

TOBACCO
CORPORATION
RETAILER EDUCATION
MATERIALS TO
REDUCE TOBACCO
SALES TO MINORS



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
TOBACCO CONTROL SECTION

TOBACCO CORPORATION RETAILER EDUCATION MATERIALS TO REDUCE TOBACCO SALES TO MINORS

Prepared by
Sondos M. S. Islam, Ph. D., M. P. H., M. S.
Tess Boley Cruz, Ph. D, M. P. H.

California Department of Health Services
Tobacco Control Section

¹The Tobacco Industry Monitoring Evaluation (TIME) Project • University of Southern California
1000 South Fremont Avenue, Unit 8, Alhambra, CA 91803 • (626) 457-6647 • tesscruz@usc.edu

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Milagros Jacobs, M. P. H., for her valuable contributions to this report.

Prepared with funding from the California Department of Health Services, Tobacco Control Section, under contract number 00-91890. Funding was provided by passage of Proposition 99, the Tobacco Tax and Health Protection Act.

Suggested citation

Islam, S. M., and T. B. Cruz. 2006. Tobacco Corporation Retailer Education Materials to Reduce Tobacco Sales to Minors. Alhambra, California: University of Southern California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	iv
Abstract.....	1
Introduction	3
Methods	11
Results.....	13
Discussion	19
Limitations.....	23
Recommendations.....	25
References	27
Appendices.....	33
A. Summary of the Components of CSAP’s Best Practices for Responsible Retailing	33
B. “We Card” Retail Education Materials Received 2002–2004.....	37
C. Content Analysis of the “We Card” Program Compared to CSAP’s Best Practices for Responsible Retailing.....	39

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVE: To evaluate the content of retail education programs sponsored by the tobacco industry and examine the extent to which the programs compare to the gold standard in retail education programs, as defined by the literature.

METHODS: Materials and information on retail educational programs were requested from six tobacco companies and the Coalition for Responsible Tobacco Retailing (Coalition), an industry lobbying organization, in 2002, 2003, and early 2004. All of the tobacco companies contacted had discontinued their retail educational programs in lieu of funding and supporting the Coalition's "We Card" program. Materials for the "We Card" program were received in each of the years 2002, 2003, and 2004. Evaluation of the program's content was based on the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention's (CSAP) Best Practices for Responsible Retailing.

RESULTS: The Coalition's "We Card" program is the main tobacco industry retailer education program. The educational content of the program covered most of CSAP's recommended components, including information on federal and state youth access laws, training in age verification processes and methods of proper refusal of tobacco sales to minors and third parties, the recommendation that all employees who sell tobacco pass a test and acknowledge they received the information, recommendations of role playing for testing employees' knowledge, providing negative feedback to violators and positive feedback to compliers, performing internal compliance checks, and getting involved with the local community through coalitions and business associations. However, the program lacked important elements recommended by CSAP, such as investigating past experiences of youth access violations when hiring new applicants for tobacco sales positions, assigning older employees in tobacco sales positions, and being more vigilant with identification requirements when the tobacco purchaser is a young adult. The program does not offer any information on the reasons for the enactment of youth access to tobacco laws, and it does not mention any of the adverse health effects of adolescent smoking or the subsequent personal and societal costs. The program does not make any recommendations on the amount and placement of in-store tobacco products, promotional items, or advertisements.

CONCLUSION: The tobacco industry's "We Card" program is a major source of information for retailers on federal and state laws prohibiting tobacco sales to minors, age verification procedures, and managerial training for employee compliance with store policies, but it lacks pertinent information about the influence of tobacco use, marketing, and advertising on adolescents. Thus, the tobacco industry's "We Card" program should not be considered as a tool for reducing adolescent smoking. Alternative education efforts should come from public health organizations and retail organizations, in combination with enforcement efforts designed to incentivize retailer compliance.

INTRODUCTION

Illegal tobacco sales to minors play a role in adolescent nicotine addiction and the subsequent establishment of regular adult tobacco use. The importance of adolescent tobacco use prevention in reducing tobacco-related diseases has been well established for several decades (Lee et al. 1993; Pierce and Gilpin 1995; United States Department of Health and Human Services 1994). The goal of adolescent smoking prevention is to guide children through their teenage years without becoming addicted to nicotine, thus diminishing their likelihood of becoming life-long tobacco users, and consequently reducing the risk of incidence of tobacco-related diseases (Kessler et al. 1997).

One potential solution to curb tobacco sales to minors is to increase retailers' compliance with tobacco youth access laws through education programs for retailers. Effective adolescent smoking prevention programs are multi-component programs that use three approaches to reduce the demand and supply of tobacco products available to adolescents. First, they reduce demand for tobacco through the implementation of socially-based smoking prevention programs aimed at schools and communities. These programs, in turn, are supported by anti-smoking media messages to counter the influences of pro-tobacco media. Finally, there needs to be a program to reduce the supply of tobacco products through the enactment and enforcement of laws prohibiting tobacco sales to minors (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention 2005).

Ironically, one of the most prominent retailer education programs about youth access was designed and funded by the tobacco industry. The connection between the tobacco industry and educational efforts to reduce youth access raises the question of whether the industry's education program encompasses the components needed to improve retailer practices. This study, conducted by the Tobacco Industry Monitoring Evaluation (TIME) Project of the University of Southern California, is designed to answer that question.

TOBACCO YOUTH ACCESS LAWS

In the late 1980s, despite laws in most states banning tobacco sales to minors, almost three-fourths of the one million tobacco retail stores in the United States (U. S.) sold tobacco to underage adolescents. These stores made over \$1 billion in illegal tobacco sales each year, and allowed 3 million minors to purchase cigarettes any time they chose (DiFranza and Tye 1990; U. S. Department of Health and Human Services 1994).

In response to the mounting evidence of increasing underage smoking and the lack of enforcement of state youth access laws, the U. S. Congress enacted more comprehensive laws with enforcement provisions in the hope of reducing illegal tobacco sales to minors. These laws included the Synar Amendment in 1992 and the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) Tobacco Regulation in 1996. The Synar Amendment stipulated that states enforce their tobacco minimum age-of-sale laws and demonstrate success. The states had to achieve an underage sales rate of no more than 20 percent or risk losing federal substance abuse block grants

(Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration 1996). The FDA's Tobacco Regulation restricted the labeling, advertising, sale, and distribution of cigarettes and smokeless tobacco to minors (Food and Drug Administration 1996). Unfortunately, the FDA regulations were overturned by the U. S. Supreme Court on March 21, 2000 (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention 2005).

In compliance with the Synar Amendment, California passed the Stop Tobacco Access to Kids Enforcement (STAKE) Act in 1994 (implemented in 1995), which required the California Department of Health Services, Tobacco Control Section (CDHS/TCS) and the Food and Drug Branch (FDB), to implement a statewide enforcement program to reduce illegal tobacco sales to minors to less than or equal to 20 percent of their purchase attempts (STAKE Act 1994). The STAKE Act requires tobacco retailers to check the identification (ID) of anyone buying tobacco who appears to be under the age of 18, to post signs at each point of sale stating that selling tobacco products to youth under the age of 18 is against the law, and to post the toll-free number 1-800-5-ASK-4-ID for reporting any unlawful tobacco sales. The act also requires CDHS to conduct an annual random scientific youth tobacco purchase survey to determine the rate of the state's illegal sales to minors, requires that the department conduct compliance checks of tobacco retailers using underage adolescents as decoys in "sting operations," and provides CDHS the right to assess and impose civil penalties on violators (STAKE Act 1994).

After passage of the STAKE Act, tobacco sales to minors in California dropped from 37 percent in 1995 to 12.8 percent in 2000, after which it gradually increased to 19.3 percent in 2002, then dropped back to 14 percent in 2004 (CDHS/TCS 2004). Although the drop in tobacco sales to minors after 1995 may be attributed to other factors besides the newly enacted youth access law, a study by Landrine et al. (2000), which surveyed the same retail stores before and after the implementation and enactment of the STAKE Act, found that the minors' access rate decreased significantly from 41.2 percent before implementation of legislation (1994) to 12.7 percent after implementation (1998), and that the same stores were three to five times more likely to sell cigarettes to minors before than after the legislation was implemented (Landrine et al. 2000). However, results of the national impact of the youth access laws in reducing illegal tobacco sales to minors have been mixed and inconclusive to date.

