

# A STUDY ON DECISION MAKING OF PARENTS' PURCHASING BEHAVIOUR AND CHILDREN INFLUENCE

<sup>1</sup>Ms.S.A.Narmatha, <sup>2</sup>Dr.N.Bharathi

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, <sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor

<sup>1</sup>Department of Commerce,

<sup>1</sup>Chikkanna Government Arts College, Tirupur, India

**Abstract :** The study is an effort to analyse the purchasing behavior of the parents influenced by their children. As today's world seems to travel with media in all the aspects, there is a great impact from infants to old age. As kids are the always found to be special in a family, parents give more priority to fulfill their wishes. Taking this an advantage marketer play a vital role in attracting the kids through various advertisements and complements. Considering above circumstance, the study analyse the decision making factors that influence the purchasing behavior. The primary data has been collected through a structured questionnaire and respective statistical tools have been applied further and the results reveal the impact of socio economic factors with decision making factors.

**IndexTerms - Parents, children, purchase behavior.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Childhood is the time for nurturing, schooling, time to play and explore the opportunity to grow both emotionally and physically. Children today, vary from the past generation, especially who are between the age group of 07-12 years. In the current era children are found with smarter attitude because of advanced technology in the environment. This nature and culture among the children has the great impact on decision making in all the aspects, particularly in purchasing a product available in the market. For few products, they are information seekers, active initiators and buyers, whereas for other categories of product, they influence the parents' purchase behaviour. Today children have more autonomy and power in decision making within the family and are vocal about what the parents should buy for them. The exposure to advertisements shows the influences on children's preferences, choices and requests for the advertised products which have led to unhealthy food habits due to 'hedonic hunger' induced by these advertisements that targets children. Children are unable to understand the intention behind advertisements, instinctively trapped and susceptible to health problems. Considering the above discussed aspects, the study is an effort to analyse the factors that manipulate the family's purchase choice and child's influence in family buying deeds on various products.

## II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study focuses on the following objectives:

- To assess the Socio economic profile of the respondents in the study.
- To examine the factors that influence the purchase decision and child's influence in family buying behaviour for different product categories.

## III. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Marketers pay special attention to children as they are the most vulnerable audiences because they enjoy advertisement the most. Marketers are making every effort to develop the brand loyalty at younger age and retain the children as future consumers. Advertisers and marketers plant the seeds of brand recognition in very young children, in the hope that the seeds will grow into life time relationship. In this context, an attempt has been made to study the personal profile of the parents and their decision making factors through children influences. The results that materialize from the study would endow a scope for awareness in decision making and purchasing behavior of the parents even there is high influence by the children in purchasing the products.

## IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The size of the sample for the study have been taken as 400 parents of the students (2<sup>nd</sup> -6<sup>th</sup> standard, i.e., age group of 7 - 12 years) studying in private schools (Matriculation syllabus) at Tirupur District, by employing convenience sampling technique.

## V. TOOLS USED FOR THE STUDY

The following are relevant statistical tools applied to analyze the objectives of the present study.

