Public reaction to the portrayal of the tobacco industry in the film *The Insider*

Helen G Dixon, David J Hill, Ron Borland, Susan J Paxton

**Abstract**

**Objectives**—To assess public perceptions of the tobacco industry and behavioural intentions for tobacco use in response to the film *The Insider*.

**Design**—Self administered pre-film survey conducted immediately before viewing and post-film telephone survey conducted within 1–5 weeks of viewing.

**Setting**—Two commercial cinemas in Melbourne, Australia.

**Subjects**—323 cinema patrons were recruited before screening of target films. 182 watched *The Insider*, 141 watched *Erin Brockovich*.

**Interventions**—Subjects watched one of two films: *The Insider* which featured information about unethical conduct by the tobacco industry and negative information about the health effects of smoking, or the “control” film *Erin Brockovich* which had an analogous plot without anti-tobacco content.

**Main outcome measures**—Pre-film questionnaire: assessed movie viewing habits, demographic characteristics, smoking status, attitudes towards the tobacco industry, intentions for smoking. Post-film questionnaire: assessed same attitudes and intentions plus questions on the film viewed and perceptions of smoking prevalence.

**Results**—266 (82%) subjects completed the post-film survey. Attitudes toward the tobacco industry were unfavourable at baseline. Those who saw *The Insider* held more negative views of business conduct by the tobacco industry than those who saw *Erin Brockovich*, once pre-existing attitudes to the industry were controlled for. *The Insider* also appears to have promoted a short term reduction in intentions to smoke.

**Conclusions**—Results of this study suggest that if people were recurrently exposed to anti-tobacco content in movies there is potential for a more substantial and lasting impact on attitudes toward the tobacco industry and smoking.
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This paper reports on a study exploring public reaction to a film containing anti-tobacco content—*The Insider*.

To date, most discussion surrounding tobacco and film has centred on “pro-smoking” film content. Concerns have been raised about the high frequency and image enhancing manner in which smoking tends to be depicted in popular movies.1 2 Negative long term health effects associated with smoking are rarely depicted in entertainment media.3 4 Research supports the thesis that actors who smoke in movies may inadvertently promote smoking to youth audiences.5 6 7 Whereas producers of news and documentary are constrained by fact, fiction and drama are not bound in this way which enables these forms of discourse to perform social symbolic functions more directly than others.8 Historically movie depictions of tobacco use have enabled attractive, image enhancing roles of smoking to be created and disseminated en masse. Fearing the influence of these images, health activists have argued that the creators of such artifice owe it to the public to show some “true” depictions of smoking.

**A new image for tobacco**

Rice and Atkin9 argued that “…the social and economic causes—such as government policies or corporate irresponsibility—of many of our social ills are rarely dealt with at those levels by the mass media in general or even in campaigns in particular” (p 380–1).

Yet in recent years media depiction of tobacco has confronted these issues. In the 1990s, tobacco policy issues received considerable coverage in mainstream news media10 11 and previously confidential tobacco industry documents entered the public domain.12 13 14 These documents revealed active efforts by the industry to conceal information on the negative health effects of smoking,15 forcing “the truth out of the shadows and into the public eye” (p 314).16 In the USA, media campaigns exposing tobacco industry manipulation have also been mounted.17–21

The theme of tobacco industry corruption has now received attention in entertainment media. In late 1999 Michael Mann’s film *The Insider* was released in cinemas throughout North America, then in 30 countries throughout South America, Europe, Australasia, Asia and the Middle East during 2000.22 *The Insider* is a thriller expose on how a series of lies by the tobacco industry were finally exposed by investigative journalism. Russell Crowe stars as real life tobacco industry whistleblower Jeffrey Wigand, who lost his job and was later sued, after talking to the media about the industry’s knowledge and exploitation of the addiciveness of nicotine despite public statements to the contrary.