In a review of the states' compliance with the Synar requirement, DiFranza found that "as a whole there was no significant national progress toward reducing the availability of tobacco to youths," and that "this failure can be attributed to inadequate resources devoted to enforcement and reliance on merchant education in lieu of bona fide law enforcement" (DiFranza 2001). In another study conducted in 1997, the researchers found that approximately 3.8 million 12–17 year old daily smokers were able to purchase cigarettes from retailers, consuming almost 1 billion packs of cigarettes per year (DiFranza and Libretti 1999). The prevalence of tobacco sales to minors did not appear to have changed much since the passage of the Synar Amendment.

RETAILER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A review of the literature on tobacco retailer education programs revealed three general types of information about the components of retailer education and factors that may influence retailers' tobacco sales to minors. The three types included studies of interventions of retail education programs, results from focus group studies with tobacco retailers, and provisions included in the Assurances of Voluntary Compliance (AVCs) reached between several attorneys general and five major retailer corporations regarding tobacco sales to minors.

STUDIES OF INTERVENTIONS TO IMPROVE RETAILER SALES PRACTICES

Most of the materials used in retailer education programs are informative brochures directed at store owners, managers, and staff. They contain information on state and local tobacco youth access laws and retailers' legal obligations, the legal age at which tobacco sales are permissible, the requirement of asking for proof of age from young customers before a tobacco sale is completed, and the requirement of displaying age-of-sale warning signs in stores.

Numerous studies have shown that merchant education about youth access laws alone is not effective in reducing illegal sales (Altman et al. 1991; DiFranza and Brown 1992). In a review of 27 interventions for preventing tobacco sales to minors, Stead and Lancaster (2000) found that giving information about youth access laws to tobacco retailers was less effective in reducing tobacco sales to minors than multi-component educational strategies supported by police enforcement. Retail education programs which led to decreases in tobacco sales to minors included two or more of the following components: community support, retail education about the legal requirements for checking identification and verifying the age of a young customer, warnings of enforcement by police and implementation of compliance checks by health officials, performance of sting operations to check compliance, notification of the results of the compliance checks to retailers, and publicity and media coverage of the educational program (Chapman et al. 1994; Gemson et al. 1998; Jason et al. 1996; Keay et al. 1993; Rigotti et al. 1997; Wildey et al. 1995).

Other studies have found that retailer education may be effective only if accompanied by ongoing active enforcement, high penalties and fines, and/or the threat of license revocation (Chapman et al. 1994; DiFranza and Rigotti 1999; Forster and Wolfson 1998; Jason et al. 1996; Lantz et al. 2000; Levy et al. 2001; Stead and Lancaster 2000).

Keay et al. (1993) found that a multilevel intervention including retailer education and community and media public awareness campaigns about the hazards of adolescent tobacco use increased retailer compliance and decreased tobacco sales to minors. The retailer education program included three on-site face-to-face visits with owners and/or managers of retail stores on a quarterly basis. The program coordinators talked about the health issues of youth and tobacco use with retailers, emphasizing the ethical and legal obligation to restrict tobacco sales to minors.

Biglan et al. (1995) found similar results through their multi-component retailer education intervention. The intervention included community mobilization to support the elimination of tobacco sales to minors, merchant education through personal visits, positive and negative consequences to clerks for selling or not selling tobacco to minors, positive publicity in newspaper articles about clerks who refused to sell tobacco to minors, and feedback to store owners/managers about the extent of their sales to adolescents. The authors note that the communitywide dissemination of information about the health hazards of smoking in general and adolescent smoking in particular through press releases and featured stories in newspapers and radio advertisements may have helped mobilize the community in support of eliminating tobacco sales to minors and increasing retailer compliance with youth access laws (Biglan et al. 1995).

Generally, the reviewed studies indicated that a sustained reduction in illegal tobacco sales cannot be achieved through merchant education programs alone. Retailer education programs should be multilevel programs which include frequent education of employees on the legal and ethical requirements of youth access laws (Keay et al. 1993), mobilization of the community in support of eliminating tobacco sales to minors, dissemination of information about the adverse health effects of tobacco use (Biglan et al. 1995), performance of regular internal compliance checks (Chapman et al. 1994), enforcement of laws by authorities, imposing high fines and/or license revocations (Forster and Wolfson 1998; Gemson et al. 1998; Jason et al. 1996; Rigotti et al. 1997; Stead and Lancaster 2000), negative reinforcement and threats of suspensions for repeat violators, and positive reinforcement in the form of bonuses for compliant employees (Biglan et al. 1995; Feighery 2003; Keay et al. 1993; O'Grady et al. 1999).

RESULTS OF TOBACCO RETAILER FOCUS GROUPS

Results from 11 focus groups conducted with 63 retailers and clerks in four California communities revealed a number of factors that retailers believed may influence compliance with youth access laws (Strategic Tobacco Retail Effort 2001). These factors included unfamiliarity of most retailers and/or clerks with the exact requirements of the federal, state, or local laws and ordinances that effect tobacco sales in their stores, and unfamiliarity with age verification of out of state licenses, passports, and military IDs. Focus group participants also expressed concerns on the handling of third party sales by adults when they suspect that the purchase is for a minor, and the handling of abusive and physically aggressive customers when an ID request is made or when a tobacco sale is refused.

Many participants believed that the most effective method of preventing tobacco sales to minors is imposing fines and/or suspension for employees who do not comply with the law. Others believed that a positive reinforcement, such as paying a bonus or receiving recognition from authorities if a clerk passed a sting operation, would have a better impact.

Almost all retailers felt that their stores play an important role in their communities, and a number of retailers said that they were open to discussing valid concerns with community groups, particularly if the customers asking for changes are those who patronize their businesses regularly. For example, one chain removed large beer displays from the front windows in response to the community's concern about the impact on the neighborhood children. The retailers also believed that the use of various tools, such as calendars, scanners, and electronic age verification (EAV) devices increased clerks' compliance with the laws.

Where health messages were concerned, many believed that posting health-related messages inside the store would not deter minors from trying to purchase tobacco products, and they did not feel that it was their responsibility to educate customers about the dangers of smoking. They also worried that health related messages may conflict with their contracts with tobacco manufactures (Strategic Tobacco Retail Effort 2001).

ASSURANCES OF VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE BY MAJOR RETAIL CORPORATIONS

Although studies have shown that retail education coupled with enforcement may increase retailers' compliance with youth access laws, sustainable enforcement has been difficult to achieve (Biglan et al. 1995). Penalties under many state sales to minors laws are relatively low, typically \$100 or less, and are imposed on individual clerks and/or stores but not on the chain to which a store might belong (Krevor et al. 2002). Krevor and colleagues (2002) suggest that the use of consumer protection actions can offset many of the limitations inherent in enforcement programs, since penalties under these laws are much higher, ranging from \$5000 to \$10,000 per infraction depending on the state, and for which the corporate parent can be held responsible. The assurances of voluntary compliance (AVCs) reached between attorneys general and major retail chains were conducted under the consumer protection authority (Biglan et al. 1995).

By 2003 attorneys general from 43 states, the District of Columbia, and two U. S. territories reached AVCs with five major retailer corporations regarding tobacco sales to minors. The provisions provide measures to reduce tobacco product sales to minors in the nation's top retail chain (Wal-Mart), the number one drug store chain (Walgreens), and all gas stations and convenience stores operating under the Exxon, Mobil, BP, ARCO, and Amoco brand names in the signing states. Those large chain store agreements compare favorably with the CSAP recommendations (Feighery 2003). In 2004 the efforts expanded to include Safeway (which includes Safeway, Vons, Pavilions, and Pak N Save) and Rite Aid. The more recent agreements, which came about as a result of legal action taken by the attorneys general, included the components described above as well as policies to ensure that employees understand health related concerns (Consumer Affairs 2004).

