Supporting Statement for
Experimental Study of *Trans* Fat Claims on Foods
OMB No. 0910-0533

B. COLLECTION OF INFORMATION USING STATISTICAL METHODS

1. Universe and Sampling

The study uses an Internet panel methodology which has proved substantially equivalent to mall intercept methodologies in that it allows visual presentation of study materials, experimental manipulation of study materials, and the random assignment of subjects to condition. The study will be implemented using a convenience sample drawn from a large national consumer Internet panel with one million households. The consumer panel includes consumers who span the full range of education, age, race and income characteristics in the population. By implementing the study in such a sample frame the generalizability of the findings to a large fraction of the general population is ensured.

Participants will be adults, aged 18 and older, who agree to participate in a study about foods and food labels. Each participant will be randomly assigned to one of 144 experimental conditions.

2. Procedures for Collecting Information

Participants will be asked to review the package labeling of one product presented to them and then answer questions about the product's perceived health benefits and nutritional characteristics and other questions (see Attachment F: Draft Questionnaire).

Participants will view a two-dimensional color mock-up of a food label. For each product, the front panel will be presented first, followed by some questions about the product. Then the participant will look at the back panel of the product label that contains a Nutrition Facts Panel (NFP) for the food product. Participants then answer a series of product perception questions related to expected health benefits and perceived nutritional characteristics of the product.

Key Product Perception Questions

1. How likely is it that eating this food as a regular part of your diet would raise the risk of [disease/health condition]? 7-point rating scale from 1 ("Very Likely" l) to 7 ("Very Unlikely")

   Will be asked for three health conditions (heart disease, high blood cholesterol, overweight and high blood pressure).

2. Do you consider this product to be high, medium or low in… [list of nutrients-calories, total fat, saturated fat, *trans* fat, cholesterol, sodium, carbohydrates]?

3. Overall, how important would [this margarine/pound cake]/[these crackers] be as part of a healthy diet? On a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 means "Very Important" and 7 means "Not at all Important."

Background questions will include standard demographics, current food label use, and health status.

In the Full Information condition, participants will read a one-page summary of the current state of scientific evidence for the health effects of *trans* fat in the diet. Nutrition scientists at FDA will review the summary for accuracy. The Full Information summary will be presented prior to viewing any labels.

Analysis Plan

This study can be viewed as an evaluation of the impact of *trans* fat content claims on judgment accuracy. Judgment accuracy will be bounded by the performance of participants in several comparison conditions: those who see no *trans* fat content claims, those who are "fully informed" about *trans* fat, and those who see the same product with varying fatty acid profiles. The impact of *trans* fat content claims and accompanying information statements will be assessed by estimating the discrepancy between participants' judgments made under these conditions compared to participants' judgments made under the respective comparison conditions. It will be possible to estimate the experimental effects of content claims and accompanying statements compared to no claims, depending on whether participants are fully informed or not, and depending on the product's fatty acid profile. Analysis of variance with specific contrasts and multivariate regression techniques will be used.

3. Methods to Increase or Maximize Response Rates

Participants are sent multiple reminders asking them to complete the interview instrument. Because participants are practiced at accessing and completing such instruments, no additional measures are necessary.

4. Tests of Procedures or Methods

The contractor will conduct three waves of Internet pretests. The first wave will include up to 15 participants. Any procedural problems identified in the first wave will be addressed and the revised procedures tested on a second wave of up to 15 participants. If additional modifications are needed, the revised procedures

will be tested on up to 10 participants. Prior experience shows that this number of pretests will be sufficient to identify and correct any procedural problems in the study.

5. Identification of Consultation

The contact individuals are Alan S. Levy, Ph.D., Consumer Studies Staff, Office of Regulations and Policy , HFS-727, telephone (301) 436-1762 (Project Officer), and Brenda M. Derby, Ph.D., Consumer Studies Staff, Office of Regulations and Policy HFS-727, telephone (301) 436-1832 (Statistician), and David B. Lambert, Ph.D., Senior Vice President, TNS Intersearch, (215) 442-9638.

REFERENCES

Andrews, J.C., Burton, S. & Netemeyer, R.G (2000). Are some comparative nutrition claims misleading? The role of nutrition knowledge, ad claim type, and disclosure conditions. *Journal of Advertising*, *29*, 3, 29-43

Andrews, J. C., Netemeyer, R.G. & Burton, S 1998. Consumer generalization of nutrient content claims in advertising. *Journal of Marketing*, *62*, 62-75.Barone, M. J., Rose, R. L., Manning, K. C., & Miniard, P. W. (1996). Another look at the impact of reference information on consumer impressions of nutrition information. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *15* (1), 55-62.

Burke, S. J., Milberg, S. J., & Moe, W. W. (1997). Displaying common but previously neglected health claims on product labels: Understanding competitive advantages, deception, and education. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *16* (2), 242-255.

Burton, S., Andrews, J.C., & Netemeyer, R.G. (2000). Nutrition ad claims and disclosures: Interaction and mediation effects for consumer evaluations of the brand and the ad. *Marketing Letters*, *11*(3), 1-13.

Center for Science in the Public Interest (2002) *Comment to Docket No. 94P-0036 (C2285).* Received December 16, 2002.

ConAgra Food (2003). *Comment to Docket No. 94P-0036 (C2297).* Received January 16, 2003.

Derby, B.M. & Levy, A.S. (2001) Do food labels work? Gauging the effects of food labels pre-and post-NLEA. In P.N. Bloom & G.T. Gundlach (Eds.), *Handbook of Marketing and Society*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 372-398.

