
Influence of children in family buying process

Dr. Vijita Singh Aggarwal, Professor

Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Dwarka, Email Id- vijitasggarwal@gmail.com

Shefali Khurana, Research Scholar

Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Dwarka, Email Id-ankushefali@gmail.com

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of the study is to find out the influence of children in family purchase decision process for different product categories: Durable products, Non durable and Child related products & services during different buying stages.

Design/methodology: Both primary and secondary research has been conducted. Primary survey was conducted 120 parents of children of age group 6-14 years in Delhi NCR as Delhi being the metropolitan city constitutes a representative market.

Findings: The study revealed the influence of children which was found to be highest for non-durable products at all the three stages of the buying decision process followed by child related products and was lowest for the durable products. Also, it was found that different product categories had variable influence over different stages of the buying decision process.

Practical implications: Marketers are expected to understand the role of children in family buying process. The study will help marketers to design marketing strategies as per the influence of children during different buying stages of buying process.

Keywords: Family buying process, Family purchase decision, Influence of children, durable products, non-durable products, child related products.

Introduction

The influencing role of children in family buying process is gaining importance worldwide. Marketers have nowadays started targeting children because of their own considerable purchasing power of the future consumers. According to YTV kids and tweens report (2008), industry spending on kids is increasing day by day. Children are influencing the lives of their family at a very broad spectrum of purchases ranging from consumables to services to big ticket items.

Children influence their parents through the process of consumer socialisation. Consumer socialization as defined by Ward in 1972 is a "process by which people acquire skills, knowledge, and attitudes relevant to their functioning as consumers in the marketplace". In today's modern market environment children learn consumption related skills and attitudes as they grow up and they use these skills to take the purchase related decisions in the buying process. So, the buying process is focussed on how children have been "socialised to act as consumers" (Kaur and Singh, 2006). After consumer socialisation, children build up their own opinions, tastes

and preferences regarding the purchase of the product (Turner et al., 2006). Previous studies (Dunsing and Hafstrom, 1975; Burns and Granbois, 1980) were focussed on the spouse influence on purchase decision making process of the family. But with the increasing role of children in family decision making, researchers are taking interest in this ignored target market segment.

The concept of influence refers to "children's active and passive attempts to achieve their parents' permission to participate in family decision making thereby achieving specific results" (Norgaard et al., 2007). The influence of children has been studied in different contexts such as in psychology of family (Gianinno & Crittenden, 2005), communication (Moschis & Moore, 1979), consumer behaviour (Su & Wang, 2010), Culture (Shoham & Dalakas, 2005) in the past. Most of the research related to this topic was done in western countries and very few studies have been found in an Indian context. Indian society is very different from the western societies in family structure, behaviour, culture, family type etc. Therefore, there is need to understand the changing role of children on major purchase decisions related to the

family on different product categories and services in an Indian context. The past researches may not be correctly reflecting current influence of children on family purchase decision making.

In the family buying process, there are three different stages: Initiation, search and evaluation and final decision. Children exert different influence on different product categories and at different buying stages of family buying process. As per the research done by (Belch et al (1985) Moschis and Mitchell (1986) Wut & Chou (2009) child has been regarded as initiator whereas (Beatty and Talpade in 1994) (McNeal, 2003) (Chaudhary & Gupta, 2012) concluded that the child not only influence on initiation stage but also at search and evaluation stage. Different authors gave contradictory results. Therefore, the aim of our study is to find out the influence of children in family purchase decision process for different product categories: Durable products, Non durable and Child related products during different buying stages.

