

**Food for Thought:
Television Food Advertising to Children in the United States
March 28, 2007**

[START RECORDING]

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: Good morning. Welcome. Thank you all for joining us here for our event, "Food For Thought: Television Food Advertising to Children in the United States." My name is Vicky Rideout and I'm a Vice President of the Kaiser Family Foundation and the director of our program for the study of entertainment media and health. I think we're all familiar with the alarming statistics about childhood obesity in this country, a rate that has tripled from five percent of children in youth in the early 1960s, to sixteen percent as of 2002. Childhood obesity isn't just the latest hot topic. It's a very serious problem that's having a devastating effect on the lives of millions of children and families in this country and that could impact our country's health care system for many years to come.

As the country has stepped up the fight against childhood obesity, policy makers, consumer advocates, and health organizations have tackled the problem on many different fronts, from looking at what foods are in school vending machines to promoting more physical activity among young people. One of the many different areas they've focused on is the issue of food marketing to children. The past couple of years have seen a flurry of activity in this regard. The Institute of Medicine convened an expert committee that recommended that if the food industry didn't

voluntarily shift the balance of food advertising to children toward healthier options, congress should mandate such a change. The Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Health and Human Services joined the IOM last year in recommending a shift toward advertising healthier food choices for children and increasing public education campaigns in the media. The American Academy of Pediatrics a complete ban on what they called junk food advertising in programming that's viewed predominately by young children. And the Federal Communications Communication has joined Senator Sam Brownback and Senator Tom Harken to form a special task force on advertising and childhood obesity. The Food and Beverage industry has responded to these concerns in a number of ways, but primarily by announcing a major initiative under which leading companies have pledged to voluntarily shift at least half of their marketing to children to healthier products or to messages that promote a health lifestyle.

As policy makers have explored this topic, a constant refrain has been frustration at not having access to solid information about the amount and nature of food advertising seen by children. Today, we're releasing a study designed to help fill that gap. This past summer we released a study documenting the world of online food marketing to children. Today, we're releasing the largest study ever conducted of

food advertising to children on television. The purpose of this study is to document how much food advertising children see on TV, for what types of foods, and what types of appeals are used to market those foods to them. In a moment I'll tell you a bit more about the study, but right now it's my great pleasure to introduce Senator Sam Brownback, whose going to offer us some opening remarks.

Senator Brownback has been at the forefront of congressional interests and issues concerning children and media for many years. Prior to joining the senate, he worked professionally in the media as a radio broadcaster and he's also worked professionally with young people as a teacher. Several months ago he spearheaded the formation of a joint Federal Communications Commission, US Senate Task Force on media and childhood obesity which began its deliberations and had its first official meeting just last week. Please join me in welcoming Senator Sam Brownback [applause].

SENATOR SAM BROWNBACK, J.D.: Thank you very much and it's a pleasure to be back here. It was here, I guess probably a little over a year ago and I was taking questions and answers and there was a mixture of people of advocacy groups in the audience, and media, and food industry where it seemed we ought to get people working together on this. And we ought to do so in an environment where it's not accusatory but it's something where we're trying to pull this together.

And out of that then came this task force that the FCC and myself, along with Senator Harken, had the first meeting of last week. I was very pleased to see the groups that were there from the food industry, the advocacy groups, the media groups, and the public sector as well, participating in what could we do to address this problem. So out of your last meeting came that task force. I was very pleased to announce that and be part of it. I want to thank the Kaiser Family Foundation for taking a good hard look at these tough topics that all of us know are out there, or anybody who has children and watch what their kid watch on TV know is out there. I mean if it wasn't for my kids I would hardly know what Sponge Bob was, or I would think it was a sponge not a cartoon, if I didn't know that. And yet I also know the power of that character now in my 9-year-old son, Mark's, life and what that character does and says, now I wouldn't say that my son would take that all at face value but it would have a big impact on him. And it'd be something that we would be fighting him, as parents, about if it wasn't healthy for him. Because we would be saying, "Now wait a minute, you know, we don't need to get that." And there would be a discussion at the grocery store about this taking place and dependent upon how vibrant my wife I felt that day as to whether or not we would win or Sponge Bob would win in this fight.

I say it somewhat kiddingly, but I also say it very seriously because this is what we're dealing with. It is a media saturated culture and we know all that. And you know those numbers. It is also now unfortunately a youth obese culture that we are now wrestling with and struggling with. And we, for the first time in US history, first time in US history may have a generation growing up who's life expectancy isn't as long as their parents, primarily because of childhood eating habits and obesity. And shame on us if we let that continue to take place; when we know it's there. When we know the numbers are there, when we know some of the actions that have taken place and when we can work together to solve it. We can do this. And we can do it in a healthy way. And we can do it in a way that works together, by industries and people combining together. I loved one of the comments from one of our groups last week, saying that what they did on one of their menus was the default menu, instead of going burger, fries, and Coke, went burger, fruit, and a Coke or burger, vegetables, and Coke, as the default menu. How many times do you go out and say, "Give me a number eight?" And simple, it's quick; I'm here to just get some sustenance and run. And what if we did things like that? We can still make money off of that and we can live healthier in the process. This is something that we can do.

And the media and the advertising have a big impact on this. I'm not saying it's determinative, but if it didn't have a big impact on it why would people spend billions of dollars advertising? If it's not working why are you spending the money? So obviously it is working or you wouldn't spend the money and we can spend it in ways that would be more encouraging.

I want to hit a couple of numbers and then I'll open it up for some of your comments or questions if I could in the limited period of time that I have here. The Institute of Medicine reported recently that one-third of American children and youth are either obese or at risk of being obese, one-third, one in three. A National Health Examination survey found that over the past 40 years the percentage of overweight children has more than tripled, more than tripled, for ages 12-19 and quadrupled for ages 6-11; that's over the past 40 years. That's one generation that we've seen that taking place, tripling and quadrupling. U.S. Surgeon General has identified overweight and obesity as "the fastest growing cause of disease and death in America." Those are strong statements and strong facts that say that we need to take strong actions.

What we're hoping for in the task force, I want to conclude with this comment, is by end of the summer having a set of specific recommendations and timeframes for

implementing them that are agreed to broadly by the group. I think our task is to get that done and to show results strong and quickly or I think you're looking at stronger government regulatory action taking place. I think this is a clear moment for people to work together and to get things done. And if they're not, if people are not working together and things are not happening I think you will see a much more regulatory regime stepping forward in this atmosphere because of the depth of the problem and the difficulty of the problem. And I'm a free market conservative person. I don't want to see this go into a heavy regulatory regime and yet the situation is very significant and known. And we have avenues out of this. And shame on us if we can't figure this out and work it out together because we can. But I think the other option exists if we don't.

With that I'm delighted again you're here and that the Kaiser Family Foundation is doing this groundbreaking work and pulling people together. I applaud it. I urge your active participation in solving this critical problem for our young people.

I think they've got some microphones off to the side and for a couple of minutes whatever you have for time, I'd be happy to take comments, thoughts or questions from people.

MALE SPEAKER: Senator thank you for starting the task force. It was me sitting over there last summer who asked you to do it and I'm thrilled that you did.

SENATOR SAM BROWNBACK, J.D.: Identify yourself too.

ROBERT KESTON: Robert Keston [misspelled?] Executive Director of Center for Screen Time Awareness. Where is camera [misspelled?] and what is happening with that? Is that the lay legislation? Is it not going anywhere? Are you waiting for the task force to do something? What happened with it?

SENATOR SAM BROWNBACK, J.D.: The Camera legislation is a bipartisan piece of legislation, myself, Senator Clinton, many others are supportive of it and it's to put more funding into understanding the effects of media on the society and particularly on children. We haven't been able to get it moving forward and funded. My hope is that we can get that done this year and even if we couldn't get the legislation through the authorizing, that we could get some of the appropriation through to start that moving forward because we need to do this. In a media saturated environment, we need to know and understand better what all it is that this is doing within the society. We see the impacts in obesity. I don't think we fully understand yet the impacts on violence or sexual activity within the culture. And clearly we know it's there and we know it's

having a big impact. And the more we can know the better off we will be.

