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Abstract:
This paper investigates the role of the child in modern consumption in terms of rights and responsibilities, focusing on the child–parent purchase relationship. Our study shows the influence of media on children which affects their buying behavior and lead to pester power among children and parents. Media has a huge impact on our lives. Due to the changing culture of the society, parents have become busy in their career, which results in children lead towards experienced things and dependent on media. We examined the children as customers within the child_parent purchase relationship. This research was carried out by designing a questionnaire which was filled by parents. Our research shows the significant relationship between dependent and independent variables.
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Introduction:
Children have become a vast market segment in which they act as a purchaser and influencer for various consumable products. Our study shows the influence of media on children which affects their buying behavior and lead to pester power among children and parents. Pester power is the ability of children to force their parents into buying them products, especially items advertised in the media. Media has a huge impact on our lives. It has been considered as a vehicle by marketers to communicate about their product through advertisements. In past Children teach about consumption by watching their parents’ behavior and copying it (Holm, Kennepohl et al. 1996).

In the view of (Clarke and Warwick 1999) child or adult is the result of a variety of factors, many of which are complex and inconsistent. Kids have direct or indirect influence over family buying decisions. Influence of children differs by product, product sub-decision, stage of the decision making process. The major driving force behind this influence is Media, providing several modes of information. Kids are getting more information by these various modes. Among these various modes Television is an important medium of information (Winick 1979) refer to television as a member of the family, that TV constitutes a very significant component of a child’s development. Marketers target children through television because of its reach to children at small age as compared to other sources of media. Children get attracted towards television advertisements due to the effects created by advertisements. Television develops the awareness of children through advertisements and attracts more children which are going to change the behavior of their parents. Parents are today compensating their fault of not being able to give time to their children through expensive goods. According to studies of (Caruana and Vassallo 2003), children have an influence on family food buying when they shop with their parents. Many children develop their own opinions and tastes about food they wish to eat. The food preferences of children should be motivated by social media advertisement. Social factors influence food choice and eating habits.

In this situation children become independent and parents seem to be losing control of the buying situation to their children. With the passage of time pester power is increasing among the children and parents. In some ways this shows negative impact on child-parents relationship.

Pester power is used to describe the influence a child has over his/her parent (Mintel Pollard, Kirk et al. 2002). This power could be apply on parents with regards to the food purchased for the household(Darian 1998). Due to this factor it has been observed that children are becoming more independent and more confident than their ancestor, children are becoming consumers in their own right at an earlier age (Turner, Kelly et al. 2006).
The age of the child and the age of the parents will also be a factor in whether healthy foods are purchased or not. As parents have a direct influence on their children those seen to be purchasing healthy food may encourage their children to do so. Younger parents are more likely to be reactive to healthy eating messages and have the income to make better nutritional choices (Körtzinger, Neale et al. 1994). In addition to catering to their children’s likes and dislikes, parents frequently take into consideration their children’s foodstuff needs in product selection (Mann, Amman et al. 2003)

Research indicates that most young consumers display rising behavior of independence with regard to their daily food behavior and are confident about which foods they prefer. Pester power involve that parents buy foods they would not otherwise choose under pressure from their children. Pester power create a number of issues. Do parents know what make up a good diet for their children? Do parents know this and still buy foods with too much salt, sugar or fat? Or, do parents think that in buying what their children ask for they are doing the right thing? Is nutrition not the issue, and ease and price more important? Results show that parents think they do not have enough information about providing their child with a healthy diet. A survey conducted in UK revealed that children have become more materialistic these days than to their previous generations (GfK Social Research, 2007).

81% of parents said they would check out the product before deciding to buy; 48% would look at the nutritional value and 33% the cost. Only 14% of those questioned said they agreed to let their children try a new product. The parents have a good understanding of marketing and promotional packaging and passed their views on to their children.

Pester power is to influence poorer parents more than the middle classes. The children of the poor are more likely to attract and poor parents cannot afford expensive (advertised) food.

