

## **Name of Program/Strategy: Restrictions on Price Promotions and Alcohol Discounts—Changing Conditions of Availability**

### **Report Contents**

1. Overview and description
2. Implementation considerations (if available)
3. Descriptive information
4. Outcomes
5. Cost effectiveness report (Washington State Institute of Public Policy – if available)
6. Washington State results (from Performance Based Prevention System (PBPS) – if available)
7. Who is using this program/strategy
8. Study populations
9. Quality of studies
10. Readiness for Dissemination
11. Costs (if available)
12. Contacts for more information

---

### **1. Overview and description**

Regulation or restriction of “happy hours” and other price promotions of alcohol (e.g., two drinks for the price of one, women drink for free), especially in on-premise outlets (i.e., bars and restaurants). Although not specific to college populations, the study has clear implications for college students; many bars surrounding campuses attract students by promoting drink specials. Restrictions on happy hours can be implemented by individual outlets, campuses (if a licensed establishment is on campus), local communities (if communities are not preempted by state law) and the state. In non-licensed settings on campus where alcohol is served, event planners may want to limit the amount of free alcohol available.

### **2. Implementation considerations (if available)**

# ***Excellence in Prevention*** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

---

## **3. Descriptive information**

<b>Areas of Interest</b>	Substance abuse prevention
<b>Outcomes</b>	
<b>Outcome Categories</b>	Alcohol
<b>Ages</b>	
<b>Gender</b>	Male Female
<b>Races/Ethnicities</b>	American Indian or Alaska Native Asian Black or African American Hispanic or Latino White Race/ethnicity unspecified
<b>Settings</b>	
<b>Geographic Locations</b>	Urban Suburban Rural and/or frontier Tribal
<b>Implementation History</b>	
<b>NIH Funding/CER Studies</b>	
<b>Adaptations</b>	
<b>Adverse Effects</b>	
<b>IOM Prevention Categories</b>	Universal

## **4. Outcomes**

### **Scientific Evidence**

Babor, Mendelson, Greenberg, and Kuehnle (1978) found that happy hours were associated with higher consumption among both light and heavy drinkers.

Although this is a reasonable strategy, there is no research on its effectiveness.

# ***Excellence in Prevention*** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

---

- 5. **Cost effectiveness report (Washington State Institute of Public Policy – if available)**
- 6. **Washington State results (from Performance Based Prevention System (PBPS) – if available)**
- 7. **Who is using this program/strategy**

Washington Counties	Oregon Counties

## **8. Study populations**

## **9. Quality of studies**

The documents below were reviewed for Quality of Research. The research point of contact can provide information regarding the studies reviewed and the availability of additional materials, including those from more recent studies that may have been conducted.

### **References**

Babor, T. F., Mendelson, J. H., Greenberg, I., & Kuehnle, J. (1978). Experimental analysis of the “happy hour”: Effects of purchase price on alcohol consumption. *Psychopharmacology*, 58, 35-41.

## **10. Readiness for Dissemination**

## **11. Costs (if available)**

## **12. Contacts**