This chapter deals with the analysis of primary data which was collected for the study for five different products viz. refrigerator, television, two-wheeler, music system, four-wheeler and electric mixer. So as to present a clear picture, the results have been arranged both in tabular and graphical format for each of the product under study.

The analysis has been carried out in terms of the observed differences in case of two major types of families i.e. single earning families (SEF) and dual earning families (DEF) for each product.

The analysis for each product has been divided into two sections. The first section deals with the different stages of the purchase decision process viz. idea initiation, information collection and final decision. The relative involvement of the various family members has been collapsed into six distinct categories and the families have been classified accordingly into:

1. Joint Decision Family (H=W=C)
2. Husband Dominant Family
3. Wife Dominant Family
4. Husband & Wife Dominant Family (H=W>Children)
5. Parent Dominant Family (H/W & Children>Other Spouse)
6. Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents)

(Product-wise analysis has been carried out for each of the decision stages on the basis of these six family types.)
The second section deals with the sub-decisions for each of the product under study. In general six sub-decisions (with minor modifications depending on the nature of the product) viz. amount to be spent, when to purchase, brand to purchase, what size, what colour and from which dealer (vendor) have been considered for the purpose of analysis.

Chi-square analysis has been performed to find out the differences among the various types of families in terms of the various stages of the decision process as well as the sub-decisions related to each of the product.

4.1 Involvement of Family Members in Refrigerator Purchase

I (A): Stages in Decision Making Process

1.1) Idea Initiation Stage [Table 4.1 (a) & Fig. 4.1.11]

1. Joint Decision Family (H=W=C): In case of single earning families, joint decision making pattern was found to be prevalent in just 4% of the families while in case of dual earning families this figure was 5%. This is indicative of the fact that refrigerator is basically a product of interest to females and thus all the family members are not expected to be equally involved during this stage.

2. Husband Dominant Family: Husband dominance in case of single earning families (30.33%) was quite high while for dual earning families there was a dramatic drop in the reported instances (7.46%) i.e there is definitely less of husband dominance during the idea initiation stage in case of dual earning families for refrigerator. The significant $\chi^2$ statistic further supports this contention.

3. Wife Dominant Family: Interestingly, wife maintains her dominance at the idea initiation stage in case of refrigerator. Wife dominance was observed in 26.96% of the single earning and 26.80% of the dual earning families.

4. Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children): In case of the dual earning families there is a striking shift vis-à-vis the role played by both the partners in comparison to that of the children (i.e. H=W>C). In just 26% of the single earning families
Table 4.1(a): Involvement of Family Members in Different Stages of Refrigerator Purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages in Purchasing</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Level of Influence</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>WD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Collection</td>
<td>Single Earning Family</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Single Earning Family</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a = \) Significant at 99\% level of confidence (df=5 & \( p=4.26E-08 \); df=5 & \( p=0.0044 \))

\( b = \) Significant at 95\% level of confidence (df=5 & \( p=0.0131 \))
Fig 4.1.11: Family Involvement in Idea Initiation (Refrigerator)

Fig 4.1.12: Family Involvement in Information Collection (Refrigerator)

Fig 4.1.13: Family Involvement in Final Decision (Refrigerator)
there was equality in roles of husbands and wives while this figure nearly doubled to 44.7% in case of dual earning families. If we see this shift in the light of waning husband dominance in case of dual earning families we can safely surmise that it is the wife who has apportioned a greater share of the decision making role. This is indicative of her growing clout in the family, perhaps because she herself is one of the contributors to common family ‘income pot’.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** The instances of husband/wife coalition formation with the children were found to be quite low (SEF=10.11% & DEF=13.43%). This perhaps can be explained in the light of growing clout of wife in dual earning families. With the husband surrendering his dominance and her role being greater acknowledged, perhaps there is no need for her to look to children as collaborators at the idea initiation stage for the product.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** In comparison to parents the children were found to be playing an insignificant role at this stage in case of refrigerator (SEF=2.24% and DEF=1.49%). Again the slight drop can be explained from the point of view of growing clout of the wife and she edging out children in the process.

The analysis above (section 1.1) and the high $\chi^2$ value of 14.424(df=5, $p=0.0131$) comprehensively establishes that there exists a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in idea initiation stage for refrigerator. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{011}$ stands rejected.

### 1.2) Information Collection Stage [Table 4.1(a) & Fig. 4.1.12]

At the aggregate level, the abnormally high value of $\chi^2$ (42.69; df=5, $p=4.2E-8$) is indicative of significant variation between the two types of families during the information collection stage. But it will be worthwhile to analyse these differences vis-a-vis the involvement of various family members.

1. **Joint Decision Family (H=W=C):** In case of single earning families there is a minor but perceptible shift in the direction of joint family decision making.
2. **Husband Dominant Family**: There is three-fold reduction in the influence wielded by the male bread earner in case of dual earning families. This is indicative of the onset of decline in the influence wielded by the husband.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: The excessive influence wielded by husbands in single earning families is a clear indicator of the subdued role of housewife during this stage. But in case of dual earning families the female seems to be striking back with a vengeance and in 23% of the families the wife held sway.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**: The trend established during the idea initiation phase seems to continue during this phase, though the level of parental egalitarianism as compared to the idea initiation stage seems to be less.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse)**: In case of SEF, parent children coalitions were found to exist in 24% of the families while this value dropped to 12% in case of dual earning families. This drop can largely be explained in the light of significantly higher number of families reporting wife dominance. Thus, it can be inferred that in single earning families it is the wife who must have been the parent acting in association with the children in collecting relevant information about refrigerator.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents)**: There is a definite decline in the role played by the children during this phase. Just 3% of the dual earning families reported instances of children dominance in information collection whereas this figure was 7% in case of single earning families. The increase in wife dominance during this phase further supports the findings.

The analysis above (section 1.2) and the significantly high $\chi^2$ value of 42.69 (df=5, p=4.26E-08) comprehensively establishes that there exists a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in information collection stage for refrigerator. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{012}$ stands rejected.
1.3) Final Decision Stage [Table 4.1(a) & Fig. 4.1.13]

At the aggregate level, the $\chi^2$ value (17.02; df=5, p=0.0044) is indicative of significant variation in between the two types of families during the final decision stage. The differences between the roles played by various family members are given below:

1. **Joint Decision Family**: There is a significant shift in the direction of joint family decision making during this stage. There is nearly a three-fold jump in the families reporting equal involvement of all the family members. This trend should be seen in the light of the fact that the wife is herself a contributor to the family income, is better educated (it can be inferred as she is employed), confident and perhaps, thus, better aware of the market. With negligible number of families reporting any role played by children during the final decision phase, it can be safely inferred that it is primarily a husband-wife affair.

2. **Husband Dominant Family**: The declining influence of the husband should be seen in the light of growing trend towards parental egalitarianism.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: Though there is a two-fold increase in the number of families reporting prevalence of wife dominance in case of dual earning families, yet their number was found to be too low to warrant further attention. The prevalence of joint decision making during this phase perhaps obviates the need for the wife to assert her role independently.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**: The drop in the number of families reporting this type of influence can be explained in the light of numerous instances of joint decision making.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse)**: The number of families reporting this type of involvement of family members was found to be quite low (12% for SEF and 13% for DEF). It should be noted that high levels of parental egalitarianism reported during this phase are indicative of relatively less involvement of children.
6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** Just 2% of the single earning families reported dominance of children and their role all together vanishes in case of dual earning families.

The analysis above (section 1.3) comprehensively establishes that there exists a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members final decision phase for refrigerator. Thus, the null hypothesis \( H_{013} \) stands rejected.

I (B): Sub-decisions for Refrigerator

1.21) **Sub-Decision: “Amount to be spent” [Table 4.1(b) & Fig. 4.1.21]**

At the aggregate level, the \( \chi^2 \) value (17.27; df=4, p=0.00171) was found to be significant indicating differences between the observations for the two types of families.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** In case of single earning families, just 13% of them reported the equal involvement of all the family members. There was a slight shift in favour of parental egalitarianism in case of dual earning families with 22% of them reporting in its favour.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Nearly 60% of the households in case of single earning families reported instances of husband dominance while this figure was just 32% for dual earning families. This decline in the unilateral dominance of husbands in dual earning families can be explained in the light of increasing egalitarianism reported during this phase.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** Few instances of wife dominance reported by both the single and dual earning families can partly be explained by the increasing trend towards parental egalitarianism evident in dual earning families and partly by the traditional setup in Indian households where the male earning member has a greater say in financial matters.
Table 4.1(b): Involvement of Family Members in Different Sub-decisions of Refrigerator Purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-decisions Type of Family</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H=W&gt;C</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H/W &amp; C&gt;S</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>C&gt;P</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 89)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.27^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Amount to be spent</td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 67)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 89)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) When to purchase</td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 67)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47.76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 88)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Which Brand to purchase?</td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 67)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = Significant at 99% level of confidence (df=4 & p=0.00171)
b = Significant at 95% level of confidence (df=4 & p=0.025)
c = Not significant
Fig 4.1.21:- Sub-Decision: Amount to be Spent (Refrigerator)

Fig 4.1.22:- Sub-Decision: When to Purchase (Refrigerator)

Fig 4.1.23:- Sub-Decision: Which brand? (Refrigerator)
4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):**
   A two-fold jump in this type of decision making pattern is evident from the data. This is again indicative of the level playing field enjoyed by the wife in case of dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (HAV&CliiIden>Spouse):**
   Few instances of parent children associations were reported by both single earning (9%) and dual earning families (3%). It is supportive of the fact that children definitely do not have any major say in financial matters.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** None of the families reported instances of children dominance.

The analysis above (section 1.21) on the high $\chi^2$ value of 17.27 (df=4, p=0.0171) comprehensively establishes that there exists a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the amount to be spent in refrigerator purchase. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{014}$ stands rejected.

1.22) **Sub-Decision: When to purchase? [Table 4.1(b) & Fig. 4.1.22]**

At the aggregate level, the $\chi^2$ value (11.068, df=4, p=0.025) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** In case of single earning families, 31% of them reported the equal involvement of all the family members as far as the decision regarding when to purchase the refrigerator was concerned. There was a definite shift in favour of equal involvement of all family members in case of dual earning families with 48% of them reporting joint family decision making. This indicates that the apart from the husband, other family members too are involved in deciding on the timing of purchase of refrigerator. Further, low values for children dominance support the contention that the wife in dual earning families has a greater say in deciding on the timing of the purchase.
2. **Husband Dominant Family**: Nearly 52% of the households in case of single earning families reported instances of husband dominance while this figure was about 30% for dual earning families. This decline in the unilateral dominance of husbands for dual earning families can be explained in the light of increasing involvement of all the family members and that too on an equal plane.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: Few instances of wife dominance reported by both the single earning and dual earning families can partly be explained in the light of increasing shift towards family egalitarianism. So it can be safely surmised that wife does not act in isolation from other family members (primarily husband in this case) and rather it seems to be a collaborative effort involving both husband and wife and to a limited extent the children.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**: A two-fold jump in this type of influence is evident from the data. Though in absolute terms the reported instances are not very many but still the variation is significant.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse)**: Few instances of parent children associations were reported by both single earning (5%) and dual earning families (3%). It is supportive of the fact that children are definitely not having any major say in deciding on the timing of purchase. Otherwise too, it is apparent from the overall trends that children are not highly involved during this sub-decision.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents)**: None of the families reported instances of children dominance.

