



Published in final edited form as:

Health Educ Behav. 2017 February ; 44(1): 5–12. doi:10.1177/1090198116637602.

What Happens When Parents and Children Go Grocery Shopping? An Observational Study of Latino Dyads in Southern California, USA

Joanna Calderon, MPH^{1,2}, Guadalupe X. Ayala, PhD, MPH^{1,2}, John P. Elder, PhD, MPH^{1,2}, George E. Belch, PhD¹, Iana A. Castro, MBA, PhD^{1,2}, Nadir Weibel, PhD³, and Julie Pickrel, MPH²

¹San Diego State University, San Diego, CA, USA

²Institute for Behavioral and Community Health, San Diego, CA, USA

³University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA

Abstract

The objective of this study was to observe parent–child interactions in *tiendas*, limited assortment food stores catering to Latinos in the United States, and to examine the extent to which child involvement influenced these interactions and their purchase outcomes. Two confederates, one posing as a *tienda* employee and one posing as a customer, observed the entire shopping trip of 100 Latino parent–child (mean age = 8 years) dyads and coded the following: number and type of parent- and child-initiated request interactions, types of purchase influence attempts used by children and how parents responded, and whether the product was purchased. Level of child involvement was examined as a potential influencing factor on purchasing. The observations were relatively short (mean duration of 10 minutes), reflecting the “quick trip” nature of the observed shopping trips. From the 100 parent–child dyads, 144 request interactions were observed, and among dyads with at least 1 request interaction during the shopping trip, the average number of request interactions per dyad was 2. Children initiated most of the request interactions by asking for a product or simply placing it in the basket; parents initiated 24% of the request interactions. Child involvement in shopping and checkout were associated with spending and purchase outcomes. These results indicate that children and parents influence each other during grocery shopping, and children who are more involved have greater influence over purchases. Furthermore, this study identified a number of targets for future family/parent and consumer food environment interventions.

Keywords

grocery shopping; Hispanic/Latino; observations; parent; child dyads

Reprints and permissions: sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Corresponding Author: Guadalupe X. Ayala, PhD, MPH, Institute for Behavioral and Community Health, 9245 Sky Park Court, Suite 220, San Diego, CA 92123, USA. ayala@mail.sdsu.edu

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Grocery shopping is a frequent behavior influenced by income, household size, the in-store environment, presence of children (Bawa & Ghosh, 1999), and race/ethnicity. Regarding the last two, compared with the U.S. population, Latinos make three times more grocery shopping trips per week (ConAgra Foods, 2011), co-shop more frequently and most often with children (Unilever, 2005), and are more likely to be influenced by children (ConAgra Foods, 2011).

When parents shop with children, there are many opportunities for parents and children to interact about food and beverage products, which determines what is purchased and consumed, and ultimately their weight status (Murphy, Ice, McCartney, Leary, & Cottrell, 2012). Children as young as 18 to 24 months attempt to influence their parents' grocery purchases (Buijzen & Valkenburg, 2008; Ebster, Wagner, & Neumueller, 2009; Flurry & Burns, 2005; Galst & White, 1976; Gaumer & Arnone, 2009; Nadeau & Bradley, 2012; Williams & Burns, 2000) through the use of purchase influence attempts, including asking nicely, begging, and negotiating. Influential factors in the relationship between purchase influence attempts and purchase outcomes include child age (older vs. younger children's requests result in purchase more often; Atkin, 1978), co-shopping frequency (which can affect parents' refusal strategies and children's influence; Ebster et al., 2009), and child movement restriction (i.e., limiting the child's movement may reduce the number of products seen, reached, and requested; Ebster et al., 2009; Rust, 1993).

Regarding child age, theories of consumer socialization suggest that child influence changes as children age and acquire the skills and knowledge to operate as consumers in the marketplace (Carlson & Grossbart, 1988; John, 1999). Children in the earlier stage of consumer socialization (i.e., perceptual stage: 2–7 years old) may make more purchase requests, but the requests of those in the analytical and reflective stages (8–14 years old) result in more purchases (Buijzen & Valkenburg, 2008; Ward & Wackman, 1972). Older children have been observed to be more involved in decision making (Pettersson, Olsson, & Fjellstrom, 2004). Additionally, parents with higher versus lower incomes are more likely to purchase a requested item (Ebster et al., 2009) and parent- versus child-initiated request interactions result in purchase more often (Atkin, 1978; Buijzen & Valkenburg, 2008). Although parents readily acknowledge children's influence in grocery purchases, they consistently underestimate this influence (Ebster et al., 2009; Gram, 2010). Examining the extent to which these patterns hold for Latino families and in novel food environments such as *tiendas* (Emond, Madanat, & Ayala, 2012) can inform future interventions in this important consumer food environment (Gittelsohn, Laska, Karpyn, Klingler, & Ayala, 2014).

