Modern parents, dangers of advertising and children:

A qualitative study on the dangers of
advertising targeted at children

Student Name: Jovan Djukanovic
Student Number: 366344

Supervisor: Prof.dr. Jeroen Jansz

Master Media Studies - Media & Business
Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Master's Thesis
June 2018

Modern parents, dangers of advertising and children

ABSTRACT

With the advancement of technology it is important to consider the societal changes that come with it. One of those changes is the way marketeers advertise their content. These changes primarily affect the newer generations, as they are the most susceptible to them. Children are who needs the most protection from these changes as the findings of Van Schaik, Chatterton and Croxon (2016) indicated there is no proper legislation for advertising to children through mobile phones. The study was a qualitative analysis that interviewed 10 parents who talked about the effects of advertising on children aged 7 to 12. The research investigated the advertising content targeted at children in Montenegro, a small country that recently joined NATO and is currently aiming to join the EU. This country is undergoing a lot of different changes, so this research aimed to provide support for advertising regulation targeted at children. The results of the research indicated an unexpected finding, which was the effects of the social norm. The social norm factor appeared to affect the parents' thoughts on advertising as some of their ideas and adjustments to raising a child were based on it. They all agreed about the effects of advertising and were not pleased about the negative outcomes, however, they did not expect regulation to solve the issue, but instead adapted to the changes themselves. This was interesting to see as the social norm factor here was that they wanted the children to be exposed to a certain amount of advertising content as, as they explained, they would eventually be exposed to it. They thought that restriction in itself is a potential danger to the child and they felt that active discussion with the child combined with minor restrictions was the best way to raise a child. The research found that the "social norm" factor had a big effect on the parents decision making and usage of the two types of mediation, namely, active and restrictive mediation (Valkenburg et al., 2013).

KEYWORDS: advertising, children, parenthood, parental mediation, social norms

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

According to the recent article of Anderson (2018), two of Apple's investors sent a letter of concern to Apple Inc. in regard to children's use of mobile phones. The letter addressed several different issues that covered their concerns about the impact of insufficient control over ways and amount of time the technology is used by children, as well as the amount of control their parents can have around proper usage of the mobile phones. The two investors, which own about 2 billion-dollar worth shares of Apple combined, are, according to Anderson (2018), aiming to increase children's protection when using mobile devices, and their first target is Apple as a technology leader in the industry of mobile phones. Their goal is to provide parents with more tools and ways of protecting their children from excessive usage. Furthermore, Sean Parker (one of the first presidents of Facebook) stated: "God only knows what it's doing to our children's brains." while referring to Facebook's effects on children (Anderson, 2018).

Excessive use of mobile phones among children has clearly become a trending issue. The studies, both in US and in Europe have found that children are using mobile phones more than ever. Namely, the studies conducted by the Influence Central (2016), have made a comparison survey in the United States between 2012 and 2016. In these surveys they found that in 2016 38% of children had access to the Internet via their phone while in 2012 19% of children had access to the Internet. Furthermore, the study also revealed that the average age for a child to receive a smartphone is now 10.3. In Europe, on the other side, 69% of the children surveyed used a mobile phone, and most of the 15-16 year old surveyed had received theirs when they were 10-12 years old (Docomo, 2009). Other research such as DIGITAL (2017) found that most of the parents interviewed for this research (90% of them) say that they provided their child a mobile plan to be able to reach them easily. Moreover, Docomo (2009) also found that 80% of the surveyed children had downloaded and used apps by the time they were 12. Another interesting research claims that "children aged 5 to 16 spend an average of six and a half hours a day in front of a screen compared with around three hours in 1995" (Wakefield, 2015), and "Kids under 9 spend more than 2 hours a day on screens", which means it tripled in four years (Rideout, 2014).

Simultaneously, mobile games have become one of the children's main time-consuming activities. According to NPD group (2014) "kids under 13 spend an average of 2 hours a day playing mobile games...the greatest proportion of their device time on gaming versus other activities" which is 57% more than two years earlier. A surprising information is that "this

age group is also playing more games (average of 5 games), as well as more games that were paid for (average of 3 games). The average amount of money spent by this age group over the past 30 days on new games, and in-game purchases is also one of the highest, second only to mobile gamers in the 25 to 44 age group."

Research problem

Gaming is an industry worth more than $70 billion a year (Chetterson, 2017) and it already overtook the movie and music industry combined, where video game industry consists of console, PC and mobile, and even though PC is currently the biggest, "mobile is poised to eclipse both PC and console sales in the next 5 years." (Nath, 2016). The business of mobile gaming industry relies on either paid mobile games, in-app purchases or in-game advertising, which means that children are exposed to online advertising while playing mobile games. Moreover, companies that advertise collect information on the users (Rideout, 2014) through games and use that data for cross-promotions.

According to Rideout, Foehr and Roberts (2010): "The average American child age 8 or older spends more than seven hours a day with screen media, watching TV, using the computer, playing video games, and using hand-held devices." This is important to consider when looking at the findings of Haynes (2015), who found that children can now be exposed to several sources of advertising simultaneously, namely, watching television while at the same time being on their phones. The amount of exposure to ads is of great importance in terms of impact of advertising on children. Haynes (2015) even speculated that by the time children reach adulthood they will have been exposed to 200.000 adverts. Some additional forms of advertising are often not even perceived as advertising by parents, who try to control the amount and content of what their children consume but are often not even aware of the scope of advertising. The research also elaborates that parents have issues with controlling how much advertising their child consumes. In other words, the number of advertisement that modern child consumes on a daily basis is rapidly growing (Haynes, 2015).

There are clear parental guidance on games, like PEGI (Pan-European Game Information), but there are still in-game purchases options as well.

Regulation and legislation of advertising to children

Existing legislation on the topic of advertising to children was assembled by UNICEF in a global report on legislative of advertising to children with all the heterogeneity of regulation and self-regulation frameworks (Van Schaik, Chatterton & Croxon, 2016). The report collected legal and regulatory regimes in 37 jurisdictions around the globe where some are to a greater or lesser degree, based upon the legislatives of International Chamber of Commerce International Code of Advertising Practice. Many of the surveyed jurisdictions have "limitations on the ability to advertise and market tobacco and alcohol products" but what is most alarming is that most of the countries' legislations, and even those who have mature online advertising, lack regulation of online advertising on websites for children, which includes mobile phones and mobile applications (Van Schaik, Chatterton & Croxon, 2016). This lack of legislation is concerning especially when looking back at the above-mentioned numbers for advertising consumption.

Arguably, the only real protection of the child comes from parents. However, there is always the question if the parents are aware of the different "dangers" from the outside world, or more specifically, if they are aware of new and advancing advertising techniques and the fact that their children's usage behavior data is collected and used for cross-promotions.

This research will examine the parents' opinions and behavior when it comes to letting their child play mobile games. This is mainly important as Buijzen and Valkenburg (2005) found that active parental mediation is the best way to protect a child from the effects of advertising. Additionally, one should consider that the parent cannot always be present when the child is playing a mobile game, which is why this research aims to enable future research on this topic in order to provide newer ways of protecting a child from mobile advertising, without the parent having to watch the child constantly. There are ways to implement restrictive mediation, with installing software solutions and adblockers, but one should consider the parents' technical proficiency and skill levels in implementing such kind of protection.

When it comes to different types of advertising, mobile games have everything from simple pop up ads and banners to games made specifically for advertising like advergames

(Advertising in video games, n.d). According to Deal (2005), pop-up ads and banner ads (aggressive marketing) generally cause negative attitudes towards a brand (90% of users have a negative attitude towards pop-up ads versus less then 40% for banner ads), which raises questions about their effectiveness, however, it should be taken into account that the study researched adults. When it comes to children, recent research of Hudders, Cauberghe, Panic, and De Vos (2016) indicates that advergames create more positive brand attitude among children, which is why marketeers are starting to use them more. Deal (2005) also found that advergames incited more positive brand recall than pop-up ads and banners. In some cases advergames can be harmless, for example the LEGO games, but for more serious cases like games that support gambling could be an issue. For example, simple football manager games could involve betting on the games that are in the game. This is why it is important for this research to look into how the parents view advergames as their child might be exposed to them as well. In other words, a sub question of this research will cover advergames as they are the most recent way of advertising and as they are far more effective than the more traditional methods such as pop up ads and banners.

Finally, the research question of this research will be:

Research question: How do parents evaluate the effects of mobile game advertising in Montenegro on their children (aged 7 – 12)?

Sub questions:

How do parents mediate the effects of advertising to their children?

How do parents view and if they understand more advanced advertising techniques such as advergames and their effects on their child?

This research is planned to be done in Montenegro, a country that got its independence in 2006, which is now a candidate for membership of the EU and which joined NATO in 2017. It is a country in transition working on implementing the latest EU laws. This small South East European country is especially interesting as it was one of six republics of Yugoslavia, which was a communist country, so the laws differed greatly, but also perceptions on business and advertising. In such countries advertising legislation is a huge issue. For example, sport is very popular in Montenegro, and parents, especially fathers socialize with their children by taking them to watch sport games, but also to the bookmakers. Betting is perceived as a connected activity. There is a fierce competition between betting companies and they have large budgets to spend on advertising. Their

campaigns involve YouTube ads before every video on the website, especially now before the World Cup in Russia. Additionally, banners are present on every website that these companies can target through Google adword which off course, includes advertisement on mobile games in the form of banners, and social networks and messengers. In the offline world, Montenegro is a home to too many billboards which are covered with different betting messages. Because of the size of the country (population of 622.000) advertising campaigns do not use targeting techniques, in this case at least targeting adult audience. For the purpose of this research, this research will be conducted in Montenegro, where there is a high presence of untargeted advertisement. The addition of the "special" type of advertising content such as gambling makes the topic more alarming for the modern day Montenegrin parent.

Relevance

The social relevance of this research is based on the fact that Montenegro is aspiring to adjust to the laws of EU, while research such as this one might provide the country with a good starting point as to what adjustment and advancement are needed. The aim of this research is also to provide one aspect to this issue and to potentially provide a base for future research and eventually better legislation on this topic on an international level, not just for Montenegro. Finally, this type of research could also provide the parents with information about advertising to children through mobile apps and could potentially aid them in protecting their child.

As far as the scientific relevance goes, there is existing research on the effects of advertising to children, however, there is a lack of research on the topic of advertising through mobile games, which are more immersive to their users. Furthermore, as parental mediation is the main factor when it comes to protecting children, this research will uncover how parents are dealing with this issue and potentially provide suggestions for future research and forms of protection.

Finally, this type of research fits the Master's program of Media and Business from both the media and business perspective. The media side is covered with the advertising topics as advertisements are the main source of income for businesses featuring them and the main source of communication with the end consumer for companies. As far as the business side goes, companies that are aware of the dangers of advertising to children could use this type of research to engage in a more socially responsible way with the consumers.

2. Theoretical framework

As follows this section covers main concepts of this research. The first concept explains the popularity of mobile games and why children like to play games as well as explaining advertising in games. The second concept covers the effects of advertising on children, as it is important to understand how advertising affects children in order to be aware of its consequences. The third and final concept covers protection of children in terms of different approaches and parenting mediation and styles as well as importance of advertising literacy.

Popularity of mobile games

As for popularity of mobile games, Furini (2007) explained it through four reasons:

1) mobile games are used by casual gamers

2) technical availability, the mobile phone limitations cannot run complex games and are available to everyone

3) nostalgia, through the use of older titles, which were very simple to play the game developers used familiarity to get the consumers to buy and play

4) technical capabilities, the modern mobile phones are less capable than modern consoles, but can however compare to older consoles.

As cited in Kuittinen, Kultima, Niemelä and Paavilainen (2007), casual games are: "games that generally involve less complicated game controls and overall complexity in terms of gameplay or investment required to get through the game". These games are not just defined as casual due to the way they are made, but also thanks to their business models. Furthermore, Sedano, Laine, Vinni and Sutinen (2007) found that mobile phones create no fear for its user and have therefore determined that mobile devices are accepted as "play tools" among its users. More specifically, the research of Sedano et al. (2007) found that the players did not look their familiar mobile device with fear, so their play time was unobstructed by the tool that they used. This is an interesting finding when looking from a parents' perspective especially, when considering at the numbers from Docomo about 69% of children in Europe using a mobile device (2009). However, these numbers might vary country per country they provide a good estimate about mobile phone popularity.

