs of the smoke-free policy to both smokers
50 and employers. Smokers may display greater opposition because the policy will directly impact their own
51 smoking – thus, smokers (employers and employees) will not have the opportunity to smoke in their workplace
52 anymore (Lazuras et al. 2009; Macy et al. 2013; Poland et al. 2000). Accordingly, employers may appear less
53 supportive than employees because of the anticipated impact of smoke-free policies on financial turnover rates.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Despite mounting evidence showing that smoke-free policies do not lead to financial losses, there are still concerns among the hospitality industry, and in some this is the result of the tobacco industry interference (Apollonio and Bero 2007; Gonzalez and Glantz 2013; Ritch and Begay 2001). Future research in Cyprus may explore whether owners' concerns about the financial losses from smoke-free policies stem from ignorance of the empirical evidence, or from the strategic involvement of the tobacco industry.

Attitudes towards the smoke-free policy were positively associated with SHS exposure at work and related health beliefs. Employers and employees who were less exposed to SHS in their venue, and perceived greater health risks from SHS exposure were more supportive of the smoke-free policy. Alongside SHS exposure and beliefs, greater policy support was predicted by a range of social norm variables, including less control from regulatory authorities, fewer complaints from smokers against the smoke-free policy, and more complaints from non-smoking clients for policy violations. With respect to the willingness to confront smoke-free policy violators, the majority of hospitality industry professionals (employers and employees) would confront a smoker who violated the smoke-free policy in their venue. Smoking status and job status did not influence willingness to confront a smoker violator, but there was a strong positive association with policy attitudes. Additionally, reporting less exposure to SHS and believing that smokers represent a minority of clients were significant predictors of confrontation willingness. Taken together, these results suggest that SHS exposure and beliefs, as well as normative factors influence different facets of smoke-free policy support. Interventions to improve policy support in the hospitality industry should acknowledge the role of social dynamics, and accordingly target both smokers' negative reactions to policies (e.g., staff and owners could learn how to counter smokers' complaints), and non-smoking customers' reactions to policy violations (e.g., increasing assertiveness for smoke-free air). Past research has emphasized the importance of non-smokers assertiveness in regulating smoking in public places (e.g., Germain et al. 2007; Lazuras et al. 2012).

Interestingly, more frequent control from regulatory authorities was negatively related to policy support. This is an important finding because it suggests that the direct involvement of state authorities may run counter to the efforts to increase policy support among the hospitality industry professionals. One way to explain this finding is through intercultural values, such as power distance, a construct that describes how much cultures value hierarchical structures in the society and display respect for authority (Hofstede 2011). For instance, the culture in Cyprus may value more flat systems with less interference and control from authorities, and this may also influence the way smoke-free policies are perceived by hospitality professionals. Nevertheless, there is currently no data on the power distance index for Cyprus, so any related claims should be treated with caution. Perhaps one way to monitor the implementation of smoke-free policies in hospitality settings without the active interference of regulatory authorities (e.g., police or authorized personnel visiting hospitality venues) is to implement technological innovations, such as smart sensors, that will detect and record SHS instances without the active interference of regulatory authorities. Similar applications have been already proposed for the surveillance of smoke-free homes (Klepeis et al. 2013), and they could be potentially applied to the implementation of smoke-free policies in hospitality settings.

The study is not free of limitations. More specifically, a longitudinal design could be used to assess changes in the smoke-free policy implementation, and how changes in implementation corresponded to attitudes of employers and employees towards the smoke-free policy. For instance, relevant studies have shown that in the longer-term, smoker customers and professionals in the hospitality industry become more supportive of

1 smoke-free policies (Borland et al. 2006). However, a cross-sectional design was preferred over a time series
2 design in the present study for two main reasons; namely, the increased financial costs and human resources
3 involved in time series designs, and the rationale of the proposed project, which aimed at mapping attitudes and
4 beliefs of study participants at the outset of the smoking ban in Cyprus.
5

6 In summary, our findings suggest that smoke-free policy support among hospitality professionals is
7 strongly associated to SHS exposure and beliefs, and social norms. Interventions and campaigns to increase
8 policy support in this target group should acknowledge the importance of smoke-free environments and their
9 health implications, as well as the social dynamics that may shape policy implementation in hospitality venues.
10 Emphasis should be placed on effectively managing the complaints of smoking clients, while at the same time
11 empowering non-smoker customers to assert their rights for smoke-free air. Additionally, it is important that
12 actions to promote smoke-free policies in the country emphasize the non-issue of supposed economic costs to
13 employers. This will help in effectively countering front groups and related tobacco industry-sponsored activity
14 against the implementation of smoke-free policies in restaurant/hospitality venues. Active interference by
15 regulatory authorities may seem essential for policy-implementation, but it was negatively associated with
16 policy support in our study. This finding warrants further consideration and research about the public views of
17 regulatory authorities in similar cultures.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Ethical standard

The study complies with the current laws of the country in which it was performed.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

This study was co-funded by the Republic of Cyprus and the European Regional Development Fund through the Cyprus Research Promotion Foundation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

1 Apollonio DE, Bero LA (2007) The creation of industry front groups: the tobacco industry and “get government
2 off our back”. *Am J Public Health* 97:419-427. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2005.081117
3

4
5
6 Borland R, Yong HH, Siahpush M, Hyland A, Campbell S, Hastings G, Cummings KM, Fong GT (2006)
7 Support for and reported compliance with smoke-free restaurants and bars by smokers in four countries:
8 findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *Tob control* 15: iii34-iii41. doi:
9 10.1136/tc.2004.008748
10
11

12
13 Callinan JE, Clarke A, Doherty K, Kelleher C (2010) Legislative smoking bans for reducing secondhand smoke
14 exposure, smoking prevalence and tobacco consumption. *Coch Dat Syst Rev.*:
15 10.1002/14651858.CD005992.pub2
16
17

