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US States* with legislation restricting possession of cigarettes to persons aged ≥18 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes the District of Columbia

Psychological perspectives on punishment

- Response-contingent application of an unpleasant or aversive event in an attempt to suppress or prevent recurrence of unwanted response

- specific deterrent effect: influence behavior of offender being punished

- general deterrent effects: influence behavior of other potential offenders
Psychological perspectives on punishment

- Potential offender perceives high likelihood that detection and punishment will result
- Punisher has a close affectionate relationship with offender
- Unintended effects of punishment:
  - recipient takes more care to avoid detection
  - others conspire to protect offender
  - pursuit of avoidance may promote sense of belonging to social out-group, leading to increased offending
  - may elicit defiance
Effects of PUP laws on teen smoking

- Studies of youth who attend diversion programs (specific effects)
  - Lazovitch et al (Minnesota)
  - Langer et al (Florida)

- Studies of youth populations subject to PUP laws (general effects)
  - Livingood et al (Florida)
  - Giovino et al (contiguous USA)
Effects of PUP laws on other tobacco control strategies

- Retailer compliance with sales to minors laws
- Parental controls
- School policies
- Other tobacco control policies, such as taxation and smoke-free laws
- Tobacco industry profile
  - good fit with industry efforts to portray smoking as an ‘adult’ behavior
  - helped companies gain an entrée into minds of policy-makers
We've gotta make it illegal for kids under 18 to smoke... how 'bout a really stiff penalty I know! We already have that one...

Nah, forget it. I know how 'bout we just...
Main conclusions

- Difficult to conclude strong positive effects of PUP laws on youth smoking, but there may be *some* effects, both specific and general.
- Theoretical, practical and strategic reasons why PUP laws may be unlikely to significantly reduce youth smoking.
- Potential for PUP laws to undermine other tobacco strategies, but also potential for reinforcement.
- PUP laws are common, so difficult and probably unnecessary to oppose them.
Research questions

• What are specific effects of PUP laws that offer different types of educational or community service penalties vs fines?

• To what extent are laws (or can laws be) enforced to a level where general deterrent effects may be measurable?

• How do youth perceive PUP laws?
Research questions (cont’d)

- Under what circumstances might PUP laws be associated with stronger or weaker school and parental controls on smoking?
- To what extent, if any, have PUP laws diverted attention from more effective tobacco control strategies?