

I N T E R F A C E

EVALUATION OF THE PREVENTION PROGRAMME
«COOL AND CLEAN»:

SUBSTUDY 3: IMPACT ON INSTITUTIONS

ABSTRACT AND SUMMARY

Lucerne, 10 August 2007

Cornelia Furrer (Project management and development)
furrer@interface-politikstudien.ch

Manuela Oetterli (Project development)

Brigitte Schwab (Project development)

PD Dr. Ueli Haefeli (Quality management of scientific evaluation)
haefeli@interface-politikstudien.ch

**EVALUATION OF THE PREVENTION PROGRAMME «COOL AND CLEAN»:
SUBSTUDY 3: IMPACT ON INSTITUTIONS**

Authors: Cornelia Furrer, Manuela Oetterli, Brigitte Schwab, Ueli Haefeli

Institution: Interface Institut für Politikstudien, Luzern

Duration of contract: 20 October 2004 to 30 June 2007

ABSTRACT

The evaluation analyses the impacts of the programme «cool and clean» («c&c») at the level of institutions. The supporting organisations are the Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH), the Federal Office of Sport (FOP), and the Swiss Olympic Association. Firstly, the changes caused by the programme on sports associations and club administrations, organisers, owners, and operators of sports sites, as well as cantonal centres (sports offices, prevention centres) were examined. Secondly, the question as to how these institutional target groups rate the programme was answered. A partially-standardised questionnaire for organisations and club administrations, case studies, as well as group and individual interviews were conducted in order to answer the questions pertaining to the evaluation.

The results show that a high level of acceptance of the goals set by «cool and clean» is present in the subjects studied. The highest effect hitherto of the programme is ascertained at smoke-free sports sites. Due partly to «cool and clean», prevention has been integrated into the statutes or mission statements of clubs or – especially at the organisational level – persons in charge of prevention have been named. Changes in regard to smoking and alcohol consumption in the context of club activities and events however, cannot be traced back to the programme «cool and clean». Further, no effect could be drawn forth in reference to the interconnectedness of the areas of sport and prevention. The marginal effect seen so far is attributed to the short duration of the programme. Changes at the institutional level require a lot of time in order to achieve sustainability. The programme «cool and clean» has the potential to develop further and expand. Hence, it should be continued over a longer period of time. An improved political anchoring of the programme with corresponding measures should be strived for. The introduction of specific measures for clubs as well as higher expectations from the «c&c»-organisers concerning the sale of alcoholic drinks should be looked at in respect to the conceptual design of the programme.

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

In the summer of 2004 the Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH), the Federal Office of Sport (FOP), and the Swiss Olympic Association as the umbrella organisation of Swiss sport organisations, consolidated all their sport-related prevention projects into one programme: «cool and clean» («c&c») with emphasis on youth and sport, was launched. The overriding aim of «cool and clean» is to prevent the consumption of addictive drugs or at least to delay the initiation age. Particularly, the programme aims to *inform*, so that fair and clean sport becomes a matter of course, *commit* so that exemplary conduct of athletes works against addictive behaviour, *change the sports environment*, so that it acts as a deterrent to addictive behaviour, and *network*, so that the prevention of addictive behaviour and sports interact in a natural manner. The prevention programme «c&c» comprises of six subprogrammes. Four of them, which are at the centre of this evaluation, at least partly aim at institutional changes in the sports setting.

- «cool and clean»-*Youth sports* is aimed at young people and heads of sports clubs and associations as well as cantonal sports offices and prevention centres. For the cantonal sports offices the integration of «c&c» in cantonal sports camps and the Y+S (Youth and Sport) training courses is of primary importance. They are supported by prevention agencies. This in turn leads to networking between the areas of sport and prevention.
- «cool and clean»-*Events* centers on organisers and hosts of sports events. The events should be carried out in an environment free of smoke and should observe laws related to the protection of minors when alcoholic drinks are sold. Moreover, «cool and clean» should be offered a stage at these events.
- «cool and clean»-*Sports sites* looks to persons in charge of sports locations. This sub programme's goal is to ensure that sports sites and the events taking place in them are smoke free. The decision must be upheld in the regulations for the sites and the entire enclosure should be marked with «c&c»-material. This subprogramme just began in the spring of 2007.
- «cool and clean»-*Smoke-free sport* wants to induce the concerns of tobacco prevention to everyone that practises sport and was launched under «cool and clean» in 2003. It is primarily a competition for clubs. Up until now, clubs have also been able to create a smoke-free environment at their sports sites with the help of "Smoke-free sport".