- Percentage Analysis
- Mean
- Standard Deviation
- ANOVA
- T-test

**VI. REVIEW OF LITERATURE: Moschis George P. (1985)** has discussed the theoretical concepts of consumer socialization. The study is an attempt that explains the family influences of the buying behaviour of customer with various factors responsible for the purchase decisions. The author has concentrated on 197 propositions on the consumer socialization. The results reveal that 14 propositions were only on the family influences, 19 propositions of peer influences, 37 propositions of mass media influences, 14 propositions of effect of other socializing agents, 38 propositions of effect of age and life cycle and 17 propositions of cultural factors along with a number of other factor propositions has great impact on purchasing behaviour. **Ekstrom, Tansuhaj and Foxman (1987)** has taken a reciprocal view of consumer socialization of children and proposed that children contribute to decision outcome through routes – one by influencing their parents by direct expression of preferences and second by communicating new knowledge to the parents and influencing purchases. The study reveals that children whose family communication pattern is characterized by a high concept–orientation influence (socialize) their parents more than children whose family communication pattern is characterized by a high socio-orientation. A child having greater influence for product purchase decisions has high product knowledge which influences the parent purchase decision. **Palan and Wilkes (1997)** has conducted an adolescent parent interaction in family decision-making and concluded that younger children are more interested and repeatedly ask for products, whereas adolescents are more likely to use a variety of influence strategies. It is through this interaction that adolescents attempt to influence decision outcomes. Adolescents do influence family decisions and that this influence may vary across different factors. **Dobhal Shailesh (1999)** has explained the changing role of children for the buying decisions in different product categories. The study also states that children act as an influencers / co-deciders for personal products, for vacations and for consumables. **Kaur and Singh (2006)** in their article have observed that children are individually active in initiating the idea to purchase a durable. In other stages of the decision making process, they exhibit joint influence along with other members of the family. This implies that they provide support to the member exerting influence to increase pressure but do not wield much influence individually. **Ogba and Johnson (2010)** in their article examined the current shifts in food trends have led to changes from normal day to day food marketing to a focus on healthy food products in United Kingdom. The study has focused on major issue of children’s health. The study reveals that the products found with bright color packaging, shapes, free gifts and other complements has high influence on purchase decision making. **Anu and Aswathy (2014) in their article have** investigated about how television advertisements influence in purchase decision of FMCG. The results states that around 30 per cent of the respondents were strongly influenced by TV ads in their purchase decision and 29 per cent opined that advertising as “Time Saver in Decision Making”. It was also observed that 80 per cent respondents agreed that TV ads provide product choices and 60 per cent agreed that TV ads disclose vital features of the product. The authors have concluded that TV ads on FMCG had influenced on the purchase decision making of the respondents. **Naveen and Sanjeev (2017)** have stated that Advertisement is a tool to introduce brand to people. The authors have also stated that TV ads provide details about the features and benefits of the products which have an impact on TV viewers and their purchase behavior.

## V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the analysis are presented in the following tables.

### Socio economic profile

Table 1 presents the Socio economic profile of the respondents in the study.

**Table 1 Socio economic profile of the respondents**

Socio economic profile	Classification	No. of respondents	Per cent
Relationship	Mother	196	49.0
	Father	204	51.0
Age	25-30 yrs	49	12.3
	31-35 yrs	115	28.7
	36-40 yrs	159	39.8
	Above 40 yrs	77	19.3
Education	High School & equivalent	109	27.3
	Graduate	141	35.3
	Post-Graduate	93	23.3
	Professional Degree	57	14.2
Family status	Single Parent	14	3.5
	Dual Parent	386	96.5
Type of family	Joint	109	27.3
	Nuclear	291	72.8
Employment status	Both Mother and Father are employed	170	42.5
	Only Father is employed	218	54.5
	Only Mother is employed	12	3.0
Monthly Income	Less than Rs.25000	52	13.0
	Rs.25000 to Rs.50000	147	36.8
	Rs.50001 to Rs.75000	109	27.3
	Rs.75001 to Rs.100000	71	17.8
	More than Rs.100000	21	5.3

Source: Primary Data

Table1 has described the Socio economic profile of the respondents. 51 per cent of the respondents are fathers of the students. 39.8 per cent are between the age group of 36 – 40 years and 35.3 per cent are graduates. With respect to the family status 96.5 per cent have dual parents status and 72.8 per cent are from nuclear family. 54.5 per cent of the respondents have reported that only father is employed in the family and 36.8 per cent have the family income between Rs.25000 to Rs.50000.

### Decision Making Factors

Table 2 reveals the mean value of decision making factors in purchase behavior of the respondents.