The analysis above (section 1.22) comprehensively establishes that there exists a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the timing of refrigerator purchase. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{015}$ stands rejected.
1.23) Sub-Decision: “Brand to purchase” [Table 4.1(b) & Fig. 4.1.23]

At the aggregate level, the insignificant $\chi^2$ value is indicative of absence of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families. But a closer look at this sub-decision is warranted.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** In case of single earning families, 24% of them reported the equal involvement of all the family members as far as the decision regarding the brand to purchase was concerned. There was a slight shift in favour of family egalitarianism in case of dual earning families with 37% of them reporting instances of joint family decision making. This indicates that the apart from the husband, other family members too are involved in deciding on the brand of refrigerator. Further, comparatively higher occurrences of children dominance support the contention that the parents are not solely responsible in deciding on the brand to be purchased.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Just 1% of the households in case of single earning families reported instances of husband dominance while it is 0% in case of dual earning families. Such a scenario is indicative of low husband involvement in this sub-decision. The job of deciding on the brand has perhaps been left out for the mother and children.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** In comparison to single earning families there is a slight increase in instances of wife dominance for dual earning families. This can be explained in the light of the wife being better educated and aware of the various alternatives available in the market.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** Though the reported instances are few, the husband-wife involvement remains fairly uniform in both types of families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** In case of single earning families about 45% of the households reported this form of influence in decision making. Interestingly, there is a drop in the reported instances in case of dual earning families. This drop should be viewed in the light of shift towards egalitarianism and also the increase in unilateral wife dominance. So instead of the coalition that the housewife must have formed with the children in case of single earning families, her role in isolation of the rest seems to have increased in case of dual earning.
families. Further, the higher occurrence of this form of influence in case of single earning families (with low husband dominance) clearly indicates that both wife and children are highly brand conscious.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** The reported instances are nearly comparable in case of both single earning families and dual earning families. Though the reported instances are few, yet they are indicative of the involvement of children in evaluating alternatives vis-a-vis brand.

The analysis above (section 1.23) comprehensively establishes that there is no relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the brand of refrigerator. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{016}$ is accepted.

1.24) **Sub-Decision: “Which size to purchase” [Table 4.1(b) & Fig. 4.1.24]**

At the aggregate level, the high $\chi^2$ value (27.58; df=5, p=4.38E-05) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** In case of single earning families, 18% of them reported the equal involvement of all the family members. But there is a definite shift in favour of family egalitarianism in case of dual earning families with 34% of them reporting instances of joint family decision making. This indicates that other family members too are involved in deciding on the size of refrigerator. Further, comparatively higher instances of children dominance support the contention that the parents are not solely responsible in deciding on the size to be purchased.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** With nearly 26% of the single earning households reporting husband dominance and this number dropping to just 4% in case of dual earning families and the consequent increase in the figures depicting increased wife dominance, it is evident that the wife’s role seems to have increased during this sub-decision.
3. **Wife Dominant Family:** In comparison to single earning families (18%) there is a two-fold increase in instances of wife dominance for dual earning families (34%). This is a pointer to the wife asserting her independent identity and herself taking up the task of deciding on the size. Otherwise too, the wife best knows what should be the size of such appliance keeping in mind the storage requirements of the family.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** There is in fact a decrease in the reported instances of this form of family member involvement. This trend is supported by increase in instances of family egalitarianism and unilateral wife dominance.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** In case of single earning families about 20% of the households reported this kind of involvement of the family members in decision making. Interestingly, there is a sudden drop in the reported instances in case of dual earning families (6%). This drop should again be viewed in the light of shift towards family egalitarianism and also the increase in wife dominance. Further, observations suggest that it must have been the housewife forming coalition with the children to influence the sub-decision regarding size of the refrigerator in case of single earning families. It is obvious that the need for such coalitions must have been obviated in case of dual earning families where she has begun to assert her independent identity.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** Nearly 12% of the dual earning families reported instances of children dominance during this sub-decision. Though the reported instances are few, yet they are indicative of the involvement of children in evaluating alternatives vis-à-vis brand. The slight increase in children dominance during this phase can be explained keeping in mind the fact that working parents might be succumbing to time pressure and perhaps taking active help of teenagers in this phase.

The analysis above (section 1.24) and the high value of \( \chi^2 \) value (27.58; df=5, p=4.38E-05) comprehensively establishes that there is indeed a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the size of refrigerator. Thus, the null hypothesis \( H_{017} \) is rejected.
Table 4.1(b): Involvement of Family Members in Different Sub-decisions of Refrigerator Purchase (contd..)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-decisions</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Level of Influence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>H=W&gt;C</td>
<td>H/W &amp;C&gt;S</td>
<td>C&gt;P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F     %</td>
<td>F     %</td>
<td>F     %</td>
<td>F     %</td>
<td>F     %</td>
<td>F     %</td>
<td>F     %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) What size to purchase?</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 89)</td>
<td>16   17.97</td>
<td>23   25.84</td>
<td>16   17.97</td>
<td>12   13.48</td>
<td>18   20.22</td>
<td>4   4.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.58^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 67)</td>
<td>23   34.32</td>
<td>3    4.47</td>
<td>23   34.32</td>
<td>6    8.95</td>
<td>4    5.97</td>
<td>8    11.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) What colour?</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 87)</td>
<td>5    5.74</td>
<td>2    2.29</td>
<td>26   29.88</td>
<td>0    0</td>
<td>40   45.97</td>
<td>14   16.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.60^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 65)</td>
<td>4    6.15</td>
<td>0    0</td>
<td>27   41.53</td>
<td>2    3.07</td>
<td>16   24.61</td>
<td>16   24.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Which dealer?</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 89)</td>
<td>11   12.35</td>
<td>45   50.56</td>
<td>2    2.24</td>
<td>30   33.70</td>
<td>1    1.12</td>
<td>0    0</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.27^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 66)</td>
<td>6    9.09</td>
<td>37   56.06</td>
<td>5    7.57</td>
<td>9    13.63</td>
<td>8    12.12</td>
<td>1    1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a = Significant at 99% level of confidence (df=5 & p=4.38 E-05; df=5 & p=0.0026)
^b = Significant at 95% level of confidence (p=0.04057)
1.25) Sub-Decision: “Which colour?” [Table 4.1(b) & Fig. 4.1.25]

At the aggregate level, the $\chi^2$ value (11.60; df=5, p=0.04057) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** The instances of involvement of all the family members during this sub-decision are abysmally low.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Negligible number of families of both types reported instances of husband dominance. These observations should be viewed in conjunction with numerous instances of wife dominance, in both types of families and greater tendency of the both the housewife and working wife to form coalitions with children and higher instances of children dominance. Perhaps, the husband in both types of families seems to have left this aspect to other members of the family to decide.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** In comparison to single earning families (30%) an increase in instances of wife dominance for dual earning families (41%) was reported. This is a pointer to the wife asserting her independent identity and herself taking up the task of deciding on the colour of the refrigerator.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** There was no reported instance of this form of influence in case of single earning families while just 3% of dual earning families reported its occurrence. This is also evident from low levels of husband involvement during this sub-decision.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** In case of single earning families about 46% of the households reported this form of influence by the family members in decision making. Interestingly, there is a sudden drop in the reported instances in case of dual earning families (25%). This drop should be viewed in the light of shift towards wife dominance and also the greater (independent) participation of children. Further, observations suggest that it must have been the housewife forming coalition with the children to influence the sub-decision regarding colour of the refrigerator in case of single earning families. It is obvious that the need for such coalitions must have been obviated in case of dual earning families where she has begun to assert her independent identity and her dominance is quite evident.
6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** Nearly 16% of the single earning families reported instances of children dominance during this sub-decision. While figure jumps to 24% in case if dual earning families. This increase can be explained from the point of view of low husband involvement as this aspect being not related either to functionality or financial aspect of the product and also on the basis of dual earning families in general being “time poor” and thus acknowledging/delegating this aspect to the children.

The analysis above (section 1.25) and the $\chi^2$ value of 11.60 (df=5, p=0.04057) comprehensively establishes that there is indeed a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the size of refrigerator. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{018}$ is rejected.

1.26) **Sub-Decision: “Which dealer?” [Table 4.1(b) & Fig. 4.1.26]**

At the aggregate level, the $\chi^2$ value (18.60; df=5, p=0.04057) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** The instances of involvement of all the family members during this sub-decision are very low.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Nearly 50% of both single earning and dual earning families reported instances of husband dominance during the vendor selection phase. These observations should be viewed in conjunction with very few instances of wife dominance. Thus, it is the husband who holds sway in deciding on the vendor.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** In comparison to single earning families (2%) there is slight increase in instances of wife dominance for dual earning families (7%). This is a pointer to the wife beginning to assert her role.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** About 33% of single earning families reported this form of
influence and their number dropped to 13% in case of dual earning families.

5. Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse): In case of single earning families just 1% of the households reported this form of influence by the family members in decision making. Interestingly, there is a sudden increase in the reported instances in case of dual earning families (12%). This slight increase should be viewed in the light of absence of independent inputs by the children in deciding on the vendor in case of single earning families.

6. Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents): The reported instances of children dominance during this sub-decision were very few for both the types of families.

The analysis above (section 1.26) comprehensively establishes that there is indeed a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the vendor selection in case of refrigerator. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{0/9}$ is rejected.

4.2 Involvement of Family Members in 2-Wheeler Purchase

II (A): Stages in Decision Making Process

2.1) Idea Initiation Stage [Table 4.2(a) & Fig.4.2.11]

1. Joint Decision Family: A negligible number of single earning families (2%) reported instances of joint family decision making during the idea initiation stage in case of refrigerator. While in case of dual earning families there was a slight increase (7%).

2. Husband Dominant Family: Husband dominance in case of single earning families was quite high (40%) while for dual earning families there was slight decrease in this value (34%). From the observations it appears that the husbands hold sway during this phase in both types of families.

