

Attitudes of parents toward advertising to children in the UK, Sweden, and New Zealand.

Brian M. Young

School of Psychology, University of Exeter, U.K.

Telephone: +44 (0)1392 264614

Facsimile: +44 (0)1392 264623

Email: B.M.Young@exeter.ac.uk

Anne de Bruin, Associate Professor of Economics

Lynne Eagle, Senior Lecturer in Marketing

Department of Commerce, Massey University at Albany, Auckland, New Zealand

Telephone: 64-9-443-9799 ext. 9455

Facsimile: 64-9-441-8177

Email: a.m.debruin@massey.ac.nz

l.eagle@massey.ac.nz

Abstract

Data based on questionnaire measures from parents in New Zealand, the UK, and Sweden on attitudes toward advertising to children is presented. There is cross-national evidence that attitudes in this area are affectively strong and consistent and data is presented on responses to particular attitude statements that support this claim. An exploratory factor analysis on the Swedish and UK data suggests a factor structure in respondents with both positive and negative attitudinal clusters toward advertising to children. The paper concludes with suggestions for future research in order that the international debate on advertising and marketing to children is informed by cross-cultural research.

Biography

Dr. Brian Young is an economic psychologist at the School of Psychology, University of Exeter. He has a long-standing interest in advertising to children and has published papers in the area including *Television Advertising and Children* published by Oxford University Press in 1990. His latest book is a collection of papers in press on *Children and the Faces of Televisual Media* in collaboration with Professor Ed Palmer published soon by Erlbaum. Brian is the academic editor of the *International Journal of Advertising and Marketing to Children* and chairs the Academic Advisory Board of the Advertising Education Forum (www.aeforum.org). He sits on the Advertising Advisory Committee of the Independent Television Commission (ITC).

Dr. Anne de Bruin is Associate Professor of Economics in the Department of

Commerce, Massey University at Albany, Auckland, and the Director of the Academy of Business Research, Massey University, New Zealand. She is a strong advocate of the benefits of inter-disciplinary research. Several of her recent international journal articles and other publications are in collaboration with colleagues in Marketing, Sociology and Management.

Dr. Lynne Eagle is a Senior Lecturer in Marketing within the Department of Commerce, Massey University at Albany, Auckland, New Zealand. Her research interests include advertising effectiveness, education markets, integrated marketing communication, marketing and public policy and marketing ethics. She is involved in several multinational research projects and has presented at numerous international conferences and has published in a number of international academic journals.

Introduction

The choice of countries in the title of this paper might strike the reader as rather odd. Why should we be interested in parental attitudes toward advertising to children in the UK, Sweden, and New Zealand? It should be pointed out at the outset that the two researchers in New Zealand and the researcher in the UK were working independently of each other and it was not until data had been collected that we discovered our mutual interests. Composite data from these three countries using questions that were similar in many respects are presented in this paper.

Attitudes toward advertising to children should be an area that invokes deeply held feelings and beliefs by respondents. It has been argued elsewhere that the waves of moral panic that have regularly occurred since the 1970s about regulation and control of such advertising are a reflection of deep-seated anxieties about both the nature of advertising and childhood with images of ‘advertiser as seducer’ and ‘child as innocent’ being used (Young, 1990; Young, in press). However, there has been remarkably little research in the field, with the occasional exception (e.g. Walsh *et al.*, 1998). In addition there has been rapidly growing concern since the turn of the century in Europe, the United States, and New Zealand about issues surrounding advertising to children, particularly in relation to perceived links to unhealthy dietary practices. It seems appropriate, therefore, to find out what parents in these countries actually do think in order to inform public policy.

When Sweden assumed the presidency of the European Union at the beginning of 2001 she proposed that the EU imposed a ban on television advertising to children in accord with Swedish television regulations that do not allow television advertising

of goods and services to children less than 12 years of age (Stanbrook, 2001; p256). At the same time the American Psychological Association had set up a task force to examine the evidence on advertising to children (Clay, 2000). In the UK the Independent Television Commission (ITC) is reviewing much of the regulatory system concerned with television advertising, including advertising to children, and the government has published a White Paper on Communications. In New Zealand issues relating to advertising directed at children have been the subject of mounting media attention (see for example Bingham 2000, Brown and Daniels 2000, De Boni 2000, Eagle and de Bruin 2000, Eagle and de Bruin, 2001, Kedgley 2000, Newth 2000). Also in New Zealand, this attention has been sparked off by the Government's review of broadcasting policy and proposed ban on advertising around children's television programmes (see Labour Party 1999; p5).

