CHAPTER 6
FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The previous chapter analyzed the collected data from the respondent through descriptive and inferential statistics. In this chapter, finding based on data analysis are presented. The findings of the study discussed in accordance with the broad objective of the study.

6.1 FINDINGS

6.1.1 Difference between Child and Parent Perception

6.1.1.1 Child’s General Influence

To analyze the difference of perception between both the respondent about child’s general influence in families’ decision making, however, the respondent were asked to rate child’s influence on a five point scale. The result of Hypothesis $H_{01A}$ is significance which states that…

- Either child overestimate their influence or parents underestimate child’s influence in family’s decision making

6.1.1.2 Child’s Personal Attributes / Resources

According to Resource theory (Blood and Wolfe, 1960), the more one possesses the resources, the more influence he/she exercise in family’s decision making, therefore, hypothesis $H_{02A}$ is tested to identify the gap between the perception of both the respondent with respect to child’s personal attribute / resource. It is found that …

- Either parents’ are overestimating the intensity of giving pocket money to their children or child underestimating the intensity of pocket money given to them
- Children overestimate their parents’ perception about their product selection or parents underestimate their child’s product selection.
- There is no difference is found between the perceptions of both the respondents as far as statement 2, 3 4 and 6 (c.f., Appendix, Questionnaire for statement)

6.1.1.3 Product Specific

- Parents hold the child more influential for Gum & Chocolate, Ice-Cream & Candies, Soft-Drink / Cold Drink, Fast Food, Restaurant, Vacation than child perceive for themselves or vice-versa
✓ Child hold the child more influential for Bicycle than Parent perceive for their child or vice-versa

6.1.1.4 Influencing Strategies used by Child.

Child uses various strategies to make their buying influence stronger in the families buying decision. Child in the family uses the strategies called asking or pleading which is softer as compare to the strategy like threatening. Both the respondent were ask to rate the intensity of the 8 different influencing strategy on a five point scale, however, following results were found,

✓ As far as the strategy Ask is concerned either child overestimate the use of this strategy than of their parent’s perception or vice-versa
✓ As far as the strategy Ask is concerned either parents overestimate the use of this strategy than of their child’s perception or vice-versa
✓ as far as Plead, Persuade, Explain and Remind strategies are concerned, there is no difference is found between the perceptions of child and their parents.

6.1.2 General Influence

This section of the chapter discusses the children’s general influence in family’s decision making considering Socio-Economics and Socio-Demographic status of family.

6.1.2.1 Gender

The culture of Gujarat is different in many ways that of the other parts of India and Western countries, however, traditionally, Boy and Girl in Gujarat, have separate importance in any family.

It may state on the bases of the result of group statistics and t statistics showed respectively in table 5.6.2.1 and 5.6.2.2 in previous chapter that parent hold Boy child more influence than of Girl.

6.1.2.2 Age

Age was the qualifying ground to select sample, however, the samples was selected whose age ranges from 10 to 13, which is grouped as 10-11 and 12-13 using Visual Binding option in SPSS.
It may state on the bases of the result of group statistics and t statistics showed respectively in table 5.6.3.1 and 5.6.3.2 in previous chapter that *age is positively related to child’s general influence in family decision making.* **12-13 age group child exercise more influence in their families decision making than of 10-11 years age group child.**

### 6.1.2.3 Order of Child

Past studies revealed that the order of child is one of the considerable factors while analyzing child’s influence in family decision making.

It may state on the bases of the result of group statistics and t statistics showed respectively in table 5.6.4.1 and 5.6.4.2 of previous chapter that *Parents hold elder child more influential than of younger one.*

### 6.1.2.4 Family Type

To analyze the influence of child belong to either nuclear or joint family, the respondents were ask to rate child’s overall influence in family deicing making on a five point scales, however, the result of Hypothesis H\textsubscript{0}E proves that *Nuclear families Children have more influence than of Joint Families Children.*

### 6.1.2.5 Parenthood

Past studies (Darley and Lim, 1986; Ekstrom et al, 1987) revealed that Single parent family’s children might be allowed to have a greater influence in family decision making family than of a nuclear (dual parent) family, however, with an objective to analyze child’s general influence in family decision making considering parenthood (single parent family or dual parent family) as socio-demographic status hypothesis H\textsubscript{0}1F is framed (cf, chapter 3, Conceptual Framework).