Literature review

Research on children as consumers had started way back in 1960s but it was only in 1970s that it gained visibility in the marketing world. Berey & Pollay (1968) was the first to investigate the influence of mother-child interaction for ready to eat breakfast cereals on the purchasing behaviour of mothers. The purchasing behaviour of mother whose child preferred packaged foods is dependent upon the child centeredness and assertiveness whereas it is independent of child demographics such as age, no. of children, no of visits to store alone or with mother etc. Howard and Madrigal (1990) examined that several studies which establish the relative influence of the husband, wife or child which varies according to the type of purchase decision, the stage of the decision-making process; and the family characteristics. (Rose et al 2002) concluded that family communication processes has considerable influence upon consumption of child. (McNeal K. C., 2003) The research examined how Chinese parents of children aged 6-14 years communicate with their children about consumption. He categorised two dimensional family communications i.e. socio-oriented and concept oriented into four categories –Laissez fairer, protective, pluralistic and consensual. Findings indicate that

Chinese parents fall in consensual category with both high socio as well as concept oriented communication. Also different demographics of parents show that higher education levels of parents and families with higher income follows concept oriented communication. (Hsieh, Hiu & Lin, 2006) conducted a research and examined the influence of parents towards the brand attitudes of children and this influence is changing with the family communication patterns between child and parent. Father acts as a gatekeeper who controls the communication in family by maintaining strict rules and regulations.

(Flurry 2007) The research on 1463 American families was carried to identify the changing role of children in family decision-making. Changing family structure and type of product are the major reasons for increased influence of child in family purchase decision making. Parents with greater financial and educational level involve their children to participate and children with greater own Income were found to exert greater influence in the suggestion to

purchase family products. (Al-Zu'bi et al 2008) A study on Jordanian fathers identified the communication structures and patterns and concluded that they implement concept-oriented communication and this type of communication boosts children confidence, self development and evaluation, encourages children to develop consumption related skills, competences and also believes in children decision to buy certain products for the family use which implies that Jordanian children have an influence on their family decision making.

Children influence across product categories and buying stages

When one person acts in such a way as to change the behaviour of another person in some intended manner, influence has occurred (Cartwright 1959). This definition is applicable when the child affects the purchase decisions of their family that is also referred as an influence. Swimyard & Sim (1987) examined the influence of children at all the four stages of purchase decision making by taking 25 products. The results showed that the influence of children is high for both child centred products such as toys, clothing's etc and for child useable products and services such as

entertainment, restaurant etc. According to McNeal (1992) child exerts both direct and indirect influence on parental purchase decision making. (Foxman & Tanushaj, 1988) (Martinez & Polo, 1999) found that the impact of children is different at three stages of buying process namely problem recognition, information search and choice for the products such as child records, pc, toothpaste, clothes etc. (McNeal, 1999) With the changing family structure and life style, children are getting involved in the decision making process. Children are having a remarkable impact on increased number of purchases in product categories such as sneakers, clothes, fast food, snacks, toys, videogames, cereals, soft drinks and so on which shows extended purchase influence of children on the whole family (Lee & Beaty, 2002). The study explained about the varied decisions at different stages of the decision process. (Shoham & Dalakas, 2003) The results revealed that teenage children exert influence over family purchases specifically for the products relevant to them and at the initiation stage. Also comparison between USA teens and Israeli teens found that Israeli teens had higher influence than US teens in family decisions because of low power distance in Israel (Wanga et.al. 2005). The research was done on 240 families on group package tours which revealed the varying role of parents and children during different buying stages. They also concluded that child shows maximum influence in problem recognition and less in information searching and final stage. (Kaur & Singh, 2006) supported the above studies and compare Indian with the western society to reach at the result that sometimes child acts as an initiator and at other times as an influencer. (Norgard et.al. 2007) found that children exerts more influence on all stages of decision making especially on initiation and choice for easy prepared meals, unhealthy foods (sweets) than healthy foods (Fruits & Vegetables) (Thakur & Khatri 2008) A cross cultural investigation was done to study the differences in parenting styles of American and Indian parents. This type of study determined the influence of children on the different levels of buying process and the results indicate that no significant difference exists in two cultures on the basis of creating interest, desire and final decision of buying packaged food products. But the difference lies in the influential behaviour of kids on family buying decision.