Additionally, looking back at the Rideout (2014) where the average play time for children under the age of 9 is about 2 hours a day.

Advertising in games

The simplest form of advertising in games are pop-up ads and banners that appear outside of game content. Games obscure the line between fun and ad, as they are both at the same time. "The mental state of "flow" that some gamers get into while playing also may contribute to a blurring of the boundaries" (Montgomery, Grier, Chester & Dorfman, 2013). Culp, Bell and Cassady (2010) examined 290 websites from Nickelodeon and Cartoon Network (channels for children). The most dominant advertising strategy for advertising was games, namely 81% contained unique games with advertising content. The number of analyzed games totaled 247. All of the games were found to have at least one brand identifier. The advertisement had only one positive advertisement promoting healthy food for every 45 exposures to a brand. In other words, the research found that the food industry used children's games to strengthen their position with the child and increase brand loyalty. As Culp, Bell and Cassady (2010) found most of these advertisements contained products containing high sugar and fat, which were the negative cases of the research. The findings of Rozendaal, Slot, van Reijmersdal and Buijzen (2013) indicated the children have awareness of the advertisement through social games, but they were uncritical towards it. This would indicate that the findings of Culp, Bell and Cassady (2010) are especially concerning when it comes to protecting children, as their findings indicated a high number of negative advertisement (sugar product advertising) targeted at children. Finally, Martinez (2017) found that playing mobile free-to-play games with advertisement was a very demanding environment for children. This is mainly due to interruptions of playtime from pop up ads and sponsored content and such an environment was frustrating for the interviewed children. Moreover, the children were also found to resist the content to some extent.

However, pop up ads and banners are not as effective as different forms of advertising through games, namely, advergames. According to Deal (2005) advergames are a type of games that intend to promote a brand through in game content instead of regular sponsored content such as pop up ads and banners. Furthermore, Deal (2005) also found that advergames were more likely to incite brand recall. When these kinds of persuasive games are used as a form of advertising they "often involve the child for a longer period of time than TV ads do, and the experience of playing the game is more immersive and may promote identification with the product" (Moore & Rideout, 2007). Other research such as

Hudders, Cauberghe, Panic, and De Vos (2016) found that advergames are much more effective than regular sponsored content such as pop ups and banners among children, as pop up ads cause frustration since they interrupt play time. More importantly, as their findings indicated a lower level of "affective advertising literacy" (the extent to which someone uses advertising literacy in order to respond and defend themselves against advertising) when compared to regular sponsored content (Hudders, Cauberghe, Panic, and De Vos, 2016). An, Jin, and Park (2014) found that three quarters of the children did not recognize advergames as adverts. However, those with higher advertising literacy were found to be more skeptical about its contents when they recognized the advergame. In other words, the children that did recognize advergames (namely the one quarter of the exposed children) had to have a high advertising literacy in order to not be affected by its content. Finally, the research of An and Kang (2014), where 131 different websites with games targeted at children were examined, found that only 10% of the websites made a clear distinction between advergames and regular games. This is concerning when considering the stronger effects of advergames. Moreover, the 10% that did have a distinction between advergames and regular games were not visible enough for its users (An & Kang, 2014).

Effects of advertising on children

The research of Haynes (2015, p.7) has shown that: "children by the age of 18 months can recognize basic brands. By the age of three they know a good range, and several hundred by the age of 10. Their brand/logo identification has been found to be higher than their knowledge of, for example, the natural world. By the age of 8-10 children also have a good sense of the relationship of brands to social status including their own." This indicates children's early susceptibility to advertising. With the change of media, the advertising to children also changed and recently, with the development of technology, it changes even faster, from print ads on comic books, and Disney's Mickey Mouse Club to specific TV channels for children (Haynes, 2015).

Opree, Buijzen, van Reijmersdal and Valkenburg (2014) have found that children aged 8 to 11, when exposed to advertising over 12 months have had increased forms of materialism. In other words, the findings indicated an increased desire towards the advertised item. Buijzen and Valkenburg (2003) also found that a child's exposure to advertising had a direct effect on the child purchase requests to their parents. An older study of Goldberg (1990), in which the researcher conducted a quasi-experiment with English and French speaking children in Quebec, where the English-speaking children were exposed to American TV

channels that contained more advertising than the French (Canadian channels) where advertising to children was banned resulted in English speaking children having more toys related to the advertisement of cereals, than the French speaking children. A similar example was found in the research of Grube and Wallack (1994) where it was established that children were more likely to start drinking alcohol when they grow up, after being exposed to beer advertising. One can conclude that both older and newer research agrees that advertising can have significant effects on children due to their susceptibility. Other research has found that advertising has cumulative effect (being exposed to a number of the same ads related to food products) on children's eating habits (Kunkel et al., 2004). According to Kunkel et al. (2004), a large number of advertisement that targets children, features candy, fast food and snacks, which as mentioned could potentially have an effect on children's eating habits.

Parental Mediation and Styles

Given the profound effects of advertising on children, the parents responsibility comes into play when having to protect children against unwanted advertisement. Primarily, one should define family communication and parental mediation. The family communication concept was based on the above-mentioned "consumer socialization" theory. As explained in Buijzen and Valkenburg (2005), family communication can be divided into two concepts, namely, socio-oriented communication and concept-oriented communication. Socio-oriented communication stresses the importance of parental authority, while the concept-oriented communication values opportunities for open-discussion with the children. On the other hand, parental mediation when it comes to advertising, is the way that the parent communicates with their child when it comes to discussing advertising content (Buijzen & Valkenburg, 2005). According to Buijzen and Valkenburg (2005) there are restrictive and active mediation. Restrictive mediation was defined by setting a strict set of rules for the child, for example, reducing advertisement consumption. On the other hand, the active mediation involves conversations with the child about the advertisement that the child is consuming (Buijzen & Valkenburg, 2005). As for parenting styles, as explained by Valkenburg et al. (2013) are the way the parents manage the parental mediation. The three parenting styles that were discussed in Valkenburg et al. (2013) are the autonomy supportive, controlling and inconsistent, which were based on the specific media parenting context. Autonomy supportive style emphasizes the child's autonomy by having the parent openly talk about topics and engage in conversation with the child. While the controlling

parenting styles, as defined by Valkenburg et al. (2013), is the pressure from a parent to behave according to a set of rules. Finally, the inconsistent parental style is the parents' irregularity when it comes to managing child's media consumption. Furthermore, in case of autonomy supportive and controlling parenting style Valkenburg et al. (2013) divided the concepts into active and restrictive. Active autonomy supportive style, for example is the parent actively understanding and discussing the child's point of view about the media content, while the restrictive autonomy supportive is about placing rules about media consumption, while still taking the child's point of view as a serious opinion (Valkenburg et al., 2013). As for controlling styles, the active controlling style is about the parent giving their own opinion about the media content without taking the child's opinion, while restrictive controlling style is restricting media content consumption and punishing unwanted behavior (Valkenburg et al. 2013).

This section covers parental mediation as Kunkel et al. (2004) found denial by the parents to the children can cause problems for the parent child relationship. This would mean that understanding parental mediation for the purpose of this research is essential. Valkenburg et al. (2013) found that restrictive mediation worked more effectively with younger children, as they are less likely to rebel. However, adolescents were found to be more individualistic and requiring the active approach with understanding in comparison to younger children (Valkenburg et al., 2013). This is an important finding for this research, as Valkenburg et al. (2013) explained adolescents are much less likely to comply with when compared to young children. This is why this research analyzes young children as they are more compliant with the parents, which also allows the parents to keep better track of the child as they should be more behaving according to the parents' rules. Moreover, Valkenburg et al. (2013) also found that young children tend to stick to their already chosen media. Finally, Valkenburg et al. (2013) established a scale to measure parental mediation. Buijzen and Valkenburg (2005) found that active mediation about advertising was found to be the most effective method of reducing the effects of advertising on children. The study was conducted on 8 to 12 year old children with their parents present. The parents were tasked with actively mediating the message from the advertising, while one of the groups was just the parent observing the child. This is especially important as Byrne and Lee (2011) found that children do not understand why parents would impose rules about advertising. More importantly, children were found to do the exact opposite of what the parent suggested, this phenomenon is referred to as resistance theory (Varava & Quick, 2015), which is why it is important to cover different types of mediation. However, as already

mentioned, the findings of Valkenburg et al. (2013), who found that restrictive mediation works better with young children when compared to adolescents, which in a sense goes against Varava and Quick (2015). However, since this research is researching parents of children aged 7 to 12, Valkenburg et al. (2013) research would seem to be more suitable as adolescents are more cognitively developed, which in a sense is related to the resistance theory of Varava and Quick (2015).

In their study Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave and Ponnet (2016) divided children into groups based on the parental mediation scale from Valkenburg et al. (2013). The groups were then exposed to the same type of advertising through social network games. To be more specific, the 780 participants were exposed to the same advertisement and were later divided into groups based on the type of mediation and parenting style that the parents used. The most relevant results came from the parenting style of autonomy supporting (where the parent supports the child's autonomy and decision making) combined with active mediation. The research suggested that restrictive media mediation in the active autonomy parenting style increased the understanding of selling intentions of the advertisement among children aged 10 to 14. While active media mediation in the same parenting style had a positive relation to understanding persuasive intentions of the advertisement. With this the research of Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave and Ponnet (2016) found that different type of parenting styles could make restrictive mediation have more positive effects. An important note here is that both the active and restrictive mediation are effective when applied correctly (Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave & Ponnet, 2016). Finally, according to Kunkel, Wilcox, Cantor, Palmer, Linn and Dowrick (2004): "A variety of research findings… have found that parent–child conflicts occur commonly when parents deny their children's product purchase requests that were precipitated by advertising."

Understanding parental mediation is important, as aside from existing legislation parents are responsible for protecting and raising their children. On the other hand, the findings of Nikken and Jansz (2007), where in 21% of the analyzed cases (536), children under the age of sixteen were found to play restricted video games (games that the parents restricted the child to play) "sometimes", while 4% were found to play them "often". For these cases Nikken and Jansz (2007) found that this behavior is mostly a cause of active parental mediation, or the parent playing together with the child. However, it should also be taken into account that different factors, such as the parents' lack of knowledge about a videogame and peer influence were found to be important factors in decision making (Nikken & Jansz, 2007)

Advertising literacy

In the research of Rozendaal, Slot, van Reijmersdal and Buijzen (2013) the advertising was targeted at children through social games. Moreover, their attitudes towards it were uncritical and they claimed to not be susceptible to peer influence, even though the results were different from their claims. Other results from the same research suggested that this uncritical attitude paired with high peer influence was the main predictor in predicting susceptibility. However, the research also found that the fair knowledge and understanding of advertising (advertising literacy) yielded to less susceptibility. This would indicate that advertising literacy was a factor in protecting children from advertising. Advertising literacy, as explained by Livingstone and Helsper (2006), is the knowledge related to advertising. Rozendaal, Slot, van Reijmersdal and Buijzen (2013) found that children had knowledge of advertising that was targeted at them.

Livingstone and Helsper (2006) argue that advertising literacy is the main factor when it comes to protecting children of different ages against effects of advertising. As they explained, this is why modern advertisements are adjusted to target children using different persuasion models based on their age (Livingstone & Helsper, 2006). However, they further argued that age was not the factor when it came to protection against advertising effects, but instead the child's literacy in advertising came into play. More specifically, teenagers were found to be less susceptible to advertising as they generally possessed more literacy, which is why it is widely believed that age is the main factor of susceptibility (Livingstone & Helsper, 2006). However, Rozendaal, Buijzen and Valkenburg (2009) found that persuasion knowledge among children aged 10 to 12 reduced a child's desire for products advertised through television, but children aged eight to ten were found to have an increased desire with the same knowledge of persuasion present. Looking back at Rozendaal, Slot, van Reijmersdal and Buijzen (2013) one could conclude that raising advertising literacy is not enough when it comes to protecting children from advertising affects. Hudders et al. (2016) findings would indicate that the child's affective advertising literacy is too low for advergames when compared to pop ups. Therefore, it can be assumed that the advertising literacy protection provided from the parents is not enough. this is an important factor as more advanced types of advertising such as advergames require the child to use even more advertising literacy. However, one should also consider parental mediation as a factor.