The AVC provisions stipulate hiring, training, supervisory, and point-of-sale practices, including restrictions on tobacco sales by underage employees; investigation of past youth access law violations for new applicants; training of new employees in responsible tobacco retailing practices with retraining (remedial) and refresher

courses offered periodically; performance of compliance checks both internally and by external/independent entities; limits on self service displays and in-store advertising; use of EAV devices to scan IDs and calculate age; periodic review of videotapes to inspect sales conduct; and the inclusion of performance measures as a basis for determining whether employees are requesting and checking IDs before making tobacco sales (Feighery 2003; Krevor et al. 2002). The provisions are designed to enhance the likelihood that clerks will comply with tobacco use access laws, and are used by the major retail corporations to train their employees (Feighery 2003).

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH RETAILERS' COMPLIANCE TO YOUTH ACCESS LAWS

Several studies indicated that requesting identification (ID) from young customers was the strongest predictor of tobacco sales to minors (Clark et al. 2000; DiFranza et al. 2001; Forster et al.1998; Landrine et al 1996; Levinson et al. 2002; Weinbaum et al. 1996). However, the completion of a tobacco sale was associated with the minor's age and behavior (Forster and Wolfson 1998; Hyland et al. 2000; Landrine et al. 2001), and with the age of the clerk (DiFranza et al. 2001).

Older adolescents (16 and 17 year olds) were more successful in purchasing tobacco products than younger adolescents (Arday et al. 1997; Hyland et al. 2000; O'Grady et al.1999; Rigotti et al. 1997). Tobacco sales to minors were almost four times more likely when the minor flashed his/her ID before being asked for it than when not presenting an ID at all (Landrine et al. 2001). Levinson et al. (2002) found that sales were more than six times as frequent when minors presented a valid ID with confidence (showing they were underage) than if they did not. A number of studies noted that adolescent smokers were significantly more likely to purchase cigarettes successfully if the clerk was less than 21 years of age (Cummings et al. 1998; DiFranza et al. 2001; Weinbaum et al. 1996). Clerks may not be trained to go beyond asking for ID before a tobacco purchase is completed, and/or may believe that their legal obligation ends by requesting the ID and not by verifying the age of the purchaser, especially if the customer appears to be confident, produces the ID before being asked, and appears to look older than 18.

Accordingly, most researchers recommend a cutoff age of 25 to 27 years of age as a trigger for ID requests to ensure that adolescents close to the legal age will be carded (Arday et al. 1997; Hyland et al. 2000; O'Grady et al. 1999; Rigotti et al. 1997). Responsible tobacco sales practices should encourage retailers to use various tools to verify the age of young customers, such as calendars, scanners, and electronic age verification (EAV) devices, or regular employee training on age calculation methods in situations where EAV devices are not available (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention 2005; Feighery 2003).

Overall, factors associated with retailer compliance include age, gender, ethnicity, self-confidence, and believability of the minor shopper; the time of day and day of the week the compliance testing was carried out; whether the test shopper shows identification or not; whether the tobacco sale is completed, whether a random sample of stores is studied, and whether the aggregate compliance rate is based on one or more checks of the same outlet (Arday et al. 1997; Clark et al. 2000; Forster et al. 1992; Keay et al. 1993; O’Grady et al. 1999; Radecki and Zdunich 1993; Rigotti et al. 1997; Stead and Lancaster 2000).

THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY’S INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATING RETAILERS ABOUT TOBACCO SALES TO MINORS

In 1995, in response to the Synar Amendment, to avoid further legislation and to gain credibility and legitimacy, the tobacco industry and various national retail associations formed the Coalition for Responsible Tobacco Retailing, purportedly established to help design better and more comprehensive campaigns to prevent tobacco sales to minors (Redhead & Austin-Lane 1998). The Coalition established a nationwide program, “We Card,” in 1995 to encourage voluntary compliance of tobacco retailers with youth access laws (Coalition for Responsible Tobacco Retailing 2005).

There is very little published information on the impact of the “We Card” program on underage tobacco sales. A 1992 study in Massachusetts found that an industry sponsored retail education program had no significant effect on sales to minors. Materials were displayed in only 5 percent of stores and sales rates to minors did not differ by program participation, with an 86 percent sales rate in participating stores versus 88 percent in nonparticipating stores (DiFranza & Brown 1992). A search of the literature did not reveal any studies evaluating the effectiveness of the “We Card” program.

There are no studies evaluating the content of the educational and training material of the industry’s retail education programs. The objective of this report, as part of the Tobacco Industry Monitoring Evaluation (TIME) Project, is to evaluate the content of the different materials in the industry’s retail education programs and examine the extent to which they compare to the “gold standard” for retailer education, as defined by the literature.

METHODS

EVALUATION TOOL

A literature search identified numerous factors associated with the efficacy of retailer education programs, but no specific “gold standard” for retailer education programs was found. The closest report that contained all the critical factors recommended in the various studies, results from various retailer focus groups, and the provisions of the AVCs, was a draft report prepared by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) titled “Best Practices for Responsible Retailing: Conference Edition” which was presented at the Responsible Retailing Forum of 2005 in Santa Fe, New Mexico (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention 2005).

The report committee used three sources of evidence in developing the report: reports on responsible retailing, actual responsible-retailing programs, and negotiated agreements between attorneys general and major retailer chains. Components of responsible retailing included a retailer component (comprehensive education and training of sales personnel, and policies for store managers and owners) and a public sector component (active involvement with public agencies and community coalitions) (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention 2005). We chose to use the CSAP report as the “gold standard” on which to base our content evaluation of the industry’s retail education program. Components of the CSAP report are summarized in Appendix A.

STUDY DESIGN

Letters requesting materials and information on the industry’s retail educational programs were mailed out to Philip Morris, R. J. Reynolds, Brown and Williamson, Lorillard, U. S. Smokeless Tobacco Co., 7-Eleven, Inc., and the Coalition for Responsible Tobacco Retailing, Inc., in 2002, 2003, and early 2004. Materials were received from the Coalition for Responsible Tobacco Retailing, Inc., in 2002, 2003, and 2004; but only once, in 2002, from Brown and Williamson, and 7-Eleven, Inc. A Philip Morris brochure was obtained at a local supermarket in Pasadena, California, in June 2003.

Phone calls from the directors of the Youth Smoking Prevention (YSP) departments of R. J. Reynolds and Lorillard in 2003 informed us that they now conduct all their retailer education through the “We Card” program administered by the Coalition for Responsible Retailing.

MATERIAL

Materials were logged as soon as they were received (Appendix B), and content analysis was conducted by a reviewer trained by the TIME project director. Questions about content analysis were discussed by the reviewer and project director until a consensus was achieved. Materials received from Brown and Williamson included a brochure titled “Smart Kids Live Big,” a door decal titled “Wake Up Live Big Be Smoke Free,”

and a video tape titled “How to Talk to Your Kids about Smoking;” a letter was received from 7-Eleven, Inc., titled “7-Eleven Franchisees Against Youth Smoking: Solution Information Packet;” and the Philip Morris U. S. A. (PM USA) brochure was titled “Help Stop Underage Smoking.” Careful review of the content of these materials revealed that they did not address retailer education, but rather were awareness campaign efforts directed towards youth, parents, and third party adults (PM USA brochure) to prevent the purchase of tobacco products by adults for underage youth. Therefore, these materials were excluded from this evaluation.

Materials received from the “We Card” program included two guides, an “Employee Guide to Prevent Tobacco Sales to Minors” and a “Guide to Best Practice” directed at store owners/managers; an age-of-purchase monthly calendar; “We Card” age-of-sale warning signage in the form of stickers, door decals, and a counter stand; a “We Card” break-room poster; a tip sheet for identifying fake IDs and refusing a sale; a CD-ROM training program; and a 20-minute California training program video for employees (Appendix B).

We received a copy of a letter dated January 15, 2002, from PM USA directed to all its retailers, informing them of a change in its 1996 policy with regards to the requirements of posting the “We Card” or equivalent signage, and informing them of the various penalties for not complying with the new PM USA policy change.

Action by the California attorney general led the Coalition to send a bulletin to California retailers and our project in July 2003. The bulletin and the accompanying explanatory letter clearly stated that every store must post the STAKE Act sign, and that the “We Card” sign did not and could not take the place of the state mandated sign. The package also included a California state sign concerning the tobacco sale law and a Stake Act age-of-sale warning sticker.