Finally, there is mixed evidence on how child involvement (e.g., the extent to which a child assists with a household task) is associated with purchasing and consumption. Research suggests that families with Latino mothers who are more authoritarian (vs. egalitarian) in their meal decision making and preparation had children who ate healthier (Arredondo et al., 2006). However, in other research, child involvement in food preparation was associated with eating more salad and more chicken, although also more calories (van der Horst, Ferrage, & Rytz, 2014). Child involvement was also associated with youth-reported preferences for fruits and vegetables (Chu et al., 2013). Finally, girls who were more

involved in food shopping consumed more fried foods (Larson, Story, Eisenberg, & Neumark-Sztainer, 2006). Given these mixed findings, more research is needed on the influence of child involvement.

Present Study

This study examined the number of parent- and child-initiated request interactions that occurred for foods and beverages, the types of purchase influence attempts used by children and how parents responded, and whether the product was purchased. Differences by consumer socialization stage were also examined but limited to two socialization stages because of the small sample size. Finally, we extended previous research by examining the entire grocery shopping trip of Latino parent-child dyads in *tiendas* and exploring whether child involvement influenced the purchase behavior of the parent.

Method

Study Design

Two brief interviews and an unobtrusive observation were conducted with 100 Latino parent-child dyads during a single grocery shopping trip in one of three *tiendas*. *Tiendas* are a major source of food for Mexican origin populations in the United States (Ayala, Mueller, Lopez-Madurga, Campbell, & Elder, 2005), in part because they are more accessible in their communities than supermarkets (Lisabeth et al., 2010). The university's institutional review board approved all study protocols.

Tienda Recruitment

A previous study's criteria were used to select the *tiendas* (Ayala, Baquero, Laraia, Ji, & Linnan, 2013): (a) bilingual (English/Spanish) or Spanish-speaking employees, (b) Spanish-language advertising, and (c) products and/or brands targeting Latino customers. Store owners/managers of five potentially eligible *tiendas* (from an enumerated list) were approached; three agreed to participate, one refused, and one was dropped after consent and before any data collection occurred due to few customers with children. No formal remuneration was offered but a thank-you gift was given. The three *tiendas* had two to three cash registers, four to five walkways, shopping carts with child seats, and the following departments: produce, serviced meat, serviced prepared foods, and serviced bakery. Involving *tiendas* with similar characteristics helped minimize sources of variance that could affect parent-child interactions (e.g., as a function of product availability).

Dyad Recruitment

Trained research assistants (RAs) approached adult-child dyads as they entered the store to assess eligibility, obtain verbal consent, and conduct the interview with the adult. Privacy and confidentiality were maintained by identifying a location outside the store where the adult felt comfortable responding to questions. RAs approached all adult-child dyads in which the child appeared to be 2 to 16 years. This range was larger than the eligible age range of 3 to 14 years to prevent the exclusion of children who appeared older/younger than their actual age. All recruitment attempts, gender of adult and child, eligibility assessment,

and, if applicable, reason for refusal were documented. Customers who were not approached because an assessment determined they were ineligible were recorded to assess generalizability.

Additional adult inclusion criteria were (a) at least 18 years old, (b) identified as Latino/Hispanic, (c) intended to purchase food products during visit, (d) parent shopping with his or her child who is between 3 and 14 years old, (e) lived with child at least 4 days/week, (f) spoke English or Spanish, and (g) had not participated previously. Verbal consent was obtained from the adult. To reduce potential bias arising from awareness of being observed, the consent script and fact sheet stated, "Observations are being conducted in the store to obtain information about store products and store customers, like yourself, to better understand shopping behaviors." If a dyad was ineligible or refused, the RA approached the next potentially eligible dyad until a dyad was successfully recruited, at which point all recruitment activities ceased until the dyad completed the three study components. Consenting dyads received \$5 on completion of the second interview.

Procedures

First Interview—The 3- to 4-minute interview asked parents if they were the primary household food shopper (i.e., purchased at least 50% of the groceries), the purpose of the shopping trip (quick trip-general, quick trip-single meal, fill-in, or major stock-up), how often they shopped with this child (co-shopping frequency), monthly household income, and parent age, education, and employment.