Of the global market (18.7%) represented primary purchases—that is, children spending their own money in the form of allowances, pocket money, and cash gifts Euromonitor, 2001.

Children also influence purchases away from product groups clearly targeted at them.

Advertising helps children learn to be consumers and thus has an important role to play in their development (Stanbrook, 1997); Gunter and Furnham, 1998; Chandler and Heinzerling, 1998; Macklin and Carlson, 1999; Furnham, 2000). So, the child–parent purchase relationship has largely been walk around from psychological and consumer behavior perspectives, rather than in an ethical or operational context.

This complexity increases when the focus is on young people who are at the stage of development described as and characterized by major physical and psychological changes (Foxall) 1990.

Literature Review:

Advertisement:

Advertising is the action of calling public attention to something that is limited to print media, television, Internet, or any other specific medium. It places actress on paid announcements. It is an announcement in a public medium promoting a product, service. Children differ in their cognitive ability while trying to understand television advertisements and hence form different attitudes towards them. The demand for the advertised products is deeply influenced by the children's attitude towards advertisements. Advertisement has greater impact on the child buying behavior which leads to negative impact for the child parent's relationship. Many earlier researches have concluded that children participation in family purchase decision is increasing and television advertisements are playing important role in defining their product choice and buying behavior pattern. Previous study findings indicate that understanding of commercial intent is related to age. Children younger than 7 or 8 years old show little awareness of what a commercial is and its believable target and appear unable to deal with commercials. As mentioned earlier that understanding of purpose of advertising improves with age, belief in the reliability of advertising tends to decline over age.

In a similar study Reeves and (Francke, Holmes et al. 1979) also observed children's behavior while shopping, but the children were showing immediately previous to the shopping trip, to television advertising in general and not only to food advertising. All of them observed a strong correlation between purchase influence attempts with total number of hours of commercial television watched per week. Television advertisements are changing eating habits of children.

(Galst and White 1976) in their studies attempted to measure the efficiency of television advertising in shaping the purchase-related behavior of children. They exposed children to food advertising in an experimental situation and then observed the effectiveness of food advertisements in influencing selection of products and brands in a natural situation (while shopping with their mothers).

(Kristensen, Hansen et al. 2005) found that television advertisements targeted at children force them to nag their parents due to the increase in desire in them to acquire the advertised product, thereby influencing the family buying decisions. Due to the constant publicity of children to television advertisements, they are able to differentiate between good and bad products and are in the situation to encourage their parents easily to purchase the product they desire.

According to (O’Guinn and Shrum 1997) advertising and programming content are the two channels of communication which inform children and young people about products and encourage them to purchase.

Parents Power:

It can be seen that the operational context for conflict in the child–parent purchase relationship can vary according to product group and, indeed, according to the nature of the child–parent relationship and the age of the child itself (Gunter and Furnham) 1998. Furthermore, it is clear that the potential conflict situation around a younger child’s largely
physiological desire to buy a chocolate bar will differ from that of an older child’s psychological need for a particular brand of clothing. In each case the relative knowledge of the parent and child is different. The limitations of parental income can also act as a contributory factor in creating inconsistency within the child–parent purchase relationship. Children’s ability to join in current consumption patterns has a vital importance for their identity and their social relations with other children.

Children enjoy greater carefulness not only in making routine consumption decisions for the family but also in pestering their parents to buy other products desired by them. Children 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.

Due to the changing culture of the society, parents have become busy in their career, which results in children lead towards experienced things and dependent on media. Parents compensate their time by providing materialistic belongings to their children. Knowing this fact, marketers promote their products like chocolates, pizzas, motor bike, cars, laptop, and holiday tours as a condition requirement for celebrating festivals and success. As a result of which, they start relating their happiness with the advertised item, which is a sign of materialism (Chan, 2006). Materialistic attitude of children impacts their interpersonal relations that ultimately results difference between parent and child.

