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Abstract

This small-scale qualitative study studied the concept of international versus local/home-grown fast food chicken outlets by exploring the preferences and perceptions of millennial consumers around selected fast food chicken brands. The research specifically focuses on the fast food chicken brands Afros, Nandos and KFC within the fast food chicken market in Durban.

The study reviews themes and theories that are relevant to millennial consumers, fast food and branding of fast food chicken stores with brand equity and its various elements. The study collected data from a small sample group who represented the population of millennial fast food chicken consumers within the Durban area. The study utilized a qualitative approach which allowed for more in-depth and insightful findings throughout the primary research.

The research methods used to collect and analyse primary data were focus groups and in-depth interviews. The insights found in the study led to findings and recommendations that could provide value to local fast food brands to improve on their products, service and branding.

It was concluded that while local fast food stores are attracting consumers for their quality food, healthiness and positive and relatable store atmosphere, they are not able to compete with international fast food restaurants due factors such as price, variety and convenience.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Overview

1.1 Introduction

Around the world local fast food chicken brands are losing business due the rise of international fast food chicken chains. Local businesses struggle to compete and “often drop like flies” while international fast food brands slowly populate and take the majority of business (Sun, 2018). This study considers the rise of international fast food chicken stores within the context of the South African fast food industry. The study focused specifically on Durban millennial consumers with regards to their perceptions on home-grown/local and international fast food chicken stores and what motivates them to purchase from either of these store categories. The brands I looked at in my study are Afros, Nandos and Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC).

1.2 Justification

The rise of international fast food brands has led to a decline in business for local fast food chicken brands (Wilby, 2011). By gaining an insight into the preferences and perceptions that local consumers have around fast food chicken brands, it can show why home-grown brands are suffering, and thus help local fast food chicken brands to compete with international fast food chicken chains. This insight will give local brands a competitive advantage over international fast food chains, allowing them to attract more business and ultimately help bolster and develop the local economy.

1.3 Problem Statement

There is a perceived problem that Durban consumers between the ages of 18 – 25 are choosing international fast food stores over local fast food chicken outlets.

1.4 Research Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the perception that consumers between the ages of 18 – 25 are choosing international fast food chicken brands over local fast food chicken brands is true and to find out what motivates this.

1.5 Research Question

The perception that Durban consumers between the ages of 18-25 are choosing international fast food stores over local fast food chicken outlets raises the following key research question: What are the key factors that influence millennial consumers when purchasing from either of the selected fast food chicken brands?
1.5.1 Research Questions
The key research question links to the following sub research questions:

- What motivates consumers to purchase from local fast food stores?
- What motivates consumers to purchase from international fast food stores?
- Do consumers know of the benefits that purchasing from local fast food brands has on the country and the economy and do they care?
- How important is brand awareness and brand identity when making the decision to purchase fast food chicken?

1.5.2 Research Objectives
From the above research questions, I was able to define the following objectives:

- Identify what motivates consumers to purchase from local fast food chicken stores.
- Identify what motivates consumers to purchase from international fast food chicken stores.
- Determine whether consumers between the age of 18 – 25 know what the benefits of purchasing from local fast food brands are for the country and the economy and whether they care.
- Identify the importance of branding when making the decision to purchase fast food chicken.

1.6 Scope
The scope of the study was a small sample size where participants were located in the Durban area. Only one global brand (KFC) and two home-grown/local brands to South Africa (Afros, Nandos) were examined as a case study for the topic.

My responses are more subjective and specific to the respondents in the study and therefore cannot be generalised. To counter this, I ensured that my study is reliable and valid through the use of qualitative trustworthiness measures such as credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. A more detailed scope can be found in chapter 5 under Limitations and Delimitations.

1.7 Chapter Outline
Chapter 1: Introduction and Overview
Chapter 1 introduces the reader to the perceived problem around fast food chicken and describes the current situation of the fast food market. It provides the rationale of the study, research questions and objectives as well as a brief scope of the study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Chapter 2 provides a theoretical framework for the study with theories and models related to fast food chicken consumers and reviews current secondary literature that is related to this study.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Chapter 3 analyses the research design and approach that will need to be adhered to in order to conduct the study. It provides the paradigm the research falls within, the population and sampling methods. The chapter also provides the outline for the data collection process.

Chapter 4: Results and Findings

Chapter 4 presents and discusses the data collected from the research conducted to reveal interesting findings and insights gathered during the research. A detailed discussion was provided around the findings from each question in relation to each objective.

Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendation

Chapter 5 presents the conclusion of the research from the primary research in order of each objective. It provides recommendations for further study and provides a detailed scope of the study in terms of limitations and delimitations.

1.8 Conclusion

In this chapter a brief introduction and context has been provided for the research, including the research problem, purpose, questions and objectives for which further primary research into millennial consumers preferences and perceptions around fast food chicken will be required to answer.

This study will provide clarity as to what motivates millennial consumers to purchase fast food chicken and more specifically, if they understand the importance of purchasing local, and whether it has an impact on their purchase decision.

Chapter 2 reviews current secondary literature and provides a theoretical framework related to the study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to gather relevant and important secondary data, conceptual and theoretical frameworks that help to form the grounding for solid primary research collection and analysis. This chapter reviews secondary literature related to the topic of fast food chicken as well as other concepts and frameworks related to the study with regards to different theories such as McDonaldization Theory, Planned Behaviour Theory, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory and Marshallian Economics Theory. Concepts such as brand equity are also referred to with the breakdown of two varying models of brand equity, namely Aaker’s Model of Brand Equity and Keller’s Model of Brand Equity. The theory and concepts are analysed and discussed in terms of their importance and relation to the study.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

The following are theories I considered when conducting my research:

- **McDonaldization**: Developed by American sociologist George Ritzer (1993) this theory reflects on the massive fast food industry and how fast food restaurants have come to dominate almost every aspect of modern-day society (Crossman, 2018). Since my study is specifically on fast food, this theory directly relates with my research. More specifically, the selected fast food brands within my study are of varying size and reach, from large international brands to small local brands, thus covering a wide scope that reflects the dominant nature of the fast food culture on society.

- **Planned Behaviour Theory**: Proposed by Icek Ajzen (1985), this theory looks at how behaviour is directly affected by one’s intentions which are influenced by one’s attitudes and beliefs. This theory has been used within marketing to predict consumers buying behaviour. Predicting buying behaviour directly relates with my research as I try to understand what preferences and perceptions consumers of fast food have and how it affects their purchase. This is therefore gaining a more in-depth understanding of the buying behaviour of consumers who purchase fast food (Cleverism, 2017).

- **Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs**: Proposed by Abraham Maslow (1943), the theory suggests the hierarchy and motivation of human needs with a five-tier model, often depicted as hierarchal levels within a pyramid. From the bottom of the pyramid up, these various needs are: physiological, safety, love and belonging, esteem and self-actualization.
In this model, Maslow suggests that humans have a certain number of needs and that these needs are arranged in a hierarchy with humans first being motivated and concerned with more primitive/basic needs such as food, water, warmth, rest, safety and security before they are motivated to improve relationships with other people and improve themselves (Burton, 2018). Therefore, if a person’s basic needs are not met, they will be motivated by those basic needs before considering improving themselves. Since ‘buying local’ is a big part of my research, I want to understand whether buying local plays a part in people’s decision-making when purchasing fast food and analyse the responses through the lens of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs where price and convenience (basic needs) play more of an important role than worrying about buying fast food chicken that is local.

- **Marshallian Economics Theory:** This theory was founded by Alfred Marshall (1890) and suggests that consumers buy what offers them the most satisfaction for the most affordable price. Price and satisfaction play a key role in how consumers decide what fast food to purchase and is one of the main reasons for the success of fast food brands. Therefore, this theory is relevant to my study as I will be considering the factor of price in relation to
fast food offerings and the role it plays within the purchase decision of the consumers in my study (Kwat, 2018).

Of the aforementioned theories, I will be utilizing and focusing on the *Marshallian Economics Theory* and *Maslow’s theory of Hierarchy Needs* in my study by allowing them to guide my questions, objectives and analysis of my findings throughout my research process.

The *Marshallian Economics Theory* suggests that price and satisfaction play a key role in the purchase decision, where what consumers pay for a commodity is always less than what they are willing to pay for it and thus the satisfaction the consumer receives from the purchase is more than the price they paid (Kwat, 2018). This results in a perceived surplus of satisfaction which leads to an increase in welfare.

This relates to whether people receive more satisfaction when purchasing from local/home-grown fast food chicken brands over international/global fast food chicken brands.

In conjunction with this, I will be analysing the responses and findings through the lens of *Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs* to gauge whether respondents prefer price and convenience as they meet more basic needs over the satisfaction of purchasing local and worrying about where their money is going.

Both these theories relate to my objective of whether consumers know about the benefits of purchasing locally and whether they care.

### 2.3 Review of Current Literature

I have conducted a literature review on various studies, journals and articles that cover a range of different topics. These topics all relate to my own research topic – consumer preferences and perceptions around selected fast food chicken brands – and provide valuable insight and knowledge around the topic of fast food and fast food consumers.

