



THE ONTARIO TOBACCO RESEARCH UNIT
UNITÉ DE RECHERCHE SUR LE TABAC DE L'ONTARIO

Generating knowledge for public health

Tobacco-Free Sports and Recreation Policies

Evaluation of Policy Implementation in Hockey Settings: Final Report

Cora McCloy
Sue Keller-Olaman
Robert Schwartz

October 2012

Suggested Citation: McCloy C, Keller-Olaman S, Schwartz R. *Tobacco-Free Sports and Recreation Policies. Evaluation of Policy Implementation in Hockey Settings: Final Report*. Toronto: Ontario Tobacco Research Unit, October 2012.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are thankful to the Tobacco-Free Sports and Recreation Community of Practice (TFSR CoP) evaluation advisory group for sharing their comments and suggestions for the evaluation planning and draft report. Their thoughtful comments greatly contributed to this project.

We also thank all the participants of this study: public health unit staff, hockey administrators, coaches, players and spectators who generously shared their thoughts and experiences with us.

Finally, we also want to thank the contributions of Maritt Kirst – the OTRU researcher who planned the evaluation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Table of Tables.....	v
Acronyms and Abbreviations	vi
Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction.....	5
Methodology	9
Limitations of the Evaluation	11
Results	13
Case Study I: Peewee and Bantam Hockey Teams (2 teams).....	14
Case Study II: Women’s Hockey League.....	29
Case Study III: Junior B Hockey Team.....	40
Case Study IV: Men’s University Hockey Team	52
Summary	57
The Way Forward	62
References	65
Appendix I: Sample TFSR Policy Template from PLBTF	66
Appendix II: Surveys	67
Appendix III: Data from All Spectator Surveys Combined	72
Appendix IV: Interview Guides	75

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1: Case Study I: Peewee and Bantam Teams–Attitudes and Beliefs (n=50)	19
Table 2: Case Study I: Peewee and Bantam Teams–Observed Tobacco Use (n=50)	19
Table 3: Case Study I: Peewee and Bantam Teams–Perceived Effectiveness (n=50).....	21
Table 4: Case Study II: Women’s Team–Attitudes and Beliefs (n=15)	31
Table 5: Case Study II: Women’s Team–Observed Tobacco Use (n=15)	32
Table 6: Case Study II: Women’s Team–Perceived Effectiveness (n=15)	33
Table 7: Case Study III: Junior B Team–Attitudes and Beliefs (n=50)	43
Table 8: Case Study III: Junior B Team–Observed Tobacco Use (n=50)	44
Table 9: Case Study III: Junior B Team–Perceived Effectiveness (n=50).....	46
Table 10: Case Study IV: University Team–Attitudes and Beliefs (n=24).....	53
Table 11: Case Study IV: University Team–Observed Tobacco Use (n=24).....	54
Table 12: Case Study IV: University Team–Perceived Effectiveness (n=24)	55
Table A3- 1: Overview of Selected Characteristics (All Survey Respondents, n=139).....	72
Table A3- 2: Attitudes and Beliefs (All Survey Respondents, n=139)	73
Table A3- 3: Tobacco Use Noticed at Hockey Events (All Respondents, n=139)	73
Table A3- 4: Locations Tobacco Observed being used by Different Groups	73
Table A3- 5: Types of Tobacco Products Observed being used by Different Groups at Hockey Events.....	74
Table A3- 6: Perceived Effectiveness of TFSR Policy (All Survey Respondents, n=139).....	74

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CAO	Coaches Association of Ontario
CCS	Canadian Cancer Society
OLA	Ontario Lung Association
OSA	Ontario Soccer Association
OTRU	Ontario Tobacco Research Unit
PARC	Physical Activity Resource Centre
PHU	Public Health Unit
PLBTF	Play, Live, Be...Tobacco-Free
PRO	Parks and Recreation Ontario
PTCC	Program Training and Consultation Centre
S4O	SPORT4ONTARIO
SFOA	Smoke-Free Ontario Act
SHL	Smokers' Helpline
TCAN	Tobacco Control Area Network
TFSR	Tobacco-free Sports and Recreation
TFSR CoP	Tobacco Free Sport and Recreation Community of Practice

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 2008, Ontario's seven Tobacco Control Area Network (TCAN) regions have been engaged in promoting tobacco-free sports and recreation (TFSR) policies. They have undertaken a variety of initiatives to support sport and recreation organizations in the adoption of TFSR policies and in developing signage. TCANs face particular challenges in local hockey settings where resources are limited and communities rely on volunteers.

The main goal of this evaluation was to explore the implementation and impact of TFSR policies within the sport of hockey in four Ontario public health units (PHUs) and examine the barriers and facilitators in TFSR policy implementation. This report is intended to serve as a practical, experience-oriented resource for the TFSR Community of Practice and other interested stakeholders to consider when moving forward in the area of TFSR policy implementation.

Specific evaluation questions:

- What TFSR policies are being implemented in hockey organizations and teams within PHUs in Ontario?
- What is the level of awareness and support of these policies within organizations, and among team members, parents, coaches and spectators?
- What is the impact of implementing TFSR policies on individual behaviours and in communities (e.g., player, parent and coach smoking behaviour, exposure to secondhand smoke, social modelling, youth perceptions of smoking, environmental protection, and smoking cessation)?
- What are the barriers and facilitators to implementing TFSR policies at the organizational level?
- What are the barriers and facilitators to implementing and enforcing TFSR policies at the team level?

The four case studies reflect a range of age, sex and geography in the Ontario hockey community. They are:

- Case Study I–Peewee/Bantam teams (2 teams)
- Case Study II–Women's League team
- Case Study III–Junior B team
- Case Study IV–University team

Relevant information was gathered through qualitative and quantitative methods. Data sources at each site included spectator surveys, focus groups with players and individual interviews with coaches, team management and PHU staff. The interviewees were purposely chosen to reflect multiple perspectives on TFSR policy.

Findings

Each of the four case studies implemented their policy in similar ways, but the impetus for initiating the TFSR policy differed slightly and the time of implementation ranged from 2005 to 2010.

- The impetus for adopting a TFSR policy included providing a positive role model, improved health and lifestyle, prevention generally and protection from secondhand smoke.
- All four case studies hoped that by adopting the TFSR policy for their team or league, change may occur in other hockey teams and players.
- All four cases demonstrated TFSR policy awareness and the perceived importance of TFSR policies through the qualitative findings and the survey responses.
- Overall, across all case studies, hockey (and sport more broadly) is perceived as a protective force against the use of tobacco. For all the players, cardiovascular levels and stamina were cited as a key reason to avoid cigarette smoking. Peewee and Bantam players viewed sport as healthy and providing them with a physical outlet away from the dangers of tobacco and other harmful products and associated behaviours.

Collectively, the four case studies describe factors of success and also challenges for the implementation of TFSR policy in a hockey setting. The success factors included:

- Strong tobacco control advocates within the hockey settings served to facilitate TFSR policy implementation and ongoing promotion.
- The commitment of PHU support as a conduit for information and as an enabler, increased the feasibility of TFSR policy implementation at the local level.
- Involvement in this evaluation stimulated awareness and prompted review of TFSR issues.
- TFSR signage and advertising also served as a key strategy to sustain the messaging and TFSR policy across the four case studies.
- Players further facilitated TFSR policy implementation when they shared the policy with family members. This in turn reiterated the importance of parents as role models to youth.

Barriers to implementing a TFSR policy in a hockey setting included:

- Player and coach turnover was a barrier to maintaining the momentum from year to year.
- Volunteer capacity and fatigue was reported by the Women's league case study.
- Reliance on individual teams and individual champions (volunteers) to promote TFSR policy and tobacco-free promotion was also cited as a barrier.
- The need for consistent funding to maintain the local TFSR messaging and promotion (e.g., logos/promotional materials, signage/ advertising, swag for players) was emphasized across case studies.

Key Lessons of the TFSR policy implementation experiences are:

- Hockey settings (organizations and venues) are perceived to be valuable and effective sites to promote TFSR messages across prevention, protection and cessation areas.
- Impacts of TFSR policy implementation include a reduction in exposure to second-hand smoke.
- People want change, including smokers. There is general agreement that a smoke-free sports and recreation environment is important and that a tobacco-free policy does not infringe upon the rights of tobacco users.
- Change can be achieved but continuous and sustained efforts are not easy. Champions at the local level are vital.
- One of the most salient findings of this evaluation was that TFSR messaging is very important (e.g., signage, logos). The messaging can help to sustain the momentum of the TFSR efforts even if the policy itself has received limited to no attention or review within the hockey team setting.
- A final lesson from the case studies is that implementation and long-term change will not be achieved without a multi-pronged approach (e.g., policy reminders, tobacco-free events, logos/promotional materials, signage/ advertising, swag for players).

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on common themes across the case studies.

- Have a process in place to revisit the policy on a regular (annual) basis. This includes review of TFSR policy and implementation reinforcement for current staff and orientation for new coaches and staff.
- Focus on, or continue to emphasise, the health and lifestyle messages. They were the most compelling reason for smoke-free sports and recreation policies (e.g., future efforts could integrate physical activity and tobacco-free policy promotion).
- There is a need to pay particular attention to the use of chew tobacco with all hockey groups (players, parents, coaches, team staff and venue management), but especially the Junior B team players.
- Extend the no smoking within 9m of arena doors rule or introduce an outright tobacco ban in hockey settings.
- We recommend that Play, Live, Be...Tobacco-Free (PLBTF) continues to increase awareness of TFSR policy among the sports and recreation community as well as the Canadian public. An increased PLBTF presence would better enable broad (e.g., organisation-wide, league-wide, arena-wide) TFSR policy implementation.

INTRODUCTION

The Broad Context for the Evaluation

This evaluation examines the implementation and impacts of tobacco-free policies within ice hockey settings in Ontario. The negative consequences of tobacco use and the short and long-term health benefits of quitting are well documented (e.g., CPHA, 2011). The purpose of Tobacco-Free Sport and Recreation (TFSR) policies is to prevent and reduce social exposure and use of tobacco products by players, coaches, spectators and leaders (Bobbili, 2010). TFSR policies ideally prevent and reduce use of tobacco through the reduction of physical and social exposure to tobacco products, provide opportunities for denormalization of tobacco use and positive role-modeling for youth if coaches and spectators are smoke-free and promote cessation (Bobbili, 2010). Sporting organizations provide an important setting for policies to create health promoting environments and to support health-oriented behaviour change (Priest et al 2008).

Play, Live, Be...Tobacco-Free (PLBTF) is an Ontario-based movement that promotes tobacco-free activity in sport and recreation. PLBTF started in 2008 and is a collaboration of public health, sport and non-profit organizations that support local, regional and provincial decision-makers in developing tobacco-free policies (see Appendix I for PLBTF policy template). The PLBTF collaborative is composed of the seven Tobacco Control Area Networks (representing the 36 Ontario public health units), the Program Training and Consultation Centre (PTCC), SPORT4ONTARIO (S4O), the Coaches Association of Ontario (CAO), Physical Activity Resource Centre (PARC), Parks and Recreation Ontario (PRO), Canadian Cancer Society (CCS) – Smokers' Helpline (SHL), the Ontario Lung Association (OLA), and the Ontario Chronic Disease Prevention Managers Network (source: <http://www.playlivebetobaccofree.ca/>). PLBTF received funding from the Ministry of Health Promotion (Healthy Communities Approach) in 2009.

There are many elements to the PLBTF movement; since 2008, public health units across Ontario's seven TCAN regions have been engaged in promoting TFSR policies through a variety of initiatives. These include developing signage, supporting sport and recreation organizations in the adoption of TFSR policies, populating the PLBTF policy database, creating radio advertisements and organizing tobacco-free events. In addition, PHU representatives and other partners participate in a Tobacco Free Sport and Recreation Community of Practice (TFSR CoP) coordinated by the PTCC (recently renamed the TFSR and Outdoor Spaces CoP).

The collective effort to promote TFSR policies is relatively new, and overall, there is a lack of rigorous evaluative evidence to indicate effectiveness (Bobbili, 2010; Priest et al., 2008). As part of the PLBTF initiative, an evaluation strategy and program logic model was developed early in 2010 (*Play, Live, Be... Tobacco-Free – Ontario Project Evaluation Report*, Sahay, 2011). A formative evaluation was also conducted that analyzed website traffic, determined PHU use of and satisfaction with PLBTF resources, and assessed a number of components: the quality of policy documents uploaded to the database, the extent to which provincial-level support has been built for PLBTF, and the extent to which collaborations and partnerships have formed between PHUs and local sports and recreation organizations (Sahay, 2011). Multiple methods were used to gather information across a range of stakeholders.

Capacity-building, decreased duplication of effort and increased awareness of TFSR policies are positive outcomes reported from the PHU support of sport and recreation organizations to date (Sahay, 2011). PLBTF resources have been well received by PHUs. Some key lessons from the formative evaluation included the need for ongoing support and adequate funding to access the appropriate media channels. In addition, sports and recreation organizations highlighted the need to monitor implementation and policy enforcement. Indeed, understanding the implementation of TFSR policies at the local level is important for all PLBTF stakeholders as they move forward.

Between April and June 2011, meetings were held with both the TFSR Community of Practice and Evaluation Advisory Group¹ devoted to evaluation and follow-up discussions. TFSR CoP members identified a range of evaluation needs and interests, including a need for common sets of indicators and tools for evaluation of local initiatives, support in conducting local evaluations, cross-learning among and across PHUs, and roll-up of local level evaluation knowledge to produce provincial level learning. Support needs ranged from external expert review and advice to involvement and conduct of design, data collection, data analysis and report writing. The TFSR Evaluation Advisory Group prioritized the need to assess and better understand the impact of TFSR policies among hockey teams and leagues. Consensus was achieved in the larger CoP that this topic was important as members felt that such an assessment would address a knowledge gap about the effectiveness of the TFSR policy work being done by PHUs in achieving a number of tobacco control objectives.

¹ The TFSR Evaluation Advisory Group was formed in March 2011. The PTCC invited one representative from each TCAN in the TFSR CoP to join the evaluation group with two OTRU staff and one PTCC staff.

The Ontario Tobacco Research Unit (OTRU) worked with the TFSR CoP to address regional evaluation needs through an examination of implementation and impacts of TFSR policies at the local level.

Members of the TFSR Evaluation Advisory Group provided assistance with study design and interpretation of findings. Plans are underway to further knowledge exchange and dissemination opportunities within local contexts.

Evaluation Questions

- What TFSR policies are being implemented in hockey organizations and teams within PHUs in Ontario?
- What is the level of awareness and support of these policies within organizations, and among team members, parents, coaches and spectators?
- What is the impact of implementing TFSR policies with individual sports teams, sports organizations and governing bodies on individual behaviours and in communities)?
- What are the barriers and facilitators to implementing TFSR policies at the organizational level?
- What are the barriers and facilitators to implementing and enforcing TFSR policies at the team level?

Study Design

A comparative case study evaluation explored the impact of TFSR policies within the sport of ice hockey in four Ontario public health units (PHUs) and examined the barriers and facilitators in TFSR policy implementation. The TFSR Evaluation Advisory Group decided to evaluate hockey team policies due in large part to timing of the hockey season in that the evaluation needed to begin in Fall 2011. In addition, CoP members felt that the hockey community had adopted a number of TFSR policies across the province and could provide an adequate sample of sports teams as a focus for the evaluation.²

² While the PLB TFSR policy database included policy reach based solely on the number of players on the team, this evaluation sought to provide a broader, more qualitative estimate based on key informant insights and information included in related policy documents.

Contextual factors at the local level such as arena settings and intra-agency relationships and communication, may influence TFSR policy implementation. A realist evaluation approach (Pawson & Tilley, 1997) that described the features and contexts of the selected cases and identified mechanisms believed to be responsible for success or related to challenges was employed to identify why, when, and how the intervention worked.

Public Health Unit Case Study Selection

Four public health units were selected as in-depth case studies. Selection was determined by:

1. An interest in participating in the evaluation.
2. Having contacts within hockey organizations that have implemented TFSR policies.
3. The ability to devote resources to support data collection activities for the evaluation.

OTRU conducted PHU evaluation consultations between August-September 2011. Seven PHUs expressed an interest and met these initial selection criteria. Over the course of the next two months, three of these PHUs declined to participate due to resource limitations and/or challenges in accessing hockey teams for the evaluation. Because of tight evaluation timelines, OTRU consulted with the TFSR Evaluation Advisory Group and confirmed the inclusion of four case study sites.

