



Marketing Management

Elixir Marketing Mgmt. 70 (2014) 24174-24180

Elixir
ISSN: 2229-712X

A Regression Analysis approach to study the impact of T.V. Advertisement targeted to Children on Family Purchase Decision

Ramandeep Kaur Chahal¹, Ramandeep S. Deol² and Navjit Singh²

¹SSS-ETC, Gurdaspur, Punjab.

²PTU, Jalandhar, Punjab.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 16 March 2014;

Received in revised form:

25 April 2014;

Accepted: 9 May 2014;

Keywords

T.V. Advertisement,
Children,
Family Purchase Decision.

ABSTRACT

Children in middle-class India take important decisions in the home, thereby contributing majorly to household budget contours. From buying white goods and cars, to cell phones and grocery and even insurance policies, children under the age of 13 are deciding which brands their parents should or should not buy. On the other hand parents today are willing to buy more for their kids because trends such as smaller family size, dual incomes and postponing children until later in life mean that families have more disposable income. The aim of this paper is to study the role of T.V. advertisement targeted to the Children in the purchase decision of the family. Today our market is flooded with advertisements targeted to children specially FMCG, Automobiles, Electronic goods sectors where child artists are used to influence the children watching the advertisements on T.V. and ultimately tell their parents about the product to be purchased. This promotional strategy adopted by many companies today has its pros and cons and the authors will try to discuss the same with the help of a primary study to be conducted in Jalandhar District of Punjab. The authors prepared a Questionnaire and apply descriptive statistics and regression analysis to find the impact of T.V. advertisement targeted to children on family purchase decision.

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved

Introduction

T.V. Advertisement & Children

According to Bhattacharyya & Kohli (2007) children in middle-class India take important decisions in the home, thereby contributing majorly to household budget contours. From buying white goods and cars, to cell phones and grocery and even insurance policies, children under the age of 13 are deciding which brands their parents should or should not buy. A study conducted by Cartoon Network and NFO across 14 A and B class cities in India with 6,436 respondents, which included kids in the age group of seven-14 years and mothers, reveals that children are now not mute spectators in major purchase decisions. Even in items not directly concerning they have strong preferences. In cars, it was found that the preferred brand of kids was the Hyundai Santro and that around 32 per cent of kids accompany parents when they go buying a car. Among watches the favourite brand of kids was Titan, while in TV the preferred brand was LG. And in music systems it was Sony. Among products that directly concern kids like colas, chocolates, biscuits and chips, children's preferences have changed somewhat. As against Pepsi some years ago, Coca-Cola has emerged as the favourite brand of fizzy drink for kids in India, while Britannia is the most favoured biscuit brand. In chocolates Cadbury's has beaten Nestle to being the kids' favourite brand. Among chips, the kids prefer PepsiCo's brand Lay's. Shift in target audience has happened on account of the fact that in middle and upper income families, television has come to occupy prime space. TV viewing has even replaced dinner table conversation. Nuclear families, working parents and latchkey kids in the metros mean that children get to spend very little time with either parent. Many spend their free time watching television or surfing the Internet.

Children and Marketing

Marketers across the world and in India have are targeting children for marketing of their products. Kids represent an important demographic to marketers because they have their own purchasing power, they influence their parents' buying decisions and they're the adult consumers of the future. As well, guilt can play a role in spending decisions as time-stressed parents substitute material goods for time spent with their kids. A child wakes up in Disney character pajamas; the toothbrush, toothpaste and perhaps even the soap are covered in cute licensed characters. They have highly advertised cereals for breakfast. Parents on the other hand have a different opinion according to them the excessive information and products thrown at them via the media, print and visual, spoiled the children. Most marketers were targeting kids even for products that had nothing to do with children.

Schools and Marketing

A school setting delivers a captive youth audience. Marketers are eagerly exploiting this medium in a number of ways, including:

- Sponsored educational materials: for example HLL has been going to school and taking to girl students on the menstrual cycles and health care after which they promote their sanitary towels and tell the girls on how it is the best along with which they give free samples. They are targeting young girls in the age group of 9 to 11 and capturing a young market.
- Advertising posted in classrooms, school buses, for health drinks of particular brands in exchange of sponsoring events or money.
- Contests and incentive programs: Many marketers advertise their products by sponsoring sports events or cultural events in

Tele:

E-mail addresses: navjit.singh13@yahoo.co.in

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved

schools. They may also hold competitions for e.g. Camel has been conducting drawing competitions in schools for decades where they advertise their product. ICICI bank a company that does not have a product range that is for kids have been holding contests through which they get names and contact numbers of the parents whom they then contact.