It can state as per table the result of hypothesis H\textsubscript{0}1F that *Single parent hold their child more influential than of parent belong to dual parent family status.*

### 6.1.2.6 Parental Working Condition

Galbraith (1973) stated that dual – income parents had less time than single income family, therefore other members in the family were more responsible for the purchase act / decision, which leads children to act as a decision maker in the family decision making, hence, the hypothesis H\textsubscript{0}1G was tested to analyzed the child’ general influence in
family’s decision making and parental working condition, however, it is found that *Children from both parent working found to have more influence in their families decision making than of Single Parent Working.*

6.1.2.7 **Family Income**

Jenkins (1979) and Moschis and Mitchll (1986) argued that children’s influence grew with the increase of their family income or social economic status. Thus, to measure the child’s general influence across various income groups, hypothesis $H_{01}$ was framed and it is found that *difference between the influences of children across all income groups.*

6.1.3 **Product Specific**

The perception of child related to the product importance stimulates their purchasing behavior which leads to take active part in their family’s buying decision. More importance they perceive, more they want to involve in his/her family buying decisions. The product which is directly used by the child, is perceived to be more important for them, children are more likely to take part in family’s buying decision for the product which is/are directly relevant to them. (Berey and Pollay, 1968; Ward and Wackman, 1972; Mehrotra and Torges, 1977; Szybilli and Sosanie, 1977; Atkin, 1978; Belch et. al., 1985; Foxman Tansuhaj and Ekstrom, 1989a; Foxman, Tansuhaj and Ekstrom, 1989b; Mangleburg, 1990; Lackman and Lanasa, 1993; Beatty and Talpade, 1994; Palan and Wilkes, 1997), however, to check the influence of child on selected 22 product/product category with respect to Socio-Economic and Socio-Demographic status of family.

6.1.3.1 **Gender**

✓ *Parents hold Girl child more influential for Gum, Chocolates, etc... and Ice-Cream, Candies etc... than Boy child*

✓ *Parents hold Boy child more influential for Soft-drink / Cold-drink, Fast Food, Deo / Perfumes, Movie Show and Vacation than Girl child*

6.1.3.2 **Age**

✓ *Parents perceive that 12-13 year children exercise more purchase influence for Soft-drink / Cold-drink, Fast Food, School Bag, Deo / Perfumes, Reastaurant and Vacation than of 10-11 years children*
6.1.3.3 Order of Child
✓ Parent hold elder child more influential for Soft-Drink / Cold-Drink, Fast Food, Stationary Item, Deo / Perfumes, Restaurant and Vacation

6.1.3.4 Family Type
✓ Nuclear families’ child exercise more influential for Gum, Chocolates, etc..., Ice-Cream, Candies etc..., Soft-drink / Cold-drink, Fast Food, School Bag, Stationary item, Cloths, Restaurant, Movie Show and Vacation than of joint families’ child

6.1.3.5 Parenthood
✓ Child from Single parent family exercise more purchase influence for Gum, Chocolates, etc..., Ice-Cream, Candies etc..., Soft-drink / Cold-drink, Fast Food, School Bag, Stationary item, Cloths, Footwear, Bathing Soap and Shampoo, Deo / Perfumes, Computer, Television, Music System, Bicycle, Scooter / Motorcycle, Car, Restaurant and Vacation than of dual parent family’s child

6.1.3.6 Parental Working Condition
✓ Child from Both parent working family exercise more purchase influence for Gum, Chocolates, etc..., Ice-Cream, Candies etc..., Fast Food, School Bag, Stationary item, Cloths, Footwear, Toothpaste, Television and Bicycle than of Single parent working

6.1.3.7 Family Income
✓ Influence of children do vary for Soft-drink / Cold-drink, Fast Food, Mobile phone, Computer, Car, Restaurant and Vacation across different income groups

6.1.4 Strategies Used by Children
To analyze to use of Influencing strategies used by the child to yield their request the responses was collected on a five point scale and was analyze considering Socio-Economics and Socio-Demographic variables. Hypotheses H05B to H05H were framed to analyze the same involving 8 different strategies Ask, Plead, Negotiate, Persuade, Explain, Threat, Remind and Power Games.

6.1.4.1 Gender
✓ Girl child in a family Explains more than Boy child
✓ Boy child in a family uses Threat and Power Games more often than Girl
✓ There is no difference found in the use of Ask, Plead, Negotiation, Persuade and Remind as an influential strategies amongst boy child and girl child
6.1.4.2 Age

✓ 12-13 age group children more often use Explain and Threat as an Influencing Strategy.

✓ There is no difference found for the use of Ask, Plead, Negotiation, Persuade, Remind and Power Games as an influential strategies amongst boy child and girl child

6.1.4.3 Order of Child

✓ Elder child in family more often uses Negotiation (Negotiate), Explain, Threat and Power Games as an influencing strategy than of Younger child.

