Gladys Phaswana & Karl Peltzer

Newspaper coverage of South African tobacco issues, 1997-2001

The purpose of this study was to investigate the way in which the tobacco issue has been framed in the mass media in South Africa. 363 South African newspaper articles published from January 1997 to December 2001 were analysed. Of the 224 articles finally selected for analysis, 100 were in line with the tobacco interest group and 124 supported the tobacco control group. The dominant frames used by the tobacco industry included "good product for the economy", "concern about teenagers and youth", "government's role in reducing marketing visibility and destruction of jobs" and "discrimination and segregation". The dominant frames used by the tobacco control advocates included "death/diseases", "innocent children", "smokers in great danger", "glamourisation of smoking; intentional lie", "passive smokers' rights" and "smoking areas". A major finding is that the frames used by both the tobacco control movement and the tobacco industry have changed over time. The tobacco industry has been steadfast in consistently targeting core human values as its dominant framing tactic. The finding may have implications for developing more effective arguments for tobacco policies.

Koerantdekking van Suid-Afrikaanse tabakkwessies, 1997-2001

Die doel van die studie was om die wyse waarop tabakaangeleentheid in die Suid-Afrikaanse massamedia aangebied word, te ondersoek. 363 Suid-Afrikaanse koerant-artikels wat vanaf Januarie 1997 tot Desember 2001 gepubliseer is, is ontleed. Van die 224 artikels wat uiteindelik geselekteer is vir ontleding, was 100 die tabakbelange-groep goedgesind, terwyl 124 die tabakbeheergroep gesteun het. Die algemeenste argumente wat deur die tabakbedryf gebruik is, was dat tabak "'n goeie produk vir die ekonomie" was; dat hulle 'n "besorgdheid oor tieners en jeugdiges" koester; dat "die regering sigbare bemarking wegneem en werksgeleenthede vernietig" en dat die ower-heidsmaatreëls "diskriminasie en segregasie" in die hand werk. Die voorstaanders van tabakbeheermaatreëls het weer meestal van argumentasiekaders soos "sterftes/siektes", "onskuldige kinders", "rokers in groot gevaar", "romantisering van rookgewoonte; op-setlike leuen", "passiewe rokers se regte" en "rookareas" gebruik.'n Belangrike bevinding is dat die argumentasiekaders wat gebruik word deur die tabakbeheergroep sowel as die tabakindustrie, met verloop van tyd verander het. Die tabakindustrie het deurgaans sy argumentasiekadering toegespits op menslike kernwaardes. Die bevinding kan van nut wees in die ontwikkeling van meer effektiewe argumente ten opsigte van tabakbeleid.

G Phaswana, Human Sciences Research Council, Private Bag X9182, Cape Town 8000 & Health Behaviour Research Unit, University of the North, Private Bag X1106, Sovenga 0727 & Prof K Peltzer, Human Sciences Research Council, Private Bag X9182, Cape Town 8000; E-mail: motlatso@yahoo.com & KPeltzer@hsrc.ac.za

The marketing strategies of transnational tobacco companies led to the widespread use of tobacco, particularly cigarettes, in the last century. By 1998, 30% of the 1236 million adults in the world smoked, with men (48%) being four times more likely to do so than women (12%). The vast majority of smokers (900 million) live in low- and middle-income countries. The addiction spread from men to women in high-income countries and then to men in low-income regions. The future growth market for the industry is women in low-income countries (Saloojee 2000: 1). According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), only two major causes of death are increasing rapidly — from AIDS and from tobacco. If unchecked, tobacco use will be the leading cause of premature death worldwide by 2030. At present, the WHO attributes about 4 million deaths a year to tobacco and expects this figure to rise to 8.4 million by 2020. Virtually all the increase will occur in low-income and middle-income countries such as South Africa, which are the most vulnerable to the tobacco industry and where tobacco control activism is rare (Saloojee 2000: 3; WHO 1999: 10).

In South Africa tobacco use is a major public health concern as it has severe consequences for smokers and non-smokers alike, as well as for the economy (Rocha-Silva *et al* 1996: 10; Yach 1996: 29). Yach (1996: 31) reports that in the country as a whole, lung cancer already accounts for 24% of all deaths from cancer in men, and 10.6% of all such deaths in women. A study of cigarette smoking in the black township population of Cape Town showed that its prevalence among adults was 53% in men compared to 6% in women (Strebel *et al* 1989: 209). Steyn *et al* (1994: 786) conducted a similar study and found that about 52% of men, and only 8% of women used tobacco regularly. Men and women who smoked cigarettes, averaged 9.6 and 4.3 per day, respectively. Peltzer & Phaswana (1999: 36) found in a pilot study among South African university students that the prevalence rates of tobacco use in the previous month were 13% in males and 0% in females. Among rural primary health care patients in the Limpopo Province of South Africa, Peltzer (1999: 96) found a 42.6% incidence of cigarette smoking in the previous six months among men and 0% among women. Snuff usage was 3.3% and 17.2% respectively.

