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Executive Summary

INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE CONTROLS ON INFANT FORMULA AND FOLLOW-ON FORMULA

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION/EVIDENCE CONSIDERED AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

Research project one – to establish the nature of infant formula and follow-on formula advertising and presentation

Objectives
1. This research project was intended to address the second and third points of the review’s remit. The objectives of the research were:

   **Objective one:** To provide an accurate representation of infant formula and follow-on formula advertising and presentation before and after the new controls were introduced.

   **Objective two:** To analyse the content of such advertising and the nature of presentation to establish if these changed following the introduction of the new controls.

Method
2. The research was undertaken by the University of Leicester’s Department of Media and Communication, with two sub-contractors, Billetts and Site Reports.

3. The research comprised of three parts:
   i) Review of relevant consumer literature on advertising impact and effects to identify coding variables for advertisement coding frames that are known to mediate consumers’ reactions or responses to advertising
   ii) Location of formula product advertisements in whichever media they occurred over two pre-defined time periods
   iii) Design and implementation of a coding system to describe the representation and nature of formula advertising

4. The research considered advertising in: TV; radio; print media including magazines and newspapers and scientific publications; cinema commercials; outdoor posters and other promotional materials in public places, including moving images, e.g., in hospitals; New media including the internet and websites; direct mail and in-store advertising including on shelf and off shelf stand alone displays. Ultimately, follow-on formula advertisements were found in four of these media: print, television, direct mail and internet.
Findings

5. This research project provided a great deal of information about the nature of infant formula and follow-on formula advertising, how this differed between 2006 and 2008/2009, how it differed between media and between different brands. The summary of the findings provided below attempts to highlight the key findings that are relevant, not only to the objectives of the research, but also to the overarching objective of the review i.e. to assess whether the new controls have been effective in making it clear to parents/parents-to-be and carers that advertisements for follow-on formula are meant only for babies over six months and are not perceived or confused as infant formula advertising, which is prohibited.

Objective one: To provide an accurate representation of infant formula and follow-on formula advertising and presentation before and after the new controls were introduced.

6. The key differences in the number of advertisements and the media used.
   • There were more print adverts in the 2008/2009 sample (33 adverts) than in the 2006 sample (16 adverts).
   • There were more television adverts in the 2006 sample (22 adverts) than in the 2008/2009 sample (7 adverts). However, it should be noted that in 2006 the majority of adverts were sponsorship slots (19 adverts, 86% of television adverts from 2006) compared to 2008/2009 (1 advert, 14% of television adverts from 2008/2009) when the majority of advertising was spot advertising (6 adverts, 86% of television adverts from 2008/2009)
   • The research discovered very little advertising via the internet\(^1\) and few direct mail (3 adverts, 4% of all advertising identified). Where this did occur it was all in 2008/2009.
   • No advertising was identified on the radio, in cinemas, as outdoor posters or in-store.
   • A larger sample of infant formula advertising was found in 2008/2009 (21 adverts) than in 2006 (9 adverts) and average campaign expenditure dropped in 2008/2009 (£3,200) compared to 2006 (expenditure £8,300).

Objective two: To analyse the content of such advertising and the nature of presentation to establish if these changed following the introduction of the new controls.

7. Changes to print advertising
   • Adverts in 2008 (average surface area 1809 cm\(^2\)) were almost twice the size of adverts from 2006 (average surface area 940 cm\(^2\)).
   • On average campaigns in 2008/2009 had more advert appearances (15.5 appearances) than in 2006 (6 appearances) and lasted for longer (5.5 months in 2008/2009 compared with 3 months in 2006).
   • The average cost of print media campaigns rose to £48,546 in 2008/2009 compared to £26,114 in 2006.
   • Adverts containing a picture of a child were more abundant in 2008/2009 (97% of adverts shown in 2008/2009) compared to 2006 (44% of adverts shown in 2006).

\(^1\)This is based on paid-for space only.
• Attributes associated with an older child were more prevalent in 2008/2009 (between
88% and 15% of print adverts from 2008/2009, depending on the attribute) compared
to 2006 (38% to 6% of print adverts from 2006, depending on the attribute).
• Product pack shots were more likely to be visually displayed in 2008/2009 (100% of
• If a pack shot was shown in the advert, the product stage was more likely to be visible
in 2008/2009 (76% of adverts with a pack shot) than 2006 (30% of adverts with a pack
shot). Of the total advertising in 2008/2009 76% identified the product stage on a pack
shot compared to 12% in 2006.
• With the exception of four advertisements for ‘goodnight milk’ products in 2008/2009
the product stage was not identified in the main body of the advert during either time
period.
• The term “follow-on formula” was identified in all adverts for follow-on formula.
• A customer helpline or careline was shown in all ads from 2006 compared with 61% of
• Pastel colours were used more often in 2008/2009 (48.5% of adverts) than 2006
(12.5% of adverts).
• Adverts were more likely to have heart-warming themes, such as infants laughing, in
2008/2009 (33.3%) than 2006 (12.1%).
• All adverts used font styles and case styles known to be most legible.
• Higher resolution colour combinations were more often used for text saying breast-
feeding is best in 2008/2009 (73% of sampled ads) than 2006 (13% of sampled ads).

8. Changes to television advertising

• Average campaign expenditure increased in 2008/2009 (£7.8 million) compared 2006
(£2.1 million)
• Product pack was shown in all ads from both time periods, however the product stage
was more likely to be present on the pack shot in 2006 (96%) than in 2008/2009
(57%).
• On average the text was held on screen for longer in 2008/2009 (average of 14
seconds, the average word count was 18.7) compared to 2006 (average of 8.7 seconds,
the average word count was 14.3).
• Fathers were more likely to feature in adverts in 2008/2009 (on screen in 3 adverts and
in the voice over of 2) than 2006 (not featured in any adverts).
• With the exception of smiling, attributes associated with older babies, were more
prevalent in 2006 (100% to 9% of television adverts from 2006, depending on the
attribute) that 2008/2009 (86% - 14% of television adverts from 2008/2009 depending
on the attribute).
• All adverts used font styles and case styles known to be most legible.

9. It should be kept in mind that the move from sponsorship slots to commercial advertising
may account for some of the changes outlined above.

10. Infant formula advertising in scientific publications

• A product pack was shown in eight out of ten adverts, with prevalence being greater in
2006 (89%) than 2008/2009 (76%).
• Age of use recommendation was more likely to be shown on visible packs in adverts from 2008/09 (76%) than 2006 (33%). Age of use was shown elsewhere in the advert in 7 adverts from 2008/2009 and no adverts in 2006
• Health and nutrition claims were more prevalent in 2008/2009 (90.9%) than in 2006 (45.5%).
• All infant formula advertising in 2008/2009 made reference to breastfeeding being best, compared to (63.6%) in 2006.
• The term Infant formula was visible in all but one advert; that advert was from 2006.

Presentation

11. There was no evidence of well organised or carefully orchestrated presentation in store. There was no evidence of “powerwalls” (a technique used in retail premises at the point of purchase / sale to attract attention to brands and product ranges). It was not possible to assess the nature of presentation any further due to the variables associated with how it would be seen by the consumer. For example where the products are displayed in relation to the context of the whole store lay-out and how the presentation of infant and follow-on formula compared to other products in store, such as breakfast cereals.

12. It was not possible to assess whether there have been any changes to the presentation of infant formula and follow-on formula following the introduction of the Regulations. This was largely due to the lack of information about the way products were presented in 2006.

Conclusions

13. The research did show that the advertising of infant formula and follow-on formula has changed between the 2006 and 2008/2009. There is, however, no evidence to link these changes to the introduction of the new Regulations or a wish by manufacturers to make the advertising clearer.

14. Information of value to involved consumers about product qualities increased in prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09 in print adverts where such information might be more readily absorbed.

15. TV adverts for formula products used techniques designed to play on the emotions of consumers more often than did print adverts, and emotional triggers increased in prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09. These emotion-triggering techniques can influence less involved consumers by drawing their attention to an advert. However, from the advertiser’s perspective, it is important to achieve an optimal level of emotionally-arousing attributes because too much emotional arousal can impede uptake of information from adverts by consumers. The use of these emotion-triggering attributes was virtually absent in the sampled infant formula adverts.

16. Based on the advertising and consumer research literature there is nothing to suggest the text used in adverts from 2008/2009 would be illegible. The narrative legibility of textual information in print and TV adverts for follow-on formula and in adverts for infant formula adopted styles of presentation associated with greater perceptual clarity for readers/viewers. For follow-on formula adverts, this clarity generally increased in prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09, while this trend was less consistent across different textual information in infant formula adverts. If the panel did feel that this should be improved, the literature would suggest that boxed text, bold text or underlined text can be easier to read, a technique utilised by only one advert in the sample from both time periods (p181).
17. TV adverts for follow-on formula were predominantly standard advertising messages in 2008-09, but primarily took the form of sponsor-related messages attached to programmes in 2006. Many of their information and format features were the same across these two samples, but the messages in 2008-09 were generally longer and faster paced than those in 2006. While able to display more information of potential value to consumers, the TV adverts from 2008-09 may have proved more difficult to process because of their faster rate of presentation and the distraction of more emotion-triggering attributes. For these reasons, it is difficult to say whether the 2008-09 formats would be more effective than the 2006 formats. The answer to any such question will depend upon the type of effects being measured. The longer 2008-09 advertising formats could provide more opportunity for viewers to become emotionally engaged, but this would not necessarily yield a more pronounced informational impact.

18. Cross-media analyses revealed transference of specific attributes across adverts for specific brands that appeared in different media. These attributes include ones of significance to target market identification, judging age appropriateness of the advertised product, and brand differentiating information that might be important to involved consumers.

19. Although the research looked at specific factors known to have an effect on the memory for adverts, memory for brand, attitude to adverts, attitude to brand, intention to purchase, readability and physiological responses, it did not look at these factors in combination. This is true of the literature, where the effect of adverts as a whole is generally not assessed. It is therefore not possible to draw conclusions about how an advert as a whole would be viewed. In addition various factors will impact on the way an advert is viewed by the individual, for example how highly involved that individual is, or when and where the advert is shown (for example other articles in the magazine, or the adjacent television programmes).
REPORT

Background

In August 2008, the Food Standards Agency and the Department of Health issued a call on behalf of its independent panel of experts for research to examine the nature of infant formula and follow-on formula advertising and presentation, before and after the introduction of new regulations concerning the advertising and presentation of these products.

The background to this call stemmed from government commitment to promote breastfeeding. This commitment is reflected in European Union legislation that aims to ensure that infant formulae and follow-on formulae meet the nutritional needs of babies. At the same time, government does not wish to discourage mothers from breastfeeding their babies and also wishes to ensure that they are not discouraged from doing so by the marketing and promotion of infant formula products. While breastfeeding is believed to provide the healthiest way of ensuring that babies receive the right balance of nutrients up to a certain age, it is also recognized that not all mothers breastfeed their babies. The availability of infant formula products provides these mothers with an alternative source of nutrients for their babies.

The Research

The University of Leicester, Department of Media and Communication was contracted to carry out this research. The University worked with two sub-contractors, Billetts and Site Reports, in respect of certain parts of this project.

The project was tasked with producing a comprehensive survey of the creative content of advertising for infant formula and follow-on formula products in all advertising media in the United Kingdom for two 12-month periods. The first of these periods ran from 1st January to 31st December 2006. The second period ran from 1st March 2008 to 28th February 2009. A content analysis methodology was used to describe the nature of the content and format attributes of qualifying advertisements. The coded variables were largely underpinned by consumer research showing that each had been found to possess qualities that registered with consumers and that could mediate consumers’ responses to advertising. To facilitate this coding procedure, the content analysis was informed by a review of relevant advertising and consumer research literature (see Appendix 2).
Research Objectives
The aim of this research was to examine the ways in which infant formula and follow-on formula are advertised and presented. The two principal research objectives stipulated in the original call were that the research should:

- Provide an accurate representation of infant formula and follow-on formula advertising and presentation before and after the new controls were introduced.
- Analyze the content of such advertising and the nature of presentation to establish if these changed following the introduction of the new controls.

Research Design and Methods
The research comprised three parts that involved:

- Review relevant consumer literature on advertising impact and effects to identify coding variables for advertisement coding frames that are known to mediate consumers’ reactions or responses to advertising
- Location of formula product advertisements in whichever media they occurred over two pre-defined time periods
- Design and implementation of a coding system to describe the representation and nature of formula advertising

Consumer Research Literature Review
A systematic search was undertaken of research literature in advertising and marketing fields using a range of literature search sources. The search details are presented in wider discussion of methodology in Appendix 1 and the full literature review is presented in Appendix 2. Searches were undertaken of online library databases (Medline, PsychINFO, PsycArticles, PsycExtra, National library for Health, PubMed, Science Citation Index, Science Direct, Science & Press, Scopus, Sociological Abstracts, Jstor, IBSS, EBSCO, ISI Web of Science, ISI Web of Knowledge, Journal Citation Reports, Informaworld, Ingentaconnect). These specialist database searches were further supplemented by searches using Google (Google Scholar) and Yahoo search engines, the British Library, and local university library sources. Finally, further literature was provided by the personal literature files held by the authors.
These sources provided access to a vast number of journals (and other texts) in psychology, sociology, media and communications, advertising, consumer behaviour and marketing. A range of search terms and phrases were used. These search terms were designed to cover the wide range of potential attributes of relevance. The universe of content was unknown in advance and is constantly changing as new research studies are added to the literature. A number of key papers and textbooks were accessed that provided broad reviews of advertising attributes and consumer responses. The bibliographies of these publications provided further leads to relevant literature on specific attributes (e.g. general production variables, use of music, text characteristics).

The literature review focused on research concerning consumer responses to advertising. In addition, further research was reviewed specifically on formula-related issues, including topics such as media representations of breast feeding, monitoring of compliance with formula advertising codes, and impact of formula marketing. The rationale for the review of wider ‘formula literature’ stemmed from findings from the advertising impact literature that the relative significance of different advertising attributes derives in part from how involved consumers are in the advertising to which they are exposed. Highly involved consumers process adverts differently from low involved consumers.

Finally, the coding frames were also informed by new qualitative research commissioned from GfK NOP on behalf of the review panel by the Food Standards Agency and Department of Health that formed part of a parallel research project about formula advertising to this one.

**Location of Formula Advertising**

The research began with the location of formula product advertising across a range of different media. Two time frames were pre-defined over which relevant materials were to be sampled for analysis. The introduction of new rules regarding advertising and presentation of infant formula and follow-on formula were published in December 2007 and came into force in Scotland from January 2008 and in England and Wales from the end of February 2008. The ‘before’ period covered 12 months up to the end of December 2006, before the review of regulations took place. The ‘after’ period covered 12 months from 1 March 2008.
The research brief identified the following media that could be included in the analysis:

- TV
- Radio
- Print media including magazines and newspapers. Scientific publications for both infant and follow-on formula advertising
- Cinema commercials
- Outdoor posters and other promotional materials in public places, including moving images, e.g., in hospitals
- New media including the internet and websites
- Direct mail
- In-store including on shelf and off shelf stand alone displays

In the first instance, the research scanned all these media. Ultimately, follow-on formula advertisements were found in four of these media: print, television, direct mail and internet.

The search for formula advertising in TV, radio, cinema, print media, new media and direct mail was carried out utilizing a digital advertising archive maintained by Billetts. The search for outdoor advertising and promotions at points of sale was carried out by Site Reports in four different parts of the United Kingdom, Belfast, Cardiff, Edinburgh and Leicester. All advertising in the Billetts database is date stamped. By law, follow-on formula products may be advertised in media targeted directly at consumers. Infant formula products may only be promoted in scientific publications such as those targeted at health and medical professionals. Prior to the project, the Billetts database did not routinely catalogue some of the scientific publications relevant to the search for infant formula adverts. After online and offline searches and consultations with medical professionals, in part conducted by Site Reports, a list of professional journals was provided to Billetts for digital search.

**Regional Surveys of Retail Outlets and Medical/Health Centres**

A further stipulation in the project brief was that the research should include national and regional media and that data collection from retail environments should cover outlets situated in rural, suburban and inner-city locations. Billetts database collects adverts from regional as well as national media. As also stipulated in the research brief, the research included presentational materials found at locations in England (Leicester), Scotland (Edinburgh), Wales (Cardiff) and Northern Ireland (Belfast). There were two survey waves that occurred
in December 2008/January 2009 and then in February 2009. The first survey covered only retail outlets and second survey also covered health and medical centres. The surveys of retail outlets covered supermarkets, convenience stores (general neighbourhood stores) and pharmacies (specialised chemist shops) in inner city, suburban and rural environments in each of the targeted cities. The first retail survey covered 108 retail sites – 27 in each city. These sites were situated in urban, suburban and rural locations – 36 in each location across the four cities. They included 36 supermarkets, 36 pharmacies, and 36 convenience stores [9 of each type of store per city]. The second retail survey covered 48 outlets (12 outlets per city location, evenly divided between urban, suburban and rural environments). The second wave survey also visited 48 health centres and GPs’ surgeries (12 per city location evenly divided between urban, suburban and rural). More details can be found about the methodology in Appendix 1 and also about these surveys and their findings in Appendix 7.

**Analysis of Advertising Content**

Content analysis was used to examine the advertising and presentational materials relating to infant formula and follow-on formula products. A core coding frame was established that covered all media and both follow-on and infant formula products. The advertising location survey identified follow-on formula advertisements in four media: print media, television, internet and direct mail.

The coding frames measures were guided by factors known to play a part in mediating consumers’ interpretations of advertisements and their reactions to advertising messages, obtained from the literature review. Although most variables measured across media and the two product categories were the same, distinct variables were coded for TV adverts in respect of factors such as use of film, music, superimposed text on the screen, and voice-overs.

The coding frames were informed by the literature review that covered published research on advertising and consumer behaviour. Although some published research was reviewed that was specifically concerned with formula product marketing, that research yielded no insights into advertising treatment variables associated with consumer reactions to advertising: Generic advertising research literature did provide some evidence of variables within the contents and formats of advertisements in different media that could trigger specific cognitive or emotional responses in consumers and which were in some cases associated with behavioural intentions.
Four broad advertising attribute categories were identified in this literature review: [1] Source Factors; [2] Message Factors; [3] Channel/Format Factors; and [4] Receiver Factors. These factors provide a convenient framework for organising a much longer list of sub-factors that comprised more detailed attributes and features that characterised advertisements and were known to have an ability to influence some aspect of consumer response. The attributes that can be subsumed under these four factor headings are not mutually exclusive. For example, some attributes subsumed under Source Factors can also be considered under the heading of Receiver Factors. Further details about the literature review with full discussion about the empirical evidence linked to selected advertising attributes are provided in Appendix 2.

Source factors included the gender, ethnicity of a product/brand adult endorser and of any children featured, and the expertise or celebrity status of an endorser. These features had been found to influence consumers’ attitudes towards an advertising message or towards the advertised brand and their intention to purchase the brand.

Message factors included brand differentiating variables, descriptions of new product features, statements about ease or convenience of use, technical information linked to health and nutrition claims, statements of risks associated with product use (including those associated with inappropriate product preparation or storage), arguments and counter-arguments concerning the product, product demonstrations, humour and heart-warming tones. These factors have been found in advertising research to affect memory for advertising content and in particular for the brand, attitude to the brand and intention to purchase.

Channel and Format factors comprised a range of audio-visual and narrative variables. Audio—visual variables included the use of pictures and graphics, the visual pace of the advertising and use of camera cuts, close-ups and zooms (associated specifically with TV and cinema advertising) and music. Narrative variables included the use of superimposed text in TV or cinema advertising, text case and font, and the use of text and background colour combinations. These variables have been associated with text readability, memory for the advertising, attitude to the advertising and the brand, and intention to purchase.

Finally, Receiver factors focused on the use of variables designed to draw in the attention of consumers and to influence their identification with the advertising message and the brand. It examined the representation of mothers and fathers in formula advertising, the depiction of affectionate and relationship scenarios. These factors can influence consumers’ emotional
responses to advertisements, their attitudes to the advertising message and to the brand, and their intention to purchase.

**Coding Reliability**
Coding reliability checks were run on sub-samples of the formula advertisement samples to pilot the coding frame variables and to ensure that they would produce consistent measures of advertisement attributes. Pilot tests were therefore run with a sub-sample of eight print advertisements (seven for follow-on formula and one for infant formula) and with four television advertisements. In the print pilot, a total of 1,072 coder judgments were made by two coders working independently with the same advertisements. There were 76 disagreements between coders, giving a total agreement rate of 93%. In the television pilot, 608 coder judgements were made by two coders. There were 42 disagreements giving a total agreement rate again of 93%. These agreement rates were highly satisfactory and indicated that in general the coding frames worked effectively with variables clearly defined. However, one problem area surfaced with the TV adverts associated with classifying the colour-contrast scores for text over background. The problem was caused by the constantly shifting background colours against superimposed text which rendered this variable highly ambiguous and difficult to code. This variable was therefore dropped from the TV coding frame. Detailed data about the development of the coding frame and the results of the pilot exercise are presented in Appendix 1.

**Research Limitations**
All research projects have limitations. These can stem from the type of methodology that is used or from logistical issues that occur during the research itself. This project is no exception. It is important to acknowledge these limitations and the implications they have for any conclusions that are drawn from the research findings.

**The Methodology**
This investigation of formula product advertising used a methodology called content analysis. This methodology can provide systematic, standardized and objective descriptions of linguistic or picture content. Its measurements are facilitated via an instrument called a coding frame. The coding frame comprises a battery of variables that, in the current context,
represented different attributes or features of formula product advertising. Advertisements were assessed in terms of the presence or absence of these attributes or features. A binary coding system was used whereby the presence of an attribute received a code of ‘1’ and the absence of an attribute was scored as ‘0’. These codes were then counted up to determine the quantity and distribution of specific variables across a sample of advertisements.

Content analysis does not measure audience or consumer reactions to content. In this study, however, consumer research was reviewed that included literature on consumers’ reactions to advertising content to inform the design of the coding frame. The reason for adopting this approach was to produce a coding frame that would use measures that had some degree of sensitivity to potential consumer reactions to advertising. Thus, if the presence of a picture of a baby or infant in a formula product advertisement had been shown through consumer research to trigger a particular emotional response in target consumers, its presence in an advertisement could be interpreted as opening up the possibility that that commercial message might also elicit such a response in consumers. We cannot know for sure that this reaction will occur, but the meaningfulness and possible significance of an attribute is indicated through reference to such empirical evidence from consumer research.

**Reliability of Consumer Research**

Although the use of consumer research in this way can add value to a coding frame, it is not possible to guarantee that a specific consumer response will automatically or invariably follow exposure to an advertisement that contains an apparently relevant attribute. We can speculate that such a response might occur on the basis of evidence from past consumer research and that in the absence of a specific attribute that that consumer response is less likely to occur.

There are other factors that should be acknowledged in this discussion of consumer research limitations. The advertising and consumer research literature does not always produce consistent evidence. Although there may be empirical support for a link between a specific advertising attribute and a specific type of consumer response emerging from some studies, other research might produce contradictory results or weaker support for the original finding. Thus, it is important to recognise that the quality and consistency of research evidence relating to the sensitivities of consumers to specific advertising attributes can vary. In the literature review carried out for this investigation, the researchers drew mostly upon evidence
from academic publications that had been peer reviewed prior to publication to ensure their quality.

In much of this research, specific attributes are often assessed in isolation for their potential to trigger specific consumer responses. These attribute effects might vary depending upon the presence or absence of other variables in an advertisement with which they might interact. To use a drug analogy, a patient might be prescribed a specific drug to treat a particular ailment. In the presence of other drugs taken by the same patient, however, the anticipated effects of the original drug could alter because its interactions with those other drugs in the recipient’s system produce changes in its active properties.

The consumer research reviewed in this report examined a small number of available studies that investigated formula advertising. Most of the literature that was examined, however, derived from studies conducted in other product areas. None of the formula advertising research located by this study provided insights into the effectiveness of specific advertising attributes. The selection of attributes for the coding frame therefore depended on evidence about consumer responses obtained from investigations of other product categories. It is not possible to guarantee that the impact upon consumers of specific attributes of advertising for other product categories will necessarily trigger the same responses in consumers when used in formula advertising.

The dependence of this review on research findings from wider advertising and consumer research (and not specifically from studies of consumers’ reactions to formula advertising) also means that the samples of participants used in those studies might represent different types of consumer from those primarily associated with the purchase of formula products. The effectiveness of specific advertising attributes in triggering particular consumer responses can also vary across different types of consumer or can be dependent upon the psychological orientation of the consumer to a particular product. Some evidence was utilised from a parallel study of formula consumers’ reactions to formula advertising conducted by GfK NOP that also informed parts of the coding frame. The latter research, however, falls into the category of consumer research that relies upon consumers’ opinions about formula advertising and its perceived effectiveness. Such evidence has been cited in the wider research literature on consumers’ reactions to advertising attributes. While such research can
yield useful insights into advertising features to which consumers have some sensitivity, its
findings do not represent evidence of actual attribute effects upon consumers.

**Sampling of Advertisements**

In carrying out this research every attempt was made to produce robust samples of infant
formula and follow-on formula advertisements for the two time periods that were covered.
However, there were no advance data on the volume and distribution of formula advertising
made available to the researchers. The current research was therefore exploratory in that
respect and one of its primary objectives was to discover the extent and distribution of this
advertising. It was necessary therefore to construct samples without any established sampling
frames being available to guide selection of the advertisements.

Discovery of formula advertising was conducted via access to the most comprehensive digital
database of advertising in the UK provided by Billetts. It became clear that this database,
although massive, did not cover all potential media or environments in which formula
advertising might be found. Furthermore, even with the media that were covered by Billetts,
within the category of print media there were potential publications, particularly with regard
to infant formula adverts, that this database did not catalogue at the outset of the study.

Further ad hoc desk research (at Leicester) and field research (via Site Reports) was therefore
conducted to locate, in particular, print publications and web sites that might carry formula
advertising that Billetts then digitised for the first time. In the absence of an authoritative
source with precise knowledge of all advertising campaigns that were run by the major
formula manufacturers during the two time periods, the end result was the construction of
convenience samples of formula advertisements and not a census. The absence of data from
which to construct comprehensive information about the known universe of advertising
linked to formula product promotions also means that we have no way of knowing whether
the samples produced in this study were representative of all formula advertising for the two
time periods. For those samples of formula adverts that were constructed, this research was
able simply to describe similarities and differences between the content and format attributes
of the samples that were drawn for the designated two time periods.
Retail Outlets Field Research

Part of the research was concerned with surveying the presence of promotional features in retail outlets. A search was conducted in this case for in-store advertising for formula products and to examine the way these products were presented. The brief for this study precluded any inclusion of analysis of product package labels. The retail survey was restricted by the refusal of a number of store owners and managers to co-operate. Some refused permission for photographic evidence of product displays to be obtained or placed restrictions on the collection of other data, such as measurements of product displays.

Data Analysis

Data analysis presented descriptive profiles of attribute presence or absence for specific samples of adverts. Comparisons were made of profiles found for adverts sampled from 2006 and from 2008-09. The data were presented as base numbers (indicating the actual numbers of adverts with a specific attribute) and as percentages (proportions of ads in a sample with a specific attribute). Statistical significance tests were computed to compare 2006 with 2008-09 results. The base sizes of the 2006 and 2008-09 samples were moderate or small. Although percentage figures provide a common denominator for comparing 2006 with 2008-09 profiles, year-to-year differences expressed in percentages can be misleading when those percentages are derived from small base numbers. Test of statistical significance represent a more robust measure of whether differences between 2006 and 2008-09 were more than simply chance fluctuations. These were run in this study. Even so, it is important not to forget that throughout this research, all these comparisons were made between modest numbers of sampled adverts within the annual sub-samples. Such statistical tests could not be conducted for internet and direct mail adverts because of the tiny samples.

The Findings

Formula Advertising – General

Follow-on formula advertising is permitted in all mainstream advertising media that can reach consumers in general and infant formula advertising is currently restricted to scientific publications, such as those targeted at health and medical professionals and for the purposes of trade prior to the retail stage. In all, 81 follow-on formula advertisements were identified across the 24 months that comprised 1st January-31st December 2006 and 1st March 2008-28th February 2009 time periods. This advertising appeared in four media. Most of this advertising
appeared in print media (n = 49) and the other major contributor was television (n = 29). A further two follow-on advertisements were located via Billetts for direct mail and one more for the Internet. In the case of the internet, two further banner advertisements were identified for online networks for mothers operated by a formula manufacturer. These are described, but were not included in the main sample because they did not promote one specific brand.

A total of 30 infant formula advertisements were located, of which 9 appeared in 2006 and 21 in 2008-09. Table 1 provides a summary of the overall distribution of formula product advertising.

Table 1. Formula Product Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Type and Medium</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>Difference N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-On Formula</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infant Formula</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For follow-on formula advertisers, print media and TV were apparently their preferred advertising media. The advertising search that utilised the Billetts’ digital advertising database and further online and offline ad hoc searches by the University of Leicester and Site Reports yielded a higher number of print adverts in in 2008-09 than 2006, while for TV, a higher number of adverts was sampled in 2006 than in 2008-09.

It is also important to note that the nature of TV advertising of follow-on formula changed from 2006 to 2008-09. In the earlier period, most televised promotions comprised sponsor slots attached to programmes, while in the latter period nearly all promotions comprised more conventional spot advertisements in advertising breaks between or within programmes. The internet and direct mail were seldom used by these advertisers. There was no formula
advertising identified via Billetts for cinema and radio or via Site Reports for outdoor locations.

In the survey of retail outlets nearly three-quarters of the stores surveyed (71%, or 111 out of 156 retail premises visited) contained any infant formula products and 62% (97 out of 156) contained follow-on formula products. Supermarkets were most likely to contain infant formula products (87%, or 47 premises out of 54 visited), followed by pharmacies (74%, 40 out of 54 visited) and convenience stores (50%, 24 out of 48). Supermarkets were also most likely to sell follow-on formula products (85%, 46 out of 54), again followed by pharmacies (57%, 31 out 54) and convenience stores (42%, 20 out of 48).

There was no evidence of any in-store advertising of formula products in either of the retail outlets surveys. Nor was there evidence of exterior store advertising or local outdoor advertising of formula products. There were in-store sales promotions (price reductions for multiple purchases or loyalty scheme bonuses) in a total of five locations: a supermarket in suburban Edinburgh (a general brand promotion for Cow & Gate), pharmacies in rural and suburban Leicester (for Cow & Gate follow-on formula and ‘all baby items’ promotions); and in supermarkets in inner city and rural Leicester (follow-on formula and general brand promotions for SMA products).

The retail outlets reports produced by Site Reports inspectors revealed no evidence of large formula product displays (or ‘powerwalls’) that dominated either the whole or parts of any retail environment.

**Follow-On Formula Advertising in Print and TV**

Most follow-on formula advertising was found in print media and on TV (see Appendix 3 for a detailed discussion of follow-on formula adverts sampled from print media and Appendix 4 for a similar discussion of follow-on formula adverts sampled from TV). A total sample of 49 print adverts for follow-on formula was found during the two time periods surveyed (1st January – 31st December 2006 and 1st March 2008 to 28th February 2009). Two-thirds of these adverts (n = 33) appeared during 2008-09 and one-third (n = 16) appeared in 2006. A total of 29 television advertisements for follow-on formula were found during the two time periods surveyed. Just over three-quarters of these adverts (n = 22) appeared during 2006 and seven appeared in 2008-09.
Products Advertised

In the print media sample, the advertised follow-on formula products comprised SMA Progress (14 in 2006; 8 in 2008-09); Cow & Gate Complete Care Follow-On Milk (zero in 2006; nine in 2008-09); Aptamil Follow-On Milk (zero in 2006; six in 2008-09); Cow & Gate Good Night Milk, Cow & Gate Step-Up Follow-On Milk, Heinz Nurture (zero in 2006; three in each case in 2008-09); Aptamil Forward (two in 2006; zero in 2008-09); and Hipp Good Night Milk (zero in 2006; one in 2008-09). In the television sample, the advertised follow-on formula products were SMA Progress (22 in 2006; three in 2008-09); Cow & Gate Complete Care Follow-On Milk (zero in 2006; three in 2008-09); and Aptamil Follow-On Milk (zero in 2006; one in 2008-09).

Distribution of Campaigns

In print media, there was evidence of these adverts displaying a wider distribution in terms of publications outlets in 2008-2009 than in 2006. The presence of these adverts in celebrity/fashion magazines declined from 2006 (56%) to 2008-09 (12%). Between 2006 and 2008-09, however, more sampled follow-on formula print adverts were found in magazines for mothers-to-be (46% to 52%) and in a range of ‘other’ magazines (zero to 33%). All sampled TV adverts in 2006 appeared on minor TV channels on multi-channel platforms, compared with over one in two (57%) in 2008-09. One advert appeared on Channel 4 and one on Five in 2008-09. For the remaining adverts for that year channel data were not available.

Scale of Campaigns

The sampled print follow-on formula adverts ran in campaigns that averaged three months duration in 2006 and five and a half months in 2008-09. With the sampled TV adverts, campaign durations for 2006 were unavailable, while in 2008-09, they tended to run on average for 11 months. In print media, the sampled adverts made an average of six appearances in 2006 and 15.5 appearances in 2008-09. These data were not available for the sampled TV adverts. Expenditure on print advertising campaigns increased from an average of £26k in 2006 to £49k in 2008-09. TV advertising campaigns also experienced increased expenditure between 2006 (£2.1m) and 2008-09 (£7.8m).

Source Factors

Source factors were included because consumer research has indicated the nature or status of the originator of an endorsement can mediate consumers’ responses to the advertising. The
gender and ethnicity of a product endorser might affect the extent to which members of the audience identify with the endorsement, the advertisements and the advertised brand. The use of an expert endorser or a celebrity endorser can also promote attitudes to an advertisement that may be either positive or negative depending upon the perceived relevance of the endorser to the product.

All adult leads in print adverts were female, with more adverts containing this feature in 2008-09 (9; 27% of that year’s sample) than in 2006 (3; 19% of that year’s sample). This increase was not significant. There was a significant increase between 2006 and 2008-09 samples in the proportions of print adverts that pictured a child (44% to 97% of adverts in each sample). All sampled TV adverts pictured a child actor in both years. The key change in relation to sampled TV adverts were significant increases in the presence of adult male on-screen actors (father figures; from zero presence in 2006 to three out of seven adverts in 2008-09) and male voice-overs (zero in 2006; two out of seven adverts in 2008-09).

None of the sampled print or TV adverts for follow-on formula used celebrity endorsers or apparently professionally qualified endorsers of these products. The print formula adverts exhibited a small, non-significant increase from 2006 (25% of adverts in this sample) to 2008-09 (30% of the year’s ad sample) in the use of non-qualified ‘expert’ endorsements of formula products.

**Message Factors**

A number of advertising message content factors had been identified in the review of consumer research as having potential effects on consumers’ responses to formula advertising. Information that attempts to differentiate the advertised brand from other brands can render those brands more memorable. The same is true of information that explains the ease or convenience of use of the advertised brand. Promoting the brand as offering something ‘new’ or different can make it stand out and may enhance the persuasiveness of the advertising in relation to eventual purchase.

**Branding and Product Differentiation**

Product packs were visually displayed in all sampled follow-on formula TV adverts in 2006 and in 2008-09 and exhibited a significant increase in presence in sampled print adverts between 2006 (38%) and 2008-09 (100%). The brand name of the advertised product, in contrast, was relatively rarely seen in the print samples (13% of adverts in 2006; 24% in 2008-09) or in the TV samples (5% in 2006; zero in 2008-09).
The identification of ‘follow-on formula’ was visible in the body of the advert in all the sampled print and TV adverts in both time periods. Follow-on formula was visible in pack shots in all TV adverts for 2006 and 2008-09 and more often in the 2008-09 print advert sample (97%) than in the 2006 print advert sample (38%). With TV adverts ‘follow-on formula’ was only mentioned in voice-overs in 2008-09 adverts (in 57% of adverts from that year).

Product stage exhibited increased visibility in pack shots over time in sampled print adverts from 2006 (31%) and 2008-09 (76%), but declined over time in TV adverts sampled from 2006 (96%) to 2008-09 (57%).

Product Features
There were significant increases in beneficial health claims (e.g., that might concern infant immunity), about follow-on formula products between 2006 and 2008-09 for the sampled print advertisements (25% to 73%) and sampled TV adverts (5% to 73%). For beneficial nutrition claims (e.g., that might make claims about how the product contains important nutrients or represents a good dietary supplement), prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09 did not change significantly for the sampled print adverts (69% to 73% of adverts from each year respectively) but did for the sampled TV adverts (zero to 43%).

The use of health claims backed up by quoted scientific evidence was completely absent in both the print and TV samples in 2006, but made some appearance in the 2008-09 samples (18% of adverts in both cases). Claims about ease of convenience of use of these products appeared only in the print adverts (only in 2008-09; one ad in a pack shot and three ads elsewhere in the message) and not at all in the TV advert samples.

Consumer Advice Information
All sampled print and TV adverts in 2006 displayed recommended age of use information and most (91%) in both cases also displayed this information in 2008-09. In the sampled print adverts, but never in the sampled TV adverts, this information was also shown in pack shots (31% in 2006; 73% in 2008-09). Price information was never shown in the sampled TV adverts and appeared in just one print advertisement in 2006. A customer care-line was shown in all sampled print adverts and in none of the TV adverts in 2006. In 2008-09, this feature had reduced in prevalence in print sample (to 61% of these adverts) and increased to the same level in the TV sample (61%). None of the sampled print or TV adverts presented
any visual demonstrations of use of follow-on formula products and none contained any narrative instructions for appropriate preparation, storage, or disposal.

All sampled print adverts in 2006 and nearly all in 2008-09 (97%), together with all sampled TV adverts in both periods contained a statement that follow-on formula is not a substitute for breast milk during the first six months of life. Further reinforcing the age appropriateness message, all print advertisements in 2006 and 2008-09 also stated that the product was suitable only for nutritional use by infants aged six months or over. The latter message was completely absent in the sampled TV adverts in 2006, and appeared in four out of seven in 2008-09 (57%). The same proportions across print and TV samples occurred in respect of consumer advice that the product should only form part of a diversified diet.

Risk Warnings
The message that the product was to be used only on the advice of a health or medical professional appeared in none of the sampled 2006 print adverts, but in over one in two of those sampled in 2008-09 (55%). This statement was found in none of the sampled TV adverts from 2006 or 2008-09.

All sampled print adverts in 2006 and most in 2008-09 (70%) visually displayed the words “Importance Notice” drawing consumers’ attention to important information about the product and its use. Warnings about appropriate preparation and storage of the product were shown on pack shots only in a minority of sampled print adverts in 2006 (38%) and in all of those sampled in (2008-09). Other statements about nature of risks associated with these products appeared in two print adverts in 2006 and none in 2008. Statements concerning consequences of misuse and avoidance of misuse consequences appeared in one print advert in 2006 and in two in 2008-09. No warning notices or statements appeared at all in sampled TV adverts.

Arguments for Use
Arguments supporting the use of follow-on formula appeared in some sampled print adverts and were rare in sampled TV adverts. A superiority of breast feeding statement appeared in two of the sampled print adverts in 2006 (13%) and none sampled from TV in that period. In 2008-09, the presence of this statement had significantly increased among that year’s sampled print adverts (85%) and occurred in one advert in the TV sample. Arguments in favour of use of these products increased significantly in prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09 for both sampled print adverts (69% to 94%) and sampled TV adverts (5% to 43%).
Promotional terms such as ‘immunity’, ‘protect’ and ‘defend/defence’ appeared in a number of the sampled formula product adverts. The use of the term ‘immunity’ was the most prevalent in the sampled print adverts (25% in 2006; 55% in 2008-09), but was completely absent from the sampled TV adverts. The term ‘protect’ was much less often present in the sampled print adverts (19% in 2006; 12% in 2008-09) and again totally absent in the TV adverts samples. The term ‘defence/defence’ appeared rarely in the sampled print adverts (6% in 2006; 12% in 2008-09) and surfaced for the first time in sampled TV adverts in 2008-09 (two adverts out of seven).

Finally, the use of thematic attributes such as humour or warm emotion-promoting themes can enhance both memory for the advertising and trigger positive attitudes towards the brand. Just three of the sampled print adverts for follow-on formula contained any elements judged as humour in 2008-09, with none appearing with this attribute in 2006. Four sampled TV adverts contained humour in 2006 and one did so in 2008-09. The presence of heart-warming themes such as images of infants laughing in sampled print adverts increased from 2006 (12%) to 2008-09 (33%). Fourteen of the TV adverts depicted an infant laughing in 2006 and five did so in 2008-09.

Pictures showing a female figure, presumably a mother, sitting with an infant doubled in prevalence in 2008-2009 (27%) compared with 2006 (13%). Just two of the TV adverts (both in 2006) depicted a mother sitting with an infant. No print adverts showed an adult female bottle feeding an infant, whereas this image did appear in one TV advert in 2006 and in two in 2008-09.

Channel/Format Factors
These factors comprised a range of picture-related and narrative-related attributes. The picture materials were potentially important in terms of enhancing consumers’ emotional reactions to the adverts and also in relation to memory for the adverts and advertised brands. The narrative elements were important to the legibility and readability of the information in the adverts. Such information needed to be perceptually apprehended before it could have any subsequent cognitive, emotional or behavioural impact.

Narrative Legibility
The narrative elements were important to the legibility and readability of information in advertisements. These features are important if consumers are to be able perceptually to apprehend textual content from commercial messages. A number of key text information
features were identified including brand names, product names, identification of follow-on formula, price information, superiority of breast feeding statement, recommended age of use, and other product-related support information in the adverts. Brand names, product names and follow-on formula identification were assessed as they appeared both in the text of the advert and in text shown on a visible pack display.

In each instance, three text format variables were examined: case, font and colour/contrast. These factors have been found by empirical research with texts to influence the legibility and readability of printed words. In the context of text legibility and readability, lower case lettering has been found to be more legible and readable than upper case lettering. Although the latter can sometimes have more impact when there is a need to draw special attention to a point. There is some evidence also that sans serif font can be more readable than serif font. However, there is also conflicting evidence on this point. Finally, it is important that where differently coloured text and backgrounds are used that the text stands out from its background. Certain colour combinations work better together than do others in terms of enhancement of the legibility of the text. High and low resolution colour combinations have been identified in the relevant empirical literature.

Use of Case
For product name, follow-on formula identification, recommended age of use, and other support text within the body of the advertisement, case styles known to yield greater legibility tended to be used always or most of the time. The latter two text categories however were totally absent in the sampled TV adverts in 2006. Follow-on formula identification in the sampled print adverts declined from universal presence in 2006 to one in two of the sampled print adverts (52%) in 2008-09. Brand name and price information were virtually absent from print and TV samples throughout both ad-survey periods. Finally, superiority of breast feeding information significantly increased in prevalence from 2006 (13%) to 2008-09 (73%) in the print adverts and was completely absent in the TV adverts.

In pack shots brand name was rarely visible, while product name and follow formula text using legible case styles were universally present in the TV adverts throughout both periods of analysis and increased in the print adverts between 2006 (38% for both types of text) and 2008-09 (to 100% and 91% respectively).
Font Style
Universal or highly frequent use of the most legible font styles occurred for the print and TV adverts in 2006 and 2008-09 in respect of text signalling product name (100% of adverts in both media), follow-on formula (all sampled TV adverts, all sampled print adverts in 2006 and all but one in 2008-09), recommended age of use (all sampled print adverts; all TV adverts in 2008-09, but none of them in 2006), and ‘other support text’ (all sampled print and TV adverts). Brand name and price information rarely featured. Product name and follow-on formula text on pack shots also adhered to this legibility status (all sampled TV adverts; all print adverts in 2008-09, but four in ten print adverts in 2006).

Colour/Contrast
This measure could only be effectively assessed in respect of the print advert samples. The dynamic nature of the sampled TV adverts meant that the background colour often failed to remain constant while text was being displayed. For text signalling product name, follow-on formula, recommended age of use and other support text in the print adverts, high colour resolution scores occurred in all or most messages. Prevalence of high resolution text-background colour combinations fell in general in 2008-09 compared with 2006, though increased in respect of statements concerning the superiority of breast feeding. On pack shots, high legibility scores were achieved in a minority rather than a majority of sampled adverts. Brand name was seldom visible at all, product name occurred in a minority of instances (2006 – 38%; 2008-09 – 31%), and labelling of ‘follow-on formula’ exhibited increased prevalence of high legibility (3006 – 38%; 2008-09 – 82%).

In general across the different text messages analysed here, lower case lettering or combinations of lower with upper case and sans serifs fonts were the styles used most often. Turning to colour-contrast factors, high resolution combinations (text and background) were used much more often with all key text messages, with the exception of brand name where low resolution combinations were just as prevalent. The general pattern over time was for a shift towards greater use of high resolution colour combinations in 2008-2009 than in 2006.

Audio-Visual Factors
All sampled TV adverts contained pictures of infants. Pictured infants were more prevalent in the sampled 2008-09 print adverts (58%) than in the 2006 sample (19%). Other picture material showed the infant and an adult female together. The latter image was slightly more prevalent in 2008-09 print adverts (27%) than in the 2006 print sample (19%). The use of this
type of image was more prevalent in the TV adverts sampled from 2008-09 (29%) than in those from 2006 (5%). In many cases, the setting was not clearly visible or discernible. Where such details could be identified, the usual settings were in the home or at an outdoor location such as in a garden or park. The use of home settings increased in the print adverts from 2006 to 2008-09 (6% to 24%) and in the TV adverts from 2006 to 2008-09 (54% to 100%). Use of outdoor settings was more prevalent in print adverts from 2008-09 (15%) than in those from 2006 (6%). In the case of TV adverts, outdoor settings were featured only rarely in 2006 (9%) and not at all in the 2008-09 sample.

The use of background music in the sampled TV adverts declined in prevalence from 2006 (100%) to 2008-09 (57%).

**Receiver Factors**

These factors are concerned with advertising attributes that might draw the consumer into the message through identification with its content. Thus, this part of the analysis examined the use of babies and infants, adult females and males (in mother/father roles), relationship themes and use of colours to create particular atmospheres within any such advertising imagery. There is evidence that such factors can influence consumers’ physiological responses to adverts and their attitudes towards advertising and brands. Although such attributes were not directly associated with actual product consumption effects, physiological reactions that signify enhanced attention or emotional involvement with advertising and favourable attitudinal reactions to adverts could in turn set up conditions that might enhance purchase decisions.

All sampled follow-on formula TV adverts displayed a baby or infant. The presence of infants in print adverts was more prevalent in the 2008-09 sample (97%) than in the 2006 sample (44%). Adverts were coded for the presence of visible displays of specific attributes or behaviours by the depicted babies of infants: has hair, head control, sitting upright, dexterity of arm movements, has teeth, self-feeding and crying.

In the print adverts, there was increased prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09 of infants with hair (38% to 88%), head control (31% to 70%), sitting upright (31% to 58%), smiling (19% to 49%) and with teeth (6% to 36%). In the case of the sampled TV adverts, the prevalence in 2006 and 2008-09 declined for infants with hair (96% to 71%), head control (100% to 57%), and showing dexterity of arm movements (91% to 57%). There was increased prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09 ad samples in respect of infants smiling (77% to 86%). Depictions of
infants self-feeding were rare in the sampled print adverts (2006: 13%; 2008-09: 15%) and in the sampled TV adverts (2006: 18%; 2008-09: 14%).

Adult females were visibly present in one in three print adverts in 2006 and in nine in 2008-09, but were depicted with infants twice in 2006 and eight times in 2008-09. Adult females appeared in 13 TV adverts in 2006 (59%) and in six (86%) in 2008-09. In all cases in 2006, the adult female appeared with an infant and this was true of five out of the six cases from 2008-09. There were no images featuring adult males or father figures in the sampled print adverts, but these figures did appear in a small number of the sampled TV adverts, though more so in 2008-09 (43%) than in 2006 (9%). There were no images in the sampled print adverts that showed only men and women together. When they were present adult males in the TV adverts were always shown with an infant and/or with a woman/mother and infant.

Affectionate touching between an adult female/mother figure and baby/infant occurred in two print adverts in 2006 (13%) and in eight in 2008-09 (24%). Such scenes were more prevalent in the sampled TV adverts in 2006 (55%) and 2008-09 (71%). In one TV advert in 2008-09 only, there was a scene of an adult male (father figure) holding an infant.

The use of soft pastel colours in images that featured babies increased in prevalence from 2006 (13%) to 2008-2009 (49%) for the print adverts. While used less often, pastel colours did appear more often in TV adverts from 2008-09 (29%) than from 2006 (5%).

The use of bold primary colours with brand names increased in prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09 for both the print advert samples (56% to 73%) and TV advert samples (0% to 57%). The use of bold colours on pack shown in the adverts increased in prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09 for the print advert samples (38% to 73%) but decreased in prevalence for the TV advert samples (100% to 86%).

**Follow-On Formula Advertising: Direct Mail, Internet and Cross-Media**

Only small samples of each of these types of formula advertising emerged and so both will be examined together. In addition to examining these adverts, a further analysis was conducted that investigated the extent to which formula brands advertised in more than one medium display common attributes across media.

The follow-on formula direct mail and web adverts were surveyed for their appearances over the periods of 1st January and 31st December 2006 and between 1st March 2008 and 28th February 2009. This produced two direct mail advertisements (Cow & Gate Good Night Milk
and Aptamil Follow-On Milk) both from the latter sample period and their features will be outlined in turn. Only one web advert appeared over the two sample time periods for Hipp Organic in 2008-09. In addition, the Billetts archive identified two further banner advertisements for the SMA Mum’s Network recorded in 2006 and for SMA Baby Club in 2008-09. The latter were not focused on the promotion of a single brand, but the SMA range, via membership of online baby networks.

The direct mail adverts featured in one case a white British female actor and in the other a white British male actor. Each featured a white British child. There was no use of expert or celebrity endorsers. Product arguments were provided in the message and images were interpreted thematically as conveying heart-warming tones. While product packs were shown there was limited information about the product in the form of nutritional ingredients, warnings about risks associated with use. In one case, some nutritional and health benefits statements were included together with an indication that the product was suitable only for infants aged six months and over. The same adverts also used an immunity claim about the product. Images of infants indicated that the actors used were age appropriate in that the infant displayed head, posture and arm movement control associated with older infants rather than very young babies.

With the web advert, there were no adult or child actors and no endorsements by celebrities or experts. The message content was limited and focused on the price and offer of free delivery. There was no pack shot and no statements on nutrition, price, product features, convenience of use, technical information, risk use or arguments/counter-arguments for the product. The brand, product name and the statement ‘follow on formula’ featured within the advertisement in upper and lower case and in sans serif font. The absence of images meant no presence of receiver factors.

**Cross-Media Advertising Attributes**

Analyses were computed to compare the attribute profiles of follow-on formula adverts sampled across more than one medium. Comparisons were made of the use of specified attributes in adverts for specific brands or brand ranges in direct mail, internet, print and TV advertising. Some evidence emerged for common features across all sampled advertising in these categories that included pictures of infants (usually of white British ethnicity); adult female actors (mother figures); identification of product name, product range (with name of brand range), and product stage; limited health and nutritional benefit statements; an
‘important notice’ statement; positive arguments in favour of product; and a statement on the superiority of breast feeding. On text legibility attributes, key product-related statements and the superiority of breast feeding statement were generally displayed with case and font styles associated with higher legibility. The use of adult males was generally far less likely than that of adult females, but where this did occur there was some cross-media transference of this feature. Images of a selected range of baby/infant behaviours also featured across the adverts in different media. Finally, the use of bold colours in the adverts and the use of primary colours on product packs in the advertisements frequently appeared in adverts in different media.

Cross-media analyses indicated that certain attributes of formula advertising occurred in follow-on formula product adverts across more than one medium. Some of these features could be expected, in the event of repeat exposure on the part of consumers, to reinforce specific information effects and emotional impacts. The use of images infants or of infants with mother figures served to identify the target consumer of these products. Such images may also engage consumers at an emotional level. Product stage information is a key signal of the age appropriateness of the advertised product. The use of specific behavioural attributes of pictured infants can reinforce the latter information. Health and nutritional benefits and positive arguments about advertised products represent information of significance to involved consumers. It is anticipated here that most consumers (i.e., mothers) are involved in the sense of giving careful thought to the use of these products.

**Infant Formula Advertising**

The sampled infant formula adverts were surveyed for their appearances in print media between the 1st January and 31st December 2006 and between 1st March 2008 and 28th February 2009. In total 30 advertisements for infant formula products were located, with 9 (30%) appearing during 2006 and 21 (70%) during 2008-2009. Detailed data for infant formula advertisements are presented in Appendix 6.

**General Factors**

Infant formula adverts are currently restricted to scientific publications, such as those targeted at medical and health professionals. In 2006, however, a small number of infant formula adverts were detected as having occurred in magazines targeted at mothers and mothers to be (5 cases) and in a national daily newspaper (one instance).

Most sampled infant formula advertising occupied more page space in 2008-09 (352 sq cms) than in 2006 (265 sq cms). Advertising campaigns were on average longer in 2006 (4.4 months) than in 2008-09 (2.6 months). Average numbers of appearances by adverts in campaigns did not differ between 2006 (2.8) and 2008-09 (2.9). Average campaign expenditure was higher in 2006 (£8.3k) than in 2008-09 (£3.2k). All sampled infant formula adverts contained a web address for consumers to consult.

**Source Factors**

None of the sampled infant formula adverts contained a featured adult actor while three contained pictures of babies, one in 2006 and two in 2008-2009. Three of these adverts featured expert medical/health professional endorsement, all of which appeared in 2008-2009. No celebrity endorsers were featured in any of these adverts.

**Message Factors**

Message factors comprised a number of product information variables and thematic variables. Product information comprised brand differentiating factors, product identification, age of use recommendation, health and nutrition benefit claims, price information, new product features, convenience of use, technical information about health and nutrition, risk and use, and arguments for the product. Thematic variables included the presence of humour and heart warming tones.

The product pack was shown more often in 2006 advert sample (89%) than in the 2008-2009 sample (76%). In contrast, the brand name was more likely to be present in 2008-09 (62%) than in 2006 (33%). The name of the manufacturer was shown slightly more often in 2008-2009 (38%) than in 2006 (33%).

The term ‘infant formula’ was seen on visible pack displays more often in the 2006 adverts (89%) than in those from 2008-09 (76%). It was also visible in other parts of the advert for all the adverts from 2008-09 and for most of those from 2006 (89%). The name of the product range was also identified almost universally (29 out of 30 adverts). None of this advertising contained details about product stage within the text of the advertisement, but such
information was shown on pack displays (for product stage 1) more often in 2006 (78%) than in 2008-09 (52%). Product stage information was present in a clear majority of sampled adverts in pack shots in 2006 (78%), but in just over one in two instances (52%) in 2008-09. This information was not detected in other parts of the advertising.

Age of use recommendation was shown significantly more often in visible packs in adverts in 2008-09 (76%) than in 2006 (33%). It was also shown elsewhere in adverts significantly more often in 2008-09 (33%) than in 2006 (0%). Price information was completely absent from infant formula advertising. More adverts sampled in 2008-09 (86%) than of those sampled in 2006 (44%), however, contained a customer helpline. None of the sampled adverts from 2006 or from 2008-09 contained any information about new product features or convenience of use.

Most of the sampled infant formula adverts contained claims about health benefits with little difference between 2006 (89%) and 2008-09 (81%). Nutrition benefits of the product appeared significantly more often in 2008-09 (91%) than in 2006 (44%). Most of the infant formula adverts contained at least some technical information about health and nutrition claims. Such information was significantly more prevalent in 2008-2009 (91%) than in 2006 (44%). It was rare for unreferenced claims about health and nutrition benefits to appear in formula adverts (in two only, in 2008-2009). Technical information about the nutritional ingredients of products was completely absent, except for two adverts in 2008-09 that contained information about energy value.

A number of risk-related features were examined. All the sampled adverts from 2006 and from 2008-09 stated that the use of infant formula with infants under six months of age should only occur on the advice of a suitably qualified health or medical professional.

