

Alcohol Advertising Compliance on Cable Television, July – September, 2015



The Center on Alcohol Marketing and Youth

624 N. Broadway, Room 288
Baltimore, MD 21205
(410) 502-6579
www.camyo.org

Craig S. Ross, PhD, MBA^a | Elizabeth R. Henahan, MPH^a | Joni Sims^a | David H. Jernigan, PhD^b

August 31, 2016

BACKGROUND

Excessive alcohol consumption contributes to an average of 4,300 deaths among people under age 21 each year,¹ and is associated with many other health risk behaviors, including smoking, physical fighting, and high-risk sexual activity.²⁻⁸ More than 14 longitudinal studies have affirmed that youth exposure to alcohol advertising is associated with the initiation of alcohol consumption by youth, the amount of alcohol consumed per drinking occasion, and adverse health consequences.⁹⁻¹¹

To help limit youth exposure to alcohol advertising, the alcohol industry has established voluntary guidelines for the placement of alcohol advertising on television that require ads to be placed only on programs with an underage audience (i.e., under age 21) that is less than 28.4% of the total audience.¹²⁻¹⁵ However, an analysis by Ross et al. found that, from 2005 through 2012, underage youth were exposed to more than 15 billion alcohol advertising impressions that aired on programs that did not comply with the alcohol industry's placement standards, and that almost all of the resulting non-compliant advertising impressions (96%) aired on cable television programs.¹⁶

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) recommends that alcohol advertisers adopt “No Buy” lists to avoid placing alcohol advertising on programs that could violate the industry's voluntary placement guidelines.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ To test the potential impact of this industry practice, Ross et al. developed three no-buy list criteria consistent with FTC recommendations, including avoiding advertising on programs that were known to have previous-

^aEpidemiology Department, Boston University School of Public Health, 715 Albany Street, Boston, MA 02118, email: csross17@bu.edu

^bCenter on Alcohol Marketing and Youth, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD USA

FUNDING SOURCE: This report was supported by Cooperative Agreement Number 5U48DP005045-02 from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the Department of Health and Human Services.

Table of Contents

Background	1
Methods	2
Results	4
Table 1a. Number and percentage of non-compliant alcohol advertising exposures on cable television programs, by quarter – United States, 2013 Q4 to 2015 Q3	4
Table 1b. Percent annual change in total and non-compliant alcohol advertising exposures on cable television programs, by quarter – United States, 2013 Q4 to 2015 Q3	4
Table 2: Number and percentage of non-compliant alcohol advertising exposures on cable television programs that ran alcohol advertising, by quarter – United States, 2013 Q4 to 2015 Q3	5
Table 3: Total non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure on the 25 cable television programs with the largest number of non-compliant exposures – United States, 2012 Q3 to 2015 Q2 and 2015 Q3	6
Table 4: Total non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure on the 25 cable television network-dayparts with the largest number of non-compliant exposures – United States, 2012 Q3 to 2015 Q2 and 2015 Q3	7
Table 5a: Total non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure for the 25 alcohol brands with the largest number of non-compliant exposures – United States, 2012 Q3 to 2015 Q2	8
Table 5b: Total non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure for the 25 alcohol brands with the largest number of non-compliant exposures – United States, 2015 Q3	9
Summary and Recommendations	10
Appendix: Detailed Methods	13

ly violated the alcohol industry's placement standards (i.e., were serially non-compliant); programs that ran during time periods that were known to be popular among underage youth (i.e., high-risk network-dayparts); or programs that were known to have a small number of adult viewers (i.e., low-rated).¹⁶ They subsequently tested the potential impact of these three no-buy list criteria on youth exposure to alcohol advertising, and estimated that by consistently using these criteria, advertisers could eliminate most of the non-compliant alcohol advertising exposures on cable television.¹⁶

The purpose of this report is to assess non-compliant alcohol advertising on cable television that aired from the fourth quarter (Q4) of 2013 (i.e., October – December 2013) through the third quarter (Q3) of 2015 (i.e., July – September 2015) based on the three no-buy list criteria developed by Ross et al., and to assess how this non-compliance varied by program, cable network and daypart, and alcohol brand.

METHODS

Measures

Detailed methods are provided in the Appendix. Briefly, alcohol advertising occurrence and commercial audience data were licensed from the Nielsen Ad Intel service (2015 © The Nielsen Company, New York, NY, data from 2012-2015 used under license, all rights reserved). This analysis focuses only on those cable television networks, dayparts, and programs that carried alcohol advertising. A *non-compliant advertisement* was defined as an advertisement that was seen by a television audience that did not comply with the alcohol industry's self-regulatory placement standard (i.e., where greater than 28.4% of all viewers aged 2 years and older were aged 2 to 20 years). Advertising exposure was measured in *impressions*, which are based on the number of viewers seeing an advertisement. *Non-compliant exposure* was therefore defined as the number of advertising impressions seen by youth ages 2 to 20 as a result of non-compliant advertisements.

Non-compliant exposure was classified into one of four sequentially evaluated and mutually exclusive categories: *serially non-compliant*, *high-risk network-daypart*, *low-rated programs*, and *other*. A serially non-compliant advertisement was an advertisement placed on a cable television program that aired at least one non-compliant alcohol advertisement in the prior year. After accounting for serially non-compliant advertisements, high-risk network-daypart advertisements were advertisements placed on cable television networks at times of day that yielded a high number of non-compliant advertisements in the prior year. After accounting for both serially non-compliant and high-risk network-daypart advertisements, low-rated non-compliant advertisements were advertisements placed on cable television programs where the legal-age adult audience (i.e., the total viewers ages 21 and older) was less than approximately 1 million viewers (or an advertising "rating" of less than 0.50, where a "rating" in this context represents the proportion of the adult audience reached by the advertisement). Any non-compliant advertisement not classified into one of the three previous categories was classified as "other."

Data Analysis

The distribution of youth exposure to alcohol advertising on all cable TV programs based on compliance with voluntary industry placement standards was analyzed by quarter for the eight quarters from 2013 Q4 through 2015 Q3. The distribution of non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure by no-buy list category (e.g., serially non-compliant) was then assessed over this same period. The change in non-compliant exposure relative to the matching-quarter in the previous year (i.e., year-over-year) was also assessed to control for seasonal variation in the placement of alcohol advertising.

We identified candidate programs for a "no-buy" list by calculating the total number of non-compliant alcohol advertising exposures by program. To produce this candidate "no-buy" list we used the 12-quarter period from 2012 Q3 through 2015 Q2. We found that a 2-year time period (8 quarters) was not long enough to stabilize the program list, so we extended this analysis

for an additional year to 12-quarters to account for seasonal fluctuations and any potential longer advertising business cycles that may contribute to variability. This 12-quarter list represents the best list of programs for advertisers to use as a “No-Buy” list.

However, using the 12-quarter period masked more recent non-compliant advertising, which may identify new television programs that pose compliance problems for alcohol advertisers. Therefore, we also separately reported the most recent quarter data, July to September (Q3) 2015. In both time periods, we restricted the analysis to the 25 programs with the largest number of non-compliant exposures.

Advertisers are often required by television networks to purchase alcohol advertising that can be placed at the discretion of the network on any program within a given network-daypart. Therefore, in addition to identifying candidate programs for a “no-buy” list, we also identified network-dayparts that could be included on a “no-buy” list. To create a network-daypart “no-buy” list, we calculated the total number of non-compliant alcohol advertising exposures by network-daypart for the 12-quarter period from 2012 Q3 through 2015 Q2 and, separately, for the most recent third-quarter of 2015. This analysis was restricted to the top 25 network-dayparts with the largest number of non-compliant exposures during these two time periods. These two lists can be used in the same manner as the program lists described above to identify long-standing and emerging network-dayparts that are non-compliant.