Observation—Observations took place inside the *tienda*, beginning as soon as the dyad entered and finishing on exit. Although parents were informed that observations were occurring inside, in this study as in previous ones (Atkin, 1978; Gaumer & Arnone, 2009), observers strived to minimize reactivity. Based on previous research and pilot testing, it was decided that two observers per store, one posing as an employee and one as a customer, would be most subtle. Additionally, this allowed for reliability comparisons by co-coding a subset of interactions. A structured observation instrument was used to minimize observer drift (Rust, 1993).

Coding began whenever a child requested or a parent offered a food or beverage product. The product name or category was coded (open ended). Next, the request interactions were coded; specifically, the conversation between the parent and child regarding a desired or offered item. Each interaction was made up of a series of exchanges where a single back-and-forth (a statement and its response) was considered one exchange. Previous studies have examined single exchanges (Atkin, 1978; Ebster et al., 2009; Gaumer & Arnone, 2009; Nadeau & Bradley, 2012); however, interactions can go beyond a single exchange, particularly with persistent children determined to obtain a desired product. Thus, an innovative aspect of this study was capturing all exchanges to characterize the entire interaction about a product.

Child purchase influence attempts were coded using nine codes from previous studies (see Table 1; Ebster et al., 2009; Flurry & Burns, 2005; Isler, Popper, & Ward, 1979; Nadeau & Bradley, 2012; Williams & Burns, 2000). As parent-initiated interactions account for

approximately 30% of purchase-related parent–child interactions (Atkin, 1978; Buijzen & Valkenburg, 2008; Gaumer & Arnone, 2009), a “responds to parent” influence attempt code was also created. The child was always coded first; thus, if the parent initiated the interaction, the child’s response was identified as “responds to parent.” In addition to verbal purchase influence attempts, codes were developed for nonverbal influence attempts (see Table 1; Pettersson et al., 2004). If a child used both verbal and nonverbal strategies, the verbalized strategy took precedence.

Seven parent response codes were developed based on previous studies (see Table 2; Atkin, 1978; Isler et al., 1979; O’Dougherty, Story, & Stang, 2006). “Select” and “wait” were added after pilot testing. Previous studies have found that parents may ignore or avoid children’s purchase influence attempts (Isler et al., 1979; O’Dougherty et al., 2006). However, an observer cannot determine whether a lack of reaction was intentional or the parent simply did not hear or see (in the case of nonverbal strategies) the child’s purchase influence attempt. Thus, the code “no reaction” was used when a parent did not react or respond to a child’s purchase influence attempt. Finally, nutrition- and/or health-related attempts were coded to determine if parents used education about healthy choices with their acquiescence or refusal.

Request outcome represented the final exchange in a request interaction. The request outcome was coded as “yes” if the parent or child agreed to a product purchase and/or if any of the following happened: the parent/child placed the item in the cart/basket or handed it to the other to place in cart/basket, the parent/child carried it for purchase or handed it to the other to carry for purchase. It was also coded as “yes” if the parent agreed nonverbally (e.g., nodded) to the item, but not the specific brand requested. Request outcome was coded as “no” if the parent refused to purchase the item or the child declined an item offered by the parent. When the parent had no reaction to the child’s request (e.g., when a child placed an item in the cart and the parent did not react), the request outcome was coded as “no reaction.” Product price was recorded when the observer could clearly identify the item that was being purchased (by brand and size). In addition to assessing the request outcome, observers determined whether the interaction resulted in an actual purchase. This additional step was important because a parent may agree to a request in order to appease the child in the moment but later remove it from the cart/basket.

Second Interview—On exiting the *tienda*, the parent completed a 1- to 3-minute interview that asked, among other questions, how much he or she spent overall, how many products were purchased because the child requested them, and the child and parent’s country of birth and years living in the United States.

Postobservation—After the observation ended, the RAs coded the degree of the child’s movement restriction for the majority of the trip: complete (carried or in a shopping cart or stroller), partial (leash or hand-holding), or none (walking around the store freely). Child involvement during the shopping trip was categorized into two groups: involvement in shopping (e.g., fetching; yes/no) and/or involvement at checkout (e.g., placing items on checkout belt; yes/no).

Quality Assurance and Data Analyses

Interrater reliability was 89% between two observers for 11 observations. Data analyses in which the unit of interest was the dyad were run in SPSS and remaining analyses were run in STATA SE V11. Descriptive analyses were conducted on characteristics of the dyads, the shopping trips, the parent- and child-initiated request interactions, the purchase influence attempts used by children and how parents responded, and whether the product was purchased. Chi-square tests explored differences between children in the perceptual versus analytical/reflective consumer socialization stages on the number of request interactions observed and purchase outcomes. Next, *t* tests examined differences in request interactions, amount spent, and purchase outcomes by child involvement in grocery shopping and child involvement at checkout. Finally, *t* tests examined differences in the number of items purchased in response to child influence comparing parent-report and observed purchases.