I'm amazed at what we're learning about the operation of the brain; what an incredible organ. There's a phrase about being fearfully and wonderfully made, and when I look at what we're just now learning about how the brain operates I think wow, fearfully and wonderfully made. But what about all the inputs into that brain and what to they do particularly when you're at a young stage, a formative stage of that brain and the inputs that you're taking whether it's through visual media or the surroundings that you have? As we learn more and more about this it seems to me we have to know more about the impacts about what the media is doing in shaping this brain and that it's responsible for us to do that and it's irresponsible for us not to know.

MARGO WOOTAN, D.Sc: Hi I'm Margo Wootan with the Center for Science in the Public Interest. One of the key places that companies market their products is in schools, especially by selling branded products to kids. I wondered if you, given your interest in childhood obesity, are going to co-sponsor Senator Harken and Markaski's [misspelled?] bipartisan bill to require USA to update its nutrition standards to improve the nutritional quality of the foods that are sold out of vending machines, school stores, and other venues outside of school meals.

SENATOR SAM BROWNBACK, J.D.: I will look at that. Senator Harken is on our task force, and he's co-chair with myself on it on the one that we just announced. And the reason that he is, is that he's deeply concerned about this and I was talking with him saying this is an approach that we can work on together. This is a bill that I'll look at and see if it's one that I can do as well. As I've stated at the outset I want to see us try to work through these things and not regulate them at this point in time but if we have to, that that will be taking place down the road, and I've talked with Senator Harken about that. This is just an update, as I understand what you're describing but I want to look it some more and I may well be on that. I've not talked directly with him about that particular issue of the updating here. But I will.

LAURIE WESSLY: Hi Senator, I'm Laurie Wessly [misspelled?] with the Girl Scouts. We have a research piece that we released last year called, "The New Normal: What Girls Say about Healthy Living." And what they say is very different than what adults tend to think about. They see the whole working out, what you eat, and emotional health wholistically. Is that part of your conservation at all in terms of nutrition and looking at how children will be affected by both the media and the larger sphere that they operate in?

SENATOR SAM BROWNBACK, J.D.: Yeah that's not a part of the task force because we've targeted in specifically on advertising and food products, and the lack of health in some of those food products and the target marketing of that in particular towards a younger age audience. It's a pretty specific topic and I think that's good for us to be able to get hard results and specific recommendations out of it. But your point's a good one, I'm glad particularly the Girl Scouts would be a good group that's well positioned to talk about the whole person in the formation. I think that's important.

On the other side of this are a lot of people, particularly younger girls and women who don't eat enough. And look at themselves and every time themselves, even though they're thin as can be, they see themselves as fat. This is something, it's very harmful. I've known people wrestling with this. That's probably another topic for the Kaiser Family Foundation but it would be well worth addressing because it does impact a lot - particularly it seems like to me of young women - in this society and culture. And it's a mental view of how you see the rest of yourself, but has a physical manifestation. I've seen this. It's very, very harmful. Maybe I would applaud Kaiser for trying to look at that issue as well because it's there and it's a very real one too.

I think we probably have to go or do you need to move on? Let me take on more and then I'll let you move on.

TODD ZWOLICK: Hi Senator, Todd Zwolick [misspelled?] with Public Radio International and WebMD. You mentioned that the industry is going to have to make some changes or you're going to try to push for regulation. Can you give us a sense of what you want to see the industry do? Is the task force going to make its recommendations and then if those aren't met you'll push forward with congressional regulation? How is that going to go and what do you need to see them do so that you don't introduce a bill?

SENATOR SAM BROWNBACK, J.D.: And Todd let me be clear on this too. I expect that we can address this in a joint working environment and that's the best way for it to take place. Because otherwise if you move into an adversarial environment groups working against groups the likelihood of you moving something legislatively forward becomes much more difficult and unlikely and even if you do get it moved forward the likelihood of lawsuits being involved become much more likely to be engaged. I'm not standing here today and threatening that I'm going to regulate the industry. What I believe will take place is that if we're not effective that you will see a lot of pressure move forward to see regulations moved forward in this. We've got a moment now, the problem's identified.

We've got some solutions that I hope can up with by mid-late summer and that those are ones that we can put forward and if we fail I think you will see this push taking place. But I far prefer people working together. It will be much faster. It will be better. It will be, I believe in the long term, much more likely to succeed on a near term basis, which we need it to succeed near term rather than be involved in a lengthy political battle and then legal battle about it. I'm not going to be talking about a regulatory regime in this. I think we've got a moment now to avoid that type of setting taking place and we should take it.

TODD ZWOLICK: Do you know what you want to see in order to avoid it?

SENATOR SAM BROWNBACK, J.D.: What I want to see is objective numbers and proof. I think that's the bottom line for all of us, is we've got to see these obesity numbers go down. And I would hope advertisers could step up and advertise more healthy and then, that is not the total problem. We can't lay this off on saying okay if we just change advertising this whole thing goes away. That's not the case. I mean parents have a huge responsibility, the industry has a responsibility to produce healthier products, we have a responsibility as a society to encourage more active lifestyles and to encourage people to get out an exercise. Get a verb, I think is what CDC or somebody else

is putting. We can not lay this off on one target and we've got a tight target right now because it's one I think that we can address and we can move forward with quickly but that doesn't answer the whole situation. I think it would be unwise and unrealistic to think that it does.

I applaud you being out. My office will look forward to hearing thoughts and suggestions and recommendations. I think a number of people that are involved in the task force are here today. I'm going to be meeting with FCC and others talking about this on an ongoing basis, even today. This is something that I think we can address, we should address, we need your inputs now and we really need your cooperative atmosphere for this to move forward. I would urge you during the breaks here in particular, find somebody that's from outside of your business or industry sector or group sector and start networking with individuals. That can be some of the most valuable things about items or workshops like this one is get that networking going. And we've got a task here that we've got a big group that we're answering to, and they're vulnerable, and it's a young population. We really owe it do it the best we can to help them. Thanks. God bless you all [applause].

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: Thank you Senator Brownback. What I'd like to do now is tell you a little bit about how we did the study that we're releasing today and then introduce

the lead author, Professor Walter Gantz to present the results.

First of all because children's viewing habits vary substantially by age the findings are presented separately for children ages 2-7; 8-12; and 13-17: any network that was in the top ten networks for any one of those age groups was included in the study. Black Entertainment Television was also included because previous Kaiser research had shown it to be in the top networks among all 13-17 year olds, and the number one network for African Americans eight and older. A total of 13 networks met these criteria and were included in the study including the Commercial Broadcast Networks, PBS, and six cable networks. A week's worth of content from six am to midnight was recorded and coded for each network with a sample collected over a several month period from May to September of 2005 in order to avoid an atypical week.

This included all genres of programming, not just children's shows. And we did this because we know that a substantial amount of children's viewing is of non-children's programming. So for the little kids it's about one-third of their viewing, for the 8-12-year-olds, its two-thirds of their viewing that's non-children's programming. And so that's something that really needs to be taken into account when you're examining their exposure to advertising. So that's something that really needs to be taken into account

when you're examining their exposure to advertising. So the total amount of television content that we collected, reviewed, and coded was 1,638 hours. This sample was then reviewed by trained coders, all non-program content; including all ads, promos, PSAs, and filler were coded. There were a total of merely 9,000 food ads in the sample. Each of these 9,000 ads, or nearly 9,000 ads, was coded along 35 different variables. That included the type of food, the target audience, the type of appeal used in the ad such as that the food tastes great or it's fun to eat and various other characteristics such as the use of a premium, depiction of a physically active lifestyle, use of licensed children's characters or an inclusion of a specific health claim.

The data from this content analysis was then paired with detailed data about children's viewing patterns to yield an estimate of the number and type of ads actually seen by children. This factors in the amount of time that children spend watching different types of television programming; such as networks that don't carry traditional advertising or Disney or programming where the advertising landscape varies substantially such as children's shows versus general audience shows or cable versus broadcast. The viewing data are from two previous foundation studies which used a sample of more than 1,000 parents of children ages 2-7, and more than 3,000 8-18 year olds.

Now if this sounds like it was a lot of data, a lot of viewing, and a lot of coding, and a lot of ad watching it was. And I want to take just one minute to recognize two people in the audience with us here today who did the lion's share of that work; Nancy Schwartz [misspelled?] and James Angellini [misspelled?]. If you can just put your hands up you guys [applause]. And of course we want to give you at least a taste of what the food ads in the study were like so we've put together a clip reel of just about three or four minutes of ads that were collected during the study in the spring to fall of 2005, let's take a look.