Once the four sites were selected, PHUs communicated with a local hockey organization to identify and recruit one or two hockey teams that had implemented TFSR policies. The four case studies took place in mostly rural settings, and included both male and female hockey players of different competitive levels and varied age groups.

The Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto approved the evaluation study (Protocol # 26880 approved on October 17, 2011).

Hereafter, this report refers to four case studies:

1. Case Study I–Peewee/Bantam teams (2 teams)
2. Case Study II–Women’s League team
3. Case Study III–Junior B team
4. Case Study IV–University team

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was planned and designed in consultation with the TFSR CoP and PHU representatives in order to reflect the interests and circumstances of the selected locales. A cross-sectional, mixed methods approach was taken. Each case study included:

1. The administration of a survey with parents and hockey event spectators.
2. A series of individual interviews with PHU staff, hockey coaches and hockey organization representatives.
3. Focus groups with the hockey team players.

The Evaluation Advisory Group reviewed key evaluation questions and OTRU developed all data collection materials (e.g., interview and focus group guides, and surveys) in collaboration with the Evaluation Advisory Group.

In the main, the data was collected by the PHU staff and members of the hockey communities involved in this evaluation. However, OTRU staff conducted all data collection at one case study site due to limited PHU resources.

Spectator Surveys

Participants were recruited using convenience sampling through intercept-surveys at hockey games in the four case study locations. Spectators at least 16 years of age were approached to participate in the survey. If they agreed to participate, they were asked to complete a survey and received a \$5 coffee gift card for their participation. Due to inconsistencies in the completion of Daily Summary Reports for each case study site, it is not known overall how many spectators were approached.

Survey questions asked about awareness of TFSR policy, support for the policy, beliefs and attitudes about tobacco use in the context of sport and recreation, observed use of tobacco in others (e.g., other spectators, administrators, and players), policy effectiveness in five areas and demographic details.

In addition to the demographic, attitudinal, and experience-based survey questions, participants were asked two open-ended questions: firstly, to identify aspects of the policy they believed to

be working well, and secondly, to suggest how to increase awareness and support of tobacco free sports and recreation policies (See Appendix II for all survey questions). A total of 139 surveys informed this evaluation. The spectator survey data was entered into a Microsoft Excel file and summaries and descriptive statistics were performed using Microsoft Excel.

Key Informant Interviews

Six PHU key informant interviews were held with staff who had been engaged in TFSR policy development, implementation and/or communication. These participants were identified through a main PHU contact for the TFSR evaluation. All six PHU staff contacted for an interview agreed to participate and telephone interviews occurred between January-March 2012.

Hockey team administrator contact names and information were provided by a PHU staff person who had established contact with the hockey team or organization. OTRU received a list of ten hockey administrators, and seven people agreed to an in-person or telephone interview. Semi-structured interviews with the hockey team administrators were conducted between January-March 2012 via the telephone (n=5) and in-person (n=2).

All interviewees were asked about barriers, facilitators and the influence of contextual factors on implementation of TFSR policies and perceived impacts of the policies (See Appendix IV for interview guides). The interviews ranged from 30 to 60 minutes in length.

Focus Groups

Four focus groups were held at three case study sites (two were held at one site). Due to time limitations, one site (case study IV) did not conduct a focus group (see limitations section). The focus groups engaged participants (total n=33) in group discussions about TFSR policy awareness, tobacco product usage, barriers and facilitators to TFSR policy implementation and player adherence to existing policies on the team. PHU staff with previous focus group facilitation experience conducted three focus groups and OTRU staff conducted one focus group. The interviews and focus groups were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. NVivo qualitative data analysis software was used to analyze common categories and emerging themes.

LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION

Each case study was planned to include in-depth information from several sources. However, due to the timing of local hockey events and the capacity and availability of PHU representatives to facilitate data collection, only partial data was collected for one case study (Case Study IV). Spectator surveys were administered for this site but no focus groups or interviews were completed.

Sampling Bias

The PHUs and hockey teams were chosen to target different interest groups that had implemented TFSR policies. Although this kind of sampling is useful to target participants that can offer different perspectives about TFSR, its limitation is that it also excludes those from intended audiences that have not implemented TFSR policies. This group could have offered information about the barriers to implementing TFSR policies.

Findings from the quantitative survey component of the evaluation were limited by the small sample size. Only 139 surveys were completed. This included only 15 surveys for Case Study II (women's league), due to the low turnout of spectators. There are some missing responses among the 139 completed surveys. Few tobacco users were among the survey respondents. There were only 8 cigarette smokers and 5 users of "other tobacco products" (one respondent used both) among the sample, representing 5.7% and 3.6% of the surveyed spectators. In the general population, the number of cigarette smokers in Canada is closer to 20% (17%, Canadians 15 years and older, Canadian Tobacco Use Monitoring Survey (2010), accessed at www.hc-sc.gc.ca).

Recall Bias

The focus groups and the hockey team administration interviewees were asked to reflect back on when the TFSR policy was implemented for their hockey team. In Case Study I, the Bantam team players who participated in this evaluation were asked to recall TFSR policy and events from two years prior when they played on the Minor Peewee team. Similarly, the current Peewee team members (Case Study I) who participated in the evaluation were asked by focus group facilitators to consider TFSR activities they engaged in as players on the Minor Atom AAA team two years ago (eight years old at that time). Hockey team administrators were also requested to reflect on their

TFSR involvement up to three years prior (Case Study III) and such efforts present an element of bias.

PHU staff at two case study sites conducted focus groups.³ Ideally, evaluators external to the PHU would have facilitated focus groups; however, budgetary considerations limited OTRU's involvement in these data collection activities.

We expect there are differences in the accuracy and completeness of recall of the survey respondents to remember who, where, and what tobacco product use they noticed over the last year, particularly as the spectators varied in how frequently they attended hockey events. In addition, spectators that were not aware of the policies also completed questions about perceived effectiveness of the policies.

Evaluation Timing

On a similar note, we acknowledge that the scheduling of tobacco-free and health events at the arenas (e.g., TFSR) and the timing of the evaluation data collection may have impacted knowledge and awareness levels of spectators in the survey.

Survey Question Limitations

The reporting of observations of tobacco use in the last year was confusing to interpret at times. It was not possible to determine the extent of tobacco use at each locale because the questions were independent from each other and multiple responses were possible.

Finally, the wording was also unclear for the survey question asking level of agreement with the following statement: "It is okay to use smoke cigarettes at indoor sports events outside of arenas". We believe many survey respondents presumed this was asking about the use of designated smoking areas outside the arena and this may be why 16% of all respondents strongly agreed.

³ Both case study site facilitators had several years of experience in working with children and youth within the health field, which added important insights during focus group discussions.

RESULTS

In total, 139 spectator surveys, 13 individual interviews and 4 focus groups with players were conducted.⁴ Following a description of case study characteristics, the findings for each case study are summarized under five broad areas:

- Awareness of TFSR policy
- Attitudinal findings/support/beliefs for TFSR policy
- Tobacco product usage (reported use; observations)
- Perceived effectiveness of TFSR policy
- Facilitators and challenges in TFSR implementation and suggestions to move forward on TFSR policy issues

The quantitative and qualitative data have been combined for each area. In the main however, the survey findings and comments are reported first followed by the qualitative findings. Verbatim quotes are included to illustrate key themes.

⁴The survey data combined across all case studies can be found in Appendix III (Tables A3-1 to A3-6).

CASE STUDY I: PEEWEE AND BANTAM HOCKEY TEAMS (2 TEAMS)

Characteristics

Case Study I is a rural community that implemented its TFSR policy in November 2009. At the time of implementation, the players who participated in the focus groups for this evaluation were on younger teams: Atom AAA (currently Peewee) and Peewee (currently Bantam) hockey teams. Hockey participants for the two focus groups are referred to by their current team membership: Peewee and Bantam.

Broadly, the TFSR policy reach includes both sets of hockey teams (two age groups). Both case study teams include approximately 17 players per team and, on average, 2 parents per player who have some level of TFSR awareness. Furthermore, there is a broad reach across several hockey teams which have reinforced TFSR messaging (via arena signage, team TFSR/PLBTF logo on jerseys). Coaching staff usually includes approximately 4-5 adults (coaches, trainer and manager) per team. The teams travel to several Ontario communities of different sizes for tournaments during a typical year. The Peewee hockey league has over 1000 children registered and exposure and reach to TFSR messaging could occur in similar ways: through PHU-led TFSR social marketing activities developed within these case study teams and within and across an additional five hockey teams in the community that have adopted TFSR policies as well.

An arena frequently used by both of these hockey teams developed its own voluntary nine metre smoke-free area policy. Although this smoke-free area policy is not under the *Smoke-Free Ontario Act* (SFOA), arena officials requested and received nine metre signage from the local PHU.

Data Collection Activities

Two focus groups were facilitated by local PHU staff at a hockey arena boardroom in December 2011 (youth staff assisted). Two hockey teams participated in focus groups: one Peewee team, ages 10-11 (n=8) who had played for 1-3 years on this team and a Bantam team with players aged 12-13 (n=11) who had played for 3 years on this team.

OTRU conducted interviews with hockey administrators (n=3) and PHU key informants (n=2) in January 2012.

Spectator Surveys

For Case Study I, the PHU collected surveys (n=50) at one home game (youth staff assisted) in December 2011. Fifty-four per cent of the 50 spectator survey respondents were male, 46% were female. Their ages ranged from 16-19 years to 65+ years, with the most common age group 40-49 yrs. Almost all (n=48, 96%) of the spectators had completed high school or university. Of the two that had not completed high school, one male was aged 16-19 years (still in school) and one (male) was aged 65 years+. Most reported their role as either a parent (n=39) or another relative of a player (n=8). One player, one “spectator” without a relation to team members and one friend of player were also reported. The majority of surveyed spectators (n=47, 94%) attended hockey events (games/ practices) on a weekly basis, two were monthly attendees. More than half of the respondents (n=30, 60%) lived in the community.

Findings

Rationale for TFSR Policy Development

All participants in this evaluation were asked to reflect on the rationale or reasons for developing a TFSR policy for their hockey team(s). A few participants felt that the \$500 PLBTF seed grant⁵ was an important incentive for the team, especially when faced with the challenge to raise extra funds for team uniforms (jerseys and work-out gear).

Number one incentive obviously is money. Sports [Laugh] teams are constantly looking for funding to support the needs of their team--so that was a good fit. When they looked at what the requirements were within this grant application--there wasn't a lot of work to be done and it was a good fit within their sport because really tobacco and sports don't mix--so when it came to having to implement the policy with the age groups that we were working with--it really, it was more a role modeling piece and education to the kids but it wasn't that anyone would potentially be cut from a team because at that age they're not using tobacco yet. (PHU Key Informant)

According to another PHU informant and one team coach, the teams decided to develop the TFSR policy in part by what they had personally witnessed at the higher levels of hockey in the community: players who regularly and openly used chew tobacco. The local Junior-level team had

⁵ Through an application process, PLBTF seed grants were provided to a number of sport teams and recreational groups across Ontario to create and promote a tobacco-free policy.

adopted their own TFSR policy and this action provided some impetus for these minor hockey teams to create their own policy:

So I think and just the education that they were getting from us [PHU] and from school and from their coaches about the deterrents of it I think they started thinking you know what we need to take this a step further [and develop a policy].
(PHU Key Informant)

Well my understanding was there, they [PHU] were trying to discourage youth-to use tobacco products--and I remember there was talk of chew tobacco--being one of the ones that it was a real problem--just as much or more so than smoking even because of the mouth cancers right. (Team Coach)

Hockey players addressed issues around both prevention and protection when they explained the reasons why the team administrators had pursued the TFSR policy:

P1: Because they want, don't want like you to get influenced on maybe making the wrong decision so-like smoking.

P2: Because they know that you're [Pause] a good athlete and that you're competitive so they don't want you to be influenced and make the wrong choice to ruin your sports career later on.

P3: To protect us like from all the harmful stuff.

P4: Like second-hand smokers can, it can also be just as bad--almost as bad--so it can affect them the same way.

Finally, hockey administrators and a couple of hockey players referred to the tireless work and commitment to TFSR by one PHU staff person who was closely connected to the hockey teams. This policy driver or 'champion' provided the needed resources and support to ensure that the TFSR grant application and process was completed.

Well one is that with [PHU staff name] being a very strong advocate for tobacco-free that's how I found out about it is through [name] and then approached the rest of the team--and the team the coaches and managerial staff and we all thought that that would be a good idea--seeing as on both teams like the there's very few if any people who use tobacco products--and we know from going in and out of arenas when there is or there, there are people out there smoking it's not, it's not something we want our kids personally exposed to. (Team Coach)

Awareness of TFSR Policy–Spectators

When asked “Are you aware that this team has put in place a tobacco-free sports and recreation policy?” well over half (n=29, 58%) of the 50 surveyed Peewee/Bantam spectators indicated that they were aware. Those who were aware heard about the policy directly from their child or the team (n=6), another parent (n=4), the health unit representative (n=5), the coach (n=3), messaging (e.g., logo, announcement at a regular game) or attending a designated Tobacco-Free game with TFSR promotion (n=9).

TFSR Policy Awareness versus Messaging

When the key informants and the focus group discussed awareness of TFSR policy, some participants appeared unsure of what a policy entailed and more often than not referred to a wide range of TFSR promotional initiatives that had been developed by local PHUs (or TCANs). One key informant made a key distinction between TFSR policy and TFSR messaging and explained that the youth hockey players were more likely to reflect back on TFSR policy events rather than the policy document itself:

I think for the kids they understand, their awareness is the Play, Live Be messaging--that tobacco and sports don't mix. I don't think that they had a high level of awareness of what would happen if somebody was smoking or using tobacco and how that would impact the team so in terms of their awareness of the actual formality of the--specific policy--their awareness was low cause that wasn't a focus. The focus of the policy was more the management and the parents and the coaches and the people who would be affected. The players it was more the education about the message and that was probably given their age as well cause they were younger. (PHU Key Informant)

The PHU key informant also suggested that players know a policy document exists but that they may never be able to recite its contents. The message is clear to them and that is the most important aspect of the tobacco-free campaign. Focus group facilitators had to prompt the young players in both focus groups to recall the specific policy but many of the participants reported that they had received TFSR policy information from their parents:

I think it was, I took my mom and then she got some information and kind of told it [the policy] to our family --and I knew already. My dad would kill us if we ever took tobacco but I think just you know to bring it up and stuff like that-to know what it was. (Bantam Player)

Everybody knows the policy, yeah. (Pewee Player)

Some hockey players stated that TFSR policy and campaign awareness stemmed from hockey jerseys they received from the PLBTF grant. Similarly, one hockey administrator felt that these jerseys (with the PLBTF logo) served to continually raise awareness levels among new players on the team. One PHU key informant felt that spectator awareness had increased since the TFSR policy was implemented in 2009.

It is much higher with home spectators than visiting spectators so you know we found that, even when we were doing the spectator surveys [for the evaluation], that people who were here from another community didn't necessarily know about it. (PHU Key Informant)

Both PHU key informants felt that overall awareness of TFSR policy has increased within the broader hockey community because TFSR messages have been included in higher levels of hockey:

A lot of the parents who have kids in minor hockey go to those games--so they've seen, they've seen it; they've been exposed to it--they're aware of it. We've got, you know signage and things outside the arenas and things so they know it's there. They're very, they're aware of it. (PHU Key Informant)

Attitudinal Findings/Support/Beliefs for TFSR Policy

The majority of respondents agreed that smoking was not an important social activity, that they should be a responsible role model and that all individuals engaged in the sport of hockey have rights to a smoke-free environment (Table 1). The majority of respondents (n=46, 92%) were in support of their team's TFSR policy.