Since 1994 the South African government has discouraged tobacco use by means of public education, support for cessation programmes, and legislation. Taxation has been a key control measure. Tobacco taxes have increased significantly over the last 5 years. In 1997 excise taxes on tobacco rose to 52%. The Department of Health is currently negotiating with the Ministry of Finance to access the revenue gained from tobacco taxes for health promotion activities. The tax increases have simultaneously increased government excise revenues and reduced cigarette consumption. Overall, tobacco use has dropped dramatically in South Africa. The prevalence of cigarette smoking among adults declined from 34% in 1992 to 24% in 1998. About 42% of men and 11% of women smoke cigarettes. Among adolescents aged 15-19 years, 14% of boys and 6% of girls are smokers (Dept of Health 1999: 15; Saloojee 2000: 3). The Tobacco Products Control Amendment Act (No 12 of 1999) came into effect on 1 October 2000. The Act prohibits all tobacco advertising, sponsorships and promotions; restricts smoking in enclosed public places to specifically designated smoking areas; outlaws the free distribution by the trade of tobacco products, and sets maximum limits on the nicotine and tar yields of cigarettes (cf RSA 2000). The build-up to the passing of the Amendment Bill was accompanied by many debates widely publicised in the media. The positive spin-off was the heightened awareness and knowledge of tobacco and its ill-effects. This may perhaps be one of the major reasons for the current decline in adult smoking rates in South Africa. The tobacco industry's endorsement of "no sale to under 16's", however, is hypocritical since it relies upon adolescents to become its next generation of smokers and is notorious for creating "smoke-screens" to detract attention from its hidden agendas (Reddy 1999: 2).

Since 1994, the political ground has shifted in both the national and the international debate on tobacco policy. Nationally, the longstanding neglect of tobacco in health policy development has been redressed. The Tobacco Products Control Act provoked fierce attacks by the tobacco and allied industries. The legally enforced release of 35 million pages of internal tobacco industry documents in the US has disclosed that the industry engaged in a decades-long effort to silence critics, including the WHO, distort science, resist legislation

and avoid litigation (Saloojee & Dagli 2000: 903). In South Africa, according to Saloojee (2000: 6), large sections of the media, fearful of a loss of tobacco advertising revenues, adopted the arguments of the industry uncritically and mounted partisan attacks on the Minister of Health. Sweda & Daynard (1996: 183) note that the industry has used strong-arm tactics over many years. These tactics include

> using the industry's size, wealth, and legal resources to intimidate individuals and local governmental bodies; setting up 'front groups' to make it appear that it has more allies than it really does; spending large sums of money to frame the public debate about smoking regulations around 'rights and liberty' rather than health, and portraying its tobacco company adversaries as extremists.

Studying the way in which the tobacco issue has been framed in the mass media over the past five years in South Africa may provide important clues on public health efforts to overcome the industry's influence on public policy and on tobacco use. The five-year time-frame (1997 to 2001) was chosen in order to identify trends before and after the Tobacco Products Control Amendment Act of 1999. The framing of the debate, or the way in which arguments were crafted to define the problem of tobacco, not only suggests to policy-makers and the public why the problem of tobacco is important, but defines appropriate solutions to the problem (Lima & Siegel 1999: 248). Given the growing influence of media coverage of tobacco issues on the South African public, it is important to examine how the issue has been framed in the media in the past five years. The media's influence on the way the public thinks about a public health issue is a result of the framing of that issue (Menashe & Siegel 1998: 307; Wallack *et al* 1993: 2), which also influences individual behaviour and plays a central role in the process of public health policy formation (Lima & Siegel 1999: 249). The framing of tobacco control issues in the media has also been shown to influence the legislative debate over control policies (Jacobson *et al* 1993: 787).

Using a framing methodology as described by Menashe & Siegel (1997) this paper describes and analyses the predominant framing tactics used by the tobacco industry and the tobacco control advocates by reviewing front-page articles from major newspapers.

Schon & Rein (1994: xiii) define frames as:

> [...] the broadly shared beliefs, values and perspectives familiar to the members of a societal culture and likely to endure in that culture over long periods of time, on which individuals and institutions draw in order to give meaning, sense, and normative direction to their thinking and action in policy matters.

As Wagenaar & Streff (1990: 203) point out,

> How questions are worded is related to how policy advocates and opponents shape and present policy options to legislators and other opinion leaders, as well as to the general public.

The effect of framing has been demonstrated in studies of public opinion on alcohol policies. Message framing has been shown to influence not only public opinion, but also individual behaviour. Issue framing is thought to play a central role in the process of public health policy information. Wallack *et al* (1993: 25) have argued that, in a sense, debates on such issues represent a battle to frame the issue in the eyes of the public and the policy-makers. For example, in the case of tobacco control, the battle for framing is evident in how the industry uses symbols and images to promote itself as a good corporate citizen, a protector of free choice, and a friend of the family farmer. The industry paints anti-tobacco activists, on the other hand, as paternalistic zealots, health fascists, and government interventionists. Jacobson *et al* (1993: 790) suggest that although health is an important core value for the public and for policy makers, personal freedom, civil liberties and individual rights may be even more compelling values.

