

READING THE TEXT

1. Why does Pozner believe that Dove's "Real Beauty" ads "reinforce the stereotypes they claim to be exposing" (para. 5)?
2. In Pozner's view, what is the basis of the objections that Richard Roeper and some other male commentators have to the Dove "Campaign for Real Beauty"?
3. Characterize Pozner's tone in this selection, particularly in her comments regarding male critics of Dove's ads. What effect does it have on your response to her essay?

READING THE SIGNS

1. In a creative journal assignment, assume the perspective of one of the Dove "Real Beauty" models and write a letter in response to Richard Roeper's complaints about the Dove ads.
2. Write an argumentative essay that validates, rejects, or complicates Pozner's claim that "the 'real beauty' backlash underscores just how necessary Dove's campaign is—however hypocritical the product they're selling may be" (para. 13).
3. Write an essay evaluating Richard Roeper's response to the Dove ad campaign. To what extent is it "unsettling" (para. 7), as Pozner sees it, or do you find it to be simply honest?
4. Write an essay arguing whether ad campaigns such as Dove's "Real Beauty" and Nike's "My Butt Is Big" are indeed revolutionary or simply a new twist on advertising's tendency to objectify women's bodies.

ERIC SCHLOSSER***Kid Kustomers***

Children rarely have much money of their own to spend, but they have a great deal of "pester power," along with the "leverage" to get their parents to buy them what they want. And so, as Eric Schlosser reports in this reading, Madison Avenue has been paying a great deal of attention to "kid kustomers" in recent years, pitching them everything from toys and candy to cell phones and automobiles. With more and more working couples spending more money on their kids to compensate for spending less time with them, Schlosser suggests, we are likely to see only an increase in such advertising in the years to come. Hmmm . . . are preteen dating services next?

A correspondent for *The Atlantic*, Schlosser is the author of *Fast Food Nation* (2001), from which this selection is taken, and *Reefer Madness: Sex, Drugs, and Cheap Labor in the American Black Market* (2003). In 2006 he published, with Charles Wilson, a book for young readers titled *Chew on This: Everything You Don't Want to Know about Fast Food*.

Twenty-five years ago, only a handful of American companies directed their marketing at children—Disney, McDonald's, candy makers, toy makers, manufacturers of breakfast cereal. Today children are being targeted by phone companies, oil companies, and automobile companies as well as clothing stores and restaurant chains. The explosion in children's advertising occurred during the 1980s. Many working parents, feeling guilty about spending less time with their kids, started spending more money on them. One marketing expert has called the 1980s "the decade of the child consumer." After largely ignoring children for years, Madison Avenue began to scrutinize and pursue them. Major ad agencies now have children's divisions, and a variety of marketing firms focus solely on kids. These groups tend to have sweet-sounding names: Small Talk, Kid Connection, Kid2Kid, the Gepetto Group, Just Kids, Inc. At least three industry publications—*Youth Market Alert*, *Selling to Kids*, and *Marketing to Kids Report*—cover the latest ad campaigns and market research. The growth in children's advertising has been driven by efforts to increase not just current, but also future, consumption. Hoping that nostalgic childhood memories of a brand will lead to a lifetime of purchases, companies now plan "cradle-to-grave" advertising strategies. They have come to believe what Ray Kroc and Walt Disney realized long ago—a person's "brand loyalty" may begin as early as the age of two. Indeed, market research has found that children often recognize a brand logo before they can recognize their own name.

The discontinued Joe Camel ad campaign, which used a hip cartoon character to sell cigarettes, showed how easily children can be influenced by the right corporate mascot. A 1991 study published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* found that nearly all of America's six-year-olds could identify Joe Camel, who was just as familiar to them as Mickey Mouse. Another study found that one-third of the cigarettes illegally sold to minors were Camels. More recently, a marketing firm conducted a survey in shopping malls across the country, asking children to describe their favorite TV ads. According to the CME KidCom Ad Traction Study II, released at the 1999 Kids' Marketing Conference in San Antonio, Texas, the Taco Bell commercials featuring a talking chihuahua were the most popular fast food ads. The kids in the survey also liked Pepsi and Nike commercials, but their favorite television ad was for Budweiser.

The bulk of the advertising directed at children today has an immediate goal. "It's not just getting kids to whine," one marketer explained in *Selling*



Do Frosted Flakes plus Yoda equal a “sugar-coated nag”?

to Kids, “it’s giving them a specific reason to ask for the product.” Years ago sociologist Vance Packard described children as “surrogate salesmen” who had to persuade other people, usually their parents, to buy what they wanted. Marketers now use different terms to explain the intended response to their ads—such as “leverage,” “the nudge factor,” “pester power.” The aim of most children’s advertising is straightforward: Get kids to nag their parents and nag them well.

James U. McNeal, a professor of marketing at Texas A&M University, is considered America’s leading authority on marketing to children. In his book *Kids As Customers* (1992), McNeal provides marketers with a thorough analysis of “children’s requesting styles and appeals.” He classifies juvenile nagging tactics into seven major categories. A *pleading* nag is one accompanied by repetitions of words like “please” or “mom, mom, mom.” A *persistent* nag involves constant requests for the coveted product and may include the phrase “I’m gonna ask just one more time.” *Forceful* nags are extremely pushy and may include subtle threats, like “Well, then, I’ll go and ask Dad.” *Demonstrative* nags are the most high-risk, often characterized by full-blown tantrums in public places, breath-holding, tears, a refusal to leave the store. *Sugar-coated* nags promise affection in return for a purchase and may rely on seemingly heartfelt declarations like “You’re the best dad in the world.” *Threatening* nags are youthful forms of blackmail, vows of eternal hatred and of running away if something isn’t bought. *Pity* nags claim the child will be heartbroken, teased, or socially stunted if the parent refuses to buy a certain item. “All of these appeals and styles may be used in combination,” McNeal’s research has discovered, “but kids tend to stick to one or two of each that proved most effective . . . for their own parents.”