The Swiss Olympic Association commissioned an external evaluative study of «cool and clean». The study was divided into four substudies and the Institut für Politikstudien Interface was assigned to perform one of these substudies. The goal of this substudy was to analyse the impact of «cool and clean» on institutions. The study was conducted between September 2006 and June 2007. The following questions and indicators were central to the investigation:

- How do sports associations, club administrations, organisers, operators of sports sites, as well as state offices gauge «cool and clean»? In their view, is the promotion of prevention a task to be undertaken within the setting of sport?
- How do associations and organisers as well as owners of sports sites¹ implement «cool and clean» and how do their activities differ from those of participants without any given responsibilities? What reasons do the institutions name against implementing «cool and clean»?
- What effects does «cool and clean» have on the work of cantonal prevention centres and sports offices? Have the prevention centres intensified their contact to the sport setting? Do the sports offices implement the «c&c»-Camp-Rules in sports camps? Is «c&c» a topic in Y+S training?
- Has «cool and clean» affected change in the sport setting in the viewpoint of association and club administrations? If so, what are those changes?
- In which manner do club administrations and owners, or accordingly, operators of sports sites, perceive and contribute to the subprogramme «cool and clean»-*Smoke-free sport*? What exactly have they done?
- Seen from the point of view of sports associations, club administrations, prevention centres and sports offices, what are the advantages and disadvantages of the tobacco prevention fund offering the financial means to run one concentrated programme?
- The number of tobacco free sports events has increased, that is, «cool and clean» is present at a minimum of twelve national events and helps to create a sporting environment free of tobacco consumption. An additional twelve regional or communal events are free of tobacco consumption as a result of «cool and clean».
- Three nationally relevant sports sites and 50 regional and communal sites are free of tobacco consumption due to «cool and clean».
- The number of joint interventions from the field of sport and that of prevention is on the rise. This means, the cantonal and communal specialist departments for the promotion of health and prevention are recording an increase in enquiries from the field of sport. Furthermore, these specialist departments are offering opportunities for further education to responsible persons of «cool and clean».

METHODOLOGY

The present sub-evaluation combined qualitative und quantitative methods. The following three approaches ensured that «cool and clean» was reflected upon and assessed from different perspectives:

- Firstly, a *partially-standardised telephone interview* was carried out with 20 association- and 50 club administrations. The questioning took place in the months of January und February 2007.

¹ Organisers and sports sites are primarily concerned with the prevention of tobacco consumption

- Secondly, four case *studies* were realised. Three of them applied to sports events. The fourth case study was conducted at a sports site which took part in the “Smoke-free sport” programme. The case studies were carried out between February and May 2007.
- Thirdly, *qualitative methods* were applied. This was mainly two guideline-based group discussions conducted in April 2007, one each with representatives of cantonal sports offices and prevention centres. These were complemented with five interviews which took place in May and June 2007 with members of the same group. In addition, two explorative talks were held at the beginning stages of the project (in November 2006) with subprogramme managers of «cool and clean».

RESULTS

In this section, the results central to the questions and indicators under investigation will be presented.

How do sports associations, club administrations, organisers, operators of sports sites, as well as state offices gauge «cool and clean»? In their view, is the promotion of prevention a task to be undertaken within the setting of sport?

The respondents rate the concept of the prevention programme «cool and clean» positively. «c&c»-organisers appraise the multifaceted support offered by the programme. The results of the partially-standardised questioning and the group discussions show that the approach, particularly by means of Commitments and the focusing on individual teams is welcomed. The most relevant aspect criticised is the inadequate inclusion of clubs in the programme. On the whole, prevention experts locate a fissure between the «c&c»-teams and their clubs. This, in their view, impedes on the developmental effect and anchoring of the programme. The breach can also be observed in the results of the partially-standardised questioning: Over 40 percent of the respondents from club administrations with participating teams were not aware of the fact that a team in their club was taking part in «cool and clean».

The representatives of cantonal sports offices and prevention centres as well as the association and club administrators affirm that prevention is a task to be undertaken within the setting of sport.

How do associations, organisers, and operators of sports sites implement «cool and clean»? How do their activities differ from those of participants without any given responsibilities? What reasons do the institutions name against implementing «cool and clean»?