Role of Children in Decision Making

Today's kids have more autonomy and power in decision-making within the family and are vocal about what they want their parents to buy. "Pester power" refers to children's ability to nag their parents into purchasing items they may not otherwise buy. Marketing to children is all about creating pester power, because advertisers know what a powerful force it can be. For the second year running, McDonald's has won the Pester Power Award in the Parents Jury Children's Television Food Advertising Awards. More than 1400 parents voted in the awards, which highlight the role played by marketing and advertising in the childhood obesity epidemic. McDonald's won the Pester Power Award for its Happy Meals advertisements, which the Parents Jury said use the promise of free toys to encourage children to pester their parents to take them to the fast food chain. Recent studies have shown that the influence children exert on the purchasing decisions in households is extensive and on the increase. Some of the factors cited are as follows:

- Parents are having fewer children and thus spending more on each child;
- Parents are having children later, at a time when they are beyond the struggle phase in their career;
- Young professionals purchase presents for children to compensate for the lack of time they are able to spend with them;
- Children are known to have strong tastes and preferences, and advertising surely has an impact on them. Today, most toothpaste advertising has started revolving around children, far from the time when the family was shown brushing together. Children decide on the toothpaste that the family will use.

Review of Literature

TV Advertisements and Child Behaviour

In last 20 years impact of TV advertisements on children memory and behavior is the major topic of debates in countries open for market competition (Boddewyn, 1984). Till 1988 advertising expense of TV program raised up to \$500 million approximately (Leccese, 1989). While looking at the children responses to TV advertisement a research experiment revealed that children's food choices specially in snacks are based on their exposure to TV commercials (Gorn and Goldberg, 1982). Atkin (1981) also confirmed these findings in his experimental study and found that the children with heavy exposure to TV advertisements are more likely to recall those brands while shopping in the market and with their parents. Those children demand advertised food products and toys while moving in market with their parents. Children ranging in between 6 to 11 years of age watch TV commercials 3 hours a day and it is estimated that over the period of a year average child see about 20,000 advertisements (Adler et al, 1980). Most of the research in consumer behavior and specially on advertisement impact on children has focused two major points : (1) impact of TV commercials in shaping behavior and its positive or negative influence on children life and habits. (2) Role of TV commercials on the development and growth mental as well as physical of the children's (Donohue, Meyer and Henke, 1978). A sad or happy program or commercial can affect the mood, and cognition of the viewer. A happy program can produce

effectiveness and positive cognitive response to commercial as well as better and effective recall (Goldberg and Gorn, 1987). Galst and White (1976) proposed a cause and effect relationship and found strong correlations between TV advertisement exposure of children and their purchase preferences as well as amount of purchase while shopping with their parents. Results of a two method study on snacks and sugar foods revealed that effectively designed message in TV advertisements can generate action and effectively persuasion in children for purchase of the product (Goldberg, Gorn and Gibson, 1978).

