Concerned about the high rates of childhood obesity in the U.S., policymakers in Congress, the Federal Trade Commission, and agencies such as the Institute of Medicine have explored a variety of potential contributing factors, including the marketing and advertising of food products to children. One area where policymakers have expressed interest, but have also noted a lack of publicly available data, is in the marketing and advertising of food products to children. In order to help fill this gap, the Kaiser Family Foundation conducted a study. "News Analysis - First Analysis of Online Food Advertising: Targeting Children," The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, 15th July 2000, released the first comprehensive analysis of the nature and scope of online food advertising to children, to help inform the decision-making process for policymakers, advocates, and industry.

Methods

The study was designed by staff of the Kaiser Family Foundation in collaboration with Elizabeth Moore, Ph.D., associate professor of marketing at the University of Notre Dame. Professor Moore and her colleagues collected and analyzed the data, and she authored the report to the Foundation on the findings. All websites were accessed and content was coded during the period from June through November 2000.

Using data from Competitive Media Reports, researchers identified the top food brands advertised to children on TV, and then searched for corporate or brand websites for those food products. Any child-oriented brand that was in the top 80% of television advertising spending in its product category was included in the study. A total of 94 brands were identified through this process.

Websites for these brands were included in the study if they had content for children ages 12 and under. In most cases, these were sites whose primary audience was children. In some cases, the primary audience appeared to be either teens or all ages, with content or separate sections likely to appeal to children. Only websites sponsored by a food manufacturer and dealing with the branded products identified through the process described above were included; food or brand characters were featured, found on 73% of the websites) and viral marketing (encouraging children to contact their peers about a specific product or brand, found on 64% of sites).

In addition, a variety of other advertising and marketing tactics are employed on these sites, including sweepstakes and promotions (65%), membership (25%), on-demand access to TV ads (53%), and incentives for product purchase (38%).

Online advertising's reach isn't as broad as that of television, but it's much deeper," said Vicky Rideout, vice president and director of Kaiser's Program for the Study of Entertainment Media and Health, who oversaw the research. "Without good information about what this new wave of advertising really looks like, there can't be effective oversight or policymaking, whether by the industry or by government," she noted. The advertising industry has announced that it is developing more detailed voluntary guidelines for online marketing to children, expected to be released shortly.

The study included detailed analysis of 77 websites, including more than 4,000 unique web pages. Based on data from Nielsen NetRatings, these sites received more than 122 million visits from children ages 2-11 in the second quarter of 2005.

TV advertising and branded websites

The report, "It's Child's Play: Advergaming and the Online Marketing of Food to Children," found that more than eight out of ten (86%) of the top food brands that target children through TV advertising also use branded websites to market to children online.

Unlike traditional TV advertising, these corporate-sponsored websites offer extensive opportunities for visitors to spend an unlimited amount of time interacting with specific food brands in more personal and detailed ways. For instance, the study documents the broad use of "advertisements" (online games in which a company's product is featured, and a food or brand character are featured, found on 73% of the websites) and viral marketing (encouraging children to contact their peers about a specific product or brand, found on 64% of sites).

In addition, a variety of other advertising and marketing tactics are employed on these sites, including sweepstakes and promotions (65%), membership (25%), on-demand access to TV ads (53%), and incentives for product purchase (38%).

Online advertising's reach isn't as broad as that of television, but it's much deeper," said Vicky Rideout, vice president and director of Kaiser's Program for the Study of Entertainment Media and Health, who oversaw the research. "Without good information about what this new wave of advertising really looks like, there can't be effective oversight or policymaking, whether by the industry or by government," she noted. The advertising industry has announced that it is developing more detailed voluntary guidelines for online marketing to children, expected to be released shortly.

The study included detailed analysis of 77 websites, including more than 4,000 unique web pages. Based on data from Nielsen NetRatings, these sites received more than 122 million visits from children ages 2-11 in the second quarter of 2005.

Advergames

About three-quarters (73%) of the websites in the study included games, ranging from one to more than 60 games per site. In total, the sites in the study contained 546 games featuring one or more food brands, such as the Chips Ahoy Soccer Shootout, Chuck E. Cheese's Tic Tac Toe, the M&M's Trivia Game, and the Pop-Tart Slam. For example, on Kellogg's FunStuffed children can "race against time while collecting Kellogg's cereal." And at the Lucky Charms site they can play Lucky's Magic Adventure and "learn the powers of all eight charms" found in Lucky Charms cereal. To encourage additional time spent at the website, many of the games promise repeat playing (71%), offer multiple levels of play (43%), or suggest other games the visitor might enjoy (22%).

Viral marketing

Almost two-thirds (64%) of sites in the study use viral marketing, in which children are encouraged to send emails to their friends about a product, or invite them to visit the company's website. For example, at juicyfruit.com users were encouraged to "send a friend this nutritious gift!" and told that if they "send this site to 5 friends" they would get a code that could then be used to access additional features on the site. Other sites encourage young users to invite friends to help them "redeem" their online "rooms," challenge them to play an
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Twenty years ago, when such a major piece of research was published in the USA, British researchers sought to replicate it in the UK, keen to determine whether similar or different findings would obtain. In today's globalised media and communications environment, US-based research will, in many ways, suffice for the UK context. For the online content that UK children engage overlaps considerably with that available to US children and, indeed, to children worldwide. But national differences still matter in drawing out the implications of these findings. British slum's of childhood and parenting differ from the US, and so do the regulatory bodies - statutory, self-regulatory and voluntary - that manage conditions of children's access to content. Hence lies an intriguing problem, for the Kaiser report's calls for regulatory responses are not merely based on American research but also reflect US norms regarding parental responsibility, consumer socialisation and children's media literacy. And they are targeted towards the US legislative and regulatory regime.

Here in the UK, I suggest we can accept the Kaiser report's findings as an adequate account of UK children's exposure to online advertising. Not a perfect account, for UK children are exposed to a somewhat different online environment - more public service-provided sites, for instance, or commercial sites linked to different television programmes. Commissioning a parallel study to examine these and scope of online advertising encountered by UK children would thus be valuable.

But what we really need, and urgently, is new research on the significance of online advertising for UK children (1, 2). Children understand, by and large, and depending on their age, what is advertising on television, or in magazines, or on the radio, and what is not. And parents know how to respond, though they may not do so in practice. Online, distinguishing advertising or sponsorship from other content is a new challenge. We simply do not know if or how well UK children can do this.

Nor whether their parents or teachers are able to advise them. Nor, most important, whether children are influenced by the burgeoning array of techniques being developed.

Such evidence as exists suggests that UK children receive little guidance in internet literacy and so lack the skills to evaluate online content. If this report had revealed even a minority of television ads were clearly marked off from programmes, or that fewer than half of television adverts contained a rating, the self-regulatory body's guidelines, there would be an outcry, and the situation would be judged unfair to children. Many parents suggest the same response would be appropriate for online advertising.
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