

Chapter - 5

Role of Children in Family Decision Making: A Quantitative Assessment

5.1: Introduction

In the context of increasing competition and changing social and economic environment, it becomes essential for the marketers to be customer-oriented. Buying behavior of customers in the marketplace plays a significant role in the strategic marketing planning. The recent awareness of consumer behavior has introduced many new dimensions in the marketing philosophy and practices. It is both, relevant and important for every business enterprise to know its customers and understand their buying behaviour.

Children represent an important target market segment and gain respective attention from the marketing point of view. The twenty first century kids play a dominant role as a consumer, sometimes as buyers and play a pivotal role in persuading their parents for a variety of goods and services. (McNeal 1992). Prior studies amply demonstrate that children including teens and threshold teens express their opinion for family purchase decision making which largely fall under the purview of their parents (Belch et Al. 1985, Foxma et Al. 1989).The marketers as well as advertisers now realized the pester power of children and as such target this group directly to find a place in the minds of the children and teens (Cook 2003).

Children influence on family buying decision making varies by product type, child, parent and family characteristics etc. Most of the studies have shown that children yield more influence in purchase decisions for children related products like toys (Burns & Harrison 1985, as cited by Kaur & Singh 2006); cereals (Belch et al. 1985, as cited by Kaur & Singh 2006); snacks (Ahuja & Stinson 1993) and children's wear (Foxman & Tansuhaj 1988). Children have also been pragmatic to yield their influence for family related products like vacations (Ahuja & Stinson 1993; Belch et al. 1985, as cited by Kaur & Singh 2006); Family eating out decisions (Filiatrault & Ritchie 1980, as cited by Kaur & Singh 2006) and movies (Darley and Lim 1986). A few researchers have studied the role of children in both family and children specific product (Foxman & Tansuhaj 1988; Mc Neal & Yeh 1997). Children were found to have less authority and less influence on family related products which involved more financial resources and more influence for their personal usage products

(Manglerburg 1990). In a similar type of study Nancarrow (2007) revealed that children have more impact on the purchase of book/comic, shoes for school, PC games etc. and less impact on the purchase of financial products like life insurance, car for family, family holiday trip. Dhobal (1999) stated that in new urban rural families in India, children were influencers for their personal care products, financial products and educational products while as they were buyer for the family toiletries and initiators or gatekeepers for the purchase decision of household products. Various researchers have revealed that a number of factors play a substantial role on children's influence on parents buying decisions across different product categories.

It is believed by researchers that the traditional role of parents concerning family purchase decision has undergone a revolutionary change due to increasing dominance of the generation Y. It is believed that the interpersonal communication in the context of family decision making has become more open and democratic in nature where all the members are to some extent involve in the family decision making. (Sen 2006). A review of previous studies disclose that children's influence in family purchase decision making vary depending on the nature of the product encountered as well as the socio-economic and demographic factors of the family. (Sen 2006).

Literature has also cited that younger children do not influence family purchase decision as much as the older children (Atkin 1978; Darley and Lim 1986; Jenkins 1979; Moschis and Mitchell 1986; Nelson 1978; Ward and Wackman 1972). The fact is that as children grow older, they develop further sophisticated decision-making abilities and skills. As age increases, the competence of the child as a consumer increases (Moschis and Moore, 1979). Manglerburg, (1990) study also stated that decisions are made by the parents without taking the opinion of the child would be due to lack of child's interest due to their low relevance and hence they would not be interested to influence such purchase decisions.

The role of children was underemphasized by researchers for long period of time. Initially the researchers in this field primarily concentrated on the influences of husbands and wives in the family buying decision making. Off late, the researchers have realized that a transformation has taken place in the family decision making

where kids and teen play the role of initiators and influencers in shaping the behavior of their parents. (Jenkins 1979; Mangleburg 1990; Lee 1994). The influence of spouse in the family decision-making process have been examined by researchers incorporating the working status of wives, their educational attainment and empowerment of women and consequently greater dominance received the attention from researchers. It should be pointed out here that the role of children is still prevalent that attached the researchers to understand the role of children in the family decision making. There is an increasing recognition of the child's importance in the family purchase decisions. Not only are children important players in the family purchase decision making process, but they are also significant influencers in situations where influence is exercised indirectly (Lee, 1994).

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine children's influence in family purchase decision process in metropolis with regard to a few conceptual variable viz. brand loyalty, involvement, brand influence score, brand trust, and demographic variables like age, gender, working status of parents and influence in different product categories. From the past literature, it has been observed that the behavior of children's is very difficult task to judge (McNeal, 1964). They behave differently in different surroundings. In order to obtain deep insights of the children's behaviour, in-depth interview techniques have been employed by conducting this research.

Structure questionnaire using open- ended questions have been developed to get the answer from the teens. Open-ended questions are extensively used as it provides greater freedom to the respondents, where they can answer in their own terminology rather than the limited set options in close- ended questions (Walker, 1988). In a study it has been revealed by Silverman (2000) that the open ended type questions give an opening to collect authentic information of people's experiences with the surroundings. This kind of questioning also encourages the interviewee to go deeper into their thought levels (Crouch and Housden, 2003).

Samples of 181 respondents have been selected after verifying all sorts of information required for this research. Initially, 200 respondents were asked to participate in the survey, but 181 sample respondents have been found suitable for this study. Various

demographic factor like age, gender, working status of parents, school education have been considered while collecting data from the study as previous studies explained that the demographic factor of the children play a significant role in deciding the type of product purchased by them (McNeal & Yeh, 2003).