Eight adverts, all from 2008-09, provided warnings about health hazards associated with inappropriate preparation of the product. None of the sampled adverts from 2006 or from 2008-09 contained warnings about the hazards associated with inappropriate storage. All sampled infant formula adverts from 2006 and from 2008-09 contained the words “Important Notice”. Use of a signal word to draw attention to a risk warning together with a statement describing the nature of the risk appeared in 13 adverts in 2008-09 and just one from 2006. A statement about the consequences of misuse of the product appeared in three infant formula adverts, all from 2008-09.
A statement about the superiority of breast feeding appeared in all adverts from 2008-2009 in just over half (56%) from 2006. There was no evidence in any of the sampled adverts from 2006 or from 2008-09 of any discouragement of breast feeding in association with arguments promoting the product in any of the sampled infant formula adverts.

Positive benefits of the product occurred in most of the sampled adverts with hardly any difference between 2006 (89%) and 2008-09 (91%). The use of text regarding the avoidance of negative outcomes of using infant formula was used more often in the sample from 2008-09 (57%) than in the sample from 2006 (33%).

The use of specific promotional terms was rare in these infant formula advert samples. Those most commonly used were ‘immunity’ (2006: 8 times/89%; 2008-09: three times/14%) and ‘protect’ (2006: two times/22%; 2008-09: three times/14%). No product demonstrations were used in any of the adverts from 2006 or from 2008-09. There was no use of humour or heart-warming tones in any of the sampled infant formula advertising.

**Channel and Format Factors**

While virtually all sampled infant formula adverts contained some picture material, images of mother figures were absent and of babies or infants were rare (appearing in just three adverts in 2008-09). Most images were either of product packs or other material not involving human actors (2006: 56%; 2008-09: 71%). There were discernible visual settings in the sampled adverts from 2006, and five adverts from 2008-09 that depicted home settings (24%) and one that depicted an outdoor location (5%).

Narrative factors comprised an analysis of text legibility and readability by coding letter case, font and colour/contrast between text and background. These attributes were coded in respect of text showing brand name, product name, identification of infant formula, superiority of breast feeding, recommended age of use, and other product-related support text. Lower case or a combination of lower and upper case were the preferred styles for brand names and product names in sampled adverts from 2006 and 2008-09. For all other text, sentence case and lower case were the most used case styles. Sans serifs font was generally the most used or only font used for all these text elements. There was no evidence of any decline in legibility from 2006 to 2008-09 among the sampled adverts.

For all text elements except brand name, high resolution colour combinations for text and background were used in most of the sampled adverts for product name (in 2008-09 though
not in 2006); product name on pack (more so in 2006 than in 2008-09); infant formula identification (much more in 2008-09 than in 2006); superiority of breast feeding (in 2008-09 but not in 2006); recommended age of use (in 2008-09 but not in 2006); in for other support text (in 2008-09 but not in 2006). Identification of brand name whether in the advert or on a pack shot tended to use poor resolution colour combinations, with 2008-09 adverts performing better than those from 2006.

Receiver Factors
Just four of the sampled infant formula adverts displayed a baby or infant within the ad message; three of these appeared in 2008-2009 and one in 2006. The most commonly occurring attributes of depicted infants were having hair, smiling, head control and sitting upright, with these features all appearing in all three of the adverts from 2008-09 that depicted a baby or infant. Thus, these features occurred in only a minority of the infant formula advert samples (14%) which is what might be expected given the target age range for these products. None of the infant formula adverts showed an adult female or male figure and hence there were no affection or relationship scenarios depicted.

There was no use of soft pastel colours in images in infant formula adverts. Bold primary colours with brand names were more widely used in 2008-09 (76%) than in 2006 (44%). In contrast, more adverts from 2006 (56%) than from 2008-09 (38%) used bold colours on pack shots.

Conclusions
The research identified that the advertising of infant formula and follow-on formula has changed between 2006 and 2008/2009. There is, however, no evidence to link these changes to the introduction of the new Regulations or a wish by manufacturers to make the advertising clearer. Further, although content analysis can register changes in the nature of formula advertising over time, it cannot provide any direct explanations of advertising strategies. The latter would require a different methodology involving interrogation of advertising planners.

Signalling the Nature of the Product
It is important for consumers to know the type of product being advertised. Follow-on formula products are designed for consumption by infants aged six months or older. Infant formula products are designed for babies/infants aged up to six months. ‘Follow-on formula’ was identified in all sampled TV adverts across both years, and exhibited a significantly
increased presence in 2008-09 compared with 2006 in the print adverts. ‘Infant formula’ was also widely identified in the sampled adverts, but less so in 2008-09 than in 2006.

Consumer research conducted by GfK/NOP indicated that ‘product stage’ is another important signal to consumers about the type of product. Product stage information was rarely seen at all in the main text of the sampled adverts, and exhibited increased presence in print adverts and decreased presence in TV adverts from 2006 to 2008-09. Product stage was identified in three-quarters of 2006 adverts and over half of those in 2008-09 in pack shots, but nowhere else in the adverts.

The age appropriateness of follow-on formula products was further reinforced in all sampled print and TV adverts in 2006 and in nearly all adverts in 2008-09 in terms of a clear statement about recommended age of use. For infant formula, recommended age of use statements significantly increased in prevalence in both the main body of adverts and in pack shots from 2006 to 2008-09.

Another important indicator of the nature of the product is the visible presence of infants whose age can be judged. Infants were always shown visually in the sampled follow-on TV adverts and were significantly more prevalent in print adverts in 2008-09 than in 2006. Particularly important was the presence of visible behavioural signs of the age of the depicted infant. Consumer research by GfK/NOP indicated that these features may be used by parents to identify the age appropriateness of an advertised product for their own child. Key indicators such as the display of head control, having hair and teeth, dexterity of arm movements, and sitting upright were more prevalent in the print adverts from 2008-09 than in those from 2006. Although most TV adverts displayed these features, their prevalence fell from 2006 to 2008-09. Thus, while the sampled print adverts displayed more extensive use of key visual signals about the age-appropriateness of the product to consumers, the sampled TV adverts showed less extensive use of these signals from the earlier to the later sample.

Attracting Consumer Interest and Identification

Advertisements must at the outset attract the attention of consumers and then engage their attention through the use of attributes designed to invoke identification with the scenario that is depicted. One technique is to use well-known celebrities who can not only attract consumers’ attention but also enhance the credibility of the advertising message. Advertising of follow-on formula in print and on TV invariably used anonymous actors rather than well-known celebrities.
The anonymous actors were usually female in print adverts and in TV adverts for follow-on formula. There was a marked change in 2008-09 compared with 2006, however, when male actors, in father figure roles, started to appear. This development signalled a change in strategy in terms of the consumers at which these messages were targeted. The scenarios depicted in TV formula adverts represented the whole family and not just part of it. The presence of a male influence in decision making was further indicated by the emergence in 2008-09 of male voice-overs in TV formula adverts.

Information about the Product

Advertising can be used to provide consumers with product relevant information that outlines its special qualities. Product packs were used universally in all the TV adverts sampled here and exhibited significantly increased presence in print adverts in 2008-09 compared with 2006. Health benefit claims for follow-on formula products exhibited significantly increased prevalence in both the print and TV advert samples from 2008-09 compared with those from 2006. There were significant increases also in the use of arguments in favour of use of these products from 2006 to 2008-09 for print and TV adverts.

Print adverts tended to include more information about product qualities than did TV adverts. The sampled print adverts showed increased prevalence of use of promotional terms such as ‘immunity’ and ‘defence/defence’ (though decreased use of ‘protect’) in 2008-09 compared with 2006, while such promotional content was completely absent from the sampled TV adverts. Such information will be particularly important to consumers who are highly involved with the product and who seek out detailed product-related information with which to make product choices. Such information can be more effectively processed from print adverts that can be read at the consumer’s own pace, whereas with TV adverts their inclusion could lead to information overload.

Making the Message Clear

Based on the literature there is nothing to suggest the text used in adverts from 2008/2009 would be illegible. In respect of print and TV advertising for follow-on formula products, textual information displayed case, font and colour attributes associated with higher degrees of perceptual clarity with adverts from 2008-09 generally exhibiting wider use of legible text features than those sampled in 2006. If the panel did feel that this should be improved, the literature would suggest that boxed text, bold text or underlined text can be easier to read, a
technique not utilised to date. The last point applies especially to TV advertising where the consumer cannot control rate of presentation.

Emotional Engagement of Consumers
Thematically emotion-evoking features such as humour and heart-warming tones created by use of images were more prevalent in the sampled TV adverts than in the print adverts. TV adverts can influence consumers’ moods through the use of background music. In the current analysis, however, use of music was much less prevalent in the TV adverts from 2008-09 than in those from 2006. Nevertheless scenes of affectionate hugging and touching between adults and infants were far more prevalent in the TV adverts than in the print adverts, although these features generally increased in prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09 for adverts in both media.

Reinforcement of Messages across Media
There was some evidence that campaigns run across different media utilise specific presentational or content attributes repeatedly. These attributes include features that confirm the nature of the product, the target age group for which it should be used, the brand differentiating qualities, and the emotional engagement of consumers.

Presentation
There was no evidence of well-organised or carefully orchestrated presentation in store environments. There was no evidence, in particular, of “powerwalls” (a technique used in retail premises at the point of purchase/sale to attract attention to brands and product ranges). It was not possible to assess the nature of presentation any further due to the variables associated with how it would be seen by the consumer. For example, where the products are displayed in relation to the context of the whole store lay-out and how the presentation of infant and follow-on formula compared to other products in store, such as breakfast cereals.

It was not possible to assess whether there have been any changes to the presentation of infant formula and follow-on formula following the introduction of the Regulations. This was largely due to the lack of information about the way products were presented in 2006.

Predicting Consumer Reaction
Content analysis cannot predict consumers’ reactions to adverts. It can identify the presence of attributes that might produce specific reactions based on evidence derived from consumer
research. In that respect, and with the caveats that attribute validation through research with advertising for other product categories might not transfer in the same way to formula advertising, the following observations can be made.

- Information of value to involved consumers – concerning brand differentiating qualities - increased in prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09 in print adverts where such information might be more readily absorbed

- Some brand and product distinguishing attributes were used by some advertisers across different media thereby maintaining brand image consistency and reinforcing certain critical messages for consumers about the advertised products.

- TV adverts for formula products more often used techniques designed to play on the emotions of consumers than did print adverts, and emotional triggers increased in prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09. These emotion-triggering techniques can influence less involved consumers by drawing their attention to an advert. It is important, however, to achieve the right balance of emotion because too much emotional arousal can impede uptake of information from adverts. The use of such techniques in infant formula adverts were virtually entirely absent.

- TV adverts for follow-on formula were predominantly standard advertising messages in 2008-09, but primarily took the form of sponsor-related messages attached to programmes in 2006. Many of their information and format features were the same across these two samples, but the messages in 2008-09 were generally longer and faster paced than those in 2006. While able to display more information of potential value to consumers, the TV adverts from 2008-09 may have proved more difficult to process because of their faster rate of presentation and the distraction of more emotion-triggering attributes. The longer formats in the 2008-09 adverts could provide viewers with more opportunity to become emotionally engaged than the shorter 2006 formats but whether this also translates into a more profound informational impact cannot be proven with this research.

- The narrative legibility of textual information in print and TV adverts for follow-on formula and in adverts for infant formula adopted styles of presentation associated with greater perceptual clarity for readers/viewers. For follow-on formula adverts, this clarity generally increased in prevalence from 2006 to 2008-09. This trend was
less consistent across different textual information in infant formula adverts, with differences between the two advert samples in terms of the use of clearer case, font and colour styles fluctuating only slightly, with improvements occurring in respect of identification of ‘infant formula’ and ‘superiority of breast feeding’ text within the ad.

- Although the research looked at specific factors known to have an effect on the memory for adverts, memory for brand, attitude to adverts, attitude to brand, intention to purchase, readability and physiological responses, it did not look at these factors in combination. This is true of the literature, where the effect of adverts as a whole is generally not assessed. It is therefore not possible to draw conclusions about how an advert as a whole would be viewed. In addition various factors will impact on the way an advert is viewed by the individual, for example how highly involved that individual is, or when and where the advert is shown (for example other articles in the magazine, or the adjacent television programmes).
Appendix 1. Research Methodology

Research Design and Methods
The research comprised three parts:

- A review of relevant consumer research literature on advertising impact and effects to identify coding variables for advertisement coding frames that are known to mediate consumers’ reactions or responses to advertising
- Locating formula product advertisements in whichever media they occurred over two pre-defined time periods
- Design and implementation of a coding system to describe the representation and nature of formula advertising

Consumer Research Literature Review
A systematic search was undertaken of research literature in advertising and marketing fields using a range of literature search sources. Searches were undertaken of online library databases (Medline, PsychINFO, PsycArticles, PsycExtra, National library for Health, PubMed, Science Citation Index, Science Direct, Science & Press, Scopus, Sociological Abstracts, JSTOR, IBSS, EBSCO, ISI Web of Science, ISI Web of Knowledge, Journal Citation Reports, Informaworld, Ingentaconnect). These specialist database searches were further supplemented by searches using Google (Google Scholar) and Yahoo search engines, the British Library, and University of Leicester Library sources (specific journals targeted included: *Journal of Advertising Research, International Journal of Advertising, Journal of Advertising, Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, British Journal of Marketing, European Journal of Marketing, Journal of Direct Marketing, Journal of Interactive Marketing, Journal of Marketing Communications, Journal Consumer Research, Journal of Consumer Marketing, Psychology and Marketing, Journal of Consumer Psychology*). Further literature was provided by the personal literature files held by the authors.

These sources provided access to a vast number of journals (and other texts) in psychology, sociology, media and communications, advertising, consumer behaviour and marketing. A range of search terms and phrases were used. These search terms were designed to cover the wide range of potential attributes of relevance. The universe of content was unknown in
advance. A number of key papers and textbooks were accessed that provided broad reviews of advertising attributes and consumer responses. The bibliographies of these publications provided further leads to relevant literature on specific attributes (e.g. general production variables, use of music, text characteristics).

The literature review focused on research concerning consumer responses to advertising. In addition, further research was reviewed specifically on formula-related issues, including topics such as media representations of breast feeding, monitoring compliance with formula advertising codes, and the impact of formula marketing. The rationale for the review of this wider ‘formula literature’ stemmed from findings from the advertising impact literature that the relative significance of different advertising attributes derives in part from how involved consumers are in the advertising to which they are exposed. Highly involved consumers process adverts differently from low involved consumers (Krugman, 1965). An awareness of formula-related issues and debates could lead to a higher degree of involvement among some consumers and it was felt to be important to consider, by reference to this literature, whether and how to take this into account in the design of the coding schedules.

The design of the coding schedules was also informed by research findings from ‘Project 2’ commissioned for the independent review and conducted by GfK NOP Social Research (see below).

**Location of Formula Advertising**

*Time Frame*

The primary research began with the location of formula product advertising across a range of different media. Two time frames – a ‘before’ and ‘after’ period - were pre-defined over which relevant materials were to be obtained for analysis. The ‘before’ period covered 12 months up to the end of December 2006, a year before new rules regarding the advertising and presentation of infant formula and follow-on formula were published. These rules came into force in England and Wales from the end of February 2008. The ‘after’ period thus covered the 12 months following this (from 1 March 2008 to 28 February 2009).
Media to be Sampled

It was necessary to establish which media outlets had been used to convey advertising for these products. The advertising of infant formula to the general public is not permitted, but it may be advertised in scientific publications (such as those targeted at health professionals)\(^2\). Subject to controls, the advertising of follow-on formula is permitted. The FSA/DH research commissioning brief identified that the media for follow-on formula advertising and presentation analysis might include the following:

- TV
- Radio
- Print media including magazines and newspapers. Scientific publications for both infant and follow-on formula advertising
- Cinema commercials
- Outdoor posters and other promotional materials in public places, including moving images, e.g., in hospitals
- New media including the internet and websites
- Direct mail
- In-store advertising including on shelf and off shelf stand alone displays

The research initially explored all these media for presence of relevant content.

Geographical Range

A further stipulation in the project brief was that the research should include national and regional media and that data collection from retail environments should cover outlets situated in rural, suburban and inner-city locations. As also stipulated in the brief, the research included presentational materials found at locations in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The separately published regulations that exist for each country were consulted so that any variations could be taken into account in the design of the relevant content coding schedules. Comparisons were made between the four nations on all relevant measures – principally product advertising and point-of-sale presentation. Preliminary inspection indicated that related websites are universal rather than regionalised in areas of their content appropriate to this investigation. We also expected mainstream media

\(^2\) In addition, infant formula advertising is permitted for the purposes of trade prior to the retail stage. Such advertising lies outside the scope of the present study.
advertising campaigns (that is, TV, cinema, radio, newspaper and magazine advertising) to utilise the same campaign content across the UK.

Advertising Access Agencies

To ensure that comprehensive coverage of formula advertising was achieved, the services of two agencies that specialise in one case (Billetts Media Monitoring) in maintaining a digital archive of advertising across all print and electronic media, and in the other (Site Reports) in tracing product advertising and promotional material at different locations and retail sites across the UK. Billetts Media Monitoring maintains the most authoritative and comprehensive advertising database in the UK. Billetts monitors and records advertising appearing outdoors (in London and the surrounding region), in the press, on television and radio, in cinemas, on the internet and in direct mail (to named householders) and ‘door drops’ (to un-named householders). Their archive contains the still and moving visual ‘creative content’ of the advertising they collect and, in the case of audio and audio-visual advertising, full transcriptions of spoken content. A range of associated data is recorded for each advertisement in the archive, including brand and product details, advertising medium, date of first publication/transmission, title of publication/programme, and the type of advertisement. The archive is regularly updated with associated data to allow subscribers to monitor a range of factors including total expenditure on the campaign in which each advertisement appeared, the total number of appearances of individual advertisements, and total campaign duration.

Billetts aims to monitor and record all advertising in all media available in the UK. Their coverage expands to include new media both as they appear and as their subscribers require. To ensure that all infant formula advertising (which is restricted under the regulations to scientific publications) appearing during the two periods under study could be included in the analysis, after informal consultation with medical and health professionals by the researchers, Billetts were instructed to add the following publications to their database:

*British Journal of Midwifery*
*British Medical Journal*
*Capital Doctor* (London only)
*Caring Business*
*Community Practitioner*
*Family Practice*
General Practitioner
Independent Nurse
Infant (formerly Journal of Neonatal Nursing)
Journal of Community Nursing
Nursing Standard
On Target Magazine
Paediatric Nursing
Pulse

The aim was to ensure that all advertising appearing in these publications since January 2006 were added to the archive. Billetts were also instructed to archive all advertising from the same date appearing in the following additional publications:

Baby & You
BBC Parenting
Junior
Mother & Baby Magazine
Practical Parenting
Pregnancy
Prima Baby

The selection of additional publications for inclusion was further guided by Billetts’ routine audits of advertising outputs. Billetts also monitored the following websites from, at the latest, 4 December 2008:

www.gurgle.co.uk
www.babycentre.co.uk
www.bounty.com
www.emmasdiary.co.uk
www.mumsnet.com
www.netmums.com
www.nctpregnancyandbabycare.com
www.ukparentslounge.com
www.askamum.co.uk
www.askbaby.com
The researchers received training in the use of the Billetts archive in early December 2008. The archive was searched at the end of the ‘after’ period to locate all infant and follow-on formula advertising appearing in all the media listed in the research brief (with the exception of in-store displays – see below) during the ‘before’ and ‘after’ periods. Separate searches were performed for each medium and each period using Billetts’ database search filters for date, medium, brand and product.3

The Billetts archive is comprehensive but not exhaustive. Billetts monitors outdoor advertising (on billboards and posters) only within the London area and does not monitor in-store advertising and presentation. The latter items were to be captured by Site Reports. This agency employs a nationwide team of advertisement auditors and specialises in the photographic capture of outdoor poster advertising, in-store advertisements and product displays. Thus, Site Reports was used to capture those forms of advertising that Billetts did not monitor.

Site Reports were commissioned to survey points of sale interiors (and exteriors as necessary) and to capture (i.e. photograph) in-store advertising and any other in-store infant and follow-on formula literature at sampling points across Great Britain and Northern Ireland. They were also required to photograph outdoor advertisements as necessary if they were not already available via the Billetts database. Site Reports inspectors were in addition briefed to search for any new or previously unknown infant formula and follow-on formula advertising campaigns. The original project brief called for this exercise to be carried out in two phases, three months apart.

3 A list of infant and follow-on formula products known to be available in the UK was provided by the FSA Nutrition Division (see Addendum to this section).
Between 11 December 2008 and 6 January 2009 Site Reports field staff visited 108 retail locations in four cities (Belfast, Cardiff, Edinburgh and Leicester). They visited three ‘retail environments’ in and around each city (inner city, suburban and rural) and in each environment looked for product promotion in three supermarkets, three convenience stores and three pharmacies. In this phase of the research Site Reports field staff found no examples of any point-of-sale advertising or promotional literature for infant or follow-on formula during these visits. There were in-store price promotions (price reductions on brand purchases) in a total of five locations.4

Site Reports were scheduled to visit GP surgeries and health centres in the four cities to search for relevant publications and literature during the second phase of this part of the project. The original project design and budget allowed for these visits to take place at two locations per city, varying between inner city, suburban and rural locations across the four cities to achieve a spread of environments across the sample – a total of eight surgery visits in all.

Because no point-of-sale advertising or promotional literature (beyond a small amount of price-promotional material) was found during the first phase of data collection, GP surgeries and health centres were made the main focus of the second phase of the research in order to increase the likelihood of detecting any promotional literature/advertising that might be found. During February 2009 in each of the four cities Site Reports field staff visited four surgeries/centres in each of the three environments, making a total of 48 surgery/centre visits across the UK. In addition, visits were made to a total of 12 different retail stores in each of the cities (distributed across types of outlet and retail environments) – a further 48 visits to retail sites.

In total Site Reports field staff visited 156 retail sites and 48 surgeries and health centres in the four sampling locations.

**Analysis of Advertising Content**

Content analysis was used to examine advertising and presentational materials relating to infant formula and follow-on formula products. Content analysis is a technique used in social

---

4 See Appendix 7 for details.
science to investigate selected elements of media output with the aim of making inferences about the general nature of that output and forming hypotheses about its likely impact on audiences (that is, listeners to or viewers/readers of that output). It involves the use of predetermined categories to measure – by counting their presence or absence – chosen attributes of elements of media output. This might involve counting the presence of certain attributes that can found in, for example, individual newspapers, types of newspaper, television programmes, television series, film genres, radio news bulletins, or, as in the present case, advertisements. The central aim of the method is that it should be conducted systematically and that it should follow a design and set of data collection procedures that are replicable and reliable (that is, can be expected to produce similar results when repeated on similar samples).

Although there were many common elements to be measured across the media investigated in this research, distinct coding schedules were developed for advertisements in different media. Separate coding schedules were developed and tested for use with: [1] audio-visual advertising in TV, cinema, and other moving image media (e.g. moving posters); [2] radio advertisements; [3] print media advertisements, including those appearing in newspapers, and popular, scientific/health professional magazines; [4] internet advertisements; [5] point-of-sale advertisements; [6] point-of-sale displays; [7] direct mail leaflets; and [8] web display and banner advertisements.

The coding measures were guided and validated principally by factors known from the review of generic consumer research literature to play a part in mediating consumers’ interpretations of advertisements and their reactions to advertising messages. The coding measures selected for the analysis in this way are explained in detail in the literature review section of this report (Appendix 2); in summary, four categories of measure were used: Source Variables, Message Variables, Channel and Format Variables, and Receiver Variables.

Source variables included attribute measures of product endorser, whether present as a visible actor in the advertisement or in a voice-over (gender, ethnicity, level of professional expertise, and status - celebrity/non-celebrity?); and the presence/absence of specific advice about infant feeding and who was giving it.

Message variables measured the presence/absence of brand and product names; product types; product ranges; use recommendations; nutrition and health benefits; price information;
customer support information; claims that something about the product was ‘new’; claims about ease of use; information on specific ingredients; suitability of use with infants under/over six months, and whether this information was evident in each advertisement in general, in voice-overs and/or in images of product packs. Measures also included whether the advertisement included specific statements about product usage, the superiority of breastfeeding, professional advice, hazards of preparation, and, again whether this was evident in the advertisement overall and/or in product pack shots. The coding schedules also contained measures for the presence/absence of the following promotional terms: ‘immunity’ ‘natural development’ ‘defend/defence protect’ ‘robust/tough’ ‘natural ingredients’ in order to assess the extent to which advertisements contained information about risk/hazards and their resolution.

Other message variables included measures of the presence/absence of product demonstrations and/or portrayals depicting product preparation, storage, or disposal and the presence/absence of themes such as humour or ‘heart warming’ depictions such as infants laughing, women bottle feeding infants in ‘homely’ surroundings that might elicit emotions in consumers that could have a positive impact on their feelings towards the product.

Channel and format measures included the type of production (whether filmed or still, in the case of television), the visual setting (whether in the home), the visual pace, the use of sound (e.g. background music), the use and positioning of text (brand and product names, narrative text, statements and ‘health warnings’) and readability factors (case, font style, use of colour).

Receiver measures counted the presence/absence in advertisements of particular attributes that might trigger consumer identification. These included the attributes of the women/mothers, men/fathers and infants depicted, their relationships, and the scenes in which they were depicted.

In addition, measures were created to reflect requirements of the 2007 infant formula and follow-on formula Regulations:

Qualitative research conducted by GfK NOP Social Research for ‘Project 2’ of the independent review was also taken into account in the design of the coding schedules. The GfK research found that for some respondents, the television and press advertisements they were shown could have been much clearer about the product being advertised. A number of
suggestions were made in this context. These included, stating in the voice-over of TV ads the age of the child for which the product is suitable; making relevant text clearer; making sure that any depicted child looked unambiguously more than six months old; making the age of the child clearer in the text of the press ads; and making product images bigger and clearer. Accordingly measures were created in the content analysis coding schedules to quantify the presence of product identification in advertisement voice-overs, text and pack shot features, and, in images of infants appearing in advertisements measures of evidence of head control, arm movements, self-feeding, and having hair and teeth (characteristics typical of infants older than six months).

Reliability Testing of Coding Schedules
In any content analysis study a critical stage in the development of a robust coding methodology is to ensure that any coding schedules that are developed are pilot tested before they are used to collect data. As already indicated, content analysis coding schedules are required to operate at a high level of reliability. This means that two or more coders using the same coding schedule to analyse the same content, will produce the same (or very similar) results. A reliability test was run on the coding schedules designed for print and audio-visual advertisements.

A number of general codes that included time period of advertising campaign, campaign medium, campaign duration, numbers of advert appearances in a specific medium, campaign expenditure, product name, manufacturer name and presence of web address were default codes within the Billetts system.

Two reliability checking exercises were conducted using two pairs of coders. Eight print advertisements and four television advertisements were double coded. The coding frame for print advertisements comprised 134 variables. The coding frame for television advertisements comprised 152 variables.
Print Formula Advertising – Coding Reliability

The print advertising sample comprised advertisements for the following eight formula products:

[1] Heinz Nurture
[2] Cow & Gate Complete Care
[3] Cow & Gate Step-up
[6] Cow & Gate Comfort 1
[7] SMA Gold [infant formula]
[8] Cow & Gate Complete Care

These advertisements were published during the ‘after’ sampling period. They were randomly selected from a total sample of 86 print media advertisements for that period. Among this test sample of eight formula advertisements were seven follow-on formula brands and one infant formula brand. Each advertisement was independently analysed by two coders. The outcome is summarised below (Table A1.1).

| Table A1.1 Double Coding of Print Formula Advertising |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                                               | Number of disagreements | Total Code Measures |
| [1] Heinz Nurture                             | 17                  | 134               |
| [2] Cow & Gate Complete Care                  | 12                  | 134               |
| [3] Cow & Gate Step-up                        | 13                  | 134               |
| [6] Cow & Gate Comfort 1                      | 6                   | 134               |
| [8] Cow & Gate Complete Care                  | 4                   | 134               |
| Total                                         | 76                  | 1072              |

There were 76 disagreements on coding judgements out of a total 1072 coding judgements. This represents a 93% agreement rate which in the academic social sciences literature would generally be regarded as acceptable. When the two coders compared their respective analyses, the discrepancies were found to have arisen in nearly every instance from a coding error of judgement on the part of one coder rather than any misunderstanding of the variables.
and how they were to be used. Such discrepancies tended to be linked to details within small print within advertisements and underlined the need to read these carefully. It was also clear that a random checking procedure should be built in to all future coding to ensure that these details were double checked.

This initial test coding exercise also identified a small number of issues with coding options of selected items that were subsequently modified. In all instances these related to the list of values used with specific variables. Modifications comprised the addition of a new value to the values list or (as in the case of colour-contrast coding) changing the coding system to ensure that it was logically consistent with the coding task.

*Television Formula Advertising – Coding Reliability*

The television advertising sample comprised a total of four advertisements for the following formula products:

- [1] SMA Progress (Long version 1)
- [2] SMA Progress (Long version 2)
- [3] Cow & Gate Complete Care Follow-on milk (long version)
- [4] Cow & Gate Complete Care Follow-on milk (end version)

These advertisements were transmitted during the ‘after’ sampling period. They were randomly selected from a total sample of seven television advertisements for that period. Each advertisement was independently analysed by two coders. The outcome is summarised below (Table A1.2).

**Table A1.2. Double Coding of Television Formula Advertising**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of disagreements</th>
<th>Total Code Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] SMA Progress</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Long version 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] SMA Progress</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Long version 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on milk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(long version)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on milk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(end version)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 42 disagreements on coding judgements out of a total of 608 coding judgements. This represents a 93% agreement rate which again would generally be regarded as acceptable. Coding discrepancies arose because of the difficulties in interpreting certain on-screen features (e.g. the colour contrast measure) and some ambiguity in what was to be recorded on the coding schedule. It was concluded that the colour-contrast variable could not be applied reliably for the coding of on-screen text against moving images. This variable was therefore deleted from the television coding schedule. Again it was clear that a random checking procedure should be built in to all future coding to ensure that potentially problematic variable coding was double checked. As with the print advertising pilot test a small number of issues were identified in the coding options for specific variables and the values used; new values were added to the values lists for these variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infant formula and follow-on formula products available in the UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutricia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2. Review: Formula Marketing, Advertising and Consumer Research

The primary aim of this research project was to produce a systematic and objective description of the nature of infant and follow-on formula advertising. Content analysis methodology was used to undertake this work. Content analysis focuses on the surface features of media content and is used to detect whether specific attributes or features characterise that content. In this exercise this methodology was applied to formula product advertising content across different advertising media. Within a content analysis, it is important to ensure that the analysis itself is divorced from the subjective perceptions or interpretations that the person carrying out the analysis might place on the content being described. It is also important that the variables being examined are measured in a quantitative fashion. Thus, attributes of content are effectively counted for their prevalence or volume across the sample of content under investigation.

In this research, the choice of variables to include in the content analysis was guided by research literature concerned with marketing of formula products and more general research on consumers’ responses to advertising. The review began by examining literature concerned with the control of formula marketing. Codes of practice that have been drawn up by the World Health Organisation and subsequently reflected in the European Directive and UK legislation have not just outlined parameters for formula product promotion but have also produced stipulations for the message content of advertising for these products.

Further research literature has emerged based on polls of public opinion about and studies of the impact of formula marketing. The latter literature, as we will see, yielded little evidence of relevance to the construction of content coding frames for formula advertising. The generic advertising and consumer research review focused on studies that had measured consumers’ responses to advertisements and how those responses were mediated by specific attributes or features within the body of the advertising. Thus, specific characteristics of the content and format of formula advertising were identified for coding purposes that had previously been shown via audience or consumer research to influence responses to advertising. Content analysis itself cannot provide direct insights into or evidence of consumers reactions to advertising or on the way consumers are influenced by advertising messages. By incorporating within such an analysis variables that have been verified through
consumer research as having the potential to shape consumers’ responses to advertising, however, a content coding frame can produce data on the prevalence of factors that could have certain effects upon consumers. These effects are neither proven nor demonstrated by content analysis, but the possibility that they could exist is identified in respect of advertisements in which relevant attributes are found to be present.

It is also important to note that the research literature on consumers’ responses to advertising does not always provide unequivocal evidence on the effects of specific advertising attributes. Different attributes of advertisements vary in their contribution to the effectiveness of advertising because they have an influence on specific types of consumer response. For instance, some attributes may be relevant to recall of advertisements, other attributes may be relevant to changing attitudes about the brand, other attributes may affect how much an advertisement is liked, and yet other attributes may be linked to intentions to purchase a brand or to actual purchase and consumption. Furthermore, the relevance or significance of specific attributes can also fluctuate with the general orientation towards advertising displayed by consumers. Thus, specific advertising attributes may influence particular types of consumer more than others, often depending upon the mindset with which consumers approach an advertisement.

I. Formula Marketing: Issues, Codes, and Marketing

Concerns about formula products have been raised internationally over a number of years. This concern was crystallized early on in a boycott of breast milk substitutes produced by Nestlé. This action was launched in July 1977 in the United States and spread to other countries. It was triggered by concerns about the way the company was marketing these products in developing countries. A number of lobby groups became established subsequently – most notably the International Baby Food Action Network (IBFAN) and the World Alliance for Breastfeeding Action (WABA) – that highlighted alleged health risks to babies associated with being fed these products. Bodies such as UNICEF have publicly confirmed these risks with statistics showing that babies fed on breast-milk substitutes in developing countries, where risks of disease were already high, were much more likely to die of diarrhoea and pneumonia than were breastfed children.

In 1974, the World Health Assembly had already noted that there had been a general decline in the prevalence of breast feeding in many parts of the world. This trend was associated with
a range of different social and cultural factors. The view taken was that action was needed to counteract this trend. Breast-feeding was regarded as beneficial to the health of both baby and mother. Encouragement of breast-feeding was seen as an important step in relation to tackling problems of malnutrition in many developing countries.

These issues were debated further by the World Health assembly in 1978. During this period, government and non-governmental organisations in many countries joined in this debate and called for worldwide action to improve the health status of infants and children. In 1978, the WHO and UNICEF jointly organised a major international conference that discussed plans to encourage breast-feeding, to provide better education and training to mothers in feeding practices, and to examine the way breast-milk substitutes were marketed. Recommendations arose from this meeting that were endorsed in 1980 by the World Health Assembly.

In 1981, the WHO recommended an *International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes* (IC) to the 34th World Health Assembly which after further debate adopted its proposals. This code banned all promotions of bottle feeding and set out requirements for the labelling and use of formula products (UNICEF, 2003). The IC recognised that breast feeding is the best way to provide an ideal diet for infants. Mothers’ milk was regarded as having the right balance of essential nutrients and contains antibodies that protect the baby from disease. Breast feeding was also regarded as important to the creation of a close emotional bond between mother and baby.

It was also recognised, however, that breast-feeding might not always be an option and that under such circumstances alternatives would need to be used. The aim of the IC was to provide guidelines ‘on the safe and adequate nutrition of infants’ and to ensure ‘the proper use of breast-milk substitutes’ through ‘appropriate marketing and distribution’ (WHO, 1981).

The IC underlines the responsibilities of governments to ensure that information that is supplied to mothers about infant feeding advises them that breast-feeding is superior to all other forms of nutrition. This message also needed to be tied in with any statements about the use of formula products. This included advice that if mothers did decide to switch to bottle feeding, even partially, this could have an impact on breast-feeding. If infant formula products were used, care should be taken to use them properly and information should be
provided about the risks associated with these products if they were used improperly. Formula product manufacturers should not attempt proactively to solicit interest in infant formula products via information or educational messages or equipment directly targeted at consumers or indeed at the healthcare system. Such materials could be used in the latter setting, only following an invitation to do so by appropriate government authorities.

The IC recommended that healthcare authorities should always seek to encourage breast-feeding and ensure that healthcare workers are given appropriate training and information on the promotion of this principle. There should be no overt promotion of formula products to pregnant women or young mothers within healthcare systems. Feeding with formula products should be demonstrated by healthcare workers only and not by manufacturers. While donations or low-price sales of formula products to healthcare institutions may be made, they must be used only for infants who have to be fed breast-milk substitutes – and not otherwise.

The IC made a number of stipulations to manufacturers concerning the labelling of formula products. Product packaging must clearly distinguish the nature of the product and labels must also contain specific items of information with the words “Important Notice” used to draw consumers’ attention to them. Product labels must advise consumers that formula products should only be used on the advice of a suitably qualified health professional, should underline the superiority of breast-feeding, should give instructions about proper use of the product including preparation, and warn against inappropriate preparation.

In 1991 Commission Directive 91/321/EEC on infant formulae and follow-on formulae was published and reflected the aims and principles of the IC. In 1995 in the UK the Infant Formula and Follow-on Formula Regulations 1995 were introduced to implement Directive 91/321/EEC on infant formulae and follow-on formulae. These Regulations for the first time prohibited the advertising of infant formula, unless this was in: a publication specializing in baby care and distributed only through the health care system; in a scientific publication; or for the purposes of trade prior to the retail stage. The Directive did not impose the same restrictions on follow-on formula advertising.

**European Directive**

In 2004 the European Commission issued a draft proposal to up-date Directive91/321/EEC and bring the compositional standards for infant and follow-on formulae in line with new
advice from the Scientific Committee on Food and to reflect discussions at an international level in the Codex Alimentarius forum. The resulting Directive 2006/141/EC on infant formulae and follow-on formulae was published on 30th December 2006. This Directive also included a new provision requiring the advertising, labelling and presentation of infant and follow-on formula to be such that it enabled consumers to make a clear distinction between the products and to avoid any risk of confusion between infant formulae and follow-on formulae. The new provision relating to confusion was intended to help address concerns that follow-on formula advertising could be seen as advertising for infant formula.

In November 2007, Public Health Minister Dawn Primarolo announced the new Regulations to implement Directive 2006/141/EC, a consultation on accompanying guidance notes and made a commitment to reviewing their effect. The Infant Formula and Follow-on Formula (England) Regulations were made on 13 December 2007 and came into force early in 2008. Equivalent parallel Regulations were also made in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The new controls included tighter rules on the labelling of all types of formula clarifying that follow-on formula should only be used by infants from six months old; allowing only a small number of approved health and nutrition claims to be displayed on infant formula milk; restrictions preventing infant formula being advertised directly to parents; new rules on how follow-on formula and infant formula are advertised so there is no confusion between the two products; and new guidance for industry and regulators concerning the application of these new rules.

Specifically the controls on the advertising of infant formula included within the 2007 Regulations are that:

- Infant formula may not be advertised directly to the general public and can only be advertised in scientific publications or for the purposes of trade prior to the retail stage.
- It must include the “important notice” containing a statement about the superiority of breastfeeding and recommending that the product be used only on the advice of an independent healthcare professional
- It must provide necessary information about appropriate use of the product so as not to discourage breastfeeding.
• It must not contain the terms “humanised”, “maternalised”, “adapted” or any similar term.
• It must not contain any picture of an infant or any other picture or text which may idealise the use of the product.
• It may only make nutrition and health claims that are listed in the legislation and under the conditions specified in the legislation.
• It must enable consumers to make a clear distinction between infant formula and follow-on formula so as to avoid any risk of confusion between the products.
• It must only contain information of a scientific and factual nature.
• It must not imply or create a belief that bottle-feeding is equivalent or superior to breastfeeding.

The controls on follow-on formula advertising are that it:
• Must provide necessary information about appropriate use of the product so as not to discourage breastfeeding.
• Must not contain the terms “humanised”, “maternalised”, “adapted” or any similar term.
• Must enable consumers to make a clear distinction between infant formula and follow-on formula so as to avoid any risk of confusion between the products.

Although the new provision relating to consumer confusion applies to the labeling, presentation and advertising of infant and follow-on formula, Directive 2006/141/EC and the 2007 Regulations put in place certain transitional periods. These transitional periods allow products that are labeled and presented (in so far as it relates to the shape, appearance and packing of the product) in compliance with the 1995 Regulations, to continue until 1st January 2010.

What follows is a review of relevant literature that was conducted to provide a background and context for the primary research. This review examines previous research about formulae use by consumers, consumer opinion about breast-feeding of formula products, the nature of formula advertising and public opinion about this advertising. Some attention is also given to a wider literature concerning research into food advertising, with special reference to
advertising for children’s products, to identify features of advertising that had been shown, through consumer research, to mediate its impact.

Use of Formula Milk
Research conducted among pregnant women and women with children aged up to 12 months in the UK in 2005 found that nearly four out of ten (38%) pregnant women said they would only breast feed, while over one in four (23%) would only use formula milk (Department of Health, 2005). More than one in three (35%) said they would use both. Among mothers with children aged up to 12 months, just over one in five (21%) said they only breast fed their babies, while more than one in three (35%) only bottle fed their infants. The remainder (44%) said they did both. Breast feeding only was much more prevalent among mothers with infants aged up to 6 months (28%) than among those with infants aged 6 to 12 months (13%). Use of bottle feeding as well as breast feeding was more prevalent among those mothers with infants aged 6 to 12 months (50%) as compared with those mothers with infants aged up to 6 months (38%).

In 2005, the great majority of mothers and mothers-to-be were aware of infant formula milk (84%) and follow-on formula milk (80%). Most were aware of both of these types of product (72%) with fewer than one in ten (9%) saying they were aware of neither. Of those who said they were aware of both products, a majority (60%) said they considered there was a difference between them while a significant minority either thought there was no difference (24%) or did not know one way or the other (16%). Among both mothers and mothers-to-be, over half (53%) said that the age at which infants should first be given follow-on formula was between 6 and 9 months. This proportion was higher among mothers with infants aged up to one year (62%) than among mothers to be (43%). Follow-on formula is not designed for infants under 6 months. Only a small minority of this sample (6%) thought that it was appropriate to use follow-on formula with very young infants, with mothers-to-be (8%) being twice as likely as mothers who already had infants aged up to one year (4%) to say this. In addition, more than one in four (27%) of mothers-to-be indicated that they did not know when to start giving follow-on formula.

Of mothers and mothers-to-be questioned in the Department of Health’s survey two out of three (67%) said they had seen or heard an advertisement for formula milk. A similar proportion had claimed to have seen or heard advertisements for infant formula (58%) as for
follow-on formula (57%). Pregnant respondents were more attuned to infant formula advertisements (60%) than to follow-on formula advertisements (49%), while mothers with young infants were more likely to mention having seen or heard advertisements for follow-on formula (66%) than for infant formula (55%). When asked where they had seen or heard these advertisements, the most mentioned media were television (64%) and magazines (55%). Few respondents in this survey mentioned newspapers (2%) or radio (1%). Some (7%) mentioned sightings in healthcare centres or GP surgeries.

A survey conducted by NCT/UNICEF (2005) by MORI was based on 1,000 telephone interviews with pregnant women and mothers. Six in ten (60%) said they had seen or heard advertising for infant formula milk. Among those respondents who had been exposed to infant formula advertising, most recalled seeing these messages in magazines or newspapers (58%), with television being the second most likely source of such advertising (37%). Other sources mentioned were leaflets from health professionals (13%), shops (11%), direct mail (7%), and health centres or GPs’ surgeries (5%). A further question asked respondents to recall the types of messages or information provided by these advertisements for the use of infant formula products. The most frequently recalled messages were that formula milk “...is as good as breast milk” (31%), that it “...makes babies healthy” (16%) and that it contains nutrients (16%). Just one in 20 respondents (5%) recalled that these advertisements instructed consumers “...not to replace breast milk and that breast feeding is better”.

Research in Northern Ireland found that one in three expectant mothers (32%) intended to formula feed their babies, while rather more (43%) said they would breast feed. One in four (25%) were undecided. By the time mothers were discharged from hospital after giving birth, more were using artificial feeding (60%) than breast feeding (40%). Mothers who intended to breast feed were more likely than mothers not intending to do so (or who were undecided) to agree that breast milk brings health benefits to babies and that it facilitates the mother-child bond. At the same time, breast feeders believed that you could control feeding better than with formula products and that mothers who used infant formula were missing out on one of the great joys of motherhood. Mothers who intended to bottle feed regarded formula feeding as enabling them to control food intake better, offer food richer than breast milk in iron, and pointed out its convenience, especially for mothers who needed to go out to work (Sittington, Stewart-Know, Wright, Bradbury, & Scott, 2007). There was no indication from this
research that formula advertising or other marketing might have played a part in enticing mothers to bottle feed their infants.

In Australia, the great majority of infants aged between 0 and 3 years were found to have obtained at least some of their nutrition from breast milk in 2001. National Health Surveys indicated an increase in the proportion of women initiating breastfeeding after being discharged from hospital following childbirth. While fewer than half of women (40-45%) were estimated to have engaged in breast feeding in the 1970s, this figure had grown to 82% by 1995 and remained at that level into the new millennium (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2003).

**Media Representations of Breast-Feeding**

The central theme of this research is the analysis of infant and follow-on formula advertising content. This research can be usefully informed by a review of previous analyses of advertising of these products. It is also pertinent to examine wider evidence about the way breast-feeding and related issues have been represented in the media more generally. In previous research, more attention has been devoted to general media representations of infant feeding than specifically to formula advertising.

Relevant research is international, though much of it derives from the United States. There has been some previous research of relevance conducted within the United Kingdom. The mass media have been regarded as having potentially powerful influences over public opinion towards breast-feeding. Such influences might, in turn, contribute to the prevalence of breast-feeding behaviour. Studies of the representation of breast-feeding in the media per se cannot demonstrate their subsequent impact upon public opinion or behaviour, but can identify the kinds of messages about infant feeding that are being presented from which it is presumed specific effects upon media consumers might follow.

Early baby care books by authors such as Dr Spock, published as long ago as the mid-1940s, promoted breast-feeding as the preferred infant feeding practice. It was initially promoted as having benefits for mothers as much as for their babies. Half a century later, medical support for breast-feeding acknowledged the nutritious value of breast milk and its health-enhancing properties for infants (Knaak, 2005).
Henderson, Kitzinger and Green (2000) analysed television programmes and newspaper articles that made reference to infant feeding in March 1999. A total of 235 such references were identified in the television sample and 38 in the newspaper sample. Bottle feeding was visually depicted more often than breast feeding and was presented as less problematic. Health benefits of breast-feeding and health risks associated with formula feeding were rarely mentioned. The authors concluded that the media seldom have positive things to say or to show about breast-feeding.

The apparent negativity of the mass media towards breast-feeding has not been a universal finding. Analysis of infant-feeding content in Chinese-language and English-language newspapers and bilingual parenting magazines in Hong Kong found, despite variations in the nature of coverage between different publications, that breast-feeding was usually framed in a positive light (Dodgson, 2008).

One American investigation of over 600 articles about infant feeding in seven popular parenting magazines, women’s magazines and African-American magazines between 1997 and 2003 found that there was in general more information about breast-feeding than formula feeding. Parenting magazines contained more infant feeding articles than did general women’s magazines, but then given the focus of parenting magazines this finding is not surprising. Images of bottle feeding, however, occurred almost as frequently as images of breast-feeding (Frerich, Andsager, Campo, Aquilino, & Dyer, 2006).

Despite the support for breast-feeding by the healthcare professions, the media have frequently presented a different picture of it. Both in news reports and dramatic representations, breast-feeding has been associated with negative outcomes for mother or child. One prominent case reported in the United States concerned a young black mother, Tabitha Walrond, whose two-month old son died from malnutrition. Walrond was found guilty of negligent homicide. Breast-reduction surgery had affected her breast-milk production, but this was a side-effect about which she had received no prior warning or advice. The news media treated her as a perpetrator when she was a victim of circumstances not entirely within her control. Nonetheless, the story frame presented breast-feeding as carrying certain risks. This message was subsequently reinforced when a dramatic representation based on this story was featured in the popular medical television drama, Chicago Hope (Brown & Peuchaud, 2008).
Foss and Southwell (2006) examined infant feeding advertisements in 87 issues of Parents’ Magazine. This magazine had been highly popular and widely read among women in America for many years. The issues examined were sampled between 1971 and 1999. The authors analysed advertisements for formula products and for other infant foods. They also reviewed articles that dealt with the subject of infant feeding. The total samples comprised 147 advertisements and 10 articles. Over the period of analysis, breast-feeding rates among American women increased in prevalence nearly two and a half times.

The number of advertisements for hand-feeding products could fluctuate dramatically from year to year across the time period monitored by these authors, but were much higher in number in 1999 than in 1972. However, comparable peaks to 1999 occurred in the mid and late 1980s. When the numbers of hand-feeding product advertisements and prevalence of breast-feeding statistics were examined together, there was evidence of a negative relationship. An increase in the number of hand-feeding infant food advertisements one year was followed by a drop in prevalence of breast-feeding the following year. This outcome is logical in that one might presume that increased encouragement of mothers of infants to use bottle feed products might in turn result in reduced breast-feeding, but this study does not have the power to demonstrate a causal connection between these variables. There may be many other factors that could influence the propensity of women to breast-feed that were not measured or controlled in this investigation. Moreover, we would also need to know how the level of exposure to this magazine related to whether a woman choose to breast-feed or not to breast-feed.

**Monitoring Formula Advertising Code Compliance**

A number of studies have been carried out in different parts of the world to assess compliance of formula product marketing with codes of practice (usually mirroring the IC) that applied at the time in their own countries. The extent to which compliance occurred, however, was often dependent on the presence of local legal requirements or voluntary agreements to observe the IC or national codes drawn from the IC that applied at the time.

Taylor (1998) conducted research in Bangladesh, Poland, South Africa and Thailand to determine the prevalence of violations of the international code of marketing of breast milk substitutes. Pregnant women and young mothers with infants aged up to six months were interviewed about whether they had received free samples of breast milk substitute products
(including infant formula), follow-on formula, other foods targeted at infants, or bottles and
teats. Samples of health workers in each country were also surveyed to find out whether they
had received incentives from companies that manufacture these substitute products to
recommend these products or to advise mothers about them.

At the time of this research, 63 countries legally required compliance with the international
code, 36 countries required voluntary compliance and in 96 other countries there was no code
compliance yet established (Sokol, 1997). The four countries selected for study represented
each of these groups: Bangladesh with a legal code, South Africa and Thailand with
voluntary codes, and Poland with no code.

Structured questionnaires were developed and administered via face-to-face interviews. The
data were collected in 1996. Mothers were most likely to receive free samples of breast milk
substitutes in the unregulated environment (Thailand -26%) and were least likely to do so in
the legally regulated setting (Bangladesh - <1%). The two countries with voluntary regulation
fell in between the other two on this measure. Similarly, health care workers were most likely
(56%) to report having received information from manufacturers that violated the
international code in Poland (where there were no legal or voluntary requirements to comply)
and much less likely to report this in the other three countries where legal or voluntary codes
were in place (15% to 33%). These findings are significant when considered alongside other
evidence that mothers who were given free samples of breast milk substitute products and of
the equipment with which to use such products were less likely to engage in breast feeding
(Bergevin, Dougherty & Kramer, 1983; Dungy, Christensen-Szalanski, Losch & Russell,
When women are encouraged through appropriate literature to engage in breastfeeding they
are more likely to breastfeed their own babies, while those being provided with literature,
products and tools associated with breast milk substitutes they are much less likely to do so
(Frank, Wirtz, Sorenson, & Heeren, 1987).

Research in West Africa in Togo and Burkina Faso obtained data from staff at 43 healthcare
facilities, 66 sales outlets, 186 health providers and 105 mothers of infants aged under six
months (Aguayo, Ross, Kanon, & Quedraogo, 2003). A number of the healthcare facilities
(14%) reported receipt of free product offers that could be handed out to mothers. While the
International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes allows for free samples to be given
to health professionals for research purposes, professionals at 12% of the healthcare facilities monitored in this study said they had received free product samples for purposes other than research. Special displays for formula products were found in 44% of retail outlets surveyed here. A number of product labelling violations were also found. There was widespread ignorance of the code among healthcare providers (90%) and most mothers said they had received no counselling on breastfeeding.

Research was conducted in Ukraine to monitor compliance of formula marketing with the IC. This study interviewed representatives of healthcare facilities and mothers of children aged under six months, as well as monitoring product displays and promotions in retail outlets, product labels, and manufacturers’ promotional materials for the trade and public (Babak, Balakireva, Kolesnikova & Mashavin, 2004).

This research found that IC breaches were prevalent in retail outlets, on product labels and in the information given out to healthcare professionals and the public by manufacturers. Code breaches included the use of pictures of babies with bottles or babies shown adjacent to product trademarks and in failing to spell out clearly the advantages of breastfeeding. The IC bans the use by product manufacturers or distributors of incentives to mothers to use breastfeeding substitutes such as free gifts or free trials of products, yet these marketing techniques were used in the Ukraine. Breaches were found in many of the 81 healthcare facilities monitored. There were 14 centres that contained product samples. The IC states that health care systems should not be used to promote formula products. Nevertheless, the researchers found product advertising and other promotional information on display in these centres: 40 healthcare centres were found to contain promotional materials and in 31 free gifts were given to healthcare workers.

In retail outlets, further breaches were found. In fact, only one in four (25%) of the retail outlets monitored were fully compliant with the IC. Shops that sold these products also contained posters, information leaflets, and other branded items. Shop assistants had been contacted by formula manufacturer representatives to encourage them to distribute promotional materials to customers, to arrange presentations about formula products for mothers, and to hand out free samples and gifts. All these actions contravened the IC.
Finally, product labels often contained breaches of the Code such as failing to provide a statement that breastfeeding is best for the child, warnings about the dangers associated with incorrect preparation of these products and that formula should only be used on the advice of a health professional.

The compliance of formula product labels with the IC was monitored in Puerto Rico. The Code requires labels for these products to present information about the benefits of breast-milk and the risks associated with formula products and to draw consumer’s attention to this information by using a prominent notice that advises of the importance of reading these instructions. Parrilla-Rodriguez and Gorrin-Peralta (2008) conducted an evaluation of labels of 34 infant formula brands. Every label examined was found to contain at least one violation of the Code. Virtually all (94%) did not contain the words “Important Notice” designed to draw consumers’ attention to advice about breast-feeding and formula-feeding. In nearly three out of four cases (74%) the label did not state that breast-feeding is best. In nearly every case (91%) labels failed to stipulate that formula foods should only be used on the advice of a professional health worker. In all but one instance, labels idealised the use of infant formula and contained text that might discourage breast-feeding (97% in each case). The authors concluded that formula product manufacturers were openly ignoring the requirements of the international code.

The Food Safety Authority of Ireland (2007) published research about the marketing, advertising and distribution of infant formulae and follow-on formulae products. The purpose of this study was to assess compliance of marketing of breast-milk substitutes with current Irish regulations. The latter regulations reflected those contained in the European Commission Directive 91/321/EEC on Infant Formulae and Follow-on Formulae (as amended).

The survey examined formula advertising, other relevant formula marketing practices and any information provided to health professionals or mothers/mothers-to-be. One part of the Irish research comprised a survey of health professionals in all 21 maternity units and three children’s hospitals in Ireland. A sample of representatives from these organisations was given a self-completion questionnaire based on an earlier instrument used by UNICEF for auditing compliance with the IC. An analysis was also carried out of a sample of formula advertisements placed in health care professional publications and women/mothers’
magazines. This examined compliance of advertising with the IC. In addition, any information provided by industry to health care professionals was collected and checked for compliance. A further component comprised an audit of a sample of retail shops and pharmacies to assess point-of-sale advertising and other in-store promotions. Finally, an analysis was conducted of information provided via the Internet. This comprised web sites usually produced by formula manufacturers.

The survey of maternity units and children’s hospitals took place between August 2005 and February 2006. There was widespread awareness of the International, EC and Irish codes and regulations though not of the FSAI Guidance Note on implementation of the Regulation. Nearly six in ten said they became familiar with these codes through training, while one in five in each case did so via the Baby Friendly Initiative or through private study. One in three said they were aware of possible breaches of the legislation and the same proportion also indicated that their hospital had procedures in place to monitor and report breaches.

Nearly nine in ten said their hospital had a policy on advertising formula within the hospital and none was aware of any formula advertising inside hospital premises. None of the hospitals reported that the industry had sought contact with mothers or mothers to be. But over nine out of ten said they used industry leaflets.

Most of the hospitals made most brands of breast-milk substitutes available to patients (79%). Virtually all (96%) said that no information was provided to patients about these products. Where these products were used in hospitals, they were generally provided free of charge. Most (87%) respondents said that workers received no free gifts from formula companies. There were no instances of industry sponsorship of equipment. However, in one in three cases, the industry had funded a study day or conference.