18
19 Germain D, Wakefield M, Durkin S (2007) Non-smokers’ responses when smokers light up: a population-based
20 study. *Prev Med* 45: 21-25. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2007.03.012
21
22

23
24 Gollwitzer PM, Sheeran P (2006) Implementation intentions and goal achievement: A meta-analysis of effects
25 and processes. *Adv Exp Soc Psychol* 38: 69-119. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(06)38002-1
26
27

28
29 Gonzalez M, Glantz, SA (2013) Failure of policy regarding smoke-free bars in the Netherlands. *Eur J Public*
30 *Health* 23: 139-145. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/ckr173
31
32

33
34 Hang B, Sarker AH, Havel C, et al (2013) Thirdhand smoke causes DNA damage in human cells. *Mutagenesis*
35 28: 381-391. doi: 10.1093/mutage/get013
36
37

38
39 Hofstede G (2011) Dimensionalizing cultures: the Hofstede model in context. *Online Read Psychol Culture* 2:
40 <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
41

42
43 Joosens L, Raw M (2013) The tobacco control scale 2013 in Europe. Association of European Cancer Leagues
44 (ECL), Brussels.
45

46
47 Karekla M, Symeou A, Tsangari H, Kapsou M, Constantinou M (2009) Smoking prevalence and tobacco
48 exposure among adolescents in Cyprus. *Eur J Public Health* 19: 655-661. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/ckp064
49
50

51
52 Klepeis NE, Hughes SC, Edwards RD, et al (2013) Promoting smoke-free homes: a novel behavioral
53 intervention using real-time audio-visual feedback on airborne particle levels. *PloS One*, 8: e73251. doi:
54 10.1371/journal.pone.0073251
55
56

57
58 Lazuras L, Eiser JR, Rodafinos A (2009) Predicting smokers’ non-compliance with smoking restrictions in
59 public places. *Tob Control* 18: 127-131. doi:10.1136/tc.2008.025841
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Lazuras L, Rodafinos A, Eiser R. (2009) Greece: smoking ban, or smoke and mirrors? *Tob Control*, 18: 343-
2 344.

3 Lazuras L, Zlatev M, Rodafinos A, Eiser JR (2012) Smokers' compliance with smoke-free policies, and non-
4 smokers' assertiveness for smoke-free air in the workplace: a study from the Balkans. *Int J Public health*, 57:
5 769-775. doi: 10.1007/s00038-012-0338-0
6

7
8
9 Laumbach R, Kipen H (2014) Mechanistic data support protecting non-smokers from the lethal effects of
10 second-hand smoke. *Int J Public Health*. doi:10.1007/s00038-014-0550-1
11

12
13
14 Li Q, Hyland A, O'Connor R, Zhao G, Du L, Li X, Fong GT (2010) Support for smoke-free policies among
15 smokers and non-smokers in six cities in China: ITC China Survey. *Tob Control* 19: i40-i46. doi:
16 10.1136/tc.2009.029850
17

18
19
20 Lim SS, Vos T, Flaxman AD, et al (2013) A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury
21 attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990–2010: a systematic analysis for the
22 Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The Lancet* 380: 2224-2260. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61766-8
23

24
25
26 Louka P, Maguire M, Evans P, Worrell M (2006) 'I think that it's a pain in the ass that I have to stand outside in
27 the cold and have a cigarette' Representations of smoking and experiences of disapproval in UK and Greek
28 smokers. *J Health Psychol* 11: 441-451. doi: 10.1177/1359105306063317
29

30
31
32 Macy JT, Chassin L, Presson CC (2013) The association between implicit and explicit attitudes toward smoking
33 and support for tobacco control measures. *Nic Tob Res*, 15: 291-296. doi: 10.1093/ntr/nts117
34

35
36
37 Mathers, C. D., Loncar, D. (2006). Projections of global mortality and burden of disease from 2002 to 2030.
38 *PLoS Medicine*, 3(11), e442. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0030442
39

40
41
42 Matt GE, Quintana PGE, Destailats H, et al (2013) Thirdhand tobacco smoke: emerging evidence and
43 arguments for a multidisciplinary research agenda. *Environ Health Pers* 119: 1218-1226, doi:
44 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1103500>
45

46
47
48 Öberg M, Jaakkola MS, Woodward A, Peruga A, Prüss-Ustün A (2011) Worldwide burden of disease from
49 exposure to second-hand smoke: a retrospective analysis of data from 192 countries. *The Lancet*, 377: 139-146.
50 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61388-8
51

52
53
54 Poland BD, Cohen JE, Ashley MJ, et al (2000) Heterogeneity among smokers and non-smokers in attitudes and
55 behaviour regarding smoking and smoking restrictions. *Tob Control* 9: 364-371.
56

57
58
59 Ritch WA, Begay ME (2001) Strange bedfellows: the history of collaboration between the Massachusetts
60 Restaurant Association and the tobacco industry. *Am J Public Health* 91: 598–603
61
62
63
64
65

1 Sivri C, Lazuras L, Rodafinos A, Eiser JR (2013) Smoke-free policies and non-smokers' reactions to SHS
2 exposure in small and medium enterprises. *Int J Occ Med Environ Health*, 26: 940-948. doi: 10.2478/s13382-
3 013-0166-3
4
5

6
7 Tamvakas I, Amos A (2010) 'These things don't happen in Greece': a qualitative study of Greek young people's
8 attitudes to smoking, secondhand smoke and the smokefree legislation. *Health Educ Res* 25: 955-964. doi:
9 10.1093/her/cyq048
10
11

12
13 World Health Organization (2009) WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic, 2009: implementing smoke-
14 free environments. WHO, Geneva.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 Table 1.3
4 Variables included in the questionnaire

5 Variable name	6 Number of items
7 Smoking status	1
8 Job status	1
9 Exposure to SHS at work	1
10 Health beliefs about SHS exposure	3
11 Changes in policy implementation	2
12 Attitudes towards smoke-free policies	12
13 Willingness to confront smoke-free policy violators	1
14 Descriptive social norms	2
15 Social norms about policy implementation	3

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2.

