CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The theoretical framework of the study forms the structure that can
hold or support a theory of a research work. A theoretical framework provides
guidance in determining what things to measure, and what statistical
relationships should be analyzed in a research. Theories are constructed in
order to explain, predict and analyze relationships between variables of
interest in the study. The theoretical framework provides a general
representation of relationships between variables under study. The conceptual
framework, on the other hand, embodies the specific direction by which the
research will have to be undertaken. Statistically speaking, the conceptual
framework describes the relationship between specific variables identified in
the study. While the theoretical framework is the theory on which the study is
based, the conceptual framework is the operationalization of the theory.

As with any relational analysis, development of a theoretical
framework assists the researcher to complete two processes as suggested by
Bliss et al. (1983). First, it gives a broad scope to thinking about the research
and conceptualizing the problem. Second, it provides a means to link ideas
and data so that deeper connections can be revealed.

Research on family decision making has been largely confined to
spouses, who have been considered as the relevant decision making unit in a
family. However, the role of third party influences, such as kids, on decision
making strategies and negotiations is essential to taking a broader view of the
relevant unit of analysis. Traditionally, women were seen to be the purchasing agents for the family. Nonetheless, increasing participation of women in the workforce has prompted a shift in this role as kids are increasingly the "buyers" for the entire family. Even in families where women do not work, kids are observed to share this role with their mothers. Kids enjoy greater discretion not only in making routine consumption decisions for the family but also in pestering their parents to buy other products desired by them.

Contemporary researchers express that “kids constitute a major consumer market, with direct purchasing power for snacks and sweets, and indirect purchase influence while shopping for big-ticket items”, (Halan, 2002; Singh, 1998). “Indian kids have recently attracted considerable attention from marketers because the market for kids products offers tremendous potential and is rapidly growing”, (Bhushan 2002). In addition to this, “54% of India is estimated to be under the age of 25”, (Bansal 2004). According to Talpade, et. al., (1993), “kids constitute three different markets: the primary, the influencer, and the future market” as in the figure below.

![Figure 3.1 Kids Influence (Talpade, et al., 1993)](image-url)
Certain products are simply kids’ products for which they are the primary users/buyers. They sometimes either purchase a product themselves or select the product before it is purchased by the parents. For other products, such as ones which are used by the entire family unit, they may influence purchases made by the parents. There are some products where kids wield direct influence or pester power by overtly specifying their preferences and voicing them aloud. For other products, parents' buying patterns are affected by prior knowledge of the tastes and preferences of their kids. This 'passive dictation' of choice is prevalent for a wide variety of daily consumed product items as well as products for household consumption. Also, decision making in households is seen to change with the mere presence of kids. The nature of joint decisions in couple decision making units and family decision making units is seen to be different (Filiatrault and Ritchie 1980). It is also observed that kids are socialized by their parents to act as rational consumers. After years of direct or indirect observation of parental behaviour in the marketplace, they gradually acquire relevant consumer skills from their parents.

“The amount of influence exerted by kids varies by product category and stage of the decision making process”, (Catherine 1996). According to this study, “for certain products they are instrumental in initiating a purchase, while for others, they make the final selections themselves. The purchasing act is governed by how they have been socialized to act as consumers.”

According to a study by Chadha (1995) and Dholal (1999), “family, peers and media are key socializing agents for kids wherein family-specific characteristics such as parental style, family's Sex Role Orientation (SRO), and patterns of communication play key roles. The structure of Indian
families has been previously characterized as joint families with traditional SRO (that is, the husband predominated in all family affairs).

However, owing to influences from the West, the structure of Indian families has changed to nuclear or extended families (nuclear families plus grandparents). The Indian families have become more modern in SRO, such that the decision making has become more egalitarian”. “Compared to this, the West is experiencing an increase in the number of single parent or female-headed households”, (Ahuja and Stinson 1993, Mangleburg et al. 1999). Such a shift in family composition and structure has a bearing on the strength in the role that kids are expected to play as buyers in the family.

Studies by Berey and Pollay, (1968), Szybillo and Sosanie, (1977), Atkin (1978), Nelson, (1979), Filiatraut and Ritchie, (1980 and, Roberts et al., (1981) in the area of teenager influence on decision making have examined the relative influence of parents and kids on several product categories with respect to decision stages and sub decisions. A few recent on teenagers (Belch, Belch, and Ceresino 1985, Foxman, Tansuhaj, and Ekstrom 1989a and 1989b), were focused on resolving some of the conceptual and methodological problems presented in this area of research (Beatty and Talpade, et. al., 1994). The conclusions indicate that kids influence varies by the type of purchase decision through decision stages and sub decisions.

“Kids have a higher influence on purchase decisions affecting them, but their influence is lower on issues involving how much to spend, where to buy, and at the final decision stage”, (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Nelson 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Beatty and Talpade 1994). The studies examined the moderating role of age and perceived product importance. It was pointed out that the influence on major purchase decisions increases with age (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Filiatraut and Ritchie 1980, Jenkins 1979, Darley and Lim 1986) and with perceived product importance (Beatty and
Talpade 1994). “Older teenagers, teenagers who are employed long hours outside the house, and teenagers in single-parent households have higher levels of influence on grocery trips” (Talpade et al. 1993). “Kids perceptions of their influence usually do not match their parents' perceptions of their influence, with kids seeing their role as more important than parents do” (Belch et al. 1985, Talpade et al. 1993, Beatty and Talpade 1994).

In India, the literature on family decision making is scanty and researchers have only partially investigated the role of kids along with other members in family purchase decision making. Family structures are undergoing a metamorphosis and the Indian society is also witnessing an increase in the number of single parent and dual career families. Though an impressive body of research exists in this field in the West, these parameters also deserve investigation in different cultural settings.

A study by Pavleen Kaur and Raghbir Singh (2006) concludes that “Studies specific to Indian marketing environment are necessary”. Webster (2000) points out that "India is an interesting culture in which to explore the antecedents of marital power because its social and intellectual grains operate in ways vastly different from those the West takes for granted. For instance, unlike western culture, where the nuclear and neo local families are both the ideological and factual norm, the joint family has been and continues to be an important element of Indian culture".

According to Telpade, et. al., (1993), kids earn their consumer behaviour mainly from their parents and marketers (Figure 3.2). Parents are the kids’ primary socialization agents who introduce and indoctrinate them into the consumer role. But marketers play an important part in kids’ consumer socialization, and their influence continues to grow as the parents have lesser time and the marketers have higher interest in tapping the kids’ attention.
Parents
• Parents teach kids to be independent.
• Parents have to constantly become, Villains, While a kid grows up and have to say, No, to most of the kids demands.