The rest of this paper will describe the methodology and results that were used in Sweden, the UK, and New Zealand. In the final section we shall draw them together with some conclusions and suggestions for future work.

The New Zealand Research

Research Methodology

Increased New Zealand focus on the impact of advertising on children was sparked by the Government's review of broadcasting policy and proposed ban on advertising around children's television programmes noted above (see Labour Party, 1999; 5) and the assumptions implicit in this policy document that advertising was a direct cause of a range of social ill-effects, especially in regard to unhealthy dietary practices.

In the interests of informing public debate and policy making, Eagle and de Bruin (2001) provided an overview of the current New Zealand framework of advertising regulation and summarised the existing literature on the issue of advertising to children. The paper posed the question as to whether restrictions on advertising on children's television are likely to work as intended, and examined alternatives for addressing the legislative, regulatory and ethical dimensions associated with advertising to children. It pointed to the dearth of empirical research internationally especially on both parent/guardian and children's perspectives, on the broad issues of advertising directed at children and of regulation of children's television programmes. This paper represents a step towards closing the research gap in terms of the research agenda referred to in our earlier paper (Eagle and de Bruin 2001). It reports research findings of a survey conducted to gauge the perspectives of parent/guardians of 5 - 12 year olds (i.e. primary school children), on issues related to advertising to children and their preferences for modes of advertising regulation. Given the number of countries in which legislation and regulation of advertising to children is currently under review, lessons learned from this study have application well beyond the New Zealand market.

A questionnaire aimed at determining the attitude of parents of primary-school aged children (aged 5 – 12 years) regarding the impact of advertising on their children was developed, drawing initially on material in the government policy document and assumptions underlying the proposed policy with regard to perceived direct linkages between exposure to advertising messages and negative influences on children (see for example Bingham 2000, Brown and Daniels 2000, Eagle and de Bruin 2000, Kedgley 2000, Newth 2000), together with the implicit assumptions that the

imposition of the recommended ban would, without further interventions, eliminate a range of societal problems (see, for example, Higham, 1999).

The questionnaire was extended and strengthened by the inclusion of items developed from a range of other sources, particularly frequently voiced criticisms identified in the literature relating to advertising directed at children. Much of this literature is based on emotive rather than empirical foundations; Grossbart et al. (1984) and Walsh et al. (1998) being examples of the latter. The questionnaire was pre-tested using a convenience sample of parents and then piloted with parents/primary caregivers from one school. No problems were found with regard to either wording or question sequencing and the study was then extended to encompass a representative range of schools.

The survey then undertaken was restricted to Metropolitan Auckland, a geographic region containing 28% of the total New Zealand population (Statistics New Zealand, 2001). Schools were selected from a list provided by the Ministry of Education, which classifies New Zealand schools from deciles 1-10, with decile 1 associated with the lowest socio-economic group and 10, the highest¹. We chose a stratified sample of schools to represent state, private ('elite') and religious (Catholic) state school sectors. The latter are those schools combining a special Christian character with the standard educational role common to all other schools. Where a school declined to participate, a replacement with a similar socio-economic profile was selected as a replacement. This occurred four times with the lowest decile level schools. The rationale given by

¹ Schools in New Zealand are classified from deciles 1 –10, with decile 1 associated with the lowest socio-economic group and 10 the highest. Factors taken into account are based on various criteria such as household income and parental educational qualifications and these ratings determine supplementary funding.

these schools for declining was that they were often portrayed in a negative light in social policy research. With the agreement of each participating school's Trust Board and the support of each Principal, a questionnaire together with a reply paid envelope, was enclosed with the school newsletter to parents. A covering letter from the school Principal explaining the origin, purpose and intention of the survey was also attached. Questionnaires were sent out to each household. Response rates are shown in Table 1. 34% of respondents were from households with only one primary school aged child, 40% of households had 2 primary aged children, 20% had 3 primary aged children and 6% had four or more children. 87% of respondents were female and 13% male.