The research examined advertisements placed in professional magazines and magazines targeted at the general public. Advertisements were found in just two professional magazines. One occurred in the UK Journal of Neonatal Nursing and ‘several’ were found in the World of Irish Nursing. Five different advertisements were assessed in all. One of these was for follow-on formula and the other four were for infant formula products. Three of the infant formula ads did not comply because they included a picture of an infant, implied equivalence of their product with breast milk or some of the other information provided was not factual.
General magazines were examined during February 2006. Again, ‘several’ advertisements were found in ‘several’ magazines. No infant formula advertisements were found. One ad included a picture of an infant being breastfed which was not prohibited by the legislation in place in 2006.

Leaflets left in staff rooms, midwife offices and given to healthcare professionals were examined. Only seven such leaflets were collected. These related to infant formula and follow-on formula products and contained brand names. Five contained information that was not strictly factual and four contained pictures of infants. These all contravened the IC. The research examined ten retail shops and eight pharmacies in the greater Dublin area. The report states that a ‘large number’ of these premises contained promotions for follow-on formula products that are permitted, but one also contained a promotion for infant formula, which is not permitted.

The web sites of Cow & Gate, Milupa, SMA Nutrition, Farleys and Hipp were examined as well as other web sites that provided general information about baby care. The general sites did not promote the use of infant formula. When information on bottle feeding was provided it was compliant. Manufacturer web sites generally required users to click through which, in the view of the researchers, meant that they were not classified as advertisements but as requested information. Again the researchers felt that this meant that they technically fell outside the legislation related to formula marketing.

**Impact Formula Marketing**

In considering standards of nutrition for infants and young children, the World Health Assembly took a view that there were risks associated with the use of breast-milk substitutes. Infant formula was classified as a special type of consumer product that should not be made generally available to consumers, but should instead be treated in the same way as a prescription medicine to be used only under medical supervision. In consequence, direct advertising of infant formula to mothers was deemed to be inappropriate. There was particular concern that any such advertising might discourage mothers from engaging in breastfeeding or could shorten the duration for which they breast feed (World Health Organisation, 2001).
The World Health Assembly made certain presumptions about the impact of infant formula marketing, and especially about advertising of these products based on wider concerns about the product itself. It is important to ask what hard evidence exists that advertising of formula products does have an effect upon parents of very young children. In addition to determining whether formula advertising affects parents’ decisions about how to feed their babies and infants, does any of this consumer effect evidence indicate whether specific advertising formats or techniques are particularly effective? While the current study is not concerned with measurement of the effects of formula advertising, there is value in knowing whether specific creative treatments are likely to enhance the impact of this advertising. The empirical evidence on formula advertising impact is limited and can be broadly divided into three kinds. The first type of evidence is based on professional or consumer opinion about formula advertising effects. The second type is based on studies that have examined macro-level relationships between expenditure of formula advertising and societal levels of consumption. The third type derives from studies that have examined whether exposure to formula marketing activities is associated with breast feeding patterns among mothers.

Opinions about Formula Advertising Effects
Research conducted among paediatricians in the United States indicated that approaching one in two (46%) endorsed their strong support for the American Academy of Paediatrics policy opposing direct consumer advertising of infant formula, while a further one in four (26%) offered some support for this position. This policy has triggered some paediatricians (27%) to increase the amount of encouragement they gave to mothers to breastfeed. Most of these health professionals (79%) noted no change in the extent to which parents asked them for advice about breast feeding since the onset of infant formula advertising. Even so, around one in two of the respondents to this survey reported that parents did sometimes ask about the use of infant formula products, though four in ten (41%) said that parents never made such enquiries. A minority of paediatricians (27%) noted that parents seemed to be asking more questions about infant formula following the onset of advertising for formula products (Fleischman, 1991).

Macro-Level Impact Research
This approach to studying the impact of advertising uses societal-level data on product consumption and advertising volume or expenditure, including the effects on consumption of advertising bans. Macro-economic research of this type has been used to try to understand the
impact of advertising in product areas such as alcohol and tobacco consumption. It has also
been used in relation to data on formula product advertising. The research evidence from
studies of alcohol and tobacco markets has been equivocal and inconclusive. Equally there
has been disagreement among researchers about the impact of formula advertising.

In the United States, the Government Accountability Office reported that the amount of infant
formula advertising on television and in print media displayed year-on-year fluctuations, but
overall exhibited growth between 1999 and 2005. The annual number of formula
advertisements in these media increased from 7,000 in 1999 to over 10,000 in 2004 (GAO,
2006). Most of this advertising occurred on television. Expenditure on infant formula
advertising for television, print and radio also grew over this period from $29m in 1999 to
$46m in 2004.

Impact of Formula Advertising on Breast Feeding Behaviour
One of the main concerns about infant formula advertising is that by encouraging the
consumption of breast-milk substitutes, it discourages mothers from breast-feeding their
infants. The introduction by the World Health Organisation of its International Code of
Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes was designed to limit the extent to which this outcome
would occur. The WHO recognises that there may be various reasons for mothers choosing
not to breast-feed their babies. There is therefore a need to understand what the reasons might
be for women deciding not to breast-feed at all or to do so only for a limited period. Thus, it
is within a wider psychological, social and economic context that the role, if any, played by
formula product advertising should be considered (Simopoulos & Grave, 1984).

It is not simply through advertising in mainstream media that formula advertisers might reach
consumers. Manufacturers of formula products have been observed frequently to distribute
literature and promotional samples to hospitals and health centres. American research found,
for instance, that many women reportedly received branded literature about infant feeding
from formula companies and some reportedly obtained free samples of formula products
while in hospital giving birth (Howard, Howard & Weitzman, 1994).

The widespread presence of infant formula advertising and other promotional materials in
hospitals was regarded as a potential threat to the willingness of mothers to begin breast-
feeding at all or to persist with it once started. Significant proportions of women who start to
breast-feed are no longer doing so beyond six months. The medical profession generally holds the view that breast-feeding is best for the child and mother, and that it should certainly be the preferred mode of feeding during the first six months of a child’s life. Anything that places the continuance of that behaviour for that minimum time-period at risk is regarded as unwelcome (Howard, Weitzman, Lawrence & Howard, 1994).

In testing whether formula marketing activities have any impact on patterns of breastfeeding, the research to date has almost invariably focused on the effects of commercially branded discharge packs given to mothers when they leave hospital after the birth of their child. The usual approach adopted by researchers is to allocate at random discharge packs with formula brand names, discharge packs without brand names and sometimes no discharge pack at all as a control. The mothers in the study are then contacted three to four months after departure from hospital, often by telephone interviewers blind to the condition into which the mothers have been placed, who question them about their breastfeeding practices. Evidence from this type of research has indicated that mothers given the branded discharge packs tend to be more likely than those given no pack or an unbranded pack to have discontinued breastfeeding within a matter of weeks or a few months after the birth of their child or at least to combine breastfeeding with bottle feeding (e.g., Frank, Wirtz, Sorensen & Heeren, 1987; Rosenberg, Eastham, Kasehagen & Sandoval, 2008).

The commercially branded discharge packs not only display the name of an infant formula manufacturer, they tend also to contain branded literature about infant feeding, contact details for the formula manufacturer, free samples and coupons towards future formula purchases. One study manipulated the contents of discharge packs to find out whether that would make any difference to breastfeeding outcomes. In this case, different participants were given packs that contained a can of infant formula powder, or a manual breast pump, or both the powder and the pump, or neither. The presence of formula powder was found to have a modest effect in increasing the likelihood that mothers would begin to supplement breastfeeding with bottle feeding within the first six weeks after childbirth. The presence of a breast pump delayed the use of formula (Bliss, Wilkie, Acredolo, Berman, & Tebb, 1997).

One direct test of the impact of exposure to formula marketing activities in a hospital setting in the United States derived from a field experiment in which more than 500 pregnant women were randomly assigned to conditions in which they received formula branded or non-
branded educational packs about infant feeding when they made their first prenatal visit (Howard, Howard, Lawrence, Andreson, DeBlieck & Weitzman, 2000). The commercial formula pack contained not only educational materials on pregnancy, infant feeding and other early child development matters, it also contained free product samples of money-off coupons for future purchases. The women in this study were then tracked throughout their pregnancy and beyond childbirth. They were differentiated in terms of their intentions to breast-feed at all and their commitment to breast-feed for just limited or more extended time periods. Four in five of the women (81%) originally contacted remained with the study after childbirth had taken place. Of these, seven in ten (70%) had chosen to breast-feed their babies. Among the latter, more than four in ten (44%) were unsure about how long they would keep up with breast-feeding or had already decided that they would not breast-feed for more than 12 weeks.

The women exposed to the formula branded and non-branded packs exhibited a small difference in prevalence of breast-feeding in each case. This finding indicated that exposure to formula promotions made little difference to women’s initial decision about whether to breast-feed or not. There was no significant difference between these two groups in their intentions as far as duration of breast-feeding was concerned. There were no statistically significant differences between women exposed to commercially branded packs about infant feeding and those who received the non-branded packs in propensity to terminate breast-feeding with two weeks of birth in respect of their overall or exclusive use of breast-feeding. Upon controlling statistically for other variables, such as maternal age, planned return to work, previous breast-feeding experience, marital status and socio-economic status, both of these inter-group differences became statistically significant. Although the study revealed no evidence about longer-term effects of infant formula marketing, it indicated that the distribution of marketing materials within hospitals might cause some women to consider early cessation of breast-feeding.

Another major American analysis of formula marketing by the US Government Accountability Office examined industry consumer data and reviewed relevant academic evidence primarily taken from medical and child health literature (GAO, 2006). This investigation made special reference to formula marketing effects on women in the US Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Special Supplemental Nutrition Programme for
Women, Infants and Children (WIC). This programme distributes free food and infant formula to low-income women to support the health and well-being of their infants.

The GAO research found that formula companies target both WIC and non-WIC women though in different ways. While formula promotion to non-WIC women occurs through the mainstream mass media that directed towards WIC women occurs via marketing channelled through the medical community. Thus, with the WIC market, health-care providers are used as intermediaries with formula marketers effectively targeting their promotions as professionals with the expectation that they will then make recommendations to consumers. As well as advertising to the medical and health community, formula companies also place free samples with them or provide products under premium offers. Other spin-off merchandising is used to broaden out the marketing effort, with branded baby name cards, calendars and pens being among the items distributed. Direct marketing to consumers in the US occurs via television, radio and print media. Mainstream media campaigns are also supported by the use of money-off coupons and free samples sent to the homes of pregnant women and new mothers. Web sites and point of sale product displays represent further components of multi-modal integrated marketing campaigns.

The effectiveness of these marketing efforts can be measured in a number of ways. The GAO obtained evidence that most US hospitals provided formula discharge packs to new mothers. A further analysis estimated that 86 per cent of mothers in the WIC programme received these packs (Baydar, McCann, Williams & Vesper, 1997). Thus, there was evidence here of widespread potential exposure of new mothers to infant formula promotions.

Evidence for the impact of formula samples in discharge packs received from hospitals derived from a range of previously published studies. Collectively, according to the GAO, most of this evidence indicated that mothers who received these packs subsequently displayed lower breastfeeding rates. Research with WIC mothers from poorer backgrounds found that receipt of formula discharge packs was associated with a lower likelihood of breastfeeding and a greater likelihood of early termination of breastfeeding. The GAO noted, however, that there was no reliable research evidence on the effects of other types of formula marketing, including advertising, on breastfeeding behaviour.
The American evidence has been supported internationally. Research in Mexico found that mothers who received formula packs upon being discharged from hospital were more likely than mothers not given these packs to be formula users within two weeks of leaving hospital after childbirth (Margen, Melnick, Neuhauser & Rios, 1991). A meta-analysis study of experimental studies conducted in six different countries found that exclusive breastfeeding at one month and any breastfeeding at four months were likely to be markedly lower among mothers who had received infant formula branded commercial discharge packs compared with non-branded educational materials about infant feeding (Perez-Esamilla, Pollitt, Lonnerdal & Dewey, 1994).

None of the research reviewed above on formula marketing provided any insights into the effects of mainstream media formula advertising or specialist media formula advertising (e.g., in medical and healthcare journals). There were no insights either into the significance of specific production treatments or formats within formula advertising that might influence consumers’ responses to these commercial messages.

II. Attributes of Advertising and Consumer Reactions

The assessment of formula advertising used in this investigation applied the methodology of content analysis. This methodology can be used to produce a descriptive account of the content and format features of advertisements in a standardised and systematic fashion. The data yielded by this analysis are quantitative in nature and indicate the extent to which specific attributes are present or absent from advertisements. In aggregation, over a sample of advertisements, this analysis can provide insights into the distribution of specific attributes. The attributes that are identified and counted in this way were included either because they were required by codes of practice drawn up for formula advertising or because they might have some significance in terms of how consumers might respond to the advertising. An account was provided in the previous section about formula product advertising and related codes of practices. In the remainder of this appendix, attention is turned to research evidence on the potential relevance of specific attributes of advertising to the way consumers might respond to advertising messages.

Much of the discussion about and research into the effects of advertising has focused on the persuasive capabilities of commercial messages. A starting proposition about all advertising is that ultimately it is designed to persuade consumers to purchase the advertised brand. To
achieve this end, advertising must act upon consumers at a number of psychological levels. It must raise their awareness of the advertised brand. It must create a favourable impression of the brand. In doing so, it must set the advertised brand apart from other brands from which it faces competition for consumers’ attention and persuade them that this brand is the best one available. Liking for the advertising itself may play a part in enhancing the brand’s image. Once a favourable attitude has been established towards the brand, this ‘feeling’ must be translated into motivation to consume, use and purchase. The advertising must eventually give rise to an intention to consume which in turn drives actual consumption.

Over the last 40 years, theoretical discussions of the persuasive influences of advertising have placed much emphasis on the way consumers cognitively process information from commercial messages and are influenced emotionally by these messages. Cognitive and affective responses have been conceived to act as precursors of behavioural action in the form of actual consumption or purchase of commodities. Thus, the persuasive process embraces changes at cognitive and emotional or affective levels as precursors of ultimate behavioural response in the form of purchase and consumption. In that context, marketing experts have also differentiated the way consumers respond to advertisements in terms of whether they display a high or low level of involvement with advertisements (and the products they are promoting). While this distinction centres on the way consumers respond psychologically to advertisements, it also has a bearing on the way in which information is processed from advertising messages and on the consumers’ degree of sensitivity to different types of content or format attributes that may characterise those messages. A number of classes of attributes have been identified to play mediating roles in driving consumers’ reactions to advertisements – with these reactions being measured in a number of different ways. However, the significance of specific attributes can be altered by the way consumers are oriented towards advertisements and, in particular, in relation to whether consumers exhibit high or low involvement with the advertising (Batra & Ray, 1985).

**Models of Communication and Persuasion**

Advertising is a form of communication that is concerned with presenting consumers with information about products that will shape their impressions of and opinions about the product being promoted and might ultimately lead to them purchasing and consuming that product. Advertising messages are therefore concerned with enhancing consumer awareness of a product, creating a favourable impression about it, and ultimately persuading consumers
to choose that product over others with which it is competing in the marketplace. The impact of advertising can therefore be measured in different ways in terms of enhanced consumer awareness of the product (or more especially of a specific brand), enhanced consumer knowledge about the product, effective memory of the product and its attributes, the establishment of positive consumer attitudes about the product (helped in part by positive consumer attitudes towards the advertisement that is promoting the product), enhanced intention to purchase or consume, and actual consumption/purchase.

At each of these stages of impact, different conditions must be satisfied to ensure that it occurs and that consumers then proceed on to the next stage, leading finally to actual consumption and use of the product. Research has shown – as indicated below – that advertisements must adopt certain format and content attributes to enhance their overall impact or their impact at specific stages of a persuasive communication process. There are some further conditions that must be noted in relation to this process. Certain combinations of advertising attributes have been found to work well together, while other combinations may cancel each other out in terms of the ultimate impact of an advertisement upon consumers. Thus, the presence of certain images in an advertisement might support or impede the impact of some of the textual information being presented at the same time.

Some attributes can achieve specific effects in terms of consumer response only when consumers have entered a particular style or mode of cognitive information processing. Thus, content attributes that encourage consumers to process information in an analytical way could result in some elements of the advertising message being processed more effectively than others. Alternatively, if it is important for consumers to be able to read and are fully cognisant of specific textual information in an advertisement, other elements within the advertisements (e.g., use of certain types of emotionally-arousing pictures or text descriptions that encourage consumers to conjure up images in their own heads) might distract their attention from that other essential content.

Routes to Persuasion
Advertising does have a further purpose and that it is persuade consumers to purchase a commodity and in a competitive marketplace to choose the advertised brand over any others within the same product class. For persuasion to work effectively, the advertisement has to create a positive disposition toward the advertised brand on the part of the consumer. It must
therefore work on consumer’s brand attitudes. To achieve this objective, information about the brand that is relevant to consumers’ attitude formation must be successfully conveyed to consumers. This is a stepwise process.

First, the advertisement and its contents must be effectively registered by the consumer. Second, the information must be effectively encoded into memory. Third, it must be understood. Fourth it must be accepted, which means it must be believed and seen as credible and relevant to consumers’ decision making. At this stage, attitude formation begins. Assuming a favourable attitude or cluster of attitudes is established around the brand, the consumer might then be motivated to prefer that brand over others. In this last instance, however, much depends upon whether a consumer is in the market for the product in the first place. Assuming that the consumer is motivated to purchase and consume that type of product, brand choice will be influenced by whether favourable impressions have been formed about the brand in question.

Attitude Change Theory
Advertising operates by influencing consumers’ attitudes and ultimately their behaviour. Theories of attitude change have been differentiated within social psychology in terms of whether attitudes are conceptualised as single process or dual process psychological entities. Single process models conceive of attitude change as occurring via the reception and processing of messages that persuade a change of viewpoint. Among single process models further distinctions have been made in terms of whether attitudes represent emotional feelings of ‘affect’ or whether they also have a cognitive or rational component.

According to one prominent single process attitude theory, attitude change is facilitated via the beliefs about an object that are triggered from memory at the point a persuasive communication is received (Fishbein, 1963, Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Changes to behavioural intention are triggered in turn by relevant attitude changes towards the object in question. In the context of advertising, the attitudes that consumers form towards the advertising message and towards the advertised brand are important precursors of behaviour change. Any features therefore that can influence the latter attitudes in a positive way can promote the eventual persuasiveness of the advertising message.
The tripartite model of Fishbein-Ajzen presumes that attitude is exclusively about emotion or ‘affect’. The cognitive component in the persuasion process comprises ‘beliefs’. Belief change was believed to drive attitude change that, in turn, motivated behavioural responses. Thus, advertising must operate on consumers’ beliefs first of all before attitude change can occur. Later research challenged this model and its support evidence both conceptually and methodologically envisaging attitudes instead as having a multidimensional structure with cognitive and affective components (Bagozzi, 1981; Bagozzi, Tybout, Craig & Sternthal, 1979).

Further research that adopted this alternative model also revealed that the persuasive influences of advertising are closely tied up with the ability of commercial messages to influence consumers at an emotional level. It was also important not only that consumers felt positively disposed towards the advertised brand but also towards the advertising message itself (Mitchell & Olson, 1981; McKenzie & Lutz, 1982). This idea was conceptually developed even further with the recognition that for advertising to work effectively, it needed to attract a positive evaluation from consumers to the brand and encourage consumers to like the advertisement at the same time (Batra & Ray, 1982). The importance of ‘liking’ for the advertisement was observed to grow in the case of commercial messages that invoked only low levels of involvement on the part of consumers. The notion of consumer involvement was developed further by other researchers (e.g., Petty & Cacioppo, 1980; Petty, Cacioppo & Goldman, 1981).

Dual process models acknowledge attitudes can be changed by messages communicated via different media but also incorporate an additional dimension that embraces message receivers’ motives to pay attention to a message and take its contents seriously. Dual process models such as the elaboration likelihood model (ELM) or the heuristic/systematic model (HSM) argue that when message receivers are highly motivated by a message, they will process its contents differently from when that motivation is low (Chaiken & Trope, 1999). When highly motivated they will be driven to focus their attention on central arguments and meanings of the message and may cognitively reconfigure these elements in their own minds in the process. When motivation or involvement is low, message receivers may be more influenced by the aesthetic qualities of the message such as whether it uses colour or sound effects or whether it is endorsed by a certain type of spokesperson (e.g., a celebrity), and so on.
Involvement Theory

According to proponents of this theory, throughout this process of persuasion, the success with which an advertisement moves a consumer from the first to last stage in the persuasion sequence is influenced by the nature of the advertising itself and the degree of involvement displayed by the consumer in the product or the advertising for the product. Involvement is associated with the concept of elaboration likelihood. This concept reflects the degree to which consumers actively engage with and process different informational and presentational aspects of an advertisement. Involved consumers will process information from an advertisement in an elaborate fashion meaning that they may reflect upon what the advertisement tells them about a product or brand, weigh up the credibility of the message, and even draw upon past knowledge to judge for themselves whether the advertising messages provides an accurate and honest representation of the product. In essence, involved consumers process advertising information in a cognitively more active and sophisticated fashion (Krugman, 1965).

Highly involved consumers have been found to adopt what has been called ‘central route processing’ and those who display only low involvement exhibit ‘peripheral route processing’ (Petty & Cacioppo, 1979, 1980). With central route processing, consumers’ attitudes towards a brand may be swayed more heavily by detailed information about the product and the brand in the form of details about the benefits and risks associated with the brand, what makes that brand superior, and how to use it effectively. With peripheral route processing, consumers pay more attention to and are influenced more by support features such as production treatments and style of promotion rather than by substantive product-related information. To simplify this explanation still further, we can say that in central route processing consumers focus on the information content of advertisements and in peripheral route processing consumers focus on the way the brand is presented and the format features of the advertisement (see Lutz, 1985).

Dual process models of attitude change and persuasion have retained popularity over time. Specific components of the persuasion process such as the source of a message and the nature of the message itself are believed to influence both the processing of information that may produce attitude change (and eventually changes in behaviour) and also the motivation to process the message (see Crano & Prislin, 2006). Modified single-process models have also emerged to challenge the principles of dual processing theory. These new models do not deny
any influence of message receive motivation in message information processing, but conceive
of a specific type of cognitive process that is invoked by source and message effects that
operates independently of the message receiver’s involvement with the message (Kruglanski
& Thompson, 1999a, 1999b).

Components of the Persuasion Process
One of the most comprehensive models of persuasive communication was developed by
McGuire (McGuire, 1989). He produced a communication-persuasion matrix. This is a model
of persuasion that identifies characteristics of persuasive communication and of target
audiences that might influence the effectiveness of the communications. The part of that
model that is most relevant as a background to the development of a coding system for
advertising is that which focused on the input side of advertisements. In this context, the
matrix comprised five broad categories of factors from which communications were believed
to be constructed:

These are characteristics of the perceived communicator (e.g., attractiveness, expertise,
credibility, trustworthiness). These might include the name of the advertiser, the reputation
of the brand being advertised, the nature and reputation of spokespersons or actors within the
advertisements who present information about the advertised brand.

These are attributes of the message itself and focus on ‘content’ attributes. Included within
this component of the communication/persuasion process are variables such as: the types of
information provided about the product concerning its functionality; attributes that set it apart
from other competing products; arguments made in favour of the product; use of specific
thematic elements (such as humour).

[3] Channel Factors
These factors focus more on the way a message is delivered to recipients and the modalities
through which information is presented. This begins by examining the way that verbal versus
non-verbal modalities are used to present informational content. In addition, it is here that
other content or narrative factors are differentiated that are concerned with presentation rather
than information. In the verbal mode, these include amount of narrative content, placement of
narrative content, use of specific linguistic techniques, and text lay-out features. In the non-
verbal mode, a range of other factors are important, such as use of images, use of music, use of sound effects, and use of colour.

[4] Receiver Factors
Advertisers generally have specific target audiences in mind. Consumer target groups may be defined in terms of their age, gender, ethnicity, education, occupational status, family status, marital status, household type, geographical location, and other ‘lifestyle’ factors, including aspirations, interests, and significant reference groups. Advertisers will generally attempt to relate to their target markets by using techniques that enhance the likelihood that consumers will identify with the product being promoted. Thus, specific ‘referents’ are incorporated in advertisements that are designed to invoke desired reactions from consumers. These referents might include the use of specific types of actor/model/spokesperson with whom consumers share an identity in terms of the personal attributes listed above. We can also include here the use of celebrity endorsers with whom consumers might identify. These techniques are used to enhance the image of specific brands as well as the authority, credibility and believability of the advertising message. They are also used to increase the perceived personal relevance of products (or specific brands) to the consumer.

[5] Destination Factors
Advertisements are designed to produce certain types of reactions or responses from particular kinds of consumers. These responses may take the form of short-term or longer-term effects. Essentially destination factors are concerned with whether an advertising message reaches its target market. One aspect of this is measurement of consumers exposed to advertisements via different media campaigns. Another aspect is determining whether target consumers are aware of the campaign and the brand. In addition, an advertisement can be directly analysed to establish the degree to which it is effectively targeting the behaviour it is designed to influence.

Consumer Cognitive Orientations
Quite early on, some authors argued that consumer involvement in advertising could vary between media, with television advertising, for example, being ‘less involving’ than print advertising (Krugman, 1965). This may be an oversimplification of the way consumers respond to advertising, but regardless of medium, evidence has accumulated that the level of consumer involvement with advertising (or with products being advertised) does make a difference to the way they respond to different styles of advertising. Thus, a consumer who is
highly involved in an advertisement will focus predominantly on central arguments or other information that are presented about the advertised product itself. A consumer who is less involved may be influenced more by peripheral features such as the use of special production treatments or celebrity endorsements. Thus, there is a difference in terms of whether an advertisement is seen as providing substantive information about a product or is simply aesthetically pleasing to look at or listen to (see Petty & Cacioppo, 1979).

The relative significance of different advertisement content and format attributes is mediated by the degree to which consumers are involved in an advertisement or the advertised product. The Elaboration Likelihood theory (Petty, Cacioppo & Schuman, 1983) differentiated conditions of high and low involvement in an advertisement. Each type of involvement invokes different information processing strategies on the part of consumers. High involvement results in ‘central route processing’ of the advertisement, whereas low involvement tends to result in ‘peripheral route processing’. Essentially, what this means is that consumers who have high involvement in an advertisement concentrate more of their attention on fundamental information about the product that is contained within the commercial message. Such information may describe specific functional qualities of the product that are central to the way it is used and that describe the benefits it will bring to the consumer. When consumers are not highly involved in a product, core product-related information is of less interest and attracts much less of their attention. Instead, their interest in an advertisement is driven more by its peripheral features, usually linked to the types of aesthetic, creative, production treatments that have been used. Thus, the use of an attractive actor or model, the use of special effects, and so on may be more attention-grabbing.

Under these distinct conditions of psychological involvement, consumers may therefore adopt different information processing strategies and their attention is oriented towards different aspects of an advertisement. The involvement effect however is not simply a matter of the type of product being marketed. More expensive, luxury items that would normally represent occasional rather than regular purchases might fall into that category, but fast-moving consumer goods that are more competitively priced and represent more frequent purchases may be less likely to attract central processing, being more effectively promoted through peripheral features that make a specific brand stand physically apart from others in the market and more especially other products being advertised alongside it in the same medium.
In the context of promoting or facilitating attitude change towards a product in consumers as a precursor to behavioural consumption of a product, the use of substantive arguments for using a particular brand is likely to be more successful with consumers who are highly involved with the product or advertisement for it. In contrast, production treatments that make reference to less central or core attributes of a product (such as its functionality, superiority, etc) and simply present an attractive promotional environment (e.g., through the use of colours, music, sound or visual effects, physically attractive actors or models, or well-known celebrities) will be more effective among consumers who display low levels of involvement (Gorn, 1982; Petty & Cacioppo, 1980; Petty, Cacioppo & Goldman, 1981).

Low versus high involvement is often linked to risk perceptions on the part of consumers when they purchase products. ‘Risks’ in this context may stem from concerns that a particular brand/product does not represent a good fit with a consumer’s self-image (psychological risk), or that it does not conform to brand/product tastes of important reference groups (social risk), or that there is a financial risk associated with the purchase (financial risk), or there is an operational risk with the product failing to deliver what is claimed in the advertisement (operational risk) (Friedman & Friedman, 1979).

The cognitive approach to analysing the way individuals process information from advertising, with special reference to the context of persuasion, has been further elaborated in terms of successive stages of analysis of advertisements by consumers. This model has been referred to as a ‘levels of representation’ (LOR) analysis. According to Greenwald and Leavitt (1985), there are three important distinctions to be made here: “(i) the role of communications in activating existing mental representations; (ii) the role of communications in forming new representations; and (iii) the role of these representations in the control of action” (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1985, p.230). What this means is that information contained in advertisements is processed via a number of stages and as this process proceeds, the consumer reactions that are evoked may represent orienting responses to a new experience, or they may draw upon pre-existing experience and knowledge, and that they may ultimately control the way consumers behave towards the advertised product (i.e., whether they consume or purchase it or not).

The levels of representation also represent levels of involvement with advertising messages. Four levels of involvement were identified here: detection and registration of [1] surface-
level or sensory features of advertising; [2] category or semantic features; [3] propositional features; and [4] conceptual features. Advertising must initially attract the consumer’s attention which it does through its physical characteristics (such as size, shape, colour, sound type and volume, etc), that trigger an orienting response towards the commercial message. Second, the consumer must register other idiosyncratic features such as verbal information (written or spoken) and picture information that may convey initial categorical information about the type of product being advertised. Third, advertising content about the product or brand is processed more deeply such that information about product functionality and use, benefits and risks associated with it are encoded and interpreted. Fourth, a further deeper level of analysis takes place during which the consumer relates the product/brand back to themselves in terms of its relevance to them and their self-image.

Coding Frame Variables
There has been wide support for the approach adopted by McGuire (1989). Although he has produced a number of different versions of his model, and each successive version has been characterised by an increased number of output (or impact) measures, there are five primary classes of variables linked to persuasive messages that have consistently featured – source factors, message factors, channel factors, receiver factors and destination factors. The first three of these, in particular, have been differentiated in terms of a range of specific content and format variables that have been investigated in the context of advertising and consumer responses.

Source effects have received considerable attention from communication and persuasion researchers. Sources can be distinguished in a number of ways. These can include their physical appearance, their social standing, their expertise, and their cultural type. Within advertisements, source considerations place the focus on the casting of actors or models for the creative production.

Casting
Demography of Actors
Some advertisements depict actors or models that might be shown endorsing and/or using the advertised product or are simply shown in the presence of the product. The population of characters in an advertisement can vary in number and in terms of their demographic
attributes. Some of these factors have been found through consumer research to mediate consumers’ responses to advertisements. In some instances, the research evidence is based on direct reactions to commercial messages and in other cases the evidence derives from self-reported data about exposure to advertising and specific measured reactions. Evidence has emerged that the number of on-screen characters is negatively linked to intention to purchase and advertised product (Stewart & Furse, 1985).

The gender of a source in an advertisement has also been found to have a significant association with intention to purchase across a range of product types. One finding indicated that having a male principal character weakened intention to purchase (Stewart & Furse, 1985). Much of the work concerned with the way the genders are used in advertising has examined broader issues such as the use of sex to sell. According to some commentators and investigators, women were for many years used in subordinate roles in advertisements, often as little more than decoration (Courtney & Whipple, 1983; Lovdal, 1989). Men were much less likely to be used in this way (Rak & McMullen, 1987; Sullivan & O’Connor, 1988). The selection of women was based on their physical attractiveness rather than any kind of expertise of relevance they might have in respect to products being advertised (Chaiken, 1979). Although psychological literature has shown that attractive people are rated as more desirable (e.g., Debevec, Madden & Kernan, 1986), the impact of physically attractive actors or models on consumer purchase decisions is far from clear (Joseph, 1982).

Whether the attractiveness of the actors – female or male – does make a difference to consumers’ reactions to the advertised product or brand seems also to depend upon whether such role models are deemed to be the most appropriate endorsers or demonstrators of that product type. If there is perceived to be a good fit between the type of actor being used and nature of the product, then this can increase the source credibility of the advertisement. If this fit is perceived to be incongruent, attitudes towards the advertisement can suffer (Richmond & Hartman, 1982; Tinkham & Reid, 1988).

There is evidence, nonetheless, that the presence of an attractive female model can influence the way consumers respond to the advertising in a positive way (Smith & Engel, 1968). Consumers’ attention to the advertisements is enhanced and better advertisement and brand recognition can follow (Chestnut, La-Chance & Lubitz, 1977; Reif & Soley, 1981).
The ethnicity of actors in advertisements can be important as well. This can also interact with socio-economic class of consumers. Thus, among middle class consumers, a shared ethnicity between consumers and actors in an advertisement can enhance positive attitudes to the advertisement. Among working-class blacks and whites, however, white actors are preferred (Qualls & Moore, 1990). The potency of ethnicity in advertising and its impact upon black consumers, however, can vary with the strength of ethnic identity. Black American teenagers were more likely to identify with black actors in advertisements when there personal ethnic identity was strong than when it was weak. Evidence also emerged that even white adolescents found advertisements with black characters appealing (Appiah, 2001).

More generally, wider reviews of research evidence concerning the effects of actor’s race on consumers’ responses to advertising have indicated that consumers of different ethnicity react differently to the use of black and white actors in promotional campaigns. One review of 14 relevant studies concluded that although white consumers in the United States did not react in any strongly negative fashion to black product endorsers or users in advertisements, they tended to prefer the use of white actors. Furthermore, black consumers exhibited more positive attitudes towards and better recall from advertisements that featured black actors (Whittler, 1991).

The pre-existing racial attitudes of consumers represent one factor can mediate their responses to black or white actors in advertisements. White consumers who revealed some degree of racial prejudice in their attitudes towards blacks were more likely than those with more balanced attitudes to make references to racially descriptive features when giving their opinions about advertisements with black actors. There was no indication, however, that these differences in the aspects of advertisements referred to by consumers also influenced their acceptance of promotional message claims (Whittler, 1989).

Attractiveness and Expertise
The persuasiveness of messages can be enhanced by using sources that are perceived by audiences as attractive and as having relevant expertise. These factors can become especially important when the personal relevance of a persuasive message for members of its audience is low (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984). A source regarded as a high in expertise can produce more persuasion than sources of low expertise (Petty, Cacioppo & Goldman, 1981).
Use of experts such as doctors, lawyers, and so on can elicit consumer responses, especially in regard to the perceived credibility of a brand. Since such endorsers may have source credibility, this feature can enhance the degree to which consumers trust the message (Ohanian, 1990; Erdogan, 1999). Endorser expertise also applies to celebrity effectiveness. If the celebrity is perceived to have relevant experience or expertise, this can enhance their credibility as a brand information source (Till & Busler, 2000).

The effectiveness of an expert source can also depend upon the strength of arguments being put forward in favour of a specific case. A source that has high relevant expertise and who puts forward a strong argument will be very persuasive. An equally highly regarded expert who puts forward a weak argument could produce no persuasion (Heesacker, Petty & Cacioppo, 1983).

Advertising messages are designed primarily to provide information about products from which consumers can take personal decisions about which products to purchase and consume. Part of the content of any advertisements is therefore devoted to the provision of product-related details. This information can take different forms. Some information may describe what is distinctive about the advertised brand, while other information may provide facts about the way the product should be used, the benefits it will bring, the reasons for choosing it over others, and, where relevant, advice about risks associated with the product or its wrongful use.

Branding
Advertisements are concerned with defining and establishing brand images for particular products. Thus, commercial messages contain features that are designed to differentiate specific brands from others in the same product range. This objective might be achieved by presenting specific characteristics of a brand (brand differentiating message) and by making direct comparisons with competing brands. Both of these features have been found to be linked positively to ad and brand recall (Stewart & Furse, 1985). The brand images can be further reinforced by repeat mentions of it within an advertisement and by repeatedly showing it in camera shot (in the case of television and cinema advertising). The latter two variables have also been found to enhance brand recall (Stewart & Furse, 1985).
Brand message attributes can produce shifts in brain wave patterns (Alwitt, 1985). These features of advertising include: audio mentions of brand name; specific product or brand-related verbal information outside the core narrative flow; visual shots of the brand in use; visual shots of product or brand, such as package shots; and presentation of specific information about the brand.

**Product Information Content**
Advertisements sometimes provide information about specific product attributes and make appeals on behalf of the product. This product information is distinguished from brand information in that it is generic to the product type rather than to the particular branded version being advertised. Although it can be important for consumers to know about these product characteristics, advertisers always run a risk of cognitive overload where they present too much information within a single commercial message (Ait El Houssi, Morel & Hultink, 2005).

One body of advertising-related research has accumulated over more than 30 years that has considered the impact of product-related appeals on consumers. It has already been noted that the significance of advertising attributes in shaping the attitudes and behaviours of consumers towards products can be mediated by consumers’ product-related motivations and experiences. The latter factors can also be linked in turn with the length of time that a product has been in circulation and available to consumers. This factor has been termed ‘market age’. When products are new to markets, consumers lack knowledge about them. As such they seek information that will reduce their ignorance and also perceptions of risks that might be associated with purchase of the product. Under such conditions, consumers are motivated to process product information and seek that information from product advertisements. With products that have been in the marketplace for some time, consumers may have gained familiarity. They are therefore less motivated to process product-related information where that information is already known to them (Grunert, 1996).

It is not difficult to see how this reasoning about product information processing also has some similarities to the notions of central versus peripheral processing of advertising. In that context, it is reasoned that involved consumers focus on product-related arguments (central processing) and less involved consumers focus instead on presentational factors that provide
more window-dressing than substantive reasons for purchase and consumption (peripheral processing).

A number of different types of product appeal have been used in advertisements. These appeals can be differentiated according to factors such as [1] appeal mode; [2] appeal prominence; [3] appeal frame; and [4] appeal source. Appeal mode variables include arguments for the product and emotional appeals. Appeal prominence identifies the degree of prominence given to product-related attributes. Appeal frame define the degree to which an advertisements uses positive and negative tones in framing arguments about a product. Appeal source was operationally defined in terms of use of expert sources.

**Appeal Mode**

How important are arguments compared to emotional appeals in advertising? There is conflicting evidence about the role played by these factors. There is evidence that emotions have more impact than arguments (Friestad & Thorson, 1986; Edwards, 1990; Edwards & von Hippel, 1995). There is other evidence that arguments work better (Golden & Johnson, 1983; Millar & Millar, 1990). Neither of these two positions may be entirely correct. Other evidence has indicated that arguments and emotional appeals both have their place, but there effectiveness depends upon the context in which they are deployed (Petty & Wegener, 1998; Stayman & Aaker, 1988).

Essentially, in situations in which consumers lack knowledge about and familiarity with products, product-related arguments should provide valuable information to help with decision making about purchase and consumption. In contrast, with products with which consumers have a great deal of familiarity, arguments in favour of the product may cause irritation and are seen as an unnecessary nuisance. The latter reaction should be more frequently occurring in older markets. Chandy et al found evidence in support of these positions.

**Appeal Prominence**

Faced with new campaigns consumers may not only seek risk-alleviating information but also need more time to process it. Hence, essential information needs to be presented for longer (in the case of TV, cinema and radio adverts) or more boldly (in the case of printed adverts). The more prominent is the key information about the product the more likely it is to be perceived and encoded (Stewart & Furse, 1986). More prominent attributes are processed
more deeply and attract more of the consumer’s attention (Gardner, 1983). This emphasis can enhance recall of advertising attributes. There is further evidence that the prominence of specific appeals in advertisements can not only enhance information recall but is also linked to persuasiveness (Stewart & Furse, 1986).

**Appeal Frame**

Advertisements often present information about the benefits of a product. However, this information can be presented in different ways. One aspect of this is the way the information is ‘framed’. For instance, the consumer can be told that this product will bring direct benefits. Alternatively, he or she might be told that choosing this product may offset some negative outcome. In the context of formula advertising, a positive frame might tell the consumer that the product will provide nutritional value.

Chandy, Tellis, MacInnis and Thaivanich (2000) examined the four categories of executional factors in advertising outlined above and their impact on consumer behaviour. They were able to assess consumers’ responses to advertisements via consumer panels located across different regional markets in the United States that received exposure to advertisements and were then tested for their reactions to these promotional messages.

Evidence emerged from this study that argument-based advertisements were more effective in younger markets than in older markets. Thus, when a product or a brand is new, consumers seek out information about it so that they can make their own evaluations. Thus, arguments that support use of the product in the advertisement will draw their attention. With longer established products or brands (that is, ‘older’ markets), with which consumers are already familiar, pro-product arguments are less relevant because they will probably have heard these all before. Instead, emotional appeals become more important in campaigns for older products and brands, and this hypothesis was supported by their findings.

It is also important with new products/brands that supporting arguments are visibly present for longer durations so that consumers have the opportunity to process them. This prominence factor is less significant with older products/brands with which consumers are very familiar. The types of arguments being considered here are ones that make comparisons with other brands/products, emphasize the unique properties of the advertised brand/product and refute any negative claims made about it. Emotional appeals used in this research made reference to feelings such as love, pride, guilt and fear.
The same study provided further evidence that the framing of arguments about the advertised brand/product is important. Negative framing was found to be more effective than positive framing with newer brands/products, while the reverse was true of older brands/products. Thus, focusing on the downside on not consuming a product had a greater impact among consumers who had little previous familiarity with it. It was not enough simply to tell consumers how good the product was when promoting something new to them. In contrast, with established products or brands, focusing on their beneficial aspects worked far better. The impact of new brands or products can be further enhanced through the use of expert endorsers. Thus, it is clear that the efficacy of specific product-related appeals is mediated by whether the advertised commodity is new or old.

A variety of different types of product-related information can be provided by advertisements. This information may describe special features or attributes of a product, provide insights into its functionality and ease of use, indicate its key ingredients, as well as articulating why it is particularly beneficial for users.

New Product Features
Research into advertising attributes and consumer reactions has indicated that information on new product features has a positive link to the persuasiveness of a commercial message. In contrast, information about a product’s components or ingredients can have the opposite effect (Stewart & Furse, 1985).

Convenience of Use
Information on convenience of use has been linked to better recall of the advertised product, but does not necessarily render the advertising message more persuasive (Stewart & Furse, 1985).

Technical Information
Research into comprehension of health information has indicated that use of medical or technical terms may cause confusion among many consumers, especially those with relatively poor literacy skills (Baker, Williams, Parker & Nurss, 1996; Mayeaux, Murphy, Arnold, Davis, Jackson, & Sentell, 1996). Information on nutritional and health-related aspects of a product has been found to have an uncertain influence over recall of the advertisement, and does not seem to make the advertising more persuasive (Stewart & Furse, 1985)
Benefits and Risks

Information can talk about the benefits of products and in some cases, the risks associated with their use. Risk-related information has some relevance in the context of formula advertising because there are recommended practices for the use of such products. Inappropriate use carries certain health risks for infants. A consensus view has emerged from research on product-related risks that consumers should be fully informed of what these are and also of the consequences that can flow from product misuse (Callan & Gwynne, 1993; Woghalter, Allison & McKenna, 1989; Wogalter, Godfrey, Fontanelle, Desaulnier, Rothstein & Laughery, 1987).

The impact of risk-related information on consumers can be mediated by presentational factors. It has been found that risk information is taken more seriously by consumers when presented in one continuous sequence in an advertisement rather than integrated in amongst other aspects of the message (Morris, Brinberg, Klimberg, Millstein, & Rivera, 1986).

A number of rules of thumb have been drawn up from research into the presentation of product risk information. The key recommended elements in terms of information presentation are [1] to use a signal word to attract the consumer’s attention; [2] a hazard statement that describes the nature of the risk; [3] a consequence statement that tells what might happen if the warning information is not heeded, and [4] an instruction statement that advises consumers on how to avoid the consequences (see Braun & Silver, 1991; Drake, Conzola & Wogalter, 1998; Wogalter & Silver, 1995).

Arguments and Counter-arguments

Much product-related information takes the form of arguments and counter-arguments about the product and its use and usefulness. The presence of these arguments may carry little weight with consumers who display only light involvement in the product or in an advertisement for it, but they can enhance brand credibility among highly involved consumers (Gardner, Mitchell & Russo, 1985).

Additional Information.

In some advertising, additional information is provided associated with products, for example links to web sites, toll-free numbers or availability of other printed informational material. This information can be integrated within the main body of advertising text or set aside from
it. This type of information is often poorly recalled by consumers and needs to be highlighted to stand any chance of being apprehended by them (Kaiser Family Foundation, 2001).

Product Demonstrations. In addition to verbal information about a product, advertisements sometimes display demonstrations of product use and demonstrations of the results of using a product. In both cases, there is some empirical evidence that these features can enhance ad recall (Stewart & Furse, 1985).

Consumer Orientation and Message Factors. The impact of information about the product or brand can also be mediated by the level of consumer involvement in the advertisement and the advertised commodity. Certain types of product-related or brand-related information, such as comparisons between the advertised brand and other brands, can enhance the effectiveness of the advertisements provided consumers are in an analytical mode. This means that if the product has significance for consumers they will therefore seek information about how beneficial it is or how well it stands up against others in the marketplace they will be more attuned to more detailed information about the product (Thompson & Hamilton, 2006).

Thematic Content
In addition to the presentation of specific propositional information about brands and about product types, advertisements use other verbal features to create an atmosphere, mood or theme. Such features can affect the way consumers respond to advertisements. Such features tend to focus on triggering emotional responses in consumers, though such reactions might also feed through into behavioural responses.

Humour. One thematic attribute that has been applied across many product types is the use of humour. Humour can render advertising both more enjoyable and more memorable. Research has indicated that humour in advertising can enhance how effectively consumers can recall commercial messages (Stewart & Furse, 1985; Stewart-Hunter, 1985). Moments when humour is present can also produce brain wave pattern shifts (Alwitt, 1985). Humour in advertising significantly enhances attitude towards the advertisement, attention to the ad and creates a positive mood state. There is no evidence that humour enhances attitudes towards the advertiser. Humour can reduce source credibility, but can promote intention to purchase the advertised brand (Eisend, 2008).
Humorous promotions have been found to enhance event attendance. In a field study that manipulated the presence versus absence of humour in direct mail flyers that were distributed to households to promote two events (a social event and a business event), attendance in each case was greater among people who had received the promotional leaflets with humour (Scott, Klein & Bryant, 1990).

_Cute or Adorable Tones._ Another thematic feature designed to trigger an appropriate emotional response is use of cute or adorable tones in advertisements. This can be achieved through verbal content supported by non-verbal content, such as images or video sequences that depict warm emotions. Such features can enhance recall of commercials (Stewart & Furse, 1985).

_Social Warmth._ Another positive emotion-triggering attribute that exudes a sense of warmth is the use of themes of family, friendship or romance. When used appropriately such attributes can increase product/brand purchase likelihood (Aaker, Stayman & Hagerty, 1986). Warmth can also be displayed through scenes that depict people laughing or openly showing that they are happy. Again, these features, when used appropriately, can enhance purchase likelihood (Aaker et al., 1986).

_Fantasy or Surreal Themes._ The use of a fantasy or surreal format, for example, was found to have a positive link to consumers’ recall of ads (Stewart & Furse, 1985).

[3] **Channel and Format Factors**

Channel factors included the use of various presentational techniques in visual or audio or textual modalities. These are surface-level features that define the way the content of an advertisement is presented to consumers. For convenience here, these attributes are divided into [1] Audio-Visual Production Techniques and [2] Narrative Factors. The former comprise non-verbal attributes and the latter verbal attributes of advertisements. These features can cut across different media in which advertising can occur, e.g., television, cinema, radio, internet, newspapers/magazines, posters, direct mail, retail promotions.
Audio-Visual Production Techniques

Audio-visual production techniques are those commonly associated with television, cinematic and audio productions. They can also sometimes apply, however, to printed matter. They are primarily non-verbal in nature.

Pictorial Background

Advertisements in all media, except radio, can contain picture elements. Pictures can have important effects on memory for informational communications both in commercial and non-commercial contexts. Pictures can convey information and create impressions that evoke emotional responses in media consumers. Pictures can sometimes outweigh narrative content in terms of capturing the audience’s attention. It is therefore essential that pictures convey meanings that are integral to the overall purpose of the message (Stewart & Furse, 1985). The use of graphic displays in television advertisements have been found to have possible positive effects on recall of the advertisement (Stewart & Furse, 1985). In all these instances, consumer impact was measured using verbal responses.

Visual Pace

Other research has shown that liking for televised advertisements can be enhanced if the advertisements adopt a faster pace. This is usually determined by the rate of scene changes within the ad (Biel & Bridgwater, 1990). This production feature has been linked to how much advertisements are liked by consumers.

Cuts, Close-ups and Zoom

Some researchers have found that non-verbal responses can be elicited by specific format features in advertisements linked to camera-work. Physical attributes of advertising have been identified that can produce changed brain wave patterns in consumers at the moment of exposure to television advertisements (Alwitt, 1985). These included: (1) cuts or dissolves between scenes; (2) camera shot zooms in or out; and (3) close-up visual shots relative to other shots in the advertisement. All these features triggered brain wave pattern shifts in consumers who were monitored continually while watching televised advertisements.

On-screen Endorsement

Another variable that has been found to generate brain wave reactions in consumers is a visual of a speaker seen on screen talking about the brand. These features generate brain
wave pattern responses that might represent orienting or attention-related responses. However, the evidence remains unclear about how to interpret psychological reactions from such physiological measures (see Alwitt, 1985).

Music
Music is commonly used in advertisements at the cinema and on television and radio. It is possibly the most heavily studied executional variable in advertising (Yalch, 1991). Music can attract the attention of viewers and create a mood state that can, when used effectively, enhance the impact of advertising at a number of different levels of psychological processing. The presence of music in ads has been found to elicit shifts in brain wave patterns (Alwitt, 1985), although, again, the psychological interpretation of what that response meant was not provided. Elsewhere, however, verbal responses have been used to determine the nature of the impact of music in advertising on consumers. An important review of experimental research evidence on the effects of music in advertisements on consumer’s responses has been published by Allan (2007).

Music can promote positive attitudes towards an advertisement (Morris & Boone, 1998; North et al., 2004; Shen et al., 2006) and towards the advertised brand (Allen & Madden, 1985; Gorn, 1982; Kellaris & Rice, 1993; Park & Young, 1986; Pitt & Abratt, 1988). Music has also been found to enhance brand recall (Brooker & Wheatley, 1994; MacInnis & Park, 1991; Olsen, 1995; Roehm, 2001). Up tempo music can affect the mood of the advertisements and trigger positive emotional reactions in consumers (Kellaris & Rice, 1993; Kellaris & Kent, 1994). There is further evidence that purchase intention can be mediated by the mood created by music in an advertisement (Alpert et al., 2005; Kellaris & Kent, 1991; Morris & Boone, 1998).

Whether the right kinds of choices of music are made for particular advertisements is important to the impact of advertisement on the consumer. Music can grab the consumer’s attention (Park & Young, 1986). Whether or not brand recall is improved as a result depends on whether the music makes a good fit with the product being promoted. Choosing the right kind of behaviour (e.g., music from the same culture as the setting in which the product is being advertised) can enhance brand recall, while making the wrong choices can impede recall (North & Hargreaves, 1997; Shen & Chen, 2006).
The impact of music in an advertisement can also be mediated by the degree to which consumers are involved in the commercial message. For instance, the use of popular music in a shampoo advertisement enhanced attitudes toward the brand among consumers with low involvement, but not among those who were highly involved in the advertisement (Park & Young, 1986).

**Narrative Factors**

From evidence reviewed earlier, it has already been established that information factors can mediate consumers’ responses to advertisements. A lot of the information contained within advertisements is carried by narrative content which is either written or spoken. While the deeper meanings conveyed by this content can have important effects on the way consumers react to ads, there is another level at which the narrative component’s influences become manifest. The physical features of the narrative and the use of specific linguistic techniques can influence how consumers respond. The influences of these features have been detected via verbal and non-verbal response measures among consumers.

**Physical Typographic Effects**

Studies have shown how linguistic factors can influence memory for advertising. An advertisement’s memorability and, ultimately, its potential to influence attitudes rests on linguistic factors, including the typeface in which the information is presented as well as the individual’s familiarity with its semantic features and syntactic complexity (Wyer, 2002). Other research on typography has shown that it can affect consumers’ ability to process brand information. Furthermore, different typographic features can interact with each other to influence consumer’s processing of brand information from an advertisement (McCarthy & Motherbaugh, 2002).

**Text Legibility and Readability**

Readability refers to the ease with which readers can read and understand text. Legibility refers to their ability visibly to distinguish text features, such as letters and words. Legibility underpins readability in part but is not the whole story. If a text is poor in terms of legibility, it will also be poor in terms of readability (Erdmann & Neal, 1968).
There are various factors that affect the legibility and then, in turn, the readability of text in printed and electronic advertising. Text consists of words that are generally presented in one or both of two cases, upper case and lower case. These tend to be set in a single font (or type face). Type faces can vary in size, usually measured as ‘points.’ One point is 1/72 of an inch. Type faces can also be emboldened to make them look blacker or more intense (see Table A2.1 below). There are other aspects of letters that include x-height, ascenders, descenders, counter forms, and serifs (or lack of serif – ‘sans serif’). The x-height refers to the height of the body of a lower case letter. This measure is important because it affects the visual impression of letters (Craig, 1980).

Table A2.1. Text Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lower case</th>
<th>UPPER CASE</th>
<th>Sentence Case {only first letter is capitalised}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-point</td>
<td>20-point</td>
<td>36 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Font - Times New Roman  
Font – Arial  
Font – Courier New  
**Bold**  
Light  
*Italic*  
Sans serif  
Serif

For text to be readable it must be sufficiently visible to make a visual impression and then subsequently to be identified within the context of a word. Thus, type must be presented that is of sufficient size, given the setting in which it is usually likely to be read (i.e., the average reading distance). However, type size alone is not the only determinant of readability. Research has shown that other attributes, such as case, font, colour and intensity can make a
difference as well. Thus, type faces that are the same size can vary in their readability depending upon other characteristics.

Case and Size Effects
The visibility of text, regardless of the medium in which it occurs, is influenced in the first place by text size. For a typeface to be legible, the reader must be able to see it. This is true of text on the printed page, on a billboard, on the TV screen or on a computer screen. With small-sized text, other factors come into play such as case and font. The latter factors determine letter shape and the ease with which letters can be identified correctly. Text size is measured in points and on screen also in pixels. Reference is also made to x-height which is the height of the main body of the letter, ignoring ascenders or descenders. The presence of an ascender enables readers to distinguish between, for example, the letter ‘n’ and letter ‘h’. These size-related factors can work in different ways in terms of their impact of text legibility. Small x-heights, for instance, might increase the amount of white space between lines and render each line more clearly distinguishable from the ones above and below it (Gurtler & Mengelt, 1985). It has been reported, however, that typefaces with large x-heights can cause greater confusion about word shapes and produce slower reading rates (Binns, 1989). Even so, the balance of evidence indicates that larger x-heights create greater legibility (Spencer, Reynolds & Coe, 1977).

There is evidence that larger font sizes, as measured in ‘points’ are preferred though are not necessarily found to produce greater ease of reading text on a computer screen by older adults (Bernard, Liao & Mills, 2001; Morrell & Echt, 1997). In other research with older adults (median age 70 years), 14-point size yielded greater legibility than 12-point size for text read from a computer screen (Bernard, Liao, Chaparro & Chaparro, 2001). Greater reported ease of readability of the larger text, however, was registered only among older men and not among older women. There was also a general tendency for letters to be seen as sharper in focus at the larger text size, with this tendency being especially pronounced again among older men (Bernard et al., 2001).

The use of upper-case or lower-case has been found to make a difference to text legibility and readability. While upper case letters are more legible than lower-case letters when presented one at a time, lower-case text has been found to be more readable than upper-case text (Tinker, 1963). Thus, upper-case lettering is less effective when used in extended passages of
text. Combining upper-case and lower-case can enhance word form recognition and hence also facilitate ease of reading (Tinker, 1963). Elsewhere evidence has emerged that lower case text can be read more quickly than upper case text (Wesson & Stewart, 1987).

Font Effects
Type and size of font have been found to be related to text readability. These can affect the ability of readers to distinguish letters and words. This in turn can affect reading speed. There is a family of font characteristics that includes stroke width, x-height, and serif versus sans serif styles. Legibility can be enhanced by the text being bolder and more prominent, which can be influenced by the thickness of lettering (stroke width) and by the height of the main body of the letter (x-height). However, the significance of font characteristics depends upon whether the letters in a text are above or below the visibility threshold for readers, given the conditions under which reading takes place (Tinker, 1944).