Table 1: Case Study I: Peewee and Bantam Teams–Attitudes and Beliefs (n=50)

Agree or disagree with the following statements about TFSR policies:	Agree/ Strongly Agree n (%)	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree n (%)	Neither (%)
Players have a right to play in a tobacco-free environment	50 (100)	0	0
Smoking and other tobacco use is an important social activity	0	48 (96)	2 (4)
It is okay to smoke cigarettes at indoor sports events outside of arenas	10 (20)	38 (76)	2 (4)
It is my responsibility to be a role model and to discourage tobacco use at team events	49 (98)	0	1 (2)
It is important to protect players and others from secondhand smoke at sports and recreation events	50 (100)	0	0
Team staff and spectators have the right to be in a tobacco-free environment	50 (100)	0	0
It is okay to use chew (spit) tobacco at sports and recreation events because it does not harm others	8 (16)	39 (78)	3 (6)
A tobacco-free policy goes against the rights of tobacco users	5 (10)	36 (72)	9 (18)

Two data points are worth highlighting. Ten spectators (20%) strongly agreed it was okay to smoke cigarettes outside arenas. In addition, eight respondents (16%) agreed it was okay to use chew tobacco at sports events because it does not harm others.

Tobacco Product Usage

Only one male (aged 40-49 years) who was a parent of a player, reported daily smoking of cigarettes. The spectator survey respondents were also asked to report how often, where and whom they had noticed using tobacco and tobacco products in their hockey setting in the last year (Table 2). Multiple responses were possible.

Table 2: Case Study I: Peewee and Bantam Teams–Observed Tobacco Use (n=50)

Noticed use of tobacco products in the following groups:	All the Time n (%)	Sometimes n (%)	Rarely n (%)	Never n (%)	Don't Know n(%)	Not Sure n (%)
Coaches or other team staff	1	3	6	38	2	0
Team administrators	10 (20)	9	6	22	3	0
Team players	0	0	0	44	0	6 "N/A"
Parents or other spectators	22 (44)	19 (38)	6	1	2	0

Parents and team administrators were observed more frequently using tobacco products than coaches or players. For example, parents were noticed smoking “all the time” (n=22) and team administrators were noticed smoking “all the time” (n=10) (Table 2). Due to the independence of the tobacco use questions and the multiple responses, it is not possible to know how many individual smokers were seen. The most common product noticed was cigarettes and the most common location was outside the arena doors (109 counts), followed by the parking lot (30 counts). One respondent noticed a coach or team staff member smoking inside the arena in the last year.

In contrast to the tobacco use noticed by spectators, hockey administration informants reported little to no tobacco usage within the hockey team management level. A PHU informant did share that a Team Manager smokes ‘discretely’ and not in front of the players. The majority of all interviewees in this case study reported that although parents continue to smoke outside arena doors, they have sensed that these numbers have decreased in the past few years.

I’d say there’s so out of seventeen families there’s one, two maybe three, two or three families out of the seventeen [who smoke]. (Former Coach)

As part of a general discussion on tobacco use, focus group participants were asked to brainstorm a list of different tobacco products. Participants of both focus groups referred to a variety of tobacco products used by people they know including chew, bong, rolled, cigars, cigarillos, weed/marijuana, and pipe. This list served to inform discussions about tobacco usage among people in their age group, both within hockey teams and outside of the hockey setting. A few players felt that the majority of people their age who do use tobacco tend to engage in little to no other activities (e.g., structured sports):

[I] see a lot of kids at the [names arena], they, they don’t really have much to do so they just go to the arena and cause trouble. (Bantam Player)

I think [hockey players] are more busy doing other things and they, like instead of getting into like the wrong crowd. (Peewee Player)

It appeared that these players viewed sport as a form of protection against tobacco use and their hockey involvement served as a positive force in their lives:

You’re preoccupied and you’re in a good environment. (Bantam Player)

Furthermore, according to focus group facilitators, players eagerly shared their knowledge of the negative impact of any tobacco use on their hockey abilities:

People don't do it because they want to be like the best skater on the team.
(Pewee Player)

You wouldn't use it cause you would lose strength, your ability and you're getting weaker and weaker as time goes on. (Pewee Player)

Perceived Effectiveness of TFSR Policy

The spectator survey respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believed the TFSR policy had been effective in five broad areas (Table 3).

Table 3: Case Study I: Pewee and Bantam Teams—Perceived Effectiveness (n=50)

How effective do you think tobacco-free sports and recreation policies are at:	Very Effective n (%)	Somewhat/A Little Effective n (%)	Not at All Effective n (%)	Don't Know n (%)
Preventing youth from starting to use tobacco products	22 (44)	25 (50)	2	1
Preventing exposure to secondhand smoke	27 (54)	20 (40)	3	1
Preventing exposure to tobacco use-related litter	19 (38)	26 (52)	5 (10)	0
Positive role modeling for youth	35 (70)	15 (30)	0	0
Encouraging tobacco users to quit	17 (34)	24 (48)	9	2

For this case study, the TFSR policy has been the most effective at positive role modeling for youth (n=35, very effective), followed by preventing exposure to secondhand smoke (n=27, very effective). Preventing youth from starting, preventing exposure to tobacco use-related litter and encouraging people to quit were not reported to be as effective (Table 3).

One PHU informant felt strongly that the TFSR policy adopted by these hockey teams has been effective at preventing youth uptake of tobacco products.

We went through those focus groups and we saw the knowledge that those players had and how adamant they were that they would never use a tobacco product.
(PHU Key Informant)

Key informants, hockey team players and administrators had mixed views on whether the TFSR policy had prevented exposure to secondhand smoke (SHS). Two players discussed the SHS issue in this way:

P1: I think it's a success because if somebody did smoke like parents on the hockey team then I'm sure they'd be safe to let the players know that we're not going to give it [SHS] to you.

P2: we're going to walk away. I think it's good but we also, because lots of people who are like from away games and stuff they like know that it, they shouldn't smoke like right by us and they probably have their, enough respect to like smoke somewhere else and nobody really smokes around us anymore. (Pewee Players)

While the players felt that SHS exposure had been reduced since they began playing on these teams (the past three years), one PHU informant had a less optimistic perspective and reflected that, *the biggest impact was definitely at the player level not necessarily at the spectator level.*

Respondents offered little insights into how the TFSR policy may have impacted tobacco litter, as a couple of key informants explained that different arenas may or may not have litter (cigarette) receptacles. In some cases, litter was less visible, and at other arenas, the cigarette butts were scattered beside the main doors, usually at the entrance.

All respondents felt that a key objective of TFSR policy implementation is to promote positive role modeling for youth. Efforts were made by both teams to achieve this goal when the policy was adopted. For example, one player reported that the TFSR policy was circulated to hockey families, and another player felt that, when the policy was shared with their families, a strong role modeling effort was made by parents.

Finally, in this case study, the TFSR policy has encouraged tobacco users to quit. Several respondents referred to a few parents who had chosen to quit smoking, in large part, as a result of the team's adoption of the policy.

Parents I think so because we had a set of parents that when we did start this[TFSR policy] they were smokers and then as the kids were made more and more aware of, like they kind of already knew but as you go into more detail they I think felt that it was time to quit and then having them have to sit, stand way out in the cold-[Laugh]-in their cars is, is and then the kids would be like stop smoking you know it was and they, they did stop so-at least two parents stopped and this could be linked to the policy. (Team Manager)

Challenges to Implementation of TFSR Policy in Case Study I

A few respondents suggested that hockey administration staff turnover (coaches mainly) has meant that the TFSR policy has remained inactive or idle from one year to the next for both of these hockey teams.

I just know the annual meeting before that I went to nothing, nothing was mentioned [policy-wise]. (Hockey Team Manager)

One PHU informant explained the challenges in this way:

They don't usually like to keep someone as the head coach because there's sometimes bias involved--and whatnot so there is turnover. Well and that's, that's the hard part so what, what the weakness of this whole policy process has been is--the policy ends--in that, that year so that policy was a very active part of the team two years ago. A lot of the knowledge has stayed with the kids and the families that were part of that--at the time--but the coach this year wouldn't have an awareness--of the policy. He would recognize the logo, he's probably heard of it--but the head coach today wouldn't know what the policy was or where to find it. (PHU Key Informant)

Aside from staff turnover, an additional challenge is competing time demands from coaches which left little energy for TFSR issues:

I think they, I just think it's just lost innocently, innocently in that there's so much to do. (Former Coach)

Several participants felt that while TFSR promotional activities can increase overall awareness levels among all hockey stakeholders, these activities are very costly to run every year (e.g., hockey arena board advertising). Many key informants felt that while the PLBTF grant initially provided important opportunities to spread and communicate the TFSR message, the budget for this promotional item remains a challenge to meet.

Finally a PHU key informant felt that ongoing implementation of the TFSR policy (and message) is lessened when hockey players move on to other teams that may not have adopted a similar policy.

Facilitators to Implementation of TFSR Policy

From an open-ended question about what was working well with the TFSR policy, several themes emerged from the Peewee/Bantam spectators:

- Increased awareness – in policy and healthy lifestyle choices
- Reduction in smoking and therefore exposure; moving smokers away from the arena doors
- Positive role modelling for children
- Increased signage; de-normalising tobacco use

There was an increase in awareness of the policy and also healthy lifestyle education (n=15, e.g., positive information given–healthy lifestyle, makes people more aware of the dangers of tobacco use and second hand smoke, educating kids on the team for healthy lifestyle choices, kids have learned the harmful effects of tobacco use, it makes it aware to spectators and others about the policy, awareness parents/players/kids).

The policy had also provided a positive role model for children (n=11 e.g., positive image, showing kids it is unacceptable, smoking unhealthy–role models, one parent has quit, team administration not using). The policy was also working well in terms of an overall reduction in exposure. In particular, survey respondents believed the policy had helped in reducing smoking in the proximity of the arena, and added that a designated area reduces exposure to SHS (n=12 e.g., preventing tobacco exposure, keeping away from kids, secondhand smoke prevention, kids less exposed, banning of it, no smoking in front of arena, less smokers around arena doors).

An increase in signage/ promotion and de-normalising smoking were also noted as positive impacts of the TFSR policy (e.g., “displays in public events, advertising, logo, getting word out, smoke free ambassadors/volunteers, ...public health representative helps”).

Multi-pronged Approach

Those interviewed believe that a key facilitator in TFSR policy implementation has been a multi-pronged approach of message reinforcement at several sites in the community where youth congregate. For example, several respondents spoke of the emotional impact they felt during a tobacco prevention school event that featured Gruen Von Behrens, an anti-tobacco advocate (chew tobacco specifically):

Yeah I'll never forget Gruen's face and how distorted it was from the chewing tobacco so I'll always remember what happened to him and that'll stop me from ever deciding to do that. (Bantam Player)

As with the survey respondents, the key informants reported that TFSR messaging and policy awareness has increased alongside a more general societal awareness that smoking is not accepted in certain areas, especially where children and youth play sports and/or engage in healthy pursuits. As one PHU informant described:

I'd say the level of awareness with the parents was fairly high-and again because we're seeing a few years ago it was something relatively new. Now we're seeing across the board in a lot of communities--that smoking is either banned on the grounds of recreation centers and arenas--or within so many meters of entrances. (PHU Key Informant)

In addition, PHU-sponsored TFSR events have incorporated a number of youth –led activities at other hockey events (e.g., Junior-level) that included giveaways for children and youth and an educational piece within the games and activities. Furthermore, the PHU had run an extensive social marketing campaign centred on high-level hockey as it was widely felt that high profile hockey players/teams could lend much attention to the tobacco-free message:

I think there're some great examples within hockey. We had already been doing work here in the community on our own within our tobacco team and with the Healthy Living [PHU name], with our local [team name] to kind of just educate people that tobacco and sports don't mix--so in the year previous to all this policy work we had already been doing rink boards and we had bus ads that had the caption of the [team name] and so in our community the younger kids really look up to that team kind of as, as heroes and--and it's a night out in our town, it's a great way to market that message. (PHU Key Informant)

Innovative TFSR Messages

Several participants shared impressive and, in a couple of cases, personal stories directly related to spreading the TFSR messaging. In one case, two Peewee players recorded a radio advertisement that involved holding their breath as they entered a hockey arena where smokers stood directly outside the doors, and in a second example, a goalie painted the TFSR/PLBTF logo on his helmet in recognition of his parent's success in quitting smoking, a direct result of the TFSR campaign.

TFSR Evaluation Study

A few respondents felt that simply participating in the TFSR evaluation has stimulated their thinking around TFSR policy and related activities. Both PHU informants reflected on how both hockey teams' participation has offered a renewed level of interest in TFSR policy implementation from both their health unit and from the hockey administration. Players shared their TFSR perceptions and were eager to explain what they had learned from the various TFSR events and activities that they had been exposed to—and in some cases—actively contributed to in the past two years. New players had the opportunity to hear about the importance of being tobacco-free within and outside of the sport setting from other players, and the PHU facilitators and youth staff who participated in the focus groups.

Suggestions to Promote TFSR policy

When asked about suggestions for increasing awareness and support for tobacco free sports and recreation policies, the Peewee/Bantam spectators emphasized:

- Increase signage and advertising
- Increase designated areas and enforcement
- Increase the TFSR policy reach beyond selected teams and hockey context
- Reinforce positive role modeling

With respect to suggestions about signage/ advertising and general promotion, there were 37 comments (e.g., radio commercials, posters in dressing rooms, newsletters, advertisements on the internet, pamphlets, post policy on the website, public events, more advertising – use a sports related recognizable face, more visible signs at each doorway including dressing rooms, bathroom doors, banners around arena doors, arena announcements, promotional videos for kids, more seminars in public events, and hosting a meeting for parents and coaches).

The survey respondents further suggested increasing designated smoking areas and increasing enforcement of the TFSR policy (n=10, e.g., the people of the arena need to enforce it more, enforce policy on not smoking outside the doors, putting it further away, rule that you can't smoke outside, policing, tobacco free public outdoor spaces, and banning all smoking from public sports areas).

In addition, the Peewee/Bantam survey respondents mentioned increasing the reach of the policy to include more teams, the organization as a whole (with buy-in), going beyond the hockey

context and including a broad range of advocates (n=9, e.g., get into the schools, teach parents, coaches needs to relay information, have policy go league wide; alliance wide, more teams across age groups and across sports, organizational policy, for every association—every administration would have to sign a clause and get the support of the arenas).

Finally, the importance of positive role modeling was emphasized (n=6, e.g., parental role modeling, coaches should never be smoking in presence of players, instruct that it is not allowed in general (not cool), more visibility of parents and spectators quitting smoking).

Aim for an Organization-wide TFSR Policy

Key informants echoed the suggestions of survey respondents: aim for an organization-wide policy and expand this to all teams. Interviewees who offered suggestions to further promote the TFSR policy and message felt the most important impact would be policy implementation at the hockey organizational level.

If you're to go and do it successfully across an organization like we're one team out of eight-in, in the Triple AAA--so to do it successfully across the organization you'd have to get all the teams doing it--as opposed to just the one. (Coach)

A second interviewee in this case study also emphasized that annual team meetings should include review of TFSR policy but there was a need to ensure that this policy review is mandated across all hockey teams and age groups in the larger association:

Then it would just be guaranteed that it has to be covered by everyone. (Former Coach)

Target All Teams/Age Groups

One PHU key informant was adamant that TFSR messaging be introduced as early as possible within hockey leagues in order to capture players before they feel more intense peer pressure to use tobacco (most notably chew tobacco):

If you can get to them early enough in hockey and start you know at the atom, peewee and go through the whole process my feel is by the time they get to be juniors, midget juniors they're not touching tobacco--so I think it's how quickly we can get to them when they start their hockey-and, and you know and the buy-in you get from the coaching staff. (PHU Key Informant)

Include TFSR Policy in the Player Code of Conduct

Two hockey team administrators felt that coaches should be informed at the beginning of the hockey season about TFSR policy and their role in promoting the policy to their players and others involved in the hockey setting. More specifically one coach suggested that a detailed plan be developed at the higher organizational level and shared with all hockey coaches:

Yeah and maybe, they could go a step further and make kind of like a team meeting agenda for these, for these coaches and say here we've kind of laid out a typical agenda that you know you've got to cover this, this, and this but we kind of just made one for you and then some coaches would be like oh hey, this is great, I'll just use this--so that someone doesn't have to, I don't have to sit there and think about what I'm going to do at my team meeting--so maybe if we kind of you know do their initial meeting plan for them. (Former Coach)

Advocate for an Arena-wide Smoking Ban Policy

Similar to survey respondents, one PHU key informant supported the notion of an organization-wide smoking ban on hockey arena property:

I think it would be helpful if you know organization wide-or if the entire arena--had a policy because then it's not just up to our team to have to enforce it. It's a policy arena wide so everybody coming in knows it so what would make it a challenge is sometimes your team has a policy that people aren't allowed to do this but the next team that's coming in they're out there having a smoke right at the door. (PHU Key Informant)

CASE STUDY II: WOMEN'S HOCKEY LEAGUE

Characteristics

Case Study II is a rural community that implemented its TFSR policy in 2010.