In addition to the material mailed to us, we downloaded files of materials from the Coalition Web site. These files included the “Manager’s Guide to Training for the Real World,” a guide covering the same topics as those in the “Guide to Best Practice” but with detailed step by step instructions for store owners/managers, a “Third Party Sales” tip sheet, and an EAV tip sheet. These materials were included in our content evaluation.

A search of the PM USA Web site for tobacco retail educational material revealed that PM USA was the major funding source for the “We Card” program, and that the company directs all inquiries regarding retailer programs to the “We Card” Web site.

The “We Card” program appears to be the main tobacco retail educational program funded, supported, and recommended by most major tobacco companies. Therefore, the content analysis of the industry’s retail educational programs presented in this report is a content analysis of the “We Card” program.

RESULTS

THE “WE CARD” PROGRAM

The “We Card” program is a voluntary retailer education program administered by the Coalition for Responsible Retailing; it is funded by major tobacco companies and various national wholesale and retail chains (www.wecard.org). It provides tobacco retailers with free educational materials on federal and state youth access laws, distributes signs, posters, door decals, brochures, minimum age-requirement stickers, age-determination calendars, a video and CD-ROM for employee training, and conducts free training seminars (Coalition for Responsible Tobacco Retailing 2005). Most of the major tobacco companies discontinued their earlier retailer educational programs in lieu of supporting and funding the more comprehensive “We Card” program (www.philipmorrisusa.com; www.rjrt.com/home.asp).

The “We Card” Web site (www.wecard.org) claims that more than 82,000 tobacco retailers have been trained in “We Card” seminars about the importance of selling tobacco products only to those of legal age to purchase them, and that more than 1.7 million educational retail kits have been distributed since 1996 to retail stores throughout the United States (Coalition for Responsible Tobacco Retailing 2005). In 2005, the Coalition decided to start charging a fee for all educational and training materials previously offered for free (Coalition for Responsible Tobacco Retailing 2005), so reach may decline in the future.

The high distribution of “We Card” kits to retailers is reflected in the TIME project survey results of tobacco-related advertising in California stores between 2002 and 2004. The survey found that more tobacco retail stores displayed the “We Card” signage than the STAKE Act mandated warning sign across the three years (Table 1) (Unger et al. 2005). A similar finding of higher prevalence of “We Card” materials compared to STAKE Act signage was found in the California Department of Health Services Youth Tobacco Purchase Surveys of 2002 to 2004 (CDHS/TCS 2004). The TIME survey results raise the question of whether the tobacco industry’s “We Card” materials are being substituted for more effective statewide enforcement efforts.

Table 1: Percent of California stores with one or more age warning signs, 2002-2004

Type of Sign	Year		
	2002	2003	2004
We Card	77.5	83.2	84.3
STAKE Act	53.6	64.3*	74.3*
Other	27.8	37.4*	24.6*
Total	92.4	96.9	95.6

N=569 stores 2002, 554 stores 2003, 565 stores 2004 *Significant change from previous year, p<.05. Source: Unger et al. 2005

Interestingly, in 2003, in response to the actions by the California attorney general, the Coalition mailed out the bulletin stating the California laws for state sign requirements to all retailers. From 2003 to 2004, the percent of stores with “We Card” signs did not increase as much as from 2002 to 2003, but the percent of stores with the STAKE Act sign significantly increased from 2003 to 2004 (Table 1).

DETAILED CONTENT OF THE “WE CARD” EDUCATIONAL KIT

The main educational and training information is covered in three basic guides: the “Guide to Best Practice” (mailed out in July 2003 after action by the California attorney general), the “Employee Guide to Prevent Tobacco Sales to Minors,” and the “Manager’s Guide to Training for the Real World.”

The “Guide to Best Practice” is directed to store owners/managers. It is 20 pages in length and is a short summary of pertinent information and recommendations on state law and store policy, training, in-store materials, supervision, compliance, and community involvement.

There are 15 recommendations in this brochure, as follows:

- Ask for ID from anyone who looks younger than 27 years old
- Educate all employees about state and store policies, especially new hires
- Set up fair and consistent store policies
- Require all employees to pass a test
- Provide regular employee training focused on preventing underage tobacco sales
- Role play confrontational situations
- Train younger employees to handle peer pressure
- Use computer based training or video to train employees
- Prominently display proper mandated signage

- Use point of sale material effectively
- Consider purchasing an EAV device and/or scanner prompts for all registers
- Continuously supervise and offer recognition to compliant employees
- Periodically check compliance
- Get involved in local community coalitions focused on preventing underage tobacco sales
- Join an industry association

The “Employee Guide to Prevent Tobacco Sales to Minors” is six pages in length, directed to all employees, and covers the following point-of-sale practices:

- A reminder to always ask for ID from anyone who looks younger than 27 years old
- A list of the age-restricted tobacco products, such as cigarettes, snuff, cigars, loose tobacco (pipe tobacco), chewing tobacco, and other tobacco-related products that may be restricted in some states (rolling paper, pipes, and lighters)
- A list of the five accepted identifications in the U. S. (driver’s license, state-issued identification card, military identification card, U. S. passport, and immigration card)
- Details to look for when determining whether an ID is valid (date of birth, photo, expiration date, description of the holder), and behaviors and appearances that may signal an underage customer
- Methods on how to refuse a sale politely, including those from friends, acquaintances, and third party sales
- An emphasis on the message that the employee is not permitted to sell tobacco to a minor
- A quiz at the end to test an employee’s knowledge and understanding of state laws and store policy

The “Manager’s Guide to Training for the Real World” covers many of the same topics in the above two guides, but discusses them in more detail. It is a 32-page, step by step manual for store owners/managers that explains why and how to provide effective in-store training. The guide includes the following topics:

- Developing a training curriculum, with recommendations that a minimum curriculum should include the following:
 - Understanding state laws and penalties
 - Minimum age requirements
 - Acceptable forms of ID
 - State signage requirements
 - Third party sales violations
- Developing clear store policies:
 - Card anyone who appears under the age of 27
 - Use disciplinary action and positive reinforcement to support policies
 - Restrict access to tobacco products: cigarettes, cigars, chewing tobacco, snuff, and loose tobacco
 - Accept only the five legal forms of identification

- Recommendation of the use of a store's video camera as a training tool for managers
- Points on spotting and refusing fake IDs and third party sales
- Refusing sales with confidence
- Dealing with confrontational customers and peer pressure
- Using point-of-sale materials effectively
- Designing evaluation of employees
- Developing on-going training and training refreshers
- Developing internal compliance checks and communicating the results of these checks

A comparison of “We Card” components and CSAP’s Best Practices for Responsible Retailing is summarized in Appendix C. In general, the program encompasses most of CSAP’s recommended components, including information on federal and state youth access laws, training in age verification processes and methods of proper refusal of tobacco sales to minors and third parties, recommendation that all tobacco sale employees pass a test and acknowledge receipt of the information, recommendations of role playing for testing employees’ knowledge, providing negative feedback to violators and positive feedback to compliers, performing internal compliance checks, and getting involved with the local community through coalitions and business associations.

Our analysis indicates the program lacks several pertinent elements recommended by CSAP, as follows:

1. The “We Card” program is not state specific, and therefore clerks are neither trained in specific state and local laws and regulations nor the explicit consequences for sales personnel who sell tobacco to minors.
2. The hiring procedures are not covered; there are no recommendations to store managers/owners on what to consider when hiring new applicants that may be involved in the sale of tobacco products, such as screening them for past violations of sales-to-minors laws. Also, the program has no recommendation or advice concerning the assignment of older adults and avoiding underage employees in the selling of tobacco products.
3. The program consistently emphasizes the legal requirement to verify the age of the tobacco purchaser through checking his/her ID, and does recommend checking anyone under the age of 27 years. However, it does not explain that the reason for the higher cut-off age is that studies have found stores were twice as likely to sell tobacco to 16 and 17 year olds as to 15 year olds (CDHS 2003), and therefore it is critical to be more vigilant with older adolescents.

4. The “We Card” program does not address any of the adverse health effects of tobacco use in general or on adolescents in particular.
5. The “We Card” program does not discuss the amount of in-store advertising and its influence on customers, restrictions of in-store tobacco advertisement, or the proper placement of tobacco promotional items, as recommended in CSAP.
6. The “We Card” program does not require active compliance checks and enforcement efforts to reduce illegal sales, although these actions would be the most effective steps to take to reduce youth sales.