Companies
• TV commercials teach kids to be demanding.
• Companies today are cashing in on what Susan Linn calls the Nag Factor (The degree to which parents’ purchasing decisions are based on being nagged by their kids).
• Companies are successful in projecting their expensive toys, sugar pumped cereals, chocolate coated fries and video games as the most haves.

Figure 3.2 Marketing war between parent and companies (Telpade, et. al., 1993)

The kid is far more open to something new-to-the-world, because almost everything around him is new-to-his-world. So when a marketer is trying to sell a new product which is a revolutionary concept to adults, he has to battle pre-conceived notions, reluctance to try new things and perception of risk in doing something new. With a kid, the marketer has someone who is willing and excited about anything new.

Kids in the family environment have the opportunity to practice by observing the consumption of their parents to learn effective or perfect consumer behavior. Indian parents are luckier than their counter parts in other countries because, due to our tradition, our kids still respect their elders and listen to their parents and therefore, when explained the ill effects of certain commodities kids are likely to listen. This counseling requires a lot of time and patience, which most working parents lack. An over worked parent does
not have the time to reinforce every day the ills of aggressive marketing to the
kids and tend to give in on days when they are tired.

A supportive family system also means that grandparents, uncles
and aunts play a very vital role in ensuring that kids do the fall prey to
advertisement and marketing gimmicks very easily. Thus, marketing to kids
in India is a war between marketers and the family where the marketer is
using is money and resources to entice kids and the family its strength and
values to protect the kids.

Kids are effectively fitting in to the consumer role owing to time
pressure and income effects in dual careers families. Moreover, exposure to
mass media and discussions with parents ensure that kids are not only aware
of the new brands available, but also know how to evaluate them on various
parameters. While younger kids clearly affect parental behaviour and
purchases, adolescents have full cognitive development and an understanding
of the economic concepts required for processing information and selection.

An analysis of kids as consumers helps in the formulation of
marketing strategies involved in making purchases in a specific product
purchasing agents for the family”. Therefore, it is believed by the researcher
that this comprehensive study will benefit a large spectrum of consumers,
retailers and other stakeholders in understanding the purchase behaviour of
kids towards convenience food items.

3.2 FORCES THAT HAVE FOSTERED KIDS CONSUMER
CLOUT

Studies carried out by Carlo Pauleho (1979) stated that the choices
offered by the birth-control pill, increased educational and labor – force
aspirations of women, and double-digit inflation of the 1970s all served to
move millions of mother into the workforce. This in turn gave families more
money to spend. In 1970, around half of mothers with kids aged 6 to 13
worked full – or part – time. By 1985, 67 percent of mothers with kids in that
age group worked. Five years later, 73 percent did so. Even with Dad and
Mom both working, families didn’t hit high – income brackets, but it did
allow them to keep up with inflation and maybe get slightly ahead of it. And it
also provided money that wouldn’t have been there otherwise.

3.2.1 Fewer Kids per Family

The total fertility rate in the early 1960s, during the last years of the
baby boom, was 3.5 per woman of kid bearing age. By the early 1960s, it had
dropped to 1.8, or close to half of the baby-boom rate (it has since risen a
little to hover around the 2-kid mark). Clearly, mothers were electing to have
fewer kids. The reasons included the soaring inflation rates of the 1970s, the
fact that mothers wanted to work or had to work and could not take care of a
large number of kids, and for some, a new philosophy of one (or two) is
enough. Whatever the reasons, there were fewer kids per family and more
money allotted to each than would otherwise have been the case. (Medical
Council of India Health report1961-2000)

3.2.2 Older (Wealthier) Parents

According to a study on Delayed parenthood by Vasundhara Singh
and Akshetha of the AIIMS (1998), in 1960s and 1970s, women viewed age
30 as the now or never age for having kids. By the mid – 1980s, births to
thirty – something women were soaring. Career – first thinking had a lot to do
with this. Uncertain economic conditions also encouraged many families to
postpone having kids. By delaying births and getting careers in place, parents
had more money when kids were born and tended to shower them with more.
Wanting kids but delaying having them seems to give kids much more importance when they arrive.

3.2.3 Fractured Families

Nayar (2001) stated in his study that splintered families mean more gift – giving relatives. Almost one in every six American kids is someone’s stepkid. While it is often little consolation to the kids, they tend to get more money and things from multiple sets of parents and grandparents. Some additional acquisitions are simply due to being shuttled between households and therefore needing another toothbrush, comb, and bedding. Naturally, some extra toys and snack items go along with the necessities. Some of the money and things parents give to kids in these situations are DWI gifts; that is, gifts to help kids deal with it.

3.2.4 Single – Parent Households

More single parents mean earlier consumer maturity (Medical Council of India report, 1992). Between 1970 and 1990, the number of births to unwed mothers in the U.S. increased two and a half times. During this same period, the number of divorced women almost tripled. The net result was a large number of single-parent households in which kids were expected to participate more in household activities. In these households, kids tend to take on the consumer role earlier in life and more regularly, handling money, shopping, buying things for the family and for themselves.

3.2.5 Grand Parents Important

There was a time when grandparents were supposed to see the grandkids only at Christmas and not meddle in their lives at other times (Gregory and Timothy 1965). It was the parents’ job to socialize their kids – not that of grandparents, with their outdated values. But with both parents
working, or with a single parent, grandparents became more welcome. As parents became busier and away from their kids more, grandparents started stepping in to help out. It just so happens that this generation of grandparents have enough money, so to speak. They visit the kids more, the grandkids visit them more, and always they give the kids money and gifts. Grandparents tend to spend even more per toy for grandkids than parents do, and grandparents are one of kids fastest-growing income sources.

3.3 ROLE OF KIDS IN DECISION MAKING

Today's kids have more autonomy and power in decision-making within the family and are vocal about what they want their parents to buy. "Pester power" refers to kids' ability to nag their parents into purchasing items which they may not otherwise buy. Marketing to kids is all about creating pester power, because advertisers know what a powerful force it can be. As per news covered in various newspapers and television channels, McDonald's has won the Pester Power Award in the Parents Jury Kids Television Food Advertising Awards, for the second consecutive time in 2010. McDonald's won the Pester Power Award for its Happy Meals advertisements which encouraged the kids to pester their parents to take them to the fast food chain.