The hockey league is comprised of approximately 115 women players who are engaged in the sport for a variety of reasons: recreational and health, as well as to bolster their competitive skills.

An estimated TFSR policy reach includes all league players plus their associated family and friends who regularly attend league games once per week. As well, the PLBTF logo is posted on a variety of arena doors where this league frequently plays. A wide range of spectators who are attending the arena for other hockey events may also be exposed to TFSR messaging.

The main host arena for the women's league had recently adopted a smoking ban and has posted signs that indicate no smoking within nine meters of the arena entrance.

Data Collection Activities

OTRU conducted one focus group (n=7) with players in March 2012 in an arena boardroom. Participants ranged in age from 25-46 years and had played in this league between 4-22 years. OTRU also conducted in-person interviews with hockey administrators (n=2) and phone interviews with PHU key informants (n=2).

Spectator Surveys

OTRU collected surveys at home games in March 2012 (n=15). Of the 15 spectator survey respondents, the majority (n=9) were male. All respondents lived in the community and their ages ranged from 16-19 years to 65+years, and the most common age group was 20-29 years group. Most reported being parents of players (n=6) or a friend of a player (n=6), and three respondents were another relative of a player. All respondents had completed high school or university. Most attended hockey events such as games or practices on a weekly (n=8) or monthly basis (n=6), and one spectator attended only yearly.

Findings

Rationale for TFSR Policy Development

The Women's Hockey League differed substantially from Case Study I, based primarily on the age and sex of players. The rationale given to adopt a TFSR policy was in large part for health reasons and the initiative was championed by a player in the league who worked in health promotion. Two team administrators (interviewed together) reflected on the links between hockey and health:

R1: And a lot of it too is we've, a lot of people are affected by cancer-

R2: Yeah.

R1: A lot of our women have had cancer so--a lot have thought it was a great idea--just because the whole health aspect--and how smoking--can cause cancer and--just awareness.

R2: I think because we're women too. I think because as women we look after ourselves and our partners and our kids and our family--and so it's the perfect avenue to think about smoke-free and, and taking care of your health so it just, it made sense, it, it just, there was no question. [PHU staff person] called me and said, 'what do you think?' and I'm like well that makes sense like that's a great thing. It's a great opportunity, I mean the money part was awesome and I know I said this is a great opportunity for you to have this but it was like okay but this is a great opportunity for us to try.

Awareness of TFSR Policy: Spectators

When asked, "Are you aware that this team has put in place a tobacco-free sports and recreation policy?" four of the spectators (27%) were aware; two of these individuals heard about the policy through a friend or spouse, and two had seen advertising (e.g., poster on an arena billboard).

The majority of the focus group respondents were aware of the policy in large part because all of them had played in the league prior to policy implementation in 2010. A couple of players described their team's reasons for adopting the TFSR policy:

[The policy] was sort of advertising being a smoke-free league and encouraging to be smoke-free especially in sport and setting good examples for maybe younger kids coming up or people who watch the sport. (Player)

A PHU informant stressed that while the TFSR policy has high awareness levels among players, there remain lower awareness levels for the general public and spectators who attend any hockey events in the arena:

I think it's sort of there's some awareness raising but I think to be honest it would have to be a push done every year to remind people to—We've got them on the, I don't know if you noticed it on the doors (PLBTF stickers). (PHU Key Informant)

Attitudinal Findings/Support/Beliefs for TFSR Policy

All of the 15 spectators surveyed (100%) were in support of their team's tobacco-free sports and recreation policy. In terms of attitudes and beliefs, all respondents agreed that players, team staff, and spectators have a right to be in a tobacco-free environment (Table 4). Most agreed that smoking is not an important social activity and that the rights of tobacco users are not violated by a tobacco-free policy.

It is important to keep in mind that the following data is drawn from only 15 respondents. Some respondents agreed that it is okay to smoke outside arenas and to use chew tobacco (n=4 and n=3 respectively). One parent respondent (male, 40-49 years) reported smoking cigarettes on a daily basis and agreed that a tobacco-free policy goes against the rights of tobacco users. The same respondent also agreed that it is okay to smoke outside sports events and use chew tobacco.

Table 4: Case Study II: Women's Team—Attitudes and Beliefs (n=15)

Agree or disagree with the following statements about TFSR policies:	Agree/Strongly Agree n (%)	Disagree/Strongly Disagree n (%)	Neither n (%)
Players have a right to play in a tobacco-free environment	15 (100)	0	0
Smoking and other tobacco use is an important social activity	1 (6.7)	12 (80)	2 (13.3)
It is okay to use smoke cigarettes at indoor sports events outside of arenas	4 (26.6)	10 (66)	1 (6.6)
It is my responsibility to be a role model and to discourage tobacco use at team events	13 (86.6)	1 (6.7)	1 (6.7)
It is important to protect players and others from secondhand smoke at sports and recreation events	13 (86.6)	1 (6.7)	0
Team staff and spectators have the right to be in a tobacco-free environment	15 (100)	0	0
It is okay to use chew (spit) tobacco at sports and recreation events because it does not harm others	3 (20)	11 (73.3)	1 (6.7)
A tobacco-free policy goes against the rights of tobacco users	1 (6.7)	13 (86.6)	1 (6.7)

Tobacco Product Usage

Two respondents reported that they used tobacco. One male respondent used tobacco on a daily basis (parent, 40-49 years) and another respondent (female) reported less than daily usage (“another relative of a player”, aged 20-29 years). Survey respondents were also asked to report how often, where and whom they had noticed using tobacco and tobacco products in their hockey setting in the past year (Table 5). Multiple responses were possible.

Table 5: Case Study II: Women’s Team–Observed Tobacco Use (n=15)

Noticed use of tobacco products in the following groups:	All the Time n (%)	Sometimes n (%)	Rarely n (%)	Never n (%)	Don’t Know n (%)	Not Sure n (%)
Coaches or other team staff	0	2	6	7	0	0
Team administrators	0	2	2	11	0	0
Team players	0	1	7 (46.7)	7	0	0
Parents or other spectators	0	6 (40)	5	4	0	0

Overall, survey respondents from the Women’s team reported few observations of tobacco use. For all observations the most common product was cigarettes, smoked by parents or other spectators. The most common location was outside / near the arena doors or in the parking lot (29 counts of use noticed outside arena doors; 8 counts of use noticed in the parking lot). There was one count of a player using chew and one count of a coach or other team staff using cigarillos. Smoking in a car by individuals from each group was also noticed (5 counts).

For players in the league there was a high level of knowledge about tobacco usage (primarily cigarette smoking) and its impact on their hockey abilities:

Well as you get older, I think you become more competitive and you want to excel in a certain sport and those, like the obvious side effects like a smoke and then go out and play and you’ll see the side effect immediately. (Player)

Two players in the focus group shared their previous smoking experiences and how tobacco use had been detrimental to their playing ability:

It does, it makes a good, a big difference. I quit in I think just the year before [TFSR policy developed] and it’s a big difference even how you feel like...always felt like

there was someone sitting on your chest and you felt like you had the worst cold when you were out there and yuck...you'd just feel--it right in your lungs. (Player)
But I was a smoker and I played-and then I quit and I obviously noticed a very big difference-a huge difference-and now I haven't smoked since 2007. (Player)

Participants discussed current tobacco users in the league and noted that many of these players do not tend to smoke visibly at the arena but do smoke cigarettes at specific events:

So you wouldn't really see people. I mean you see it more at tournaments--where people are, had a few drinks and they go out and you know have a cigarette or something but-maybe banquet night we might see and I find the women in our league too if they do, they hide-it, like they're not proud to stand out there. They're like I'm going to go hide cause I don't want to advertise. (Player)

Of note, players reflected on tobacco users in their league and that these few players appeared to play tournaments far less often than nonsmokers. At a team administration level, respondents estimated that at least two team administrators were current smokers but like the players, chose to hide their tobacco use as much as possible.

Perceived Effectiveness of TFSR Policy

The spectator survey respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of TFSR policy in five broad areas (Table 6).

Table 6: Case Study II: Women's Team—Perceived Effectiveness (n=15)

How effective do you think tobacco-free sports and recreation policies are at:	Very Effective n (%)	Somewhat/A Little Effective n (%)	Not at All Effective n (%)	Don't Know n (%)
Preventing youth from starting to use tobacco products	5 (33)	10 (66)	0	0
Preventing exposure to secondhand smoke	7 (46.7)	6 (40)	2 (13.3)	0
Preventing exposure to tobacco use-related litter	5 (33)	10 (66)	0	0
Positive role modeling for youth	9 (60)	5 (33)	1 (6.7)	0
Encouraging tobacco users to quit	3 (20)	12 (80)	0	0

Similar to other case studies in this evaluation, when the “very effective” responses are examined, TFSR policies are perceived to be the most effective in the provision of positive role

models and prevention of second hand smoke exposure. Reducing litter, preventing youth from starting and encouraging people to quit were perceived to be relatively less effective (Table 6).

From the focus group discussion, many of the players' perspectives on TFSR policy effectiveness related to role modeling and preventing youth uptake. For example, three participants mentioned the importance of coaching and tobacco prevention:

P1: Well and for some of you like you work with the younger girls have started and you help coach those younger students and so you're a role model for them too.

P2: yeah cause I coach one of the three, four and five year old girls so I mean that would be horrible if I was walking in you know just having a cigarette outside and there's Coach [Name] coming in and you know smell like smoke.

P3: And those young kids in the change room.

P2: they figure it out really fast.

Another player felt that because there are players in upper levels of high school playing in the league crucial that all league players including smokers, are *promoting a healthy lifestyle*.

Some focus group participants reported that SHS exposure had declined in the past few years, but they were not sure if this change was a result of the TFSR policy adopted by the league. One player shared a personal story on SHS:

Yeah my dad used to coach and he's a heavy smoker and he would consciously make sure that he didn't come to the game smelling like cigarette smoke and he would wait until afterwards and then he wouldn't even smoke outside the facility... [he'd] wait to go home and so he'd make sure that he wasn't smoking visibly around any of the players and that he didn't smell of smoke when he came to the game. (Player)

A hockey administrator reported that SHS exposure still occurs outside arena doors. The administrator's own children make dramatic efforts to ensure that the smokers understand that this exposure has a negative impact on other arena users:

My kids are very good at saying when they walk through [arena doors] and there's smoke they plug their nose and say, 'Oh that's so bad.' (League Treasurer)

One focus group participant, an arena employee, provided insights into tobacco-related litter that is visible both inside and outside the arena despite the positioning of a cigarette receptacle outside the nine metre yellow perimeter to encourage smokers to remain far from the entrance doors:

P: I'm not exaggerating but that perimeter of that line is littered with cigarette butts.

I: Is there receptacle for them to put the garbage?

P: Oh yeah. but they're just lazy so I, I like going out when there's a big function and everybody is out there smoking away and I like to bring my bag and my broom and show, show them like somebody actually comes and sweeps this up you know.

Furthermore, tobacco-related litter visible inside the arena also poses a problem for those who are tasked with cleaning the garbage:

I find Skoal packs on the like rink benches all the time... Yeah I get the privilege of cleaning up after it... [players] they spit into water bottles and spectators actually spit into like their Timmie's cups or whatever so it's awesome when you knock one of those goes over accidentally... when it comes to like outdoor garbage yeah the majority of it is absolutely cigarette butts and Skoal containers and stuff like that. It depends on who's playing too-like men's leagues and stuff. (Player)

Finally, there is limited evidence that the TFSR policy may have effectively encouraged tobacco users to quit or reduce. During an interview with one hockey administrator she drew a connection to one player who had smoked and quit just prior to the team's adoption of the TFSR policy:

In fact actually maybe this makes sense, in fact the girl that I spoke of who had put it [TFSR/PLBTF logo] on her jacket had, was a former smoker previous, she had quit before the tobacco-free sports policy went in but I think maybe that could be one of the reasons why she-kind of hooked onto it because she was adamant she was not going back to it. (Hockey Administrator)

A second hockey administrator also recounted cessation efforts by a few smokers in the league who used laser therapy services to quit smoking immediately after implementation of the TFSR policy. While it was not clear if the players successfully quit, the administrator considered their effort a positive step and due in part to the TFSR policy.

Challenges in Implementing TFSR Policy

Staff and Funding Challenges

A few respondents referred to the lack of TFSR policy review which has meant that key tobacco-free messages have not remained at the forefront of the league's organization. For one PHU informant there is little time available to continue much of the TFSR public relation and media awareness activities that occurred as part of the initial PLBTF grants.

A few participants also cited funding challenges that caused TFSR-related activities to fall to the wayside. For example, maintenance of the women's league website relies on volunteers but has been disbanded in the past year due to shortages of skilled volunteers. The TFSR policy had been posted on this website but was inaccessible at the time of this report. One hockey administrator provided a further example of funding challenges that impact the league's ability to continue to promote TFSR policy and messaging:

We don't have that [published TFSR league materials] because we don't have the money as a league to produce that ourselves each year. That's the last thing as the treasurer to say, 'Okay don't forget we're going to spend another you know two hundred and fifty dollars'...It'd be like no, we can't afford to do that. (League Treasurer)

Facilitators in Implementing TFSR Policy

According to all spectator survey respondents, the policy implementation had led to increased awareness about the policy and about healthy lifestyle more generally. Respondents also stated that the TFSR policy had reduced exposure to SHS and had facilitated behaviour change in smokers such as increased compliance with the designated area-away from arena doors and management/self-regulation of their smoking:

(Policy) forces people who want to smoke to actually think about their smoke-pre-plan their last cigarette. (Spectator)

A further comment was that the policy led individuals to consider themselves as role models for the younger players.

PHU Partnerships

Both PHU key informants felt that ongoing partnerships with a number of hockey teams in the community had enabled them to gain ongoing funding support for arena board messaging. Thus, the PHU has tapped into Junior-level TFSR arena promotions to ensure that the messaging is reaching a wide segment of the community that attend these games. Because the women's league also plays in some of these spaces, they too can continue to keep the tobacco-free message visible to spectators and players involved in their league.

It is, like we're in for the long-term as long as we can find the money to do it. (PHU Key Informant)

Multiple TFSR Messaging Platforms

Participants in this case study identified their multiple roles as players, coaches, teachers, parents, and role models to other league players. The TFSR message is being promoted from several avenues, beyond the arena. For example, one player in the focus group reinforced key tobacco prevention messages in her role as a teacher. She had learned about chew tobacco use in sports such as hockey and baseball via TFSR policy messaging and now feels that she would like to adopt more material about chew tobacco in the school curriculum.

And I don't find there's as much information out there about chewing tobacco-and like as a, as a teacher we have all these awesome posters of people and their teeth and everything else-but it's mostly cigarette related-I and not so much about chewing tobacco...I know a friend of mine's brother who played baseball for years and they all were chewing tobacco cause they, it didn't smell as much as the smoke on your clothes. It was just contained in the mouth and then they didn't smell and then your parents wouldn't catch you and that kind of thing. (Player)

The PHU also facilitated policy implementation and arranged a TFSR policy launch media photo opportunity to communicate the positive actions of the team. In addition, players expressed gratitude that PHU staff had created *teachable moments* and encouraged all players (smokers and non-smokers) to participate in ongoing TFSR messaging at the end of year team banquet. Finally, the women's league has been able to spread TFSR awareness via its affiliated summer ball hockey league where players (some different from ice hockey) are similarly exposed to any ongoing implementation activities.

Overall, TFSR messaging has also been sustained via PHU work within other hockey leagues, most notably through junior-level teams. The PHU key informant noted that signage and designated tobacco-free games raise awareness about TFSR to all teams that utilise the arena.

The Junior C [team name] is one where I have the great partnership and we've had gosh this is our, I think our third year of having the tobacco-free promotion game-- where we get a game designated and they put stuff on the website and president and vice-president of that club are just huge, huge supporters of tobacco-free sport--maybe the coaching a little, members a little less--but still some support there and so they want you know to be in the public eye, they want photos, it's on their website. (PHU Key Informant)

Suggestions to Promote TFSR Policy

In terms of approaches to increase awareness and support for TFSR policies, the most common response from the survey respondents was to increase advertising or signage (n=9). Examples of possible approaches included signage on the back of hockey jerseys, posters on arena doors, radio advertising and a digital billboard outside the arena.