#### 2.3.1 Background

The concept of fast food has a rich history, with fast food being sold by vendors in Roman times and through the middle ages. It was necessary as many homes did not have a kitchen. In the 1800’s the British developed “Fish ‘N Chips” in coastal towns to feed the men and women in the large trawling industry (HCLDR, 2016). However, the enormous fast food Industry that we know of today started in America and was first developed by the brand White Castle in 1921, selling their burgers for just one nickel each, along with side orders for chips and cola (Pirello, 2012). They quickly became a commercial success with their burgers becoming extremely popular. Though it was only after World War 2, when the McDonalds brothers designed their fast food
hamburger restaurant to eliminate costs and streamline their process of making food, that the fast food industry started to grow into what we know it as today, a massive multi-billion-dollar industry.

Today the fast food industry generates more than $570 billion in revenue, with $200 billion being generated in the US alone in 2015 (Franchise Help, 2018). Fast food started out as a western culture, and with the rise of technology and the globalisation of the world, it is now a global culture with more than 500,000 fast food outlets around the world (Sutter Health, 2018).

In this study I conducted research on three different fast food brands, all at three varying levels of locality, where two brands are South African-grown brands (Afro’s and Nando’s) and another is a global franchise (KFC). I will be providing context on brands that fall within each of these categories.

Kentucky Fried Chicken, an American fast food chain, also known as KFC, was started by Harland Sanders in 1930 in the small town of Corbin, Kentucky (KFC, 2018). They became well-known for their fried chicken that had a special mix of herbs and spices. It quickly grew to fame and today KFC is one of the most widely recognized fast food brands in the world. There are now over 20,500 KFC outlets in more than 12 countries across the globe (KFC, 2018). Its large international success is the reason why I have chosen it to represent the international fast food chicken brand in my study.

Nando’s is an international fast food chicken brand that specialises in flame-grilled, peri-peri chicken. Although Nando’s is an international brand, its origins are South African, and because it has national coverage around the country, I have decided that it will represent the national fast food chicken brand in my study. It started out in 1987 in Rosettenville, South Africa, and has grown to become a national favourite in the country (Nando’s, 2018). The brand now has over 1000 restaurants in 24 countries (Rate Your Nando’s, 2018).

Afro’s Chicken is a proudly local chicken takeaway that started in a small trailer in Durban in 2012. Since then it has grown to 13 outlets within Durban. They also have outlets in Cape Town and Johannesburg but are largely located around the Durban area. They provide affordable and simple fast food, with the dominant ingredient being tenderized chicken (Afro’s Chicken Shop, 2018). Since it is a relatively new brand, having been established for only 6 years, that has its origins in Durban, the region in which I will be conducting my study, I have chosen Afro’s Chicken to represent the Durban-grown fast food chicken brand within my study.
2.3.2 Food Brands Use Glocalisation

_Glocalisation in Food and Agribusiness_, a paper written by Kumar and Goel (2007), argues the importance of ‘glocalisation’ in the expansion of food brands into new emerging markets. Glocalisation is a phenomenon whereby a producer of goods needs to “adapt his/her product in some way to particular features of the envisaged set of consumers” in order to suit a market or markets of diverse consumers (KB Manage, 2018). The term is a combination of the concepts “globalisation” and “localisation” (KB Manage, 2018). By discussing and reflecting on successful examples of how major fast food brands have expanded into the Indian market, Kumar and Goel illustrate how these brands have changed or adapted their menus and food options to fit the local demand (Kumar and Goel, 2007).

One example saw the major international fast food brand McDonalds create a menu that was specially developed for the Indian consumer by creating vegetarian food options to suit “Indian tastes and preferences” (Kumar and Goel, 2007).

Through this glocalisation technique international fast food brands expand on the offerings to meet the needs of the consumers in that region. This allows fast food companies to quickly create positive perceptions by building trust and rapport with their consumers as they create a menu that is more familiar to that of the local cuisine. This makes local consumers more willing to try food from these newly emerged fast food brands, such as McDonalds, which leads to consumers who become supporters or even advocates for the brand, helping to expand it even further into the local market.

McDonalds India has now been successfully running for over a decade, all due to its ability to adapt and relate with the local population. This shows that fast food brands are no longer ‘one size fits all’ but are extremely flexible to local markets and the tastes of the local populace. This is relevant to my research as it shows that fast food brands now compete with local food brands by producing similar meals. This takes the unique local cuisine factor away from local food businesses and makes it increasingly harder for them to survive, as price and convenience become the main concern for the consumer, factors that international fast food brands excel at. This a unique factor that I can consider within my research going forward by evaluating whether a local twist of flavour in a fast food restaurant is an important preference for fast food consumers.

2.3.3 Millennials Seek Sustainability

A study by a global measurement and data analytics company, Nielsen (2015), showed that millennial consumers are increasingly showing preference for sustainability when making
purchase decisions. Almost 3-out-of-4 respondents said they would pay extra for sustainable offerings (Nielsen, 2015).

These sustainable offerings included an extensive list of factors such as products made from natural and organic ingredients, products known for being environmentally friendly, products from companies known for commitment to social value, packaging that is environmentally friendly and products that are from brands that have TV commercials which indicate they carry out social good (Nielsen, 2015).

This is extremely important as it shows that millennials are now evaluating the importance of sustainable products and are aware of their power as a consumer to purchase the right product for the environment no matter the market or the industry.

Sustainability is something that has recently became a major “concern” in the food industry, as consumers are now far more wary about what they eat than ever, and are more aware of food sourcing, handling and the ingredients that are used. This is something that I feel is very relevant to my study and that needs to be addressed in the collection of my data around the selected fast food brands I have chosen.

2.3.4 SERVQUAL Study

Lee and Ulgado (1997) conducted a study whereby they compared American and Korean consumer perceptions of the US fast food company McDonalds (Lee and Ulgado, 1997).

Their study specifically looked at the measurement of perceived service value by using the standardized SERVQUAL (Service Quality) model. SERVQUAL is a research model which was developed and implemented by the American marketing gurus Parasuraman and Berry in 1988 and is a method used to capture and measure the service quality experienced by customers (Mulder, 2018). The model is used to highlight short-comings in service quality and address them. It uses what is known as the ‘GAP analysis’ to determine the perceived service quality of consumers by comparing the gap between the expected service quality and the actual service quality (Mulder, 2018).

Lee and Ulgado (1997) used this model as an instrument in their study and considered the five dimensions within the model that relate to service quality such as physical and tangible environment, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy. However they also included other factors such as price, service time and location convenience.

The study brought up interesting findings, as the participants in the two countries had strikingly different results. In the US, participants were mainly concerned about the price and assurance
of the service quality. On the other hand, Korean consumers held reliability and empathy in relative importance. Lee and Ulgado (1997) explained that Americans, who live in a fast-paced westernized world, value the time-saving aspect of fast-food. Time is money and therefore price is extremely important. This has led to the American population needing to feel that they have spent their money wisely and made a confident decision, therefore reassurance is highly valued, not just with which restaurant, but also with menu-item selection (Lee and Ulgado, 1997).

In contrast, Lee and Ulgado (1997) discuss how Korean culture puts a different emphasis on the value of time. Koreans consider eating as more of a social, family-related and entertaining experience, even if it falls within a busy day. Koreans, like other Asian cultures, have a more collectivist culture, where the perspective of the group or extended family is of primary concern as opposed to the individualism, which sees the experience from the perspective of the individual or the immediate family come first. Koreans idea of food is also different to that of the US, where local small eateries influence the perception of US fast-food chains. They may have pre-conceived ideas of McDonalds which may represent an embodiment of an American experience (Lee and Ulgado, 1997).

However, once the novelty of that experience has worn off, traditional Korean expectations of service quality, as well as McDonalds higher food prices relative to domestic food eateries, bring about lower perceptions of the US fast-food chain. Koreans value reliable service that meets their needs or that reacts quickly if their needs are not being met. They also value empathy and feel the need for McDonalds to empathise with their specific needs as a customer in a selfless manner. Therefore, making sure the consumer feels welcome while making sure their best interest is at heart is more important than time-saving service (Lee and Ulgado, 1997).

Here we can see how two different cultures vary more than just in cuisine - they also value different factors when it comes to service quality. This illustrates that different cultures exhibit different behaviour, and this ultimately affects their purchase decision. This is an extremely important component of fast food businesses and is something that is very relevant to my study. Understanding what different individuals feel when it comes to service quality is extremely important and needs to be addressed in my study. It is similar to the situation in South Africa where my study was conducted which has a very diverse range of cultures (Hattingh, 2013). This may highlight the fact that different cultures value different factors when it comes to service quality and whether location, convenience or price are important as well.

2.3.5 Millennials' Demand Instant Gratification

Spray (2015) talks about how millennials are carving out a new future for retail. That is a future of immediacy and convenience. She discusses how the rise in technology has seen younger
generations grow up in a world of instant gratification as almost everything we do as a consumer can now be carried out through a few taps on the screen of a smart phone. This has put pressure on retail companies to speed up their delivery process to allow consumers to quickly purchase items with just ‘one click’. Speed and quality of delivery for new items is extremely important today, especially for younger impatient generations of millennial consumers (Spray, 2015).