Kids are generally known to have strong tastes and preferences, and advertising surely has an impact on them. Today, most toothpaste advertising has started revolving around kids, far from the time when the family was shown brushing together. Kids decide on the toothpaste that the family will use. Pester power is considered to be worst when it is used to decide the food that is to be consumed. Kids have been bombarded with advertisements on Burgers, Cola, Pizza and Coke.
Influences created by marketers on kids may be harmful but the one created on food are the worst. Pester power on parents to buy toys or to get their TV time, to get themselves new gizmos, decision on places to eat out, clothes they need to buy, purchase of electronic stuff like TV, Music system, computers, mobile phones, car etc are on the high. The kids also decide on what their parents should wear and the places they should visit. Parents who had taken part in a survey conducted by a media research agency in UK in 2009 opined that pester power had created havoc in their lives. The day long wining by the kid to get a particular toy or gizmo that his friends had or he had seen in an advertisement could be very straining for a parent who has a high demanding job. Parents felt that kids have mastered the ability to continuously ask for what they want and change their persuasion techniques from pleading to crying to threatening. Parents who are tired or stressed feel the easy way out is to give in to the kid’s demands thus contributing to increasing the ‘Pester Power’ (www.times100.co.uk/pesterpowerresearch).

3.4 STAGES OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR DEVELOPMENT

Let us look more closely at kids’ development of consumer behaviour patterns to understand how kids come to have certain consumer competence and preferences at certain ages as per a study by Laudon and Della Vitta (2006), which is in concurrence with the stages in evolution of kid as a consumer as defined by McNeal James (1997).

3.4.1 Stage One: First Store visit

The kid’s first visit to the store marks the beginning of knowledge about commercial sources of satisfying goods and services ordinarily provided by parents. Many mothers were asked to recall the first time they introduced their kids to the marketplace. The median age of a kid’s first visit was 2 months. Most had visited one or more stores by the age of 6 months
shows that the first type of store visited in 78 percent of cases was a supermarket (of various sizes), followed by mass merchandisers (9 percent), shopping malls (7 percent), and drug stores (4 percent) (Tibillo, A.M. Bakshi, 2001)

“At this tender age, when a kid can sit erect, he or she is placed in his or her culturally defined observation post high atop a shopping cart. From this vantage point, the kid stays safety in proximity to parents but can see for the first time the wonderland of marketing”, (McNeal, 1997). Here, the kids begin building impressions of the market place through sensory experiences – colors, shapes, sounds, aromas, flavors, and textures.

At first, they only respond to whatever market stimulus is in their presence, but soon they are able to recall some of these representations in their mind and ask for them. It is important for both parents and marketers to keep in mind that the foundations of kids consumer behaviour patterns are constructed before they take their first steps. This finding could be particularly significant to supermarkets, the most frequented type of store by infants, which operate at around 1 percent net profit and are under stage by other retail types such as convenience store and mass merchandisers.

### 3.4.2 Stage Two: First in Store Request

According to McNeal (1997), kids accompanying parents to shops begin to ask for things that they see and make connections between television advertisement and store contents. They pay more attention to those ads and the list of things they want increases. At the same time, the youngster is learning how to get parents to respond to his or her wishes and wants. This may take the form of a grunt, whine, scream, or gesture--indeed some tears may be necessary--but eventually almost all kids are able on a regular basis to persuade Mom or Dad to buy something for them.
When mothers were asked when their kids first made a request (through pointing, gesturing, talking) for a product, the median age reported was 24 months, with the earliest being 7 months. Thus, at around 18 months, many kids recognize some products on the shelves of food stores that mother provides as rewards at home, usually sweets. At this moment, the kid makes the connection and gestures toward the product – usually a brand. To the kid it is merely a recognizable set of colors, shapes, and symbols such as the multicolored rooster on a box of Kellogg’s Corn Flakes. Mom interprets this as a request and hands the package to the kid who happens to be strategically situated in the observation seat of the shopping cart.

The stage occurs first only when in the presence of a certain product in a store, or brand of product, or more precisely, a certain package design (Todd 2001). Soon the kids will be able to recall the representation of the product in their minds at any time, perhaps when they see the brand advertised on TV or when they simply think of it in the car on the way to the supermarket. This is the beginning of the influence market among kids. At this point, the display level, package design, and point of purchase presentation that targets kids becomes very important.

Not surprisingly, supermarkets are by far the biggest beneficiaries of such first requests – 76 percent of the time – since supermarkets are likely to be the first type of store kids visit. Following in the distance are mass merchandisers at 11 percent and toy stores at 7 percent. The most requested product is ready to eat cereal, often by the brand name itself or a brand association (Tony Tiger, for instance). Kids asked for cereal on 47 percent of first request occasions, and sweet snack items 30 percent of the time, often by brand name as well. Toys finish third at 21 percent.
These first two stages of consumer behaviour perceptually connecting to the market place and consciously seeking products from it suggest a logical pattern. Parents introduce kids to the market place (although with many other environments) as part of the daily routine of caring for them. By the age of 6 months or suggestive of, kids have developed a rudimentary repertoire of some store and product images. Many of these products are in use at home, where packages begin to make impressions on kids, cereal, for example, is introduced to kids as a good transition food between soft and solid food, and some sweets are received as rewards (Sridhar Guda 2003).

Also, parents begin to use TV as a pleasure giving device, and kids see products there. This connection eventually creates an expectation in the minds of these toddlers; that is, that a certain store will offer a certain satisfying product. All they have to do is ask for it at shopping time.

3.4.3 Stage Three: First in Store Selection

McNeal (1997) points out that, kids are able to come down from the shopping trolley and make their own choices with the permission of parents. They are able to recognize brands and locate goods in the store. At this point the kid has completed many connections, from advertisements to wants, to stores, to displays, to packages, to retrieval of want-satisfying products. For many parents this is a pleasing experience. For the marketers, it signals the beginning of the kids’ understanding of the want-satisfaction process in a market-driven society.

As kids learn to walk, to seek independent action, they arrive at the “I can do it, I want to do it” stage, in which they want to retrieve the requested products themselves. The median age at which this first physical act toward becoming a consumer begins is 42 months, although it is often witnessed as early as 24 months. Free from the shopping cart and mother’s arms, the kid
ventures into a maze of fixtures and displays and often to mom’s amazement, locates and selects satisfying products (Todd 2005).