[VIDEO 24:18 - 27:43]

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: Okay at this point it's my pleasure to introduce to you the lead author of the study Indiana University Professor Walter Gantz. Professor Gantz has conducted numerous large scale content analyses on issues concerning media and health including the study of news coverage of cancer for the National Cancer Institute, and the most significant study previously of advertising to children which he co-authored with Professor Dale Kunkel in 1992. Please join me in welcoming Professor Walter Gantz [applause].

WALTER GANTZ, PhD: Thanks Vicky. I'm going to highlight the key findings of our study. The first thing we found, even before we started to look at food ads is this:

when children watch television they're exposed to a lot of ads. Two to seven year olds see about 17 minutes of advertising on television every day. That's for a wide variety of products including food, toys, and so on. In part because they watch more television, 8-12 and 13-17 year olds see twice as much TV advertising as 2-7 year olds. For tweens the figure stands at 37 minutes per day.

As it turns out children's shows feature the largest proportion of food ads. One out of every two ads on children's shows is for food. This is considerably greater than for any other program and genre with other popular genres such dramas, sit-coms, and reality shows well behind. As this slide documents, even when we factor in the amount time of children spend watching non-children's programming food is still the number one product children see advertised. Food ads represent one out of every three ads children see. The proportions are a bit less for older children.

Our next slides will give you a better sense of the amount of food advertising children are likely to see. Across age groups children see a lot of foods. On a typical day 2-7-year-olds are likely to be exposed to 12 food ads. For a year that works out to be about 4,400 ads. For 8-12 year olds, in part because they watch so much more television, the figures are considerably higher. They're

likely to see 21 food ads a day or for the year 7,600 ads.
13-17 year olds see 17 food ads and about 6,000 per year.

Our next slide will give you a better sense of the type of foods children see advertised on TV. On typical day the average 8-12-year-old will see five ads for candy and snacks, four for fast food, four for soft drinks including soda, three for cereal, two for restaurants, one for prepared foods, and two from the following combined categories dairy, water, juice, meat, poultry, fish, fruit, vegetables, or grains.

This slide and the ones that follow focus on food ads targeting children and teens. Incidentally in this study we had over 2,600 food ads that targeted children and teens. From these ads we learned about the range of foods advertised and the healthiness of the TV food diet. We found that one-third of the food ads aimed at children or teens were for candy or snacks. Almost as many were for cereal, one in ten ads for foods and seven percent for dine in restaurants.

In addition to recording the amount and type of food adds that children see we thought it was important to record the persuasive strategies, the hooks if you will, that food manufacturers use in their ads to get children interested in their products. Every food ad was coded for its primary persuasive appeal. As you can see, one out of three food ads aimed at children or teens relied on appeals that focused on

the taste of the product, 18 percent pitched the product in terms of fun associated with eating it, 16 percent focused on premiums or contests, one percent of all food ads targeting this audience used health as its primary appeal.

As Vicky noted a few moments ago each food ad was coded along a number of dimensions, including the five that are listed in the slide. One in five food ads targeting children or teens promoted their Web sites where, of course, advertisers have a much greater opportunity with and persuade this target audience. About as many used a premium. No matter what they used as a persuasive appeal, 15-percent portrayed an active physical lifestyle. This figure can be used as a benchmark to see how well the industry responds to its pledge to depict healthier lifestyle. Relatively few used a children's TV or movie character.

We looked for 14 health claims that might be used in food ads. As you can see a total of 13 percent of all food ads targeting children or teens offered a health claim. The claim that was offered most often was that the product provided essential nutrients. That occurred in nine percent of the ads. No other specific health claim was used in more than one percent of the ads.

The inclusion of health claims varied dramatically across food products. Almost all of the ads to children for water and juices featured a specific health claim, about one

in three cereal's ads also offered a specific health claim as well; for soft drinks the figure was 20 percent, for fast foods two percent.

I have one more slide to offer; while children are exposed to thousand of food ads each year they are exposed to very few public service announcements on fitness or nutrition. The average 2-7-year-old will encounter one PSA on fitness and nutrition every few days. In all they'll see 164 of these PSAs each year. The figures drop for 8-12 and 13-17 year olds because of the programming they watch. So for example, 13-17 year olds will see less than one PSA a week on fitness and nutrition. That works out to be about 47 over the course of an entire year. Clearly there is plenty of room for growth in this area. At this point I'm going to return the mic to Vicky [applause].

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: Okay before we start our panel discussion which is what's coming up next, I just want to make a couple of comments about what I find to be significant about the study's findings. The first thing I think this study makes clear is that kids of all ages in this country are exposed to what I think we'd all agree is a large amount of food advertising on television; anywhere from 4,000 ads to 7,000 ads a year. That's especially true for tweens who see more food ads than any other age groups. I think that's important, because this is an age the 9, 10, 11 year olds

where kids are starting to have their own money, they're away from their parents for more of the day, they're starting to make more and more of their own independent choices about food. I think that as the food industry and policy makers look at this issue, this is going to be an age group and an audience that they're going to need to be very aware of.

Second it's pretty clear that most of the food ads that kids see on TV today are for foods that nutritionists probably need to be eating less of, not more of, if we're going to get serious about tackling childhood obesity. Things like sugared cereals, candies, chips, fast foods, sodas, and soft drinks, which together comprise more than 80 percent of all the ads targeted at children and teens.

The other thing I think this study makes clear is that at this point children are seeing relatively few public services messages about fitness or nutrition on TV. And I think this is important as well, we all want to put the positive power of media to work and support a public education campaign to kids on these issues. But right now these messages simply aren't getting a lot of air time. So those same tweens who see 21 food ads a day see one PSA every two to three days on fitness or nutrition. So if policy makers, if media companies, if advertisers are serious about media campaigns they're going to have to come up with some serious resources to really make a difference.

And finally with one in five food ads on TV driving kids to the Web, online advertising continues to be very relevant to this discussion.

Now whenever the foundation releases a study like this we try to pull together folks who represent a variety of different perspectives to look at what we did, to tell us what they think of it, and help us place it in a broader context. I'm delighted to introduce today's panel to you now. And I'd like to ask you all to come on up through the side door there and join us on stage now. And if there's folks who need a seat you can feel free to come fill in the front row.

Okay Michael McGinnis is a former Assistant Surgeon General of the United States and Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services under Presidents Carter, Regan, Bush, and Clinton. He is currently a senior scholar at the Institute of Medicine where he served as chairman of the IOMs committee on food marketing to children, a group that conducted an extensive review of all the available research on the issue of food marketing and children's dietary health and we're delighted to have him with us today.

Next Nancy Green is Vice President for Health and Wellness at PepsiCo, one of the largest food companies in the country. A company that's behind such popular foods as

Cheetos, Fritos, Doritos, Lays Potato Chips, Grandma's Cookies, Cap'n Crunch Cereal, and many others including of course Pepsi Soda. And Pepsi is also a company that's been out in front of efforts to adjust their product lines and their marketing practices to deal with the rise in obesity. So we're delighted to have Nancy with us today.

Lee Peeler is CEO of the food and beverage industry's new Children's Food and Beverage Advertising Initiative and also the president and CEO of NARC, the National Advertising Review Council, with an unfortunate acronym. And a former top executive at the federal trade commission; the initiative, the Children's Food and Beverage Advertising Initiative is that consortium of companies that have pledged to shift at least half of their advertising to children to either healthier foods or to messages promoting a healthy lifestyle. So we're particularly delighted to have Lee with us here today.

Margo Wootan is director of National Policy at the Center for Science in the Public Interest, an organization that has vigorously advocated for changes in food advertising in children and has offered many other proposals to help curb obesity and promote nutrition. And we're delighted to have Margo with us.

Finally Dale Kunkel is professor at the University of Arizona and an expert on issues concerning children in

advertising. He served on the IOM's committee on food and marketing to children and has authored numerous studies and other publications on the topic of children and advertising.

It's not my pleasure to turn the floor over to Jackie Judd, who's going to be moderating our panel discussion here this morning. Jackie Judd is familiar to all as the former award winning journalist who spent 16 years as a correspondent for ABC News, for World News Tonight, Night Line, and Good Morning America. She's now Vice President and Senior Advisor for Communications at the Kaiser Family Foundation, so please join me in welcoming Jackie Judd [applause].