American children's influence was lower as compared to Indian children as parental indulgence is more in case of Indian culture (Wut & Chou 2009). A research was conducted in Hong Kong on 366 members of family to determine the children's influence in family decision making in the Chinese context. They concluded that the influence is more at choice making stage and less at final stage. (Chaudary & Gupta, 2012) (Ramzy et.al 2012). The results revealed that the child related products exerts more influence than non durables and durables. Nondurables come at second and durables at the last. Children influence was higher at first two stages and lower in the last stage for different product clusters. (Sharma & Sonwaney, 2014) found the moderating effect of type of product and stage of purchase decision making in family decision making

Objectives of the study

Family as a primary decision making unit plays a considerable role in purchase decision processes of individuals. According to Kotler in 2009 different roles are being performed by the family members i.e. initiator (starts the buying process), influencer (exerts influence on other family members for purchase), information gatherer (collects information), gatekeeper (who controls the flow of information) and decision maker. Different studies showed different results as children play different roles of initiator, influencer, information gatherer, decision maker etc in family purchase decision making (Wang et.al, 2005, Kaur & Singh, 2006 & Chaudhary & Gupta 2012).

- To analyse which product category: durable, non durable and child related is more influenced by children
- To examine the child's influence during different stages of family buying process.

Research methodology

For this study survey method was used, a questionnaire was administered to examine family decision-making process for three product classes and three buying stages. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part included questions on demographics and the second part included questions to check the influence of children on different product categories across three buying decision

stages (initiation, search & evaluation and final decision) in family purchase decision making process. The products in each category (Durable, non durable and child related) were selected from available literature. The total 25 product categories has been selected from the literature review which were segregated into three categories: Durable products (shampoo, toothpaste, TV, Furniture, laptops & computers, cars, clothing & shoes, house, Washing machine, refrigerator), non durables (soft drinks, cereals, snack foods, candies & sweets, fast food, easy to prepare meals) and child related products & services (books, a movie out, family entertainment, vacation, dining out, education, play-stations, bicycles). A tabular form of questionnaire was formulated in which the first part covered demographic profile of respondents (Parents of children of age group 6-12yrs) and the second part was having questions on buying stages in table. The vertical axis in the table has 25 product categories as mentioned above and on the horizontal axis, there are three stages of buying process i.e. Initiation stage, search & evaluation stage and final decision stage and respondents were asked to rank them on the High (3), Medium (2) and low scale (1) in each stage of buying process. Convenience sampling was used to conduct the research. Respondents were the parents of 6-12 years old children and they were asked to consider the eldest children between 6-12 years to fill the questionnaire so as to avoid any confusion. For the sample Delhi NCR was targeted with self administered questions as Delhi being the metropolitan city constitutes a representative market. The sample included 103 parents as respondents.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

For the purpose of data analysis univariate ANOVA test was computed to determine the statistical significance of the hypothesis developed and the results of the analysis are given below:

H1: There is significant difference in children influence for three product categories (nondurable, durable, child's related) in family buying process.

H2: There is significant difference in children influence levels in different family buying process stages (initiation, search and evaluation & final decision)

The data which were collected through questionnaire method was analysed using Univariate ANOVA. First of

all Cronbach's alpha and KMO was calculate the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. The value of Cronbach's alpha was 0.791 which shows that the instrument used in the study is reliable. Then the value of KMO was determined which was 0.701 (Sashikala & Girish, 2015) and it showed that the questionnaire was accepted for the study. The Bartlett's test showed a significant level at .000 which concluded that variables are uncorrelated. Hence, the instrument used for the study is accepted.

To examine the hypothesis one way ANOVA was used to compare the influence of children on product categories across buying stages. The results stated that children's influence in family buying process varies with the product categories for three different buying stages of family buying process. According to the analysis children have highest influence during the purchase of Non durable goods, less influence on child related goods and the least influence on Durable goods. One way ANOVA was applied along with post hoc test in order to compare the influence levels of children across three buying stages of family buying process. One of the Assumption of ANOVA is Homogeneity of variance which is tested by Levene's statistic and found there is no significant difference between the group variances.

The given below tables I, II, III are showing the mean values of three product categories across the buying stages i.e. initiation, search & evaluation, and final decision stage, which are as discussed below.