Distribution of study hospitality venues by Cyprus districts in 2012

Venues/Districts	Nicosia % (n)	Limassol % (n)	Larnaca % (n)	Paphos % (n)	Famagusta % (n)
Restaurants	44.4% (55)	56.4% (123)	60.5% (69)	49.4% (44)	20% (11)
Café/bars	36.3% (45)	32.6% (71)	31.6% (36)	25.8% (23)	20% (11)
Hotels	19.4% (24)	11% (24)	7.9% (9)	24.7% (22)	60% (33)
Total % (n)	20.7% (124)	36.3% (218)	19.0% (114)	14.8% (89)	9.2% (55)

Table 3

Predictors of attitudes towards smoke-free policies in hospitality venues in Cyprus, 2012

	B	β	95% CI for B
Job status	-.204	-.145*	-.294 to -.114
Educational level	.049	.060	-.003 to .101
Smoking status	-.319	-.230*	-.410 to -.227
Exposure to SHS	-.080	-.122*	-.124 to -.036
SHS health beliefs	.136	.198*	.091 to .180
Perceived prevalence of smokers in Cyprus	.000	.008	-.003 to .004
Perceived prevalence of smoker clients	-.006	-.186*	-.008 to .004
Frequency of control from regulatory authorities	-.071	-.101*	-.118 to -.024
Frequency of smokers complaining about the policy	-.137	-.285*	-.172 to -.103
Frequency of non-smokers complaining about policy violations	.088	.127*	.041 to .135

Note. * $p < .001$, except the effect for the frequency of control from regulatory authorities where $p = .003$; B indicates the regression coefficient for each predictor (i.e., how much the dependent variable will change if the predictor changed by one unit); β indicates the standardized beta coefficients (i.e., the relative strength of each predictor variable in the model).

1
2 **Support for Smoke-free Policies ~~among Employers and Employees~~ in the Cyprus Hospitality Industry ~~in~~**
3 **Cyprus**
4
5
6
7

8 Lambros Lazuras¹, Christos S. Savva,² Michael A. Talias,³

9
10 Elpidoforos S. Soteriades ^{4,5}
11
12
13

14 ¹South East European Research Centre (SEERC), Thessaloniki, Greece

15 ²Cyprus University of Technology, Department of Commerce, Finance and Shipping, Limassol, Cyprus

16
17 ³Open University of Cyprus, Postgraduate Healthcare Management Program, Nicosia, Cyprus

18
19 ⁴Cyprus Institute of Biomedical Sciences (CIBS), Department of Occupational and Environmental Medicine,
20 Nicosia, Cyprus

21
22 ⁵Harvard School of Public Health, Department of Environmental Health, Environmental and Occupational
23 Medicine and Epidemiology (EOME), Boston, MA, USA
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Correspondence to:

36 Dr Lambros Lazuras

37
38 T: 0030 2310 224 521

39
40 F: 0030 2310 269 095

41
42 M: l.lazuras@sheffield.ac.uk
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

Objectives: The present study used attitudinal and behavioural indicators to measure support for smoke-free policies among employers and employees in the hospitality industry in Cyprus.

Methods: A representative sample of 600 participants (95% response rate) completed anonymous structured questionnaires on demographic variables, smoking status, exposure to second-hand smoke at work and related health beliefs, social norms, and smoke-free policy support.

Results: Participants were predominantly males (68.3%), with a mean age of 40 years ($SD = 12.69$), and 39.7% were employers/owners of the hospitality venue. Analysis of variance showed that employers and smokers were less supportive of smoke-free policies, as compared to employees and non-smokers. Linear regression models showed that attitudes towards smoke-free policy were predicted by smoking status, SHS exposure and related health beliefs, and social norm variables. Logistic regression analysis showed that willingness to confront a policy violator was predicted by SHS exposure, perceived prevalence of smoker clients, and smoke-free policy attitudes.

Conclusions: SHS exposure and related health beliefs, and normative factors should be targeted by interventions aiming to promote policy support in the hospitality industry in Cyprus.

Keywords: Smoke-free policies; hospitality industry; policy support; Cyprus

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Support for Smoke-free Policies in the Cyprus Hospitality Industry among Employers and Employees in the Hospitality Industry in Cyprus

Introduction

Tobacco use is the single most important cause of preventable death in developed and developing countries, accounting for about 5.4 million deaths annually. Unless preventive action is taken, the death toll of tobacco use is expected to almost double within the next 15 years (Mathers and Loncar 2006; WHO 2009). Non-smokers exposed to second-hand smoke (SHS) are also at risk for smoking-related disease and mortality (Laumbach and Kipen, 2014). A recent analysis of the global burden of disease showed that SHS exposure was amongst the leading 3 causes of death in the world (Lim et al. 2013). Another study found that SHS exposure accounted for 10.9 million lost disability-adjusted-life-years (DALYs) in both children and adults (Öberg et al. 2011). Scientific evidence is also accumulating about the toxicity and health compromising effects of exposure to third-hand smoke (THS). THS comprises residual pollutants that remain on surfaces and/or dust even in the absence of active smoking, and are re-emitted in the air, or react with other compounds to produce secondary environmental pollutants (Hang et al. 2013; Matt et al. 2011). Smoke-free policies in public settings are effective ways to de-normalize tobacco use, reduce smoking among current smokers, and protect non-smokers from passive exposure to SHS and THS (Borland et al. 2006; Callinan et al. 2010; Matt et al. 2011).