JACKIE JUDD: Thank you for joining us and good morning everyone. Michael McGinnis I want to start with you and the Institute of Medicine report that we've heard about this morning. In that report it was concluded that food marketing to kids, "represents a direct threat to the health of the next generation." Strong words. What did the committee feel comfortable in saying was the linkage between advertising and behavior of kids?

J MICHAEL MCGINNIS, MD, M.P.P: I think it's clear to say now that there are several indisputable in this terrain. One of them is the relationship between or the trend with respect to dietary habits and health challenges. As you heard earlier the obesity rate for kids is skyrocketing as is

the incidence of type two diabetes, it used to be called adult onset diabetes. Secondly, an indisputable is the tremendous focus on kids when it comes to advertising foods and beverages. There's been an extremely sophisticated approach evolved to advertising and marketing foods and beverages to kids. If you look, as we did, at 1994 to 2004 period the number of new products introduced to kids tenfold. For the market as a whole it was flat, so marketing is shifting dramatically and shifting toward kids. Thirdly the major focus of our study was the fact that we know have proof that television advertising affects the food attitudes, preferences, requests, and choices of kids. So there are clear and compelling issues that confront us when we look at media and that's why this study is so important because it helps gives us a sense of the magnitude of the issue we're dealing with.

JACKIE JUDD: Dale Kunkel one of the things that has struck me in the report that has come out today is the sheer volumes of commercials that kids of all ages see. In fact I was so struck by it I thought the arithmetic was wrong and I went down and I multiplied but in fact it was correct. I want to know what you think, is it the sheer volume of commercials that leads to the cause and effect behavior that Michael McGinnis just described.

DALE KUNKEL, PhD: It's a nice focus Jackie because what you have is the way in which media impacts children the most is a slow cumulative drip, drip, drip. It's the way it works if you're talking about the effects of TV violence on youth, it's the way that it works if you're talking about sexual solmization, other topics that people interested in kids and media are concerned with. It's the same way that it works for advertising. We have experimental lab studies, we have lots of them, over 100 that show what's the impact of individual ads. What this study does, and this study is a content study but you only do content studies that have really compelling implications when you can ground them in previous effects research. We know from these lab studies what happens with individual messages now imagine that you have to magnify the impact of that individual lab study thousands and thousands of times based on the exposure level that kids have. I think that's the concern. You see I think a really nice point that Vicky made is the imbalance between the thousands of ads that kids see for food products, which are predominantly products that are not healthy when consumed in abundance and the pro social messages that we're conveying to children, exercise more, eat more healthfully, the imbalance I can't calculate that number but I'll guarantee you that it's 100 to one of more. PSAs can have an effect but until we've got a level playing field they're not going

to be the answer. The answer is going to be changing the product profile of the products that are marketed to children so that they are promoting health food products to children.

JACKIE JUDD: Nancy Green, Senator Brownback said in his remarks, if it's not working why would they be spending the money? Meaning food manufacturers. So I'd like to ask you what is your view of the impact of marketing on childhood obesity and on choices kids are making.

NANCY GREEN, PhD: If we take a step back and look at PepsiCo that I represent, I first would like to say in listing our brands we had a couple brands that didn't get listed I'd like to mention like Quaker and Tropicana and Dole beverages. If you look across our portfolio and our marketing, only less than one percent of our total marketing dollars are toward children's marketing. If you look at the company wide it's not a huge effort that we spend toward marketing to children.

JACKIE JUDD: What does that translate into dollars?

NANCY GREEN, PhD: I don't have the exact dollar, as a percent of our marketing budget. In looking at that, I would say too, that I think this was a very good snapshot of 2005. If you look at some of the things that we've done since that period in time. We've been involved in identifying products that meet criteria that are based on authoritative statements from FDA and then institute of

medicine. We've identified those products with a logo on our package and those are the products that we know focus on advertising to children. In 2006 we had 50 percent of all of our ads that went to children had to have qualify for our Smart Spot logo. We will be moving about that this year, so we are moving to advertising our healthier products.

JACKIE JUDD: But I don't think I have an answer yet to the question I asked. What is the link that your company sees between advertising and subsequent choices?

NANCY GREEN, PhD: That's a hard question to answer. You do look at ads when you test ads to see if they are effective in getting children's attention. But we focus more of our ads on adults so some of the ads for children have very little research behind them. It's not like our advertising program for adults.

JACKIE JUDD: Lee Peeler I want to turn to you know as Vicky mentioned before, one reason the initiative that you represent here today was formed as because of the report that came out from the Institute of Medicine. Can you lay out for us what kind of agreement the food companies that have joined this initiative have come to?

C. LEE PEELER, J.D.: Sure I'd be delighted to and thanks for the opportunity to talk to you today. The first thing to say is the initiative was formed by eleven of the nation's largest food manufacturers. They represent about

two-thirds of television advertising dollars that are directed to the kids. The focus on the program is on advertising that is primarily directed to kids under 12 and it has a set of core principles that everybody who participates in the program has to meet. The primary core principle is that each company that is participating in the program agrees to develop a plan to devote at least 50-percent of its advertising to promoting either healthier products as defined by government or scientific standards or healthier lifestyle messaging. There's the core piece of the pledge. There's some subsidiary undertakings that each of the companies have company; one is no marketing in elementary schools at all. The second is no product placement in editorial content. The third is dealing with interactive games the companies have agreed to either have those games relate to better for you product or to include the healthy lifestyle messaging component of the core program. And the last is with respect to licensed characters, they've agreed to reduce their use of licensed characters or use the licensed characters for products that meet either the healthier product or messaging criteria.

Now what's really unique about the program is that it builds on the work that's already been done by a lot of individual companies. It brings the companies together. They will submit pledges to the program, which is going to be

administered by the Council of Better Business Bureaus. The program will check the pledges for conformance with the criteria, publicly post them so that everybody, parents, educators, advocacy groups will know exactly what they companies have undertaken. The big addition here is that the Council of Better Bureaus organization that I'm associated with will actually monitor the implementation of those pledges and annually report on whether the companies have complied with their pledges or not.

JACKIE JUDD: This was announced late last year. The companies who are members have I think between six and nine months to submit their plans. So what kind of timeline are we talking about for when significant changes will begin to show up on television?

C. LEE PEELER, J.D.: Well we're hoping to have the pledges out and public this summer or early fall. Each of the pledges will have an implementation period. I don't have a specific date right now. I can tell you that some of the companies are already implementing some of these policies just as Nancy talked about and Kraft is already doing it and other companies are developing their policies.

JACKIE JUDD: Is there an end date by which the companies have to show some changes on television?

C. LEE PEELER, J.D.: They're going to have to show some changes on television in the plan that they propose.

We've agreed that at the end of three years we'll go back and review the plan, review the whole program to make sure that we are getting the results we want to get.

JACKIE JUDD: Margo Wootan, on the face of it a 50 percent shift in the way food advertising is presented to children and teenagers sounds radical. Is it?

MARGO WOOTAN, D.Sc: Looks good on paper but in reality I think what we'll see are candy bar ads with physical activity messages in them. What the Kaiser Family's study shows today is that self regulation isn't working. There's a tremendous amount of marketing aimed at kids, a lot of it is for food and the food advertising is almost exclusively marketing unhealthy products to kids. We know it works, both from the IOM study and from industry investing so many resources. And what the industry has proposed so far is really a mixed bag. I think a few individual companies have proposed changes to their marketing practices that are meaningful and I applaud Kraft and the Disney company and a few other, very few other companies for what they're doing. We were very excited when the self regulatory agency, the Children's Advertising Review Unit said that they were going to update their guidelines for marketing to children. And then what CARU proposed is meaningless. They hardly changed the guidelines at all. This is the first update they've done in 30 years and all they did was tinker with some minor

issues. And while what Lee talked about with the CBBV initiative sounds promising it's a step back from what many individual companies are already proposing. The biggest concerns are what the nutrition standards will be and the second big concern is that it's only going to apply to 50-percent of the marketing. That doesn't mean 50-percent are going to be health food ads and the other 50-percent are going to be strong messages encouraging kids to be physically active and to eat healthier diets. We've seen the kind of PSAs that the industry has come up with and they're not motivational messages that get kids to eat better and be physically active; they're Ronald McDonald riding a bicycle through a garden. That doesn't do anything to encourage healthy eating or physical activity. I'm very concerned that the industry is not as serious about self regulation as they are.