DISCUSSION

Studies have shown that understanding the underlying reason for a specific policy or regulation enhances the chances for compliance (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention 2005). Health education messages for retailers do not need to cast the store staff as public health agents required to educate their customers about the dangers of smoking, as some retailers in focus groups have argued (Strategic Tobacco Retail Effort 2000). Rather, the purpose is to supply the retailers with information that increases their understanding of the effects of tobacco, of the tobacco industry, and of their store practices. First, they need to understand the negative health consequences of tobacco use in general and adolescent nicotine addiction in particular, as well as its subsequent toll on society as the basis for the enactment of youth access laws. This knowledge may increase their vigilance and compliance with the law. The understanding of the hazards of tobacco use may also help denormalize tobacco use in the eyes of the leading suppliers of tobacco to the public. Programs developed in Massachusetts and Minnesota have stressed the health consequences of tobacco use in general and adolescent tobacco use in particular (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention 2005).

Retailer education materials need to provide background information on store practices that contribute to youth tobacco sales. For example, underage employees tend to sell tobacco products to minors more often than older employees and are a major source for high school-aged smokers (Cummings et al. 1998; DiFranza and Coleman 2001; Weinbaum et al. 1996). Therefore, retailers need to understand the importance of placing older employees at the cash register.

The tobacco industry's program, "We Card," does not discuss the influence of store tobacco advertisements or price reductions, or the risks of selling tobacco to minors (or to anyone); and it does not conduct compliance checks or enforce penalties, including the loss of tobacco sales, for violations. However, these would be ways in which a retailer education program could be more effective.

It would be helpful if retailers understood the ways in which the tobacco industry tries to influence the store environment and customers as a basis for understanding the need to reduce these influences. A qualitative study with 29 tobacco retailers conducted by Feighery et al. (2003) found that tobacco companies exert substantial control on retail stores through their incentives programs and on the amount and placement of their products and advertisements in the most visible locations, thereby causing all shoppers, regardless of age, to be exposed to pro-smoking messages. Another study found that stores where adolescents shopped more frequently contained almost three times more tobacco marketing materials and shelf space than other stores in the same community (Henriksen et al. 2004).

The “We Card” program is widely distributed in the U. S., but its influence may be greater among independent retailers as compared to larger retail chains in which AVCs are more likely to operate. Lacking the training programs of the big chains, the independent retailers may depend more on external sources for information regarding youth access laws and responsible retailing practices, as indicated from the results of retailer focus groups (Strategic Tobacco Retail Effort 2001). Some retailers mentioned they did like the “We Card” age-of-purchase calendars supplied by the program; others mentioned showing the “We Card” video training to their employees (Strategic Tobacco Retail Effort 2001). They also mentioned that it is convenient to get their information from one source. Thus, independent tobacco retailers appear to depend on the “We Card” program as a source of information for federal and state youth access laws (Strategic Tobacco Retail Effort 2000).

If a retailer education program hopes to successfully take the place of “We Card,” then it will need to find ways to be equally useful and accessible. Dependence of retailers on the “We Card” program for information and training regarding youth access laws points to the need for an alternative widespread retailer education program. This is an opportune time because the Coalition for Responsible Tobacco Retailing has started to charge a fee for its “We Card” educational kit, making it less accessible.

The Coalition claims that its “We Card” program has been very successful, yet our literature review revealed no evidence of any scientific study, industry or otherwise, evaluating the effects of the “We Card” Program on tobacco sales or on adolescent smoking prevalence rates. A study of the tobacco documents by Landman et al. (2002) found that R. J. Reynolds evaluated the success of a tobacco retail program in the United Kingdom based on the percentage of retailers using its materials at the point of sale; no evaluation of the program’s impact on tobacco sales to minors was reported (Landman et al. 2002). Studies evaluating the impact of the presence of age-of-sale warning signs on tobacco sales to minors found that they had no effect on retailer compliance with youth access state laws (Arday et al. 1997; DiFranza and Brown 1992; O’Grady et al. 1999). In a study investigating the association between type of signage at retail stores and illegal tobacco sales to minors, researchers found that government signage had a protective effect on tobacco sales to minors in comparison to no warning signs, whereas the tobacco industry’s signage was equivalent to having no sign at all (Cowling and Robins 2000).

The industry’s claim that it has a good program to reduce youth sales appears to ignore the studies that found minimal to no association between retailer education programs and decreases in tobacco sales to minors and adolescent tobacco use, unless there is community wide enforcement of retailer compliance (Bagott et al. 1997; Chaloupka and Pacula 1998; Fichtenberg and Glantz 2002; Forster and Wolfson 1998; Rigotti et al. 1997; Stead and Lancaster 2000). In studies that did find a minimal association between retailer education and adolescent smoking, the effect was limited to younger adolescents (7th grade) and was not sustainable

(Altman et al. 1999; Forster et al. 1998; Staff et al. 1998). Studies have also shown that adolescent smokers find other social means to obtain tobacco products when retail compliance to youth access laws increases, especially if the enforcement leaves gaps in a community (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 1996; Forster and Wolfson 1998; Rigotti et al. 1997).

What evidence we do have about the industry's program suggests that the program is not a good use of funds for deterring tobacco sales to minors. Instead, it may do harm by diluting the effectiveness of the state mandated signage and conveying the myth that tobacco corporations are concerned about reducing tobacco use among youth.

The tobacco industry is spending millions of dollars and a great amount of public relations effort to refute allegations that it targets adolescents in its marketing activities. PM USA claims to have spent over \$ 500 million in youth smoking prevention since 1998 through its media and merchant programs promoting responsible retailing (Philip Morris USA 2003a). The following quote from PM USA's Web site indicates that it considers responsible retailing as a youth smoking prevention program: "Philip Morris USA believes that responsible retailing is an integral part of the overall effort to help prevent youth smoking. Efforts in this area include support of the Coalition for Responsible Tobacco Retailing and the 'We Card' program and youth access prevention requirements and incentives for retail customers" (Philip Morris USA 2003b).

Philip Morris's labeling of the "We Card" program as a youth smoking prevention effort may give the impression that it is a responsible corporate citizen. The image and perception of the tobacco industry as responsible may normalize tobacco use among older age groups and undermine public health and litigation efforts to reduce tobacco use in all age populations. It may also be a means to fight states' efforts to pass stricter tobacco legislation (Landman et al. 2002).

A state-sponsored free tobacco retail education program, encompassing all the necessary elements for responsible retailing practices, may be one way to inform retailers about the health hazards of tobacco use in the hope of increasing their compliance with youth access laws. Other states have implemented their own programs. Florida's "Slashing Underage Sales II" is offered through a retailer kit (with a training video for employees, signage, and a specialty calendar) and via the Internet (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention 2005). The Alabama Alcoholic Beverage Control Board administers a legislatively mandated responsible vendor program that has been expanded to include tobacco (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention 2005).

Maine's "No Buts" program is a voluntary program for retailers who agree to adopt identified responsible-retailing practices, including a written tobacco sales policy, hiring and training practices, and using some of the store items provided in the retailer's kit. The Maine program is tied into licensing penalties, such

that stores gain some credit toward reducing future penalties or against potential license revocation if they participate in the Maine program and have three clean compliance checks (Archard 2005). The Tobacco Coordinator for the Maine attorney general's office credits part of that state's success to the combination of the credits and the threat of fines and potential loss of license for violations. Retailers must renew their licenses annually; licenses can be suspended after two violations; and while retailer participation in the "No Buts" training is initially voluntary, it is required after a violation. Additionally, the program has outreach efforts and special training materials designed to appeal to young clerks (Archard 2005). It is a good example of how tobacco control efforts, state licensing, and states' attorneys general can work in partnership to improve retailer compliance.