Culture plays an important role in smoke-free policy implementation. Relevant research from Greece – a European country with comparably high smoking rates and lower support for smoke-free policies in public places – attests to that (Lazuras et al. 2009). In particular, Tamvakas and Amos (2011) showed that young people aged 14-16 years old in Greece viewed tobacco use and exposure to SHS as a normal part of their culture. Importantly, the “right” to smoke in public places was seen as more fundamental and important than the right for smoke-free air, and smoke-free policies were viewed as meaningless and unfeasible. Accordingly, compared to UK smokers, Greek smokers were more likely to actively oppose smoke-free policies, offered a wide range of self-justifying arguments for opposing smoke-free policies, viewed smoke-free policies as “racism” against smokers, and adopted a “libertarian” view with regards to protecting smokers’ rights to smoke (Louka et al. 2006). More recent studies have shown that the majority of Greek non-smokers, although bothered by exposure to SHS at work, were less likely to ask smoking colleagues not to smoke – even if smoking at work constituted a policy violation (Sivri et al. 2013).

Findings from Greece could potentially inform research in similar cultural settings where smoking is still seen as a normative behaviour and smoke-free policies are opposed or not fully implemented. In this respect, Cyprus shares a similar cultural setting with Greece, has one of the highest prevalence rates of adult smoking in Europe, and exposure to SHS at home and in public settings is common (Karekla et al. 2009). Although a strict smoke-free legislation for public places was introduced in January of 2010 in Cyprus, a recent report on the progress of tobacco control policies in European countries (Joosens and Raw, 2013) showed that Cyprus moved “downwards” by eight places in the rank on the Tobacco Control Scale. Specifically, as of January 2014 Cyprus had a very low average score, which was equal to that of Greece, for smoke-free policy implementation in hospitality venues, such as bars and restaurants.

The present study used attitudinal and behavioural indicators to measure support for smoke-free policies among employers and employees in the hospitality industry in Cyprus. The hospitality industry in

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
Cyprus was selected as a target of the current study because the tobacco industry has often targeted this business sector in order to foster opposition against smoke-free policies (Gonzalez and Glantz 2013), and because both employers and employees in hospitality venues can regulate the implementation of smoke-free policies (e.g., through the use/removal of tobacco signage, ashtrays etc.), and discourage policy violators (e.g., by confronting smokers who smoke in non-designated areas). Two important indicators of policy support were evaluated. The first indicator reflected employers and employees' attitudes towards smoke-free policies, that is, the expected benefits and losses from the implementation of smoke-free policies in hospitality venues. The second indicator included participants' willingness to confront smoke-free policy violations by smokers.

12 **Methods**

13 **Participants/Design**

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
A representative sample of 600 participants (95% response rate) including both owners/employers and employees were recruited from hospitality venues (i.e., restaurants, café/bars, and hotels) across all districts of Cyprus. Details about the sample distribution by each district are presented in Table 2. A multistage, random selection process was used for sample selection, which was broken down by district according to the actual population distribution. At the first stage, 600 hospitality venues were randomly selected. We ensured that the selected venues were in operation before 2010 so that we could get valid data about changes in smoke-free policy. At the second stage, one respondent per venue was selected. The manager of the venue was requested to complete the survey, and where the manager was not available an employee who had been working there before 2010 was asked to complete the survey. Participants were predominantly males (68.3%), with a mean age of 40 years ($SD = 12.69$), and 39.7% were employers/owners of the hospitality venue. The survey lasted for 3 months. Data collection was based on structured face-to-face interviews. Following ethical standards in behavioural research, all participants were informed about the aims and purposes of the study and their participation rights (i.e., anonymity and confidentiality of the data, voluntary participation, and the right to withdraw from the study without consequences). The study was approved by the Cyprus National Ethics Committee.

36 **Measures**

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
A battery of anonymous structured questionnaires was used for data collection. Preliminary pilot testing was conducted in order to evaluate the overall survey and identify any deficiencies and/or practical problems with survey completion. The pilot study was administered to a small sample ($n=30$) of target group participants (employers and employees) from cafeterias and bars, restaurants and hotels over all five districts of Cyprus. Following their comments and feedback, relevant revisions and linguistic adjustments were made for better comprehension of survey items and response options. The questionnaire variables are presented in Table 1.

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Smoking status was measured with a single question "Do you smoke" followed by four distinct response options "No, I have never smoked", "No, but I am a former smoker", "Yes, I smoke, but not every day", and "Yes, I smoke at least once a day". Former smokers were asked to indicate the year they quit smoking, and occasional smokers (i.e., those who reported smoking but not on a daily basis) were further asked to indicate how many days per week they smoked, and how many cigarettes/cigars they smoked on those days. For reasons of further analyses, we collapsed response categories and created a binary variable comprising current non-smokers (i.e., never and former smokers), and current smokers (i.e., occasional and daily smokers).

1 Job status was assessed with a single item asking participants to denote if they were owners or co-
2 owners/employers/partners, permanent or temporary employees. Educational status was also assessed with a
3 single item asking participants to select their highest academic achievement among several different response
4 options.

5
6 Exposure to SHS at work was assessed with a single item asking participants to report if they were
7 exposed to the smoke of others during the week prior to the survey on a five-point scale (not at all, a little,
8 moderately, a lot, very much). Higher scores reflected greater SHS exposure at the workplace.