5.2: Reliability & Validity

Data obtained from the field survey was analyzed in several steps. Reliability was tested using Cronbach's coefficient Alpha. Cronbach's Alpha measures how well a set of items or variables, measure a single uni-dimensional latent construct that is a coefficient of reliability or consistency. Reliability is expressed as a coefficient between 0 and 1.00. The higher the coefficient, the more reliable is the test. A threshold of a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.6 and above is acceptable (Cronbach's, 1951). All constructs depicted that the value of Cronbach's Alpha were greater or equal to 0.6 and thus, the study constructs were reliable. Further a test of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), which measure sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of Sphericity was applied to test whether there was a relationship among the variables. A sample size is considered to be adequate if KMO is greater than 0.5. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measures of sampling adequacy shows the value of test statistic as 0.713 which is greater than 0.5. With the value of test statistic and the associated significance level, it shows that there exists a high relationship among variables. Factor analysis methods have also been employed to judge the validity of the construct.

**Table-5.1a: Factor Analysis Results
Product: Vacation Choice**

Items	F1	F2
INVT 1		.791
INVT 2		.803
INVT 3		.722
BT 1	.740	
BT 2	.749	
BT 3	.857	
BT 4	.831	
BT 5	.834	

Loadings above 0.30 are reported.

**Table-5.1b: Factor Analysis Results
Product: Computer**

Items	F1	F2
INVT 1		.649
INVT 2		.812
INVT 3	.374	.746
BT 1	.713	
BT 2	.703	
BT 3	.786	
BT 4	.779	
BT 5	.626	

Loadings above 0.30 are reported.

Table-5.2

Cronbach's coefficient Alpha	
Scales	Alpha Values
Involvement	.713
Brand Trust	.695
Brand Influence Score	.665

5.3: Demographic profile of the respondents

The age of the sample population depicts that 29% of the respondents represented children of 8-10 years, 9% of the respondents represented children of 11-13 years, 35% of the respondents represented children of 14-16 years, 39% of the respondents represented children of 17-19 years. The demographic profile of the children represents that 52 percent of the children were male and 48 percent were female.

The modal family income of majority respondents was ₹ 10 000 – ₹ 30 000, representing 41% of the respondents. 27% of respondents earns ₹ 30 001 – ₹50 000, 17% of respondents earned ₹ 50 001 - ₹70 000 and 15% of the respondents earned ₹ 70, 001 and above.

Children in India have an influence in various product categories, which is used not only for direct consumption but also for the family and household. This creates an impact on decision-making. Children are mostly influenced by products, which are used for their direct consumption. Clothes, food items, games particularly video-games and mobile phones are the main categories. The reason they participate in direct consumption decision making could be due to their interest in that particular product category or it may be due to limited financial resources. Jensen (1995, as cited by Kaur and Singh, 2006), cited that children's influence is maximum, where they play the role of "users" of the product.

5.4. Brand Influence Score of Different Products

Table: 5.3

Brand Influence Score of Different Products

Product	Involvement of Children	Decision Making Role			BIS
		Initiators	Influencers	Accepters	
Vacation Choice	Low- Moderate	8 percent	21 percent	71 percent	39
Computer	Moderate-High	11 percent	58 percent	28 percent	80
Television Set	Low- Moderate	19 percent	24 percent	47 percent	62
Health drink	High	22 percent	61 percent	19 percent	105
Candy	High	46 percent	39 percent	15 percent	131
Apparel	High	48 percent	36 percent	16 percent	142

Considering products of children's own use, 38.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that their children have influence for the purchase of health-drink, while 47.3% agreed that their children had influence on the purchase of health-drink, 7.6% were neutral, and 3.8% disagreed while 2.7% of the respondents strongly disagreed that their children did influence the purchase of health-drink.

26.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that their children had influence for vacation choice, 56.6% of the respondents agreed that their children have some influence in the purchase of vacation choice, 7.6% of the respondents were neutral, 4.9% of the respondents disagreed while 4.9% of the respondents strongly disagreed that their children had some influence on the purchase of vacation choice.

For products which are used by the whole family, 13% of the respondents strongly agreed that their children had influence in a television set/dish Television Set that they took, 50% of the respondents agreed that their children had some influence on television set/dish Television Set, 20.2% of the respondents were neutral, 12.5% disagreed that their children had an influence on vacation while 4.3% strongly disagreed that their children had influence on the television set/dish Television Set that they took.

8.2% of the respondents strongly agreed that their children had some influence on the computer that they bought, 61.4% of the respondents agreed that their children had some influence on the purchase of their computer, 14.1% of the respondents

were neutral, 10.9% of the respondents disagreed that their children had some influence on the purchase of television while 5.4% of the respondents strongly disagreed that their children had some influence on the purchase of a computer.

Table 5.3 reveals the Brand Influence Score of children in purchasing the various selected products on a 5-Point Likert Scale ranging from very high, high, indifferent, low, and very low. Children involvement is high in purchasing the various products like candies, computer, and health drink while their Brand Influence Score is less in purchasing television set, vacation choice etc. Children usually do not wear those clothes which are bought by their parents.

The study carried by Chaudhary and Gupta (2012) found out that children have an influencing role whether the products are for the child's own use like automobile, snacks, clothes, etc or the products are for family use like family vacation or the product is for joint consumption of the household products, children have a very strong power to influence. Children in India have an influence in various product categories, which is used not only for direct consumption but also for the family and household.