She also goes on to highlight the importance of delivery times, which are increasingly becoming shorter and shorter, and if items take too long to arrive, this can actually tarnish the reputation of a brand.

This is relevant to my research as today delivery of items is becoming more and more expected with brands, especially in the food industry, as online food delivery platforms are expanding choice and convenience, allowing customers to order from a wide variety of restaurants with one tap on their phone (Hirschberg, 2016). This is another crucial factor to consider when conducting my research, especially since my target population are millennial consumers who have grown up with technology and thus are labelled as ‘digital natives’ (Barkho, 2018), who expect online delivery options which are convenient and immediate when you order.

2.3.6 Students Neglect Healthy Food and Opt for Convenience

Ukonu (2016) carried out a study that examined the effect of globalisation on students’ food choices. In particular, it identified and explored the shift from homemade food to fast food within the younger student generation (Ukonu, 2016).

He proceeds to talk about Globalisation which is the process by which the world is becoming increasingly interconnected as a result of massively increased trade and cultural exchange (BBC, 2018). He discusses the effect globalisation has had on the globe and the transformation that has taken place which has created a world that operates at a heightened speed, where there is now a rapid movement of goods, people, resources, ideas and technology. This has ultimately shaped and drastically changed the food industry. Food is now sourced, shipped, prepared and packaged differently and more importantly, it is made and prepared at a much quicker rate creating what is known today as ‘fast food’, a western culture that, due to globalisation, is now a global food culture.

Ukonu's (2016) study, conducted in the University of Central Lancashire, United Kingdom, illustrates that fast food has greatly influenced the food choices of students, and he concludes that fast food is extremely prevalent among students, with 40% of the students interviewed preferring fast food over homemade meals. Another common theme was that participants who
preferred fast food over homemade food, consumed fast food at a higher frequency with a consumption rate of 4-6 days a week (Ukonu, 2016).

However, his study found that there was a significant difference between male and female genders, with 80% of male students preferring fast food over homemade food, whereas 65% of females disagreed and preferred home cooked meals instead. This large gap highlights a significant difference in fast food consumption between the two different genders. This suggests that females are more worried and conscious of their health decisions then men.

The study also found that it was factors such as the price, convenience, taste, variety, peer pressure and cravings that led to a high numbers of students consuming fast food, where the key factors were price, convenience and taste.

These are interesting insights that have a direct relation to my study in that they are preferences that younger consumers have around fast food and why they consume it, which is what I aim to research with my own study. Thus price, convenience, taste, variety and peer pressure are key factors I can consider.

2.3.7 Consumers’ Power to Influence Brands

Mainwaring (2011) argues the importance of brands to be socially responsible, with the increasing power of consumers using their voice in order to “halt unsustainable business practices” (Mainwaring, 2011).

He discusses this ‘consumer power’ in relation to the rise in social media, which has slowly moved beyond a new age marketing tool and is now allowing consumers across the globe to share and voice their opinions on the actions of brands. Social media is now giving consumers the power to keep brands in check, as they are able to voice their opinions to a global audience and can very quickly gain support from the rest of the global community. This then forms effective movements of consumers based on shared values, movements that can make a huge positive impact in society.

On the other hand, brands are also using social media to start conversations with consumers, including conversations around social issues. One example highlighted in the article was where Pepsi (2010) started a crowdsourcing project to co-create how Pepsi managed their charitable contributions.

Therefore social media does not just create dialogue between a brand and its consumers but, as Simon puts it, it also creates a powerful “rationale” for brands to partner up with the mass movement of consumers who can now demand high standards for brands to be purposeful and
behave responsibly (Mainwaring, 2011). Therefore, for brands to survive, they must be attentive to their consumers demands, otherwise they will quickly be abandoned by consumers, and ultimately the brand will lose business to their more responsible competitors.

This topic is relevant to my study, as it shows that sustainability and acting responsibly are becoming extremely important for brands today, especially fast food brands, who need to re-evaluate their products and their actions, ensuring that the food and beverages that they produce are sustainable and environmentally sourced as millennials become increasing environmentally conscious and demand higher and higher standards from brands. This factor of sustainability can be considered when conducting my research to determine whether the sustainability of fast food brands and their offerings is something that consumers understand and look for when purchasing fast food.

2.3.8 Consumers See Fast Food as a Treat

Meredith Melnick discusses why the majority of people who order from fast food restaurants don’t purchase the healthier options on the menu and instead, opt for the standard, unhealthy menu offerings (Melnick, 2011).

Although it is a widely known fact that the majority of people already know, Melnick raises some valid points on the matter. Firstly, that the majority of people who make the decision to buy food from a fast food outlet have already made the decision to eat unhealthily, despite there being healthy options on the menu. This is due to the fact that healthy foods are not the main drivers of these outlets, but rather the standard unhealthy versions such as a “burger and chips” (Melnick, 2011). People also watch their weight at home. When they are out, it is a different story as most fast food purchases are made on impulse, not intellect. Even if consumers wanted to purchase something healthy before they walk into the store, the imagery and smells once inside take over and their impulse decision is to buy the tastier menu option.

Melnick references a survey by the food research firm Technomic, that has interesting findings on people who demand healthier fast food options. The survey showed that while 47% of Americans say they want healthier restaurant options, only 23% actually went out and bought them (Melnick, 2011).

The firm elaborates on a few reasons why this occurs. Firstly, eating out is a treat, so people reward themselves for the occasion. Many people also don’t believe healthy options are actually healthy, such as the McDonald’s salad which supposedly contains more sugar than most of the meals on the menu. Peer pressure is also a driving factor, as it has become a culture in America
to tease people if they order a salad over a burger and fries. Last and most importantly, healthy options generally cost more than the standard burger and fries and are less filling in some cases.

Therefore, the solution that Melnick (2011) suggested was for people to cook healthy food at home. The problem with this is that it’s a chore that many people feel they do not have the time for, and ultimately convenience is the most important factor for them in going to fast-food restaurants (Melnick, 2011).

This article raises some interesting points that relate to my study around fast food and the major factor is the health concerns of consumers when they purchase fast food and whether the ingredients and preparation of the food are of a healthy standard. This will be an interesting factor to consider in my research going forward as I could question people and understand if health is a preference of theirs when they purchase fast food, seeing as my study includes three different fast food brands who sell varying food choices, some with more organic, healthier options.

2.3.9 Brand Equity

Brand Equity describes “a set of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand name and symbol, which add to or subtract from the value provided by a product or service.” (Aaker, 2013) This added intangible value that is associated with a brand allows it to survive in rapid changing and fast paced markets, by giving a brand a competitive unique selling point that differentiates it from competitors.

Branding plays a key factor when purchasing any product with consumers purchasing new products from brands that are either familiar to them or a brand they like (Saleh, 2017). I want to identify the role of branding when purchasing from either global or local fast food chicken brands. To do this, I will be analysing two varying models of Brand Equity, namely Model of Brand Equity and Keller’s Model of Brand Equity.
2.3.9.1 Aaker’s Model of Brand Equity

David Aaker (1996) model of brand equity focuses on five major asset categories that each create and add to the equity of a brand. These categories are brand awareness, brand loyalty, perceived quality, brand associations and other proprietary assets.

![Aaker's Brand Equity Model](source)

**Figure 2.1:** Aaker’s Brand Equity Model  
Source: Klopper and North (2016).

*Brand awareness* considers the brand’s presence in the consumer’s mind and is the first step in creating brand equity which comes before brand consideration and evaluation. It also acts as the anchor to which associations and preconceived ideas can be attached. There are a number of different ways in which a consumer can remember a brand, namely, recognition, recall, top of mind and dominant brand (Klopper and North, 2016).

*Recognition* refers to consumers having previous interactions with a brand that have been positive and, when the consumer sees the brand in future interactions, it evokes a feeling of familiarity and liking. *Recall* is when a consumer recollects a brand when a product class is
mentioned (Eg. Fast Food Chicken). *Top of mind* refers to the brand that is first recalled by consumers. *Dominant brand* refers to the brand that is the only brand recalled (Klopper and North, 2016).

Another important consideration is *brand loyalty*, which refers to the loyalty consumers show for a brand with continued support and even advocacy (Klopper and North, 2016). Brand loyalty is important as it helps secure future sales and profit streams.

*Perceived Quality* is another key component in brand equity as it suggests the perception consumers have around a product and determines what price they are willing to pay for it (Klopper and North, 2016).

*Brand associations* relate to the associations consumers have around a brand, its products, its employees and its culture. These associations help create positive attitudes and feelings towards a brand and thus build brand equity (Klopper and North, 2016).

### 2.3.9.2 Keller’s Model of Brand Equity

Kelvin Lane Keller’s (1998) model of brand equity is based on customer brand equity, and views brand equity from a customer perspective with the power of a brand’s equity being determined by consumers as a result of their experiences with a brand - what they have felt, heard and seen - over time (Klopper and North, 2016).