9
10 Health beliefs about SHS exposure were also assessed with the mean of three items reflecting three
11 different health risks of SHS exposure (respiratory problems, lung cancer, and cardiovascular disease). A stem
12 proposition describing the term of SHS exposure was used, and respondents were asked to indicate the
13 likelihood that SHS exposure could lead to the stated health risks. Responses were coded on a five-point Likert
14 scale (1 = definitely not, 5 = definitely yes), and higher scores reflected greater perceived health risks from SHS
15 exposure (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.93$).
16
17

18
19 Changes in policy implementation were assessed with two items. The first item referred to the tobacco
20 control policy in the venue before the introduction of the smoke-free legislation, and the second item was about
21 the tobacco control policy in the venue after the introduction of the smoke-free legislation in Cyprus in October
22 of 2010. It is noteworthy that the smoke-free policy included exceptions since it allowed smoking in outdoors
23 areas of public buildings, therefore, giving the opportunity to cafeterias, bars, restaurants and hotels to create
24 smoking designated areas in their outdoor premises. The outdoor smoking designated areas in many occasions
25 were adjacent to the indoor areas, thereby allowing smoke to enter into the indoor environment. For this reason,
26 we had included specific questions in our study questionnaire in order to address the above issue as evaluate
27 whether the policy of each venue participating in the study survey was 100% prohibitive or had loopholes,
28 which could allow smokers or employees to circumvent the spirit of the new law. Responses in both items were
29 categorical and included four options: "smoking is prohibited in all indoor areas" denoting a complete ban on
30 smoking indoors; "smoking is allowed in certain *indoor area*" denoting partial ban, "smoking is allowed only in
31 outdoor areas/sitting places" denoting a total ban on indoor smoking but no restriction for smoking in outdoor
32 areas of the venue; finally, "smoking is allowed in all areas, both indoors and outdoors" denoted no smoking
33 restriction in the hospitality venue.
34
35

36
37 Attitudes towards smoke-free policies in hospitality venues were assessed with a 12-item questionnaire,
38 comprising both negative and positive outcome expectancies. Negative outcome expectancies reflected concerns
39 about the negative financial impact of smoke-free policies in the hospitality industry and the rights of smokers,
40 whereas positive outcome expectancies reflected on the health of the public (i.e., protecting clients and
41 employees from SHS exposure), and financial benefits (i.e., reduced costs for cleaning and repairing damage
42 caused by burning cigarettes) of smoke-free policies. Response options were coded on a typical 5-point Likert
43 scale, 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, and the internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.81$).
44
45

46
47 Willingness to confront smoke-free policy violators was assessed with a single-itemed implementation
48 intention hypothetical scenario. Implementation intentions are considered a proximal predictor of actual
49 behaviour (see Gollwitzer and Sheeran 2006 for a meta-analysis), and can be seen as a direct context-specific
50 behavioural tendency. Implementation intention measures include an "if" situation, followed by specific "then"
51 response. In this study, the "if" part reflected a situation whereby a smoker client smoked in a smoke-free area
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(non-designated for smoking), and the “then” part included four hypothetical options: a) ask the client politely to put out the cigarette and not light another one, b) call the police, c) do nothing, and d) other (open-ended response option). For reasons of further analysis we collapsed response options and created a new binary variable (1= would take action against the policy violation, and 2 = I would remain passive/not take any action against the policy violation).

Social norms concerning the smoke-free policy were assessed with 5 items. However, each item reflected different dimensions of social norms, thus, the items could not be averaged in a single mean score. More specifically, two items assessed descriptive norms, namely, the perceived prevalence of clients who were smoking, and the perceived prevalence of smokers in Cyprus. Responses were coded on an open-ended format (from 0 – 100%). Accordingly, three items assessed social norms concerning policy implementation: frequency of regulatory control by the respective authorities, frequency of clients who complained about the smoke-free policy of the venue, and frequency of non-smoker clients complaining about smoke-free policy violations.

Results

Demographic characteristics and smoking status

Almost half of the respondents (48.4%, $n = 293$) had a university degree either at an undergraduate or postgraduate level, about 39% ($n = 294$) completed secondary education, and 2.2% ($n = 13$) had completed only primary education. A large percentage 36.7% ($n = 220$) reported that they never smoked, 19% ($n = 114$) were former smokers, 9.2% ($n = 55$) were occasional smokers, and 35.2% ($n = 211$) were daily smokers. Analysis of frequencies with Pearson’s chi-square showed that there were no differences in smoking status by educational level and job status, but there were statistically significant gender differences ($\chi^2 = 10.37$, $p = .001$), with more males being current smokers.

Changes in smoke-free policy implementation in hospitality venues

In Nicosia, 68.4% ($n = 80$) public venues allowed smoking in all areas of the venue prior to the introduction of the law, but this rate was decreased to 8.9% ($n = 11$) after the law was introduced in 2010. Accordingly, 43.5% ($n = 91$) hospitality and tourist venues in Limassol allowed smoking everywhere before 2010, but only 4.6% ($n = 10$) did so after the law was passed. In Larnaca, almost half of the visited venues (48.2% or $n = 53$) allowed smoking everywhere before the smoke-free law, but this rate was reduced to 2.6% ($n = 3$) when the study took place. Perhaps the largest decrease was observed in Paphos where 67.4% ($n = 60$) venues used to allow smoking everywhere, but only 1.1% (only one venue) allowed smoking after 2010. Lastly, venues that allowed smoking everywhere in the Famagusta district were reduced from 30.9% ($n = 17$) to 3.6% (only two venues) after the smoke-free law was passed. Collectively, these findings show that the introduction of the smoke-free law in Cyprus was followed by significant reductions in public smoking in hospitality and tourist venues.

Attitudes towards smoke-free policies

Univariate analysis of variance was used to assess the main and interaction effects of job status (employers vs. employees) and current smoking status (smoker vs. non-smoker) on attitudes towards the smoke-free policy in hospitality venues. The results showed that the main effects of smoking status and job status were statistically significant, but there was no significant interaction between these two variables. Current smokers ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 0.64$) were significantly less supportive of the smoke-free policy compared to non-smokers ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 0.64$, $F = 85.04$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .125$). Accordingly, owners/employers ($M = 2.98$, $SD = 0.68$)

1
2
3 were less supportive of smoke-free policies, as compared to employees ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.66$, $F = 28.72$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .046$).