The findings also agreed with Belch *et al.*, 1985; Foxman *et al.*, 1989; Jenkins, 1979; Lee and Beatty, 2002, who found out that children's influence seems to vary across product categories. Their findings showed that children gained most influence when it came to products for their own consumption. The findings relate with Nogaard (2007); Chaudhary and Gupta (2012), who concluded that for products that involved significant financial expenditure such as automobiles, Television Set, washing machines, computers and vacations etc., parents would like to take major decisions and limit their child's involvement due to the financial risk associated with these decisions. The past research have revealed that 55% of the respondents felt that their children had some influence at the need recognition stage of family purchase decision making process, 7% of the respondents felt that their children influenced the need recognition of the family purchase decision making process, 27% of the respondents felt that their children influenced the need recognition of the family purchase decision making process, 9% of the respondents

felt that their children influenced the need recognition of the family purchase decision making process while 2% of the respondents never felt that their children influenced the need recognition of the family purchase decision making process. The research study carried out by Kapoor (2001), found out that children (initiator) first expressed the need for personal computers and television but the final purchase was made after consultation with other family members. It has been cited in the past literature of family purchase decision making that 37% of the respondents felt that their children often influence information search stage, 6% of the respondents always felt that their children influenced information search stage, 28% of the respondents are felt that their children sometimes influenced information search stage, 11% of the respondents seldom felt that their children influences information search stage while 18% never felt that their children influenced information search stage. Gotze *et al.* (2009) pointed out that today's teen spent more time with their friends to compare what they have and what was new in the market. Studies revealed that 36% of the respondents felt that their children often had influence at the evaluation of alternatives stage, 12% of the respondents felt that their children always had influence at the evaluation of alternatives stage, 22% of the respondents felt that their children sometimes had influence at the evaluation of alternatives stage, 15% of the respondents felt that their children seldom had influence at the evaluation of alternatives stage while 15% of the felt that their children never had influence at the evaluation of alternatives stage.

Wut and Chou (2009) found that children have more influence in the choice-making stage of decision making and parents still control the final decision, which is consistent with previous research findings (Belch *et al.*, 1985; Moschis and Mitchell, 1986). According to the study, it has been revealed that 28% of the respondents felt that their children often had influence at the purchase decision stage, 6% of the respondents felt that their children always had some influence at the purchase decision stage, 19% of the respondents felt that sometimes their children had influence at the purchase decision stage, 9% were seldom while 38% of the respondents never thought that their children had influence at the purchase decision stage. Belch *et al.*, 1985; Jenkins (1979) found that children do not know

how much to spend but they can make communicative decisions such as model, color, brand, shape and time of purchase (Belch *et al.*, 1985; Darley and Lim, 1986).

5.5: One-Way ANOVA Result

It is important to understand children’s influence with regard to product category as it helps the marketer to devise better strategies for children’s products. Children are expected to have more influence on the products that they use for their direct consumption because of the personal relevance (Foxman, Tansuhaj et al. 1989; Mangleburg 1990; Beatty and Talpade 1994; John 1999). Conversely, children are expected to have less influence in products that are more expensive because parents will want to make these decisions without consideration of the child’s desires. Based on the above discussion the following are presented:

H1: The influence of parents and children for purchase of various products (categories: high-value, low-value, & child-centric) are not same.

Table: 5.4
One-Way ANOVA Result

Product Category		N	Mean	SD	F	Sig
High-value products	Children	181	2.43	0.43	1.368	.213
	Parents	181	2.36	0.70		
	Total	362	2.39	0.58		
Low-value products	Children	181	2.60	0.69	4.648	.012*
	Parents	181	2.75	0.71		
	Total	362	2.68	0.70		
Child-centric products	Children	181	3.72	0.64	4.883	.003*
	Parents	181	3.95	0.54		
	Total	362	3.84	0.61		

Rating scale score close to 1 is parent dominated and close to 5 is child dominated.

The inferences drawn from the above Table are as follows:

- **High value products:** The mean score of children respondents is 2.43 while the parents mean score is 2.13. The ANOVA table shows the F value is 1.368, and the significance value is 0.243. Since it is >0.05, the mean difference existing between parents and children for the purchase of high-value products is not statistically significant at the 5% level. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.
- **Low value products:** The mean score of children respondents is 2.60 while the parents mean score is 2.75.. The ANOVA table shows the F value is 4.648, and the

significance value is 0.012. Since it is <0.05 , the mean difference existing between parents and children for the purchase of low-value products is statistically significant at the 5% level. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

- **Child centric products:** The mean score of children respondents is 3.72 while the parents mean score is 3.95. The ANOVA table shows the F value is 4.883, and the significance value is 0.003. Since it is <0.05 , the mean difference existing between parents and children for the purchase of children-centered products is statistically significant at the 5% level. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

The similar findings have been cited by Belch, Belch et al. 1985; Isler, Popper et al. 1987; Swinyard and Sim 1987; Foxman, Tansuhaj et al. 1989; Mangleburg 1990; Martensen and Gronholdt 2008 that the influence will be less in case of durable products. It has also been revealed from the study of Jenkins 1979; Verma and Kapoor 2003; Bosman 2006 that in the purchase of more expensive durable products children's have less influencing power.

5.6: t- Test Results

A child's age is the most commonly researched variable in research involving purchase decision influence (Mangleburg 1990). The influence that children have on parental purchase decisions appears to increase with age (Ward and Wackman 1972; Atkin 1978; Jenkins 1979; Moschis and Mitchell 1986; Swinyard and Sim 1987; Laczniak and Palan 2004). Atkin (1978) found that parents refuse younger children's requests more often than older children's requests. The gender of the children affects the kind of products they purchase. The research objective is to understand the role of sex and age factors in affecting purchase decision in the context of children's buying behaviour. As children get older, parents feel more confident in their child's decision-making abilities. Therefore it is expected that:

H2: The older the child the more influence the child will have in purchase decisions for all three product categories. This will hold true for both A1A2 & C D Families in the socio-economic class of the society.

