



Volume: 2, Issue: 6, 411-414
June 2015
www.allsubjectjournal.com
e-ISSN: 2349-4182
p-ISSN: 2349-5979
Impact Factor: 3.762

T. Muthuraj

Research scholar,
Department of commerce,
Thiruvalluvar College,
Papanasam, Tirunelveli
District.

S. Sudalayandi

Associate professor,
Department of commerce,
Thiruvalluvar College,
Papanasam, Tirunelveli
District.

An empirical study on family influence in the process of purchase decision for products in Tirunelveli city

T. Muthuraj, S. Sudalayandi

Abstract

Marketers have traditionally used family to segment markets, since the inception of the society, the consumers and marketers co exist. It is very essential to study the roles played by the family members while deciding to purchase any commodity from the market. Family plays a primary role in the demand formation in consumer markets worldwide. It is the field where a wide variety of consumer decisions are made every day. Family decision-making is a complex process in which multiple individuals combine their personal needs, wants and resources in order to reach a satisfactory outcome. The development of the social system leads to modifications of the known behavioral patterns of the family as a consumption unit. This study examines family decision-making roles involved in purchases of products and the effect of parents and children roles in the purchase decision.

Keywords: Family influence decision, purchase decision-making, behavioral patterns.

1. Introduction

In the context of increasing competition and changing social and economic environment, it becomes essential for the marketers to be customer-oriented. Buying behaviour of customers in the marketplace plays a significant role in the strategic marketing planning. The recent awareness of consumer behaviour has introduced many new dimensions in the marketing philosophy and practices. It is both, relevant and important for every business enterprise to know its customers and understand their buying behaviour. "Family as a consuming and decision making unit is a central phenomenon in marketing and consumer behaviour". Family always plays a very important mediating function. It combines the individual with a larger society, where the person learns various roles suitable for an adult life. The way children learn to become consumers in our society may be largely the result of family influence. Since culture exerts considerable influence on the family unit, it is also likely that cultural variables influence the socialization process of the family

2. Statement of the Problem

Family as a consuming and decision making unit is a central phenomenon in marketing and consumer behavior. All family members play different roles in the process of buying any product or service. These roles are those of initiator, influencer, gatekeeper and decision-maker, the researcher has made an effort to understand the degree of influence exercised by the family members in the family purchase decision in the different product categories. Hence the statement of the problem is to study the influence of family in the process of family purchase decision for the products.

3. Scope of the Study

The study is carried out in Tirunelveli City. The marketer will get insight on the family member influence on family purchase decision for various product categories. It will help marketer to design the strategy to market their goods and services to tap the market more efficiently.

4. Objectives of the Study

- To examine the level of influence on various categories of products between family members (parents and children).

5. Hypothesis

Ho: There is no significant relationship between categories of the products and the respondents.

Correspondence:

T. Muthuraj

Research scholar,
Department of commerce,
Thiruvalluvar College,
Papanasam, Tirunelveli
District.

Ho: There is no significant relationship between Demographic profile of the respondents and categories of the products.

6. Methodology

Data collection: Data collection was done from primary as well as secondary sources.

6.1 Primary data questionnaires: Further it was modified and validated using a 5-point Likert scale for the present study. Secondary data was collected from selective sources of data like journals, websites, textbooks, company brochures, magazines and newspapers.

6.2 Samples for the study: The present study is restricted to Tirunelveli City only. Respondents are the parents and children. This study looks at the degree of influence of family members purchase decisions. For the study, 50 samples were chosen as respondents from the Tirunelveli City.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1: Distribution on Decision making on the product category