Results

Dyad Recruitment

Figure 1 depicts our recruitment attempts and outcomes. Our final sample consisted of 100 dyads; from among the 104 eligible dyads, only 1 refused and 3 were dropped due to becoming ineligible after consenting (i.e., another adult joining dyad). Among those who refused to be screened, the most common reasons given were “don’t have time/in a hurry” (43%) and “not interested” (26%). Among ineligible dyads, the most common reasons were child age (49%) and adults shopping with a child who was not their own or did not live with them 4 days per week or more (39%); in two thirds of these dyads, the adult was the grandparent.

Dyad and Trip Characteristics

Forty-one percent of dyads reported a household income of less than \$2,000/month (see Table 3). Most adults were the main household food shopper, made two grocery shopping trips per week, including one with their child; more than two third reported always grocery shopping with their child(ren). The most and least common dyad makeups were mother–daughter and father–daughter, respectively. A majority of the trips were quick trips.

Request Interactions Observed: Child- and Parent-Initiated

Observations ranged from 2 to 55 minutes ($M = 10$ minutes). A total of 144 request interactions were observed, with a mean of 2 request interactions per dyad among dyads with at least 1 request interaction (see Table 4). One third of dyads did not have any request interactions. Children initiated 76% of the request interactions. Among dyads with request interactions, 60% had no parent-initiated interactions and 16% had exclusively parent-initiated interactions. The results indicate that children in the perceptual consumer socialization stage initiated more request interactions than children in the analytical/reflective stages (55% vs. 45%), while parents initiated more request interactions with children in the analytical/reflective stages than with children in the perceptual stage (63% vs. 37%; $\chi^2 = 3.40, p = .065$). When analyses were limited to the first request interaction for each dyad, using only independent observations, similar results were found (data not

shown). The predominant language used was Spanish (48%) and 22% of requests were nonverbal. Only one request interaction contained a parent nutrition education attempt. The child consumed the product requested in-store in only a few cases. Because of missing data (e.g., products without a price sign), price information was available for only 50 request interactions. An average of \$2.37 ($SD = \2.11) was spent per request interaction, with the amount ranging from \$0.33 to \$9.49.

Child Purchase Influence Attempts and Parent Responses

Across the 144 request interactions, 276 child purchase influence attempts and 249 parent responses were observed and coded. The most common purchase influence attempt used by children in their first exchange with their parents was “just asks” (72%), followed by nonverbal behaviors, such as handing the product to the parent, placing it directly in the basket/cart, or carrying it to the cash register (18%) and pointing (7%; see Table 1). Furthermore, exploring purchase influence attempts during the first exchange only by consumer socialization stage suggested that a higher percentage of older children placed items directly in the basket/cart while a higher percentage of younger children used pointing (see Table 1). Parents’ most common initial response was “no reaction” (24%), followed by hard “no” (22%) and an explanation (17%; see Table 2).

Purchase Outcomes

Parents agreed verbally or nonverbally to purchase the product in approximately half of the interactions (see Table 5). At checkout, decision to purchase increased to 58%, with “no responses” generally converting to a decision to purchase. The average number of items purchased as a result of a request interaction was one. Although not significant, parent-initiated requests were more likely to result in a purchase than child-initiated requests (66% vs. 56%). Request interactions initiated by children in the analytical/reflective stages resulted in purchase more often (65%) than those initiated by children in the perceptual stage (48%; $\chi^2 = 2.85, p = .091$). Exploring the first request interaction for each dyad, those initiated by children in the analytical/reflective stages resulted in purchase more often (73%) than those initiated by children in the perceptual stage (44%; $\chi^2 = 3.95, p = .047$). Co-shopping frequency and household income were not associated with purchase outcomes. Associations with child movement restrictions and trip type were not examined given the low variance in these factors.

Child Involvement

Two thirds of children assisted in shopping and almost half assisted at checkout. Dyads in which the child assisted (vs. did not assist) with shopping had a greater number of interactions (1.69 vs. 0.94, $p = .05$) and purchases (1.06 vs. 0.44, $p = .01$). For child-initiated request interactions, the number of interactions (1.26 vs. 0.74, $p = .05$) and purchases (0.77 vs. 0.32, $p = .05$) were greater when the child assisted with shopping. No differences emerged for parent-initiated interactions and purchases. Dyads in which the child assisted (vs. did not assist) with shopping spent more money during the shopping trip (\$25.01 vs. \$14.02, $p = .05$) and reported buying more products at the request of the child (1.65 vs. 0.65, $p = .05$).