All 20 *associations* with the largest youth sections take part in «cool and clean». Their activities can be divided into two groups. On the one hand they implement «cool and clean» at association events: 85 percent of the respondents from club administrations integrate the «c&c»-materials and almost 80 percent hold smoke-free events. Less than half abstain from the sale of alcoholic drinks. On the other hand the associations actively canvass for «cool and clean» in their member clubs.

The case studies show that «cool and clean» is offered a platform at *events*, particularly by means of the materials. Premises were kept free of tobacco consumption as far

as it was within the sphere of influence of the organisers. Nowhere, however, was smoking forbidden outdoors. The law for the protection of minors with regard to the sale of alcohol was adhered to as far as it was observable. A slightly lower level of tobacco and alcohol consumption could be observed at «c&c»-events in comparison to the events observed within the reference measurement. This could not be linked to «cool and clean» though it cannot be ruled out. Overall, from the viewpoint of the evaluation, the requirements for a «cool and clean»-event were maintained with the exception of outdoor areas where smoking was not forbidden. In our opinion, however, the programme hitherto has not been able to seed a decisive impulse for change where the abstention of smoking and sale and consumption of alcohol is concerned. All in all a significant entrainment effect could be observed.

Only one *operator of a sports site*, a football club, was involved in the evaluation. This operator implemented “Smoke-free sport” in his club because, from the point of view of the President, there was a massive exposure to smoke in the club location. Smoke-free placards and place cards were used and the ashtrays removed for the achievement of a smoke-free area. Furthermore, the concept of a smoke-free sport site has been integrated into the mission statement of the club. From the viewpoint of the evaluation, the effects of “cool and clean” are most impressive at this particular site: The abolition of exposure to smoke indoors is clearly a result of the «c&c»-sub-programme “Smoke-free sport”. It can be deduced that the studied sports site would not have been, or only with difficulty have become, smoke free without the implementation of “Smoke-free sport”.

Clubs cannot take part in «cool and clean» as integral institutions. However, 25 Presidents of clubs from which no youth team took part in «cool and clean» were questioned as to their reasons for abstention, using the partially-standardised survey. The responses were heterogeneous. The most frequent reply with five occurrences was the lack of sufficient information about the programme, and four occurrences pertaining to lack of interest by club members.

What effects does «cool and clean» have on the work of cantonal prevention centres and sports offices? Have the prevention centres intensified their contact to the sport setting? Do the sports offices implement «cool and clean»-Camp-Rules in sports camps? Is «cool and clean» a topic in Y+S training?

The cantonal sports offices and prevention centres play a key role in the «cool and clean» programme as multipliers and experts. It can be observed that the questioned sports offices implement «cool and clean»-Camp-Rules in sports camps. Many dialogue partners stressed that the rules, for the most part, were applied and had been enforced before the implementation of «cool and clean». «cool and clean» is presented and the information material is made available at Y+S-training courses. The prevention centres have worked out further education courses for “c&c”-trainers and the first activities will be run in the near future. Independent of «cool and clean», some prevention centres are noticing an increase in enquiries from the sport setting, particularly from club administrations. This investigation does not show an increase in the collaboration between prevention centres and cantonal sports offices as a result of «cool and clean». In summary, the empirical data, in our point of view, shows little impact of the

programme on the work of the cantonal offices. The programme is, to the most part, not a central constituent of the tasks performed by the institutions questioned. Where the sports offices are concerned, the need for action appears to be covered by measures taken in the past. As to the prevention centres, the little significance given to «cool and clean» is justified otherwise. On the one hand, the prevention experts cannot impose on the area of sport without prior necessity being recognised by the responsible parties for sport. On the other hand, prevention centres seem to work more with performance-related mandates than sports offices. The contracts governing these mandates would have to be newly created in order to accommodate the concerns of «cool and clean».

Has «cool and clean» affected change in the sport setting in the view-point of association and club administrations? If so, what are those changes?

The question as to whether prevention is regularly on the agenda at conferences or annual general meetings was affirmed by 6 of the 20 questioned *associations*. 4 of them ascribed this to «cool and clean». However, the most frequently mentioned changes due to «cool and clean» at the level of the associations were alcohol-free events and the naming of responsible persons for prevention issues. At the 6 *clubs* with «c&c»-teams where this is anchored in the statutes, «cool and clean» was only mentioned once as being the reason. At sports clubs, the increase of smoke-free events and the decrease in smoking in the domain of sport is linked to «cool and clean»-Smoke-free sport. Overall, further changes due to «cool and clean» especially at the association, and considerably less at the club level, can be discerned from the results of the partially-standardised questionnaire. There is an impression that the programme «cool and clean» has not yet been able to extend to the level of club administrations.