The final analysis presents the total number of non-compliant alcohol advertising exposures by alcohol brand for these two time periods. This analysis was restricted to the 25 brands with the largest number of non-compliant exposures during these two time periods, and the distribution of these exposures was assessed based on the no-buy list criteria (e.g., serially non-compliant).

RESULTS

Table 1a: Number and percentage of non-compliant¹ alcohol advertising exposures on cable television programs, by quarter – United States, 2013 Q4 to 2015 Q3

Time Period	Age 2 to 20 Exposure		
	Total (000)	Non-Compliant ¹ (000)	Percent Non-Compliant ¹
Year 1			
2013Q4	4,317,372	596,075	13.8%
2014Q1	2,224,896	295,926	13.3%
2014Q2	4,629,874	548,449	11.8%
2014Q3	4,305,479	510,150	11.8%
Total Year 1	15,477,621	1,950,600	12.6%
Year 2			
2014Q4	4,516,480	514,873	11.4%
2015Q1	2,220,768	250,443	11.3%
2015Q2	4,989,908	549,755	11.0%
2015Q3	4,438,349	492,278	11.1%
Total Year 2	16,165,505	1,807,349	11.2%
Total Years 1-2	31,643,126	3,757,949	11.9%

Table 1b: Percent annual change in total and non-compliant¹ alcohol advertising exposures on cable television programs, by quarter – United States, 2013 Q4 to 2015 Q3

Year 2 / Year 1	Percent Change in Total Exposure	Percent Change in Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure
Q4	4.6%	-13.6%
Q1	-0.2%	-15.4%
Q2	7.8%	0.2%
Q3	3.1%	-3.5%
Total	4.4%	-7.3%

Source: Nielsen, 2013-2015

¹A non-compliant advertisement is one in which viewers ages 2 to 20 make up more than 28.4% of all viewers ages 2 and older.

Non-compliant exposure is age 2 to 20 impressions resulting from non-compliant advertisements.

Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

Key Findings from Tables 1a and 1b:

- Youth were exposed to a total of 31.6 billion alcohol advertising impressions on cable TV during the 2-year period from 2013 Q4 through 2015 Q3, and about 3.8 billion (11.9%) of these impressions were due to non-compliant alcohol advertising.
- Total youth advertising exposure increased by 4.4% in Year 2 compared to Year 1, while non-compliant exposure decreased by 7.3% from 2.0 billion impressions in Year 1 to 1.8 billion in Year 2.
- The percent of total alcohol advertising exposure that did *not* comply with industry standards ranged from 13.8% in 2013 Q4 to 11.0% in 2015 Q2.
- Non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure on cable TV *decreased* by 13.6% in Q4 of Year 2 (October to December 2014) relative to Q4 of Year 1 (October to December 2013); 15.4% in Q1 of Year 2 (January to March 2015) relative to Q1 of Year 1 (January to March 2014); and 3.5% in Q3 of Year 2 (July to September 2015) relative to Q3 of Year 1 (July to September 2014). In contrast, non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure on cable TV *increased* by 0.2% in Q2 of Year 2 (April to June 2015) relative to Q2 of Year 1 (April to June 2014).

Table 2: Number and percentage of non-compliant¹ alcohol advertising exposures on cable television programs, by quarter – United States, 2013 Q4 to 2015 Q3

Non-Compliant¹ Age 2 to 20 Exposure (Percent of All)

Time Period	All (000)	Serially Non-Compliant ² (000)	High-Risk Network-Dayparts ³ (000)	Low-Rated Programs ⁴ (000)	Other ⁵ (000)
Year 1					
2013Q4	596,075	394,509 (66.2%)	117,712 (19.7%)	63,742 (10.7%)	20,111 (3.4%)
2014Q1	295,926	232,556 (78.6%)	30,276 (10.2%)	14,731 (5.0%)	18,363 (6.2%)
2014Q2	548,449	439,524 (80.1%)	84,864 (15.5%)	24,061 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)
2014Q3	510,150	349,054 (68.4%)	125,449 (24.6%)	34,445 (6.8%)	1,202 (0.2%)
Total Year 1	1,950,600	1,415,643 (72.6%)	358,301 (18.4%)	136,979 (7.0%)	39,676 (2.0%)
Year 2					
2014Q4	514,873	353,671 (68.7%)	131,056 (25.5%)	30,147 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)
2015Q1	250,443	201,244 (80.4%)	36,289 (14.5%)	12,910 (5.2%)	0 (0.0%)
2015Q2	549,755	441,419 (80.3%)	75,575 (13.7%)	32,761 (6.0%)	0 (0.0%)
2015Q3	492,278	361,155 (73.4%)	91,675 (18.6%)	39,448 (8.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total Year 2	1,807,349	1,357,488 (75.1%)	334,595 (18.5%)	115,266 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Total Years 1-2	3,757,949	2,773,131 (73.8%)	692,897 (18.4%)	252,245 (6.7%)	39,676 (1.1%)
Percent Change					
Year 2 / Year 1	-7.3%	-4.1%	-6.6%	-15.9%	-100.0%

Source: Nielsen, 2013-2015

¹A non-compliant advertisement is one in which viewers ages 2 to 20 make up more than 28.4% of all viewers ages 2 and older. Non-compliant exposure is age 2 to 20 advertising impressions resulting from non-compliant advertisements.

²Exposure resulting from placement of advertisements on the same programs that were found to produce non-compliant advertisements in the prior calendar year.

³Exposure resulting from placement of advertisements on any one of 194 network-time-of-day combinations that accounted for 90% of non-compliant exposure in the prior calendar year.

⁴Exposure resulting from placement of advertisements on cable television programs with an adult rating (ages 21 and older) less than 0.50 (less than approximately 1 million adult viewers).

⁵Exposure resulting from all other non-compliant advertising placements.

NOTE: Each category of non-compliant exposure (e.g., serially non-compliant) was sequentially evaluated in the order presented (footnotes 2-5), and is mutually exclusive (e.g., exposures that occurred on high-risk network-dayparts are exclusive of exposures on serially non-compliant programs).

Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

Key Findings from Table 2:

- From 2013 Q4 through 2015 Q3, almost all (98.9%) of non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure met one of three no-buy list criteria.
- From 2013 Q4 through 2015 Q3, serially non-compliant programs were responsible for 73.8% of non-compliant exposure; high-risk network-dayparts were responsible for 18.4% of this exposure; and low-rated cable programs were responsible for 6.7% of this exposure.
- Taken together, serially non-compliant alcohol advertising and advertising on high-risk network-dayparts accounted for approximately 9 out of every 10 non-compliant exposures in both years.
- Comparing Year 2 to Year 1, non-compliant alcohol advertising *decreased* 4.1% on serially non-compliant programs; *decreased* 6.6% on high-risk network-dayparts; *decreased* 15.9% on low-rated cable programs; and *decreased* 100.0% on other types of non-compliant exposure.
- The *decrease* in non-compliant exposure classified as “other” in Year 2 compared to Year 1 was due to the airing of alcohol advertising during holiday specials in 2013 Q4 and during the NBA All-Star game in 2014 Q1, which did not occur during comparable periods in Year 2.