Table 1 about here

New Zealand Results

A twelve-item list of opinions/statements regarding the influence of television advertising directed at children was presented (the statements were developed from policy documents and from the literature as noted earlier). Parents were asked to indicate the strength of their agreement or disagreement with each statement on a five point Likert scale, with 1 = totally disagree, 2 = disagree somewhat, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree somewhat and 5 = totally agree. The results are shown in Table 2. Each statement was tested via a t-test with a null hypothesis of 3 (neutral), i.e. that parents' views would not be strongly positive or negative, was conducted. The null hypothesis can be rejected at the 0.25 (2-tail) level of significance for many of the statements

tested (asterisked in Table 2), indicating that parents' views are unlikely to be neutral on these issues.

Table 2 about here.

The food and nutrition issue was represented in an attempt to gauge how parents perceived the specific impact of television advertising on this issue. Critics of television food advertising aimed at children focus on an imbalance between the types of foods advertised and recommendations in dietary guidelines (e.g. Hammond *et al.*, 1999). Table 2 however shows that the parents in this study were relatively neutral on issues such as whether advertised foods on television were an important cause of unhealthy eating habits (statement a). Statements g and h, however, indicate that there are some concerns, if not particularly strong ones, regarding some aspects of advertised food products i.e., that there is too much sugar and fat in food products advertised in television programmes directed at children (statement g) and there are too many additives in food products advertised on television (statement h). There is slightly higher support for these statements among higher decile schools.

Agreement was also moderately high across all schools with statements that television encourages children to want products they do not need (statement c) and

that there are too many advertisements in television programmes directed at children (statement f).

Television advertising did not have much impact on either discussion or conflict within the family. Parents were neutral on whether advertisements encouraged discussion of products (statement l), with the results being significant for only one low decile school. They tended to lean more toward disagreeing that advertisements were a cause of conflict (statement d), but with the results for only two schools, one at either end of the socio-economic spectrum, being significant. Only moderate levels of agreement were obtained for the statement that television advertising is an important cause of pestering (statement b) though there tended to be agreement that advertising provided information on available products (statement k). There was stronger agreement among the higher socio-economic schools for statement b, but no evident trend for statement k.

A broad argument of the proponents of stringent restrictions on television advertising hinges on the extensive exposure of children to television and their limited cognitive ability to deal with the commercial activities that advertising represents (e.g. Brucks *et al.* 1988). Interestingly, there was agreement that children are able to distinguish between programmes and advertisements (statement i), although this is likely to be age-specific. There was disagreement regarding whether children understand the commercial intent of commercials (statement j). Again, this appears to be related to the age of the children concerned. With regard to this latter aspect, advertising in programmes aimed at pre-school children is not permitted in New Zealand .

The UK and Swedish studies²

Questionnaire

A questionnaire consisting of 34 attitude statements on advertising to children was constructed. These items were based on 22 focus group interviews with parents, children, and grandparents in the UK and Sweden. A content analysis of transcripts was conducted and some of the various themes that emerged involved attitudes toward advertising. In addition attitude statements were generated by colleagues and taken from statements in the existing literature. Responses were on a five point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' with the other categories unlabelled. In addition scaled responses were obtained on whether respondents wanted stronger or weaker regulations on advertising to children and whether respondents felt that children needed protection from the adult world ('innocent') or were capable of coping with the adult world ('capable'). Basic demographic information on family status, country, gender, marital status, age group, number and age of children, number of grandchildren, occupation, retirement status, and annual pre-tax household income was collected.

Respondents

There were 172 adults sampled in the UK and 371 adults sampled in Sweden, ranging in age from mid-20s to 70s. All of them were or had been parents and the older adults were often grandparents. They were predominantly female in both societies and were sampled from middle class catchment areas (Malmö in Sweden and Exeter in England).

² This research was supported by funding from the Advertising Association in the UK and Anna Danhall was the bilingual research assistant who did the work in both Malmö and Exeter.