1. Objective

The objective of this research is to identify the major frames that have been used by the tobacco control movement and by the tobacco industry in the policy debate. This will help to explain why public health advocates have not been more effective in overcoming the industry's opposition to control policies. The identification of framing strategies could also help the public advocates to develop more effective frames, to counteract opposition frames more effectively, and to develop messages that resonate more clearly with the public's underlying values and expectations.

2. Method

2.1 Sample selection

In selecting the sample for the analysis of articles, Sabinet Online was used as the main tool. From Sabinet Online, the SAPA (South African Press Association) database and the SA News database were chosen from which to retrieve all articles related to tobacco issues. The SAPA database covers all media spectra, *ie* any South African news on paper, radio or television, whereas the SA News database covers only newspapers. The SAPA database was used mainly because of its non-discriminatory nature in publicising the news. The SA News database was selected mainly because it covers a wide variety of newspapers: *The Sowetan*, *City Press*, *The Star*, *Sunday Times*, *Business Times*, *Sunday Independent*, *Business Day*, *Cape Times*, *Independent on Saturday*, *Financial Mail*, *Mail & Guardian*, *Cape Argus*, *Herald*, *Die Burger*, *Beeld*, *Rapport*, *Finansies & Tegniek*, and the *Natal Witness*. The search was limited to news articles published from January 1997 to December 2001. In all, 363 articles written in English (273) or Afrikaans (90) were retrieved. Articles that met any of the following criteria were excluded: repeat stories in the same newspaper (*ie* articles with the same news in different editions); articles revealing personal dislike for the tobacco industry or the health department; articles dealing with the abilities of the health minister or his/her trips overseas; articles dealing with international tobacco issues without spelling out any implications for South Africa; personal human interest stories lacking any discussion of societal or policy implications; stories about cigarette-related-fires, and stories about smokeless tobacco products.

After evaluating each story identified and implementing the abovementioned exclusion criteria, 139 articles were eliminated and 224 articles remained for analysis.

2.2 Content analysis

Articles were grouped according to the arguments presented by the advocates of tobacco control and the tobacco interest group. Of the 224 articles selected for analysis, 100 were in line with the tobacco interest group and 124 supported the tobacco control group. For the

purposes of this paper, tobacco control frames were defined as those supporting the regulation of tobacco (*ie* public health advocates, medical professionals, etc). Tobacco interest frames were defined as those opposing the regulation of tobacco (*ie* the tobacco industry, restaurant associations, the advertising industry, smokers' rights groups and civil libertarians).

In developing tobacco control and tobacco interest frames that characterised the arguments presented in each news article, we used a framing matrix. Each frame was accompanied by seven aspects: title of frame; core position / basic argument; metaphor; images / pictures evoked by the article; catchphrase / words or phrases repeated in the article; implied solution to the problem, and principle. By means of this process 12 frames were identified for the tobacco interest group and 16 for the tobacco control group.

Once all the frames had been identified, we independently reviewed all the main arguments and made sure that the frames identified on the framing matrix actually represented all the arguments. We then compared our findings and checked for similar, consistent answers. Discrepancies were easily resolved in most cases, and in the few difficult ones, we focused again on the consistency between a proposed frame's core position and its appeal to principle. Once a complete list of frames had been identified, each of the authors conducted an in-depth analysis of all the articles in our sample. For each article, a frame was identified for every tobacco control and tobacco interest argument in it. After we had each analysed the articles, we compared results and resolved any discrepancies by mutual agreement. For each article, we created a record containing all the tobacco control and tobacco interest frames appearing in the article. We were then able to analyse the extent of the appearance of each frame, ie the pattern of frame appearances, by year, as well as the appearance of tobacco control and tobacco interest frames together in articles (cf Menashe & Siegel 1997: 312).

3. Results

A total of 12 tobacco interest and 16 tobacco control frames were identified from the 224 newspaper articles and found to be representa-

tive of all the frames used in tobacco control and tobacco interest arguments (Tables 1 and 2).

Table 3 indicates trends in tobacco interest frames over the past five years.

The most dominant frames used by the tobacco industry included the following:

- A good product for the economy (45 articles)

  The message is that the tobacco industry contributes towards job creation, crime prevention and education programmes. Also that although smoking causes death, it earns the government a significant income (Keenan 1999).

- The unconstitutionality of the Act (45 articles)

  The message is that the tobacco law contradicts the doctrines of democracy (Wessels 1997).

- Freedom of expression (39 articles)

  The message is that the government is infringing freedom of speech (*Beeld* 8 April 1999).

- Concern about teenagers and youth (23 articles)

  The message is that the tobacco industry has no desire to encourage children to smoke. It argues that there must be a better way to stop juveniles from smoking than to ban all tobacco advertising (*Die Burger* 21 April 1999).