Impact on Family Purchase Decision

In Western literature, children have been reported to wield a lot of influence in purchase decisions for children products such as snacks (Ahuja and Stinson, 1993); toys (Burns and Harrison, 1985; Jensen, 1995; Williams and Veeck, 1998); children's wear (Converse and Crawford, 1949; Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988; Holdert and Antonides, 1997; Van Syckle, 1951); and cereals (Belch et al., 1985; Berey and Pollay, 1968). Children have been observed to influence decisions for family products also, such as holiday/vacations (Ahuja and Stinson, 1993; Belch et al., 1985; Dunne, 1999; Holdert and Antonides, 1997; Jenkins, 1979); movies (Darley and Lim, 1986); and eating at particular restaurants or even decision making for the family to eat out (Filiatrault and Ritchie, 1980; Williams and Veeck, 1998). Some researchers investigated the role children play in purchase of children and family products together (Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988; Geuens et al., 2002; Hall et al., 1995; Mangleburg et al., 1999; McNeal and Yeh, 1997). Jensen (1995) studied three categories of products—those that are primarily for children (e.g., toys, candy), products for family consumption (food, shampoo, toothpaste), and parents' products (gasoline, coffee, rice). Similarly, Johnson (1995) selected products as categorized by Sheth (1974)—products for individual use, those for family use, and finally products for the household. In India, Singh (1992) studied the role played by family members while purchasing a television across five occupational categories: teachers, doctors, businesspeople, lawyers, and engineers. Children of engineers and doctors were found to have remarkable influence in the purchase decision. Hundal (2001) in a study of rural buying behavior in the Amritsar district of Punjab investigated the role of family members in making purchase decisions for durables including refrigerators, televisions, air coolers, and washing machines. His findings projected that product selection decisions in rural families were mostly made by spouses together but they were highly influenced by children. Halan (2002) opines that "marketing to kids is no longer kid stuff" (p.46). In a focus group study by Kids-Link, the market research group of Kid Stuff Promos and Events, with boys and girls in the age group of 13-15 years in Delhi, girls estimated that they were able to influence 50 percent of the decisions. The study highlighted that kids have a lot of information because of exposure to television, other media, and friends. They reflected that parents sought their opinion even in making purchase of products not directly related to the children, such as cars, because of their higher knowledge of brands, models, and the latest trends. Also, children stated that parents bought products that made the kids happy.

Impacts of TV advertisement on Children

As materialism is perceived to increase in young children, the chance of parent-child conflict tends to increase. Children try to become part of the consuming, materialistic public, and pressure their parents to buy particular products – those commodities that provide instant happiness upon consumption. Some of these items are costly or harmful to the child –

characteristics which parents can understand although their children may not. This discrepancy in views can often result in arguments, tantrums and verbal aggression. While there is no solid proof that advertising is the cause of child-parent conflict, Ward and Wackman (1972) did determine that a positive correlation between child product requests and the level of parent-child conflicts did exist. Perhaps this is one area in which more research can be undertaken; for example, does a relationship exist between the amount of exposure to commercials and the level of arguing? As children view the commercial more often, does their combative style and their level of anger increase? The existence of parent-child conflict has resulted in many children actually attaining their desired products. However, many of these same children can experience anger, disappointment or even unhappiness when they receive the desired product and it does not meet their expectations. Children believe that they will attain the life portrayed in the commercial, and when, upon purchase of a product, they deem their own lives to be less satisfactory, they may become disappointed. Second, when the child receives products and they do not meet the performance standards set by the child, this actual experience can incite anger and unhappiness. For example, when a child is bought Rice Krispies, and Snap, Crackle and Pop don't come alive to amuse them, they can feel cheated and unhappy with the entire experience. Anger may even result from these unfulfilled expectations.

Objectives & Hypothesis

On reviewing the above literature the authors framed the following Objectives:

To study the relationship between the "watching Advertisement on TV by children" with:

- Developing a purchase desire among children of the advertised product.
- Influencing the family purchase decision by telling the parents about advertised product.
- Developing the materialistic attitude among children due to excessive exposure to TV advertisement.
- Developing a stage of Child parent Conflict while making the purchases.

On the basis of the above objectives the following Hypothesis were framed.

Hypothesis

H01: There is no relationship between Watching T.V. Advertising and purchase intention among children.

H02: There is no relationship between Watching T.V advertisement and influencing family purchase decision by children.

H03: There is no relationship between Watching T.V advertising and Materialism among children.

H04: There is no relationship between Watching T.V advertisement and Child parent conflict

Research Design

The research is primarily descriptive in nature in which authors conducted a primary study on a sample of 125 Parents selected from Hoshairpur City of Punjab. The convenience and snowball sampling method was used while selecting the sample. A questionnaire was developed to elicit the information from the parents about their child's influence in the family purchase decision after watching TV advertisements. The responses were obtained on a 5 point Likert scale from the respondents and Interview method was chosen for administering the questionnaire. The data was analyzed with the help of bivariate correlation and simple regression techniques to see if their exists a significant relationship in the variables under study.

