

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

CHILDREN AND ELECTRONIC MEDIA  
A FUTURE OF CHILDREN EVENT

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, April 23, 2008

**Welcome and Introduction:**

[ISABEL SAWHILL](#)

Co-Director, Center on Children and Families, and Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution

**Overview:**

[ELISABETH HIRSCHHORN DONAHUE](#)

Lecturer of Public and International Affairs, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University

PANEL ONE: ROLE OF GOVERNMENT AND POLICY

**Moderator:**

[ELISABETH HIRSCHHORN DONAHUE](#)

Lecturer of Public and International Affairs, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University

**Panelists:**

AMY JORDAN

Director, Media and the Developing Child Sector, Annenberg Public Policy Center, University of Pennsylvania

COLIN CROWELL

Professional Staff Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives

SUSAN NEWCOMER

Extramural Program Staff, Demographic and Behavioral Sciences Branch, National Institutes of Health

PANEL TWO: POSITIVE MEDIA CAMPAIGNS

**Moderator:**

RON HASKINS

Co-Director, Center on Children and Families, and Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution

**Panelists:**

TINA HOFF

Vice President and Director, Entertainment Media Partnerships, Kaiser Family Foundation

MARISA NIGHTINGALE

Senior Director, Media Programs and Youth Initiatives, The National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy

W. DOUGLAS EVANS

Division Vice President and Director, Center for Health Promotion Research, Research Triangle Institute

PETER KLAUS

Senior Vice President, Fleishman-Hillard Digital

\* \* \* \* \*

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. SAWHILL: Good morning! I want to welcome all of you on this nice spring day, even though a little cloudy still, and hope we can have a stimulating discussion on the new issue of *The Future of Children*. It's a volume on children and the media, and we are very pleased that we have some of the authors here today. One of the co-editors of the volume, Elizabeth Donahue from Princeton -- she is not only a co-editor of today's volume, but also an associate editor of the journal in general. And I'm very, very sad to have to report that the guest editor for this volume, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, who's a professor at Columbia University, is not with us today. Her husband died very suddenly and unexpectedly this week, and so I'm sure those of you who know her and have been colleagues with her will join me in sending her our deepest condolences. But we're very glad that Elizabeth is here, and another senior editor of the journal is my colleague, Ron Haskins. He has worked very hard on putting this event together and writing a policy brief on what we can take away from what we've learned from all this research in terms of guidance for policy, along with Elizabeth and Marisa Nightingale who is here in the front row. And you'll be hearing more from who heads the media work at the National Campaign for Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy.

So we have a terrific group of people, and I think that -- you know, all of us when we think about the media and children, the question, particularly if you're a parent, that you always have is "what impact does the media have on children?" You know, there's so much sex and violence and other less-than-uplifting stuff in the media, that I think all of us sort of look at that and say "how is this effecting the development of children?" whether they be very young children or older children such as teenagers. What's wonderful about this volume, I think, is that it's pulled together some of the best people in the country, most knowledgeable people, to look at what we know about that topic. And then to ask the question, a much tougher question even, "what can we do about it?" There being various First Amendment reasons why we can't necessarily stop some of the bad stuff that is on television or in the rest of the media, but I think what the policy brief we're releasing today does and does very nicely is it says "let's fight fire with fire. Let's put some positive messages into the media and see if we can make a difference in that way."

So that in a nutshell is what we're going to be talking about. I really want to thank all of the people who've been involved in producing this volume, and then putting this event together. I've had almost nothing to do with it. I'm just here to thank all of them. I know Elizabeth has done a huge amount of work on this, and my colleague, Ron Haskins, has done a lot of work, and the whole team here at Brookings

that works with Ron, Julie Clover -- I think they're still out in the hall, hoping more people are going to trickle in, but want to thank all those people who've been involved.

And with that, I think I should turn this over to you, Elizabeth, to start the first panel.

MS. DONAHUE: Thank you. I'm not using PowerPoint in my rebellion against the media. At *The Future of Children* - I don't know how many of you are familiar with our journal. We produce two volumes a year and the topics vary widely. We've done obesity, poverty, social mobility, and we're always looking for issues that are tapping into what is going on with children, mostly in the United States. So the motivation for this volume really came very organically; it came from all of us looking around as parents, and some of us as teachers, and saying "what are people worried about in terms of kids today?" And what I heard over and over -- I have three boys -- is parents are very concerned about media. It is all anyone talks about, and the hand-ringing going on is sort of astounding, myself included. And so one of the things that we set out to do is say "okay, this is here, we're not going back." Media is a huge part of our children's lives; it's a part of all of our lives. So what do we know about electronic media and its effect on children? So that's what really was the genesis of this volume.

There are lots of facts on media, they're all in the volume, and I'm not going to go over them because numbers will make us all wilt and go to sleep. But I encourage you to look at the volume -- there are copies outside -- there's a whole chapter on trends, and there's a lot of data in that chapter, as well as on our website which you can find outside as well. We're going to start breaking some of these numbers down into shorter pieces. One of the things we've done is we've partnered with Child Trends to do some state-level data analysis, so coming this spring and early summer there will be stuff on our website that will break down media use by state, so you can see where your state is in terms of the information. So I think that's very helpful.

To paint the picture a little bit, I'll give sort of a very quick overview on what we're seeing in terms of media. First of all -- and this is not a surprise to anyone in the room who has kids or have seen kids -- is that kids spend a huge amount of time with media, 6+ hours a day. They spend more time with media than any other single activity other than sleeping, so talk about saturation. Media has saturated our homes. The average 8-18 year-old lives in a household with three televisions, three video players, three radios, three iPods or other MP3 devices, two video game consoles, and a personal computer. And I can tell you anecdotally, my house looks way worse than that. So this has saturated our homes. One of the things that's interesting, and it's interesting in

terms of how we measure media use and exposure, is that multi-tasking is on the rise. Again, you all know this. It seems intuitive and sort of obvious to say, but the amount of multi-tasking that goes on is unbelievable.

When kids report how much media exposure they have, 81% of their use is multi-tasking. They're using two or more things 81% of the time that they're using media. So that's a lot of multi-tasking. So what's happened is that old media, like television, hasn't actually gone down. You know there was this theory for awhile that these other newer media were crowding out television. Television use is about the same, but all these other things have added on top of it. So all it's done is have a multiplier effect on how much media exposure kids are getting. And the TV is often on in the background while they're doing their IMing and their homework and listening to music, and, I don't know, baking a cake, I don't know what else they're doing. But they're doing a lot of things at one time.

The other thing that's interesting is this idea of convergence, which we'll hear a lot about, where you know -- it used to be we would ask kids "what sort of media did you use today?" "Did you watch television, did you listen to music, did you use your computer?" But you can do all -- you can get the same program from so many different sources today, right? You can watch your television program on your TV, you can watch it on your computer, you can watch it on your phone, right, your cell phone. And so how one measure what kids are intaking is

actually pretty complicated with convergence. And the other thing that's going on that's important that we talk a lot about in the policy brief is because of convergence, media has become very portable. And so teens, in particular, have access to a lot of media in places where there are no teachers or parents. They can watch their program on their iPod, you know, their iPhone when parents or teachers are not around. So regulating it from a parental point of view is much more difficult when it's not actually in your home.

Okay, so those are the things that motivated the volume. What did we learn? And I feel so -- it just seems like such an obvious answer, but I have to say it. It's that content matters. And over and over and over in every chapter, that was the bottom line conclusion. I feel like we should have buttons: "it's the content stupid." It really is the content. It's not the type of platform that it's on, it's not even how much time the kids are using it, it's really what the content is. And this is very important because content is probably the hardest thing to regulate, right? From a parental point of view, it's much easier to say "you've got an hour of media use, screen time," rather than combing through all of this stuff that's coming into your home. And I would tell this funny anecdote about how when I was working on the introduction for this, my kids were in the playroom and I had no idea what they were doing, but they could only do it for an hour. It's sort of like, "do as I say, and not as I do." And so parents



have come to rely on rating systems to help them regulate what comes into their home, but these are largely dictated by the industry themselves. There's no independent government body overseeing what the rating systems are. And as Amy Jordan talks about in her chapter in the volume, they're very complicated, they're not consistent. Most parents don't know what half of the symbols mean, and so relying on the rating systems as a way to regulate what comes into your home is very difficult. At the government level, it's much more complicated. Usually when we come into this room and we have a policy issue, be it poverty or obesity or social mobility, we look to the Hill and government agencies and say "well, what can we do?" But of course in media we have the First Amendment. And if what we're really concerned about is content, not platform, not how much time, not how things are delivered, but the content, the First Amendment is extremely powerful, because as a rule in this country, we don't like to regulate content. The government doesn't like to regulate content. There are ways around it. For many years, we regulated broadcast television because the government licenses broadcasts, so it's like the government is the landlord, they can regulate it, they have a certain amount of power over broadcasts. But of course the amount of media coming through broadcasts now is minimized, right? So we really are losing that tie to regulation as some of our speakers will address.

Another back-end way into regulating has been to regulate the platform, not the content. So mandating V-chips in television, but again, with convergence, that becomes somewhat meaningless if you can get your television program on your computer or your cell phone, does it really matter that there's a V-chip in your house? And as someone who lives in a house where I have to ask my 12-year-old to turn the television on because I don't know how to turn it on, these kids are all going to be able to get around the V-chips. These mechanisms are not really what's going to be able to control content.