The California Cigarette and Tobacco Products Licensing Act of 2003 (California Business and Professions Code 22990-22996), which went into effect in January 2004, requires licensing of tobacco retailers, wholesalers, manufacturers, distributors, and importers in California. The law has significant flaws: tobacco retailers do not have to pay an annual license fee (the funding generated initially for the program runs out by 2010); the law did not appropriate funding for sales to minors compliance checks; retailers face little likelihood that a license would be suspended for illegal sales to minors because of the stringent contingencies required before convictions lead to suspension; and the database of licensed retailers is not accessible to public health tobacco control agencies (Roeseler 2003). More effective licensing agreements could be enacted at the local level or at the state level when the law expires in 2010. Components of effective licensing ordinances would include an annual fee that funds routine compliance checks, enforcement of licensing and other tobacco control laws, administration and retailer education, clear designation of the enforcement agencies, multiple and cumulative penalties including suspension of license for violation of any tobacco control law and revocation of license for third or fourth violations, and loss of tobacco advertising with loss of license (Kline 2003).

An effective program to reduce illegal sales to youth would combine several of the components discussed above: comprehensive retailer education, widespread reach and access, public health and consumer protection partnerships, licensing with annual fees to fund education and enforcement, routine compliance checks, meaningful financial penalties for violations, and license revocation for repeated problems.

LIMITATIONS

This study is based on an analysis of materials retrieved from literature reviews and requests for materials. There may have been relevant materials that were not included. Also, the absence of studies on the effectiveness of the “We Card” materials does not indicate the materials cannot be effective, but simply that there is no indication that they work. Finally, the evaluation criteria for our content analysis have not yet been validated; thus, generalizations from these results should be made with caution.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Retailer education should include the components recommended by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, including the rationale for age verification practices, the risks of tobacco use, and the effects of retail advertising (including the promotional strategies of price reductions) on youth.

Retailers need to learn that there is no proof that the “We Card” program works. Instead, it may be completely ineffective at reducing tobacco sales to minors.

Positive education for retailers would help them understand the reasons for structuring their store environments and practices in recommended ways, and could help them understand the effects of their tobacco sales. It may also help defuse lobbying efforts on the part of retailers against tobacco control efforts.

Efforts should be made to explore the feasibility of linking annual tobacco retailer licensing and fees to state required tobacco retailer education, outreach, and surveillance. Stronger licensing and penalty fees would help offset the costs of this education effort and serve as a strong incentive to avoid illegal sales.

Compliance checks are an essential component of reducing sales of tobacco to youth. Retailer education needs to stress the need for routine checks as a way to help the stores reduce underage sales. Ideally, the stores would fund effective compliance checks to watch over their own employees and identify staff needing more education.

There should be some mechanism that rewards retailers and their staff who complete a rigorous course of education on reducing tobacco sales to youth.

The involvement of the retail chains in setting up AVCs, albeit under pressure from the attorneys general, suggests that stores, gas stations, and pharmacies can be powerful partners for or against retailer compliance. While the industry as a whole may not be ready, there may be chains or associations that could be involved in discussions and trainings conducted by the California Tobacco Control Section, with the goal of improving compliance as a way to protect youth and avoid penalties. These types of partnerships may help build a growing awareness within the retail industry about the risks of tobacco and the need to end sales to youth.

REFERENCES

- Altman, D. G., L. Rasenick-Douss, V. Foster, and J. B. Tye. 1991. Sustained effects of an educational program to reduce sales of cigarettes to minors. *American Journal of Public Health* 81: 891–893.
- Altman, D. G., A. Y. Wheelis, M. McFarlane, H. Lee, and S. P. Fortmann. 1999. The relationship between tobacco access and use among adolescents: A four community study. *Soc Sci Med* 48: 759–775.
- American Lung Association of California. 2004. Tobacco retail licensing reduces tobacco sales to minors: Six arguments for enforcement. Retrieved April 27, 2005, from <http://www.californialung.org/thecenter/documents/Licensing-Enforcement-Support.doc>.
- Arday, D. R., R. M. Klevens, D. E. Nelson, P. Huang, G. A. Giovino, and P. Mowery. 1997. Predictors of tobacco sales to minors. *Prev Med* 26(1): 8–13.
- Bagott, M., C. Jordan, C. Wright, and S. Jarvis. 1997. Test sales do not have impact on prevalence of smoking by children. *British Medical Journal* 315: 491.
- Biglan, A., J. Henderson, D. Humphrey, M. Yasui, R. Whisman, C. Black, et al. 1995. Mobilising positive reinforcement to reduce youth access to tobacco. *Tobacco Control* 4: 42–48.
- California Department of Health Services Tobacco Control Section. 2004. California youth tobacco purchase survey. Retrieved April 26, 2005, from http://www.tecc.org/store/stages/1_document/t_illegalsales.ppt.
- California Office of the Attorney General. 2005. News Alerts. Retrieved May 25, 2005, from <http://www.ag.ca.gov/newsalerts/2004/>.
- Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. 2005. Best practices for responsible retailing: Conference edition. Retrieved April 27, 2005, from http://fcpr.fsu.edu/retail/documents/BP_Report_Conference_Edition.pdf.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 1996. Tobacco use and usual source of cigarettes among high school students, United States, 1995. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR)* 45: 413–418.

Chaloupka, F. J., and R. L. Pacula. 1998. Limiting youth access to tobacco: The early impact of the Synar Amendment on youth smoking. Chicago, IL: Department of Economics, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Chapman, S., M. King, B. Andrews, E. McKay, P. Markham, and S. Woodward. 1994. Effects of publicity and a warning letter on illegal cigarette sales to minors. *Australian Journal of Public Health* 18: 39–42.

Clark, P. I., S. L. Natanblut, C. L. Schmitt, C. Wolters, and R. Iachan. 2000. Factors associated with tobacco sales to minors: Lessons learned from the FDA compliance checks. *JAMA* 284(6): 729–734.

Coalition for Responsible Tobacco Retailing. 2005. We Card's history & accomplishments. Retrieved April 26, 2005, from <http://wecard.org/Pages/history.html>.

Consumer Affairs. 2004. News Alert. Retrieved May 25, 2005, from http://www.consumeraffairs.com/news04/tobacco_ca.

Cowling, D. W., and D. M. Robins. 2000. Rate of illegal tobacco sales to minors varies by sign type in California. *American Journal of Public Health* 90(11): 1792–1793.

Cummings, K. M., A. Hyland, T. Saunders-Martin, J. Perla, P. R. Coppola, and T. F. Pechacek. 1988. Evaluation of an enforcement program to reduce tobacco sales to minors. *American Journal of Public Health* 88(6): 932–936.

DiFranza, J. R. 2001. State and federal compliance with the Synar Amendment: Federal fiscal year 1998. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine* 155(5): 572–578.

DiFranza, J. R., and L. J. Brown. 1992. The Tobacco Institute's "It's the Law" campaign: Has it halted illegal sales of tobacco to children? *American Journal of Public Health* 82(9): 1271–1272.

DiFranza, J. R., and M. Coleman. 2001. Sources of tobacco for youth in communities with strong enforcement of youth access laws. *Tobacco Control* 10: 323–328.

DiFranza, J. R., and J. J. Libretti. 1999. State and federal revenues from tobacco consumed by minors. *American Journal of Public Health* 89(7): 1106–1108.

DiFranza, J. R., and N. A. Rigotti. 1999. Impediments to the enforcement of youth access laws. *Tobacco Control* 8(2): 152–155.

DiFranza, J. R., J. A. Savageau, and J. Bouchard. 2001. Is the standard compliance check protocol a valid measure of the accessibility of tobacco to underage smokers? *Tobacco Control* 10: 227–232.

DiFranza, J. R., and J. B. Tye. 1990. Who profits from tobacco sales to children? *JAMA* 263: 2784–2787.

Feighery, E. 2003. Literature review of the provisions included in the assurances of voluntary compliance. Oakland, CA: Public Health Institute.

Feighery, E., K. Ribisl, P. Clark, and H. Haladjian. 2003. How tobacco companies ensure prime placement of their advertising and products in stores: Interviews with retailers about tobacco company incentive programmes. *Tobacco Control* 12(2): 184–188.

Fichtenberg, C. M., and S. A. Glantz. 2002. Youth access interventions do not affect youth smoking. *Pediatrics* 109: 1088–1092.

Food and Drug Administration. 1996. Regulations restricting the sale and distribution of cigarettes and smokeless tobacco to protect children and adolescents: Final rule. *Federal Register* 61: 44369–45318.

