

A Study on Parents Perception of influence of TV commercials on their children's purchase behavior with reference to the city of Visakhapatnam

Ms. T. Susmitha¹

Research Scholar in GITAM Institute of Management, GITAM (Deemed to be) University,
Visakhapatnam.

Dr. A. Subrahmanyam²

Associate Professor, GITAM Institute of Management, GITAM ((Deemed to be) University,
Visakhapatnam.

Prof. M. Jyothsna³

Professor, GITAM Institute of Management, GITAM ((Deemed to be) University,
Visakhapatnam.

ABSTRACT

In this research paper the authors have studied parent's perception of influence of TV commercials on their childrens' purchase behavior. The authors have collected data from various schools like Government school, Private National and Private International schools. A 5 point Likert scale questionnaire was designed. A 2- stage sampling technique method was adopted. In the first stage 3 different categories of schools were selected from the various schools in Visakhapatnam urban area. In the second stage information was gathered from parents of the children studying 3rd grade to 10th grade in these 3 categories of schools. Total of 250 questionnaires were circulated, but completely filled questionnaires came to 220 in number. The study was undertaken in the city of Visakhapatnam. A questionnaire was used in order to collect data on the parent's perception of influence of TV commercials on their childrens' purchase behavior. Different categories of schools were visited in order to collect the data. This was to give an overall view of children's perception from different schools rather than a lopsided view of one category of schools. The data collected was analyzed through the use of Anova Tables summated scale and meaningful conclusions were drawn. Through the study and analysis, it was found that parents from various categories of schools like Government, Private National and International schools had different views on their childrens' perception of influence of TV commercials on purchase behavior. Findings also support review of literature.

Key Words: Parents Perception, television advertisement, family purchase decisions, Demographic variables, Occupation as a variable, Gender as a variable, Age as a variable, Education as a variable, Income as a variable, Family Type as a Variable.

One of the most frequently used methods for assessment of people characteristics, especially attitudes, in the social sciences. It has been developed for the measurement of attitudes, beliefs, emotions, feelings, perceptions.

INTRODUCTION

Many studies have been done on the effect of advertisement on consumer's choice of products and their decision making process. Despite the existence of these studies, very few of them specifically look into how television advertising affects children. Many of these studies focus mainly at how advertising is perceived by the general public as a marketing tool and rarely

focuses on children as consumers and how their consumption behaviour is impacted by television advertising. This research gap has resulted in a study being made to understand the parent's perception of influence of TV commercials on their childrens' purchase behavior.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Ward and Wackman (1972) noted that the impact of children was high in products such as cereals for breakfast, snacks, sweets, soft beverages, toys and games. It was low in products such as vehicles, furnishings and detergents. **Mangleburg (1990)** research demonstrates that the more appropriate the child's product is; the more impact it has. Similarly, perceived importance of the product in the children is also reflected in an increased impact. **Beatty and Talpade (1994)** indicated that children would make the choice on the basis of the predetermined limits set by the parents such as the parent decides the car model and the child chooses the color. **Young, de Bruin and Eagle (2003)** among parents in Great Britain and Sweden on television advertising for kids stated the following: ads promote kids to exert pressure on their parents to purchase advertised products, the desire for products relies on the intensity of advertising, kids are more readily affected by advertising than adults and too much of exposure to advertising leads people to make unnecessary purchasing. **Baqiocco, D'Alessio and Lagin (2009)** indicate that the attitudes of parents towards television advertising differ from the attitudes of their children. Parents underestimate the cognitive abilities of children; they believe that children enjoy more advertising than they do. They consider their children immature and less suspicious of advertising. **Goldberg and Gorn (1978)** also evaluated the impact of repeated advertising exposure on children's material object preferences (e.g., a toy) over more socially oriented options (e.g., friends). These results support the fact that publicity positively alters preferences in a product category in which spectators are current consumers and the impact of non-commercial sources of socialization (e.g., parents) considerably negates the impact of advertising. **Gupta & Chundawat (2002)** many social and family variables have an impact on the decision-making process of the customer. They develop from formal and informal interactions between customers and others. In family decision making, there are different roles which illustrate the interaction between family members in various roles related to consumption. **Kaur & Singh (2006)** tried to explore children's impact in the family buying decision making in India and the West and revealed how children developed as influencers in buying choices when traditionally females were seen as buying agents for their families. Increasing women's involvement in the workforce has led to a change in this position as kids are progressively the "buyers" for the whole family. Children enjoy greater involvement not only in making routine family consumption decisions, but also in pestering their parents in buying other products they want. Recently Indian children have drawn significant attention from marketers because there is tremendous potential and rapid growth in the market for children's products. **Grossbart, Crosby (1984)** were of the opinion that parents ' attitude towards advertising to children was dependent on the degree to which such advertising disrupted parent-child relationship when they interact with the child during the child's socialization phase. **McNeal (1964)** noted that as children mature, they have an enhanced willingness to purchase independently in the retail context probably, combined with enhanced parental permissiveness. Children gradually take over responsibility and are encouraged and warned by parents whose dual objective is to develop skills while preventing damage. This is often associated with the discussion about so-called ' pester power, ' specifically child-focused advertising, where parents

