Mobile Marketing to Children: A Content Analysis of Food and Beverage Company Apps

Lisa B. Hurwitz, M.A.; Eric D. Morales; Heather Montague, M.A.; Alexis R. Lauricella, Ph.D.,
M.P.P.; and Ellen Wartella, Ph.D.

Center on Media and Human Development, Northwestern University

Correspondence should be directed to:

Lisa B. Hurwitz

Center on Media and Human Development

Northwestern University

2240 Campus Drive, Rm. 2-168

Evanston, IL 60208-3545, USA

Phone: 1 (847) 467-2084

Fax: 1 (847) 467-1464

lisa.hurwitz@u.northwestern.edu

Mobile Marketing to Children: A Content Analysis of Food and Beverage Company Apps

Globally, mobile technology penetration among families has risen steadily. While this technology can be used to promote public health (e.g., through the mHealth movement), it also may have less desirous public health impacts. For example, food manufacturers may have created dynamic apps promoting obesogenic products similar to the unhealthy foods they market to children via television commercials and online food-branded games.¹⁻⁴ Nevertheless, in the U.S., large food manufacturers recently pledged to curtail the advertising of processed foods to youth,⁵ which may deter them from leveraging new mobile technologies. This first-of-its-kind study aimed to describe food-branded mobile applications (apps) available for children on iOS devices (e.g., the iPad) across food product categories to better understand the nature of this content in the U.S.

To date, scholars at the Rudd Center for Food Policy are the only researchers to have studied food-branded apps, providing brief descriptions of apps promoting fast foods and sugary beverages.^{1,2} In their most recent report on fast food marketing, they identified two child-directed apps, only one of which featured food.² They also recently identified 13 child-oriented sugary beverage apps: nine game, one eBook, one app promoting a contest, one app linked to a real-world event, and one arts app.¹ However, they did not report on apps associated with other food categories, such as cereals or candy, some of the products most commonly marketed to children on other media platforms.³ They also did not quantify the saturation of engaging and interactive features (e.g., the prevalence of branded characters) within apps, features which may lead to marketing's effectiveness.³ Nor did they analyse the the healthfulness of foods these apps promoted.

This study aimed to expand understanding of food marketing to children by examining apps produced by America's leading food manufacturers across product categories. In the general children's app marketplace outside the context of food marketing, games and art-themed activities are popular.⁶ Such apps include dynamic, potentially appealing features such as branded characters and music.⁶ Food marketers may be emulating these existing apps. We thus sought to characterize the prevalence of food-branded apps, identify common types of content within them (e.g., games), tally frequently employed branding and interactivity features, and explore the healthfulness of promoted foods.

To identify a sample of apps, we consulted food company sales reports and created a stratified sampling frame of food brands (~700) produced by 36 top selling American manufacturers. In November 2013, we selected 153 brands from this sampling frame and searched the App Store for iOS apps promoting each. We focused on iOS offerings because preliminary searches identified only one Android food app not available for iOS, which did not appear to target children. This search only yielded 36 apps. To increase our sample, we also searched for apps promoting multiple brands or the company in general, locating an additional 19 apps ($N = 55$).

Researchers recorded app content with video-cameras as they engaged with apps, exploring them until exhausting all content or at least 10 minutes had elapsed. Five apps were not recorded because the app required users to shake the iPad in a way that precluded recording under our protocol (2) or due to experimenter error (3).

We scored video data using Datavyu coding software⁷ and calculated reliability in R.⁸ Initially, we examined all 50 apps, classifying each by target audience (*child-* or *adult-oriented*; $\kappa = .89$) and type of food promoted ($\kappa = .69$). Next, we focused on the child-oriented apps,

identifying broad content features (e.g., games; $\kappa = .82$). We also noted specific food products (e.g., Honey Nut Cheerios) marketed within content features ($\kappa = 1.00$) and categorized products based on the Go-Slow-Whoa framework ($\kappa = .63$)⁹ and the Institute of Medicine (IOM) nutritional standards for foods in schools ($\kappa = 1.00$).¹⁰ Go-Slow-Whoa categorizes foods based on nutrient and calorie density into items individuals can eat almost anytime (“Go”), sometimes, (“Slow”), or only once in a while (“Whoa”).⁹ The IOM standards dichotomize foods as appropriate or inappropriate for school children based on calories, fat, sugar, and sodium.¹⁰ Finally, coders scored each arts activity and game, the two most common types of content (as discussed below), in greater detail (see Table 1).