According to Keller, brand equity is driven by *brand knowledge* that is created by a customer’s perceptions, preferences and behaviour. More specifically Keller illustrates that *brand knowledge* is dependent on *brand awareness* and *brand image*. 
Brand awareness is the power of a brand in relation to a consumer’s memory of it and whether the consumer is able to identify the brand in varying conditions (Klopper and North, 2016).

Brand image refers to the perceptions a consumer has formed from brand associations a consumer has in their memory. Keller goes into great depth to illustrate the various types of associations (Klopper and North, 2016).

### 2.3.9.3 Brand Equity Model Comparison

When analysing both Aaker’s and Keller’s brand equity models, it is clear they have a similar understanding of brand equity and how it is formed. Both suggest brand equity is created through past experiences and memories which reflect associations that consumers have formed around a brand. These associations are then attached not only to the brand, but its products and services as well.
However, Aaker’s model considers more components in the creation and building of brand equity, highlighting five varying factors that add to brand equity whereas Keller’s model only considers two components, both of which feature in Aaker’s model. Thus, I will be using Aaker’s Brand Equity model to analyse the role of branding when purchasing fast food chicken by unpacking respondents’ answers in terms of brand awareness, brand associations, brand loyalty and perceived quality.

2.4 Operationalisation

The synthesised literature I have reviewed helped me to gain a better understanding into the area of the fast food chicken industry and provided me with key insights and issues that relate to and expand on my research problem. The literature review highlighted models, concepts and variables that I have been able to utilize with regards to my research. These include the sustainability of brands and their actions; the importance of glocalisation in the expansion of international fast food chains; the SERVQUAL model that uses five different dimensions to analyse the consumer perceptions on service quality; the importance of different preferences such as price and location convenience; the concept of instant gratification and how it has created a need for quicker faster service and delivery times; the factor of healthy food offerings as well as brand equity models that will help to me to unpack respondents’ answers to understand the role of branding in purchasing fast food chicken. These models and concepts gave me a framework with which I modelled and constructed my research design as well as the context and background to analyse the answers in my study.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined and provided key literature and presented a conceptual and theoretical framework which has been used to help formulate my research design and data collection processes throughout the rest of my research in Chapter 3. More than this, it has guided me on my interpretation and analysis of my findings in Chapter 4 and 5.

Chapter 3 analyses the research design and approach and outlines the data collection and data analysis process.
Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides and justifies the choice of the research approach by detailing the proposed paradigm, the conceptual approach for the study, the population and sampling method used. The chapter also details the data collection and data analysis methods that were used when conducting the primary research.

3.2 Proposed Paradigm

A research paradigm, first termed by Thomas Kuhn (1962), can be defined as a set of beliefs that influence what should be studied, how it should be studied and how the results of a study should be interpreted (du Plooy-Cillers, Davis and Bezuidenhout, 2014). Therefore, we could say that a research paradigm guides the researcher on how he/she should conduct the research and acts as an organizing principle by which reality is interpreted (Nieuwenhuis, 2016).

Interpretivism is a paradigm that looks at understanding and describing meaningful social interaction and experiences (du Plooy-Cillers, Davis and Bezuidenhout, 2014).

3.2.1 Ontological Position

In terms of ontology, an interpretist researcher assumes that reality is subjective and constructed through the meanings and understandings developed socially and experientially (Cohen and Crabtree, 2006). In my study I assume that the millennial consumers’ views on the various fast food brands are subjective and constructed through experiences.

3.2.2 Epistemological Position

Since researchers within the interpretivism paradigm see reality as subjective, in terms of epistemology, they feel that reality needs to be interpreted in order to discover the underlying meaning of events and activities (Patel, 2015). In my study I interpreted the underlying meaning to the purchases of millennial consumers and selected fast food brands.

3.2.3 Methodological Position

Interpretive researchers aim to gain an in-depth understanding of multiple realities and therefore depend on qualitative research, with methods such as focus groups, in-depth interviews, ethnography and narrative inquiry (du Plooy-Cillers, Davis and Bezuidenhout, 2014). In my study I aimed to gain an in-depth understanding of respondent’s realities around fast food chicken by understanding how they perceive the different fast food brands mentioned within my study.
The study and research I conducted looked at gaining a more in-depth understanding of consumer perceptions and preferences around fast food chicken brands in Durban. In my case these social interactions and experiences are the interactions and experiences that consumers have with selected fast food chicken brands such as Afros Chicken, Nando’s and KFC. Therefore, my study fits in with the Interpretivism paradigm.

3.3 Conceptual Approach

My study specifically looks at getting an in-depth understanding of perceptions and preferences that consumers in South Africa have on fast food chicken brands. My research was an explorative process of uncovering different consumers’ subjective opinions and views. Qualitative research is mostly exploratory research that looks at understanding underlying reasons, opinions and motives. Considering this, by looking to gain an ‘understanding’ of perceptions and preferences of consumers, my study is qualitative in design (DeFranzo, 2011).

Since I explored different subjective insights, my research was exploratory research as it looked at “obtaining new insights” (Dudovskiy, 2018).

3.4 Deductive, Inductive and Abductive Approaches

Deductive reasoning focuses on the testing of an existing theory, while inductive reasoning aims at generating a new theory that emerges from the data collected (Gabriel, 2013). As mentioned above, my research was explorative and thus uncovered insights into preferences and perceptions of local fast food millennial consumers that have not been discovered before within my area of study (DeFranzo, 2011).

The last type of approach is known as abductive reasoning and is a hybrid of both inductive and deductive reasoning that is set to address the weaknesses of the other two approaches. Adductive reasoning seeks to choose the best explanation among research data after encountering empirical data that cannot be explained by an existing set of theories (Dudovskiy, 2018).

After reviewing these three different approaches it was decided that my research favours a deductive approach. Since my study is based on qualitative data, it has collected new findings and insights which I will use to test existing theories and conceptual models. Thus, this suits the purpose of the deductive approach.

Phenomenology is a qualitative mode of enquiry that seeks to understand a phenomenon from an individual’s point of perspective. Since I analysed how people perceive different fast food
restaurants, I used phenomenology as my qualitative mode of enquiry (du Plooy-Cillers, Davis and Bezuidenhout, 2014).

A cross-sectional survey design is used to create a snapshot of a phenomenon at one point of time and thus you only collect data from your respondents once (Cherry, 2018). Due to the limited time I had to conduct my study, I collected data from my respondents once and thus used a cross-sectional survey design.

3.5 Population

A population can be defined as a large group consisting the entirety of people, units and objects, that share a common characteristic, from a data set (Surbhi, 2016). My target population consisted of people within Durban suburban areas between the ages of 18 – 25, both male and female and whose lifestyles create a preference for fast food, thus fitting into the LSM groups 2-10. The suburbs include Glen Hills, Glenashley, La Lucia and Umhlanga. It is difficult to establish the amount of people as the exact number of people who purchase fast food within these suburbs is not certain.

3.6 Sampling

A sample is a part of the population that is selected to represent the entire group (Surbhi, 2016). Convenience sampling is a type of sampling method that involves selecting a sample group by who is the most convenient (du Plooy-Cillers, Davis and Bezuidenhout, 2014). Out of my above-mentioned population, I used the convenience sampling method to define my sample group, by finding and interviewing people that were conveniently placed. My research used a qualitative approach, and therefore a representative sample was not needed. Therefore, my sample group was made up of 8 - 12 people, both male and female, out of my target population that are located in suburbs in and around the area of Durban.

3.7 Data Collection Methods

Since my study is qualitative in design, I had to collect in-depth data first hand from respondents. Focus groups are a common qualitative research technique and typically consist of a small number of participants who share a common characteristic. These participants are led through discussions around a specific topic to allow a researcher to capture attitudes and perceptions from the group around that specific topic (Kokemuller, 2018). Interviews are a qualitative data collection method that involve direct, one-on-one engagement with individual participants. The interviews allow the researcher the opportunity “to capture understanding of attitudes, perceptions, motivations” and other in-depth insights (Steber, 2017).
Data was collected from the above-mentioned sample group through the use of focus groups and in-depth interviews. This is a good way to obtain in-depth responses from my respondents as they tend to express themselves more freely (du Plooy-Cillers, Davis and Bezuidenhout, 2014).

3.7.1 Focus Groups
My data collection commenced in two stages. The first stage was through the use of focus groups where the topic was discussed with a number of respondents in order to get a better understanding of the common thoughts and feelings of the sample population from a group perspective.

3.7.2 Interviews
The second phase of the data collection was carried out through the use of in-depth interviews, which elicited responses from individuals from the target population to gain further in-depth insights from an individual perspective.

3.7.3 Research Schedule
Both the focus groups and the interviews were guided by an interview schedule which was used as my research instrument and focused on open-ended questions that allowed me to receive more in-depth answers (refer to Appendix 2, pg 58).

3.7.4 Recording Data
Both methods involved recording participants as they answered a list of pre-set questions about their fast food perceptions and preferences. I recorded the focus groups and interviews in the form of audio and short hand-written notes to allow for more accurate observations and data-analysis.