**Table2. Decision Making Factors - Descriptive Statistics**

Decision Making factors	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D
I am happy to take my child shopping with me	400	1.00	5.00	4.29	.80
I feel comfortable in taking my children for shopping purchases	400	1.00	5.00	4.09	.83
Children help me in purchase decision making	400	1.00	5.00	3.92	.95
Children are good decision makers in purchases	400	1.00	5.00	3.52	1.08
Children always interrupt and influence in purchase decisions	400	1.00	5.00	3.74	1.12
Children make their own purchase decision in their related choice of product	400	1.00	5.00	3.87	.95
I take my child's preferences into consideration when I go food shopping.	400	1.00	5.00	3.78	.89
I sometimes buy the products my child requests in order to avoid conflict.	400	1.00	5.00	3.76	.96
I only buy the products that my child requests if they are high in nutritional value.	400	1.00	5.00	3.96	.95

Table 2 describes the mean value for various decision making factors. The highest mean score has been found for the statement "I am happy to take my child shopping with me" (4.29), followed by "I feel comfortable in taking my children for shopping purchases" (4.09), "I only buy the products that my child requests if they are high in nutritional value" (3.96) and "Children help me in purchase decision making" (3.92). The least score has been found for the statement "Children are good decision makers in purchases" (3.52).

### Socio economic profile and Decision Making Factors- A Relationship

The decision making score was calculated by adding the ratings given by the respondents to items given in the scale explained above. The total score represents the decision making score of the respondents in favour of their children. The mean scores were found for selected socio economic variables of the respondents which are given below.

**Table 3. Decision making scores by socio economic profile of the respondents.**

		Decision Making Score		
		Mean	S.D	No.
Relationship with student	Mother	34.45	5.06	196
	Father	35.39	5.11	204
Age of the respondent	25-30 yrs	32.57	5.13	49
	31-35 yrs	34.45	5.04	115
	36-40 yrs	35.28	4.65	159
	Above 40 yrs	36.43	5.51	77
Highest level of education of the respondent	High School & equivalent	35.78	5.48	109
	Graduate	34.84	4.92	141
	Post-Graduate	34.09	5.09	93
	Professional Degree	34.91	4.69	57
Family Status	Single Parent	35.50	5.20	14
	Dual Parent	34.91	5.10	386
Type of Family	Joint	34.81	4.75	109
	Nuclear	34.98	5.23	291
Employment Status of the Respondent Family	Both Mother and Father are employed	34.81	5.40	170
	Only Father is employed	35.06	4.78	218
	Only Mother is employed	34.33	6.71	12
Monthly Income of the Family	Less than Rs.25000	35.00	5.88	52
	Rs.25000 to Rs.50000	35.24	4.87	147
	Rs.50001 to Rs.75000	34.71	5.28	109
	Rs.75001 to Rs.100000	34.14	4.97	71
	More than Rs.100000	36.43	3.91	21
Total		34.93	5.10	400

The mean decision making score is higher for fathers (35.39) compared to mothers (34.45). That is fathers make the decision making more in favour of their children compared to mothers. While comparing different age groups it was found that above respondents in the age group 40 years have higher mean score (36.43) compared to other age groups. Respondents with the educational qualification of high school or equivalent have higher mean score (35.78) compared to other educational groups.

Respondents in joint or nuclear type of family have more or less similar mean scores. The mean score of respondents in the group 'Only Father employed' have mean score of 35.06 which is higher than other occupational status of the parents. Respondents having monthly income more than Rs.100000 have higher mean decision making score (36.43) compared to other income groups. T -test and ANOVA have been applied to find significant difference between the groups of independent variables such as relationship of the respondents with the students, family status and type of family with decision making factors.

**Ho:** "The decision making scores do not differ significantly among the groups of relationship with the student, Family Status and Type of Family".

**Table4 T-test comparing the decision making scores among socio economic Profile of respondents**

Socio economic profile	t	df	Sig.
Relationship	1.854	398	Ns
Family status	0.425	398	Ns
Type of family	0.294	398	Ns

Ns – Not Significant.

The T-test results indicate that among the Socio economic profile, namely, relationship of the respondents with the students, family status and type of family do not have significant relationship with decision making factors for purchasing the products influenced by children. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

#### ANOVA

One way ANOVA has been applied to find significant difference between the groups independent variables such as age, education, employment status and monthly income with decision making factors.

**Ho:** "The mean decision making scores do not differ significantly among the groups of demographic profile of the respondents namely, Age, Education, Employment Status and Monthly income".