For assistance at checkout, dyads in which the child assisted (vs. did not assist) had a greater number of purchases of requested items (1.08 vs. 0.63, $p < .05$), spent more money during the shopping trip (\$28.52 vs. \$14.38, $p < .01$), and reported buying more products at the request of the child (1.81 vs. 0.82, $p < .01$). Differences did not emerge for number of interactions, number of child- or parent-initiated interactions, or number of child- or parent-initiated purchases.

Perceived Child Influence

Parents' reports of number of items purchased in response to child influence were significantly different from those observed (1.29 vs. 0.95, $p = .05$). Despite this difference, in 60% of dyads the parent-reported items were concordant with the actual items purchased; 11% underreported and 29% overreported.

Discussion

Observations of Latino parent-child interactions while grocery shopping revealed that both parents and children had an influence on purchase decisions. When children requested products, they were most likely to just ask or use nonverbal strategies, including placing the products in the cart (used more often by older children) or pointing to them on the store shelf (used more often by younger children). Parents' lack of reaction to child-initiated interactions supports the findings of O'Dougherty et al. (2006) that parents often use avoidance as a refusal strategy. On the other hand, parents' agreement to purchase (i.e., "yes" response) occurred less readily compared with previous studies (23% vs. 31% to 64% in other studies; Atkin, 1978; Buijzen & Valkenburg, 2008; Gaumer & Arnone, 2009; O'Dougherty et al., 2006). Furthermore, child involvement in shopping and during checkout was associated with almost double the amount spent and more products purchased at the child's request. This supports previous findings that child involvement can have an effect on what children may consume (Arredondo et al., 2006; Larson et al., 2006), warranting additional research for how to effectively teach children lifelong skills for healthy growth and development.

Although methodological factors may explain study results, culture contributes to the explanation (Arredondo et al., 2006; Hughes, Power, Orlet Fisher, Mueller, & Nicklas, 2005; Patrick, Nicklas, Hughes, & Morales, 2005). For low-income Latinos, food purchases provide a readily available opportunity to provide children with immediate gratification (Patrick et al., 2005). Latino parents are often considered indulgent, characterized by a lack of control over a child's diet (Hughes et al., 2005; Rodriguez-Oliveros et al., 2011), which is a barrier to healthy eating. Parents who are more indulgent are less likely to place restrictions on foods, which may explain why children are at increased risk of child obesity (Arredondo et al., 2006; Hughes et al., 2005). If an indulgent feeding style translates into parents readily agreeing to purchase requested items, then children may feel more confident in making requests (decision history) and the difference in purchase outcomes for parent-versus child-initiated interactions may be reduced. In addition, the value placed on parents' provision of gratification via food as an attainable pleasure may also result in more parents

agreeing to children's requests regardless of income. Additional research is needed on the relationship between parent feeding styles and parent-child grocery shopping behavior.

The disparity between parent-reported and actual (observed) items purchased based on a request from the child confirms that self-reports are not an accurate representation of behaviors. However, contrary to previous research with non-Latino samples, parents overreported the number of items purchased at the child's request during the shopping trip. This departure may be due to not understanding the question or social desirability bias. The trend toward an indulgent feeding style may contribute to this overestimation. If parents value providing gratification via food, then they may be more likely to present themselves as having purchased several items at their child's request. Irrespective, the discrepancy between parent report and observed behavior highlights the importance of observational research.

Limitations

Our approach introduced limitations. For example, including demands (e.g., "I want ice cream.") in the "just asks" purchase influence attempt code did not allow for a comparison between asking and demanding. We sought to avoid subjective interpretations of observed interactions. Second, 41% of the items did not have a price sign, limiting our analyses of cost as a moderator in the interaction-outcome relationship. A previous study found that parents were more likely to purchase lower priced items (Ebster et al., 2009). Third, to reduce sources of variance, the study was limited to dyads with a parent and one child. Finally, other potential influential factors were not examined in this study given insufficient variance (e.g., proxies of acculturation such as years living in the United States) or because they were beyond the scope of this study (e.g., store factors such as product placement and location of request).

Implications

When grocery shopping, children influence purchases via their own attempts and by parent invitation. Evidence on the types of purchase influence attempts used by children suggests the need for parenting interventions that promote limit setting when grocery shopping, and being aware of how child involvement influences spending and purchase outcomes. Given the number of interactions observed during a single 10-minute shopping trip, a typical 30-minute shopping trip may involve six or more interactions. Thus, it is important to consider the impact that directing these interactions toward healthier food and beverage choices could have on dietary intake given the frequency with which people visit these stores (Ayala et al., 2015; Sanchez-Flack et al., 2016).