3.8 Pilot Study
A pilot study was completed to test whether the research questions and objectives were relevant. Respondents were asked to elaborate and discuss their answers to ensure that credible in-depth information around millennial consumers perceptions and preferences of the selected fast food chicken brands is collected and that there was no confusion around the wording or phrasing of the questions. The process highlighted a few places where questions needed to be reworked and rephrased although the majority of the questions produced sound responses that addressed the research objectives.
3.9 Data Analysis Method

My aim was to find key themes in my data to gain an in-depth understanding of the motivations behind the purchases of participants in my study. I achieved this by analysing and interpreting my data though the use of qualitative content analysis (du Plooy-Cillers, Davis and Bezuidenhout, 2014).

Qualitative content analysis is the subjective interpretation of data through the classification process of coding and identifying themes and patterns (du Plooy-Cillers, Davis and Bezuidenhout, 2014). Coding is the process of methodically reading through your captured data and dividing it into meaningful analytical units (Nieuwenhuis, 2016).

I utilised thematic coding to analyse and segment my data. Thematic coding is a process that reduces and divides data by means of identifying different themes (du Plooy-Cillers, Davis and Bezuidenhout, 2014). Since I focused on deductive reasoning in my study, I closely scrutinised the text and compressed it into different content categories which I based on a specific set of coding themes that emerged from the data.

3.10 Research Trustworthiness

Researchers must ensure that their research data collection methods are reliable, valid and trustworthy in order for the research to be deemed credible. In quantitative research, validity and reliability are valued to ensure that the data that is collected can be generalised to a larger population and that the study is credible (du Plooy-Cillers, Davis and Bezuidenhout, 2014).

However, since my research is qualitative in design, findings are more subjective and specific to the respondents in the study and therefore cannot be generalised. Due to this, determining the credibility of my qualitative research will differ from that of quantitative research where trustworthiness is valued over validity and reliability. Trustworthiness in qualitative research is further divided into four parts, namely credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (du Plooy-Cillers, Davis and Bezuidenhout, 2014). Therefore, the trustworthiness of my study was maintained as my research was credible, transferable, dependable and confirmable which ensured that it was valid both internally and externally while being reliable and objective.
3.11 Credibility

Credibility allows a researcher to contribute to the trustworthiness of the data through a number of different attributes (Devault, 2018). To ensure the credibility of my research, I utilised the attributes of crystallisation and member checks. Crystallisation is a method of analysis that analyses captured data to ensure that we see the data from as many angles as possible, by moving away from a quantitative data analysis that is two dimensional and shifting towards a crystal “which allows for an infinite variety of shapes, substances, transmutations, dimensions and angles of approach” (Nieuwenhuis, 2016). Thus when analysing data captured from my respondents, I ensured that I viewed it from every possible angle and described my findings in a way that crystallised it from my data gathered. Member checks is an attribute of credibility that involves asking respondents in your study to review data collected from him/her and the researcher’s interpretation of that data (Devault, 2018). This ensured that the data captured, and the interpretation of that data was accurate and credible.

3.12 Transferability

Transferability is the generalisation of a study’s findings into other situations and contexts. This establishes that a research study’s findings could be applicable to other contexts and thus further adds to the trustworthiness of the study. (Devault, 2018). However, qualitative research looks at the interpretation of the data, and thus generalisation of data in qualitative research is limited. Therefore, I ensured the transferability of my research with the technique of providing a thick description of the phenomenon in my study by providing “robust and detailed accounts of their experiences during data collection” (DeMotts, 2018).

3.13 Dependability

Dependability ensures that a researcher’s findings are repeatable and consistent by assuring that other researchers who conducted the study would capture similar findings and interpretations. This is an important measure of the trustworthiness of a study as it ensures that the researcher was methodical and not misguided with their study (DeMotts, 2018). I ensured and demonstrated the credibility of my study mentioned above by ensuring the dependability of my study (Nieuwenhuis, 2016). I further enhanced the dependability of my study by ensuring that I recorded and journalled all of my changes and decisions throughout my research process to allow observers to follow my reasoning and thus gauge the dependability of my study (Nieuwenhuis, 2016). These recordings and captured data will be erased after a five-year period.
3.14 Confirmability

The last criterion of trustworthiness is confirmability, which is described as the level of confidence to which the findings from a study are formed based on the answers of the respondents and not shaped by the researcher's bias (DeMotts, 2018). An audit trail was utilised to ensure the confirmability of my study by documenting and detailing the process of data collection, data analysis, and interpretation of the data to allow observers to “trace the course of the research step by step” (Nieuwenhuis, 2016).

3.15 Conclusion

In this chapter I have expanded upon and justified my choice of research approach by detailing the proposed paradigm, the conceptual approach for the study, the population and sampling method used. The chapter also details the data collection and data analysis methods that were used when conducting the primary research. Research trustworthiness has been discussed with regard to how the research has been collected and analysed in terms of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Chapter 4 presents and discusses the data collected from the research conducted to reveal interesting findings and insights gathered during the research.
Chapter 4: Research Findings

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter the data collected from the focus groups and interviews will be presented and discussed. The analysis of the data collected was as per the methodology stated in the previous chapter (Chapter 3). It is important to note that this was a small-scale qualitative study which was limited by both time and resources and thus, unlike a larger qualitative study, it is not statistically sound. Therefore the findings of the study cannot be generalised to a larger population with any degree of confidence. In some instances, the findings of the study have been presented in a qualitative form simply for ease of readability, but the analysis of the research was qualitative.

4.2 Presentation and Discussion of the Findings

Findings have been presented in the form of tables and word clouds allowing for the findings to be stylish and easy-to-read. Findings have been discussed based on the research questions and how they relate and answer to the research objectives. A more detailed account of these findings is based on the interview schedule that was used and therefore the responses have been analysed as one, except where there are differences.

4.3 Methodology Applied

4.3.1 Focus Groups

A total of 8 people completed two focus groups. The focus groups were both mixed gender and were split between males and females (5 females, 3 males) with the participants ranging between the ages 19 – 25. The participants were also split by ethnicity (4 Black, 2 white, 2 Indian). Convenience sampling was utilised for this method of study. The focus groups were audio recorded for accuracy and ease of data collection. All of the respondent’s identities have been kept anonymous for the purposes of this study.

4.3.2 Interviews

A total of 4 individuals were interviewed in four separate interview sessions. The respondents were mixed gender and evenly split (2 female, 2 male). Convenience sampling was also utilized for this method of study. All of the respondent’s identities have been kept anonymous for the purposes of this study. The interviews were audio recorded for accuracy and ease of data collection.
4.4 Profiles of Respondents

The ages of the respondents of both the focus groups and interviews have been listed in the tables below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18 - 21</th>
<th>22 - 25</th>
<th></th>
<th>18 - 21</th>
<th>22 - 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1: Profiles of respondents – Focus Groups**

The focus groups were evenly split between the age ranges, however due to the type of sampling method that was used there was a larger number of females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18 - 21</th>
<th>22 - 25</th>
<th></th>
<th>18 - 21</th>
<th>22 - 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2: Profiles of respondents – Interviews**

The interviews had an even split between the age groups for females, however the males were more one sided in terms of age.

4.5 Answering Research Objectives from Responses

The responses presented below will be discussed in relation to how they answered the research questions and therefore the research objectives listed in chapter 1. The responses are visually depicted in the form of word clouds and tables before being discussed.

4.6 Responses – Research Objective 1: Identify what motivates consumers to purchase from local fast food chicken stores.

4.6.1 Focus Group and Interview Question 1: How often do you find yourself purchasing from local fast food chicken stores such as Afros or Nando’s?
Figure 4.1: Eating Frequency – Local Fast Food Chicken

4.6.1.1 Question Purpose
The question asking, “How often do you find yourself purchasing from local fast food stores such as Afros or Nando’s?” was to understand the amount of time each respondent spent at these stores and was also used as a warm-up question so that respondents would be able to recall information later in the interview or focus group that would provide primary data used to meet Objective 1.

4.6.1.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews
Figure 4.1 shows a varied set of answers with regard to how frequently respondents ate at local fast food chicken stores. The most common finding being between one to three times a month.

4.6.2 Focus Group and Interview Question 2: What do you like about the purchasing experience when you buy food from a local fast food chicken store?
4.6.2.1 Question Purpose

The purpose of asking respondents what they like about the purchasing experience when they buy food from a local fast food chicken store was to understand what positive perceptions they had for local fast food chicken stores. It was also used to highlight some of their preferences in terms of why they bought from the local store and what they look for when purchasing fast food chicken in general.

4.6.2.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews

Figure 4.2 shows that the most common findings that came to light were that the stores felt ‘homely’ and produced ‘healthy’ meals as well as the ‘atmosphere’ of the stores being pleasant, with one person going on to mention how they were able to sit at local fast food chicken stores due to this pleasant atmosphere. There were other varying answers of how the stores felt relatable and South African because they were immersed in local culture.
4.6.3 Focus Group and Interview Question 3: What don’t you like about the purchasing experience when you buy food from a local fast food chicken store?
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**Figure 4.3:** Local Fast Food Chicken Dislikes

### 4.6.3.1 Question Purpose

The purpose of asking respondents what they disliked about the purchasing experience from local fast food chicken stores was to understand what negative perceptions they had around local fast food chicken and also to highlight preferences in terms of what they do not like when purchasing fast food chicken in general.