strive to educate children to be responsible consumers while at the same time attempting to protect them from any possibly damaging advertising influences.

3.OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- (i) To understand parent's perception of influence of TV advertisements on their children in general.
- (ii) To study the differences among parent's perception of influence of TV advertisements on their children based on socio demographic variables.

4. METHODOLOGY

Sample size: 220 sample respondents were selected using a structured questionnaire.

Response Rate: Researchers used 250 questionnaires, and respondents filled 220 questionnaires.

Research design: Quantitative research method was used, in which structured questionnaires based on the study was done. This survey is cross-sectional in the nature. The sample consisted of

Research tools: One of the most important tools developed and used in social sciences for assessment of people's perceptions is the summated scale. Research tools include percentages, frequencies and ANOVA with summated scale.

Data Collection Method: The data collection tools which we used are observation method and interview method.

Sampling technique: We used the 2-stage sampling where in respondents were selected. First stage 3 different categories of schools were selected from various schools in Visakhapatnam urban area. This was to give an overall view of children's perception from different schools rather than a lopsided view of one category of schools. In the second stage information was gathered from parents of the children studying 3rd grade to 10th grade in these 3 categories of schools.

Sample Design-Primary Data is collected from respondents in Visakhapatnam through questionnaires and personal interviews. For this 220 sample respondents were selected using a structured questionnaire containing variables to be scaled on a five point Likert scale with "strongly agree" dictating the highest level of satisfaction and "strongly disagree" as the highest level of dissatisfaction. The collected data are analyzed through SPSS 21 version for deriving meaningful conclusions.

Hypotheses:

H01 Socio demographic variables of parents do not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding unnecessary purchase of products.

H01a Age of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding unnecessary purchase of products.

H01b Education of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding unnecessary purchase of products.

H01c Income of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding unnecessary purchase of products.

H01d Family type (nuclear/ Joint) does not influence the perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding unnecessary purchase of products.

H02 Socio demographic variables of parents do not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding purchase of low nutritional food.

H02a Age of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding purchase of low nutritional food.

H02b Education of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding purchase of low nutritional food.

H02c Income of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding purchase of low nutritional food.

H02d Family type (nuclear/ Joint) does not influence the perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding purchase of low nutritional food.

H03 Socio demographic variables of parents do not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials leading to materialistic consumption.

H03a Age of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding leading to materialistic consumption.

H03b Education of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding leading to materialistic consumption.

H03c Income of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding leading to materialistic consumption.

H03d Family type (nuclear/ Joint) does not influence the perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding materialistic consumption.

H04 Socio demographic variables of parents do not influence their perception on children's attitude towards new commercials leading to purchase of new varieties of products.

H04a Age of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding purchase of new varieties of products.

H04b Education of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding purchase of new varieties of products.

H04c Income of parents does not influence their perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding purchase of new varieties of products.

H04d Family type (nuclear/ Joint) does not influence the perception on children's attitude towards commercials regarding purchase of new varieties of products.

