Shame-Based Appeals in a Tobacco Control Public Health Campaign: Potential Harms and Benefits

Cati G. Brown-Johnson, PhD and **Judith J. Prochaska, PhD, MPH**
Stanford Prevention Research Center, Department of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA

Smoking is the leading preventable cause of death worldwide, responsible for 1 in 10 deaths globally (>5 million a year). Tobacco use adversely impacts not just smokers, but also those around them through secondhand smoke exposure. Given the significant personal and societal costs of tobacco use, any strategy to reduce smoking should be considered.

In this issue, Amonini et al. report on development and evaluation of a shame-based public health campaign in Perth, Australia.[1] Public health media campaigns in Australia, in particular, have raised awareness and instigated behavior change via approaches ranging from direct and forceful (e.g., "Belt Up or Suffer the Pain" seatbelt campaign[2]) to humorous and memorable (e.g., "Slip! Slop! Slap!" for skin cancer prevention[3]).

In developing their tobacco control ad campaign, Amonini et al. conducted focus groups with smokers and interviewed former smokers, identifying salient themes of social isolation (e.g., "you feel like a 'leper'"). Next, they created and piloted an ad prototype in an experimental setting, which demonstrated believability/relevance and perceived efficacy in stopping smokers from smoking. Finally, they created the shame-based ad, evaluating it in a publicly launched campaign wherein a majority of respondents self-reported in the first several weeks that they reduced cigarette consumption (36%), attempted cessation (16%), or quit (2%).

While suggestive as a promising public health approach, the potential for harm associated with an emphasis on shame also bears consideration, particularly when in relation to a behavior sustained through addiction and increasingly concentrated among marginalized groups. Today, smokers in Australia and other industrialized countries are largely characterized by lower income and education, ethnic minority status, and co-occurring mental and physical health disorders.[4] Capitalization on shame-based public health campaigns will, in effect, target these groups.

Corresponding Author: Judith J. Prochaska, PhD, MPH, Stanford Prevention Research Center, Department of Medicine, Stanford University, Medical School Office Building, X316 1265 Welch Road, Stanford, CA 94305-5411 USA, T 650-724-3608/ F 650-725-6247 jpro@stanford.edu.

In contrast, the tobacco industry's campaigns have emphasized themes of freedom, affluence, and excitement, creating the perception that smoking is a choice of free will.[5] In this context, when smokers fail to quit, they often blame themselves.[6]

SMOKING-RELATED SHAME AND STIGMA

Stigma is a concept derived from classic sociology, whereby negative differential treatment is experienced by groups with socially "discredited" identities.[7] Stigma related to smoking is experienced as shame, self-judgment, and outright discrimination in the form of denial of goods, opportunities, and services.[8] Shame is a central focus of research on lung cancer stigma (whereby smokers blame themselves for the disease),[9] and an emergent area of interest with respect to tobacco use more generally.

Research indicates about 40% of smokers and ex-smokers perceive substantial smoking stigma,[10] with a "deep divide" existing between smokers and nonsmokers.[11] While a minority of smokers report experiencing outright discrimination (e.g. denial of work or housing), smokers may withstand many tiny insults (e.g., purposeful coughing in their presence, glaring looks from nonsmokers).[11] Smokers speak of "smoking islands", the few remaining areas, largely isolated, where one can smoke without judgment.[12] While cessation is a positive possible response to smoking stigma, of concern is smokers' reported hiding of their use from potential supports, such as family, friends, and health care providers.[10]

Shame-based anti-tobacco public health campaigns may lead smokers to attempt cessation in isolation, unassisted. Only 3-5% of unaided quit attempts are successful, and defeated efforts may negatively impact smokers by decreasing self-efficacy and increasing stigmatization upon relapse. To counteract this potential, shame-based appeals ought to at minimum include explicit instructions to contact a clinician or quit-line for help with quitting smoking.

RISKS OF A SHAME-BASED ANTI-TOBACCO MEDIA APPROACH

As with medications, side effects must be considered both in terms of likelihood and magnitude. Of concern, in their three-part study Amonini et al. did not test for increases in experienced shame among viewers.

Prior to dissemination, assessment of message impact on shame and stigma should be examined, particularly among disadvantaged groups. Broad-based communication interventions will reach those diagnosed with lung cancer and COPD, who, smoker or not, may internalize the stigma of negative societal impressions. Lung cancer stigma is associated with poorer psychosocial outcomes[13] and morbidity[14] among smokers and non-smokers equally.[15] As such, shame-based public messages may contribute to stress and increased symptom burden. With regard to smokers with mental illness, imagery suggestive of individuals as lepers or isolates may compound stereotypes with adverse effects. Explicit fore-fronting of diversity and gender analyses is a strategy within tobacco control for protecting such vulnerable groups.[16]

MESSAGE ALTERNATIVES WORTH EXPLORING

In the current study, all messages except the shame-based ad had previously been used in public campaigns, and Amonini et al. acknowledged a potential novelty confound effect. Future investigation should compare multiple novel message themes; worth considering as an alternative are shame-free guilt appeals, which explicitly do not elicit shame.