Children influence on non durable products

As seen from Table I, II, III children have high influence in case of non durable goods (mean=1.34) in initiation stage, (mean=1.384) in search and evaluation stage, (mean=1.398) in final decision stage of family buying process. Non durable goods are those goods which are consumed and used up in relatively short period of time and their total utility is exhausted in a single use (Dwivedi, 2005). These are the products which are directly consumed and used by the children (clothing, foods, cereals, snacks) fall in this category (Desai, 2008) and also cheap products used by children for direct consumption (Foxman et al 1989). Children are nowadays more knowledgeable and technology savvy than their parents. So, they use their knowledge during

search stage of buying process and evaluate the various alternatives of products especially during the purchase of non durable products as these products are directly relevant to them. It is evident from the results that non durable products are heavily influenced by children because these products are inexpensive and children find

no need to consult with their parents for their purchase (Belch at al1985). The findings shows significant differences in means and standard deviation values with F value of 17.356 at initiation stage, 21.132 at search and evaluation stage, and 17.356 at final purchase decision stage. The ANOVA table shows

Table 3 Long term total yield from the date of listing till 25th August 2011

Issuer Company	Issue Price	Adjusted Price	Capital Yield	Dividend Yield	Total Yield
Educomp Solutions Limited	125	1019.00	715.20%	17.84%	733.04%
UTV Software Communications Limited	130	937.55	621.19%	2.69%	623.88%
Emami Limited	70	467.60	568.00%	40.00%	608.00%
Tulip IT Services Limited	120	734.50	512.08%	14.17%	526.25%
Yes Bank Limited	45	267.35	494.11%	5.56%	499.67%
India Infoline Limited	76	364.00	378.95%	73.68%	452.63%
AIA Engineering Limited	315	1673.00	431.11%	14.92%	446.03%
Bombay Rayon Fashions Limited	70	277.85	296.93%	9.71%	306.64%
Shree Renuka Sugars Limited	285	1093.00	283.51%	9.82%	293.33%
Infrastructure Development Finance Company Limited	34	106.90	214.41%	23.24%	237.65%
Amar Remedies Limited	28	91.70	227.50%	7.14%	234.64%
Gateway Distriparks Limited	72	166.44	131.16%	33.51%	164.67%
Everest Kanto Cylinder Limited	160	349.00	118.13%	21.25%	139.38%
ABG Shipyard Limited	185	343.65	85.76%	5.14%	90.89%
Shoppers Stop Limited	238	390.35	64.01%	0.00%	64.01%
Aurionpro Solutions Limited	90	130.00	44.44%	9.00%	53.44%
HT Media Limited	530	728.25	37.41%	1.85%	39.25%
Triveni Engineering & Industries Limited	48	21.25	-55.73%	71.88%	16.15%
Jai Prakash Hydro-Power Limited	32	32.90	2.81%	12.50%	15.31%
IL&FS Investmart Limited	125	29.00	-76.80%	88.40%	11.60%
Provogue (India) Limited	150	141.00	-6.00%	4.73%	-1.27%
Repro India Limited	165	136.35	-17.36%	10.30%	-7.06%
Shringar Cinemas Limited	53	40.45	-23.68%	0.00%	-23.68%
3i Infotech Limited	100	52.20	-47.80%	17.00%	-30.80%
Bartronics India Limited	75	49.50	-34.00%	2.67%	-31.33%
Talbro Automotive Components Limited	102	42.00	-58.82%	13.92%	-44.90%
PVR Limited	225	115.80	-48.53%	2.67%	-45.87%
Bannari Amman Spinning Mills Limited	135	65.80	-51.26%	4.81%	-46.44%
Sasken Communication Technologies Limited	260	100.55	-61.33%	10.77%	-50.56%
Kernex Microsystems (I) Limited	250	103.07	-58.77%	1.48%	-57.29%
Punj Lloyd Limited	700	272.75	-61.04%	0.97%	-60.06%
Gokaldas Exports Limited	425	154.40	-63.67%	2.59%	-61.08%
Suzlon Energy Limited	510	179.25	-64.85%	2.94%	-61.91%
Jet Airways (India) Limited	1100	272.50	-75.23%	1.36%	-73.86%
Allsec Technologies Limited	135	14.30	-89.41%	7.41%	-82.00%
Nectar Lifesciences Limited	240	18.80	-92.17%	4.38%	-87.79%
Prithvi Information Solutions Limited	270	21.40	-92.07%	3.15%	-88.93%
SPL Industries Limited	70	3.20	-95.43%	1.43%	-94.00%
Celebrity Fashions Limited	180	6.85	-96.19%	0.56%	-95.64%

*Piramyd Retail Limited, Shri Ramrupai Balaji Steels Limited not included

significant value .000 in all the three tables which is less than .05. Hence, it can be concluded that there exists

significant difference in three product categories mean influence score. Thus, H1 and H2 are accepted.