Anti-tobacco activists welcomed the emergence of a movie that cast tobacco in a bad light,23 whereas the tobacco industry was concerned about the impact of this film on
### Table 1 Characteristics of subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey/Date (2000)</th>
<th>The Insider</th>
<th>Erin Brockovich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-film/Jan 27-Feb 1</td>
<td>Post-film/ Feb 1-March 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample (n)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex*</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years†</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest education level NS</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School certificate</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All secondary school</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade certificate or diploma</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or college degree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking status NS</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy smoker</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light smoker</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional smoker</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-smoker</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-smoker</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS, non-significant effect for demographic variable between film conditions, p < 0.05.  
*Significant difference in sex distribution between two film conditions, p < 0.01.  
†Significant difference in age distribution between two film conditions, p < 0.05.

The aim of this study was to assess people’s perceptions of the tobacco industry and their behavioural intentions for smoking in response to viewing the film The Insider. It was hypothesised that viewing a film featuring corporate misconduct by the tobacco industry (that is, viewing The Insider) would lead to negative perceptions of the tobacco industry, compared to viewing a film which does not present such information. We were uncertain whether exposure to this film would transpose into an anti-smoking message. A secondary aim was to investigate public perceptions of smoking prevalence in films and in real life.

### Method

Three hundred and eighty three cinema patrons were recruited in the foyers of two Melbourne cinemas before screenings of target films. However, because Erin Brockovich was released after The Insider, 55 (28%) of the people recruited for Erin Brockovich reported that they had seen The Insider. As the manipulation of interest for this study was exposure to either one movie or the other, these cases were excluded from all analyses.

Table 1 lists the characteristics of the 323 subjects eligible for the study. One hundred and eighty two watched The Insider, and 141 watched Erin Brockovich. Subjects in the two film conditions had comparable education ($\chi^2 = 3.94, \text{df} = 5, p = 0.559$) and smoking status ($\chi^2 = 6.52, \text{df} = 4, p = 0.164$). However, among those who saw Erin Brockovich, there was a higher proportion of women ($\chi^2 = 12.13, \text{df} = 1, p < 0.001$) and subjects in the youngest age group ($\chi^2 = 16.33, \text{df} = 6, p = 0.012$). The distribution of smokers compares fairly well to the general population, although non-smokers were overrepresented (c/f $\chi^2$). The proportion with tertiary education was also high (c/f $\chi^2$). In Australia, cinema attendance is more frequent among those of higher socioeconomic status (SES)---the proportion of non-smokers in our sample may reflect the higher SES of our sample.

Two hundred and sixty six (82%) subjects completed the post-film survey. The demographic profile of subjects at the post-film survey was comparable to that at the pre-film survey.

### Materials

#### Films

Subjects viewed The Insider or Erin Brockovich (control film). Erin Brockovich had a comparable subtext to The Insider (tale of whistleblower on industry cover up of the harmful health impact of their products on the community) without anti-tobacco content (table 2). Both films were classified “M15+”, meaning that patrons aged 15 years or under are not admitted to the film unless accompanied by a parent or adult guardian.

#### Questionnaires

The pre-film questionnaire included multiple choice items assessing age, sex, highest level of completed education, smoking status (response options as per categories in table 1), frequency of watching movies in cinema, video and TV respectively (response options: 7 = at least twice a week, 6 = once a week, 5 = every two weeks, 4 = once a month, 3 = every two to three months, 2 = twice a year, 1 = less often, adapted from Village cinemail registration form). Items on exercise, alcohol and industries other than the tobacco industry were also included to distract from the study’s focus on tobacco and thereby minimise response bias.
In the pre-film and post-film surveys, subjects were required to rate people in a list of professions on “ethics and honesty” and “power” respectively. The list of professions consisted of politician, movie director, nurse, tobacco industry executive, scientist, TV reporter, and multinational food company executive. Responses to these items were assessed using a five point scale ranging from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high). Intentions for smoking were also assessed with the question, “Do you think you will be smoking cigarettes this time next year?” Response options ranged from 1 (no chance of smoking) through to 7 (certain to be smoking). This established measure has been found to have high test-retest reliability. The post-film questionnaire included further items assessing perceptions of business conduct by the tobacco industry and other industries. Subjects were required to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements about the tobacco industry and other industries on a five point Likert scale where 1 equals “strongly agree” and 5 equals “strongly disagree”. Multiple choice items were used to assess perceptions of smoking prevalence in “real life” and in films compared to real life.