PHU: I think the, the lessons that we have learned from it all are we need to have it at a, at a higher level so that it's sustainable--so sustainability is kind of a, a concern right now and even to have an entire arena so that the signage can be placed up in the arena because you have multiple teams and multiple leagues-- playing within arenas--so if it's arena wide and that that, so it starts to fit into municipal bylaws--but it's all part of the same the part that's going to get you to an end result. (PHU Key Informant)

Other suggestions included:

- Reward players who don't smoke – “take one for the team”- “on game, no cigs for the day”
- Make the outside ban (area) longer
- Something like 'Driven to Quit'–Maybe 'Playin to Quit' that would eliminate or reduce tobacco usage
- Get rid of cigarette receptacles at the arena door

Focus group and key informant participants offered a range of suggestions to assist TFSR policy implementation:

- Include TFSR/PLBTF logos on all hockey league communications and literature
- Contact the adjacent recreation centre to place TFSR logos on available wall space
- Sustain an existing partnership with a local logo printer to continue TFSR messaging for a low cost
- Ensure that TFSR messaging is prominent (visible) at the year-end banquet and at weekly league games:

It's a great avenue once a week at the table [to include TFSR messages].

(Player/Executive)

CASE STUDY III: JUNIOR B HOCKEY TEAM

Characteristics

Case Study III is a rural community that implemented its TFSR policy in November 2008, one of the first sport teams to do so.

An estimate of TFSR policy reach includes a large spectatorship with over six hundred spectators attending each home game, on average. There are approximately twenty players on the team in addition to approximately ten coaching and administrative staff. Approximately two parents per player are also reached via player conduct discussions at the beginning of the hockey season. PHU-sponsored TFSR events and messaging also reach visiting team players.

Because the home arena for this hockey team is a municipally owned facility there is a smoking ban nine metres from the arena entrance (signage posted). However, as noted by a PHU informant, in some cases, vehicles are parked within this nine metre area.

Data Collection Activities

PHU staff conducted one focus group (n=7) with players at the hockey arena boardroom in November 2011. Players ranged in age from 17-20 years and had played on this team for either one year (n=5) or two years (n=2).

OTRU conducted phone interviews with hockey administrators (n=2) and PHU key informants (n=2) in February and March 2012.

Spectator Surveys

PHU (youth staff included) collected surveys at one home game in January 2012 (n=50). Of the 50 spectator survey respondents, 60% were male and the majority (n=41, 82%) lived in the community. Their ages ranged from 16-19 years to 65+ years and the most common age group was 40-49 years. Most had completed high school or university (n=44, 88%). Of those who had not completed high school, 8 were school age (aged 16-19 years). Most (n=23, 46%) reported their role as spectator with no relation to a player. In addition, there were 8 players, 7 volunteers, 4 relatives of a player, 4 friends of players and four other. Most (n=31, 62%) attended hockey events such as games or practices on a weekly basis, 9 were monthly, 7 were every other month and two yearly.

Findings

Rationale for TFSR Policy Development

This Case Study team developed a TFSR policy for a range of reasons. Two PHU informants described how this TFSR policy stemmed from a TCAN initiative that was primarily interested in smoke-free outdoor spaces, but staff felt that the appetite for such by-laws was not very strong in the community. The focus on youth and tobacco-free sport and recreation activities within a key major sporting team in the community was considered a launching point for outdoor by-law development.

We [PHU] just did a, a large kind of campaign with them [team name] and part of my job was to kind of support that and really kind of take it to other kind of areas so we used the [team name] as kind of a, you know like a, a champion of the community and, and with the youth that I was working with at the time [Youth Action Alliance: YAA] we really kind of took you know here look at these older guys and we kind of brought them to kind of the younger hockey teams to do some role modeling and, to help discussion and, really used it as a tool to further you know some work on public policy in terms of our smoke-free outdoor spaces bylaw. (PHU Key Informant)

Players shared a wide range of reasons why the team adopted a TFSR policy that included the hockey organization's interests in maintaining healthy players and being solid role models for children and youth in the community:

[TFSR policy] keeps our team clean and able to focus on hockey. (Player)

P1: Also for that like it doesn't lead on to other things and then like the team does it outside of the rink and then people start finding out and then the team gets a bad rep.

P2: I feel like they put it in place cause they want to like eliminate it like entirely so if the policy is there and then if they want to like get rid of it entirely.

P3: Like he was saying it also it's a representation on not just yourself but the organization as well and the community. If you're going to away games and you know like you're outside at an away game and you know everybody's smoking a cigarette after or before the game it, it reflects poorly on the coaching staff and like the [Team name] in general and I know a lot of teams they want to keep their organizations as one of the highest organizations possible in the league so in any league that you're in.

I think another big thing is just the health factor like you, you don't want guys getting sick. (Player)

Awareness of TFSR Policy – Junior B Spectators

When asked “Are you aware that this team has put in place a tobacco-free sports and recreation policy?” over half (n=27, 54%) of the survey respondents indicated that they were aware. Seven were informed during games they had attended one month prior and/or when it was “Tobacco-free night” and 6 had heard about the policy from a local public health unit representative. The remainder had been informed by relatives or a player (n=4), through volunteering or working at the arena (n=4), by word of mouth (n=2), signs (n=2), or by a meeting (n=2). The 22 respondents who were unaware of the TFSR policy were mainly spectators (n=13) or friends (n=6).

TFSR awareness levels were high among focus group participants:

P1: Every time you walk in and out of the locker room there's a sign posted right on the bulletin board that says like tobacco free sports policy so you kind of know like-

P2: Yeah we all are aware.

P1: -not using tobacco here.

P2: it's pretty straightforward.

Participants stated that Player Handbooks received at the start of the season contain team policies and TFSR policy guidelines are included in this list. Parental awareness is raised for those players who require a parent/guardian signature to confirm that players have read and agree to the code of conduct and team policies (under age 18). Hockey team administrators also shared that there have been high awareness levels and ongoing support for TFSR policy on the team since its 2008 adoption:

Yeah you know that's been a message right from the very get go--around our team, yep. (Hockey Administrator)

Similar to Case Study I, a few respondents spoke more broadly about TFSR policy and messaging. One player spoke about both aspects of TFSR:

Well it's like all over really so it's really hard to avoid so like it's always out there, there's always meetings about it, there's like advertisement for it, there's memos, there's everything so it's like right at you the whole time like right when you walk in the rink. (Player)

Attitudinal Findings/Support/Beliefs for TFSR Policy

In total, 36 survey respondents (72%) were in support of the team's TFSR policy. The remaining 28% who had indicated they were not aware of the policy in the prior question responded 'not applicable'. Generally, the respondents agreed that players, team staff, and spectators have the right to be in a tobacco-free environment. There was general agreement that smoking is not an important social activity and that they had the responsibility to be a positive role model and discourage tobacco use at hockey events (Table 7).

Table 7: Case Study III: Junior B Team—Attitudes and Beliefs (n=50)

Agree or disagree with the following statements about TFSR policies:	Agree/ Strongly Agree n (%)	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree n (%)	Neither n (%)	Don't Know n (%)
Players have a right to play in a tobacco-free environment	48 (96)	0	2 (4)	0
Smoking and other tobacco use is an important social activity	3 (6)	46 (92)	1 (2)	0
It is okay to use smoke cigarettes at indoor sports events outside of arenas	5 (10)	40 (80)	5 (10)	0
It is my responsibility to be a role model and to discourage tobacco use at team events	39 (78)	6 (12)	5 (10)	0
It is important to protect players and others from secondhand smoke at sports and recreation events	50 (100)	0	0	0
Team staff and spectators have the right to be in a tobacco-free environment	50 (100)	0	0	0
It is okay to use chew (spit) tobacco at sports and recreation events because it does not harm others	3 (6)	42 (84)	5 (10)	0
A tobacco-free policy goes against the rights of tobacco users	5 (10)	38 (76)	7 (14)	0

Tobacco Product Usage

In total, six Junior B survey respondents reported personal tobacco use. All tobacco users were male. Three who identified themselves as spectators, smoked cigarettes on a daily basis; two were aged 40-49 years and the third was aged 16-19 years old. One parent (40-49 years) also

reported smoking cigarettes on a daily basis. Finally, two players (aged 16-19 years old) reported tobacco use, one smoked cigarettes daily and the second used “other product” less than daily.

The spectator survey respondents were also asked to report how often, where and whom they had noticed using tobacco and tobacco products in their hockey setting in the past year. Multiple responses were possible.

Table 8: Case Study III: Junior B Team—Observed Tobacco Use (n=50)

Noticed use of tobacco products in the following groups:	All the Time n (%)	Sometimes n (%)	Rarely n (%)	Never n (%)	Don't Know/ n (%)	Not Sure n (%)
Coaches or other team staff	0	9 (18)	2	39 (78)	0	0
Team administrators	0	3	5	42 (84)	0	0
Team players	3	10 (20)	3	34 (68)	0	0
Parents or other spectators	15 (30)	18 (36)	5	12	0	0

Parents and other spectators were more frequently noticed using tobacco in the last year, followed by players. For all observations, the most common product was cigarettes (113 counts) and the most common location was outside / near the arena doors (83 counts) or in the parking lot (38 counts). Some players were observed using chew tobacco (11 counts) and cigarillos (1 count) and some of these observed players were using tobacco inside the arena (7 counts). Similarly, there were coaches or team staff (3 counts), and team administrators (3 counts) noticed using tobacco inside the arena. Coaches and team staff and administrators were noticed smoking cigarettes and using chew.

Similar to the Peewee/Bantam case study (Case Study I), the Junior B players discussed general tobacco use patterns among people their age and many felt that there are high levels of tobacco use especially near the high school:

You'll drive by sometimes and you'll see like forty to fifty kids like, like standing there smoking cigarettes...and I don't know, I think it's wrong personally. (Player)

During the focus group, a number of hockey-specific, tobacco-use discussions were held. Players noted that they don't choose to smoke cigarettes as smoking would negatively impact their cardiovascular ability as it lowered their lung capacity. Of note, a few of the players perceived chew tobacco as a less harmful choice of tobacco:

P1: For stamina wise it's [chew] less harmful for your body-

P2: Yeah.

P1: whereas in cigarettes it's easier to lose your stamina and you're allowed to breathe easier with chewing tobacco so.

P3: Yeah and like people don't really think twice about throwing in a chew. It's just like they do it ...whereas smoking a cigarette they'll you know kind of just say, 'oh I shouldn't be doing this'.

P4: having to chew is like easier if you really need that nicotine fix really.

Players reported that the most favoured tobacco products in the league are chew and cigars. Chew was cited as most frequently used by players although it was not clear during the focus group if participants used the product. Comments provided important insights into Junior-level player choices and reasons for these. Another player suggested that Junior-level players choose chew tobacco because it is discrete:

It's easier to hide-especially if people don't know what, you could think it's gum in your mouth or something like that so it's a little bit easier. (Player)

Two players described their previous experiences with tobacco use problems among players with Junior-level teams, and the team administration:

Last year was I guess it's kind of like a sanitary too cause like when I played Junior C they had like spit, little spittoons everywhere around the room, little spitters and even our trainer he got in trouble once cause he was smoking in the trainers' room--and all the jerseys smelled like smoke so it was kind of disgusting. (Player)

Players talked about cigar use but primarily in reference to celebratory events and mostly in reference to elite players' (e.g., NHL) use. Two players did mention their personal use:

P1: Like I've personally and I've smoked a cigar and I don't even inhale it.

P2: Yeah you don't. You're not supposed to. Yeah and cause I don't know if that makes any difference or not. What kind of cigars are we talking here? The big fatties or like the stogies?

One PHU key informant noted that at the Junior B level chew tobacco use patterns change as players move from team to team and individuals may not be fully aware of any TFSR policies that are in place:

People [players] can be bought and sold at any time so at any minute you could have three players, they just had three players come up in the last maybe month and a half from a smaller town who didn't have a policy and if they chew regularly then that immediately changes from month to month to year to year. (PHU Key Informant)

This PHU informant also shared anecdotal evidence heard from other Junior-level players (not participants in this evaluation study) that American hockey players have negatively impacted chew tobacco use in Ontario hockey leagues:

[American players] bring tins of like nine to ten cans and sell them to the other players for twenty bucks and that's what they do on buses...so the, the kind of the hockey culture in certain pockets seems to you know to really be endorsing chewing tobacco right now as kind of a social norm. (PHU Key Informant)

Perceived Effectiveness of TFSR Policy

The spectator survey respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believed the TFSR policy had been effective in five broad areas (Table 9).

Table 9: Case Study III: Junior B Team—Perceived Effectiveness (n=50)

How effective do you think tobacco-free sports and recreation policies are at:	Very Effective n (%)	Somewhat/ A Little Effective n (%)	Not at All Effective	Don't Know n (%)
Preventing youth from starting to use tobacco products	10 (20)	38 (76)	2 (4)	0
Preventing exposure to secondhand smoke	28 (56)	18 (36)	4 (8)	0
Preventing exposure to tobacco use-related litter	14 (28)	30 (60)	6 (12)	0
Positive role modeling for youth	26 (52)	22 (44)	2 (4)	0
Encouraging tobacco users to quit	16 (32)	28 (56)	6 (12)	0

The TFSR policy was rated relatively more effective at preventing exposure to second hand smoke and providing a positive role model for youth than encouraging users to quit, preventing litter or preventing youth from starting. This pattern was consistent with the other case studies in this evaluation.

Focus group participants also reported that the TFSR policy may have prevented youth from starting to use tobacco products. For example, one player felt that with a TFSR policy in place

with the team, there was reduced pressure to use tobacco both within and outside the hockey environment:

Personally I think that some players might feel like peer pressure outside of the rink to try it but with like a rule in place saying like you're not supposed to it makes it easy just to not do it like just get off the ice and don't do it. It's pretty simple.

(Player)

One team administrator reported that there has been a substantial drop in chew tobacco use at this case study site:

You know, us taking the policy a little bit further and, with a new coaching staff and management staff that have been very you know they're on top of everything--you know I haven't seen any this year at all. (Coach)

Few respondents addressed the impact of TFSR policy on SHS exposure levels. A PHU informant felt that exposure outside arenas is improving but it is also part of the general expectation that sporting spaces should be healthy spaces.

Building (arena) design is a limiting factor in assessing TFSR policy impacts on tobacco-related litter. One PHU key informant described an older building design that could not easily accommodate policy driven changes as there was limited space to position cigarette receptacles. As a result, many smokers remained by the arena doors, and according to a number of key informants and focus group participants, SHS had not dropped significantly since the inception of the TFSR policy in 2008.

For many players the TFSR policy and associated messaging have been effective in providing positive role modeling for youth:

Obviously there's a lot of younger fans and especially in a town like ours where like all the kids you know like trying to look up to the guys that are on the team so like if they see one of the guys smoking a cigarette or something you know obviously they're going to think oh that's cool or whatever but I think it's good that no one does it and it just sets a role, like it shows the kids like you can't, you can't succeed here if you're doing that stuff like you got to be dedicated. (Player)

One hockey team administrator noted that since the 2008 TFSR policy inception, there has been little to no tobacco use at senior administrative levels, therefore providing non-smoking role models to youth or the team players.

There was some evidence that the TFSR policy has had some effect on smokers who wanted to quit or to reconsider their tobacco use behaviours. One player described how a teammate had placed a chew in his mouth in the change room and many of the players were:

A bit rattled and it's just something you don't need so when you have a group of guys that are in there that are all, 'like alright we're not doing this', I think it works really well just to have like a full team that agrees like on it. (Player)

In another case, a coach was reported to have quit or reduced his cigarette smoking:

He's really cut back knowing that like if, if we're not allowed to do it and like not, it's frowned upon for us to do it and that it's the same for him too like it's not like he's above, above our team laws. (Player)

Finally, as many as twenty five smoking cessation quit kits were picked up by hockey spectators at PHU led TFSR events held during hockey games. A PHU key informant felt that awareness and knowledge of quit strategies may have increased as a result of both the PHU TFSR messaging at the game and the availability of the smoking cessation kits.