Results

A first pass through the data produced frequencies and basic descriptive statistics, such as means and standard deviations, for each of the attitude and opinion statements. The range of agreement for the UK sample varied from a mean of 1.43 (advertising makes children put pressure on their parents to buy them things) to 4.27 (the products advertised on TV are the best products to buy) using similar response scales and values as in Table 1. In addition the mean standard deviation across the 34 statements (again for the UK sample) was 1.26. Similar results were obtained for the Swedish sample. A full set of means for the Swedish and UK respondents (the rows in Table 2) on each of the 34 attitude statements are given in Table 4.

Table 4 about here

For those items that are starred in Table 4 there is a significant difference between UK and Swedish attitudes at the 0.01 level. If the results that are significantly different between cultures are examined then most of them can be explained on the assumption that the Swedish sample holds more negative attitudes toward advertising than the UK sample. It should be note however that in the absence of any measures of reliability of the attitude scale within either culture it is not possible to attribute significant differences on an **individual** attitude item to cultural differences. Nevertheless there

is good evidence that across all the 23 starred attitude items where significant difference between UK and Swedish items were obtained, the vast majority were in the same direction .

The UK/Swedish results can be summarised as follows:

The Swedish group disapprove of advertising to children more than the UK group although there are interesting pockets of difference that suggest the situation is more complex. There is a similarity between groups and this cross-cultural study suggests that in both cultures the majority of people agree that:

- Advertising makes children put pressure on their parents to buy them things.
- The more advertising children watch, the more they will want products advertised.
- Children are deceived by adverts more easily than adults.
- Children are exposed to too much TV advertising.
- Advertising persuades people to buy products they do not really need.

The majority of people would disagree that:

- The products advertised the most on TV are the best products to buy.

Although the items from the New Zealand study were derived independently of the attitude items in the UK and Swedish studies, there is a certain consensus if Tables 2 and 4 are examined. All three cultures perceive ‘pester power’ (Table 2; item b: Table 4; item 4) as a negative consequence of advertising to children for example. In addition, there is general agreement that there is too much advertising to children (Table 2; item f: Table 4; item 22) and Swedish and New Zealand respondents agree that advertising to children creates false needs (Table 2; item c: Table 4; item 32).

Finally there were two questions asked on whether respondents wanted stronger or weaker regulations on advertising to children and whether respondents felt that children needed protection from the adult world (‘innocent’) or were capable of coping with the adult world (‘capable’). Results from these are given In Tables 5 and 6 respectively.

Tables 5 and 6 about here

Both countries want stronger regulations on TV advertising to children. The percentage wanting weaker regulations is negligible in both countries as if wanting ‘weaker’ regulations *vis-à-vis* children in any case was taboo. There is more uncertainty with the Swedish group and, given the fact that the UK group in general is

less certain on most statements, this would suggest that some respondents in Sweden know and recognise that regulations on TV advertising to children can't go much further anyway.

This last attitude statement (Table 6) produces one of the more dramatic and interesting results. Whereas there is a split in the UK sample with some respondents seeing children as 'innocent' and others as 'capable', almost two-thirds of the Swedish group view children as innocent. If this result is taken with results for item 26 (concerned with exposing children to the adult world where about one-third of the Swedish sample think it's good to expose children to the adult world) it appears that there is a tension or paradox in Swedish and UK cultural values here. A speculative account would be that both communities hold both protective and libertarian attitudes toward children. Whether these values co-exist in individuals or predominate to a greater or less extent in groups of people is not known but, at the level of available discourses in the two cultures, both sets of attitudes can be found when people talk, and in media discussions. In general they are culturally or socially represented and are quite salient or available as resources when the subject of children or childhood is aired. The difference lies in the particular domains of adult life where adults are prepared to admit children and those domains that are still 'off-limits'. In Sweden, as contrasted with the UK, there is a greater tendency to view children as in need of protection from advertising, marketing, and commercial life in general. Our data here supports this. But more Swedish respondents (compared with the UK group) tend to think that children should be exposed to the adult world from an early age. Although we don't know what aspects of the adult world Swedish respondents had in mind, it would appear that it would not be advertising.

