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PUTTING BRANDS IN THE PICTURE: CHILDREN’S DRAWINGS OF THEIR FAVOURITE THINGS
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ABSTRACT

This paper reports on the results from a recent and continuing exploratory research project that is concerned to find out more about children’s consumption behaviour by looking at their favourite things and the extent to which brands feature in this repertoire of precious items. The project analysed drawings made by children during a series of classroom visits by the researchers. The resulting compendium provides an interesting look at the objects and possessions that are important to children and demonstrate the extent of their early consumption experience with brands.

BACKGROUND

Marketing to children is on the increase and children’s spending has been doubling every ten years for the past three decades (McNeal 1999; Schor 2004; Linn 2004). The toy market (70:30 traditional toys: video games) was estimated to be worth $85.4 billion in 2003 split between Asia/Oceania 29%, America 41%, and Europe 30%, and Africa 1% (ITCA 2003). Although demand for traditional toys and clothing still dominates the market, there is growing demand for audiovisual, sports and furniture products usually associated with the adult market (Meegan 1993). Electronics and computer-related games are increasingly popular (Kline, Dyer-Witheford and de Peuter 2003; Vowles 1996), and in one Australian study levels of ownership of hi tech products were similar among adults and children (Schiffman et al. 2001). The children’s market has expanded to include products and merchandise associated with celebrity, fashion, television and film (Haynes et al. 1993; Kapur 2005; Marshall and Ffelan 1999; Russell and Tyler 2005).

Socialised consumption

More liberal attitudes to parenting and consumption, increasing household affluence and more integrative consumer socialisation enable children to take a more active and involved role in family purchase behaviour (Lackman and Lanasa 1993; McNeal 1992; Moschis and Churchill 1978; Ward 1974). Moschis (1985) found that this process of socialisation provided a clear guide to children regarding the consumption of particular products and brands. Further, this consumption socialisation contributed significantly to the formation of brand preferences and consumption habits combining, as it does, parental product preference and usage with marketplace information. Children display differing degrees of interest, and influence, depending on the product category with certain categories more central to their consumption. In an Australian study parents rated their children as having most influence in takeaway food and breakfast cereal (Hill et al. 1998). Their influence varied by product category but the research found no consistent effects according to children’s age or gender, family communication or decision type, socioeconomic or marital status. In addition to family influences, peers and mass media can play an important role in developing brand preferences (Gorn and Goldberg 1977; Moschis, Moore and Stanley. 1983; O’Guinn and Schrum 1997).

Branded possessions

Children begin to establish powerful relationships with objects such as ‘soft’ toys that provide some security and comfort as well as using possessions as instruments of control and power, dictating who is, and is not, allowed to play with these favourite things (Gunter and Furnham 1998). Possessions may be important due to intrinsic qualities, for instrumental reasons, other use related factors, effort in acquiring or maintaining possession, emotional and self expressive reasons, or due to personal links to the past or symbolic interrelatedness (Dittmar 1992). Most marketing efforts towards children involve building brands that appeal to children (Lindstrom and Seybold 2003; McNeal 1999) and for some this onslaught of advertising and promotion is encouraging excessive consumption (Linn 2004; Schor 2004). Branding is believed to play an important role in the children’s market and marketers have been keen to emphasise the role of brands and branding in childhood consumption (Acuff 1997; Lindstrom and Seybold 2003; McNeal 1999). In one study over half of the children, 56%, asked for brand name items in their Christmas gift requests (O’mes, Young, and Kyungsung 1994). O’Cass and Clarke (2001), in an Australian study of brand requests at Christmas, reported around 45% of requests for branded items with around one third of the letters containing no mention of brand name in the children’s letters7 to Santa highlighting the extent to which children are brand orientated in their request behaviour.