Table: 5.5

Child's Age	Mean A1 A2	Mean C D	t-value	Significance Level
8-10	4.69	4.31	2.917	.005
11-13	4.80	4.44	2.740	.008
14-16	4.88	4.43	2.801	.006
17-19	4.23	3.36	3.018	.004

Table:5.6

Child Age/Product Type		Mean A1A2	Mean C D
Age	Product Type		
8-10	Low-value product	4.69	4.31
	High-value product	6.53	6.60
	Child-centric product	4.51	3.40
11-13	Low-value product	4.44	4.80
	High-value product	6.15	6.60
	Child-centric product	3.53	3.10
14-16	Low-value product	4.88	4.43
	High-value product	6.58	6.50
	Child-centric product	3.35	2.97
17-19	Low-value product	5.31	4.47
	High-value product	6.56	6.43
	Child-centric product	5.16	3.47

A t-test was used to test hypotheses two. Support was found for this hypothesis. As can be seen by examining the means more closely, in general, the older the child, the more perceived influence (higher means = more influence). There were differences between the A1A2 and C D scores. Except for the 11-13 year range, C D perceived children to have greater influence in purchase decisions for high-value products in comparison to A1A2 categories. When looking more closely at product categories, A1A2 perceive more influence in the younger ages than do from the C D.

The similar findings have also been reported in Ward and Wackman's (1972) research that parent's yield more to older than younger children's requests for various products. Nelson (1979) showed that younger children have less involvement than older children in choosing restaurants for family meals. Darley and Lim (1986) found that older children in general have more influence than younger children on family

leisure activities (movies, family outings and participant sports). Moschis and Mitchell (1986) found that older children have greater influence in all decision stages.

5.7: Binary Logistic Model

It has been revealed that younger children have less involvement than older children in choosing product for family consumption and hence less brand trust. It is seen that older children in general have more influence than younger children on family leisure activities. Finally, when it comes to influence in decision stages, the older children have greater influence in all decision stages. Marquis Marie (2004) explored that Gender differences were observed in terms of influencing, selecting and purchasing specific products. The results obtained contributed to our knowledge on interpersonal influences on children's consumer behavior and on individual differences in consumer purchase decision making. Jenkins Roger L. (1979) conducted an exploratory study focusing on the relationship between children's influence patterns and various demographic, socio-economic, personality, and attitudinal variables. Hundal (2001) in a study demonstrated the buying behaviour pattern of children living in same city but fall under different social stratification scale of the Amritsar district of Punjab and reported the significance difference in the decision making pattern in the context of family purchase decisions for durables products including refrigerators, televisions, air coolers, and washing machines etc. Family decision making also depends on the family type. Nuclear family would be more open to consider children's opinion on family purchases compared to joint family (Kaur and Singh, 2006; Jain and Bhatt 2004).

Based on the above literature the following hypothesis can be prepared:

H3: The family pattern, age, gender & working status of the parents have more involvement and trust in purchase decisions for different product categories. This will hold true for both A1A2 & C D Families in the socio-economic class of the society.

The results of the logistic regression for different products are as follows:

The results of the Binary Logistic Model for Vacation Choice

Classification Table for Binary Logistic Model

Table: 5.7

Observed Variable		Predicted		
		Age of Children		Percentage Correct
		.00(Children)	1.00 (Teen)	
Age of Children	.00 (Children)	76	7	90.5
	1.00 (Teen)	13	85	85.9
Overall Percentage				88.0

Source: Primary Data through Survey Technique

Variables in the Equation (Using Binary Logistic Model)

Table: 5.8

Vacation Choice	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Involvement	.647	.132	23.943	1	.000	1.909	1.474	2.474
Brand Trust	.701	.133	27.750	1	.000	2.016	1.553	2.617

Note: (a): The value of Chi-square:128.829; df : 2 ; p<.000; (b) Cox & Snell R Square: .505; Nagelkerke R Square: .675

Source: Primary Data using Survey Technique

The results of the logistic regression model clearly demonstrate that in case vacation choice, the age of teens have more influential role in the decision making process, may be because of the availability of sources of information, consciousness. The cognitive abilities of the child play a very vital role in deciding the brand with all sorts of required information. It is believed that the cognitive ability of the child increases with age. Moschis & Moore (1979) in their study established that age was found to a very important determinant for getting information from sources. Teens has a very insignificant role to play. The results are matching with Atkin (1978), who found that older children's have more influence, more dominant role often than younger children's.

The Logit model predicts the group membership to a great level of precision and the misclassification is quite low for vacation choice. It should be noted here that the results obtained are quite satisfactory due to the fact that we have simply chosen the respondents who play significant role in decision making (for the particular product

categories) to be purchased for the consumption of the family. The purpose of this research was to explore children's influence on purchase decisions on selected demographic variables between two segmented age group of children. On the basis of the findings it can be concluded that the age of the children's influence on purchase decision making process for a product like vacation choice. The maximum level of influence have been observed in case of higher aged child, because of information of the products that directly they have compared to the other segmented group. The research findings are supported by the previous studies (Foxman, Tansuhaj et al. 1989; Mangleburg 1990; Beatty & Talpade 1994; John 1999).

These findings are supported by the higher cognitive levels, greater experience as consumers and higher levels of development possessed by older children (Mangleburg 1990). As children get older, parents feel more confident in their child's decision-making abilities. Therefore it is revealed that the older the child the more influence the child will have in purchase decisions for all three product categories. Swinyard, Sim (1993) examined children's influence in selecting a place for vacations and it was reported that older children are perceived as more influential than younger children.

These findings entail focusing on children belong to Kolkata and Delhi metropolis when designing marketing programs for service oriented leisure related products. Special attention should be given to older children as they practice heavier influence on their parents purchasing decisions. Marketing programs must be initiated after targeting the above stated segmented population of children.

