

The Influence of Junk Food Advertisements on School Going Children's in Chennai

¹Mrs.H.Mickle Aancy, ²Dr.K.Maran

¹Research Scholar, Mother Treasa Womens University, Kodaikannal.

²Professor & Director, SriSairam Institute of Management Studies, Chennai.

Abstract: Advertising is one of the promotion techniques of marketing. It is used to encourage the school going children's to buy more junk food items and to provide more ideas and gives the buying behaviour of junk foods. An advertisement is providing more information and makes awareness of the product in the market. Today's school going children's are more attracted with all types of advertisement Medias like television, radio, online, magazines etc. It is the important part of the school going children's to learn more information's of junk food items and other product also. That influence to make more buying behaviour of junk foods. When the school going children's watch young adults in good shape eating junk foods in the advertisements they assume that it is good for the health. Nowadays, so much of openness and exposures in media and commercials parents are often worried about what all their school going children's are watching. In this study school going children's under the age group of 4-15 in Chennai school going children's.

Keywords: Junk food, Advertisement media, Information, School going children's

I. INTRODUCTION

Advertising has become so integral part of our life & society that we cannot imagine any event, newspaper, magazine, TV serial, Cinema etc. without advertising. The basic objective of any advertisement is to stimulate sales, direct or indirect by trying to make tall claims about product performance. The degree of impact of advertising is devastating for school going children's. Television is no more just a source of entertainment for children. They showcase the must haves for a kid making them a consumer even before they have reached the age of 4. Thus the influence of the media on the psychosocial development of school going children's is profound. Thus, it is important for the parents to know their child's exposure to media and to provide guidance on age-appropriate use of all media, including television, radio, music, video games and the Internet. The objectives of this research paper are to explore both the beneficial and harmful effects of media on school going children's mental and physical health. We are also emphasizing on directing children's towards imbibing healthy food habits in them by suggesting parents to be more aware & regulating the advertisement targeted on children.

School going children's are innocent and not so mature. When a marketer advertises a product on television, they do not understand that it is a business and their main aim is to sell. They do not understand that advertisers try to push their products and market in such a way that school going children's want to buy it. Children take everything at face value and believe without a doubt the messages in the advertisements. Advertisements are made in such a way as to attract the attention of school going children's. School going children's do not understand it to be marketing strategy. School going children's are an extremely vulnerable target audience and get easily carried away.

II. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to explore the attitude of school going children's towards advertisements and endeavoured to understand their buying response, particularly of junk food. The study also examined the key development stages of childhood that influence children's response to television advertising.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To identify the school going children's age and their preference of Junk food
2. To find the the gender and their preference of junk food.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table:1 shows that gender of the respondents

Gender	No of Respondents	Percentage
Male	47	59
Female	33	41
Total	80	100

From the above table:1 inferred that 59% of the respondents are male children’s and 41% of the respondents are female children’s.

Table:2 showing the advertisement preferred by the children

Mode of advertisement	No of Respondents	Percentage
(a) Television	35	44
(b) Radio	8	10
(c) Magazines	9	11
(d) Banners	20	25
(e) Online	8	10
Total	80	100

From the above table:2 inferred that 44% of the school going children’s gives the preference of television and 25% of the school going children’s gives the preference of banner advertisement and 11% of the school going children’s gives the preference of magazine advertisements and 10% of the school going children’s gives the preference of Radio and Online advertisement.

Table:3 showing advertisement preference on Gender with Cross tabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Advertisement TV	Count	20	10	30	
	Expected Count	17.6	12.4	30.0	
Radio	Count	5	8	13	
	Expected Count	7.6	5.4	13.0	
Magazines	Count	7	5	12	
	Expected Count	7.0	5.0	12.0	
Banners	Count	10	5	15	
	Expected Count	8.8	6.2	15.0	
Online	Count	5	5	10	
	Expected Count	5.9	4.1	10.0	
Total	Count	47	33	80	
	Expected Count	47.0	33.0	80.0	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.689 ^a	4	.450
Likelihood Ratio	3.668	4	.453
Linear-by-Linear Association	.172	1	.679
N of Valid Cases	80		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.13.

Since probability value is > 0.05% level of significance, we accept the null hypothesis; hence we infer that there is no significant difference between the mode of advertisement and its impact of the genders. The chi-square value is 3.689. The linear association between the variables is 0.172. The P value is 0.450.

Ho There is no significant difference between the choice of food consumed

H1 There is a significant difference between the choice of food consumed

Table:4 Showing the single factor anova by using excell

Anova: Single Factor						
SUMMARY						
Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance		
products	4	10	2.5	1.666666667		
Respondents	4	80	20	126		
ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	612.5	1	612.5	9.595300261	0.02118	5.987378
Within Groups	383	6	63.83333			
Total	995.5	7				

Since probability value is $> 0.05\%$ level of significance, we accept the null hypothesis; hence we infer that there is no significant difference between choices of food consumed. F-Critical value is 5.98 and difference between the group 1 and difference within the group is 6. The P value is 0.02118.

Table:5 showing Age and Food consumption with Cross tabulation

			Food			Total
			Food	Cloths	stationary	
Age	4-6	Count	6	6	5	17
		Expected Count	7.4	4.9	4.7	17.0
	7-9	Count	7	6	5	18
		Expected Count	7.9	5.2	5.0	18.0
	10-12	Count	12	5	6	23
		Expected Count	10.1	6.6	6.3	23.0
	13-15	Count	10	6	6	22
		Expected Count	9.6	6.3	6.0	22.0
Total		Count	35	23	22	80
		Expected Count	35.0	23.0	22.0	80.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.598 ^a	6	.953
Likelihood Ratio	1.612	6	.952
Linear-by-Linear Association	.354	1	.552
N of Valid Cases	80		

Since probability value is $< 0.05\%$ level of significance, we accept the alternative hypothesis; hence we infer that there is a significant difference between the age and their food consumption. The chi-square value is 1.598. The linear association between the variables is 0.354. The P value is 0.953.