### 4.6.3.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews

Figure 4.3 shows that the most common responses were about the price of the fast food chicken with respondents complaining that other fast food chicken stores were much kinder to their budget.
4.6.4 Focus Group and Interview Question 4: What makes you purchase from local fast food chicken stores (Afros or Nandos) over global/international fast food chicken stores (KFC)?

Figure 4.4: Primary Motivator for Local Choice

4.6.4.1 Question Purpose
The purpose of asking respondents what makes them purchase fast food chicken from local stores over global stores was to pinpoint what the most important deciding factor was for choosing a local fast food store over a global fast food store, again to better understand their preferences and perceptions.

4.6.4.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews
Figure 4.4 shows that the most common findings were due to the perceived healthiness of the food and the ingredients used and thus the quality of the food was another major deciding factor. Other notable mentions were the fact that many people liked supporting local stores because they want to see them do well as stores that are proudly South African.

4.7 Responses – Research Objective 2: Identify what motivates consumers to purchase from international/global fast food chicken stores
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4.7.1  Focus Group and Interview Question 5: How often do you find yourself purchasing from international/global fast food chicken franchises/stores such as KFC?

![Eating Frequency - Local Fast Food Chicken](image)

**Figure 4.5** : Eating Frequency – Local Fast Food Chicken

4.7.1.1  Question Purpose

The question asking how often you find yourself purchasing from local fast food stores such as KFC was similar to question 1 in that it was used to understand the amount of time each respondent spent at these stores and to help respondents as a warm up question so that they would be able to recall information later in the interview or focus group.

4.7.1.2  Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews

Figure 4.1 shows a varied set of answers with regards to how frequently respondents ate at local fast food chicken stores. The most common finding being four or more times a month, which is more than that of the local stores.

4.7.2  Focus Group and Interview Question 6: What do you like about the purchasing experience when you buy food from a big international/global fast food chicken franchise/store?
4.7.2.1  Question Purpose
The purpose of asking respondents what they like about the purchasing experience when they buy food from a global fast food chicken store was to understand what positive perceptions they had for global fast food chicken stores as well as to highlight some of their preferences in terms of why they bought from the global store and what they look for when purchasing fast food chicken in general.

4.7.2.2  Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews
Figure 4.6 shows that the most common theme was that respondents liked the affordable price of the fast food chicken at global stores while other notable mentions included convenience due to the placement and number of these stores and the speed at which they received their food, commenting on how quick it was.

4.7.3  Focus Group and Interview Question 7: What don’t you like about the purchasing experience when you buy food from a big international/global fast food chicken franchise?
4.7.3.1 Question Purpose
The purpose of asking respondents what they dislike about the purchasing experience when they buy food from a global fast food chicken store was to understand what negative perceptions they had for global fast food chicken stores as well as to highlight some of their preferences in terms of what they don’t look for when purchasing fast food chicken in general.

4.7.3.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews
Figure 4.7 shows that a common theme was that respondents perceived the food to be unhealthy with one respondent even commenting that it makes them feel worse about themselves when purchasing from global fast food stores, and another stating that they question what is put into the food. Another common theme that emerged was that respondents felt the atmosphere in the store was not so pleasant due to the fact that it felt rushed, the store not feeling clean and the unhappy staff.
4.7.4 Focus Group and Interview Question 8: What makes you buy from global fast food chicken stores (KFC) over local fast food chicken stores (Afros or Nandos)?
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**Figure 4.8**: Global Fast Food Chicken Likes

4.7.4.1 Question Purpose

The purpose of asking respondents what makes them purchase fast food chicken from global stores over local stores was to pinpoint what the most important deciding factor was for choosing a global fast food store over a fast food store was, again to better understand their preferences and perceptions.

4.7.4.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews

Figure 4.8 shows the same common themes as question 6 with price and convenience being the primary drivers for choosing global fast food chicken stores. Another common theme was the variety of offerings that global stores had in comparison to local stores.

4.8 Responses – Research Objective 3: Determine whether consumers between the age of 18 – 25 know what the benefits of purchasing from local fast food brands are for the country and the economy and whether they care.
4.8.1 Focus Group and Interview Question 9: What do you think the benefits of buying from local fast food stores over global fast food stores are for the country?
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Figure 4.9: Understanding Benefit of Buying Local

4.8.1.1 Question Purpose

The purpose of asking respondents what they felt the benefit of buying local was, was to understand whether they knew if buying local was a good thing, and to judge whether they actually understood the benefits. It was also used as a warm up question for question 10 where I ask a follow up question to their answer.

4.8.1.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews

Figure 4.9 shows that a large portion of the responses to this question followed a similar theme which was that purchasing local helped improve and stimulate the economy, with some respondents going into more depth stipulating that it would provide more jobs for local people (people around us). Thus, all the respondents had a basic understanding of the benefit of buying from local fast food stores over global fast food stores.
4.8.2 Focus Group and Interview Question 10: 2. How do these benefits affect your purchase decision by making you think about where your money is going?

Figure 4.10: Impact of Localness on Purchasing

4.8.2.1 Question Purpose
The purpose of asking respondents what the benefits of purchasing local had on their purchase decision was to understand if respondents thought about where their money was going when purchasing fast food chicken.

4.8.2.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews
Figure 4.10 shows that the common trend was that respondents did not think about whether they were buying local or not, with more in-depth responses suggesting that it was either a non-existent thought or one that followed a series of other more pertinent thoughts and, as such, buying local was an afterthought.
Focus Group and Interview Question 11: How could local stores make you want to purchase from them more?

4.8.3.1 Question Purpose

The purpose of asking what local fast food chicken stores could improve on to make respondents buy from them more was to determine whether or not local stores were doing something wrong and what could they improve on to attract more consumers.

4.8.3.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews

Figure 4.11 shows that many of the common themes are the areas which the respondents mentioned global fast food stores do well, with the common themes revolving around improving pricing, variety and accessibility.

4.9 Responses – Objective 4: Identify the importance of branding when making the decision to purchase fast food chicken.
4.9.1 Focus Group and Interview Question 12: What associations come to mind when you think of local fast food chicken brands?

Figure 4.12: Associations of Local Fast Food Chicken

4.9.1.1 Question Purpose
The purpose of asking respondents what associations come to mind they think of local fast food chicken brands was to get a broader understanding of their perceptions around local fast food brands and was used as a warm up question for question 12.

4.9.1.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews
Figure 4.12 shows that common themes for perceptions were that local stores felt homely and produced healthy food with some respondents mentioning that they felt the food was fresh. Other notable responses were that the stores felt familiar and that the overall experience was good.
4.9.2 Focus Group and Interview Question 13: What do you think of when you associate with global fast food chicken brands?

Figure 4.13: Associations of Global Fast Food Chicken

4.9.2.1 Question Purpose
The purpose of asking respondents what associations come to mind they think of local fast food chicken brands was to get a broader understanding of their perceptions around local fast food brands and was used as a warm up question for question 12.

4.9.2.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews
Figure 4.13 shows the common themes in the responses were both positive and negative with respondents mentioning that they perceived global fast food stores to be quick and affordable but also unhealthy and rushed.
Focus Group and Interview Question 14: Do the brands from these stores (KFC, Nando’s and Afros) play a big part when you purchase fast food?

Figure 4.14: Importance of Branding When Purchasing Fast Food Chicken

4.9.3.1 Question Purpose
The purpose of asking respondents if the brands from the fast food chicken stores mentioned in my study played an important role when purchasing fast food was to understand their perceptions of branding when it came to fast food and whether or not the brand was important to them.

4.9.3.2 Discussion of Findings: Focus Groups and Interviews
Figure 4.14 shows the common theme that ran through most of the responses was that branding did play a big part when they purchased fast food chicken, with more in-depth responses suggesting that they remember good and bad service and that they link those experiences to the brand in order to form better purchase decisions in the future.
4.10 Conclusion

The research conducted provided sufficient findings and insights into the research problem whilst meeting the research objectives needed for the study with respondents providing detailed and credible qualitative data around the topics raised.

Chapter 5 presents the conclusion of the research from the primary research in order of each objective and provides recommendations for further study.
Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter the final conclusions of the study are provided, including any recommendations for further research. The chapter also notes the limitations and delimitations of the study whilst entailing the anticipated contribution of the study. The final conclusions from the research findings are listed under each of the study’s four objectives and draw on literature and the theoretical framework discussed in chapter 2 as well as the primary research presented and discussed in chapter 4.

5.2 Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

The final conclusions from the research findings are listed under each objective for ease of reference. Each objective will be discussed in terms of the primary research presented in chapter 4 and reference to key concepts, literature and theory in chapter 2.

5.3 Objective 1 - What motivates consumers to purchase from local fast food chicken stores

5.3.1 Findings from Literature Review

Lee and Ulgado’s (1997) study showed that different cultures value different factors when it comes to the service quality of fast food with American consumers valuing price, time and assurance of purchase while Korean consumers valued empathy and reliability. The former lived fast paced lives and so time and price were extremely important, while the latter valued eating out as more of a social occasion experienced with family or friends and thus looked for reliability and empathy for their needs with quality service.

*Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory* suggest that people have a certain number of needs and ordered in a hierarchy with some needs being more primitive than others. The pyramid model suggests that humans are motivated by more basic needs such as food, shelter, water, safety and security before moving onto more complex needs and as such, if basic needs are not met, they will be motivated by those before anything else (Burton, 2018). *Marshallian Economics Theory* suggests that people purchase what offers them the most satisfaction with the right price being slightly less than the perceived satisfaction they receive.

Quality fast food chicken generally comes at a more premium price, where less consistent quality fast food chicken is cheaper. If consumers have a reduced budget, *Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs*
Theory suggests that people will opt for the cheaper chicken, since food is a more basic need that needs to be satisfied.

Therefore, fast food brands need to understand what their consumers are looking for. In South Africa we have a diverse nation made up of multiple different cultures and so understanding what each culture wants is extremely important.

5.3.2 Findings from Focus Groups and Interviews
Question 1, 2, 3 and 4 in the Focus Groups and Interviews addressed Objective 1. Respondents stated and detailed what they liked and disliked about the purchasing experience in the stores of local fast food chicken brands mentioned in the study.

5.3.3 Conclusion
Research gathered for this objective revealed that respondents liked to purchase from local fast food chicken stores because they perceived them to produce good quality healthy meals; they enjoyed the atmosphere inside the stores mentioning the fact that they were able to sit down and enjoy a meal inside the store and lastly, due to the fact that they were local stores, they felt proud and happy to support brands that were home-grown. However, respondents also spoke about how they disliked the price of the food, mentioning that purchasing local fast food was not always affordable and thus Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs is true in this respect.

5.3.4 Recommendations
From the statements respondents have made both in the interviews and the focus groups, it appears that local stores need to work on the competitiveness of their pricing or change their offerings to make people feel as though they are getting value for their money from their purchase with suggestions such as incentive or loyalty programmes, where consumers are rewarded for purchasing from a local food store either by vouchers or discounts on repeated purchases. Another suggestion would be to sell smaller and less expensive meals that would appeal to lower income mass market consumers.

5.4 Objective 2 - What motivates consumers to purchase from global fast food chicken stores

5.4.1 Findings from Literature Review
The literature highlighted that while there are healthier options and alternative to fast food millennials, more particularly students have increasingly chosen fast food to satisfy their appetites due to factors such as the price, convenience, taste, variety, peer pressure and cravings (Ukonu, 2016).
Melnick also adds that fast food consumers are not looking for healthier options on the menu, but rather see fast food as a treat and so choose to buy the unhealthy options at fast food stores, since those types of food are the main drivers for purchase decisions at these outlets, not the healthy options. Melnick also mentions that people watch their weight at home, but not when they are out and about where most of the food decisions are made based on impulse (Melnick, 2011).

5.4.2 Findings from Focus Groups and Interviews
Question 5, 6, 7 and 8 in the Focus Groups and Interviews addressed Objective 2. Respondents stated what motivated them to purchase fast food chicken from the global fast food chicken brand mentioned in the study by stating what they liked and disliked about the experience.

5.4.3 Conclusion
The insights from the responses in both the interviews and the focus groups matched that of the literature review with respondents perceiving global fast food as unhealthy and of inconsistent quality in comparison to that of the local fast food stores, but bought food from those stores anyway because of the price and convenience that the global fast food chicken brand offered.

5.4.4 Recommendations
From these findings it is clear that global fast food brands appeal to a more mass market and lower income consumers and, if local fast food stores are to compete, they need to improve in the strengths of the global fast food brands, such as pricing and the convenient placement of stores to make the life of a consumer as easy as possible. Suggestions for pricing have already been made in the previous recommendations for Objective 1, however further recommendations for convenience can be suggested, such as the implementation of roaming food trucks that are conveniently placed next to office parks or business outlets that increase the accessibility of local fast food chicken.

5.5 Objective 3 - Whether consumers between the age of 18 – 25 know what the benefits of purchasing from local fast food brands are for the country and the economy and whether they care.

5.5.1 Findings from Literature Review
Purchasing local, as concluded in the first objective with the primary research, provided respondents with a satisfaction boost as they supported a local chicken brand which made them feel proud and patriotic. Looking at this through the lens of the Marshallian Economics Theory would suggest that the extra satisfaction boost of the fast food chicken brand being local, on top
of the satisfaction of purchasing a meal, would mean an excess in satisfaction and thus the ratio between price and satisfaction would change with satisfaction being slightly higher than price (Kwat, 2018).

5.5.2 Findings from Focus Groups and Interviews
Question 9, 10, and 11 in the Focus Groups and Interviews addressed Objective 3. Respondents provided their understanding of the importance of buying local fast food chicken and the benefits to the country including whether they care by stating how and if it affected their decision when purchasing fast food chicken and what key areas local fast food brands could improve upon.

5.5.3 Conclusion
The responses from the focus groups and interviews did not match the view of Marshallian Economics Theory as respondents fully understood the benefits of purchasing local over global stating that buying local did not affect their purchasing decision, with factors such as price, convenience, taste and variety influencing their decisions more and mentioning that purchasing local was an afterthought. Some of these factors, according to respondents, such as variety and price, are issues for concern for local fast food brands.

5.5.4 Recommendations
It appears that local fast food brands cannot rely on the patriotic support from consumers and need to improve on their variety and pricing of their offerings if they are to attract more consumers. As mentioned previously, suggestions for pricing have already been made, however further recommendations for variety can be made by suggesting that local fast food stores expand on their food offerings by creating more options for each type of food item they sell, and slowly expand on the offerings, allowing consumers to have a greater choice when deciding to purchase from local fast food stores.

5.6 Objective 4 – The importance of branding when making the decision to purchase fast food chicken.

5.6.1 Findings from Literature Review
Aaker’s Brand Equity Model pinpoints four major areas, excluding other proprietary assets, where companies can build strong brand equity that ensures a strong and strategically sound brand. These areas are brand awareness, brand loyalty, perceived quality and brand associations.
5.6.2 Findings from Focus Groups and Interviews
Question 12, 13, and 14 in the Focus Groups and Interviews addressed Objective 4. Respondents detailed their associations of the different brands within the study and stated whether they felt branding played a big part in their decision when purchasing fast food chicken.

5.6.3 Conclusions
The responses from the focus groups and interviews highlighted insights that matched that of Aaker’s Brand Equity Model, with respondents stating that they felt branding played an important part of the purchasing decision, mentioning various personal accounts and experiences with brands and how those experiences shaped their future experience with any store from that brand. This shows that brand associations, perceived quality of the food and the awareness of the brand play an important part when purchasing fast food chicken and thereafter, positive interactions with the brand are rewarded with brand loyalty.

5.6.4 Recommendations
Fast food chicken brands need to understand the importance of brand equity and ensure that all interactions with the brand are positive to maximise brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality and finally brand loyalty and effectively build a strong brand. They therefore need to make sure that the consumers’ needs are met at all times with good quality food and excellent customer service that makes for a delightful consumer experience with the brand each time. As previously mentioned in the findings from the primary research, local fast food chicken stores are already perceived as having great atmospheres and providing great lived experiences, therefore suggestions would be to carry on these experiences and to keep adding to the current atmosphere at these stores.

5.7 Final Conclusions
The results from the primary research addressed each of the objectives stipulated in Chapter 1 and, as a result, the primary research has answered the main research question of what key factors influence millennial consumers when purchasing from either of the selected fast food chicken brands by providing insight into what motivates consumers to purchase from local and global fast food chicken brands with common factors such as price, variety, healthiness, quality and store atmosphere coming through as the main drivers for purchasing fast food chicken.
5.8 Limitations

I am limited by validity and reliability of my study since my research is qualitative in design. I am limited by the scope of my study as well as size of my sample group due to the fact that this study was a small qualitative study with 12 respondents. I cannot generalise my findings to the population of Durban consumers of fast food chicken.

Due to low finances and time constraints, the scope of my study has been limited to a small area within the city of Durban. These time constraints have also forced me to use one-off interviews which limits the amount of information the research would be able to collect and record as I won’t be able to build a relationship with participants that would allow me to get a ranged number of responses and thus more in-depth subjective data.

I am limited by the use of focus groups due to the fact that the conversations can be hard to control and produce irrelevant answers; respondents can feel peer pressured to answer truthfully and the researcher’s skill in setting and asking questions can affect the quality of the responses. To counter this, I have pilot tested my interview schedule for my focus groups to ensure I captured relevant and in-depth information in a well organised and structured manner.

The brands in this study (KFC, Afros, Nando’s) were chosen based on popularity within the Durban region, and not on similarly prepared food, and so my study was limited by this as the brands could not be directly compared with regards to food preference - KFC serves crumbed chicken, Nando’s is Portuguese style and Afros is more simple and respondents may have a very strong preference for one style of food.