McNeal never advocates turning children into screaming, breath-holding 5
monsters. He has been studying “Kid Kustomers” for more than thirty years
and believes in a more traditional marketing approach. “The key is getting
children to see a firm . . . in much the same way as [they see] mom or dad,
grandma or grandpa,” McNeal argues. “Likewise, if a company can ally itself
with universal values such as patriotism, national defense, and good health, it
is likely to nurture belief in it among children.”

Before trying to affect children’s behavior, advertisers have to learn about
their tastes. Today’s market researchers not only conduct surveys of chil-
dren in shopping malls, they also organize focus groups for kids as young
as two or three. They analyze children’s artwork, hire children to run focus
groups, stage slumber parties and then question children into the night. They
send cultural anthropologists into homes, stores, fast food restaurants, and
other places where kids like to gather, quietly and surreptitiously observing
the behavior of prospective customers. They study the academic literature on
child development, seeking insights from the work of theorists such as Erik
Erikson and Jean Piaget. They study the fantasy lives of young children; they
apply the findings in advertisements and product designs.

Dan S. Acuff—the president of Youth Market System Consulting and
the author of *What Kids Buy and Why* (1997)—stresses the importance of
dream research. Studies suggest that until the age of six, roughly 80 percent
of children’s dreams are about animals. Rounded, soft creatures like Barney,
Disney’s animated characters, and the Teletubbies therefore have an obvious
appeal to young children. The Character Lab, a division of Youth Market Sys-
tem Consulting, uses a proprietary technique called Character Appeal Quad-
rant Analysis to help companies develop new mascots. The technique purports
to create imaginary characters who perfectly fit the targeted age group’s level
of cognitive and neurological development.

Children’s clubs have for years been considered an effective means of
targeting ads and collecting demographic information; the clubs appeal to a
child’s fundamental need for status and belonging. Disney’s Mickey Mouse
Club, formed in 1930, was one of the trailblazers. During the 1980s and
1990s, children’s clubs proliferated, as corporations used them to solicit
the names, addresses, zip codes, and personal comments of young custom-
ers. “Marketing messages sent through a club not only can be personalized,”
James McNeal advises, “they can be tailored for a certain age or geographical
group.” A well-designed and well-run children’s club can be extremely good
for business. According to one Burger King executive, the creation of a Burger
King Kids Club in 1991 increased the sales of children’s meals as much as
300 percent.

The Internet has become another powerful tool for assembling data
about children. In 1998 a federal investigation of Web sites aimed at chil-
dren found that 89 percent requested personal information from kids; only
1 percent required that children obtain parental approval before supplying
the information. A character on the McDonald’s Web site told children that

Ronald McDonald was “the ultimate authority in everything.” The site encouraged kids to send Ronald an e-mail revealing their favorite menu item at McDonald’s, their favorite book, their favorite sports team — and their name. Fast food Web sites no longer ask children to provide personal information without first gaining parental approval; to do so is now a violation of federal law, thanks to the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act, which took effect in April of 2000.

Despite the growing importance of the Internet, television remains the primary medium for children’s advertising. The effects of these TV ads have long been a subject of controversy. In 1978, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) tried to ban all television ads directed at children seven years old or younger. Many studies had found that young children often could not tell the difference between television programming and television advertising. They also could not comprehend the real purpose of commercials and trusted that advertising claims were true. Michael Pertschuk, the head of the FTC, argued that children need to be shielded from advertising that preys upon their immaturity. “They cannot protect themselves,” he said, “against adults who exploit their present-mindedness.”

The FTC’s proposed ban was supported by the American Academy of Pediatrics, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Consumers Union, and the Child Welfare League, among others. But it was attacked by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Toy Manufacturers of America, and the Association of National Advertisers. The industry groups lobbied Congress to prevent any restrictions on children’s ads and sued in federal court to block Pertschuk from participating in future FTC meetings on the subject. In April of 1981, three months after the inauguration of President Ronald Reagan, an FTC staff report argued that a ban on ads aimed at children would be impractical, effectively killing the proposal. “We are delighted by the FTC’s reasonable recommendation,” said the head of the National Association of Broadcasters.

The Saturday-morning children’s ads that caused angry debates twenty years ago now seem almost quaint. Far from being banned, TV advertising aimed at kids is now broadcast twenty-four hours a day, closed-captioned and in stereo. Nickelodeon, the Disney Channel, the Cartoon Network, and the other children’s cable networks are now responsible for about 80 percent of all television viewing by kids. None of these networks existed before 1979. The typical American child now spends about twenty-one hours a week watching television — roughly one and a half months of TV every year. That does not include the time children spend in front of a screen watching videos, playing videogames, or using the computer. Outside of school, the typical American child spends more time watching television than doing any other activity except sleeping. During the course of a year, he or she watches more than thirty thousand TV commercials. Even the nation’s youngest children are watching a great deal of television. About one-quarter of American children between the ages of two and five have a TV in their room.