PROCEDURE
Field workers approached cinema patrons in the foyer before screenings of the respective films and explained that the Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria was doing a survey of people’s reactions to The Insider and Erin Brockovich. Patrons were asked whether they were seeing the target film. If they answered “yes”, the field worker explained the procedures (including an assurance of the confidentiality of their answers), and invited the person to participate in the survey in exchange for a free cinema ticket to be provided after the screening. Subjects who completed the post-film survey were posted a free cinema ticket. The cinema foyer. They then watched the film as they normally would.

Surveying was conducted during the films’ first week of release in Melbourne cinemas. To obtain sufficient sample size, recruiting was carried out over five nights for The Insider (27 January to 1 February 2000) and three nights for Erin Brockovich (13–15 April 2000); the differing dates reflect the respective release dates. There were sufficient numbers of field workers on duty that all people who entered the foyer were approached—very few eligible subjects declined to participate.

Two days post-viewing, field workers began telephoning subjects regarding the post-film survey. Subjects who completed the post-film survey were posted a free cinema ticket. The mean (SD) time delay between seeing the film and completing the post-film questionnaire was 11.08 (7.74) days.

ANALYSIS
The data were analysed using SPSS. Data were missing on less than 2% of cases for all variables, except the measures of subjects’ ratings of different professions where it was up to 5% of cases. This appeared to be caused by confusion over the question format. A significance level of p < 0.05 is accepted throughout.

The mean number of days taken for successful follow up was less for The Insider subjects.
who saw The Insider and Erin Brockovich

Table 3 Mean level of disagreement (1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree) with statements about tobacco companies and other industries for subjects
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(i) There should be greater penalties for companies whose products cause sickness or death 1.62 (0.80) 1.75 (0.87)

(h) Tobacco companies will stop at nothing to sell their products 1.82 (0.88) 2.17 (1.01)

(g) Tobacco companies distort the truth about smoking so more people smoke 1.84 (0.92) 2.34 (0.98)

(e) Tobacco companies behave in socially irresponsible ways 1.99 (1.05) 2.09 (0.94)

(d) Tobacco companies have every right to sell their products while they are legal 2.41 (1.01) 2.32 (0.85)

(b) Tobacco companies make a positive contribution to the community through sponsorship of sport and cultural activities 3.83 (1.15) 3.47 (1.16)

(a) Tobacco companies have freely provided information on the health risks of smoking 3.91 (1.17) 3.32 (1.24)

Changes in ratings of a tobacco industry executive as a function of film viewing

For the “ethics and honesty” MANCOVA, the combined effect of the covariates was significant, F(4, 242) = 3.09, p = 0.016. Smokers tended to rate a tobacco industry executive higher on ethics and honesty than non-smokers, t(242) = −2.915, p = 0.004. A main effect of film (F(1, 242) = 5.31, p = 0.022) revealed that The Insider subjects tended to rate a tobacco industry executive as lower on ethics and honesty compared to Erin Brockovich subjects at pre- (x̄ = 1.68 v = 1.78) and post-film (x̄ = 1.63 v = 1.90) (t(242) = −2.305, p = 0.022). There was no significant main effect of time (F(1, 246) = 0.35, p = 0.553) nor interaction between film viewed and time (F(1, 246) = 2.07, p = 0.151), although the direction of the trend was for the difference between The Insider and Erin Brockovich subjects to be greater after film viewing.

For “power” the combined effect of the covariates was not significant (F(4, 241) = 2.14, p = 0.077). A main effect of film (F(1, 241) = 5.61, p = 0.019) revealed that The Insider subjects tended to rate a tobacco industry executive as higher on power compared to Erin Brockovich subjects at pre- (x̄ = 3.72 v = 3.54) and post-film (x̄ = 3.96 v = 3.72) (t(241) = −2.368, p = 0.019). There was a significant main effect of time (F(1, 245) = 9.25, p = 0.003) but no significant interaction between film viewed and time (F(1, 245) = 0.14, p = 0.707), although the direction of the trend was for the difference between The Insider and Erin Brockovich subjects to be greater after film viewing. Irrespective of film viewed, subjects tended to rate a tobacco industry executive as higher on power at post-film than at pre-film (t(241) = −3.041, p = 0.004). A main effect of time also occurred for the MANCOVA on ratings of a multinational food company executive for power (F(1, 242) = 9.41, p = 0.002).