Furthermore, Rozendaal, Lapierre, Van Reijmersdal, and Buijzen (2011) claim that there is not enough empirical evidence that advertising literacy decreases a child's susceptibility

to advertising, as Rozendaal et al. (2011) explain young children under the age of 12 are not capable of cognitively reasoning and using their advertising knowledge as their minds are not mature enough. As elaborated in Rozendaal et al. (2011), the children are likely to have issues with retrieving knowledge spontaneously. This is further supported through children's uncritical attitudes toward advertising, even though they are aware of the persuasive message of advertisements (Rozendaal, Slot, van Reijmersdal & Buijzen, 2013). The article of Rozendaal et al. (2011) concludes that the concept of advertising literacy should be expanded into two dimensions that divide advertising literacy into performance (the children's capability of using their advertising literacy knowledge) and "attitudinal advertising literacy" (to cover the conditions of low elaboration, where children do no actively defend themselves against advertising). For this research these two concepts are important as it will look into children aged 7 to 12. These findings again further support the findings of Hudders et al. (2016) and emphasize the importance of understanding advergames.

For a final note, as cited in Vanwesenbeeck, Walrave and Ponnet (2016): "Consumer socialization is defined by Ward (1974) as "the processes by which young people acquire skills, knowledge, and attitudes relevant to their functioning as consumers in the market place" (p. 2)." (p.4). In other words, exposure to advertisement is a part of a person's socialization, which is why it is important to consider the potential dangers of it as well. In other words, it is important to consider the child's development into an adult consumer capable of making their own purchase decisions.

3. Methodology

The following sections cover different parts of the methodology of this research. It elaborates the research design, sampling method, operationalization, method of analysis and lastly its validity and reliability. The research design elaborates on the choice of method, namely the type of research and research method that was chosen. The sampling method section covers the sampling method and a detailed description of the sample that was used in this research. The operationalization section covers how the interviews were conducted, namely, how the participants were contacted, what they were told before the interview and what types of questions they were asked. The final part covers the validity and reliability of this research.

Research design

The research question of this research aims to analyze the evaluation and thoughts of parents about their children's exposure to mobile app advertising. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2011) qualitative methods examine the experiences of the participants and allow access to more in-depth analysis. The research question, which is aiming to analyze the parents' personal evaluation and understanding of advertising through mobile games, it is not measuring their knowledge but instead it is an analysis of how they evaluate the topic. Considering Denzin and Lincoln (2011) explanation of qualitative methods one can conclude that a qualitative study is the best choice. More importantly, it is also important to consider that qualitative studies allow for unexpected factors that the theoretical section cannot predict, while surveys on the other hand would limit the research with a set of questions and scales.

The method of the research was in-depth interviews. The choice is based on the fact that in-depth interviews provide meaning that the participants assign to their experiences (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Additionally, in-depth interviews are a good choice for exploratory studies, while also providing in-depth and personalized data as they allow the researcher to ask sub questions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). On the other hand, surveys can only cover what the researcher can assume about the parent's thoughts, which in this case is not possible. As for other qualitative methods, focus groups could be a valid method, however, this research aimed to uncover parents' personal thoughts about a topic without the effect of

what other parents might say about the same topic. Finally, in-depth interviews allow the participants to engage in personal reflection, as the interview might provide them with a new perspective on the issue.

The in-depth interviews were semi-standardized, as that allows the researcher to change and adapt the order of questions in order to collect the most information that they can out of a participant (Fielding & Thomas, 2008). Additionally, semi structured in-depth interviews also provide an opportunity to question certain standpoints that might differ among the participants. The interviews were conducted face-to-face, which allowed the researcher to grasp the participant's reactions first hand. The data was analyzed through a thematic analysis. The choice of a thematic analysis is based on the fact that a thematic analysis allows examining and grouping of the data into themes, which then provides insight into repetitive themes that the parents expressed (Attride-Stirling, 2001; Braun & Clarke, 2006). Through thematic analysis, one can also uncover the implicit and explicit meanings of the interviews.

Sampling method

The sampling location was the country Montenegro, as it is currently a country that is experiencing a lot of changes due to its goal to join the EU. Additionally, a lot of the advertising content is unfiltered, for example, political campaigns appearing on every device without the proper age group targeting. This provides a wider exposure than other types of advertising, for example the research of Culp, Bell and Cassady (2010) which looked into sugar product advertising on children's' websites. The decision for age sampling was made based on the school system that is used in Montenegro. Namely, children start pre-school at the age of six, while at the age of seven they start elementary school. So the age of seven was selected to be the lower limit of the age group for children. As for the high limit, at the age of 13 children in the Montenegro school system start having more complex subjects such as Chemistry and Physics, which is why 12 was selected as the upper limit of the age group for the sample. This is similar to the research samples that Buijzen and Valkenburg (2005) used. More specifically, the research of Buijzen and Valkenburg (2005) was conducted with a duo of a parent with a 8 to 12 year old child. Similarly, this research interviewed parents of children aged 7 to 12 years old.

As qualitative studies aim to provide detailed information instead of a generalization of results (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011) a large sample size is not necessary. The sample size

included 10 parents that have a child aged 8 to 12 years. Further requirements for the parents were for them to play mobile games themselves, as such knowledge about the ads and games cannot be speculated. More specifically, parents who do not play mobile apps do not have the ability to talk about advertising through mobile apps, nor provide a clear understanding of what their child encounters while playing mobile games. However, the research does not require the parents to have knowledge about advertising in general, as this might affect their judgment, although this did not mean exclusion from the research, parents with knowledge in the field could provide useful information.

The sampling method for this research was a non-probability method, namely the snowball method combined with the convenience method, which will be described in the following paragraph. This is mainly due to the fact that access to a list of parents that have children in the required age group is unobtainable. Therefore, the use of referrals from already established contacts was most viable, in other words, the snowball method. Finally, due to the constrictions of the researcher, the research was based in Montenegro. This also provided the researcher with a full use of personal tools, for example, meeting the participants in person and meeting them in their familiar environment. The way that this sampling method of convenience and snowball method was implemented was as follows:

The starting point for this research was a contact in the NGO roditelji.me, which is a NGO for parents in Montenegro, this person is the start from a convenience method (Ritchie, Lewis & Elman, 2003). As for the snowball method, as explained in Goodman (1961), the k factor were that the contact refers the research to people who they know that meet the conditions from the research, namely, the referrals had to be parents to have a child aged 7 to 12. Accordingly, the contact in the NGO referred this research to a number of participants. Additionally, the second contact from the convenience method was an employee of UNICEF, who also referred more participants to the research, including a parent that works in UNICEF. Each of the participants was also asked for further referral according to the same conditions. This method provided some form of a random factor in the research, as not all the parents were selected from the same group.

A total of 26 parents were contacted, while the final sample consisted of seven female and three male participants, a total of ten participants (N=10) (Figure 1). Six of the parents had one child while four had two or more children. Additionally, three of the four parents who had several children had adolescent children. The total of children was 13, while seven of the children were male and six of the children were female, without including the

adolescents. Finally, five of the participants had experience in the field of advertising (micro and small business owners or managers), while the others worked in different fields. However, three had some experience with digital advertising, for example setting up a sponsored ad on Facebook. Seven of the children from the participants had their own phones, one had a tablet while the rest used their parents' mobile phones. All of them were able to download apps on their own, in fact the parents considered them to be proficient with their phones. In some cases the parents claimed that their child could download apps from the age of four.

Name	Gender	Number of children	Gender of children	Children age
Natasa	Female	2	1 male 1 female	9 years old 11 years old
Milutin	Male	1	1 male	7 years old
Danilo	Male	3	1 male 2 female	8 years old 10 years old 12 years old
Danijela	Female	2	1 female 1 male	9 years old 12 years old
Maja	Female	2	1 female 1 male	12 years old 17 years old
Jelena	Female	1	1 female	7 years old
Dusica	Female	2	2 male	11 years old 17 years old
Nina	Female	1	1 female	7 years old
Nikola	Male	1	1 male	7 years old
Andjela	Female	1	1 male	7 years old

Figure 1.

Operationalization

All of the in-depth interviews with the parents started with a consent form explaining their rights, usage of acquired data, confidentiality and ability to remain anonymous. The in-depth interviews were all audio recorded through audio software. The average length of the

interviews was about 44 minutes, however, this does not include the cut footage, as some of the interviews had to be cut due to the appearance of guests or waiters. The location of the interview was chosen by the participant as that was the place where they felt most comfortable at. The following sections cover some of the explanations for the choices of the talking topics that were used in the research (Appendix 1). Additionally, it is important to consider that depending on the parents' answers some sub questions were asked outside of the topic list. This allowed the research to look into relevant concepts that might uncover some unexpected results. As can be noted from the Appendix 1, the topics were numbered 1 through 14. The sub questions were listed under their topic marked with the letters of the alphabet. However, it is important to consider that the numbering was not used in a specific order of asking questions, as the parents could start another topic on their own without the researchers' intervention. For example, the parents discussing their child's mobile apps usage when asked about their own app usage.

Before the start of the interviews the participants were given a short explanation of the topic and the goal of the research, namely, to uncover the views of parents regarding mobile game advertising to children. They were also informed about their right to remain anonymous and they were told how the information from the research will be used. They were also informed about their child's anonymity and the research' use of information about their children.

The interviews then started with questions in regard to the parent's personal use of mobile apps and their knowledge about advertising (Appendix 1). Sub questions, later on in the interview, involved questions to see their own experience and effects of advertising on the parents; this was mainly to provide perspective and a starting point on how they experience the effects of advertising on their child, while being exposed to advertising content. What can be derived from the theoretical section, parental mediation was included in the interviews and the parents were asked how they mediate their child's playtime, as this was an indication about their general parental mediation. The parents were not asked directly about the theory, instead they were asked to explain how they manage their child's play time, how they talk to the child about content that they consume etc. This section aimed to start the parents' thoughts about the topic and have a good starting point for the rest of their talk.

Moreover, the parents were also asked about how they talk to their child about advertising and sub questions about whether or not they talk about it before the child is

exposed or after, as this could be an indication of the parents considering advertising to be a threat to their child. This way the questions would somewhat provide insight into how the parents protect their children, more importantly, these questions referred to the concepts of active mediation that was found in Buijzen and Valkenburg (2005) to be most effective when it came to protecting of a child, as explained in the theoretical framework of the paper. Parents were asked about their own experiences with marketing. This was done mainly because their own knowledge affects their attitudes and also ability to explain ads to the child. They were also asked about their child's advertising literacy, partly to chek their own advertising literacy but also to uncover if the parents used other ways of protection for their child. This was mainly done if the parents did not mention this on their own. Sub questions were asked about different types of ads to understand their knowledge more in detail. Further questions discussed their child's exposure to ads and general mobile use. For example, the parents were asked how much time the child spends on its mobile phone and how often they ask about content that comes up on their screens. Sub questions narrowed down these topics, for example, the parents were asked how the child deals with pop up ads. Some sub questions also addressed in game purchases and types of ads that their child encounters, as these questions indicated some effects that the ads had (Appendix 1). Then the parents were asked to describe if there were any effects of advertisements on their children, for example, the child wanting a certain type of product after engaging in a mobile game. This part aimed to have the parent talk about their child's susceptibility to advertising.

The questions were structured in this way in order to lead the parents to talk more about the topic instead of just asking directly what is needed to know. This also allowed the parents to talk about what they thought was important about a certain topic, which uncovered other unexpected themes within the topic of discussion. Moreover, as there is a large number of mobile games, the researcher asked the parents to describe the game that their child was playing and asked the parent to show the game if necessary. This way asking questions about certain parts of the game becomes viable, especially if an advergame is in question. Additionally, examples of advergames and adverts were used, as direct examples gave better insight to the parents about the topic. Such examples were the LEGO and Čokolino games that are popular in Montenegro (Appendix 1). However, these examples were used after thoroughly questioning about how they evaluate mobile game advertising. This is an important note as it could uncover the lack of knowledge and therefore their own advertising literacy as being a key factor in their evaluation. Finally, the interviewer asked about how the parents would protect the child against unwanted advertising, this resulted in

different opinions that are covered in the results section. This part was important as the parents took a standpoint on who they felt was responsible for their child's safety.

Data collection and analysis

The data collection of the research was conducted through audio recordings of the interviews. The recordings were transcribed verbatim in order for them to be thoroughly analyzed through thematic analysis. Three of the interviews were conducted in English while seven were in Montenegrin (Serbian, same language, different dialect). The tool that was used for the recordings was QuickTime Player on a MacAir laptop's microphone. The files are in .aifc format, which is one of the higher quality ones for audio. The researcher stayed as neutral as possible during the interview in order to avoid affecting the respondent, while also maintaining engagement and keeping the interview to the point. This was important as the parents were discussing personal things about how they raise their child.