- Discrimination and segregation (21 articles)

  The tobacco industry argues that smokers are subjected to unfair discrimination and that they are segregated from non-smokers in public places, including the workplace. It claims that regulations on smoking tobacco in public places are impractical and unenforceable (*City Press* 22 April 2001).

A pattern-over-time analysis of the tobacco interest frames indicated that tobacco interest groups have used five of their dominant frames consistently over the past five years. They emphasise that tobacco is a good product for the economy (n=45) because it contributes to job creation, crime prevention, and education programmes; that they are concerned about teenagers and the youth, and that their

Table 1: Tobacco interest frames (1997–2001)

Frame	Core position	Metaphor	Images	Catchphrases	Implied solution	Principle
1. Good product for the economy	Tobacco industry contributes towards job creation, crime prevention & education programmes; thousands of jobs will be lost.	Job losses	Millions in advertising expenditure will now exit South Africa.	Good for the economy; helps larger and smaller media ventures.	Withdraw tobacco bill, as it is unconstitutional.	People depend on it for survival; more money.
2. Concern about teenagers and youth	Tobacco company has no desire to encourage children to smoke.	Corporate concern	Health of South African children is prioritised.	The tobacco industry gives bu saries and scholarships to poor children.	The tobacco industry would appreciate effective restrictions not a total ban.	Educating children.
3. Just selling for visibility/recognition	Tobacco companies just want visibility.	Visibility/ recognition	Adult magazines should not have restrictions.	Sponsors are just paying for visibility.	Tobacco has a right to be responsibly promoted.	Tobacco is legally manufactured.
4. Health vs wealth	Tens of millions of rands spent on sponsorship of sport, music and other cultural events would be lost.	Lost wealth; employment	A tobacco ban means consumers would get less information on which to base their decision to smoke or not to smoke.	A total tobacco ban would result in the disappearance of the health notices currently displayed on advertisements.	Reconsider tobacco bill and work on public interest.	Let small businesses develop; employment; community health.
5. Government	Government is taking away marketing visibility; government passes laws that destroy jobs.	Government goes beyond reasonable judgement of commercial reality.	The ban on tobacco promotion is an infringement of free speech.	Tobacco regulations go beyond powers; banning tobacco will result in endless legal disputes, enforcement problems and civil disobedience.	Regulations need to go back to the drawing board.	Free enteprise.
6. Discrimination/ segregation	Anti-smoking zealots discriminate unfairly against smokers; prohibiting smoking is unconstitutional. Smokers are segregated from non-smokers in public places including workplaces; the tobacco industry supports tobacco growers.	Regulations violate the equality clause of the constitution.	Regulations are based on the premise that smokers should be segregated, isolated, alienated and punished.	Regulations are punitive; smoking places range from as difficult as possible to implement to totally impossible.	Sort out the issue of smokers' rights.	Equality; unconstitutional.
7. Freedom of expression and trade	If a product is legally manufactured and sold, it has a right to be responsibly promoted.	Free expression	Restrictions on tobacco advertising seriously infringe the right to freedom of speech.	Rights of commercial speech; a legal product has a right to be promoted.	Any legally manufactured product has a right to be promoted.	Freedom of speech.

Table 1: Tobacco interest frames (1997–2001) (continued)

Frame	Core position	Metaphor	Images	Catch phrases	Implied solution	Principle
8. Unconstitutionality of act	Tobacco regulations would bring an immediate ban on sport & musical sponsorship.	Regulations unconstitutional	The minister has exceeded her powers by passing tobacco regulations.	The time frames set out for tobacco	The legality and constitutionality of the Act should be considered.	Regulations unconstitutional; right to trade.
9. Building & renovation costs	Buildings have to be walled off and serviced by a separate ventilation system.	Walled buildings	Smoking areas are required to be separated from non-smoking areas by concrete walls.	Smoking rooms are required to have both extractor ventilation & windows.	Consider the legality of the constitution.	Regulations impose costs on the industry.
10. Salaries vs. employees	Tobacco legislation has not negatively influenced the salaries of tobacco employees.	High salaries	Pay of tobacco employees has increased by 10.6%.	Tobacco employees are among the most highly paid workers in the country.	Let the industry continue attaining productivity gains.	Employees benefit.
11. Tax	The Government has an incentive to aise cigarette taxes to reduce consumption.	Cigarette tax	Excise tax is the single most important const aint on tobacco consumption in SA.	Local consumers are more price-sensitive than in developed countries.	Increasing excise tax may reduce tobacco consumption.	The tobacco industry contributes vital revenue to government coffers.
12. Local producers	99% of cigarettes smoked in SA are made in the country with 60% local tobacco content.	Local tobacco content	Tobacco is the fifth largest cash crop in South Africa.	Local tobacco farmers and manufacturers would suffer severe economic damage.	Give local farmers a chance.	Thousands of jobs would be lost.