With the relatively large sample sizes and 34 attitude statements it was possible to reduce the attitude statements using an exploratory factor analysis on the total population sampled in both countries. Ten factors with eigenvalues greater than or equal to 1.00 were extracted using principal component analysis and varimax rotation. These factors (dimensions) explained 58 percent of the total variance. Inspection of the statements that contributed to each factor suggested that factors one, two, three, four, and six were readily interpretable and also formed scales with good internal consistency. Table 7 displays the statements loading on each of these five factors, their loadings, communalities, the factors' labels, their eigenvalues, and the percentage of variance explained by each factor. This Table can be 'read' by examining the loadings of each statement on each factor. (The loading of a statement on a factor can be viewed as equivalent to the correlation coefficient of that statement with that factor where the range is from +1 through 0 to -1). High positive loadings make a major contribution to the meaning of that factor and high negative loadings make a major contribution to the **opposite** meaning of that factor.

Table 7 about here

Any factor analysis is sensitive to the pool of items that constitute the data to be analysed and the analysis in Table 7 is no exception. The fact that there is a factor (no. 2) devoted to 'food advertising' is partly predictable because of the identifiable

subset of items on this issue and the semantic separation of 'food advertising' from 'advertising in general' will influence the end result. In addition a small factor with two highly correlated items on 'entertainment' (no. 5) is most likely a consequence of the semantic symmetry of these two attitude statements. The existence of separate factors however for positive (no. 3) and negative (no. 1 and no. 4) aspects of advertising cannot be explained away so easily and provide us with evidence that needs to be accounted for with a tentative model which would require a separate test using confirmatory factor analysis³. The suggestion would be that individuals can hold separate sets of attitudes toward advertising to children and that these attitude clusters can be both positive and negative. In other words the structure of attitudes toward advertising to children is one where positive and negative attitudes can co-exist.

General discussion and future research.

The data obtained from samples in different cultures show certain similarities. We have shown that asking respondents about their attitudes toward advertising to children produces a set of responses that are affectively charged across the spectrum from strong agreement to strong disagreement with standard deviations that demonstrate some degree of consensus within groups of respondents. In this sense it is valuable and meaningful to obtain this data. Valuable in the sense that information on how different populations feel about the issue of advertising to children can and should inform the debate and meaningful as they appear to be attitudes with consistent

³ An identical factor analysis was performed on both UK and Swedish samples separately although the small UK sample should be noted as limiting the possible validity of such an analysis. Although the factors were not identical there was evidence in both samples of similar separate attitude clusters, both positive and negative.

vector qualities of strength and direction. There is also evidence for an internal organised structure within respondents. What still needs to be done?

The debate about advertising to children involves social attitudes and vested interests. Advertisers for example are concerned about the future of their own industry and have an obvious interest in protecting their own members against additional controls and bans on their activities. Advertising is also responsive to public opinion. It is important to assess public opinion for a global industry on a world-wide scale both in order to track attitudes and to identify areas where public opinion and scientific fact diverge in order to inform the debate. The database needs to be extended to include a wider range of cultures and groups so that we can go beyond simple demographic claims to predictions based on cross-cultural dimensions such as those proposed by Hofstede (1991). Advertising to children involves attitudes toward children and childhood as well as attitudes toward commerce and the material and commercial world and should provide a rich vein of values and beliefs. So for example the preliminary evidence that there are differences and similarities in attitudes toward childhood and children in different cultures is to be expected on the basis of what we know about cultural differences in our expectations of children (Goodnow and Collins, 1990). In order to develop a theory of attitudes toward children we need to assess both attitudes toward advertising and attitudes toward children in a systematic way. To this we need to produce short-form questionnaires based on exploratory multivariate analyses that are easily transported and translated between cultures. In this way we believe the debate which is now an international one, can be conducted in an informed and sensible way.