3. Wife Dominant Family: There were no reported cases of wife dominance from both types of families.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages In Purchasing</th>
<th>Level of Influence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Family</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>H=W&gt;C</td>
<td>H/W &amp;C&gt;S</td>
<td>C&gt;P</td>
<td>χ²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Initiation</td>
<td>Single Earning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (n₁ = 100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (n₂ = 70)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Single Earning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Family (n₁ = 89)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (n₂ = 65)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.82</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Single Earning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65.65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (n₁ = 99)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (n₂ = 68)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = Significant at 99% level of confidence (df=5 & p=0.003; df=4 & p=3.107E-07)
c = Not significant
Fig 4.2.11: Family Involvement in Idea Initiation (2-Wheeler)

Fig 4.2.12: Family Involvement in Information Collection (2-Wheeler)

Fig 4.2.13: Family Involvement in Final Decision (2-Wheeler)
4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):**  
This form of influence too seems to be practically absent in both types of families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** The instances of husband/wife coalition formation with the children were found to be quite high (SEF=32% & DEF=37%). This perhaps can be explained in the light of dominant role of husbands and practical absence of inputs on part of the wife. The higher instances of children dominance and absence of reported cases of unilateral wife dominance indicate that the children seem to be acting as a group along with their fathers during this phase.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** The children seem to playing a significant role at this stage in case of 2-wheeler (SEF=25% and DEF=21%). Such a scenario can be explained in the light of growing use of 2-wheeler by the children themselves.

   But at the aggregate level the variations are insignificant ($\chi^2=4.24$) and there is no relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in idea initiation stage for 2-wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{021}$ stands accepted.

### 2.2) Information Collection Stage [Table 4.2(a) & Fig. 4.2.12]

1. **Joint Decision Family (H=W=C):** A negligible number of single earning families (7%) reported instances of family egalitarianism during the information collection stage in case of 2-wheeler. While in case of dual earning families there was a three-fold increase (25%).

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported in 19% of single earning families while in case of dual earning families there was slight decrease in the number of reported cases (12%). Thus, the husband continues to hold sway, though to a lesser extent in case of dual earning families.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** There were practically no reported cases of unilateral wife dominance from both types of families.
4. Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children): This form of influence too seems to be practically absent in both types of families.

5. Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse): The instances of husband/wife coalition formation with the children were found to be quite high (SEF=28% & DEF=35%). This, perhaps, can be explained in the light of dominant role of husbands and practical absence of inputs on part of the wife. The higher instances of children dominance and absence of reported cases of wife dominance indicate that it is the children who seem to be acting in collaboration with their fathers during this phase.

6. Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents): The children seem to be playing a significant role at this stage in case of 2-wheeler (SEF=42% and DEF=20%). The decrease in the role of children in case of dual earning families can be explained in the light of higher occurrences of husband-children coalition formation in case of dual earning families.

The analysis above (section 2.2) and significant $\chi^2$ value (17.88; df=5, p=0.003) comprehensively establishes that there is indeed a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in information collection stage in case of 2-wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{022}$ is rejected.

2.3) Final Decision Stage [Table 4.2(a) & Fig. 4.2.13]

1. Joint Decision Family (H=W=C): A negligible number of single earning families (3%) reported instances of equal participation of all the family members during the information collection stage in case of 2-wheeler. While in case of dual earning families there is nearly a three-fold increase (18%). This is indicative of growing role of the entire family in deciding on the 2-wheeler purchase.

2. Husband Dominant Family: Numerous instances of husband dominance were reported in case of single earning families (66%) while in case of dual earning families there was sharp decline in the number of reported cases (35%). Thus, the husband’s dominance appears to be challenged during this stage. It should also be seen in the
light of collaborative decision making pattern (involving husband-wife dyad) which is evident during this phase.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** There were practically no reported cases of unilateral wife dominance from both types of families.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** This form of influence seems to be gaining ground in case of dual earning families (29%). The few instances of this form of influence in case of single earning families during this stage are supported by higher reported instances of husband dominance. Observations further suggest that the influence of wife in coalition with the other partner seems to be marked. These are suggestive of increasing role of wife during the final decision stage even in case of a male oriented product like 2-wheeler.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** The instances of husband/wife coalition formation with the children were found to be significant (26%) in case of single earning families. While in case of dual earning families there is a fall in the number of such reported cases (16%). The high occurrences of parental egalitarianism in case of dual earning families suggests that the role of children seems to have been completely sidelined by the wife.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** There were no reported instances of children dominance in both type of families. This is indicative of the fact that it is a crucial decision stage and parental dominance must be overshadowing their influence.

*The analysis above (section 2.3) and high $\chi^2$ value (35.84; df=4, p=3.107E-07) comprehensively establishes that there is indeed a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in final decision stage in case of 2-wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{023}$ is rejected.*
I (B): Sub-decisions for 2-Wheeler

2.21) Sub-Decision: “Amount to be spent?” [Table 4.2(b) & Fig. 4.2.21]

At the aggregate level, the $\chi^2$ value (17.193; df=3, p=0.0064) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families.

1. **Joint Decision Family (H=W=C):** The instances of involvement of all the family members during this sub-decision are almost negligible.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Instances of husband dominance were reported by 81% of the single earning families while this figure was about 63% in case of dual earning families. This decrease in husband dominance in case of single earning families should be seen in the light of coming into prominence of husband & wife dominant family during this phase. This is indicative of the slight increase in the role played by the wife in dual earning families.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** None of the families reported wife dominance during this sub-decision. This complete absence of independent role of wife is evident from the fact that a two-wheeler is primarily a product of interest to the male breadwinner and in some cases grown-up children too.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** None of the single earning families reported the prevalence of this form of decision making pattern. While 12% of dual earning families reported this form of influence. This is indicative of the coming into prominence of the working wife and it also suggests that the role played by the children is negligible during this sub-decision.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** In case of single earning families just 17% of the households reported this form of influence by the family members in decision making. Interestingly, there is a sudden increase in the reported instances in case of dual earning families (24%). This is evident from the fact that there is a decrease in husband dominance and corresponding increase in husband & wife dominant families. It is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-decisions Type of Family</th>
<th>Level of Influence</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (( n_1 = 100 ))</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Amount to be spent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Earning Family (( n_2 = 70 ))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (( n_1 = 100 ))</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) When to purchase</td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (( n_2 = 70 ))</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (( n_1 = 100 ))</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Which Brand to purchase?</td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (( n_2 = 69 ))</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( * \) = Significant at 99% level of confidence for (df=3 & \( p=0.0064 \); df=5 & \( p=0.0026 \); df=5 & \( p=0.0062 \))
suggestive of the increase in the role played by the wife during this sub-decision previously considered to be a male bastion.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** There were no reported instances of children dominance during this sub-decision. This is otherwise too evident from the peculiar socio-economic setup found in India where the children are generally not gainfully employed and consequently their influence during this stage is minimal.

*The analysis above (section 2.21) and the high $\chi^2$ value of 17.193 (df=3, p=0.0064) comprehensively establishes that there is indeed a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the amount to be spent during two-wheeler purchase. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{024}$ is rejected.*

### 2.22) Sub-Decision: “When to purchase?” [Table 4.2(b) & Fig. 4.2.22]

At the aggregate level, the $\chi^2$ value (18.288; df=5, p=0.0026) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** Just 10% of the single earning families reported this pattern of decision making. While in case of dual earning families this figure takes a quantum jump. These observations are to be seen in the light of waning husband dominance in case of dual earning families and growing clout of wife.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** The instances of husband dominance were reported by 37% of the single earning families and this figure dropped to 21% in case of dual earning families. This decrease in husband dominance in case of dual earning families is indicative of coming into prominence of husband & wife dominant family during this phase and the slight increase in the involvement of the wife.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** Just 1% of the single earning families reported instances of wife dominance. It is interesting to note the
sudden jump (in comparative sense of the term) in case of dual earning families (6%). This trend, if viewed keeping in mind the increase husband and wife dominance is suggestive of the increasing involvement of wife in an case of a product primarily of interest to the male members.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family** *(Husband=Wife>Children)*: 19% of single earning families reported the prevalence of this form of influence in family decision making. While in case of dual earning families there is a 8% increase in this form of influence.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family** *(H/W&Children>Spouse)*: In case of single earning families 32% of the households reported this form of influence by the family members in decision making. There is a sudden decrease in the reported instances of this form of influence in case of dual earning families (17%). This decrease can be the result of increase in the number of husband and wife dominant families and also the reduction in the reported instances of association of wife and children.

6. **Children Dominant Family** *(Children>Parents)*: Just 1% of the single earning families reported children dominance during this sub-decision. While in case of dual earning families this figure was 4%. This is otherwise too evident from the fact that the parents in general and the husband in particular call the shots vis-à-vis the timing of the purchase of such big-ticket items.

*The analysis above (section 2.22) comprehensively establishes that there is indeed a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the timing of the purchase. Thus, the null hypothesis *H*0.25 is rejected.*

2.23) **Sub-Decision:** “Which brand to purchase?” [Table 4.2(b) & Fig. 4.2.23]

At the aggregate level, the significantly high $\chi^2$ value (21.598; df=5, p=0.0062) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families.

1. **Joint Decision Family**: Just 16% of the single earning families reported this pattern of decision making. While in case of dual earning families this figure was 27%. When these observations are
seen in the light of growing wife dominance and decline in children dominant families it becomes amply clear that there is a definite shift towards the involvement of more family members on an equal footing during this sub-decision.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** The low reportings of husband dominance (37%) in case of single earning families further dropped to about 3% in case of dual earning families. This decrease in husband dominance in case of dual earning families is indicative of coming into prominence of parent children dominant family (where either of the parents is forming a coalition with the children) during this phase and the slight increase in the involvement of the wife.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** None of the single earning families reported instances of wife dominance. While in case of dual earning families there was a sudden jump (17%). This can largely be explained keeping in mind that the wife is herself contributing to the family income and perhaps wants the family earnings to be justly spent on the best available brand. This finding is all the more interesting in the light of the fact that a two-wheeler is primarily a product of interest to the male members of the household.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** The reported instances of this type of family in case of both single and dual earning families were comparable and few.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** In case of single earning families 37% of the households reported this form of influence while there was a decrease in the reported instances of this form of influence in case of dual earning families (29%). This decrease can be on account of more democratic norms being pursued in dual earning families and the increase in the independent influence of the working wife.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** 31% of single earning families reported children dominance during this sub-decision. While in case of dual earning families this figure fell to 17%. This is otherwise too evident from greater tendency towards equitable involvement of all the family members rather than unilateral dominance of the children. But what is evident from the observations is that children do play a significant role in this sub-decision.