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Linear regression was used to assess the predictors of attitudes towards smoke-free policies. Predictor variables included job status (employers vs. employees), educational level, smoking status (current smoker vs. non-smoker), exposure to SHS at work/in the venue, health beliefs about SHS exposure, and the normative variables (perceived prevalence of smoking clients and of smokers in Cyprus, frequency of regulatory control from inspection authorities, complaints from smokers against policy implementation, and complaints from non-smokers for policy violations). Unstandardized regression coefficients (B) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) indicated the regression coefficient for each predictor (i.e., how much the dependent variable will change if the predictor changed by one unit), and standardized beta coefficients (β) indicated the relative strength of each predictor variable in the model. The regression model predicted 39.1% (Adjusted R^2) of the variance in attitudes towards smoke-free policies. More positive attitudes towards smoke-free policies were associated with being an employee (vs. employer), being a non-smoker (vs. smoker), being less frequently exposed to SHS at work and perceiving greater health risk from SHS exposure, having less control from regulatory authorities, fewer complaints from smokers against the smoke-free policy, more complaints from non-smoking clients for policy violations, and believing that smokers clients are the minority – yet, the near-zero value in the regression coefficient (B) suggests that this variable may have a non-significant effect on policy attitudes. The findings from the regression analysis are summarized in Table 3.

Willingness to confront smoke-free policy violations

When asked how they would react to a smoking client who violated the smoke-free policy in their venue, the majority of respondents (88.5% or $n = 510$) said that they would take action, instead of remaining passive. Logistic regression analysis was used to assess the predictors of willingness to confront smokers who violated the smoke-free policy. The same set of predictor variables that was used in the linear regression models was employed again. In addition, we included attitudes towards smoke-free policies as a predictor variable. The findings showed that the overall model was statistically significant (Omnibus $\chi^2 = 52.07$, $df = 11$, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 16.3\%$), but only three parameters significantly predicted willingness to confront smoke-free policy violations: being less frequently exposed to SHS at work (OR = 0.78, 95% CI = 0.62 to 0.99), perceiving fewer smoking clients (OR = 0.96, 95% CI = 0.95 to 0.98), and holding more positive attitudes towards smoke-free policies (OR = 1.77, 95% CI = 1.09 to 2.87).

Discussion

The present study assessed attitudinal and behavioural indicators of smoke-free policy support among hospitality industry professionals in Cyprus. The results showed that, overall, there were significant improvements in smoke-free policy implementation, with the vast majority (>90%) of the visited venues prohibiting smoking in indoor areas after the smoke-free law was passed in 2010. This is in line with research showing that once hospitality venues become smoke-free, staff and clients gradually adjust to this change and support the smoke-free policy (Borland et al. 2006; Li et al. 2010). However, smokers and employers/owners were less supportive as compared to non-smokers and employees toward the smoke-free policy in hospitality venues. This finding could be explained in terms of the expected costs of the smoke-free policy to both smokers and employers. Smokers may display greater opposition because the policy will directly impact their own smoking – thus, smokers (employers and employees) will not have the opportunity to smoke in their workplace

1 anymore (Lazuras et al. 2009; Macy et al. 2013; Poland et al. 2000). Accordingly, employers may appear less
2 supportive than employees because of the anticipated impact of smoke-free policies on financial turnover rates.
3 Despite mounting evidence showing that smoke-free policies do not lead to financial losses, there are still
4 concerns among the hospitality industry, and in some this is the result of the tobacco industry interference
5 (Apollonio and Bero 2007; Gonzalez and Glantz 2013; Ritch and Begay 2001). Future research in Cyprus may
6 explore whether owners' concerns about the financial losses from smoke-free policies stem from ignorance of
7 the empirical evidence, or from the strategic involvement of the tobacco industry.
8
9

10 Attitudes towards the smoke-free policy were positively associated with SHS exposure at work and
11 related health beliefs. Employers and employees who were less exposed to SHS in their venue, and perceived
12 greater health risks from SHS exposure were more supportive of the smoke-free policy. Alongside SHS
13 exposure and beliefs, greater policy support was predicted by a range of social norm variables, including less
14 control from regulatory authorities, fewer complaints from smokers against the smoke-free policy, and more
15 complaints from non-smoking clients for policy violations. With respect to the willingness to confront smoke-
16 free policy violators, the majority of hospitality industry professionals (employers and employees) would
17 confront a smoker who violated the smoke-free policy in their venue. Smoking status and job status did not
18 influence willingness to confront a smoker violator, but there was a strong positive association with policy
19 attitudes. Additionally, reporting less exposure to SHS and believing that smokers represent a minority of clients
20 were significant predictors of confrontation willingness. Taken together, these results suggest that SHS exposure
21 and beliefs, as well as normative factors influence different facets of smoke-free policy support. Interventions to
22 improve policy support in the hospitality industry should acknowledge the role of social dynamics, and
23 accordingly target both smokers' negative reactions to policies (e.g., staff and owners could learn how to
24 counter smokers' complaints), and non-smoking customers' reactions to policy violations (e.g., increasing
25 assertiveness for smoke-free air). Past research has emphasized the importance of non-smokers assertiveness in
26 regulating smoking in public places (e.g., Germain et al. 2007; Lazuras et al. 2012).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Interestingly, more frequent control from regulatory authorities was negatively related to policy
37 support. This is an important finding because it suggests that the direct involvement of state authorities may run
38 counter to the efforts to increase policy support among the hospitality industry professionals. One way to
39 explain this finding is through intercultural values, such as power distance, a construct that describes how much
40 cultures value hierarchical structures in the society and display respect for authority (Hofstede 2011). For
41 instance, the culture in Cyprus may value more flat systems with less interference and control from authorities,
42 and this may also influence the way smoke-free policies are perceived by hospitality professionals.
43 Nevertheless, there is currently no data on the power distance index for Cyprus, so any related claims should be
44 treated with caution. Perhaps one way to monitor the implementation of smoke-free policies in hospitality
45 settings without the active interference of regulatory authorities (e.g., police or authorized personnel visiting
46 hospitality venues) is to implement technological innovations, such as smart sensors, that will detect and record
47 SHS instances without the active interference of regulatory authorities. Similar applications have been already
48 proposed for the surveillance of smoke-free homes (Klepeis et al. 2013), and they could be potentially applied to
49 the implementation of smoke-free policies in hospitality settings.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 The study is not free of limitations. More specifically, a longitudinal design could be used to assess
58 changes in the smoke-free policy implementation, and how changes in implementation corresponded to attitudes
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 of employers and employees towards the smoke-free policy. For instance, relevant studies have shown that in
2 the longer-term, smoker customers and professionals in the hospitality industry become more supportive of
3 smoke-free policies (Borland et al. 2006). However, a cross-sectional design was preferred over a time series
4 design in the present study for two main reasons; namely, the increased financial costs and human resources
5 involved in time series designs, and the rationale of the proposed project, which aimed at mapping attitudes and
6 beliefs of study participants at the outset of the smoking ban in Cyprus.
7
8