Larger type size is more legible and the use of bold can also accentuate the orienting of attention to the highlighted type face. These factors also interact with colour contrast effects, however, that can both further enhance or counter-act their effects. The presence or absence of serifs (terminal strokes at the end of main strokes in letters) can also mediate legibility of text. The difficulty in studying font characteristics stems from the variety of factors that define fonts. It can be a complex undertaking to manipulate specific font features (serifs, stroke width, letter height and width) while holding others constant.

The evidence on serif versus sans serif effects is equivocal. It should also be noted that the importance of serifs to legibility and readability has been investigated by researchers working mainly outside the context of advertising. Some researchers have found that sans serif fonts are more readable than serif fonts (Craig, 1980; McLean, 1980, Wright, Warner, Winter & Ziegler, 1977; Yager, Aquilante & Plass, 1998) or that sans serif fonts are preferred by readers (Krulée & Novy, 1986, Sanocki, 1988). Other evidence has indicated that sans serif fonts enhance readability (see Bix, 2002; Nonprescription Drug Manufacturers Association, 1991). Preferences for serifs over sans serifs can also depend upon letter size, with serifs being preferred with larger letter sizes, but sans serifs being liked better with small letter sizes (Jha & Daftuar, 1981).
Stroke width has also been found to influence legibility (Kruelee & Novy, 1986; Yager et al., 1998). This variable represents the thickness of the strokes that comprise the letter. Some fonts have a uniform stroke width throughout all letters, while with other fonts, stroke widths can vary between letters and within the same letters. Thus, some fonts are bolder than others.

Letter height is another factor than can affect the visibility of letters in text. The key measure used here is the ‘x-height’ which is the height of the lower case letters of a font. This is different from the point size. Two fonts may exhibit different x-heights at the same point size. This is true of Times New Roman and Arial. The latter has higher x-heights than the former at different point size levels.

The visibility of text also depends upon the quality of letter resolution. This factor can vary between printed and screen presentations. This can also mean that while text with specific font characteristics may be rendered more legible in print, the same effects may not follow those font attributes when used with screen text presentations.

The legibility of letters by letter case can also vary depending upon whether letters are presented singly or joined together in strings of text. For instance, upper-case letters have been found to be more legible than lower-case when presented one at a time. However, lower case text is more legible and more readable than upper case in the context of extended passages of prose (Tinker, 1963).

Woods, Davis and Scharff (2005) examined the effects of typeface and font size on text legibility with children. In a letter recognition task, the sans serif font Arial performed better than the serif font Times New Roman. Under conditions in which exposure times are limited, sans serif fonts, which have no additional stroke features, seem to be more straightforward to process. They create less ‘noise’ around the core features of letters and hence become more immediately identifiable.

Text font has been found to mediate readers’ emotional responses to a text. Juni and Gross (2008) presented satirical readings from the New York Times to university students. Some readers received the texts of Times Roman and others in Arial. Afterwards, the texts were rated as both funnier and angrier by readers who received them in Times Roman compared with Arial. The authors claimed that the emotions experienced by readers in the Times
Roman condition were consistent with the intentions of these satirical commentaries. It was also suggested that the findings could have important implications for advertisers.

**Colour Contrast Effects.**

It is important to select the appropriate combinations of text and background colour to preserve high levels of legibility and readability. In the context of advertising, colour has been observed to bring certain benefits over black-and-white presentations in terms of maintaining consumer’s interest in familiar brands, though does not necessarily work better in terms of arousing interest in brands (Warner & Franzen, 1947). Colour should be used with care in advertising because indiscriminate use of it could adversely affect text legibility and readability (Schindler, 1986).

Some colours, such as reds and green, can generate strong after-images. Some colour combinations may also result in the ‘bleeding’ of colours reducing text legibility (Allan, Shepard, Collins & MacQueen, 1989). It is important to avoid highly saturated colours such as blues and violets where it is crucial for text messages to be clearly readable (Travis, Bowles, Seton & Peppe, 1990). When using coloured text and background, it is recommended that there should be high chromatic contrast to enhance attractiveness and readability (Legge, Parish, Luebker & Wurm, 1990). Selecting the right colour combinations for text and background is important to the legibility and readability of text on the printed page and in a newer medium such as web sites (Erdogan, 2008).

In the context of text legibility and readability some colour foreground/background combinations attain high contrast index scores than others. The best combinations are: black on yellow, black on white, yellow on black, white on black, blue on white, white on blue. The worst combinations are: brown on white, white on brown, brown on yellow, yellow on brown, red on white, white on red, red on yellow and yellow on red (Thielen, 2008; see Table A2.2). There is evidence, however, that some people prefer unusual colour combinations despite their effects on text readability (Pastoor, 1990). While much of this evidence has derived from studies of printed text, evidence has also emerged that specific colour pairings work better than others with text presented on web sites and read on a screen. Web pages that used dark text on a light ground were found to be more legible in general, although specific dark-light colour pairings worked well even with light on dark arrangements. The most preferred and most legible combinations were black text on a white background, then white
text on a background, then blue text on a white background, yellow text on a background and blue text on a yellow background. The least preferred and legible combinations were green text on a red background, red text on a blue background, green text on a red background and red text on a blue background (Erdogan, 2008).

### Table A2.2 Text Readability - Colour-Contrast Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Character Colour</th>
<th>Background Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Textual features can interact with information factors to affect the overall impact of an advertisement. It is important for visual content to support or at least not to distract attention from or upset comprehension of audio-verbal information about risks (Reeves, 1998). In any audio-visual presentation, for example, if essential information is contained in the narrative and image or visual content presented alongside it does not provide relevant informational support, recall of the narrative content can be impeded (see Gunter, 1987). Risk information, for example, can be highlighted by the use of specific production techniques such as use of a different speaker, a change in tone or volume in audio-visual advertisements or other attention-grabbing methods such as text size, font or colour in print advertisements (Kaphingst, Dejong, Rudd, & Daltroy, 2004).
**Other Text Formatting Factors**

A range of additional physical presentation and organisation of text (and supporting image) features have been observed to influence the ease with which readers can recognise and absorb meaning from texts. These factors can influence information processing from texts shown on the printed page and on an electronic (television or computer) screen.

Text can be most easily read if it presented with optimal degrees of spacing between lines of text. Lines that are too closely spaced not only look aesthetically displeasing but also render information difficult to apprehend because a disproportionate amount of cognitive effort is expended in visibly identifying words and separating out lines of text. Equally, excessive white space between lines can also impair reading speed because the sequential flow of reading is disrupted (see Table A2.3) (Hartley, 1980).

**Table A2.3. Line Spacing**

| Reading speed can be undermined by line spacing that uses excessive amounts of white space between lines. This can affect readability and understanding of text information. Equally, when the amount of white space between lines is too small, this can also adversely affect information processing because the lines can become blurred and the reader then spends a lot of effort differentiating between the lines and this reduces the cognitive resources devoted to the processing of meaning from the text. |

Text can be superimposed over pictures as well as over a blank background. Such superimposed text has been found to trigger brain wave responses (Alwitt, 1985). The presence of these features has also been linked to ad recall (Stewart & Furse, 1985). Studies of legibility and readability, however, have found that the impact of superimposed text can be enhanced by boxing it in and also by drawing in the reader’s attention through the use of bold and underlined headings (see Table A2.4) (Fowler & Barker, 1974; Hartley Bartlett & Branthwaite, 1980).
Narrative Linguistic Complexity
While the physical features of text can influence its legibility and through that also its readability, there are other deeper-seated linguistic factors connected to consumer’s understanding of the rules of language and meanings of words and phrases that can also affect their uptake of information from advertisements and then, in turn, any impact the advertising might have on their attitudes and behaviours. There is research evidence to show that linguistic factors can influence memory for advertising. An advertisement’s potential to influence attitudes and behaviour rests on these linguistic factors, including the individual’s familiarity with its semantic features and syntactic complexity (Wyer, 2002).

Use of Analogies
These features can enhance consumer perceptions of product benefits with new products but may be offset by other product attribute information if the latter creates cognitive overload for consumers (Ait El Houssi, Morel & Hultink, 2005).

Rhetoric and Resonance.
The use of word play in advertisements can render them more memorable. This technique often works via the juxtaposition of key phrases and pictures that resonate together in the meanings they convey. This technique begins with the appropriation of a well-known phrase that is used in an unusual commercial context, but in such a way that resonates with attributes of the advertised product (McQuarrie, 1989). One example from the United States was for a cigarette brand called Buck’s which showed a picture of a stag and used the headline “Herd of These?” Another advertisement for ski boots showed a picture of boots in the snow with the headline “It’s Haute as Hell in Aspen.” Resonant headlines have been found to render magazine advertisements more memorable, the resonant headlines better recalled and the brands seen in a more positive light (McQuarrie & Mick, 1992).
Some researchers have tested the use of visually displayed metaphorical devices in advertisements on consumers’ responses. Metaphorical images have been compared with literal images that depict the product and its use in a realistic fashion. The use of metaphorical images was found to enhance the persuasiveness of the promotional message (Jeong, 2008).

**Text Complexity**

The readability of text can be influenced by the linguistic complexity of the text. This can be defined in terms of the types of words used and how complex, technical and familiar they are to readers. It is also defined in terms of the syntactic complexity of sentences (i.e., whether they are short or long). A text in general can also be rendered less readable if it is information dense and contains many new concepts. Much of the research on this topic has derived from the education field. There have, however, been a few advertising-related studies.

The readability of a text determines how easy it is for a reader to understand. With some texts, readers must display enhanced linguistic ability to comprehend its meaning. With other texts, this may not be necessary. As well as the challenge posed to linguistic ability, the complexity of a text can affect the motivation of a reader to try to understand the messages a text conveys. Reader motivation is also important to text comprehension and might even offset ability deficiencies.

There are other important implications of text complexity to message assimilation that apply with particular acuity in the context of advertising. The more difficult a passage of text is to understand, the greater are the cognitive resources the reader must devote to interpretation of text meaning. As cognitive resources are finite, this could mean that resources are reduced elsewhere, for example, in relation to the storage of the information content of the text in memory (Daneman & Carpenter, 1983).

For instance, complicated words with which readers are unfamiliar could attract significant attention and command a disproportionate cognitive processing resource, hence diminishing the information processing resource available for other parts of the text. If readers have low linguistic ability, this problem can become even more serious. (Just & Carpenter, 1992). It has been observed that readers who show poor memory and comprehension of texts often
have devoted far too much cognitive capacity to simply trying to understand technical terms (Daneman & Carpenter, 1983).

There have been some studies that have investigated readability within advertising. Typically, this research – which in total comprises a fairly small body of work – has adopted the methods of experimental psychology and constructed interventionist studies in which specific linguistic features of texts were systematically manipulated by the researchers. One such investigation manipulated active versus passive voice and the positioning of adverbs in key sentences. In this case, an important qualifying adverb was placed either just before the verb or at the end of the sentence (Bradley & Meeds, 2002).

In this research high linguistic complexity was defined by the use of the passive voice and unusual positioning of the adverb. Low linguistic complexity was defined by the use of the active voice and usual positioning of the adverb. There were two conditions of moderate complexity defined by the two remaining combinations of these features. The findings showed that moderate levels of complexity worked best in terms of readability, with high complexity being worst and low complexity being better than high, but not as good as moderate complexity. This study, however, did not manipulate readers’ motivation which is also known to be important in this context.

In another study, Lowrey (1998) studied the effects of syntactic complexity and strength of arguments made about the brand on memory for ad details and brand attitudes following exposure to advertising. The use of simple syntax enhanced brand recognition, but not attitude to the brand. Strength of arguments further enhanced cognitive responses to the ad, but only in the case of ads using text with simple syntax. Lowrey argued that some text complexity is needed to motivate readers. Excessive complexity, however, can overdo it and reduce information storage from an advertisement. Syntactic complexity apparently can trigger motivation which in turn enhances the impact of strong arguments on attitudes to the brand. This effect is also especially likely among highly involved consumers.

Chebat, Gelinas-Chebat, Hombourger and Woodisde (2003) examined high versus low text readability, strong versus weak arguments for the brand and high versus low consumer involvement in a study with engineering students. They found that high readability enhanced processing of advertisement information in the presence of strong arguments, but not weak
arguments. High readability also seemed to benefit consumers who exhibited low involvement in the advertising.

High readability combined with strong arguments enhanced attitudes towards the advertisement and the brand. High readability did not have this effect if arguments were weak. The same combination of factors also enhanced behavioural intention towards the brand. High readability enhanced attitudes under low involvement but not under high involvement. Strong arguments also enhanced attitudes better under high than low involvement.

[4] Receiver Factors
These are factors that are designed to trigger consumer identification with an advertisement and with the brand being advertised. This response has been measured in different ways and can be evoked through a number of attributes or features within advertisements. Some of the factors subsumed under this heading are also relevant under the Source Factors heading. Under that heading, however, their significance in the context of consumer response to advertising is found in relation to the role they play in enhancing the credibility of the brand and the authority and believability of the message. Under the current heading, some of these same factors play a part in drawing in consumers such that they identify with the advertisement, the advertised brand and perceive it as having relevance to their own lives and needs. The key variables in this context are:

- The nature of actors seen using or demonstrating products, e.g., demographic characteristics
- The use of celebrity endorsers
- The use of expert endorsers
- Scenarios in which actors appear to be in a relationship
- Physical displays of affection or emotion

Nature of Actors
The types of actors or sources that are presented in advertisements as product users or endorsers represent features that can influence the degree to which consumers identify with scenarios within an advertisement and then in turn identify with the advertised product itself. This identification response can be triggered by demographic or cultural similarities between actors or sources in advertising and consumers. For example, people from the same socio-
cultural milieu may share common background experiences, lifestyles and values as well as styles of socialisation (Roth & Moorman, 1988; Quinn & Holland, 1987).

Evidence has emerged that people who have different cultural orientations may have internalised different models about social situations and styles of behaviour that might render them likely to identify more strongly or less strongly with scenarios depicted in advertising (Quinn, 1992). This response mode has been shown to occur among ethnically similar or different sources/actors in advertising and consumers (Whittler & DiMeo, 1991; Dishpande & Stayman, 1994). Such differences between consumers and actors within advertisements can weaken the impact of the advertising because consumers are likely to see it as less relevant to their own lives (Brumbaugh, 2002).

The gender of a spokesperson in an advertisement can mediate the extent to which consumers identify with the message. In particular, the perceived appropriateness of the gender of spokesperson to the type of product is a key factor. However, consumers’ attitudes and usage intentions were influenced more by conflicted combinations. In other words, a traditionally masculine product endorsed by a female or a feminine product endorsed by a male endorser triggered more positive consumer responses (Debever & Iyer, 1986).

The ethnicity of the source of testimonials for products in advertisements on commercial web sites has been found to mediate consumer responses. Black browsers identified more strongly with black sources of product-related testimonials and recalled more produce-related information from such commercials than they did from commercials with white testimonials or no testimonials (Oppiah, 2007).

Celebrity Endorsers

Celebrity endorsers can produce positive impact on consumer attitudes towards an advert and associated brand and purchase intention (Goldsmith, Lafferty & Newell, 2000; Erdogan, Baker & Tagg, 2001). This process works through ‘meaning transfer’. Celebrities have established personas (and reputations) gained through the activities for which they are known. The meaning attached to a celebrity can become transferred to a product through association (Erdogan & Baker, 2000; McCracken, 1989). However, a celebrity’s current standing can also mediate the impact they have on brand status. A celebrity whose reputation has suffered could negatively influence brand evaluations (Erdogan & Baker, 2000). There
must be a strong link between celebrity and brand before this happens (see Amos, Holmes & Strutton, 2008; Till & Shimp, 1998).

Relationship Scenarios
Advertisements depict products in a wide range of scenarios. Scenarios in which the actors featured in the advertisements appear to be in a relationship have been found to trigger consumer responses. One source of evidence derives from EEG responses in consumers while they are watching televised advertisements. Brain wave patterns can be responsive to advertising featuring two people who are apparently in a relationship with each other (Alwitt, 1985). Once again, what this evidence does not indicate is how such responses can or should be interpreted psychologically.

Displays of Affection
Displays of affection between actors in an advertisement are designed to elicit an empathic emotional response. Research using EEG responses has indicated that two people seen in televised advertising touching each other and scenes in which actors on screen display emotion can trigger brain wave pattern changes (Alwitt, 1985).

[5] Destination Factors
Destination factors are ingredients of an advertisement that reflect the desired end consumer behaviour. These are not always present in advertisements. By their nature, however, they might often be expected to take the form of images that depict illustrations of the behaviour associated with use of the advertised product. They might also take the form of narrative content that describes the behaviour ultimately sought by the commercial message. In the current context therefore these factors would be expected to comprise descriptions or illustrations of baby/infant feeding behaviour. These might include references to use of the product in the context of infant feeding. Theoretically, such attributes are believed to suggest that behaviour to potential consumers and thus serve as a controlling device designed to condition the desired behaviour.
Coding Variables

The review of literature was used to identify coding variables to be applied to infant and follow-on formula advertisements in different media. It is important to note that in validating coding variables in terms of consumer research, the empirical evidence on the impact of specific content or format factors within commercial messages is not always consistent. Some consumer impact studies provide conflicting results about the effects of specific advertising variables.

Consumer research has also assessed the impact of advertising at a number of different levels of consumer response. Impact variables include whether a commercial message can be perceived; whether it attracts the consumer’s attention; whether it is easily remembered; whether it shapes consumer’s attitudes towards to advertisement or towards the advertised brand; whether it encourages consumers to want to use the product or brand; and ultimately whether it motivates actual consumption or purchase. Tables A2.5 to A2.8 below summarise the variables selected.

These tables distinguish between four categories of variables; Source Variables, Messages Variables, Channel and Format Variables, and Receiver Variables, following the structure of the literature review above.
### Table A2.5. Advertisement Coding Variables – Source Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Memory for Ad</th>
<th>Memory for Brand</th>
<th>Attitude to Ad</th>
<th>Attitude to Brand</th>
<th>Intention to Purchase</th>
<th>Actual Purchase or Use</th>
<th>Readability</th>
<th>EEG/other physiological</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of endorser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stewart &amp; Furse, 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity of endorser</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualls &amp; Moore, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of on-screen actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stewart &amp; Furse, 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise of endorser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erdogan, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity status and expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Till &amp; Busler, 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A2.6. Advertisement Coding Variables – Message Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Consumer Response Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memory for Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Message Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand differentiating factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New product features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical information – health and nutrition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments/counter-arguments for product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product demonstrations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart-warming tones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive emotions – people laughing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reference**
- Stewart & Furse, 1985
- Alwitt, 1985
- Morris, Brinberg, Klimberg, Millstein, & Rivera, 1986
- Gardner, Mitchell & Russo, 1985
- Kaiser Family Foundation, 2001
- Stewart & Furse, 1985
- Aaker, Stayman & Hagerty, 1986
Table A2.7. Advertisement Coding Variables – Channel and Format Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Consumer Response Measures</th>
<th>Channel/Format Factors</th>
<th>Audio-Visual Techniques</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memory for Ad</td>
<td>Memory for Brand</td>
<td>Attitude to Ad</td>
<td>Attitude to Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture content</td>
<td></td>
<td>X [-ve]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuts, close-ups, zooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-screen endorser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super-imposed text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of analogies</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric and analogy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text case and font</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour-contrast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table A2.8. Advertisement Coding Variables – Receiver Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Consumer Response Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memory for Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver Factors</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender counter-stereotyping</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity endorsers</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship scenarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays of affection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References


Appendix 3. Findings: Follow-On Formula Advertisements - Print

Follow-on formula advertisements were surveyed for their appearances in print media between the 1st January and 31st December 2006 and between 1st March 2008 and 28th February 2009. In total 49 advertisements for follow-on formula products were found, with 33 (67%) appearing during 2008-2009 and 16 (33%) during 2006. This survey was carried out utilising the digital advertising archive maintained by Billetts. In reporting the data, both numbers of adverts and the percentages of the total sample or sub-sample that they represent are presented. For data shown in parentheses, the first figure shown is the number of adverts and the second figure is the percentage of its total sample/sub-sample base figure that number represents.

General Factors

Over both time periods, there were eight follow-on products advertised in print media. In terms of the numbers of advertisements in print media per product, the most frequently occurring overall were advertisements for SMA Progress (22; 45%) followed by Cow & gate Complete Care Follow On Milk (9; 18%), Aptamil Follow On Milk (6; 12%), Cow & Gate Good Night Milk, Cow & Gate Step Up Follow On Milk, and Heinz Nurture (3, 6% each), Aptamil Forward (2; 4%), and Hipp Good Night Milk (1; 2%).

Table A3.1 presents the distributions of advertisements by product for the two time periods of the survey. The data here confirm the greater volume of follow-on formula advertising in 2008-2009 compared with 2006. In 2006, most of this advertising was for SMA Progress (88%), with the remainder being for Aptamil Forward (13%). In 2008-2009, the advertising was distributed among Cow & Gate Complete Care Follow-On Milk (27%), SMA Progress (24%), Aptamil Follow-On Milk (18%), Cow & Gate Good Night Milk, Cow & Gate Step-Up Follow-On Milk, and Heinz Nurture (9% each), and Hipp Good Night Milk (3%). This shift in distribution of products from year to year was significant ($X^2 = 25.9$, df = 7, $p < 0.001$)
Table A3.1  Distribution of Product Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate Good Night Milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil Follow On Milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA Progress</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil Forward</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipp Good Night Milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz Nurture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate Step Up Follow On Milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate Complete Care Follow On Milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The advertised products derived from four manufacturers across the two time periods: Nutricia (23; 47%), John Wyeth (22; 45%), Heinz (3; 6%) and Hipp (1; 2%). Much of the 2006 print advertising of follow-on formula was for John Wyeth (manufacturer of SMA) products (14; 88%) with the remainder coming from Nutricia (manufacturer of Aptamil and Cow & Gate) (2; 13%). In 2008-2009, most of the advertising was for Nutricia products (21; 64%), with others coming from John Wyeth (8; 24%), Heinz (3; 9%) and Hipp (1; 3%). The difference in distributions of manufacturers that advertised in 2006 and in 2008-09 was significant ($X^2 = 17.5$, df = 3, $p < 0.001$).

Type of Publication in which Advertisement Occurred

Most follow-on formula print advertisements occurred in magazines across both time periods. In 2006, all follow-on formula print advertising was divided between that occurring in magazines for celebrity and fashion (9; 56%) and magazines for mothers or mothers to be (7; 44%). In 2008-2009, this advertising was more widely distributed in terms of categories of print media ($X^2 = 13.9$, df = 3, $p < 0.003$), occurring across magazines for mothers/mothers to be (17; 52%), magazines – other (11; 33%), celebrity and fashion magazines (4; 12%) and in a national Sunday newspaper (1; 3%).

Size of advertisements [square cms]

Advertisement size data were supplied by the Billetts’ advertising archive. Print advertisements varied in size over quite a wide range. On average, adverts published in 2008-2009 (1809 sq cms) were bigger than those in 2006 (940 sq cms).
**Campaign duration**

Data on advertising durations were supplied by Billetts. Advertising campaign durations varied between one month and 21 months. Short-duration advertising campaigns in which advertisements appeared in print media for no more than one month were more likely to occur in 2008-09 (46%) than in 2006 (38%). Advertisements were far more likely to appear in print media for between two months and six months in 2006 (56%) than in 2008-09 (18%). Advertisements for follow-on formula in print media were far more likely to run for between seven and 12 months in 2008-09 (27%) than in 2006 (6%). No follow-on formula adverts ran for over 12 months in 2006 compared with just under one in ten (9%) in 2008-09.

**Number of ad appearances in campaign**

These data were supplied by the Billetts’ advertising archive. The average number of media appearances made by each sampled advert was far higher in 2008-2009 (15.5) than in 2006 (6.0). A larger proportion of adverts made just one appearance in print media in 2008-09 (35%) than in 2006 (19%). The sampled print follow-on formula adverts were far more likely to make two or three appearances in 2006 (37%) than in 2008-09 (15%). At the higher end of the scale, the sampled adverts were far more likely to make between 27 and 59 appearances in print media in 2008-09 (21%) than in 2006 when there were no campaigns in which adverts made appearances within this range.

**Campaign expenditure**

Campaign expenditure data for print advertising are logged as a default by the Billetts advertising database. Average expenditure on the sampled print follow-on formula adverts was £41,221. Average expenditure was higher in 2008-09 (£48,546) than in 2006 (£26,114). These averages were situated at the low end of overall recorded expenditure on the sampled adverts. Consistent with this finding, amounts in the lowest range of between £2000 and £4000 were much more frequently occurring in 2006 (25%) than in 2008-09 (12%) In contrast, expenditure on print advertising of £100,000 or more was absent in 2006 but occurred quite often (38%) in 2008-09. The maximum spent on any advertising campaign for follow on formula was £254,504 in 2008-09.

**Other Information**

Billetts’ data indicated that most of the sampled print adverts contained a web address (46; 93.9%). All adverts analysed in 2006 contained a web address while nine in ten (90.9%) did
in 2008-09. This shift was statistically non-significant. In contrast, no follow-on formula print ad made a reference to a consumer or trade award.

Source Factors
In the more detailed classification of formula product advertising, we began by examining source factors. These factors concerned characteristics of the endorsers – the actors or models – featured in advertisements. These factors can be important because they are attributes through which consumer identification can be invoked.

Gender and Ethnicity of Endorsers
All pictured principal adults featured in the sampled print formula product adverts were female (n = 12; 25% of all adverts). A clear majority of these adverts, however, contained no pictured principal adult (37; 76%). This pattern was similar in 2006 and 2008-2009, though numerically and proportionately more follow-on formula print adverts had a principal female actor in 2008-2009 (9; 27%) than in 2006 (3; 19%). This difference, however, was not statistically significant.

In terms of ethnicity, all pictured principal adult actors (12; 25%) were classified as white-British. There was no pictured child actor in one in five of all follow-on formula product advertisements (10; 20%). In a clear majority of these adverts, the principal child actor was classified as white-British (37; 76%) and in two cases, adverts featured a British Black-Afro-Caribbean child (4%). The profile of advertising on this dimension shifted dramatically between 2006 and 2008-2009 (X² = 19.8, df = 2, p < 0.0001). In 2006, over half of follow-on formula print adverts (9; 56%) contained no pictured child actor; in 2008-2009, this position had changed radically with only one advertisement picturing an infant/baby (3%). In 2006, between three and four out of ten follow-on formula print adverts (6; 38%) contained a pictured white-British child actor. In 2008-2009, nearly all such adverts (31; 94%) contained a white-british child actor. In both years, just one advert contained a pictured ethnic minority actor (Black-Afro-Caribbean-British in each case).

Expert Endorsement and Advice
The sampled follow-on formula adverts were coded for their use of ‘expert’ endorsers with identified and relevant professional experience in medicine, health and child matters or ‘other
experts’ portrayed in the role of giving expert advice about the product but with no identified medical or professional health-related qualifications. Just one advertisement overall (which appeared in 2006) contained any such endorsement. In addition, all adverts were coded for the use of other ‘expert’ endorsers whose qualifications were unknown. Three examples of this type of advertisement emerged, all of which appeared in 2008-2009.

The sampled adverts were classified in terms of whether they provided general baby or infant-related advice or guidance. Different numbers, but similar proportions, of adverts with this feature were detected in 2006 (4; 25.0%) and 2008-2009 (10; 30.3%). In 13 out of these 14 cases, this guidance and advice was presented in text form only. In one case, it was accompanied by picture support material.

The adverts were coded also in respect of the presence of any celebrity endorsement. None was found throughout any of this advertising. There was no evidence either of any use of celebrities as experts. None of the year to year shifts in distribution on any of these features were statistically significant.

**Message Factors**

**Product Information**

**Brand Differentiating Factors**

A number of brand differentiating factors were coded within the sampled follow-on formula print adverts. The product pack was universally present in print adverts found in 2008-09 (33; 100%). Packs were less often visible in 2006 (6; 38%). This difference was significant ($\chi^2 = 25.9$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$). The visible pack was the most usual way of displaying the brand name. Consumer research conducted by GfK for the Food Standards Agency and Department of Health, to which reference was made in Appendix 2, indicated that consumers find product pack shots important indicators of the type of formula product being advertised. The brand name was visible in other parts of the advert only in far fewer instances, and was more prevalent in adverts in 2008-09 (8; 24%) than in 2006 (2; 13%). The name of the manufacturer was shown on the product pack in the advert more often in 2008-09 (9; 27%) than in 2006 (2; 13%). Neither brand name nor manufacturer name distribution differences between 2006 and 2008-09 were statistically significant.
Follow-on formula was also identified on a visible pack in print adverts much more often in 2008-2009 (32; 97%) than in 2006 (6; 37%). This difference was significant ($X^2 = 26.0$, df = 2, $p < 0.0001$). Follow-on formula was identified in the body of all adverts, other than on a pack shot, in both 2006 and 2008-09. The year to year changes were not significant.

### Table A3.2 Presence of Brand Differentiating Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product pack visible in ad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand name shown in ad (other than on visible pack)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of manufacturer shown on pack in ad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not shown on pack</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pack not shown in ad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula identified on visible pack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not shown on pack</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pack not shown in ad</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula identified in ad (other than on visible pack)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Product Identification

The name of the product range (e.g., Aptamil, Cow & Gate) was identified in every sampled follow-on formula print advert in 2006 and in 2008-09. The name of the product range was also identified on a visible product pack in all the print adverts analysed in 2008-2009 but only for a minority of those coded in 2006 (6; 38%). The latter shift was from year to year was significant ($X^2 = 25.9$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$).
Table A3.3 Product Differentiation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow &amp; Gate] visible in advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow &amp; Gate] visible on pack shown in advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Pack not shown in ad</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2 or 3; etc) visible in advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Product stage ‘1’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Product stage ‘2’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Product stage ‘3’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Good night milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] Not visible</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2, or 3, etc) visible on pack in advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Product stage ‘1’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Product stage ‘2’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Product stage ‘3’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Good night milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] Pack not shown in advertisement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The visibility of the product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2, or 3) in each sampled advert was coded. The only product stage information identified was for ‘good night milk’ which appeared in four adverts, all of which occurred in 2008-2009 (12% of ads for that period). The latter difference between 2006 and 2008-09 was not significant. This information was also coded for its visibility on packs shown in adverts. Here product stage 3 occurred more often in pack shots in print adverts in 2008-09 (25; 76%) than in 2006 (5; 31%). Goodnight milk
was mentioned in four adverts in 2008-09 (12%). The year to year distribution shift here was significant ($X^2 = 26.4$, df = 3, $p < 0.0001$).

**Age of Use Recommendation**

Age of use recommendation on pack shots in the adverts was far more likely to be present in adverts sampled in 2008-2009 (24; 73%) than in those coded for 2006 (5, 31%). This was a significant difference ($X^2 = 26.1$, df = 2, $p < 0.0001$). Age of use recommendation was shown elsewhere in follow-on formula print adverts in all adverts in 2006 and in most instances (30; 91%) in 2008-09. This 2006 to 2008-09 shift was not statistically significant.

**Health and Nutrition Benefits of Product**

Statements about the nutritional benefits of follow-on formula products were not coded as clearly visible on displayed packs in any of the adverts coded. Nutrition benefits statements were found elsewhere in these adverts in a majority of cases in 2006 (11; 69%) and 2008-2009 (24; 73%).

There were no clearly visible statements about the health benefits of these products on packs shown in the adverts. This type of statement was found elsewhere in sampled print adverts more often in 2008-2009 (24; 73%) than in 2006 (4; 25%). The latter difference was significant ($X^2 = 10.0$, df = 1, $p < 0.002$).

**Price Information**

No price information was shown anywhere on a visible pack in any of the adverts. Price information was visible elsewhere in the advertising message in two cases overall, both of which appeared in 2008-2009.

A customer helpline or careline was included in all sampled follow-on formula print adverts in 2006 and in six out of ten cases in 2008-2009 (20; 61%). This year to year change was significant ($X^2 = 26.0$, df = 2, $p < 0.0001$).

**New Product Features**

Only one advert overall (which appeared in 2008-2009) contained a statement indicating that there was something ‘new’ about the brand or product on a product pack seen in the advert.
None of the follow-on formula print adverts sampled in either 2006 or 2008-09 contained such a statement anywhere else in the advert.

**Convenience of Use**

Just one follow-on formula print advert presented information about the ease of use of the product as a visibly displayed product pack seen in the advert and this occurred in 2008-2009. A statement about ease of use of the product was present elsewhere in the advert in three cases, all of which occurred in 2008-2009 (9% of adverts that year).

**Technical Information about Health and Nutrition**

The presence of qualifying health or nutrition claims occurred in six adverts, all of which appeared in 2008-2009 (18%). The year to year difference was not quite significant. The presence of non-qualifying health or nutrition claims – where no apparently qualified expert source was cited in support – occurred in 18 adverts, all of which again appeared in 2008-2009 (55%). This year to year difference was significant ($X^2 = 13.8$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$).

A series of further codes classified each advert in terms of whether it contained technical information about the energy value (in kJ and kcal) of products, protein content, carbohydrate content, lipids content, quantity of choline, inositol, carnitine, and other specified minerals or vitamins. None of the follow-on formula print adverts contained this type of information.

**Risk and Use**

Each advert was coded for a range of risk-related attributes. All adverts in 2006 and in 2008-09 contained a statement that the product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over the age of six months somewhere in the advert. In addition, all adverts in both years contained a statement that the product should form only part of a diversified diet.

All adverts in 2006 and all but one follow-on advert (32; 97%) in 2008-09 contained a statement that the product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during the first six months of life. This slight downward shift was not significant. A statement that the product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during the first six months of life was visible on a product pack shot in six adverts (38%) in 2006 and in all 33 adverts from 2008-2009. This finding was significant ($X^2 = 25.9$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$).
Just two adverts (both in 2008-2009) stated that any decision to use the product before six months of age should be made only on the advice of a health professional in the body of the advert. This year to year difference was not significant. No such statement appeared in any print adverts in 2006. There was no evidence either in 2006 or in 2008-09 of any such statement appearing on a visible pack in follow-on formula print adverts.

Just two adverts, again both appearing in 2008-2009 (6%), provided a warning of health hazards associated with inappropriate preparation of the product. The same number of adverts (both in 2008-2009) also presented a warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage of the product. No such statements appeared in print adverts for follow-on formula products in sampled from 2006. No warning statements about the health hazards associated with inappropriate preparation of the product were seen on a visible product pack in adverts in 2006 or 2008-09. The same finding was true of health hazard warnings concerning inappropriate storage of follow-on formula products. Thus, on none of these measures did statistically significant changes occur between the samples of adverts from 2006 and from 2008-09.

The presence of the words “Important Notice” appeared in all 16 adverts in 2006 and in seven in ten (23; 70%) of those from 2008-2009. This difference was significant ($X^2 = 6.1$, df = 1, $p < 0.01$). Presence of words “Important Notice” on visible pack occurred none of the adverts in which pack shots were present.

A statement recommending that the product is to be used only on the advice of a health professional appeared in 18 adverts in 2008-2009 (55%) and in none of the adverts coded in 2006. This difference was significant ($X^2 = 13.8$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$). This statement was visible not on pack shots in any adverts from 2006 or 2008-09.

A statement that the product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over the age of six months was present in all adverts in 2006 and in 2008-09. It was also shown in visible pack shots in all adverts in 2008-09 but in just six instances in 2006 (38%) representing a significant increase in prevalence ($X^2 = 25.9$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$).

The use of a signal word to draw attention to a risk warning and a statement describing the nature of the risk appeared in two adverts, both of which appeared in 2006 (13% of adverts
from that year). Neither of these risk warnings appeared in any adverts in 2008-09. In both instances, these year to year shifts achieved statistical significance ($X^2 = 4.3$, df = 1, $p < 0.04$).

The use of a statement defining the consequences of misuse of the product and the use of an instruction statement advising on how to avoid consequences of misuse appeared in one advert in 2006 (6%) and two in 2008-2009 (6%). These differences from year to year were non-significant.

**Arguments and Counter-Arguments about the Product**

A statement concerning the superiority of breast feeding appeared more often in print adverts sampled from 2008-09 (28; 85%) than in those from 2006 (2; 13%). This difference between years was statistically significant ($X^2 = 23.8$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$). Information concerning the appropriate use of the product, with no discouragement of breast feeding, appeared in two adverts, both of which occurred in 2008-2009 (6%).

Arguments in favour of the product that described its positive benefits were found more often in adverts in 2008-2009 (31; 94%) than in 2006 (11; 69%). This year to year difference was significant ($X^2 = 5.6$, df = 1, $p < 0.02$). Arguments describing how to offset negative outcomes (e.g., health problems) for the child of product use appeared in just one advert overall, which appeared in 2006.

Coding also examined the texts of adverts for the use of specific promotional terms. The term ‘immunity’ was present more often in 2008-2009 (18; 55%) than in 2006 (4; 25%). This year to year change was significant ($X^2 = 3.8$, df = 1, $p < 0.05$). The term ‘protect’ in three adverts in 2006 (19%) and in three more adverts from 2008-2009 (12%). The term ‘defend/defence’ was found in one advert in 2006 (6%) and in four adverts in 2008-2009 (12%). Terms such as ‘natural development’, ‘robust/tough’ and ‘natural ingredients’ were found in none of the follow-on print adverts for 2006 or 2008-09. None of the year to year differences, other than that for ‘immunity’, were significant.
**Product Demonstrations**

No advertisements contained instructions for appropriate preparation, for storage, or for disposal. There was no picture material in any of the adverts illustrating methods of preparation.

**Thematic Content**

**Humour**

The presence of funny situations was found in three adverts that all occurred in 2008-2009, though the difference between adverts from 2006 and those from 2008-09 on this variable did not achieve statistical significance. The coding frame also analysed all advertising for the presence of ‘heart-warming tones’. This was defined in terms of whether any adverts showed pictures of infants laughing. This feature appeared in two adverts in 2006 (12%) and in 11 from 2008-2009 (33%). A further criterion was whether there were pictures showing a mother sitting with an infant at a table or on a chair. Two instances of this were found in 2006 (13%) and nine in 2008-2009 (27%). None of the adverts analysed here contained any images of a mother bottle feeding her infant, though there were images that showed mother with baby in the presence of the product. As indicated in the next section, there were significant differences between the two advertisement samples in the use of images of mother with baby/infant.

**Channel/Format Factors**

**Audio-Visual Techniques**

**Visual Format**

Visual format features included the nature of picture material used in an advert and the physical setting presented within an image. As Table A3.4 below shows, the most frequently appearing picture type showed an infant on his or her own or showed a mother in the presence of the advertised product with her infant. These two types of images were more likely to occur in 2008-2009 than in 2006. The attribute distributions of 2006 and 2008-09 were significantly different ($X^2 = 19.3$, df = 3, p < 0.001).
Table A3.4 Types of Visual Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual Setting</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture of infant only – no product use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of product used by mother with infant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other picture material</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of infant only with product</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of mother and infant – no product use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of mother only with product</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of mother only – no product use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of product only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No picture material at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table A3.5 shows, the most frequently occurring visual settings were in home and outdoor locations. The 2006 and 2008-09 distributions were significantly different ($X^2 = 11.6$, df = 3, $p < 0.009$). Once again, these illustrations appeared in adverts more often in 2008-2009 than in 2006. There was also an increase between 2006 and 2008-09 in the prevalence of the use of images of outdoor settings in print follow-on formula adverts. This trend tallies with the opinions of consumers surveyed by GfK/NOP who indicated that the greater use of outdoor settings with infants might represent a clearer signal that the product being advertised is targeted at parents/carers of infants aged six months or older. In a number of cases, the setting was not discernible.
Table A3.5. Visual Setting of Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor locations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In retail setting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In car/vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not discernible</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No visible setting depicted</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Factors

A range of narrative factors were coded within each advertisement in terms of ‘case’, ‘font’ and ‘colour/contrast’. There were two principal case variables – ‘UPPER CASE’ and ‘lower case’. The coding frame also assessed text for using a mixture of upper case and lower case within the text. A fourth category of ‘Sentence Case’ was included in which only the first letter of a word is capitalised. Text font was categorised into serif only, sans serif only, or serif and sans serif.

A scoring scale for character-background colour combinations was utilised that ranged from a low of 0.2 to a high of 2.0. Scores of 1.0 and above on this scale represent colour combinations that are regarded as yielding relatively high resolution and which render the fore-grounded text more legible against its background. Scores below 1.0 represent less clear colour combinations that can mean that the text is less legible.

Brand Names in Adverts

Table A3.6 summarizes the findings for the brand name reference within the adverts. In most cases the brand name was not visible in the advert (other than on a visible pack). None of the brand name text style profiles differed significantly between adverts from 2006 and those from 2008-09. As the data in the table below show, where this specific text was shown, there was a tendency to use upper case lettering (6% of ads) or a combination of upper and lower case (6% of ads) in 2008-2009 and to use lower case (13%) in 2006. Only a combination of serif and sans serif fonts were used both in 2006 (13% of ads) and in 2008-2009 (13% of ads), which can be regarded as a legibility enhancing style choice. As the figures in Table A3.6 again show, in those few adverts with the brand name shown in the body of the advert in 2006, both ads (13%) used a relatively low resolution colour combination. In 2008-09, one
case (3%) used a colour combination with a low resolution (that is scoring less than 1.0; e.g., white on red and red on white) and in three cases (9%) used a combination of much higher resolution was used (that is, 1.0 or higher; e.g., blue on white).

### Table A3.6. Brand Name Visible in Advert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour/Contrast</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on red (0.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red on white (0.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Brand Names on Packs in Adverts

Turning to text showing the brand name on a pack visibly displayed in the advert, lower-case only or upper case only tended to be used. As the data shown in Table A3.7 below show, in 2008-2009, the ads were similarly likely to use upper case only (12%) or lower case only (15%). In 2006, where such text was present, only lower case was used (13%). Only sans serif font was used for this text in both 2006 (13% of ads) and in 2008-09 (27% of ads). The text/background colour combinations used here tended to be low resolution combinations (i.e., below 1.0) more often than high resolution combinations (1.0 and above). Only a low resolution combination was present in ads in 2006 (13%), while in 2008-09 low resolution combinations (18%) outnumbered the use of high resolution colours (9%). None of the 2006 versus 2008-09 differences observed in the table here achieved statistical significance.
### Table A3.7. Brand Name Visible on Pack in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour/Contrast</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on red (0.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red on white (0.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on yellow (1.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Product Names in Adverts

Relevant data for this text are shown in Table A3.8 below. As these data show, the product name, when displayed in the advertisements, was mostly shown in a mix of upper and lower case, though in lower case in only a small number of adverts. The use of upper plus lower case was more prevalent in 2008-2009 (97% of ads) than in 2006 (56%). Ads in 2006 (44%) were more likely than those in 2008-09 (3%) to use lower case only text here. Virtually all occurrences of product names in an advert were presented in sans serif font only (2006 –m 100%; 2008-09 – 97%). There was one exception that used serif and sans serif together in 2008-09. All ads in 2006 (100%) used high resolution colour combinations with this text. In 2008-09, this was true of just over four in ten ads (42%), with the remainder (58%) using relatively low resolution colour combinations.
Table A3.8 Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] Visible in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour/Contrast</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on red (0.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red on white (0.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on green (1.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on yellow (1.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on blue (1.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on white (1.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Product Name on Packs in Adverts**

Turning to the visible presence of product names on product packs displayed in adverts, data shown in Table A3.9 indicate that most adverts in which this text occurred used an upper case plus lower case combination, which would be regarded as clarity enhancing. This was more especially true in 2008-2009 than in 2006. In 2008-09, upper plus lower case text was the most prevalent (67% of ads) followed by lower case only (33% of ads). In 2006, where this text was present, only upper plus lower case was used (38%). All text as such was, when present, shown in sans serifs font in adverts sampled from 2006 (38% of ads) and 2008-09 (100% of ads). Once again, this would be seen as a higher legibility style choice. More colour combinations for product name text against its background comprised low resolution (below 1.0) than high resolution combinations (1.0 and higher). In 2006, only a single high resolution colour combination was used (blue on white; 38%). In 2008-09, relatively low resolution colour combinations (70% of ads) outnumber high resolution combinations (30%).
There was no evidence that use of high resolution combinations increased over time with product name text in a pack shot.

The 2006 versus 2008-09 profiles differed significantly for product name in ad case ($X^2 = 13.1$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$), product name in ad colour/contrast ($X^2 = 32.3$, df = 7, $p < 0.0001$), product name on pack case ($X^2 = 25.6$, df = 2, $p < 0.0001$), product name on pack font ($X^2 = 25.9$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$), product name on pack colour/contrast ($X^2 = 36.6$, df = 3, $p < 0.0001$).

Table A3.9. Product Name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] Visible on Pack in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour/Contrast</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red on white (0.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on yellow (1.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on blue (1.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identification of Follow-on Formula in Adverts

As data presented in Table A3.10 indicate, text identifying a product as follow-on formula in this advertising was shown in lower case only in 2006 (100% of ads). In 2008-09, this text was shown in upper plus lower case (46%), lower case only (27%) or sentence case (24%). The case style distributions differed significantly between 2006 and 2008-2009 ($X^2 = 22.8$, df = 3, $p < 0.0001$). All adverts in 2006 (100%) presented this text in san serif font only as did
virtually all (97%) in 2008-09. All adverts sampled in 2006 (100%) presented this text in a high resolution colour against its background (scoring 1.0 and higher). This was true of most adverts (76%) sampled in 2008-09. The font and colour-contrast profiles of adverts from 2006 and from 2008-09 were not significantly different.

Table A3.10. Identification of ‘Follow-on Formula’ Visible in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour/Contrast</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on red (0.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red on white (0.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on green (1.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on blue (1.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on white (1.8)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on yellow (2.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identification of Follow-on Formula on Packs in Adverts

Table A3.11 presents data for text identifying the product as follow-on formula on product packaging in an advertisement used a range of different case types in 2008-2009: lower case only (52%), upper plus lower case (36%), upper case only 99%) and sentence case (3%). In 2006, in comparison, only sentence case was used (38% of ads). All text of this kind occurred in sans serif font in adverts from 2006 (in 38% of sampled ads) and from 2008-09 (100% of ads). A clear majority of adverts that contained this text used high resolution (i.e., 1.0 and higher) rather than low resolution colour combinations (below 1.0) in 2008-09 (81% of ads)
and this was true of all adverts containing this text in 2006 (38% of these ads). Follow-on formula identification text on pack shots differed between 2006 and 2008-09 to a statistically significant degree for case ($X^2 = 45.1$, df = 4, $p < 0.0001$), for font style ($X^2 = 25.9$, df = 1, $p < 0.001$), and for colour/contrast ($X^2 = 27.4$, df = 5, $p < 0.0001$).

Table A3.11. Identification of ‘Follow-on Formula’ Visible on Pack in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Font</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour/Contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red on yellow (0.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red on white (0.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on yellow (1.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on blue (1.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Price Information in Adverts**

As Table A3.12 shows, price information was not present at all in adverts from 2006 and was shown only rarely in follow-on formula print advertisements in 2008-09. When it did occur in 2008-09, it was presented in sentence case (6% of ads) and sans serif only font (6% of ads). It always used high resolution colour combinations for text and background (6% of ads).
Table A3.12. Price Information in Advertisements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Font</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour/Contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on white (1.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Superiority of Breast Feeding Statement in Adverts**

As Table A3.13 shows, a statement concerning the superiority of breast feeding was presented in only a minority of adverts in 2006 and used sentence case, sans serif fonts and high resolution colour combinations. All these would be classified as legibility-enhancing style choices. In 2006, this text occurred only in sentence case (13% of ads). In 2008-09, this text was more prevalent and used mostly sentence case (73% of ads) and occasionally in upper case only (6%) or lower case only (3%). In 2006, this text occurred only in sentence case (13% of ads) and the same was true of 2008-09 (82% of ads). Only a minority of the ads in 2006 showed this text and it always appeared as high resolution blue on white (13%). Most of the adverts that contained this text in 2008-09 used high resolution colour combinations of text versus background colour combinations (73% of ads), with a few (12%) using a relatively low resolution combination. Adverts from 2006 and from 2008-09 differed significantly in the text styles of ‘superiority of breast-feeding statements in terms of case (X^2 = 21.5, df = 3, p < 0.0001), font (X^2 = 20.3, df = 1, p < 0.0001), and colour/contrast (X^2 = 26.2, df = 4, p < 0.0001).
Table A3.13. Superiority of Breast Feeding Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Font</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour/Contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on green (1.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on white (1.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Age of Use Text**

Table A3.14 below shows that text concerning the age of recommended use was shown in all advertisements in 2006 and in 2008-09. The text occurred only in lower case only in 2006 (100% of ads) and in 2008-09 (100% of ads) and only in sans serif font in both years. This text also always achieved a high colour-background resolution score (1.0 or higher) across all ads in 2006 and in 2008-09. All these features would be classified as legibility enhancing style choices. In 2008-09, this text occurred in either sentence case or lower case only and only in sans serifs font, and it achieved high resolution colour versus background scores in eight in ten adverts. Again these choices were legibility-enhancing text presentation styles. Only case style differed significantly between adverts from 2006 and 2008-09 ($X^2 = 15.0$, df = 2, $p < 0.001$).
Table A3.14. Recommended Age of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour/Contrast</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red on white (0.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on green (1.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on blue (1.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on white (1.8)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on yellow (2.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Product-related Support Information in Adverts

Finally, Table A3.15 below shows that other text with product-related information was found in all follow-on formula print adverts. This text used sentence case only and sans serif font only in all adverts in 2006 and 2008-09. A clear majority of the adverts from 2006 (87%) used high resolution colour-background combinations. This was true of a smaller majority of adverts sampled from 2008-09 (58%). Only colour/contrast differed significantly for adverts from 2006 and from 2008-09 (X² = 24.3, df = 8, p < 0.002).
Table A3.15. Other Support Text with Product-related Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour/Contrast</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on red (0.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red on white (0.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow on blue (1.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on blue (1.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on black (1.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on white (1.8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on yellow (2.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Receiver Factors**

**Use of Babies and Infants**

A majority of the adverts in 2008-09 displayed a baby or infant within the message (32; 97%) while only a minority did in 2006 (7; 43.8%). This difference was significant ($X^2 = 18.8$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$).

Each advert was coded for any visible displays of baby/infant behaviours. These features were coded because of the importance they seem to have in enabling consumers to determine the age of a child shown in formula adverts which, in turn, signals the age group at which the product is targeted. The coded characteristics used here were guided by consumer research conducted by GfK/NOP for the Food Standards Agency and Department of Health in another part of the review of which this study forms a part.
Important features include whether the depicted infant has hair, display head and arm control, can sit upright unaided and can self-feed. The findings showed that in print adverts for follow-on formula sampled here, all these critical features were more prevalent in 2008-09 than in 2006. They were only ever present in a minority of adverts sampled in 2006, but in three cases – hair, head control and sitting upright – the majority of depicted infants in these adverts displayed these features. Features such as smiling, dexterity of arm movements, teeth and self-feeding occurred in a minority of the adverts from this period.

Table A3.16. Attributes of Depicted Babies and Infants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has hair</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting upright</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexterity of arm movements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has teeth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-feeding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The year to year differences were significant for head control ($X^2 = 28.8$, df $= 3$, $p < 0.0001$), dexterity of arm movement ($X^2 = 20.1$, df $= 3$, $p < 0.0001$), self-feeding ($X^2 = 22.6$, df $= 3$, $p < 0.0001$), has hair ($X^2 = 22.3$, df $= 3$, $p < 0.0001$), has teeth ($X^2 = 21.3$, df $= 3$, $p < 0.0001$), sitting upright ($X^2 = 19.2$, df $= 3$, $p < 0.0001$), and smiling ($X^2 = 19.1$, df $= 3$, $p < 0.0001$).

**Presence of Adult Female (Mother Figure)**

Mothers were visibly more prevalent in adverts in 2008-2009 (9; 27%) than in 2006 (3; 19%). This difference, however, was not significant. Adult females or mother figures were depicted with infants in only two adverts both from 2008-09. There were no images of pregnant women in any of the advertisements from 2006 or from 2008-09.
**Presence of Adult Male (Father Figure)**

There were no images of adult men or father figures in any of the adverts from 2006 or 2008-09. In consequence there were no images either of fathers with babies or infants or of fathers feeding infants from either annual sample.

**Relationship Scenarios**

There were no images of a man and woman together in any of these adverts. Consequently there were no images of a man and woman together with an infant.

**Displays of affection**

There were no images depicting a man and woman together hugging or displaying other signs of affection. Scenes depicting a mother and infant making affectionate physical contact occurred in two adverts from 2006 (13% of all adverts that year) and in eight adverts from 2008-2009 (24%).

**Use of Colours**

The images used in follow-on formula adverts were analysed further for their use of colours. The use of soft focus pastel colours in images featuring babies occurred in 16 adverts in 2008-2009 and in just two adverts from 2006. This difference was significant ($X^2 = 6.7, \text{df} = 2, p < 0.04$). The use of bold primary colours with brand names was found in 24 adverts in 2008-2009 (73%) and in nine adverts in 2006 (56%). This difference did not achieve statistical significance. Finally, the use of bold primary colours on packs was far more prevalent in advertising in 2008-2009 (24; 73%) than in 2006 (6; 38%). This difference was significant ($X^2 = 5.6, \text{df} = 1, p < 0.02$).

**Summary of Main Findings**

A total sample of 49 print adverts for follow-on formula was found during the two time periods surveyed (1st January – 31st December 2006 and 1st March 2008 to 28th February 2009). Two-thirds of these adverts ($n = 33$) appeared during 2008-09 and one-third ($n = 16$) appeared in 2006. The annex to this section present a table that contains a summary of the advertising attributes that exhibited significant change from the 2006 print follow-on formula ad sample to the 2008-09 print follow-on formula ad sample.
General

In print media, follow-on formula adverts were found mainly in magazines for mothers and mothers-to-be (49%) and to a lesser extent in celebrity and fashion magazines (27%). There was evidence of these adverts displaying a slightly wider distribution in terms of publications outlets in 2008-2009 than in 2006.

Follow-on formula adverts tended to run mainly in campaigns of limited duration, up to six months (73%). Such relatively short campaigns were more prevalent in 2006 (94% of all ads) than in 2008-09 (64%). There was also some evidence of increased use of longer campaigns in 2008-2009. Consistent with this finding, one in two follow-on formula advertising campaigns (51%) comprised limited numbers of ad appearances, usually no more than three. In 2008-2009, however, there was evidence of a growth in the use of campaigns that comprised larger numbers of ad appearances. During the more recent period, campaigns were run in which adverts averaged 16 appearances compared with six appearances in 2006.

Follow-on formula adverts occupied more page space on average in the advert samples from 2008-09 than in that from 2006. Average ad size in 2008-09 was 1809 sq cm compared with 940 sq cm in 2006.

Expenditure on follow-on formula print advertising campaigns ranged from £2000 to £250,000. Average expenditure on print follow-on formula advertising campaigns was £41,221. Average expenditure was higher in 2008-09 (£48,546) than in 2006 (£26,114). While there was a clear preference in 2008-09 over 2006 for cheaper campaigns that cost no more than £4,000, the higher average expenditure on advertising in 2008-09 was caused by the fairly high prevalence of £100,000+ campaigns that year (38% of all ads). In 2006, such expensive campaigns were completely absent.

All follow-on formula adverts from 2006 and from 2008-09 presented a web address.

Source Factors

Source factors were included because consumer research has indicated the nature of the endorsement can mediate consumers’ responses to the advertising. The gender and ethnicity of a product endorser might affect the extent to which members of the audience identify with the endorsement, the advertisements and the advertised brand. The use of an expert endorser
or a celebrity endorser can also promote attitudes to an advertisement that may be either positive or negative depending upon the perceived relevance of the endorser to the product.

Only one in four follow-on formula print adverts contained an adult actor and they were always female and white. There was a pictured child actor in four out of five of these adverts (80%), and these were mainly white. Both adult and child actors exhibited increased prevalence in these adverts in 2008-2009 compared with 2006.

Only one follow-on formula print advertisement was found that contained any expert endorsement and this appeared in 2006. There was no use of celebrity endorsement. Just over one in four of these adverts provided general baby or infant-related advice, and this tended to be provided in text form only.

**Message Factors**

A number of advertising message content factors had been identified in the review of consumer research as having potential effects on consumers’ responses to formula advertising. Information that attempts to differentiate the advertised brand from other brands can render those brands more memorable. The same is true of information that explains the ease or convenience of use of the advertised brand. Promoting the brand as offering something ‘new’ or different can make it stand out from competing brands which is the first step in drawing in consumers’ attention.