Ford, G. T., Hastak, M., Mitra, A., & Ringold, D. J. (1996). Can consumers interpret nutrition information in the presence of a health claim? A laboratory investigation. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, 15*, 16-27.

Garretson, Judith A. and Scot Burton (2000), "Effects of Nutrition Facts Panel Values, Nutrition Claims, and Health Claims on Consumer Attitudes, Perception of Disease-Related Risks, and Trust," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *19* (Fall), 213-27.

Geiger, C. J. (1998). Health claims: History, current regulatory status, and consumer research. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 98* (11), 1312-1322.

Hutt, P. B. (1986). Government regulation of health claims in food labeling and advertising. *Food Drug Cosmetic Law Journal, 41*, 3-73.

International Food Information Council (2003). *Impact of trans fat label information on consumer food choices: Summary Findings. 6/10/2003.* (www.ific.org/research/transres.cfm) (Also submitted as a comment to Docket No. 94P-0036).

Jacoby, J., Handlin, A.H. & Simonson, A. (1994) Survey evidence in deceptive advertising cases under the Lanham Act: An historical review of comments from the bench. *The Trademark Reporter, 84*, 541-585.

Jacoby, J. & Morrin, M. (1998) Not manufactured or authorized by …: Recent federal cases involving trademark disclaimers. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, 17*, 97-107.

Jacoby, J. & Szybillo, G.J. Why disclaimers fail. (1994) *The Trademark Reporter, 84*, 224-244.

Johar, G.V. (1995) Consumer involvement and deception from implied advertising claims. *Journal of Marketing Research, 32*, 267-279.

Keller, S. B., Landry, M., Olson, J., Velliquestte, A. M., Burton, S., & Andrews, J.C. (1997). The effects of nutrition package claims, Nutrition Facts panels, and motivation to process nutrition information on consumer product evaluations. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 16* (2), 256-269.

The Keystone Center (1996). *The Final Report of the Keystone National Policy Dialogue on Food, Nutrition, and Health.* (March). Keystone, CO: Author.

Kozup, J., Burton, S., & Creyer, E.H. (2006). The provision of *trans* fat information and its interaction with consumer knowledge. *Journal of Consumer Affairs, 40* (1), 163-176.

Levy, A. S. (1996). Summary report on health claims focus groups. In The *Final Report of the Keystone National Policy Dialogue on Food, Nutrition, and Health.* (March 1996), pp. 141-150. Keystone, CO: The Keystone Center.

Levy, A.S., Derby, B. M., & Roe, B. E. (1997). Consumer *impacts of health claims: An experimental study*. [On-line]. Available: http://vm.cfsan.fda.gov/label.html

Levy, A. S. & Fein, S. B. (1998). Consumers' ability to perform tasks using nutrition labels. *Journal of Nutrition Education, 30* (4), 210-217.

Levy, A. S., Fein, S. B., & Schucker, R. E. (1996). Performance characteristics of seven nutrition label formats. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, 15* (1), 1-15.

Levy, A. S., Fein, S. B., & Schucker, R. E. (1996). Performance characteristics of seven nutrition label formats. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, 15* (1), 1-15.

Mason, M.J. & Scammon, D.L. (2000). Health claims and disclaimers: Extended boundaries and research opportunities in consumer interpretation. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, 19*(1), 144-150.

Mathios, A. D. & Ippolito, P. (1999). Health claims in food advertising and labeling: Disseminating nutrition information to consumers. In E. Frazao (Ed.), America's *Eating Habits: Changes and Consequences* (pp. 189-212). (Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 750). Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mazis, Michael B. and Mary Anne Raymond (1997), "Consumer perceptions of health claims in advertisements and on food labels," *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 31 (1), 10-26.

Mitra, A., Hastak, M., Ford, G. T., & Ringold, D. J. (1999). Can the educationally disadvantaged interpret the FDA-mandated Nutrition Facts panel in the presence of an implied health claim? *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, 18* (1), 106-117.

Mojduszka, E. M. & Caswell, J. A. (2000). A test of nutritional quality signaling in food markets prior to implementation of mandatory labeling. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 82*, 289-309.

Moorman, C. (1998). Market-level effects of information: competitive responses and consumer dynamics. *Journal of Marketing Research, 35* (1), 82-98.

Moorman, C. (1996). A quasi-experiment to assess the consumer and informational determinants of nutrition information processing activities: The case of the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, 15* (1), 28-44.

Murphy, D., Hoppock, T.H., and Rusk, M.K. Generic copy test of food health claims in advertising. Federal Trade Commission Staff Report, November, 1998.

Pearson and Shaw v. Shalala. United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, January 15, 1999, No. 98-5043, Durk Pearson and Sandy Shaw, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [http://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/common/opinions/1990001/98-5943a.txt], 1999.

Roe, B. E., Levy, A. S., & Derby, B. M. (1999). The impact of health claims on consumer search and product evaluation outcomes: Results from FDA experimental data. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *18* (1), 89-105.

Russo, J.E., Metcalf, B.L. & Stephens, D. (1991) Identifying misleading advertising. *Journal of Consumer Research, 8*, 119-131.

Steinborn, S. B. & Todd, K. A. (1999). The end of paternalism: A new approach to food labeling. *Food and Drug Law Journal, 54*(3), 401-422.

Vladeck, D.C. (1999) Devaluing truth: Unverified health claims in the aftermath of Pearson v. Shalala. *Food and Drug Law Journal, 54*,535-553.

Vladeck, D.C. (2000). Truth and consequences: The perils of half-truths and unsubstantiated health claims for dietary supplements. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, 19* (1), 132-138.