There are cases where public safety trumps the First Amendment. Child pornography is probably the best example. But again, it has to be a pretty immediate harm before the courts are willing to say, that they're willing to intervene and trump the First Amendment. And there have been a lot of cases in recent years where the First Amendment has been upheld as a means to overturn what Congress has tried to do. Congress has passed a lot of laws trying to protect children, mostly on the internet, from harmful material, and the Supreme Court over and over overturns those laws and says they violate the First Amendment. So what can we do? Are we stuck? Or do we just don't do anything? I don't think so. I think the government and policymakers still have a very powerful role to play, and I think they do it in three important ways. One is there are still areas the government has control over. Mostly broadcasts for

somewhat cable, which I think our speaker, Colin Crowell, who is with the Committee on Energy and Commerce for the U.S. House of Representatives, will address. There's another place for government in terms of, are there situations where the First Amendment should be trumped, and can we build a case record for that? And I think Colin will address that as well; that's a role for the Hill to play. The other area that I think we also have room for is funding. The government can spend money. We don't have much of it left, but they can still spend money. And one area that we really do need some spending on is research. As much as I like to think we've pulled together in this volume what we know about the effects of media on children, there's a lot of sentences in here that say "well, we really don't know, we really don't know", or "the resource base really isn't there." And that's particularly true for the newer media, which is being invented faster than we can set up the research protocols to study it. So Susan Newcomer, who is from the National Institutes of Health, will address some of the research needs and what government can do in terms of funding those research needs.

And finally -- and I think is very important -- parents and non-profits have a huge role to play in this area. And the government can help organize this effort. The court of public opinion is pretty important, and we have examples. When Webkinz, the popular website for younger children, started putting movie tie-ins on, parents got

infuriated, organized with the help of non-profits, and Webkinz pulled them. Similar with Facebook when they started this viral marketing where they were telling people what their friends were purchasing. There was an uproar. The newspapers wrote about it, the non-profits got involved, and Facebook stopped. So there are examples of things where the court of public opinion can have a pretty powerful role, but as we all know who are parents, doing it on your own is a monumental task. And so I do think there's a role of non-profits and of the government to help organize some of these parental efforts.

And finally, as we'll hear from our last panel today, media can be positive. We do find this in this volume. This is not a negative volume about media. Kids can learn from media if it's done right and the content is right. And we have lots of examples in our second panel of media that is helping children and youth make positive decisions about their health and behavior, and so we should meet fire with fire and get to where the kids are and have some positive influences in their lives.

So with that, I'm going to turn it to our panel. We're first going to hear from Colin.

MR. CROWELL: Sure. Thank you Elizabeth, and I'll start with the requisite disclosure with respect to congressional staff experts, which is that we're actually not experts compared to the real experts, just compared to other congressional staff. So, I've worked on

the House Telecommunications Subcommittee and its Chairman in various capacities in the minority and majority for 20 years now. And one of the things that I will do is not give you an exhaustive rundown of areas in media and legislation that we've gotten into, but hit some of the high notes in ways that will be sort of illustrious of some of the areas where we have gotten involved and where we tried to walk a very narrow balance between the First Amendment and the governmental interest in protecting children. That is sort of the nexus of most of the areas that I'll discuss.

I checked into this -- shortly after President Reagan pocket-vetoed the first version of the Children's Television Act in 1988, we came back in the subsequent Congress and in that Congress, George Bush the first signed the Children's Television Act into law. That law was like many of the efforts that we have on the Hill. And in one act, sort of embodied both the promotion of healthy content, educational and informational content, for children with legislative language that was designed to limit the harm to children, namely the crass commercialization of children's television on the dial with advertisements for toys and sugary cereal and various things like that. So what did Congress do? In that act, Congress stipulated that broadcast licensees had an obligation, when it came up for license renewal, to demonstrate that their overall programming met a public interest standard with respect to kids and in particular, the FCC was supposed to look at the extent to which that

licensee was meeting the educational and informational needs of the child audience. So it was both in the context of the overall programming, and then specifically the extent to which they were meeting the educational and informational needs of kids. There were no numerical limits set there, okay? And so in the immediate aftermath of that act, the FCC did not set any standard guidelines for licensees coming up for renewal. And what we had then, subsequently, was a hearing on the Hill several years later that explained -- we had the CBS Television Network come up and testify where they explained that the Flintstones were educational and informational because it explained to children what life was like back in the Stone Age. And that the Jetsons met the standard because they explained to children what life would be like in the future. So that was one example of a licensee submitting to the Commission how they felt they were fulfilling the statute. Not surprisingly, the reaction from the Hill was not very favorable, and the FCC subsequently put in place what is called a processing guideline, stipulating that the bureau-level officials at the Commission could renew the broadcast license if you demonstrated you did at least three hours a week of educational and informational programming, and that became the processing guideline after that.

To limit the harm and the commercialization on children's television, the Congress put in place limits with respect to advertising. And said that on Saturday and Sunday mornings, there could

only be 12 minutes of ads per hour, and 10½ minutes, rather 10½ minutes on Saturdays and Sundays, and Mondays through Fridays there could be 12 minutes. Those actual numerical limits on the advertising were put into the statute. However, Congress, in the statute, gave the Commission the discretion to subsequently go back and review such limits to make sure that they were adequate in protecting in kids and reflected the public interest. It is that ability of the Commission to look at the overall numerical limits of the ads in a way that is content neutral. Doesn't matter what the content of the ads are, which is the authority that the FCC could invoke, for example, if industry and public interest groups, consumer groups, and marketers are unable to reach some kind of agreement with respect to the marketing of food products to kids during the children's block on the broadcast licensees, the Commission could come in and dramatically lower those limits. That's the threat to the programmers, that the repercussions of not reaching agreements to have more healthy and nutritious advertisements substitute for content that is high in sugar or salt and fatty food supplements. So those are the things that are relevant with respect to sort of the balance. That particular aspect of the law applies not only to broadcast licensees, but also to cable. So it applies to operators and content providers like Viacom who have Nickelodeon, you know Nick Jr. It applies to Disney's cable channels, not just to Disney's owned ABC television network. So that is an example of where Congress

has gotten in. There are several others where Congress has gotten in. Elizabeth mentioned the V-chip. The V-chip was simply meant to upgrade the on/off button, and it was done in a way -- I've got the off button up here as a speaker just now. But that was meant to give parents the tools. One of the things that is out there is that -- and the Kaiser Family Foundation has noted this in its surveys of parents -- is that parents know it's in the set. And if parents are familiar with the rating system and they have young children, they find it extremely useful. However, if they don't know it's in the set, and they find the rating system confusing, and they don't understand it, and their facility with the technology isn't quite up to speed, then it is an inadequate tool to deal with the daily deluge of content that many parents might find problematic.

And so with that I'll stop there and take questions later.

MS. NEWCOMER: Thank you. I have a confession to make. I don't own a television set, my computer at home uses dial-up, and I don't have a cell phone. So my children compensate, and my grandchildren compensate, but I myself --

(Interruption)

MS. NEWCOMER: Okay, as I said, I don't own a television set, I don't own -- my computer has dial-up, I don't own a cell phone. My children and grandchildren, however, compensate.



I'm going to talk a little bit about the role of one federal agency in examining media impact on behavior. The National Institutes of Health, specifically the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development. Other parts of the federal government, especially the CDC, do fund public service announcements addressing, and usually advising, changes in specific behaviors. But in a media-saturated world as we've heard about, it's difficult really, if not impossible, to attribute a given behavior to any single media-related or any single determinant, in fact, because your family foundation as noted has funded a series of content analyses of broadcast TV which provides some information on how much sexual content there is in programming as one measure of its potential influence. That's a sort of "oh, ain't it awful" kind of attempt to explain what is going on. Then there's a spate of media literacy curricula which were developed in the '70s and the '80s, attempting to teach young people to be educated consumers. But linking actual media content and exposure, I believe there's an interaction. Content matters, but probably duration also matters. To subsequent behavior remains a challenge. Just try to explain this to an economist for instance. And as more and more media are used by more and more people, the challenge grows. In June of '98, the NIH issued a program announcement calling for research on the impact of media on adolescent sexual behavior. I was, I am, was the project officer for that particular set of applications, and over the next three

years, eight applications were submitted and five received reviews favorable enough to permit the NIH to fund them. Of course, the economist on the review panel said “unobserved heterogeneity, what’s the counterfactual, etc., etc.” And so getting the funding -- getting the applications through to get them funded was somewhat of a challenge. This effort was in part a response to early Congressional interest in the topic. And Amy will talk a little bit about continuing Congressional interest in funding such studies to examine the actual impact of media on behavior. So far, we haven’t seen any money set aside for it, but we are always hopeful.

In general, the five studies that we did fund used content analysis of broadcast media combined with surveys of adolescents’ viewing habits over the subsequent several years, and those surveys included their sexual behaviors reported in those subsequent years. Now one concern which all of them address is trying to examine the extent to which looking at media with heavy sexual content. Frequent consumption of that kind of media have levels -- and the level is a portrayal of responsible sexual behavior -- how or if that is the causal influence on young children’s, especially seventh, eighth, ninth graders, subsequent sexual behavior. And since they swim in a media world, it’s very difficult to do. As can be expected, there have been considerable measurement issues with that. As Elizabeth said, the multi-tasking is very

difficult. How do you measure how much content in media when a kid can click through 57 web pages in one minute? How do you measure that? What's the unit of analysis? How do you figure out how much of it? How do you figure out -- is it the kids who are interested in sex who then seek out sexual media, sexually laden media, or is it the kids who see it who then go and say "I can do that?" We don't know. There are very few places in the world where there are, as it were, media virgins. Where you could introduce media, and then follow behavior. There was a small study, I believe, in the Falkland Islands about that some years ago, but it didn't find much impact. So, you know, it's a real challenge.