**Table 4. ANOVA comparing the decision making scores among Socio economic profile of the respondents.**

Socio economic profile		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Age	Between Groups	490.872	3	163.624	6.551	**
	With in Groups	9891.168	396	24.978		
	Total	10382.040	399			
Education	Between Groups	146.203	3	48.734	1.885	Ns
	With in Groups	10235.837	396	25.848		
	Total	10382.040	399			
Employment status	Between Groups	10.554	2	5.277	.202	Ns
	With in Groups	10371.486	397	26.125		
	Total	10382.040	399			
Monthly Income	Between Groups	111.033	4	27.758	1.068	Ns
	With in Groups	10271.007	395	26.003		
	Total	10382.040	399			

\*\* Significant @ 1 per cent level, Ns – Not Significant.

Table 4 reveals the results of ANOVA. The hypothesis has been rejected in the case of age of the respondents as there is a significant relationship between the age and decision making factors. The other Socio economic profile factors, namely, education, employment status and monthly income do not have significant relationship with the decision making factors, hence the null hypothesis has been rejected with respect to age only.

#### Findings

Based on the inference made, the findings and suitable suggestions are given below:

- The respondents are happy and comfortable to take their children for purchasing the products.
- The respondents buy the products on request of the children which is of high nutritional benefits, means that even children influence the parents to buy the products due to attraction of advertisement and other sources parents stick on to the healthy products.

- It is interesting to note that Socio economic profile of the respondents other than age do not have any impact on decision making and purchase behavior which shows that to maintain a decorum parents listen to the children in purchasing a product (avoid conflict).

## VI.CONCLUSION

In today's savvy marketers, every child represents a new chance to build cradle-to-grave brand loyalty. There are various problems caused by television advertisements on the health issues, both physiological and psychological, in children and to suggest measures to overcome these health problems for a society of healthy children in future. Marketers pay special attention to children as they are most vulnerable audiences of the society because they enjoy advertisements to the maximum. A child makes his first brand and category choice in school canteen, when he is hardly four or five years, makes it clear the impact of TV advertisement on brand recognition of children. Children initially take advertisement as entertainment and being innocent and gullible; force their parents for product purchase. Parents today are willing to buy much more for their kids due to high socio economic factors, such as smaller family size, dual incomes and postponing children until later in life. All this mean that families have more disposable income. Also, a snide guilt plays a role in spending decisions as time-stressed parents try to substitute material goods for less time spent with their kids. Moreover, due to the fact that children's personal spending is also on rise, marketers are showing great interest in this segment. It could be concluded that children are attracted towards poppy advertisements and influence their parents' purchase behavior.

## REFERENCE

- George P. Moschis and Ruth B. Smith (1985) ,"Consumer Socialization: Origins, Trends and Directions For Future Research", *Historical Perspective in Consumer Research: National and International Perspectives*, 275-281.
- Karin M. Ekstrom, Patriya S. Tansuhaj, and Ellen R. Foxman (1987) ,"Children's Influence in Family Decisions and Consumer Socialization: a Reciprocal View", *Advances in Consumer Research* (14), 283-288.
- Kay M. Palan and Robert E. Wilkes (1997), *Adolescent-Parent Interaction in Family Decision Making*, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24(2),159-69.
- Dhobhal,Shailesh(1999),“NufgenMarketingorSellingtotheNewUrbanFamily”, *BusinessToday*, 66-81.
- Pavleen Kaur and Raghbir Singh (2006),”Children in Family Purchase Decision Making in India and the West: A Review”,*Academy of Marketing Science Review* ,Volume No. 8 Available: <http://www.amsreview.org/article/kaur08-2006.pdf>
- Ogba, Ike and Johnson, Rebecca (2010), “How Packaging Affects the Product Preferences of Children and the Buyer Behaviour of their Parents in the Food Industry”. *YoungConsumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers*, 11 (1),77-89.
- Anu P Mathew, Aswathy S (2014), “Influence of Television advertising on purchasing decision making of FMCG-A study on Hindustan Unilever Limited”, *International Journal of Commerce, Business And Management (IJCBM)*, Vol.3(5).
- Naveen. V& Dr. Sanjeev Padashetty, *Effects of Television Ads in Purchase Decision: A Literature Review*, *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (IJIR)* Vol-3(3), 417 – 420.