As for the choice of a thematic analysis, as per Braun and Clarke (2006) explained, thematic analysis allows the researcher to bring out the main words and themes in the interviews. This also allows the researcher to compare the similarities and differences between the interviews. This type of analysis is conducted through coding. The coding process started with open coding, where the researcher draws out the raw data from the interview (Boeije, 2014; Braun & Clarke, 2006). The next step was looking for relationships between the words and placing them into categories., so that the researcher could establish the main concepts of the interviews. This process is called "axial coding" (Straus & Corbin, 2008). Finally, the researcher conducted selective coding, where the goal is to find connections between the main concepts (Straus & Corbin, 2008). Finally, the selective coding looked at the connection between the main concepts in order to find the answers for this research (Boeije, 2014). The thematic analysis was done according to Braun and Clarke (2006) method, while Attride-Stirling (2001) approach was an extension to the thematic analysis, namely, thematic networking was used for this research. More specifically, thematic networking, as explained in Attride-Stirlling (2001), was illustrated as a creation of codes into a hierarchical order with the goal of providing possibility to asses and track the themes to its core words, this also uncovered unexpected findings when one looks at the results backwards or tries to group the words differently.

The tool that was used for coding the data was Atlas.ti (a tool used for qualitative research). The tool allows for easier open coding and data management. Through Atlas.ti the

researcher was able to examine the raw data that was gathered from the interview. The collected data was then categorized into groups through the tools option of highlighting words. The words were mainly keywords from participants and some words that were repetitive, for example the same words that the participants used when discussing certain topics.

The axial coding, which allowed the researcher to group the data into networks, was then used on the open codes. The networks consisted of a main concept that was made out of sub concepts, which contained the open codes. For example, a main concept was "mediation" while the sub concepts were "active mediation" and "restrictive mediation", while the open codes in these categories involved "questions form the child", "request from the child", "restrictive content" etc., while the concept of "protection" had the subcategories of "software" and "discussion with the child". On the Atlas.ti tool this was the network section.

For the selective coding, Atlas.ti was used to reorganize the axial codes into different categories by looking at which category contained the most useful information. This was achieved with arrows through the tool of Atlas.ti.

Validity and reliability

Denzin and Lincoln (2011) extensively discuss the difficulties with both validity and reliability in qualitative methods as they are essentially different from the quantitative ones. The main issue that is discussed is that quantitative studies are precise and use software and statistics to analyze data, while qualitative studies rely on the researcher's thoughts, understandings and interpretations, which are inherently subjective. This results in a lack of replicability. This is why the results section includes important citations from the participants with detailed explanations of the interpretation from the researcher.

As Baxter and Jack (2008) explain to achieve some form of reliability in qualitative research transparency is required. Looking back at the data collection section of this paper, a detailed description of the tools used for the research was provided. Additionally, the researchers' approach and behavior with the participants was described. The operationalization section also connects the theoretical framework and in depth explanations as to why some of the topics that were used in the interviews. The section discusses in detail what questions were used for what purpose. This way future researchers can use the same questions to achieve some form of replicability. However, one should also consider the culture of the country and of the participants. More specifically, some cultural aspects in

other countries might affect the reliability of suing the same set of questions depending on the parents' culture. Additionally, some things that are considered a part of daily life in the country, one such example is gambling and a lack of enforcement of age regulation and how this is a known issue in the country that the parents are aware of, but can not do much about it. Finally, one should also take into account the intersubjectivity of the researcher and the participants, as this differs for everyone. More specifically, this is an important consideration as the researcher is from the same country and is very familiar with the culture in the country. Finally, one should also consider that the parents are discussing their child's mobile use and safety with a researcher that they are not familiar with, which again affects their subjectivity and storytelling.

Similarly, validity is also an issue for qualitative studies, however, it is a cornerstone of qualitative studies because establishing reliability in qualitative studies is difficult (Baxter & Jack, 2008). To ensure some form of validity the researcher used the same set of topics and examples for every participant while focusing the interviews with extra sub questions to keep the interviewee on track, as consistency is important in qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Through the same examples the participants were provided with the same knowledge, which again adds to the validity of this research. Finally, as validity is difficult to establish, the Results section of this paper contains the data analysis in detail and reasoning in detail. With this method, the validity of the research can be established, as validity is essentially proving that the answer of the research is logical. Also, as mentioned the results section will also include citations with in depth explanations in order to deepen the validity of the research.

4. Results

To start off, all of the conducted interviews were relevant for this research and provided different perspectives on the issue. What was perhaps the most interesting finding was the parents agreement when it came to protecting the child, however, their approach to this issue differed greatly. When it came to mediation, the findings had a huge variety among the parents, however, an important note here is that all the parents used both active and restrictive mediation. Some of course used one more than the other parents, which is what made this research more relevant, as there is a variety of opinions. This did not just vary on mediation, but was present on their approach when it came to establishing trust with the child. A final interesting finding was their comparison with how their own parents raised them in different times.

The parents' education was an interesting factor in the research as some background in marketing resulted in some statements that where contradictory, for example, the parents doubting the effect of advertisement on themselves, but admitting that good targeting and influencer marketing was effective on them. This was interesting to see as, in their own words not all forms of advertising were effective. When asked about the effects of advertising through mobile games, all of the parents said that it was frustrating and ineffective. It was interesting to see that all of the parents commented that pop-up ads are annoying and ineffective and that their children have learned very early to find "X" to turn them off. They also claimed that pop-up ads have a negative effect on the brand perception. Their opinion regarding banners was not that consistent. Some claimed that banners were annoying and ineffective but the others said that if targeted well banners can be very effective. Targeting was found to be a general problem in Montenegro, mainly that it was not properly executed.

The parents' occupation resulted in some of the most interesting perspectives. For example, Nikola is an employee in UNICEF and his perspective was especially interesting, as UNICEF is already working on the issue. Their last project was an app (net-friends) that works on educating children about the dangers of the Internet, games and online advertising. The participant explained that the app was unsuccessful, as they are having issues in getting children's interest. Another interesting occupation was a UX designer, namely, Milutin. This is mainly because he took his son's protection into his own hands and created a special firewall on his router in order to deflect unwanted content. The firewall also has a specialized ad blocker. This is interesting as from his perspective it was the parents'

responsibility to defend their children and he took it very seriously. Other occupations provided different perspectives as well, however the perspective did not come from the parents expertise in the job. For example, Danijela runs her own marketing agency from home, which allows her to spend a lot of time with her children. This resulted in some interesting statements when it came to watching over the kids and devoting time to them. Furthermore, in some cases the parents' usage of mobile apps was interesting as well, as Danilo was able to look at games from his own perspective, as he spends several hours a day on mobile games.

Almost all of the parents gave their child their own device at a very early age, contrary to the findings of Docomo (2009) which stated that children get their phones at the age of 10-12. Namely the children received a phone or as early as the age of 5. The only one that is different is Milutin who claims that his own child will get the mobile phone at the age of 13. Although, these findings cannot be generalized, since this research had only 10 participants.

Some of the parents explicitly created separate accounts for their children's phone use but others just seemed to not understand the importance of creating a separate account. Later in the interviews they would get to do the point were they would understand targeting and potential problem their older accounts would create in terms of targeting to the children. Most of them understood parental controls.

Results from codes

As for the results themselves, the open coding resulted in 123 open codes, which were mainly open codes relating to the topic. When the parents went off topic, which was often for some of them, the interviewer kept them on topic as much as possible, but some parts of the conversation went off, for example, discussions about their work and professional interests and such. In some cases, the professional interests were relevant for the topic, for example, critical thinking about advertisement and Nikola's answers that related to UNICEF's work in Montenegro. In other words, the parents went off topic at times, which is why the semi standardized in depth interview format was the best choice for this topic. This proves the relevance of the chosen method of research.

Next, the open codes were processed into axial codes. This was first done by grouping open codes into sub concepts, a total of nine. The sub concepts were mainly a name for a topic under which similar open codes belong to. For example, the open codes "restrictions", "data plan" and "parental controls" were under the sub concept "restrictive mediation".

Furthermore, the sub concepts were then grouped into concepts. For example, the sub concepts: "active mediation" and "restrictive mediation" were grouped under the concept "Parental mediation/protection". There was a total of five concepts under axial codes. Finally, the five open codes were coded into three selective codes. The three selective codes were: "Parental Responsibility", which had the axial code "Parental Mediation/Protection", "Parental Discussion", which had the axial codes "Advertisement" and "Game content", and finally, "Social norm", which had the axial codes "Peer pressure" and "Social norm". It is also important to mention that "Parental discussion" and "Parental Responsibility" had some overlaps with codes, however, the separation of the two codes was made based on the parents' answers. This was mainly done so because the parents stressed the importance of trust with the child for any topic and as discussed in the theoretical framework of this research, "parental mediation" refers to actively discussing advertising content with the child, while the "Parental discussion" as a code covered other topics as well, such as the content of the game, which the parents found to be important. From the "DataFiles" this can be noted through the axial code "Advertisement" being a part of both "Parental Responsibility" and "Parental discussion".

As follows the next sections will list the most important results from the research. It will also elaborate on the grouping of some codes, as there were unexpected findings, which will be discussed in the next chapter. The sections will also list examples from parents as those can provide both validity and a clearer understanding of the results of this research.

Advertising effectiveness and literacy

For the purpose of the parents of being able to reflect on their own experience with advertising to the child's the parents were asked how they deal with advertising and how it affects them. The most interesting answer for this question was provided by Milutin who stated: "It depends on the type of advertising. That what has influence on me, that's what I see, are two types of advertising - influencer advertising, I believe so much to people when I follow on the Internet, on YouTube, on their blogs, social media and I don't know what else... and... I follow people about when I'm sure, I don't know how much I'm right, they wouldn't permit to advertise some bad thing which is low quality, so, um, I don't know now…" For him marketing is only as effective as the advertising is, to which he named specific examples. Furthermore, he also stated that: "Everyday marketing or target marketing kills me, in a sense that I'm really susceptible to buy a thing which someone through re-advertising offers, it's big possibility to sell something to me." From all the

parents, Milutin provided the answer that explained his susceptibility to advertising even though he provides a clear understanding of how it works. This is an important factor as later on, when he was asked about his child's way of understanding advertising he stated: "it's more difficult for every child to make a difference that it is, that it isn't advertising. Anyway the child cannot understand advertising, because it wants that toy which is being advertised, so you can partly explain to him that it is an advertisement and that it will be sold to you." His answers can be seen as a critical analysis of advertising effectiveness on both him and the child. Moreover, his statement clearly matches the findings of Rozendaal et al. (2011) and Valkenburg et al. (2013), who both claimed that children under the age of 12 are not cognitively capable of defending themselves even with some advertising literacy. His claims can even be seen through his use of restrictive mediation, which will be discussed later in this section.

When it comes to other parents, their approach to advertising was a bit different, as both Nina, Danijela and Dusica, who work in the marketing sector mentioned: "it is a professional interest". However, Nina's case here is interesting as she claimed: ""Marketing doesn't affect me at all.", but in the case of her daughter she stated, "My daughter is a typical example of the effect of marketing and how it affects consumption." This answer would indicate that Nina has a clear understanding of the profane effects advertising can have on a child, which is supported by the findings of Buijzen and Valkenburg (2003). Later on in the interview, Nina even stated: "She (her daughter) even uses marketing slogans in her regular speech." This is also where her "professional" perspective came into play, when she stated: "I understand them (businesses), they want to sell their product that's clear. And it's up to us to fight with those attacks and protect our kids. But it's hard to explain sometimes." This provided a clear sense and awareness of her responsibility as a parent. Similarly Milutin stated: "It's not possible that the chocolate factory cares about whether the child will eat too much chocolate or not. Parent is the one who takes care about that... and parent chooses channel and learn child to the right things. It is more difficult now, than it was before." On the other hand, Andjela provided a lack of interest in the dangers of advertising to her child: "I really don't like it and I try not to think about that so much, you know", but later on in the interview her answers changed, this is why the non standardized in depth interview gave better results than other kind of research method would give. Danilo's case is also interesting as he inadvertently referred to the "resistance theory" from Varava and Quick (2015) :""For now it's forbidden (Coca Cola). How it's going to be when they start to decide by themselves I don't know. If ads have any effect - probably they do. But

also everything that is forbidden also has an effect. Counter effect. That's why I try to explain why something is forbidden"

It can be concluded that the parents agreed on the fact that there is an effect of advertisement on children and the following sections will discuss how the parents approached the issue and how they dealt with it.