I want to spend my last 1½ minutes talking about the five studies that we did fund. A couple of them are cited in the chapter on risky behavior. First is Jane Brown's. She looked at a survey of content analysis of a number of different media, not simply broadcast television, and then children's subsequent sexual beliefs and behaviors. She looked at television, movies, magazines, books, and the internet. She refers to the media as the sexual super-peer and says can do good as well as bad things. Her results find that kids with greater exposure to sexual content in the media are more likely to intend to have sex. And if we believe the Fishbein and Ajzen arguments, and you want to know whether people are going to do something, ask them if they intend to do it. It's probably the most simple measure of whether they are going to do it. Then we get into

what makes them intend to do it, that's another matter, but intentions do map on to behavior fairly easily. So, she found that kids who looked at a lot of sexy media were, indeed, more likely to say they were going to have sex. Another challenge is that some places it's very difficult to ask sixth or seventh or eighth graders questions about their own sexual behavior. Institution review boards are concerned about that.

Second grant was to Rebecca Collins at the Rand Corporation, and basically she found the same kinds of things. Her group also found that exposure to sexually degrading lyrics in MTV and other video did increase kids' tolerance of sexual behavior. Then Martin Fishbein, who Amy may talk about, has another grant that looks at those things. Joel Gruby, who used his skills from looking at influence of advertising content on alcohol consumption, used some of the same things for looking at sexual behavior. And Deborah Tollman looked at sexual self-image of kids who looked at a lot of television. All of the findings this chorus of five, in fact, did find that the media do have an influence. By and large it's not good, but it can be positive. It can act as a sexual super-peer and encourage sensible behavior. So, that's what I have to say. I will be glad to answer questions when the time comes.

MS. DONAHUE: And so we will wrap up this panel with Amy Jordan, who's with the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania.

MS. JORDAN: Yes, yes. I was really privileged to be able to participate in the creation of this volume on children and media. I wrote the chapter on children's media policy, it's the last chapter. And I'm also very privileged to work at the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania. I've been there for about 10 years. I've been looking at media policy, and I have to say that over the past 10 years, my job has been getting harder and harder. And I think, in part, it's because it's becoming so difficult to define the contours of the medium, right? When I was a child, my friends and I we had four channels; so we had three network stations and PBS. And they were all regulated channels. And then by the time I had children, there were dozens of channels with the introduction of cable television. My friends and the Annenberg Public Policy Center's surveys found that parents really didn't know the difference between broadcast and cable and what should be regulated and what isn't regulated and how it's regulated. So it's very confusing. And then most recently, in the last decade or so, there's been this explosion of the media that are available in homes and to children. And it's made a lot of people from my generation and other generations assume that television is going to go away, but of course that hasn't happened. Television has gone everywhere, right? It's on computers, it's on DVDs, it's on cell phones, it's on iPods. Every kind of platform that you can imagine, it's on today. So I think that it means that some of the

policies that we have -- it's not television that's become obsolete is my point. Maybe it's television policy that's become obsolete, and that's not the fault of policymakers. So just to reassure Colin, I think that people like Colin have and should be very judicious in their policymaking processes. We need to take our time and think about the role of media in the lives of children today, and make sure that we develop policies that are appropriate to it. But the problem is, by the time we've thought about and talked about these policies, new media have been introduced. And it makes it very -- I think it makes it very challenging.

So what I'm not going to do today is argue that media regulation is a good thing or a bad thing, but rather that we have a really good opportunity right now to do a few things -- I'm going to say three things that we should do; the three points in particular that I want to make. So I think right now it's time to take stock of our current policies and how well they're working in the new media environment. Colin talked about a couple of policies that are on the book with relation, with respect to television. They include the V-chip regulations and the FCC processing guideline that, at least in my world, we call the three-hour rule because it mandates a certain amount of educational television for children on broadcast TV. And I think that one of the failures that we have as a government that makes policy for improving the role of media in the lives of children, is that we put these policies in place, but then we don't have

the money within the government to evaluate how well they're working. So other organizations do step in, like the Kaiser Family Foundation and like the Annenberg Public Policy Center, to look at how well they're working, and we do learn some things that make me think that it's really important to have an evaluation component built in, not just after the policies have been introduced or are seeing how well the mandates are working, but even before so that we can give things like the V-chip a test run. As Colin pointed out, there are a lot of families that don't know that their television set has a V-chip. My guess is that if you bought a television set in the last seven years, and probably all of you have, you have a V-chip and you don't know it, and you don't know how to work it. So I think understanding why that's the case, why is it that people don't know, why is it that only certain people are motivated to use it. Those who feel technically sophisticated, those who have young children, they do use it, you know, but why is this a policy that hasn't worked as well as it might. I think it's also important to understand the unintended consequences of policies. And I've been thinking about this in particular with respect to regulating junk food marketing to children. And I was reading news reports of a journal, what was it called? *The Journal of Public Economics* -- so the economists in the audience probably know about this -- that found that the piecemeal approach that we've taken to banning smoking in public areas, like bars and restaurants, has some unintended

consequences that are surprising. I live in Montgomery County; right next door is Delaware County. And I read in this article that death by drunk driving has gone up 26% since Delaware banned smoking in bars. And that's because Delaware County, its neighbor, hasn't banned smoking in bars. So I worry -- how is this related to junk food marketing? Well, what's happening is that people, of course, in Delaware, are driving over to Delaware County, having their smokes and having their drinks, and then going back and creating havoc. So I worry about this with respect to food marketing, because what happens if we ban junk food marketing on children's television programming? Does that mean that the junk food marketing will then just go over into its unregulated neighboring adjacent areas, like product placement and "adver gaining", a phrase that the Kaiser Family Foundation coined, gaining on internet websites.

Okay, so that's my first point, the need for evaluation. My second point is that we -- as Susan said -- we do need to generate more research on media use patterns and media use of facts in this new media environment. And I'm going to argue that, very briefly, that without this new research on how very young children are using media that we barely understand ourselves as adults, we can't make effective policy. So for those of you who are perhaps in charge of some purse strings out there, I'm going to second Susan's plea for more funding to better understand this.



And my third and final point is that this is a really important time for parents and advocates and policymakers to express their concerns to media makers. As Elizabeth pointed out in her opening remarks, the what we call “the raised eyebrow technique” of regulation, you know, where you say “hum, I don’t really like what you’re doing” often does produce changes in the industry, where the industry gets it. They get that the public doesn’t like this. They get that policymakers are concerned. Policymakers don’t really want to come down with a heavy hand and make new policies and regulate in really powerful ways. They do want the industry to behave responsibly. So I think that this is an important time to say what it is we need and what it is we desire from our media makers, and make sure that we build in a process for seeing how industry promises and pledges result in changes in how programs are made, how food is marketed, and how they look after the well-being of children. Thank you.

MS. DONAHUE: So what we’ll do now is open it up to questions and answers. I will start, and then we have people who have mikes, so please make your questions short, identify who you are and what organization you come from. Okay?

So I’m going to start actually. Colin, this is for you. When we were talking about today, I had, in preparation for writing the introduction, I had actually gone back and read a lot of these First

Amendment cases. I went to law school a long time ago, and I needed to update myself on the role of, you know, what the First Amendment was saying. And I mentioned this case to you. There was a case in which the Supreme Court found that the creation of virtual child pornography was protected by the First Amendment. So while you can't make real child pornography because that's harming real children, you can make virtual child pornography. And that's okay because real children aren't harmed in the making of it. And when I read that case, I thought, okay, what can we regulate? I mean, is all content just -- think of it as virtual child porn? Is it off? Is it there? And the court found that the harm to children was too tangential. We couldn't go there. And so I mentioned this to Colin, and I thought you had a really interesting point about the role that Capitol Hill can play in such a case. And I wondered if you'd elaborate on that?