Table 2: Tobacco control frames (1997–2001)

Frame	Core position	Metaphor	Images	Catch phrases	Implied solution	Principle
1. Consumer addiction	Smoking is addictive because cigarettes contain a drug called nicotine.	Nicotine is addictive	The tobacco industry failed to warn smokers that smoking causes cancer.	Nicotine is addictive.	Irresponsible corporate behaviour will be punished.	Health; consumer protection.
2. Death; diseases	Smoking kills; therefore dangers of tobacco to community's health necessitate urgent comprehensive action.	Stopping smoking is a bonus to one's health; tobacco has other chemicals that kill.	Millions of regular smokers have been killed by the habit.	Death; tobacco kills; cancer is the most common killer of South Africans aged 15-64 years; 25 000 tobacco-related deaths a year.	Regulate the toxic and addictive agents in cigarettes; Heart Foundation challenges smoke s to quit smoking; educate people.	Healthy lifestyle.
3. Corporate liability	Tobacco is the only legal consumer product that kills when used exactly as manufacturers prescribe.	Manufacturers are liable for damages.	The tobacco industry continues to associate sport and glamour with cigarettes.	Tobacco companies have known of the damages associated with smoking but deny it.	Tell smoke s the truth about tobacco's effects.	Health; consumer protection.
4. High prices; hospitals' money	Smoking causes increased health costs and lost productivity.	Inc eased health costs and lost p oductivity.	If everyone stopped buying cigarettes, more jobs would be created.	Lost productivity; health costs.	Tobacco bill would lower government health costs and inc ease productivity.	Huge medical bills.
5. Smoking irrevocable	Tobacco industries encourage decision to smoke, but through addiction it becomes irrevocable without great effort.	Smoking is ir evocable.	Tobacco regulation should map out exactly where people can and cannot smoke.	The Health department is gathering its arsenal for a tough fight to get new anti- tobacco regulations passed.	Ban tobacco advertising.	Health.
6. Smokers in great danger; health hazard	Cigarette smoking is one of the leading causes of death; tobacco contains 200 poisonous chemicals.	Poisonous chemicals; death.	Smoking is the biggest risk factor in contracting cardio-vascular disease; regular smokers will be killed by their habit.	Health risk; smokers are warned of the dangers of smoking.	Resource centre will teach the nation about risks of smoking.	Health; smoking kills.
7. Smoking glamourised/Lying intentionally	Tobacco companies deliberately lie and t y to hide the dangers of smoking; tobacco industry is targeting third-world countries; deceptive.	The tobacco industry is manipulative and deceptive; smoking is glamourised.	The tobacco industry is well aware of the health risk caused by cigarettes but it continues to lie.	Targeting developing countries is evil and deceitful; tobacco companies mislead the public about the dangers of smoking; truth is lacking.	Ban tobacco advertising and prohibit smoking.	Stop deception; the public has a right to know the truth.
8. Innocent children	The tobacco industry targets our children and youth as a future market; children are bombarded with messages that smoking is part of an attractive, healthy, fun-loving lifestyle.	Smoking brings attractiveness and love; the net for trapping youngsters into smoking is advertising.	The tobacco industry presents smoking as an entry to adulthood; advertising says smoking is a symbol of independence and a way to boost self-esteem and confidence; popularity, parties, fashion, success and glamour.	A dangerous and addictive p oduct is sold to the youth and adolescents; childrena e told that smoking is "cool", young people are a vulnerable walking target.	Children should not smoke; ban all tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship; enforce laws against sales to mino s.	Health; prohibit sales to minors; tell teenagers the truth.

Table 2: Tobacco control frames (1997–2001) (continued)

Frame	Core position	Metaphor	Images	Catch phrases	Implied solution	Principle
9. Passive smokers' rights	Non-smokers have a right to a smoke-free environment; non-smoking women might be genetically susceptible to second-hand smoke.	Environmental health and safety.	People are forced to inhale tobacco smoke against their will at work and in public places.	Non-smokers have a right to a clean environment unpolluted by tobacco smoke; right to a smoke-free environment; good health.	Ban tobacco advertising and sponsorship and also prohibit smoking in public places; protect non-smokers from smokers; jail for smokers.	Good health; freedom and individual rights; smoke-free environment.
10. Negative economic consequences	Working days are lost to South African industry each year.	Absenteeism.	More workers are absent from work due to smoking related diseases than due to strikes.	Money spent on cigarettes will still be spent, but on other goods and services, thereby c eating new jobs.	Ban tobacco and 50 000 jobs will be created.	Huge medical bills; absenteeism.
11. Smoking areas	Smokers will not be allowed to indulge their smoking habit unless smoking areas have been created.	Smoking areas should be ventilated.	Smoking rooms should have a sign: 'Smoking Room' displayed in black-and-white.	Health messages warning smokers of the habit should be pinned on the entrance to the smoking room.	Smoking rooms should be separated from the public by a solid wall; no smoking in public places.	Good health.
12. Advertising limitation	Retailers of tobacco should only be allowed to advertise if they put health warnings on the advert.	Health warning.	The advert should not be more than a metre away from the point of sale.	Manufacturers have a duty to inform customers fully of the risks of tobacco products and their emissions.	Any communication from tobacco manufacturers should have a health-warning message.	Health warning.
13. Smoking and gender	Smoking is viewed as a sign of equality between the sexes because it has been acceptable for men to smoke.	Smoking and equality.	Tobacco advertising lets women believe that smoking keeps them thin.	Non-smoking women and children are likely to be exposed to environmental smoke.	Ban all direct and indirect tobacco advertising.	Smoke-free environment.
14. Locally produced goods	Smokers who stop will reallocate their tobacco expenditure to other local goods and services.	Local goods and services.	The economy of country will be boosted, as people will use more locally produced products.	Smokers will switch to locally produced goods and services.	Substitute other local products for tobacco.	Economic boost.
15. Government	Government wants to detach sport from smoking.	Detach sport from smoking	Other companies like Vodacom can sponsor sport, not tobacco.	Government is more concerned about the wellbeing of people.	Detach sport from smoking.	Healthy lifestyle.
16. Tax	Higher taxes and restrictions on adverts help decreasing smoking.	Tax decreases smoking.	Tax should be used to implement a health promotion body.	1/4 million South Africans will stop smoking due to even higher excise tax on tobacco.	Increase tax on cigarettes.	High tax.