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

The authors identified five variables after a comprehensive literature survey and name them as "Watching TV Ad", "Developing a purchase Intention", "Influence on family Purchase Decision", "Materialism among children" and "Child Parent Conflict". The authors used the first variable "Watching TV Ad by children" as Independent variable and its effect on other variables was studied by using simple linear regression techniques through SPSS.

Correlation:

The bivariate correlation was obtained of the variables among themselves as shown in **Table 1**. It was found that the "Watching TV Ad" is having a positive and high correlation of: 0.863 with "Developing a purchase Intention" 0.643 with "Influence on family Purchase Decision", 0.603 with "Materialism among children" and negative and low correlation with -0.158. It means the first three variables are positively and highly correlated with the Independent variable i.e. "Watching TV Ad".

Simple Linear Regression Models

Hypothesis One:

H01: There is no relationship between Watching T.V. Advertising and purchase intention among children.

The above hypothesis was tested through SPSS and the results are shown in **Table no. 2, 3 & 4**.

The value of R in table 2 is 0.863 and R Square is 0.745. The value of R shows a positive between variables. The table 3 shows the sum of squares for regression, residual and the total. The regression sum of square value is 72.98 and the residual sum of squares 25.01. The value of F test is 358.883 significant at α 0.000. This shows the models goodness of fit in explaining the variations. This rejects our null Hypothesis and validates alternative hypothesis H11. Table 4 shows the betas values of constant and the variables in the model. The beta values show the importance of each variable and represent the t statistics values for each variable in the model. The value of t for preparedness is well above +2, which makes it a useful predictor. Hence we reject H01.

Hypothesis Two:

H02: There is no relationship between Watching T.V advertisement and influencing family purchase decision by children.

The above hypothesis was tested through SPSS and the results are shown in **Table no. 5, 6 & 7**.

The value of R in Table 5 is 0.643 and R Square is 0.414. The value of R shows a positive between variables. The Table 6 shows the sum of squares for regression, residual and the total. The regression sum of square value is 22.86 and the residual sum of squares 32.38. The value of F test is 86.15 significant at α 0.000. This shows the models goodness of fit in explaining the variations. This rejects our null Hypothesis and validates alternative hypothesis H11. Table 7 shows the betas values of constant and the variables in the model. The beta values show the importance of each variable and represent the t statistics values for each variable in the model. The value of t for preparedness is well above +2, which makes it a useful predictor. Hence we reject H01.

Hypothesis Three:

H03: There is no relationship between Watching T.V advertising and Materialism among children.

The above hypothesis was tested through SPSS and the results are shown in **Table no. 8, 9 & 10**.

The value of R in Table 8 is 0.603 and R Square is 0.363. The value of R shows a positive between variables.

Table 1

Correlations						
		WATCHAD	PURCHDESIRE	FINALPURCH	materialistic	conflict
WATCHAD	Pearson Correlation	1	.863**	.643**	.603**	-.158
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.079
	N	125	125	125	125	125
PURCHDESIRE	Pearson Correlation	.863**	1	.535**	.704**	-.182*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.042
	N	125	125	125	125	125
FINALPURCH	Pearson Correlation	.643**	.535**	1	.273**	.133
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.002	.140
	N	125	125	125	125	125
materialistic	Pearson Correlation	.603**	.704**	.273**	1	-.200*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.002		.025
	N	125	125	125	125	125
conflict	Pearson Correlation	-.158	-.182*	.133	-.200*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.079	.042	.140	.025	
	N	125	125	125	125	125
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).						

Table 2

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.863 ^a	.745	.743	.451
a. Predictors: (Constant), WATCHAD				

Table 3

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	72.986	1	72.986	358.883	.000 ^a
	Residual	25.014	123	.203		
	Total	98.000	124			
a. Predictors: (Constant), WATCHAD						
b. Dependent Variable: PURCHDESIRE						

Table 4

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.118	.117		9.554	.000
	WATCHAD	.635	.034	.863	18.944	.000
a. Dependent Variable: PURCHDESIRE						

Table 5

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.643 ^a	.414	.409	.513
a. Predictors: (Constant), WATCHAD				

Table 6

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	22.860	1	22.860	86.815	.000 ^a
	Residual	32.388	123	.263		
	Total	55.248	124			
a. Predictors: (Constant), WATCHAD						
b. Dependent Variable: FINALPURCH						