We conducted analyses using the SPSS Complex Samples module.

Initially, we examined the target audience for all 50 apps. Thirty-seven (weighted 88%) were adult-oriented, while only 13 (weighted 12%) were child-oriented. The paucity of apps may be due to the current self-regulatory environment in the U.S.⁵ or the mHealth movement, both of which might deter companies from creating food-branded apps. Or the small number of apps at the time data were collected may be a reflection on the relative newness of app marketplaces.

Across all 50 apps, the greatest number were associated with beverages (11 apps, 37%), fast foods (10, 9%), and candies (8, 20%). The 13 child-oriented apps were linked to beverages (2, 15%), candies (2, 15%), cereals (3, 23%), fast foods, fruits/vegetables, pastas, grain-based snacks, dairy products, and a company in general (1 app per category, 8% each). Thus, a wide variety of products were featured across the sample.

The remaining analyses focused exclusively on the 13 child-oriented apps. Ten apps (77%) featured arts activities, yielding 12 different arts activities. The remaining 3 apps (23%) featured games (5 games total). Almost all apps (11 apps, 85%) also featured decorative entry

portals, 3 contained videos (25%), 2 contained display advertisements for company products (17%), and 1 contained a quiz/poll (8%). Altogether we noted 44 different content features within the set of 13 child-oriented apps (includes arts activities, games, entry portals, videos, display advertisements, and quizzes/polls). Only 19 of the 44 content features (43%) showed specific branded food products ($M = 1.46$ content features promoting specific products per app). The ratio of arts- to game-themed apps is surprising, giving the ubiquity of games in the online food marketing space³ and the lack of research pointing to the effectiveness of arts activities. But, as described in more detail below, arts activities were fairly simplistic, and accordingly may have been easier or more cost-efficient to produce.

Table 1

Most (11 of 12) arts activities functioned well enough to record and code. As seen in Table 1, most allowed users to create multiple pieces of artwork (9 activities, 82%) and use multiple stickers/stampers (10, 91%). More than half allowed users to rotate stickers/stamps (7, 64%) and save artwork to the iPad's Photo Library (6, 55%). Slightly less than half (5, 46%) allowed children to decorate with branded food, prompted them to continue making artwork, or allowed them to use the iPad's camera. The remaining coded features appeared infrequently (see Table 1).

Next, analyses focused on the five games. As shown in Table 1, all included prompts to continue playing, and four featured multiple levels and tracked scores. Only one allowed play as a branded food item (i.e., using a piece of cereal as an avatar) or had the primary goal of collecting branded foods. Three gave bonus points for collecting foods and allowed the use foods as tools. Other coded features appeared less frequently (see Table 1).

We subsequently assessed the nutritional quality of the foods promoted in the 19 content features showing branded items (i.e., within arts activities, games, entry portals, videos, and banner advertisements). Of these 19 content features, 10 (53%) promoted “Go”, 1 (5%) promoted “Slow”, and the remainder promoted “Whoa” foods (8 features, 42%). Four features (16%) promoted foods that met the IOM’s standards for foods allowed in schools. These findings may initially seem alarming, but it is important to keep in mind that less than half of app content features promoted any food. Additionally, this nutritional profile is actually stronger than what has been documented in other recent marketing efforts across other platforms (e.g., child-targeted television advertisements).⁴

In conclusion, industry self-regulation may have deterred companies from creating apps promoting unhealthy foods in 2013.⁵ Our data suggest food company apps may not present a major threat to youth at the moment, at least relative to food marketing across other media platforms. We identified few child-oriented food apps, most of which featuring simplistic art activities and promoted healthier foods relative to previously documented marketing.⁴

Author Statements

Acknowledgements

Thanks to ALA, THR, and SA for their indispensable assistance recording and coding the data analysed in this article. Further thanks to LBR and other members of UNIVERSITY LAB for additional feedback on this project.