Table 1 Showing Children's Influence for Three Product Categories in Initiation Stage

Descriptives								
Initiation								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Non-Durable	103	1.343273	.6101473	.0601196	1.224026	1.462520	.0000	2.5000
Durable	103	.789644	.7070061	.0696634	.651467	.927821	.0000	3.0000
Child Related	103	1.214806	.7890988	.0777522	1.060585	1.369027	.0000	2.7500
Total	309	1.115908	.7424233	.0422350	1.032802	1.199013	.0000	3.0000
ANOVA								
Initiation								
	Sum of Squares		df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		
Between Groups	17.296		2	8.648	17.356	.000		
Within Groups	152.471		306	.498				
Total	169.767		308					

Table II showing Children's Influence for three Product Categories in Search and Evaluation Stage

Descriptives								
Search and Evaluation								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Non-Durable	103	1.3847	.59375	.05850	1.2687	1.5008	.00	2.50
Durable	103	.7767	.70161	.06913	.6396	.9138	.00	2.67
Child Related	103	1.1517	.72880	.07181	1.0093	1.2941	.00	2.75
ANOVA								
Search and Evaluation								
	Sum of Squares		df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		
Between Groups	19.384		6332	9.692	21.132	.000		
Within Groups	140.345		306	.459				

Children influence on durable goods

As seen from table I, II, III, durable goods are least influenced by children at all decision stages of buying process. The mean values are (0.789, 0.776, and 0.769) at initiation, search & evaluation and final purchase decision stage respectively. Durable goods are those whose utility or usefulness is not exhausted in short run use (Dwivedi,2005) such as washing machine, mobiles, clothing and shoes, refrigerator, house etc. The findings are supported by research findings (Mangleberg,1990,Belch.at.al1985,Swimyard &Sim1987, Martensen and gronholdt2008). Durable products are expensive and not directly relevant to children so

because of this reason children are not interested in influencing such purchase decisions. The findings shows significant differences at .05 in mean and standard deviation values with F value of 17.356 at initiation stage,21.132 at search and evaluation stage, and 17.356 at final purchase decision stage. Thus, it is concluded that the influence level of children in the family buying process varies again with respect to different product categories. These products are of directly no use to children and they don't know how much to spend (Belch et.al 1985). The results also showed the least influence of children on these products at all buying process stages.

Table III Showing Children Influence for three Product Categories in Final Purchase Stage

Descriptives								
Final								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Non-Durable	103	1.3981	.58884	.05802	1.2830	1.5131	.00	2.88
Durable	103	.7691	.70388	.06936	.6316	.9067	.00	2.89
Child Related	103	1.1569	.72865	.07180	1.0145	1.2993	.00	2.50
Total	309	1.1080	.72254	.04110	1.0272	1.1889	.00	2.89
ANOVA								
Initiation								
	Sum of Squares		df	Mean Square		F	Sig.	
Between Groups	17.296		2	8.648		17.356	.000	
Within Groups	152.471		306	.498				
Total	169.767		308					

Children influence on child related goods and services

The mean values as shown in Table I indicate that children have comparatively less influence in case of child related goods & services (1.21) than non durable goods (1.34) in initiation stage and this difference is almost same in other stages of buying process.