References

- Bingham, E. (2000), "Ad free TV for kids govt aim", *NZ Herald*, March 1: A1
- Brown, J. and Daniels, C. (2000), "TV ads a turnoff for youngsters", *Weekend Herald*, March 4-5: A3.
- Brucks, M., Armstrong, G. and Goldberg, M. (1988), "Children's use of cognitive defenses against television advertising: a cognitive response approach", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. **14**, 471 - 482.
- Clay, R. A. (2000), "Advertising to children: Is it ethical?", *APA Monitor on Psychology*, September 2000, 52-53. American Psychological Association.
- Eagle, L. and de Bruin, A. (2000), "Advert ban could have major drawbacks", *NZ Herald*, March 6: A17.
- Eagle, L. and de Bruin, A. (2001), "Advertising restrictions: protection of the young and vulnerable?", *International Journal of Advertising & Marketing to Children*, Vol. **2**, No. 4, pp. 259-271.
- Goodnow, J. J. and Collins, W. A. (1990), *Development According to Parents*, Hove, Erlbaum.
- Grossbart, S., Sanford, L. and Crosby, L. (1984), "Understanding the Bases of Parental Concern and Reaction to Children's Food" *Journal of Marketing*, 48(3): 79-93.
- Hammond, K.M., Wylie, A. and Casswell, S. (1999), "The extent and nature of television food advertising to New Zealand children and adolescents", *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, Vol. **23** No. 1, pp. 49 - 55.
- Hofstede, Geert (1991), *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, London, McGraw-Hill.
- Kedgley, S. (2000), "Food advertising can harm your child's health", *NZ Herald*, March 9: A13.
- Labour Party (1999), "Broadcasting: It's About Us". Broadcasting Policy, September 1999, NZ Labour Party, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Newth, K. (2000), "Fast-food fat in spotlight: heart foundation to investigate ads targeting children", *Sunday Star Times*, March 26: A7.
- Stanbrook, L. (2001), "Politics, policy, and research", *International Journal of Advertising & Marketing to Children*, Vol. **2**, No. 4, pp. 253-257.
- Statistics New Zealand (2001), New Zealand Census Statistics, www.statistics.govt.nz

Walsh, A. D., Laczniak, R. N., and Carlson, L. (1998), "Mothers' preferences for regulating children's television", *The Journal of Advertising*, Vol. **27**, No. 3, pp. 23-36.

Young, Brian M. (1990), *Television Advertising and Children*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Young, Brian M. (in press), "Children and commercial communications: issues and politics". In: *The Faces of Televisual Media: Teaching, Violence, Selling to Children* (Eds.) Palmer, Edward L. and Young, Brian M., New York, NY, Erlbaum.

Table 1. Response rates by type and decile level of school

School Profile	No. responses	Response rate
Decile 10 Private	118	28%
Decile 10 Religious State	51	23%
Decile 10 State	59	15%
Decile 7 State	64	30%
Decile 5 State	56	18%
Decile 3 State	69	16%
Decile 1 State	31	18%
Decile 1 Religious State	67	27%

Table 2a. Agreement / Disagreement (on a five point scale where 1 = totally disagree and 5 = totally agree and 3 = neutral) with Opinions/ Statements on Television Advertising Directed at Children
Summary of all participating schools

Each mean tested against a null hypothesis of 3 (neural, i.e. parents would not have strongly positive or negative views. *Denotes that the null hypothesis of 3 (neutral) can be rejected at the 0.025 (2-tail) level of significance

Statement	Decile 10 Private	
	Mean	Std Dev
a. advertised foods on television is an important cause of unhealthy eating habits	3.5*	1.2
b. television advertising is an important cause of my children pestering me for advertised products	3.7*	1.2
c. television advertising encourages my children to want products they don't need	4.0*	1.1
d. television advertising to children leads to family conflict	2.8	1.3
e. television advertising to children uses tricks and gimmicks	3.8*	1.0
f. there are too many ads in television programmes directed at children	3.9*	1.0
g. there is too much sugar and fat in food products advertised in television programmes directed at children	4.0*	1.0
h. there are too many additives in food products advertised in television programmes directed at children	4.0*	1.0
i. children are able to distinguish between programmes and advertising	3.8*	1.3
j. children understand the commercial intent of advertisements	2.9	1.4
k. advertisements provide information regarding available products	3.6*	0.8
l. advertisements encourages discussion of products within the family	3.1	1.1

Table 2. Agreement / Disagreement (on a five point scale where 1 = totally disagree and 5 = totally agree and 3 = neutral) with Opinions/ Statements on Television Advertising Directed at Children. Each mean tested against a null hypothesis of 3 (neutral, i.e. parents would not have strongly positive or negative views. *Denotes that the null hypothesis of 3 (neutral) can be rejected at the 0.025 (2-tail) level of significance