Family decision making depends on the family type. Nuclear family would be more open to consider children's opinion on family purchases compared to joint family. The children in the interview data influenced and helped their parents in deciding the colour of the car, deciding the destination of the vacation or making choice of electronic device. Family structural changes, such as more single families and smaller family size (McNeal 1992; Hahlo 1993; Lackman and Lanasa 1993; Gunter and Furnham 1998), also increase the influence children in family purchase decision making process.

The results of the Binary Logistic Model for Computer Classification Table for Binary Logistic Model

Table:5.9

Observed		Predicted		
		Family Type		Percentage Correct
		.00 (Nuclear)	1.00 (Joint)	
Family type	.00 (Nuclear)	78	7	91.8
	1.00 (Joint)	11	85	88.8
Overall Percentage				90.2

Source: Primary Data through Survey Technique

**Table:5.10
Variables in the Equation (Using Binary Logistic Model)**

Computer	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Involvement	.296	.119	6.162	1	.013	1.344	1.064	1.697
Brand Trust	.608	.119	26.230	1	.000	1.837	1.456	2.319

Note: (a): The value of Chi-square:143.697; df : 2; p<.000; (b) Cox & Snell R Square: **.544**; Nagelkerke R Square: **.727**

Source: Primary Data through Survey Technique

The logistic regression model amply demonstrate that for a durable product like computer, the teens have more influential role in the decision making process in comparison to their parents, may be because of use of the product and also the attachment with this type of product helps the children to get more involved with the purchase decision making process. It has also been reported that Family patter/type also plays a significant role in decision making. It has been revealed from the table that children having nuclear family have more say in the family decision making patter. Similar findings have also been reported by Chaudhary and Gupta (2012) that teens from nuclear family have a very significant role to play in decision making process. Our results are also matching with Verma and Kapoor 2003, who found that children’s have more influence, more dominant role to play in case of products like computer, music systems, audio player etc. Our findings are also supported by the previous researches conducted in this area, viz. Nelson (1979), Darley and Lim (1986) & Moschis and Mitchell (1986). It should be noted here that the logit model can classify the group membership to a great level of precision and the misclassification is quite low for the product like computer.

Male child are expected to have more influence on the products that are used for family consumption. The male child is expected to have more influence in products that are more expensive as they get involved with the process of information search and brand selection. Therefore female children’s influence is less with durable products which tend to be more expensive (Isler, Popper et al. 1987; Swinyard and Sim 1987).

The results of the Binary Logistic Model for Television Set Classification Table for Binary Logistic Model

Table:5.11

Observed		Predicted		
		Gender of the Respondents		Percentage Correct
		.00 (Male)	1.00 (Female)	
Gender of the Respondents	.00 (Male)	78	6	92.9
	1.00(Female)	7	89	92.9
Overall Percentage				92.9

Source: Primary Data through Survey Technique

Variables in the Equation (Using Binary Logistic Model)

Table: 5.12

Television Set	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Involvement	.446	.101	19.370	1	.000	1.561	1.280	1.904
Brand Trust	.594	.126	22.058	1	.000	1.811	1.413	2.320

Note: (a):The value of Chi-square: 174.642 ; df : 2 ; p<.000; (b) Cox & Snell R Square: .615; Nagelkerke R Square: .822

Source: Primary Data through Survey Technique

The gender of the children and involvement with the brand in the context of family purchase decision making process plays a vital role. It has been found that involvement of male child in purchase decision making process is very significant and it can be concluded that the gender has significant influence in family purchasing decision making. It has been seen from the above table that the male child are more involved with the product choice like television set than the female child. The similar findings has been projected earlier with different research model (Ezan & Lagier, 2009). The similar findings have also been reported in the past studies explaining children's gender effectiveness in influencing purchase decision (McNeil, 2003).

It has been revealed that the above logistic model can classify respondents based on the gender specification and insignificant level of misclassification for the product like television set leads to explain the greater level of precision in this study. The Brand trust behavior of child has also been observed stating that the male part of the child possess more brand trust behavior and they stick by with those brand where they have more trust. Similar findings have also been reported by Ali and Batra (2011); Atkin (1978); Lee & Collins (1999); McNeal & Yeh (2003), showing the influence of child on family purchase decisions with gender.

Children have more influence over family decision-making when socio-orientation is lower and concept orientation is higher (Geuens, Mast et al. 2002; Moschis and Moore 1979). Laczniaak and Palan (2004) found that children of higher income families where both parents work outside have greater influence on purchase decisions compared to the children of single working parents, who have very little influence.

**The results of the Binary Logistic Model for Health Drink
Classification Table for Binary Logistic Model**

Table: 5.13

Observed		Predicted		
		Working Status of Parents		Percentage Correct
		.00 (Single Working)	1.00(Both Working)	
Working Status of Parents	.00(Single Working)	82	17	83.2
	1.00(Both Working)	19	63	76.8
Overall Percentage				80.3

Source: Primary Data through Survey Technique

Variables in the Equation (Using Binary Logistic Model)

Table: 5.14

Health Drink	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Involvement	.309	.063	24.140	1	.000	1.734	.649	.830
Brand Trust	.443	.096	21.266	1	.000	1.642	.532	.775

Note: (a)The value of Chi-square:86.187 ; df : 2 ; p<.000; (b) Cox & Snell R Square: **.376**; Nagelkerke R Square: .503

Source: Primary Data through Survey Technique

The children influence is analysed using the child centric product health drink. For the product health drink child directly participate in choosing their preferred brand from the market. The working status of parents, as one of very important demographic variable, plays a crucial role to segregate respondents. The child having, both working parents have more power to voice their opinion, stating that they are more involved with brand selection behaviour. It has been revealed that the both parents working family seem to have more influence and are more predominant compared with single parent working family. The children of both parents working family have been voicing their opinion for the purchase of various products directly for their own use as well as family use. In our study, it has been revealed from the above table that the logit model has been able to classify respondents in a better way. The value of Chi-square signify that the overall model is fit with $p < .000$ and t value of Cox & Snell R Square & Nagelkerke R Square shows that both value re not significant which justify the model fit. The similar findings have also been reported in the study of Sunita Kumar in the year of 2012 & Wang, S., B. B. Holloway, et al. (2007), Geuens, Pellemans et al. 2003.