MR. CROWELL: Sure. And this goes a little back to what we did with respect to the Children's Television Act and also with the V-chip and ratings system. There needs to be a causal connecting principle between the action of marketplace participants and harm to children. And so in that particular case, as you said, it was tangential whether a virtual facsimile was directly related to harm to an actual child, okay? With respect to violence in the media, I think through a series of hearings that we did on the TV ratings system and the V-chip, the "V" standing for violence, I think the testimony that we got in building the

legislative history for putting the V-chip into the law was that the medical evidence was overwhelming, that there was a causal connection between exposure to graphic violence and the development of young children in ways that was highly negative. And that was pretty persuasive. And I think the hearings that we do in building that legislative history then is something that would give great pause to the general council of a media company as to whether or not this is something that they could take to court and adequately challenge. In other areas where you know that sort of legislative homework is not done and things are done on the fly, it's perhaps a more easily challenged statute. But I think it also then tends to bolster the plea from both of these guys here about -- you need the overwhelming evidence from the medical community. From the pediatricians, from people who have done surveys, and the information that becomes part of the legislative history, that becomes part of the case law, that if it's challenged -- because otherwise it becomes simply anecdotal. The other thing in a court challenge, the way that the courts typically look at this, is they want to make sure that if we step in, in Congress, and the national legislature acts, that we are acting in a way that is "the least restrictive means necessary of achieving the policy goal." And that's the ground on which the court looks to Congress to step in and choose the least restrictive means necessary. So if you look at the V-chip, what we were doing is we were saying that the broadcasters and the cable

operators and the movie industry and the rest of them, they themselves would rate their own programming. The government would not step in. Government officials would not rate the programming and regulate it in that way. The industry would do so voluntarily, okay? If, however, the broadcaster, the cable operator, the programmer, rated their program according to this new rating system, then the law said if you rate, then you should send the protocol and transmit the rating electronically so the V-chip in the TV could work. As television migrates to computers, this is actually easier because everyone can download the software necessary to block and things like that because the facility of the device is more flexible. But televisions, the state of the television industry, was such that they're built, they're on the shelf, you buy them, and it's hard to download anything into them. They're sort of hard-wired. So you actually had to include the V-chip technology in the set. And that's what the law did. It mandated that it was there. Ironically, the V-chip is sort of a misnomer because the chip was already in the set. The chip, itself, was the closed-captioning chip that Congress had mandated as part of the Americans With Disabilities Act. The engineers who were pulling that closed-captioning chip together and doing the standard protocol to put that in, pursuant to the ADA, had extra room on it and decided they were going to put in content indicators so that you could turn on the closed-captioning chip, if you wanted that, and you could also have content indicators to

have a rating system. The engineers knew that that was possible. On the board of the engineering group were representatives of the networks, and they told the engineers to take it out, which is why Congress had to step in and say put it back in, okay? And so that is sort of the legislative history, sort of informs all of that and that's how you get to something that which is not only sustainable, but is in fact rarely challenged as a result.

MS. DONAHUE: So let's open it up to the floor.

MS. GUERNSEY: Hi. Thank you. My name is Lisa Guernsey. I'm a freelance reporter, and I did a book last year about screen time in children zero to five. There was a piece in the *Post* this Sunday about content for young children and how parents like myself are often very confused really about well what are kids really even picking up from what they're seeing? I'm curious about, from the parents' perspective, and perhaps this comes into regulation, but it also may just be about education and awareness. I'm curious about what steps are being taken to help parents figure out which programs are even labeled "EI," which ones the V-chip ratings actually relate to when it comes to particular ages, like what a five-year-old understands versus what an eight-year-old does. And I'm thinking about my own experience at home. We use a digital video recorder, which is a fabulous tool, and I think a lot of parents are finding it to be very useful. But when we do that and we see all of the lists of programs available, there's absolutely no way to

know what programs are actually educational on that list, on that kind of that guide on the screen. There's certainly no TV fantasy violence kind of rating listed there at all. There's no way to know which ones are even part of the "EI," like which ones are part of this three-hour rule. So is there a way, or maybe there is some movement in this direction for even the cable companies, the people who make these devices to help parents with this? Thank you.

MS. DONAHUE: I'm going to let Amy take it and then Colin.

MS. JORDAN: Okay. I think that's a really good question, Lisa. Two things come to mind. One is, based on our research with parents through the Annenberg Public Policy Center, we know that parents feel really lost when it comes to this sea of children's shows that are out there. And, you know, in our particular market in any given week there are literally hundreds of shows, if you just have basic cable, not even digital cable that they have to try and pick and choose from. I'll speak to the "EI" logo in particular, and then I'll let Colin speak to some of the efforts that might be being made in the digital area. So right now, the commercial broadcast stations, and that doesn't include cable, although I notice some cable shows will label their programs "EI," do have to have a little bug on screen and it runs throughout the program. It used to run just through the first five seconds, but now it runs throughout. So if you're

watching with your child, you'll know that the show is educational and informational. And there are probably certain channels -- I know that there are certain channels that parents say they trust to offer always educational programming, like PBS, so they don't even feel like they need to look it up. But we have the experience this year of identifying all the educational programs, and then also all of the children's programs. And we had such a time of it, trying to find all the shows that are out there, and which ones were supposed to be educational, which ones weren't. We ended up going to the websites of the stations, and we went to one website, the website that airs -- or the station that airs "Gossip Girl" -- what is that? WB or CW, right, the new station. And it was labeled as an educational and informational program for children. And if you know "Gossip Girls," you know that it's about as far away from educational and for children as it can get, even though it's probably a perfectly fine show for adults and older kids. So I think that even the stations, themselves, they're supposed to have a liaison, right, that they've identified that can answer questions? They didn't have liaisons when we called them up. So, it is challenging, I think, for parents to find it. Again, to get back to my point of the need for evaluation and follow up, so you can put the rules on the books. It did result in a change of what was available on ABC and CBS and NBC. They didn't abandon the child audience. There is educational

programming out there, but darned if parents can find it, and darned if parents know about the three-hour rule.

MR. CROWELL: I would say there are several things that are ongoing, and we actually did a hearing on this just a little over a year ago, and essentially what you have is a situation where you don't want Congress stepping in in each and every instance, particularly with respect to things that are content sensitive. So the industry, itself, has to rate and then it's up to the marketplace and parents and watchdog groups to make sure that those ratings are accurate. And you mentioned one which was not. Univision, the Spanish-language broadcaster, was recently fined by the FCC for having Spanish-language telenovelas, you know, as their, you know, educational and informational content that was found quite devoid of educational and informational content for young children, regardless of what the ratings are in Spanish-language households for it. And that was a major fine, I think, and sent a very strong message to the rest of the industry, okay, that the FCC was going to take this serious when it came time for license renewal. With respect to having the information more readily available to parents and helping parents find it, there are several things, including some of the things that we worked on. One was Chairman Markey had a meeting with the publishers of *TV Guide*. *TV Guide* was not putting the ratings in the television guide, and so for the 20-something-million households who



subscribe to that and get that and it sits on the coffee table and they peruse through it, there were no ratings in there. We pointed that out to them. They have changed their policy, and if you look at *TV Guide* now, it now includes the ratings for the shows in the *Guide* itself. Okay? So what you have is you have those people who might be using the *TV Guide* get that in a -- and if you've seen *TV Guide* lately, a font size that even at my age and as my eyes start to go, it would be hard to discern. But, it is a step and can help in some areas.

One of the other things that we have suggested to the industry is, for parents in the home who are trying, is to have an audio component to the ratings when the show first comes on. So right now it flashes on the screen for five seconds, you know, what the rating is in the corner of the screen, and if you happen to be out of the room or just around the corner as the next show is coming on, it might be useful if there was an audio announcement that says the rating aloud so that the parent could hear it and come back in the room or what have you. The other thing is that the ratings often came at the top of the hour, and then you never see it again, okay? And so what we had suggested was that the rating should come on as well after each commercial break, okay? So if a parent is with the child, even if the parent is flipping channels and is coming out of a commercial and the show is starting, the rating should come back on, okay? And that is another suggestion we made.

In digital, as the television industry goes to digital technology, there is a greater facility to send information. The versatility of the digital transmissions is that information can be sent which supplements the TV ratings in a way over the air so that the program guides can become more feature rich, can become more interactive, you can have search functions if you're looking specifically for EI. There's no reason why that can't be a search function, okay?. And particularly with the satellite and with the cable systems to set-top boxes certainly have that feature and functionality in it. And so that's something that also we should encourage and push the industry to try to adopt those things. There were all things that been mentioned that, you know, at the hearing and that we thought we could follow up on.

MS. DONAHUE: I think we have time for one more question.

SPEAKER: Hi. I'm (inaudible) I'm a pediatrician, internist, and adolescent medicine specialist at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and a Fellow at the Center for Prevention of School Violence, and my question relates to what is the role of government and policymaking as it relates to mediums that have not traditionally been regulated.

For instance, all of us have probably seen many of the YouTube demonstrations of girls fighting each other or just people fighting in

general. And, so, my question really is how do we -- is there a role for policy development in those particular forums or platforms?

MS. DONAHUE: Right. That's a great question.

SPEAKER: I would say just briefly the role of government generally in this area, because of the First Amendment, is properly limited. Okay? And, so, to the extent to which the government is going to step in, again, there needs to be a direct sort of persuasive casual connection between what's present and what the harm is, and, so, we would have to discern that, we'd have to have hearings on it, there would have to be the supporting evidence from the medical community and other areas to act.

This has been the case with respect to sort of violence in videogames, for example, and, so, Congress often uses the bully pulpit or hortatory rhetoric to kind of encourage the industry to do that which would make the parents feel they're being responsive, and, so, the videogame industry has ratings like that.

One of the things in the new media that, as you see, the ratings and video move to the Internet, we have a hearing next week, for example. I mentioned the closed captioning chip. That is something where closed captioning is on the evening on Desperate Housewives, but when you shift and move that to iTunes and you sell it for \$1.99 and you download it to your computer, the question is: Are the closed captions required to go to your computer?

So, on the device that's sitting over here it's available, but when you download it a day later, it may not be available, and that goes to your You Tube example.

The one thing that we have tried to do, and I'll just mention this because I know the Internet is one of those areas where parents are particularly concerned, Congressman Markey and a Republican on the committee several years ago passed an Internet Bill for children because the U.S. Government actually owns the domain of the dot U.S. domain, so, you have dot com, dot net, dot org. Well, dot U.S. is help by the U.S. Government and is on a subcontract is out there. We created the dot kids dot U.S. domain. On that domain are just Web sites that are for kids and there's no commercialization. You can't find any link outside that domain to problematic areas of the Internet.