As brands continue to pervade the enchanted world of childhood there is some concern over the extent to which they have become an integral part of children’s everyday worlds (Langer 2004). There is clearly evidence that even pre-school children can recognise and even request brands (Gotez 2002, Haynes et al. 1993; John 1999). As John notes (1999: p 192) ‘These developments in brand awareness foster a greater understanding of brands and product categories. Children begin to discern similarities and differences among brands, learning the structural aspects of how brands are positioned within a product category. Children also learn about product categories themselves, developing a greater understanding of how product types are grouped together and distinguished from one another. We refer to this type of knowledge about product categories and brands as structural knowledge. Young consumers also begin to understand the symbolic meaning and status accorded to certain types of products and brand names. We refer to this type of knowledge as symbolic knowledge’.

Pre-school children can recall advertised brands especially those names associated with colours, pictures, or cartoon characters (Macklin 1996). Brand awareness and image are two important components of brand knowledge and believed to be key elements in the success of brands (Keller 1993). Other studies show high levels of brand recognition and recall among 4-11 year olds (Ross and Harradine 2002; Brennan 2005). One question is what meanings do these brands carry for the children and are they active in the construction of those meanings or simply succumb to the pressure of the companies promoting them? (Langer 2004)?

Chaplin and John (2005) look at how children use brands to create identities and construct self concepts as
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7 In this study the letters were categorized according to whether there were single, multiple or no brand requests. There was no indication of what proportion of total requested items were for brands.
they move from concrete, (familiarity and ownership), to abstract brand associations (personalities, user stereotypes, reference group influence). They map out this relationship between possessions and self concept highlighting the developmental aspects. Possessions play a greater role in defining self in children over 8 years old (Dixon and Street 1975). By middle childhood research has shown children are able to name multiple brands from cereals, snacks, and toy categories, and to recognise that brands can cover multiple categories (Foxman, Tansuhaj and Ekstrom. 1989; Hite and Hite 1995; McNeal 1992; Omes et. al.1994; Rossiter 1976; Ruben 1974; Ward, Wackman and Wartella; 1977). Yet while the importance of brands has been shown among adolescents the role of brands for younger children is less clear. Ji (2002), looking at the connections children form with brands, found children developed different relationships with a variety of brands embedded within their social environment. A key criterion in this research was the child’s knowledge of the brand name and their ability to recall the brand name as a means to determine that they had established a relationship with the brand.

**Possessions and self**

The individual’s identification with ‘things’ and material objects can help to establish self-not self boundaries in adult consumers (Belk 1987). When asked to identify favourite things it is assumed that those items which individuals list are more central to the self and this has been shown to differ across gender and culture (Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton 1981; Wallendorf and Arnould 1988). Moreover, the attachments also vary over time and the development of the individual, reflecting individuation, i.e., differentiation of self from others and integration, i.e., integration of self with others (Schultz et al. 1989; Myers 1985). How individuals think, feel and behave towards objects reflects their attachment and part of the challenge is in understanding what brands mean to consumers and how their use relates to identity formation (Elliot and Wattanasuwan 1998). But there has been much less work looking at this in relation to children (Elliot and Leonard 2004; Phoenix 2005). Moreover, much of the work on how children understand and interpret brands, particularly in relation to consumption symbolism, has been taken from a developmental perspective (Belk, Bahn and Mayer;1982; Belk et al. 1984, Achenreiner and John 2003). But what is the nature of children’s attachment to goods and what role, if any, do brands play in their everyday lives, or in constructing identities in an increasingly material world? An initial step in identifying the presence and significance of brands in the consumption experiences of young children was undertaken with two New Zealand primary schools.

**METHOD**

In this research we asked children to draw their favourite possessions and then analysed the pictures for brand references in what is a more ‘natural’ and, presumably, embedded set of associations. This was a convenience sample selected through personal contacts with parents who had children at two Dunedin schools. Permission to talk to the children was granted by the school principals who approved this with the classroom teachers and parents. Ethical permission was approved by the University of Otago, New Zealand.