5.8: Multiple Regression Method

Multiple regression analysis have been employed to judge the brand loyalty behaviour of teens in purchasing different product either for their own use or the use of whole family itself, on a 5-Point Likert Scale. The results, using multiple regressive model illustrates that the items like candies, computer, health drink, cloths which has significant effect on involvement of children and the level of involvement is not highly significant for other products like vacation choice and television set, as tested by t-value at 5% significance.

McDougall Jean, Chantrey David (2004) reported that today's teens are much more grown up than previous generations, and this gives lot of opportunities to marketers. Children are found to influence not only the brands they buy for themselves but also expensive family purchases. It has been examined that children are very brand loyal and a few conceptual variable also responsible to measure the degree of brand loyalty.

It has also been outlined in the previous literature that the brand trust and involvement plays a significant role in determining brand loyalty.

The multiple regression results are self explanatory, a few comments are necessary to focus on the regression co-efficient in predicting brand loyalty.

Table: 5.15
Regression Coefficients

Variables		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
Vacation Choice	Involvement	.361	.147	.137	2.452	.017
	Brand Trust	.228	.191	.063	1.191	.238
	Brand Influence Score	.144	.079	.102	1.827	.072

Dependent Variable: Brand (Destination Loyalty) Loyalty,
Note: Adjusted R Square: .499, F: 62.201, P<.000

The choice of vacation falls under the purview of joint decision making where all members of the family finalize the destination after a great deal of deliberations and exchanges of views among themselves. The choice of vacation is obviously non-repetitive in nature for which search for information, risk perception and money at stake are considered to play a pivotal role in selecting a vacation destination. In view of this the level of involvement and pester power of children are found to be significant in predicting loyalty toward a destination. The value of r-square is found to be high and the F value is also significant beyond $p < 0.000$.

Holdert, Antonides (1997) reported that children's influence was higher in the stages of the decision making process- for selecting vacation place but the decisions are mostly be mediated by parents. Thus parental authority holds significance in the purchase decisions. Jenkins Roger L. (1979) cited that children were perceived to exert minimal influence in the following major decision categories: vacation decisions and automobiles. Swinyard, Sim (1993) examined children's influence in selecting a place for vacations and it was reported that older children are perceived as more influential than younger children.

Table: 5.16
Regression Coefficients

Variables		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
Computer	Involvement	1.008	.226	.464	4.450	.000
	Brand Trust	.016	.157	.009	.099	.921
	Brand Influence Score	.136	.087	.129	1.552	.125

Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty

Note: Adjusted R Square 0.517, F: 14.730, P < .000

Similarly, the level of involvement for computer is found to be significantly influencing the loyalty towards a particular brand. Children do not have a significant role in this respect though the coefficient if found to be positive. The involvement construct includes many dimensions like risk, pleasure, importance, sign value and in this context a composite score of involvement has been taken into consideration. The theory posits that highly involved customers have a very smaller number of brand in their consideration set which is developed by considering the attitude toward the brand. For this reason it may be argued that the brand trust has not been found to be significant in this case. The magnitude of r-square is found to be high and the F value is also significant beyond $p < 0.000$.

Table: 5.17
Regression Coefficients

Variables		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
Health Drink	Involvement	.651	.238	.317	2.734	.008
	Brand Trust	.371	.170	.247	2.191	.033
	Brand Influence Score	.235	.097	.282	2.420	.019

Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty

Note: Adjusted R Square: 0.396: F: 7.210, P<.000

As expected, for health drinks all the independents variables are found to be significant in influencing the brand loyalty score. The involvement is found to be highly significant that may be due to the hedonic value associated with the product. It is observed that the trust and brand influence score are also significantly influencing loyalty towards the brand. The brand influence score is high by any standard

indicating extreme loyalty toward a particular brand that lead to adoption. The level of r-square is found to be high and the F value is also significant beyond $p < 0.000$.

Similar findings have also been reported by Gram, M. (2010), showing that children's are highly involved while selecting a brand of health drink for their as well as family consumption. They use to apply a range of negotiation strategies to purchase their preferred brand.

Table: 5.18
Regression Coefficients

Variables		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
Candy	Involvement	.481	.186	.236	2.592	.012
	Brand Trust	.379	.173	.200	2.189	.032
	Brand Influence Score	.418	.072	.533	5.781	.000

Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty

Note: Adjusted R Square: 0.403; F: 13.829, $P < .000$

For different brand of candy, it is observed that all the independent variables are positively associated with level of brand loyalty. The most significant variable is brand influence score that has maximum influence on the brand of candy to be favored. The level of r-square is found to be high and the F value is also significant beyond $p < 0.000$.

Table: 5.19
Regression Coefficients

Variables		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
Apparel	Involvement	.591	.218	.288	2.703	.009
	Bran Trust	.314	.150	.213	2.089	.041
	Brand Influence Score	.369	.089	.439	4.161	.000

Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty

Adjusted R Square: .438; F: 11.157, $P < .000$

Similar observations are also observed in case of apparel where all the independent variables are significant as revealed by the values of 't'. Apparel is socially visible product for which it is expected that involvement, brand trust and brand influence score have a dominant role in predicting the brand loyalty behavior of teens. The level of r-square is found to be high and the F value is also significant beyond $p < 0.000$.