9 In summary, our findings suggest that smoke-free policy support among hospitality professionals is
10 strongly associated to SHS exposure and beliefs, and social norms. Interventions and campaigns to increase
11 policy support in this target group should acknowledge the importance of smoke-free environments and their
12 health implications, as well as the social dynamics that may shape policy implementation in hospitality venues.
13 Emphasis should be placed on effectively managing the complaints of smoking clients, while at the same time
14 empowering non-smoker customers to assert their rights for smoke-free air. Additionally, it is important that
15 actions to promote smoke-free policies in the country emphasize the non-issue of supposed economic costs to
16 employers. This will help in effectively countering front groups and related tobacco industry-sponsored activity
17 against the implementation of smoke-free policies in restaurant/hospitality venues. Active interference by
18 regulatory authorities may seem essential for policy-implementation, but it was negatively associated with
19 policy support in our study. This finding warrants further consideration and research about the public views of
20 regulatory authorities in similar cultures.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Ethical standard

The study complies with the current laws of the country in which it was performed.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

This study was co-funded by the Republic of Cyprus and the European Regional Development Fund through the Cyprus Research Promotion Foundation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- 1 Apollonio DE, Bero LA (2007) The creation of industry front groups: the tobacco industry and “get government
2 off our back”. *Am J Public Health* 97:419-427. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2005.081117
3
4
5
6 Borland R, Yong HH, Siahpush M, Hyland A, Campbell S, Hastings G, Cummings KM, Fong GT (2006)
7 Support for and reported compliance with smoke-free restaurants and bars by smokers in four countries:
8 findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *Tob control* 15: iii34-iii41. doi:
9 10.1136/tc.2004.008748
10
11
12
13 Callinan JE, Clarke A, Doherty K, Kelleher C (2010) Legislative smoking bans for reducing secondhand smoke
14 exposure, smoking prevalence and tobacco consumption. *Coch Dat Syst Rev.*:
15 10.1002/14651858.CD005992.pub2
16
17
18
19 Germain D, Wakefield M, Durkin S (2007) Non-smokers’ responses when smokers light up: a population-based
20 study. *Prev Med* 45: 21-25. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2007.03.012
21
22
23
24 Gollwitzer PM, Sheeran P (2006) Implementation intentions and goal achievement: A meta-analysis of effects
25 and processes. *Adv Exp Soc Psychol* 38: 69-119. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(06)38002-1
26
27
28
29 Gonzalez M, Glantz, SA (2013) Failure of policy regarding smoke-free bars in the Netherlands. *Eur J Public*
30 *Health* 23: 139-145. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/ckr173
31
32
33 Hang B, Sarker AH, Havel C, et al (2013) Thirdhand smoke causes DNA damage in human cells. *Mutagenesis*
34 28: 381-391. doi: 10.1093/mutage/get013
35
36
37
38 Hofstede G (2011) Dimensionalizing cultures: the Hofstede model in context. *Online Read Psychol Culture* 2:
39 <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
40
41
42 Joosens L, Raw M (2013) The tobacco control scale 2013 in Europe. Association of European Cancer Leagues
43 (ECL), Brussels.
44
45
46 Karekla M, Symeou A, Tsangari H, Kapsou M, Constantinou M (2009) Smoking prevalence and tobacco
47 exposure among adolescents in Cyprus. *Eur J Public Health* 19: 655-661. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/ckp064
48
49
50
51 Klepeis NE, Hughes SC, Edwards RD, et al (2013) Promoting smoke-free homes: a novel behavioral
52 intervention using real-time audio-visual feedback on airborne particle levels. *PloS One*, 8: e73251. doi:
53 10.1371/journal.pone.0073251
54
55
56
57 Lazuras L, Eiser JR, Rodafinos A (2009) Predicting smokers’ non-compliance with smoking restrictions in
58 public places. *Tob Control* 18: 127-131. doi:10.1136/tc.2008.025841
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Lazuras L, Rodafinos A, Eiser R. (2009) Greece: smoking ban, or smoke and mirrors? *Tob Control*, 18: 343-
2 344.