The kid now believes he or she is performing an adult function, one that is very fruitful. Very soon the kid will test the system by retrieving products from the shelf without asking. Chances are Mom will go along with it just for the novelty of it. Another shopper has been born. At this point, if marketers haven’t figured out how important a memorable package is, they are racking up losses in the new business column.

This self selection behaviour makes its first appearance in supermarkets 56 percent of the time, followed by mass merchandisers at 23 percent, toy stores at 11 percent, and other mall specialty stores at 7 percent. Clearly, the broad product selection in supermarkets is no longer broad enough for these new consumers. They start to pay much more attention to mass merchandisers such as Target, Wal-Mart, and Kmart (Paco Underhill 2003).

Paco Underhill (2006) further says that this shift in store focus can be attributed to kids insatiable need for play. Of the first products selected in this phase, 28 percent are toys. Cereals continue to be most important selection at 35 percent, occupy an important role in which cereal is selected. Sweet and some salty snacks account for 24 percent of first selections, followed, interestingly, by books at 6 percent and clothing at 45 percent. Thus, the kids broaden the scope of their wants and get experience fulfilling them. These experiences are marked in their minds and serve as guides for years.

Selecting a product from a shelf is a hands on activity and involve a good deal of mental and physical participation on the part of the kid. This act,
in effect, is taking something desirable, something valued, from another
without any repercussions from parents. The experience is likely to leave a
number of impressions on his or her mind about the store, its offerings, its
physical appearance, and its atmosphere. In turn, these impressions will
produce feelings – liking, disliking. The role of self service and self selection
in facilitating the learning and mastering of purchase behaviour should not be
overlooked or minimized. For instance, self service is not yet a common
merchandising practice in China. The lack of self service may at least delay
the development of the consumer behaviour process, and possibly make it
more difficult and more complex.

Review of these first three stages in the development of consumer
behaviour in childhood, we can see that kids have a number of positive
experiences related to supermarkets. In fact, young kids, particularly
preschoolers, often talk about one of their favourite stores being a certain
supermarket.

Mothers take their kids to the supermarket and permit and
encourage them to practice their consumer behaviour there. They help to
make each visit a favourable experience – buying products requested by kids,
letting kids select desired products, giving kids rides in shopping carts, and
giving kids treats during the visit. They even show the kids how to make a
successful purchase in the supermarket.

Courage to consummate the exchange process for the first time.
The mathematics of it all are staggering, and can get in the way of what
otherwise is wonderful experience – exchanging money that used to have
little value except as a plaything for something covert such as a toy car.
This big moment is accompanied by a major shift in retail location. A young kid’s first purchase attempt more often than not take place at a mass merchandiser (43 percent) rather than a supermarket (19 percent). Almost 20 percent take place at toy stores, 10 percent at convenience stores (where the kid is beginning to go more frequently with his time impoverished parents) and 9 percent at malls.

Toys are the chief object of kid’s desires on the first purchase (54 percent of the time), while sweet snacks continue at a reasonably important level of 24 percent. Kids may also ask to purchase gifts for others (8 percent), and they may even buy clothing (5 percent), usually at a mass merchandiser or superstore. Some (6 percent) want to purchase their own cereal or other food items, sometimes fruit for their cereal.

In the consumer behaviour cycle, satisfying the play need is most important, and while kids still have a warm spot in their hearts for supermarkets, these stores don’t come to mind very much when they think of purchasing play satisfaction. At this point, also, a kid’s range of wants has broadened, and only mass merchandisers would be willing to take this as a challenge.

The most fundamental step in the development of consumer behaviour patterns – first purchase – could not take place without money. Fortunately for merchants, an accumulation of money, usually called a piggy bank, has been developing, perhaps since birth.

It will take quite a few of these episodes of consumer behaviour before this consumer cadet will feel comfortable with the exchange process, but we see the emergence of a primary consumer that will reach fruition in
the next and last stage. The importance of the checkout personnel in this first time purchase cannot be overstated.

3.4.4 Stage Four First Solo Purchase

According to McNeal (1997), advertisers recognize that brand loyalties and consumer habits formed when kids are young and vulnerable will be carried through to adulthood. If you own this kid at an early age... you can own this kid for years to come is the motto of the advertisers.

It is only a matter of time until youngsters want to do the whole thing on their own – to go to the store and get something. Many kids see it as a rite of passage even more than their parents do. The competitiveness of school chums fosters this adventure, and 50 percent of the time it is to a convenience store, just because it is accessible (Peter Gregoris 2000).

Moschis et al. (2000) in their study have stated that the median age for the first independent purchase is 96 months (8 years). According to this study, although abut 1 in 4 kids solo before they enter elementary school. In nearly all cases, the retail outlets where kids make their first purchases are convenient ones – close to home, school, and where mothers go. Supermarkets get 14 percent of first independent purchases, malls (usually variety and specialty stores) 12 percent, mass merchandisers 11 percent, and toy stores 8 percent.

Once this independent purchase act has occurred a few times, kids begin to feel they have mastered the universe and have grown up several notches. They are likely to make independent purchases frequently for a while to confirm their newfound status as Corporal Consumer. At this point the kid is primary influencer and future consumer at the same time, a veritable mountain of market potential. The loyalty of the kid consumer towards the
product and the store is based on how kids feel about the type of store where they make the first purchase.

McNeal (1997) defines one more stage before the first solo purchase. In this stage, the kids accompanying parents make independent purchases in the presence of their parents and the final step in their development as a consumer is learning to pay for their purchases at the checkout counter.

3.5 CHARACTERISTICS OF KIDS AS BUYERS

In a study on buying behavior of kids carried out by Ruchi Gupta (2010), wide range of characteristics exhibited by kids as buyers are discussed. Some of the characters have been discussed in this section.

3.5.1 Kids as fast learners and with low discretion

Kids are fast learners. Their learning curve steeply high during the time they grow up in age and when their intake and assimilation of information is gauged in the crucible of their already acquired knowledge. As far as the context of this discussion is concerned, it could well be said that they are ‘vulnerable’ to learning. Now where have we encountered such a depressing expression for the habit of fast and effective learning? The irony lies in knowing that while it is a boon that they are fast learners, it is a bane that the article they are subjected to learn is not always appreciable.

