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.

Koerantdekkings van Suid-Afrikaanse tabakkwesties, 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 koerantartikels wat vanaf Januarie 1997 tot Desember 2001 gepubliseer is, is ontleed. Van die 224 artikels wat uiteindelik geselekteer is vir ontleiding, was 100 die tabakbelangegroep 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 owerheidsmaatreëls “diskriminasie en segregasie” in die hand werk. Die voorstanders van tabakbeheergroepstreëls het meerwaar van argumentasiekaders soos “sterftes/siektes”, “onskuldige kinders”, “rokers in groot gevaar”, “romantisering van rookgewoonte; opsettelike leuens”, “passiewe rokers se regte” en “nokareas” 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.
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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 1.236 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 timeframe (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 policymakers 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 1995: 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 cul-
ture over long periods of time, on which individuals and institu-
tions 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 in-
fluence 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 pa-
ternalistic zealots, health fascists, and government interventionists.
Jacobson et al (1993: 790) suggest that although health is an import-
ant 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 in-
dustry’s opposition to control policies. The identification of framing
strategies could also help the public advocates to develop more ef-
fective frames, to counteract opposition frames more effectively, and
to develop messages that resonate more clearly with the public’s un-
derlying 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 Sunday Times*, *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 control group and 124 supported the tobacco interest group. For the
purposes of this paper, tobacco control frames were defined as those supporting the regulation of tobacco (i.e., public health advocates, medical professionals, etc.). Tobacco interest frames were defined as those opposing the regulation of tobacco (i.e., 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, i.e., 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-
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Core position</th>
<th>Metaphor</th>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Catchphrases</th>
<th>Implied solution</th>
<th>Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Good product for the economy</td>
<td>Tobacco industry contributes towards job creation, crime prevention &amp; education programmes, thousands of jobs will be lost.</td>
<td>Job losses</td>
<td>Millions in advertising expenditure will move out South Africa.</td>
<td>Good for the economy helps larger and smaller media ventures</td>
<td>Withdraw tobacco bill, as it is unconstitutional.</td>
<td>People depend on it for survival, more money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Concern about teenagers and youth</td>
<td>Tobacco company has no desire to encourage children to smoke</td>
<td>Corporate concern</td>
<td>Health of South African children is prioritised.</td>
<td>The tobacco industry gives by sakes and scholarships to poor children.</td>
<td>The tobacco industry would appreciate effective measures not a total ban.</td>
<td>Educating children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Just selling for visibility/recognition</td>
<td>Tobacco companies just want visibility</td>
<td>Visibility/recognition</td>
<td>Adult magazines should not have restrictions.</td>
<td>Sponsors are just paying for visibility.</td>
<td>Tobacco has a right to be responsibly promoted.</td>
<td>Tobacco is legally manufactured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Health vs wealth</td>
<td>Tobacco has no desire to encourage children to smoke</td>
<td>Loss of wealth, employment</td>
<td>A tobacco ban means consumers would get less information on which to base their decision to smoke or not to smoke.</td>
<td>A total tobacco ban would result in the disappearance of the health notices currently displayed on advertisements.</td>
<td>Regulations need to go back to the drawing board.</td>
<td>Free enterprise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Government</td>
<td>Government is taking away marketing visibility, government passes laws that destroy jobs.</td>
<td>Government goes beyond reasonable judgment of commercial viability</td>
<td>The ban on tobacco promotion is an infringement of free speech.</td>
<td>Tobacco regulations go beyond powers; banning tobacco will result in endless legal disputes, enforcement problems and civil disobedience.</td>
<td>Regulations need to go back to the drawing board.</td>
<td>Free enterprise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Discrimination/segregation</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Regulation to the equality clause of the constitution.</td>
<td>Regulations are based on the premise that smokers should be segregated, isolated, alienated and punished.</td>
<td>Regulations are punitive, smoking places range from as difficult as possible to impossible to totally impossible.</td>
<td>Sort out the issue of smokers' rights.</td>
<td>Equality, unconstitutional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Freedom of expression and trade</td>
<td>If a product is legally manufactured and sold, it has a right to be responsibly promoted.</td>
<td>Freedom of expression</td>
<td>Restrictions on tobacco advertising sexually infringe the right to freedom of speech.</td>
<td>Rights of commercial speech, a legal product has a right to be promoted.</td>
<td>Any legally manufactured product has a right to be promoted.</td>
<td>Freedom of speech.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Core position</th>
<th>Metaphor</th>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Catch phrases</th>