Statement	Decile 10 Private		Decile 10 Religious		Decile 10 State		Decile 7 State		Decile 5 State		Decile 3 State		Decile 1 State		Decile 1 Religious	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
a. advertised foods on television is an important cause of unhealthy eating habits	3.7*	1.1	3.7*	1.1	3.6*	1.1	3.2	1.2	3.5*	1.1	3.4*	1.2	3.5*	1.4	3.5*	1.4
b. television advertising is an important cause of my children pestering me for advertised products	3.7*	1.2	3.9*	1.1	3.8*	1.1	3.7*	1.2	3.7*	1.3	3.7*	1.3	3.5*	1.4	3.4*	1.4
c. television advertising encourages my children to want products they don't need	3.9*	1.1	4.4*	0.8	4.2*	0.8	4.3*	1.0	3.8*	1.1	4.0*	1.2	3.9*	1.2	3.9*	1.2
d. television advertising to children leads to family conflict	2.6*	1.3	2.9	1.2	3.0	1.0	2.8	1.4	2.7	1.3	2.7	1.3	3.1	1.4	2.5	1.3
e. television advertising to children uses tricks and gimmicks	3.8*	1.0	4.1	0.7	4.1*	0.8	4.0*	0.9	3.7*	1.2	3.8*	1.0	3.9*	1.1	3.5*	1.3
f. there are too many ads in television programmes directed at children	4.1*	1.0	4.0*	1.1	4.0*	0.8	4.1*	0.9	3.8*	1.2	4.0*	1.0	3.7*	1.1	3.6*	1.2
g. there is too much sugar and fat in food products advertised in television programmes directed at children	4.1*	1.0	4.2*	0.9	4.0*	0.9	3.9*	1.0	3.6*	1.2	3.8*	1.1	4.4*	0.8	3.8*	1.2
h. there are too many additives in food products	4.1*	1.0	4.2*	0.9	4.0*	0.9	3.7*	1.0	3.6*	1.1	3.8*	1.1	4.2*	1.2	3.6*	1.1

advertised in television programmes directed at children																
i. children are able to distinguish between programmes and advertising	3.8*	1.3	4.1*	1.0	3.7*	1.3	3.9*	1.2	4.1*	1.3	3.9*	1.2	3.8*	1.4	3.3	1.4
j. children understand the commercial intent of advertisements	2.9	1.4	2.8	1.4	2.7	1.3	2.8	1.4	3.4*	1.3	2.9	1.3	2.8	1.3	2.8	1.4
k. advertisements provide information regarding available products	3.7*	0.8	3.6*	1.0	3.6*	1.0	3.8*	0.9	3.6*	1.1	3.5*	1.1	3.5*	1.2	3.5*	1.2
l. advertisements encourages discussion of products within the family	3.1	1.1	3.1	1.0	3.1	1.1	3.2	1.1	3.0	1.1	3.0	1.2	4.3*	0.8	3.1	1.3

Table 4. Attitudes toward statements on advertising to children with UK and Swedish samples. Entries are means ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ (1) to ‘strongly agree’ (5). Mid-point (3) is ‘not sure’. Starred (*) items are significantly different between UK and Swedish samples based on χ^2 with Yates correction where necessary ($p < 0.01$).