The provision of technical information can promote the prominence of the brand, but could also render the message confusing and therefore more difficult to process. Risk-related information can work to make a brand more or less appealing depending upon how it is presented and the clarity with which consumers can understand such important content. Arguments that explain the benefits of a brand can enhance its appeal. In addition, arguments in a more negative frame that indicate what the brand can do in terms of reducing problems the consumer might otherwise experience can also promote positive attitudes towards it. Where appropriate the presence of product demonstrations can enhance recall of the advertising message and, in turn, promote the salience of the brand. Finally, the use of thematic attributes such as humour or warm emotion-promoting themes can enhance both memory for the advertising and trigger positive attitudes towards the brand.
Features such as presence of product pack, brand name, manufacturer name, and identification of product as follow-on formula increased in prevalence from adverts sampled in 2006 to those sampled in 2008-09. The name of the product range in the advert was universal in adverts from 2006 and 2008-09 and increased in prevalence from a minority of adverts in 2006 to all of them in 2008-09 in its visibility on pack shots. Product stage was more likely to be visible in 2006 and 2008-09 on pack shots than elsewhere in a print advert and this information generally increased in prevalence in 2008-09 compared with 2006. Age of use information was present in all adverts in 2006 and virtually all in 2008-09.

Information about the health and nutrition benefits of the product was more prevalent in 2008-09 than in 2006, especially in respect of health benefits. In contrast, only one advert overall claimed that there was something new about the advertised product or provided information promoting convenience of use and this appeared in 2008-09. Although health claims were prevalent, the use of scientific support for such claims was rare (occurring in 6 adverts only). The use of unqualified health claims, for the product were somewhat more prevalent (appearing in 18 adverts). All of these latter claims appeared in adverts in 2008-2009.

Virtually all follow-on formula print advertising contained some form of risk warning. All but one of these adverts made clear that the product should not be used as a substitute for breast milk before six months of age. This information was much more likely to be seen on visibly displayed product packaging in the advert in 2008-09 than in 2006.

Advice that use of the product with infants before they are six months old should only occur on the advice of a suitably qualified health professional occurred in the text of the advert in just two cases in 2008-09. This information was never shown on pack shots in adverts.

Other warnings about hazards associated with inappropriate preparation of the product were visible in the adverts but never shown on pack shots. Where these statements did occur, they were more prevalent in 2008-09 than in 2006. All adverts in 2006 displayed the words “Important Notice” both in the text of the advert and seven out of ten did so in 2008-09. A statement that the product was to be used only on the advice of a health professional occurred in two adverts in 2008-09 but in none of those from 2006. Warnings about consequences of misuse of the product were rare and appeared in only three of these adverts in 2008-09.
The follow-on formula adverts contained various arguments about the product. A statement that breast feeding was best occurred in most adverts in 2008-09 but in only two in 2006.

The presence of a number of promotional terms was examined. These included: defend/defence, immunity, natural ingredients, natural development, protect, and robust/tough. Immunity was the most widely used term and occurred much more frequently in adverts from 2008-09 than in those from 2006. None of the adverts from 2006 or 2008-09 contained any product demonstrations.

Just three adverts for follow-on formula contained any elements judged as humour and all appeared in 2008-09. Pictures of infants laughing or of mother and baby together were more prevalent in 2008-09 than in 2006.

**Channel/Format Factors**

These factors comprised a range of picture-related and narrative-related attributes. The picture materials were potentially important in terms of enhancing consumers’ emotional reactions to the adverts and also in relation to memory for the adverts and advertised brands. The narrative elements were important to the legibility and readability of the information in the adverts. Such information needed to be perceptually apprehended before it could have any subsequent cognitive, emotional or behavioural impact.

All follow-on formula print adverts contained some picture material. This was most likely to comprise pictures of babies or infants, sometimes with and usually without the product. Other picture material showed the infant and his or her mother together. In many cases, the setting was not clearly visible or discernible. Where such details could be identified, the usual settings were in the home or at an outdoor location such as in a garden or park. Images of infants only or of infants with a female adult (and presumed to be a mother) were more prevalent in 2008-09 than in 2006. Visual settings usually comprised home settings, although there was an increase in the use of outdoor settings between 2006 and 2008-09.

A number of key text information features were identified including brand names, product names, identification of follow-on formula, price information, superiority of breast feeding statement, recommended age of use, and other product-related support information in the
adverts. Brand names, product names and follow-on formula identification were assessed as they appeared both in the text of the advert and in text shown on a visible pack display.

In each instance, three text format variables were examined: case, font and colour/contrast. These factors have been found by empirical research with texts to influence the legibility and readability of printed words. In the context of text legibility and readability, lower case lettering has been found to be more legible and readable than upper case lettering. Although the latter can sometimes have more impact when there is a need to draw special attention to a point. There is some evidence also that sans serif font can be more readable than serif font. However, there is also conflicting evidence on this point. Finally, it is important that where differently coloured text and backgrounds are used that the text stands out from its background. Certain colour combinations work better together than do others in terms of enhancement of the legibility of the text. High and low resolution colour combinations have been identified in the relevant empirical literature.

In general across the different text messages analysed here, lower case lettering or combinations of lower with upper case and sans serifs fonts were the styles used most often. This was true of adverts from 2006 and from 2008-09. Turning to colour-contrast factors, high resolution combinations (text and background) were used much more often with all key text messages, with the exception of brand name where low resolution combinations were just as prevalent. The general pattern over time was for a shift towards greater use of high resolution colour combinations in 2008-2009 than in 2006.

**Receiver Factors**

These factors are concerned with advertising attributes that might draw the consumer into the message through identification with its contents. Thus, this part of the analysis examined the use of babies/infants, mothers and fathers, relationship themes and use of colours to create particular atmospheres within any such advertising imagery. There is evidence that such factors can influence consumer’s attitudes towards advertising and brands and that these responses may in turn set up conditions that could eventually influence purchase decisions.

Most follow-on formula print adverts (eight in ten) displayed a baby/infant. Virtually all those adverts appearing in 2008-2009 did so. Adverts were coded for the presence of visible displays of specific attributes or behaviours by the depicted babies/infants: has hair, head
control, sitting upright, dexterity of arm movements, has teeth, self-feeding and crying. These features have been found useful by consumers in determining the age-appropriateness of the advertised product. In general, the prevalence of these features increased from 2006 to 2008-09.

Female adult figures, presumed to be mothers were visibly present in more than one in four adverts in 2008-09 and in fewer than one in five in 2006. They were seldom depicted with infants. There were no images featuring adult males, presumed to be father figures. Consequently, there were no images that showed men and women (mothers and fathers) together. Affectionate touching between females presumed to be mothers and babies/infants occurred proportionately twice as often in adverts in 2008-09 as in 2006.

The use of soft pastel colours in images that featured babies/infants occurred much more often in adverts in 2008-09 than in those from 2006. The use of bold primary colours on product packs was found more again in adverts from 2008-09 than in those from 2006.

### Annex

**Attributes that Displayed Significant Changes between the 2006 and 2008-09 Follow-On Formula Print Advert Samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Chi square score</th>
<th>2008-09 compared with 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of pictured child ethnic profile</td>
<td>$X^2 = 19.8^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product pack visibility in advert</td>
<td>$X^2 = 25.9^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Follow-On Formula’ visibility in advert</td>
<td>$X^2 = 26.0^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product range visibility in advert</td>
<td>$X^2 = 25.9^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product stage on pack shot visibility in advert</td>
<td>$X^2 = 26.4^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of use recommendation in advert</td>
<td>$X^2 = 26.1^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefit claim in advert</td>
<td>$X^2 = 10.0^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer careline/helpline shown</td>
<td>26.0***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-qualified health claims</td>
<td>13.8***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to be used as substitute for breast milk in pack shot</td>
<td>25.9***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use only on advice of medical or health professional in advert</td>
<td>13.8***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable only for particular nutritional by infants 6 months+ in pack shots</td>
<td>25.9***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority of breast feeding statement</td>
<td>23.8***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive benefits arguments</td>
<td>5.6*</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of term ‘immunity’</td>
<td>3.8*</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant/infant with adult female images</td>
<td>19.3***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home settings pictures</td>
<td>11.6**</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name in ad legibility - case</td>
<td>13.1**</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name in ad legibility - colour</td>
<td>32.3***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name on pack – case</td>
<td>25.6***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name on pack – font</td>
<td>25.9***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name on pack – colour</td>
<td>36.6***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula in advert legibility – case</td>
<td>22.8***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula on pack in advert legibility - case</td>
<td>45.1***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula on pack in advert legibility – font</td>
<td>25.9***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula on pack in advert legibility - colour</td>
<td>27.4***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority of breast feeding legibility – case</td>
<td>21.5***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority of breast feeding legibility – font</td>
<td>20.3***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority of breast feeding legibility – colour</td>
<td>26.2***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended age of use legibility – case</td>
<td>15.6***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product related support information legibility – colour</td>
<td>24.3**</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictured infant has hair</td>
<td>22.3***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictured infant display head control</td>
<td>28.8***</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement Feature</td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictured infant display dexterity of arm movements</td>
<td>$20.1^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictured infant self-feeding</td>
<td>$22.6^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictured infant has teeth</td>
<td>$21.3^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictured infant shown smiling</td>
<td>$19.1^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of pastel colours in images of infants</td>
<td>$6.7^*$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of bold primary colours</td>
<td>$5.6^*$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of ‘Important Notice’</td>
<td>$6.1^{**}$</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of signal word with warning</td>
<td>$4.3^*$</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of risk warning</td>
<td>$4.3^*$</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1. Significance levels: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$

Note 2. These tests of statistical significance indicated that any differences in the prevalence of specific advertising attributes between the ad samples from 2006 and from 2008-09 with a single * had a less than one in 20 (5%) probability, those with a double ** exhibited less than one in 100 (1%) probability, and those with a triple *** exhibited less than one in 1000 (0.1%) probability of being purely chance fluctuations.
Appendix 4. Findings: Follow-On Formula Advertisements - Television

Using the Billetts archive follow-on formula advertisements were surveyed for their appearances on television between the 1st January and 31st December 2006 and between 1st March 2008 and 28th February 2009. In total 29 television advertisements for follow-on formula products were found, with 22 (76%) appearing during 2006 and 7 (24%) during 2008-2009.

General Factors

Over both time periods, three follow-on product ranges were advertised. The most frequently advertised product overall was SMA Progress (25; 86.2%) followed by Cow & Gate Complete Care Follow On Milk (3; 10.3%), and Aptamil Follow On Milk (1; 3.4%). Table A4.1 presents the distributions of advertisements by product for the two time periods. The data here confirm the greater volume of follow-on advertising in 2006 compared with 2008-9. In 2006, all of the television advertising was for SMA Progress. In 2008-2009, the advertising was distributed among Cow & Gate Complete Care Follow-On Milk (3; 43%), SMA Progress (3; 43%), Aptamil Follow-On Milk (1; 14%). The year to year changes observed here were significant ($X^2 = 19.0, df = 2, p < 0.001$).

Table A4.1  Distribution of Product Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil Follow On Milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA Progress</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate Complete Care Follow on Milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The advertised products came from two manufacturers across the two time periods: John Wyeth (25; 86%) and Nutricia (4; 14%). All of the 2006 television advertising of follow-on formula was for John Wyeth products. In 2008-2009, the advertising was split between Nutricia (4; 57%), and John Wyeth (3; 43%) products.
Type of advertisement and running times
Overall most follow-on formula television advertisements were in short (between 10 and 15 seconds) programme sponsor slots (20; 69%); the rest occupied commercial slots within or between programmes, typically running for 20 seconds. Follow-on formula advertisements were more likely to appear in sponsor slots in 2006 than they were in 2008-9. Nineteen out of 22 (86%) television advertisements running in 2006 were in sponsor slots while all but one of the television advertisements in 2008-9 were in commercial slots (6; 86%). The mean running time for television advertisements was much longer in 2008-09 (28.9 seconds) than in 2006 (16.2 seconds).

Channel
All TV adverts in 2006 appeared on minor TV channels on multi-channel platforms, compared with over one in two (57%) in 2008-09. One advert appeared on Channel 4 and one on Five in 2008-09. For the remaining advert for that year channel data were not available. The channel distributions differed significantly between 2006 and 2008-09 ($X^2 = 10.5$, df = 3, $p < 0.02$).

Number of advertising slots
Billetts recorded no duration data for the majority of campaigns that ran in 2006 (most of these being programme sponsorship slots for which detailed data of this sort are unavailable). For the remainder, the number of advertising slots, overall, occupied by each follow-on formula television advertisement varied from 1,098 to 16,251. In 2008-9 each advertisement appeared, on average, 7,593 times. These data represent the total number of transmissions of each advertisement across all TV channels on which they appeared.

Campaign duration
The television advertising campaigns in the sample overall ran for between two and 30 months, although again Billetts recorded no duration data for the majority of campaigns that ran in 2006. The campaigns in 2008-9 ran for an average of 11 months.

Campaign expenditure
Expenditure data for the majority of television campaigns that ran in 2006 is missing; the total expenditure recorded was just under £2,132,000 for that period. For 2008-9, the figure was just under £7,823,000. The maximum recorded spend on a single television advertising
campaign for follow on formula in 2006 was £1,612,001; the maximum in 2008-9 was £2,309,392.

Source Factors

Gender of voiceover and principal adult on-screen actors

The majority of television advertisements used female voices (27; 93%); all voiceovers in 2006 were female; 71% (5 out of 7) of voiceovers in 2008-9 were female. In 31% of cases overall (n = 9, all in 2006) the advertisements contained no on-screen adult actors. Of the remaining cases, in 85% of the advertisements the principal on-screen actor was female. The only male adult on-screen actors appeared in the advertisements shown in 2008-9 (3; 43% of the advertisements shown in that period). The gender distribution of voice-overs ($X^2 = 6.8$, df = 1, $p < 0.009$) and of principal on-screen adult actor ($X^2 = 12.3$, df = 2, $p < 0.002$) differed significantly.

Ethnicity of Endorsers

In terms of ethnicity, in one of the television advertisements the principal adult actor was classified as ‘Black-Afro Caribbean British’ (3% of the total number of television advertisements); in one the ethnicity of the principal adult actor could not be classified (3%), and the remainder (17; 59%) contained a principal adult actor who was classified as ‘White-British’. There were no statistically significant differences between the two advertisement samples here.

All the television advertisements contained child actors. The majority were classified as ‘White British’ (26; 90%), two (7%) were classified as ‘Black-Afro Caribbean British’ and one (3%) was classified as ‘Asian British’. This pattern was broadly consistent across the two time periods. In 2006 86% (n = 19) of the principal on-screen child actors in the advertisements were ‘White British’, 9% (n = 2) were ‘Black Afro-Caribbean British’ and one (5%) was ‘Asian-British’. In 2008-9, all seven of the principal on-screen child actors in the advertisements were ‘White British’. The ethnic profiles of on-screen adult and child actors did not differ significantly between televised adverts in 2006 and 2008-09.
Celebrity and Expert Endorsement and Advice

None of the follow-on formula advertisements on television made use of ‘expert’ or celebrity endorsements. One advert which appeared in 2008-2009 contained baby/infant-related advice of a general sort. This was for Aptamil Follow-On Milk.

Message Factors

Product Information

Brand Differentiating Factors

As in the print advertising analysis a number of brand differentiating factors were coded for in the follow-on formula television advertisements. In all cases in both sampled periods the product pack was visible in the advert. Again, the visible pack was the usual way of displaying the brand name; the brand name was visible in other parts of the advert in only one case in 2006.

Follow-on formula was identified visually in all the television adverts on the visible pack and otherwise in both the 2006 and 2008-09 ad samples. It was mentioned in the spoken narrative in only a minority of cases and these all occurred in 2008-09, which represented a statistically significant difference from the 2006 ad sample ($X^2 = 14.6$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$).

---

The voice-over text reads: ‘Breast milk is perfect for your baby, nothing compares to it. It strengthens your baby’s natural defences and reduces the risk of infection. How time flies by. If you decide to move on from breast feeding Aptamil Follow On contains immuno fortis, to help support some of your baby’s natural defences. Aptamil Follow On, helping support your baby’.
Table A4.2 Presence of Brand Differentiating Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product pack visible in ad</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand name shown in ad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(other than on visible pack)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow on formula identified on visible pack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not shown on pack</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pack not shown in ad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula identified in ad (other than on visible pack)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula identified in spoken narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Product Identification**

The name of the product range was identifiable visually in all follow-on formula television advertisements and was also identifiable on the product packs shown in every case. In the majority of television advertisements shown in 2006 (21; 96%) the voice over also mentioned the product name and range. In 2008-9, the voice-overs in all advertisements did so. This difference was non-significant.

Again, the visibility of the product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2, or 3) in each advertisement was coded. It was more likely to be visible in pack shots advertisements shown in 2006 (21; 96% of those cases) than in the 2008-9 period (4; 57%). This difference was significant ($X^2 = 6.6$, df = 1, p < 0.01). None of the television advertisements presented the product stage visually otherwise, nor was the product stage mentioned in voice-overs.

**Age of Use Recommendation**
Age of use recommendations was coded in pack shots and otherwise. In pack shots this was unclear in the majority of cases. It was, however, far more likely to be coded as present in advert pack shots in 2008-2009 (6; 86%) than in those coded for 2006 when none could coded for this variable. This difference was significant ($X^2 = 23.8$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$). No advertisements shown in 2006 contained an age of use recommendation elsewhere either, but age of use recommendations were present elsewhere in follow-on formula television adverts shown in 2008-9 (3; 43%). Again this year to year difference was significant ($X^2 = 10.5$, df = 1, $p < 0.001$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table A4.3 Product Differentiation Factors</strong></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow &amp; Gate] visible in advertisement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow &amp; Gate] visible on pack shown in advertisement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Pack not shown in ad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow &amp; Gate] spoken in narrative in advertisement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2 or 3; etc) visible in advertisement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Product stage ‘1’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Product stage ‘2’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Product stage ‘3’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Good night milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] Not visible</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2, or 3, etc) visible on pack in advertisement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Product stage ‘1’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Product stage ‘2’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Product stage ‘3’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Good night milk</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] Not visible on pack</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] Pack not shown in advertisement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2 or 3; etc) audible in spoken narrative in advertisement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Product stage ‘1’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Product stage ‘2’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Product stage ‘3’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Good night milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] Not mentioned</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health and Nutrition Benefits of Product

Statements about the health and nutrition benefits of follow-on formula products were on the whole not visible either in pack shots or elsewhere in any of the television adverts coded. One advert containing a nutrition benefit statement in a pack shot was found in the 2008-9 period (14% of all the television advertisements for that period). Three adverts containing a nutrition benefit statement appearing elsewhere were found in the 2008-9 period (43%). None of the 2006 TV adverts contained nutrition statements in the advert or on a pack shot. Only the visible statement in advert difference was significant here ($X^2 = 10.5$, df = 1, $p < 0.001$).

One advert in 2008-09 and none in 2006 contained any statement about health benefits of product on a pack shot (a non-significant difference) and three adverts in 2008-09 and one in 2006 showed such a statement elsewhere in the advert (a significant difference; $X^2 = 6.6$, df = 1, $p < 0.01$). Four adverts in 2008-09 and none in 2006 contained any spoken discussion of nutrition benefits. This difference was significant ($X^2 = 10.5$, df = 1, $p < 0.001$).

Price Information/helplines

No price information was shown anywhere on a visible pack or elsewhere, or was audible in any of the television advertisements. None contained information about helplines.

New Product Features

None of the television adverts contained a statement indicating that there was something ‘new’ about the brand or product, either in a product pack shot or anywhere else in the advert.

Convenience or ease of Use

None of the television follow-on formula advertisements contained information about the product’s ease of use either in a product pack shot, in any text displayed, or in any voice-overs.

Technical Information about Health and Nutrition

No health or nutrition claims qualified by cited medical evidence were found in any of the television advertisements, but non-qualifying statements - where no apparently qualified expert source was cited in support – appeared in five television advertisements overall. One of these appeared in the voice-over only in an advert in 2006 and four appeared in 2008-2009 (one in the voice-over only; three were both visible and spoken about). Only one year-to-year
difference was significant and this was for visual text health claims without the clinical backup evidence being cited \( (X^2 = 11.9, \text{df} = 2, p < 0.003) \) which signalled an increase in presence of this feature in 2008-09 compared with 2006.

As before, a series of further codes classified each advertisement in terms of whether it contained technical information about the energy value (in kJ and kcal) of products, protein content, carbohydrate content, lipids content, quantity of choline, inositol, carnitine, and other specified minerals or vitamins. None of the follow-on formula television adverts in 2006 or in 2008-09 contained this type of information.

**Risk and Use**

Each television advertisement was coded for a range of risk-related attributes. None of the adverts shown in 2006 contained a statement anywhere in the advert to the effect that the product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over the age of six months. Five of the adverts shown in the 2008-9 period contained such a statement; one of these appeared in the voice-over, the rest appeared as on-screen text. These four adverts were the only cases to contain a statement – again as on-screen text - that the product should form only part of a diversified diet. The year to year change in presence of this information was significant \( (X^2 = 19.0, \text{df} = 2, p < 0.0001) \).

No TV adverts in 2006 contained a statement that the product should form only part of a diversified diet, whereas four adverts did in 2008-09 (57%). This change was significant \( (X^2 = 14.6, \text{df} = 1, p < 0.0001) \).

All the follow-on formula advertisements on television that were analysed contained an on-screen statement that the product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during the first six months of life. Four advertisements (all in 2008-2009, 57% of the ads appearing in the 2008-9 period) contained the statement that any decision to use the product before six months of age should be made only on the advice of a medical or pharmaceutical professional. This year to year difference was significant \( (X^2 = 14.6, \text{df} = 1, p < 0.0001) \).

None of the television advertisements for follow-on formula in the analysis contained a warning – either in the form of on-screen text or in a voice over - of health hazards associated with inappropriate preparation or storage of the product being advertised.
None of the television adverts contained the words ‘Important notice’ anywhere in the advertisement.

Statements recommending, a) that the product is to be used only on the advice of a medical, health or pharmaceutical professional, and b) that the product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over the age of six months were visible in pack shots in four adverts in total. All of these adverts appeared in 2008-2009 representing 57% of the total number shown in that period. These statements appeared in none of the adverts shown in 2006. In both cases, these changes from year to year were significant ($X^2 = 14.6, df = 1, p < 0.0001$).

None of the pack shots in the television advertisements analysed in 2006 and in 2008-09 contained:

- statements that the product should form only part of a diversified diet
- statements that the product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during first six months of life
- statements that any decision to use the product before six months of age, should be made only on the advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional
- any warning of health hazards of inappropriate preparation
- any warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage on visible pack in advertisement
- the words “Important Notice”
- statements recommending that the product is used only on the advice of medical/health/pharmaceutical professional
- a signal word to draw attention to risk warning
- a risk statement describing nature of risk
- a consequence statement defining consequences of misuse
- an instruction statement advising on how to avoid the consequences of misuse

**Arguments and Counter-Arguments about the Product**

A statement concerning a) the superiority of breast feeding and b) information about the appropriate use of follow-on milk so as not to discourage breast feeding was present in the voice-over in one case: an advertisement for Aptamil Follow-On Milk shown in the 2008-9 period. These small changes from year to year were not statistically significant.
Arguments in favour of follow-on formula that described its positive benefits were found in four adverts in total, one in 2006 (5%) and three in 2008-2009 (43%). This result was significant ($X^2 = 6.6$, df = 1, $p < 0.01$). There were no advertisements containing arguments describing how to offset negative outcomes of product use for the child.

Coding of the texts of adverts for the use of specific promotional terms found no instances of the use of the terms ‘immunity’, ‘natural development’, ‘protect’, ‘robust/tough’, or ‘natural ingredients’. The terms ‘defend’ or ‘defence’ were used in on-screen text in two advertisements overall, both appearing in the 2008-9 period (29%). These terms were also used in the voice-overs of three television adverts overall, all of which appeared in 2008-9 (43%). The analysis found no instances of the terms ‘immunity’, ‘natural development’ ‘protect’, ‘robust/tough’ or ‘natural ingredients’ being used in voice-overs, although an advertisement for Aptamil Follow-On Milk in 2008-9 mentioned the ingredient ‘immuno fortis’ in its voice over script. The presence of the term defend/defence increased significantly from 2006 to 2008-09 both in visual presentation ($X^2 = 6.8$, df = 1, $p < 0.009$) and in voice-over ($X^2 = 10.6$, df = 1, $p < 0.001$).

**Product Demonstrations**

None of the television advertisements in the analysis contained instructions for appropriate preparation, for storage, or for disposal of the products advertised. One advert shown in the 2008-9 period contained visual material illustrating a method of preparation. This did not represent a statistically significant change from 2006.

**Thematic Content**

**Humour**

Five follow-on formula television advertisements overall depicted funny situations. Four of these occurred in 2006 and one appeared in 2008-09. These differences between ad samples were not statistically significant.

The coding frame also analysed all advertising for the presence of ‘heart-warming tones’, again defined in terms of whether the adverts contained images of infants laughing. Nineteen adverts were found that did this in total, 14 appearing in 2006 (64%) and five appearing in 2008-2009 (71%). Only two adverts were found showing a mother sitting with an infant at a
table or on a chair. Both of these appeared in 2006 (9%). Three television advertisements contained scenes of a mother bottle feeding her infant; one was shown in 2006 (5%); two in 2008-9 (29%). None of these differences between the 2006 and 2008-09 ad samples achieved statistical significance.

**Channel/Format Factors**

**Audio-Visual Techniques**

**Visual Format and use of music**

Visual format features coded in follow-on formula television advertisements included the type of production, the visual setting, the number of scene cuts per minute, and the use of background music. Table A4.4 summarizes these findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A4.4 Visual Format and Use of Music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Format</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Production</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Film situation with narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Still depiction of product and text content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Mix of both above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual setting of advertisement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] In home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] In retail setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] In car/vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Outdoor locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] Not discernible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Pace</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of scene cuts per minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is any background music playing?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequently used production type was a mixture of film with narrative together with still shots of the product and text. This was a little more likely to be the type of production
employed in adverts shown in 2008-9 than in 2006. Overall, the visual setting was most frequently the home, universally the case in the television adverts from 2008-09 and occurring in one in two cases in 2006. In many cases in 2006, however, the setting was not discernible. Outdoor locations were used in 2006 adverts but not at all in 2008-09. The changes from 2006 to 2008-09 in terms of production type and visual setting were not significant.

Overall, visual pace employed in television advertisements for follow-on formula tended to be slow. Over the two sample periods, 2008-9 contained advertisements with a higher mean number of scene cuts per minute (7.9 compared with 2.3 in 2006). The proportion of high-rate scene cuts per minute increased significantly in 2008-09 compared with 2006 ($X^2 = 20.2$, df = 6, $p < 0.003$).

Background music was more likely to be used in adverts shown during 2006 (all cases) than in 2008-9 (57%), a difference that was significant ($X^2 = 10.5$, df = 1, $p < 0.001$).

**Visible narrative factors**

*Use of text*

Any superimposed ‘health warning’ text - to the effect that the product is not a breast milk substitute - appearing in each television advertisement was coded in terms of ‘position’, ‘proportion of screen occupied’, ‘type of presentation’, ‘length of time on screen’ ‘number of words used’ and ‘number of lines used.’ Table A4.6 summarizes the findings.

There was a high level of consistency between time periods: all adverts displayed their health warning text at the bottom of the screen, occupying between one and 10% of the screen area, and, in the majority of cases not presenting it in a text box. There were no significant changes from year to year in terms of position on screen of superimposed text, proportion of total screen occupied by superimposed text or in the extent to which superimposed text was boxed or not boxed.

There was some variation over the length of time the text appeared on screen, the text in 2008-9 adverts staying on screen longer on average than the text in 2006 adverts (14 seconds and 8.7 seconds respectively). One explanation for this lies in the greater average word count of the text used in the later period (18.7 words compared with 14.3 words). In most cases (23;
79% of all adverts) the text was contained in a single line. It was more likely to take up two lines in 2008-9 than in 2006: it did so in 43% of cases in 2008-9 compared with 14% of cases in 2006. The proportion of long-hold text increased significantly from 2006 to 2008-09 ($X^2 = 25.4$, df = 6, $p < 0.0001$) as did the proportion of long word count statements ($X^2 = 24.9$, df = 6, $p < 0.0001$).

Table A4.6 Properties of superimposed health warning text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Top of screen only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Bottom of screen only</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Other part of screen only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Top and bottom of screen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Various parts of screen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] No superimposed text used</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of total screen occupied</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] 1-10%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] 11-20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] 21-40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] 41-50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] 51%+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Contained within box</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Not contained within box</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of hold (seconds)</strong></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word count</strong></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Line count</strong></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Text Style
Brand and product names, statements and recommendations appearing on packs in pack shots and otherwise were coded in terms of ‘letter case’ and ‘font style’.

Brand Name
In most cases the brand name was not visible in the advert. The key findings are shown in Table A4.8 below. This text was not visible in any ads from 2006. In 2008-09 on the one occasion it appeared, it was shown in lower case and sans serifs font. None of the year to year changes achieved statistical significance.

Table A4.8: Brand name visible in advertisement and on pack in pack shots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product Name in Adverts
The product name, which was displayed in all the television advertisements, was mostly shown in a mix of upper and lower case, though in lower case only and sentence case in a small number of adverts. The relevant data are shown in Table A4.9 below. The use of upper plus lower case was most prevalent in 2006 (91% of ads) followed by lower case only (9%). In 2008-09 upper plus lower case and sentence case (43% of ads each) were equally likely to be used, with one advert showing this text in lower case only (14%). All occurrences of product names in an advert were presented in sans serif font only in 2006 (100% of ads) and in 2008-09 (100% of ads). The change in case style for product name visible in advert ($X^2 = 11.1$, df = 2, $p < 0.004$) and shown in a pack shot ($X^2 = 6.8$, df = 1, $p < 0.009$) was significant.
Table A4.9 Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product Name on Packs in Adverts

Turning to the visible presence of product names on product packs displayed in adverts, most adverts in which this text occurred used an upper case plus lower case combination. The relevant data are shown in Table A4.10 below. Only upper plus lower case was used in 2006 (100% of ads) and in most ads (71%) in 2008-09. Two adverts from 2008-09 (29%) showed this text in lower case only. All instances of this text appeared in sans serif font in 2006 (100%) and in 2008-09 (100%). The change in case style for product name shown in a pack shot ($X^2 = 6.8, df = 1, p < 0.009$) was significant.

Table A4.10 Product Name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] Visible on Pack in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identification of Follow-on Formula in Adverts

As data presented in Table A4.11 indicate, text identifying a product as follow-on formula in television advertising tended to be shown most often in lower case only overall, although whereas this was universal in 2006 (1005 of ads), in 2008-2009 adverts were more varied in this sense, with the text shown equally in lower case only (43% of ads) and sentence case (43% of ads) and one case comprising upper plus lower case (14%). All adverts presented this text in san serifs font only throughout both analysis periods. Case style displayed a significant shift from 2006 to 2008-09 ($X^2 = 4.6$, df = 2, $p < 0.001$).

Table A4.11 Identification of ‘Follow-on Formula’ Visible in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identification of Follow-on Formula on Packs in Adverts

Table A4.12 shows that text identifying the product as follow-on formula on product packaging in television advertisements used sentence case or lower case. All adverts from 2006 showed this text in sentence case, and this case was used in the majority of adverts (86%) in 2008-9. All instances of this text appeared in sans serif font in 2006 (100%) and 2008-09 (100%). Case style distribution for text shown on a pack shot here changed significantly from 2006 to 2008-09 ($X^2 = 23.8$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$). This finding did not represent a drop in legibility from year to year, however, because although there were some style distribution changes, the case styles used in both ad samples represented ones known to enhance legibility.
Table A4.12 Identification of ‘Follow-on Formula’ Visible on Pack in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Price Information in Adverts

Price information did not appear in follow-on formula television advertisements.

Superiority of Breast Feeding Statement in Adverts

No television advertisements contained an on-screen statement concerning the superiority of breast feeding.

Recommended Age of Use Text

Text concerning the recommended age of use was shown in only a minority of television advertisements and all these occurred in 2008-09. The data are shown in Table A4.13 below. This text was not shown at all in 2006. In 2008-09 it appeared most often in sentence case (71% of ads) and in a minority of adverts in appeared in lower case only (29%). This text appeared in 2008-09 only in sans serif font (100% of ads). Case style ($X^2 = 29.0$, df = 2, $p < 0.0001$) and font style ($X^2 = 15.1$, df = 1, $p < 0.0001$) both changed significantly from 2006 to 2008-09, but these changes reflected the fact that such text was present only in the adverts sampled from 2008-09.
### Table A4.13 Recommended Age of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A4.14 Other Support Text with Product-related Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Product-related Support Information in Adverts

All television advertisements analysed contained other product-related text. In 2006, this text appeared in the majority of instances (91%) in upper plus lower case and in a minority of ads (29%) in sentence case. In 2008-9 only sentence case was used (100% of ads). All advertisements in 2006 (100%) and in 2008-09 (100%) used sans serif font for this text. Case style changed significantly from 2006 to 2008-09 ($X^2 = 20.1$, df = 1, p < 0.0001).
**Receiver Factors**

*Use of Babies and Infants*

All the sampled TV follow-on formula adverts displayed a baby/infant. Each advertisement was coded for any visible displays of baby/infant behaviours. Most showed babies/infants with hair and displaying some degree of head control. Many also showed babies/infants sitting upright. More than three-quarters of all adverts showed babies/infants smiling or displaying dexterity of arm movements. Fewer showed babies/infants with teeth, self-feeding or crying. With the exception of smiling, the adverts shown in 2008-2009 generally depicted babies/infants with fewer of these attributes than those babies/infants depicted in 2006, but the majority of cases during the period did display them. Significant year to year changes occurred in respect of depiction of head control ($X^2 = 10.5$, df = 1, $p < 0.001$), dexterity of arm movements ($X^2 = 4.2$, df = 1, $p < 0.04$), and self-feeding ($X^2 = 6.8$, df = 2, $p < 0.03$). An overwhelming majority of sampled adverts from 2006 displayed babies/infants showing head control plus dexterity of arm movements and having hair (n = 20). At least four out of seven displayed a combination of all these features except for self-feeding and crying.

**Table A4.15 Attributes of Depicted Babies and Infants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has hair</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head control</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting upright</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexterity of arm movements</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has teeth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-feeding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presence of Adult Female (Mother Figure)**

Mothers (or, to be precise, adult female actors presumed to be portraying mothers) were more prevalent in adverts in 2008-2009 (6; 86%) than in 2006 (13; 59%). Mothers were depicted with infants more frequently in adverts shown in 2008-2009 (5; 71%) than in adverts shown in 2006 (13; 59%). There were two adverts that depicted mothers without infants – both in
the 2008-2009 period. Only one advert (shown in 2006) contained images of a pregnant woman. None of the differences observed here between the ad samples from 2006 and from 2008-09 were found to be statistically significant.

**Presence of Adult Males and Relationship Scenarios**

Adult males appeared in a minority of the television adverts and they were more likely to appear in adverts shown in the 2008-9 period (3; 43%) than in 2006 (2; 9%). This change was significant ($X^2 = 4.2$, df = 1, $p < 0.04$). There were four adverts showing a father and infant together two of which appeared in 2006 and two in 2008-09. None of the adverts depicting an adult male with infants showed them sitting at a table or in a chair or showed bottle feeding. Four adverts in total showed a man and woman together; this setting was more likely to be seen in adverts shown in 2008-9 (2; 29%) than in 2006 (2; 9%). And four adverts showed a man and woman together with an infant, two from each period. None of the differences reported here for the two ad samples were found to be statistically significant.

**Displays of affection**

There were no television advertisements in the sample containing scenes depicting a man and woman making affectionate physical contact. A total of 17 adverts contained scenes of a mother and infant hugging/making affectionate physical contact. These were proportionately more likely to be found in adverts shown in 2008-9 (5; 71%) than in 2006 (12; 55%). These changes were not significant. Once again, it is important here to be mindful of the small sample of adverts found in 2008-09. One advertisement (shown in 2008-9) contained a scene depicting a father holding an infant against himself.

**Use of Colours**

The follow-on formula television advertisements were coded for their use of colour. The use of pastel colours in scenes featuring babies occurred in three cases overall. Two of these appeared in 2008-2009 and one appeared in 2006. Bold primary colours were used alongside brand names in four advertisements overall, all of which were located in adverts shown in 2008-9. This year to year difference was significant ($X^2 = 14.6$, df = 1, $p < 0.001$). Primary colours were found on all product packs shown in television adverts, with one exception (an advertisement for Aptamil Follow-Milk, shown in 2008-9).
Summary of Main Findings

A total of 29 television advertisements for follow-on formula were found during the two time periods surveyed (1st January – 31st December 2006 and 1st March 2008 to 28th February 2009). Just over three quarters of these adverts (n = 22) appeared during 2006 (seven appeared in 2008-2009). The Annex to this section presents a table that contains a summary of the advertising attributes that displayed significant changes from the 2006 TV follow-on formula ad sample to the 2008-09 TV follow-on formula ad sample.

General

Two thirds of the television advertisements analysed occupied programme sponsorship slots, with a running time of, on average, just over 16 seconds. These made up the majority of adverts shown in 2006. All but one of the adverts in 2008-9 were shown in longer commercial slots with an average running time of 28.9 seconds.

Because the majority of follow-on formula television adverts shown in 2006 were in sponsorship slots there was limited data available on campaign duration. In the 2008-9 period, the average number of appearances for each advertisement was 7593 running over, on average, 11 months.

Expenditure data for the majority of television campaigns that ran in 2006 is missing; the total expenditure recorded was just under £2,132,000 for that period. For 2008-9, the figure was just under £7,823,000. The maximum recorded spend on a single television advertising campaign for follow on formula in 2006 was £1,612,001; the maximum in 2008-9 was £2,309,392.

Source Factors

Source factors were included because consumer research has indicated the nature of the endorsement can mediate consumers’ responses to advertising. The gender and ethnicity of a product endorser might affect the extent to which members of the audience identify with the endorsement, the advertisements and the advertised brand. The use of an expert endorser or a celebrity endorser can also promote attitudes to an advertisement that may be either positive or negative depending upon the perceived relevance of the endorser to the product.
The majority of television advertisements used female voices. In almost one third of all advertisements there were no on-screen adult actors. For the remaining two thirds in the majority of cases the principal on-screen actor was female. The only male adult on-screen actors appeared in the three advertisements shown in 2008-9 (less than half of the advertisements shown in that period and representing around just 10% of the total number of advertisements analysed).

In the majority of the television advertisements containing a principal adult actor, the actor was classified as ‘White-British’; in only one was the principal adult actor classified as ‘Black-Afro Caribbean British’. All the television advertisements contained child actors and the majority of them were classified as ‘White-British’. This pattern was broadly consistent across the two time periods.

None of the follow-on formula advertisements on television made use of ‘expert’ or celebrity endorsements. One advert which appeared in 2008-2009 contained general baby/infant-related advice.

**Message Factors**

A number of advertising message content factors had been identified in the review of consumer research as having potential effects on consumers’ responses to formula advertising. Information that attempts to differentiate the advertised brand from other brands can render those brands more memorable. The same is true of information that explains the ease or convenience of use of the advertised brand. Promoting the brand as offering something ‘new’ or different can make it stand out and may enhance the persuasiveness of the advertising in relation to eventual purchase.

The provision of technical information can promote the prominence of the brand, but could also render the message confusing and therefore more difficult to process. Risk-related information can work to make a brand more or less appealing depending upon how it is presented and the clarity with which consumers can understand such important content. Arguments that explain the benefits of a brand can enhance its appeal. In addition, arguments in a more negative frame that indicate what the brand can do in terms of reducing problems the consumer might otherwise experience can also promote positive attitudes towards it. Where appropriate the presence of product demonstrations can enhance recall of the
advertising message and, in turn, promote the salience of the brand. Finally, the use of thematic attributes such as humour or warm emotion-promoting themes can enhance both memory for the advertising and trigger positive attitudes towards the brand.

All the follow-on formula television advertisements contained brand differentiating attributes. In all cases the product pack was visible in the advert and the visible pack was the usual way of displaying the brand name and in all cases the product was identified clearly either on the product pack or otherwise visually, and in all but one of the voice over scripts. The product stage of for each brand was visible in most cases in pack shots, although this was a little more likely to be the case in 2006 than in 2008-9.

Age of use recommendation information was unclear in most pack shots overall, although it was more discernible in pack shots appearing in ads in 2008-9 than in 2006. No advertisements shown in 2006 contained an age of use recommendation elsewhere either, but age of use recommendations were present elsewhere in follow-on formula television adverts in a minority of the advertisements shown in 2008-9.

Few follow-on formula adverts shown on television presented information about the health and nutrition benefits of the product and none contained statements indicating that there was something ‘new’ about the brand or product or promoting convenience of use.

Few of the television advertisements (none shown in 2006) contained a statement to the effect that the product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over the age of six months. Where such a statement did appear it did so in a small number of adverts shown in the 2008-9 period. A similar number contained the statement that the product should form only part of a diversified diet.

All the television adverts analysed contained an on-screen statement that the product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during the first six months of life. A small minority (and these mostly in 2008-9) contained the statement that any decision to use the product before six months of age should be made only on the advice of a medical or pharmaceutical professional.
Most television advertisements did not contain statements recommending, a) that the product is to be used only on the advice of a medical, health or pharmaceutical professional, and b) that the product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over the age of six months. Those appearing in 2008-9 were more likely to do so. None of the television advertisements for follow-on formula contained a warning of health hazards associated with inappropriate preparation or storage of the product being advertised and none contained the words ‘Important notice’ anywhere in the advertisement.

Only one advertisement contained a statement concerning the superiority of breast feeding. This occurred in the voice over for an advertisement for Aptamil Follow-On Milk shown in the 2008-9 period. Arguments in favour of follow-on formula that described its positive benefits were found in four adverts in total of which three appeared in 2008-2009. There were no advertisements containing arguments describing how to offset negative outcomes of product use for the child.

The terms ‘defend’ or ‘defence’ were used in on-screen text in two advertisements overall both appearing in the 2008-9 period. These terms were also used in the voice overs in a total of three television ads, all of which appeared in 2008-9. The analysis found no instances of the terms ‘immunity’, ‘natural development’ ‘protect’, ‘robust/tough’ or ‘natural ingredients’ being used in on-screen text or in voice overs, with one exception: an advertisement for Aptamil Follow-On Milk which mentioned the ingredient ‘immuno fortis’.

A small number of follow-on formula television advertisements overall depicted funny situations, and few showed scenes of mothers sitting at tables with an infant or bottle feeding. Rather more – nearly two thirds of the total - contained images of infants laughing. These were fairly evenly distributed between the two periods.

All adverts displayed a ‘health warning’ – to the effect that the product is not a breast milk substitute - at the bottom of the screen, occupying around 10% or less of the screen area. The text in 2008-9 adverts, being slightly longer in terms of their word count, appeared on screen longer on average than the text in 2006 adverts. In most cases the text was contained in a single line.
Channel/Format Factors

These factors comprised a range of visual and narrative attributes. The visual aspects of the advertisements were potentially important in terms of enhancing consumers’ emotional reactions to the adverts and also in relation to memory for the adverts and advertised brands. The narrative elements were important to the legibility and readability of the information in the adverts. Such information needed to be perceptually apprehended before it could have any subsequent cognitive, emotional or behavioural impact.

Most television ads used a mixture of film and voice over narrative, together with still shots of the product and on-screen text. This was a little more likely to be the type of production employed in adverts shown in 2008-9 than in 2006. Where it was discernible, the visual setting was most frequently the home. Visual pace was generally slow, the advertisements in 2008-9 being a little faster paced than those in 2006. Most adverts used background music, although this was more likely to be the case in 2006 than in 2008-9.

Text information features were identified in brand names, product names, identification of follow-on formula, price information, superiority of breast feeding statement, recommended age of use, and other product-related support information in the adverts. Brand names, product names and follow-on formula identification were assessed as they appeared in any on-screen text in the advert and in text shown on a visible pack display.

In each instance, two text format variables were examined: case and font. These factors have been found by empirical research with texts to influence the legibility and readability of printed words. In the context of text legibility and readability, lower case lettering has been found to be more legible and readable than upper case lettering. Although the latter can sometimes have more impact when there is a need to draw special attention to a point. There is some evidence also that sans serif font can be more readable than serif font. However, there is also conflicting evidence on this point.

Overall in all uses of text – on-screen or in pack shots - the styles used most often were lower case lettering or combinations of lower with upper case and sans serifs fonts.
**Receiver Factors**

These factors are concerned with advertising attributes that might draw the consumer into the message through identification with its contents. Thus, this part of the analysis examined the use of babies and infants, mothers and fathers, relationship themes and use of colours to create particular atmospheres within any such advertising imagery. There is evidence that such factors can influence consumers’ physiological responses to and attitudes towards advertising and brands. Although such responses may not directly impact upon purchase decisions, by demonstrating an advert’s ability to draw in consumer attention and to create a positive feeling about it and about the advertised brand, it could set up conditions that could eventually influence product choice.

All the television follow-on formula advertisements displayed a baby or infant, most of whom had hair and displayed some degree of head control. More than two thirds showed babies or infants sitting upright. More than three quarters of all adverts showed babies or infants smiling or displaying dexterity of arm movements. Fewer showed babies and infants with teeth, self-feeding or crying. The majority of adverts shown in 2008-2009 contained images of infants with these attributes but they generally depicted babies and infants with fewer of these attributes than those babies and infants depicted in 2006.

Adult females or mother figures appeared in nearly two thirds of all television follow-on formula adverts, being a little more prevalent in 2008-9 than 2006. In most cases they were depicted with infants, again a little more often in 2008-9 than in 2006. Adult males or father figures appeared in a small number of advertisements, more commonly in 2008-9 than in 2006. When they were present they were likely to be shown with an infant and/or with a woman and infant. More than half the television adverts contained scenes of a woman and infant hugging or making affectionate physical contact. Soft pastel colours were rarely used. Bold primary colours were not widely used in the adverts generally, but were found on all but one of the product packs shown in the advertisements.
## Annex

**Attributes that Displayed Significant Changes between the 2006 and 2008-09 Follow-On Formula TV Advert Samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Chi-square score</th>
<th>2008-09 compared with 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of adult males on screen</td>
<td>$X^2 = 12.3^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of male in voice-over</td>
<td>$X^2 = 6.8^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-On Formula identified in voice-over</td>
<td>$X^2 = 14.6^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of use recommendation visible in advert</td>
<td>$X^2 = 23.8^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of use recommendation visible in pack shot in advert</td>
<td>$X^2 = 10.5^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition benefits of product on pack in advert</td>
<td>$X^2 = 10.5^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefits of product shown</td>
<td>$X^2 = 6.6^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition benefits of product spoken</td>
<td>$X^2 = 10.5^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom-qualified health claims shown</td>
<td>$X^2 = 11.9^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for particular nutritional use by infant aged 6 months+ in ad</td>
<td>$X^2 = 19.0^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for particular nutritional use by infant aged 6 months+ in pack in ad</td>
<td>$X^2 = 14.6^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can form part of a diversified diet</td>
<td>$X^2 = 19.0^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only to be used on advice of health or medical professional</td>
<td>$X^2 = 14.6^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive benefits arguments</td>
<td>$X^2 = 6.6^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of term ‘defend/defence’ – visible in text</td>
<td>$X^2 = 6.8^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of term ‘defend/defence’ in voice-over</td>
<td>$X^2 = 10.6^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of high-rate scene cuts</td>
<td>$X^2 = 20.2^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of long-hold text scenes</td>
<td>$X^2 = 25.4^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of long word count statements</td>
<td>$X^2 = 24.9^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended age of use legibility – case</td>
<td>$X^2 = 29.0^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended age of use legibility – font</td>
<td>$X^2 = 15.1^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>X² Value</td>
<td>Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other product-related information legibility – case</td>
<td>X² = 20.1**</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictured infant dexterity of arm movements</td>
<td>X² = 4.2*</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of adult males</td>
<td>X² = 4.2*</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of bold primary colours</td>
<td>X² = 14.6**</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product stage identified</td>
<td>X² = 6.6*</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of background music</td>
<td>X² = 10.5**</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name in advert legibility case</td>
<td>X² = 11.1**</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name in pack in advert legibility – case</td>
<td>X² = 6.8**</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name in pack in advert – font</td>
<td>X² = 6.8**</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-On Formula identification legibility – case</td>
<td>X² = 4.6**</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Formula identification legibility on pack shots - case</td>
<td>X² = 23.8**</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictured infant head control</td>
<td>X² = 10.5***</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictured infant self-feeding</td>
<td>X² = 6.8*</td>
<td>Down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Significance levels: *** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05

Note 2. These tests of statistical significance indicated that any differences in the prevalence of specific advertising attributes between the ad samples from 2006 and from 2008-09 with a single * had a less than one in 20 (5%) probability, those with a double ** exhibited less than one in 100 (1%) probability, and those with a triple *** exhibited less than one in 1000 (0.1%) probability of being purely chance fluctuations.
Appendix 5. Findings: Follow Formula Advertisements: Direct Mail, Internet and Cross-Media Analysis

Appendix 5 presents findings from analyses of direct mail and internet advertisements for follow-on formula. It also discusses a less formally structured analysis of formula manufacturers’ web sites that contain content about follow-on formula products, often placed alongside information about infant formula products. Finally, this appendix present findings from a series of cross-media analyses that compared the attribute profiles of advertisements for specific brands or brand families that were promoted in more than one medium (e.g., print, TV, direct mail or internet).

Direct Mail Advertisements

Follow-on formula direct mail advertisements were also surveyed for their appearances over the periods of 1st January and 31st December 2006 and between 1st March 2008 and 28th February 2009. This produced two direct mail advertisements (Cow & Gate Follow-on Night Milk and Aptamil Follow-On Milk) both from the latter sample period and their features will be outlined in turn.

Advertisement 1

General Factors

The first advertisement, for Cow & Gate Good Night Milk was recorded on 1st September 2008 and coded as 619.5 sq cm. in size (see Figure A5.1 below) and according to Billetts campaign expenditure data cost £9,029

Figure A5.1 Cow & Gate Direct Mail Advertisement
Source Factors
No celebrity expertise was presented here. A female adult actor of white British origin and children also of British origin ethnic origin, however, were presented in the advertisement. Expert endorsement features in this case in the form of “Fae, baby care advisor and mum” as well as other general detail of the brand and of the product pack. The latter included visible text of the product stage ‘Good Night Milk’ in this case but no recommendations on ‘age of use’; health benefits or price appeared on the pack shot or the advertisement more generally.

Message Factors
The coding revealed that the advertisement offered no statements about the ease of product use or any health or nutritional claims. In terms of risk/use variables, no warnings were offered or information presented on diet, the use of milk at certain ages, any mention of breastfeeding or its’ superiority. However, the advertisement did include an argument in favour of the product. This situates the product within a bedtime routine scenario and this representation explains the benefits thereof. Appearing as idealised in this scenario then the product was also accompanied by heart-warming tones of images of happy infants at bedtime and is accompanied by a helpline telephone number. However, details on product use including demonstrations of the appropriate storage, preparation or disposal of the product did not feature here.

Channel and Format Factors
The advertisement was also coded for channel and format factors. The visual format of the advertisement included pictures of an infant and mother situated in the home setting. Present also was a brand image and this appeared in sans serif and in upper case with lower case and with a colour contrast score of 0.4. As visible on pack in the advertisement, the product name appeared in lower case in sans serif only and with a colour contrast score of 0.5. The ‘Night Follow-on Milk’ statement and supporting text in the advertisement appeared in upper and lower case and in sans serif only with a colour contrast score of 1.5. The brand name and product name also appeared in the advertisement in san serif font and with a colour contrast score of 1.5. No mention is made of price information; superiority of breast feeding statement; recommended age of use or other product-related information.
Receiver Factors

The advertisement was also coded for receiver factors including images of babies. Images included featured babies/infants, with hair. A leading image showed a baby with head control, dexterity of arms and sitting upright and smiling. Another featured a mother present with an infant and this image depicted a display of affection with the mother kissing the child. No father, man and women together or pregnant women featured within advertisement. However, the advertisement did include pastel colours in the images of the babies and the primary colour of blue in the rest of advertisement.

Advertisement 2

General Factors

The second direct mail advertisement appeared on 1st January 2009 and featured Aptamil Follow-on Milk (see Figure A5.2 below) At as 619.5 sq cm. in size, it included a web address for the company and according to Billetts campaign expenditure data cost £ 15, 934.

Figure A5.2 Aptamil Direct Mail Advertisement

Source Factors

Coded for source factors, this advertisement showed a male principal adult actor and child as both of white British ethnicity. The advertisement was also coded as offering general baby and infant related advice. However, there was no evidence either of expert or celebrity endorsement offered.

Message Factors

Analysed for the nature of its product information, the advertisement displayed the product pack and the name of the manufacturer as visible on the pack. The ‘follow-on’ label, the
product name also featured on the pack and within the advertisement more generally. The product stage appeared only on the pack shot. Additional information on the benefits of the product featured in the advertisement text but was not visible on the small pack shot.

The advertisement contained various statements including those on the nutritional and health benefits of the product, the product’s suitability for use with infants aged six months or older and about the superiority of breast feeding. Absent, however, were warnings about preparation, inappropriate storage or comments on misuse. Immunity was a promotional term that was included here but was not accompanied by details of preparation or storage of the follow-on formula.

Channel and Format Factors
Coded for visual format, the advertisement revealed pictures of an infant with the product but the visual setting to this was indiscernible. The brand name appeared also in upper and lower case and in sans serif only in the advertisement and on the product pack shot both with a colour contrast score of 1.4. Visible also was the statement indentifying ‘follow-on formula’ on both the pack and within the advertisements generally. This appeared in both the advertisement and the pack shot in san serif font and as a colour contrast score of 0.4. The statements on the superiority of breastfeeding, the recommended age of use and surrounding text that appeared were also presented in upper case with lower case, in sans serif only, and with a colour contrast score of 0.4.

Receiver Factors
Analysed in terms of receiver factors the advertisement showed that baby actors were presented with head control, dexterity of arms, hair and to be sitting upright. A picture of a father with infant was present in the advertisement which also used pastel colours for the images of babies and primary colours in other parts.

Summary of Main Findings
A total of two advertisements were recorded from the periods of 1st January and 31st December 2006 and between 1st March 2008 and 28th February 2009. Both advertisements featured in the second sample period.

General Factors
Both advertisements appeared only once in the sample period, were recorded as 619.5 sq cm. in size and cost £9,029 and £15,934.
Source Factors
Source factors were included because consumer research has indicated the nature of the endorsement can mediate consumers’ responses to advertising. Both advertisements included children and adult actors with British – while ethnic backgrounds and also women and men adult actors in the advertisements. Significant also was the focus on product advice.

Message Factors
A number of advertising message content factors had been identified in the review of consumer research as having potential effects on consumers’ responses to formula advertising, including information that attempts to differentiate, explain the ease or convenience of use or as something ‘new’ or different. In this sample one advert included all these information factors. The other contained ‘heart warming’ tones.

Channel / Format Factors
The visual and narrative attributes contained here were important as visual aspects were potentially important in terms of enhancing consumers’ emotional reactions to the adverts and narrative elements were important as these inform the legibility and readability of the information in the adverts.

In terms of visual attributes, both advertisements contain emotive pictures including those of an infant and an infant with mother. Narrative attributes reveal a different picture. These show that some colour contrasts included, as research explains, would not enhance legibility.

Receiver Factors
As explained previously, such factors including the use of babies and infants, mothers and fathers, relationship themes and use of colours to create particular atmospheres within any such advertising imagery, are concerned with advertising attributes that might draw the consumer into the message through identification with its contents.

Combined the advertisements demonstrate images of displays of affection between mother and child, pastel colours used to depict the infants and also the infant actors of a discernable age with hair, dexterous arms and seating positions. An unusual feature was the presence of a father and child within one advertisement which appears to be counter stereotypical.
Follow-On Formula Web Advertisements

Follow-on formula advertisements were surveyed on the internet across the two sample time periods and one was recorded. This advertisement featured a display for Hipp Organic and this will be examined in what follows.