So, if you get your kids in there, unless they're going to start to type the url themselves, there's no way they can link. Okay? There's no online chats to deal with issues and concerns of parents about child predators online in that area. But that is a domain that, again, do parents know about it?

MS. DONAHUE: No.

SPEAKER: No. Because parents don't know about it, there's no commercialization, what's on there? Great Web sites from the Smithsonian. Okay? Various other Web sites. That is government trying

to use positive ways of kind of frontloading and getting good, healthy information out there to kids so parents can feel comfortable, but, again, parents need to know about it, they need to have the facility to kind of get their kids there, set the browser so that they're only there, but it's an example of what can Congress do. Well, you can try something like that. Regulating the Internet is a really tough one. Okay? So, you can try that limited, kind of positive way.

MS. DONAHUE: Amy, you --

MS. JORDAN: Yes, I'd like to say something very specific to your comment which I think it's really critical as we're considering what new research we need to be thinking about the child audience in a less monolithic way, so we've broken up the child audience in terms of age, in terms of gender, in terms of race or ethnicity, but we really haven't been thinking about vulnerable children who may be seeking out certain kinds of media content that may exacerbate issues for them. So, I would argue that we need to develop a better understanding of who these groups of children are and how they use media in ways that are detrimental to their healthy development.

But I would also argue, and I guess maybe we'll close on this now, that media can be really wonderful for children who are vulnerable in different ways. Let's say autistic or have physical limitations, and media can really open up their worlds, and as a communications researcher, we

really haven't done anything to understand how these populations of children are really thriving with the new kinds of media content that are out there, so, I would say we need to think about vulnerable children in every way possible and understand how media plays such a robust role in their lives.

MS. DONAHUE: That's a perfect launching pad to get to our next panel, and I just want to sort of echo what Amy just said.

One of the interesting findings in the volume is that when you look at how kids use these social networking sites, which is one of the things that gives parents so much angst, they generally use them the way they used to. They're not talking to strangers by and large, they're talking to their friends. So, it's a different platform for what they used to do.

Is their audience broader, do they have more friends than they used to? Yes, but that's not necessarily a bad thing. But the idea that kids are online talking to would-be predators is a very small, small part of the population, and what we found is that, generally, kids are taking their offline behavior and using it online. But does that mean that the troubled child who would have inappropriately talked to a stranger now has a bigger universe to do so? Yes.

And, so, we need to teach manners to kids and rules and protocols the same way you teach your kids if some guy in a van comes

by and says can you help me find my dog, you say no and you run the other way, we have to teach kids the same sort of sense stuff on the Internet, but I do think it is a myth that children are on the Internet talking to strangers.

And to echo Amy's second point is when they do talk to strangers, it's not all for ill. A lot of kids who need information, and this gets us into the next panel, on health, things they're afraid to ask questions out loud, find information from the Internet that can help them make good, healthy decisions, so, I think sort of the fear of the Internet has to be coupled with the things that kids can get from the Internet that are really wonderful, and we're going to get great examples of that right now.

Don't get up. We're not taking a break; we're just shifting.

MR. HASKINS: I'm Ron Haskins, senior fellow here at Brookings, and also at the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and I want to introduce this session with some very zippy and original sayings that you're all going to want to write down and remember; these are very clever.

The first is: We want to fight fire with fire, and the second is: We want to practice what we preach.

So, the point of this panel, as Elizabeth already said about fire with fire, is that we think to offset the negative messages that kids get,

whether it has to do with drugs or violence or sex or whatever it happens to be, that we need to offset those messages with positive messages and programming that appeals to kids in a positive way. And, of course, if we could do that and figure out ever better ways to use the new media and the old media and all the media to do it, we would be practicing what we preach.

And on this panel, we are going to show you how people have thought of this before and are actually doing it and doing it in quite an interesting way.

And the last original thing I want to say before we hear from the Panel is that I'm very nervous about this panel because all of them have fancy PowerPoints that have videos built into the PowerPoints and so forth, and I'm going to be shocked if this comes off without some hitches, but all these folks, who you can tell are somewhat younger than I am, they think it's all fine, so, I hope they're right.

We're going to begin with Doug Evans, who's from the Research Triangle Institute and also an author of one of the papers in the volume about positive social messages.

Tina Hoff from the Kaiser Family Foundation came all the way from California. I'm really grateful to her.

Marisa Nightingale, who's often here at Brookings, who's office is right across the street, the National Campaign to Prevent Teen



Pregnancy, and also one of the authors of the policy brief that all of you may have gotten. If not, it's available outside.

And then, finally, Peter Klaus from Fleishman-Hillard.

So, let's begin with Doug. Thank you.

(Pause)

MR. EVANS: Thanks very much. I want to briefly talk about social marketing in relation to children's media use today, and I want to also thank the editors of the *Future of Children* for giving me the opportunity to write an article for this volume. It was an exciting opportunity, and I really enjoyed working on it.

What I'm going to talk to you about today is social marketing and how it can be applied to the issue of children's media use and how it can be potentially a protective factor that we can use as an intervention strategy to promote more healthful media use. Not necessarily stop it, because I don't think that's really the issue, and it's not something we could do even if we wanted to.

So, let me just say a little bit about what social marketing is. People hear that phrase; it's not always that clear what it is and how it relates to health communication, for example. But, basically, social marketing is the use of commercial marketing techniques to benefit society and to change social behavior.

In particular, it's been used a lot in public health to change health behaviors in tobacco, obesity, HIV-AIDS, in particular, and there's a lot of evidence accumulating now that it is effective in changing many health behaviors. The three that I mentioned are among those where there's the best evidence. There seems to be a growing consensus that social marketing is most effective in changing single choice kinds of behavior, so, I decided to drink 1 percent milk as opposed to whole milk is a lot easier than changing a behavior that requires continual maintenance, continual decision-making, and I think we can see intuitively why that might be true.

So, deciding not to become a smoker, for example, might be a little bit more difficult than choosing to just switch to a different kind of milk. Choosing to always use a condom when engaging in sexual intercourse might be a little bit harder. But there is evidence from those areas that shows that social marketing is effective in changing health behavior.

In particular, there's growing evidence for some specific strategies within social marketing, which, after all, is really applying the principles of commercial marketing, the same ones that we've been talking about earlier today, potentially talking about regulating them and turning those around and using them to promote more healthful behaviors.

The use of branding in particular is one strategy that I've done a lot of work on that there's now growing evidence works. You can brand healthful behaviors the same way that you can brand products. You can brand healthy lifestyles, for example, and I'm going to talk about that in a second.

There's more rigorous research to echo the comments that Amy Jordan made earlier. Much more rigorous research is needed on the mechanisms by which social marketing affects health behavior.

So, how does it work? Well, from what we know at this point, it works in many of the same ways that commercial marketing works. You build a relationship between a brand or a message or an audience and you increase the perceived value of the behavior, one that might not seem particularly desirable, like limiting media use, for example. I want to use more media. Well, why would it be beneficial to me to limit media use? That might be the kernel of the message that we might develop.

And, also, the notion of developing alternatives to unhealthy behaviors. It's really the idea of competition, which is, obviously, central to marketing. If you want somebody to change their behavior, well, what's the benefit that you're offering instead of what they're doing right now, and we need to think a lot more about that.

There are some good examples in social marketing of how we've successfully done that, and I think we can apply that to the topic of

media use. Also, giving people opportunity is giving them situations in which they can engage in the behavior I think is essential.

There are a lot of publications out there now on branding in particular. Examples like that Truth Campaign, which many of you may have heard of or the Verb Campaign that promoted physical activity in tweens. A lot of work that's been done overseas, like the Love Life Campaign to promote ABC, Abstinence Being Faithful in Condom Use, in South Africa. I've done some work on that. This is just a little example of an event that the Love Life Campaign did, and one of the things that's interesting about this is it's not only a media campaign, but it's a social engagement campaign. You can go to an event, you can do things, you can become part of something that's bigger than just you, and you can see that a lot of other people are doing it, too. You can generate social movements around an issue. I think there's every reason to think we can do that around children's media use.

Also, obviously, since we're talking about kids, parent-child engagement's a big issue. Parents are going to be the ones in many cases, especially with younger kids, who are promoting the behavior. We may want to develop messages aimed at kids, but we may also want to, in tandem, develop messages aimed at parents so that they can be the influencers of kids.

So, there are a number of ways we can do that. One way is with what I would call traditional PSA campaigns, basically just a public service announcement aimed at an audience, informing them about a health issue or trying to promote them to do something about it. The TV Boss Campaign is one that's out there that's promoting the use of V Chips and other TV use regulation, and then there are more multi-channel kinds of campaigns. I just showed you an example a second ago. Another one that's focused on media use, among other things, is the 5-4-3-2-1 Go Campaign, which is an obesity prevention social marketing effort in Chicago that I'm working on. And you can also, along with strategies like that, combine strategies; you can try to promote more parental involvement in communication with kids.

So, what I'm going to do very quickly is pray that this works, and I am going to just show you a current campaign, which you can decide what think of for yourself, but it is an example of something that's out there right now, and here we go.

(Video plays)

MR. EVANS: Okay, that was the Spanish test. Actually, I meant for the English one to go first, so, let's do that one now.