The result contradicts previous findings of (Ramzy, et.al., 2012) as these products have highest influence in all the stages of buying process. Child related goods & services has considerably less influence because Indian parents are protective and much concerned about children's well being, hence they try various options before making the purchase such as for consumption related dining out, movie out, family entertainment,

education etc. Indian parents want the children to purchase the things which are good in terms of money and value. Thus they keep a watch on consumption of these products so as to stay them away from bad books, vulgar language movies etc. Children have moderate influence having mean values of 1.21 in initiation stage and 1.15 in both search and evaluation and final purchase decision stage. The moderate influence is due to the maximum say of family in these kinds of decisions.

Overall influence of children on product categories across buying stages

As seen in tables IV, V, VI which shows multiple comparisons of different product categories during different stages of the buying process. Tukey's HSD test was applied to find the significant difference among

product categories across buying stages of buying process. The results indicate that there exists a significant difference between non durable and durable category but not between child related goods and services and non durable goods in the initiation stage of buying process. Although significant difference also exists between child related goods and services and durable goods. This is because some products in non durable category are also child related. In search and evaluation stage a significant difference exists among all

the product categories. Because children are nowadays aware of all the media channels i.e. TV, Internet etc. They are in regular exposure of advertisements and online information which is also easily accessible to them. In final stage of buying process, it is also concluded that clear significant difference exists among all the product categories which is less than .05. Overall, influence of children is highest in the initiation stage (1.15) moderate influence in the final purchase decision stage (1.10) and then decreases slightly in search and evaluation stage.

Table IV - Multiple Comparisons Table for Initiation Stage

Initiation Tukey HSD						
(I) grouping	(J) grouping	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Non-Durable	Durable	.5536296*	.0983625	.000	.321969	.785290
	Child Related	.1284674	.0983625	.393	-.103193	.360128
Durable	Non-Durable	-.5536296*	.0983625	.000	-.785290	-.321969
	Child Related	-.4251622*	.0983625	.000	-.656823	-.193501
Child Related	Non-Durable	-.1284674	.0983625	.393	-.360128	-.103193
	Durable	.4251622*	.0983625	.000	.193501	.656823
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

**Table V
Search Stage**

Search Tukey HSD						
(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Non-Durable	Durable	.60801*	.09437	.000	.3858	.8303
	Child Related	.23301*	.09437	.037	.0108	.4553
Durable	Non-Durable	-.60801*	.09437	.000	-.8303	-.3858
	Child Related	-.37500*	.09437	.000	-.5973	-.1527
Child Related	Non-Durable	-.23301*	.09437	.037	-.4553	-.0108
	Durable	.37500*	.09437	.000	.1527	.5973
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

Table VI for Final Stage						
Multiple Comparisons Table						
Final Tukey HSD						
(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Non-Durable	Durable	.62891*	.09427	.000	.4069	.8509
	Child Related	.24116*	.09427	.030	.0191	.4632
Durable	Non-Durable	-.62891*	.09427	.000	-.8509	-.4069
	Child Related	-.38775*	.09427	.000	-.6098	-.1657
Child Related	Non-Durable	-.24116*	.09427	.030	-.4632	-.0191
	Durable	.38775*	.09427	.000	.1657	.6098
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

The results supported the previous findings (MCNeal,2003)(Moschis&Mitchel,1986).They concluded that children exerts highest influence in Problem recognition stage and low influence in other stages for all the product categories(Shoham & Dalakas,2003),(Wut & Chou,2009).

Limitations

Sample size and sampling geographical area is limited to Delhi NCR. However Delhi being the metropolitan city constitutes a representative market. The sampling size was only 103 and the research work was completed in a limited region. Thus, the findings cannot be hold true for other areas as well. The future scope of study includes the effect of demographics, parental style, consumer socialisation agents in Family buying process in the context of different cultures because limited study has been conducted in this area