Table:6 showing gender and remembrance of advertisement (Two-Factor without Replication)

<i>SUMMARY</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>
one week	2	42	21	2
one month	2	23	11.5	24.5
more than a year	2	15	7.5	12.5
Male	3	47	15.66667	36.33333333
Female	3	33	11	63

ANOVA

<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Rows	192.3333333	2	96.16667	30.36842105	0.031879	19
Columns	32.66666667	1	32.66667	10.31578947	0.084791	18.51282
Total	225	5				

Since probability value is $> 0.05\%$ level of significance, we accept the null hypothesis; hence we infer that there is no significant difference between the gender and the remembrance of junk food advertisements to the school going children's. P-Value of rows 0.031879 and the F value of rows 30.368. P-value of columns 0.084791 and the F-value of columns 10.316.

V. CONCLUSION

Advertisement is integral part of the industry which wants its product to be reached to the Customer & then converts those customers into consumers. But in this process they should not forget that it's their social responsibility to take care of the future of the country which are been targeted tactfully to earn profits. Parents should make the kids more aware of the surrounding so that starts taking proper & logical decision. Parents should be aware that advertising is going on, and it's influencing their School going children's more than they think. Also government's role is important here. It can do it by implementing proper food laws and harmonization of various laws into single unified law. Of course, TV in moderation can be a good thing: Pre-schoolers can get help learning the alphabet on public television, grade scholars can learn about wildlife on nature shows, and parents can keep up with current events on the evening news. But despite its advantages, too much television can be detrimental: School going children's who consistently spend more than 4 hours per day watching TV are more likely to be overweight. TV characters often depict risky behaviours, such as smoking and drinking, and also reinforce gender-role and racial stereotypes. Thus it must be controlled by parents to a minimum level.

REFERENCES

- [1] IASO (International Association for the Study of Obesity), "Obesity: understanding and challenging the global epidemic," Tech. Rep. 2009-2010, 2009, http://www.iaso.org/site_media/uploads/IASO_Summary_Report_2009.pdf. View at Google Scholar
- [2] WHO (World Health Organization), "Prioritizing areas for action in the field of population-based prevention of childhood obesity. A set of tools for Member States to determine and identify priority areas for action," WHO Publications, 2012, <http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/childhood/tools/en/index.html>.
- [3] OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development), Obesity and the Economics of Prevention: Fit Not Fat, OECD, Paris, France, 2010.
- [4] K. L. Procter, "The aetiology of childhood obesity: a review," Nutrition Research Reviews, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 29–45, 2007. View at Publisher · View at Google Scholar · View at Scopus
- [5] L. A. Reisch, W. Gwozdz, and S. C. Beckmann, "Consumer behavior in childhood obesity research and policy," in Epidemiology of Obesity in Children and Adolescents: Prevalence and Aetiology, L. Moreno, I. Pigeot, and W. Ahrens, Eds., pp. 431–454, Springer, New York, NY, USA, 2011. View at Google Scholar
- [6] M. Scully, H. Dixon, and M. Wakefield, "Association between commercial television exposure and fast-food consumption among adults," Public Health Nutrition, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 105–110, 2009. View at Publisher · View at Google Scholar · View at Scopus
- [7] L. A. Reisch and W. Gwozdz, "Chubby cheeks and climate change: childhood obesity as a sustainable development issue," International Journal of Consumer Studies, vol. 35, no. 19, pp. 3–9, 2011. View at Google Scholar
- [8] Kickbusch, "The food system: a prism of present and future challenges for health promotion and sustainable development," White Paper, Health Promotion Switzerland, 2010. View at Google Scholar
- [9] U. S. Department of Health Human Services, "2020 LHI topics," 2012, <http://healthypeople.gov/2020/LHI/2020indicators.aspx>.
- [10] J. Portillo and J. Weinkle, "Senate bill 934: improving the school food environment by extending national standards," Infant, Child, & Adolescent Nutrition, no. 2, pp. 229–231, 2010. View at Google Scholar

- [11] T. K. Boehmer, S. L. Lovegreen, D. Haire-Joshu, and R. C. Brownson, "What constitutes an obesogenic environment in rural communities?" *The American Journal of Health Promotion*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 411–421, 2006. View at Google Scholar · View at Scopus
- [12] B. Butland, S. Jebb, P. Kopelman et al., "Tackling obesity: future choices," Foresight Project Report, UK Government, 2007, <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/foresight/docs/obesity/17.pdf>. View at Google Scholar
- [13] G. Egger, B. Swinburn, and S. Rossner, "Dusting off the epidemiological triad: could it work with obesity?" *Obesity Reviews*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 115–119, 2003. View at Publisher · View at Google Scholar · View at Scopus
- [14] S. A. French, M. Story, and R. W. Jeffery, "Environmental influences on eating and physical activity," *Annual Review of Public Health*, vol. 22, pp. 309–335, 2001. View at Google Scholar
- [15] J. O. Hill, H. R. Wyatt, G. W. Reed, and J. C. Peters, "Obesity and the environment: where do we go from here?" *Science*, vol. 299, no. 5608, pp. 853–855, 2003. View at Publisher · View at Google Scholar · View at Scopus