Sl.no	Categories of products	Parents		Children		Both	
		Mean	Stdev	Mean	Stdev	Mean	Stdev
Home appliance							
1	TV	2.32	0.80	2.71	0.52	6.369	2.705
2	Refrigerator	1.53	0.79	1.72	0.63	2.682	1.987
3	Washing machine	2.33	1.04	2.10	0.99	5.210	3.752
4	Mixer/ grinder	2.83	0.88	2.75	0.81	7.687	3.337
Electronics Goods							
5	Mobile	2.59	0.99	2.93	0.55	7.667	3.285
6	Computer/Laptop	2.56	0.92	2.36	0.93	6.313	3.572
7	CDs/DVDs player	3.76	0.98	3.63	0.82	13.903	5.314
Consumption Items							
8	Fruits/Vegetables	2.86	1.01	2.48	0.94	7.323	3.881
9	Floors	3.25	1.12	3.13	0.81	10.451	5.099
10	Milk & Oil Bread	2.49	1.04	2.49	0.95	6.549	4.082
11	Detergent/Soap & Toothpaste	2.35	0.99	2.20	0.93	5.487	3.698
12	Cereals	3.50	0.96	3.12	1.02	11.287	5.227
Children Products							
13	Video games	4.14	0.75	3.58	1.09	15.046	5.763
14	Ice Creams/Chocolates/Juice	4.23	0.81	3.80	0.76	16.067	4.599
15	Bicycle	4.03	0.82	4.19	0.45	16.908	3.859
16	Toys	3.61	0.89	3.41	1.12	12.528	5.562
17	Snacks	2.83	0.88	2.75	0.81	7.687	3.337

Source: Primary Data

Table 2: Distribution on One-way ANOVA result

Sl.no	Particulars	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig	
1	Home appliance & Electronics	Children	2.36	0.70	1.368	.243
		Parents	2.43	0.43		
		Total	2.39	0.58		
2	Consumption Items	Children	2.75	0.71	4.648	.032*
		Parents	2.60	0.69		
		Total	2.68	0.70		
3	Children Products	Children	3.95	0.54	14.883	.000*
		Parents	3.72	0.64		
		Total	3.84	0.61		

Source: Primary data

Table 3: Distribution on correlation analysis

Sl.no	Particulars	R square	F	df1	Sig.	Constant	b2	Result
1	Demographic profile	0.14	15.93	2	0.0	18.84	6.41	0.253
2	Category of products	0.002	.039	1	0.5	5.62	0.93	

Source: Primary data

6.3 Statistical tools and techniques: Considering the amount and nature of data for this research, it is necessary to use statistical tools. Following descriptive and inferential statistical methods were employed in the present investigation. The statistical techniques which are used in the study are given below in brief:

- Descriptive statistics – is used to summarize variables in terms of central tendency and measures of dispersion.
- Reliability test – is used to check the measurement error and ensure the goodness of data.
- One-way ANOVA – is utilized to find the gap on various factors based on independent variables.

7. Limitations

- The study is restricted only to Tirunelveli city.
- Family members mean only parent (father & mother) and children not any others.
- The children means, the children belong to age group between 6 to 12 years only.

8. Finding

- **Parents' decision making:** The influence was found to be maximum in the purchase of a refrigerator (with a mean score of 1.53). This was followed by Mobile and TV (with mean scores of 2.05 and 2.35, respectively). Washing machine and detergent/soap & Soap followed with mean scores of 2.33 and 2.35 respectively where parents decided on the purchase of the product.
- **Children's decision making:** The influence was found the maximum in case of purchase of the bicycle (with a mean score of 4.19). This was followed by ice creams/chocolates/juice and CDs/DVDs Player (with mean scores of 3.80 and 3.63, respectively). Video games and Toys followed with mean scores of 3.58 and 3.41, respectively where children decided on the purchase of the product.
- **Parent-children decision making:** The influence was found the maximum in case of purchase of the bicycle (with a mean score of 16.91). This was followed by ice creams/chocolates/juice and CDs/DVDs player (with mean scores of 16.067 and 15.046, respectively). Video games and Toys followed with mean scores of 13.903 and 12.528 respectively. These were joint decisions by parents, and their children made while purchasing the product.
- **Home appliance & Electronics:** Children respondents gave this category a mean score of 2.43 while the parents gave this a mean score of 2.36. The ANOVA table shows the F value is 1.368, and the significance value is 0.243. Since it is >0.05 , the mean difference existing between parents and children for the purchase of high-value products is not statistically significant at the 5% level. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.
- **Consumption Items:** The children respondents gave this category a mean score of 2.60 while the parents gave this a mean score of 2.75. The ANOVA table shows the F value is 4.648, and the significance value is 0.032. Since it is <0.05 , the mean difference existing between parents and children for the purchase of low value products is statistically significant at the 5% level. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted.
- **Children Products:** The children respondents gave this category a mean score of 3.72 while the parents gave this a mean score of 3.95. The ANOVA table shows the F value is 14.883, and the significance value is 0.000. Since it is <0.05 , the mean difference existing between parents and children for the purchase of children-centered products is statistically significant at the 5% level. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted.
- Correlation analysis was used to find the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. It was found that, there was correlation between the dependent and independent variables. This means there is significant association between demographic profile of the respondents and category of products.