Table 7

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.339	.133		10.053	.000
	WATCHAD	.355	.038	.643	9.317	.000
a. Dependent Variable: FINALPURCH						

Table 8

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.603 ^a	.363	.358	.822
a. Predictors: (Constant), WATCHAD				

Table 9. Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.019	.213		9.465	.000
	WATCHAD	.511	.061	.603	8.374	.000
a. Dependent Variable: materialistic						

Table 10

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	47.363	1	47.363	70.117	.000 ^a
	Residual	83.085	123	.675		
	Total	130.448	124			
a. Predictors: (Constant), WATCHAD						
b. Dependent Variable: materialistic						

Table 11

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.158 ^a	.025	.017	.356
a. Predictors: (Constant), WATCHAD				

Table 12

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.397	1	.397	3.138	.079 ^a
	Residual	15.555	123	.126		
	Total	15.952	124			
a. Predictors: (Constant), WATCHAD						
b. Dependent Variable: conflict						

Table 13

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	1.282	.092		13.883	.000
WATCHAD	-.047	.026	-.158	-1.771	.079
a. Dependent Variable: conflict					

The Table 9 shows the sum of squares for regression, residual and the total. The regression sum of square value is 47.36 and the residual sum of squares 83.08. The value of F test is 70.11 significant at α 0.000. This shows the models goodness of fit in explaining the variations. This rejects our null Hypothesis and validates alternative hypothesis H11. Table 10 shows the betas values of constant and the variables in the model. The beta values show the importance of each variable and represent the t statistics values for each variable in the model. The value of t for preparedness is well above +2, which makes it a useful predictor. Hence we reject H01 and accept the alternate hypothesis that there is a relationship between "watching TV AD" and "Materialism among Children".

Hypothesis Four:

H04: There is no relationship between Watching T.V advertisement and Child parent conflict

The above hypothesis was tested through SPSS and the results are shown in **Table no. 11, 12 & 13.**

The value of R in Table 11 is 0.158 and R Square is 0.025. The value of R shows a very negligible positive relation between variables. The Table 12 shows the sum of squares for regression, residual and the total. The regression sum of square value is very small i.e. 0.397 and the residual sum of squares 15.55. The value of F test is 3.13 which is not significant at 0.05. This accepts our null Hypothesis. Table 13 shows the betas values of constant and the variables in the model. The value of t is also not significant at 0.05. Hence we accept null hypothesis that there is no relationship between "watching TV AD" and "Child Parent Conflict"

Conclusion:

The focus of the study was to determine the impact of television advertising targeted to children on family purchase decision. Television advertising on children influences determinants such as developing a purchase desire, influencing family decisions, developing materialism among children. In today's media oriented society, almost every children is bombarded continuously with mass media messages including over hundreds advertisements every day, from television, radio, movies, video/computer games, Internet, music CDs, billboards, newspapers, magazines, clothing, packaging and other marketing materials. Such daily exposure to many forms of the mass media has a tremendous impact upon thinking, values, purchases, food intake, attitude, and actions of children. Research evidence tends to suggest that television advertising results in developing a strong purchase desire of the advertised product among children which ultimately leads to high materialism among them and it strongly influence the future family purchase decisions as children play an active part in family purchases as told by the parents of the children considered under this study. However despite all these there is a pleasing finding of this study is that according to the parents there is no clear evidence of any Child-Parent Conflict arising out of the influence of children on family purchase decisions.

References:

- Adler, Richard P., Scott Ward, Gerald S. Lesser, Laurene K. Merringoff, Thomas S. Robertson, and John R. Rossiter (1980), *The Effects of Television Advertising on Children: Review and Recommendations*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books
- Atkin, Charles K. (1981), "Effects of Television Advertising on Children," in *Children and the Faces of Television: Teaching, Violence, Selling*, Edward L. Palmer and Aimee Dorr, eds. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 287-304.
- Ahuja, R. D. B. and K.M. Stinson. 1993. "Female-Headed Single Parent Families: An Exploratory Study of Children's Influence in Family Decision Making." *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20, 469-474.
- Belch, G., M.A. Belch, and G. Ceresino. 1985. "Parental and Teenage Influences in Family Decision Making." *Journal of Business Research*, 13 (April), 163 – 176.
- Berey, Lewis A. and R.W. Pollay. 1968, "The Influencing Role of Child in Family Decision-Making." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 5 (February), 70-72.
- Bhattacharyya & Kohli (2007), "Target Marketing to Children – The Ethical Aspect", Presented at *International Marketing Conference on Marketing & Society, 8-10 April, 2007, IIMK*
- Boddewyn, J. J. (1984), *Advertising to Children: Regulation and Self-Regulation in 40 Countries*. New York: International Advertising Association, Inc.
- Burns, A.C. and M.C. Harrison. 1985. "Children's Self-Perceptions of Their Participation in Retail Store Patronage Decisions." *Advances in Consumer Research*, 12.
- Converse, P.D. and C.M. Crawford. 1949. "Family Buying: Who Does It? Who Influences It?" *Current Economic Comment*, 11 (November), 28 – 50.
- Darley, W. F. and J. S. Lim. 1986. "Family Decision Making in Leisure Time Activities: An Exploratory Investigation of the Impact of Locus of Control, Child Age Influence Factor and Parental Type on Perceived Child Influence." In *Advances in Consumer Research*, 13, Richard J. Lutz (Ed.), Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 370-374.
- Donohue, T.R., Meyer, T.P. & Henke, L.L. (1978) 'Black and white children's perceptions of television commercials', *Journal of Marketing*, 42, 34 –40.
- Filiatrault, Pierre and J.R.B. Ritchie. 1980. "Joint Purchasing Decisions: A Comparison of Influence Structure in Family and Couple Decision-Making Units." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7 (September), 131- 140.
- Foxman, Ellen, Patriya S. Tansuhaj, and K. M. Ekstrom. 1989. "Family Members' Perception of Adolescents Influence in Family Decision-Making." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (March), 482-91.
- Galst, Joann and White, Mary (1976), "The Unhealthy Persuader: The Reinforcing Value of Television and Children's Purchase-Influencing Attempts at the Super- market," *Child Development*, 47.
- Geuens, M.G., G. Mast, and P.D. Pelsmacker. 2002. "Children's Influence on Family Purchase Behavior: The Role of Family

- Structure." *Asia Pacific Advances in Consumer Research*, 5, 130-135.
- Gorn, Gerald J. and Marvin E. Goldberg (1982), "Behavioral Evidence of the Effects of Televised Food Messages on Children," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (2), 200-5.
- Halan, Deepak. 2002. "Why Kids Mean Business," *Indian Management*, December, 46-49.
- Holdert, F. and G. Antonides. 1997. "Family Type Effects on Household Members' Decision Making," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 24, 48-54
- Hundal, B.S. 2001. "Consumer Behaviour in Rural Market: A Study of Durables." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar.
- Jensen, J.M. 1995. "Children's Purchase Requests and Parental Responses: Results from an Exploratory Study in Denmark." *European Advances in Consumer Research*, 2, 54-60.
- Leccese, Donna (1989), "Toy Advertising and TV: A Healthy Marriage," *Playthings* (July), 28- 55.
- Mangleburg, T. and T. Bristol. 1998. "Socialization and Adolescents' Skepticism toward Advertising." *Journal of Advertising*, Fall. (www.findarticles.com).
- McNeal, J.U. and C.H. Yeh. 1997. "Development of Consumer Behavior Patterns among Chinese Children." 14 (1), *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 45-59
- Sheth, J. N. 1974. "A Theory of Family Buying Decisions." In Jagdish N. Sheth (Ed.), *Models Of Buyer Behaviour - Conceptual, Qualitative and Empirical*, New York: Harper and Row Publications, 17-33.
- Singh, P. 1992. "Family Buying Behavior for TV - An Empirical Investigation." *Vaniya*, 4 (March), 124-133.
- Ward, S. and Daniel Wackman. 1972. "Children's Purchase Influence Attempts and Parental Yielding," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9 (November), 316- 319.
- Williams, L.A. and A. Veeck. 1998. "An Exploratory Study of Children's Purchase Influence in Urban China." *Asia Pacific Advances in Consumer Research*, 3, 13-19.