The study concentrated on pre-adolescent children aged between 8 and 11. This age group have exposure to multiple brands and often ask for products by brand name (Achenreiner and John 2003; John 1999; Belk et al. 1984). After discussion with the teachers at each school the classes were split into separate groups for the research sessions. These comprised two with Year 4 children (aged 7 and 8 years) and two with Year 6 children (aged 10 and 11 years). In line with other research practice, the majority of the groups comprised separate groups of boys and girls (Guber and Berry 1993). The sessions were conducted by the two authors in May, 2005 in the regular classrooms of the children to keep the situation as normal and familiar as possible. Each session lasted approximately thirty minutes.

A total of 84 children participated in the sessions, with a mode of eleven children and a maximum of fifteen children in any one group. The Year 4 group consisted of 34 children and the Year 6 group 50 children. The gender split was 62% boys and 48% girls. The classroom teacher attended for part of the session in an informal and observational role. Children were asked to think about their favourite possessions and then to draw them. It was made clear that accuracy of detail and drawing ability were not an issue. What was important was to select from all the things that they ‘treasured’ a maximum of four that they would draw. Drawing was used as the medium of representation in accordance with conventional practice in psychology (DiLeo 1973; Golomb 1992; Thomas and Silk 1990; Zaltman 1997), education (Matthews 1999), media research (Gauntlett 2004; Lealand 2006) and, increasingly, consumer behaviour (McNeal 1992; McNeal and Ji 2003; Macklin 1996; Rossiter 1976c). Drawings can provide rich data that is more reflective and recognises the creative process in individuals not always captured by other more conventional research methods (Gauntlett 2004; Pridmore and Landsdown 1997).

Drawing is seen by children as ‘ordinary’, not requiring any specialised skill, or personal artistic achievement and a natural part of their socialisation (Christensen and James 2000; Zaltman 1997). For children of this age it is also a familiar and rule free activity, that allows them to draw what they value (Dennis 1966). Some have expressed caution over using free drawing but the approach is appropriate where children are happy to talk about the drawings they have produced (Veale 2005). In addition, drawings help create a relaxed atmosphere and provide an alternative way to gain insights into children’s perspectives on the research topic, particularly where these are used as focus group stimulus (Yuen 2004). The justification for using drawing as a way of exploring children’s consumption experiences is, perhaps, best summed up by McNeal and Ji (2003):

*The rich information, both verbal and visual elicited from children’s memory by the drawing technique... suggests that the drawing method is a valid means through which consumer researchers can tap into young consumers’ minds.*

(McNeal and Ji 2003)

The exercise began with the researchers introducing the idea of favourite possessions. The children were asked to describe any items that they brought to school with them that were not directly related to school or school programs. These items were discussed to provide an introduction to and shared context for an understanding of the notion of ‘special’. In addition to providing a self-directed and experiential element to the research context, it also produced an amusing range of items that settled and relaxed the children. Lucky charms, strangely fashioned ‘blu tack’ models and baby-teeth that were missed by the tooth fairy, provided some interesting opportunities for brief Sawyeresque stories. The
discussed then developed to include possessions from home. The children were asked to imagine a scenario where they had a limited amount of time to gather together up to four of their most prized possessions. It was made clear that this should only include ‘things’ and not people (to avoid the difficulties of decisions such as, “What about Granny?”). The children were also told to confine their collection to easily transportable items so that items of furniture, such as bunk beds and desks, would not be included.

It was decided at this stage not to share examples between the children but to end the context-setting exercise with examples of the researcher’s special possessions. This enabled the researcher to select items that, while providing a certain degree of guidance to the children, also avoided the tendency for convergent and emulative behaviour. It was noted in the earlier discussion that a number of children were quick to claim similar contents in their school bags or pockets as each example of a special possession was described. Children were then asked to think about the four items that they treasured most and to draw them. A limit of four drawings was set to minimise fatigue and maintain interest levels, although some of the children drew more than four items. Having less space for each drawing also encouraged less attention to detail. The researcher moved around the room chatting to individuals about their drawings. At the end of the session the children were asked to write down the source of their possessions and then there was a ‘show and tell’ session to conclude the project. These verbal accounts were not recorded but children were encouraged to write on their drawings to help explain what they had drawn. This typically took the form of labels or single names in order to provide some ‘words’ to support the visuals (Veale 2005).