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the research assistants for their invaluable support in carrying out this study and Mrs. Katie Bothwell for editing the article.

Funding

The authors disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: National Cancer Institute (Ms. Calderon: Grant number R01CA140326-04S1; Dr. Ayala: Grant number R01CA140326). The National Cancer Institute had no role in the design, analysis, and writing of this article.

References

- Arredondo EM, Elder JP, Ayala GX, Campbell N, Baquero B, Duerksen S. Is parenting style related to children's healthy eating and physical activity in Latino families? *Health Education Research*. 2006; 21:862–871. DOI: 10.1093/her/cyl110 [PubMed: 17032706]
- Atkin CK. Observations of parent-child interaction in supermarket decision-making. *Journal of Marketing*. 1978; 42(4):41–45.
- Ayala GX, Baquero B, Laraia BA, Ji M, Linnan L. Efficacy of a store-based environmental change intervention compared with a delayed treatment control condition on store customers' intake of fruits and vegetables. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2013; 16:1953–1960. DOI: 10.1017/S1368980013000955 [PubMed: 23561842]
- Ayala GX, Baquero B, Pickrel JL, Mayer J, Belch G, Rock CL, ... Elder JP. A store-based intervention to increase fruit and vegetable consumption: The El Valor de Nuestra Salud cluster randomized controlled trial. *Contemporary Clinical Trials*. 2015; 42:228–238. DOI: 10.1016/j.cct.2015.04.009 [PubMed: 25924592]
- Ayala GX, Mueller K, Lopez-Madurga E, Campbell NR, Elder JP. Restaurant and food shopping selections among Latino women in Southern California. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*. 2005; 105:38–45. [PubMed: 15635343]
- Bawa K, Ghosh A. A model of household grocery shopping behavior. *Marketing Letters*. 1999; 10:149–160.
- Buijzen M, Valkenburg PM. Observing purchase-related parent-child communication in retail environments: A development and socialization perspective. *Human Communication Research*. 2008; 34:50–69.
- Carlson L, Grossbart S. Parental style and consumer socialization of children. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 1988; 15:77–94.
- Chu YL, Farmer A, Fung C, Kuhle S, Storey KE, Veugelers PJ. Involvement in home meal preparation is associated with food preference and self-efficacy among Canadian children. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2013; 16:108–112. DOI: 10.1017/S1368980012001218 [PubMed: 22578854]
- ConAgra Foods. The Hispanic food shopper: New insights for growth. 2011. Retrieved from http://www.multiculturalretail360.com/userfiles/file/2012Presentations/ConcurrentSessionD-1-CAG_Hispanic81412Finallessvideo.pdf
- Ebster C, Wagner U, Neumueller D. Children's influence on in-store purchases. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. 2009; 16:145–154.
- Emond JA, Madanat HN, Ayala GX. Do Latino and non-Latino grocery stores differ in the availability and affordability of healthy food items in a low-income, metropolitan region? *Public Health Nutrition*. 2012; 15:360–369. [PubMed: 21733278]
- Flurry LA, Burns AC. Children's influence in purchase decisions: A social power theory approach. *Journal of Business Research*. 2005; 58:593–601.
- Galst JP, White MA. The unhealthy persuader: The reinforcing value of television and children's purchase-influencing attempts at the supermarket. *Child Development*. 1976; 47:1089–1096.
- Gaumer CJ, Arnone C. Grocery store observation: Parent-child interaction in family purchases. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*. 2009; 16:1–18.
- Gittelsohn J, Laska MN, Karpyn A, Klingler K, Ayala GX. Lessons learned from small store programs to increase healthy food access. *American Journal of Health Behavior*. 2014; 38:307–315. DOI: 10.5993/AJHB.38.2.16 [PubMed: 24629559]
- Gram M. Self-reporting vs. observation: Some cautionary examples for parent/child food shopping behaviour. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 2010; 34:294–399.
- Hughes SO, Power TG, Orlet Fisher J, Mueller S, Nicklas TA. Revisiting a neglected construct: Parenting styles in a child-feeding context. *Appetite*. 2005; 44:83–92. DOI: 10.1016/j.appet.2004.08.007 [PubMed: 15604035]
- Isler L, Popper ET, Ward S. Children's purchase requests and parental responses: Results from a diary study. *Journal of Advertising Research*. 1979; 27(5):28–39.
- John DR. Consumer socialization of children: A retrospective look at twenty-five years of research. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 1999; 26:183–213.