"Parental responsibility"

The most important finding of the research was that all of the parents felt that it is their own responsibility to protect the child from any threats on dangers. The first interesting concept here was their view of mobile phones, in the example of Milutin stated:"parents are treating phone as babysitter, what phone is not", later on he added, "you give the phone to a child and you cannot expect that it will teach your child to behave. It is up to a parent to control what kid watches, it is up to a parent to talk with kid about that." From these specific examples, the notion of parental responsibility can be taken out.

When it comes to other parents, some of them named their own examples from their childhood. An interesting quote from Jelena: "They watched over us from the window, while we were outside. We now look at our kids not through the window, but through their screens and we need to accept that." Similarly, Milutin stated: "that's nothing different than it used to be. You let your kid go outside um, it's on you to see with whom he hangs out and what is that they show um, what is doing and to talk with your kid about that what is happening". This symbolic is interesting as the interviewees used it to explain how the times have changed and how the parents had to adapt to the current societal changes. This type of context was used as a selective code, namely "parental responsibility", which is partially why the code was separated from "Parental discussion". The concept included one axial code, namely the concept "Parental mediation/protection" with two sub concepts of "active mediation" and "restrictive mediation". Open codes that were in these sub concepts included concepts such as "restricting play time", "parental controls", "taking away the phone", "data plan", "testing content" and others. These were under sub concept of "restrictive mediation". On the other side "active mediation" had open codes such as: "playing with the child", "teaching the child how to play", "talking about the game content", "explaining meaning of advertisement" etc. As an example of what would be coded: "Well, he knows something, you know, because the first time when the advertisement showed up on his game while he was playing, you know he clicks on it and then he been watching that, and after that he

asked me what is it, and I explained him that they, um, that is marketing, you know, they are selling things for him that are usually the similar content as that game he's playing." (Andjela). This short part would be open coded with "active mediation", "questions form the child", "explaining the meaning of advertisement". As for the grouping, these concepts were grouped together due to the parents' explanation of the importance of parental supervision. This is an important factor as all of the parents believed their child to be capable enough to understand the dangers of advertising and other content. In their own words, they aimed to have a healthy relationship with the child, so that the child would come to them with any questions. A strong example comes from participants Nina and Jelena, which went as far as complying with the child's questions by purchasing a certain product in order to teach the child about how fake the advertisements that they saw were. In Jelena's words when asked why she bought the product: "Fine. I bought her the "čokolino" (food for very young children), of course I made it at home and she ate one spoon worth of it and said mommy this is horrible. So now, I have one "čokolino" at home and I don't know what it's for anymore… perhaps for some baby to eat. But that wasn't... how do I say this… a 1,60e. That is not much … if I didn't buy it she would bother me, and she would be left with the wrong impression. I gave those 1,60e, and she simply saw that … it's something that you eat when you are aged one and a half. You don't eat that when you are seven." She was then asked to elaborate would she then do the same for different sweetened product for example Snickers bars, to which she replied that she does not have an issue with buying products for educational purposes and that later on she can use those as an example for the child when she gets baited by advertising again. In her case, this can be seen as a clear finding that was found in Buijzen and Valkenburg (2003), where the child's purchase requests increased based on advertisement exposure. Her approach to the child and advertising can be clearly seen as an act of active mediation combined with strong autonomy supporting parenting style, as she allows the child to make their own decisions (Valkenburg et al., 2013).

So, the second important concept from the axial coding here was "protection", which was also under the selective code of "parental responsibility". "Protection" did share some of the open codes with the concept "parental mediation", however, it was defined differently. For example, "software" and "parental controls" were under both concepts due to the context that they provide. This is mainly because the axial code "protection" included open codes such as: "marketeers responsibility", "governmental regulation", "CSR". The final analysis, however, indicated that the "protection" code was not as relevant. More specifically, when the parents were asked about receiving external help from companies in

the form of software or the government in the form of regulation they all agreed that it would be nice, but also explained how the main responsibility is on them. Maja says: "My daughter just goes out on the street and she can see three betting houses. We do talk about applications now but this is a matter of the community. It is up to us, the individuals to do something." And so, the final selective code under which these two axial codes under is called "parental responsibility".

Perhaps the most interesting finding was that all of the parents used the "Autonomy supportive" parenting style, which was found to be the most effective when raising a child (Valkenburg et al., 2013). This is especially interesting since, some of the parents used a combination of restrictive and active mediation. Interestingly, all of the parents had restriction on game time in one way or another, which in a sense is the restrictive mediation. This ranged from parental controls in the case of Danilo, to simply taking the phone in the case of Dusica and finally trusting the child to put it down when the time is up in the case of Danijela. In the case of Maja who stated: "we used to use an application to control the time spent on the phone. Not anymore", it was interesting to see that her approach changed as the child grew, which would match the findings of Valkenburg et al. (2013) that restrictive mediation does not work well with adolescents, so in a sense Maja is slowly changing and adapting in her own way. However, the type of games was looked at differently by each parent. Some of the open codes for deciding the content for the child fall under "active mediation", for example, "playing together with the child" and "discussing the content with the child". However, only one of the parents looked at the reviews, namely Milutin, while others either looked at the game's contents or checked the age restrictions.

For specific examples, Nikola said: "Now, he has his own mobile phone from until about six months ago but until then he was using our devices, so the problem for him, and this is now becoming a very nice learning tool, is that his data traffic is limited so he actually needs to learn, the same way he is learning to control his pocket money, he is learning how to manage his data, because at their school they don't have Wi-Fi access during classes, now, he has it at home of course, but whenever he is outside there are very few places in Montenegro where you can get free public Wi-Fi so controlling these things and managing with, through his data allowance he has during a month is also one of the ways that we are trying to control his screen time and mobile usage." In a sense, this can be seen as a restrictive tool for mediation of advertising and content in general, since the child cannot access unwanted content outside of the house, where Nikola is ready to talk to the child. Through Nikola's words it can be easily concluded that active autonomy supporting

mediation is what he uses. For example, as Nikola stated when asked about talking to the child about advertising: "Every half a year or year or so, we need to have a big talk about some of these things every time making it more complex so that he can understand it. The point there is that he still cannot grasp the concept fully of these things, but at least we are now at the point where he realizes why it exists, what the point of all of it is, so now he's looking at it from not something shiny that I am going to click on because it is shiny, that this interests me so I'm going to see it."

For other parents, Milutin used restrictive mediation the most of all the parents, but also spoke to the child about the content, however, his case is especially interesting as he did not directly tell the child not to do something, he "simply"(his words) programmed the routers firewall to limit some content, which the child is not aware of. He later explained some of his other restrictions: ": …I want to limit, from one side, the content about which I think that, actually the agencies which work with it (referring to ESRB), think that it isn't appropriate for a child of that age... to limit my child the access to that content and slowly, under controlled circumstances supervise, child accesses for example --- rating over that until he is under the supervision of his parents he can have the access to the content. If the child is 13, I mean 7 years old he can have the access to the content which is for the children of age 13, as far as he is being watched..." This is an interesting example of using both restrictive and active mediation. In another answer, Milutin also stated: "you must be here and guide your child through what he watches, otherwise you let other people explain what it is." This is a clear example of active mediation and an understanding of providing the child with the necessary knowledge. Andjela, on the other hand, had a more relaxed approach: "I'm just around in the house usually when he's playing, you know so I can say to him it's over now, an hour has passed or something like that. Or there is someone else in the house to tell him about that." Through her words, it seems like a form of restrictive mediation, however, her choices for the content are a bit different, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

On the other hand, Nina and Jelena were the most trusting and active autonomy supporting of their child. Jelena firmly believed that talking to the child about the advertising content was enough for the child to understand. They both named examples and explained how the child was annoyed by political ads after a while of being exposed. However, Nina differed in a sense that this was more of a thing that her child understand later on. Finally, when asked for the reasoning as to why they used the methods that they did Danijela gave an interesting example: "The parents have to be… I mean parents have their guard to high up

and they think that they can protect the child by removing the device itself, which is impossible, because they will go to school and talk to their buddies, and that one buddy will let them use their phone and then he will be exposed to it… it's going to make it even "sweeter" (better feeling) for them and it will be even more effective on them. So, I think that it is not a solution and that the parents should definitely be involved like it is the case with any other form of "vaspitanje" (educating the child to have manners and behave nicely)", but that is just one segment". From this example, it can be derived that Danijela's motivation is partially based on fear of the child finding the content on their own and not understanding it. An interesting approach here was the answer from Jelena: "my daughter sits close to me and I can check in every moment what is she doing on the phone or tablet. We are in this together." From her statement the clear usage of the active mediation can be derived. Both of these statements complement the research of Nikken and Jansz (2007) in a sense that Danijela's case emphasizes the fact that she knows her child will play restricted content, while Jelena's case would belong in the 4% which play restricted content with the parent through active mediation. In a similar case, Milutin stated: "They can do that or, that nothing can replace that the content that your child consumes, however hard it was, how tired of work it was, things like that that the content your child consumes, you have to consume with him, you have to be there to explain it to him what is it um, to a certain extent. 20%-30% of time how much is that content consumed, you must be here and guide your child through what he watches, otherwise you let other people explain what it is." This again confirms the usage of both active and restrictive mediation. Now, it is important to differentiate the two because Milutin was using restrictive mediation the most, however, this does not meant that he does not use active mediation to a large extent. This is specifically told here by him when he claimed "20%-30% of time how much is that content consumed, you must be here and guide your child through what he watches, otherwise you let other people explain what it is." An interesting point of view was given by Milutin who explained a story form his own childhood: "I had huge desire when I was young to have electric toothbrush, because it was advertised in „Politikin Zabavnik", and on the last page was a text that it is amazing and that children should have them. And when I moved in my proper apartment, the first thing I have bought was that electric toothbrush, because Oral B has advertisement in „Zabavnik". It is the same thing now with advertising." This example, gives some perspective into the importance of the child consuming content as Milutin explained this is not a negative case for him. However, looking back at Danijela's words "sweeter" because it is forbidden, it would seem this had a long term effect on Milutin.

"Parental Discussion"

It should be noted that other parents talked about their child's technical proficiency to an extent of saying that they know more than they do as a parent. To be more specific, Andjela stated: "I'm learning with this but I think that he knows, um, more then me right now.", Nina stated: "My girl, like all the new generations, is tied to mobile phones, tablets and all the modern technology stuff, and she knows it better than we do." Other parents had similar statements, however, in the case of Milutin and Dusica it was a bit different, as Milutin is a UX designer, while Dusica's husband is proficient enough and in charge of the tech stuff through the house. Danijela's child as described by her is very much into programming even at the age of 12. Aside from the child's technical proficiency it is important to consider what parents consider the phone to be. For example, Jelena stated: "her approach to the tablet or a phone and its applications is the same as per any toy, doll or a ball. A toy to play with." This would indicate the child values the phone as a play tool, which was stated in (Sedano, Laine, Vinni & Sutinen, 2007). This was the case with Danilo and Maja who both stated: "the harshest punishment for my daughter is to take away her phone". Now, this value that the children place in the phone is an important consideration when for the parents and this topic will be raised again in the next section as well. The next important concept that was raised by the parents was the "trust" that they wanted to build with the child, while the child is still young.

The next important finding was how the parents discussed the content with the child. This was interesting to see, as mentioned in the previous example from Nina and Jelena buying a product to the child to show them the "truth" about advertisement. Other examples included commentary on the advertisement, especially if it was a bad advertisement, this was the case with Danijela. Danijela's case is interesting as she works online and runs her own advertising agency from home. This gave an opportunity to her to be present for the child whenever, she claimed. Through the interview it can be noted that she actively engaged with the child in order to explain how advertising works through specific examples. However, these examples mostly came from the fact that she has experience in the field of marketing.