**FINDINGS**

The drawing exercise proved a valuable research tool and all of the children participated in the exercise drawing their favourite things and recalling items and artefacts that they considered to be ‘special’ to them. The exercise generated over 400 images of favourite items and covered a range of product categories dominated by electronics, sports and hobbies, pets, toys, and clothing. The following is a summary of the main findings emerging from the analysis of the drawings. This involved looking at each of the drawings and determining both the nature of the products presented, particularly where brands were indicated in the pictures, and identifying themes and issues that emerged from the data. Children had also annotated and written notes on the drawings, mainly on the back of their work helping with the analysis and interpretation. As with any such drawing much of the interpretation relies on the individual accounts of the pictures.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronics</strong></td>
<td>(29.5%)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaming machine games</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Box</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereo/ Radio/ Speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD Player</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other gaming machines</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD's/ DVD</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/ Laptop</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports and Hobbies</strong></td>
<td>(18.8%)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trophy’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Sports Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and magazines</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorbike/ Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Albums</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pets</strong></td>
<td>(16.9%)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toys &amp; Decorations</strong></td>
<td>(11.8%)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Toys</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1 shows that electronic equipment was the largest product category represented in the favourite things drawings. Games consoles alone accounted for around 10% of all the drawings, followed by television at 7%. Sports and hobbies were the second most popular product category with the majority of drawings being sports related products. Pets proved popular with the children and arguably represent the largest single possessions category, with a large proportion of the drawings depicting pet dogs, cats, and goldfish. Toys accounted for 11.8%, with soft toys representing around 7% of the illustrations. Clothing and furniture each accounted for around 6% of the items with a number of children drawing their bed in the exercise. Other categories included drawings relating to money, cars and food and drink items.

In the drawings we identified about forty different brand names across the groups. The electronics category was dominated by PS2 (Sony) and X-Box (Microsoft) although there was no specific reference to the parent company. Several games console games were drawn including Tony Hawkes, Crash Bandicoot, Motocross Mania, Spyro the Dragon, Tekken (all playstation games). Phillips and Sky were cited in relation to television whereas Sony was named in relation to compact discs (CD). Various artists, such as Green Day, and 50 cents, were cited. Although pets are not specifically branded some of the children identified the breed of their dog and a number wrote down the name of their pet. A number of toy brands were specified including Lego, Warhammer, Duelmaster, Empire Earth and licensed items from Star Wars and The Incredibles. Bratz dolls were drawn along with ‘Pooh’ bear and Noddy characters. No specific brand of furniture was identified but Elementz and Billabong were referred to in the drawings of favourite clothes. Both MacDonald’s and KFC were listed as favourite items, in the case of the former the golden arches featured in the drawing. References were made to Mazda and Ford cars. In a separate exercise where the children drew their rooms Ford duvet covers and various books – The Kazillion Wish, Lord of the Rings, Santa Paws, Princess Diary, Famous Five and Secret Seven – were included in the drawings.

### FIGURE 1
FAVORITE PRODUCTS – GIRL AGED 10.
Despite the reference to some brand names there was a complete absence of any reference to brands in a number of drawings produced by the children (Figure 1). For example, in figure 1, six product categories are represented in the drawing including a soft toy, pets (two), a keyboard and clothes. In addition, money is drawn as a favourite thing, and as something that allows the child to acquire some of these other favourite things. The drawings of food show pizza as a favourite food item and emphasise the breadth of interpretation and imagination of favourite things.