Though Amonini et al. did not find guilt to be as effective as shame, shame-free guilt messaging has been a powerful motivator in other contexts. A recent study promoting STD screening found that shame-free guilt appeals focusing on behavior (e.g., "forgetful behavior") and the consequence of actions on others (e.g., to elicit empathy) that identified specific coping strategies outperformed shame appeals that focused on intrinsic features of identity (e.g., "an irresponsible person").[18] Since Amonini et al. did not formally assess the impact of the ads on feelings of shame and guilt, we do not know whether the guilt ad utilized was "shame-free." Future messages assessed for elicitation of shame and guilt individually will be better equipped to help determine the risks and benefits of shame and/or guilt messaging.

In exploring novel public health approaches, studies such as Amonini et al.'s may move the field forward on the path to 100% smoke-free. Consistent with the Hippocratic oath of ethical practice in medicine, however, public health efforts above all must do no damage or harm. As tobacco use increasingly becomes denormalized, public health campaigns must not only attend to positive results, but also guard against harm in vulnerable groups. In particular, interventions that risk stigmatizing could backfire by exacerbating health disparities rather than reducing them.

Acknowledgments

REFERENCES

1. Amonini, C.; Pettigrew, S.; Clayforth, C. Tobacco Control. The potential for shame as a message appeal in anti-smoking television advertisements. in press

2. World Health Organization. Transport Accident Commission of Australia. [accessed Nov 10, 2014] 40 years of seat-belts - Belt up or Suffer the Pain 2010. http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/videos/australia_seat_belts_40_years/en

3. Montague M, Borland R, Sinclair C. Slip! Slop! Slap! and SunSmart, 1980-2000: Skin cancer control and 20 years of population-based campaigning. Health Education & Behavior. 2001; 28(3): 290–305. [PubMed: 11380050]

4. Graham H. Smoking, stigma and social class. Journal of Social Policy. 2012; 41(01):83–99.

5. Mejia P, Dorfman L, Cheyne A, et al. The origins of personal responsibility rhetoric in news coverage of the tobacco industry. American Journal of Public Health. 2014; 104(6):1048–1051. [PubMed: 24825205]

6. Halding A-G, Heggdal K, Wahl A. Experiences of self-blame and stigmatisation for self-infliction among individuals living with COPD. Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences. 2011; 25(1):100–107. [PubMed: 20534028]

7. Goffman, E. Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Prentice-Hall Inc; Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, USA: 1963.

8. Brown-Johnson, CG.; Cataldo, JK.; Orozco, N., et al. UCSF Health Disparities Research Symposium VII. San Francisco, California: 2013. Validating the Internalized Stigma of Smoking Inventory (ISSI) with a seriously mentally ill population.

9. Chapple A, Ziebland S, McPherson A. Stigma, shame, and blame experienced by patients with lung cancer: Qualitative study. British Medical Journal. 2004; 328(7454):1470–1473. [PubMed: 15194599]

10. Stuber J, Galea S. Who conceals their smoking status from their health care provider? Nicotine & Tobacco Research. 2009; 11(3):303–307. [PubMed: 19246431]

11. McCool J, Hoek J, Edwards R, et al. Crossing the smoking divide for young adults: Expressions of stigma and identity among smokers and nonsmokers. Nicotine & Tobacco Research. 2012; 15(2): 552–556. [PubMed: 22949576]

12. Thompson L, Pearce J, Barnett JR. Moralising geographies: Stigma, smoking islands and responsible subjects. Area. 2007; 39(4):508–517.

13. Brown-Johnson CG, Brodsky JL, Cataldo JK. Lung cancer stigma, anxiety, depression, and quality of life. Journal of Psychosocial Oncology. 2014; 32(1):59–73. [PubMed: 24428251]

14. Cataldo JK, Brodsky JL. Lung cancer stigma, anxiety, depression and symptom severity. Oncology. 2013; 85(1):33–40. [PubMed: 23816853]

15. Cataldo JK, Jahan TM, Pongquan VL. Lung cancer stigma, depression, and quality of life among ever and never smokers. European Journal of Oncology Nursing. 2012; 16(3):264–269. [PubMed: 21803653]

16. Amos A, Greaves L, Nichter M, et al. Women and tobacco: a call for including gender in tobacco control research, policy and practice. Tobacco Control. 2012; 21(2):236–243. [PubMed: 22166266]

17. Tangney, JP.; Dearing, RL. Shame and Guilt. The Guilford Press; New York, New York: 2002.

18. Boudewyns V, Turner MM, Paquin RS. Shame - free guilt appeals: Testing the emotional and cognitive effects of shame and guilt appeals. Psychology & Marketing. 2013; 30(9):811–825.