5.ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1 Socio- demographic variables of respondents

Sr. No.	Characteristics	Category	Frequency	Percentages
1.	Relation with the child	Father	111	50.5
		Mother	109	49.5
2.	Age	20 – 30 Years	31	14.1
		30 – 40 Years	134	60.9
		40 – 50 Years	42	19.1
		50 Years & Above	13	5.9
3.	Education	Secondary School	90	40.9
		Intermediate	39	17.7
		Graduate	48	21.8
		Post Graduate	43	19.5
4.	Occupation	Banker	10	4.5
		Doctor	3	1.4
		Accountant	12	5.5
		Engineer	10	4.5
		Business	49	22.3
		Others	136	61.8
5.	Family income	< Rs. 15000	82	37.3
		Rs. 15000 – 25000	47	21.4
		Rs. 25000 – 35000	25	11.4
		Rs. 35000 – 45000	16	7.3
		Rs. 45000 - 55000	17	7.7
		> Rs. 55000	33	15.0
6	Family Type	Nuclear	165	75.0
		Joint	55	25.0
7	Age group of child 1	8-10	33	15.0
		11-12	51	23.2
		13-14	136	61.8
8	Age group of child 2	Not applicable	40	18.2
		8-10	78	35.5
		11-12	70	31.8
		13-14	32	14.5

Table 2 ANOVA ON UNNECESSARY PURCHASING

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	.910	3	.303	.385	.764
	Within Groups	170.049	216	.787		
	Total	170.959	219			
Education	Between Groups	23.105	4	5.776	8.399	.000
	Within Groups	147.855	215	.688		
	Total	170.959	219			
Family Income	Between Groups	9.222	5	1.844	2.440	.035
	Within Groups	161.738	214	.756		
	Total	170.959	219			
Family Type	Between Groups	2.347	3	.782	1.002	.393
	Within Groups	168.612	216	.781		
	Total	170.959	219			

An ANOVA test was conducted to test the difference in the opinion of age, education, family income and family type groups on critical factors of unnecessary purchasing. The results indicate that there is no significant difference regarding the age group ($F = .385$, $p = 0.764$) and family type ($F = 1.002$, $p = 0.393$) there is a significant difference according to the education ($F = 8.399$, $p = 0.000$) and family income of the respondents ($F = 2.440$, $p = 0.035$) at 5 percent level of significance.

Table 3 ANOVA ON LOW NUTRITIONAL FOOD

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	.463	3	.154	.204	.894
	Within Groups	163.283	216	.756		
	Total	163.745	219			
Education	Between Groups	10.285	4	2.571	3.602	.007
	Within Groups	153.460	215	.714		
	Total	163.745	219			
Family Income	Between Groups	7.046	5	1.409	1.924	.091
	Within Groups	156.700	214	.732		
	Total	163.745	219			
Family Type	Between Groups	3.633	3	1.211	1.634	.183
	Within Groups	160.112	216	.741		
	Total	163.745	219			

An ANOVA test was conducted to test the difference in the opinion of age, education, family income and family type groups on critical factors of low nutritional food. The results indicate that there is no significant difference regarding the age group ($F = .204$, $p = 0.894$); family income ($F = 1.924$, $p = 0.091$) and family type ($F = 1.634$, $p = 0.183$) there is a significant difference according to the education levels of the respondents ($F = 3.602$, $p = 0.007$) at 5 percent level of significance.

Table 4 ANOVA ON MATERIALISM

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	1.913	3	.638	.777	.508
	Within Groups	177.264	216	.821		
	Total	179.177	219			
Education	Between Groups	8.328	4	2.082	2.620	.036
	Within Groups	170.850	215	.795		
	Total	179.177	219			
Family Income	Between Groups	7.815	5	1.563	1.952	.087
	Within Groups	171.362	214	.801		

	Total	179.177	219			
Family Type	Between Groups	1.785	3	.595	.724	.538
	Within Groups	177.392	216	.821		
	Total	179.177	219			

An ANOVA test was conducted to test the difference regarding age, education, family income and family type groups on critical factors of materialism. The results indicate that there is no significant difference according to the age group ($F = .777$, $p = 0.508$); family income ($F = 1.952$, $p = 0.087$) and family type ($F = .724$, $p = 0.538$). However there is a significant difference in accordance with the education ($F = 2.620$, $p = 0.036$) at 5 percent level of significance.