Table 3: Total non-compliant¹ alcohol advertising exposure on the 25 cable television programs with the largest number of non-compliant¹ exposures — United States, 2012 Q3 to 2015 Q2 and 2015 Q3

Ranked by Total Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure 2012 Q3 through 2015 Q2			Ranked by Total Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure 2015 Q3		
Cable Network:Program	Non-Compliant ¹ Ads	Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure (000)	Cable Network:Program	Non-Compliant ¹ Ads	Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure (000)
FX:FX MOVIE PRIME	1,246	399,394	ESQ:AMERICAN NINJA WARRIOR	1,069	41,697
BET:BET MOVIE OF THE WEEK	1,171	198,356	TRU:TRUTV TOP FUNNIEST	344	27,440
CMDY:COMEDY CENTRAL MOVIE	1,101	193,694	BET:BET MOVIE OF THE WEEK	199	24,795
FX:FX MOVIE LATE	643	134,397	FXX:FXX MOVIE PRIME	190	18,206
FXX:FXX MOVIE PRIME	1,663	129,985	VH1:R&R PICTURE SHOWS	177	17,230
SPIKE:SPIKE TV MOVIE	756	127,391	TRU:HACK MY LIFE	159	12,835
ESPN:SPORTSCENTER MORNING	789	109,759	TRU:FAMELESS	178	11,801
TRU:IMPRACTICAL JOKERS	529	89,049	ENT:KEEPING UP KARDASHIANS	124	10,899
TRU:WORLDS DUMBEST	573	70,599	TRU:WORLDS DUMBEST	124	10,606
FX:FX MOVIE WKND AFTERNOON	257	69,260	CMDY:COMEDY CENTRAL MOVIE	80	9,443
CMDY:COLBERT REPORT	451	60,295	ESPN:SPORTSCENTER MORNING	118	8,664
ESQ:AMERICAN NINJA WARRIOR	1,269	58,607	SCI:MYTHBUSTERS	90	8,134
NGC:BRAIN GAMES	482	51,969	FX:MOVIE DOWNLOAD	30	7,514
TRU:SOUTH BEACH TOW	424	51,639	VH1:LOVE & HIP HOP ATLANTA 4	53	6,242
ENT:MOVIES WE LOVE	408	51,618	TBSC:FRIENDS	27	5,225
SPIKE:INK MASTER	364	51,537	FX:FX MOVIE PRIME	30	5,122
CMDY:ITS ALWAYS SUNNY IN PHILL	417	51,056	TRU:HOW TO BE A GROWN UP	120	4,673
CMDY:DAILY SHOW	347	45,642	SPIKE:SPIKE TV MOVIE	34	4,603
ESPN:SPORTSCENTER MORNING L	251	44,617	SPIKE:INK MASTER	35	4,416
VH1:R&R PICTURE SHOWS	441	44,025	BET:NELLYVILLE	35	4,395
CMDY:TOSH.O	218	43,242	SCI:OUTRAGEOUS ACTS OF SCIENC	51	4,003
ESPN:SPORTSCENTER AM L	311	41,263	TRAV:GHOST ADVENTURES	33	3,989
FX:DVD ON TV	135	36,157	VH1:TWINNING	50	3,666
TRU:CARBONARO EFFECT_ THE	326	35,993	TRU:SIX DEGREES OF EVERYTHING	61	3,392
TRU:TRUTV TOP FUNNIEST	360	35,735	BRVO:BRAVO MOVIE	31	3,269
Top 25 Programs	14,932	2,225,277	Top 25 Programs	3,442	262,259
Remaining 11,580 Programs	71,859	3,593,499	Remaining 3,179 Programs	6,129	230,019
All Programs	86,791	5,818,776	All Programs	9,571	492,278
Top 25 Programs as Percent of All Programs	17.2%	38.2%	Top 25 Programs as a Percent of All Programs	36.0%	53.3%

Source: Nielsen, 2012-2015

¹A non-compliant advertisement is one in which viewers ages 2 to 20 make up more than 28.4% of all viewers ages 2 and older. Non-compliant exposure is age 2 to 20 impressions resulting from non-compliant advertisements.

NOTE: Programs with the designation "L" appended to their name indicate that the ad appeared on the "live" telecast as opposed to a later repetition of the telecast.

Programs highlighted in boldface in the table generated non-compliant exposure during high-risk dayparts.

Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

Key Findings from Table 3:

- The 25 cable programs with the largest number of non-compliant alcohol advertising exposures accounted for over half (53.3%) of all non-compliant exposure during 2015 Q3, and nearly 2 in 5 (38.2%) of all non-compliant advertising exposure during the 12-quarter period from 2012 Q3 through 2015 Q2 (i.e., the preceding 12 quarters).
- Eleven (44%) of the programs with the largest number of non-compliant exposures in 2015 Q3 were also among the 25 programs with the largest number of non-compliant exposures during the preceding 12 quarters, and accounted for almost 1 in 4 (24.4%) of the non-compliant exposures during this three-year period (data not shown). These 11 programs included: *BET:BET Movie of the Week*, *CMDY:Comedy Central Movie*, *ESPN:Sportscenter Morning*, *ESQ:American Ninja Warrior*, *FX:FX Movie Prime*, *FXX:FXX Movie Prime*, *SPIKE:Ink Master*, *SPIKE:Spike TV Movie*, *TRU:TRUTV Top Funniest*, *TRU:Worlds Dumbest*, and *VH1:R&R Picture Shows*.
- The cable programs that were responsible for high levels of non-compliant exposure in the most recent quarter (2015 Q3), but *not* in the preceding 12 quarters included: *BET:Nellyville*, *BRVO:Bravo Movie*, *ENT:Keeping Up Kardashians*, *FX:Movie Download*, *SCI:Mythbusters*, *SCI:Outrageous Acts of Science*, *TBSC:Friends*, *TRAV:Ghost Adventures*, *TRU:Fameless*, *TRU:Hack My Life*, *TRU:How to be a Grownup*, *TRU:Six Degrees of Everything*, *VH1:Love & Hip Hop Atlanta 4*, and *VH1:Twinning*.
- Twenty of the 25 programs with the largest number of non-compliant exposures in 2015 Q3 generated serially non-compliant advertising exposure, as did all 25 of these programs during the preceding 12 quarters. The five programs in 2015 Q3 that did not generate serially non-complaint exposures all generated non-compliant exposure during high-risk network-dayparts.

Table 4: Total non-compliant¹ alcohol advertising exposure on the 25 cable television network-dayparts² with the largest number of non-compliant¹ exposures – United States, 2012 Q3 to 2015 Q2 and 2015 Q3