In which manner do club administrations perceive and contribute to the subprogramme «cool and clean»-Smoke-free sport?

The preparatory phase and the pretest of the questionnaire to the partially-standardised survey showed that club administrations do not make a difference between the complete programme «cool and clean» and the subprogramme “smoke-free sport” in their day to day life, or even, only recognise one of the two. Therefore, with the exception of the question on participation in the programmes, we forewent a differentiation. Of the 46 respondents 18 clubs (39%) took part in “smoke-free sport”. 8 of these declared that their events are smoke free due to “smoke-free sport” or «cool and clean».

Seen from the point of view of sports associations, club administrations, prevention centres and sports offices, what are the advantages and disadvantages of the tobacco prevention fund offering the financial means to run one concentrated programme?

The partially-standardised questioning shows that a majority of the association and club administrations welcome the bringing together of resources. Respondents seem to appreciate not having to choose from many different programmes. The representatives of cantonal sport offices and prevention centres too see the preponderance of advantages. Positive mention was made of the fact that a central office for prevention in sport is made available at the federal level.

The most important disadvantage of combining resources into one programme, it was mentioned, is that the whole subject of prevention would then need to be covered by it. However, this is not the case with «cool and clean» as, most notably, the prevention of sexual assaults is not specifically treated.

Indicator: Achievement of aims with regard to smoke-free events

The following indicators were evaluated: “*«cool and clean» is present at a minimum of twelve national events and helps to create a sporting environment free of tobacco consumption. An additional twelve regional or communal events are free of tobacco consumption as a result of «cool and clean».*”

According to the programme management, 15 national events and 24 regional or communal events took place between 1 January and 25 June 2007 under the «c&c»-label and were smoke-free accordingly. The actual number of «c&c»-events should however be placed higher because no formal registration is necessary for the use of «c&c»-materials or for smoke-free events to be held. «c&c»-materials are available to all interested parties online. Therefore, exact data as to the number of events with «c&c»-presence is not available. All in all the evaluation has ascertained that the numbers for both categories had already been clearly exceeded just after half a year. Events are not systematically checked for tobacco consumption, though «cool and clean»-representatives sometimes attend the events. In addition, a reporting session for the organisers of events is currently being set up.

Indicator: Achievement of aims with regard to smoke-free sports sites

The following aims were specified in reference to sports sites: “*Three nationally relevant sports sites and 50 regional and communal sites are free of tobacco consumption due to «cool and clean».*”

In most cases, the municipality, who own sports facilities, have to be won over if «cool and clean»-presence and subsequent smoke free sports sites are to be achieved. Due to a change in the procedure, the activities related to this subprogramme were first implemented in May 2007. According to the programme management, five interested owners of sports sites (four of them are municipalities) could be won over. These intend to declare the inner and outer premises of their locations smoke free thanks to «cool and clean». Therefore, the aims with regard to smoke-free sports sites have not been achieved.

Indicator: Achievement of aims with regard to joint interventions from the areas of sport and prevention

The indicator that concerns the collaboration and networking between the sport setting and the prevention centres is: “*The number of joint interventions from the field of sport and that of prevention is on the rise. This means, the cantonal and communal specialist departments for the promotion of health and prevention are recording an increase in enquiries from the field of sport. Furthermore, these specialist departments are offering opportunities for further education to responsible persons of «cool and clean».*”

The evaluation could identify an increase in enquiries from the field of sport. These do not necessarily result from the programme «cool and clean». The second part of the

indicator can be positively assessed: Further education courses are being offered or they are, according to the programme management, in the process of being set up.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the empirical data, the evaluation could elicit in summary the following changes leaning towards the achievement of the objectives set:

- *Smoking and the consumption of alcohol:* The changes in regard to smoking within the framework of club activities, at events, and in the sports sites are to be rated positively but with caution. The observed consumption of alcohol at events by spectators as opposed to athletes is comparatively widespread. In our opinion, the changes detected at the observed sports sites are clearly attributable to the programme «cool and clean», otherwise a significant entrainment effect could be observed.
- *Institutional changes:* There were isolated cases of prevention included in the statutes and mission statements or – particularly at the sports association level – persons responsible for prevention named. These incidences are partly due to «cool and clean».
- *Networking:* When an exchange between the fields of sport and prevention was present, it had preexisted before the programme came into effect. Networking between the two fields has not intensified due to «cool and clean».