Table 5 ANOVA ON EXPOSURE TO ADVERTISING

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	.290	3	.097	.096	.962
	Within Groups	216.488	216	1.002		
	Total	216.777	219			
Education	Between Groups	18.674	4	4.669	5.067	.001
	Within Groups	198.103	215	.921		
	Total	216.777	219			
Family Income	Between Groups	17.805	5	3.561	3.830	.002
	Within Groups	198.972	214	.930		
	Total	216.777	219			
Family Type	Between Groups	.558	3	.186	.186	.906
	Within Groups	216.220	216	1.001		
	Total	216.777	219			

An ANOVA test was conducted to test the difference regarding the age, education, family income and family type groups on critical factors of exposure to advertising. The results indicate that there is no significant difference in accordance with the age group ($F = .096$, $p = 0.962$) and family type ($F = .186$, $p = 0.906$) there is a significant difference according to education ($F = 5.067$, $p = 0.001$) and family income ($F = 3.830$, $p = 0.002$) at 5 percent level of significance.

6.FINDINGS

	Unnecessary Purchasing	Low Nutritional Food	Materialism	Exposure to advertising
Age	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
Education	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted
Family Income	Accepted	Rejected	Rejected	Accepted
Family Type	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected

Parents across various age groups and family type felt commercials do not influence children in unnecessary purchasing of products. Parents across education and family income groups felt commercials do influence children in unnecessary purchase of products.

Parents across various age groups, family income and family type felt commercials do not influence children in purchase of low nutritional food. Parents across education groups felt commercials do influence children in purchase of low nutritional food.

Parents across various age groups, family income and family type felt commercials do not influence children in indulging in materialism. Parents across education groups felt commercials do influence children in indulging in materialism.

Parents across various age groups and family type felt commercials do not influence children in exposure to advertising. Parents across education and family income groups felt commercials do influence in exposure to advertising.

7. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings through primary data analysis and through review of literature the study has significant managerial implications. First of all, it provides an insight into the influence of socio demographic variables on parent's perception of influence of TV commercials on their children's purchase behavior. Questions were asked from various respondents whose children belong to different categories of schools. The questions related to children insisting on unnecessary purchase of products when they see its advertisement and purchasing of products they already have. The questions related to children insisting on purchase of low nutritional food, for and junk food. The questions related to children's obsessive behavior leading to materialism, was on demanding for Play stations, I-pod, toys and gifts. Some questions were also asked on exposure to new product advertisements leading to purchase of new varieties of products.

The results show how the influence of commercials play an important role in defining purchase behavior in children. This study is helpful to organizations in shaping their promotional strategies, psychologists in understanding human behavior and to parents in understanding the influence of commercials on their children.

8. REFERENCES

1. Ward, S. and D.B. Wackman, (1972) Children's purchase influence attempts and parental yielding. *J. Market. Res.*, 9: pp 316-319
2. Mangleburg, T. F., (1990). Children's Influence in Purchase Decisions: A Review and Critique. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 17(1), pp 813-825
3. Beatty, S.E., Talpade, S. (1994), "Adolescent influence in family decision making: a replication with extension", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 21 No. September, pp.332-41
4. Young, B.M., deBruin, A., Eagle, L. (2003.), Attitudes of Parents Toward Advertising to Children in the UK, Sweden and New Zealand, *Journal of Marketing Management*, pp 475-490.
5. Baiocco, R., D'Alessio, M., Laghi, F., (2009) Discrepancies Between Parents' and Children's Attitudes Toward TV Advertising, *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 170 (2), pp 176-191.
6. Goldberg, Marvin E. and Gerald J. Gorn (1978), "Some Unintended Consequences of TV Advertising to Children," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 5 (June), pp 22-29.
7. Gupta, S. & Chundawat, D.S. (2002). Family and social influences in buying decision making – A study of television, *Decision*, 29 (2) July-Dec, 2002, pp 45-65.
8. Kaur, P. & Singh, R. (2006). Children in Family purchase decision making in India and the West, *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, Vol. 8, pp. 12-34.

9. Grossbart, S.L., Crosby, L.A., (1984) Understanding the Bases of Parental Concern and Reactions to Children's Food Advertising, *Journal of Marketing*, 48 (3), pp 79-92
10. McNeal, J. U. (1964) 'Children as Consumers', Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas, Austin.