9. Suggestions

This study has different implications for marketers, parents and children. For all three of them there is a clear indication that children influence exists, although it depends on various factors. Marketers should advertise for products during the child's viewing hours and not traditional business hours. To

find about the TV viewing habits, a detailed investigation is essential.

10 Conclusion

The parents and children influence is analysed from various aspects. For Home appliance & Electronics and Consumption Items are mostly decided and influenced by parents. Children Products is mostly decided by children themselves. The descending order of influence for products are Video games, Ice Creams/Chocolates/Juice, Bicycle, Toys, Snacks, CDs/DVDs player, Toothpaste and TV. Thus it can be concluded that the children are the centre of attraction in any family irrespective of country and culture. They have been participating in all activities of the family. In the same way, they have been voicing their opinion for purchase of various products. There are also few other family products where children influence is observed higher. Finally the study shows that no matter what types of the products, all the products are decided and influenced by both parents and children only that the level changes. This means home appliance, electronics, consumption items are highly decided by parents and moderately decided by children and for children products the vice versa.

11. References

1. Alvin, B. C., & Harrison, M. C. (1985). "Children's Self-Perceptions of Their Participation in Retail Store Patronage Decisions". *Advances in Consumer Research*, 12.
2. Atkin, C. K. (1978). "Observation of Parent-Child Interaction in Supermarket Decision Making". *Journal of Marketing*, 42, pp. 41-45.
3. Brown, W. (1979). "The Family and Consumer Decision Making: A Cultural View". *Academy of Marketing Science Journal (pre-1986)*, 7(4), pp.335-345.
4. ResearchersWorld -Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce ■ E-ISSN 2229-4686 ■ ISSN 2231-4172 International Refereed Research Journal ■ www.researchersworld.com ■ Vol.-IV, Issue-3(1), July 2013 [44]
5. Chan, K. (2001). "Children's Perceived Truthfulness of Television Advertising and Parental Influence: A Hong Kong Study". *Advances in Consumer Research*, 28, pp.207-212.
6. Chan, K., & McNeal, J.U. (2003). "Parent-Child Communication about Consumption and Advertising in China". *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 20 (4), pp.317-334.
7. Chang, L., Schwartz, D., Dodge, K., & Chang, M. C. (2003). "Harsh parenting in relation to child emotion regulation and aggression". *Journal of Family Psychology*, 17, pp.598-606.
8. Ferreira, P., Pessôa, S., & Veloso, F. (2008). "The Evolution of International Output Differences (1970-2000): From Factors to Productivity". *BE Journal of Macroeconomics*, 8 (1), Article 3.
9. Flurry, L. (2007). "Children's influence in family decision-making: Examining the impact of the changing American family. *Journal of Business Research*", 60, 322-330.
10. Foxall, G. R. (1977), *Consumer Behaviour: a practical guide*, R.P.A. (Books), England.
11. Foxman, E. R., Tansuhaj, P.S., & Ekstrom, K. M. (1989). "Adolescents' influence in family purchase decisions: a socialisation perspective". *Journal of Business Research*, 18, 159-172.

12. Indiantelevision.com. (2006). "Kid Power: Excerpts from the Indian Survey". <http://www.indiantelevision.com/marketdatabase/demographics/kidpower.htm>.
13. Kaur, A., & Medury, Y. (2010). "Children's influence on family purchases: some new insights". Global Marketing Conference, September, 172-184. Tokyo, Japan
14. Lee, C.K.C., & Beatty, S.E. (2002). "Family Structure and Influence in Family Decision Making". *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 19 (1), 24-41.
15. Moschis, G. P., & Moore, R. L. (1979). "Decision making among the young: a socialisation Perspective". *Journal of Consumer Research*, 6(4), 101-112.
16. Mangleburg, T.F. (1990). "Influence in Purchase decisions: a review and critique". *Advances in Consumer Research*, 17, pp.813-825.
17. Soni, P., & Singh, R. (2003). "Dimensions of Purchase Decision Making in Families Revisited: Pitfalls and Prospects". *The Management Review*, 15(3), pp.59-88.