Young kids are known for their age old notorious questions about their origin that has left parents often mumbling for an apt answer right from the beginning. Is it because the parents don’t know the answer? No, but it is in view with how an explanation for such a question would conform to an innocent mind’s curiosity. It is not feasible to give a young mind the technically accurate deserving answer for a logical and relevant question.
What an adult would do with a piece of information and what a kid will do with the same thing would be diametrically reverse in nature. This is the discretion probably that the marketers knowingly or unknowingly do not take head of and has eventually become the sprout of the mentioned problem.

3.5.2 Immature, intrepid decision-making

The success of a business is hinged on fast decision making of consumers. This indirectly means that such decisions are made without applying much rational faculties of thought. Lesser price, added services, rebate, enhanced service options, all come with a buy if you make the purchase within the stipulated few days. Lesser the time to think of buying, larger is the benefit for the business. This is more or less coercing the customer to make a decision unduly in favor of a brand. Yet this works in the marketplace because the volume of business such campaigns can attract within a short span of time is the ultimate catch for the company.

3.5.3 Blockades and detours for the mind

By regulating the accessibility to information and procurement of a product, enterprises literally control the purchase decisions of the market. It is in this context that marketing activities to tap the unexploited haven of business are considered and realized. Anything is available for a price, even choices. When the corporate brand wars revved up, there was more than one option for a product with different companies to choose from. There was a virtual feeling for the buyer of being the king. So when multiple choices were a unique selling proposition, every company came up with multiple labels of their product under the same roof.
3.5.4 The market for kids

Whilst these are manipulations for a mature market, to persuade the kids is an entirely different ball game altogether. Kids have needs and wants quite infantile in comparison to that of their intelligent elders. Their mood swings are largely predictable yet highly volatile. In spite of all this they command a remarkable share of market for an enterprise. It is because their influences on purchase decisions are trident in nature.

They have a direct share of spending from their family. These are things they have as mandatory purchase for kids. They have a share of emotional quotient with their parents in making a purchase decision that is technically out of their scope of interference. They constitute the emerging future market which would prove promising if their loyalty can be bought by the brand.

3.6 FACTORS INFLUENCING PESTER POWER

The family structure has changed a lot from past in the Indian society. More working women results in more dual income family groups. The role of grandparents is increasing in bringing up kids thus making grandparents the fastest growing income sources for the kids. Rise in the number of dual income households are also considered as a driver of pester power.

Koshy Abraham, Sisir Gosh (2002) in their study have stated that unlike in the foreign countries where kids enjoy more freedom on advancement of age, their Indian counterparts are dependent upon their parents for purchase till they complete their studies, at least their school final or higher secondary education, which is just the opposite of the culture seen in Western countries where the kids are comparatively more independent.
3.7 TERMINOLOGIES RELATED TO MARKETING TO KIDS

Kidfluence: The direct and indirect influence that the kids have/may have on the purchase decisions of their parents.

KAGOY- The full form of KAGOY is "Kids Are Getting Older Younger". This happened because of the information overflow. Today's kids know more and want more.

Pester Power (or the Nag Factor); This is the phenomenon where the kids pester their parents to buy things they want.

Transtoying: The theory that daily used products can be also be sold with giving them a toy like appearance.

Viral Marketing: More or less like word-of-mouth, but it's online, it harnesses the network effort of the internet and can be very useful in reaching a large number of people.

Though there is no "winning formula" which will guarantee success, there is a systematic approach to product and program development which will increase the chances of success. This approach, developed by the authors, is called 'Youth Market Systems'. According to Koshy Abraham, Sisir Gosh (2002), a deep understanding of underlying abilities, motivations and needs of kids is central to this approach.

3.8 CONTRIBUTION OF KIDS GROWING OLD YOUNG (KGOY)

In sociological and marketing circles, it has been commented that kids of today are qualitatively different from those of the previous generations in terms of their attitudes and motivations. It is argued that kids of today are more independent, sophisticated and confident than their predecessors. The
theory has been that 'childhood', as perceived by adults, is becoming ever shorter and that kids are growing out of toys and childish behavior sooner as they become more sophisticated consumers in their own right. (Koshy Abraham, Sisir Gosh, 2002)

As society in general has become more media-literate, kids, perhaps inevitably, have also become more media-aware; not surprising, since so much advertising and promotion is targeted specifically at them. This trend has meant that kids have become more sophisticated consumers and are aware of brands and fashion trends from a very young age, as advertisers directly target kids more than ever before. Kids are increasingly brand and advertising-literate and are able to make informed decisions about the products that they buy.

In terms of the impact on character-merchandising, kids from the age of 7 or even younger may reject overtly kidish or infantile nursery themes such as Winnie the Pooh in the repertoire of products that they use and consume. This is particularly pertinent to non-food and drink products such as school bags, lunch boxes, etc., which must be credible at school. Licensees and licensors of character goods need to be aware of kids developing, maturing tastes and must be able to adapt accordingly in terms of the themes selected for a particular age group.

This is a slightly more complex issue than at first appreciated, as it is not true to say that kids are maturing in all senses at an earlier stage. Physically and biologically, their development is broadly in" line with kids of the previous generation, but what has changed is the-environment in which they find themselves. This environment is one in which mom works and kids have to fend for themselves after school, one in which their knowledge of the world around them is shaped not just by their parents or teachers, but also by television and the internet.
A further important manifestation of KGOY is that many kids, from an earlier age, will be drawn to more anarchic cartoons such as The Simpsons and South Park which deal with adult (very adult in the latter) themes. Some of these vehicles tend to be associated with a shorter wear-out factor as kids move on to the next big thing. To some extent, this may denote that some, particularly older, kids are actually rebelling against the nostalgia of more wholesome fare which parents approve of and which they may perceive as passe.

Mintel (1996) believes that the cult following of The Simpsons and South Park bears testament to the KGOY factor in terms of kids’ lifestyle and behavior which sees them shrug off childish things at ages younger than ever before as they aspire to the media consumed by their older siblings.

3.9 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Pester power is a term which has a wide circulation in marketing circles to denote a kid's influence over a parent or relative in the buying process. Both anecdotally and in professional circles, much has been said about the power that kids exercise in commercial life in terms of what is bought in the household. Kids are very susceptible to advertising (also to peer pressure), and parents often find it difficult to deny their kids goods which feature their favorite characters.

3.10 THE ROLE OF PESTER POWER

Pester power is by no means a new phenomenon, but is consistent with the nature of a modern consumer society, whereby kids are becoming increasingly sophisticated consumers "in their own right. Pester power occurs when kids, generally influenced by advertising; promotional character-merchandising; below-the-line promotions or other marketing stimuli and
perhaps peer pressure, seek to mobilize their parents' or other adults' spending power to get what they want. Typically these could range from the latest 'must haves' such as the Harry Potter video/DVD or other merchandise, the latest Play Station 2 games, Pokemon/ Digimon collector cards, a breakfast cereal give-away featuring the Simpsons, The bard of Rings or Star Wars, etc.