When it came to regular examples, all of the parents agreed that pop-up ads and banners were mostly annoying to both the child and the parent. In their own words, "the only time I or the child clicks on these ads is by accident, it is very rare that the child actually clicks it on purpose" this was mentioned by most of the participants. Some of the parents also added that their child learned how to turn them off on their own by just pressing everywhere, for

example Maja stated:"If she can't find the x close the popup ad she gets very nervous."
Milutin went as far as stating:"a child of a year and eight months now with perfect
percentage turns off pop ups on YouTube. So, at that age the child is trained to don't watch
the banners, to turn them off." Moreover, he also elaborated on this by saying:"I won't buy
it, I feel negative emotion towards that which has been advertised because it stands between
me and that what I want to do."

However, unlike pop-up ads banners were found to be less annoying because they were
not in the way of the game (Jelena's words) Finally, when asked about advergames, only
two of the parents knew what these were, but after explaining the concept with some
examples the parents had an easier time relating it to the child's games. However, the
parents did not feel that these were as dangerous mainly due to the brands that created these
games. For example, the LEGO games are very popular among the children and the parents
trust the brand, however, when asked about sugary products or other games the parents
simply replied they would not let the child play those types or that their child is not into
those types of games. The emphasis of the interviews was the political campaign present on
the banners of some games. However, not all of the parents saw this type of content in the
mobile game advertisement. This was similar for bookmakers.

For the bookmakers, the parents were a lot more specific. This was mainly because of
the capital having a lot of physical locations for betting and a lack of regulation for minors.
All of the parents agreed on bookmakers advertising on their child's phone was scandalous
and that it is an existing problem, as an example of that Danilo replied to the question about
what he thinks about that type of advertisement: "I think that's a disaster. And I think that it
will have an effect on them when they grow up" Similarly, Nikola replied to the same
question, however, he provided more context: "Not yet, I mean well, at least not in detail, he
asked me a couple of times what is this, and I try to explain to him what it is but he is not
that much interested in sports apart from watching a couple of his favorite teams, it is still
not something that interests him that much. Plus, he is still on the level of competing against
me. Like we are watching a game, who do you think is going to win and that's enough for
him, for now, but like I said, 3-4 years maximum maybe even less than that I think we are
going to have a huge problem there and to be perfectly honest I am not even sure what it's
going to be." Through this it can be noted that the parents are taking steps towards resolving
the issue, however, the danger of the effects is not as present as much. This can be derived
from "Not yet, I mean well, at least not in detail, he asked me a couple of times what is this,
and I try to explain to him what it is but he is not that much interested in sports..", this would

indicate that the danger is not there yet, however Nikola acknowledged it by saying "3-4 years maximum maybe even less than that I think we are going to have a huge problem". Another example is from Nina, who was asked how she fights against her child being exposed to bookmakers advertising: "Well am trying to somehow, when the moment comes, to be elsewhere (not on the topic of betting) with her (referring to her daughter) haha. However, kids these days are very much on "you" with betting (this is a term that they are very familiar with - betting). I don't think that is okay." She then proceeded to say she cannot do much about it considering that her husband occasionally bets and as a parent you need to set an example for the child.

Another interesting concept here was the questions that the children asked of the parents. For example, Nikola stated: "No. my son came up to me two weeks ago and asked me what's Poker Stars and I am like "where did you see that?" "I was looking at something and there was this nice lady and she said Poker Stars and they said that you can win money so maybe we should go there and win some money and use it for our vacation" and I had to explain to him what Texas Hold'em is, how it works, what gambling is, and stuff like that so…of course he understood, he knows some of the card games and then he realizes …and then I had to explain why some of the people would go there and actually lose their money and how someone can be happy if they win their money from someone else, when he knows that person is going to be sad, and so on… so I don't think these are the things you should go through with a nine year old and these are the things he should be seeing but unfortunately as you said there is no control." This example in particular raises concerns about the bookmakers and casinos advertising that the children can see. From Nikola's words it can be derived that the child was interested in gambling for innocent reasons at the current time but later on this might affect the child's behavior as was found in Grube and Wallack (1994).

These examples were in the second selective code "parental discussion". Now this code did not have as many open codes as the previous one but was found to be important as the parents valued a discussion with the child more than they did other solutions such as software. The axial codes under this category was "advertisement" and "game content", however, as mentioned the axial codes of "active mediation" and "restrictive mediation" were a part of the code. The concept of "game content" does not relate to the topic of the research question but was found important due to the parents stressing about the importance of checking the game's content and because Danilo and Natasa had expectations that the game content would be somewhat related to its advertising. The concept of "advertisement" had two sub concepts, namely, "banners and pop ups" and "advergames". These sub

concepts covered open codes such as "annoying pop ups", "watching pop ups for game content", "banner size" etc.

The unexpected "Social norm"

The last selective code of the research was "social norm". This concept was used in both axial and selective coding as it does not fall under the other two selective codes. The axial codes under this selective code were "peer pressure" and "social norm". This is mainly due to how the parents explained the importance of their child playing mobile games in order to fit in with their peers. The concepts have some overlap with the open code that include "talking with peers" and "pop culture". "Pop culture" was an open code that was present for all ten of the participants. All of them said "whatever the kids play these days" or words with similar meaning to those. For example, Natasa explained: "Uh, it would be nice to say that I do not allow them to play the games, you know, they are sometimes very annoying (laughs). It's the easiest way to give them a phone, to allow them to play on the phone. So I don't like it in one way, but I know that I have to give them because they have to be to follow their generation, so that they definitely don't feel out of their generation if they don't play same kind of games." These factors were an unexpected result of this research mainly because of the changing role of video games in society as can be noted from Natasa's response. The social norm factor in her words can be taken out of "...So I don't like it in one way, but I know that I have to give them because they have to be to follow their generation, so that they definitely don't feel out of their generation if they don't play same kind of games.". Additionally, "definitely don't feel out of their generation" this would indicate a sense of peer pressure and social inclusion, which were both open codes. Natasa's fears, in this case seem to be affecting her choice of letting the child play different kinds of games.

Moreover, the parents were also somewhat critical of their own understanding and thoughts about phones. To relate to Natasa's previous answer this can be seen in another thought that she brought up: "Because they sit crunched on that mobile phone like not that very healthy position and I don't like how they stare on their small screens and then it's too close to their eyes. I know it's all maybe saying that I am too old for that, but it's annoying to see them. It would be normal to see the kids running around or outside and playing football or something." Looking back at her previous choice of letting them play so they can fit in, it would seem as though she acknowledges the social values that the mobile games bring, while also being concerned about their health. This could also be the reason as to why she limited their play time to what she says "not more than an hour of something like that, but

it's not always the same, it depends on how much time do I have, well, how much patience do I have to forbid the playing, it's not always the same."

Similarly, other parents made the same comparison as Natasa, for example, Dusica said: "They chose the games themselves, but I assume they heard about some of those games from their peers, since in school they talk about games a lot…Do you play this?... Do you play that? (referring to how they talk in school). Although I think that my older child doesn't as much… the younger one uses what is popular among his peers a lot more than the older one. This is an important finding, as it elaborates on the fact that the parents are aware of the change and are somewhat reluctant about it, but still accept it and fight it in their own way. In Dusica's case, she stated that:"...But they have limitations when they study… this is when they have to leave their phones in a "safe" place in front of our eyes"\". This is yet another indication about the importance of the child being exposed to a certain amount of content, however, both Natasa and Dusica set down their own limitations based on the fear that mobile games might impede the child in other ways. In her own words Danijela discussed a little bit more of this issue: "The parents have to be… I mean parents have their guard too high up and they think that they can protect the child by removing the device itself, which is impossible, because they will go to school and talk to their buddies, and that one buddy will let them use their phone and then he will be exposed to it… it's going to make it even "sweeter" (better feeling) for them and it will be even more effective on them. So, I think that it is not a solution and that the parents should definitely be involved like it is the case with any other form of "vaspitanje" (educating the child to have manners and behave nicely)", but that is just one segment." The words "sweeter" are especially relevant for this research as similarly to the social norm, it seems like another motivation for the parents' choices. This theme came up with other parents as well, namely, Andjela stated that: "Because some of his friends, I don't know, they play almost every type of the game and their parents aren't controlling them and I'm not allowing those things yet, you know." However, an important consideration for this section is that parents are afraid of how other parents raise their children and are somewhat creating a pressure amongst each other to limit their child, as can be noted from Andjela's words: "their parents aren't controlling them and I am not allowing those things yet". Milutin's case, who was found to be the parent with the most restrictive approach stated: "I'm planning to remove all the restrictions in some period of life. You have... the main thing is that you are preparing your child, not for the world you'd like it to be, the world where everybody read books, draw graffiti and hang out, in nature. You're preparing for the world like it is for real now, everyone is constantly on the

phones. I don't want that the limitation of using screens influences on the other disciplines which are important for further life, so I have intuition, gradually, depending on how would child behave, somewhere around fifteen years old, I'm planning to cancel the restriction." From his words, it can be derived that he went deeper into the topic, by describing phones to be a part of the "real now" and how he is preparing the child for the world. This is an interesting approach as he is taking the "screen influence" very seriously. Later on, Milutin also stated:"you will limit one of the main intuitive mechanisms for future life." In Milutin's case, who is clearly applying the findings of Rozendaal et a. (2011) and Valkenburg et al. (2013), as was mentioned, this again, reaffirms that his adaption of restrictive and active mediation is exactly as it is in the research. More specifically, he is changing the usage of restrictive mediation to be smaller, while increasing the usage of active mediation as the child grows. Milutin also stated: "you must be here and guide your child through what he watches, otherwise you let other people explain what it is.", which again provides the meaning that there is a certain amount of fear to outside factors that the parents cannot control. Additionally, this reaffirms the assumption that phones are not only viewed as play tools in society anymore but have become like a toy (Sedano, Laine, Vinni & Sutinen, 2007). Similarly to Milutin, Danilo stated:" If we would strictly follow parental guidance I think the kids would grow up to be unadjusted. They need slow adjustment to get acquainted with the world in time." However, Danilo's words take a bit of a different approach, as he claimed "if we would strictly follow parental guidance I think the kids would grow up to be unadjusted ", this would indirectly imply that he does not trust the other parents or companies writing the guidance with raising his child because he understands the value of letting the child experience the worlds for themselves. To add to this, Jelena's words also provide some additional thoughts for this research: "I think that by letting her try out things she sees on the ad, she is growing up and on examples understands that what we buy is not the same as advertise, and that really helps." Jelena's answer here relates the current unexpected effect of the "social norm" to advertising. From her point of view, it can be concluded that she values the experience that advertising provides to her child, which relates to the "consumer socialization" concept discussed in the theoretical section of this paper. This notion was also brought up by Nina: "I decided to allow her everything. Why? Because as a parent I have two directions. One is to place all protections and limitations but that only counts at home. The moment she gets out she will be out of her community because she wouldn't know what are they talking about and then comes another problem - social pressure. And I will be a negative character who puts limitation and she can't hangout with her friends able to talk about everything they are talking about." What is important to note in

this section is that each of the parents used a different amount of restrictive and active mediation, while also mentioning the "social norm" factor. What is perhaps the most relevant part of this research is that these issues came up without the parents being directly asked about it. The final note here would be Nikola, who somewhat elaborates on his choice of using restrictive mediation as well as his thoughts on some parts of the issue: "I am extreme philosophically, economically even politically i am really against censorship of most kinds. So even when it comes to gambling you need to focus on times slots when you can present some of these things even if not banning it outright. However, what I think needs to be done is that we need to have parental control systems for mobile phones on the level of quality that we have for desktop computers. I have 0 issues firing up his computer and doing whatever he wants because I know that I have parental controls in place that are going to stop him from doing anything that I would not really want him to do and I checked at least twice a week to see what he has been doing, what he has been playing, what kinds of websites he has been visiting and this is something I have had 0 issues with." As can be noted from his words, Nikola is against censorship, however, he wants some control in the form of parental controls over what his child does. This is an interesting topic, as Danilo briefly talked about wanting to be aware of what the child does on their phone as well. In his case, however, it was interesting that he stated: "Control… why wouldn't it be good for me to know what they are doing in any given point in time...I would not have to check it all the time, but I would like to be able to see when I think it is needed. That would be good." When looking at the issue as Danilo stated here, it is important to consider the proficiency of the parents, especially since all of them used restrictive mediation in one way or another, however, if they are limited with what they can do on the mobile device, this might become an issue. This was somewhat answered by Nikola, when he was asked as to why he does not use, for example, a full control through a device that offers this option. He stated: "yes, there are but at least or maybe I haven't used the right app so far, the level of control and the things that fall through the cracks so to speak are much more … Advertising usually falls through the cracks… So this is something would probably be to …because it's very hard to fight tobacco, alcohol, betting it's much easier to restrict access to some of this content in a way that you can filter them from your phone." This is yet another interesting statement as he claimed here that "advertising falls through the cracks". This could be an indication as to why he also relies on active mediation combined with restrictive mediation.