Results

Perceptions of different professions

At pre-film “Nurse” received the highest mean rating for “ethics and honesty” (x̄ = 4.10, SD = 0.79) and “tobacco industry executive” received the lowest (x̄ = 1.77, SD = 0.87). The mean score for “tobacco industry executive” was significantly lower than for “politician” (x̄ = 2.12, SD = 0.88), the next lowest (t(308) = 6.02, p < 0.001). An approximately reverse pattern was found for “power” with nurse receiving the lowest rating pre-film (x̄ = 2.43, SD = 1.10). Politician (x̄ = 4.10, SD = 0.98) followed by tobacco industry executive (x̄ = 3.58, SD = 1.08) received the highest power ratings (t(308) = 8.53, p < 0.001).

Table 3 Mean level of disagreement (1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree) with statements about tobacco companies and other industries for subjects who saw The Insider and Erin Brockovich

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>The Insider Mean (SD) n=154</th>
<th>Erin Brockovich Mean (SD) n=107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Tobacco companies have freely provided information on the health risks of smoking</td>
<td>3.91 (1.17)</td>
<td>3.32 (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Tobacco companies make a positive contribution to the community through sponsorship of sport and cultural activities</td>
<td>3.83 (1.15)</td>
<td>3.47 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Commercial news media gives accurate information on current affairs</td>
<td>3.30 (1.14)</td>
<td>3.24 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Tobacco companies have every right to sell their products while they are legal</td>
<td>2.41 (1.01)</td>
<td>2.32 (0.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Tobacco companies behave in socially irresponsible ways</td>
<td>1.99 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.09 (0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) When big companies are involved, news media aren’t always free to present things as they are</td>
<td>1.89 (0.81)</td>
<td>2.20 (0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Tobacco companies distort the truth about smoking so more people smoke</td>
<td>1.84 (0.92)</td>
<td>2.34 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Tobacco companies will stop at nothing to sell their products</td>
<td>1.82 (0.88)</td>
<td>2.17 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) There should be greater penalties for companies whose products cause sickness or death</td>
<td>1.62 (0.80)</td>
<td>1.75 (0.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC REACTION TO “THE INSIDER”

Table 3 lists subjects’ mean scores on the positively worded items assessing level of agreement with statements about the tobacco industry and other industries, for the two conditions. Subjects in both conditions tended to disagree with the positively worded statements about the tobacco industry (a and b) and agree with the negatively worded statements about the industry (e, g, and h).

Principal components analysis was performed on the items about the tobacco industry. Two factors were extracted. The first factor based subscale measured “perceptions of business conduct by the tobacco industry” (items a, e, g, and h; factor loadings from 0.46 to 0.74) and the second measured “community acceptance of the tobacco industry” (items b and d; factor loadings 0.76 and 0.78).

An index of perceptions of business conduct by the tobacco industry was created by computing the mean of items a, e, g, and h (Cronbach’s α = 0.62; x̄ = 2.09, SD = 0.73). Scores on the positively worded item (a) were reversed to make them comparable to the other negatively worded statements. For the regression analysis, more negative views of business conduct by the tobacco industry were associated with being older (F(7,236) = 4.53, p = 0.034), a non-smoker (F(7,236) = 6.87, p = 0.009), rating tobacco industry executive as low on “ethics and honesty” (F(7,236) = 15.83, p < 0.001) and high on “power” (F(7,236) = 5.24, p = 0.023) at pre-film. People who saw The Insider tended to hold more negative views of business conduct by the tobacco industry (F(7,236) = 14.98, p < 0.001)—film condition added an increment of 5% to explanation of the dependent variable.

An index of community acceptance of the tobacco industry was created by computing the mean of items b and d (Cronbach’s α = 0.43; x̄ = 3.02, SD = 0.85). For the regression analysis, weaker community acceptance of the tobacco industry was associated with being younger (F(7,235) = 6.09, p = 0.014), and rating a tobacco industry executive as lower on “ethics and honesty” pre-film (F(7,235) = 7.97, p = 0.005). People who saw The Insider tended to show less community acceptance of the tobacco industry (F(7,235) = 6.22, p = 0.013)—film condition added an increment of 2% to explanation of the dependent variable.