In short, pester power can be looked upon as a means of kids supplementing their own finite spending power by commandeering that of their parents' or other adults. To this end, kids may employ a number of tactics to coerce parents or other adults into buying them what they wane. A kid may successfully pester for an item featuring a sought-after character sported during the weekly grocery shop. This can unleash impulse spend, boosting marker values. Pester power not only leads to a parent buying an item for a kid, but may also result in extra pocket money in order to buy the item in question.

The framework for the current study was based on the certain assumptions. Firstly, kids are non earning members of the family and are dependent upon the parents for any purchases pertaining to them. Once they feel the need for a particular product, they try their level best through different means to get the parents to buy it for them. The different forces leading to pester power in kids were identified as awareness about a product, external influence and perceived use of the product.

Next, the parents yield to the pestering of their kids, thus resulting in purchase of the product for them. Apart from pester of kids; there are several other factors that exert an influence on the purchase intention in parents. They are family status, socio economic status, situational influences, awareness of products by the parents, and perception of the parents regarding the ethical aspects of the product. But, products like packaged convenience
food items which are not very high priced are both affordable by the parents and easy to procure. Hence the products considered for the study were packaged convenience food items for which, the effect of socio economic status and family status was assumed to be constant.

The purchase of items leads to satisfaction of kids, thereby leading to satisfaction of the parents. The framework developed for study based on the above assumptions, is given below:

![Diagram of study framework](image)

**Figure 3.3 A framework of the study developed by Dr. D. Sudha Rani Ravindran and Hari Sundar G.**

The objectives of the study were based on the above framework and are discussed in the following section.

## 3.11 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aims to find the effect of pester power of kids on purchase intention of parents and thereby on satisfaction of adult. As such, the primary objectives of the study are based on the framework as in Figure 3.3. They are:
A. To find the impact of pester behaviour of kids on the purchase intention of parents and its effect on satisfaction of purchase

B. To find the impact of the factors leading to pester behaviour of kids

C. To find the impact of the factors leading to purchase intention of parents

The study also aimed to find out the influence of other factors on the pester power of kids, purchase intention of parents, and compare between different factors. As such, the secondary objectives of the study were:

A. To find out whether family status has an influence on

B. The decision making ability of kids

C. The purchase intention of parents subject to pester pressure at the point of purchase

D. The expense initiated through pester pressure of kids

E. To compare the level of influence induced through different promotional factors on the pester behaviour of kids

F. To compare the factors considered by parents while intending to purchase the products of kids’ choice

G. To compare the level of awareness of parents and kids regarding the packaged convenience food items

H. To find out the frequency of purchase of different convenience food items

I. To compare the perception of parents towards ethical and unethical marketing practices

J. To identify the factors that influence the level of satisfaction of the buying behaviour of parents and kids
Based on the above framework, the following constructs were identified for the study in the light of the primary objectives developed for the study:

1. Pester power (PP)
2. Purchase intentions of the adult (PI)
3. Perceived use on purchase (PU)
4. Level of Awareness of the Kid (AWC)
5. Awareness of the Adult (AWA)
6. External Influence (EI)
7. Situational Influence (SI)
8. Satisfaction of the adult (STSFCN)
9. Unethical Aspects (UEA)
10. Financial Constraints (FC)

The proposed model for the research consisted of the interaction of the above constructs and is presented in the following section.
3.12 RESEARCH MODEL ON PESTER POWER

![Diagram of Research Model]

**Figure 3.4 Pester Power – Purchase Intention (PP-PI) Model**

(Proposed Model Developed by Dr. D. Sudharani and Hari Sundar (2010))

The figure depicts a model of the influencers of pester power and the effect of pester power on the purchase intention of the parents. The model, named as PP-PI Model, has been developed by the researcher and the research supervisor, Dr. D. Sudharani Ravindran.

3.11.1 **Explanation of the Constructs**

**Pester power** is the power of a kid to influence the purchase decision of their parents. The awareness of the kid about the product, perceived use by the kid and external influence paves way for the higher order construct, pester power (McLean *et al.* 1992). Thus, pester power; a second order construct, is measured by three first order constructs - external influences on child, perceived use on purchase and level of awareness of kid.
**Purchase intention** is the intention of the parent to purchase the item for the kid. Verma and Kapoor (2004) observe that parents often find it difficult to say ‘no’ to their younger children because of their immaturity levels shown through constant nagging and also because their demands are for mostly inexpensive products.

A study by Dodds et al. (1991) indicate that purchase decision is mainly affected by awareness about the product in addition to various other factors considered.

Tinson and Nancarrow (2005) give a broader framework for analyzing the influence in family decision making and include the situational factors like the extent of access to media and retail outlets, presence and the absence of different members during the purchase decision making and making demands for products while at store.

Based on the above studies, Purchase Intention, considered as a higher order construct, is measured by the first order constructs – financial constraints, awareness of adult and situational influences.

**Satisfaction of the adult** is the satisfaction derived from purchasing a product of the kids’ choice for the kid.

According to the model, pester power leads to purchase intension in adult which in turn leads to satisfaction in the adult. The relation between pester power and purchase intentions of adult is assumed to be moderated by the unethical aspects of advertisements. The model, along with the moderating effect of unethical aspects, was tested in the study.
3.12 SCALE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The term “scale” is commonly used to refer to a measurement instrument developed for the purpose of measuring a theoretical phenomenon that cannot be readily observed or assessed directly (DeVellis 2003). The scale development process is of critical importance in a study and hence specific steps were carried out in order to construct a reliable and valid measure capable of drawing conclusions about the construct(s) measured.

The main traditional procedure for scale development developed was based on Churchill’s (1979) guidelines which involved six key steps viz. specification of the domain of the constructs, generation of sample items, purification of measures, assessment of data, assessment of construct validity and development of norms.

The procedure has been criticized for being over dependent on psychometric aspects like the classical reliability theory where reliability was assessed as the ‘the degree to which a multi-item measurement instrument consistently measures a sample of people’ (Finn and Kayande 1997). This approach was largely drawn from psychology studies where the object or unit of study was the person, unlike in marketing where the object can be a firm or a brand which might require generalization. However, Churchill’s (1979) guidelines still remains the main scale development procedure that marketing researchers apply.