Table: 5.20
Regression Coefficients

Variables		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
Television Set	Involvement	.303	.167	.179	1.819	.013
	Brand Trust	.685	.345	.195	1.988	.051
	Brand Influence Score	.636	.155	.406	4.094	.000

Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty
Adjusted R Square: 0.459; F: 11.085, P<.000

For durable like television set, the children play a dominant role in influencing the brand choice behavior. Regression model has investigated the relationship between brand loyalty behaviour and various independent variables, viz. involvement, brand trust and brand influence score. The level of r-square is found to be high and the F value is also significant beyond $p < 0.000$.

Similar findings have been cited by Chundawat D.S., Gupta Seema (2003) & Hundal (2001). It was found that for television, the demand was initiated and influenced mostly by children. This indicates that children are playing an increasingly important role in purchase decisions of the family, which may be attributed to the sociological changes taking place.

Children are seen influencing insignificantly in family products like holiday/vacations. The similar findings have also been reported by Ahuja and Stinson, 1993; Belch et al., 1985, and by Kaur and Singh, 2006.

5.9: Conclusion

Decision making is a complex process especially when children involve and influence the family purchase decision- making process. The family type, gender, age creates an impact the way children's influence the purchase decision for personal or family use. The research findings suggest that female child have less influences than the boy child to create the maximum impact in the decision making process. Child took interest in shaping the purchase behaviour in various product category and exert their pester power to dominate the decision process. It has been revealed that the product category considered in our study like selecting the vacation destination or making choice of

electronic device like computer or television set or their personal products like candy or health-drink, children have significant role to play. The type of family played a major role in family purchases. The conclusions from this research also indicated that children's participation in decision stages depends on the product category. For an expensive product, children were only involved in information search stage, whereas for an inexpensive product, the children would simultaneously participate in all decision stages.

Due to limited cognitive ability, younger children do not much participate in evaluation stage compared to the elder ones. The communication between the parents and the children in India mainly depends on the family type. In a nuclear family, there is more of concept oriented communication style whereas in a joint family, socio-oriented communication style is observed. However, the younger children in India did not have much say as compared to the older children due to their thinking abilities. In conclusion, children do occupy the centre position in the Indian family where they not only influence in family decision- making but they also act as future customers

The knowledge of family buying roles is important in developing appropriate marketing strategies. The marketer can use this knowledge to identify the family members who play the roles of initiator and influencer for particular products and then develop an appropriate communication strategy targeted at these members to evoke the desired response. Since children tend to influence product decisions that are relevant to them, marketers must appeal to children as much as parents. Furthermore children's involvement with a product category has a positive impact on children's level of influence on family decision making. Therefore marketers could try to identify the types of products that appeal to children. By doing so, they could plan more child-friendly marketing activities, making it easier to connect with the children in order to increase their involvement. The trick is to achieve an effective balance between responsible marketing and effective marketing.

References

- Atkin, Charles K. (1978), "Observation of Parent-Child Interaction in Supermarket Decision-Making," *Journal of Marketing*, 42 (October), 41-5.
- Beatty, S. E. and S. Talpade (1994). Adolescent influence in family decision making: A replication with extension. *The Journal of Consumer Research* 21(2): 332-341.
- Belch, George, Michael A. Belch, and Gayle Ceresino (1985), "Parental and Teenage Influences in Family Decision Making," *Journal of Business Research*, 13 (April), 163-76.
- Belch, M.A. and Willis, L.A. (2001). Family decision at the turn of the century: has the changing structure of households impacted the family decision-making process?. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 2(2), 111-124.
- Berey, Lewis A. and Richard W. Pollay (1968), "The Influencing Role of the Child in Family Decision Making," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 5 (February), 70-2.
- Brody, Gene H., Zolinda Stoneman, Scott Lane and Alice K. Sanders (1981), "Television Food Commercials Aimed at Children, Family Grocery Shopping and Mother-Child Interactions," *Family Relations*, 30, 435-9.
- Carlson, L. and S. Grossbart (1988). Parental style and consumer socialization of children. *The Journal of Consumer Research* 15(1): 77-94.
- Caruana, A. and Vassallo, R. (2003). Children's perception of their influence over purchases: The role of parental communication patterns. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 20(1): 55-66.
- Chaundry, M. and Gupta, A. (2012). Children's Influence in Family Buying Process in India. *Journal of Young Consumers*, 13(2), 161-175.
- Darley, W.F., Lim, J.S. (1986), "Family decision making in leisure time activities: an exploratory investigation of the impact of locus of control, child age influence factor and parental type on perceived child influence", in Lutz, R.J. (Eds), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Association for Consumer Research, Provo, UT, Vol. 13 pp.370-374.
- Davis, H.L., Rigaux, B.P. (1974), "Perception of marital roles in decision processes", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 1 No.1, pp.51-62.
- Flurry, L.A., Veeck, A. (2009), "Children's relative influence in family decision making in urban China", *Journal of Macromarketing*, Vol. 29 No.2, pp.145-259.
- Foxman, Ellen and Patriya Tansuhaj (1988), "Adolescents' and Mothers' Perceptions of Relative Influence in Family Purchase Decisions: Patterns of Agreement and Disagreement," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, M. Houston (ed), 15, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 449-53.
- Foxman, E. R., P. S. Tansuhaj, et al. (1989). Family members' perceptions of adolescents' influence in family decision making. *Journal of Consumer Research* 15(March): 482-491.
- Geuens, M., G. Mast, et al. (2002). Children's influence on family purchase behavior: The role of family structure. *Asia Pacific Advances in Consumer Research* 5: 130-135.