The high $\chi^2$ value (21.598; df=5, $p=0.0062$) and the analysis above (section 2.23) comprehensively establishes that there is indeed a relationship between
the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the brand to be purchased in case of two-wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{026}$ is rejected.

2.24) Sub-Decision: “Which type to purchase?” [Table 4.2(b) & Fig. 4.2.24]

At the aggregate level, the low $\chi^2$ value (7.20) is indicative of insignificant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** This pattern of decision making was reported by 31% of single earning families. Though the variation is insignificant (27%) in case of dual earning families yet the high reported instances in both types of families are indicative of equitable involvement of all the family members in deciding on the type of the two-wheeler to be purchased. It should be noted that though the wife or the children may themselves not be using the product, yet they may be concerned about the type of two-wheeler because they too “use” it as a pillion rider and some of the children may themselves be using it for their conveyance and hence their interest.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported by 17% of the single earning families. While in case of dual earning families the reported instances were higher (27%). This increase should be viewed in the light of decline in children dominant families and increase in husband-wife dominant families.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** A two-wheeler being mainly a product of interest to the males, instances of wife dominance are virtually non-existent.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** Few instances of such type of families are indicative of high influence wielded by the husband. There was a marginal increase in the number of reported instances in case of dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** In case of single earning families 13% of the households reported this form of influence while there was a slight increase in the
### Table 4.2(b): Involvement of Family Members in Different Sub-decisions of 2-Wheeler Purchase (contd..)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-decisions</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H=W&gt;C</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H/W &amp; C&gt;S</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>C&gt;P</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4) What type to purchase?</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 100)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>7.20&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 69)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) What colour?</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 97)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46.39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>4.585&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 69)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46.37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Which dealer?</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 99)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.025&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 68)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>c</sup> = Not significant
reported instances of this form of influence in case of dual earning families (18%). This increase though minor may be on account of more democratic norms being pursued in dual earning families and the growing role of the children (this can be inferred as unilateral influence of wife is practically absent).

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** In case of single earning families 34% of them reported children dominance during this sub-decision. While in case of dual earning families this figure fell to 21%. This is otherwise too evident from greater tendency towards equitable involvement of all the family members rather than unilateral dominance of the children. But what can be inferred from the observations is that children do play a significant role in this sub-decision.

The low $\chi^2$ value (7.20) and the analysis above (section 2.24) comprehensively establishes that there is no relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the type of two-wheeler to be purchased. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{027}$ is accepted.

**2.25) Sub-Decision: “What colour?” [Table 4.2(b) & Fig. 4.2.25]**

At the aggregate level, the low $\chi^2$ value (4.585) is indicative of insignificant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** This pattern of decision making was reported by just 5% of single earning and 10% of dual earning families. The few instances of unilateral husband and wife dominance are indicative of pronounced role of the children and formation of parent (wife) children associations.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported by 4% of the single earning and 1% of dual earning families. This is a pointer to the fact that male breadwinner is not involved in the choice of colour.
3. **Wife Dominant Family:** A two-wheeler being mainly a product of interest to the males, instances of wife dominance are quite few. But there is uniformity in the responses in case of single earning and dual earning families. This is indicative of low unilateral involvement of wife in deciding on the colour of the 2-wheeler.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** There were few instances of this form of influence in case of both single earning and dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** In case of both single earning and dual earning families, 46% of the households reported this form of influence by the family members in decision making. From few occurrences of joint decision making and husband dominance in case of the two types of families it can be safely surmised that it is the wife acting in collaboration with the children during this sub-decision.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** In case of single earning families 30% of them reported children dominance during this sub-decision. While in case of dual earning families this figure was 32%. These observation bring home the point that children play a significant role in this sub-decision.

*The low $\chi^2$ value (4.585) and the analysis above (section 2.25) comprehensively establishes that there is no relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the colour of two-wheeler to be purchased. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{028}$ is accepted.*

2.26) **Sub-Decision: "Which dealer (vendor)?" [Table 4.2(b) & Fig. 4.2.26]**

At the aggregate level, the low $\chi^2$ value (3.025) is indicative of insignificant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** This form of decision making is practically non-existent in both types of families.
2. **Husband Dominant Family:** 93% of the single earning and 91% of dual earning families reported husband dominance. These observations indicate that the husband’s unilateral influence holds sway during this sub-decision.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** None of the families reported wife dominance.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** There were very few instances of this form of influence in case of both single earning and dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** The instances of this form of influence are too few to warrant attention.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** None of the families reported children dominance during this sub-decision.

The low \( \chi^2 \) value (3.025) and the analysis above (section 2.26) comprehensively establishes that there is no relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the selection of the dealer vis-a-vis two-wheeler to be purchased. Thus, the null hypothesis \( H_{0.29} \) is accepted.

### 4.3 Involvement of Family Members in Music System Purchase

#### III (A): Stages in Decision Making Process

#### 3.11) Idea Initiation Stage [Table 4.3(a) & Fig. 4.3.11]

1. **Joint Decision Family:** A negligible number of single earning families (2%) and none of the dual earning families reported this kind of decision making pattern. This can largely be explained on account of predominant role being played by the children during this stage.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance in case of single earning families stood at 20% while for dual earning families this was 6%. Thus, it appears that despite the aggressive involvement of
children during this stage, the male breadwinner still has some role to play and is not all together sidelined.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** There were very few reported instances of wife dominance during this stage in both single earning and dual earning families.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** This form of influence was reported by 9% of the single earning and none of the dual earning families. From the few reported instances of wife dominance it can be surmised that apart from the children, husband is the only other family member who is involved during this stage.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** The reported instances of husband/wife coalition formation with the children were found to be few. This can be explained in the light of low husband involvement and absence of wife involvement and unilateral role of children.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** About 61% of the single earning families reported children dominance during this phase. While this figure rose to 87% in case of dual earning families. The rise in children dominance in case of dual earning families can be due to increased time pressure on the parents and relatively low interest in an item like music system. So we can safely infer that idea initiators in case of music system are primarily the children.

*The analysis above and the $\chi^2$ value of 12.62 (df=5, $p=0.02722$) establishes that there exists a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in idea initiation stage for music system. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{031}$ stands rejected.*
Table 4.3(a): Involvement of Family Members in Different Stages of Music System Purchase

| Stages In Purchasing | Type of Family                  | F  | %  | F  | %  | F  | %  | F  | %  | F  | %  | F  | %  | χ²      |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------|
| Idea Initiation      | Single Earning Family (n₁ = 94) | 2  | 2.12| 19 | 20.21| 2  | 2.12| 9  | 9.57| 4  | 4.25| 58 | 61.70  | 12.62   |
|                      | Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 48)   | 0  | 0  | 3  | 6.25| 1  | 2.08| 0  | 0  | 2  | 4.17| 42 | 87.50  |
| Information Collection | Single Earning Family (n₁ = 97) | 1  | 1.03| 3  | 3.09| 2  | 2.06| 2  | 2.06| 32 | 32.98| 57 | 58.70  | 3.767   |
|                      | Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 63)   | 0  | 0  | 2  | 3.17| 1  | 1.58| 0  | 0  | 28 | 44.44| 32 | 50.79  |
| Final Decision       | Single Earning Family (n₁ = 100)| 1  | 1  | 27 | 27.00| 2  | 2.00| 2  | 2.00| 29 | 29.00| 39 | 39.00  | 11.57   |
|                      | Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 64)   | 2  | 3.12| 5  | 7.81| 2  | 3.13| 0  | 0  | 22 | 34.30| 33 | 51.56  |

b = Significant at 95% level of confidence (df=5 & p=0.02722; df=5 & p=0.0411)
c = Not significant
Fig 4.3.11: Family Involvement in Idea Initiation (Music System)

Fig 4.3.12: Family Involvement in Information Collection (Music System)

Fig 4.3.13: Family Involvement in Final Decision (Music System)
3.12) Information Collection Stage [Table 4.3(a) & Fig. 4.3.12]

At an aggregate level the low chi-square value (3.67) is indicative of insignificant variation in observation for the two types of families. But still the role being played by different family members deserves a closer look.

1. **Joint Decision Family**: A negligible number of single earning families (1%) none of the dual earning families reported instances of this kind of decision making pattern. This can largely be explained on account of significant role being played by the children during this stage.

2. **Husband Dominant Family**: Husband dominance in case of single earning and dual earning families stood at a meager 3%.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: There were few reported cases of wife dominance during this stage in both single earning and dual earning families.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**: This form of influence too was reported by just 2% of the single earning and none of dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse)**: The reported instances of husband/wife coalition formation with the children were found to be quite high (32%) in case of single earning families and 44% in case of dual earning families. This can be explained in the light of low unilateral husband and wife involvement and absence of joint family decision making. It appears that there is a increased tendency in case of both types of families for parents to form coalitions with the children in the household during this stage of the decision making process. Thus, apart from collaborating with each other, the children are not averse to forming associations with either of the parents during this stage.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents)**: About 59% of the single earning families 51% of dual earning families reported instances of children dominance during this stage. The children dominance in case of both types of families can be due to increased time pressure on the parents and it is an item of little interest to the parents. So we can safely infer that the children actively participate in the information collection phase in case of music system.
On the basis of analysis above and the low $\chi^2$ value (3.76) we can surmise that there does not exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in information collection stage for music system. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{032}$ stands accepted.

3.13) Final Decision Stage [Table 4.3(a) & Fig.4.3.13]

At an aggregate level the high chi-square value of 11.57 (df=5, p=0.0411) is indicative of significant variation in observations for the two types of families.

1. **Joint Decision Family**: A negligible number of single earning families (1%) reported instances of joint family decision making during the information collection stage in case of music system. In case of dual earning families too this pattern of family member involvement was found to exist in case of 3% of the families. This can largely be explained on account of significant role being played by the children during this stage and also because music system is of little interest to other members of the family.

2. **Husband Dominant Family**: Husband dominance was reported by 27% of single earning families and just 8% of dual earning families. In comparison to information collection stage there is a pronounced positive shift in the role played by the husband. Thus, we can safely surmise that the critical decision regarding the final selection from the available alternatives has a strong husband component.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: There were very few reported cases of wife dominance during this stage in both single earning and dual earning families.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**: This form of influence was reported by just 2% of the single earning and none of dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse)**: The reported instances of husband/wife coalition formation with the children were found to be quite high (29%) in case of single earning families and they further rose to 34% in case of dual
earning families. This can be explained in the light of low unilateral husband and wife involvement and absence of joint family decision making. It appears that there is a pronounced tendency in case of both types of families for the parents to form associations with the children during this stage of the decision making process.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** About 39% of the single earning families and 51% of dual earning families reported instances of children dominance during this stage. The children dominance in case of both types of families can be due to increased time pressure on the parents and it is also a fact that it is an item of less interest to the parents in comparison to the children. Further we should not lose sight of the fact that music system is comparatively inexpensive item and the financial risk associated with it is quite low.