(Video plays)

MR. EVANS: We like laughter.

So, what's the future here? Social marketing in media use. The commercial marketers will always have a lot more money. How are we going to compete with that? We need to develop more persuasive and competing brands, we need to think about what kind of social mobilization we want.

What do we want people to do, and what kinds of impacts do we want? Not just individual behavior, but also upstream on policies and other aspects of the social environment that we all live in, and we probably want to target both parents and kids with different messages, and I think most importantly, we don't want to just tell people no. There's also an accumulation of evidence that negative social marketing messages tend to be less effective than more positive behavior promoting messages. We don't want to demonize media use, and we want to think about how can we brand more healthful media use.

So, I'll end on that note.

MR. HASKINS: So, Tina Hoff from Kaiser Foundation.

Thank you.

MS. HOFF: Great. Thanks for having me here today.

By way of just a brief introduction, you've heard a little bit about some of our work in the earlier panel. We're an operating foundation based in California. We have an office here in Washington, so, I would normally say to a Washington crowd you might be more familiar

with our health policy work, but, actually, for this crowd, you may be more familiar with some of the work that we do to study the effects of media which were referenced by some of the other panelists up here and are in the report.

The program that I am representing today is our work with media. For more than 10 years now, we've partnered with some of the leading media companies in the U.S. to undertake media campaigns that address social issues. A major priority of ours is on HIV-AIDS.

In all of these campaigns, we use a variety of media technologies, including both traditional and new media. I think what best defines our approach is to go where the audience goes. Looking at and thinking about new media here today, it obviously can mean a lot of different things to different people.

For me, new media is basically about the use of technology that helps anyone communicate with virtually everyone or at least the people that you want to talk to, and I thought *Time Magazine* sort of set it up really well a couple of years ago when they made you their person of the year, which was really reflecting the increasing involvement of the audience in the development of content, making basically the user the producer of content, and that's sort of where I'm going to draw from in the examples of some of the work that we've done, and, very specifically, how we're using that kind of new media technology to make an issue like HIV-

AIDS more personal. So, for our audience, which is teens and young adults, how you make HIV an issue that's relevant for them today.

And I'm going to focus on three examples, three recent examples from our campaign with MTV, which has been ongoing for about 10 years. These are some more recent examples in how we're beginning to bring new media into the work with traditional media, and I think you're going to see a lot of traditional media increasingly playing on this technology, too, and messages going off air and onto other platforms.

So, the first example is from a program that we did two years ago called *Think HIV, This is Me*. It was the first show that MTV did that was entirely made up of user-generated content, and that's a sort of new media buzzword that gets used a lot, and basically means the audience creates the content. In conjunction with the show, we also did a complimentary vlogging contest. That's video blogging.

We wanted to extend the reach of the young people who are featured in the show onto the Web site and to bring in a larger group of people, so, we had young people compete to be their state vlogger on HIV, working in conjunction with the National Association of State and Territorial AIDS Directors, we selected representatives from each state.

I'm going to show you a clip from the show that I think will give you a little bit of a flavor of what the content looked like.

(Video plays)



MS. HOFF: So, as you can see, it's not exactly the kind of slick, sort of produced program that a lot of MTV content is. It was very raw, it was very intimate portraits. That was a little clip from the intro. It was much more in the vein of the kinds of things that you might see on You Tube today or MySpace and something that we're really seeing our audience respond to and also bring them into the messaging.

Another project that we're doing is a contest that's underway right now with MTV involving the hip-hop artist Common, and we had young people compete to develop lyrics about HIV testing, and the winner is going to have their winning lyric performed on MTV by Common, and this grew out of actually a campaign that we did with Common and some other artists a few years ago where we had them use their creative talents to develop messages, and we thought let's get the audience involved in doing this, as well. Everybody wants to be the next American Idol, the next superstar; let's give them a chance to do it, and we got a great response off of the campaign, and we had more than 2,000 young people submit entries. Many of them were video entries, and I'm going to show you an example of one in a few minutes.

So, first, let's take a look at this clip that ran to promote the contest on MTV, and you can see a little, hear a little bit more about how the contest works.

(Video plays)

MS. HOFF: And here's a sample of the kind of submissions that we're getting.

(Video plays)

MS. HOFF: So, we thought that was pretty good considering we pay ad agencies a lot more to develop concepts. I thought this one was pretty good and good to go. This isn't the winning one yet. We've got some other great submissions. They'll be released in June and lead up to National HIV Testing Day.

And, lastly, and I think I just have one minute left myself, the last example is a texting campaign, texting service that we're offering through our MTV campaign.

Since the beginning of our work with media, we've always offered information references. In the past, that's been a toll-free hotline and Web sites, and we continue to offer those services, but we wanted to see what we could do with mobile phones, given that we were realizing most of our audience was on the phone while they were watching our programming.

So, we launched a pilot project where you can text in your ZIP code to a special short code to know it, and you get back the closest testing center. We tap into the CDC's database and we work with them to identify testing locations and we got a great response off of it.

In the two months that we did a pilot, we promoted it on MTV, we had 50,000 young people text in to get a testing center, so, we're looking at how we can expand that and what other content we can distribute through phones.

So, with that, I will wrap it up and turn it over to Marisa.

MR. HASKINS: Marisa Nightingale from the National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy. See, I remembered it.

MS. NIGHTINGALE: Thank you. Good morning. Thanks everybody for having me.

The campaign is a private non-profit that you can read more about in the material, so, I won't go into too much detail, but we, similar to the Kaiser Family Foundation, work in partnership with the media to try to get positive messages out. So, while the bulk of our media work really is to integrate messages into the content of television shows, magazines, that's not what I'm going to talk about today because Ron asked us to give examples of something that was more new media. So, that's what I'm going to do.

And so far everything has worked well, so, I hope I don't break that. Okay.

So, we have a new PSA campaign for teens, and PSA, Public Service Advertising, can help bolster what's going on in content, it

can also get you into environments where you're really not going to get a story about teen pregnancy like in a skateboarding magazine or a music Web site, so, it's really important to have this kind of attention-grabber for our audience in particular.

The objective of our campaign was, as some of the folks earlier talked about, not to scold teens or bully them, but to try to come at it in a more positive way and help them feel like the stage of life they're in right now is something to be celebrated and to hang on to, and the fastest way to lost that is to become a parent as a teenager.

So, the core message is you're a teen, stay that way. Not all the words in the campaign are necessarily sunshiny and positive, although the concept of the campaign is positive. And what I mean by that is the campaign is really -- this is sort of an anatomy of the ads. It's trying to get teens to tell us the words they use to describe themselves or their friends, using images of things that they do in their daily lives. The tagline on this particular ad, because I don't think you can read it, is "One of our three girls gets pregnant before age 20. I'm not going to be the one."

And, just like Tina, we honed in on the *Time Magazine* person of the year is you message because really the hallmark of new media, as you probably know, is that it's not just a passive consumption of messages. What makes something considered new media is when you, the audience member, become a part of it; you watch it when and how you

want to, on your iPod, on your computer. You become a generator of content, you create things, you upload your own photos, you use your own words to describe what's going on, and then you can also comment on it and share it. So, we wanted to have all of those elements in this campaign to really make it live in the environments where we know our audience is.

So, we have television ads that were shot by teens across the country. I'm going to show you a couple of them since time only allows for a few, but you can go to our Web site and watch all of them if you want.

(Video plays)

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: That one ran on American Idol, which made us all faint. But, as you can see, these ads, they've been placed in traditional media, they've run on broadcast television and cable, but also on the Internet, and I'm going to get into that more in a second.

The print versions are very similar. Teens doing things that they like to do, using words that really came from them. This was all teen-generated.

Can you guys read this? Okay.

So, some of the placements for the print campaign were also, like I said, in places where you wouldn't really see a story or a feature article about teen pregnancy, particularly in magazines that

teenage boys read, like ones that focus on gaming and skateboarding, but it's where we really needed to have our messages.

So, when people ask, they'll say, how do you define success of an ad campaign like this, I think there are really two levels.

One is the visibility in reach, which is a pretty traditional way to measure the success of an ad campaign, and the other is for our purposes, did they create conversation among the target audience because the big obstacle in the teen pregnancy prevention world is still that teens think it's just not going to happen to them. So, anything we can do to personalize that risk and get them to really own the message, we feel like that's success.

And it's not always measured by how much they like it; it's how much did they react to it. So, on visibility and reach, it's been very successful, it's won two advertising awards.

What's notable here is 450,000 online video views, which means that teens are choosing to watch them in addition to just having it served up to them while they're watching Idol.

I'm not going to take the time to read these out to you, but I'll just read the first two lines of this one. This is a comment on our MySpace page. "When I first saw a Stay Teen commercial, I was disgusted. All I thought about was no, sex is good, sex is fun, but the commercial stuck on (sic) on my head long enough for me to have an epiphany and decide I

don't want to ruin the best years of my life. If I ever do have children, I want to tell them how much fun I had as a teenager. I want to be a good role model for my children." And it goes on.

We have a Web site that is that online home for this campaign where there's more information. You can do a mash-up, which means create your own ad, upload your own video. And I think, as I mentioned before, we did a contest with MySpace where people could enter, create their own ad, and I have the winner. I don't know if I have time to show it. It's 15 seconds.

MR. HASKINS: No, let's --

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: Okay.