Challenges in Implementing TFSR Policy

Respondents identified key challenges in implementing TFSR policy for this team. A PHU informant felt that the transient nature of Junior-level hockey has meant that new coaching staff and players may not be fully aware of the TFSR policy. This individual also mentioned that as long as Junior-level and higher tiered hockey teams focus on winning at all costs, the tobacco use problems may linger:

I think they're more concerned about winning and if it was the best player on the team I don't think especially if the coaching staff are chewing then I don't see them doing that [enforcing policy] and I think and anecdotally I've heard a lot of stories from coaches locally and in other places where...they've actually been endorsing their players to chew to give them some sort of competitive advantage. (PHU Key Informant)

However, a current coach contradicted this opinion and reported that there were no TFSR policy implementation challenges because there were little to no tobacco users in the hockey organization.

Facilitators in Implementing TFSR Policy

In terms of what the spectator's believed was working well, the survey results showed the TFSR policy was reported to raise awareness about being tobacco-free (n=5) and that the policy facilitated discussion of TFSR generally (n=2). In addition, respondents reported that the policy worked well to "prevent young players from starting" (n=3) and improve protection, so that "people with allergies can attend events" (n=3). The spectators also believed the policy worked well in terms of managing smoking behaviour (e.g., "out of the building"). Respondents also reported that the policy was successful in terms of comprehensiveness, and because it provided consistent messaging, facilitated positive role modelling and was visible at TFSR events.

Shifting Social Norms

During the focus group discussions, players perceived that changing the social norm was a major facilitator in all TFSR efforts, (especially for SHS exposure):

P1: I think actually like throughout...I don't want to say worldwide but at least like Canadian efforts that I know of a lot of people have like taken a closer look at smoking and have become more like conscious and aware of their own smoking habits and it was, like I know recently, the past couple of years there's been a big emphasis on like the effects of second hand smoke on young children and just the lifespan of say like parents smoking around their children and those children grow up to, to develop diseases and stuff and I think it's pretty much sunk into peoples' brains nowadays that it's, it's, second hand smoke is just not one of those things that you do.

P2: It, it doesn't benefit you at all.

PHU and Youth TFSR Events at Junior Hockey Games

Several respondents spoke highly of recurring PHU-led TFSR events that included youth staff in promotional and educational activities. In one case, the PHU youth staff used pink chalk to draw the nine metre distance outside arena entrances ('good visual'), in an effort to restrict smokers' proximity to the doors and to also raise awareness of SHS issues. One coach supported these

PHU efforts and felt that youth engagement in these events meant that younger spectators would be exposed to key tobacco prevention messages. As noted previously a PHU staff also used these hockey events to promote cessation efforts:

For me I, I brought my, you know want to quit display and kind of the, the Called Action to Quitting and I, and I left I think I had twenty-five quit kits and just you know please, please take one for you or someone in your life. (PHU Key Informant)

PHU TFSR activities that were showcased at other sporting venues/events in the community prompted the Junior hockey team to revisit its own TFSR policy and focus again on policy implementation and enforcement.

Additional TFSR Policy Facilitators

The Junior hockey case study team suggested that the TFSR policy was upheld in large part because of the team's Player Handbook/Code of Conduct and the coaches' efforts to increase compliance and keep tobacco products away from the team:

P1: The coaches have been rather uptight with it. I mean they've caught some kids and punished them accordingly so they keep an eye on it too so, which kind of controls the actions.

I: And what's punishing accordingly?

P1: M'hmm.

P2: One kid had to miss a game and that was it so they'll make you sit out so.

P3: It's a pretty severe punishment I think.

Suggestions to Promote TFSR Policy

Consistent with the Women's team case study, the majority of survey respondents suggested that more advertising or signage would increase awareness and support for TFSR (n=14). Signage could include: on the ice placements, posters and flyers, billboards, and banners. Other suggestions were to ensure that the focus of TFSR policies included "younger kids" (n=3). Finally survey respondents suggested that designated smoking areas be clearly outlined and/or placed further than nine metres from the arena doors (n=3).

PHU, hockey player and hockey administrator respondents offered further suggestions to promote TFSR policy:

- Mandate tobacco educational interventions to ensure that TFSR policy awareness and support continues. For example, players felt that tobacco issues should be offered in a seminar-type setting for two sets of players:

I feel that there could be like a little bit more seminars and like talk about it because like you get the odd talk here and there about all the drugs and like tobacco and all that. I just think it needs to be mentioned a little bit more like throughout the team. (Player)

I think there could be more of like these seminars and stuff with like higher levels of sports like I don't know if it's like professional but like say the OHL in hockey...I know a lot of little kids see like the OHL or hear about the OHL or the NHL or anything like that smoking or like their parties or whatever but I think they could have a little more effort towards those people. (Player)

- Incorporate a tougher approach to tobacco use at the Junior-league and higher levels. According to one PHU informant, broader support for TFSR policy should stem from hockey league administration:

If it was, if the OHL and, and all the leagues had a tobacco-free policy and you know it was tested like it was tested [Laugh] like say steroids or something then there would be no tobacco use at all...you know it's easy to get a ten year old not to start chewing tobacco. It's the nineteen year olds that I'm more concerned about. (PHU Key Informant)

- Adapt tobacco-specific coaching resources from other provinces. One PHU informant suggested that Ontario Junior-level hockey teams in particular could learn from these more progressive resources:

A Public Health group in Alberta that has a really good coaches' manual that really helps to illustrate what you should be doing with your teams and your players and related to tobacco use. (PHU Key Informant)

CASE STUDY IV: MEN'S UNIVERSITY HOCKEY TEAM

Characteristics

Case Study IV is a mid-sized community that implemented its TFSR policy in 2005. There are approximately thirty players and five coaching staff. Visiting players are also reached as part of the TFSR marketing. This hockey team has an estimated wide policy reach due to an average of 3000 or more spectators at its home games.

The arena is covered by a municipal by-law that bans smoking within 10 metres of the entrance to a recreational facility.

Data Collection Activities

Only partial data was collected from this case study site. Both the PHU and OTRU faced timing challenges and delays in receiving key hockey administrative approval to arrange focus groups. Spectator surveys were undertaken but no focus groups with players or interviews with hockey administrators or PHU key informants were held.

Spectator Survey

One PHU staff person collected spectator surveys (n=24) at a December 2011 home game. A PHU-sponsored event that addressed flavoured tobacco products was held in November 2011 at one university hockey game.

Three quarters (75%) of the survey respondents were male and all respondents lived in the community. This group of spectators ranged in age from 30-39 yrs to 50-64 years with the most common age group being 50-64 years (n=9, 38%). Over half of the respondents (n=13, 54%) had completed university or college and the remainder (n=11, 46%) had completed high school. Most (n=22, 92%) reported their role as spectator, with no relation to a player. Hockey events (games/practices) were most often attended on a monthly basis (n=13, 54%), 5 spectators attended on a weekly basis and 6 attended every other month.

Findings

Awareness of TFSR Policy–Spectators

When asked “Are you aware that this team has put in place a tobacco-free sports and recreation policy?” 9 of the 24 (37.5%) survey respondents indicated that they were aware of the policy. Of the 9 who were aware, six heard about the policy during games where there had been announcements about a smoke-free policy and / or displays and promotions by the health unit sponsor. The remainder had been informed by friends or directly by a local public health staff member.

Attitudinal Findings/Support/Beliefs for TFSR Policy

Most of the University team survey respondents (n=23, 96%) were in support of their team’s tobacco-free sports and recreation policy; only 1 responded “don’t know” (Table 10). In terms of attitudes and beliefs, the survey respondents in Case Study IV were similar to the other case studies. They indicated that players, team staff and spectators have the right to a tobacco-free environment (Table 10). They also thought it important to protect players and others from SHS. There was some uncertainty around the responsibility to be a positive role model and discourage tobacco use (29% neither agree or disagree or don’t know).

Table 10: Case Study IV: University Team–Attitudes and Beliefs (n=24)

Agree or disagree with the following statements about TFSR policies:	Agree/ Strongly Agree n (%)	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree n (%)	Neither n (%)	Don’t Know n (%)
Players have a right to play in a tobacco-free environment	24 (100)	0	0	0
Smoking and other tobacco use is an important social activity	1 (4)	19 (79)	4 (16.6)	0
It is okay to use smoke cigarettes at indoor sports events outside of arenas	3 (12.5)	14 (58)	7 (29)	0
It is my responsibility to be a role model and to discourage tobacco use at team events	13 (54)	4 (16.6)	7 (29)	0
It is important to protect players and others from secondhand smoke at sports and recreation events	24 (100)	0	0	0
Team staff and spectators have the right to be in a tobacco-free environment	23 (96)	0	1 (4)	0
It is okay to use chew (spit) tobacco at sports and recreation events because it does not harm others	0	18 (75)	6 (25)	0
A tobacco-free policy goes against the rights of tobacco users	1 (4)	19 (79)	4 (17)	0

Three respondents (12.5%) believed it was okay to smoke outside arenas. The one individual who believed smoking and tobacco use is an important social activity (male spectator, 30-39 years), smokes cigarettes on a daily basis. One individual who agreed that a tobacco-free policy goes against the rights of tobacco users (male spectator, 40-49 years) was not a tobacco user.

Tobacco Product Usage

Four respondents identified themselves as tobacco users: 3 were cigarette smokers. Of the 3 cigarette smokers, two said they smoked daily (one male spectator and one female spectator, both aged 30-39 years) and one smoked less than daily (male spectator, 40-49 years). One respondent reported that he used other tobacco products (male spectator, 50-64 years).

The university team spectators were also asked to report how often, where and whom they had noticed using tobacco and tobacco products in their hockey setting in the past year. Multiple responses were possible.

Table 11: Case Study IV: University Team–Observed Tobacco Use (n=24)

Noticed use of tobacco products in the following groups:	All the Time n (%)	Sometimes n (%)	Rarely n (%)	Never n (%)	Don't Know n (%)	Not Sure n (%)
Coaches or other team staff	0	3	2	15	4	0
Team administrators	0	1	3	13	7	0
Team players	0	0	4	20	0	0
Parents or other spectators	15 (62.5)	9 (37.5)	0	0	0	0

Parents and other spectators were the most frequently noticed using tobacco products in the last year (Table 11). It is not possible to know how many individual smoking parents were seen. Four reported cigarette smokers responded to the survey for this case study. The most common product used was cigarettes and the most common location for all groups was outside / near the arena doors (37 counts) followed by the parking lot (8 counts) and in their car (4 counts).

Perceived Effectiveness of TFSR Policy

Respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of tobacco-free sports and recreation policies on five areas (Table 12).

Table 12: Case Study IV: University Team–Perceived Effectiveness (n=24)

How effective do you think tobacco-free sports and recreation policies are at:	Very Effective n (%)	Somewhat/A Little Effective n (%)	Not at All Effective n (%)	Don't Know n (%)
Preventing youth from starting to use tobacco products	7 (29)	15 (62.5)	0	2
Preventing exposure to secondhand smoke	9 (37.5)	12 (50)	3	2
Preventing exposure to tobacco use-related litter	4 (17)	18 (75)	0	2
Positive role modeling for youth	7 (29)	16 (67)	0	1
Encouraging tobacco users to quit	2 (8.3)	18 (75)	4	2

For Case Study IV, the TFSR policy was rated relatively more effective at preventing exposure to SHS, providing a positive role model and preventing youth from starting to use tobacco (37.5%, 29%, 29% “very effective”, respectively). The policy was rated as less effective at preventing exposure to litter and encouraging users to quit (Table 12).

When asked what they believed was working well about the TFSR policy, the survey respondents reported the following:

- Provides a positive role model (n=5, e.g., good role model for university players, help kids, parents and organizers believe they have responsibility to promote positive images and lead by example).
- Promotes awareness and healthy lifestyle choices (n=4, e.g., keep university athletes positive, help kids to know that smoking isn't healthy; encouraging non-smoking).
- Prevents youth from starting (n=3, e.g., keep kids from starting to smoke).
- Provides wider benefits (n=3, e.g., community support, encourage other teams to adopt similar rules, limiting smoking).

The following suggestions were made to increase awareness and support for tobacco free sports and recreation policies:

- Similar to the other three case studies, the survey respondents emphasized signage and advertising (n=22, e.g., advertising on posters, on tickets, ‘no smoking’ at entrances, internet ads, announce at games, ads in paper, game program, signs in arena. Having players take part in advertising was also mentioned (“Players in ads, NHLers would be good”).

- There were some suggestions to focus on the policy promotion in general (e.g., increase the promotion of TFSR generally, promote more at all games, more media, increased media attention, ad campaign).
- Schools were also suggested as a setting to increase awareness (e.g., go into schools, promotion in schools).
- Finally, one comment was to “tell people about policy”.

SUMMARY

Tobacco-free sports and recreation initiatives are relatively new (e.g., Play, Live, Be...Tobacco-Free movement). Undertaking these efforts is challenging in local hockey settings where resources are limited and communities rely on volunteers. This evaluation was designed to learn about the TFSR policies being implemented in Ontario. Levels of awareness, structures and processes that are associated with successful policy implementation and policy impacts were explored. Barriers were also identified.

Rationale for TFSR Policy

Each of the four case studies implemented their policy in similar ways, but the impetus for initiating the TFSR policy differed slightly and the time of implementation ranged from 2005 to 2010.

Case Study I (Bantam and Peewee teams) emphasized the importance of having the policy in place to provide role models for the younger players, to raise awareness and knowledge about healthy lifestyles and to establish a tobacco-free mindset before these players considered tobacco use.

Case Study II (Women's league) also highlighted the importance of healthy lifestyle choices, positive role modeling as well as prevention, particularly for their own children and the girls that they coach. In addition, several women mentioned that personal health challenges were also a driver of the relatively recent (2010) TFSR policy implementation in their league.

Case Study III (Junior B) also reported that TFSR policy adoption emerged out of health concerns (e.g., chew tobacco use) and the desire to provide a positive role model for youth, and for these players in turn to set high standards for non-tobacco use to community members.

Case Study IV (Men's University) has the longest-standing TFSR policy, in place since 2005, but there is no information available on the rationale for adopting the policy.

All four case studies embraced the hope that adoption of the TFSR policy for their team or league would stimulate change for other hockey teams and players. For example, in Case Study I, a PHU key informant shared that other hockey leagues and other sports teams in the community had become part of a drive to de-normalize the growing issue of chew tobacco use beyond Peewee and Bantam levels.

Awareness Levels

All four case studies demonstrated awareness of TFSR policy through the qualitative findings and the survey responses. Approximately half of the spectator survey respondents were aware of the TFSR policy; this included spectators who attended hockey games infrequently and lived outside the community. Because TFSR policy implementation is currently linked to single teams, the Peewee/Bantam interviewees believed that visiting spectators were less aware of TFSR than home spectators. The most common ways that the survey respondents heard about the policy was by attending an event or game where TFSR was promoted or via a PHU staff member.

Players especially talked about being aware of their TFSR policy through the signage and advertising around the arena. In fact it was common in Case Studies I through III, for individuals to talk about their policy in terms of TFSR events and messages (e.g., signage, PLBTF logos on jerseys). This was particularly evident among the younger Peewee/Bantam players who were not necessarily aware of their policy document but understood the negative consequences of tobacco use and the link between behaviour and the messaging and tobacco-free designated events.

The Junior B team was reminded about the TFSR policy via their Player Code of Conduct (or handbook), which also prompted revisiting the policy at the start of each year. There was also a perception that a broader societal awareness had increased over the past few years and that smoking in certain areas, particularly in sport and recreation settings, was becoming more unacceptable.

All four case studies recognized the importance of a TFSR policy. Regardless of their awareness level, the majority of the survey respondents (n=121, 87%) did support the team's tobacco-free sports and recreation policy.

Tobacco Use

Overall, very few individuals reported using tobacco and the majority of survey respondents (70%) did not recall noticing any tobacco use in the last year. There was an overall general perception that use had declined since TFSR policy implementation. Of note, Peewee/Bantam and Women's league players articulated the protective aspect of sport involvement: for the young players, hockey represents a healthy influence in their lives. Similarly, one women's league player reflected on her role as a mother and spoke about youth tobacco use but felt that

her children (ages 15-16) who play sports do not *“hang out with anyone who smokes like it’s just not what they do.”*

Survey results indicate that parents and other spectators were the most frequently observed smoking cigarettes. Use of other types of tobacco including cigars, cigarillos, and chew tobacco were reported infrequently, but coaches/team staff and the Junior B players were observed using chew tobacco. The women’s league described tobacco use by players and management as a discrete activity. Respondents at this site also believed that smokers were less likely to travel to tournaments because they could not hide their smoking and were not perceived as being fit to endure additional hockey games beyond the weekly games.