Advertisement 1

General Factors

The display advertisement, for Hipp Organic Follow-on milk (See Figure A5.3 below), appeared once on 26/11/2008 and was recorded by Billets campaign data as ‘no spend’. At 42 square centimetres in size, the display advertisement featured on the website www.hipp.co.uk but offered no clickable link to another website and did not make reference to a consumer trade award for the product.

Figure A5.3 Hipp Organic Direct Mail Advertisement

Source Factors

The advertisement did not include a principal adult actor (thus no evidence of their ethnicity) nor was there endorsements of the product offered by recognised experts (such as doctors, medical or healthcare professionals) or other expert types (where their qualifications are unknown) or those made by celebrities. Also no guidance and/or advice on general baby/infant were provided here.

Message Factors

The advertisement featured price and product information in the text ‘No more heavy bags! HiPP Follow on milk £17.97 for 3 boxes. Free delivery’, but did not include any pack shots, product stage, information on ‘age of use’, health or nutrition benefits of product, convenience of use or technical information. Also, the advertisement offered no statements on product features, on convenience of use, on technical information. Nor did it include
statements on risk / use including age of use, substitute for breast milk or health warnings. Absent also were statements on the arguments or counter arguments for the product, including the superiority of breast feeding, product benefits or negative outcomes and those that offer a sense of promotional terms such as immunity, natural development, defence, robust / tough or natural ingredients. Similarly, this advertisement excludes instructions on appropriate preparation, storage, disposal and images related to these and themes such as funny scenarios and heart-warming tones.

Channel and Format Factors
There were no images presented in the advert. In terms of narrative content, the brand, product name and the statement, ‘follow on formula’, and price information featured in upper and lower case and in sans serif font with a colour contrast score of 0.4. Statements contained on pack images and those found generally on the superiority of breast feeding, recommended age of use and other product-related information were absent. The other supporting text appeared also in upper and lower case and in sans serif font with a colour contrast score of 0.4.

Receiver Factors
The advertisement did not feature images of babies / infants (and thus variables on the visibility of hair, self feeding and dexterity are not relevant here). Likewise there were no images presented of mothers and fathers featured together or separate, or images that present relationship scenarios or general examples of fathers feeding or sitting with infants and gender counter stereotyping. Brand names, however, did appear in primary colours here.

Summary of Key Findings
The display advertisement for Hipp Organic appeared in the second period of the two sample periods of 1st January and 31st December 2006 and between 1st March 2008 and 28th February 2009.

General Factors
The advertisement appeared as appeared as 42 cm sq. in size and featured on the web site www.hipp.co.uk with costs that were recoded as ‘no spend’.

Source Factors
These factors have been included as consumer research suggests that these can mediate the consumers’ experiences of products. The ethnic identity, gender and age of actors
represented can help to create particular associations between product and identity and other information inform associations about the quality of the product among consumers. However, the advertisement coded here does not include these types of images or information and therefore no comment can be offered on this.

Message Factors
As has been suggested previously, various message content factors, including particular information offered on brands, can influence consumers’ responses to formula advertising. However, as was introduced above, this advertisement due to its size and focus does not contain information on brand, product and convenience of use etc. and thus no comment can be made on these features here.

Channel/Format Factors
These visual and narrative attributes, as have been explained by consumer research, are important as these can enhance and distract consumer emotional reactions to brands. As the display advertisement coded here did not contain images, no comment can be offered on this aspect of the advertising. However, the font choice and colour contrast of the information that appears within the advertisements can be discussed as enhancing readability.

Receiver Factors
As we have discussed, these factors are concerned with advertising attributes that might draw the consumer into the message through identification with its contents. However, the advertisement coded did not such contain images and thus is no suggestion can be made of potential influence of relationship scenarios or displays of affection.

Formula Manufacturers’ Web Sites
For further interest, formula manufacturers’ web sites were visited to find out what types of online information they might provide about infant and follow-on formula products. This was not a formal content analysis of the sites; instead inspections were conducted to identify broadly the types of information content about formula products they provided. The web sites of Heinz, HIPP, Nestle, Nutricia and John Wyeth were visited in February and March 2009.
**Heinz Baby Food**

The first page of this web site provides a potted history of the company’s involvement in baby food production. Historical milestones are listed starting in 1931 when the company first launched baby food products. Heinz categorizes baby food products by age ranges. Four categories are differentiated: New Born: 0 – 3 months; Baby: 4 – 6 months; Baby: 7 – 12 months; and Toddler: 12 – 18 months. There are clickable links for each of these categories on the first page of the company’s baby food web site.

The Newborn: 0 – 3 months link takes the visitor to the Heinz Nurture product range. The important notice about breastfeeding being best emerges prominently on this page. There is also a further link to information on breast feeding. Information is provided about the Nurture Range with six different products listed. These are shown below:

[1] Nurture Newborn Infant Milk – from birth onwards
[3] Nurture Growing Baby Follow-On Milk – from six months onwards up to weaning
[5] Nurture Gentle Follow-On Milk – from six months onwards for babies with sensitive tummies

There are clickable links for each of the six products listed above. These take the visitor to another level of the site where additional product information is provided and where packs are visibly shown. Product-related information at this level is generally thin. The section on Growing Baby Follow-On Milk contains a link the Little Book on Nurturing which is a guide compiled by 250 mothers with tips of infant feeding that can be downloaded. Throughout this site, therefore, there was product information for infant and follow-on formula products that could be readily navigated by visitors to the site.

**HIPP Organic Baby Foods**

The initial page of this site contains a prominent statement about important changes to HIPP formula milks to ensure they comply with new EC and UK regulations for these products. Visitors are then directed to the HIPP product range: Stage 1 from four months; Stage 1 from
six months; Stage 2 from seven months; Stage 3 from 10 months; Stage 3 from 12 months; and Stage 4 from 15 months. In addition, milks and other drinks products are listed here.

By clicking on Milks, visitors are taken to another level of this site where a prominent important notice is provided about the merits of breastfeeding and the reasons for using formula milks. It is made clear to consumers that they should talk to medical or health professionals first before switching from breastfeeding to formula products. The importance of following instructions for use of these products is also emphasized.


With First Infant Milk from birth onwards, further reference is made to new EC/UK regulations for formula products. Further information is then provided about the product itself and its ingredients, with a detailed list of contents including vitamins, minerals, protein, carbohydrate and fat contents.

A similar format is then followed for each of the other three product types. The reminder of new EC/UK regulations recurs with Follow-On Milk together with a breastfeeding is best statement and then further product details as for the First Infant Milk product. Good Night Milk is a follow-on formula product but is offered as an alternative to normal follow-on milk and contains a mixture of follow-on milk and cereals. Product ingredients are shown again as for the other two product categories described above. Finally, Growing Up Milk is designed for older infants, though it is still described as a follow-on milk product. Its detailed ingredients are listed.

With this site, product-related information was present on infant formula and follow-on formula products. Information about both product categories could be readily navigated by visitors to the site. The site did provide warnings about how to use these products and consumers were advised to seek professional advice before using formula products as an alternative to breastfeeding.
**Nestle® - Baby Foods**

Nestle’s UK web site was visited. As with the other manufacturer sites, the Nestle® site has a Products link on its first page. There was also – at the time of visiting (10th March 2009) – an announcement on this page about new Infant Formula products enhanced with bifidus BL natural cultures. A separate link was available here. Clicking on this takes the visitor to a section of the web site that provides further details about this range of new developments. These products are listed under the general brand heading of Nestle® Good Start® Natural Cultures™.

Visitors can find preparation instructions for these products and a detailed ingredients list. There is no ‘Important Notice’ about breastfeeding present here and site makes a fleeting reference to the benefits of breastfeeding: “Nothing else is breast milk. But for those who can’t breast feed, or for those who choose to supplement, one thing is clear. Nothing else is Good Start® Natural Cultures™.”

Clicking on the general Products link on the home page takes the visitor through to a section that lists Nestle® Baby Formula products. Here, a statement about the advantages of breastfeeding is presented. A number of specific products are listed here: Nestle® Stage 1 Infant Formula Birth+; Nestle® Good Start® Natural Cultures™; Nestle® Good Start® milk – Stage 1 infant formula birth+ with Omega 3 and Omega 6; Nestle® Alsoy® Stage 1 soy-based infant formula Birth+ with Omega 3 and Omega 6. Visitors can click on these product names and link through to further product-related information.

**Nutricia**

The Nutricia web site offers visitors two pathways – the Nutricia Baby Division and the Nutricia Medical Division. Both ultimately lead to the same product-related information. The Nutricia Baby Division, in contrast to the Medical Division, would seem to be targeted at consumers and links through to another site level that again has two parts: Cow & Gate and Aptamil. Each of these categories offers distinct pathways again for health care professionals and consumers. Once again, though, both pathways lead ultimately to the same product information.

Information is provided about Cow & Gate baby milk products. These comprise Cow & gate Good Night Milk; Milks for Sensitive Tummies; Cow & Gate Special Milks; and Cow &
Gate Milks for Babies with Allergies. Under the heading of ‘milks for sensitive tummies’, Cow& Gate offers an infant formula product (Cow & Gate Comfort First Infant Milk) and a follow-on formula product (Cow & Gate Comfort Follow-On Milk). Under the special milks category, there are four products: Cow & Gate Nutriprem for pre-term and low birth weight babies; Cow & Gate Nutriprem Breast Milk Fortifier; Cow & Gate Nutriprem 1 and Nutriprem 2. The last three products are for use under supervision by health professionals. There are three Cow & Gate infant formula products for babies with allergies: Pepti Junior, Pepti and Infasoy.

Under the Aptamil heading, Nutricia offers a number of infant formula products: Aptamil First, Aptamil Extra Hungry and Aptamil Easy Digest. Detailed nutrient ingredients are listed for each of these products. En route to accessing product information, however, important notices are provided about the use of formula products that provide instructions for use and also reinforce the message that breastfeeding is best. Aptamil Follow-On milk is also described with detailed product ingredients supplied as well as instructions for appropriate use.

**John Wyeth – SMA**

By searching for SMA products, the Infant Milk from SMA Nutrition web site can be accessed. This site provides information about the SMA Nutrition range, including SMA Gold, SMA White, SMA Progress and SMA Special Feeds. The SMA Gold product is described as the first major protein innovation in baby milk in over three decades. There is a link to further product information. The product can be used from birth to 12 months, although the manufacturer advises that some babies are ready to switch to follow-on formula at six months. In relation to all four product categories, usage information is provided together with descriptions of the benefits of the product, pack sizes and important notice information about breastfeeding. SMA Gold and SMA White are infant formula products and SMA Progress is a follow-on formula product. The Special Feeds range comprises four products - SMW High Energy, SMA Wysoy, SMA LF and SMA Staydown. For each of these products further links lead to information about when to use the product, its benefits, it pack formats and important notice information about breastfeeding.
This site was found to contain much product-related information for infant and follow-on formula products. This information – whether for infant formula or follow-on formula products – could, at the time if inspection - be navigated by any visitors to the site.

Cross Media Analysis
This section introduces a cross-media analysis of the advertising for follow-on formula which examines the different media used to advertise these products in a particular campaign across the two sample periods (2006 and 2008-2009). The intention of this analysis was to identify the various media used including direct mail and print; direct mail, print and television; and print and television that featured in these campaigns and to explore the attributes that appear commonly within the individual advertisements. The analysis focused on those attributes that were shared by adverts for specific brands that appeared in different media. These are displayed in the tables of this section in a simple descriptive fashion. Those adverts that share a specific attribute are signalled by the letter ‘X’. Where a ‘Y’ appears, the advert exhibited a different value on the dimension being considered.

Direct Mail and Print
The first identified example of a cross media campaign is that offered by Cow & Gate for their product ‘Good Night Milk’. This particular campaign used a direct mail posting along with three print advertisements. All of these ran in the 2008-2009 sample period and included several common attributes.

General Factors
Although the adverts varied in size and duration due mainly to their different media forms, they, as is reflected in Table A5.1 below, did include a web address to the company’s website.

Table A5.1 Web Address in Advertisement by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web address in advertisement</td>
<td>Direct mail Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source Factors

Gender and Ethnicity of Endorsers

Additionally, in terms of the ‘source’ factors outlined in detail within the previous appendices, the Cow & Gate adverts shared similarities in terms of the gender and ethnicity of the endorsers included. The direct mail and one of the print advertisements, for instance, both featured a female adult principal actor which was also coded as representing a while British ethnicity. Moreover, as Table A5.2 below also shows there were commonalities across the advertisements in terms of the presence of a child actor who also appeared in all of the adverts as representing a white British ethnicity.

Table A5.2 Similarities in Adult and Child Actors and Ethnicities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Adult principal actor</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of adult actor: female</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity of adult actor: while British</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of child actor</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity of child actor: white British</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expert Endorsement and Advice

As is shown Table A5.3, featuring also with the direct mail and one of the print advertisements was expert endorsement and advice which in this case was the presence of baby – related advice.

Table A5.3 Presence of Baby Related Advice by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of baby related advice</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Message Factors

Product Differentiation

Moving to explore the various message factors included within the advertisements, the analysis showed that the direct mail and all of the print adverts included production information, the details of which are represented in Table A5.4 that follows.

Table A5.4 Product Differentiation by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product pack visible in advert</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of manufacturer on product pack in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula visible on pack in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula identified in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the advertisements included clear images of the Cow & Gate Good Night Milk product and along with this the pack reproduced in such size as to afford the opportunity to read the manufacturer’s name. Additionally, the adverts showed some similarity in featuring a picture of the product that included the words ‘follow-on formula’ visibly, with one print advert not including this characteristic, and a unity among the others in use of the same words within the advertisements more generally.

Brand Differentiating Factors

An analysis of the advertisements that featured in the Cow & Gate campaign revealed also the presence of information on product identification across the advertisements. Table A5.5 outlines this in more detail. For these adverts the product pack featured clearly in all of the adverts in addition to information on the product range. However, as the table shows, there were differences between the direct mail and print advertisements with the product stage being visible clearly on the product pack and within the advertisement generally within the print advertisements which was not the case with the direct mail advertisement.
Table A5.5 Product Pack, Range and Stage by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Mail Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product pack visible in advert</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product range visible in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product range visible on pack in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product range visible in text in advertisement</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product stage visible on pack in ad</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product stage visible in ad</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of Use Recommendation

A similar point can be made about the presence of information on the ‘age of recommended use’ of the product which, as is reflect in Table A5.6 below, featured clearly within the print advertisements but not in the direct mail advertisement.

Table A5.6 Age of Use Recommended in Ad by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Mail Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of use recommended in ad</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health and Nutrition Benefits of Product

Another aspect of message factors is the presence of information on health and nutrition benefits of the product. In a similar way to the above two examples, this information featured clearly within all of the print advertisements but was not presented in the direct mail advertisement for Good Night Milk. However, a statement about the nutritional benefits of the product appeared in the direct mail advert and in two of the print advertisements (see Table A5.7).
Table A5.7 Health and Nutrition Benefits Claims by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements about nutritional benefits seen on pack in ad</td>
<td>Direct Mail Ad Print Ad 1 Print Ad 2 Print Ad 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements about nutritional benefits seen in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical Information about Health and Nutrition and risk and Use

Technical information about health and nutrition and that on risk and use is another area where the adverts exhibited similarities as is represented in Table A5.8 below.

Table A5.8 Technical Information about Health Qualities by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over age of six months</td>
<td>Direct Mail Ad Print Ad 1 Print Ad 2 Print Ad 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over age of six months on pack in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of words “important notice” in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A5.8 shows the representation of particular statements within all of the advertisements across these media. Statements about the suitability of the product for a specific age group were visible on the product represented in the advertisements as well as within their
surrounding text. The words “important notice” also featured in both the direct mail and two of the print advertisements.

**Arguments and Counter-Arguments about the Product**

Apart from the information discussed above, the advertisements also featured statements that were described in the coding frame as arguments about the product (see Table A5.9).

**Table A5.9 Arguments in Favour of Product by Media**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument in favour of product describing product benefits (positive frame)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, all of the adverts in the Cow & Gate campaign featured an argument in favour of the product which described the product benefits which is coded as offering a ‘positive frame’ as part of this analysis.

**Channel/Format Factors**

Similarities in the advertisements can also be observed in terms of audio-visual techniques that were featured. Despite its absence from one Print advertisement, the picture of an infant not using the Cow & Gate product appeared in the direct mail and the other two print advertisements as is represented below in Table A5.10.

**Table A5.10 Picture of Infant by Media**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture of infant: no product use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Legibility Factors**

Product Name in Advert

When then comparing the visual format of the advertisements there were also similarities observed between the characteristics of how product names appeared in the advertisements.
There was congruence between the direct mail advertisements and two of the print adverts in the use of upper case and the colour use of brown on white to display the product name in the advertisements. However, different attributes featured in the remaining print advertisements (see Table A5.11).

Table A5.11 Product Name in Advert Legibility by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product name visible in ad: upper and lower case</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name visible in ad: colour (brown on white)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product Name on Packs in Adverts

A comparison was also made between the advertisements in terms of the characteristics of the representation of the product name on the pack in the advertisement. Table A5.12 below, shows that all of the advertisements within the campaign featured the product name on the pack in upper and lower case, in sans serif only and with the colours brown on white.

Table A5.12 Product Name on Pack Shots Legibility by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product name visible on pack in ad: upper and lower case</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name visible in ad: font style (sans serif only)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name visible in ad: colour (brown on white)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identification of Follow-on Formula in Adverts

A statement that identified the words “follow-on formula” also shared the same characteristics across the various advertisements in the campaign. As shown in Table A5.13 below, this text featured in upper and lower case and in sans serif font. There were also similarities between some of the advertisements in terms of the colour in which the words were displayed with the direct mail and two of the print advertisements including the colour white on blue while the other print advertisement offer a different attribute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement identifying “follow-on formula” visible in ad: letter case</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(upper and lower case)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement identifying “follow-on formula” visible in ad: font style</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sans serif only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement identifying “follow-on formula” visible in ad: colour</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(white on blue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identification of Follow-on Formula on Packs in Adverts

Comparisons can be made between the advertisements in terms of the display of the words “follow-on formula” within the advertisement. It is clear from the findings shown in Table A5.14 below, that the words featured in sans serif font and with a white on blue colour scheme within all of the advertisements.
Table A5.14 Follow-on Formula on Pack Shot Legibility by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement identifying “follow-on formula” visible on pack: font style (sans serif only)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement identifying “follow-on formula” visible on pack: colour (white on blue)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended Age of Use Text

Text featuring the words “recommended age of use” was also presented in a similar fashion in the various advertisements within the campaign. These words appeared in lower case only within the direct mail and two of the print advertisements, with the other print advertisement showing a different case attribute. However, as is also outlined below in Table A5.15, these words featured in sans serif font in all of the advertisements.

Table A5.15 Recommended Age of Use in Advert Legibility by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended age of use: letter case (lower case only)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended age of use: font style (sans serif only)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Product-related Support Information in Adverts

The analysis of advertisements in the Cow & Gate campaign also reveals a resemblance in the representation of product-related support information. As is illustrated in Table A5.16 below, this statement featured in sentence case and in sans serif font in all of the observed advertisements. However, a difference emerged in the colour scheme used to present the
statement with the characteristic of white on blue featuring within the direct mail and two of the print advertisements and a different attribute appearing in the last print advertisement.

Table A5.16 Other Product Support in Advert legibility by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute: Other information: letter case (sentence case)</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute: Other information: font style (sans serif only)</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute: Other information: colour (white in blue)</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receiver Factors

*Use of Babies and Infants*

Additionally, some similarities were observed in the presence of actors or characters within the advertisements. A baby or infant was present within all of the advertisements analysed here. However, the presence of an adult female (‘mother’) character featured in only the direct mail and one of the print advertisements. The two other print advertisements did not feature this character (see Table A5.17).

Table A5.17 Presence of Baby/Infant and Adult Female by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute: Presence of baby / infant in ad</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute: Presence of adult female/mother in ad</th>
<th>Direct Mail Ad</th>
<th>Print Ad 1</th>
<th>Print Ad 2</th>
<th>Print Ad 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of Colours
Finally, there were similarities observed in the use of colours within the advertisements in this Cow & Gate campaign. The use of pastel colours in images of babies featured in the direct mail and one of the print advertisements. The other two print advertisements did not feature pastel colours to convey softness in this way. However, despite this, all of the advertisements used bold colours in their presentation of brand names and use primary colours on the product packs that they include as is revealed in the last table.

Table A5.18 Use of Colours in Advert by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Mail Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of pastel colours in images of babies to convey softness</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of bold colours in brand names and advertisements</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of primary colours on packs in ads</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary
The analysis of advertisements in the Cow & Gate follow-on formula product advertisements across direct mail and print media revealed that there were significant similarities present in some general factors, source factors, message factors, channel and format factors and receiver factors. Significantly, these included the presence of a website address, child actors with a while British ethnicity, the visibility of product packs, manufacturers name and terms such as follow-on formula and arguments in favour of product, and use of bold colours in names and the advertisement. There are also significant similarities in the presentation of particular statements including letter case, font and colour scheme used. The presence of adult characters with white British ethnicity appeared across some of the adverts as did baby-related advice and product range and stage (these featuring in all of the print advertisements), the use of pastel colours accompanying images of babies and among one print advert differences in the presentation of some statements.
Direct Mail, Print and Television
The following sub-section examines the direct mail, print and television advertisements that featured as part of the Aptamil Follow-on Milk campaign over the period, 2008-2009. It reports on an analysis of nine advertisements, including one direct mail, six print adverts and two TV adverts that featured in the time period. This analysis, due to the quantity of advertisements, will introduce the numbers of advertisements that share particular attributes. Where it is possible to talk generally about the use of attribute across the advertisements, it will do this and represent those that share an attribute with ‘X’.

General Factors
The direct mail, print and television advertisements that featured in the Aptamil Follow-on Milk campaign shared different characteristics in terms of their size, duration and expenditure etc. that cannot be compared. However, a shared feature among the advertisements, with the exception of one print advertisement, was the presence of a web address (one print and five TV adverts).

Source Factors
Gender and Ethnicity of Endorsers
A similarity between the advertisements use of adult actors can also been observed. Six out of the eight advertisements which included an adult character, featured a male adult character. Of the other advertisements, one TV advert included a female adult character and a print advert did not feature an adult character. Interestingly, of these advertisements all of the adult characters including the image of the female character were represented with a white British ethnicity. A similar pattern can be observed of the representation of the principal child actor. These appeared in eight out of nine advertisements in the campaign and all were represented with a while British ethnicity.

Expert Endorsement and Advice
Another a feature of the advertisements is the introduction of expert and endorsement and advice. Although none of the 9 advertisements include expert endorsement or a range of advice information, 3 advertisements (1, direct mail; 1 print and 1 television) included advice or guidance on the provision of general baby/ infant care. The other 6 advertisements did not contain this information. However, more general commonalities, including the presence of various message factors can be observed in the advertisements in the campaign.
Message Factors

Product Differentiation

All of the advertisements (one direct mail; six print and two TV) included a visible image of the Aptamil Follow-on milk. Over half (n = 5) also included an image of the brand name apart from that showed on the image of the product pack if this was included. The name of manufacturer, however, was a feature that appeared common to the print adverts only (n = 5) and was absent from the single direct mail and the two TV adverts. Table A5.19 outlines three attributes that appeared within all of the advertisements in the campaign.

Table A5.19 Follow-on Formula and Product Range by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Direct Mail (all)</th>
<th>Print (all)</th>
<th>Television (all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula identified on visible pack</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula identified in ad (other than on visible pack)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product range visible in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is shown above, the words “follow-on formula” appeared in all of the advertisements on such a scale as to be visible on the image of the product pack and within the other contents of the advertisement. Similarly, the product range also appeared in the direct mail advert, the 6 print advertisements and the two television advertisements.

Age of Use Recommendation

Another attribute common to some of the advertisements was the statement “age of use recommendation”. Although this was visible on the image of the pack in only three advertisements (one direct mail; one print and one TV), the age of recommended use appeared in the text of 7 out of the 9 advertisements (one direct mail; five print and one TV). Only a single print and one television advertisement did not include the phrase. There was a similar situation observed in the presence of statements about the health and nutritional benefits of the product.
Health and Nutrition Benefits of Product

Statements of nutritional benefits of the product appeared in seven of the advertisements (one direct mail; five print and one TV), and one print and one TV advert excluded this information. Similar results occurred in respect of health benefits of the product. Here, a number of advertisements including, one direct mail advert, one TV advert and five print adverts, featured such statements leaving, two adverts (one print; one TV) that excluded the information. Finally, both statements of health benefits and statements of nutritional beliefs were visible on the image of product pack in only a single television advert.

Price Information

Although price information visible on the pack appeared in only one TV advert, its visibility in the advertisements more generally was high occurring in six (one direct mail; three print and two TV adverts) out of nine advertisements. All of the advertisements in the Aptamil campaign included this information.

New Product Features

Six out of the nine advertisements in this campaign, including one direct mail and five print, included a helpline/customer care/customer services telephone number, whereas the two TV adverts did not. In terms of the display of new product features, none of these adverts included statements that there was something new about the product, or ease of product use, or qualified or those of nutritional health claims. However, details of other aspects of the product did feature.

Technical Information about Health and Nutrition

A significant number of adverts ($n = 7$) included non-qualified health or nutritional claims. These included one direct mail advert, one TV advert and five print adverts.

Risk and Use

Further analysis of the adverts that featured in the Aptamil campaign revealed how statements that the product is suitable only for particular use by infants over six months appeared in a uniform way across the different media (one direct mail advert; six print adverts and two TV adverts).
Similar coverage was given to other health related statements in the advertisements. The statement that the product should form part of a diversified diet featured in eight of the nine adverts (one direct mail; six print; one TV advert) with only one TV advert not including this information. Extensive coverage was given to statements that the product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during the first six months of life in the advertisements, which appeared in all nine adverts. Despite this, statements that any decision to use the product before six months of age should be made only with the advice of a medical/health professional appeared in only a single TV advert. In a similar way the “warning of health hazards” of inappropriate preparation appeared in two adverts (one direct mail and one TV). Warning statements about inappropriate storage did not appear in the adverts and, further, the presence of the phrase “Important Notice” appeared in the six print adverts but nowhere else.

Other related statements also appeared across the various advertisements. Those that outlined how the product was to used only on the advice of a medical/health professional, for example, featured in three adverts (one direct mail; one print; one TV) and were absent from the others (five print and one TV advert).

The statement that the product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants age six months visible on the pack in the advertisement was present in eight out of the nine advertisements and was absent only from the direct mail advertisement.

Statements describing (i) the nature of risk (ii) the consequences of misuse together (iii) ways to avoid misuse appeared only in the single direct mail advertisement. Similarly, a statement about the superiority of breast feeding featured only in the direct mail advert and one TV advert. Finally, it was found that a statement about the appropriate use of the product offering no discouragement of breast feeding appeared in only a single TV advert.

**Arguments and Counter-Arguments about the Product**

Arguments and counter-arguments about the product were another aspect that appeared commonly to the various advertisements analysed. An argument in favour of the product that described its benefits appeared in seven (one direct mail; five print; one TV) out of the nine advertisements.
Another commonality across the advertising was the introduction of specific promotional terms. In this case, the term “immunity” featured across six (one direct mail and five print adverts) out of the nine advertisements.

Only one TV advert included picture material that illustrated methods of preparation, leaving the other advertisements in the campaign as not including this detail.

**Thematic Content**
In terms of thematic content and the attribute of heart-warming tones within the advertising in particular, it was recorded that just the single direct mail advert and the two TV adverts included images of babies laughing. Interestingly, this attribute did not feature in the print versions in the campaign. However, in five out of the six print advertisements heart-warming tones did appear as reflected in the presented images of a woman (presumably intended to portray a mother) sitting with an infant at a table.

**Channel/Format Factors**
The analysis of advertisement in the Aptamil campaign also uncovered similarities in the channel and format factors of the content.

**Brand Names in Adverts and on Packs in Adverts**
In terms of narrative features and the presence of brand names within the advertisements, six out of the nine advertisements featured the brand name visible on the pack in lower case. The three exceptions (one direct mail; one print; one TV advert) did not include this information. Moreover, there was a common font used in the advertisements to present the brand name (visible on the pack). Sans serif font was used here in a total of six adverts (five print adverts and one TV advert). Three advertisements did not include the brand name visible on product pack.

**Product Names in Adverts**
The analysis of the advertisements also shows a similarity in terms of the font used to display the product name in the advertisements. Sans serif font was used consistently across all of the advertisements. However, the advertisements did differ according to the colour in which the product name was presented. The single direct mail advert, for instance, was presented in
blue on white and the print advertisements, by contrast, included one brown on white, one
blue on white and four black on white.

Product Name on Packs in Adverts
The presentation of the product name on pack in advertisements was another feature that was
comparable across the advertisements. In terms of the font used, all of the advertisements
used sans serif to display the product name on the pack in the advertisement. The letter case
used, however, revealed some complexity to the presentation of the product name. In all of
the print adverts (n = 6), for example, this appeared in upper and lower case, whereas it
appeared in sentence case for the direct mail advert and for the two TV adverts. Other
similarities were noted in terms of the colour contrast used in the presentation of the product
name on the pack in the advertisement. The single direct mail advertisement and five of the
print advertisements used blue on white, for instance, whereas this featured as blue on yellow
in the remaining print advertisement.

Identification of Follow-on Formula in Adverts
The presentation of the phrase “follow-on formula” also offered a point of comparison across
the various advertisements. An attribute that appeared in eight (one direct mail; six print
adverts; one TV advert) out of the nine advertisements was the use of upper and lower case in
the presentation of the phrase. Sentence case was used in the remaining (TV) advert.
Additionally, there were similarities in the font used in the presentation of the word “follow-
on formula” in the text of advertisement generally. Among the advertisements, the direct
mail advertisement, five out of the six print adverts and the two TV adverts used sans serif.
However, one print advert used a combination of serif and sans serif and it is important to
note that all of the advertisements used different colour configurations to present this phrase.

Identification of Follow-on Formula on Packs in Adverts
The single direct mail advert, one print advert and one TV advert used lower case. Five print
adverts used upper and lower case and one TV advert used just sentence case.

Superiority of Breast Feeding Statement in Adverts
Another similarity between the advertisements can be observed in the presentation of the
statement about the superiority of breast feeding. For most of the advertisements (seven out
of nine) this statement appeared in sentence case (one direct mail and six print adverts). There
was congruence in the font styles used across the advertisements. For example, these statements were presented in sans serif font in the single direct mail and the six print advertisements. A similar finding was observed with the colour contrast of the statements. This phrase appeared in ‘black on white’ within the direct mail and five of the print advertisements. It then appeared in blue on white in the other print advert. Television advertisements were not coded for colour contrast.

Recommended Age of Use Text
The use of lower case within statements on the recommended age of use is another similarity between some advertisements. In this case, the lower case was used in four print adverts. In a similar way, the phrase appeared in sentence case in five adverts (one direct mail; two print; two TV). Additionally, this statement appeared in sans serif font in all of the advertisements and in ‘blue on white’ in the single direct mail and one of the print advertisements and black on white for the other five print advertisements. The television advertisements were not coded for this.

Other Product-related Support Information in Adverts
A strong comparison can be seen among the advertisements in terms of the letter case used to present other product-related support information. Sentence case was represented across all of these advertisements. Product-related support information also appeared in sans serif font in all of the advertisements. In terms of colour contrast, this was presented in ‘blue on white’ in the direct mail advert and one of the print adverts. Four of the other print adverts presented the statement with ‘white on black’ and one with ‘brown on white’. Again, the television advertisements were not examined for this attribute.

Receiver Factors

Use of Babies and Infants
Various receiver factors including the presentation of actors and situations, also appeared across the advertisements in the campaign. The presence of a baby/infant, for example appeared in eight out of the nine advertisements (one direct mail; five print; two TV) and was absent from a single print advertisements. Within the advertisements similar characteristics of the represented baby / infant were also noticed. All of the images babies/infants were coded with hair apart from two advertisements: one TV advert where it was judged difficult to make this assessment and one print advert where no such images appeared. In the single direct mail and a television advertisement, the baby/infant was coded as showing head control, dexterity
of arms movements, sitting upright, smiling and as self feeding. These attributes were either absent or judged difficult to code in the other advertisements with infants/babies present.

**Presence of Adult Female (Mother Figure)**
The presence of an adult female character was another feature common to some of the advertisements. This appeared in three advertisements (one print and two TV adverts), whereas no such images were present in the other six advertisements (one direct mail and five print).

**Presence of Adult Male (Father Figure)**
Adult male characters appeared in two of these adverts (one direct mail and one TV). Additionally, the direct mail advertisement, in particular, included the image of a father figure with an infant.

**Relationship Scenarios**
One TV advert included an image of a man and women together and with an infant in family setting. The other advertisements did not include these images. However, displays of affection as illustrated in terms scenes of adult female (mother) and infant hugging/making affectionate physical contact featured prominently in the print adverts (n = 5) and TV advertisements (n = 2). Additionally, the direct mail advertisement included an image of a father figure holding a baby/infant against him. The other advertisements did not include this attribute.

**Use of Colours**
Finally, there were similarities in the use of colour among the advertisements. The analysis has revealed that a single TV advert included pastel colours in its image of a baby to convey softness. Similarly, two advertisements (one direct mail; on TV) used bold colours in the presentation of brand names and three adverts (one direct mail and two TV) used primary colours on images of product packs.

**Summary**
This sub-section examined the attributes common to the direct mail, print and television advertisements which featured in the Aptamil campaign, 2008-2009. As has been discussed
above, some characteristics were shared across all of the advertisements and others featured in smaller numbers of these advertisements.

Taking those attributes that were shared across the advertisements first, it was notable that the Aptamil product was visible in its advertisements along with the presence of the terms “follow-on formula” in the pack. These advertisements generally also presented the product range and the price. The presence of child actors and the shared ‘British white’ ethnicity of the adult and child actors was an attribute shared across the advertisements. Certain statements also appeared uniformly. Those that discussed the product as suitable for particular use by infants aged over six months featured in all of these advertisements and other statements that discussed the product use as part of a diversified diet, the product not to be used as a substitute for breast milk, and as suitable only for a nutritional use by infant over six months featured in eight out of the nine advertisements. When the product name featured it appears in san serif font in all of the advertisements. Similarly, most of the advertisements (eight out of nine) featured an image of a baby/infant.

Although there was some variation in the presence of attributes in the various advertisements, this analysis revealed how certain ones featured more often than not. The presence of an internet address featured commonly, for example. In addition, the age of use recommendation (which featured mostly in print advertisements), nutritional and health benefits of the product, helplines/customer care/customer services and non-qualifying health benefits appeared in many of these adverts.

An argument in favour of product that focused on the term “immunity” appeared across the range as did the presentation of the brand name in sans serif font. Further, upper and lower sentence case was favoured in the presentation of various statements apart from the statement about the superiority of breast feeding that featured mostly in sentence case. To a lesser degree some images featured such as mothers and infant and one instance of a father and an infant and the presence of family settings. Also, in a small number of the advertisements particular characteristics of age including the presence of hair, dexterity of arms, sitting upright and self feeding appeared in the advertisements.
Print and Television 1.

The following sub-section examines the print and television advertisements that featured as part of the Cow & Gate Step-Up Follow-on Milk campaign over the period, 2008-2009. It reports on an analysis of 12 advertisements, including nine print and three TV adverts that featured in the time period. This analysis, due to the quantity of advertisements, will introduce the numbers of advertisements that share particular attributes. Where it is possible to talk generally about the use of attribute across the advertisements, the discussion will do this and represent those that share an attribute with ‘X’.

General Factors

The print and TV adverts that featured in the Cow & Gate Step-Up Follow-on Milk campaign shared different characteristics in terms of their size, duration and expenditure etc. that cannot be compared. Other features, such as the presence of a website appeared uniformly across the nine print adverts but did not feature in the TV adverts. However, there were similarities observed in terms of sources factors within the advertising.

Source Factors

Gender and Ethnicity of Endorsers

A between media difference was observed in the presentation of adult actor in the advertisements, where a male actor featured in the three TV adverts but where this character was absent from the nine print adverts. However, a child actor was included in all of the advertisements across both media and all had white British ethnicity.

Table A5.20 Ethnicity of Principal Child Actor by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media form</th>
<th>Ethnicity of principal child actor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>No actor pictured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, beyond the representation of the child character, the advertisements did not include any other source factors such as expert endorsement or advice.
Message Factors

Brand Differentiating Factors and Product Identification

Analysing these advertisements displayed common attributes in their message factors. All of the adverts across both media, for example, included a visible image of Cow & Gate Step-Up Follow-on Milk. They also all shared other attributes as are illustrated in Table A5.21.

Table A5.21 Follow-on Formula, Product Range and Product Stage by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Print (all)</th>
<th>Television (all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula identified on visible pack</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula identified in ad (other than on visible pack)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product range visible in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product range visible on pack in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product stage (stage 3) visible on pack in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above shows the advertisements in the Cow & Gate campaign included a picture of the product pack, the phrase follow-on formula visible on pack and in the advertisements, the product range visible also on the product pack represented and in the advertisement and the product stage (stage 3) make clear on the packs. However, the analysis revealed that the product stage (stage 3) was not visible in any of the advertisements (other than the pack shots included).

Age of Use Recommendation

Another similarity among these advertisements was the visible presentation of age of recommended use for the product in the advertisements. In all 12 advertisements this information was included on the product pack that was visible in the advertisement. A slight difference between the advertisements was observed when examining the visibility of this in the advertisements generally, where this information featured in 11 (out of the 12) advertisements and was absent from one TV advert.
**Health and Nutrition Benefits of Product**

There was a similar pattern observed in presentation of statements about nutritional and health benefits of the product. In all, 11 out of the 12 advertisements (nine print adverts and two TV adverts) presented statements on both nutritional benefits and health benefits in the text of the advertisement. None of these included visible statements on nutritional or health benefits on the product packs represented in the advertisements.

**New Product Features**

These advertisements did not include information on price, new product features, or ease of use (visible on product or in the text), though some of the print adverts (six out of nine) included a reference to a helpline/careline/customer services telephone number. This did not feature in any of the TV adverts, however. Similarly, the presence of qualifying health or nutritional claims appeared in six out of the nine print adverts and was absent from the TV adverts in this ad sub-sample. A different finding was observed with the presence of non-qualifying health and nutritional claims as is reflect in Table A5.22 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A5.22 Presence of Non-Qualified Health or Nutritional Claims by Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is outlined above, all of the advertisements in the sample included non-qualifying health or nutritional claims. A similar observation can also be made of the presence of some risk and use statements.

**Risk and Use**

A further analysis of the advertisements in the Cow & Gate campaign revealed that there were similarities between adverts in the presence of some risk and use statements. Those that featured uniformly across of the 12 advertisements are outlined in Table A5.23 below.
Table A5.23 Risk and Use Statements in Adverts by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Print (all)</th>
<th>Television (all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement that product is suitable only for particular use by infants over six months</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement that product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during the first six months of life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement recommending that product is used only on advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the presence of these statements, the statement that the product is suitable for particular nutritional use by infants over the age of six months was visible on product packs in 10 out of the 12 advertisements (nine print and one TV). Further, the statement that any decision to use product before six months of age should only be made on the advice of a medical/health professional featured in all the TV adverts while being completely absent from the print adverts. And finally, the statement concerning the superiority of breast feeding appeared in all of the print adverts (n = 9) and was absent from the TV adverts. The statements in the above table were not visible in product packs and those warning of health hazards associated with inappropriate preparation or either inappropriate storage did not feature. Nor did the words “important notice” appear.

Arguments and Counter-Arguments about the Product

Another commonality among the advertisements in the sample can be seen in the representation of arguments for the product as Table A5.24 below reveals.
Table A5.24 Argument in Favour of Product by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media form</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is described above arguments about product benefits featured in 11 out of the 12 advertisements (nine print and two TV). Additionally, the use of the promotional term “immunity” also featured in some print advertisements (six out of nine) in the sample, but was absent from all the TV adverts in this sub-sample. The promotional terms “natural development”, “robust/tough”, “protect” and “natural ingredients” did not appear anywhere in this sub-sample, but the term “defend/defence” was visible in five advertisements (out of 12) across the sample (three print and two TV).

**Thematic Content**

**Humour**

There were also similarities in the presentation of thematic content among the advertisements. Funny situations featured in only a single TV advert, while pictures of infants laughing appeared in all of these adverts. Other instances of the presentation of ‘heart warming’ tones also appeared but within one medium only. Pictures of a mother sitting with an infant at a table and chair, for example, featured in all of the TV adverts but were absent from the print adverts. In similar way, pictures of an adult female feeding an infant appeared in two (out of three) TV adverts and were completely absent from the print advert. Six of the adverts (three print and three TV) represented depicted characters within a ‘home’ setting.

**Channel/Format Factors**

**Narrative Factors**

**Product Names in Adverts and Packs**

The analysis of the advertisements across the campaign showed congruence in the presentation of the product name in all of the advertisements. In both the visible product pack and the image within the advertisement generally, the product name appeared in lower
case, in san serif font and, in the print advertisements, consistently with ‘brown on white’ colour contrast (the latter was not coded for TV adverts).

Identification of Follow-on Formula in Adverts and on Pack in Adverts
The presentation of the phrase “follow-on formula” appeared uniformly in sans serif font across all of the advertisements in the sample (n = 12). However, differences appeared in the use of sentence case with three print adverts using a combination of lower and upper case, while the six others and the three TV adverts all used sentence case. Differences in presentation were also observed in the colours used for text and background in the print adverts with three print adverts using ‘brown on white’ and the other six using ‘black on white’. A similar pattern emerged in the presentation of the phrase on product pack in the advertisements. Again sans serif font was used in all of the advertisements (n = 12) and a ‘blue on white’ colour contrast appeared in all of the print advertisements.

Superiority of Breast Feeding Statement in Adverts
This statement on the superiority of breast feeding appeared only in the print adverts and was presented in sentence case with san serif font in all nine of these adverts. A difference emerged as to the colour combinations used within this sample. This statement was displayed as brown letters on white background in three print adverts and as ‘black on white’ in the remaining six print advertisements.

Recommended Age of Use Text
This statement was presented with sans serif font in all of the advertisements in the campaign (n = 12). However, there were differences in the use of sentence case. The print adverts were divided between two adverts that used upper and lower case and six adverts that used sentence case. In a similar way, the TV adverts sample included two that used upper and lower case and one that used sentence case. The colour contrasts for the statements that appeared in the print adverts followed those outlined in the above section with three using ‘brown on white’ and six using ‘back on white’.

Other Product-related Support Information in Adverts
The presentation of other product-related support information was uniform among the advertisements in the sample. This was presented in sentence case and sans serif font in all
12 advertisements. Similarly and in terms of colour contrast, all of the print advertisements presented this information within a ‘brown on white’ colour scheme.

**Receiver Factors**

**Use of Babies and Infants**

Various receiver factors, including the presentation of actors and situations, also appeared across the advertisements in the campaign. The use of babies and infants and related behaviours appears consistently across the advertising as is illustrated in Table A5.25 below.

### Table A5.25 Presence of Infant/Baby Behaviours by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Print (all)</th>
<th>Television (all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of infant/ baby in advertisement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays of baby infant behaviours: Head control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays of baby infant behaviours: Has hair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays of baby infant behaviours: Has teeth</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays of baby infant behaviours: Sitting upright</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays of baby infant behaviours: Smiling</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the features shown in the table appeared in all the print and TV adverts in this sub-sample. In addition the presence of ‘dexterity of arm movements’ featured in six advert (three print and three TV).

**Presence of Adult Female (Mother Figure)**

Images of mother figures were also noted as featuring in some advertisements in this sub-sample. Two TV adverts included a mother with an infant and on both occasions represented a scene which involved the characters hugging or making affectionate physical contact.
Use of Colours
Finally, the use of pastel colours in images of babies to represent softness appeared in six print adverts. Bold colours featured in the presentation of brand names in all of the advertisements (n = 12) and where a pack shot appeared (in 11 out of 12 adverts) this also included bold primary colours.

Summary
This analysis examined the attributes common to the print and television advertisements which featured in the Cow & Gate Step-Up Follow-on Milk campaign, 2008-2009. As has been discussed above, some characteristics are shared across all of the advertisements and others feature in smaller groups of advertisements. The analysis has revealed a range of attributes that feature across the advertisements including the presence of a child actor and the commonality of a white British ethnicity for both the main child and main adult actor. Additionally, the phrase follow-on formula as well as information on product range and product stage feature on both the product packs represented and in the advertisements themselves. This is also the case with non qualified health and nutritional claims and arguments in favour of the product. Importantly, also statements on appropriate use by six months, use as part of a diversified diet, use on advice of professionals and not as a substitute for breast milk appeared in all of the advertisements. The images of infants laughing was prevalent and the use of san serif font to present various statements and bold colours in other presentation.

In addition other attributes were also shared across the advertising to a less extent. These included the presence of an age of recommended use and statements on heath and nutritional benefits all appearing in 11 out of the 12 advertisements. Similarly, promotional terms such as “immunity” appeared in six print adverts and “defend/ defence” in five print adverts across the sample. A helpline/careline/customer services telephone number also appeared prominently as did configurations of upper and lower case and sentence statement in the presentation of statements and images of a mother character with baby.
Print and Television 2

The following sub-section examines the print and television advertisements that featured as part of the SMA Progress campaign over the period, 2008-2009. This analysis reports on a sample of 10 advertisements, including eight print and two TV adverts which featured in this time period. Due to their quantity, the numbers of advertisements that share particular attributes will be introduced. Where it is possible to talk generally about the presence of attributes across the advertisements, this section will use ‘X’ to and represent those that do so.

General Factors

The print and TV adverts that featured in the SMA Progress campaign shared different characteristics in terms of their size, duration and expenditure that cannot be compared. However, all of the print adverts (n = 8) included a web address (this was absent from the TV adverts) and neither sets of advertisements included reference to a consumer/ trade award for the product.

Source Factors

Gender and Ethnicity of Endorsers

In terms of source factors, a difference appeared in the gender of the represented adult actors between the advertisements. For example, of the three print adverts that included an adult actor, all featured a female adult actor. This contrasted sharply with the adult actors included in the TV adverts (two out of two), which appeared as male adult actors. However, all of the adult actors included in the campaign were represented as having a white British ethnicity.

All of the advertisements in the campaign included a main child actor (n = 10) but although the majority of advertisements represented these as having a white British ethnicity (n = 9), one print advert included a child actor who represented a Black- Afro-Caribbean British ethnicity.

Expert Endorsement and Advice

Although expert endorsement and advice did not feature as part of the TV adverts in this set, this was a feature of the print advertisements. These adverts included the use of an expert endorsement (with the qualifications of the expert unknown) in three out of eight instances.
Five print adverts also featured general baby/infant-related advice/guidance. Again, this attribute was absent from the TV adverts.

**Message Factors**

**Product Information**

A prominent feature in the advertisements within the SMA Progress campaign was the presentation of a product pack. This appeared in all of the advertisements (n = 10) and was accompanied by the presentation of other attributes which are outlined in the Table A5.26 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Print (all)</th>
<th>Television (all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula identified on visible pack</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula identified in ad (other than on visible pack)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product range identified on visible pack</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product range on visible pack</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product stage (stage 3) visible on pack in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is illustrated above, all the advertisements in the campaign included the phrase “follow-on formula” visible on the product pack and elsewhere within the advertisement generally as well as including the information on the product range on the visible product pack and in the advertisement. The product stage (stage 3) was visible in all adverts and on packs in some print adverts (four out of eight) but not in any of the TV adverts.

**Age of Use Recommendation**

In a similar way the ‘age of use recommendation’ statement was also visible on the product pack in the advertisements across the campaign. Indeed, this featured in eight of the advertisements (seven print and one TV) and was coded as unclear in one TV advert. However, the statement that featured in the advertisements, generally appeared, in contrast, only in the print adverts and did not feature in the TV adverts.
**Health and Nutrition Benefits of Product**

Statements on health and nutritional benefits of the product featured across the campaign. However, these did not appear on the product packs in the advertisements but elsewhere in the advertisements. Six print adverts included this information and none of the TV adverts. No statements on health benefits of the product were visible on the product packs that featured in any of these advertisements. Nonetheless, such statements did feature in three print adverts and though not within any of the TV adverts.

**Convenience of Use**

Statements on the convenience of use also featured in some of the advertisements in this set. These appeared in the print adverts rather than the TV adverts and featured on a product pack in one print advert and elsewhere in the advert in three other print adverts.

**Risk and Use**

Risk statements featured in the print advertisement rather than the television advertisements. For example, the statement that product is suitable only for particular use by infants over six months, the statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet and the presence of the words “important notice” appeared in all the print advertisements (n = 8) and in none of the TV adverts. Similarly, the statement that any decision to use product before six months of age should only be made on the advice of a medical/health professional as well as the statement that the product is suitable for particular nutritional use by infants over the age of six months featured in only two print adverts. Likewise, the statement concerning the superiority of breast feeding appeared in four print adverts, whereas the statement that the product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during the first six months of life appeared in all the adverts across print and TV.

**Arguments and Counter-Arguments about the Product**

Arguments about the product describing the product benefits appeared in all of the print adverts but remained absent from the television advertisements in the campaign.
Thematic Content

Humour

Thematic content also featured in the advertisements in the campaign but not across the different media forms. So, for example, an image of a baby/infant laughing appeared in only 1 television advertisement, whereas pictures of a mother sitting with an infant at a table and chair appeared in 3 print advertisements, only.

Channel/Format Factors

Audio-Visual Techniques

Visual Format

In terms of visual setting a similarity was observed in the presentation of the scene ‘in home’ in four advert across the two media (two print; two TV). Additionally, two print adverts were coded as showing an ‘outdoor’ scene.

Narrative Factors

Product Names in Adverts and on Pack in Adverts

In terms of narrative factors, product names appearing in the advertisements were featured in sans serif font in all of the adverts. However, the use of case style presented varied within print adverts, with statements featuring in upper and lower case (in seven print adverts) and lower case (in one advert) and sentence case being used in both of the TV adverts. The colour contrast varied considerably in all of the print adverts. Further, there was a similarity in the presentation of the product name on the product packs in the advertisements. These appeared in lower case and in sans serif font in all of the adverts. Within the print adverts this information appeared in red text on a white background throughout all the adverts.

Identification of Follow-on Formula in Adverts and on Packs in Adverts

A similar pattern emerged in the presentation of the phrase “follow-on formula” in the advertisements. This appeared in sans serif font in all of the adverts, and in lower case in eight adverts (six print; two TV). The remaining print adverts presented this text in lower case. The same phrase appeared in lower case and sans serif font on the product pack images in all of the adverts. A difference emerged in the colour contrast used to present the phrase in the print adverts, with three adverts featuring this in ‘red on white’ and five adverts as ‘blue on white’.
Superiority of Breast Feeding Statement in Adverts
The superiority of the breast feeding statement featured in only four print adverts. This appeared in sans serif font and in sentence case in all these adverts. Further, this text was presented with a colour contrast of ‘brown on white’ (in one advert) and as ‘black on white’ (in three adverts).

Recommended Age of Use Text and Other Product-related Support Information in Adverts
The statements on recommended age of use and other product related support information were presented in sans serif font and in sentence case in all of the advertisements.

Receiver Factors

Use of Babies and Infants
The analysis of the advertisements in the SMA progress campaign 2008-2009 also showed how particular characters appeared. For example, a baby/infant featured in all of the adverts in this sub-set (n = 10). However, the presentation of various baby/infant behaviours varied: head control featured in eight print adverts; dexterity of arm movements featured in three print adverts; sitting upright featured in five print adverts and self-feeding featured in one print advert. Two attributes appeared commonly across the advertising (hair featured in seven print adverts and on TV advert and smiling featured in two print adverts and both TV adverts.

Presence of Adult Female (Mother Figure)
The presence of a mother figure also featured in these print and TV adverts. This character type appeared in three print and both TV adverts and a scenario depicting and adult female with infant was coded in two adverts (one print and one TV), a female adult without infant in two adverts (both on TV) and a would-be mother (pregnant woman) in two adverts (both on TV).

Presence of Adult Male (Father Figure)
Similarly, the analysis also revealed that the presence of father character in some of the advertisements. This character type appeared in both TV adverts and a scene of father figure and an infant, a father figure with an infant sitting at a table and chair and a father bottle feeding an infant. No such images appeared in the print advertisements.


**Relationship Scenarios and Displays of Affection**

These advertisements also included relationship scenarios and displays of affection between characters. In both the TV adverts there was scene of a man and women together and another with a man holding an infant against him. In a combination of print and television advertisements there was also a scene represented of a mother and infant hugging/making affectionate physical contact (one print advert; two TV adverts).

**Use of Colours**

Finally, an analysis of these adverts revealed the use of pastel colours in images of babies to convey softness in several advertisements (in six print adverts and one TV advert) and the use of bold colours in the names in eight print adverts and the use of bold colours on pack in either print adverts and one TV advert.

**Summary**

This analysis examined the attributes common to the print and TV adverts which featured in the SMA Progress campaign, 2008-2009. As has been discussed above, rarely were characteristics are shared across all of the advertisements. Those that did included the presence of a child actor and the white British ethnicity of both the adult and child actor (with the exception of one instance). The presence of the term “follow-on formula” and product range with coded in the adverts and the product pack in the adverts in all of the advertisements in the campaign. Similarly presence of the product stage (stage 3) and the age of recommendation both appeared in all of the advertisements. The statement that the product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during the first six months of life appeared in all the advertisements (eight print and two TV) and the statement that the product is suitable only for nutritional use by infants over six months of age visible on pack featured in one less (eight print adverts and one TV advert). Some crossover with characters, particularly the mother character and infant and the presentation of home settings were coded together with the consistent use of sans serif font for product names and various statements and the use of bold colours in advertisements and on product packs in advertisements.
Print and Television 3
The following examines the print and television advertisements that featured as part of the SMA Progress campaign over the period, 2006. This analysis reports on a sample of 35 advertisements, including 14 print adverts and 21 TV adverts, which featured in the time period. Due to their quantity, those advertisements that shared particular attributes will be introduced numerically. Where it is possible to talk generally about the presence of attributes across the advertisements, this section will use ‘X’ to and represent those that do so.

General Factors
As noted in the previous sub-section the print and TV adverts that featured in the SMA Progress campaign shared different characteristics in terms of their size, duration and expenditure that cannot be compared. All of the print adverts (n = 14), however, included a web address. These were absent from the television advertisements and other general information such as references made to trade awards was absent from the both the print and television advertisements.

Source Factors
Gender and Ethnicity of Endorsers
In terms of source factors and the gender of endorsers, there were similarities between a number of these adverts. For example, of the 14 advertisements that featured adult actors, all included a female actor (one print and 13 TV), with a white British ethnicity apart from one advertisement that include a female actors with Black Afro-Caribbean British ethnicity. Similarly, 26 adverts (out of 35) included a child actor with a white British ethnicity in 23 advertisements (four print and 19 TV) and a Black Afro-Caribbean British ethnicity in three advertisements (one print and two TV).

Expert Endorsement and Advice
Further, an instance of expert endorsement did feature in the campaign in a single print advertisement and general baby advice / guidance also appeared in 2 print advertisements.

Message Factors
Product Information
The analysis of the advertisements in the campaign also reveals similarities and differences in the message factors. The presence of an image of SMA progress product appeared in 26 (out
of 36) advertisements (4 print and 22 television). The other attributes that featured commonly in all the advertisements are represented in Table A5.27 below.

Table A5.27 Brand Name, Follow-on Formula, Product Range and Product Stage by Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Print (all)</th>
<th>Television (all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand name show in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on formula indentified in ad (other than on visible pack)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product range indentified on visible pack</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product range on visible pack</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product stage (stage 3) visible on pack in ad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, details on the visible product pack were also coded in both print and television advertisements. The product pack was absent in 10 of these adverts. For example, the phrase “follow-on formula” and the presence of the product range were both visible on the product pack in 26 adverts (four print and 22 TV). The product stage (stage 3) was visible on the product pack in 25 adverts (three print and 22 TV).

**Age of Use Recommendation**

The age of use recommendation also featured in the campaign but only in four print adverts.

**Health and Nutrition Benefits of Product**

Statements on the nutritional benefits of product in advertisements appeared in nine print adverts and remained absent from the TV adverts. However, statement on the health benefits of the product did featured in both print and TV adverts, though in small numbers (two print; one TV). A helpline/careline/customer service telephone number was also observed in a number of advertisements in the campaign. However, all of the 14 adverts where this appeared were print based.