Despite the short duration of «cool and clean», tendentious improvements can be discerned. Based on experience from other prevention programmes, it must be borne in mind that changes at the institutional level require a lot of time and commitment, not only to be introduced, but also to have a sustainable effect. Therefore, our first recommendation for the attention of the experts is as follows:

Recommendation 1: Continue «cool and clean»

The programme «cool and clean» has shown tendentious improvements despite its short duration. Generally speaking, awareness of prevention in sport has not yet been sufficiently developed in the observed participants and multipliers. On this account, we recommend that the programme be continued.

The question is posed by the evaluation as to whether the activities aimed at so far can achieve the changes in behaviour targeted by the programme (prevent the consumption of addictive drugs or at least delay the initiation age). In our opinion, further activities are required. For example, cantonal sports offices and prevention centres need guidelines and corresponding funds in order to concede the necessary significance to «cool and clean». These guidelines must be formulated within the framework of politics. Further, based on experience from other prevention programmes, it must be borne in mind that changes at the institutional level require a lot of time and commitment, not only to be introduced, but also to have a sustainable effect. The duration of a programme is hence a central factor in the success of the programme. This too is influenced by policy. Therefore, it is important, that «cool and clean» include the political arena in its deliberations.

Recommendation 2: Establish lobbying at policy level

«cool and clean» must be better anchored at policy level. For example, sport functionaries, who are politically active (this is often the case), could be won over for this purpose. The result expected at the national level is the long-term existence of the programme. At the cantonal level, prevention in the arena of sport should be an aim integrated in the performance-related mandates of prevention centres.

The following two recommendations concern corrections to the conceptual design of the programme. They are intended to be medium-term provisions.

For the time being, the empirical data show that the programme has not yet adequately reached out to sports clubs. In our opinion, clubs, which are central to the sustainability of the programme, need to be successfully embedded in the programme, or else the developmental effect of the programme is impeded.

Recommendation 3: Review specific measure for the target group “clubs”

We recommend that middle-term measures be reviewed for the target group “clubs”. As low-level and short-term interventions, coaches of teams who sign up with «c&c» can be called upon to inform their club administrations of their commitment. Medium-term measures should consider if resources could be extended towards the engagement of personnel to facilitate mentoring of clubs rather than for the production of accessories.

The evaluation further determined that there is a big entrainment effect present with regard to the consumption of tobacco and the sale of alcoholic beverages. Special efforts are not expected from organisers of events in order to receive the «cool and clean»-Label. In particular with regard to the sale of alcohol, no additional obligations are imposed on the part of «cool and clean» since the protection of minors already represents a legal obligation. It is doubtful whether the sub-program “c&c”-Events will contribute much to the achievement of objectives in its current form. The programme’s ambiguous approach on the consumption of alcohol might thereby play a role. In accordance with Commitment four alcohol is not compatible with sport and in everyday life. At the same time «cool and clean» does not propagate abstinence, but a sensible attitude towards alcohol. In our opinion, it is crucial for the acceptance of the program that the latter is demanded and not complete abstinence. In order to achieve this goal, we recommend measures for the sale of alcohol.

Recommendation 4: Increase demands on organisers of events with regard to the sale of alcohol

Demands, which go beyond the protection of minors, must be made so that «cool and clean» is a program that can be taken seriously with regard to the prevention of alcohol at events. Organisers should be obligated, for example, to serve only alcohol-free beverages at VIP aperitifs. In this manner, an example is set, and, at the same time, «cool and clean» is promoted. Further, other vendors of alcoholic beverages present at events should be clearly informed that the organisers, in keeping with the context of «cool and clean», propagate a moderate consumption of alcohol. In the long-term it is also to be examined whether «cool and clean» can offer support for alcohol sponsoring to be replaced otherwise.

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE:

INTERFACE

Institut für Politikstudien

Seidenhofstr. 12

CH-6003 Luzern

Tel +41 (0)41 226 04 26

Fax +41 (0)41 226 04 36

www.interface-politikstudien.ch

Cornelia Furrer, furrer@interface-politikstudien.ch

Ueli Haefeli, haefeli@interface-politikstudien.ch