Table 3: Trends in dominant tobacco interest frames (1997-2001)

Tobacco interest frames	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Total
1. Good product for the economy	10	14	9	9	3	45
2. Concern about teenagers and youth	10	3	5	5	0	23
3. Just doing business/visibility	1	1	4	5	0	11
4. Health *vs* wealth	3	3	1	2	1	10
5. Government	1	8	5	3	0	17
6. Discrimination/segregation	1	3	2	7	8	21
7. Freedom of expression/choice	11	2	14	7	5	39
8. Unconstitutionality of the Act	7	3	16	4	12	42
9. Buildings and cost of renovation	0	0	2	7	9	18
10. Salaries *vs* employees	0	0	1	2	2	5
11. Tax	6	1	1	1	5	14
12. Local producers	1	0	0	1	1	3
Total articles	51	38	60	53	46	248

advertisements are aimed at people wanting to switch to new brands, not at children. They also contend that the tobacco law is unconstitutional (n=45) because tobacco is a legal product, and can therefore be used like any other product. They claim that the government is infringing the freedom of speech of smokers (n=34), since only non-smokers are being heard. Finally, they say smokers are being discriminated against and segregated (n=21), unlike non-smokers. Although a number of new frames have been introduced over time, this has been primarily in response to the new frames introduced by tobacco control advocates and the Tobacco Control Act. For example, when the tobacco control group introduced the non-smokers' rights frame, the tobacco industry counter-attacked with the message that anti-smoking zeal discriminates against smokers; that smokers are treated as contemporary social outcasts; that tobacco control regulations are punitive and contravene freedom of expression and trade, and that non-smoking zones have cost implications in terms of buildings and renovations.

Table 4 indicates trends in tobacco control frames over the past five years.

The most dominant frames used by the tobacco control advocates included the following:

Table 4: Trends in dominant tobacco control frames (1997-2001)

Tobacco control frames	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Total
1. Consumer addiction	6	6	1	8	1	22
2. Death; diseases	18	6	12	8	16	60
3. Corporate liability	5	0	1	4	9	19
4. High prices; hospitals' money	1	2	1	4	2	10
5. Smoking irrevocable	0	3	5	4	1	13
6. Smokers in great danger	2	3	4	5	1	15
7. Smoking glamourised/lying intentionally	4	4	4	1	0	13
8. Innocent children	13	5	10	8	9	45
9. Passive smokers' right/second-hand smoking	1	4	3	6	7	21
10. Negative economic impact	2	1	4	4	0	11
11. Smoking area	1	1	6	10	11	29
12. Advertising limitation/ban sponsorship	7	3	6	8	10	34
13. Smoking and gender	1	0	0	2	0	3
14. Locally produced goods	0	0	0	1	0	1
15. Government	0	2	1	0	0	3
16. Tax	5	0	0	2	5	12
Total articles	66	40	58	75	72	311

- Death/diseases (60 articles)

  The message is that smoking kills and comprehensive action needs to be taken (Ayoob 2001).

- Innocent children (45 articles)

  The message is that the tobacco industry is targeting children and the youth as its future market and that sales to minors need to be stopped. Also that the tobacco industry has studied child psychology and based marketing decisions on the study. The tool that they use to "hook" children on their product is imagery (Naidoo 1997).

- Advertising limitation (34 articles)

  The message is that tobacco advertisements and tobacco's sponsorship of sport should be banned (*Beeld* 9 October 1999).

- Smoking area (29 articles)

  The message is that smokers can only smoke in designated smoking areas. Smoking restrictions help particularly in the workplace because tobacco consumption is reduced and smokers end up quitting (Pela 2001).

- Consumer addiction (22 articles)

  The message is that tobacco is addictive, so the tar and nicotine content should not exceed 15mg and 1.5 mg per cigarette, respectively (Bigalke 2000).