(Video plays)

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: As you can see, teens are owning this campaign, they're making it their own, they're hearing it, and that's our goal.

MR. HASKINS: Thank you.

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: So, thanks, you guys.

MR. HASKINS: Peter Klaus.

MR. KLAUS: Good morning. As I scroll back to the beginning, I am Peter Klaus. I am with Fleishman-Hillard, an international communications firm. We have offices around the world, but we are D.C. has about 250 people, 50 of which are dedicated digital

professionals. I am a senior strategist on that team, and our job is to work with our traditional colleagues to bring best digital practices to our communications work.

And the program that I'm going to present today is not focused on a teen audience or a youth audience, but it focuses on members of the military who are enlisted between the ages of 18 and 24, and we still believe this is relevant because, 10 years ago, this audience had the Internet, they grew up with it, so, a lot of these applications, we apply to a variety of our social marketing programs.

This particular campaign won the International Webby Award in 2007 for best healthcare Web site, besting Web MD. Our team also the Webby Award in 2006 for a campaign we do for the White House National Office of Drug Control Policy. You may have seen it, "What's Your Anti-Drug?" or "Parents, the Anti-Drug."

So, we really feel we have a hand on how to best integrate these digital elements to really achieve awareness because we're not only competing with a lot of commercial interests, as you can see, there are a lot fantastic campaigns out there, and our job for our clients is to make sure that ours are seen.

So, to begin, the Department of Defense came to us with a challenge, binge drinking. The binge drinking rate is 56 percent in the 18



to 25-year-old active duty military population, and we were brought in, so, how can we develop a media campaign to bring that number down?

So, we had several objectives. Obviously, to help reduce alcohol abuse among active duty military, raise the awareness of the negative effects of excessive drinking, and motivate installations and international partners to actually take this campaign and make it their own in local areas.

So, of course, like most people who focus on these campaigns, we began with research, looking at the existing surveys, doing an audit an analysis of specific alcohol abuse and prevention programs that existed in the military already and conducting focus groups. Whenever we approach our development of media campaigns, we always talk to the target audience first, and not just the beginning, but throughout the lifecycle of the program so we can ensure that we're reaching them in ways that they perceive to be effective.

So, again, what we found from this sort of review of research was that, again, our primary audience was this military classification, enlisted service members age 18 to 24. We found that the culture really does endorse drinking, and the specific definition of binge drinking is five drinks or more on the same occasion, and most of the people that we spoke to in the focus group said that's just getting started for us, so, don't come to us with that message, so, we realized that we had to tweak that

message, but we had to be sort of moving away from that textbook definition of binge drinking and really talk more about control, which we'll talk about in a second.

These folks do feel stressed, they feel frustration and boredom. The lack a lot of control at this point in their lives, so, we knew that that theme of control was going to resonate with this audience, which is often repeated, I think, when we talk about these types of campaigns with young people that the long-term consequences weren't exactly resonating as much as those factors affect them on a daily basis. Embarrassment among peers, loss of control, things of that nature.

But, as we were questioning them about this topic, we really found that they were uncomfortable with being associated with being out of control or their drinking was a concern, so, that was sort of a hint for us. We found, again, that humor and being entertained was a way into getting them to discuss this issue, and they definitely told us that a military look and feel or a top down feel is not something that they were interested or that would resonate with them.

So, we knew we had to start with some type of umbrella brand or theme to begin communicating messages that we thought might work, so, after reviewing that research, and because they lack a lot of control at present in their lives when they're in the military, this theme of control came about, and, so, when went into our initial round of testing, we

came up with taglines and brands like always on-duty, and what they told us was I'm already always on-duty, I don't always want to be on-duty. So, we had to go back to the drawing board and get a little bit more creative and subtle about the approach that we would use.

So, we knew what our strategies were, to use humor and entertainment to grab attention, use non-traditional and innovative approaches. We knew that this would be an Internet-focused campaign because it's available 24-7, with traditional media offshoots to let them know about what was going on the Web site.

So, essentially the campaign we came up with was that guy, really trying to sort of rally them around this concept of we all know who that guy is, what his behavior patterns are, and not wanting to get out of control, so, it's not about don't have more five drinks, it's about not getting out of control. We've all seen that guy during the testing, everybody knew that person, but never admitted that they had ever been that person.

So, as we developed the campaign, we knew that we had to start somewhere. In terms of this initial testing with the target audience, so, we worked with our creative team to develop the visual execution, things, again, that we thought might work. We didn't just assume, okay, we've done this initial round of research, let's have our best go at it and develop a Web site, develop all these materials. We knew that this had to be tested, and it really did impact the types of materials and development

of the Web site. Once we sort of done that, we knew we had to pilot these activities, so, we went to four different bases to really get firsthand input into what we were doing.

And this is a screen shot of the Web site, and I think you'll agree that it's not very traditional. I mean, if you were to land on the site, there's no order for content, there's no necessary direction that you can take, and this really came from a lot of the feedback we received, which is this is an audience that's used to gaming a lot, they're used to exploring things. We didn't want to tell them what to do; the entire intention is for them to navigate through this city environment and to sort of figure out which pieces are most relevant to them. Again, entertaining them, while at the same time conveying a lot of these messages.

To complement this and to let them know that that Web site-enriched environment existed, we worked on base and in the communities around bases, putting things on buses, billboards, things of that nature to let them know about it. Coasters that went into the bars and a lot of the areas where these guys were actually drinking, so, they were being intercepted with that messaging right where the behavior was taking place.

We also created a profile page on MySpace which looks somewhat similar to the Web site, and get a lot of questioning often. Well, if you invested so much money in this Web site, why the heck would you

need to spend a bunch of money on a MySpace page, as well? And I think really what's happening is these tools allow you to communicate in a two-way direction with this youth audience, and it's something they're doing with each other and it's something that they increasing expect of even those of us who are trying to reach them with health messages. It's not just about anymore what we have to say, here it is. When they hear something and they have questions, they need to find some mechanism to interact with us so that we can provide feedback and provide additional counseling, and I don't think that's a role that many of us in this field are used to doing or necessarily are comfortable with doing.

So, there are a variety of broadcast elements, and I'm running out of time here, but I do want to show, if I can find my mouse, one of the advertisements which can be found on the MySpace page.

(Video plays)

MR. KLAUS: And the context here is that he's imagining how it did happen and then the reality of actually what did happen.

(Video plays)

MR. KLAUS: So, that's just a sort of depiction of what that looks like, it appears in movie theaters on the bases, again, on the MySpace page, and on the Web site, and they're able to actually sort of send this video around and share it, and there's really what we consider ourselves at this point, and I'll end on this point, is that to the point of

content, every organization and every group really has to see itself as its own NBC, its own ABC. We have to get better and more creative about creating content like this. It's not somebody else's job or one off PSAs. We have to think about the development of content as our responsibility and that we should take ownership of making it the best possible so it can compete with in an entertaining and educational way with all the other elements out there.

So, I'll end on that note.

MR. HASKINS: Thank you.

Well, if anybody asks you what you did this morning, I hope you don't tell them that you went to Brookings and watched a guy from the military barf in a bar. This is something I thought I would never see at Brookings, but now I've seen it, so.

And we made it through there without any serious problems, so, that's pretty impressive. Thank you for all the people who handled the technical issues.

I want to ask two brief questions. Please keep the answers brief. All of you do not feel you should answer both of these questions.

But the first thing is, as a parent, what comes out to me in watching this sort of thing is it appears to leave parents completely out. I mean, anything that we saw out there, I think parents, they would laugh just like we did, but they're not necessarily watching it. The kids are

interacting with the people who made the media, and what's the role of parents?

MR. KLAUS: I think the role of parents is extremely important in speaking for the campaign that we do for the White House anti-drug campaign. There is a complete dedicate online research that tells them how to sort of go through the media with their children.

Again, I think the young people want to have the feel of a peer to peer environment, but that doesn't necessarily mean that there shouldn't be a resource for parents that's guiding them through this issue from their perspective, and there is a sort of complimentary media campaign going on at all times with that particular anti-drug campaign where we're coaching parents through sort of the media analysis process and media literacy, I think, is a really important topic.

If we can't stop this media from happening, how can we tell parents to talk about it with their kids to help explain it? When you see that violent video on You Tube, yes, it exists, but what if there was a resource that helped parents figure out how to talk about it with their kids, and we think that that should exist, and it exists on a lot of the campaigns that we work on.

MR. HASKINS: Doug?

MR. EVANS: I think the big issue is developmental stage. I mean, you saw a range of age target audiences in these campaigns.

I mean, the one that I showed, the Parent Speak Up Campaign is aimed really more at tween-aged kids, whereas the others were aimed more at teenage and young adults, and, obviously, the social influences are very different.

I mean, parents are a much greater influence on younger kids, and, as they age, peers become a greater influence. There's actually a danger of turning off teenagers by having parents be the primary influence, so, I think we need to consider that.

MS. NIGHTINGALE: Yes, and I just want to add to that. I mean, at the campaign, we have a lot for parents. We encourage them to actually watch the CW and go on MySpace and first get familiar with what their kids are doing and where they are so that they can talk about it, but the ads that we create for teens can't feel like a parent has come in, or even that our campaign has come in. I mean, you guys all notice from those ads, they feel like they're made by teens for other teens, and our logo is on there on purpose.