**Risk and Use**

In terms of the presence of statements on risk use, the analysis revealed that most of these appeared in just one medium. For example, the presence of non-qualifying health or
nutritional claims appeared in one TV advert. Statements that the product should be used by infants over six months; that product should form only part of a diversified diet and the presence of the words “important notice” appeared in 14 print adverts and was absent from the TV adverts. Likewise, statements outlining how the product is suitable only for nutritional use by infants over six months of age featured in a small number of print adverts (n = 4) and were absent from TV adverts. Signal words linked to risk warnings and statements those describing the nature of the risk appeared in two print adverts, whereas statements on the consequences of misuse and those on ways to avoid misused featured in single print advert. The only statement that appeared in all adverts (n = 35) was that which introduced the product as not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during the first six months of life.

*Arguments and Counter-Arguments about the Product*

The use of terms such as “immunity” and “protect” featured only in the print adverts (two instances and one instance respectively). Further, an argument describing offsetting of negative outcome through product use appeared in a single print advert. However, an argument on the positive benefits of product use appeared to cross the media forms and appeared in 10 advertisements (nine print and one TV).

*Thematic Content*

Humour

This analysis revealed that particular thematic content did appear in the different advertisements. For example, images of a baby infant laughing appeared in 15 adverts (one print and 14 TV); images of mother sitting with an infant at a table and chair appeared in three advertisements (one print and two TV). Other images such those that depicted funny situations or a mother bottle-feeding an infant/baby appeared only in TV adverts (four and three adverts, respectively).

*Channel/Format Factors*

Visual Format

There were similarities in the presentation of settings across the adverts in this sub-sample. The setting coded as ‘home’ featured in 12 advertisements (one print and 11 TV). Scenes coded as ‘outdoor’ features in just one print and one TV advert.
Narrative Factors

Product Names in Adverts and on Packs in Adverts
All product names appeared in sans serif font and in upper and lower case in 27 adverts (seven print and 20 TV) and in lower case in nine adverts (seven in print and two TV). When appearing on the product pack in the advert, this text again appeared in sans serif font and in upper and lower case in 26 advertisements (four print and 22 TV). Few were coded with colour contrast due to being unclear and these were not applicable to the television advertisements.

Identification of Follow-on Formula in Adverts and on Packs in Adverts
All of advertisements (n = 36) displayed the words “follow-on formula” in lower case and in sans serif font. The colour contrast for the print adverts was divided into ‘black on white’ in 12 adverts and ‘blue on yellow’ in two adverts. When the words were decipherable on product packs (n = 26), these appeared in sentence case and in sans serif font.

Recommended Age of Use Text and Other Product-related Support Information in Adverts
Where the recommended age of use text appeared in the adverts (14 print adverts only), it was displayed in lower case and sans serif font and with the colour contrast of ‘blue on white’. Other product-related support information appeared in all the adverts (n = 36) and was featured in sentence case in 14 print adverts and upper and lower case and lower case only in 20 and two TV adverts, respectively.

Receiver Factors

Use of Babies and Infants
The presence of a baby/infant was found across the advertising. For instance, these images appeared in 27 advertisements in all (five print and 22 TV), and included various baby/infant characteristics. The control of the head featured in 27 advertisements (five print and 22 TV); dexterity of arm movements featured in 23 advertisements (three print; 20 TV); self-feeding featured in six advertisements (two print and four TV); the presence of hair in 26 advertisements (five print and 21 TV); the presence of teeth in 13 advertisements (one print and 12 TV); upright sitting in 20 advertisements (five print and 15 TV); smiling in 19 advertisements (two print and 17 TV); and finally crying in only television advertisements.
*Presence of Adult Female (Mother Figure)*

The presence of a mother character featured in 14 advertisements (one print and 13 TV) in this sub-sample. An image of a mother figure with an infant was coded in 13 TV adverts and a character of a pregnant women appeared in a single TV advert.

*Presence of Adult Male (Father Figure) and Relationship Scenarios*

Father figures appeared in two TV adverts and depicted an adult male character with an infant. Furthermore, two TV adverts also included scenes with a man and women together with a baby in a family setting.

*Use of Colours*

Finally, pastel colours were used in images of babies to convey softness in one print and on TV advert. Bold colours were used in seven print adverts and on packs in four print and 22 TV adverts.

*Summary*

This analysis examined the attributes common to the print and TV advertisements which featured in the SMA Progress campaign, 2006. Some characteristics were shared across all of the advertisements. For example, the presence of female adult actors and child actors appear consistently across the advertisements and as does to some degree the general presentation of these with a white British ethnicity. Similarly, the campaign included the presence of the product, manufacturers name, the phrase follow-on formula, the product range and the product stage (stage 3) within all of the advertisements. The only statement that appeared in all of the advertisements (n=35) was that which introduced the product as not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during the first six months of life. But to a lesser extent, arguments about the positive benefits of the product was present across some of the advertisements as was the presentation of various statements san serif font, the presence of the mother character and use of bold colour in the product packs within the advertisements.
Cross-Brand Analysis: Overall Summary

In conclusion, on the basis of these cross-media analyses, several attributes can be discussed as being present across the various campaigns. These include the presence of adult and child actors presented with a British white ethnicity and a strong female presence in some advertisements and a male adult actor in other ones. The product name, range and stage all appeared in the adverts but were not generally visible on the product packs included in these adverts. Similarly, statements on risk and use often appeared across advertising in different media as did the statement on the superiority of breast feeding. Turning to text features, sans serif font was widely used as were combinations of upper and lower sentence case. Images of infants and a selected range of baby/infant behaviours and mother figures also featured across the adverts in different media. Finally, the use of bold colours in the adverts and the use of primary colours on product packs in the advertisements frequently appeared in adverts in different media.
Appendix 6. Findings: Infant Formula Advertisements

Infant formula advertisements were surveyed for their appearances in print media between the 1st January and 31st December 2006 and between 1st March 2008 and 28th February 2009. In total 30 advertisements for infant formula products were found, with 9 (30%) appearing during 2006 and 21 (70%) during 2008-2009. This survey was carried out utilising the digital advertising archive maintained by Billetts.

In terms of the numbers of advertisements in print media per product, the most frequently occurring overall were advertisements for SMA Gold (9) followed by Aptamil First (8), Heinz Nurture (5), Aptamil Easy Digest (3), Cow & Gate Comfort (3); SMA Nutrition and Cow & Gate First Infant Milk (one each).

Table A6.1 presents the distributions of advertisements by product for the two time periods of the survey. The data here confirm the greater volume of follow-on advertising in 2008-2009 compared with 2006. SMA Gold and Aptamil First were the most widely advertised products overall and exhibited a relatively strong presence in both of the monitored time periods. Heinz Nurture, Aptamil Easy Digest, Cow & Gate Comfort, and Cow & Gate First Infant Milk were all promoted only in 2008-2009. Infant formula advertising for SMA Nutrition was found only in 2006.

Table A6.1. Distribution of Adverts by Manufacturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>No. Adverts 2006</th>
<th>% Adverts 2006</th>
<th>No. Adverts 2008-09</th>
<th>% Adverts 2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMA Gold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil First</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz Nurture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil Easy Digest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate Comfort</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA Nutrition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate First Infant Milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The advertised products derived from three manufacturers across the two time periods: Nutricia (15; 50%), John Wyeth (10; 33%) and Heinz (5; 17%). Much of the 2006 infant formula advertising was for John Wyeth products (6; 67%) with the remainder coming from Nutricia (3; 33%). In 2008-2009, most of the advertising was for Nutricia products (12;
57%), with others coming from Heinz (5; 24%) and John Wyeth (4; 19%). The difference in distributions of manufacturers that advertised in 2006 and in 2008-09 was significant ($X^2 = 7.1. df = 2, p < .03$).

**Type of Publication in which Advertisement Occurred**

Most infant formula advertisements occurred in specialist magazines for medical and health professionals (25; 83%). Some advertising was detected in general magazines for mothers and mothers to be (4; 13%) and one in a daily national newspaper (1; 3%). The latter advertising in more popular media targeted at consumers was restricted to 2006. All advertising in 2008-2009 occurred in specialist publications targeted at the medical and health professions. This is significant ($X^2 = 14.0, df = 2, p <.001$).

**Size of advertisements [square cms]**

Data on size of advertisements were provided by Billetts. Infant formula advertisements varied in size over quite a wide range, although most of this advertising was fairly modest in terms of page space occupied. The average infant formula advertisement size across the two time periods was 322.2 square cms. Advertisements were, on average, larger in area in 2008-2009 (351.6 sq cms) than in 2006 (264.8 sq cms).

**Campaign duration**

Data on advertising durations were also supplied by Billetts. Advertising campaign durations varied between one month and 12 months. The average length of campaigns over both time periods was 3.3 months. Campaigns ran over longer average durations in 2006 (4.4 months) than in 2008-2009 (2.6 months).

**Number of ad appearances in campaign**

Data from Billetts showed that in most infant formula advertising campaigns only small numbers of ad appearances occurred. The average number of advertisement appearances in campaigns over the two surveyed time periods was 2.9. There was hardly any difference between 2006 (2.8) and 2008-2009 (2.9). Most infant ad campaigns comprised just one (11, 37%) or two or three appearances (13, 40%). One in five comprised between four and 11 appearances (7; 20%) and just one campaign (3%) ran for 12 or more appearances. Single ad campaigns were more prevalent in 2008-2009 (9, 43%) than in 2006 (2; 22%). Campaigns that ran for two or three ad appearances were more prevalent in 2006 (4, 44%) than in 2008-
2009 (8, 38%). A larger proportion of ad campaigns ran for between four and 11 appearances in 2006 (3, 33%) than in 2008-2009 (4, 19%). The longest ad campaign overall occurred in 2008-2009.

**Campaign expenditure**

Campaign expenditure data are logged as a default by the Billetts advertising database. The average amount spent on an infant formula advertising campaign over the two time periods was £4,776). Campaign expenditures were higher on average in 2006 (£8,305.6) than in 2008-2009 (£3,263.5). The most frequent amount spent on an ad campaign for infant formula products was up to £2,000 (15, 47%). In more than one in four campaigns, expenditure ranged from £2,001 to £4,000 (8, 23%). In one in five campaigns, expenditure was between £4,001 and £10,000 (7, 21%). Two campaigns (4%) cost over £10,000. A larger proportion of the campaigns run in 2006 (55%) than of those run in 2008-2009 (43%) cost up to £2000. A much larger proportion of campaigns run in 2008-2009 (28.5%) than of those run in 2006 (22%) cost between £2,001 and £4,000. The same is found for campaigns run in 2008-2009 (24%) than of those run in 2006 (11%) that cost between £4,001 and £10,000. Only one campaign in 2006 (11%) and one again in 2008-2009 (5%) cost over £10,000.

**Other Information**

Billetts’ data indicated that all infant formula adverts contained a web address while none of them made any reference to consumer or trade awards for the advertised product.

**Source Factors**

In the more detailed classification of infant formula product advertising, we began by examining source factors. These factors concerned characteristics of the endorsers – the actors or models – featured in advertisements. These factors can be important because they are attributes through which consumer identification can be invoked.

**Gender and Ethnicity of Endorsers**

All infant formula adverts contained no pictured adult actor (30, 100%). More appearances were made by child actors in infant formula adverts. Three infant formula adverts overall contained child actors. One of these who was British Asian, appeared in 2006, and two others – one White British and one British Asian – appeared in 2008-2009.
**Expert Endorsement and Advice**

Infant formula adverts were coded for their use of an expert endorser with identified and relevant professional experience in medicine, health and child matters. Three adverts in total (10%) involved any use of an expert endorser. All these adverts appeared in 2008-2009. None of the adverts used any other kind of expert for whom qualifications were unknown.

These advertisements were classified in terms of whether they provided general baby or infant-related advice or guidance. Overall, four examples of such advertisements occurred (13%). One of these adverts appeared in 2006 and three appeared in 2008-2009.

The advertisements were coded also in respect of the presence of any celebrity endorsement. None was found throughout any of this advertising. There was no evidence either therefore of any use of celebrities as experts.

**Message Factors**

**Product Information**

**Brand Differentiating Factors**

A number of brand differentiating factors were coded within infant formula print adverts. In a majority of cases (24; 80%) the product pack was visible in the advert. This was much more likely to be true in 2006 (89%) than in 2008-2009 (76%). The visible pack was the most usual way of displaying the brand name. The brand name was visible in other parts of the advert only in a slim majority of cases (16; 53%). Proportionately, this was much more likely to be the case in 2008-2009 (13; 62%) as in 2006 (3; 33%). None of the differences reported between the adverts samples in 2006 and those from 2008-09 were statistically significant.

The name of the manufacturer was shown in a minority of cases on the product pack in the advert (11; 37%). In a majority of cases, it was not shown on the visible product pack. Once again, the manufacturer’s name was more often visible on product packs in adverts in 2008-2009 (8; 38%) than in 2006 (3; 33%). None of these differences between the ad samples from 2006 and from 2008-09 were statistically significant.
Infant formula was identified in a majority of adverts (24; 80%) on the visible pack in adverts. This distribution was similar for 2006 (89%) and 2008-2009 (76%). Infant formula was identified in other parts of adverts in nearly all cases (29; 97%). The only exception to this occurred in one advert in 2006. None of the differences identified here between the ad samples from 2006 and from 2008-09 were statistically significant.

**Product Identification**

The name of the product range (e.g., Aptamil, Cow & Gate) was identified in all but one infant formula advert (32; 97%). The name of the product range was also identified on a visible product pack on a majority of the adverts (24; 80%). This was true of an overwhelming majority of the adverts analysed in 2006 (8; 89%) and most of those analysed in 2008-2009 (16; 76%).

No infant formula advertising contained any details about product stage within the main message content of the advert. As Table A6.2 below shows, however, there was some visibility of this information on product packs seen in adverts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2, or 3, etc) visible on pack in advertisement</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Product stage ‘1’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Product stage ‘2’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Product stage ‘3’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Good night milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] Pack not shown in advertisement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age of Use Recommendation**

Age of use recommendation was shown in a visible pack in most infant formula adverts (19; 63%). This information was far more likely to be present in adverts in 2008-2009 (16; 76%) than on those coded for 2006 (3, 33%). This is significant ($X^2 = 14.0$, df = 2, p < .001).
of use recommendation was shown elsewhere in infant formula adverts in 7 cases (23%). In 2006, no ads showed an age of use recommendation, while in 2008-2009, 7 out of 21 (33%) ads showed this. This is also significant ($X^2 = 3.9$, df = 1, $p < .05$).

**Health and Nutrition Benefits of Product**

Statements about the nutritional benefits of infant formula products were coded as clearly visible on displayed packs in one advert in total (3%). This feature occurred on one advert in 2006. Text concerning the nutrition benefits on infant formula appeared in other parts of adverts in 23 cases overall (77%). Proportionately, these statements occurred more often in 2008-2009 (219; 90.5%) than in 2006 (4; 44.4%). This is significant ($X^2 = 7.5$, df = 1, $p < .006$).

There were visible statements about the health benefits of these products on packs shown in the adverts in three cases (14%) featuring in 2008-2009. Health benefits statements occurred elsewhere in infant formula adverts in a much larger number of cases (25; 83%). There was little difference proportionally between adverts in 2006 and in 2008-2009 in the extent to which such text occurred.

**Price Information**

No price information was shown anywhere on a visible pack or elsewhere in any of the adverts.

A customer helpline or careline was included in a majority of infant formula adverts (22; 73%). This was true of a majority of adverts in 2006 (4; 44%) and of a large majority in 2008-2009 (18; 86%). This is marginally significant ($X^2 = 3.6$, df = 1, $p < .06$).

**New Product Features**

No infant formula adverts contained a statement indicating that there was something ‘new’ about the brand or product on a product pack seen in the advert or anywhere else in these adverts.

**Convenience of Use**

No infant formula adverts presented information about ease of use of the product whether in the main body of the advert or visibly displayed on a product pack seen in the advert.
Technical Information about Health and Nutrition

The presence of qualified health or nutrition claims occurred in most infant formula adverts overall (23; 77%). There was a greater prevalence of this information in adverts from 2008-2009 (19; 91%) than from those in 2006 (4; 44%). This is significant \( (X^2 = 7.5, df = 1, p < .006) \). The presence of non-qualified health or nutrition claims – where no apparently qualified expert source was cited in support – occurred in just two infant formula adverts overall (7%). Both of these adverts occurred in 2008-2009.

A series of further codes classified each advert in terms of whether it contained technical information about the energy value (in kJ and kcal) of products, protein content, carbohydrate content, lipids content, quantity of choline, inositol, carnitine, and other specified minerals or vitamins. Two adverts overall contained information about energy value (7%), both from 2008-2009. None of the infant formula adverts contained information on any of the other factors.

Risk and Use

Each advert was coded for a range of risk-related attributes. All infant formula adverts (30; 100%) stated that any decision to use the product before six months of age should be made only on the advice of a medical or pharmaceutical professional in the body of the advert. This information was not seen on any product packs shown in adverts for infant formula.

Eight adverts, all of which appeared in 2008-2009 (27% of ads that year), provided a warning of health hazards associated with inappropriate preparation of the product. This is significant \( (X^2 = 4.7, df = 1, p < .03) \). No infant formula adverts displayed this information on product packs shown in the adverts. A warning about the health hazards associated with inappropriate storage of infant formula was present in none of the adverts either in the main body of the ad or on a pack shown in the ad.

The presence of the words “Important Notice” appeared in all infant formula adverts. The words “Important Notice” were seen on a visible pack display in just one infant formula advert and that occurred in 2008-2009. The use of a signal word to draw attention to a risk warning and a statement describing the nature of the risk appeared in 14 infant formula adverts overall (47%). One of these adverts appeared in 2006 and the other 13 all appeared in 2008-2009. This is significant \( (X^2 = 6.5, df = 1, p < .01) \). The use of a statement describing
the nature of risk associated with these products also appeared in 14 infant formula adverts (one in 2006 and 13 in 2008-2009). This is also significant ($X^2 = 6.5$, df = 1, $p < .01$).

The use of a statement defining the consequences of misuse of the product appeared in three infant formula adverts (14%). All three of these adverts occurred in 2008-2009. The use of an instruction statement advising on how to avoid consequences of misuse appeared no infant formula adverts.

**Arguments and Counter-Arguments about the Product**
A statement concerning the superiority of breast feeding appeared at some point in 26 infant formula adverts in total (87%). This statement appeared in all adverts in 2008-2009 and in five out of 9 in 2006 (56%). This is significant ($X^2 = 10.8$, df = 1, $p < .001$). Information concerning the appropriate use of the product, with no discouragement of breast feeding did not appear in the infant formula adverts. Arguments in favour of the product that described its positive benefits were found in 27 adverts in total (90%). This feature was present more often in adverts in 2008-2009 (19; 91%) than in 2006 (8; 89%). Arguments describing how to offset negative outcomes for the child of product use appeared in 15 infant formula adverts (50%). This figure included three out of 9 ads in 2006 (33%) and 12 out of 21 ads in 2008-2009 (57%).

Coding also examined the texts of adverts for the use of specific promotional terms. Terms like ‘robust/tough’ and ‘natural ingredients’ were never used. The terms ‘natural development’ occurred only once in 2006. The term ‘protect’ was used five times (17%) overall. Two of these occurrences fell in 2006 and the other three were found in 2008-2009. The term ‘immunity’ was used 11 times (37%) overall, Eight of these instances occurred in 2006 (88.9% of ads that year) and the other three in 2008-2009 (14% of ads that year). This was significant ($X^2 = 15.1$, df = 1, $p < .000$).

**Product Demonstrations**
No advertisements contained instructions for appropriate preparation, for storage, or for disposal. There was no picture material in any of the adverts illustrating methods of preparation.
Thematic Content

*Humour and Heart-Warming Tones*

There was no evidence of the use of funny situations in any infant formula adverts. There were no instances either of the use of any pictures of infants laughing or of a mother bottle feeding an infant. There was one example of an image of a woman/‘mother’ sitting with an infant at a table. This occurred in 2006.

Channel/Format Factors

Audio-Visual Techniques

*Visual Format*

Visual format features included the nature of picture material used in an advert and the physical setting presented within an image. There were eight instances of pictures used to show only the product, three that showed a picture of an infant only and one case of a picture of a mother with an infant. There was a range of other imagery used in infant formula adverts (see Table A6.3).

**Table A6.3. Types of Visual Presentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Visual Presentation</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture of product used by mother with infant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of mother and infant – no product use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of infant only with product</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of infant only – no product use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of mother only with product</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of mother only – no product use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of product only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Picture material</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No picture material at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most frequently occurring visual settings were in home and outdoor locations (see Table A6.4). All the use of such illustrations was confined to adverts that appeared in 2008-2009. In a number of cases, the setting was not discernible.

**Table A6.4. Visual Setting of Advertisement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In retail setting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In car/vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor locations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not discernible</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No visible setting depicted</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Factors**

A range of narrative factors were coded within each advertisement in terms of ‘case’, ‘font’ and ‘colour/contrast’. As with follow-on formula advertising, text case was classified into upper case, lower case, a mixture of upper and lower case, and sentence case (where just the first letter of a word is capitalised). Font was classified into serifs, sans serif and serifs and sans serif combined. A scoring scale for character-background colour combinations was utilised that ranged from a low of 0.2 to a high of 2.0. Scores of 1.0 and above on this scale represent colour combinations that are regarded as yielding relatively high resolution and which render the foregrounded text more legible against its background. Scores below 1.0 represent less clear colour combinations that can mean that the text is less legible.

**Brand Name in Advert**

The brand name when shown in the advert tended most often to be spelled out in lower case only in 2006 (33%) and in lower case (38%) and upper case (24%) in 2008-09. When present, it was exclusively shown in sans serif font in 2006 (33%) and in 2008-09 (62%). The text–background colours tended more often to exhibit a lower than higher resolution combination. Upper case lettering was used only in 2008-2009 (24%). A high resolution colour combination was also restricted to adverts in 2008-2009 (24%). Low resolution combinations were present in ads in 206 (33%) and in 2008-09 (38%)
Table A6.5. Brand Name Visible in Advert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Font</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour/Contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on red (0.4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brand Name on Packs in Adverts**

Turning to text showing the brand name on a pack visibly displayed in the advert, lower-case only was used when this text was present in both 2006 (33%) and 2008-09 (38%) Sans serif font only was used in 2006 (33%) and in 2008-09 (38%). The colour combination for text versus background used throughout was a relatively low resolution partnership both in 2006 (33%) and in 2008-09 (38%).

Table A6.6. Brand Name Visible on Pack in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Font</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour/Contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on red (0.4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Product Name Visible in Adverts**

The product name, when displayed in the advertisements, was mostly shown in a mix of upper and lower case in 2006 (100%) and in 2008-09 (67%). Lower case only was used only in 2008-2009 (33%). This is significant ($X^2 = 3.9, \text{df} = 1, p < .05$). All product name text when shown was presented in sans serif font only in both 2006 (100%) and 2008-09 (100%). Low resolution colour combinations were more prevalent in 2006 (56%) than in 2008-09 (19%). High resolution combinations were more prevalent in 2008-09 (81%) than in 2006 (11%) Only the colour combination distributions were significantly different between 2006 and 2008-09 ($X^2 = 30.0, \text{df} = 7, p < .000$).

**Table A6.7. Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] Visible in Advertisement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Font</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour/Contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on red (0.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on yellow (0.7)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on yellow (1.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on blue (1.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on white (1.8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on yellow (2.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Product Name on Packs in Adverts**

Turning to the visible presence of product names on product packs displayed in adverts, most adverts in which this text occurred used an upper case plus lower case combination. This was
more especially true in 2006 (89%) than in 2008-2009 (43%). Some adverts in 2008-09 showed this text in lower case only (33%) This case distribution difference for 2006 and 2008-09 here were significant ($X^2 = 5.9$, df = 2, $p < .05$). All text as such, when present, was in sans serifs only font in 2006 (89% of ads) and 2008-09 (76% of ads). Most colour combinations for product name text against its background comprised high resolution options in 2006 (78%) and 2008-09 (57%). Some low resolution text was found here in a minority of ads in 2008-09 (19%).

Table A6.8. Product Name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] Visible on Pack in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour/Contrast</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green on white (1.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identification of Infant Formula in Adverts**

Text identifying a product as infant formula in the advertising tended to be shown most often with words presented in sentence case and lower case only. This text when present was equally likely to be shown in lower case (4%) or sentence case (44%) in 2006. In 2008-09, it was more likely to be shown in sentence case (62%) than in lower case (38%). Virtually all adverts presented this text in sans serifs font only throughout both analysis periods. A clear majority of adverts overall presented this text in a high resolution colour against its background. However, in 2006, most adverts used low resolution colour combinations, while in 2008-2009 relatively few did. This is significant ($X^2 = 19.0$, df = 6, $p < .004$).
### Table A6.9. Identification of ‘Infant Formula’ Visible in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Font</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour/Contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on red (0.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on yellow (0.7)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on blue (1.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on white (1.8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on yellow (2.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identification of Infant Formula on Packs in Adverts**

Text identifying the product as infant formula on product packaging in an advertisement used a range of different case types, including sentence case, upper and lower case together, and lower case only. Sentence case (44%) and upper plus lower case (44%) were equally likely to be used in ads from 2006. In 2008-09, this text was shown in sentence case (43%) or lower case only (19%) or upper plus lower case (14%). Sans serifs only font was used throughout for this text when present in both 2006 (89%) and 2008-09 (76%). Over half of all adverts (56%) used low resolution colour combinations for the text and background in 2006 compared with 33% in 2008-09. High resolution colour combinations were more prevalent for this text, when present, in 2008-09 (19%) than in 2006 (0%). None of these year-to-year differences was statistically significant.
Table A6.10. Identification of ‘Infant Formula’ Visible on Pack in Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Font</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour/Contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red on white (0.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on yellow (0.7)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on yellow (1.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Price Information**

No price information was shown in any infant formula adverts.

**Superiority of Breast Feeding**

A statement concerning the superiority of breast feeding was presented in all infant formula adverts. Such text was generally shown in sentence case in 2006 (100%) and in 2008-09 (81%). It was shown only in sans serif font in both years. When present it was shown more often in low (56%) than high resolution colour combinations (33%) in 2006. In 2008-09, it was shown much more often in high resolution colour combinations (86%) than low resolution combinations (15%). The colour combination distributions in 2006 and in 2008-09 for this text differed significantly This is significant ($X^2 = 21.2$, df = 6, p < .002).
Table A6.11. Superiority of Breast Feeding Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour/Contrast</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on red (0.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on yellow (0.7)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on blue (1.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on white (1.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on yellow (2.0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Age of Use**

Text concerning the age of recommended use was shown in most infant formula advertisements in these samples (77%). When present, this text occurred only in sentence case in 2006 (78%) and in sentence case (33%), lower case only (29%) or upper case plus lower case (14%) in 2008-09. This text was shown only in sans serifs font in 2006 (78% of ads) and in 2008-09 (76%). In 2006, when present, this text occurred slightly more often in low resolution colour combinations (44%) than high resolution combinations (3%). In 2008-09, it appeared more often in high (52%) than low resolution combinations (24%). Year to year differences here were not statistically significant.
Table A6.12. Recommended Age of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Font</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour/Contrast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red on white (0.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on green (1.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on blue (1.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on white (1.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Product-Related Information**

Finally, analysis of other text with product-related information was found in all infant formula print adverts. This text was shown in sentence case and sans serifs font in every advert in 2006 (100%) and again in 2008-09 (100%). Low resolution colour combinations (55%) were more prevalent than high resolution combinations (44%) in 2006. In 2008-09, high resolution colour combinations (86%) outnumbered low resolution combinations (15%). Only the colour combination distributions differed significantly between 2006 and 2008-09 ($X^2 = 30.0, df = 8, p < .000$).
Table A6.13. Other Support Text with Product-related Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Upper case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Upper case + lower case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Lower case only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Sentence case</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Serif only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Serif + Sans serif</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Sans serif only</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Not shown in advert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour/Contrast</th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on red (0.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow on brown (0.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown on white (0.9)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on green (1.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on yellow (1.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue on white (1.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White on black (1.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on white (1.8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black on yellow (2.0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Receiver Factors**

*Use of Babies and Infants*

Just three infant formula adverts displayed a baby or infant within the message (10%). All of these adverts appeared in 2008-2009.

Each advert was coded for any visible displays of baby/infant behaviours. All three adverts in the 2008-09 sample that contained any depicted babies or infants showed them displaying head control and sitting upright. One advert displayed a baby or infant showing some dexterity of arm movements. None of the adverts showed a baby or infant with teeth, self-feeding or crying.
Table A6.14. Attributes of Depicted Babies and Infants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 N</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2008-09 N</th>
<th>2008-09 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has hair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting upright</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexterity of arm movements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has teeth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-feeding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presence of Mother**

No mothers were visibly present in the advertisements in the samples. Similarly, there were no images showing a mother, a mother with an infant or of pregnant women.

**Presence of Father**

There were no images of fathers or men in these adverts. In consequence there were no images either of fathers with babies or infants or of fathers feeding infants.

**Relationship Scenarios**

There were no images of a man and woman together in any of these adverts. Consequently there were no images of a man and woman together with an infant.

**Displays of affection**

There were no images depicting a man and woman together hugging or displaying other signs of affection. Given the findings reported earlier, it is not surprising that there were no scenes showing a father holding an infant against him.

**Use of Colours**

The images used in infant formula adverts were analysed further for their use of colours. There was no detected use of pastel colours in images of babies to convey softness. However the use of bold primary colours occurred in 20 out of 30 infant formula adverts (67%). The use of such colours was more prevalent in adverts from 2008-2009 (16; 76%) than in those from 2006 (4; 44%). The use of bold primary colours on packs in infant formula adverts...
occurred in 13 out of 30 cases (43%). A somewhat higher proportion of adverts used such colours in 2006 (5; 56%) than in 2008-2009 (8; 38%).

Summary of Findings
Infant formula adverts were surveyed between 1st January and 31st December 2006 and between 1st March 2008 and 28th February 2009. A total of 30 advertisements were located, with 9 (30%) appearing in 2006 and 21 (70%) appearing in 2008-2009. The Annex to this section presents a summary table showing all the advertising attributes that exhibited significant changes from the 2006 ad sample to the 2008-09 ad sample.

General
The advertised products were for SMA Gold (30%), Aptamil First (27%), Heinz Nurture (17%), Aptamil Easy Digest (10%), Cow & Gate Comfort (10%), SMA Nutrition and Cow & Gate First Infant Milk (3% each). These products derived from three manufacturers: Nutricia (50%), John Wyeth (33%) and Heinz (17%).

Infant formula adverts are currently restricted to specialist publications targeted at medical and health professionals. In 2006, however, a small number of infant formula adverts were detected as having occurred in magazines targeted at mothers and mothers to be (4 cases) and in a national daily newspaper (one instance).

Most infant formula advertising occupied limited page space of no more than 400 square centimetres. Most campaigns ran for no more than six months and involved no more than three advert appearances. The prevalence of short campaigns increased in 2008-2009 over 2006. Understandably campaign expenditures frequently tended to be limited to amounts not exceeding £4,000. All infant formula adverts contained a web address for consumers to consult.

Source Factors
Although no adverts contained adult actors, four did contain child actors, three of whom were British Asian and one was white British. One of these adverts appeared in 2006 and three appeared in 2008-2009. Three adverts featured expert medical/health professional
endorsement, all of which appeared in 2008-2009. No celebrity endorsers were featured in any of these adverts.

**Message Factors**
Message factors comprised a number of product information variables and thematic variables. Product information comprised brand differentiating factors, product identification, age of use recommendation, health and nutrition benefits claims, price information, new product features, convenience of use, technical information about health and nutrition, risk and use and arguments for the product. Thematic variables included the presence of humour and ‘heart warming’ tones.

The product pack was shown in more than eight in ten adverts for infant formula, with prevalence being greater in 2006 (89%) than in 2008-2009 (76%). Otherwise the brand name was present elsewhere in an advert in just over one in two cases (53%). The name of the manufacturer was shown in just over one in three adverts (37%), more so in 2008-2009 (38%) than in 2006 (33%).

Infant formula was identified in three-quarters of adverts on the visible pack display and in other parts of the advert for all except one advert. The name of the product range was also identified almost universally (32 out of 33 adverts). None of this advertising contained details about product stage within the text of the advertisement, but such information was shown on pack displays (for product stage 1) in over one in two cases (60%).

Age of use recommendation was shown more often in visible packs in adverts (63%) than elsewhere in the text of the advert (23%). Over time, this information was more likely to be displayed in 2008-2009 than in 2006. Most infant formula adverts contained claims about health benefits (83%) and nutrition benefits (77%) of the product in the text of the ad while this information was visibly displayed only rarely on product packs shown in the adverts.

Price information was completely absent from infant formula advertising. Most of these adverts (73%), however, contained a customer helpline. None of these adverts contained any information about new product features or convenience of use.
Most infant formula adverts contained at least some technical information about health and nutrition claims (77%). Such information was especially prevalent in 2008-2009 (91%). The presence of unreferenced claims about health and nutrition benefits was rare (two adverts only, in 2008-2009). Technical information about the nutritional ingredients of products was completely absent.

A number of risk-related features were examined. None of these adverts contained statements about the suitability of these products for infants aged over six months and only one advert contained a reference to the product forming part of a diversified diet. This statement was visible on pack displays in the ads in a majority of cases (80%).

All of the adverts (100%) across the time periods stated that the use of infant formula with infants under six months of age should only occur on the advice of a suitably qualified health or medical professional.

Around one in four infant formula adverts (26%) provided warnings about health hazards associated with inappropriate preparation of the product. None contained warnings about the hazards associated with inappropriate storage. All infant formula adverts contained the words “Important Notice”. More than four in ten (47%) of these adverts used a signal word to draw attention to a risk warning together with a statement describing the nature of the risk. One in ten (10%) contained a statement about the consequences of misuse of the product.

Most infant formula adverts contained a statement about the superiority of breast feeding (87%). This statement appeared in all adverts from 2008-2009. There was no evidence of any discouragement of breast feeding in association with arguments promoting the product. Positive benefits of the product occurred in over nine in ten adverts (90%). The use of specific promotional terms was rare. Those most commonly used were ‘immunity’ (11 times) and ‘protect’ (five times). No product demonstrations were used in these adverts. There was no use of humour or heart-warming tones in infant formula advertising.

**Channel and Format Factors**

While virtually all infant formula adverts contained picture material, images of babies or infants and of mothers were rare (three adverts; 10%). Most visual settings could not be readily discerned (80%). Those that could mostly comprised home settings (17% of all ads).
Narrative factors comprised an analysis of text legibility and readability by coding letter case, font and colour/contrast between text and background. These attributes were coded in respect of text showing brand name, product name, identification of infant formula, superiority of breast feeding, recommended age of use, and other product-related support text. Lower case or a combination of lower and upper case were the preferred styles for brand names and product names. For all other text, sentence case and lower case were the most used case styles. Sans serifs font was generally the most used or only font used for all these text elements. For all text elements except brand name, high resolution colour combinations were used for text and background.

**Receiver Factors**

Just four infant formula adverts displayed a baby or infant within the ad message. Three of these appeared in 2008-2009. The most commonly occurring attributes of depicted infants were having hair, smiling, head control and sitting upright. All these features appeared in 2008-2009. A mother was visibly present in only one infant formula advert and there were no images that featured father or male figures. Consequently, there were no relationship scenarios or scenes of affection between mother/father pairs.

There was no use of soft pastel colours in images in infant formula adverts. Bold primary colours were used in most adverts (67%), especially in 2008-2009 (76%). In around four out of ten cases (43%) bold colours were used for product packs shown in these adverts.
Annex

Attributes that displayed Significant Changes between the 2006 and 2008-09 Infant Formula Advert Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Chi-square scores</th>
<th>2008-09 compared with 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of use recommendation shown on pack shot in advert</td>
<td>$X^2 = 14.0^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of use recommendation shown in advert</td>
<td>$X^2 = 3.9^*$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition benefits of product stated</td>
<td>$X^2 = 7.5^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified health claims stated</td>
<td>$X^2 = 7.5^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health hazards associated with inappropriate preparation stated</td>
<td>$X^2 = 4.7^*$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal word to draw attention to hazard warning shown</td>
<td>$X^2 = 6.5^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of risks associated with product</td>
<td>$X^2 = 6.5^{**}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority of breast feeding statement</td>
<td>$X^2 = 10.8^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of term ‘immunity’</td>
<td>$X^2 = 10.8^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name in advert legibility – case</td>
<td>$X^2 = 3.9^*$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name in advert legibility – colour</td>
<td>$X^2 = 30.0^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product name on pack in advert legibility – case</td>
<td>$X^2 = 5.9^*$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Infant formula’ identification in advert legibility – colour</td>
<td>$X^2 = 5.9^*$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority of breast feeding statement legibility – colour</td>
<td>$X^2 = 21.2^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other product-related information legibility – colour</td>
<td>$X^2 = 30.0^{***}$</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1. Significance levels: *** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05

Note 2. These tests of statistical significance indicated that any differences in the prevalence of specific advertising attributes between the ad samples from 2006 and from 2008-09 with a single * had a less than one in 20 (5%) probability, those with a double ** exhibited less than one in 100 (1%) probability, and those with a triple *** exhibited less than one in 1000 (0.1%) probability of being purely chance fluctuations.
Appendix 7. Findings: Formula Products in Retail Settings

In-Store Displays of Formula Products

In-store advertising has become increasingly significant in recent years as a part of the ‘marketing mix’ that manufacturers of a wide range of goods employ to promote their products (West, 2001; Benady, 2006). For some commentators retail premises represent the ‘ultimate advertising and marketing opportunity’ (Mintel, quoted in West, 2001 p41) for they provide a channel to communicate directly with consumers as they are about to make a purchase. Where manufacturers compete strongly with one another, the ways products are arranged and displayed in store have been found to play a key role in winning sales (East et al, 2003).

The Site Reports survey of retail premises in inner city, suburban and rural locations in and around Belfast, Cardiff, Edinburgh and Leicester was carried out to monitor the presentation of infant formula and follow-on formula products across the country. The survey was conducted in two phases. In the first phase field inspectors made 108 separate visits; in the second they made a further 48. In all, 39 retail outlets were surveyed in each region (27 in phase 1 and 12 in phase 2). These were evenly divided between inner city, suburban and rural retail environments in each case and between three types of retail outlet: supermarkets, pharmacies and convenience stores.

Table A7.1 Retail premises visits by region and retail environment, phases 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inner city</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S’market</td>
<td>Pharm</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ph 1+2</td>
<td>Ph 1+2</td>
<td>Ph 1+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast</td>
<td>3+1</td>
<td>3+2</td>
<td>3+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>3+1</td>
<td>3+2</td>
<td>3+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>3+1</td>
<td>3+2</td>
<td>3+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>3+2</td>
<td>3+1</td>
<td>3+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | S’market   | Pharm    | Con   |
|                | Ph 1+2     | Ph 1+2   | Ph 1+2|
| Belfast        | 3+1        | 3+2      | 3+1   |
| Cardiff        | 3+1        | 3+2      | 3+1   |
| Edinburgh      | 3+1        | 3+2      | 3+1   |
| Leicester      | 3+2        | 3+1      | 3+1   |
| Totals         | 20         | 16       | 16    |

|                | S’market   | Pharm    | Con   |
|                | Ph 1+2     | Ph 1+2   | Ph 1+2|
| Belfast        | 3+1        | 3+2      | 3+1   |
| Cardiff        | 3+1        | 3+2      | 3+1   |
| Edinburgh      | 3+1        | 3+2      | 3+1   |
| Leicester      | 3+2        | 3+1      | 3+1   |
| Totals         | 17         | 19       | 16    |
Visits were also made to 48 GP surgeries and health centres during the second survey phase.

Table A7.2 GP surgery/health centre visits by region/environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inner city</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belfast</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 1 fieldwork was conducted between December 11\textsuperscript{th} 2008 and 6\textsuperscript{th} January 2009; phase 2 fieldwork was conducted during February 2009. For each phase field inspectors were briefed to survey the interior of retail premises (and exteriors as necessary), capture (i.e. record by means of digital photography) in-store displays of formula products and any in-store advertising, and to collect any formula literature available (such as product flyers or information leaflets). For the surgery/health centre survey inspectors were instructed to contact practice/centre managers in advance to arrange visits to coincide with ante- and post-natal clinic times and to photograph any displays and collect any literature they found during each visit.

Prevalence of Formula Products in Retail Outlets

Nearly three-quarters of the stores surveyed (71%, or 111 out of 156 retail premises visited) contained any infant formula products and 62% (97 out of 156) contained follow-on formula products. Supermarkets were most likely to contain infant formula products (87%, or 47 premises out of 54 visited), followed by pharmacies (74%, 40 out of 54 visited) and convenience stores (50%, 24 out of 48). Supermarkets were also most likely to sell follow-on formula products (85%, 46 out of 54), again followed by pharmacies (57%, 31 out 54) and convenience stores (42%, 20 out of 48).

Regional Distribution of Formula Products in Retail Outlets

Infant formula products were most likely to be found in retail outlets in Belfast (77% of the premises visited in Belfast – 30 out of 39 - were selling infant formula), followed by Leicester (74% - 29 out of 39), Edinburgh (72%), and Cardiff (64%). Follow-on formula products were also most likely to be found in retail outlets in Belfast (69%) followed by Cardiff, Edinburgh and Leicester (all 59%).

272
As Table A7.3 shows, a total of 28 different infant formula products and 20 different follow-on formula products were identified across all retail outlets in the first phase of the research. Similar numbers were found among the premises visited in the second phase (26 infant formula products and 19 follow-on formula products). There were small regional variations in the numbers of products found and some reduction (notably in Edinburgh) in the numbers available between the phase 1 and phase 2 surveys.

Table A7.3. Number of products on sale by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Infant Formula</th>
<th>Follow-On Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The products identified were associated with five major formula brands. These are shown in Table A7.4 below. At the time of the first survey the brand with the largest number of distinct infant formula and follow-on formula products was Cow & Gate, with a total of 19 products across the two product categories. Aptamil and SMA were marketing nine products each, HIPP six products, and Heinz four products (all for infant formula). The pattern was similar at the time of the second survey albeit with a small reduction in the range available overall.

Table A7.4. Numbers of products by brand on sale (all regions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All locations</th>
<th>Infant Formula</th>
<th>Follow-On Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The distribution of infant formula products available across the four regions surveyed was similar to the overall position in both phases of the research, although here, as already noted, there was a conspicuous reduction in the range of products available in Edinburgh:

Table A7. 5. Infant formula brands/numbers of products on sale by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Belfast</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar results by regional location were found for follow-on formula products.

Table A7. 6. Follow-on formula brands/numbers of products on sale by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Belfast</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location Distribution of Formula Products in Retail Outlets

Infant formula products were most likely to be found in retail outlets in rural locations (75% 39 out of 52 retail premises visited in rural areas were selling infant formula), followed by inner city locations (71%, 36 out of 52) and finally, suburban locations (69% 36 out of 52).

Follow-on formula products were most likely to be found in retail outlets in rural locations (65%) and least likely to be found in suburban locations (55%). These products were found in 63% of inner-city retail premises.
On looking at the distribution of major infant formula brands by physical location, most of the major brands were fairly evenly distributed across inner city, suburban and rural locations in all regions. There were some exceptions. Cow & Gate products, for example, were especially prevalent in suburban Leicester.

With follow-on formula products prevalence was again fairly evenly distributed by physical location in different regions, except for HIPP products which were absent from retail outlets in rural Leicester.

Table A7.7. Distribution of infant formula brands/numbers of products on sale by region (inner city retail environment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inner city</th>
<th>Belfast</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A7.8. Distribution of infant formula brands/numbers of products on sale by region (suburban retail environment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Belfast</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A7.9. Distribution of infant formula brands/numbers of products on sale by region (rural retail environment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Belfast</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A7.10. Distribution of follow-on formula brands/numbers of products on sale by region (inner city retail environment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inner city</th>
<th>Belfast</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A7.11. Distribution of follow-on formula brands/numbers of products on sale by region (suburban retail environment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Belfast</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A7.12. Distribution of follow-on formula brands/numbers of products on sale by region (rural retail environment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Belfast</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In-store Advertising and Presentation

The term ‘powerwall’ has been used in recent years to describe a marketing technique used in retail premises at the point of purchase/sale to attract attention to brands and product ranges. Powerwalls are created by manufacturers by paying retailers for space in which to display their products to their exact specifications. These specifications are designed to increase the visual and therefore, it is thought, the persuasive impact of their displays. For example, retailers might be instructed by manufacturers to ensure that displays of their products are set in the line of sight for consumers entering a store or when approaching the cash till.

The ‘powerwall’ technique is prevalent in the marketing of tobacco products and has assumed greater importance in recent years as controls on paid-for advertising in media outlets have been tightened, media channels have multiplied and audiences have become fragmented into more narrowly differentiated consumer categories. As opportunities to reach large audiences with persuasive messages via the mass media diminish, retail premises are seen by some as the ‘last remaining battlefields’ for tobacco brands competing with one another to attract new customers (DiPasquale, 2002). Point of purchase/sale tobacco displays are thought to be growing in their importance as ways of communicating brand imagery. Recent research has shown that children who are exposed to tobacco advertising for particular tobacco brands at the point of purchase tend to exaggerate those brands’ popularity, availability and use (Hickling and Miller, 2008). It is for this reason that ‘powerwalls’ have acquired some notoriety and have attracted criticism from health campaigners.
While this was not the central aim of this part of the research and no attempt was made to measure relative display sizes or to chart systematically the positioning of displays in the premises visited, the data from the Site Reports surveys – in the form of digital images captured in-store by Site Reports inspectors (where this is available)\(^6\) - does provide some indication of the nature of in-store displays and of the importance infant and follow-on formula manufacturers were placing on retail displays at the time of the fieldwork.

The first point to note in this regard is that no evidence was found of any in-store advertising of formula products in either of the Site Reports surveys. Nor was there evidence of exterior store advertising or local outdoor advertising of formula products. There were in-store sales promotions (price reductions for multiple purchases or loyalty scheme bonuses) in a total of five locations: a supermarket in suburban Edinburgh (a general brand promotion for Cow & Gate), pharmacies in rural and suburban Leicester (for Cow& Gate follow-on formula and ‘baby items’ promotions); and in supermarkets in inner city and rural Leicester (follow-on formula and general brand promotions for SMA products). (see Table A7.13) for in-store images and further details of these).

\(^6\) In 19 (12%) out of the 156 stores visited, permission to capture digital images was refused. In 39 stores no formula products were visible. A total of 154 separate images were recorded by Site Reports inspectors.
Table A7.13
In-store Price Promotions Recorded by Site Reports Field Staff

Phase 1

Sainsbury's suburban Edinburgh 20 Dec 09:

Special Offer: Save £1.00 Cow & Gate 1+ 500ml x 4 and 900g.

Boots rural Leicester 23 Dec 08

2 for £8 Cow & Gate Goodnight milk 400g
Table A7.13 continued.

**Somerfield inner city Leicester 23 Dec 08:**

*Buy 5 get 6th free SMA progress 250ml*

![Image of Somerfield inner city Leicester promotion](image1)

---

**Somerfield rural Leicester 11 Dec 08:**

*Buy 1 get 1 free on SMA 250ml products*

![Image of Somerfield rural Leicester promotion](image2)
Table A7.13 continued.

Phase 2

Boots suburban Leicester 26 Feb 09:

2 for £12 on C & G follow on and growing up milk.

Triple Boots points on baby items when £20 is spent.

The available visual evidence does not support the conclusion that the retail presentation of infant formula products is a well-coordinated or carefully orchestrated activity. Displays varied widely between store types. As might be expected, by virtue of the greater number of product lines they sell and the greater retail space at their disposal, the majority of supermarket displays tended to be larger than the displays in convenience stores or pharmacies. In many of the premises visited in the latter categories, product ranges were
sparse and, in so far as can be judged from the limited evidence available, displays do not appear to have been positioned in noticeably prominent positions - either near cash tills or store entrances. Within store categories, the displays in convenience stores especially lacked the uniformity that one might expect to find in a ‘powerwall’ display. This is noteworthy given the fact that in discussions of tobacco retailing, convenience stores are thought to be favoured sites for the use of the technique (e.g. Non-Smokers’ Rights Association, 2007).

Table A7.14 contains images typical of the displays recorded across the sample.

Table A7.14. Images of In-store Displays

**Supermarkets**

Belfast – Sainsbury’s inner city (Phase 1)

Cardiff – Morrisons inner city (Phase 2)
Table A7.14 continued.

Edinburgh – Asda suburban (Phase 1)

Leicester – Morrisons rural (Phase 1)

Convenience Stores

Belfast – Inner city (Phase 2)
Table A7.14 continued.

Cardiff – suburban (Phase 2)

Edinburgh – inner city (Phase 1)
Table A7.14 continued.

Leicester – suburban (Phase 2)

Pharmacies

Belfast – suburban (Phase 2)

Cardiff – suburban (Phase 1)
Table A7.14 continued.

Edinburgh – rural (Phase 2)

Survey of Surgeries and Health Centres
Almost no promotional material was visible at the 48 surgeries and health centres visited by Site Reports inspectors: just one Cow & Gate generic product information leaflet (‘Mum to Be’) was found in three surgeries by the Cardiff inspector (see Tables A7.15 for location details and the Annex at end of this section for images of leaflets).
Table A7.15. Details of GPs Surgeries where Cow & Gate Information Leaflet Found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of Site:</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birchfield Surgery</td>
<td>GPs Surgeries</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Church Rd, Whitchurch, CF14 2DZ</td>
<td>Environment: Suburban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type of Site:</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltmead Medical Centre</td>
<td>GPs Surgeries</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 Calre Road, Grangetown, CF11 6QQ</td>
<td>Environment: Inner City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type of Site:</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Road Medical Practice</td>
<td>GPs Surgeries</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182 North Rd, CF14 3BJ</td>
<td>Environment: Suburban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

A total of 156 visits to retail premises and 48 to GP surgeries and health centres in Belfast, Cardiff, Edinburgh and Leicester were made by Site Reports field staff to survey the presentation of infant and follow-on formula products during December 2008 and January (Phase 1) and February 2009 (Phase 2). Nearly three quarters of the retail premises visited contained some formula products; supermarkets were more likely to contain these products than convenience stores or pharmacies. Overall, stores located in rural areas were more likely to sell formula products than those in inner-city or suburban locations, but the differences here were slight. On the whole, infant formula products were more widely available than follow-on formula products.

The five main formula product brands were represented fairly consistently across retail outlet categories and retail environments with Cow & Gate showing greatest overall market.
presence by virtue of having the widest product range. There were only minor changes in product availability between the two phases of the survey.

There was no evidence of in-store advertising, exterior store advertising or local outdoor advertising of infant or follow-on formula product. There were in-store sales promotions in a total of five locations. None of the GP surgeries and health centres contained any promotional literature specifically promoting the sale of infant or follow-on formula. In-store product displays were by and large modest. There was no evidence of the deliberate attempt to create ‘powerwalls’ of products by brands in any of the premises included in the surveys.
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Annex: Cow & Gate Information Leaflets
First Trimester

We don't want to tell our family and friends yet but I need to talk to someone!

Sue, 7 weeks pregnant

Most couples want to wait until they're sure everything's ok before breaking the good news but, as a new mum-to-be, you're naturally bursting to talk about it. Don't worry, if you want to have a chat with someone you can turn to, to answer all the questions buzzing around your head, and who knows how you're feeling from personal experience, you can always give the Cow & Gate team a call on 08457 623 623. Here are a few helpful tips and advice to the meantime.

Foods to avoid

When you're pregnant, certain foods should be avoided; soft mould-ripened cheeses such as Camembert, blue and blue-veined varieties, offal-based products, pickles and undercooked meats and foods containing raw or partially cooked eggs.

Vitamins & supplements

If you're taking vitamin supplements, make sure they're suitable for pregnancy as many contain vitamin A, which can be harmful in large doses. However, doctors do recommend taking folate and for the first 3 months of pregnancy as it has been shown to reduce the risk of neural tube defects, such as spina bifida, and can also help with your baby's brain development.

Coping with morning sickness

Another tip is, if you're suffering from morning sickness, try eating little and often. The nausea should pass by the 12th week or so of your pregnancy, but if it doesn't, don't worry – it's not uncommon if it continues throughout pregnancy.

9, 8, 7 months to go...

9 months and counting...

Having a baby is one of the most natural things in the world and so is having a lot of questions!

At Cow & Gate our team of Midwives, Healthcare Professionals and experienced Mums reassure thousands of mums-to-be like you about all kinds of topics, from what to expect at each stage of pregnancy, to diet and nutrition advice for you and your baby. Our team have put together this leaflet to give you a taste of the topics we cover and what you can expect at each stage as you count down to your big day. If you want to find out more, why not join our Cow & Gate Mum and Baby Club by filling in the form overleaf, and if you have any questions, no matter how silly they may seem, just give us a call!

cowandgate.co.uk
Call us: 08457 623 623

Mum to be?

A quick guide to pregnancy while you wait...

“This might sound silly but...”