- Passive smokers' rights (21 articles)

  The message is that non-smokers have a right to a smoke-free environment and that exposure to second-hand smoke can cause both long-term and immediate damage to human health (Pela 2001).

The tobacco control group centres its argument on the message that tobacco kills and that it is essential to live in a smoke-free society. It also focuses primarily on combating smoking among the youth and preventing the tobacco industry from targeting the youth as potential smokers. The killer frame (60), innocent children frame (45), advertising limitation frame (34) and smoking area frame (29) were mentioned most frequently over the period of five years. However, another interesting frame mentioned by the tobacco control advocates was that smoking has a negative economic impact. This is due to the fact that many working days are lost to South African industry each year because of absenteeism. Workers are more absent from work due to smoking-related diseases than to strikes. Ill health due to smoking-related diseases also causes a loss in productivity. Furthermore, there was an increase in arguments for designated smoking areas and limitations on advertising. This was also due to the fact that exposure to second-hand smoke can do both short- and long-term damage to health. Moreover, the Tobacco Institute of South Africa (TISA) argues that the tobacco advertisements induce children to smoke since they depict social and financial success as associated with smoking.

4. Discussion

We have presented what is probably the first published systematic analysis of the frames used by tobacco control advocates and by the tobacco industry in South Africa in arguing public policy issues, including the Tobacco Products Control Amendment Act of 1999, over the past five years. The tobacco control advocates emphasise and continually remind the public that the tobacco industry produces a product that is deadly for everyone: smokers, passive smokers, adults and the youth. The tobacco industry emphasises that it offers a "good product for the economy". Yach & Paterson (1994: 839) studied 30 issues of magazines in South Africa over a three-month period, and found that there was not a single feature article on the adverse effects of smoking on health in any of them. Only two magazines had single sentences in their health columns mentioning that smoking was bad for health. Saloojee & Dagli (2000: 906) note that to date the industry has not spoken very much to the general public about smoking issues, and that their objective is to convince the general public that

> its health is not threatened by other people's smoking; smoking is a matter of choice; smoking problems are best handled by voluntary private action, not public decrees; smokers are constructive members of society, and zealotry of anti-smokers is at the root of the social problems of smoking.

Similar tobacco interest frames were identified in this study, such as discrimination/segregation, freedom of expression and trade, the unconstitutionality of the Tobacco Control Act and concern about teenagers and the youth.

A major finding of this analysis is that the frames used by the tobacco control movement and the tobacco industry have changed over time. The tobacco industry has been steadfast in consistently targeting core human values as its dominant framing tactic. This finding may have implications for developing more effective arguments for tobacco policies. Tobacco control advocates must not accept the frames used by the tobacco industry as setting the parameters of the debate. Instead, they must reframe these policy issues so that supporting, rather than opposing, the tobacco control policy in question is perceived as reinforcing the core values of freedom, autonomy, fairness and free enterprise. For example, when the tobacco industry talks

about civil liberties, public health advocates might talk about the most basic liberties of all: the right to breathe clean air and to raise one's children without interference from an industry that is only trying to enhance its profits. Similarly, when the tobacco industry talks about the economic hardship caused by the regulation of smoking in public places, public health advocates might talk about the economic hardship that restaurant workers, among others, suffer when they become sick, hospitalised, or disabled from the devastating illnesses caused by second-hand smoke (Menashe & Siegel 1997: 320).

This study found that tobacco control advocates indicated that the tobacco industry targets children and the youth as its future market. Altman *et al* (1999: 759) found evidence in various adolescent communities that the tobacco industry has deliberately targeted children and the youth. This information needs to be widely disseminated and popularised in order to assist the youth to see through the advertisements and even to become angered by the manipulation of an industry creating their images for them. In this context Yach & Ferguson (1999: 757) suggest that the profoundly negative associations of tobacco with health should lead to its being removed from all memorable experiences and that positive health messages and images should be introduced instead. Moreover, the power of humour to satirise the industry should be more fully exploited in tobacco control messages.

In terms of women's perceptions, the tobacco interest group stated that smoking by women is a sign of gender equality and that smoking keeps women slim. Regarding gender bias, data collected in South Africa, Britain, Sweden and China found that tobacco advertisers constantly promote the idea that smoking represents the "emancipation" or "liberation" of women (Magardie 2000: 14).

These findings provide some important lessons for public health practitioners. Careful, well-thought-out framing strategies are vital in developing a successful long-term tobacco control policy campaign. The public health community should move towards a more co-ordinated, consistent framing of tobacco control issues firmly rooted in the principles of public health (Menashe & Siegel 1997: 321). Basil (1996: 399) notes that health communication experts should make a concerted effort to refute the arguments put forward by the

tobacco companies, eg that the principle of freedom of speech is abused, message framing encourages the continued marketing of cigarettes, and tobacco advertising swamps public health messages in terms of both quantity and style. Balbach & Glantz (1998: 397) note from a study in California that anti-tobacco media campaigns which expose manipulation by the tobacco industry are a key component of an effective tobacco control programme.