Ranked by Total Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure 2012 Q3 through 2015 Q2			Ranked by Total Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure 2015 Q3		
Cable Network:Daypart	Non-Compliant ¹ Ads	Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure (000)	Cable Network:Daypart	Non-Compliant ¹ Ads	Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure (000)
FX:Overnight	1,479	240,375	TRU:Overnight	591	33,176
TRU:Overnight	2,610	225,157	ESQ:Prime	311	13,605
FX:Prime	617	213,630	BET:Prime	96	13,376
CMDY:Overnight	1,264	186,349	TRU:MF_EF_16_18	126	11,723
ESPN:Overnight	1,114	178,561	VH1:Overnight	94	11,068
TRU:Prime	971	158,987	TRU:Prime	98	10,143
VH1:Prime	738	156,910	VH1:Prime	77	8,392
CMDY:Prime	699	138,953	ESQ:WE_Day_10_16	216	8,320
ESPN:MF_Morn_05_10	795	110,129	BET:Overnight	78	7,650
BET:Prime	568	107,800	ESPN:MF_Morn_05_10	97	6,907
SPIKE:Overnight	900	102,152	SPIKE:Overnight	52	6,420
BET:Overnight	502	77,503	CMDY:Prime	55	6,391
FX:PrimeAccess	268	75,641	ESPN:Overnight	79	6,387
SPIKE:Prime	385	70,424	FXX:MF_EN_18_19	71	6,270
FXX:Overnight	1,293	69,420	FXX:Prime	49	6,005
FX:MF_EN_18_19	298	64,707	TRU:WE_Day_10_16	89	5,973
FXX:Prime	682	64,445	ESQ:MF_EF_16_18	180	5,770
TBSC:Overnight	473	63,434	ESQ:Overnight	295	5,607
CMDY:PrimeAccess	316	56,906	FX:Overnight	52	5,592
VH1:Overnight	417	52,126	FXX:PrimeAccess	62	5,501
NBAT:Overnight	2,518	51,229	FX:Prime	24	5,484
ESPN2:Overnight	1,140	50,054	SCI:Prime	55	5,385
FX:WE_Day_10_16	187	48,594	VH1:WE_Day_10_16	68	4,998
APL:Prime	216	47,155	ESPN2:MF_Day_10_16	73	4,580
APL:Overnight	330	43,629	FS2:Prime	104	4,491
Top 25 Network-Dayparts	20,780	2,654,271	Top 25 Network-Dayparts	3,092	209,214
Remaining 933 Network-Dayparts	66,011	3,164,506	Remaining 769 Network-Dayparts	6,479	283,064
All Network-Dayparts	86,791	5,818,776	All Network-Dayparts	9,571	492,278
Top 25 Network-Dayparts as a Percent of All Network-Dayparts	23.9%	45.6%	Top 25 Network-Dayparts as a Percent of All Network-Dayparts	32.3%	42.5%

Source: Nielsen, 2012-2015

¹A non-compliant advertisement is one in which viewers ages 2 to 20 make up more than 28.4% of all viewers ages 2 and older. Non-compliant exposure is age 2 to 20 impressions resulting from non-compliant advertisements.

²A network-daypart is a particular time of day on a given television network (e.g., Prime Time ("Prime"), which runs from 8PM to 10:59PM). A complete list of network abbreviations and dayparts is provided in the Appendix.

NOTE: These high-risk network-dayparts have been listed independent of the serially non-compliant programs listed in Table 3.

Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

Key Findings from Table 4:

- Thirteen (52%) of the 25 network-dayparts that generated the most non-compliant exposure in 2015 Q3 were also among the 25 network-dayparts with the largest number of non-compliant advertising exposures in the preceding 12 quarters. These network-dayparts included the following: *BET:Overnight*, *BET:Prime*, *CMDY:Prime*, *ESPN:MF_Morn_05_10*, *ESPN:Overnight*, *FX:Overnight*, *FX:Prime*, *FXX:Prime*, *SPIKE:Overnight*, *TRU:Overnight*, *TRU:Prime*, *VH1:Overnight*, and *VH1:Prime*. Collectively, these 13 network-dayparts accounted for 31.4% of all non-compliant exposure in the 12-quarter period (data not shown).
- Network-dayparts generating high levels of non-compliant exposure in the most recent quarter that did not appear on the 12-quarter list included: *ESPN2:MF_Day_10_16*, *ESQ:MF_EF_16_18*, *ESQ:Overnight*, *ESQ:Prime*, *ESQ:WE_Day_10_16*, *FS2:Prime*, *FXX:MF_EN_18_19*, *FXX:PrimeAccess*, *SCI:Prime*, *TRU:MF_EF_16_18*, *TRU:WE_Day_10_16*, and *VH1:WE_Day_10_16*.
- About 1.5 billion (55.8%) of the 2.7 billion non-compliant impressions generated by these 25 high-risk network-dayparts were broadcast on serially non-compliant cable television programs (data not shown).

Table 5a: Total non-compliant¹ alcohol advertising exposure for the 25 alcohol brands with the largest number of non-compliant¹ exposures – United States, 2012 Q3 to 2015 Q2

Brand	Age 2 to 20 Total Exposure (000)	Total Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure (Percent of Total Exposure) (000)	Type of Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure (Percent of Total Non-Compliant Exposure)			
			Serially Non-Compliant ² (000)	High-Risk Network-Daypart ³ (000)	Low-Rated Programs ⁴ (000)	Other ⁵ (000)
Heineken Beer	1,923,615	266,404 (13.8%)	200,634 (75.3%)	34,462 (12.9%)	29,543 (11.1%)	1,765 (0.7%)
Dos Equis Beer	1,745,903	226,215 (13.0%)	172,030 (76.0%)	26,143 (11.6%)	26,655 (11.8%)	1,387 (0.6%)
Samuel Adams Beers	1,358,100	205,521 (15.1%)	167,643 (81.6%)	22,117 (10.8%)	15,287 (7.4%)	476 (0.2%)
Miller Lite	1,839,875	197,409 (10.7%)	153,943 (78.0%)	24,523 (12.4%)	18,468 (9.4%)	476 (0.2%)
Corona Extra Beer	1,699,346	193,801 (11.4%)	146,349 (75.5%)	28,497 (14.7%)	16,794 (8.7%)	2,162 (1.1%)
Bud Light	1,718,748	190,280 (11.1%)	141,886 (74.6%)	29,792 (15.7%)	18,602 (9.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Redds Brewing Company Beverages	1,469,125	178,372 (12.1%)	137,187 (76.9%)	27,844 (15.6%)	9,905 (5.6%)	3,436 (1.9%)
Disaronno Originale Amaretto	663,029	159,669 (24.1%)	98,289 (61.6%)	38,617 (24.2%)	22,762 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Bacardi Rums	977,954	157,049 (16.1%)	115,819 (73.7%)	30,918 (19.7%)	10,312 (6.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Samuel Adams Boston Lager	967,214	136,210 (14.1%)	105,814 (77.7%)	17,297 (12.7%)	13,099 (9.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Hennessy Cognacs	680,978	128,507 (18.9%)	95,789 (74.5%)	19,934 (15.5%)	6,035 (4.7%)	6,749 (5.3%)
Bud Light Lime-a-Rita	740,243	120,325 (16.3%)	92,663 (77.0%)	22,557 (18.7%)	5,104 (4.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Coors Light	1,140,509	111,105 (9.7%)	85,739 (77.2%)	16,383 (14.7%)	8,508 (7.7%)	476 (0.4%)
Strongbow Hard Cider	688,670	96,908 (14.1%)	54,282 (56.0%)	37,038 (38.2%)	5,589 (5.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Twisted Tea Malt Beverage	796,245	86,002 (10.8%)	58,635 (68.2%)	21,004 (24.4%)	5,161 (6.0%)	1,202 (1.4%)
Bud Light Platinum	656,588	79,239 (12.1%)	56,695 (71.5%)	16,469 (20.8%)	4,019 (5.1%)	2,056 (2.6%)
Dewar's White Label Scotch Whiskey	513,211	79,130 (15.4%)	62,801 (79.4%)	12,969 (16.4%)	3,361 (4.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Budweiser Beer	577,109	75,743 (13.1%)	56,095 (74.1%)	9,165 (12.1%)	10,483 (13.8%)	0 (0.0%)
1800 Silver Tequila	514,944	75,607 (14.7%)	64,627 (85.5%)	8,170 (10.8%)	2,810 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Southern Comfort	610,058	73,463 (12.0%)	47,086 (64.1%)	21,024 (28.6%)	4,784 (6.5%)	569 (0.8%)
Sailor Jerry Spiced Navy Rums	379,651	72,102 (19.0%)	59,384 (82.4%)	7,265 (10.1%)	4,881 (6.8%)	572 (0.8%)
Jose Cuervo Especial Tequila	505,254	69,890 (13.8%)	54,023 (77.3%)	11,093 (15.9%)	4,774 (6.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Angry Orchard Hard Ciders	661,543	67,089 (10.1%)	49,691 (74.1%)	11,203 (16.7%)	5,542 (8.3%)	653 (1.0%)
Grey Goose Vodka	442,103	66,222 (15.0%)	49,473 (74.7%)	14,055 (21.2%)	2,694 (4.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Heineken Premium Lite Lager	593,016	65,941 (11.1%)	50,084 (76.0%)	11,305 (17.1%)	4,552 (6.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Top 25 Brands	23,863,031	3,178,204 (12.7%)	2,376,661 (74.8%)	519,840 (16.4%)	259,725 (8.2%)	21,978 (0.7%)
Remaining 161 Brands	21,888,087	2,640,572 (12.1%)	1,912,750 (72.4%)	502,925 (19.0%)	201,586 (7.6%)	23,311 (0.9%)
All Brands	45,751,118	5,818,776 (12.7%)	4,289,411 (73.7%)	1,022,765 (17.6%)	461,311 (7.9%)	45,289 (0.8%)
Top 25 Brands as a Percent of All Brands	52.2%	54.6%	55.4%	50.8%	56.3%	48.5%