(Geunens et al.) 2002 observed that the relative influence of children varies by the extent to which the parents are busy. Foxman et al. (1989) found that both parents and children supposed that children had low influence in selecting price ranges. Children are more involved in sub decisions regarding color, make/model, and brand choices (Belch et al.)1985 ; (Darley and Lim) 1986; (Jenkins) 1979; (Nelson) 1978; (Szybillo and Sosanie) 1977. The most common focus in this line of research has been examination of the extent to which parents give up to the requests of children Atkin, 1978; Berey & Pollay, 1978.

Environment:

Environment is the natural world, as a whole or in a particular geographical area, especially as affected by human activity.

Environment has a greater impact on the child buying behavior. With the passage of time the need has been changed which lead to inspire toward to fulfill needs.

We take cultural influences for approved, but they are important. An American will usually not negotiate with a store owner. This is a common practice in much of the World. Physical factors also influence our behavior. We are more likely to buy a soft drink when we are thirsty, for example, and food manufacturers have found that it is more effective to advertise their products on the radio in the late afternoon when people are getting hungry. A person’s self-image will also tend to influence what he or she will buy—an upwardly mobile manager may buy a flashy car to project an image of success. Social factors also influence what the consumers buy—often, consumers seek to duplicate others whom they admire, and may buy the same brands. The social environment can include both the ordinary culture. Americans are more likely to have corn flakes or ham and eggs for breakfast than to have rice, which is preferred in many Asian countries and a subculture. Thus, sneaker manufacturers are ready to have their products worn by admired participant. Finally, consumer behavior is influenced by learning.

Pester power

Pester power has been very choice and responsive issue in the marketing world. Even since children were considered to have a importance role of influencer in the family purchase decisions, the area of pester power has been great concern to marketers. Pester power can be defined as children’s control on family use patterns (Gunter and Furnham, 1998). Basini, 2012). Pester power can also be term in public driven game and not a business relationship (Nash and Basini, 2012). Children have got limited amount of power and they arrange many plan of action to power their influence over their parent’s and so the term pestering. The power of children has been so much so that the families have been lead to many purchase decision due to the control strength by children. McNeal (1999) explain the three source of power for the child customers, they have their personal expenses control, the role as customers whose loyalty repay before time and their power more adults purchasing behavior. Children have been found to force the power more adults purchasing actions to products Dittmar, (2011). The information gather through the many agent give the children importance amount of knowledge and skills to communicate and very a lot agree while making the purchase decision. A debate about pester power would not be complete without telling the hope of consumer socialization of children. According to Ward (1974), user socialization can be defined as “processes by which young people

To acquire skills, knowledge, and attitudes relevant to their performance as customers in the market place.

Kids buying behavior

Kids represent a central market section to marketers because kids have their personal business conduct. Most of the time, kids examine the buying decision of their parents because they are adults of future

There were some children in describe wearing trainer and they said. Do you want to see a trick? Unexpectedly, we’ll come out from below the shoes and they turned into breaker blade. I thinking it was very cool. Every day on the way to school I told my mum about them. I don’t think I pestered her but I kept talking about them. Then, one day my mum got them as a shock for me’ (Fitzsimons, 2001)

Impudence on children’s buying behavior is in fact, family and peer group, rather than marketing and that, in fact advertising helps children learn to be user and so has an important socialization role to play in their growth
According to Euromonitor (2001), the total value of the worldwide children's market in 2000—that is goods sold specifically for children—was US$396b. This market has developed by 17.6% in real terms since 1997, far out-stripping the child population growth during the same period, and more increase growth of 14.3% is predict by 2005. The major single product group was food, accounting for $62b (15.7%), and other key groups included toys and games, clothing and footwear. The US is the key player where the children’s market has been expected.

These children as customers within the child parent purchase relationship. The ethical framework of this topic has been set out in terms of rights and tasks within the child parent dynamic, acknowledge post-modern marketing theory. The children have a right to some control more purchases that involve them, but that exercise this right can result in competition and ‘pestering’ of parents. Parents also have rights and, as a result, at this point successful purchase behavior might be loss.