JACKIE JUDD: Lee and Nancy do you want to respond to that?

C. LEE PEELER, J.D.: Yes.

JACKIE JUDD: I thought you would [laughter].

C. LEE PEELER, J.D.: There are two different views of this. One is the view that CSBI has taken which is this is not going to work. And the second is the view that other people have taken which is let's see. Let's challenge this group to put in place a plan that will work. I think that

that second view is the best view. To say that self regulation has failed when we haven't started I think is consistent with the first view. The Children's Review Unit looks at questions of how products are presented. Are they presented truthfully. The revised guidelines say things like don't show kids overeating. Don't disparage foods recommended to be eaten more often. So that's the product presentation side.

Self regulation hasn't before addressed the question of what products are advertised to kids. This is a first effort by the industry to do that. I would say give us a chance to see what we can do. Absolutely showing Ronald McDonald riding a bicycle or anybody else riding a bicycle is not going to be enough to meet the health messaging criteria of the program. It's got to be a clearer message from the ads.

One other thing, no company is going to step back. The companies who have done a lot are going to be building on their program.

JACKIE JUDD: You provide a baseline. They can exceed that.

C. LEE PEELER, J.D.: They can exceed that. We expect many of the companies that are participating to exceed that. The program expressly contemplates that the criteria will change over time. Again we're getting started. It's an

initiative, it's going to be transparent, it's going to be accountable. I'm sure that everybody in this audience and particularly Margo will be commenting on what we do.

NANCY GREEN, PhD: And Jackie just to build you on what you said, I think from an industry perspective we do look at the 50-percent as minimum. Different companies are at different places as far as where they can go and how fast they can go but certainly none of the then companies that signed up are going to go and take a step backwards and we'll all be challenged to go beyond where we are today.

JACKIE JUDD: We have a representative in the audience from the Association of National Advertisers, Dan Jaffey [misspelled?] and I'm wondering if you would like to stand up and perhaps respond to some of what Margo Wootan had to say. Also describe to the audience what your industry feels its responsibility is in this arena of food advertising to children?

DAN JAFFEY: I very much appreciate this opportunity. I want to congratulate the Kaiser Family Foundation and Senator Brownback who are part of that task force as well for these efforts. The key thing to understand in my view is that the advertising community, the total advertising community, the total food community is tremendously committed to taking major steps, unprecedented steps to respond to the obesity problem. There is no debate in our community about

the need to try to help society to come to grips with this problem. What I find would be a false message out of this meeting is if we look at 2005 and say that's the current picture. The purpose of the study is to paint a picture of the current landscape of food advertising to children on TV. The current landscape is dramatically changed. Billions of dollars have already been spent by the advertising community and Mary's office may - if you'll here to talk about what's happened in the supermarket area.

Let me talk about the restaurant area, there's been an enormous transformation already, not next year, not two years from now, but already in providing many new options. If you start talking about cereals or if you start talking about quick service restaurants you have to actually look at what is in the market place. Also there's been an enormous growth since 2005 in regard to public service advertising, over 270 million dollars, that would put that almost at the level of the top 100 products; 270 million dollars has been spent on public service advertising out of the Advertising Council and that is only increasing. There are new programs that are about to roll out. I think you should really sit back and think about what the numbers are involved for these 11 companies you've been told-I'll stop in one sec-there are 11 companies two-thirds of all advertising to kids, half of that going to messages that are not anything but health

messages or physical education messaging. Think of the dollars that that includes. The government could not, whether anybody wanted to or not, could not dragoon that kind of money to go to that sort of activity. This is the biggest effort by the advertising community in history. Thank you.

JACKIE JUDD: Thank you Dan. Vicky, I think that you should jump in here now because Dan was suggesting that the snap shot this report today presents it is not current.

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: Well it is from 2005, there's always a little bit of a lag whenever you do any kind of research to go through and do all of that coding and we would be happy to update and we're going to look forward to updating it. I think we'll wait for Lee's initiative to be fully implemented, some companies are taking some steps. Others haven't even announced what steps they're going to take or what timeline they're going to take them on.

With regard to the increase in public service advertising though I think we also need to recognize that at the time we did this study the Verb campaign was still on the air. That's the Center for Disease Control's campaign something like 100 million dollars of paid advertising time behind it. That has now been de-funded and now it's off the air. I'm not sure that there's more public service advertising on the air now than there was at the time.

JACKIE JUDD: Michael McGinnis you wanted to jump in.

J MICHAEL MCGINNIS, MD, M.P.P: I'd just like to comment a little bit on the initiative. I think there's good news and other news with respect to the initiative. The good news, and I don't think we can underscore this enough is that everybody is on the same page. Everybody says this is a problem and everybody says we have to move in the right direction. And everybody actually has a pretty decent sense of what that direction ought to be, so that's very good news unlike some other circumstances. The other news with respect to the initiative itself, and I'll comment primarily as a reference point from the IOM study's perspective is that there are some additional emphasis that can be given in the initiatives relative to our recommendations and I'll just mention three or four items.

First of all we would like to see and recommended not just individual standards from individual companies but consistent standards across the industry in order to improve the quality and the sustainability of the message, not just to be just developed by industry, it should be a cooperative effort by industry, government, and the scientific community to ensure the integrity of the work. Secondly the magnitude of this shift, even though we in the IOM committee didn't state specifically what the level of shift ought to be it was very clear that the shift ought to be to greater than 50 percent and really in terms of our discussions more like 75-

80 percent of the focus in these ads targeted to kids that focus on healthier foods.

Thirdly we recommended and feel strongly that no licensed characters should be used at all for advertising what is termed as unhealthy products. If they're used they should only be focused on health promotion activities.

Lastly on this issue of social marketing the positive ads, that may be run by companies or others, this is a very important effort. The magnitude of the ads you've heard and you've seen the nature of the ads. The only way that we can use advertising to shift children's behavior is if we have a sustained large scale social marketing campaign. This can be done by a fund, there's not reason that the monies that the industry says that they're going to put into this kind of work can't be put into a neutral fund and paired with government funds in order to allow this kind of capacity over time.

The notion of whether we're talking about 2005 or 2007 really is a moot point. Because what the data are for is track progress.

MALE SPEAKER: Michael is merciful because our committee for the national academies had 18 recommendations and he didn't give you all of them. He hit the highlights. I want to focus us on what I think and I know I suspect Michael agrees with me is the most important of our

recommendations. For me the most important recommendation is the one that says that within two years time from the release of that report which was the first quarter of '06 that the national academies expects that we would see at least, a balance between healthy foods marketed to children and the non-nutritious or less health foods that now dominate food marketing to children. We were really uncomfortable with such a recommendation because no one who is advocating for children wants to suggest that it's okay for half of all of the ads that kids see year in and year out to be for foods that aren't healthy for them, but we're sensitive to the fact that we need to make some progress in incremental steps. That number one recommendation in our report is going to be the focus of the policy debate here and the thing that I find makes me a little nervous is that the commitment that we have from the food industry initiative here says that we'll devote half of our advertising to either healthy food or healthy lifestyles. That can be fulfilled with no change whatsoever in the configuration of products that are advertised to children. We can come back two or three years from now. They can have done everything they've committed to and that pie chart is still going to look the same with the sugared cereals and the fast foods dominating.

JACKIE JUDD: But put in the context of perhaps a healthy lifestyle. Is that what you're suggesting?

DALE KUNKEL, PhD: Yes, yes that's my worry. Because if you have the kids on skateboards eating Big Macs then that's okay and we saw some ads like that that would qualify already in the videotape. So while I agree that it's wonderful to see the industry is sensitive to this issue and moving in the right direction I want to be really clear that I want people to think about and focus on the recommendations that came out of the IOM committee and to see it's not the most radical organization in this town [laughter] and I want to see if those recommendations are being fulfilled by the industry.