- Larson NI, Story M, Eisenberg ME, Neumark-Sztainer D. Food preparation and purchasing roles among adolescents: Associations with sociodemographic characteristics and diet quality. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*. 2006; 106:211–218. DOI: 10.1016/j.jada.2005.10.029 [PubMed: 16442868]
- Lisabeth LD, Sánchez BN, Escobar J, Hughes R, Meurer WJ, Zuniga B, ... Morgenstern LB. The food environment in an urban Mexican American community. *Health & Place*. 2010; 16:598–605. [PubMed: 20167528]
- Murphy E, Ice C, McCartney K, Leary J, Cottrell L. Is parent and child weight status associated with decision making and physical activity opportunities. *Appetite*. 2012; 59:563–569. [PubMed: 22732569]
- Nadeau J, Bradley M. Observing the influence of affective states on parent-child interactions and in-store purchase decisions. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*. 2012; 11:105–114.
- O'Dougherty M, Story M, Stang J. Observations of parent-child co-shoppers in super markets: Children's involvement in food selections, parental yielding and refusal strategies. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*. 2006; 38:183–188. [PubMed: 16731454]
- Patrick H, Nicklas TA, Hughes SO, Morales M. The benefits of authoritative feeding style: Caregiver feeding styles and children's food consumption patterns. *Appetite*. 2005; 44:243–249. DOI: 10.1016/j.appet.2002.07.001 [PubMed: 15808898]
- Pettersson A, Olsson U, Fjellstrom C. Family life in grocery stores—A study of interaction between adults and children. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 2004; 28:317–328.
- Rodriguez-Oliveros G, Haines J, Ortega-Altamirano D, Power E, Taveras EM, Gonzalez-Unzaga MA, Reyes-Morales H. Obesity determinants in Mexican preschool children: Parental perceptions and practices related to feeding and physical activity. *Archives of Medical Research*. 2011; 42:532–539. DOI: 10.1016/j.arcmed.2011.10.006 [PubMed: 22019411]
- Rust L. Observations: Parents and children shopping together: A new approach to the qualitative analysis of observational data. *Journal of Advertising Research*. 1993; 33(4):65–70.
- Sanchez-Flack JC, Baquero B, Linnan LA, Gittelsohn J, Pickrel JL, Ayala GX. What influences Latino grocery shopping behavior? Perspectives on the small food store environment from managers and employees in San Diego, California. *Ecology of Food and Nutrition*. 2016; Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/03670244.2015.1112282
- Unilever. Trip management: The next big thing. 2005. Retrieved from <https://www.unileverusa.com/news/press-releases/2005/trip-management.html>
- van der Horst K, Ferrage A, Rytz A. Involving children in meal preparation. Effects on food intake. *Appetite*. 2014; 79:18–24. DOI: 10.1016/j.appet.2014.03.030 [PubMed: 24709485]
- Ward S, Wackman DB. Children's purchase influence attempts and parental yielding. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 1972; 9:316–319.
- Williams LA, Burns AC. Exploring the dimensionality of children's direct influence attempts. *Advances in Consumer Research*. 2000; 27:64–71.




Figure 1.
Dyad recruitment outcomes.

Table 1
 Child Purchase Influence Attempts: Frequency of Use at First Exchange Overall and by Consumer Socialization Stage, as Well as Overall Use.

| Code | Operationalization | First exchange overall (n = 108); % (n) | First exchange perceptual stage (n = 60); % (n) | First exchange analytical/reflective stage (n = 48); % (n) | Overall use (n = 276); % (n) |
|---------------------|---|---|---|--|------------------------------|
| Just asks | Makes a simple request or a demand | 72.2 (78) | 76.7 (46) | 66.7 (32) | 48.9 (135) |
| Placed item in cart | Nonverbal request, including putting items in cart or basket, handing to parent, or child carrying to cashier | 17.6 (19) | 6.7 (4) | 31.3 (15) | 13.0 (36) |
| Responds to parent | Parent-initiated the request interaction | N/A | N/A | N/A | 13.4 (37) |
| Points/nonverbal | Simply points to an item, no verbalization | 6.5 (7) | 10.0 (6) | 2.1 (1) | 7.3 (20) |
| Begs and pleads | Repeatedly makes a request | 1.9 (2) | 3.3 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 5.8 (16) |
| Negotiates | Offers to do something in exchange for item requested. Negotiates for smaller/cheaper item | 0.9 (1) | 1.7 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 4.7 (13) |
| Asks nicely | Makes a polite request | 0.9 (1) | 1.7 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 1.8 (5) |
| Displays anger | Verbal (yelling) or nonverbal (kicking) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) |
| Other | Does not fit previously defined categories | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 5.1 (14) |

Note. N/A = not applicable.