- Geuens, M., P. Pellemans, et al. (2003). How family structure affects parent-child communication about consumption. *Advertising and Marketing to Children* Jan/Mar: 57-62.
- Gram Malene (2010), "Children as co-decision makers in the family? The case of family holidays", *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers*, Vol. 8 Iss: 1, pp.19 – 28.
- Guneri B., Yurt O., Kaplan M.D. and Delen M. (2010), "The Influence of Children on Family Purchasing Decisions in Turkey", *Asian Journal of Marketing*, Vol.4 Iss: 1, pp. 36-48.
- Hundal, B.S. (2001), "*Consumer Behaviour in Rural Market: A Study of Durables*", *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar.
- Isler, L., E. T. Popper, et al. (1987). Children's purchase requests and parental responses from a diary study. *Journal of Advertising Research* 27(Oct-Nov): 28-39.
- Jenkins, R.L. (1979), "The influence of children in family decision making: parents' perceptions", in Wilkie, W.L. (Eds), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Association for Consumer Research, Ann Arbor, MI, Vol. Vol. 6 pp.413-8.
- John, D. R. (1999). Consumer socialization of children: A retrospective look at twenty-five years of research. *Journal of Consumer Research* 26: 183-213.
- Lackman, C. and J. M. Lanasa (1993). Family decision making theory: An overview and assessment. *Psychology & Marketing* 10(2): 81-93.
- Laczniak, R. N. and K. M. Palan (2004). Under the influence: Targeted advertising pinpoints how kids sway parents' buying decisions. *Marketing Research* 16(1): 34-39.
- Martensen, A. and L. Gronholdt (2008). Children's influence on family decision making. *Innovative Marketing* 4(4): 14-22
- Martin, C. A. and A. J. Bush (2000). Do role models influence teenagers' purchase intentions and behavior? *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 17(5): 441-454.
- Mehrotra, Sunil and Sandra Torges (1977), "Determinants of Children's Influence on Mothers' Buying Behavior," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, W. D.Perreault (ed), 4, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 56-60.
- McDougall Jean, Chantrey David (2004), "The making of tomorrow's consumer", *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers*, Vol. 5 Iss: 4, pp.8 – 18.
- McNeal, J.U. and Ji, M. (2003). "Children's visual memory of packaging", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 20, No. 5, pp. 400–427.
- McNeal, J.U. and Yeh, C.H. (1997). "Development of consumer behavior patterns among Chinese children", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 45-59.
- McNeal, J.U. and Yeh, C.H. (2003). "Consumer Behavior of Chinese Children: 1995-2002", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol.20, No. 6, pp. 542-554.
- Moschis, G. P. and L. G. Mitchell (1986). Television advertising and interpersonal influences on teenager's participation in family consumer decisions. *Advances in Consumer Research* 13: 181-186.
- Moschis, G. P. and R. L. Moore (1978b). Determinants of childrens' influence on mothers' buying behavior. *Advances in Consumer Research* 6: 359-363.

- Moschis, G. P. and R. L. Moore (1979a). Decision making among the young: A socialization perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research* 6: 101-112.
- Moschis, G. P. and R. L. Moore (1979b). Family communication and consumer socialization. *Advances in Consumer Research*. W. L. Wilkie, Association for Consumer Research. 6: 757-759.
- Moschis, G. P., R. L. Moore, and R. B. Smith (1984). The impact of family communication on adolescent consumer socialization. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 11: 314-319.
- Moschis, G. P., A. E. Prahasto, and L. G. Mitchell (1986). Family communication influences on the development of consumer behavior: Some additional findings. *Advances in Consumer Research*. R. J. Lutz. Provo, UT, Association for Consumer Research. 13: 365-369.
- Moschis, G.P. (1985), The role of family communication in consumer socialization of children and adolescents. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 11(4), 898-913.
- Moschis, George P. and Linda G. Mitchell (1986), "Television Advertising and Interpersonal Influences on Teenagers' Participation in Family Consumer Decisions," *Advances in Consumer Research*, R. J. Lutz (ed), 13, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 181-6.
- Nelson, James E. (1979), "Children as Information Sources in Family Decision to Eat Out," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, W. L. Wilkie (ed), 6, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 419-23.
- Szybillo, George J. and Arlene K. Sosanie (1977), "Family Decision Making: Husband, Wife and Children," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, W. D. Perreault (ed), 4, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 46-9.
- Swinyard William R., Sim Cheng Peng (1993), "Perception of Children's Influence on Family Decision Processes", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 4 Iss: 1, pp.25 – 38.
- Swinyard, W. R. and C. P. Sim (1987). Perception of children's influence on family decision processes. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 4(winter): 25-38.
- Thomson, E. S., Laing, A. W. and McKee, L. (2007), "Family purchase decision making: Exploring Child Influence Behaviour", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 6 Iss: 4, pp. 182–202.
- Verma, D. P. S. and S. Kapoor (2003). Dimensions of buying roles in family decision making. *Management Review* Dec: 7-14.
- Wang, S., B. B. Holloway, et al. (2007). Adolescent influence in family purchase decisions: An update and cross-national extension. *Journal of Business Research* 60(11): 1117-1124.
- Ward, Scott and Daniel B. Wackman (1972), "Children's Purchase Influence Attempts and Parental Yielding," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9 (November), 316-19.
- Williams, L.A. and Veeck A. (1998), "An Exploratory Study of Children's Purchase Influence in Urban China", *Asia Pacific Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol.3, pp.13-19.
- Wut Tai Ming, Chou Ting-Jui (2009), "Children's influences on family decision making in Hong Kong", *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers*, Vol. 10 Iss: 2, pp.146 – 156.