Source: Nielsen, 2012-2015

¹A non-compliant advertisement is one in which viewers ages 2 to 20 make up more than 28.4% of all viewers ages 2 and older. Non-compliant exposure is the total number of age 2 to 20 impressions resulting from non-compliant advertisements.

²Exposure resulting from placement of advertisements on the same programs that were found to produce non-compliant advertisements in the prior calendar year.

³Exposure resulting from placement of advertisements on any one of 135 network and time of the day combinations that accounted for 90% of non-compliant exposure in the prior calendar year.

⁴Placement on cable television programs with an adult rating (ages 21 and older) less than 0.50 (less than approximately 1 million adult viewers).

⁵All other non-compliant underage advertising exposure.

NOTE: Alcohol brands are listed based on total non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure. Each category of non-compliant exposure (e.g., serially non-compliant) was sequentially evaluated in the order presented (footnotes 2-5), and is mutually exclusive (e.g., exposures that occurred on high-risk network-dayparts are exclusive of exposures on serially non-compliant programs).

Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

Table 5b: Total non-compliant¹ alcohol advertising exposure for the 25 alcohol brands with the largest number of non-compliant¹ exposures – United States, 2015 Q3

Brand	Age 2 to 20 Total Exposure (000)	Total Non-Compliant Exposure (Percent of Total Exposure) (000)	Type of Non-Compliant ¹ Exposure (Percent of Total Non-Compliant Exposure)			
			Serially Non-Compliant ² (000)	High-Risk Network-Daypart ³ (000)	Low-Rated Programs ⁴ (000)	Other ⁵ (000)
Bud Light	321,588	39,397 (12.3%)	26,981 (68.5%)	9,616 (24.4%)	2,800 (7.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Heineken Premium Lite Lager	263,237	29,773 (11.3%)	23,335 (78.4%)	4,444 (14.9%)	1,994 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Michelob Ultra Light Beer	180,516	24,240 (13.4%)	19,510 (80.5%)	2,980 (12.3%)	1,750 (7.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Bacardi Limon Rum	115,125	22,933 (19.9%)	16,016 (69.8%)	6,635 (28.9%)	282 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Corona Extra Beer	201,139	21,832 (10.9%)	16,445 (75.3%)	4,159 (19.1%)	1,228 (5.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Bud Light Lime-a-Rita	152,941	20,424 (13.4%)	14,888 (72.9%)	3,385 (16.6%)	2,151 (10.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Redds Brewing Company Beverages	193,747	18,764 (9.7%)	13,014 (69.4%)	4,732 (25.2%)	1,018 (5.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Samuel Adams Boston Lager	143,191	18,477 (12.9%)	14,538 (78.7%)	3,630 (19.6%)	309 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Bud Light Lime	147,555	18,031 (12.2%)	13,057 (72.4%)	1,960 (10.9%)	3,014 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Twisted Tea Malt Beverage	114,937	17,624 (15.3%)	13,723 (77.9%)	2,296 (13.0%)	1,605 (9.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Budweiser Beer	125,705	17,010 (13.5%)	12,296 (72.3%)	2,942 (17.3%)	1,772 (10.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Coors Light	148,741	15,148 (10.2%)	11,800 (77.9%)	1,769 (11.7%)	1,579 (10.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Miller Lite	126,851	14,678 (11.6%)	9,460 (64.5%)	3,132 (21.3%)	2,086 (14.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Stella Artois Beer	102,758	13,872 (13.5%)	10,229 (73.7%)	2,507 (18.1%)	1,136 (8.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Dos Equis Beer	125,294	13,304 (10.6%)	8,605 (64.7%)	3,673 (27.6%)	1,026 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Strongbow Hard Cider	169,614	13,106 (7.7%)	8,961 (68.4%)	2,705 (20.6%)	1,440 (11.0%)	0 (0.0%)
The Traveler Beer Company Beers	100,200	11,360 (11.3%)	8,843 (77.8%)	2,174 (19.1%)	343 (3.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Disaronno Originale Amaretto	53,805	9,869 (18.3%)	5,937 (60.2%)	3,088 (31.3%)	844 (8.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Serrales DonQ Rums	19,622	8,936 (45.5%)	8,539 (95.6%)	364 (4.1%)	33 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Smirnoff Ice Malt Beverage	65,632	8,239 (12.6%)	5,705 (69.2%)	1,581 (19.2%)	953 (11.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Smith and Forge Hard Cider	89,574	7,654 (8.5%)	5,364 (70.1%)	1,898 (24.8%)	392 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Sailor Jerry Spiced Navy Rums	28,805	6,744 (23.4%)	2,293 (34.0%)	92 (1.4%)	4,359 (64.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Hennessy Cognacs	44,022	6,527 (14.8%)	5,319 (81.5%)	783 (12.0%)	425 (6.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Leinenkugel's Beer	106,784	6,459 (6.0%)	4,457 (69.0%)	714 (11.1%)	1,288 (19.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Angry Orchard Hard Ciders	63,783	6,193 (9.7%)	5,333 (86.1%)	466 (7.5%)	394 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Top 25 Brands	3,205,166	390,594 (11.1%)	284,648 (72.9%)	71,725 (18.4%)	34,221 (8.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Remaining 57 Brands	1,233,183	101,684 (8.2%)	76,507 (75.2%)	19,950 (19.6%)	5,227 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)
All Brands	4,438,349	492,278 (11.1%)	361,155 (73.4%)	91,675 (18.6%)	39,448 (8.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Top 25 Brands as a Percent of All Brands	72.2%	79.3%	78.8%	78.2%	86.7%	NA

Source: Nielsen, 2015

¹A non-compliant advertisement is one in which viewers ages 2 to 20 make up more than 28.4% of all viewers ages 2 and older. Non-compliant exposure is the total number of age 2 to 20 impressions resulting from non-compliant advertisements.

²Exposure resulting from placement of advertisements on the same programs that were found to produce non-compliant advertisements in the prior calendar year.