✓ There is no significance difference found between the elder and younger child for the use of Ask, Pleading, Persuade and Remind as influencing strategies to yield their request.

6.1.4.4 Family Type

✓ Child belong to Joint family more often use Ask, Plead and Negotiate as an influential strategy to yield their request than of Nuclear families’ child

✓ Child belong to Nuclear family more often use Explain, Threat and Power Games as an influential strategy to yield their request than of Joint families’ child

✓ There is no significance difference found between the child of nuclear and joint family for the use of Persuade and Remind as influencing strategies to yield their request.

6.1.4.5 Parenthood

✓ Child belong to Single parent family status more often uses Explain, Threat, Remind and Power Games as a influencing strategy to yield their request than of a child belong to dual parent family status

✓ There is no significance found difference between the child of belong to either single parent family or dual parent family for the use of Ask, Plead, Negotiate and Persuade as influencing strategies to yield their request.

6.1.4.6 Parental Working Condition

✓ Child belong to the family where as both parent are working they uses Remind as a influencing strategy to yield their request than of a child belong to dual parent family status

✓ There is no significance difference found between the child of Single parent working and both parent working condition of a family for the use of Ask, Plead, Negotiate, Persuade, Explain, Threat and Power Games.
6.1.4.7 Family Income

✓ Children do differ for the use of Threat, Remind and Power Games as a influencing strategy to yield their request across all income groups
✓ Use of Ask, Plead, Negotiate, Persuade and Explain as a influencing strategy by children do not differ across income groups.

6.2 IMPLICATIONS

6.2.1 Theoretical implication

The study, proposed a conceptual model to understand the factors which affects the children’s influence in family buying decision making. The characteristics included in proposed conceptual model were drawn from previous studies conducted in western countries and the same had never been explored before in Indian setting.

The study explore the effect of various characteristics of family that have an impact on child’s influence in family’s decision making by proposed conceptual model and research hypothesis. The result of many of the link of proposed model and research hypothesis confirmed the result reported in previous studies, however, although, not all assumption were supporting the result of previous study.

Thus, the empirical study has contributed to the current research of family decision making and provided guidance towards further research in the same area by way of testing and improving proposed model.

6.2.2 Managerial Implication

The empirical study demonstrated that marketer can’t afford to neglect the role and power of child in his/her family’s decision making when they design product and/or services. The nature of product is very important aspect while targeting children as a customer, however, marketer and advertiser should select the channel and the media accordingly.

The marketer, advertiser and service provider of family outing related product/services should consider the role and influence of child in their family’s decision making. Marketer and advertise of the product, which is more relevant to children, are to be targeted considering his/her mother, as she may be performing the role of gatekeeper.

6.3 LIMITATION
Lack of Theoretical Explanation: The conceptual justification for pattern which has been observed about child’s influence, was not well defined (Mangleburg, 1990), therefore, an adequate development of a theoretical aspects in this field is required to have better understanding about the role of child in their family’s buying decision making.

Language Problem: The questionnaire was first drafted and designed in English Language, however, the questionnaire were distributed in Gujarati Language. Later, the gathered data was coded in English. The difference between two languages may exaggerate, however, the Language is no the major problem of the study but it takes more time in coding of a variable which consumes more time which in turn influence the efficiency and effectiveness of the study.

Sample area: Generalization of result may be extended to major cities of Gujarat like Ahmedabad, Vadodara, Surat and Rajkot, as the data was collected from the schools of these cities, in spite of these cities of Gujarat consisting major population of Gujarat and represent heterogeneity of urban population of the state.

The study involved only influential strategies used by child and does not involve the response strategy of parents’.

6.4 SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research addresses child’s influence in family’s buying decision making which is carried in the state of Gujarat of India, however, which may not be same for other States of India.

The research can be extended to the following context of the child’s influence in family’s decision making…

a. As the age was qualifying ground to select the sample elements, which needs to be extended to other age/age-group of child which may be further extended to Adolescents, Young and Teenagers
b. The research can be conducted including more specific product/product-category
c. The response of child’s influencing strategies can be analyzed through Parent's strategies.
d. The study focused on the direct influence of child in their family’s buying decision making, however, indirect influence can also be measured.
e. The research can be conducted involving the Socializing agent and the effect of it for various context of child’s influence in family’s decision making

f. This study focused on the factors which influence the child’s role in family’s buying decision making, however, there is a need to develop well defined concepts to understand “Why”, “When” and “What Extent” these factors identified have impact on child’s influence in family buying decision making.