The non-tobacco industry items were analysed individually, owing to low reliability of composite measure. People who saw The Insider (F(7,233) = 10.04, p = 0.002) and smokers (F(7,233) = 4.51, p = 0.035) were more likely to agree with the statement “when big companies are involved, news media aren’t always free to present things as they are”—film condition added an increment of 4% to explanation of the dependent variable. There were no effects for the covariates or film condition on responses to the statements “Commercial news media gives accurate information on current affairs” and “There should be greater penalties for companies whose products cause sickness or death”.

INTENTIONS TO SMOKE

To assess whether the films had an impact on intentions for smoking, we performed MANCOVA on subjects’ pre and post-film intention scores for those who completed their follow up survey within two weeks of seeing the film, as we assumed any effects of the films on intentions were likely to be short term. The combined effect of the covariates was significant (F(4,188) = 114.97, p < 0.001). As would be expected, current smokers reported stronger intentions to smoke in future than non-smokers (t(188) = 21.11, p < 0.001). There were no significant effects for age group (p = 0.070), education (p = 0.934), sex (p = 0.269) or main effects for time (F(1,192) = 0.46, p = 0.498) and film (F(1,188) = 0.62, p = 0.431). However, there was a significant interaction between film and time, with subjects who saw The Insider showing a decline in intentions at post-film (pre-film: x̄ = 1.97, SD = 1.57; post-film: x̄ = 1.76, SD = 1.44), and a divergent trend for Erin Brockovich subjects (pre-film: x̄ = 1.75, SD = 1.55; post-film: x̄ = 1.86, SD = 1.80) (F(1,192) = 4.63, p = 0.03). The trend of decline in intentions among Insider subjects occurred for current smokers (pre: x̄ = 3.94, post: x̄ = 3.75), ex-smokers (pre: x̄ = 2.18, post: x̄ = 1.41), and non-smokers (pre: x̄ = 1.16, post: x̄ = 1.05). When the MANCOVA was performed with late respondents included, the interaction between time and film was not significant (F(1,259) = 3.38, p = 0.067).

PERCEPTIONS OF SMOKING PREVALENCE

For the question, “Do you think more people smoke in films than in real life?”, 52% answered “No, fewer people smoke in films than in real life”, 22% answered “No, a similar number of people smoke in films and in real life”, 17% answered “Yes, more people smoke in films than in real life”, and 9% answered “Not sure”.

For the question, “In Australia, do you think smoking is less or more common than it was 10 years ago?”, 43% answered “Less common, fewer people smoke these days”, 13% answered “About the same”, 34% answered “More common, more people smoke these days”, and 10% were “Not sure”. The first three response categories were treated as a three level dependent variable for the regression analysis. Higher perceptions of smoking prevalence in real life were associated with lower educational status (F(7,211) = 8.09, p = 0.005), and watching movies more frequently (F(7,211) = 13.87, p < 0.001).

Discussion

ATTITUDES TO THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY

Steve Kottak, a spokesman for Brown and Williamson in the USA, is quoted as saying of The Insider: “We regard ourselves as an ethical company and a responsible company. This movie has set us back in that regard”.

However our results indicate that before viewing the films, people’s perceptions of the ethics
and honesty of a tobacco industry executive were low relative to other professions. These findings parallel those of another Australian survey. As far as the movie promoting a more negative perception of the ethics of the tobacco industry goes, there was little room to move. People’s baseline attitudes to the industry made a significant contribution to explaining their attitudes to the industry at post-film.

Erin Brockovich had parallels with The Insider, in that a major plot element was about a large business covering up the health impact of their products on the community. Our results suggest both films may have promoted a generalised perception of the power of big business, and subjects in both conditions showed similar agreement with the statement “there should be greater penalties for companies whose products cause sickness or death” at post-film.