Young children’s automatic and natural association of brands with particular possessions was noticeable in one major product category: computer game consoles. Both Play Station 2 and X Box game consoles featured in a number of drawings along with specific games such as Crash Bandicoots, Spyro and Tekken. Although the game consoles are branded, respectively, by Sony and Microsoft, the parent brands were subsumed under their more ‘generic’ titles (Figure 2). The drawings reveal significant detail - the inclusion of two control pads with individual buttons identified, connecting leads and the brand logo on the console. Children referred to Play Station 2 and X Box, for example, as if these were the names of the product category itself, rather than a particular choice from a range of competing options. This might be a reflection of limited advertising awareness and its potential for brand consolidation is an interesting issue for marketers. In contrast to the work of Hite and Hite (1995), this could be evidence that children are unable to understand the concept of brand extension and cannot associate brand names from different product categories. This is an interesting reflection on the salience of brands and the assimilatory nature of concepts such as reputation, status and quality. Transfer of symbolic and associational values, key components of brand promotion, were not assimilated by these children in accordance with conventional expectations. However, a number of the children talked about the differences between the games consoles and the merits of one over the other, but in relation to concrete aspects as opposed to symbolic differences or personalities.

What is more likely, however, is the effect of the salience of Play Station 2 and X Box as market leaders that are seen as synonymous with the product in the same way that Hoover is both a product and a domestic function. This provides support for the idea that, especially for younger children, brand associations are concrete as opposed to abstract (Chaplin and John 2005). The authors would also agree that for younger children there is less evidence of them using brands for anything other than the intrinsic properties or qualities of the product and there was limited discussion or comment on what the brands meant for the children, beyond being fun to play. The use of drawings to reveal explicit brand references is also in keeping with the notion that younger children rely more heavily on brand images and symbols as product attributes (Ward, Wackman and Wartella 1977). Furthermore, the reference to games consoles was predominantly made by boys, reflecting the gender bias in gaming towards males (Kline et al. 2003).
Another category that featured specific brands was toys. Character motifs such as Bratz dolls (Figure 3), exclusively among the girl’s drawings, and Pooh bears featured prominently. Other merchandised products such as Star Wars figures and Incredibles puzzles were also mentioned. In contrast to the synonymous identification of brand and product in relation to Play Station and X Box, these children made a distinction between particular branded products and their more generic counterparts. That is, they mentioned ‘dolls’ and Bratz dolls, and ‘teddy bears’ and Pooh bears. Again, the detail is in the drawings, revealing the children’s intricate knowledge of the dolls and the differences between the character versions available in the range.

By far the largest single category of favourite possessions was pets, with a large number of children including more than one in their selections. Many of these pets were named in the drawing exercise and described as ‘friends’. The largest category of pets was dogs. An interesting diversion prompted by this research, is the notion of breeds of dogs as brands. With the exception of a single reference to a ‘poodle’ in the drawings, all other descriptions were for non-specific breeds. However, during the post-drawing discussion certain breeds of dog were identified. Labradors, for example, were described as friendly, loyal and family-friendly. In contrast, pit-bull terriers were associated with security, protection and aggression. Such branded associations were commonly shared and strongly agreed.

Although this category of ‘possessions’ is not branded, the source of their acquisition is. Places such as The Pet Warehouse and the SPCA were identified. Similarly a number of children were specific in the sources of other possessions. For example, certain discount shops, such as the $2 Shop, were mentioned as were particular second-hand outlets. This is an interesting addition to the socialisation of consumption research and reveals an exposure to, and awareness of, retail outlets as branded arenas of consumption where children can acquire products. This may reflect the children’s exposure to retail outlets on accompanied and unaccompanied shopping trips. Much of the work in this area focuses on aspects of socialisation such as family decision-making, brand and product preferences and usage behaviours but there is little account of the socialisation of consumption location preferences. The preference for particular brands is complemented, for some, with a preference for certain acquisition sources and retail brands. Such association of products and brands with particular retail sources has interesting implications for retail positioning and brand promotion.