MARGO WOOTAN, D.Sc: Jackie can I? One other recommendation, Vicky the last time you released a report on food marketing to kids on Web sites Dan and I were up here on the dais together. One really terrific outcome from that report was that we agreed to work with the food industry to lobby for more funding for nutrition and physical activity promotion. We're now actually GMA and ANA and Nestle and McDonald's and a number of food companies along with the largest nutrition and physical activity coalition in the country, the National Alliance for Nutrition and Activity are actually lobbying together to try to get more funding for nutrition and physical activity promotion for parents and children. I think that was a really terrific outcome. I think one really important step we need to take to address

this issue of childhood obesity and food marketing to kids is to address foods in schools. The industry has agreed to some voluntary standards which are quite reasonable. But if they're really serious about getting soda and sports drinks and other sugary drinks and junk food out of schools, they should make it real. They should agree to support Senator Harken and Senator Murkowski's [misspelled?] bill to ensure that those standards are enforced and agree not only to not oppose but to actually support getting soda and junk food out of schools once and for all.

JACKIE JUDD: Margo I want to ask you one question and then I'm going to turn it over to the audience for a few a moments. What is your expectation of how the epidemic of childhood obesity might different if this one piece of the puzzle did change significantly; TV advertising? Because there are so many other pieces, as you just suggested; online advertising, what's offered in schools, what's offered at home.

MARGO WOOTAN, D.Sc: I think that food marketing to kids is one of the most important issues that we need to address in terms of childhood obesity. I would say not just TV advertising, the CBB initiative covers a little more than that though not quite enough. The CARU guidelines cover all types of marketing. It needs to be not just TV but in school, on packaging, Web sites, cell phone, all the full

range of marketing techniques that companies are now using to promote unhealthy foods to kids. What's important about it is it shapes the way that children think about food in a way that makes it almost impossible for parents to feed their children a healthy diet. I can deal with my daughter nagging me from time to time, and I do, and all parents do. The problem is that food marketing almost makes us parents out to be liars. That the kind of diet that we encourage our children to eat is light years away from the kind of diet that food marketers market as desirable to eat. The kids not only nag for unhealthy food, which we could deal with that, they expect that is the kind of diet that everyone else is eating and that they should eat. It has a tremendous impact on the way kids think about food and what they expect to be fed not only by their parents, but by schools, by aftercare programs, by daycare centers, by everyone who feeds children.

JACKIE JUDD: I'd like to open it up to the audience now for questions. I will ask all of you to wait until the microphone is your hand, stand up, identify yourself, and your affiliation. I know there are some reporters in the room who are on deadline so I'd like to go to a couple of them first if possible.

IRA TENOWITZ: Ira Tenowitz [misspelled?] with Advertising Age, sort of a two part question; one how do the numbers compare with the numbers that came up and have been

talked about before. I think Dale you had some numbers if I remember correctly. Secondly we talk so much about what marketers should do. What about media companies? What should they be doing in terms of restricting their advertising?

JACKIE JUDD: Dale do you mind?

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: I can answer the first part about how it differs from previous studies and that is that there really haven't been any previous studies that have looked at the entire landscape to kids and tried to calculate what their total exposure is. There was a preliminary study from the FTC that was previewed at their workshop a couple of years ago but that has not been published yet. I think it's coming soon. The previous studies in this field have limited to looking at what's on children's programs. Children's programs have more food ads to kids than other types of programming. If you just rely on that you will overestimate kids' exposure to food advertising, which is why it's important to include also the non commercial networks and all the other types of programming. As far as what recommendations might be made from the IOM committee companies I'll leave that to either Dale or Mr. McGinnis.

JACKIE JUDD: Dale go ahead.

DALE KUNKEL, PhD: Sure and it's a good question Ira because while the focus in this discussion has been on what

the food companies are doing it, it's really the companies, the Nickelodeon cable channels, the networks that are transmitting the ads as well as the programs that ultimately control the big flow. If I'm interested in this slow steady drip, drip of cumulative effects then they're one kind of turning the faucet and determining what's the overall configuration of the ads. When the IOM recommends that there be a balance between healthy and more healthy, less healthy food products advertised to children, we're not recommending that that come from every company, we're saying that's we need to see in the overall media environment. So what that means is companies like Nickelodeon or the networks, then they would have to look at their overall configuration of advertising to see are we only taking ads or only selling ads for products that are not nutritious when consumed in abundance. If that's the case than the media companies would have an obligation to either attract advertising from food manufacturers who are marketing healthy products or to get the companies that have the big corporate conglomerates so to get them to change their product profile. If they can't get to that balance then I think ultimately the media companies would have an obligation to err in balanced proportion, a pro-nutrition, pro-exercise PSAs so that we ultimately have at least a level playing field, a "balance" of messages

directed to children that are promoting health foods and lifestyles as well as unhealthy one.

JACKIE JUDD: Michael McGinnis did you want to jump in?

J MICHAEL MCGINNIS, MD, M.P.P: I think Dale said it very well, just to emphasize the fact that the media companies are the gateways.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Can I just clarify? I think overall, Ira, that when we've been talking about food marketers today, we're not talking just about food companies. We're talking about all the food marketers, the supermarkets, the entertainment companies, the ad agencies. When I talk about food marketers and I think what I've heard other people say today I think it applies to the entertainment companies just as much as the food companies. They share in this responsibility.

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: just wanted to say that Mary Sofos [misspelled?] from the Grocery Manufacturers Association wanted to just make a comment.

MARY SOFOS: Thank you Vicky and I did want to make just a couple of comments. I wanted to first thank the Kaiser Foundation for doing this report. We will certainly take a hard look at it and see what we can take from it that we can add to the efforts that we've already undertaken. I represent a number of the companies that have been talked

about today such as Pepsi and Kraft and others and please be assured that we have been actively engaged in this effort for many years and I think one of the things that we need to look at in terms of the study is it is a good snapshot of food ad exposures. But I think someone else mentioned that we need to look at what's actually happening with the products because that's where this starts, with product reformulation. I think what this study may have missed is the dramatic changes that have happened over the past couple of years in terms of product reformulation, where our companies have dramatically reduced calories, saturated fats, trans fats, and improved the nutritional profiles of these foods. What this study doesn't quite capture and I think it's a challenge for all of us to figure out a way to capture it is the improvements that have been made in those products that may not be the subject or featured in these advertisements. Nevertheless we are, within our own company product portfolios steadily improving the products that are offered to children and adults. I think that's one of the things that hopefully as the children's food and beverage initiative continues its implementation will be able to capture in a much more effective way so that we can get a true picture of how much of the food that's being advertised is actually vastly improved over the same version of that product five or six years ago.

JACKIE JUDD: I think Vicky already addressed that issue of the currency of this report. If I can ask you - no I'm not done [laughter], the price of standing up with microphone is I get to ask you a question now. What is your association's view of the linkage between marketing and obesity in children?

MARY SOPHOS: I think there's been a lot of demonstration that advertising can affect food choices, there's no question about that. We also think that that is why is why that we undertake the initiatives we're undertaking today. Frankly I think when you look at the kind of advertising that is done to children, you may never see nutritional characteristics of the food as being the primary message. You have to advertise a compelling message to children but that doesn't mean that the products themselves aren't improved or that parents today have a huge variety of choices in the supermarket that they didn't have before for lower calorie, and lower fat, lower sodium, lower sugar options. Can we impact food preferences? Surely. But we have to make sure we're targeting the folks who are going to be purchasing those products and then making sure that on the shelf they have these better for you choices to choose.

JACKIE JUDD: You raise a good point and Nancy I want to ask you to follow up on that, and that is the tension between efforts to emphasize good nutrition when possible,

but also needing to appeal to the audience you're reaching out to.

NANCY GREEN, PhD: I think that's an extremely good point. It kind of follows up one of the things Dale mentioned just a minute ago in talking about promoting an active lifestyle, healthier lifestyle. I think from an industry perspective what we have been focused on is transforming our portfolio: taking our products and making them better. Then having the better products being the ones that we advertise to children. I don't know that we have the answer to how you advertise a healthy lifestyle message and get it right and motivational for kids. For us internally at Pepsi we've said that we have to show that those messages are effective with kids. It's going to be easier for us to work on our product portfolio maybe than it is to develop—I think it's very challenging to develop lifestyle messaging that is motivational for children. And we're committed to looking at that but we don't have the answer on how to do that.

JACKIE JUDD: Yes.

DALE KUNKEL, PhD: I think it is very challenging to develop those types of messages for kids but there is a program with the Ad Council and Robert Wood Johnson [misspelled?] and about 30 public and private participants that's working on doing exactly that. They're developing lifestyle messages for kids. They've licensed the Shrek

characters so that will be something that's very compelling to kids. And it's going to be run as PSAs but also cross promotion with various companies who are participating in the same program. There are efforts underway to do that and those efforts are going to be research based and they're going to be tested.