Attitude Statement	UK	SWE
1. Advertising is a valuable source of information for consumers*	2.68	2.77
2. Food advertising is the main influence on children's diets*	2.39	1.52
3. Most children older than 5 years understand the purpose of advertising*	2.14	1.44
4. Advertising makes children put pressure on their parents to buy them things	3.57	3.26
5. There should be a ban on advertising heavily sugared products aimed at children*	3.25	2.9
6. Food advertising leads to bad eating habits in adults*	1.45	1.82
7. The more advertising children watch, the more they will want products advertised	3.31	3.18
8. Children are deceived by adverts more easily than adults	3.15	3.4
9. Advertising healthy products leads to good eating habits*	2.58	2.13
10. Advertising is generally misleading*	2.53	2.61
11. Advertising promotes competition*	2.82	2.38
12. Competition benefits the consumer*	2.54	4.27
13. In general, adverts are more informative*	1.93	1.3
14. The more advertising children watch, the better they will understand them*	1.27	1.18
15. Adverts aimed at children under the age of 12 should be banned*	2.46	3.26
16. Most advertising is entertaining*	1.81	1.27
17. The products advertised the most on TV are the best products to buy	0.73	0.53
18. If unhealthy foods were not advertised children's eating habits would improve	2.14	2.03
19. Most advertising insults the intelligence of the average consumer	2.58	2.47
20. Advertising aimed at children who are too young to understand the purpose of advertising should be banned*	2.88	3.4
21. In general, advertising presents a true picture of the product advertised*	1.18	0.94
22. Children are exposed to too much TV advertising	3.21	3.29
23. Children usually demand food they have seen in TV adverts*	2.75	2.24
24. Advertising helps children become more aware of the world around them*	1.83	1.19
25. Food advertising helps improve public knowledge of food*	1.87	1.21
26. The best way of bringing up children is to expose them to the adult world from an early age*	0.94	1.69
27. Advertising keeps me up to date with new brands	2.34	2.12
28. Junk food advertising should be banned completely	2.81	2.86
29. Parents have the overall responsibility for deciding what adverts their children should watch	2.97	3.03
30. Most adverts deceive children*	2.29	1.94
31. There should be health warnings on advertisements for sugared products*	3.14	2.8
32. Advertising persuades people to buy products they do not really need*	3.03	3.17
33. When children decide what to buy, they are influenced more by their friends than by advertising	2.88	2.85
34. Most TV adverts are annoying*	2.75	3.01

	UK	Sweden
Stronger	87	72
No Change	13	22
Weaker	01	05

Table 5. Responses to “Would you like to see stronger regulations or weaker regulations regarding TV advertising to children?” Significant difference with raw data based on χ^2 with Yates correction where necessary ($p < 0.01$). (Entries are percentages).

	UK	Sweden
Innocent	39	64
Not sure	25	11
Capable	36	24

Table 6. Responses to “How do you see children in general?” Significant difference with raw data based on χ^2 with Yates correction where necessary ($p < 0.01$). (Entries are percentages).

Table 7. Five Dimensions of Attitudes Towards Advertisements.

Factor 1: Advertising is negative (Eigenvalue = 5.79; Variance explained = 17%; Cronbach's alpha = 0.74)		
	Loadings	<i>Communalities</i>
Most advertising insults the intelligence of the average consumer	0.70	0.60
Most adverts deceive children	0.68	0.64
Advertising aimed at too young to understand the purpose of advertising should be banned	0.62	0.66
Adverts aimed at children under the age of 12 should be banned	0.60	0.67
Advertising is generally misleading	0.59	0.46
Advertising persuades people to buy things they do not really need	0.40	0.47
If unhealthy foods were not advertised children's eating habits would improve	0.38	0.46
Factor 2: Food advertising is negative (Eigenvalue = 4.18; Variance explained = 12.3%; Cronbach's alpha = 0.79)		
Junk food adverts should be banned	0.80	0.73
There should be a ban on advertising heavily sugared products aimed at children	0.78	0.69
There should be health warnings on adverts for sugared products	0.76	0.67
Children are exposed to too much TV advertising	0.42	0.48

Table 7: Five Dimensions of Attitudes Towards Advertisements (continued).

Factor 3: Advertising is positive (information) (Eigenvalue = 1.73; Variance explained = 5.1%; Cronbach's alpha = 0.61)		
	Loadings	<i>Communalities</i>
The more adverts children watch the better they will understand them	0.64	0.51
Food advertising helps improve public knowledge of food	0.58	0.52
In general, adverts are very informative	0.56	0.57
Advertising is a valuable source of information for consumers	0.54	0.52
Most children older than 5 years old understand the purpose of advertising	0.53	0.48
Advertising helps children become more aware of the world around them	0.52	0.54
Factor 4: Advertising is negative (effects) (Eigenvalue = 1.43; Variance explained = 4.2%; Cronbach's alpha = 0.65)		
Advertising makes children put pressure on their parents to buy them things	0.73	0.61
The more adverts children watch the more they will want products advertised	0.71	0.62
Children usually demand food they have seen in TV adverts	0.52	0.54
Food advertising is the main influence on children's diet	0.46	0.52
Factor 6: Advertising is positive (entertaining) (Eigenvalue = 1.20; Variance explained = 3.5%; Cronbach's alpha = 0.60)		
Most advertising is entertaining	0.80	0.72
Most TV adverts are annoying	-0.70	0.73