<th>Implied solution</th>
<th>Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Unconstitutionality of act</td>
<td>Tobacco regulations would bring an immediate ban on sport &amp; musical sponsorship.</td>
<td>Regulations unconstitutional</td>
<td>The minister has exceeded her powers by passing tobacco regulations.</td>
<td>The time frames set out for tobacco</td>
<td>The legality and constitutionality of the Act should be considered.</td>
<td>Regulations unconstitutional; right to trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Building &amp; renovation aims</td>
<td>Buildings have to be walled off and served by a separate ventilation system.</td>
<td>Walled buildings</td>
<td>Smoking areas are required to be separated from non-smoking areas by concrete walls.</td>
<td>Smoking rooms are required to have both extractive ventilation &amp; windows.</td>
<td>Consider the legality of the constitution.</td>
<td>Regulations impose costs on the industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Salaries vs. employees</td>
<td>Tobacco legislation has not negatively influenced the salaries of tobacco employees.</td>
<td>High salaries</td>
<td>Pay of tobacco employees has increased by 10.6%.</td>
<td>Tobacco employees are among the most highly paid workers in the country.</td>
<td>Let the industry continue attaining productivity gains.</td>
<td>Employees benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tax</td>
<td>The Government has an incentive to raise cigarette taxes to reduce consumption.</td>
<td>Cigarette tax</td>
<td>Excise tax is the single most important cost on tobacco consumption in SA.</td>
<td>Local consumers are more price-sensitive than in developed countries.</td>
<td>Increasing excise tax may reduce tobacco consumption.</td>
<td>The tobacco industry benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Local producers</td>
<td>99% of cigarettes smoked in SA are made in the country with 60% local tobacco content.</td>
<td>Local tobacco content</td>
<td>Tobacco is the fifth largest cash crop in South Africa.</td>
<td>Local tobacco farmers and manufacturers would suffer severe economic damage.</td>
<td>Give local farmers a chance.</td>
<td>Thousands of jobs would be lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Core position</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Images</td>
<td>Implied solution</td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Consumer addiction</td>
<td>Smoking is addictive because cigarettes contain a drug called nicotine.</td>
<td>Nicotine is addictive</td>
<td>nicotine is addictive</td>
<td>Irresponsible corporate behaviour will be punished.</td>
<td>Health, consumer protection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Death, disease</td>
<td>Smoking kills; chemotherapy-dangers of tobacco to community’s health.</td>
<td>Chemotherapy is like a needle in one’s body.</td>
<td>Millions of regular smokers have been killed by the habit.</td>
<td>Deadly, tobacco kills; cancer is the most common killer of South Africans.</td>
<td>Regulate the time and addictive agents in cigarettes. Heart Transplantation challenges smoking. Smoking is not an addiction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Corporate liability</td>
<td>Tobacco is the only legal consumer product that kills when used exactly as manufacturers prescribe.</td>
<td>Corporate liability is set for damages.</td>
<td>Tobacco companies have known of the dangers associated with smoking but deny it.</td>
<td>To make the truth about tobacco’s effects.</td>
<td>Health, consumer protection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High prices, hospitals’ money</td>
<td>Smoking raises increased health costs and lost productivity.</td>
<td>Smoking is irrevocable.</td>
<td>Tobacco regulation should regulate exactly where people eat and cannot smoke.</td>
<td>Tobacco bill would lower government health costs and increase productivity.</td>
<td>Huge medical bills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Smoking irrevocable</td>
<td>Tobacco regulates the smoking decision.</td>
<td>Smoking is irrevocable.</td>
<td>Tobacco regulation should regulate exactly where people eat and cannot smoke.</td>
<td>The Health department is gathering its arsenal for a fight to get new anti-tobacco regulations passed.</td>
<td>But tobacco advertising.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Smokers in great danger, health based</td>
<td>Cigarette smoking is one of the leading causes of death. Tobacco contains 300 poisonous chemicals.</td>
<td>Poisonous chemicals, death.</td>
<td>Smoking is the biggest risk factor in contracting cardiovascular disease. Regular smokers will be killed by their habit.</td>
<td>Health risks, smokers are warned of the dangers of smoking.</td>
<td>Resource centre will teach the nation about risks of smoking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Smoking glamorous/Lying unusually</td>
<td>Tobacco companies deliberately lie and try to hide the dangers of smoking. Tobacco industry is targeting third-world countries. Everybody lies.</td>
<td>The tobacco industry is well aware of the health risks caused by cigarettes but continues to lie.</td>
<td>Targeting developing countries is evil and deceitful. Tobacco companies mislead the public about the dangers of smoking.</td>
<td>But tobacco advertising and prohibiting smoking.</td>
<td>Stop deception, the public has a right to know the truth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Innocent children</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Smoking brings attractiveness and love and for those who smoke is an advertisement.</td>
<td>Tobacco industry presents smoking as an entry to adulthood. Advertising says making it a symbol of independence and a wave to the self-esteem and confidence, popularity, fashion, success and glamour.</td>
<td>A dangerous and addictive product sold to the youth and adolescents. Children are told that smoking is “cool.” Young people are a vulnerable walking target.</td>