Most tobacco use occurred outside, near the arena doors or in the parking lot, although players were noticed using chew tobacco inside the arena.

The Junior B case study revealed a negative aspect of hockey culture and tobacco use. The interviews and focus groups clearly captured participants’ knowledge about the negative effects of smoking. There was however, a perception by some participants that chew was less harmful than smoking. There were also comments about the ease of using chew tobacco because it was less visible than smoking (“could be gum”). In addition, there were some comments indicating that tobacco could be useful for performance (“a fix”) and that the use of chew may be ignored if a player’s performance was successful (i.e., implying that winning the game was more important than addressing chew tobacco use).

Impacts of TFSR Policy

It is important to acknowledge TFSR policy achievements to date. Both the Peewee/Bantam and Women’s league case studies mentioned that individuals (parents and players respectively) had quit smoking as a result of their TFSR policy adoption. The spectator surveys showed that across all four case studies, the TFSR policy was perceived most effective in positive role modeling for youth (“very” or “somewhat effective”, 91%), and in preventing exposure to second-hand smoke (“very” or “somewhat effective”, 84%). In addition, respondents believed that the TFSR policy was effective in preventing youth from starting to use tobacco products (“very” or “somewhat effective”, 80%), preventing exposure to tobacco use-related litter (“very” or “somewhat effective”, 71%) and encouraging tobacco users to quit (“very” or “somewhat effective”, 65%; See Table III-6 in Appendices).

Further reports of TFSR policy implementation impacts included:

- Provision of positive role modelling for players (e.g., Peewee/Bantam) leading to increased awareness and knowledge in younger players.
- De-normalization of tobacco use and increased awareness of the TFSR policy generally, and about healthy lifestyle choices more broadly (reach included parents, spectators, families, and community members).
- Reduction in smoking among a few parents and potentially among Junior-level players (more likely decreased chew usage). Spectators accessed quit smoking kits at PHU hockey events.
- Reduced exposure to second-hand smoke as smokers have tended to move away from the arena doorways (through establishment of designated areas).

Challenges

Barriers to implementing a TFSR policy in a hockey setting included:

- Maintenance of the momentum from year to year: Interviews highlighted player and coach turnover leading to ebbs and flows in the momentum of the tobacco-free efforts. New coaches may not be as attentive or informed as those involved with initial policy implementation. Similarly, as many of the volunteers are the family members of players, there is also a turnover from year to year.
- Volunteer capacity and fatigue: The Women's league case study reported that some activities were dropped (e.g., website maintenance, production of written materials) because there were no volunteers available or no volunteers with the appropriate skill-set.
- Reliance on individual teams and individual champions (volunteers) to promote TFSR policy and tobacco-free promotion.
- Lack of consistent funding to maintain the local TFSR messaging and to achieve all elements (e.g., logos/promotional materials, signage/ advertising, swag for players). Funding was emphasized across the case studies.
- Little to no TFSR policy review in place to ensure that the policy items are revisited on an annual basis.

Facilitators

Strong tobacco control advocates within the hockey settings including enthusiastic and committed PHU staff and youth workers, hockey administrators, players, and parents served to facilitate TFSR policy implementation and ongoing promotion. In addition, PHU-led TFSR promotional activities served to remind all those engaged in the sport of hockey the importance of sustained tobacco control efforts.

The PHU acted as a conduit for information and as an enabler, providing resources, and leading tobacco-free events and thereby increasing the feasibility of TFSR policy implementation at the local level. This evaluation demonstrates that without committed PHU support, the implementation of the TFSR policy would not have achieved its many successes to date. In addition, all cases confirmed that involvement in this evaluation, through the local PHU contact person, has stimulated awareness and an important return and review of TFSR issues.

TFSR signage and advertising also served as a key strategy to sustain the TFSR policy and messaging across the four case studies. Innovative messaging also resonated among the case studies (e.g., tailoring messages to younger children in the Peewee/Bantam teams). TFSR events, signage, logos, the designated smoke-free areas (nine metres drawn with chalk) all stimulated TFSR messaging and kept consistent, key messages alive in each hockey setting.

Players further facilitated TFSR policy implementation when they shared the policy with family members. This in turn, reiterated the importance of parents as role models to youth. Although the actual TFSR policy may not have been central in the minds of Case Study I participants, the awareness of related messaging had continued throughout other PHU-led events and across other hockey and sport settings in the community.

Overall, across all case studies, it would appear that hockey and sport more broadly effectively serves as a protective force against engagement in tobacco product use. For all the players, cardiovascular levels and stamina were cited as key reasons to avoid cigarette smoking. For the Peewee and Bantam players, sport is viewed as a venue that is healthy and provides them with a physical outlet away from the dangers of tobacco and other harmful products and associated behaviours.

Accomplishments of the TFSR Evaluation

A central goal of collecting data from multiple PHUs and respondents of varied age, sex, and roles in the hockey community was to capture a range of views about TFSR policy. The findings further the understanding of TFSR policy implementation and provide evidence of progress towards the “Play, Live Be...Tobacco-Free” intermediate and long-term outcomes.

This evaluation offered all participating public health units and hockey teams an opportunity to revisit and stimulate TFSR policy and associated messaging. In addition, the evaluation provides varied, case by case insights into TFSR policy impacts across different age groups.

From a capacity-building standpoint the evaluation strengthened, and in some cases was an introduction to, the research process. Two of the Case Study sites engaged PHU youth in survey collection and focus group data collection activities. PHU staff also spoke of their involvement in data collection and fieldwork and reported that the evaluation had bolstered their focus group facilitation skills and increased their research capacity. Such experience was deemed useful for future research initiatives.

Key Lessons

The key lessons of the TFSR policy implementation experiences are:

- Hockey settings (organizations and venues) are perceived to be valuable and effective sites to promote TFSR messages across prevention, protection and cessation areas.
- Impacts of TFSR policy implementation include a reduction in exposure to second-hand smoke.
- People want change, including smokers. There is general agreement that a smoke-free sports and recreation environment is important and that a tobacco-free policy does not infringe upon the rights of tobacco users.
- Change can be achieved but continuous and sustained efforts are not easy. Champions at the local level are vital.
- One of the most salient findings of this evaluation was that TFSR messaging is very important (e.g., signage, logos). The messaging can help to sustain the momentum of the TFSR efforts even if the policy itself has received limited to no attention or review within the hockey team setting.
- A final lesson from the case studies is that implementation and long-term change will not be achieved without a multi-pronged approach (e.g., policy reminders, tobacco-free events, logos/promotional materials, signage/ advertising, swag for players).

THE WAY FORWARD

A single approach may not be possible in all settings given varied contextual factors such as management structure, arena or venue ownership, SFOA jurisdiction, volunteer availability and location (especially rural). Implementation needs the engagement of management/leaders, a broad reach (beyond single teams) and enough resources at the local level to support policy awareness (e.g., policy reminders, tobacco-free events, logos/promotional materials, signage/advertising, swag for players).⁶

The following recommendations are based on common themes across the case studies.

Revisit the Policy

A key focus moving forward is to ensure that hockey teams include a specific protocol for addressing team policies and codes of conduct on a regular (annual) basis. This annual review would include the TFSR policy, its content and enforcement.

In addition, a well-funded (reinforcement/ training) TFSR policy program is needed to maintain awareness among current coaches/staff and hockey organizations and to orient new coaches and staff to the policy and implementation. This will also shift reliance from PHU staff, including youth workers, who have been the primary advocates and communicators of these policies.

Emphasise Health and Lifestyle

Health and healthy lifestyle choices were a common impetus for adopting a TFSR policy. Therefore, strategies to work with local hockey arenas should focus on, or continue to emphasise, the health message first as it seems to be the most compelling reason for smoke-free sports and recreation policies (e.g., vehicles could include a social marketing campaign that integrates physical activity and tobacco-free policy promotion).

⁶ The Ontario Soccer Association (OSA) is an example of an organization-wide concerted effort to implement TFSR policies in the club system. The OSA used their 2010 PLBTF seed grant in part to ensure that tobacco-free team policies were developed as part of their Club Excellence Award criteria. (Accessed June 11th 2012 from <http://www.playlivebetobaccofree.ca/Sport/Success-Stories.aspx>). The number of soccer clubs that have adopted a TFSR policy has increased: fifteen soccer clubs in 2011 and another twenty-two clubs in 2012 (Personal communication, M.Greenwood, June 15th 2012).

Chew Tobacco

The findings show that the messages about the detrimental effects of chew tobacco are not penetrating all groups, especially the Junior B team players. There is also a sense that coaches may equate chew tobacco use with competitive edge. There is a need to address this area of tobacco use with all groups (players, parents, coaches, team staff and venue management).

Extend Designated Area/Bans

We recommend either extending the 9-metre rule from arena doors or introducing an outright tobacco ban in hockey settings.

Raise Awareness and Expand TFSR Policy Reach

We recommend that “Play, Live, Be...Tobacco-Free” continues to increase awareness of itself and TFSR policy among the sports and recreation community as well as the Canadian public. We recommend identifying mechanisms for increasing its presence. This could include continued efforts to increase the number of policies being developed and implemented with accompanying signage and advertisements in and around arenas. An increased PLBTF presence would better enable broad (e.g., organisation-wide, league-wide, arena-wide) TFSR policy implementation. Adequate funding and resources will be needed to assist sports and recreation organizations in advocating, developing and implementing policy.

REFERENCES

Bobbili, S. (2010). *Impact of tobacco-free policies within sports teams*. Toronto, ON: Program Training and Consultation Centre, LEARN Project.

Canadian Public Health Association (CPHA), December 2011. The Winnable Battle: Ending Tobacco Use in Canada. CPHA Position Paper. Accessed February 2012 at www.cpha.ca/uploads/positions/position-paper-tobacco_e.pdf

NVivo qualitative data analysis software; QSR International Pty Ltd. Version 9, 2010.

Pawson R. (2006). *Evidence-based policy: A realist perspective*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Pawson R. & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Pikora T, Wen Phang J, Karro J, Corti B, Clarkson J, Donovan RJ, Frizzell S, Wilkinson A. *Are smoke-free policies implemented and adhered to at sporting venues?* Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health (August 1999), 23 (4), pg. 407-409.

Play, Live, Be...Tobacco-free website. www.playlivebetobaccofree.ca

Priest, N., Armstrong, R., Doyle, J. & Waters, E. (2008). *Policy interventions implemented through sporting organizations for promoting healthy behaviour change (review)*. The Cochrane Collaboration, Wiley Publishers. Report provided by the TFSR CoP.

Program Training and Consultation Centre (Resource Centre of the Smoke-Free Ontario Strategy with links to Play, Live, Be...Tobacco-free). Accessed at www.ptcc-cfc.on.ca

Sahay T, Health Promotion Consulting Group Inc. *Play, Live, Be...Tobacco-free – Ontario Project Evaluation Report 2011*. Report provided by the TFSR CoP.

Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods, Fourth Edition*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd.

APPENDIX I: SAMPLE TFSR POLICY TEMPLATE FROM PLBTF



Tobacco-free Policy

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

The *[name of organization]* is committed to providing a healthy environment for participants, volunteers and spectators involved with our organization. We recognize that there is significant evidence demonstrating the negative health impacts of tobacco use and exposure (including second-hand smoke from the use of tobacco indoors and exposure to drifting smoke outdoors) and that no level of tobacco exposure is safe. We also recognize that children and youth gain positive images of tobacco use when they see role-models, leaders and individuals that they respect using tobacco.

COMMITMENT

We believe that *[name of sport]* is a *[healthy activity/sport]* that promotes physical activity and healthy living. Players, coaches and volunteers involved in our *[organization/sport]* have a responsibility to model positive health behaviour with regard to tobacco use.

POLICY

Activities including but not limited to games, tournaments, competitions, practices, training sessions, events (e.g., fundraising) and other performances sanctioned by our organization will be tobacco-free.

Definition: Tobacco-free means that the use of tobacco by players/participants, coaches/leaders, parents/caregivers, spectators and officials is prohibited during all activities sanctioned or engaged in by our organization.

Tobacco products include: cigarettes, cigars, pipes, cigarillos, tobacco chew, plug, or snuff, snus, hookah, bidis and kreteks.

SCOPE AND LOCATION

The *[name of organization]* tobacco-free policy will apply to all activities including, but not limited to games, tournaments, competitions, practices, training sessions, events (e.g., fundraising) and other performances sanctioned by our organization. Locations for each of these activities will vary, however our policy will apply to all locations while the *[name of organization]* sanctioned activity is ongoing.

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

We will promote the tobacco-free policy at all our activities by:

- Providing a copy of the policy and explaining it to coaching staff. Coaching staff will explain the policy to parents/caregivers.

- Reviewing and sharing the policy with others organizations/groups who may attend or participate in our activities.
- Including the policy in all orientation and information packages provided to coaches, officials, players, members, volunteers and teams/organizations attending or participating in our activities and/or using our facilities.
- Making the policy visible throughout the year using various channels/opportunities including information on our website, banners/signage at events and encouraging coaches and all players to promote a tobacco-free lifestyle.

POLICY ENFORCEMENT

We will enforce the tobacco-free policy to ensure that all those attending and participating in the *[name of organization]*'s activities has access to a tobacco-free environment.

We will use the following steps to enforce our policy:

1. Post signs about our policy where our activities take place, using signs, banners and include in information materials available at the activity.
2. Encourage our coaches, players/members, officials and volunteers to respectfully remind individuals using tobacco at *[name of organization]* activities about the tobacco-free policy.
3. Provide one verbal warning to individuals who repeatedly do not follow the policy. Verbal warning will be delivered by an official representative of the *[name of organization]* including member of the executive, (referee), team coach or manager. The *[name of organization]* representative will inform the *[name of organization]* executive about the verbal warning including the date, location and name of the individual who was warned.
4. The Executive will provide a formal written warning to the individual. Following a written warning, the individual violating the policy again may be brought to the *[name of organization]* for disciplinary actions which could include being banned from all *[name of organization]* events.

POLICY APPROVAL

This policy will be reviewed by the *[name of organization]* Executive Committee annually.

Policy Approved: *[DATE]*

Policy Revised: *[revision date, if applicable]*

APPENDIX II: SURVEYS

Study Title: An evaluation of the impact of Tobacco Free Sports and Recreation Policies in Ontario hockey leagues

Spectator/Parent Survey

Interviewer: Introduction/Consent

Hello. I am from the [insert name of public health unit]. We are conducting a study to assess the impact of tobacco-free sports and recreation policies. We are asking parents of hockey players and spectators at games to participate in a short survey about their views on tobacco-free sport and recreation policy. We do not need your name or any identifying information. All information gathered through the survey will be kept strictly confidential and will not be shared with any person or group that is not associated with this study. Your participation is voluntary and you may stop the survey at any time. If you do not want to answer a question, just let me know and we can skip that question. The survey should take only 5-10 minutes. The results will be used to better understand the impact of tobacco-free sport and recreation activities in both this team and the broader hockey community. To thank you for your participation, you will receive a \$5 Tim Horton's card.

Would you like to participate?

Yes: Continue to survey on next page

No: Thank individual and stop.

Spectator/Parent Survey

Date: _____ _____	Time: _____
City/town: _____ _____	Public Health Unit: _____
Name of team: _____	
Type of event: _____	

1. Are you:

- 6 A parent of a player
- 5 Another relative of a player
- 4 A friend of a player
- 3 A Volunteer
- 2 A Spectator
- 1 Other, please specify _____

2. Are you aware that this team has put in place a tobacco-free sports and recreation policy?

[Interviewer: define if participant not aware of the policy: a policy whereby all players, coaches, administrators, visitors and volunteers are requested to refrain from the use of tobacco products and act as role models by discouraging the use of tobacco products during all team events (games, practices, team functions)]

- 1 Yes (go to question 2a)
- 0 No (go to question 3)

a. If yes, how did you hear about the policy?