While the viewing The Insider only accounted for a small (but significant) proportion of the variance in the dependent variables assessing attitudes toward the tobacco industry at post-film, it should be remembered that the effects observed are the result of a single exposure to anti-tobacco content in a movie. A study that captured the cumulative effects of repeated exposure to negative (or positive) depictions could be expected to show more substantial and lasting change. We found that the post-film survey items that focused on content specific to The Insider tended to elicit differences between viewing conditions. Subjects who saw The Insider tended to hold more negative perceptions of business conduct by the tobacco industry and show less community acceptance of the tobacco industry at post-film than those who saw Erin Brockovich. Another issue that received considerable attention in The Insider (but not Erin Brockovich) was that of news media bowing to pressure from big business. People who saw The Insider tended to agree more strongly that “when big companies are involved, news media aren’t always free to present things as they are”.

### Intentions for Smoking

A most interesting finding is that The Insider may have promoted a reduction in intentions to smoke in the future among subjects that persisted for up to two weeks. Compared to the barrage of positive smoking images in films, The Insider represents a drop in the ocean. Yet the presence of this small effect for intentions suggests that if people were more recurrently exposed to anti-tobacco content in movies there may be potential for a more substantial and lasting cumulative impact on attitudes toward smoking. Our survey was of people aged 15 and over, who self selected to see this film. It would be of interest to assess whether this film would promote an anti-smoking message to adolescents, who continue to be a challenging group to influence not to smoke. Evaluation results for anti-tobacco industry campaigns in the USA suggest that demonisation of the tobacco industry may be effective at promoting an anti-smoking message to youth audiences.

### What this paper adds

Concerns have been raised about the role pro-tobacco images in movies may play in promoting smoking. This paper explores audience response to a movie containing anti-tobacco content—The Insider. Results suggest that the versatile and popular medium of film also has the potential to promote an anti-smoking message when tobacco is presented in a negative light.

### Perceptions of Smoking Prevalence

While people may be influenced by depictions of actors smoking in films, our results indicate viewers may not attend to the frequency of these depictions. Contrary to content analysis showing elevated smoking prevalence in films, a minority of subjects felt more people smoke in films than in real life. Cultivation theory predicts that people who consume a lot of media will hold perceptions of reality that reflect those of the media environment. In Australia, population smoking rates declined during this period. We found that people who perceived “real world” smoking rates to have increased over the past 10 years watched movies more frequently than those who did not hold this perception. This finding points to the role movies may play in normalising smoking.

### Study Limitations

A criticism of much past experimental media research is that the findings have limited ecological validity—viewers are often exposed to media “stimuli” which are stripped of their narrative and genre context and viewed in non-naturalistic conditions; responses are measured immediately after exposure. We were committed to surveying viewers who were seeing the movies for the first time, in a naturalistic setting, and monitoring more lasting attitude changes. It was not feasible to randomise subjects to the respective films as they were released at different times, and we aimed to study people’s responses to films watched when and where the subjects chose. A limitation of this quasi-experimental design is that the control group was non-equivalent. The within-subjects design gave us the capacity to conduct conservative statistical analyses controlling for observed pre-existing differences between subjects in the two film conditions, and effects for film condition still occurred. However, for the variables that were only assessed at post-film and differed as a function of film condition, we cannot be certain of the direction of causality of the correlations observed. It is possible that there were other important covariates that we failed to assess. For example, different viewers may have gravitated to the two films based on the way they were marketed. In Australian cinemas, a prominent US actress such as Julia Roberts may attract a subtly different crowd compared to Russell Crowe who is a male.
New Zealand born star. Also promotions for The Insider mentioned a cover up story involving the tobacco industry, so viewers may have had some pre-conceived ideas about the industry before viewing the film.

CONCLUSIONS

Just as positive movie depictions of smoking may promote attitudes supportive of smoking, our results suggest the versatile and popular medium of film also has the potential to promote an anti-smoking message when tobacco is presented in a negative light. Film-makers are in a powerful position. No doubt their creativity is up to the challenge of producing more frequent depictions of the dark side of tobacco. On creative and ethical grounds, this approach would be more artful than regurgitating clichéd images of smoking as sexy, cool, or calming, which only perpetuate the mythology of tobacco advertising.
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