Bibliography

ALTMAN D G, A Y WHEELIS, M MCFARLANE & H LEE
1999. The relationship between tobacco access and use among adolescents: a four community study. *Social Science & Medicine* 48: 759-75.

AYOOB Z
2001. 'Stop tobacco use' call. *Natal Witness* 15 May: 2.

BALBACH E D & S A GLANTZ
1998. Tobacco control advocates must demand high-quality media campaigns: the California experience. *Tobacco Control* 7(4): 397-408.

BASIL M D
1999. Tobacco: co-opting our public health. *Journal of Health Communication* 1(4): 399-413.

BEELD
1997. Verbod op tabakborgskappe 'n terugwaartse stap. 9 October 1997: 3.

1999. Tabakwet plaas 'Grondwet onder verhoor'. 8 April 1999: 5.

BIGALKE I
2000. Regulasies teen rook in 3 fases in werking gestel. *Die Burger* 30 September: 8.

BURGER, DIE
1999. Tabakbedryf beskuldig Zuma van skynheiligheid en inkonsekwentheid. 21 April: 13.

CITY PRESS
2001. Cigarette adverts to go up in flames. 22 April: 2.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, RSA
1999. *South African demographic and health survey 1998*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

EDITORIAL
1999. Tobacco control in Africa: opportunities for prevention. *Tobacco Control* 8: 353-4.

JACOBSON P D, J WASSERMAN & K RAUBE
1993. The politics of anti-smoking legislation. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy, and Law* 18: 787-819.

KEENAN T
1999. Kan SA rokers dink aan Amerikaanse eise? *Finansies & Tegniek* 13 Augustus: 34.

LIMA J C & M SIEGEL
1999. The tobacco settlement: an analysis of newspaper coverage of a national policy debate, 1997-98. *Tobacco Control* 8: 247-53.

MAGARDIE K
2000. Tobacco groups target women. *Mail & Guardian*, 20-26 October 2000: 58.

MENASHE C L & M SIEGEL
1998. The power of frame: an analysis of newspaper coverage of tobacco issues — United States, 1985-1996. *Journal of Health Communication* 3: 307-25.

NAIDOO Y
1997. Call for probe into tobacco industry. *The Sunday Independent* 30 March: 2.

PARRY C D H, A BHANA, J BAYLEY, H POTGIETER & M LOWRIE (eds)
1999. *Monitoring alcohol and drug abuse trends in South Africa*. Tygerberg, South Africa: Medical Research Council.

PELA M
2000. WHO names No Tobacco day theme. *Sowetan* 30 May: 4.

2001. Smoke a threat to kids' health. *Sowetan* 31 May: 13.

PELTZER K
1999: Substance abuse in rural primary health care patients in the Northern Province, South Africa. Parry *et al* (eds) 1999: 94-101.

PELTZER K & N PHASWANA
1999. Substance use among South African university students: a quantitative and qualitative study. *Urban Health & Development Bulletin* 2: 36-45.

REDDY P
1999. The tobacco legislation: the South African experience. <http://www.procor.org/procor-special-hma/msg00007.htm> 30 November 1999.

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA (RSA)
2000. *Tobacco Products Control Amendment Act, 2000 (Act No 12 of 1999)*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

ROCHA-SILVA L, A DE MIRANDA & R ERASMUS
1996. *Alcohol, tobacco and other drug use among South African youth*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

SALOOJEE Y
2000: Tobacco control. *South African Health Review* 22: 1-9.

SALOOJEE Y & E DAGLI
2000. Tobacco industry tactics for resisting public policy on health. *Bulletin of the World Health Organisation* 78: 902-10.

SCHON D E & M REIN
1994. *Frame reflection: toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies*. New York: Basic Books.

STEYN K, P L BOURNE, P L JOOSTE & J M FOURIE
1994. Smoking in the black community of the Cape Peninsula. *East African Medical Journal* 71: 784-9.

STREBEL P, L KUHN & D YACH
1989. Determinants of cigarette smoking in the black township population of Cape Town. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 43: 209-13.

SWEDA E L JR & R A DAYNARD
1996. Tobacco industry tactics. *British Medical Bulletin* 52(1): 183-92.

WAGENAAR A C & F M STREFF
1990. Public opinion on alcohol policies. *Journal of Public Health Policy* 11: 189-205.

WALLACK L, L DORFMAN,
D JERNIGAN & M THEMBA
1993: *Media advocacy and public health: power for prevention.* Newbury Park, Calif: Sage.

WESSELS E
1997. Zuma se wet teen tabakreklame by sport veroordeel. *Die Burger* 9 September: 8.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION
(WHO)
1999. *The World Health Report 1999 — Making a difference.* Geneva: WHO.

YACH D
1996. Tobacco in Africa. *World Health Forum* 17: 29-36.

YACH D & B J FERGUSON
1999. Can we stop children and adolescents from smoking? (Discussion) *Social Science & Medicine* 48: 757-8.

YACH D & G PATERSON
1994. Tobacco advertising in South Africa with specific reference to magazines. *South African Medical Journal* 84: 838-41.