The parents explained that even advertisement that their child is exposed to is a big part of the child's everyday life with their peers as can be seen from some of the above-

mentioned examples. The parents explained that even if they as a parent forbade a game or used software to protect the child from advertising content the child would eventually see it in school or would face exclusion.

An example of this can be seen in the above-mentioned quote from Danijela, where she explained that the children at school would eventually expose the child to cell phones and even make the exposure "sweeter", as she stated. This is an important concept, as it plays on the parents' fear, especially, because such a claim is supported by Kunkel et al. (2004), who claimed that denial from the parents results in disagreements. Moreover, Nikola gave a similar example but expanded it more: "I don't think that's going to work very well. Because you are going to have at least some of the kids in the school that their parents either don't care or they think that their kids are old enough that they are ok to have full access and they are going to come and tell your own kids do you know about that and that, and they are going to say no, and then they are going to keep showing them this stuff and so on. These things get around whether it's something as benign as a website you would not like them to visit or an ad for some type of toy that they want to get or I don't know if should speak about this a scandal that we had a with a 15 year-olds recording sex video, high school kids circling for about a month before anyone from the school got informed and reacted to that. And this is something that happens all over. You are not going to stop them by banning things, but you can stop them by speaking to them and teach parents about this. " Similarly Nina explained: "Unfortunately, today 90% of a child's socialization is inside the school, or on the streets, or from their friends. So, if I forbade her something or something doesn't reach her, then I will have a different problem – she will turn away from me, she will close of her path to me and then I won't know what is going on." Both Nina and Nikola first described the importance of not restricting the child's content, however, the important point of their answer was: Nikola's words "You are not going to stop them by banning things, but you can stop them by speaking to them..." and Nina's words: "So, if I forbade her something or something doesn't reach her, then I will have a different problem – she will turn away from me, she will close of her path to me and then I won't know what is going on." As much as these two parts differ in the wording, the same meaning can be derived from them. Both Nikola and Nina are trying to build a certain type of trust with the child, in order to resolve the issues that the child might face when seeing inappropriate content in school.

Other parents had similar examples and even mentioned disagreements with some parents, however, they did not discuss this in detail. Looking back at the interview this can be looked as peer pressure among parents, as to what the right way is to raise a child in the

modern times.

On a final note for the "social norm" was a statement from Nina: "They sometimes make me to play with them when they need an additional player for candy crush or submarines. Otherwise I am seen as a boring mom. I have to adjust to them." From her answer it can be derived that she as a parent felt responsible to keep up with the latest trends for her child. The words "I have to adjust to them" also give of a strong meaning of her "having" to play the mobile games so she can fit the child's image of a non "boring mom". The fact that she placed value in this raises an interesting point for parents, as in the past the parents would go outside and play with the child and now they have to play mobile games with the child or "watch them through the screen" as was stated by Jelena. As an interesting comparison Dusica and Jelena brought up a comparison to their own childhood. Dusica stated: "We as parents don't have proper control, that our parents used to have. We didn't even have phones so that our parents could call as and check where are we and what are we doing, but they still had more control over our lives because today internet is everywhere and children can use it without any supervision." This clearly indicates some form of awareness as to how everything has changed for her child and that the same rules do not apply more. However, one should consider the most technically proficient parent Milutin, who is capable of dealing with the most recent changes through programs and knowledge. As for Jelena's statement: "My mother told me when my daughter was 2 years old, that it was easier for her to raise me than it is going to be for me to raise my daughter." This would indicate that even Jelena's parents are aware of the changes and that they seem to fear them more than the parents interviewed for this research. Other parents had their kids (Danijela, Dusica, Maja and Nikola) had their children attend classes for learning about the dangers of the Internet. This approach would indicate that the more autonomy supportive parenting style, where the three parents expect the child to understand what is dangerous for them and what not.

The answers to the research question

The results of this research provided interesting answers to the research questions, while also uncovering the hidden and unexpected factors that the research did not anticipate. The following sections covers each research question individually.

How do parents evaluate the effects of mobile game advertising on their children (aged 7 – 12)?

The parents concern of the effects was not high, due to the parents' confidence in their

methods, however, as explained, the parents did not seem to be aware of their own subjectivity, which was expected. So, their evaluation was lacking due to their trust in the child's ability to fight the effects of the advertisement, when provided with the right knowledge. However, it is important to consider that they found political parties and gambling advertising to be an issue, but they placed priority on solving the enforcement of the above-mentioned enforcement of age regulation for children entering bookmakers locations and betting on their own or with their parents. Furthermore, it should also be considered that the age of the children is still not rebellious and they are more likely to listen to the parent, as was discussed in Valkenburg et al. (2013).

Another interesting answer that can be derived from the results is also that advertising did not seem like an immediate threat to the child, which is why the parents' reaction was not as was expected to some extent. Furthermore, this is supported by the fact that the parents' thought that the Internet has more dangers than advertisement could ever have. For example, Danijela, Maja, Dusica and Nikola sent their child to educational classes about Internet safety, while the other participants were equally scared of the online content that the child could see. In other words, this answer to the research question of this paper is more viable simply because it is not clouded by the parents' subjectivity.

The sub question: How do parents mediate the effects of advertising to their children?

As explained, the selective code "parental discussion" covers the answer to this sub question, as the parents believed that active discussion with the child mediates the effects of advertisement. All of the parents also used autonomy supportive style with active discussions with the child, while also adding some restrictions to the content. Specific examples, included data plans outside of the house and discussions at home whenever the child has questions or the parents felt the need to describe.

Finally, the last sub question:

How do parents view and if they understand more advanced advertising techniques such as advergames and their effects on their child?

The answer to this sub question was unexpected as the parents chose to simply restrict these unwanted games and when asked how they would deal with the advergames if their child played without them knowing about it, they went back to the discussion part. More specifically, the parents relied on the trust that they are trying to build with the child, or as they explained it they expect the child to come to them with the questions that they might

have. Overall, advergames did not spark much of the attention during the interviews, which seems like it is a topic still to be developed.

To expand on the research question and sub question another selective code was added, namely, "social norm". The unexpected finding was how much the parents disregarded the dangers of advertising. This unexpected finding is mainly based on other societal issues present in the country, which the parents discussed as a lack of enforcement of regulation from the government. This is somewhat mentioned as the answer to the research question. Moreover, some (as mentioned) named examples from their own childhood claiming that even then they were exposed to advertising through various ways and that these days there is more advertising, but as Milutin claimed with his toothbrush example it was not too big of a deal. More specifically, he explained his fixation on an electric toothbrush, which he saw in a magazine targeted at children. His parents at the time did not buy it for him, so he waited until he got old and bought it then. This would indicate that the parent is aware of how strong advertising can be on a child, but also, as he explained, it is a part of life. This lack of worry among the parents resulted in the final selective code of "social norms". Additional examples relate to the examples from parents as to why they do not take the phone away, namely, they (the children) will still talk to their peers who have a phone. Danijela even mentioned social exclusion based on not keeping up with the latest pop-culture.

"Social norm", this selective code was picked due the parents explanation that technology is changing our society and how they as parents are responsible in keeping up with the changes and not restricting the child based on their own beliefs. Arguably, the parents' understanding of the newer concepts was what caused the unexpected selective code of this research.

5. Conclusion

The first important point to understand as to why the selective codes were found so important as a part of the answer to the research question is the parents' attitude towards advertising. As mentioned the parents did not feel that advertising was a danger to their child, as the issues that they already encountered were dealt with in the above-mentioned examples or were simply seen as a part of the child's socialization, this directly relates to "consumer socialization" as the parents understand that it is, and it will be a part of the child's life. The way the parents dealt with such issues was somewhat of an expected result as all theoretical framework covered the concepts of parental mediation and advertising literacy, which both ended up as selective codes. Namely, the parents engaged in active discussions with the child in order to provide them with the necessary knowledge to deal with advertising content, Nikola even went as far as going back to the topic every half a year or so, while Nina and Jelena bought products to the child in order to teach them that everything that they see on an advert is not always true. So, the possible answer to the research question is that the parents think they found a way to deal with the issue without the help of legislation or software. The parents approach to the issue matched the active mediation as protection from Buijzen and Valkenburg (2005), however, the parents' explanation on the importance of discussion of content was more towards the findings Rosendaal et al. (2010). This is interesting as most of the parents claimed that they do not have the time to always watch the child, but instead they trust the child with decision-making, which is contrary to the findings of Rozendaal et al. (2011) and Rozendaal et al. (2013) that young children are unable to critically assess the content. The parents did confirm that the children sometimes do not apply the already acquired knowledge from the parent to new issues. This is somewhat of a contradiction to their previous claim of trusting the child with their decision making, as they themselves stated that sometimes they do not use the acquired knowledge. This was the case with Jelena where she used the previous example of her buying the product to the child upon request for future reference when the child forgets. So, in a way Jelena found a solution to the lack of critical thinking discussed in Rozendaal et al. (2013). However, it should also be considered that in cases such as Nikola's and some others, the parents understood that the child is too young to understand certain concepts, but he still wanted to provide him with the knowledge.

What can also be derived from the mentioned trust from the parents is that of the autonomy supporting. As was mentioned in the results it was explained that all of the parents were using autonomy supporting style with a combination of active and restrictive

mediation. This is an interesting finding for this research, as it can now be claimed that the parents used a combination of both the mediation with the autonomy style to help the child grow. These findings confirm what Vanwesenbeeck et al. (2016) findings, as their research found that the autonomy supporting style is the best way to go, but the type of active or restrictive mediation was situational. From the examples that the parents used, it can be assumed that the parents understand what is best for their child and have adapted to the current advertisement.

As was mentioned, the parents were not pleased with the bookmakers and political parties' advertisement reaching their child. In fact, they even blamed the bookmakers and political parties for neglecting this issue, especially since there is a lack of enforcement of regulation for under age gambling. The parents also explained that they cannot be concerned with advertising from bookmakers when their child is freely able to enter some bookmaking locations and gamble, which made sense to some extent. When it came to the child's reaction, the parents said that the child asked about politics and gambling but in most cases was too young to understand what the gambling or politics is. This however, as explained by Nikola and Jelena was a concern for the future.

Finally, it is important to consider that the parents are subjective when it comes to their child, especially when they named a case where the child's attention was diverted with "colors". However, the parents believed that in time the child will learn to distinguish these ads as well, but that is a topic of the child's brain maturing. The parents also agreed on the fact that their child is yet to mature, however, their approach to letting the child grow, or the "autonomy supporting" differed. This was an interesting finding, as all of the parents used autonomy supporting style in one way or another.

Overall, advertising through mobile games in Montenegro, was not considered much of a danger, even though political campaigns and bookmaker advertisement is present in the country. However, what was most interesting here is the unexpected factor of the "social norm". Both advertising and mobile phone gaming have become a part of Montenegro's society to the point that parents are afraid to restrict certain content to their child because they know that they will see it in schools. The way that the parents dealt with this was through active, and some restrictive mediation. From what can be derived from the results these actions from the parents are entirely based on trust building with the child, who as discussed is still in the age of not rebelling against the parents. The parents also stressed the importance of building trust with the child because as they explained, they are aware of what

dangers they can expect from teenagers. Their parenting and mediation approach matched the findings indicated in the theoretical section, which discussed the efficiency of active and restrictive mediation with children under the age of 12, however, not all of the parents used restrictive mediation equally. As was discussed, Milutin, Danilo and Nikola used restrictive mediation more than the other participants, however, this seemed to be a matter of technical proficiency as well, as was in the case of Dusica, who had her husband take care of the technical part of raising the children. It could be assumed that with the technological and societal changes the parents' way of raising children advanced with it, however, this does not mean that the parents are completely aware of this. This assumption can mainly be based on how they adapted their mediation and parenting style to the child based on the social norms in the country. These results, however, cannot be generalized but do provide insight for future quantitative research that could investigate the extent to which these assumptions can be made. Additionally, future research could also measure the effects of the unexpected "social norm" finding. It would be interesting to see the effects it has on parental decision making. Another suggestion for a future analysis would be to see the effectiveness of these parents' methods in the future, when their children grow up.