Ethical Review and Informed Consent

Review by our university Institutional Review Board (IRB) and informed consent were not required for this study because human subjects were not involved, as per U.S. Department of Health and Human Services guidelines.

Funding

This research was supported by National Science Foundation Grant #1251745.

Competing Interests

The authors certify that there is no conflict of interest with any financial organisation regarding the material in the manuscript.

Authorship

LBH and EW formulated the research aims of this study. LBH, HM, ARL, and EW designed this study, with refinement from EDM. LBH, EDM, HM, and ARL carried out this investigation. LBH and EDM analysed the data, with input from HM. All authors played a role in writing the manuscript and approve the final version.

References

1. Harris JL, Schwartz MB, LoDolce M, et al. *Sugary drink f.a.c.t.s. (food advertising to children and teens score): Sugary drink marketing to youth: Some progress but much room to improve*. New Haven, CT: Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity; 2014.
2. Harris JL, Schwartz MB, Munsell CR, et al. *Fast food f.a.c.t.s. (food advertising to children and teens score) 2013: Measuring progress in nutrition and marketing to children and teens*. New Haven, CT: Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity; 2013.
3. Culp J, Bell RA, Cassady D. Characteristics of food industry web sites and “advergates” targeting children. *J Nutr Educ Behav*. 2010;42(3):197-201.
4. Kunkel D, Castonguay J, Wright PJ, McKinley CJ. Solution or smokescreen? Evaluating industry self-regulation of televised food marketing to children. *Communication Law and Policy*. 2014;19(3):263-292.
5. Better Business Bureaus. Children's food and advertising initiative: Program and core principles statement. 4th ed. Washington, D.C.: Better Business Bureaus; 2014: <http://www.bbb.org/globalassets/local-bbbs/council-113/media/cfbai/enhanced-core-principles-fourth-edition-with-appendix-a.pdf>.
6. Authors. 2015.
7. Datavyu Team. Datavyu: A video coding tool [Computer software]. 2014.
8. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Computer software]. 2015.
9. HHS. We can! Go, slow, and whoa foods. 2013: <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/educational/wecan/downloads/go-slow-whoa.pdf>.

- 1
2
3
4 **10.** IOM. *Nutrition standards for foods in schools: Leading the way toward healthier youth.*
5
6
7 Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press; 2007.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1

Arts Activity and Game Feature Codes and Reliability (m = 11 art activities & 5 games)

Code	# of Activities with Feature	% of Activities with Feature	Percent Agreement	κ
Arts Activities ($m = 11$)				
Choose from multiple stickers	10	91%	100%	1.00
Create multiple pieces of artwork	9	82%	100%	1.00
Rotate stickers	7	64%	100%	1.00
Save artwork to Photo Library	6	55%	80%	0.44
Use food items as decoration	5	46%	80%	0.55
Prompts for user to continue making art	5	46%	100%	1.00
Use iPad camera	5	46%	100%	1.00
Choose from multiple colouring utensils	4	36%	80%	^a
Use branded characters as decoration	3	27%	80%	0.55
Share artwork externally via email or the like	3	27%	80%	0.67
Animate artwork	2	18%	100%	1.00
Import content from iPad for art	2	18%	100%	1.00
Music playing in background	1	9%	100%	1.00
Microphone available to record user's voice	0	0%	100%	1.00
Games ($m = 5$)				
Explicit invitations to continue playing game	5	100%	75%	^b
Multiple levels	4	80%	100%	1.00
Scoring	4	80%	100%	1.00
Player moves branded food for bonus points	3	60%	75%	0.50
Player used food pieces as tools/equipment	3	60%	100%	1.00
Brand logos embedded in game background	3	60%	75%	0.50
Music playing in background	2	40%	75%	^b
Primary goal of manipulating branded food	1	20%	100%	1.00
Player embodies food	1	20%	100%	1.00
Player shares content as a reward for winning	1	20%	75%	^a
Player embodies a product mascot	0	0%	100%	1.00

Note. Codes to capture different art features, unweighted number of content features with a given interactivity or branding feature, weighted percentage of content with each feature, and percent agreement and Kappa inter-rater agreement on these codes.

^a κ could not be calculated because one coder never observed this feature.

^b κ could not be calculated because one coder scored this feature in every game.