On the basis of analysis above and the high $\chi^2$ value (11.57, df=5, $p=0.0411$) we can surmise that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in final decision stage for music system. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{033}$ stands rejected.

### III (B): Sub-decisions for Music System

3.21) **Sub-Decision: “Amount to be spent?” [Table 4.3(b) & Fig. 4.3.21]**

At the aggregate level, the significantly high $\chi^2$ value (39.47) is indicative of differences in observations for the single earning and dual earning families.

1. **JointDecision Family (H=W=C):** Only about 7% of the single earning families reported instances of equal participation of all the family members during this sub-decision while in case of dual earning families this figure stood at 32%. Music system being a low risk item — financially, the involvement of children and the wife during this sub-decision is not surprising.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported by 57% of the single earning and 25% of dual earning families. The sudden drop in the unilateral influence wielded by the husband is
worth noting. This can largely be explained in the light of growing dominance of working wife during this sub-decision.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** Just 2% of the single earning families reported instances of wife dominance, while this figure rose to 9% in case of dual earning families. On account of her being a contributor to the family “income pot” it appears that she must be having at least some say in case of relatively inexpensive item like music system.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** There is were few reportings (4%) of this form of influence in case of single earning families. In case of dual earning families this figure rose to 14%. Thus, it is evident that there is a growing trend in favour of equal influence wielded by the spouses in case of dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (HAV&Children>Spouse):** Just 23% of single earning families reported the occurrence of this type of influence. Since husband is unilaterally holding sway during this phase, it must be the wife forming a coalition with the children in case of single earning families. The dramatic drop in this form of influence in case of dual earning families should be seen in the light of growing trend towards joint family decision making. The prevalence of joint decision making may have perhaps obviated the need for the children to form coalition with their mothers to attain their goal. Further, due to higher disposable income in case of dual earning families, parents may not be averse to willingly succumb to the desires of their children.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** Just 5% of the single earning families reported this form of influence. While this figure stood at about 11% in case of dual earning families. The growing role of children during this sub-decision (which is financially oriented) can largely be explained on account of the higher disposable income of the family.

The high \( \chi^2 \) value (39.427) and the analysis above (section 3.21) comprehensively establishes that there exists a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the amount to be spent in case of music system. Thus, the null hypothesis \( H_{034} \) stands rejected.
Table 4.3(b): Involvement of Family Members in Different Sub-decisions of Music System Purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-decisions</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>H=W&gt;C</th>
<th>H/W &amp; C&gt;S</th>
<th>C&gt;P</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Amount to</td>
<td>Single Earning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be spent</td>
<td>Family (n₁ = 96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.81</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (n₂ = 64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) When to</td>
<td>Single Earning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase</td>
<td>Family (n₁ = 94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (n₂ = 53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Which</td>
<td>Single Earning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand to</td>
<td>Family (n₁ = 78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase?</td>
<td>Dual Earning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (n₂ = 50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = Significant at 99% level of confidence (df=5 & p=1.948E - 07; df=4 & p=0.00035)
c = Not significant
Fig 4.3.21: Sub-Decision: Amount to be Spent (Music System)

Fig 4.3.22: Sub-Decision: When to Purchase? (Music System)

Fig 4.3.23: Sub-Decision: Which Brand? (Music System)
3.22) 

Sub-Decision: "When to purchase?" [Table 3 (b) & Fig. 3.22]

At the aggregate level, the low $\chi^2$ value (4.81) is indicative of insignificant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision “when to purchase” in case of music system.

1. **Joint Decision Family**: The instances of equal involvement of all the family members were found to be negligible in case of both single and dual earning families.

2. **Husband Dominant Family**: Husband dominance was reported by 17% of the single earning families and 15% of dual earning families. Thus the unilateral influence wielded by the husband is fairly uniform in case of both types of families.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: Just 2% of the single and dual earning families reported wife dominance during this sub-decision.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**: There were few (2%) instances of this form of influence in case of single earning families and this figure fell to 0% in case of dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse)**: About 30% of single earning and 47% of dual earning families reported the occurrence of this type of influence in decision making. Few instances of unilateral wife dominance in both types of families are indicative of greater involvement of wife in association with the children during this stage.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents)**: 45% of the single earning families reported this form of influence. While this figure stood at about 34% in case of dual earning families. These are indicative of continued influence wielded by the children in both types of families.

The low $\chi^2$ value (4.81) and the analysis above (section 3.22) comprehensively establishes that there does not exist any relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members.
during the sub-decision ‘when to purchase’ in case of music system. Thus, the null hypothesis \(H_{035}\) stands accepted.

3.23) Sub-Decision: “Which brand to purchase?” [Table 4.3(b) & Fig. 4.3.23]

At the aggregate level, the high \(\chi^2\) value (20.774) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision “which brand to purchase” in case of music system.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** Instances of equal involvement of all the family members were found to be negligible in case of both single and dual earning families.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported by just 1% of the single earning families and 10% of dual earning families. Thus, the unilateral influence wielded by the husband though less in absolute terms does exist and is in fact more pronounced in case of dual earning families. This should be seen in the light of the waning wife dominance in dual earning families.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** Just 6% of the single earning families reported wife dominance during this sub-decision while none of the dual earning families reported the presence of this form of influence.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** None of the families reported the occurrence of this form of influence.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** About 33% of single earning families report the occurrence of this type of influence in family decision making. While this figure slides to 8% in case of dual earning families. It appears that higher disposable income in case of dual earning families must have obviated the need for the children to form associations with either of the parent.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** 56% of the single earning families reported this form of influence. This figure
stood at 82% in case of dual earning families. The increase in reporting of children dominant families on the sub-decision related to brand is indicative of the growing role of children vis-à-vis brand in case of consumer products.

The high \( \chi^2 \) value (20.774) and the analysis above (section 3.23) comprehensively establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision ‘which brand to purchase’ in case of music system. Thus, the null hypothesis \( H_{036} \) stands rejected.

3.24) Sub-Decision: “Which model?” [Table 4.3(b) & Fig.4.3.24]

At the aggregate level, the high \( \chi^2 \) value (10.61) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision “which model to purchase” in case of music system.

1. **Joint Decision Family**: Instances of equal involvement of all the family members were negligible in case of both single and dual earning families.

2. **Husband Dominant Family**: Husband dominance was reported by just 10% of the single earning families and 24% of dual earning families. Thus, the unilateral influence wielded by the husband though less in absolute terms does exist and is in fact more pronounced in case of dual earning families. This should be seen in the light of near absence of wife dominance in dual earning families.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: Wife dominance was found to be negligible in case of both single (2%) and dual earning families (0%). These figures suggest that wife is not very much interested in the model of the music system and has perhaps left it for the children and the husband to decide.
4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):**

None of the families reported the occurrence of this form of influence.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):**

About 7% of single earning families reported the occurrence of this type of influence in decision making. While this figure rose to 15% in case of dual earning families. The near absence of wife dominance and also low occurrence of joint family involvement is indicative of formation of coalition between wife and children on this sub-decision in case of dual earning families.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):**

About 77% of the single earning families report the occurrence of this form of influence. This figure dropped to 59% in case of dual earning families. This drop in the influence wielded by the children should be seen in the light of growing husband dominance and rise in reported instances of parent children associations.

*The high $\chi^2$ value (10.61) and the analysis above (section 3.24) comprehensively establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision ‘which model to purchase’ in case of music system. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{017}$ stands rejected.*

3.25) **Sub-Decision: “Which dealer?” [Table 4.3(b) & Fig. 4.3.25]**

At the aggregate level, the high $\chi^2$ value (22.74) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** Instances of equal involvement of all the family members were found to be negligible in case of both single and dual earning families.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Just 41% of the single earning families and about 70% of dual earning families reported husband dominance. Thus, the unilateral influence wielded by the husband was substantial in single earning families and markedly pronounced
in case of dual earning families. Thus, we can safely surmise that it is the husband who plays a dominant role in deciding on the vendor even in case of relatively inexpensive item like music system.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** The reported instances of wife dominance were found to be 17% in case of single earning families and just 1% in case of dual earning families. Perhaps because of her other professional obligations the wife may be hard pressed for time and may not be playing a dominant role anymore.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** About 17% of single earning families reported instances of this type of influence. This figure dropped to 6% in case of dual earning families. These findings are supported by the large instances of husband dominance in case of dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** About 19% of single earning families reported the occurrence of parent-children dominant families. While this figure marginally dropped to 12% in case of dual earning families.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** Just 3% of the single earning families reported the occurrence of this form of influence. This figure was about 9% in case of dual earning families.

*The high $\chi^2$ value (22.7) and the analysis above (section 3.25) comprehensively establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision ‘which dealer’ in case of music system. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{038}$ stands rejected.*
Table 4.3(b): Involvement of Family Members in Different Sub-decisions of Music System Purchase (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-decisions Type of Family</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>H=W&gt;C</th>
<th>H/W &amp; C&gt;S</th>
<th>C&gt;P</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 84)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 57)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 97)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41.23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 63)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = Significant 99% level of confidence (df=5 & p=0.00037)
b = Significant at 95% level of confidence (df=4 & p=0.03127)
4.4 Involvement of Family Members in 4-Wheeler Purchase

IV (A): Stages in Decision Making Process

4.11) Idea Initiation Stage [Table 4.4(a) & Fig. 4.4.11]

At the aggregate level, the low $\chi^2$ value (4.67) is indicative of insignificant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the idea initiation stage in case four-wheeler.

1. Joint Decision Family (H=W=C): A substantial number of single earning families (34%) reported instances of joint family decision making during the idea initiation stage. While in case of dual earning families this kind of decision making pattern was acknowledged by 40% of the households. Thus, it is interesting to note that a trend in favour of democratic style of decision making whereby all the family members are equally involved is quite visible during this stage.

2. Husband Dominant Family: Husband dominance in case of single earning families stood at 16% while for dual earning families this value was 18%.

3. Wife Dominant Family: There were few reported cases of wife dominance during this stage in single earning families (4%). While in case of dual earning families this pattern of influence was all together missing.

4. Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children): This form of influence was reported by about 24% of the single earning families and 30% of dual earning families. This fairly uniform pattern of occurrence in case of both types of families suggests that together, both husband and wives have considerable influence at the idea initiation stage.

5. Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse): The instances of husband/wife coalition formation with the children were reported by about 20% of the single earning families. While in case of dual earning families this figure was 10%. If we see these occurrences in the light of increase in husband-wife dominant families, it becomes evident that wife begins to make her presence felt in case of dual earning families.
6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** There were very few reported instances of children dominant families. This is indicative of the absence of any significant role playing by the children during this stage.