You'll be amazed how many mums start their calls with those words but if something's on your mind, you can be sure it's not silly. Our team talk to over 1,000 mums and mums-to-be every week. Here are a few examples of the types of calls we have helped with:

Since I got into my 2nd trimester I'm so frisky! What are the safest sexual positions? Becky, 24 weeks pregnant

I don't think I'd ever had heartburn before I got pregnant but now I'm getting it all the time. What am I doing wrong? Debbie, 28 weeks pregnant

Is it just in your curves? Faye or dosage? I'm not really stressed, honest! Holly, 14 weeks pregnant
Appendix 8. Coding Frames

Follow-On Formula Advertisements - Print

*Advertisement Code Number:* [001-999]

**General Codes**

[1] *Time period advertisement appeared*

[2] *Product Name*
   - [give name]

[3] *Manufacturer name*
   - [01] Nutricia
   - [02] Danone
   - [03] Heinz
   - [04] Hipp
   - [05] Nestle
   - [06] John Wyeth

[4] *Type of Publication in which Advertisement Occurred*
   - [01] Daily national newspaper
   - [02] Sunday national newspaper
   - [03] Regional newspaper
   - [04] Magazine – celebrity/fashion
   - [05] Magazine – for mothers/mothers to be
   - [06] Magazine – household/property
   - [07] Magazine – news and current affairs
   - [08] Magazine – general interest for women
   - [09] Magazine - other

[5] *Size of advertisements [square cms]*

[6] *Campaign duration [in months - supplied by Billetts]*

[7] *Number of ad appearances in campaign [Billets]*

[8] *Campaign expenditure [supplied by Billetts]*
Web address in ad (supplied by Billetts)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Reference made to consumer/trade award for product
[1] Yes
[2] No

Source Factors
Gender of endorser

Gender of principal adult pictured actor
[1] Male
[2] Female
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No pictured actor

Ethnicity of endorser

Ethnicity of principal pictured adult actor
[01] White – British
[02] White – other
[03] Black – Afro-Caribbean – British
[04] Black – Afro-Caribbean – other
[05] Asian – British
[06] Asian – Other
[07] Other – British
[08] Other – Other
[09] Cannot judge
[10] No pictured adult actor

Ethnicity of principal pictured child actor
[01] White – British
[02] White – other
[03] Black – Afro-Caribbean – British
[04] Black – Afro-Caribbean – other
[05] Asian – British
[06] Asian – Other
[07] Other – British
[08] Other – Other
[09] Cannot judge
[10] No pictured child actor
Expertise of endorser
[14] Any use of ‘expert’ endorsement (e.g., doctor, medical or healthcare professional)?
[1] Yes
[2] No

[1] Yes
[2] No

[15] Provision of general baby/infant-related advice or guidance
[1] Yes – text only
[2] Yes, pictures and text
[3] No

Celebrity status and endorser
[16] Any use of celebrity endorsement?
[1] Yes
[2] No

[17] Any evidence of celebrity expertise? [e.g., pictured with own children or reference made to own children]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Message Factors

Product Information

Brand Differentiating Factors

[18] Product pack visible in ad
[1] Yes
[2] No

[19] Brand name shown in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[20] Name of manufacturer shown on product pack in ad
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad
[21] **Follow-on formula identified on visible pack**
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[22] **Follow-on formula identified in ad (other than on visible pack)**
[1] Yes
[2] No

[23] **Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement**
[1] Yes
[2] No

[24] **Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow & Gate] visible on pack shown in advertisement**
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[25] **Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2 or 3; etc) visible in advertisement**
[1] Product stage ‘1’
[2] Product stage ‘2’
[3] Product stage ‘3’
[4] Good night milk
[5] Other
[6] Not visible

[26] **Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2, or 3, etc) visible on pack in advertisement**
[1] Product stage ‘1’
[2] Product stage ‘2’
[3] Product stage ‘3’
[4] Good night milk
[5] Other
[6] Not visible on pack
[6] Pack not shown in advertisement

[27] **Age of use recommendation shown on visible pack**
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad
[28] Age of use recommendation shown in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[29] Any statements about nutrition benefits of product seen on pack?
[1] Yes
[2] Not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[30] Any statements visible about nutrition benefits of product in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[31] Any statements about health benefits of product seen on pack?
[1] Yes
[2] Not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[32] Any statements visible about health benefits of product in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[33] Price information shown on visible product pack?
[1] Yes
[2] No not visible on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[34] Price information visible elsewhere in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[35] Is a helpline/careline/customer services telephone number included in the advertisement?
[1] Yes
[2] No

New Product Features

[36] Any statement indicating that there is something ‘new’ about this product/brand seen on product pack?
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad
Any statement indicating that there is something ‘new’ about this product/brand in ad (other than on pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Convenience of Use
Any text statement indicating ease of use of product on visibly displayed product pack
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

Any text statement indicating ease of use of product in ad (other than on pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Technical information – health and nutrition shown anywhere in advertisement
Presence of qualifying health or nutrition claims
[1] Yes
[2] No

Presence of non-qualifying health or nutrition claims
[1] Yes
[2] No

Available energy value (in kJ and kcal)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Protein content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Carbohydrate content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Lipids content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Quantity of choline
[1] Yes
[2] No
[47] Quantity of inositol
[1] Yes
[2] No

[48] Quantity of carnitine
[1] Yes
[2] No

[49] Quantities of other specified minerals/vitamins
[1] Yes- any information
[2] No

[50] Vitamins
[1] Yes
[2] No

Risk/Use

[51] Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over age of six months anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[52] Statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[53] Statement that product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during first six months of life anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[54] Statement that any decision to use product before six months of age, should be made only on the advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[55] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate preparation anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No
[56] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage anywhere in advertisement

1] Yes
2] No

[57] Presence of words “Important Notice”

1] Yes
2] No

[58] Statement recommending that product is used only on advice of medical/health/pharmaceutical professional anywhere in advertisement

1] Yes
2] No

[59] Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over age of six months on visible pack in advertisement

1] Yes
2] No, not seen on pack
3] Pack not shown in ad

[60] Statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet on visible pack in advertisement

1] Yes
2] No, not seen on pack
3] Pack not shown in ad

[61] Statement that product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during first six months of life on visible pack in advertisement

1] Yes
2] No, not seen on pack
3] Pack not shown in ad

[62] Statement that any decision to use product before six months of age, should be made only on the advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional on visible pack in advertisement

1] Yes
2] No, not seen on pack
3] Pack not shown in ad

[63] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate preparation on visible pack in advertisement

1] Yes
2] No, not seen on pack
3] Pack not shown in ad
[64] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[65] Presence of words “Important Notice” on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[66] Statement recommending that product is used only on advice of medical/health/pharmaceutical professional on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[67] Use of signal word to draw attention to risk warning in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[68] Use of risk statement describing nature of risk
[1] Yes
[2] No

[69] Use of consequence statement defining consequences of misuse
[1] Yes
[2] No

[70] Use of instruction statement advising on how to avoid consequences of misuse
[1] Yes
[2] No

Arguments/Counter-arguments for Product

[71] Statement concerning superiority of breast feeding anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[72] Necessary information about appropriate use of product – no discouragement of breast feeding anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No
[73] Argument in favour of product – describing product benefits [positive frame]
[1] Yes
[2] No

[74] Argument describing offsetting of negative outcome through product use [negative frame]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Presence of specific promotional terms in the text of the advertisement [code actual use of these terms only]
[75] Immunity
[1] Yes
[2] No

[76] Natural development
[1] Yes
[2] No

[77] Defend/Defence
[1] Yes
[2] No

[78] Protect
[1] Yes
[2] No

[79] Robust/tough
[1] Yes
[2] No

[80] Natural ingredients
[1] Yes
[2] No

Product Demonstrations

[81] Instructions for appropriate preparation
[1] Yes
[2] No
Instructions for storage
[1] Yes
[2] No

Instructions for disposal
[1] Yes
[2] No

Any picture material illustrating methods of preparation
[1] Yes
[2] No

Thematic Content
Humour
Presence of funny situations [slapstick, quirky incidents]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Heart-warming tones
Any picture of infant laughing
[1] Yes
[2] No

Any picture of mother sitting with infant at table/chair?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable
[9] Unclear

Any picture of mother bottle feeding infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable
Channel/Format Factors
Audio-Visual Techniques

Visual Format

[89] Type of Presentation
[1] Picture of product used by mother with infant
[3] Picture of infant only with product
[4] Picture of infant only – no product use
[5] Picture of mother only with product
[6] Picture of mother only – no product use
[7] Picture of product only
[8] Other Picture material
[9] No picture material at all

[90] Visual setting of advertisement
[1] In home
[2] In retail setting
[3] In car/vehicle
[4] Outdoor locations
[5] Other
[6] Not discernible
[7] No visible setting depicted

Narrative Factors

[91] Brand name visible in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[92] Brand name visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[93] Brand name visible in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0
[94] Brand name visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[95] Brand name visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[96] Brand name visible on pack in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[97] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[98] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[99] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[100] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert
[101] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[102] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[103] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[104] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[105] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[106] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[107] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[108] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0
[109]Price information
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[110]Price information
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[111]Price information
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[112]Superiority of breast feeding statement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[113]Superiority of breast feeding statement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[114]Superiority of breast feeding statement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[115]Recommended age of use
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert
[116] Recommended age of use
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[117] Recommended age of use
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[118] Other support text with product-related information
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[119] Other support text with product-related information
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[120] Other support text with product-related information
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0
### Text Readability - Colour-Contrast Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Character Colour</th>
<th>Background Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Receiver Factors

Nature of actors – e.g., similar to intended consumer – mothers

- **[121]** Any presence of baby/infant in advertisement
  - [1] Yes
  - [2] No
  - [3] Not applicable

- **[122]** Any visible displays of baby/infant behaviours
  
  **Head control**
  - [1] Yes
  - [2] No
  - [3] Cannot judge
  - [4] No baby/infant in ad

- **[123]** Dexterity of arm movements
  - [1] Yes
  - [2] No
  - [3] Cannot judge
  - [4] No baby/infant in ad
[124] Self-feeding
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[125] Has hair
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[126] Has teeth
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[127] Sitting upright
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[128] Display of emotional facial expression (smiling)
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[129] Display of emotional facial expression (crying)
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[130] Any presence of mother in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[131] Any picture of mother with infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No mother in advertisements
### Gender counter-stereotyping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[132] Any picture of mother without infant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] No mother in advertisements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[133] Any picture of pregnant woman?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] No mother in advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Relationship Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[138] Picture of man and woman together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[139] Picture of man and women together with baby/infant (family setting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Displays of affection

[140] Scene depicting woman and man hugging/making affectionate physical contact
[1] Yes
[2] No

[141] Scene depicting mother and infant hugging/making affectionate physical contact
[1] Yes
[2] No

[142] Scene depicting father holding infant against him?
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of Colours

[143] Use of pastel colours in images of babies to convey softness
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No use of pastels
[4] No images of babies

[144] Use of bold primary colours with brand names in advertisements
[1] Yes
[2] No

[145] Use of bold primary colours on packs in advertisements
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No packs visible in advertisement
Follow-On Formula Advertisements - Television

Advertisement Code Number: [001-999]

General Codes

[1] Time period advertisement appeared

[2] Product Name
[give name]

[3] Manufacturer name
[01] Nutricia
[02] Danone
[03] Heinz
[04] Hipp
[05] Nestle
[06] John Wyeth

[01] Long version
[02] End version
[03] Music change
[04] Phone number change
[05] Launch version

[5] Ad type [supplied by Billetts]
[1] Commercial
[2] Sponsorship/promotion

[6] Channel [supplied by Billetts]
[1] ITV
[2] ITV variants (e.g. ITV2)
[3] Channel 4
[4] Channel 4 variants (e.g. C4 +1; E4)
[5] Five
[6] Five variants
[7] Multi channel (e.g. Living; UKTV) including variants
[9] Data not available
[7] **Duration of advertisements** [supplied by Billetts]
   In seconds_____________

[8] **Number of ad slots run in campaign** [supplied by Billetts]

[9] **Campaign duration** [in months supplied by Billetts]

[10] **Campaign expenditure** [supplied by Billetts]

   [1] Yes
   [2] No

[12] **Spoken reference made to consumer/trade award for product**
   [1] Yes
   [2] No

**Source Factors**

**Gender of endorser**

[13] **Gender of voice-over**
   [1] Male
   [2] Female
   [3] Cannot judge
   [4] No voice-over

[14] **Gender of principal adult on-screen actor**
   [1] Male
   [2] Female
   [3] Cannot judge
   [4] No on-screen actor
Ethnicity of endorser

[15] Ethnicity of principal on-screen adult actor
[01] White – British
[02] White – other
[03] Black – Afro-Caribbean – British
[04] Black – Afro-Caribbean – other
[05] Asian – British
[06] Asian – Other
[07] Other – British
[08] Other – Other
[09] Cannot judge [10] No on-screen actor

[16] Ethnicity of principal on-screen child actor
[01] White – British
[02] White – other
[03] Black – Afro-Caribbean – British
[04] Black – Afro-Caribbean – other
[05] Asian – British
[06] Asian – Other
[07] Other – British
[08] Other – Other
[09] Cannot judge [10] No on-screen actor

Expertise of endorser

[17] Any use of ‘expert’ endorsement (e.g., doctor, medical or healthcare professional)?
[1] Yes
[2] No

[18] Any use of other ‘expert’ endorsement (qualifications of expert unknown)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[19] Provision of general baby/infant-related advice or guidance
[1] Yes – text only
[2] Yes, pictures and text
[3] Yes, voice-over only
[4] Yes, pictures and voice over
[5] Yes, text and voice over
[6] Yes, text, pictures and voice-over
[7] No
Celebrity status and endorser

[20] Any use of celebrity endorsement?
[1] Yes
[2] No

[21] Any evidence of celebrity expertise? [e.g., pictured with own children or reference made to own children]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Message Factors

Product Information

Brand Differentiating Factors

[22] Product Pack visible in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[23] Brand name shown in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[24] Follow-on formula identified on visible pack
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[25] Follow-on formula identified visibly in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[26] Follow-on formula identified in spoken narrative
[1] Yes
[2] No

[27] Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow & Gate] visible in ad
[1] Yes
[2] No
[28] **Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow & Gate] visible on pack shown in ad**

[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[29] **Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow & Gate] spoken in narrative in ad**

[1] Yes
[2] No

[30] **Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2 or 3; etc) visible in on-screen text in advertisement**

[1] Product stage ‘1’
[2] Product stage ‘2’
[3] Product stage ‘3’
[4] Good night milk
[5] Other
[6] Not visible

[31] **Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2 or 3; etc) audible in spoken narrative in advertisement**

[1] Product stage ‘1’
[2] Product stage ‘2’
[3] Product stage ‘3’
[4] Good night milk
[5] Other
[6] Not visible

[32] **Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2, or 3, etc) visible on pack in advertisement**

[1] Product stage ‘1’
[2] Product stage ‘2’
[3] Product stage ‘3’
[4] Good night milk
[5] Other
[6] Not visible on pack
[6] Pack not shown in advertisement

[33] **Age of use recommendation shown on visible pack**

[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad
[9] Unclear
[34] Age of use recommendation shown in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[35] Any statements about nutrition benefits of product seen on pack?
[1] Yes
[2] Not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[36] Any statements visible about nutrition benefits of product in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[37] Any statements about health benefits of product seen on pack?
[1] Yes
[2] Not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[38] Any statements visible about health benefits of product in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[39] Any spoken discussion of nutrition benefits of product?
[1] Yes
[2] No

[40] Any spoken discussion of health benefits of product?
[1] Yes
[2] No

[41] Any price information shown on visible product pack?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable

[42] Price information visible elsewhere in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No
Any price information stated orally?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable

Is a helpline/careline/customer services telephone number included in the advertisement?
[1] Yes
[2] No

New Product Features
Any statement indicating that there is something ‘new’ about this product/brand seen on product pack?
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

Any visibly displayed text statement indicating that there is something ‘new’ about this product/brand in ad (other than on pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Any oral statement indicating that there is something ‘new’ about this product/brand?
[1] Yes
[2] No

Convenience of Use
Any written text statement indicating ease of use of product on visibly displayed product pack
[1] Yes
[2] No, not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad
[9] Unclear

Any written text statement indicating ease of use of product in ad (other than on pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Any voice-over statement indicating ease of use of product
[1] Yes
[2] No
Technical information – health and nutrition

[51] Presence of qualifying health or nutrition claims
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[52] Presence of non-qualifying health or nutrition claims
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[53] Available energy value (in kJ and kcal)
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[54] Protein content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[55] Carbohydrate content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[56] Lipids content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[57] Quantity of choline
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all
[58] **Quantity of inositol**
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[59] **Quantity of carnitine**
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[60] **Quantities of other specified minerals/vitamins**

**Minerals – visibly shown**
[1] Yes
[2] No

**Minerals – spoken about in narrative**
[1] Yes
[2] No

**Vitamins – visibly shown**
[1] Yes
[2] No

**Vitamins – spoken about in narrative**
[1] Yes
[2] No

**Risk/Use**

[64] **Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over age of six months**
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[65] **Statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet**
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all
[66] Statement that product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during first six months of life
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[67] Statement that any decision to use product before six months of age, should be made only on the advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] ‘Talk to your healthcare professional’
[5] Not present at all

[68] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate preparation
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[69] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[70] Presence of words “Important Notice” anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[71] Statement recommending that product is used only on advice of medical/health/pharmaceutical professional
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all
[72] Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over age of six months on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[73] Statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[74] Statement that product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during first six months of life on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[75] Statement that any decision to use product before six months of age, should be made only on the advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[76] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate preparation on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[77] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[78] Presence of words “Important Notice” on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad
Statement recommending that product is used only on advice of medical/health/pharmaceutical professional on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

Use of signal word to draw attention to risk warning in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of risk statement describing nature of risk
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of consequence statement defining consequences of misuse
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of instruction statement advising on how to avoid consequences of misuse
[1] Yes
[2] No

Arguments/Counter-arguments for Product

Statement concerning superiority of breast feeding
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

Necessary information about appropriate use of product – no discouragement of breast feeding
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

Argument in favour of product – describing product benefits [positive frame]
[1] Yes
[2] No
[87] Argument describing offsetting of negative outcome through product use [negative frame]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Presence of specific promotional terms in the text of the advertisement [code actual use of these terms only]

[88] Immunity
[1] Yes
[2] No

[89] Natural development
[1] Yes
[2] No

[90] Defend/Defence
[1] Yes
[2] No

[91] Protect
[1] Yes
[2] No

[92] Robust/tough
[1] Yes
[2] No

[93] Natural ingredients
[1] Yes
[2] No

Presence of specific promotional terms in the spoken narrative of the advertisement [code actual use of these terms only]

[94] Immunity
[1] Yes
[2] No

[95] Natural development
[1] Yes
[2] No

[96] Defend/Defence
[1] Yes
[2] No
[97] Protect
[1] Yes
[2] No

[98] Robust/tough
[1] Yes
[2] No

[99] Natural ingredients
[1] Yes
[2] No

Product Demonstrations
[100] Instructions for appropriate preparation
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[101] Instructions for storage
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[102] Instructions for disposal
[1] Yes – visibly shown only
[2] Yes, spoken only
[3] Yes visibly shown and spoken about
[4] Not present at all

[103] Any picture material illustrating methods of preparation
[1] Yes
[2] No

Thematic Content
Humour
[104] Presence of funny situations [slapstick, quirky incidents]
[1] Yes
[2] No
Heart-warming tones

[105] Any picture of infant laughing
[1] Yes
[2] No

[106] Any picture of mother sitting with infant at table/chair?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable
[9] Unclear

[107] Any picture of mother bottle feeding infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable

Channel/Format Factors

Audio-Visual Techniques

Visual Format

[108] Type of Production
[1] Film situation with narrative
[2] Still depiction of product and text content
[3] Mix of both above

[109] Visual setting of advertisement
[1] In home
[2] In retail setting
[3] In car/vehicle
[4] Outdoor locations
[5] Other
[6] Not discernible
[7] Not applicable

[110] Visual Pace
Number of scene cuts per minute

Use of Music

[111] Any background music playing?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable
Visible Narrative Factors

[112] Use of superimposed text – position (code only ‘health warning’ text)
[1] Top of screen only
[2] Bottom of screen only
[3] Other part of screen only
[4] Top and bottom of screen
[5] Various parts of screen
[6] No superimposed text used at all

[113] Superimposed text – proportion of total screen occupied
[1] 1-10%
[2] 11-20%
[3] 21-40%
[4] 41-50%
[5] 51%+

[114] Presentation of superimposed text
[1] Contained within box
[2] Not contained within box
[3] No superimposed text present

[115] Duration of hold of superimposed text
In seconds ___________

[116] Superimposed text – amount of text
Word count______________

[117] Superimposed text – line count
Number of lines of text_________________

[118] Brand name visible in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[119] Brand name visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert
[120] Brand name visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[121] Brand name visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[122] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[123] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[124] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] on pack display in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[125] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] on pack display in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert
[126]Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[127]Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[128]Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[129]Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visibly shown on pack in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[130]Price information
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[4] Not shown in advert

[131]Price information
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert
[132] Superiority of breast feeding statement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[133] Superiority of breast feeding statement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[134] Recommended age of use
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[135] Recommended age of use
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[136] Other support text with product-related information
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[137] Other support text with product-related information
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert
Receiver Factors
Nature of actors – e.g., similar to intended consumer – mothers

[138] Any presence of baby/infant in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable

[139] Any visible displays of baby/infant behaviours

Head control
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

Dexterity of arm movements
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

Self-feeding
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

Has hair
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

Has teeth
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

Sitting upright
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad
[145] Display of emotional facial expression (smiling)
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[146] Display of emotional facial expression (crying)
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[147] Any presence of mother in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[148] Any picture of mother with infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No mother in advertisement

[149] Any picture of mother without infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No mother in advertisement

[150] Any picture of pregnant woman?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No mother in advertisement

Gender counter-stereotyping

[151] Any presence of father in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[152] Any picture showing father with infant
[1] Yes
[2] No
Any picture of father sitting with infant at table/chair?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No presence of father in advertisement

Any picture of father bottle feeding infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No presence of father in advertisement

Relationship Scenarios

Picture of man and woman together
[1] Yes
[2] No

Picture of man and women together with baby/infant (family setting)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Displays of affection

Scene depicting woman and man hugging/making affectionate physical contact
[1] Yes
[2] No

Scene depicting mother and infant hugging/making affectionate physical contact
[1] Yes
[2] No

Scene depicting father holding infant against him?
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of Colours

Use of pastel colours in images of babies to convey softness
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No use of pastels
[4] No images of babies

Use of bold primary colours with brand names in advertisements
[1] Yes
[2] No
[162] Use of bold primary colours on packs in advertisements

[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No packs visible in advertisement
Follow-On Formula Advertisements – Direct Mail

Advertisement Code Number: [001-999]

General Codes

[1] Time period advertisement appeared

[2] Product Name
[give name]

[3] Manufacturer name
[01] Nutricia
[02] Danone
[03] Heinz
[04] Hipp
[05] Nestle
[06] John Wyeth

[4] Size of advertisements [square cms]

[5] Campaign duration [in months supplied by Billetts]

[6] Number of ad appearances in campaign [Billets]

[7] Campaign expenditure [supplied by Billetts]

[8] Web address in ad (supplied by Billetts)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[9] Reference made to consumer/trade award for product
[1] Yes
[2] No
**Source Factors**

**Gender of endorser**

[10] Gender of principal pictured adult actor
[1] Male  
[2] Female  
[3] Cannot judge  
[4] No pictured actor

Ethnicity of endorser

[01] White – British  
[02] White – other  
[03] Black – Afro-Caribbean – British  
[04] Black – Afro-Caribbean – other  
[05] Asian – British  
[06] Asian – Other  
[07] Other- British  
[08] Other – Other  
[09] Cannot judge  
[10] No pictured adult actor

[12] Ethnicity of principal pictured child actor
[01] White – British  
[02] White – other  
[03] Black – Afro-Caribbean – British  
[04] Black – Afro-Caribbean – other  
[05] Asian – British  
[06] Asian – Other  
[07] Other- British  
[08] Other – Other  
[09] Cannot judge  
[10] No pictured child actor

Expertise of endorser

[13] Any use of ‘expert’ endorsement (e.g., doctor, medical or healthcare professional clearly identified)?
[1] Yes  
[2] No

[14] Any use of other ‘expert’ endorsement (qualifications of expert unknown)
[1] Yes  
[2] No
[15] Provision of general baby/infant-related advice or guidance
[1] Yes – text only
[2] Yes, pictures and text
[3] No

Celebrity status and endorser

[16] Any use of celebrity endorsement?
[1] Yes
[2] No

[17] Any evidence of celebrity expertise? [e.g., pictured with own children or reference made to own children]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Message Factors
Product Information
Brand Differentiating Factors

[18] Product pack visible in ad
[1] Yes
[2] No

[19] Brand name shown in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[20] Name of manufacturer shown on product pack in ad
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[21] Follow-on formula identified on visible pack
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[22] Follow-on formula identified in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No
[23] Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow & Gate] visible in ad
[1] Yes
[2] No

[24] Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow & Gate] visible on pack shown in ad
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Pack not shown

[25] Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2 or 3; etc) visible in text in advertisement
[1] Product stage ‘1’
[2] Product stage ‘2’
[3] Product stage ‘3’
[4] Good night milk
[5] Other
[6] Not visible

[26] Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2 or 3; etc) visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Product stage ‘1’
[2] Product stage ‘2’
[3] Product stage ‘3’
[4] Good night milk
[5] Other
[6] Not visible on pack
[7] Pack not shown in advertisement

[27] Age of use recommendation shown on visible pack
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown
[9] Unclear

[28] Age of use recommendation shown in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[29] Any statements about nutrition benefits of product seen on pack?
[1] Yes
[2] Not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown
[30] Any statements visible about nutrition benefits of product in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[31] Any statements about health benefits of product seen on pack?
[1] Yes
[2] Not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[32] Any statements visible about health benefits of product in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[33] Price information shown on visible product pack?
[1] Yes
[2] No not visible on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[34] Price information shown elsewhere in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[35] Is a helpline/careline/customer services telephone number included in the advertisement?
[1] Yes
[2] No

New Product Features
[36] Any written statement indicating that there is something ‘new’ about this product/brand?
[1] Yes
[2] No

Convenience of Use
[37] Any text statement indicating ease of use of product on visibly displayed product pack
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[38] Any written text statement indicating ease of use of product (other than on pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No
Technical information – health and nutrition

[39] Presence of qualifying health or nutrition claims
[1] Yes
[2] No

[40] Presence of non-qualifying health or nutrition claims
[1] Yes
[2] No

[41] Available energy value (in kJ and kcal)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[42] Protein content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[43] Carbohydrate content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[44] Lipids content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[45] Quantity of choline
[1] Yes
[2] No

[46] Quantity of inositol
[1] Yes
[2] No

[47] Quantity of carnitine
[1] Yes
[2] No

[48] Quantities of other specified minerals/vitamins
  Minerals
[1] Yes
[2] No
Vitamins

[1] Yes – any information
[2] No information

Risk/Use

[50] Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over age of six months
[1] Yes
[2] No

[51] Statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet
[1] Yes
[2] No

[52] Statement that product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during first six months of life
[1] Yes
[2] No

[53] Statement that any decision to use product before six months of age, should be made only on the advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional
[1] Yes
[2] No

[54] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate preparation
[1] Yes
[2] No

[55] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage
[1] Yes
[2] No

[56] Presence of words “Important Notice” anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[57] Statement recommending that product is used only on advice of medical/health/pharmaceutical professional
[1] Yes
[2] No
[58] Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over age of six months on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[59] Statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[60] Statement that product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during first six months of life on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[61] Statement that any decision to use product before six months of age, should be made only on the advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[62] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate preparation on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[63] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[64] Presence of words “Important Notice” on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown
Statement recommending that product is used only on advice of medical/health/pharmaceutical professional on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

Use of signal word to draw attention to risk warning in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of risk statement describing nature of risk
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of consequence statement defining consequences of misuse
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of instruction statement advising on how to avoid consequences of misuse
[1] Yes
[2] No

Arguments/Counter-arguments for Product
Statement concerning superiority of breast feeding
[1] Yes
[2] No

Necessary information about appropriate use of product – no discouragement of breast feeding
[1] Yes
[2] No

Argument in favour of product – describing product benefits [positive frame]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Argument describing offsetting of negative outcome through product use [negative frame]
[1] Yes
[2] No
Presence of specific promotional terms in the text of the advertisement [code actual use of these terms only]

[74] Immunity
[1] Yes
[2] No

[75] Natural development
[1] Yes
[2] No

[76] Defend/Defence
[1] Yes
[2] No

[77] Protect
[1] Yes
[2] No

[78] Robust/tough
[1] Yes
[2] No

[79] Natural ingredients
[1] Yes
[2] No

Product Demonstrations

[80] Instructions for appropriate preparation
[1] Yes
[2] No

[81] Instructions for storage
[1] Yes
[2] No

[82] Instructions for disposal
[1] Yes
[2] No

[83] Any picture material illustrating methods of preparation
[1] Yes
[2] No
Thematic Content
Humour
[84] Presence of funny situations [slapstick, quirky incidents]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Heart-warming tones
[85] Any picture of infant
[1] Yes
[2] No

[86] Any picture that idealises use of product
[1] Yes
[2] No

[87] Any picture of mother sitting with infant at table/chair?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable

[88] Any picture of mother bottle feeding infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable

Channel/Format Factors
Audio-Visual Techniques

Visual Format
[89] Type of Presentation
[1] Picture of product used by mother with infant
[3] Picture of infant only with product
[4] Picture of infant only – no product use
[5] Picture of mother only with product
[6] Picture of mother only – no product use
[7] Picture of product only
[8] Other picture material
[9] No picture material at all
Visual setting of advertisement

1. In home
2. In retail setting
3. In car/vehicle
4. Outdoor locations
5. Other
6. Not discernible
7. No visible setting depicted

Narrative Factors

Brand name visibly shown in advertisement

1. Upper case only
2. Upper case + lower case
3. Lower case only
4. Sentence case
9. Not shown in advert

Brand name visibly shown in advertisement

1. Serif only
2. Serif + Sans serif
3. Sans serif only
4. Not shown in advert

Brand name visibly shown in advertisement

Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

Brand name visible on pack in advertisement

1. Upper case only
2. Upper case + lower case
3. Lower case only
4. Sentence case
9. Not shown in advert

Brand name visible on pack in advertisement

1. Serif only
2. Serif + Sans serif
3. Sans serif only
4. Not shown in advert

Brand name visible on pack in advertisement

Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0
[97] **Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement**
1. Upper case only
2. Upper case + lower case
3. Lower case only
4. Sentence case
9. Not shown in advert

[98] **Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement**
1. Serif only
2. Serif + Sans serif
3. Sans serif only
4. Not shown in advert

[99] **Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement**
Colour contrast score _____
Not present = 0

[100] **Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement**
1. Upper case only
2. Upper case + lower case
3. Lower case only
4. Sentence case
9. Not shown in advert

[101] **Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement**
1. Serif only
2. Serif + Sans serif
3. Sans serif only
4. Not shown in advert

[102] **Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement**
Colour contrast score _____
Not present = 0

[103] **Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement**
1. Upper case only
2. Upper case + lower case
3. Lower case only
4. Sentence case
9. Not shown in advert
[104] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[105] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[106] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[107] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[108] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[109] Price information
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[110] Price information
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[111] Price information
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0
[112] Superiority of breast feeding statement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[113] Superiority of breast feeding statement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[114] Superiority of breast feeding statement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[115] Recommended age of use
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[116] Recommended age of use
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[117] Recommended age of use
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[118] Other support text with product-related information
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert
[Other support text with product-related information]
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[Other support text with product-related information]
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

**Text Readability - Colour-Contrast Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Character Colour</th>
<th>Background Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Receiver Factors
Nature of actors – e.g., similar to intended consumer – mothers

[121] Any presence of baby/infant in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable

Any visible displays of baby/infant behaviours

[122] Head control
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[123] Dexterity of arm movements
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[124] Self-feeding
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[125] Has hair
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[126] Has teeth
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[127] Sitting upright
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display of emotional facial expression (smiling)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Cannot judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] No baby/infant in ad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display of emotional facial expression (crying)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Cannot judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] No baby/infant in ad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any presence of mother in advertisement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any picture of mother with infant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] No mother in advertisements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any picture of mother without infant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] No mother in advertisements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any picture of pregnant woman?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] No mother in advertisement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender counter-stereotyping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any presence of father in advertisement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any picture showing father with infant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[136] Any picture of father sitting with infant at table/chair?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No presence of father in advertisement

[137] Any picture of father bottle feeding infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No presence of father in advertisement

Relationship Scenarios

[138] Picture of man and woman together
[1] Yes
[2] No

[139] Picture of man and women together with baby/infant (family setting)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Displays of affection

[140] Scene depicting woman and man hugging/making affectionate physical contact
[1] Yes
[2] No

[141] Scene depicting mother and infant hugging/making affectionate physical contact
[1] Yes
[2] No

[142] Scene depicting father holding infant against him?
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of Colours

[143] Use of pastel colours in images of babies to convey softness
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No images of babies
[144] Use of bold primary colours with brand names in advertisements
[1] Yes
[2] No

[145] Use of bold primary colours on packs in advertisements
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No packs visible in advertisement
Follow-On Formula Advertisements - Internet

Advertisement Code Number: [001-999]

General Codes

[1] Time period advertisement appeared

[2] Product Name
[give name]

[3] Manufacturer name
[01] Nutricia
[02] Danone
[03] Heinz
[04] Hipp
[05] Nestle
[06] John Wyeth

[4] Advertisement format
[1] Banner
[2] Display

[5] Size of advertisement [square cms]

[6] Campaign duration [supplied by Billetts]

[7] Number of ad appearances in campaign [in months supplied by Billets]

[8] Campaign expenditure [supplied by Billetts]

[9] Web address in ad [supplied by Billetts]
[1] Yes
[2] No

[10] Clickable link
[1] Yes
[2] No

Reference made to consumer/trade award for product
[1] Yes
[2] No

Source Factors
Gender of endorser

Gender of principal pictured adult actor
[1] Male
[2] Female
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No pictured actor

Ethnicity of endorser

Ethnicity of principal pictured adult actor
[01] White – British
[02] White – other
[03] Black – Afro-Caribbean – British
[04] Black – Afro-Caribbean – other
[05] Asian – British
[06] Asian – Other
[07] Other - British
[08] Other – Other
[09] Cannot judge
[10] No pictured adult actor

Ethnicity of principal pictured child actor
[01] White – British
[02] White – other
[03] Black – Afro-Caribbean – British
[04] Black – Afro-Caribbean – other
[05] Asian – British
[06] Asian – Other
[07] Other - British
[08] Other – Other
[09] Cannot judge
[10] No pictured child actor
Expertise of endorser
[16] Any use of ‘expert’ endorsement (e.g., doctor, medical or healthcare professional)?
[1] Yes
[2] No

[17] Any use of other ‘expert’ endorsement (qualifications of expert unknown)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[18] Provision of general baby/infant-related advice or guidance
[1] Yes – text only
[2] Yes, pictures and text
[3] No

Celebrity status and endorser
[19] Any use of celebrity endorsement?
[1] Yes
[2] No

[20] Any evidence of celebrity expertise? [e.g., pictured with own children or reference made to own children]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Product Information
Brand Differentiating Factors

[21] Product pack visible in ad
[1] Yes
[2] No

[22] Brand name shown in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[23] Name of manufacturer shown on product pack in ad
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[24] Follow-on formula identified on visible pack
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown
[25] Follow-on formula identified in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[26] Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow & Gate] visible in ad
[1] Yes
[2] No

[27] Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow & Gate] visible on pack shown in ad
[1] Yes
[2] No

[28] Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2 or 3; etc) visible in text in advertisement
[1] Product stage ‘1’
[2] Product stage ‘2’
[3] Product stage ‘3’
[4] Good night milk
[5] Other
[6] Not visible

[29] Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2 or 3; etc) visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Product stage ‘1’
[2] Product stage ‘2’
[3] Product stage ‘3’
[4] Good night milk
[5] Other
[6] Not visible on pack
[7] Pack not shown in advertisement

[30] Age of use recommendation shown on visible pack
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown
[9] Unclear

[31] Age of use recommendation shown in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[32] Any statements about nutrition benefits of product seen on pack?
[1] Yes
[2] Not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown
[33] Any statements visible about nutrition benefits of product in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[34] Any statements about health benefits of product seen on pack?
[1] Yes
[2] Not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[35] Any statements visible about health benefits of product in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[36] Price information shown on visible product pack?
[1] Yes
[2] No not visible on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[37] Price information shown elsewhere in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[38] Is a helpline/careline/customer services telephone number included in the advertisement?
[1] Yes
[2] No

New Product Features
[39] Any statement indicating that there is something ‘new’ about this product/brand seen on product pack?
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[40] Any statement indicating that there is something ‘new’ about this product/brand in ad (other than on pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No
Convenience of Use

[41] Any text statement indicating ease of use of product on visibly displayed product pack
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[42] Any text statement indicating ease of use of product in ad (other than on pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Technical information – health and nutrition shown anywhere in advertisement

[43] Presence of qualifying health or nutrition claims
[1] Yes
[2] No

[44] Presence of non-qualifying health or nutrition claims
[1] Yes
[2] No

[45] Available energy value (in kJ and kcal)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[46] Protein content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[46] Carbohydrate content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[47] Lipids content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[48] Quantity of choline
[1] Yes
[2] No

[49] Quantity of inositol
[1] Yes
[2] No
[50] Quantity of carnitine
[1] Yes
[2] No

[51] Quantities of other specified minerals/vitamins
Minerals
[1] Yes – any
[2] None

Vitamins
[1] Yes – any
[2] None

Risk/Use

[53] Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over age of six months anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[54] Statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[55] Statement that product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during first six months of life anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[56] Statement that any decision to use product before six months of age, should be made only on the advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[57] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate preparation anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[58] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No
[59] Presence of words “Important Notice”
[1] Yes
[2] No

[60] Statement recommending that product is used only on advice of medical/health/pharmaceutical professional anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[61] Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants over age of six months on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[62] Statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[63] Statement that product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during first six months of life on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[64] Statement that any decision to use product before six months of age, should be made only on the advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[65] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate preparation on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[66] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown
[67] Presence of words “Important Notice” on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[68] Statement recommending that product is used only on advice of medical/health/pharmaceutical professional on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown

[69] Use of signal word to draw attention to risk warning in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[70] Use of risk statement describing nature of risk
[1] Yes
[2] No

[71] Use of consequence statement defining consequences of misuse
[1] Yes
[2] No

[72] Use of instruction statement advising on how to avoid consequences of misuse
[1] Yes
[2] No

Arguments/Counter-arguments for Product

[73] Statement concerning superiority of breast feeding anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[74] Necessary information about appropriate use of product – no discouragement of breast feeding anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[75] Argument in favour of product – describing product benefits [positive frame]
[1] Yes
[2] No
Argument describing offsetting of negative outcome through product use [negative frame]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Presence of specific promotional terms in the text of the advertisement [code actual use of these terms only]
[77] Immunity
[1] Yes
[2] No

[78] Natural development
[1] Yes
[2] No

[79] Defend/Defence
[1] Yes
[2] No

[80] Protect
[1] Yes
[2] No

[81] Robust/tough
[1] Yes
[2] No

[82] Natural ingredients
[1] Yes
[2] No

Product Demonstrations

[83] Instructions for appropriate preparation
[1] Yes
[2] No

[84] Instructions for storage
[1] Yes
[2] No

[85] Instructions for disposal
[1] Yes
[2] No
Thematic Content

Humour

Presence of funny situations [slapstick, quirky incidents]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Heart-warming tones

Any picture of infant laughing
[1] Yes
[2] No

Any picture of mother sitting with infant at table/chair?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable

Any picture of mother bottle feeding infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable

Channel/Format Factors

Audio-Visual Techniques

Visual Format

Type of Presentation
[1] Picture of product used by mother with infant
[3] Picture of infant only with product
[4] Picture of infant only – no product use
[5] Picture of mother only with product
[6] Picture of mother only – no product use
[7] Picture of product only
[8] Other picture material
[9] No picture material at all
Visual setting of advertisement

1. In home
2. In retail setting
3. In car/vehicle
4. Outdoor locations
5. Other
6. Not discernible
7. No visible setting depicted

Narrative Factors

Brand name visible in advertisement

1. Upper case only
2. Upper case + lower case
3. Lower case only
4. Sentence case
9. Not shown in advert

Brand name visible on pack in advertisement

1. Upper case only
2. Upper case + lower case
3. Lower case only
4. Sentence case
9. Not shown in advert

Colour contrast score
Not present = 0

Brand name visible on pack in advertisement

1. Serif only
2. Serif + Sans serif
3. Sans serif only
4. Not shown in advert

Colour contrast score
Not present = 0
[99] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[100] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[101] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[102] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[103] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[104] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[105] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert
[106] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[107] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[108] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[109] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[110] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[111] Price information
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[112] Price information
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[113] Price information
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0
Superiority of breast feeding statement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

Superiority of breast feeding statement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

Superiority of breast feeding statement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

Recommended age of use
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

Recommended age of use
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

Recommended age of use
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

Other support text with product-related information
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert
Other support text with product-related information
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

Other support text with product-related information
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

Text Readability - Colour-Contrast Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Character Colour</th>
<th>Background Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Receiver Factors
Nature of actors – e.g., similar to intended consumer – mothers

[123] Any presence of baby/infant in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable

[124] Any visible displays of baby/infant behaviours

Head control
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

Dexterity of arm movements
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

Self-feeding
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

Has hair
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

Has teeth
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

Sitting upright
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Cannot judge</th>
<th>No baby/infant in ad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Display of emotional facial expression (smiling)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cannot judge</td>
<td>No baby/infant in ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Display of emotional facial expression (crying)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cannot judge</td>
<td>No baby/infant in ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Any presence of mother in advertisement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Any picture of mother with infant?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No mother in advertisements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Any picture of mother without infant?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No mother in advertisements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Any picture of pregnant woman?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No mother in advertisement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender counter-stereotyping**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Any presence of father in advertisement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Any picture showing father with infant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Any picture of father sitting with infant at table/chair?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[3] No presence of father in advertisement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[139] Any picture of father bottle feeding infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No presence of father in advertisement

Relationship Scenarios

[140] Picture of man and woman together
[1] Yes
[2] No

[141] Picture of man and women together with baby/infant (family setting)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Displays of affection

[142] Scene depicting woman and man hugging/making affectionate physical contact
[1] Yes
[2] No

[143] Scene depicting mother and infant hugging/making affectionate physical contact
[1] Yes
[2] No

[144] Scene depicting father holding infant against him?
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of Colours

[145] Use of pastel colours in images of babies to convey softness
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No use of pastels
[4] No images of babies

[146] Use of bold primary colours with brand names in advertisements
[1] Yes
[2] No

[147] Use of bold primary colours on packs in advertisements
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No packs visible in advertisement
**Infant Formula Advertisements - Print**

*Advertisement Code Number: [001-999]*

**General Codes**

1. **Time period advertisement appeared**

2. **Product Name**
   - [give name]

3. **Manufacturer name**
   - [01] Nutricia
   - [02] Danone
   - [03] Heinz
   - [04] Hipp
   - [05] Nestle
   - [06] John Wyeth

4. **Type of Publication in which Advertisement Occurred**
   - [01] Daily national newspaper
   - [02] Sunday national newspaper
   - [03] Regional newspaper
   - [04] Magazine – celebrity/fashion
   - [05] Magazine – for mothers/mothers to be
   - [06] Magazine – household/property
   - [07] Magazine – news and current affairs
   - [08] Magazine – general interest for women
   - [09] Magazine - other

5. **Size of advertisements [square cms]**

6. **Campaign duration [in months - supplied by Billets]**

7. **Number of ad appearances in campaign [Billets]**

8. **Campaign expenditure [supplied by Billets]**

9. **Web address in ad (supplied by Billets)**
   - [1] Yes
   - [2] No
Reference made to consumer/trade award for product
[1] Yes
[2] No

Source Factors
Gender of endorser

Gender of principal adult pictured actor
[1] Male
[2] Female
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No pictured actor

Ethnicity of endorser

Ethnicity of principal pictured adult actor
[01] White – British
[02] White – other
[03] Black – Afro-Caribbean – British
[04] Black – Afro-Caribbean – other
[05] Asian – British
[06] Asian – Other
[07] Other – British
[08] Other – Other
[09] Cannot judge
[10] No pictured adult actor

Ethnicity of principal pictured child actor
[01] White – British
[02] White – other
[03] Black – Afro-Caribbean – British
[04] Black – Afro-Caribbean – other
[05] Asian – British
[06] Asian – Other
[07] Other – British
[08] Other – Other
[09] Cannot judge
[10] No pictured child actor
Expertise of endorser

[14] Any use of ‘expert’ endorsement (e.g., doctor, medical or healthcare professional)?
[1] Yes
[2] No

[1] Yes
[2] No

[15] Provision of general baby/infant-related advice or guidance
[1] Yes – text only
[2] Yes, pictures and text
[3] No

Celebrity status and endorser

[16] Any use of celebrity endorsement?
[1] Yes
[2] No

[17] Any evidence of celebrity expertise? [e.g., pictured with own children or reference made to own children]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Message Factors

Product Information

Brand Differentiating Factors

[18] Product pack visible in ad
[1] Yes
[2] No

[19] Brand name shown in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[20] Name of manufacturer shown on product pack in ad
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad
[21] Infant formula identified on visible pack
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[22] Infant formula identified in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[23] Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[24] Name of product [with product range, e.g., Aptamil; Cow & Gate] visible on pack shown in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[25] Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2 or 3; etc) visible in advertisement
[1] Product stage ‘1’
[2] Product stage ‘2’
[3] Product stage ‘3’
[4] Good night milk
[5] Other
[6] Not visible

[26] Product stage (e.g., Aptamil 1, 2, or 3, etc) visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Product stage ‘1’
[2] Product stage ‘2’
[3] Product stage ‘3’
[4] Good night milk
[5] Other
[6] Not visible on pack
[6] Pack not shown in advertisement

[27] Age of use recommendation shown on visible pack
[1] Yes
[2] Not shown on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad
[28] Age of use recommendation shown in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[29] Any statements about nutrition benefits of product seen on pack?
[1] Yes
[2] Not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[30] Any statements visible about nutrition benefits of product in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[31] Any statements about health benefits of product seen on pack?
[1] Yes
[2] Not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[32] Any statements visible about health benefits of product in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[33] Price information shown on visible product pack?
[1] Yes
[2] No not visible on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[34] Price information visible elsewhere in ad (other than on visible pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[35] Is a helpline/careline/customer services telephone number included in the advertisement?
[1] Yes
[2] No

New Product Features

[36] Any statement indicating that there is something ‘new’ about this product/brand seen on product pack?
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad
[37] Any statement indicating that there is something ‘new’ about this product/brand in ad (other than on pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Convenience of Use
[38] Any text statement indicating ease of use of product on visibly displayed product pack
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[39] Any text statement indicating ease of use of product in ad (other than on pack)
[1] Yes
[2] No

Technical information – health and nutrition shown anywhere in advertisement

[40] Presence of qualifying health or nutrition claims
[1] Yes
[2] No

[41] Presence of non-qualifying health or nutrition claims
[1] Yes
[2] No

[42] Available energy value (in kJ and kcal)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[43] Protein content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[44] Carbohydrate content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No

[45] Lipids content (expressed in numerical form)
[1] Yes
[2] No
[46] Quantity of choline
[1] Yes
[2] No

[47] Quantity of inositol
[1] Yes
[2] No

[48] Quantity of carnitine
[1] Yes
[2] No

[49] Quantities of other specified minerals/vitamins
[1] Yes - any information
[2] No

[50] Vitamins
[1] Yes
[2] No

Risk/Use
[51] Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants up to age of six months anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[52] Statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[53] Statement that product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk during after first six months of life anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[54] Statement that any decision to use product before six months of age, should be made only on the advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No
[55] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate preparation anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[56] Warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[57] Presence of words “Important Notice”
[1] Yes
[2] No

[58] Statement recommending that product is used only on advice of medical/health/pharmaceutical professional anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[59] Statement that product is suitable only for particular nutritional use by infants up to age of six months on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[60] Statement that product should form only part of a diversified diet on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[61] Statement that product is not to be used as a substitute for breast milk after first six months of life on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

[62] Statement that any decision to use product before six months of age, should be made only on the advice of a medical/health/pharmaceutical professional on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad
Warning of health hazards of inappropriate preparation on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

Warning of health hazards of inappropriate storage on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

Presence of words “Important Notice” on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

Statement recommending that product is used only on advice of medical/health/pharmaceutical professional on visible pack in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No, not seen on pack
[3] Pack not shown in ad

Use of signal word to draw attention to risk warning in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of risk statement describing nature of risk
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of consequence statement defining consequences of misuse
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of instruction statement advising on how to avoid consequences of misuse
[1] Yes
[2] No

Arguments/Counter-arguments for Product

Statement concerning superiority of breast feeding anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No
[72] Necessary information about appropriate use of product – no discouragement of breast feeding anywhere in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[73] Argument in favour of product – describing product benefits [positive frame]
[1] Yes
[2] No

[74] Argument describing offsetting of negative outcome through product use [negative frame]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Presence of specific promotional terms in the text of the advertisement [code actual use of these terms only]

[75] Immunity
[1] Yes
[2] No

[76] Natural development
[1] Yes
[2] No

[77] Defend/Defence
[1] Yes
[2] No

[78] Protect
[1] Yes
[2] No

[79] Robust/tough
[1] Yes
[2] No

[80] Natural ingredients
[1] Yes
[2] No
Product Demonstrations

[81] Instructions for appropriate preparation
[1] Yes
[2] No

[82] Instructions for storage
[1] Yes
[2] No

[83] Instructions for disposal
[1] Yes
[2] No

[84] Any picture material illustrating methods of preparation
[1] Yes
[2] No

Thematic Content

Humour

[85] Presence of funny situations [slapstick, quirky incidents]
[1] Yes
[2] No

Heart-warming tones

[86] Any picture of infant laughing
[1] Yes
[2] No

[87] Any picture of mother sitting with infant at table/chair?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable
[9] Unclear

[88] Any picture of mother bottle feeding infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Not applicable
Channel/Format Factors
Audio-Visual Techniques

Visual Format

[89] Type of Presentation
[1] Picture of product used by mother with infant
[3] Picture of infant only with product
[4] Picture of infant only – no product use
[5] Picture of mother only with product
[6] Picture of mother only – no product use
[7] Picture of product only
[8] Other Picture material
[9] No picture material at all

[90] Visual setting of advertisement
[1] In home
[2] In retail setting
[3] In car/vehicle
[4] Outdoor locations
[5] Other
[6] Not discernible
[7] No visible setting depicted

Narrative Factors

[91] Brand name visible in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[92] Brand name visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[93] Brand name visible in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0
[94] Brand name visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[95] Brand name visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[96] Brand name visible on pack in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[97] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[98] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[99] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible in advertisement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[100] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert
[101] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[102] Product name [e.g., Aptamil/Cow & Gate] visible on pack in advertisement
Colour contrast score ______
Not present = 0

[103] Statement identifying ‘follow-on formula’ visible in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[104] Statement identifying ‘infant formula’ visible in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[105] Statement identifying ‘infant formula’ visible in advertisement
Colour contrast score ______
Not present = 0

[106] Statement identifying ‘infant formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[107] Statement identifying ‘infant formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[108] Statement identifying ‘infant formula’ visible on pack in advertisement
Colour contrast score ______
Not present = 0
[109] Price information
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[110] Price information
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[111] Price information
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[112] Superiority of breast feeding statement
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

[113] Superiority of breast feeding statement
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

[114] Superiority of breast feeding statement
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

[115] Recommended age of use
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert
Recommended age of use
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

Recommended age of use
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0

Other support text with product-related information
[1] Upper case only
[2] Upper case + lower case
[3] Lower case only
[4] Sentence case
[9] Not shown in advert

Other support text with product-related information
[1] Serif only
[2] Serif + Sans serif
[3] Sans serif only
[4] Not shown in advert

Other support text with product-related information
Colour contrast score_____
Not present = 0
### Text Readability - Colour-Contrast Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Character Colour</th>
<th>Background Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Receiver Factors

**Nature of actors – e.g., similar to intended consumer – mothers**

**[121] Any presence of baby/infant in advertisement**

- [1] Yes
- [2] No
- [3] Not applicable

**Any visible displays of baby/infant behaviours**

**[122] Head control**

- [1] Yes
- [2] No
- [3] Cannot judge
- [4] No baby/infant in ad

**[123] Dexterity of arm movements**

- [1] Yes
- [2] No
- [3] Cannot judge
- [4] No baby/infant in ad
[124] Self-feeding
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[125] Has hair
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[126] Has teeth
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[127] Sitting upright
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[128] Display of emotional facial expression (smiling)
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[129] Display of emotional facial expression (crying)
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Cannot judge
[4] No baby/infant in ad

[130] Any presence of mother in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No
[131] Any picture of mother with infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No mother in advertisements

[132] Any picture of mother without infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No mother in advertisements

[133] Any picture of pregnant woman?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No mother in advertisement

Gender counter-stereotyping

[134] Any presence of father in advertisement
[1] Yes
[2] No

[135] Any picture showing father with infant
[1] Yes
[2] No

[136] Any picture of father sitting with infant at table/chair?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No presence of father in advertisement

[137] Any picture of father bottle feeding infant?
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No presence of father in advertisement

Relationship Scenarios

[138] Picture of man and woman together
[1] Yes
[2] No

[139] Picture of man and women together with baby/infant (family setting)
[1] Yes
[2] No
Displays of affection

[140] Scene depicting woman and man hugging/making affectionate physical contact
[1] Yes
[2] No

[141] Scene depicting mother and infant hugging/making affectionate physical contact
[1] Yes
[2] No

[142] Scene depicting father holding infant against him?
[1] Yes
[2] No

Use of Colours

[143] Use of pastel colours in images of babies to convey softness
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No use of pastels
[4] No images of babies

[144] Use of bold primary colours with brand names in advertisements
[1] Yes
[2] No

[145] Use of bold primary colours on packs in advertisements
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] No packs visible in advertisement
Appendix 9. Distributions of Infant and Follow-on Formula Products in Retail Outlets

Table A9-1 Infant Formula Products Retail Distribution – UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Belfast</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort First Milk 900g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Infant Milk for Newborn – 900g</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First infant Milk for Newborn – 500ml</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First infant Milk for Newborn – 200ml</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 900g</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 500ml</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 200ml</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infasoy – 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Milk – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Milk – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic First Infant Milk 0 900g</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula – 1l</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula Milk – 900g/450g</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula – 250ml</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Starter Pack – 12 bottles in a box</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed for Hungrier Babies – 1l</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed for Hungrier Babies – 900g</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed for Hungrier Babies – 250ml</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wysoy 860g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First - 900g</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First – 200ml</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Hungry – 900g</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Hungry – 200ml</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture New Born – 900g</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture New Born – 250ml</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture Hungry Baby – 900g</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture Hungry Baby – 250ml</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A9-2. Follow-On Formula Products Retail Distribution - UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands</th>
<th>Belfast</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months + Stage 3 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months + Stage 3 500ml</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months + Stage 3 200ml</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnight Milk from 6 months – 400g</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 10 x 37g sachets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnight Milk Drink – 350g</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to Feed – 250ml</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk – 900g</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk – 200ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil (Dark Blue) Growing Up Milk – 200ml</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>Inner City</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort First Milk 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Infant Milk for Newborn – 900g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First infant Milk for Newborn – 500ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First infant Milk for Newborn – 200ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 500ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 200ml</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infasoy – 900g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Milk – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Milk – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic First Infant Milk 0 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula – 1l</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula Milk – 900g/450g</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula – 250ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Starter Pack – 12 bottles in a box</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed for Hungrier Babies – 1l</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed/ Hungrier Babies – 900g</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed/Hungrier Babies – 250ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wysoy 860g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First - 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First – 200ml</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Hungry – 900g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Hungry – 200ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture New Born – 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture New Born – 250ml</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture Hungry Baby – 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture Hungry Baby – 250ml</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table A9-4 Follow-On Formula Products Retail Distribution - Belfast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Inner City</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months + Stage 3 900g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months + Stage 3 500ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months + Stage 3 200ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnight Milk from 6 months – 400g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 10 x 37g sachets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnight Milk Drink – 350g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to Feed – 250ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk – 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk – 200ml</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil (Dark Blue) Growing Up Milk – 200ml</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>Inner City</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort First Milk 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Infant Milk for Newborn – 900g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First infant Milk for Newborn – 500ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First infant Milk for Newborn – 200ml</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 900g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 500ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 200ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infasoy – 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Milk – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Milk – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic First Infant Milk 0 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula – 1l</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula Milk – 900g/450g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula – 250ml</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Starter Pack – 12 bottles in a box</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed for Hungrier Babies – 1l</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed/Hungrier Babies – 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed/ Hungrier Babies – 250ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wysoy 860g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First - 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First – 200ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Hungry – 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Hungry – 200ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture New Born – 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture New Born – 250ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture – Hungry Baby – 250ml</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture Hungry Baby – 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture Hungry Baby – 250ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A9-6. Follow-On Formula Products Retail Distribution - Cardiff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Inner City</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months 500ml</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months 200ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnight Milk from 6 months – 400g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 10 x 37g sachets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnight Milk Drink – 350g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to Feed – 250ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk – 900g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk – 200m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil (Dark Blue) Growing Up Milk – 200ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>Inner City</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort First Milk 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Infant Milk for Newborn – 900g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First infant Milk for Newborn – 500ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First infant Milk for Newborn – 200ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 900g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 500ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 200ml</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infasoy – 900g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Milk – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Milk – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic First Infant Milk 0 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula – 1l</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula Milk – 900g/450g</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula – 250ml</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Starter Pack – 12 bottles in a box</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed for Hungrier Babies – 1l</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed for Hungrier Babies – 900g</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed for Hungrier Babies – 250ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wysoy 860g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First - 900g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First – 200ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Hungry – 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Hungry – 200ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture New Born – 900g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture New Born – 250ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture Hungry Baby – 900g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture Hungry Baby – 250ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A9-8. Follow-On Formula Products Retail Distribution - Edinburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Inner City</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months + Stage 3 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months + Stage 3 500ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months + Stage 3 200ml</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnight Milk from 6 months – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 10 x 37g sachets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnight Milk Drink – 350g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to Feed – 250ml</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk – 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk – 200ml</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil (Dark Blue) Growing Up Milk – 200ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>Inner City</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort First Milk 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Infant Milk for Newborn – 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First infant Milk for Newborn – 500ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First infant Milk for Newborn – 200ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 900g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 500ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Milk for Hungrier babies – 200ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infasoy – 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Milk – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Milk – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic First Infant Milk 0 900g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula – 1l</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula Milk – 900g/450g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Infant Formula – 250ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Starter Pack – 12 bottles in a box</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed for Hungrier Babies – 1l</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed for Hungrier Babies – 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ready to Feed for Hungrier Babies – 250ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wysoy 860g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First - 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First – 200ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Hungry – 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Hungry – 200ml</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture New Born – 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture New Born – 250ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture Hungry Baby – 900g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurture Hungry Baby – 250ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>Inner City</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow &amp; Gate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months + Stage 3 900g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk for Babies 6 months + Stage 3 500ml</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnight Milk from 6 months – 400g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 500 ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Follow-On Milk – 10 x 37g sachets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnight Milk Drink – 350g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Follow-On Milk – 900g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to Feed – 250ml</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk – 900g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-on Milk – 200m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptamil (Dark Blue) Growing Up Milk – 200ml</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>