Table 2

Parent Responses to Children's Influence Attempts: Frequency of Use at First Exchange and Overall.

| Code | Operationalization | First exchange (<i>n</i> = 108); % (<i>n</i>) | Overall usage (<i>n</i> = 249); % (<i>n</i>) |
|----------------|---|--|---|
| No reaction | No response either with silence or otherwise acting as though the request was not heard | 24.1 (26) | 21.3 (53) |
| Hard no | Refuses with no explanation or told to return item | 22.2 (24) | 15.7 (39) |
| Yes | Agrees to purchase, including nonverbal (nods) | 13.9 (15) | 22.5 (56) |
| Explanation | Nonconfrontational explanation, with or without no. Refuses, but suggests the item might be purchased at another time | 16.7 (18) | 12.4 (31) |
| Select | Open: From a general product category (e.g., "What chips do you want?"); Closed: From a finite number of options provided by parent (e.g., "Do you want plain or barbeque chips?") | 11.1 (12) | 14.5 (36) |
| Other | Does not fit previously defined categories | 8.3 (9) | 9.2 (23) |
| Wait | Stalls, either to manage requests or because occupied | 2.8 (3) | 1.2 (3) |
| Suggests other | Includes suggesting different size or quantity within product category. Excludes: Same product, but different brand | 0.1 (1) | 3.2 (8) |

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 3Child, Parent, Dyad ($N = 100$), and Trip Characteristics.

| Characteristics | Percent (n) or mean \pm SD or median (range) |
|---|--|
| Child characteristics | |
| Female | 49.0% (49) |
| Age (years) | 7.9 \pm 3.4 |
| Perceptual stage (3–7 years) | 46.0% (46) |
| Analytical/reflective stage (>7 to 14 years) | 54.0% (54) |
| Foreign-born (Mexico) | 7.0% (7) |
| Years in United States (among foreign-born) | 2.9 \pm 1.5 |
| Parent characteristics | |
| Female | 60.0% (60) |
| Age (years) | 37.9 \pm 7.3 |
| Up to high school graduate | 55.0% (55) |
| Employed full-time or part-time | 70.0% (70) |
| Monthly household income < \$2000 | 41.0% (41) |
| Foreign-born (Mexico) | 66.0% (66) |
| Years in United States (among foreign-born) | 19.2 \pm 12.2 |
| Dyad characteristics | |
| Mother–daughter | 36.0% (36) |
| Father–son | 27.0% (27) |
| Mother–son | 24.0% (24) |
| Father–daughter | 13.0% (13) |
| Shopping characteristics | |
| Quick trip (vs. stock-up, special Purpose) ^a | 83.0% (43) |
| Dollars spent during observed shopping trip | \$21.06 \pm \$22.33 |
| Grocery shopping days per week | 2 (2–7 days/week) |
| Percent of parents who always shop with a child | 70.0% (70) |

^aData available from 52 dyads only because this question was added after data collection had commenced.

Table 4Characteristics of Parent–Child Request Interactions in Food Stores ($N=100$).

| Characteristics | Percent (n) or mean \pm SD or median (range) |
|---|--|
| Dyads with any request interactions | 68% (68) |
| Average number of interactions across all dyads | 1 \pm 1 |
| Average number of interactions among dyads with at least one request interaction ($n=68$) | 2 \pm 1 |
| Number of request interactions observed | 144 |
| Child-initiated request interactions | 76% (109) |
| Parent-initiated request Interactions | 24% (35) |
| Language of request interaction ^a | |
| Spanish | 48% (68) |
| English | 29% (41) |
| Both | 2% (3) |
| Nonverbal only | 22% (31) |
| Exchanges per request interaction | 2 \pm 1 |
| Nutrition education attempt by Parent | <1% (1) |
| No child movement restriction during interaction | 92% (92) |

^aOne case with missing data.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 5Outcomes of the Parent–Child Request Interactions Observed ($n = 144$).

| Outcomes | Percent (n) or mean \pm SD or median (range) |
|---|--|
| Parental response to request interaction ^a | |
| Percent yes | 52.1% (74) |
| Percent no | 30.3% (43) |
| Percent no response | 17.6% (25) |
| Parental purchase from request interaction | 58.3% (84) |
| Number of items purchased per successful interaction | 1 (1–2) |
| Amount spent per interaction ^b | \$2.37 \pm \$2.11 |

^aBased on 142 interactions, including parent-initiated interactions; two cases with missing data.

^bBased on 50 interactions in which the price was visible/available.