The analysis above and the low \( \chi^2 \) value of 4.67 establishes that there does not exist any relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in idea initiation stage for four-wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis \( H_{041} \) stands accepted.

4.12) **Information Collection Stage [Table 4.4(a) & Fig. 4.4.12]**

At the aggregate level, the high \( \chi^2 \) value of 26.44 (df=5, \( p=7.3E-05 \)) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the information collection stage in case four-wheeler.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** Just 10% of single earning families reported instances of joint family decision making during the information collection stage. While in case of dual earning families this kind of decision making pattern was acknowledged by 16% of the households. Thus, it is interesting to note that there is a definite trend in favour of democratic style of decision making, whereby all the family members are equally involved, during this stage.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** About 21% of the single earning families reported instances of husband dominance while for dual earning families this value was 36%. Thus, the male breadwinner’s unilateral role exhibits an upswing during this stage. This is indicative of rise in interest of the husband.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** There are very few reported cases of wife dominance during this stage in dual earning families (2%). While none of the single earning families reported instances of wife dominance.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** This form of influence was reported by about 10% of the single earning families and 32% of dual earning families. The two-fold increase in reported instances of this form of influence during this
Table 4.4(a): Involvement of Family Members in Different Stages of 4-Wheeler Purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages In Purchasing</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>H=W&gt;C</th>
<th>H/W &amp;C&gt;S</th>
<th>C&gt;P</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea Initiation</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (( n_1 = 71 ))</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (( n_2 = 50 ))</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Collection</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (( n_1 = 70 ))</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (( n_2 = 50 ))</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (( n_1 = 71 ))</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50.70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (( n_2 = 50 ))</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> = Significant at 99% level of confidence (df=5 & p=7.31E-05; df=3 & p=6.07E-05)
<sup>c</sup> = Not significant
stage are indicative of the growing role of the wife in case of dual earning families. This can largely be on account of greater leverage that working wife has in case of dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** The reported instances of husband/wife coalition formation with the children were about 39% for single earning families. While in case of dual earning families this figure fell to 8%. If we see these occurrences in the light of increase in husband and wife dominant families, it becomes evident that wife begins to make her presence felt in case of dual earning families and her role equals that of the husband and the children are sidelined in the process.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** Reported instances of children dominant families were 20%. While this figure dropped to 6% in case of dual earning families. Thus, with growth in family kitty it appears that both husband and wife’s role has experienced a definite upswing and in the process the children’s role appears to have been sidelined during this sub-decision.

The analysis above (section 4.12) and the high \( \chi^2 \) value of 26.44 comprehensively establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in information collection stage for four-wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis \( H_{042} \) stands rejected.

**4.13) Final Decision Stage [Table 4.4(a) & Fig. 4.4.13]**

At the aggregate level, the high \( \chi^2 \) value of 22.14 (df=3, p=6.07E-05) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to final decision stage in case four-wheeler.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** Just 11% of single earning families reported instances of joint family decision making during the final decision stage. While in case of dual earning families this kind of decision making pattern was acknowledged by 20% of the households. Thus, there is a definite trend in favour of democratic style of family decision
making, whereby all the family members are equally involved, during this stage.

2. **Husband Dominant Family**: About 50% of the single earning families reported instances of husband dominance while for dual earning families this value was 42%. Thus, the male breadwinner’s unilateral role is more pronounced in case of single earning families and experiences a decline in case of dual earning families.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: None of the single and dual earning families reported instances of wife dominance. These can be explained in the light of automobile (in India) being an item of interest and use by the male breadwinner.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**: This form of influence was reported by about just 8% of the single earning families while for dual earning families it was 34%. The four-fold increase in reported instances of this form of influence during this stage are indicative of the growing role of the wife in case of dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse)**: The instances of husband/wife coalition formation with the children were reported by about 29% of the single earning families. While in case of dual earning families this figure dropped to just 4%. If we see these in the light of increase in husband and wife dominant families, it becomes evident that wife begins to make her presence felt in case of dual earning families and her role equals that of the husband and children are sidelined in the process.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents)**: None of the families i.e. single earning families or dual earning families reported instances of children dominant family during this stage. This can largely be explained as the final decision in case of big-ticket item like car is a crucial one for the parents and cannot be left to the children.

The analysis above (section 4.13) and the high $\chi^2$ value of 22.14 (df=3, $p=6.07E-05$) comprehensively establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in information collection stage for four-wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{043}$ stands rejected.
IV (B): Sub-decisions for Four Wheeler

4.21) Sub-Decision: “Amount to be spent?” [Table 4.4(b) & Fig. 4.4.21]

At the aggregate level, the high $\chi^2$ value of 13.94 (df=4, p=0.007) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision ‘amount to be spent’ in case of four-wheeler.

1. **Joint Decision Family**: Instances of equal involvement of all the family members were reported by about 31% of the single earning families while this figure was 28% in respect of dual earning families. Though four-wheeler is a big ticket item, fairly uniform levels of involvement of all the family members in case of both single and dual earning families are indicative of growing role being played by all the family members in the Indian context even in case of critical sub-decision pertaining to allocation of funds.

2. **Husband Dominant Family**: Husband dominance was reported by just 35% of the single earning families and about 24% of dual earning families. Thus, the unilateral influence wielded by the husband in single earning families appears to be waning in case of dual earning families. If viewed in the light of high occurrences of joint family decision making, and also, husband and wife dominant families, these are indicative of the growing clout of the wife in case of a product which otherwise was considered to be male oriented.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: None of the families reported instances of wife dominance. This can further be explained in the light of equal role playing by the wife during this sub-decision.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**: About 17% of single earning families report instances of this type of influence. This figure rose to 44% in case of dual earning families. If we corroborate these with the decline in reported instances of husband dominance, it becomes clear that it is the (working) wife whose influence has dramatically gone up. It is further interesting to note that she stands at equal footing with the husband.
Table 4.4(b): Involvement of Family Members in Different Sub-decisions of 4-Wheeler Purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-decisions</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H=W&gt;C</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H/W &amp; C&gt;S</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>C&gt;P</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Amount to be spent</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 71)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.98</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = 13.94^a )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 50)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) When to purchase</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 71)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = 14.9868^b )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 50)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Which Brand to purchase?</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 71)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = 16.826^a )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 50)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a = \) Significant at 99\% level of confidence (df=4 & p=0.007; df=5 & p=0.00484)
\( b = \) Significant at 95\% level of confidence (df=5 & p=0.104)
5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** About 15% of single earning families reported the occurrence of this type of family and this figure was just 4% in case of dual earning families. These observations make it amply clear that parent-children are rare and that the children’s role is minimal during this sub-decision, which is related to the financial allocation.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** This form of influence is practically absent in both types of families.

*The high $\chi^2$ value of 13.94 (df=4, p=0.007) and the analysis above (section 4.21) comprehensively establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision ‘amount to be spent’ in case of four wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{044}$ stands rejected.*

4.22) **Sub-Decision: “When to purchase?”** [Table 4.4(b) & Fig. 4.4.22]

At the aggregate level, the high $\chi^2$ value of 13.94 (df=4, p=0.007) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision ‘amount to be spent’ in case of four-wheeler.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** The instances of equal involvement of all the family members were reported by about 3% of the single earning families while this figure rose to 10% in case of dual earning families. Though four-wheeler is a big-ticket item, the rise in reported instances of joint decision making pattern in case of dual earning families are indicative of growing role being played by all the family members. The decline in reported instances of husband dominance suggest that it is the father who seems to have been edged out in this process.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported by 77% of the single earning and about 54% of dual earning families. Thus, the unilateral influence wielded by the husband in single earning families appears to be waning in case of dual earning families. If viewed in the light of increase in reported instances of
husband and wife dominant families these figures are indicative of
the growing clout of the wife at the expense of the husband during
this sub-decision.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: Just 1% of the single earning families
reported instances of wife dominance while there was no such
reported case in case of dual earning families (i.e. 0%).

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**:
About 11% of single earning families reported instances of this
type of influence. This figure nearly rose three-fold to 32% in case
of dual earning families. If we corroborate these with the decline in
reported instances of husband dominance, it becomes clear that it is
the (working) wife who is seeing the husband eye-to-eye during
this sub-decision.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse)**:
About 7% of single earning families reported the occurrence of
parent-children dominant family. While this figure was 2% in case
of dual earning families. These observations make it amply clear
that parent-children dominance is fairly low and that the children’s
role during this sub-decision which is related to the timing of
purchase and consequently the allocation of substantial part of
family income in the purchase of a big ticket item is minimal.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents)**: This form of
influence is practically absent in both types of families.

*The high $\chi^2$ value of 14.98 (df=5, p=0.104) and the analysis above (section 4.22) comprehensively establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision ‘when to purchase’ in case of four wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{045}$ stands rejected.*
4.23) Sub-Decision: “Which brand to purchase?” [Table 4.4(b) & Fig.4.4.23]

At the aggregate level, the high $\chi^2$ value of 16.826 (df=5, p=0.00484) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision 'which brand to purchase' in case of four-wheeler.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** The instances of equal involvement of all the family members were reported by about 42% of the single earning families while this figure dropped to 14% in respect of dual earning families. We have to view these observations in the context of falling husband dominance and rising instances of wife dominance and also the rise in equal involvement of husband and wife. Thus, we can surmise that it is the husband and the children who have been partially edged out by the working wife and she appears to be more brand conscious in case of dual earning families.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported by 17% of the single earning families and about 12% of dual earning families. Thus, the unilateral influence wielded by the husband in single earning families appears to be waning in case of dual earning families. These figures (in the light of rising instances of wife dominance) are indicative of the growing clout of the working wife at the expense of the husband during this sub-decision.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** About 17% of the single earning families reported instances of wife dominance while this figure was 26% in case of dual earning families. These trends are again indicative of growing interest of the wife in the sub-decision pertaining to the brand of the four-wheeler.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** About 8% of single earning families reported instances of this type of influence. This figure jumped to 24% in case of dual earning families. If we corroborate these with the decline in reported instances of husband dominance and rise in the influence wielded by the wife, it becomes clear that it is the working wife who is seeing the husband eye-to-eye during this sub-decision and is very much involved at an equal footing along with the husband.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** About 14% of single earning and 22% of dual earning families
reported influence of this type. The rise in reported instances of parent-children dominance during this sub-decision are suggestive of growing clout of children in dual earning families vis-à-vis brand and that parents are not averse to acknowledging the role of children during this sub-decision.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** This form of influence is practically absent in both types of families.