A scale is considered uni-dimensional, if all the items of the scale measure one common variable. Gerbing and Anderson (1988) advocated the use Confirmatory factor analysis as a more accurate measure of uni-dimensionality rather than coefficient alpha, item-to-total correlations and suggested that exploratory factor analysis which may be adopted in the preliminary analysis as an item reduction technique. DeVellis (1991)
recommends that experts should review the initial pool of items for relevance, clarity, and conciseness and based on comments from expert reviewer’s items may be removed or new items may be considered. Spector (1992) suggested an initial pilot test to be administered with the pool of items to a small number of respondents, obtain feedback, and make revisions before administering to a larger sample. Most of the scale development literature in marketing was focused on improvements on the Churchill theory by adding procedures or modifying the sequence of procedures to increase psychometric properties of the measure. The content validity of the items selected for measurement is the minimum psychometric requirement for measurement adequacy and is the first step in construct validation of a new measure (Schriesheim et al. 1990). Content validity must be built into the measure through the development of items by adequately capturing the specific domain of interest of the study. There seems to be no generally accepted quantitative index of content validity of measures and therefore more dependence have to be placed on the theoretical considerations.

Rossiter (2002) introduced a more rational, content-validity based, expert judgment procedure in the form of the C-OAR-SE procedure. The C-OAR-SE procedure for measure development consists of six steps such as Construct definition consisting the Object to be rated, the Attribute on which it is to be rated, the Rater entity, which is the person or group who does the ratings; Scale (item type and answer format) selection and Enumeration (scoring)

Finn and Kayande (2005) recommend that, if the C-OAR-SE procedure is used to develop scales for a construct, then empirical validation may be adopted using multivariate generalizability theory which is a statistical theory for evaluating the dependability (or reliability) of measurements. Researchers have opinioned that no scale development
procedure is perfectly complete or perfectly flawless. Hence, this study sought to incorporate the best practices of the top scholars in the marketing discipline into a procedure to develop scales for constructs with exceptional psychometric properties. The amalgamated scale development procedure as shown in Figure 3.5 is adopted in this study

**Figure 3.5 Scale development process**

In the expert panel review stage, the expert panel, consisting of members from industry and academia felt the need to remove the items pertaining to the following variables viz. hyperactive kids, hyper parenting, cohabiters and whether kids have influence in online purchase. The panel opined that the terms – hyperactive kids and hyper parenting were pure jargons, perceived differently/ not understood by many people. The item on cohabiters was felt to be a sensitive question. Regarding whether kids have influence in online purchase, the panel opined that online buying behaviour should not be mixed with direct buying behaviour. Moreover, it did not suit the product chosen for study – packaged convenience food items.
3.13 MEASUREMENT STRATEGY OF CONSTRUCTS

An event, category, behavior, or attribute that expresses a construct and has different values depending on how it is used in a particular study are called variables. This study focused on analysis of relationships between variables which are abstract and not directly measurable. Hence the concept of latent variables was adopted to explain the variables of interest in this study. Latent variables (LV) can be considered “hypothetical constructs invented by researcher for the purpose of understanding a research area” (Bentler 1980). Since LVs are unobservable and cannot be directly measured, researchers use observable and empirically measurable indicator variables (also referred to as manifest variables (MVs)) to estimate LVs in the model. These variables are constructs invented to explain phenomenon of interest in this study. The connections between the constructs and indicators or measures are referred as epistemic relationships or “rules of correspondence” (Bagozzi 1984). There are two basic types of relationships exist in causal modeling namely Reflective and Formative.

Constructs are usually viewed as causes of indicators, meaning that variation in a construct leads to variation in its indicators. Such indicators are termed “reflective” because they represent reflections, or manifestations, of a construct. The “formative” indicators are viewed as causes of constructs as construct is formed or induced by its indicators (Edwards and Bagozzi, 2000). A construct should be modeled as having formative indicators if the indicators are viewed as defining characteristics of the construct, changes in the indicators are expected to cause changes in the construct, changes in the construct are not expected to cause changes in the indicators, the indicators do not necessarily share a common theme, eliminating an indicator may alter the conceptual domain of the construct, a change in the value of one of the indicators is not necessarily expected to be associated with a change in all the
other indicators, and the indicators are not expected to have the same antecedents and consequences.

On the other hand, a construct should be modeled as having reflective indicators if the opposite is true (Jarvis et al. 2003). When the construct is complex, we should use higher order models because such models treat each dimension as an important component of the construct (Ruiz et al. 2008). According to Chin (1998), the choice between measuring latent constructs with formative or reflective indicators should be based on the research objectives, the substantive theory for the latent construct, and the empirical conditions. Table 3.1 below explains the major difference between formative and reflective measurements.

The first step in developing a conceptual model linking the different variables of interest in the study was done on the basis of a study (Rejikumar G, 2010) on the linkage between customer expectation, service quality, customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions in the banking sector. The analysis and results of the above study gave insights into the nature and structure of various constructs to be developed. In the research model, the author had linked Perceived service quality and satisfaction. In similar lines, the researcher, in the present study, decided to develop a model linking pester power and purchase intention, thus leading to satisfaction of purchase.

Table below shows a comparison of formative and reflective measurements.
Table 3.1 Differences between formative and reflective measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Formative Construct</th>
<th>Reflective Construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>A construct which consists of a composite of multiple measures</td>
<td>A construct which has observed measures that are affected by an underlying latent-observable variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of measurement items(indicators)</td>
<td>Un-correlated(Multidimensional)</td>
<td>Correlated/multi-collinear (uni-dimensional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between Construct and indicators</td>
<td>Indicator change leads to Construct change</td>
<td>Construct changes affect the indicators as they are reflections of underlying construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement error</td>
<td>At construct level</td>
<td>At indicator level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical equation</td>
<td>(Item)=Indicator weight*Construct+ Measurement error</td>
<td>Construct=factor loading 1<em>indicator1+ factor loading 2</em>indicator 2+...-measurement error 1- measurement error 2-......so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect when an indicator(s) removed</td>
<td>May affect Content Validity</td>
<td>May not affect Content Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Consistency (Cronbach alpha)</td>
<td>Not required-prove nothing</td>
<td>Required to prove convergent validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path diagram (x1,x2,x3 are indicators)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Review on Construct development by Hisham Bin Md-Bashir (http://doresearch.wordpress.com)