3 Lazuras L, Zlatev M, Rodafinos A, Eiser JR (2012) Smokers' compliance with smoke-free policies, and non-
4 smokers' assertiveness for smoke-free air in the workplace: a study from the Balkans. *Int J Public health*, 57:
5 769-775. doi: 10.1007/s00038-012-0338-0
6

7
8
9 Laumbach R, Kipen H (2014) Mechanistic data support protecting non-smokers from the lethal effects of
10 second-hand smoke. *Int J Public Health*. doi:10.1007/s00038-014-0550-1
11

12
13
14 Li Q, Hyland A, O'Connor R, Zhao G, Du L, Li X, Fong GT (2010) Support for smoke-free policies among
15 smokers and non-smokers in six cities in China: ITC China Survey. *Tob Control* 19: i40-i46. doi:
16 10.1136/tc.2009.029850
17

18
19
20 Lim SS, Vos T, Flaxman AD, et al (2013) A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury
21 attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990–2010: a systematic analysis for the
22 Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The Lancet* 380: 2224-2260. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61766-8
23

24
25
26 Louka P, Maguire M, Evans P, Worrell M (2006) 'I think that it's a pain in the ass that I have to stand outside in
27 the cold and have a cigarette' Representations of smoking and experiences of disapproval in UK and Greek
28 smokers. *J Health Psychol* 11: 441-451. doi: 10.1177/1359105306063317
29

30
31
32 Macy JT, Chassin L, Presson CC (2013) The association between implicit and explicit attitudes toward smoking
33 and support for tobacco control measures. *Nic Tob Res*, 15: 291-296. doi: 10.1093/ntr/nts117
34

35
36
37 Mathers, C. D., Loncar, D. (2006). Projections of global mortality and burden of disease from 2002 to 2030.
38 *PLoS Medicine*, 3(11), e442. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0030442
39

40
41
42 Matt GE, Quintana PGE, Destailats H, et al (2013) Thirdhand tobacco smoke: emerging evidence and
43 arguments for a multidisciplinary research agenda. *Environ Health Pers* 119: 1218-1226, doi:
44 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1103500>
45

46
47
48 Öberg M, Jaakkola MS, Woodward A, Peruga A, Prüss-Ustün A (2011) Worldwide burden of disease from
49 exposure to second-hand smoke: a retrospective analysis of data from 192 countries. *The Lancet*, 377: 139-146.
50 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61388-8
51

52
53
54 Poland BD, Cohen JE, Ashley MJ, et al (2000) Heterogeneity among smokers and non-smokers in attitudes and
55 behaviour regarding smoking and smoking restrictions. *Tob Control* 9: 364-371.
56

57
58
59 Ritch WA, Begay ME (2001) Strange bedfellows: the history of collaboration between the Massachusetts
60 Restaurant Association and the tobacco industry. *Am J Public Health* 91: 598–603
61
62
63
64
65

1 Sivri C, Lazuras L, Rodafinos A, Eiser JR (2013) Smoke-free policies and non-smokers' reactions to SHS
2 exposure in small and medium enterprises. *Int J Occ Med Environ Health*, 26: 940-948. doi: 10.2478/s13382-
3 013-0166-3
4
5

6
7 Tamvakas I, Amos A (2010) 'These things don't happen in Greece': a qualitative study of Greek young people's
8 attitudes to smoking, secondhand smoke and the smokefree legislation. *Health Educ Res* 25: 955-964. doi:
9 10.1093/her/cyq048
10
11

12
13 World Health Organization (2009) WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic, 2009: implementing smoke-
14 free environments. WHO, Geneva.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 Table 1.3
4 Variables included in the questionnaire

5 Variable name	6 Number of items
7 Smoking status	1
8 Job status	1
9 Exposure to SHS at work	1
10 Health beliefs about SHS exposure	3
11 Changes in policy implementation	2
12 Attitudes towards smoke-free policies	12
13 Willingness to confront smoke-free policy violators	1
14 Descriptive social norms	2
15 Social norms about policy implementation	3

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2.

Distribution of study hospitality venues by Cyprus districts in 2012

Venues/Districts	Nicosia % (n)	Limassol % (n)	Larnaca % (n)	Paphos % (n)	Famagusta % (n)
Restaurants	44.4% (55)	56.4% (123)	60.5% (69)	49.4% (44)	20% (11)
Café/bars	36.3% (45)	32.6% (71)	31.6% (36)	25.8% (23)	20% (11)
Hotels	19.4% (24)	11% (24)	7.9% (9)	24.7% (22)	60% (33)
Total % (n)	20.7% (124)	36.3% (218)	19.0% (114)	14.8% (89)	9.2% (55)

Table 3

Predictors of attitudes towards smoke-free policies in hospitality venues in Cyprus, 2012

	B	β	95% CI for B
Job status	-.204	-.145*	-.294 to -.114
Educational level	.049	.060	-.003 to .101
Smoking status	-.319	-.230*	-.410 to -.227
Exposure to SHS	-.080	-.122*	-.124 to -.036
SHS health beliefs	.136	.198*	.091 to .180
Perceived prevalence of smokers in Cyprus	.000	.008	-.003 to .004
Perceived prevalence of smoker clients	-.006	-.186*	-.008 to .004
Frequency of control from regulatory authorities	-.071	-.101*	-.118 to -.024
Frequency of smokers complaining about the policy	-.137	-.285*	-.172 to -.103
Frequency of non-smokers complaining about policy violations	.088	.127*	.041 to .135

Note. * $p < .001$, except the effect for the frequency of control from regulatory authorities where $p = .003$; **B** indicates the regression coefficient for each predictor (i.e., how much the dependent variable will change if the predictor changed by one unit); β indicates the standardized beta coefficients (i.e., the relative strength of each predictor variable in the model).-

Editor: Editorial Comments: The manuscript can now be accepted. However, the TITLE should be crisper and shorter - e.g. Support for Smoke-free Policies in the Cyprus Hospitality Industry.

And the title/legend to Table 3 is really not sufficient. It is a minimal standard of reader-friendliness to explain the key terms shown, namely B and beta as those are not universally defined in the same way by all scientists.

Response: We apologize for the minor errors. We have now revised the manuscript as appropriate by revising the title of the manuscript and updating the information provided in Table 3; however, due to the length of the notification about regression coefficients that was requested by the Editor, we included the relevant description as a note and not on the Table title/legend.