³Exposure resulting from placement of advertisements on any one of 135 network and time of the day combinations that accounted for 90% of non-compliant exposure in the prior calendar year.

⁴Placement on cable television programs with an adult rating (ages 21 and older) less than 0.50 (less than approximately 1 million adult viewers).

⁵All other non-compliant underage advertising exposure.

NOTE: Alcohol brands are listed based on total non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure. Each category of non-compliant exposure (e.g., serially non-compliant) was sequentially evaluated in the order presented (footnotes 2-5), and is mutually exclusive (e.g., exposures that occurred on high-risk network-dayparts are exclusive of exposures on serially non-compliant programs).

NA = Not Applicable (divide by zero)

Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

Key Findings from Tables 5a and 5b:

- The 25 alcohol brands with the largest number of non-compliant alcohol advertising exposures were responsible for almost 4 in 5 (79.3%) of the non-compliant exposures during 2015 Q3 (Table 5b), and over half (54.6%) of all non-compliant exposures in the 12 quarters from 2012 Q3 to 2015 Q2 (Table 5a) (the preceding 12 quarters).
- Serially non-compliant programs were responsible for nearly 3 in 4 (72.9%) of the non-compliant advertising exposures in 2015 Q3 (Table 5b), ranging from 34.0% (Sailor Jerry Spiced Navy Rums) to 95.6% (Serrales DonQ Rums). Similarly, serially non-compliant programs were responsible for 3 in 4 (74.8%) of the non-compliant advertising exposures during the preceding 12 quarters (Table 5a), ranging from 56.0% (Strongbow Hard Cider) to 85.5% (1800 Silver Tequila).
- Sixteen (64%) of the 25 brands with the largest number of non-compliant exposures in 2015 Q3 were also among the 25 brands with the largest number of non-compliant exposures during the preceding 12 quarters. These brands included Angry Orchard Hard Ciders, Bud Light, Bud Light Lime, Bud Light Lime-a-Rita, Budweiser Beer, Coors Light, Disaronno Originale Amaretto, Dos Equis Beer, Heineken Premium Lite Lager, Hennessy Cognacs, Miller Lite, Redds Brewing Company Beverages, Sailor Jerry Spiced Navy Rums, Samuel Adams Boston Lager, Strongbow Hard Cider, and Twisted Tea Malt Beverage. Collectively, these 16 brands accounted for over one-third (36.2%) of all non-compliant exposure from 2012 Q3 through 2015 Q2 (data not shown).
- During 2015 Q3, almost 1 in 2 advertisements (45.5%) from the Serrales DonQ Rum brand were non-compliant (Table 5b). This high level of non-compliant exposure was due to the repeated placement of ads on the Esquire Network channel during the American Ninja Warrior program, which had a large youth audience. As a result, nearly all of the ads (95.6%) for Serrales DonQ Rum generated serially non-compliant exposure.
- Brands listed in Tables 5a and 5b varied considerably in the proportion of their total advertising exposure that was non-compliant, ranging from 9.7% to 24.1% in the 12-quarter time period and from 6.0% to 45.5% in 2015 Q3.
- In 2015 Q3, the top 25 brands placed 2,167 non-compliant advertisements on the 25 cable network programs identified as “no-buy” list candidates (Table 3), generating 151.9 million non-compliant advertising impressions in the most recent quarter (data not shown).

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the 2-year period ending in 2015 Q3, youth under the legal drinking age saw 3.8 billion non-compliant alcohol advertising impressions, approximately 1 out of every 8 alcohol advertising impressions seen by youth. In the most recent quarter, total underage exposure increased (3.1%) while non-compliant exposure declined (3.5%) relative to the third quarter in the previous year.

As has been reported in prior analyses,¹⁶ the programs on which non-compliant advertising appears are relatively consistent from year to year. Twenty-three of the top 25 programs with the highest amount of non-compliant exposure in the 12-quarter period in this report were the same as the previous 12-quarter period reported in the 2015 Q2 report.²⁰ Similarly, 23 of the top 25 cable television network-dayparts with the largest number of non-compliant exposures in this 12-quarter period were the same as the previous 12-quarter period in the 2015 Q2 report.²⁰ Comparing the top 25 programs across Q1, Q2, and Q3 quarterly reports (2012 Q1 through 2015 Q3), 21 out of 25 programs on the 12-quarter lists in all three reports (84%) were the same programs that consistently produced the highest amount of non-compliant exposure.^{20, 21}

Two new programs appeared on the 12-quarter list in the current report, compared to the 12-quarter list of the 2015 Q2 report. Both programs, *VH1:R&R Picture Shows* and *TRU:TRUTV Top Funnies*, migrated from the 2015 Q2 top 25 list to the 12-quarter list in the current report. We observed a similar migration for the two new network-dayparts in the current 12-quarter list. In the previous report, 2015 Q2, *APL:Overnight* and *VH1:Overnight* were among the top 25 in 2015 Q2 but were not on the 12-quarter list. In the current Q3 report, both of these network-dayparts were on the top 25 list for the 12-quarter time period.²⁰ This is the second quarterly report showing this pattern, which suggests that the most recent quarter list may serve as a predictor of programs and network-dayparts that may pose longer term problems for alcohol advertisers unless action is taken to remove alcohol advertising from them.²⁰

From the fourth quarter of 2013 through the third quarter of 2015, almost all (98.9%) of non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure appeared on cable television programs that met one of the three no-buy list criteria, demonstrating the potential usefulness of these criteria for reducing non-compliant alcohol advertising on cable TV, consistent with FTC recommendations. Furthermore, almost 3 in 4 (73.8%) of these non-compliant exposures resulted from the placement of alcohol advertising on programs that were non-compliant in the prior year (i.e., serially non-compliant), and an additional 18.4% of non-compliant exposure occurred when ads were placed on high-risk network-dayparts that have generated the majority of non-compliant exposure in the past. Alcohol advertisers could therefore easily avoid this non-compliant exposure by placing serially non-compliant programs and high-risk network-dayparts on a “no-buy” list, and sharing this “no-buy” list with media buyers and television networks.

During the 12-quarter time period from July 2013 to June 2015 the 25 programs with the largest number of non-compliant exposures were responsible for almost 2 in 5 of the total non-compliant alcohol advertising exposures. Similarly, the 25 high-risk network-dayparts were responsible for about 46% of non-compliant exposure. Taken together, these two lists are a good starting point for “no-buy” lists for both cable TV programs and network-dayparts. These “no-buy” lists could also be used in combination. For example, ads might be placed on the NGC network during prime time, but not on the program *Brain Games*.

By using these “no-buy” list criteria sequentially, in the order presented, alcohol companies should not face an unreasonable burden when changing their advertising practices to reduce youth exposure. First, alcohol industry codes already require a post-audit of advertising placements that should identify programs and network-dayparts that are resulting in non-compliant exposure. Second, the non-compliant exposure is highly concentrated on a relatively small number of programs and networks. Therefore, there should not be a problem finding alternative programming for the advertising placements.

For the third “no-buy” list criterion, low-rated programs, we recommend that advertisers use a more restrictive underage audience composition threshold, consistent with the FTC recommendations in its 2014 report (Executive Summary, page iii, Recommendation 1a).¹⁹

We noted that many of the individual programs that are generating non-compliant exposure are televised movies including the *FX Prime Movie*, *BET Movie of the Week*, *FX Movie Late*, *FXX Movie Prime*, *Spike TV Movie*, *ENT Movies We Love*, and *FX DVD on TV*. The audience for a televised movie varies depending on the movie itself, and thus special consideration may need to be taken to avoid non-compliant advertising during televised movies. Future research may examine non-compliant placements on televised movies to determine if movie genre, Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) rating (e.g., PG, PG-13, or R ratings), or other factors are useful for predicting the probability of a movie generating a non-compliant alcohol advertising exposure.