Objectives of Study:

- Our purpose is to study the level of materialism among children due to the media and to overcome the effect of materialism.
- To study the media influence on children this affects their buying behavior.
- We examined the children as customers within the child parent purchase relationship.
- To study whether kids have influence in buying decision made by family.
- To assess the pester power effect occurring on account of advertisement.

Hypothesis:

H1: There is significant relationship between pester power and TV advertisement.
H2: There is significant relationship between pester power and Environment.
H3: There is significant relationship between pester power and kids buying behavior.
H4: There is significant relationship between pester power and parent’s power.

Conceptual Framework:

This research consist of total five variables four are independent such as TV Advertisment, Environment, Kids Buying Behavior and Parents Power they have influence/effect on dependent variable Pester Power. There is significant relationship between dependent and independent variables.
Methodology:
Sampling:
We use simple random sampling method. The data has been collected from a sample of 200 parents of kids between age group of 5-17 through self-structured questionnaire. Kids were considered, selected of both genders. The questionnaire included questions using Five-point Likert Scale.

Types of Research:
The research is Descriptive and Exploratory. Descriptive research is working for the kids and Exploratory Research is used for the parents.

Research Instrument:
Research Instruments would include questionnaires which consist on the following scales:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- disagree
- Strongly disagree

Data Analysis Techniques:
We use SPSS software for data analysis. In SPSS, we calculate descriptive analysis, reliability, correlation and at the end we run regression, we analyze model summary. ANOVAs and coefficient analysis.

Descriptive Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV advertisement</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>2.497</td>
<td>6.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>2.352</td>
<td>5.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Power</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>8.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KidsBuyingBehavior</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>2.708</td>
<td>7.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pester Power</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2.228</td>
<td>4.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In descriptive analysis descriptive statistics table showing N=sample size, Rang= middle positions of minimum and maximum values and all values of mean, Std. Deviation and Variance.

This table shows the mean, standard deviation and variance of 200 individuals.

TV Advertisement The mean of TV advertisement is 12.92 which are near to agree. Standard deviation is 2.947; variance is 6.235 which shows that it is much effective because its standard deviation is low.

Environment The mean of environment is 10.87 which are near to agree. Standard deviation is 2.53 and variance is 5.531 which shows that it is high effective because its standard deviation is low.

Parent Power The mean of Parent Power is 10.89 which are near to agree. Standard deviation is 2.846 and variance is 8.089 which is shows that it is high effective because it standard deviation is low.

Kids Buying Behavior The mean of Kids Buying Behavior is 11.21 which are strongly agreed. Standard deviation is 2.078 and variance is 7.333 which are shows that it is high effective because its standard deviation is low.

Pester power the mean of pester power is 6.07 which are near to agree. Standard deviation is 2.228 and variance is 4.966 which are shows that it is high effective because its standard deviation is low.

Reliability:

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TV advertisement</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Parent Power</th>
<th>KidsBuyingBehavior</th>
<th>Pester Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV advertisement</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Power</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KidsBuyingBehavior</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pester Power</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation table are showing relationship of all independent variables with dependent variable. The main thing here is two tail tests which show relationship between all variables. Correlation between TV advertisement and Environment is (.281 **), TV advertisement and Parent Power is (.292 **), TV advertisement and kids buying behavior is (.343 **), TV advertisement and pester power is (.378 **), Environment and TV advertisement is (.281 **), Environment and Parent Power is (.303 **), Environment and kids buying behavior is (.409 **), Environment and Pester Power is (.457 **), Parent Power and TV advertisement is (.292 **), Parent Power and Environment is (.303 **), Parent Power and kids buying behavior is (.454 **), Parent Power and pester power is (.470 **), Kids Buying Behavior and TV advertisement is (.343 **), Kids Buying Behavior and Environment is (.409 **), Kids Buying Behavior and Parent Power is (.454 **), Kids Buying Behavior and Pester Power is (.601 **), Pester Power and TV advertisement is (.378 **), Pester Power and Environment is (.457 **), Pester Power and Parent Power is (.470 **) and level of relationship in Pester Power and kids buying behavior is (.601 **). In some variables relationship is low and between some variables relationship is high. Either relationship is low or high but existed and significant. Low relationship is between Environment and TV advertisement and high is between Pester Power and kids buying behavior is (.281 **) and (.601 **) respectively. In the above table all null hypothesis are rejected and alternate are accepted and shows all independent variables have significant affect on dependent variables and strong correlation each other.
Regression:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regression model summary table representing the values of R, R square, Adjusted R Square and std. Error of estimation. R value is .683 which is highly significant because the required value of R for significance is .5 and std. error of estimate is minimal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>460.669</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>115.167</td>
<td>42.575</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>527.486</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>988.155</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All coefficients are significant as indicated by t values in the table. The direct effect of pester power by TV Advertisement is .132. The direct effect of environment on pester power is .203. The direct effect of parent power on pester power is 1.96. The standardized direct effect of kids buying behavior on pester power is .384. All supported hypothesis in terms of relationship, standardized regression coefficients and their significance are summarized in Table.

Findings

- Mobile Phones with cameras class the highest in the list of device of desire for kids 7-14.
- An estimated $12 billion a year is now spent on advertising and marketing to children.
- Children, who watch a lot of television, want more toys seen in advertisements and eat more advertised food than children who do not watch as much television (Strasburger) 2002.
- The media-specifically the Television for 80% of the respondents represents the primary way in which the kids learn about new products and brand names.
- The top 5 products for which the kids have disturb their parents in the last six months include – Fast Food Restaurants, Own clothing, Chips, Chocolates and games and toys.(35percent among girls and 80 percent among boys for toys and games).
- Parents report that kids influence them into buying by adopting a variety of strategies.

Conclusion:
The purpose of present study is to investigate the role of media in the level of materialism among children with the help of existing literature. Materialism has become an important concern for the researchers due to its impacts on the development of children. The working culture of dual income households has changed the process of consumer socialization of children from parents to media. Media makes the children alert about the new and innovative products available in market. This alertness of children is not a problem until children start connecting their happiness with worldly things which is a sign of materialism. Due to the changing culture of the society, parents have become busy in their career, which results in making children disposed towards worldly things and dependent on media. Parents compensate their time by providing materialistic belongings to their children. Knowing this fact, marketers promote their products like chocolates, pizzas, motor bike, cars, laptop, and holiday tours as a prerequisite requirement for celebrating festivals and success. For this purpose, they make use of channels related to children like cartoon network and nickelodeon (D’Silva et al., 2007). The message conveyed through these channels helps in developing the image of advertised item as perfect. Children consider the message of advertisers true because of their incapability to understand the reality behind the advertisements. So they start relating their happiness with the advertised item, which is a sign of materialism Chan, 2006. Materialistic attitude of children impacts their interpersonal relations. That finally results conflict between parent and child. Therefore, parental guidance plays an active role in reducing the consequence of materialism among children Buijzen & Valkenburg, 2003; Flouri, (1999).

Limitations

The most important constraint of the study is that we drew sample from only 1 city kids, the results of which may not be true representative. The study can be widely generalized through inclusion of more geographical areas. The second constraint of the study is the use of convenience sampling for data collection. The use of non-probability sampling doesn’t represent whole population. Another limitation of the study is the selection of only few school’s kids. Further research should be conducted by replicating independent variable to check effect on pester power. This study observed only short-term effects of TV advertisement, Environment, and kids buying behavior. Further research can be conducted to focus on its long term effects. The current study examines the relationships among TV advertisement, Environment; kids buying behavior, parent power with pester power. Further research studies should be conducted to examine relationships among pester power and other variables such as packing style of food items, income of parents and technological toys for kids.
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