Forster, J. L., M. Hourigan, and P. McGovern. 1992. Availability of cigarettes to underage youth in three communities. *Preventive Medicine* 21: 320–328.

Forster, J. L., D. M. Murray, M. Wolfson, T. M. Blaine, A. C. Wagenaar, and D. Henrikus. 1998. The effects of community policies to reduce youth access to tobacco. *American Journal of Public Health* 88(8): 1193–1198.

Forster, J. L., and M. Wolfson. 1998. Youth access to tobacco: Policies and politics. *Annual Review of Public Health* 19: 203–235.

Gemson, D. H., H. L. Moats, B. X. Watkins, M. L. Ganz, S. Robinson, and E. Heaton. 1998. Laying down the law: Reducing illegal tobacco sales to minors in central Harlem. *American Journal of Public Health* 88: 936–939.

Henrikson, L., E. C. Feighery, N. C. Schleicher, H. H. Haladjian, and S. P. Fortmann. 2004. Reaching youth at the point of sale: Cigarette marketing is more prevalent in stores where adolescents shop frequently. *Tobacco Control* 13(3): 315–318.

Hyland, A., K. M. Cummings, and M. Seiwel. 2000. The impact of untruthful age reporting during tobacco compliance checks. *J Public Health Manag Pract* 6(3): 115–118.

Jason, L. A., W. D. Billows, D. L. Schnopp-Wyatt, and C. King. 1996. Reducing the illegal sales of cigarettes to minors: Analysis of alternative enforcement schedules. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* 29: 333–344.

Keay, K., S. Woodruff, M. Wildey, and E. M. Kenney. 1993. Effect of a retailer intervention on cigarette sales to minors in San Diego County, California. *Tobacco Control* 3: 145–151.

Kessler, D. A., J. P. Wildenfeld, and L. J. Thompson. 1997. The Food and Drug Administration's rule on tobacco: Blending science and law. *Pediatrics* 99(6): 884–887.

Kline, R. 2003. Effective and innovative local licensing ordinances. Training presentation, November 2003. Retrieved June 14, 2005, from <http://www.tecc.org/store/training/licensing2.html>

Krevor, B. S., A. Lieberman, and K. Gerlack. 2002. Application of consumer protection authority in preventing tobacco sales to minors. *Tobacco Control* 11: 109–111.

Landman, A., P. M. Ling, and S. Glantz. 2002. Tobacco industry youth smoking prevention programs: Protecting the industry and hurting tobacco control. *American Journal of Public Health* 92(6): 917–930.

Landrine, H., E. A. Klonoff, and R. Alcaraz. 1996. Asking age and identification may decrease minors' access to tobacco. *Prev Med* 25(3): 301–306.

Landrine, H., E. A. Klonoff, D. Lang, and R. Alcaraz. 2001. Use of identification cards by underage youth to purchase tobacco. *JAMA* 285(18): 2329.

Landrine, H., E. A. Klonoff, and A. Reina-Patton. 2000. Minors' access to tobacco before and after the California STAKE Act. *Tobacco Control* 9(Suppl. II): ii15–ii17.

Lantz, P. M., P. D. Jacobson, and K. E. Warner. 2000. Investing in youth tobacco control: A review of smoking prevention and control strategies. *Tobacco Control* 9: 47–63.

Lee, L. L., E. A. Gilpin, and J. P. Pierce. 1993. Changes in the patterns of initiation of cigarette smoking in the United States: 1950, 1965, and 1980. *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention* 2(6): 593–597.

Levinson, A. H., S. Hendershott, and T. E. Byers. 2002. The ID effect on youth access to cigarettes. *Tobacco Control* 11(4): 296–299.

Levy, D., T. K. Friend, and H. Holder. 2001. Effect of policies directed at youth access to smoking: Results from the simsmoke computer simulation model. *Tobacco Control* 10: 108–116.

O’Grady, B., M. Asbridge, and T. Abernathy. 1999. Analysis of factors related to illegal tobacco sales to young people in Ontario. *Tobacco Control* 8(3): 301–305.

Philip Morris USA. 2003a. Youth access prevention. Retrieved April 26, 2005, from http://www.philipmorrisusa.com/en/policies_practices/ysp/youth_access_prevention.asp.

Philip Morris USA. 2003a. Youth smoking prevention. Retrieved April 30, 2005, from http://www.philipmorrisusa.com/en/policies_practices/ysp/responsible_retailing.asp.

Pierce, J. P., and E. A. Gilpin. 1995. A historical analysis of tobacco marketing and the uptake of smoking by youth in the United States 1890-1977. *Health Psychology* 14: 500–508.

Radecki, T. E., and C. D. Zdunich. 1993. Tobacco sales to minors in 97 U. S. and Canadian communities. *Tobacco Control* 2: 300–305.

Redhead, S. C., and J. Austin-Lane. 1998. Congressional research service report to Congress 98–678: Tobacco control: Enforcement and effectiveness of federal and state youth access laws. Retrieved April 27, 2005, from <http://www.ncseonline.org/NLE/CRSreports/Agriculture/ag-72.cfm>

Roeseler, A. 2003. AB 71 (B&P Code 22970–22995)—Its impact on local licensing. Training presentation, November 2003. Retrieved June 14, 2005, from <http://www.tecc.org/store/training/licensing2.html>.

Rigotti, N. A., J. R. DiFranza, Y. Chang, T. Tisdale, B. Kemp, and D. E. Singer. 1997. The effect of enforcing tobacco sales laws on adolescents’ access to tobacco and smoking behavior. *New England Journal of Medicine* 337(15): 1044–1051.

Staff, M., L. March, A. Brnabic, K. Hort, J. Alcock, S. Coles, et al. 1998. Can non-prosecutory enforcement of public health legislation reduce smoking among high school students? *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 22(suppl. 3): 332–335.

STAKE Act. 1994. California Business and Professions Code 22950–22960.

Stead, F. L., and T. Lancaster. 2000. A systematic review of interventions for preventing tobacco sales to minors. *Tobacco Control* 9: 169–176.

Strategic Tobacco Retail Effort. 2000. What do retailers say about illegal sales and tobacco marketing? Retrieved April 26, 2005, from <http://www.tecc.org/store/introduction/introduction.pdf>.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. 1996. Tobacco regulation for substance abuse prevention and treatment block grants. Final rule. *Federal Register*. Retrieved April 27, 2005, from <http://www.health.org/govpubs/synarr/fact.aspx>.

Sussman, S. 2002. Tobacco industry youth tobacco programming: A review. *Prevention Science* 3(1): 57–67.

Unger, J. B., T. B. Cruz, and E. C. Feighery. 2005. Tobacco advertising in retail outlets in California, 2002–2004. Alhambra, CA: University of Southern California.

United States Department of Health and Human Services. 1994. Preventing tobacco use among young people: A report of the Surgeon General (No. stock number 017-001-00491-0). Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health.

Weinbaum, Z., V. Quinn, A. Roeseler, V. Foster, N. Bagnato, M. Johnson, et al. 1996. Estimates of retailers willing to sell tobacco to minors—California, August–September 1995 and June–July 1996. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR)* 45(5): 1095–1100.

Willey, M. B., S. I. Woodruff, A. Agro, K. D. Keay, E. M. Kenney, and T. L. Conway. 1995. Sustained effects of educating retailers to reduce cigarette sales to minors. *Public Health Rep* 110: 625–629.

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF THE COMPONENTS OF CSAP'S BEST PRACTICES FOR RESPONSIBLE RETAILING

PERSONNEL POLICIES

Screen applicants for positions that might involve selling tobacco for past violations of prohibitions on selling or supplying tobacco or other restricted products to minors. If found, this fact should be taken into consideration in the hiring decision.

Assign only adult employees (preferably 21 years or older) to sell tobacco.

Inform new employee of store policies concerning youth access to tobacco products and the disciplinary consequences of making an illegal tobacco sale to a minor.

Inform new employee that he/she will be actively monitored for compliance with sales to minor laws and store policies in connection with compensation, promotion, and retention decisions.