5.9 Delimitations

This study focuses on the preferences and perceptions millennial consumers have in relation to global and home-grown fast food chicken brands and will be restricted to the city of Durban of which the whole has not been fully explored. The study has therefore not considered the perceptions or preferences of millennial consumers outside of Durban or internationally due to time constraints and limited research resources. The study focused on what motivates consumers to purchase from either home-grown or global fast food chicken brands by accessing what respondents’ key driving factors are when purchasing fast food chicken and whether or not buying local is a key factor. Only two theories were used to form the theoretical framework of the study and these theories specifically touched on one objective of the research and thus were not encompassed across the entire study.
5.10 Anticipated Contribution

The study has highlighted the key factors that influence consumers to purchase from fast food chicken brands within Durban, South Africa. This research will be valuable to local fast food restaurants who can learn and improve on their brands, offerings or service to better meet the needs of the emerging fast food millennial consumer by drawing on some of the main insights that were found in the study namely, the lack of variety of their offerings and the high pricing of their food. The study also highlighted the strong points of local fast food stores with insights such as their great store atmosphere, the quality and freshness of their food and lastly, the most important insight - that their food is perceived as healthy in comparison to global fast food brands.

5.11 Suggestions for Further Research

Suggestions can be made to conduct a similar study throughout the rest of South Africa for more accurate insights and to compare results and discover whether the findings from different regions are similar or how they differ. Other suggestions would be to research the in-store experiences at different fast food stores in order to establish what local fast food chicken stores can improve on to make the lived experience even greater as well as conducting the same study with brands that are more similar in terms of the style of fast food chicken offered (Portuguese Styled Chicken, Crumbed Chicken, etc.) to establish more accurate conclusions.

5.12 Research Ethics

This study involved face to face interviewing of consumers between the ages of 18 - 25. An ethical clearance form had been applied for and collected before the start of the research. All observations and data were collected with proper informed consent and permission from the sample participants (Refer to Appendix 2, pg 60). I was honest and forthcoming about the purpose of my study with my participants and told them what I am looking for in my interviews. I avoided causing any emotional and physical harm to the patients during the interview process and notified the participants that their identity would remain confidential. As a researcher I did not falsify any information collected or distort any of my findings. Analysis of data was professional and objective and was not influenced by personal bias. Lastly all data is stored on a password protected computer. All hard copies are securely stored under lock and key. All data will be destroyed after 5 years and electronic copies will be erased.
5.13 Concluding Remarks

This study explored the perceptions and preferences millennial consumers had around selected fast food chicken brands of local and global origin with a focus on purchasing from local/home-grown brands. The study aimed to ascertain whether millennial consumers were purchasing from global fast food chicken brands over local/home-grown chicken brands by understanding their preferences and perceptions when purchasing fast food chicken. The study was based on the Interpretive paradigm and collected qualitative data through focus groups and in-depth interviews. A literature review was conducted to provide context and academic data to the research. Data that was collected was analysed through a qualitative mode of enquiry using thematic analysis.

The primary research evidently shows that while consumers purchase from local fast food stores for their quality food, healthiness and positive and relatable store atmosphere, they are still continuing to purchase from international fast food stores due to their price, variety and convenience, with price being the dominant driver as supported by theoretical frameworks. Having drawn on conclusions from the primary data collected, recommendations have been made to help local fast food chicken stores meet the needs of the emerging fast food millennial consumer. These recommendations include improving on the affordability of their offerings or adding extra incentives or benefits to the purchasing experience, so the consumer feels they are getting greater value for money, increasing the variety of offerings sold at local fast food chicken stores by expanding on the number of choices a consumer can choose from when looking for a meal and lastly, to increase the accessibility of purchasing local fast food chicken through the use of mobile food trucks that are conveniently situated.
## Research Purpose
The purpose of this study is to determine whether the perception that consumers between the ages of 18 – 25 are choosing international fast food chicken brands over local fast food chicken brands is true and to find out what motivates this.

## Research Question
What are the key factors that influence millennial consumers when purchasing fast food chicken brands?

## Research Rationale
By gaining an insight into the preferences and perceptions that local consumers have around fast food chicken brands it can be known why home-grown brands are suffering, and thus help local fast food chicken brands compete with international fast food chicken chains. This insight will give local brands a competitive advantage over international fast food chains, allowing them to attract more business and ultimately help bolster and develop the local economy.

## Literature

## Anticipated Findings
I expect to find that convenience and price are the main drivers behind why consumers buy from international fast food chicken brands over local fast food chicken brands.
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Appendix 2 – Research Schedule

Steven Prinsloo 14014541
Interview Schedule – Focus Group and Interview

Objective: Identify what motivates consumers to purchase from local fast food chicken stores. (Example Afros or Nandos)

1. How often do you find yourself purchasing from local fast food chicken stores such as Afros or Nandos?
2. What do you like about the purchasing experience when you buy food from a local fast food chicken store?
3. What don’t you like about the purchasing experience when you buy food from a local fast food chicken store?
4. What makes you purchase from local fast food chicken stores (Afros or Nandos) over global/international fast food chicken stores (KFC)?

Objective: Identify what motivates consumers to purchase from international/global fast food chicken stores. (Example KFC)

1. How often do you find yourself purchasing from international/global fast food chicken franchises/stores such as KFC?
2. What do you like about the purchasing experience when you buy food from a big international/global fast food chicken franchise/ store?
3. What don’t you like about the purchasing experience when you buy food from a big international/global fast food chicken franchise?
4. What makes you buy from global fast food chicken stores (Eg. KFC) over local fast food chicken stores (Such as Afros and/or Nandos)?

Objective: Determine whether consumers between the age of 18 – 30 know the of the benefits of purchasing from local fast food brands has on the country and whether they care.

1. What do you think the benefit of buying from local fast food stores over global fast food stores are for the country (South Africa)?
2. How do these benefits affect your purchase decision by making you think about where your money is going? If so why?
3. How could local stores make you want to purchase from them more?
Objective: Determine whether the brand image and identity play an important part of the purchase decision when purchasing fast food chicken.

1. What associations come to mind you think of local fast food chicken brands?
2. What associations come to mind you think of global fast food chicken brands?
3. Do the brands from these stores (KFC, Nandos and Afros) play a big part when you purchase fast food? If so why?
Appendix 3 – Consent Form

EXPLANATORY INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

To whom it may concern,

My name is Steven Prinsloo and I am a student at Vega School of Brand Leadership. I am currently conducting research under the supervision of Graham Dowing about the perceptions and preferences of fast food brands. I hope that this research will enhance our understanding of how important it is to understand where and what you purchase when it comes to fast food.

I would like to invite you to participate in my study. In order to explain to you what your participation in my study will involve, I have formulated questions that I will try to fully answer so that you can make an informed decision about whether or not to participate. If you have any additional questions that you feel are not addressed or explained in this information sheet, please do not hesitate to ask me for more information. Once you have read and understood all the information contained in this sheet and are willing to participate, please complete and sign the consent form below.

What will I be doing if I participate in your study?

I would like to invite you to participate in this research because you are a millennial consumer who purchases food from a selected fast food brand. If you decide to participate in this research, I would like to conduct one interview with you. The interview will take approximately ten minutes of your time. It will be scheduled at a time that it is convenient for both of us and will take place at a location that is convenient to you. I will be asking you questions about your perceptions and preferences when it comes to different fast food brands.

You can decide whether or not to participate in this research. If you decide to participate, you can choose to withdraw at any time or to decide not to answer particular interview questions.

Are there any risks/ or discomforts involved in participating in this study?

Whether or not you decide to participate in this research, there will be no negative impact on you. There are no direct risks or benefits to you if you participate in this study. You might, however, indirectly find that it is helpful to talk about your preferences or perceptions of fast food brands. If you find at any stage that you are not comfortable with the line of questioning, you may withdraw or refrain from participating.

Do I have to participate in the study?

- Your inclusion in this study is purely voluntary;
- If you do not wish to participate in this study, you have every right not to do so;
- Even if you agree to participate in this study, you may withdraw at any time without having to provide an explanation for your decision.
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Consent form for participants

I, _______________________________________, agree to participate in the research conducted by Steven Prinsloo about millennial consumers perceptions and preferences of selected fast food brands.

This research has been explained to me and I understand what participation in this research will involve. I understand that:

1. I agree to be interviewed for this research.
2. My confidentiality will be ensured. My name and personal details will be kept private.
3. My participation in this research is voluntary and I have the right to withdraw from the research at any time. There will be no repercussions should I choose to withdraw from the research.
4. I may choose not to answer any of the questions that are asked during the research interview.
5. I may be quoted directly when the research is published, but my identity will be protected.

__________________________________    ____________________
Signature      Date
Consent form for audio-recording/ video recording

I, ________________________________, agree to allow Steven Prinsloo to audio record my interviews as part of the research about millennial consumers perceptions and preferences of selected fast food brands.

This research has been explained to me and I understand what participation in this research will involve. I understand that:

1. My confidentiality will be ensured. My name and personal details will be kept private.
2. The recordings will be stored in a password protected file on the researcher’s computer.
3. Only the researcher, the researcher’s supervisor and possibly a transcriber (who will sign a confidentiality agreement) will have access to these recordings.

_______________________    ____________________
Signature      Date