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: I wanted to just say to Mary's point about that there have already been dramatic changes in product reformulation. I think that is something that we can measure. We'll accept that as a challenge, and we can absolutely go back and look at the detailed nutritional profiles of the foods from 2005 in this study and then update them to detailed nutritional profile now and look for those changes and we will do that.

I don't want to be a naysayer here but something that's troubling me has to do with the incredible challenge that I think is facing Lee's initiative in terms of effecting a substantial portion of the ads that kids are seeing. Because if you think about the tweens, the 8-12 year olds who are seeing 21 food ads right now, two thirds of their viewing is on programs that are not primarily directed to children under 12. I think that those ads on those two-thirds of their viewing will probably not be affected by the initiative if I'm understanding it correctly. Now we're down to perhaps effecting a third of the television programming and the add

content that they're seeing. The initiative represents most of the companies that advertise to kids in that one third but not all of them. And they're hoping that half of the ads, or they've pledged that half of the ads that kids see in that one-third of the ads that kids see will be either for healthier foods or show case healthier lifestyles. So we're talking about affecting about one-sixth maybe of the ads the kids see. That's a concern I have. I don't know what the solution is or how to deal with that but I'm thinking that we need to have our expectations for that in line with the magnitude of the challenge.

C. LEE PEELER, J.D.: We think the right thing to do is focus on the ads that are directed to kids and that will have content that's most compelling to kids. Looking at all ads that kids view is a challenge, as Mary said there's an overall effort by the industry to address health and obesity issues for all segments of the population and the original PSA messages were directed to adults rather than children. So there is an overall effort there. The other thing is that some of the ads in the sample, like the ads for Ensure and Pedialyte aren't going to be very attractive to kids at all.

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: There were 9,000 ads in the sample of food ads overall. But there were only 2,613 that we said were targeted at children and teens and there weren't

any ads for Ensure or Pedialyte that were counted in that category as being targeted to children and teens.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Can I just add, I don't think that this has to be that difficult that we shouldn't be just talking about children's programming, we should be talking about programming that's popular with children. So my 9-year-old's favorite show is American Idol. That's a favorite show of many tweens and older upper elementary school aged kids. I think we should be looking at programs that have a certain percentage of the audience as children, or a certain number of children in the audience. And media companies have all of this information. They know what the most popular shows are. Vicky knows what the most popular shows are, what the most popular viewing times are for kids. We need to address junk food marketing in those programs that kids watch, not just what's considered children's programming.

MALE SPEAKER: And if I could just interject briefly that is exactly the tactic that's being employed United Kingdom. They have just announced through the Food Standards Agency a ban on so-called junk food advertising in program environments where children have a substantial presence, not just child-oriented shows but shows children are, perhaps as low as 25-percent of the audience composition.

JACKIE JUDD: Can we have a question on this side of the audience? Gentleman right back there?

BRENT REYNOLDS: My name is Brent Reynolds [misspelled?] and I'm a recovering stay at home parent with four kids, so I appreciate everything you do here. I have two questions and a brief comment if I could to provoke some more thoughts. One is for Mr. Peeler, if you are going to spend, or your goal is to spend 50 percent of your advertising on health lifestyle/health food and you have no timeline, I would ask you to revisit that very quickly. To stand here in front of us and say you have a world class advertising, you have a world class group behind you, and no timeline, that's ridiculous. I don't buy it. I suggest you revisit that quickly. For Nancy Green, PepsiCo's committed you said one percent to advertising towards kids. That's great you have an opportunity to commit today to 50-percent of that advertising for healthy foods and take no hit in your bottom line at all. Think about that, that's a great possibility to stand up and make a huge impact. The final thing is we have to take back some of what we do as parents and what was do as families, and I want to thank the PEP organization in Maryland, they're at Parent Encouragement.org. They will teach you how to say no to your kids. How to limit TV time. I don't have a TV. So I don't have a TV problem. I don't carry junk foods and sodas in my house. My kids eat very healthy organic foods mostly. So we have to push it down from the advertisers fault back to our

level, when I'm speaking with groups advocating in Northern Virginia for solutions to mass transit or educational issues, I always say, "I have met the enemy and it is I," me, you. It's everybody. We need to push it back to the parents too. You need to take some control, quit allowing your kids access to junk food, don't carry it. My kids' idea of a snack is a banana. Take some personal control today go home, and take some control. Don't let your kids buy all the stuff. Thank you very much to the Kaiser Family Foundation.

JACKIE JUDD: Thank you. Hang on for a second. I want you to take the first question, but can you clarify something for us. You had said as this gentleman mentioned, one percent of the budget is for children's advertising but to go back to the point that Dale just made about advertising seen by programs watched by children, I presume that one percent then grows, about advertising that children see.

NANCY GREEN, PhD: The one percent number is programs that are for children. It is children's programming, absolutely. The other thing to address, the gentleman's challenge, I am happy to say that in 2006 100 percent of our products that we advertise for our snack products did meet our Smart Spot criteria, which is public criteria that's on our Web site. We are absolutely focusing those products on kids. I do think that comes over into other advertising as well because those products are part of the most rapidly

growing part of our portfolio because people are interested in healthier products. Therefore that advertising mix is shifting across all of our portfolio, not just what we advertise to children.

C. LEE PEELER, J.D.: To quick responses. We know need a timeframe and we publish the pledges it will be right there. And you and everyone else will be able to look at it and comment it. And again we hope we have that out very quickly. We just put this initiative together six months ago.

JACKIE JUDD: Will each individual company have the right to establish its own timeline?

C. LEE PEELER, J.D.: Each individual company will publish in consultation with the initiative an implementation schedule and for some companies it will be different than other companies. Then the last thing is I think everybody on the panel would probably agree that there's an important role for parents. The purpose of this program is to say that advertising can have a positive affect, helping parents there.

MARGO WOOTAN, D.Sc: I just want to stand up for the parents without sounding too defensive. But even if your child never watches television they are still exposed to tremendous amounts of marketing in this media age that we live in. There's marketing on cell phones, on Web sites, in

schools, on packages in the supermarkets. I think that limiting junk food marketing to kids is not an abdication of parental responsibility, it's supporting parents in their efforts to feed their children a health diet. It's like with traffic laws that we have. Parents certainly should keep their children from playing in traffic but that doesn't mean we don't need laws to keep people from driving recklessly 80 miles an hour through residential neighborhoods. Parents need some support and we need to limit the amount of junk food marketing so that parents can do their job better, not in place of parents doing their job.

JACKIE JUDD: In the front here, I'm sorry right behind you. You'll be next okay.

HALLEY FOKAY: Halley Fokay [misspelled?] from *Capitol News Service* I'm wondering without the legislation, with just the recommendations that we have now, I mean obviously this advertising works as the study sees. They're making lots of money off this advertising. What are the incentives for these companies to do this? The business world is not sadly or not a moral world other than just saying it's a good thing to do. How are you recommending the companies, what are their initiative to do this without consequences?

NANCY GREEN, PhD: As I mentioned earlier we have the Smart Spot program which identifies our healthier product.

That for PepsiCo has done two things; it has absolutely shown the business case for emphasizing your healthier products. That's the part of our portfolio that's growing most rapidly. That highlighted that for us internally and really made the business case for us. Secondly on that, when you had the criteria that was made available within the company it really drove product transformation. So we have internal goals to have more products that qualify. It did two things, it shifted our product mix, and it shifted what we're advertising both. It is because there's a strong business case there as well.

JACKIE JUDD: Interesting question and answer.

MARGO WOOTAN, D.Sc: Can I just add one additional incentive real quick. The other incentive is to avoid negative publicity which companies are getting for marketing junk food to kids and to avoid additional regulation or litigation which companies are also facing. There are some other reasons why companies are moving in this direction.

DICK KELLY: Dick Kelly [misspelled?] from the Federal Trade Commission, one of the striking things from the study that I noticed was that of the 2,613 that appeared to be geared towards children and teens the coders could not find a single ad for fruit, vegetables, meat, fish, poultry, or grains. I think the question to the panel is how will that change over time? Has it already begun to change what

incentives are there to bring about change so that some of the products that are marketed or geared towards the kids are more focused on things like that? I know Margo had said in the past, the desire is to change what kids are eating.

JACKIE JUDD: Nancy and then Michael.