The final note here is that this research has contributed to developing a starting point for investigating the changes in social norms through mobile games and devices. As this was the finding that seemed to affect the parents decisions the most. However, an important note to be stressed here was that the parents did not place value in advergames, as the current threats did not come from them. On the other hand, even though the parents thought that pop-up ads were annoying and ineffective, they were concerned about their content, as in some cases the children asked questions about the content. The same was for banners, however, they were found to be less annoying and stressful.

6. References:

An, S., Jin, H. S., & Park, E. H. (2014). Children's advertising literacy for advergames:

Perception of the game as advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, *43*(1), 63-72.

An, S., & Kang, H. (2014). Advertising or games? Advergames on the internet gaming sites

targeting children. *International Journal of Advertising, 33*(3), 509-532.

Advertising in video games (n.d). In *Wikipedia.* Retrieved January 29, 2018, from:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Advertising_in_video_games

Anderson, J. (2018, January 8). A letter from two big Apple investors powerfully

summarizes how smartphones mess with kids' brains. *Quartz.* Retrieved from:
https://qz.com/1174317/a-letter-from-apple-aapl-investors-jana-partners-and-calstrs-
powerfully-summarizes-how-smartphones-mess-with-kids-brains/

Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic networks: an analytic tool for qualitative research.

Qualitative research, *1*(3), 385-405. https://doi.org/10.1177/146879410100100307

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and

implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 544-559.
Retrieved from: https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol13/iss4/2

Boeije, H. (2014). *Analysis in qualitative research.* London: SAGE.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative*

Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for*

beginners. London: SAGE.

Buijzen, M., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2005). Parental mediation of undesired advertising

effects. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *49*(2), 153-165.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4902_1

Buijzen, M., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2003). The unintended effects of television advertising:

A parent-child survey. *Communication Research, 30*(5), 483-503. doi: 10.1177/0093650203256361

Byrne, S., & Lee, T. (2011). Toward predicting youth resistance to internet risk prevention

strategies. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *55*(1), 90-113. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2011.546255

Chetterson, C. (2017, June 29). How Games Overtook the Movie Industry. *Geekadelphia.*

Retrieved from: http://www.geekadelphia.com/2017/06/29/how-games-overtook-the-movie-industry/

Culp, J. Bell, R. A., & Cassady, D. (2010). Characteristics of food industry web sites and

"advergames" targeting children. *Journal of nutrition education and behavior*, *42*(3), 197-201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneb.2009.07.008

Deal, D. (2005, June). The ability of branded online games to build brand equity: An

exploratory study. In *Proceedings of DiGRA 2005 Conference: Changing Views– Worlds in Play* (pp. 1-7). Retrieved from: http://www.digra.org/wp-content/uploads/digital-library/06278.45507.pdf

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*.

(3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

DIGITAL (2017, February 28). MOBILE KIDS: THE PARENT, THE CHILD AND THE

SMARTPHONE. *Nielsen.* Retrieved from: http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/news/2017/mobile-kids--the-parent-the-child-and-the-smartphone.html

Docomo, G. N. (2014). *Children's use of mobile phones – A special report 2014.* Japan.

Retrieved from: https://www.gsma.com/publicpolicy/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/GSMA_Childrens_use_of_mobile_phones_2014.pdf

Fielding, N., & Thomas, H. (2008) Qualitative Interviewing. In Gilbert, N. (Ed.),

Researching social life (3rd ed.) (pp. 245-265). London: SAGE.

Furini, M. (2007, November). Mobile Games: What to expect in the near Future. In

GAMEON (pp. 93-95). Retrieved from:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/221024346_Mobile_Games_What_to_expect_in_the_near_Future

Goldberg, M. E. (1990). A quasi-experiment assessing the effectiveness of TV advertising

directed to children. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *27*(4), 445-454. Doi:
10.2307/3172629

Goodman, L. A. (1961). Snowball sampling. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, *32*(1),

148-170. Retrieved from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2237615

Grube, J. W., & Wallack, L. (1994). Television beer advertising and drinking knowledge,

beliefs, and intentions among schoolchildren. *American Journal of Public
Health*, *84*(2), 254-259. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.84.2.254

Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2001). Are the strategic stars aligned for your corporate brand.

Harvard business review, *74*(2), 128-134. Retrieved from:
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mary_Hatch/publication/290844150_Are_the_stars_aligned_for_your_corporate_brand/links/57bc6bc708ae280fcea00cd8.pdf

Haynes, M. (2015). *(2015) Children and Advertising History*. doi:

10.13140/RG.2.2.35454.59209

Hudders L., Cauberghe V., Panic K., & De Vos, W. (2016) Children's Advertising Literacy

for New Advertising Formats: The Mediating Impact of Advertising Literacy on the
(Un)Intended Effects of Advergames and Advertising Funded Programs. In: Verlegh
P., Voorveld H., & Eisend M. (Eds.) *Advances in Advertising Research, 6,* (pp. 241-
252). European Advertising Academy. Springer Gabler: Wiesbaden.

Influence Central (2016). Smartphones & the Dramatic Reshaping of American Families.

Influence Central. Retrieved from: http://influence-central.com/

Kuittinen, J., Kultima, A., Niemelä, J., & Paavilainen, J. (2007, November). Casual games

discussion. In *Proceedings of the 2007 conference on Future Play* (pp. 105-112).
ACM. doi:10.1145/1328202.1328221

Kunkel, D., Wilcox, B. L., Cantor, J., Palmer, E., Linn, S., & Dowrick, P. (2004). *Report of

the APA task force on advertising and children*. Washington, DC: American
Psychological Association.

Livingstone, S., & Helsper, E. J. (2006). Does advertising literacy mediate the effects of

advertising on children? A critical examination of two linked research literatures in
relation to obesity and food choice. *Journal of communication*, *56*(3), 560-584.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00301.x

Martínez, C. (2017). The struggles of everyday life: How children view and engage with

advertising in mobile games. *Convergence – The International Journal of Research
into New Media Technologies*, (pp. 1-20). Sage.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856517743665

Montgomery, K. C., Grier, S. A., Chester, J., & Dorfman, L. (2013). The digital food

marketing landscape: challenges for researchers. In Williams J., Pasch K., Collins C.
(Eds.), *Advances in Communication Research to Reduce Childhood Obesity* (pp.
221-242). Springer: New York.

Moore, E. S., & Rideout, V. J. (2007). The online marketing of food to children: is it just fun

and games?. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 26*(2), 202-220.
https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.26.2.202

Nath, T. (2016, June 13). Investing in Video Games: This Industry Pulls In More Revenue

Than Movies, Music. *Nasdaq.* Retrieved from:
http://www.nasdaq.com/article/investing-in-video-games-this-industry-pulls-in-
more-revenue-than-movies-music-cm634585

Nikken, P., & Jansz, J. (2007). Playing restricted videogames: Relations with game ratings

and parental mediation. *Journal of children and media*, *1*(3), 227-243.

NPD Group (2014). Average Time Spent Playing Games on Mobile Devices Has Increased

57 Percent Since 2012. *NPD.* Retrieved from:
https://www.npd.com/wps/portal/npd/us/news/press-releases/2015/average-time-
spent-playing-games-on-mobile-devices-has-increased-57-percent-since-2012/

Opree, S. J., Buijzen, M., van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2014). Children's

advertising exposure, advertised product desire, and materialism: A longitudinal
study. *Communication Research*, *41*(5), 717-735.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650213479129

Rideout, V. (2014). Advertising to children and teens: Current practices. *Common Sense

Media*. Retrieved from: https://www.commonsensemedia.org/research/advertising-
to-children-and-teens-current-practices

Rideout, V. J., Foehr, U. G., & Roberts, D. F. (2010). Generation M [superscript 2]: Media

in the Lives of 8-to 18-Year-Olds. *Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation*. Menlo Park,
California: Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.

Rozendaal, E., Buijzen, M., & Valkenburg, P. (2009). Do children's cognitive advertising

defenses reduce their desire for advertised products?. *Communications*, *34*(3), 287-
303. doi: 10.1515/COMM.2009.018

Rozendaal, E., Lapierre, M. A., Van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Buijzen, M. (2011).

Reconsidering advertising literacy as a defense against advertising
effects. *MediaPsychology*, *14*(4), 333-354.
https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2011.620540

Rozendaal, E. Slot, N. Van Reijmersdal, E., & Buijzen, M. (2013). Children's responses to

advertising in social games. *Journal of Advertising*, *42*(2/3), 142-154.
https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2013.774588

Sahin, A. Zehir, C., & Kitapçı, H. (2011). The effects of brand experiences, trust and

satisfaction on building brand loyalty; an empirical research on global brands. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *24*, 1288-1301. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.143

Sedano, C. I., Laine, T. H., Vinni, M., & Sutinen, E. (2007, November). Where is the answer?: the importance of curiosity in pervasive mobile games. In *Proceedings of the 2007 conference on Future Play* (pp. 46-53). ACM.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (2008). Osnovy kachestvennogo issledovaniya: obosnovannaya teoriya, protsedury i tekhniki [Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory, procedures and techniques]. *Moscow: URSS. (Transl. of: Strauss, AL, & Corbin, JM (1990). Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory, procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications).

Valkenburg, P. M. Piotrowski, J. T. Hermanns, J., & de Leeuw, R. (2013). Developing and validating the perceived parental media mediation scale: A self-determination perspective. *Human Communication Research*, *39*(4), 445-469. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12010

Van Schaik, R. Chatterton, E., & Croxon, S. (2016, December 13). Advertising and Marketing to Children. *DLA Piper.* Retrieved from: https://www.dlapiper.com/en/uk/insights/publications/2016/12/advertising-and-marketing-to-children/

Vanwesenbeeck, I. Walrave, M., & Ponnet, K. (2016). Young adolescents and advertising on social network games: a structural equation model of perceived parental media mediation, advertising literacy, and behavioral intention. *Journal of Advertising*, *45*(2), 183-197. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2015.1123125

Varava, K. A., & Quick, B. L. (2015). Adolescents and movie ratings: Is psychological reactance a theoretical explanation for the forbidden fruit effect?. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *59*(1), 149-168. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2014.998224

Wakefield, J. (2015, March 27). Children spend six hours or more a day on screens. *BBC.*

Retrieved from: http://www.bbc.com/news/technology-32067158

7. Appendix 1.

As follows the list includes a general topic list that was used for the interviews:

Introduction
1. Consent form and information about the research
2. Information about the interviewee and their child
3. What type of mobile games does the interviewee participate in?

Advertising

4. How does the interviewee feel about advertising?
a. Do they feel like it affects them?
5. What does the interviewee know about advertising to children?
. How does the parent engage with the child when the child asks for questions about certain content? Additionally, how do they select content for their child? Online reviews? Do they check it personally? Etc.
a. What do they specifically do when they find their child with content that they do not want them with?
b. How literate is their child about advertising?
c. Asking the parents for examples of effects of advertising
d. How does the approach unknown issues. For example when facing an advertisement that they do not understand.

Mobile apps
6. What kind of games does their child play?
a. Examples of games that the child plays
b. Restrictions about games. Namely, do they use software to limit the child's play time or do they sit with the child for a certain amount of time? Other methods?
c. Can the child download their own games?
d. Restriction for in-app purchases

Mobile app advertising
7. How does the interviewee feel about pop up adds and banners in mobile apps?
a. Effectiveness of banners on themselves and their child. For example, how does the parent/child deal with this type of advertisement?
8. How does the interviewee feel about their child's exposure to such content?
. Have they talked to the child about it?
a. Effectiveness of this type of advertising on the child

Advergames
9. What do they know about advergames?
a. The researcher provided information about advergames if the parent does not know what such games are. Examples that were used: LEGO games and Čokolino
10. Effects of advergames
11. Examples used in foreign countries (advertisement for sugar products)
12. Examples in Montenegro
. Gambling advertisement
a. Political campaigns

b.   How the parent talked to the child about these types of advertisement?
c.   How does the parent feel towards this type of unfiltered advertising content?

Protection
13.   How would they protect the child?
14.   3rd party involvement (companies providing solutions)
a.   Game developers
b.   Phone makers
c.   Legislation

Examples used for each participant: LEGO games, Čokolino games, Political campaigns and bookmaker advertising