Table 3.2 Chart showing construct, nature and indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Nature of Construct</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pester Power (PP)</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>External Influence (EI), Perceived Use (PU) and Awareness of Chind (AWC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influence</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Influence of Ads, Peer Group,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Nature of Construct</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EI)</td>
<td>Situational Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Use (PU)</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Value Attachment, Taste, Satisfying ego needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of the Kid (AWC)</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Awareness from media, awareness from peer group, awareness about contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical Aspects (UEA)</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Unnecessary expense, bad advertisements, addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention (PI)</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Financial Constraints (FC), Situational Influences (SI), Ethical Aspects (EA) and Awareness (AWA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Constraints</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Budgetary allocation, Nature of spending, Fear of financial stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Influences (SI)</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Impulse buying, Store attributes, keep the kid happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Parent about the product (AWA)</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Quality, Hygiene and Content, Brand Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Satisfaction (STSFCN)</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>Seeing the kid happy, getting things done, keeping up of promises, family happiness, kid satisfaction, health dimension, financial dimension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.14 HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

A hypothesis is a conjectural statement of the relation between two or more variables (Kerlinger 1956). A hypothesis can be defined as a tentative explanation of the research problem, a possible outcome of the research, or an educated guess about the research outcome (Sarantakos 1993).

Hypotheses developed for this study were derived from the belief formulated during the literature review process. According to Preece (1994),
"a good hypothesis is not just any old assertion which can form the basis of a good discussion, though the term is often used in this way." He noted that a good hypothesis should contain two concepts, propose a relationship between them, the concepts used must be capable of being reduced to a level where they can be measured objectively or at least recognized consistently and it should always, or nearly always, relate to an existing wider body of knowledge or theory.

3.15 HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

The hypotheses formulated in the study were tested in order to realize the study objectives. The following are the details of the hypotheses used for the study.

3.15.1 Hypotheses regarding validation of the proposed model

The primary objective of the study is to find the impact of pester behaviour of kids on the purchase intention of parents and its effect on satisfaction of purchase. The proposed model tested for achieving this objective. For this, it was also important to identify the different factors leading to pester behaviour in kids and purchase intention in parents. The following hypotheses were formulated in connection with validation of the proposed model:

Factors leading to Pester Power (PP)

1. External influences (EI) cause pester power (PP) in kids: EI \( \rightarrow \) PP

2. Perceived use (PU) of the product causes pester power (PP) in kids: PU \( \rightarrow \) PP

3. Kids’ level of awareness (AWC) of the product causes pester power in kids: AWC \( \rightarrow \) PP
Impact of Pester Power (PP) on Purchase Intention in parents (PI)

4. Pester power (PP) causes purchase intention (PI) in parents: PP → PI

Other factors leading to Purchasing Intention

5. Financial constraints do not restrict the parents from satisfying their kids’ demand of products chosen for this study

6. Situational influences (SI) lead to purchase intention (PI) in parents: SI → PI

7. Parents’ level of awareness (AWA) of the product leads to purchase intention (PI): AWA → PI

Impact of purchase intention on satisfaction of adults

8. Purchase of the product for kids leads to satisfaction of parents: PI → STFCN

Moderating effects of unethical marketing practices

9. Awareness of unethical marketing practices (UEA) moderate the relationship between pester power of kids and purchase intention of parents

The secondary objectives of the study were aimed at gaining an insight into the whether family status has an influence on pester behavior and purchase intention, comparing the level of influence of different factors on the pester behaviour of kids and purchase intention of parents; and comparing the perception of parents towards ethical and unethical marketing practices.

For achieving the objective of understanding the factors that have an influence of pester behaviour in kids, the following hypotheses were formulated for testing
10. Parents exercise their choice in purchasing packaged 
convenience food items for their kids

11. Kids’ involvement in decision making regarding purchase of 
convenience foods is influenced by their family status.

12. The family status influences the purchase intention of parents 
who are subject to pester power at the point of purchase

13. The family status influences the expense initiated through pester 
power of kids

For meeting the objective of comparing the level of influence of different 
factors on pester behaviour of kids and purchase intention of parents, the 
following hypotheses were formulated

14. Various promotion factors induce different levels of influence 
on the pester behaviour of kids

15. There is significant difference in the factors inducing pester 
power in kids, as perceived by the parents

For comparing the level of awareness and preference of food items of parents 
and kids, the following hypotheses were formulated

16. The level of awareness of packaged convenience food items of 
kids is different from that of parents

17. The preference of food items by kids is different from that of 
parents

In order to compare the level of improvement in kids’ decision making and 
buying behaviour, the following hypotheses were formulated
18. There is significant difference in the level of improvement in the decision making ability of kids with respect to the external influencers, as perceived by the parents

19. There is significant difference in the level of improvement in the buying behaviour of kids with respect to the external influencers, as perceived by the parents

To compare the perception of parents towards different ethical and unethical marketing practices, the following hypotheses were formulated

20. There is significant difference in the perception of parents towards ethical marketing practices

21. There is significant difference in the perception of parents towards unethical marketing practices

For comparing the frequency of purchase of different food items, the following hypothesis was tested

22. There is significant difference in the frequency of purchase of the different food items.

3.16 EXPECTED OUTCOME OF THE STUDY

It was expected that the conceptual model developed will help in establishing the linkage between the variables such as brand awareness, influence of advertising, perceived use of product, pester power, influence of ethical/ unethical aspects, situational influences, financial constraints, purchase intentions and satisfaction of purchase. This is in addition to the demographic variables such as age of parent, gender of parent, family style, number of kids, etc. The analysis may provide an insight into the customer thinking process and will help in formulating strategies to influence the target customers especially kids by way of new marketing strategies. It was
expected that the hypotheses proposed will be accepted, thus establishing the relationship between the variables under study.

The proposed model was expected to be effective in explaining the factors contributing to Pester power consumer behaviour in kids and how they influence their parents for buying of products with reference to Kerala context.

3.17 CONCLUSION

Kids are better aware and informed than their parents about what to buy and when to buy because they are the repository of consumption experiences of several households. Today, consumption is accepted to be the food of life, “Too much” is bad for you, but how much is too much is open for interpretation. Parents find justifications for why there’s no harm in giving their kids more and more.

The study will help in identifying critical factors that contribute to pester power in kids. It was expected to identify actions and develop innovative strategies to understand and manage customer expectations for enhanced customer satisfaction resulting in favorable behavioral intentions.