3. Do you support this team's tobacco-free sports and recreation policy?

- 1 Yes
- 0 No
- 98 Don't know

4. Please let us know whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about tobacco-free sports and recreation policies. (Interviewer: please circle only one response per item)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/not sure
a. Players have a right to play in a tobacco-free environment	5	4	3	2	1	98
b. Smoking and other tobacco use is an important social activity	5	4	3	2	1	98
c. It is ok to use smoke cigarettes at indoor sports events outside	5	4	3	2	1	98

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/not sure
of arenas						
d. It is my responsibility to be a role model and to discourage tobacco use at team events	5	4	3	2	1	98
e. It is important to protect players and others from secondhand smoke at sports and recreation events	5	4	3	2	1	98
f. Team staff and spectators have the right to be in a tobacco-free environment	5	4	3	2	1	98
g. It is ok to use chew (spit) tobacco at sports and recreation events because it does not harm others	5	4	3	2	1	98
h. A tobacco-free policy goes against the rights of tobacco users	5	4	3	2	1	98

5. In the last year, how often have you noticed use of tobacco products by the following groups at team events (for example, games, practices, functions)?

	All the time	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't know/not sure
Coaches or other team staff	4	3	2	1	98
Team administrators (managers, executives)	4	3	2	1	98
Team players	4	3	2	1	98
Parents or other spectators	4	3	2	1	98

6. If you have seen any of these groups using tobacco products in the last year, where do they typically use these products? (Interviewer: skip if have not seen anyone using tobacco products)

	Outside near the arena doors	Inside the arena	In the parking lot	In their car	Other	Don't know
Coaches or other team staff	1	3	4	5	6	98
Team Administrators	1	3	4	5	6	98
Players	1	3	4	5	6	98
Parents	1	3	4	5	6	98
Other Spectators	1	3	4	5	6	98

7. What types of products are they typically using? (*Interviewer: skip if have not seen anyone using tobacco products*)

	Cigarettes	Cigars	Cigarillos	Chew
Coaches or other team staff	1	2	3	4
Team Administrators	1	2	3	4
Players	1	2	3	4
Parents	1	2	3	4
Other Spectators	1	2	3	4

8. How effective do you think tobacco-free sports and recreation policies are at:

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	A little effective	Not at all effective	Don't know
Preventing youth from starting to use tobacco products	4	3	2	1	98
Preventing exposure to secondhand smoke	4	3	2	1	98
Preventing exposure to tobacco use-related litter	4	3	2	1	98
Positive role modeling for youth	4	3	2	1	98
Encouraging tobacco users to quit	4	3	2	1	98

9. What do you think is working well about the tobacco free sports and recreation policy put in place by this team/organization? (*Interviewer: skip if were not aware of policy*)

10. What approaches would you suggest for increasing awareness and support for tobacco free sports and recreation policies?

The next few questions tell us a little bit more about you.

11. What is your age group?

- 1 16-19 2 20-29 3 30-39
 4 40-49 5 50-64 6 65+

12. Are you:

- 1 Male 2 Female 3 Other

13. What is the highest level of education you have reached?

- 1 Less than high school
 2 Completed high school
 3 Completed university/college

14. At the present time, how often do you smoke cigarettes?

- 0 not at all
- 1 less than daily
- 2 daily

15. Do you use any other tobacco products?

- 1 Yes
- 0 No

16. How often do you attend hockey league games/practices or functions?

- 5 weekly
- 4 monthly
- 3 every other month
- 2 yearly
- 1 less than once a year

17. Do you live in this community?

- 1 Yes
- 0 No

Thank you very much for completing this survey!

(Interviewer: Please ask participant to sign receipt of the \$5 gift card)

APPENDIX III: DATA FROM ALL SPECTATOR SURVEYS COMBINED

Table A3-1: Overview of Selected Characteristics (All Survey Respondents, n=139)

Surveys completed	Case Study	n	%
	• Peewee AAA and Bantam	50	35.97
	• Women's league	15	10.79
	• Junior B team	50	35.97
	• University team	24	17.27
	Total	139	
Characteristics of Survey Respondents	Category	n	%
Age group	16-19 years	18	12.95
	20-29	16	11.51
	30-39	29	20.86
	40-49	42	30.22
	50-64	26	18.71
	65+	8	5.76
Gender	Male	84	60.43
	Female	55	39.57
Education	High school or less	49	35.25
	More than high school	90	64.75
Current cigarette smoking status*	Non-smokers	128	94.12
	Smokers	8	5.88
Current use of other tobacco products**	Yes	5	3.65
	No	132	96.35
Role in hockey community	Parent of player	47	33.81
	Another relative of a player	16	11.51
	Friend of a player	11	7.91
	Volunteer	7	5.04
	Spectator	46	33.09
	Other	3	2.16
	Player	9	6.47
Frequency of attendance at hockey league games/practices or functions	Weekly	89	64.96
	Monthly	30	21.90
	Every other month	14	10.22
	Yearly	3	2.19
	Less than once a year	1	0.73

*n=136; **n=137

Table A3-2: Attitudes and Beliefs (All Survey Respondents, n=139)

Agree or disagree with the following statements about TFSR policies:	Agree/ Strongly Agree n (%)	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree n (%)	Neither n (%)
Players have a right to play in a tobacco-free environment	137 (98.56)	0	2 (1.44)
Smoking and other tobacco use is an important social activity	5 (3.6)	125 (89.93)	9 (6.47)
It is okay to use smoke cigarettes at indoor sports events (if) outside of arenas*	22 (16.06)	100 (72.99)	15 (10.95)
It is my responsibility to be a role model and to discourage tobacco use at team events	114 (82.01)	11 (7.91)	14 (10.07)
It is important to protect players and others from secondhand smoke at sports and recreation events	138 (99.28)	1 (0.72)	0
Team staff and spectators have the right to be in a tobacco-free environment	138 (99.28)	0	1 (0.72)
It is okay to use chew (spit) tobacco at sports and recreation events because it does not harm others	14 (10.07)	110 (79.14)	15 (10.79)
A tobacco-free policy goes against the rights of tobacco users	13 (9.35)	105 (75.54)	21 (15.11)

*n=137

Table A3-3: Tobacco Use Noticed at Hockey Events (All Respondents, n=139)

Noticed use of tobacco products in the following groups:	All the Time n (%)	Sometimes n (%)	Rarely n (%)	Never n (%)	Don't Know n (%)
Coaches or other team staff (n=139)	1	17	16	99	6
Team administrators (*n=135)	11	15	16	87	10
Team players (*n=135)	3	11	14	105	2
Parents or other spectators (n=139)	52	42	16	17	2

Table A3-4: Locations Tobacco Observed being used by Different Groups

Tobacco observed* being used by:	Outside near arena doors n (%)	Inside arena n (%)	In parking lot n (%)	In their car n (%)	Other/ n (%)	Total Observations
Coaches or other team staff (n=44)	32 (56)	3 (5)	11 (19)	3 (5)	8 (14)	57
Team administrators (n=50)	38 (59)	3 (4.6)	13 (20)	4 (6)	6 (9)	64
Team players (n=33)	11 (24)	7 (16)	9 (20)	6 (13)	12 (27)	45
Parents or other spectators (n=95)	83 (65)	2 (1.6)	30 (24)	9 (7)	3 (2)	127

*Multiple observations possible so total observations exceed number of survey respondents

Table A3-5: Types of Tobacco Products Observed being used by Different Groups at Hockey Events

Observed* being used by:	Cigarettes n (%)	Cigars n (%)	Cigarillos n (%)	Chew n (%)	Total Observations
Coaches or other team staff (n=39)	34 (79)	0	2 (4.6)	7 (16)	43
Team administrators (n=43)	42 (93)	0	1 (2)	2 (4)	45
Team players (n=28)	18 (49)	2 (5.4)	1 (3)	16 (43)	37
Parents or other spectators (n=92)	92 (95)	0	1 (1)	4 (4)	97

*Multiple observations possible so total observations exceed number of survey respondents

Table A3-6: Perceived Effectiveness of TFSR Policy (All Survey Respondents, n=139)

How effective do you think tobacco-free sports and recreation policies are at:	Very Effective n (%)	Somewhat n (%)	A Little Effective n (%)	Not at All Effective n (%)	Don't Know n (%)
Preventing youth from starting to use tobacco products	44 (31.65)	67 (49)	21 (15)	4 (2.88)	3
Preventing exposure to secondhand smoke	71 (51.08)	47 (33.8)	9 (6.5)	12 (8.63)	3
Preventing exposure to tobacco use-related litter	42 (30.22)	58 (41.7)	26 (18.7)	11 (7.9)	2
Positive role modeling for youth	77 (55.4)	50 (36)	8 (5.7)	3	1
Encouraging tobacco users to quit	38 (27.34)	52 (38.1)	28 (20.8)	19 (13.67)	4

APPENDIX IV: INTERVIEW GUIDES

Key Informant Interview Guide – Team administrators (coaches, other team staff, organization executives)

- 1) Please describe your current roles and responsibilities with the [insert name of hockey team/organization].
- 2) How were you involved in the implementation of the tobacco-free sports and recreation policy with the team/organization?
- 3) Please describe how the policy was developed and implemented by your team.
 - Why did your organization/team decide to develop and implement the policy?
 - How was the policy communicated to staff, players, parents?
 - What role did your local PHU have in TFSR policy development, implementation and/or communication?
- 4) Overall, what is your perception of how well the tobacco-free policy is working to achieve its objectives (prevent youth tobacco use, reduce exposure to secondhand smoke and other environmental exposure, positive role modeling, promote cessation)?
 - What level of awareness of the policy do you think exists with:
 - players
 - hockey team administrators
 - parents
 - spectators at team games/events
 - What degree of tobacco product usage do you think exists with:
 - hockey players (e.g., cigarettes, chew)
 - hockey team administrators
 - parents
 - spectators at team games/events

- 5) What if any changes have you noticed since the policy was implemented?
- Changes in awareness of the policy?
 - Changes in tobacco product use (use and cessation) by administrators, players, parents or other spectators?
 - Changes in exposure to secondhand smoke?
 - Changes in amount of tobacco- related litter?
 - Other changes?
- 6) What do you feel is working well in implementing the policy or has facilitated impact of the policy with your team?
- Educational materials/training?
 - Protocols and resources?
 - Signage – where is the signage posted?
 - Other facilitators/enablers?
 - Can you share any positive examples of impact of the smoke-free policy with your team/organization?
- 7) What tobacco-free policy compliance issues, if any, do you deal with in your team?
- Probes:
- What happened? how was it received? did the enforcement work (i.e., intended consequences)?
 - How do you respond to compliance issues? (i.e., what action has been taken with violations, e.g., warnings, expulsions?)
 - What, if any guidelines does your team use to assist staff in dealing with compliance issues? How were these developed?
 - Which staff are involved in enforcing and dealing with compliance issues?
 - Are you personally comfortable enforcing the policy?
 - Have there been any unintended consequences of enforcing the policy (e.g., have players left the team, complaints by parents)

- 8) Overall, what do you think are the barriers, if any, to full compliance to the policy with your team?
- 9) What is your current relationship with your local PHU with respect to TFSR policy implementation and communication?
- 10) How effective do you think tobacco free sports and recreation policies are at preventing tobacco use uptake by youth and reducing secondhand smoke exposure and other environmental exposures like litter, promoting positive role modeling and cessation?
- 11) Do you have any other thoughts that you would like to share about your experience with tobacco-free sports and recreation policies?

Key Informant Interview Guide – Public Health Unit Staff

- 1) Please describe your current roles and responsibilities with the [insert name of PHU].
- 2) How were you involved in the development/implementation and/or communication of the TFSR policy with the hockey team(s)/organization?
- 3) Please describe the TFSR policy development process.
 - Why did the hockey team (s)/organizations decide to implement the policy?
 - How was the policy communicated to staff, players, parents? What role, if any did your PHU play in this part of the policy process? Please explain.
- 4) Overall, what is your perception of how well the TFSR policy is working to achieve its objectives (prevent youth tobacco use, reduce exposure to secondhand smoke and other environmental exposure, positive role modeling, promote cessation)?
 - What level of awareness of the policy do you think exists with:
 - players
 - hockey team administrators
 - parents
 - spectators at team games/events

- What degree of tobacco product usage do you think exists with:
 - hockey players (e.g., cigarettes, chew)
 - hockey team administrators
 - parents
 - spectators at team games/events

- 5) What if any changes have you noticed since the policy was implemented?
 - Changes in awareness of the policy?
 - Changes in tobacco product use (use and cessation) by administrators, players, parents or other spectators?
 - Changes in exposure to secondhand smoke?
 - Changes in amount of tobacco- related litter?
 - Other changes?

- 6) What do you feel is working well in implementing the policy or has facilitated impact of the policy with the hockey team(s)?
 - Educational materials/training?
 - Protocols and resources?
 - Signage – where is the signage posted?
 - Other facilitators?
 - Can you share any positive examples of impact of the TFSR policy with the team/organization?

- 7) What is your current relationship with the hockey team (s) with respect to ongoing implementation and/or communication of the TFSR policy?

- 8) What TFSR policy compliance issues, if any, have you dealt with at the PHU level?
Probes:
 - What happened? How was it received? Did the enforcement work (i.e., intended consequences)?
 - Are you aware of any unintended consequences of enforcing the policy (e.g., have players left the team, complaints by parents)?
 - Are you personally comfortable enforcing the team policy?

- 9) Overall, what do you think are the barriers, if any, to full compliance to the policy with the hockey team (s)?
- 10) How effective do you think TFSR policies are at preventing tobacco use uptake by youth and reducing secondhand smoke exposure and other environmental exposures like litter, promoting positive role modeling and cessation?
- 11) Do you have any other thoughts that you would like to share about your experience with TFSR policies?

TFSR Focus Group Interview Guide – Hockey Players

Facilitator Introduction. [Facilitator ensures that all consent forms have been signed and collected]

Facilitator: As part of this study, we are really interested in finding out more about what youth on hockey teams think about tobacco-free sports and recreation policies and how they are working to achieve their goals. We would like this discussion to be a relaxed conversation, and for everyone to remember that there are no right or wrong answers – we would just like you to share your thoughts and opinions. During the discussion today it will be really important to give everyone a chance to talk and not to interrupt each other. It will also be important to keep what everyone discusses here today to ourselves, to protect everyone’s privacy. I’m interested in anything that comes to your mind and I’m here to learn from you and ask follow-up questions when need be.

If everyone is ok with that, let’s start the discussion...

- 1) Introductions (go around table and ask everyone to say their first name and how they are involved on the team, e.g., position; length of time playing hockey)
- 2) What do you enjoy about being a part of the [name of hockey team] (travel opportunities, friendships, fitness etc.)? [facilitator may also briefly share their own hockey or other sport experiences]
- 3) We’d like to write down a list of tobacco products that you think youth your age use. [notetaker or facilitator records responses on flip chart paper: for youth players only].
- 4) Do you feel that playing in sport (hockey in particular) means players your age are more likely to use tobacco products like these? Less likely? Why do you think this is so?
- 5) Are you aware of the tobacco free sports and recreation policy that your team has put into place? (explain policy if not aware)
 - What do you think the goals of the policy are? Why do you think the team put this policy into place?
 - Where can you find information about the policy?

- 6) Do you think this policy is a good idea? Why or why not?
- 7) In general, how aware of the policy do you think players, team staff and parents are?
- 8) How well do you think the policy is working to achieve its goals (probes: to prevent youth from smoking, promote positive role modeling, reduce exposure to secondhand smoke, promote cessation – which means helping smokers to quit)?
 - Do you think the policy has made any changes to the way players see tobacco use? If yes, in what ways? If not, why not?
 - Has the policy changed behaviour for players, team staff or parents? For example, have players, team staff or parents stopped smoking completely or at least at team games/practices/events?
 - Do you still see coaches, referees, parents or spectators smoking at team games/events? If so in what places?
- 9) Have you had any experience with enforcing or promoting the policy, like letting teammates, parents or anyone else know about the policy or asking anyone not to use tobacco products at games or events?
 - If yes, please describe where that happened. What did you do to enforce the policy?
 - Are you comfortable enforcing the policy with these groups?
- 10) Have there been any negative consequences from enforcing the policy? (e.g., did a teammate leave the team? Were parents or coaches upset?)
- 11) How useful/helpful do you think tobacco-free sports and recreation policies are at preventing youth from using tobacco?
 - What about keeping secondhand smoke out of the air that youth breathe?
 - What about encouraging youth and other people like coaches and parents to quit using tobacco?
- 12) What other types of policies or tools do you think would help to prevent youth from using tobacco?