COMPREHENSIVE TRAINING TOPICS

Federal, state, and local laws on youth access to tobacco (in particular the health and societal costs of tobacco use as the basis for these laws)

Company policies on youth access laws

Definition of tobacco products and, where applicable, smoking paraphernalia to which company policies and sales to minor laws apply

Laws and company policies on requiring identification, including the age that triggers ID verification and the acceptable forms of ID

Specific age-verifying protocols designed to ensure that the date of birth is read, clearly understood by the clerk, and compared to a calendar or EAV device. The trainer should explain that many illegal sales are made to minors who produce IDs showing that they are under the legal age

Verification of an ID's authenticity

Features of an ID that must be checked

How to tell and what to do if an ID appears to have been altered or is being misused

Prescribed methods and practical techniques for handling recurring situations

When and how to ask for a second ID

Declining a sale when the customer has no ID or when ID shows customer to be underage

Declining a sale because of concerns about whether the ID has been altered or is being misused

Recognizing and declining a potential third-party sale

Resisting customer pressure and handling a customer's abusive conduct

Clear directives on when to seek additional assistance from the store supervisor and behavior that triggers contacting the police (e.g., theft, abusive behavior)

Emphasis on the special challenges associated with declining to sell tobacco to underage persons who are friends, acquaintances, and peer group members

Trainees should practice the techniques, methods, and phrases that they should use in these situations

Emphasis on an employee's not being required to make a tobacco sale (and being required to refuse) if there is any question that doing so would violate the laws or company policies on youth access to tobacco

Written test to establish that the employee has the knowledge required to perform in accordance with the laws and company policies on youth access to tobacco

Training should include testing with role playing to ensure that the employee can perform properly

Written acknowledgment by each new employee that he/she has read and understands the policy and other information provided, will follow the policies, and will refrain from selling tobacco products to minors

RETRAINING

Employees who have responsibilities related to tobacco sales but are not new hires should receive additional training periodically (every 6 months) to ensure that they maintain the requisite knowledge, skill, and motivation. At a minimum, this training should include the following components:

- A review of the applicable laws and the company's written policies on sales to minors.
- A discussion of performance goals for specific compliance checks and ways to attain those goals.

On completion of such training, each employee should be required to sign an acknowledgment that he or she has read and understands the policy statements and other information provided.

In addition to periodically scheduled retraining for all employees, any employee who is observed by store supervisors to depart from the store's prescribed tobacco sales protocols should be immediately retrained in the proper protocol.

POINT-OF-SALE PRACTICES

Signage

- Signage and posting requirements by local, state, or federal law
- Signs should be posted on each store entrance and at each cash register where tobacco is sold
- Signs should be posted at each tobacco product display, indicating the minimum lawful age for a person to purchase tobacco products
- The store will ask for an ID from any person appearing to be a particular age (often 26 or higher)

Inspection of IDs

- Use of specialty age calendars, checkout scanners, and EAV devices to ensure that age can be easily and reliably verified
- Use of video cameras at checkout counters for internal supervision
- Signs indicating that all sales are to be clerk assisted
- No vending machines or self-service displays

SUPERVISORY POLICIES

An internal compliance check should be performed at varying or random times of the day no less frequently than once every 6 months.

The internal compliance check should either use a person of legal age who should be requested to produce ID or preferably, where it is legal to do so, use a person who is under legal age to buy tobacco to test whether IDs are being requested and whether sales are made in spite of the presentation of an underage ID.

Employees who fail the compliance test should be informed immediately, instructed on what constitutes proper compliance, and cautioned to avoid further instances of noncompliance

A non-complying employee should be informed at the earliest practicable time of the consequences of the violation and any subsequent violations, given remedial training and testing (if the employee is being retained), and informed that he or she will be the subject of additional compliance checks in the future.

Both the employee who passes a compliance check and his or her immediate supervisor should at the earliest practicable time not only be informed of the success but also be reminded that passing a compliance test is noted in personnel records and taken into account in company decisions on compensation, promotion, and retention.

The employee should be presented with a tangible reward, such as a cash bonus or “comp” time.

USE OF VIDEOTAPES

Supervisory personnel should periodically review the tapes to monitor employees’ compliance with sales to minor laws and store policies.

EMPLOYEE POLICIES

Companies should establish employee incentives and disincentives to reinforce company policies on tobacco sales to young customers.

PUBLIC SECTOR COMPONENT

Store owners should get involved in community coalitions. Community coalitions can augment the number of compliance inspections performed by enforcement agencies and provide additional information to retailers.

APPENDIX B: “WE CARD” RETAIL EDUCATION MATERIALS RECEIVED 2002–2004

ID#	Material Name	Material Type	Quantity Received	Date Received
2a	Age of Purchase Calendar 2002/2003/2004	Calendar	3	7/12/02, 9/19/03, 1/5/04
2b	Renewal Kit Explanation Letter	Letter	1	7/12/02
2c	18 Yrs Tobacco Purchase	Sticker	5	7/12/02, 9/19/03, 1/5/04
2d	18 Yrs of Age decal	Door Decal	4	7/12/02, 9/19/03, 1/5/04
2e	“We Card” Order Form	Postcard	2	7/12/02, 7/19/03
2f	California Employee Guide	Brochure	4	7/12/02, 9/19/03, 1/5/04
2g	Guide to Best Practices	Brochure	3	7/7/03, 7/12/02, 1/5/04
2h	California State Sign	Sticker	3	7/07/03, 9/19/03, 1/5/04
2i	Special Bulletin	Bulletin	4	7/07/03, 9/19/03, 1/5/04
2j	“We Card” Explanation Letter	Letter	2	7/07/03, 7/19/03
2k	18 Yr Old Fake ID Tip Sheet	Sheet	1	9/19/03
2l	18 Yr “We Card” Break-room	Poster	1	9/19/03
2m	18 Yr “We Card” Counter Sign	Stand	1	9/19/03
2n	“We Card” California Training	Video	1	9/19/03
2o	“We Card” Training Program	CD-ROM	1	9/19/03
2p	Thank You & Item Reduction Notice	Postcard	1	1/5/04

APPENDIX C: CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE “WE CARD” PROGRAM COMPARED TO CSAP’S BEST PRACTICES FOR RESPONSIBLE RETAILING

Component	CSAP’s Best Practices for Responsible Retailing—Personnel Policies	Covered in “We Card” Program?
Hiring	Screening new applicants for past violations of youth access laws	NO
	Assigning only adult employees (>21 yr) to sell tobacco	NO
	New employees should be supplied with written information on store policies regarding tobacco sales and the disciplinary consequences of making a tobacco sale to a minor; monitoring of compliance will be used in connection with compensation, promotion, and retention decisions by owners/managers; signed acknowledgment by employee for receiving the above information	YES

Component	CSAP’s Best Practices for Responsible Retailing—Personnel Policies	Covered in “We Card” Program?
Training	Federal, state, and local laws of youth access to tobacco	YES
	Adverse effects of tobacco use on health and its societal costs explained	NO
	Company policies on youth access laws	YES
	Definition of tobacco products and tobacco paraphernalia	YES
	Store policies on requiring identification for tobacco sales	YES
	Age that triggers ID verification	YES
	Acceptable forms of ID	YES
	Age-verifying protocols to ensure that the date of birth is read and clearly understood	YES
	Verification of an ID’s authenticity	YES
	When and how to ask for a second ID	YES
	Explanation about the numerous illegal sales made to minors who produce IDs showing that they are under the legal age	NO
	Declining a sale when: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • customer has no ID • ID shows customer to be underage • ID has been altered or is being misused • A potential third-party sale 	YES

Component	CSAP’s Best Practices for Responsible Retailing—Personnel Policies	Covered in “We Card” Program?
Training	Emphasis on the special challenges associated with declining to sell tobacco to underage friends and acquaintances	YES
	Resisting customer pressure and handling a customer’s abusive conduct	YES
	Role playing to practice techniques, methods, and phrases that should be used in declining a tobacco sale to minors, friends, and third party sales	YES
	Clear directives on when to seek additional assistance from store supervisor	YES
	Clear directives on what triggers contacting the police (theft, aggressive physical behavior)	YES
	Written test to establish employee has the knowledge required to perform in accordance with the laws and company policies on youth access to tobacco	YES
	Retraining for any employee observed to depart from store’s policy for tobacco sales to minors	YES