MS. HOFF: Right. I think we have exactly the same philosophy, and you have to know your audience, so, you direct your campaign at a particular audience. Our campaign is aimed at parents, are aimed at parents, are aimed at outlets that reach those parents and are messages that direct to them, like that Parents Speak Up Campaign. We've also had a long time Talking With Your Kids Campaign we had



conducted, but our teen campaigns need to be true to them. They can't be their parents PSA campaign.

MR. HASKINS: If you're like I am and you see this stuff and you think, gee, it's amazing and all this great graphics, and I love the chicken one. I watch that whenever I can. They watch that chicken run around, but it does raise the issue for an old-fashioned social scientist like me, how do you know if these things have any impact? How do you really know if your -- what?

SPEAKER: That was my question.

MR. HASKINS: How can you tell if you have an impact? Are you working hard to figure out ways to evaluate the impact of these ads?

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: I'll take the first answer on that.

On our Stay Teen Campaign, we -- right now, we're tracking activity, which is not an evaluation of impact on behavior, and I know that well. So, right now, we're trying to figure out are young people even using it and are they sending it to each other, and we do know from other social science research that if you have somebody from the audience engaged with the message, participate in it, and personalize it, that is a step along the way to behavior change.

But we also have to be careful about our expectations from a PSA campaign. I mean, content work aside, a 15 or 30 second PSA,

unless there's something miraculous about it, it's not going to change a behavior. It can really support other activities, which is our whole goal. It can cause attention to some deeper activities and it's part of a wide range of things that we do.

So, the short answer for are we evaluating Stay Teen is we hope to come up with some impact evaluation in the future, but, right now, we're just trying to figure out are people using it, and I think the answer is yes so far.

MS. HOFF: And we do the same kind of monitoring. I think there are a lot of really great PSA campaigns that never get seen, so, making sure your campaign is actually getting out there is obviously critical in evaluating how anybody is responding to it, and we do that very carefully, as well, and make sure that the message gets out. We also have a direct referral on all of our messages that direct people either to a Web site hotline or mobile service now. Our hotlines connect out to other information resources, including the CDC's hotline for HIV and STDs, and they've told us we account for, across our various campaigns in the U.S., about a third of all of their hotline calls.

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: Wow.

MS. HOFF: So, that's one measure of, obviously, impact for us. We also do audience surveys to understand how the audiences, at least self-reporting response to our campaigns, and we found that the

audience that has seen our messages on MTV or BET does respond differently than those who haven't seen those messages. They're more likely to do the actions that we're looking for, whether that's get tested, think about using condoms, having a conversation with their parents.

MR. HASKINS: Doug?

MR. EVANS: I was just going to say I think one of the challenges here is really to use the new media both as a tool for delivering messages and as a tool for evaluating and conducting research, and there's really a wide range of work that's going on out there from just observational studies to randomize experiments to evaluate campaigns like this.

For the Parents Speak Up Campaign we're doing a randomized trial, but we're doing it online and we're exposing people to messages online, so, there are a wide variety of strategies you can use, but we do need to build the evidence space on how messages work, what the mechanisms are by which they influence audiences so that we can know how to design better messages.

MR. HASKINS: Peter, the campaign that you showed us strikes me as a -- and especially the military because you can get a lot of information and officers can make them do things and so forth, so, they have to participate, and have a very clear goal, which is to reduce binge drinking.

Have you evaluated that, or do you have plans to, or tell us how you would do it?

MR. KLAUS: Yes, it's very interesting. It happens a lot for a firm like ours because we're brought in. People know that we create great media and can get the attention, but, again, we're not brought in as scientists; we're brought in as media people.

So, what happens is there will be a pre-existing piece of research, such as the one that showed that showed 56 percent of that population as binge drinking, so, that particular study in this particular case happens every 3 years. That survey and its results will come out again next year.

The best that we can do in the meantime, except doing nothing, is to create a campaign like this, capture everything that we've known we've put into the atmosphere, see if that has changed when that survey comes out, and then conduct additional research to see if, in fact, drinking went down, how much of a role did this particular campaign play? There are certainly other things going on in the environment.

So, it's very complex, and I think the best that any of us can do in terms of a media campaign is really just being specific about being better about capturing what we do.

For example, is watching a PSA -- does that have the same impact as somebody clicking through a Web site and actually taking a

quiz? Is watching something in a passive nature, does it have less of an impact or more of an impact than actually going and doing something, and I think those are things that are very deep research questions and are certainly beyond my research expertise, but I'm very interested in that, and I look forward to working with folks like those on the first panel and this panel to really try to find out more answers about how do we add this all up and make those connections between the real behavior change and these sort of media activities that we're conducting.

MR. HASKINS: Audience? Questions in the audience?  
Right there in the back on your left?

MR. LEVY: Great work. I really appreciate it. My name is Dan Levy, and I'm the president of the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics and a national spokesperson for the AAP.

And here's my question. I'm involved in all matter of producing media and teaching media literacy and deconstructing media messages, and the biggest uphill battle that I have is selling this concept to schools. I went to the superintendent of Maryland schools, they hired me to do this right after Columbine, and I got nowhere.

So, the question is: In order to sell this to schools, and this is a matter of health policy, in my opinion, you have to convince schools that this has an impact on school performance. I am aware of some research and I'm involved with some research down at Clemson to do just

this, but what evidence do you have that this may improve school performance and how we could possibly use this as a selling point to schools?

MR. HASKINS: Will the people at the microphones make sure that they're on, please? I think that might not have been on.

Anybody on the panel want to --

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: I mean, I can offer a little bit. We get --

MR. HASKINS: You stumped the panel.

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: As far as selling it to schools, I mean -- you mean media literacy as something that they should teach or --

MR. LEVY: (Off mike).

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: Right.

MR. LEVY: (Off mike).

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: Right. Yes.

MR. LEVY: So, how can we reverse that trend and show schools (off mike)?

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: I mean, one thing that we do at the campaign every May, which is Teen Pregnancy Prevention Month, May 7 is the national day to prevent teen pregnancy, and we have an online quiz that we try to get people to take, just as many people as possible, and a number of schools actually use that activity, whether it's health class or

sometimes even English class, where they have their kids just for that day take our quiz online, discuss it, we do discussion guides for teachers.

So, there are things like that where we can kind of on these single opportunities get in there, but I would say a lot of work is done outside the school system with youth programs, after school groups, and media.

MR. HASKINS: Elizabeth?

MS. HOFF: We looked at this issue in the volume of education, and we're actually having a conference next week at Princeton on education and media technology if you'd like to come. It's Friday, May 2.

But what we found was very interesting, is that while there are definitely educational benefits to kids using media outside of school, in schools, the data's a little bit more mixed, and what it really comes down to is the comfort level of the teachers with the technology, and our teacher workforce really has a very low comfort level with technology.

So, what we found is a lot of schools invest in technology and they don't use it, or they use it like they use it a whiteboard the way they used to use a chalkboard, and, so, it's a lot of money going into technology that's not necessarily showing educational outcomes, and, so, what people who are in the field are talking about right now is really going back and taking it not from the students but really going to the teachers

and doing much more training of teachers of what this new technology can do.

MR. HASKINS: Another question? Over here.

MS. SYLVAN: Hi, I'm Julia Sylvan. I work for the American Psychological Association. I'm with the Direct Violence Prevention, and media violence impact on behaviors is a big part of my job.

What I was curious about asking the Panel, one issue I was going to raise is the effect of finance of those campaigns and the difficulty for us and others to get funding for media campaigns, and as the first presenter said about the competition with the commercial marketing.

And, so, I would like to hear from your experience in terms of funding and then using the rationale for how effective it's going to be the use of the money for what the campaign is about, and, also, I would like to know if it's not evaluation, I mean, how can we move forward with this impasse with this discussion when we see so many campaigns and the difficulty for them, for all us to continue to doing those campaigns in this environment of skepticisms about the role of you are doing. So, how do you deal with this?

MR. EVANS: I'll throw one piece in. I think there's a lot in your question, so, I'll just answer one piece of it, which I think was about the effectiveness and what we know about how effective campaigns are.



And one thing that we know is that if you compare a media campaign evaluation affect size in terms of affect size on the intended behavior change, they're typically small when you compare them to, say, a clinical study where you're looking for 40, 50 percent affect size. Some of the largest affect sizes you tend to see in media campaigns are in the 20 percent range, and there have been some metanalysis that found that around 5 to 9 percent is a typical range. For a social scientist, that's a pretty small affect size, but if you're reaching 10 million people, a 5 percent affect size is a big difference.

MS. NIGHTINGDALE: Just two things I'd add quickly that I think that are opportunities that have emerged. I mean, certainly, the marketplace is much more crowded now, there's a lot of issues, but, on the positive side, new media offers a lot more opportunity to target your message and to be your own producer, and you can effectively go out and take over a channel yourself and push out your content if you can reach your right audience.

And, secondly, I think the growth in social marketing efforts from corporate partners also offers opportunity. You always want to be careful about who you're aligning with. Their core interest is probably not the same as yours and it's still their product, but if you can align those interests and get their resources behind- you, I think there's a lot of

opportunity now with corporate entities seeing a value and having a social issue association.

MR. HASKINS: Well, please join me in thanking the members of the Panel. And I'd like to thank the audience and inform you that our next event will be on May 7. We're going to have an interesting program with Becky Blank on low-income moms who are not doing well in the job market and have lost their welfare benefits, so, we'll see you on May 7.

Thank you.

\* \* \* \* \*