We also noted that youth exposure to non-compliant alcohol advertising decreased by 7.3% in the most recent year compared to the prior year, despite the fact that overall youth exposure to alcohol advertising increased by 4.4%. This finding affirms that it is possible to further reduce youth exposure to non-compliant alcohol advertising even in an environment where total alcohol advertising exposure is increasing.

Finally, most individual alcohol brands are generating non-compliant exposure in a similar fashion – that is, through ads placed on serially non-compliant programs and during high-risk network-dayparts. Thus, individual brands could also reduce youth exposure to alcohol advertising by adopting the “no-buy” list criteria described in this report.

REFERENCES

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Alcohol Related Disease Impact (ARDI) application. 2013; www.cdc.gov/ardi. Accessed October 7, 2015.
2. Grant BF, Stinson FS, Harford TC. Age at onset of alcohol use and DSM-IV alcohol abuse and dependence: A 12-year follow-up. *J Subst Abuse*. 2001;13(4):493-504.
3. Miller JW, Naimi TS, Brewer RD, Jones SE. Binge drinking and associated health risk behaviors among high school students. *Pediatrics*. 2007;119(1):76-85.
4. Hingson R, Heeren T, Zakocs R, Winter M, Wechsler H. Age of first intoxication, heavy drinking, driving after drinking and risk of unintentional injury among U.S. college students. *J Stud Alcohol*. 2003;64(1):23-31.
5. Hingson R, Heeren T, Levenson S, Jamanka A, Voas R. Age of drinking onset, driving after drinking, and involvement in alcohol related motor-vehicle crashes. *Accid Anal Prev*. 2002;34(1):85-92.
6. Stueve A, O'Donnell LN. Early alcohol initiation and subsequent sexual and alcohol risk behaviors among urban youths. *Am J Public Health*. 2005;95(5):887-893.
7. Hingson RW, Zha W. Age of drinking onset, alcohol use disorders, frequent heavy drinking, and unintentionally injuring oneself and others after drinking. *Pediatrics*. 2009;123(6):1477-1484.
8. Hingson R, Heeren T, Winter MR, Wechsler H. Early age of first drunkenness as a factor in college students' unplanned and unprotected sex attributable to drinking. *Pediatrics*. 2003;111(1):34-41.
9. Grenard JL, Dent CW, Stacy A. Exposure to alcohol advertisements and teenage alcohol-related problems. *Pediatrics*. 2013;131(2):e369 - e379.
10. Smith LA, Foxcroft DR. The effect of alcohol advertising, marketing and portrayal on drinking behaviour in young people: systematic review of prospective cohort studies. *BMC Public Health*. 2009;9(51):1-11.
11. Anderson P, de Bruijn A, Angus K, Gordon R, Hastings G. Impact of alcohol advertising and media exposure on adolescent alcohol use: a systematic review of longitudinal studies. *Alcohol Alcohol*. 2009;44(3):229-243.
12. The Beer Institute. *Advertising and Marketing Code*. Washington, DC: Beer Institute; 2011.
13. Distilled Spirits Council of the United States. *Code of Responsible Practices for Beverage Alcohol Advertising and Marketing*. Washington, D.C.: Distilled Spirits Council of the United States; 2011.
14. The Wine Institute. Code of Advertising Standards. 2011; <http://www.wineinstitute.org/initiatives/issuesandpolicy/adcode/details>. Accessed February 29, 2012.
15. Distilled Spirits Council of the United States. *2011 Media 'Buying' Guidelines: Demographic Data/Advertisement Placement Guidelines*. Washington, DC: Distilled Spirits Council of the United States; 2011.
16. Ross C, Brewer R, Jernigan D. The potential impact of a "no-buy" list on youth exposure to alcohol advertising on cable television. *J Stud Alcohol*. 2016;77(1):7-16.
17. Evans J, Kelly R. *Self-Regulation in the Alcohol Industry: A Review of Industry Efforts to Avoid Promoting Alcohol to Underage Consumers*. Washington, D.C.: Federal Trade Commission; 1999.
18. Evans J, Dash J, Blickman N, C.L. P, Engle MK, Mulholland J. *Alcohol Marketing and Advertising: A Report to Congress*. Washington, D.C.: Federal Trade Commission; 2003.
19. Evans JM, Krainsky E, Fentonmiller K, Brady C, Yoeli E, Jaroszewicz A. *Self-Regulation in the Alcohol Industry: Report of the Federal Trade Commission*. Washington, DC: Federal Trade Commission; March 2014.
20. Ross C, Henahan E, Sims J, Jernigan D. *Alcohol advertising compliance on cable television, April-June (Q2), 2015*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health; In Press 2016.
21. Ross C, Sims J, Jernigan D. *Alcohol advertising compliance on cable television, January-March, 2015*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health; 2016.
22. Evans J, Marcus P, Engle MK. *Self-regulation in the Alcohol Industry: Report of the Federal Trade Commission*. Washington, D.C.: Federal Trade Commission; June 2008.

APPENDIX: Detailed Methods

Data Sources

Cable television alcohol advertising and audience data were sourced from Nielsen Ad Intel service (2016 © The Nielsen Company, New York, NY, data from 2012-2015 used under license, all rights reserved). The viewing audience at the time of the advertisement plus an additional three days of digital video recorder playback (“C3” ratings) was acquired for every alcohol advertisement.

Measures

A *non-compliant advertisement* was defined as an advertisement that was seen by a television audience that did not comply with the alcohol industry’s self-regulatory placement standard (i.e., where greater than 28.4% of all viewers aged 2 years and older were aged 2 to 20 years). Advertising impressions are based on the number of viewers seeing an advertisement. *Underage impressions* are total impressions for persons ages 2 to 20. *Underage composition* is the proportion of the viewing audience that is ages 2 to 20 relative to all viewers ages 2 and older. *Non-compliant exposure* was defined as the number of advertising impressions seen by youth ages 2 to 20 as a result of non-compliant advertisements.

A *daypart* is a time of day on which a program may be televised. We have organized time into the following dayparts:

Daypart	Description
MF_Day_10_16	Weekday Daytime - Monday-Friday 10AM to 3:59PM
MF_EF_16_18	Weekday Early Fringe - Monday-Friday 4PM to 5:59PM
MF_EN_18_19	Weekday Early News - Monday-Friday 6PM-6:59PM
MF_LN_23_2330	Weekday Late News - Monday-Friday 11PM-11:29PM
MF_Morn_05_10	Weekday Morning - Monday-Friday 5AM to 9:59AM
Overnight	Overnight - 11:30PM to 4:59AM
Prime	Prime - Monday-Sunday 8PM to 10:59PM
PrimeAccess	PrimeAccess - Monday-Sunday 7PM-7:59PM
WE_Day_10_16	Weekend Daytime - Saturday-Sunday 10AM to 3:59PM
WE_EF_16_18	Weekend Early Fringe - Saturday-Sunday 4PM to 5:59PM
WE_EN_18_19	Weekend Early News - Saturday-Sunday 6PM-6:59PM
WE_LN_23_2330	Weekend Late News - Saturday-Sunday 11PM-11:29PM
WE_Morn_05_10	Weekend Morning - Saturday-Sunday 5AM to 9:59AM

Quarters were defined as follows:

Quarter	Dates
Q1	January 1 through March 31
Q2	April 1 through June 30
Q3	July 1 through September 30
Q4	October 1 through December 31

Classification of Non-compliant Advertisements

Non-compliant advertisements for the prior year were flagged and the cable network, program title, and daypart were noted. Any cable network program that contained a non-compliant advertisement from any alcohol advertiser in the prior year was classified as a non-compliant program. Non-compliant advertisements from the current year that were placed on the same program as a non-compliant program from the prior year were classified as “*serially non-compliant*” ad placements.