<td>Children should not smoke, but all tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship, petition laws against sales to minors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Core position</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Images</td>
<td>Catch phrases</td>
<td>Implied solution</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Passive smokers’ rights</td>
<td>Non-smokers have a right to a smoke-free environment; non-smoking women might be genetically susceptible to second-hand smoke.</td>
<td>Environmental health and safety</td>
<td>People are forced to inhale tobacco smoke against their will at work and in public places.</td>
<td>Non-smokers have a right to a clean environment unpolluted by tobacco smoke; right to a smoke-free environment; good health.</td>
<td>Ban tobacco advertising and sponsorship and also prohibit smoking in public places; protect non-smokers from smokers; jail for smokers.</td>
<td>Good health; freedom and individual rights; smoke-free environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Negative economic consequences</td>
<td>Working days are lost to South African industry each year.</td>
<td>Absenteeism.</td>
<td>More workers are absent due to smoking related diseases than due to strikes.</td>
<td>Money spent on cigarettes will still be spent, but on other goods and services, thereby creating new jobs.</td>
<td>But tobacco and 30,000 jobs will be created.</td>
<td>Huge medical bills; absenteeism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Smoking areas</td>
<td>Smokers will not be allowed to indulge their smoking habit unless smoking areas have been created.</td>
<td>Smoking areas should be ventilated.</td>
<td>Smoking rooms should have a sign: Smoking Room, displayed in black and white.</td>
<td>Health messages warning smokers of the habit should be posted on the entrance to the smoking room.</td>
<td>Smoking rooms should be separated from the public by a solid wall; no smoking in public places.</td>
<td>Good health; freedom and individual rights; smoke-free environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Advertising limitation</td>
<td>Rotation of tobacco should only be allowed to advertise if they put health warnings on the ad.</td>
<td>Health warning.</td>
<td>The ad should not be more than a metre away from the point of sale.</td>
<td>Manufacturers have a duty to inform customers fully of the risks of tobacco products and their emissions.</td>
<td>Any communication from tobacco manufacturers should have a health-warning message.</td>
<td>Health warning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Smoking and gender</td>
<td>Smoking is viewed as a sign of masculinity because it has been acceptable for men to smoke.</td>
<td>Smoking and equality.</td>
<td>Tobacco advertising lets women believe that smoking keeps them thin.</td>
<td>Non-smoking women and children are likely to be exposed to environmental tobacco.</td>
<td>Ban all direct and indirect tobacco advertising.</td>
<td>Smoke-free environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Locally produced goods</td>
<td>Smokers who stop will reallocate their tobacco expenditure to other goods and services.</td>
<td>Local goods and services.</td>
<td>The economy of country will be boosted, as people will use more locally produced products.</td>
<td>Smokers will switch to locally produced goods and services.</td>
<td>Substitute other local products for tobacco.</td>
<td>Economic boost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Government</td>
<td>Government wants to detach sport from smoking.</td>
<td>Detach sport from smoking.</td>
<td>Other companies like Vodacom can sponsor sport, not tobacco.</td>
<td>Government is more concerned about the well-being of people.</td>
<td>Detach sport from smoking.</td>
<td>Healthy lifestyle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tax</td>
<td>Higher taxes and restrictions on advertising help decrease smoking.</td>
<td>Tax decreases smoking.</td>
<td>Tax should be used to implement a health promotion body.</td>
<td>1/4 million South Africans will stop smoking due to higher income tax on tobacco.</td>
<td>Increase tax on cigarettes.</td>
<td>High tax.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:
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Table 4: Trends in dominant tobacco control frames (1997-2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tobacco control frames</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consumer addiction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Death, diseases</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Corporate liability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High prices, hospitals’ money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Smoking irrevocable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Smokers in great danger</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Smoking glamourised/lying intentionally</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Innocent children</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Passive smokers’ right/second-hand smoking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Negative economic impact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Smoking area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Advertising limitation/ban sponsorship</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Smoking and gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Locally produced goods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tax</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total articles</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **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).
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- **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 coordinated, 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.
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