The high $\chi^2$ value of 16.826 ($df=5$, $p=0.00484$) and the analysis above (section 4.23) comprehensively establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision ‘which brand to purchase’ in case of four wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{046}$ stands rejected.

4.24) **Sub-Decision: “What type to purchase?” [Table 4.4(b) & Fig. 4.4.24]**

At the aggregate level, the high $\chi^2$ value of 16.72 ($df=5$, $p=0.0050$) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision ‘which brand to purchase’ in case of four-wheeler.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** The instances of equal involvement of all the family members were reported by about 23% of the single earning and 18% of dual earning families. In the context of fall in unilateral husband and wife dominance and rising instances of husband and wife dominant families indicate a shift towards parental egalitarianism.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported by 10% of the single earning families and just 4% of dual earning families. Thus, the unilateral influence wielded by the husband in single earning families appears to have declined in case of dual earning families. These figures (in the light of rising instances of equal role played by husband and wife) are indicative of the growing clout of the wife at the expense of the husband during this sub-decision in case of dual earning families.
3. **Wife Dominant Family:** About 7% of the single earning families reported instances of wife dominance while this figure was 4% in case of dual earning families. But keeping in mind the increase in instances of parental egalitarianism, we can conclude that unilaterally wife does not wield any considerable influence but in association with the husband her influence is noticeable.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** None of single earning families reported instances of this type of influence while in case of dual earning families this figure shot up to 20%. If we relate these with the decline in reported instances of unilateral husband and wife dominance it becomes clear that it is the working wife who is very much involved and that too at an equal footing along with the husband in the sub-decision relating to the type of the four-wheeler to be purchased i.e. whether it is a car, van, multi-utility vehicle etc.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** About 29% of single earning families report the occurrence of this type of families. While this figure dropped to 22% in case of dual earning families. This fall in reported instances can be explained if we relate it with the rise in parental egalitarianism. Thus, the trend exhibits few instances of children’s involvement.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** Both types of families reported children dominant families in nearly 30% of the cases which is the highest reported instance of any single form of influence during this sub-decision. Thus, it is evident that the children wield significant influence in both types of families in the sub-decision pertaining to the type of the four-wheeler that is to be purchased.

*The high $\chi^2$ value of 16.72 (df=5, $p=0.0050$) and the analysis above (section 4.24) establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision ‘what type to purchase’ in case of four wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{047}$ stands rejected.*
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### Table 4.4(b): Involvement of Family Members in Different Sub-decisions of 4-Wheeler Purchase (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-decisions Type of Family</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>H=W&gt;C</th>
<th>H/W &amp;C&gt;S</th>
<th>C&gt;P</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (n_1 = 69)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n_2 = 49)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (n_1 = 71)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n_2 = 48)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (n_1 = 65)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n_2 = 47)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Significant at 99% level of confidence \(\text{df}=5\ & \ p=0.0050; \ \text{df}=5\ & \ p=0.0098\)
c = Not significant
4.25) Sub-Decision: “What colour to purchase?” [Table 4.4(b) & Fig. 4.25]

At the aggregate level, the high $\chi^2$ value of 15.12 (df=5, $p=0.0098$) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision ‘which brand to purchase’ in case of four-wheeler.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** The instances of equal involvement of all the family members were reported by about 23% of the single earning families while this figure dramatically dropped to 6% in respect of dual earning families. We have to view these observations in the context of few instances of husband and wife dominance and rising instances of parent-children dominant families indicating shift wherein none of the parents is very particular about the colour in isolation from the children.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported by about 5% of the single earning families and just 4% of dual earning families. Thus, the unilateral influence wielded by the husband in single earning families appears to be minimal with respect to the colour of the automobile.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** About 3% of the single earning families reported instances of wife dominance while this figure was 8% in case of dual earning families. But if we view these observations in the light of increase in instances of parent-children dominant families, it is evident that independently the wife does not wield significant influence in deciding on the colour of the automobile.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** Low instances of this form of influence wielded by the spouses are indicative of their minimal influence in isolation from the children.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** About 56% of single earning families reported the occurrence of parent-children dominant families and this figure dropped to about 46% in case of dual earning families. This fall in reported instances of parent-children dominance during this sub-decision can be explained if we relate it with the rise in independent influence of the children in case of dual earning families. Further, we can safely reach to a conclusion that the parents and children together play an important role in deciding on the colour of the automobile.
6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** About 7% of the single earning families reported instances of children dominance during this sub-decision. While in case of dual earning families there is four-fold increase in the reported instances of children dominant families.

The high $\chi^2$ value of 15.12 ($df=5, p=0.0098$) and the analysis above (section 4.25) establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision ‘what colour to purchase’ in case of four-wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{048}$ stands rejected.

4.26) **Sub-Decision: “From where to purchase?”** [Table 4.4(b) & Fig. 4.4.26]

At the aggregate level, the low $\chi^2$ value of 6.67 is indicative of insignificant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision ‘from where to purchase’ in case of four-wheeler.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** The reported instances of equal involvement of all the family members was minimal in both types of families.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported by about 77% of the single earning and 74% of dual earning families. Thus, the unilateral influence wielded by the husband is uniform in both types of families (this is further supported by the insignificant chi-square value). The near absence of wife dominance and few instances of involvement of other family members during this sub-decision are indicative of dominant role of the husband in vendor selection.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** There is near absence of any reported instance of wife dominance in both types of families.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):**

Low instances of this form of influence wielded by the spouses in
both single earning and dual earning families are to be seen in the light of near total husband dominance during this sub-decision.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):**

Just 8% of single earning and 2% of dual earning families reported the occurrence of parent-children dominant families. The few instances of this form of influence are indicative of minimal role of children.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** Just about 2% of the single earning and none of the dual earning families reported instances of children dominance during this sub-decision. This is further supported by the large number of reportings of husband dominance and is pointer to the fact that it is the male breadwinner who decides on the vendor from whom such big ticket item is to be purchased.

The low $\chi^2$ value of 6.67 and the analysis above (section 4.26) establishes that there exits no relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision pertaining to the vendor in case of four-wheeler. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{049}$ stands accepted.

### 4.5 Involvement of Family Members in Electric Mixer Purchase

#### V (A): Stages in Decision Making Process

5.11) **Idea Initiation Stage [Table 4.5(a) & Fig. 4.5.11]**

At the aggregate level, the high $\chi^2$ value of 31.92 (df=5, $p=6.13E-06$) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the idea initiation stage in case of electric mixer.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** Very few of single earning families (1%) reported instances of joint family decision making during the idea initiation stage. While in case of dual earning families this kind of decision making pattern was acknowledged by 7% of the households.
These observations should be seen in the light of the fact that electric mixer is a product and is primarily of interest to the wife.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance in case of single earning families stood at 10% while for dual earning families this value was just 1%. Thus, in the light of high reported instances of wife dominance in case of both types of families, it appears that the wife completely edges out husband’s unilateral influence during this stage of the decision process.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** About 52% of the single earning families reported wife dominance during this stage. While in case of dual earning families this figure marginally fell to 46%. Thus, in case of both types of families it is the wife who is the idea initiator.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** This form of influence was reported by about 16% of the single earning families and 7% of dual earning families. These observations when viewed in the light of numerous instances of wife dominance are indicative of low husband involvement.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** The instances of equal influence wielded by husband/wife and the children were reported by about 10% of the single earning families. In case of dual earning families this figure was 36%. These findings suggest that the children’s influence is equal to that of either of the spouses in quite a few dual earning families.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** Whatever unilateral influence children had in case of single earning families (10%) seems to have all together waned in case of dual earning families (1%). This is indicative of the absence of any significant role playing by the children during this stage in case of electric mixer. Otherwise too, it is the mother who is the initiator as the product is primarily of interest to her.

*The analysis above and the high $\chi^2$ value of 31.92 (df=5, $p=6.13E-06$) establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in idea initiation stage for electric mixer. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{051}$ stands rejected.*
Table 4.5(a): Involvement of Family Members in Different Stages of Electric Mixer Purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages In Purchasing</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>H=W&gt;C</th>
<th>H/W &amp;C&gt;S</th>
<th>C&gt;P</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea Initiation</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 107)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 71)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Collection</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 94)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 57)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 107)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.90</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 71)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Significant at 99% level of confidence (df=5 & p=6.13 E -06; df=5 & p=0.00128)

\(\chi^2\) = Not significant
5.12) Information Collection Stage [Table 4.5(a) & Fig. 4.5.12]

At the aggregate level, the low $\chi^2$ value of 5.4 is indicative of insignificant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the idea initiation stage in case electric mixer.

1. **Joint Decision Family**: About 16% of single earning families reported instances of joint family decision making during the information collection stage. While in case of dual earning families this kind of influence pattern was acknowledged by 23% of the households. Thus, about a quarter of the households in case of dual earning families reported that all the family members are equally involved at this stage in case of a product which is otherwise wife oriented.

2. **Husband Dominant Family**: Husband dominance in case of single earning families stood at 21% while for dual earning families this value was about 8% only. Thus, in the light of high reported instances of wife dominance in case of both types of families, it appears that the wife completely edges out husband’s unilateral influence during this stage of the decision process in case of dual earning families.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: About 24% of the single earning families reported instances of wife dominance during this stage. In case of dual earning families this figure was about 23%. Thus, in case of both types of families the wife’s unilateral influence is significant. This is expected as it is a wife oriented and low ticket item.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**: This form of influence, whereby husband’s influence is the same as that of the wife, was reported by about 19% of the single earning families and 23% of dual earning families. These observations are suggestive of the setting in of modern sex role norms.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse)**: The instances of equal influence wielded by husband/wife and the children were reported by about 14% of the single earning families. While in case of dual earning families this figure marginally rose to 19%. Thus, the influence wielded by the children during this stage cannot be totally ignored.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents)**: Relatively very few of both types of families reported instances of children dominance.
The analysis above (section 5.12) and the low $\chi^2$ value of 5.40 establishes that there does not exist any relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in information collection stage for electric mixer. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{052}$ stands accepted.