NANCY GREEN, PhD: I think the 2005 dietary guidelines really did help with that. Because the guidelines in 2005 went away from just talking about nutrients to talking about foods so it allowed industry to start talking more about foods. Whole grains is a perfect example, the fact that they were identified as not getting enough whole grains, if the Kaiser Family Foundation went back and looked today I'm sure that you would see a number of ads where they emphasized whole grains. We even have a logo now that goes on products that carry whole grains. The other thing with the CBB programs because vegetables and fruits were shortfall nutrients that's one of the criteria of products that would be qualified to be advertised. I think in my opinion the dietary guidelines in 2005 really help the industry be able to talk about some of these things.

J MICHAEL MCGINNIS, MD, M.P.P: Just to add a couple of points in that respect. In the IOM assessment we did look at the issue of fruit and vegetable marketing and concluded because of the decentralized nature of the industry relative to processed foods that there needed to be some sort of

incentive program and called on the USDA to look specifically at that and make recommendations on how that marketing might be increased.

Secondly I think your point underscores the fact that there does need to be a dedicated effort to a sustained health promotion effort that can include the balanced focus.

JACKIE JUDD: Mary Sophos from Grocery Manufacturer's Association, a quick response.

MARY SOPHOS: Yes I just actually wanted to add something to that point because on the dietary guidelines, the food industry, the food manufacturers and the retail sector have teamed up in an in store promotion to promote the dietary guidelines. It's called, "Take a Peek" and it was kicked off in January with the support of the USDA. What we're looking to do is take exactly the kind of foods that Nancy was talking about that are supposed to be promoted through the dietary guidelines and make sure that consumers are aware of those choices in the supermarket at the time that they make purchases. We're hoping to get kicked off with a number of retailers. We're hoping to build so that retailers across the country are participating in this along with manufacturers. We think it's going to be an effective education and tool to help consumers make dietary guidelines and actual part of their lives.

SHERRY HOPE-CULVER: Hi Sherry Hope-Culver [misspelled?] with the Media Education Lab at Tempe University. I appreciate the recommendations that I'm hearing about information to advertisers and to the food manufacturers and I feel like the one group that I really haven't talked about getting information to are the kids and even the parents we talked about. And there's information to the kids about nutrition, which I do feel is getting to them. But I'm wondering if the issue of media literacy has come up in any of the discussion, whether it's from the CVB or the other projects and how we help kids decipher these ads themselves.

FEMALE SPEAKER: There's a whole separate movement on media literacy to kids and the folks on this panel aren't directly associated with that. Obviously the focus of this study and the focus of the people who are on the panel has to do with commercial advertising of foods to children and I think that's their primary focus and I commend them for it. Because I think if Lee's initiative went off in too many different directions it would probably be a lot harder for him to accomplish his goals. I don't know whether the IOM committee made any recommendations that had to do with media literacy.

DALE KUNKEL, PhD: I'm trying to remember, Michael will help me.

J MICHAEL MCGINNIS, MD, M.P.P: There's no recommendation but it is discussed as an issue. You've looked at it independently.

DALE KUNKEL, PhD: To speak directly to the question media literacy can be helpful in this context and it absolutely can not be a panacea. The reason why is there are different capabilities, intellectual cognitive capabilities across the age range of childhood. Children eight and below lack the cognitive ability to take into account complex motives and intentions no the part of the others and to use that to then make sense of messages that they're receiving, whether it's their parents or someone talking to them or watching television advertising. You can't accelerate a young child's ability to recognize and defend against commercial persuasion. So for that segment of the child population media literacy really offers little promise in terms of addressing these concerns. In contrast for older children, tweens, and adolescents who have more social experience and more refined cognitive capabilities then they could benefit substantially from examination of the ways in which advertisers try to manipulate them with lifestyle appeals and so forth. I think it can be helpful in this equation but I hesitate to put too many eggs in that basket.

JACKIE JUDD: I think we have time for two more questions.

AMY ARO: Hi, Amy Aro [misspelled?] National Cancer Institute. My question has to do with developing the healthier food product lines. Dale Kunkel actually wrote a very wonderful paper that came out this month in the *Journal of Nutrition Education Behavior* on developing a food rating system. I guess my question has to do with and it's directed towards Nancy, I know that Pepsi has their Smart Spot line and I know Kraft has their own line and each of the different food product line have their own emphasis of what they're trying to promote for healthier foods nutrient wise. I guess my question has to do with going back to the standardization issue and whether or not there are any plans to try and standardize this across different food companies?

NANCY GREEN, PhD: The answer is yes there are some efforts underway for that. We were talking earlier today, there's a lot of guidance out there and authoritative statements about dietary patterns and what a healthy diet should like. When you start talking about individual foods, there are less authoritative statements out there on that. It all gets into how does it fit into the diet? We use some standards coming out of FDA and IOM reports to come up with what we're using with PepsiCo. But right now there is an initiative of the Keystone Round Table that is looking at can industry and the number of officials are there from different, it's not just industry it's industry as well from

some consumer groups, government organizations to really try to tackle this. I am a nutritionist by background and as any of you know if you get three nutritionists in the room you will have three different opinions. It will be a challenge for us to come together on this and it is looking at those authoritative statements to try to give us some guidance.

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: I just wanted to raise an issue with Lee before we come to a close here today and that has to do with getting a little more information about the 50-percent of all ads from your member companies will be either for healthier foods or promote healthier lifestyles. As I've been preparing for this event and talking with people I think the nervousness on the part of some consumer advocates and so on, well is everybody just—as Margo said—is everybody going to just skate out of that by just having a fast food ad in which the character is riding a bicycle? You said earlier that that's not going to be the case, that that wouldn't qualify. I wonder if you could just talk a little bit more about that because I think people are looking for more information on exactly what the standards are going to be.

C. LEE PEELER, J.D.: Again that's one of the things we're working through right now. But the one thing that's clear is simply showing riding a bike or skipping or running in your ad is not enough. There are some communications issues as people in the audience have already suggested. We

will be very clear and very transparent about what the criteria are that we've approved when we publish the pledges. And that will give everybody an opportunity to comment on them.

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: And as far as standards on when something is a healthier for you food, can you talk a little bit about some of the different ways the companies could meet that designation.

C. LEE PEELER, J.D.: Again there are a variety of ways, sort of similar to the issue that Nancy was just raising, the company's can meet that criteria. It's going to have to meet two tests. It has to be consistent with established government or scientific standards and the second thing is it's going to have to be something the company is going to be willing to stand behind when we make it public.

JACKIE JUDD: On this side.

MAURICE LEBOCK: I'm Maurice Lebock [misspelled?] special counsel to Shaping America's Health and initiative of the American Diabetes Association. I applaud the Kaiser Family Foundation for its report, especially addressing a subject that really has not been adequately addressed in the past. However we do now that with the IOM report, with the National Obesity Action Forum, there have been tons of reports, there are thousands of organizations now attempting to address obesity and weight management. One of the things

that frustrate many of us and we continue to hear in every report that's published is a lack of leadership, lack of coordination related to these problems. Are there any plans a foot? Do you see any movement toward getting either the US Surgeon General or other entities to take the leadership in pulling these resources together?

J MICHAEL MCGINNIS, MD, M.P.P: One of our key recommendations in the IOM report reflected that sentiment. It's clearly important. We called for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to work with colleagues in USDA education, FTC, FCC, and report on the progress, in effect to use the data that are generated by this report and others to give a sense of the direction. We called for that report two years after the release of our IOM report and we're hopeful that something of that sort will emerge.

JACKIE JUDD: I think your question kind of leads us back to where we began with Senator Brownback, who pretty clearly said unless there is leadership, unless there's real significant action, there may well be regulation. I'll turn it over for a final word to Vicky.

VICKY RIDEOUT, MA: I basically just want to thank everybody for joining us here today. I want to say a special thank you to our panelists for participating in this and sharing what's going on with you guys now. We will accept the challenge to refine and update and continue our research

Food for Thought: Television Food Advertising to Children
in the United States
03/28/07

67

efforts. I want to say a special congratulations to Dick Kelly who is celebrating the last day of his tenure at the Federal Trade Commission after something like 35 years there [applause]. And I also have to say happy 40th birthday to Patty Miller and I hope you have something a lot better planned for the rest of the day. Thank you.

[END RECORDING]