CONCLUSIONS

This drawing exercise revealed somewhat limited reference to brands among young New Zealand school children aged between 8 and 11, perhaps allaying some of the concerns about the branding of childhood (Langer 2004). Although branded goods were evident in the children’s preferences, in the main, their drawings made reference to generic categories of toys and included electrical goods, game consoles and stereos, as well as clothes and pets in their repertoire of favourite things. In the case of games consoles Playstation 2 and X-Box were synonymous with the product categories although there was no specific reference to either Sony or Microsoft brand. This may relate, in part, to the relatively limited competition in the sector and the promotion of specific product features of each console. It is clear that the boys relate to the specific console brand name but in doing so this also ties them into certain games and in turn may be related as much to what their friends own and play with than any ‘brand loyalty’. Boys talked most about games and games consoles, reflecting the gender bias in this category (Kline et al. 2003; Seiter 1993). Other research reports no gender differences in brand requests (O’Cass and Clarke 2001) but in this study more of the boys referred to brands in their drawings. This may be related, in part, to the gender bias towards the more heavily branded games consoles in their drawings but as a group they referred to a broader range of brand names.

References to brands were more prevalent in the drawings of older children than for younger ones and particularly strong in relation to games and toys, lending some support to the idea that brands become more
important as children get older (Caplin and John 2003; Dixon and Street 1975). Interestingly, while clothing featured in the drawing exercise for both age groups references to brands were somewhat. Although some of the older boys referred to certain brands of skateboard and surf clothing.

However, the findings provide limited evidence of brands being used as part of an individuation process as an extension of the self. Indeed, the idea of self appears to be expressed through the use of or ownership of certain products, rather than certain brands. Although this is not unexpected, given the nature of the research context, it does raise the question of the salience of brands in the mind’s eye of the beholders. The merits of different brands are more likely to be discussed in terms of what the product can do, or its play value, rather than in relation to any notion of self image. Perhaps somewhat surprising, was the reference to retail brands as children identified certain retail outlets in both their discussion and drawings. These represent an important part of their exposure to brands and an aspect of brand exposure that warrants further investigation.

Overall the attachment, for this group of children, was to products rather than to brands, reiterating the idea that the self-brand connection may be somewhat limited. When not asked to ‘talk’ specifically about brands the children tended to draw products that they owned rather than brands, reflecting structural rather than symbolic aspects of their favourite things. This may reflect the fact that some of the items they drew, for example pets, were not ‘branded’. Their attachment to certain products, and any group integration, may derive from familiarity and ownership of certain items, as much as it does from marketing (Paul 2002). Indeed, if brand marketing and advertising are so persuasive we might ask why brands were not more prominent in their drawings. This does not constitute a ‘rejection’ of brands, indeed the same children talked about brands in a related exercise, but it indicates that their reference point to these possessions in not necessarily framed in terms of the brand.

This research has been limited to one approach and a small sample of children from a specific region. Further research into the role of brands in the everyday lives of young consumers might explore the unprompted recall of brands in a more representative sample of young children. Possessions were not more prominent in their drawings. This does not indicate that the children being used as part of an individuation process as an extension of the self. Indeed, the idea of self appears to be expressed through the use of or ownership of certain products, rather than certain brands. Although this is not unexpected, given the nature of the research context, it does raise the question of the salience of brands in the mind’s eye of the beholders. The merits of different brands are more likely to be discussed in terms of what the product can do, or its play value, rather than in relation to any notion of self image. Perhaps somewhat surprising, was the reference to retail brands as children identified certain retail outlets in both their discussion and drawings. These represent an important part of their exposure to brands and an aspect of brand exposure that warrants further investigation.
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8 For example, a number of the boys drew motorbikes and it emerged that several of the boys did actually own small motorbikes which they rode at the weekend under parental supervision. But in terms of inclusion most identified with the product rather than the specific brand.