5.13) Final Decision Stage [Table 4.5(a) & Fig. 4.5.13]

At the aggregate level, the high $\chi^2$ value of 19.93 is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the final decision stage in case of electric mixer.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** About 6% of single earning families reported instances of joint family decision making during the final decision stage. While in case of dual earning families this kind of influence pattern was acknowledged by 21% of the households. Thus, there is a definite shift in favour of equitable involvement of all the family members during the final and crucial stage.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance in case of single earning families stood at 12% while for dual earning families this value was about 6% only. Thus, in the light of high reported instances of wife dominance in case of both types of families, it appears that the wife completely overshadows the husband during this stage of the decision process in case of dual earning families.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** About 30% of the single earning families reported wife dominance during this stage. While in case of dual earning families this figure was about 21%. Thus, in case of both types of families the wife’s unilateral influence is significant. This is expected as it is a wife oriented and low ticket item.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** This form of influence, whereby husband’s influence is the same as that of the wife but more than that of the children, was reported by about 34% of the single earning and 39% of dual earning families. These observations when viewed in the light of numerous instances of wife dominance are indicative of substantial influence wielded by the wife in case of dual earning families.
5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** The instances of equal influence wielded by husband/wife and the children were reported by about 17% of the single earning families. In case of dual earning families this figure fell to a meager 6%.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** Relatively few instances of this type of influence pattern were reported.

The analysis above and the high $\chi^2$ value of 19.93 (df=5, $p=0.00128$) establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members in final decision stage for electric mixer. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{053}$ stands rejected.

V (B): Sub-decisions for Electric Mixer

5.21) **Sub-Decision: “Amount to be spent?” [Table 4.5(b) & Fig. 4.5.21]**

At the aggregate level, the high $\chi^2$ value of 21.825 (df=5, $p=0.0056$) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision ‘amount to be spent’ in case of electric mixer.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** The instances of equal involvement of all the family members was reported by about 2% of the single earning families while this figure was 15% in respect of dual earning families. Though electric mixer is a low-ticket item of primary interest to the mother, yet the rise in reported instances in case of dual earning families are indicative of growing interest of all the family members in deciding on the amount to be spent in its purchase.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported by about 6% of the single earning and 17% of dual earning families. Thus, the unilateral influence wielded by the husband in this stage seems to have grown in case of dual earning families.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** The reported instances of wife dominance in case of single earning families were 57% while this figure fell to 30% in case of dual earning families. The findings suggest that wife
seems to be losing her unilateral influence in case of dual earning families. But these observations should be seen in the light of growing instances of equal participation of all the family members in case of dual earning families.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):**
   About 7% of single earning families reported instances of this type of influence. This figure moved upwards to 11% in case of dual earning families. This rise in influence of the wife, though minor, is expected as she is better educated and desirous of playing greater role in case of items of interest to her.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):**
   About 15% of single earning families report the occurrence of parent-children dominant family. While this figure rose to 23% in case of dual earning families.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** This form of influence was reported by just 11% of the families in case of single earning families and it fell to an insignificant 2% in case of dual earning families. The growing influence of the working wife seems to have completely edged out the influence of the children.

*The high $\chi^2$ value of 21.825 (df=5, p=0.0056) and the analysis above (section 5.21) comprehensively establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision 'amount to be spent' in case of electric mixer. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{054}$ stands rejected.*

5.22) **Sub-Decision: “When to purchase?” [Table 4.5(b) & Fig. 4.5.22]**

At the aggregate level, the low $\chi^2$ value of 7.15 is indicative of insignificant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision ‘when to purchase’ in case of electric mixer.

1. **Joint Decision Family:** The instances of equal involvement of all the family members were reported by about 6% of the single
Table 4.5(b): Involvement of Family Members in Different Sub-decisions of Electric Mixer Purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-decisions Type of Family</th>
<th>JD F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HD F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>WD F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H=W&gt;C F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H/W&amp;C&gt;S F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>C&gt;P F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 84)</td>
<td>2 2.38</td>
<td>5 5.95</td>
<td>48 57.14</td>
<td>6 7.14</td>
<td>13 15.47</td>
<td>10 11.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 52)</td>
<td>8 15.38</td>
<td>9 17.30</td>
<td>16 30.76</td>
<td>6 11.53</td>
<td>12 23.07</td>
<td>1 1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.825*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 106)</td>
<td>6 5.66</td>
<td>4 3.77</td>
<td>64 60.37</td>
<td>14 13.20</td>
<td>18 16.98</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.15c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 71)</td>
<td>9 12.67</td>
<td>1 1.40</td>
<td>36 50.70</td>
<td>11 15.49</td>
<td>12 16.90</td>
<td>2 2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 106)</td>
<td>6 5.66</td>
<td>18 16.98</td>
<td>31 29.24</td>
<td>9 8.49</td>
<td>39 36.79</td>
<td>3 2.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.55c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 71)</td>
<td>13 18.30</td>
<td>8 11.26</td>
<td>12 16.90</td>
<td>8 11.26</td>
<td>27 38.02</td>
<td>3 4.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = Significant at 99% level of confidence (df=5 & p=0.0056)
c = Not significant
earning and 12% of dual earning families. Though electric mixer is a low-ticket item of primary interest to the wife, yet the rise in reported instances of equal involvement of all family members are indicative of growing interest of all the family members in matters hitherto considered in the wife's domain of influence. This may partly also be explained on account of the family kitty swelling and with the general improvement in standard of living other family members may also be realizing the need for such an item.

2. **Husband Dominant Family:** Husband dominance was reported by negligible number of both types of families. This is expected as it is an item which of generally not of interest to the male members of the family.

3. **Wife Dominant Family:** The reported instances of wife dominance in case of single earning families were 60% while this figure fell to 50% in case of dual earning families. These observations should be seen in the light of growing instances of equal participation of all the family members in case of dual earning families.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children):** About 13% of single earning families reported instances of this type of influence. This figure moved marginally upwards to 15% in case of dual earning families. These observations when viewed in the light of fall in unilateral wife dominance are indicative of growing shift in favour of equal participation of both the spouses in deciding on items of general household use.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** About 17% of single and dual earning families reported the occurrence of parent-children dominant families. Thus, the influence wielded by the children and either spouse remained fairly uniform in both types of families.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** This form of influence was reported by negligible number of both types of families. These findings support the contention that an electric mixer is an item which not of much interest to the children and hence their low influence in decision pertaining to the timing of purchase.

*The low $\chi^2$ value of 7.15 and the analysis above (section 5.22) establishes that there does not exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of*
involvement of family members during the sub-decision ‘when to purchase’ in case of electric mixer. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{055}$ stands accepted.

5.23) Sub-Decision: "Which brand to purchase?" [Table 4.5(b) & Fig. 4.5.23]

At the aggregate level, the low $\chi^2$ value of 10.55 is indicative of insignificant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision ‘which brand to purchase’ in case of electric mixer.

1. **Joint Decision Family**: The occurrences of equal involvement of all the family members were reported by just 6% of the single earning families while this figure was 18% in respect of dual earning families. Though electric mixer is an item of primary interest to the wife, yet the rise in influence of this type is indicative of growing interest of all the family members in evaluating the various available brands.

2. **Husband Dominant Family**: Husband dominance was reported by about 17% of the single earning families while this figure was 11% in case of dual earning families. These comparatively lower levels of unilateral influence of the husband are perhaps on account of electric mixer being a product of less interest to the male breadwinner.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: The reported instances of wife dominance in case of single earning families were 29% while this figure fell to about 17% in case of dual earning families. The above observations suggest the wife seems to be loosing her unilateral influence in case of dual earning families. But these observations should be seen in the light of increase in instances of equal participation of all the family members in case of dual earning families and also the higher occurrences of parent children dominance.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**: About 8% of single earning families reported instances of this type of influence. This figure moved marginally upwards to 11% in case of dual earning families. These observations when viewed in the light of decline in unilateral wife dominance and higher instances
of parent-children dominance are indicative of decline in unilateral influence wielded by either of the spouses.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse):** About 37% of single and 38% of dual earning families reported the occurrence of parent-children dominant families. Thus, the influence wielded by the children and either spouse remains uniform in both types of families and is indicative of equal participation of either of the spouses along with the children in the evaluation of the alternatives vis-à-vis brand. Further, since electric mixer is an item of female interest we can surmise that it is the wife who is actively involved along with the children during this sub-decision.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents):** This form of influence was reported by negligible number of both types of families. These findings support the contention that an electric mixer is an item which not of much interest to the children and hence their low unilateral influence in the sub-decision pertaining to the brand to be purchased.

*At an aggregate level the low $\chi^2$ value of 10.55 and the analysis above (section 5.23) establishes that there does not exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision ‘which brand to purchase’ in case of electric mixer. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{056}$ stands accepted.*

5.24) Sub-Decision: “From where to purchase?” [Table 4.5(b) & Fig. 4.5.24]

At the aggregate level, the $\chi^2$ value of 10.17 (df=4, $p=0.03755$) is indicative of significant differences between the observations for the single earning and dual earning families with respect to the sub-decision ‘from where to purchase’ in case of electric mixer.

1. **Joint Decision Family (H=W=C):** The instances of equal involvement of all the family members was negligible in case of both types of families.
Table 4.5(b): Involvement of Family Members in Different Sub-decisions of Electric Mixer Purchase (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-decisions Type of Family</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>H=W&gt;C</th>
<th>H/W &amp; C&gt;S</th>
<th>C&gt;P</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Earning Family (n₁ = 105)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60.95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) From where to purchase?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Earning Family (n₂ = 70)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( b = \text{Significant 95\% level of confidence (df=4 & p=0.03755)} \)
2. **Husband Dominant Family**: Husband dominance was reported by about 61% of the single earning families while this figure was 40% in case of dual earning families. These comparatively lower levels of unilateral influence of the husband in case of single earning families are perhaps on account of growing influence of the working wife as is evident from the growing instances of equal husband-wife influence in case of dual earning families.

3. **Wife Dominant Family**: The reported instances of wife dominance in case of single earning families were just 6% while this figure was marginally higher in case of dual earning families and stood at 9%. The above observations suggest the unilateral influence wielded by the wife on deciding on the vendor is very low even though the product is of interest to her.

4. **Husband & Wife Dominant Family (Husband=Wife>Children)**: About 30% of single earning families reported instances of this type of influence. This figure rose to 46% in case of dual earning families. These observations suggest that rather than wielding unilateral influence, i.e. parental egalitarianism appears to have increased in case of dual earning families. These observations are further indicative of the growing influence of the working wife when viewed in the light of few instances of unilateral husband dominance in case of dual earning families.

5. **Parent-Children Dominant Family (H/W&Children>Spouse)**: Negligible number of both types of families reported instances of this form of influence.

6. **Children Dominant Family (Children>Parents)**: This form of influence was reported by none of the families. It should be noted that the vendor decision, being crucial, appears to be still in the realm of husband in case of single earning families and gradual inroads are being made into this male bastion by the working wife. Thus, it may take some time before the children start playing any significant role in this sub-decision.

*At an aggregate level the $\chi^2$ value of 10.17 and the analysis above (section 5.24) establishes that there does exist a relationship between the type of family and the level of involvement of family members during the sub-decision ‘from where to purchase’ in case of electric mixer. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{057}$ stands rejected.*