Non-compliant exposure was also aggregated by cable network and daypart. The network and daypart combinations that accounted for 90% of all non-compliant exposure in the prior year were flagged as “*high-risk network-dayparts*.” Any non-compliant advertisement from the current year that was not serially non-compliant, and was found to be placed on a high-risk network daypart, was classified as a “*high-risk network-daypart*” non-compliant ad placement.

For the remaining non-compliant advertisements that were classified as neither “serially non-compliant” nor “high-risk network-daypart,” we flagged those advertisements for which the adult (ages 21 and older) audience rating was less 0.50. A rating for a program is the per-capita exposure for the program (that is, advertising impressions divided by the population). A rating of 0.50 translates into approximately 1,000,000 adult viewers. A non-compliant advertisement placed on a program with an adult rating of less than 0.50 that was neither “serially non-compliant” nor “high-risk network-daypart” was classified as “*low-rated*.” For low-rated programs, we recommend that alcohol companies “guardband” their placement guidelines to a lower youth composition limit, consistent with recommendations of the FTC in their 2014 report (see Executive Summary page iii Recommendation 1a).¹⁹ All remaining non-compliant advertisements were classified as “*other*.”

Methods for creating tables

Table 1 - Non-compliance Trend

Alcohol advertising is highly seasonal, with advertising volume typically increasing in summer months and during the holiday season. Therefore, to compare non-compliant exposure with prior periods, we provide 8 quarters of data. For the 8-quarter period, we show the amount of total underage exposure to alcohol advertising, the amount of non-compliant exposure, and the percent of underage exposure that is non-compliant. Year over year values are calculated for comparison with the prior year.

Table 2 - Non-compliant Ad Classification

We classify all non-compliant advertisements into one of the following mutually exclusive, sequentially-evaluated categories: (a) “Serially Non-Compliant;” (b) “High-Risk Network-Daypart;” (c) “Low-Rated;” (d) “Other.” The categories are shown for the previous 8 quarters of data and Year/Year changes are calculated for the total Year/Year change.

Table 3 - “No-Buy” Programs

To reduce non-compliant exposure, the FTC has recommended that alcohol companies and media networks maintain lists of “No-Buy” programs that have a history of generating high levels of non-compliant exposure,^{17,18,22} and the FTC’s 2014 report indicated that 11 of the 14 alcohol companies queried for that report had such lists in place.¹⁹

We report the top 25 programs on cable networks that generated the most non-compliant exposure during the past 12 quarters and in the most recent quarter. The 12-quarter list highlights programs with a long history of generating non-compliant exposure, while the list for the most recent quarter may identify more recent programming that should be avoided by alcohol companies.

Table 4 - “No-Buy” Network-Dayparts

For those situations where alcohol companies cannot purchase advertisements on individual programs (and must purchase advertisements on network-dayparts), we report the top 25 network-dayparts that generated the most non-compliant exposure for the past 12 quarters as well as the most recent quarter.

Table 5 - Non-compliant Ad Placements by Brand

Since alcohol advertising is typically purchased for individual brands, we report the top 25 brands ranked by total non-compliant exposure for the past 12 quarters as well as the most recent quarter. For each brand, we classify the non-compliant exposure into one of the following mutually exclusive, sequentially evaluated categories: (a) “Serially Non-Compliant;” (b) “High-Risk Network-Daypart;” (c) “Low-Rated;” (d) “Other.”

List of Network Abbreviations

NETWORK ABBREVIATION	NETWORK TITLE	NETWORK ABBREVIATION	NETWORK TITLE
AEN	A&E NETWORK	HLN	HLN
FAM	ABC FAMILY	HGTV	HOME AND GARDEN TV
ADSM	ADULT SWIM	IFC	IFC TV
AJAM	AL JAZEERA AMERICA	INSP	INSP
AMC	AMC	ID	INVESTIGATION DISCOVERY
AHC	AMERICAN HEROES CHANNEL	LMN	LIFETIME MOVIE NETWORK
APL	ANIMAL PLANET	LIF	LIFETIME TELEVISION
BBCA	BBC-AMERICA	LOGO	LOGO
BEIN	BEIN SPORT	MLBN	MLB NETWORK
BET	BLACK ENTERTAINMENT TV	MSNBC	MSNBC
BOOM	BOOMERANG	MTV	MTV
BRVO	BRAVO	MTV2	MTV2
CNTRC	CENTRIC	NGWD	NAT GEO WILD
CHIL	CHILLER	NGC	NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC CHNL
CLOO	CLOO	NBAT	NBA-TV
CMT	CMT	NBCSN	NBC SPORTS NETWORK
CNBC	CNBC	NFLN	NFL NETWORK
CNN	CNN	NKJR	NICK JR
CMDY	COMEDY CENTRAL	NAN	NICK-AT-NITE
CC	COOKING CHANNEL	NICK	NICKELODEON
DAM	DESTINATION AMERICA	NKTNS	NICKTOONS
DISC	DISCOVERY CHANNEL	OWN	OPRAH WINFREY NETWORK
DFC	DISCOVERY FAMILY CHANNEL	OVTN	OVATION
DLIF	DISCOVERY LIFE CHANNEL	OXYG	OXYGEN MEDIA
DXD	DISNEY XD	POP	POP
DIY	DIY NETWORK	REAL	REAL
ENT	E!	RLZC	REELZCHANNEL
REY	EL REY	RFD	RFD-TV
ESPN	ESPN	SCI	SCIENCE
ESPCL	ESPN CLASSIC	SMTH	SMITHSONIAN
ESPN2	ESPN2	SOAP	SOAP
ENN	ESPNEWS	SPIKE	SPIKE TV
ESPNU	ESPNU	SPRT	SPROUT
ESQ	ESQUIRE NETWORK	SUND	SUNDANCE TV
FOOD	FOOD NETWORK	SYFY	SYFY
FBN	FOX BUSINESS NETWORK	TBS	TBS
FOXNC	FOX NEWS CHANNEL	TBSC	TBS NETWORK
FS1	FOX SPORTS 1	TNNK	TEENNICK
FS2	FOX SPORTS 2	TOON	THE CARTOON NETWORK
FSOC	FSOC	TWC	THE WEATHER CHANNEL
FUSE	FUSE	TLC	TLC
FX	FX	TRAV	TRAVEL CHANNEL
FXM	FX MOVIE CHANNEL	TRU	TRUTV
FXX	FXX	TNT	TURNER NETWORK TELEVISION
FYI	FYI	TVL	TV LAND
G4	G4	TV1	TV ONE
GOLF	GOLF CHANNEL	UP	UP
GAC	GREAT AMERICAN COUNTRY	USA	USA NETWORK
GSN	GSN	VEL	VELOCITY
GSN	GSN	VH1	VH1
H2	H2	VH1C	VH1 CLASSIC
HALL	HALLMARK CHANNEL	WETV	WETV
HMM	HALLMARK MOVIES & MYSTERIES	WGNA	WGN AMERICA
HIST	HISTORY		