Conclusion

The results of the research reported that the influence of children in family buying process across three product categories. The possible reason for this could be the changing social trends of fewer children, dual working parents, increased exposure to media and Nuclear families etc (McNeal, 2000). Due to the long working

time of parents, they are not able to spend sufficient time with their children; hence they feel guilty for this. To overcome this guilt, they become highly involved and concerned about their children's taste and preferences. So, they are open to their children and generally consult them before making a buying decision specially in case of Non durable products such as soft drinks, snack foods etc. This is because children can easily buy these products with their pocket money as they are inexpensive. They find no need to consult about these products with their children. After non durable products children exert moderate influence on child related products and services and the least influence on durable products .The least influence is because durable products are expensive and not directly relevant to the children. Hence, Parents would like to limit their children involvement in purchase due to the financials associated with these purchase decisions. The results also showed that out of three buying stages (initiation, search & evaluation and final) influence of non durable products are found to be highest in initiation which is followed by child related and durable products . Durable products scored less in each stage which concludes that children exerts very less influence in family buying process on durable products (Verma & Kapoor, 2003). In search and evaluation stage child related products and services has more influence than in any other stage of buying process. Overall Children influence has highest

in initiation stage and declines in search and final stage(Belch, Belch, & Ceresino, 1985)(Nørgaard, Bruns, & Christensen, 2007).

Managerial implications

The study will help marketers to design marketing strategies as per the influence of children during different buying stages of buying process. Special attention should be given to non durable product category which children like to influence more .As findings suggest that children exert maximum influence in initiation stage, so marketers should frame such promotion policies to make children aware and informed about the product. Marketers should use specific kind of media for specific product category as per the requirement. They should focus more on promotional campaigns such as on duration, reach and frequency of advertisements and also on the kind of ads that grabs an attention of children. Marketers should persuade the parents rather than children to buy durable products by choosing special pricing strategies as these products are influenced less by children .Child related products and services have moderate influence so marketers should make such policies to engage both parents and children in family buying process in taking collective decisions.

References

1. Al-Zu'bi, A., Crowther, G., & Worsdale, G. (2008). Jordanian childrens perception of athers communication struct ures . *Young consumers* , 265-281.
2. Beatty, & Lee, C. K. (2002). Family structure and influence in family decision making. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* , 24-41.
3. Belch, Belch, & Ceresino, G. (1985). Parental and teenage child influences in. *Journal of Business research* , 163-176.
4. Berey, L. A., & Pollay, R. W. (1968). The Influencing Role of the Child in Family Decision Making. *Journal of Marketing Research* , 70-72.
5. Burns, & Granbois. (1980). Advancing the study of family purchase decision making. *Advances in Consumer Research* , 221-226.
6. C J Su, S. W. (2010). Across-cultural study of East Asian adolescents influence. *Journal of global business technology* , 52-67.
7. Chaudhary, M., & Gupta, A. (2012). Children's influence in family buying process in India. *Young Consumers* , 161-175.
8. Chaudhary, M., Medury, Y., & Gupta, A. (2012). Child's Use Of Pester Power In India. *Indian Streams Research Journal*.
9. D.Cartwright. (1959). Studies in social power. England: oxford.
10. D.P.S Verma. & S. Kapoor. (2003). Dimensions of buying roles in family decision making. . *Management Review* .
11. Dalakas, A. S. (2003). Family consumer decision making in Israel: the role of teens and parents. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* , 238 - 251.
12. Desai, T. (2008). Children's influence on family purchase decision in India.
13. Dunsing, M., & J.L.Hafstrom. (1975). Methodological considerations in family decision-making. *Advances in Consumer research* , 103-111.
14. Dwivedi, D. N. (2005). Macroeconomics: Theory and Policy. Tata McGraw-Hill Education.
15. Flurry, L. A. (2007). Children's influence in family decision-making: Examining the impact of the changing American family. *Journal of Business Research* , 322-330.
16. Foxman, E. R., Tansuhaj, P., & Ekstrom. (1989). Family members perception of adolscent's influence in family decision making. *Journal of cosumer research* , 482-491.
17. Gianinno, & Crittenden. (2005). Assessing Shared Understanding of Economic Exchange Among Children and Adults. *Psychology & Marketing* , 551-576.
18. Howard, D., & Madrigal, R. (1990). Who makes the decision: The parent or the child? the percieved influence of parents and children on the purchase of recreation services. *Journal of leisure research* .
19. Hsieh, Y.-C., Chiu, H.-C., & Lin, C.-C. (2006). Family communication and parental influence on children's brand attitudes. *Journal of Business Research* , 1079-1086.
20. Kaur, P., & Singh, R. (2006). Children family decision making in India and West: A review. *Academy of Marketing Science Review* .
21. Kotler, P., & Keller, K. K. (2009). *Marketing Management*. Pearson Prentice Hall.

22. Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2011). Marketing Management. Pearson publishers.
23. Mahima, S. T., & Puja, K. (2008). Relationship between Parental Overindulgence and. *Seoul Journal of Business*.
24. Mangleburg, T. F. (1990). Children's Influence in Purchase Decisions: a Review and Critique. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 813-825.
25. Martensen, A., & Grønholdt, L. (2008). Children's influence on family decision making. *Innovative Marketing*, 4(4).
26. Martinez, E., & Polo, Y. (1999). Determining factors in family purchasing behaviour: An empirical investigation. *Journal of consumer Marketing*, 461-481.
27. McNeal, J. U., & F.Ji, M. (1999). Chinese children as consumers:an analysis of their new product. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 345-364.
28. McNeal, J. U., & Yeh, C.-H. (1997). Development of consumerbehavior patternsamong chinese children. *JOURNAL OF CONSUMER MARKETING*, 45-59.
29. McNeal, K. C. (2003). Parent-child communications about consumption and advertising in China. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 317 - 334.
30. Mitchell, M. G. (1986). Television Advertising and Interpersonal Influences. *Advances in Consumer research*, 1981-1986.
31. Moschis. (1987). consumer socialisation:A lifestyle perspective. Lexington books.
32. Moschis, G., & Moore, a. R. (1979). Decision making among the young: A socialization perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 101-112.
33. Norgaard, M., Christensen, K. B., & Mikkelsen. (2007). Children'sinfluence on and participation in the family decision process during food buying. *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers*, 197-206.
34. Poulton, T. (2008). Kidfluence on family spending strong:YTV Tween report. Retrieved from www.corusent.com.
35. Ramzy, O., Ogden, D. T., Ogden, J. R., & Zakaria, M. Y. (2012). Perceptions of Children's Influence on Purchase Decisions;Empirical Investigation for the U.S. and Egyptian Families. *World Journal of Management*, 30-50.
36. Rose, G. M., Boushb, D., & Shoham, A. (2002). Family communication and children's purchasing influence:a cross-national examination. *Journal of Business Research*, 867-873.
37. Rose, G. M., Bush, V. D., & Kahle, L. (1998). The Influence of Family CommunicationPatterns on Parental Reactions toward Advertising: A Cross-National Examination. *Journal ofAdvertising*, 71-85.
38. S.Beatty, & S.Talpade. (1994). Adolescent influence in family decision making: a replication with extension. *Journal of consumer research*, 332-334.
39. S.Ward, & D.Wackman. (1972). Ward, S., & Wackman, D. (1972). Children's Purchase Influence Attempts and Parental Yielding. *Marketing Research*.
40. Sashikala, & Girish. (20125). Factors Influencing Retail Investor's Trading Behavior in Indian equity market. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 10(11), 206-211.
41. Sharmaa, A., & Sonwaney, V. (2014). Theoretical modeling of influence of children on family purchase decision taking. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 38-46.
42. Shoham, A., & Dalakas, V. (2003). Family consumer decision making in Israel:the role of teens &parents. *Journal of consumer Marketing*, 238-251.
43. Shoham, A., & Dalakas, V. (2005). He said, she said . . . they said: parents' and. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 152-160.
44. Swinyard, W. R., & Sim, C. P. (1987). PERCEPTION OF CHILDREN'S INFLUENCE ON FAMILY DECISION PROCESSES. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25-38.
45. turner, Kelly, J., & McKenna, K. (2006). Food for thought:Parents perspectives of child influence. *British food journal*, 181-191.
46. Wang, K.-C., Hsiehb, A.-T., Yehc, Y.-C., & Tsaid, C.-W. (2005). Who is the decision-maker: the parents or the child in group package tours? *Tourism Management*, 183-194.
47. Wut, T. M., & Chou, T.-J. (2009). Children's influences on family decision making in Hong Kong. *Young Consumers*, 146-156.

