

Relationship between Parental Overindulgence and Buying Behavior in the Context of Invasive Marketing: A Comparative Study of Two Cultures

Singh Thakur Mahima*

*Apeejay School of Management
New Delhi, India*

Khatri Puja**

*Guru Govind Singh Indraprastha University
New Delhi, India*

Abstract

This scientific investigation adopts a cross cultural perspective in studying the relationship between parental overindulgence and perception of parents regarding the influence of children in bringing in awareness, creating interest, desire and influencing final purchase decision of packaged food products. Child rearing practices differ from culture to culture and can be an important factor influencing the buying behaviour of families. Parenting styles in two cultures (American & Indian) were studied to gauge the level of influence of children to the four levels of AIDA (Strong 1925). The sample size was 117 (40 American parents and 77 Indian parents). The results indicate that there exists no significant difference in the two cultures regarding the contribution of children in bringing in initial information, creating interest and desire about packaged food products in the family but the two cultures differed significantly in terms of the contribution kids have in influencing the actual buying decisions regarding packaged food products. The influence of American children was lower in final purchase than Indian children. Indian parents showed higher level of indulgence ($M=3.33$,

* Main Author, Professor, Apeejay School of Management (msthakur_iitd@yahoo.co.in).

** Coauthor, Professor, Guru Govind Singh Indraprastha University (pujakhatri12@gmail.com).

S.D. =1.7) than American parents (M=2.02, S.D. =1.86). The level of indulgence was found to regress on actual buying behavior of parents. The study points at the shift of Indian parents towards over indulgence as a result of invasive marketing practices targeted at the children. The study has implications for marketers, social agencies, and parents and attempts to highlight the growing in marketing influence in the socio cultural fabric.

Keywords: overindulgent parenting style, AIDA, parental buying behaviour, intercultural context

INTRODUCTION

Overwhelming level of social stimulation inundates families today. Marketers over the globe are targeting children as influential vehicles of marketing and prospective adult consumers. These children have their own purchase power and influence over the buying decisions of parents. Children contribute in the decision making process of various products in families. The family dynamics (family climate, parental style) buffer the impact of the role of children in the different stages (awareness, interest, desire and actual buy, AIDA; Strong 1925) of decision making process. The family culture may be a microcosm of the national or regional culture. Thus decision making in families may differ in collectivistic and individualistic cultures. The Western cultural value ascribes individualism and low-context while Asian/oriental ascribes collectivism and high-context (Kim et al. 1998). Individualism-collectivism is a cultural-level variable referring to the extent to which members of a culture tend to have an independent versus interdependent construal of the self (Hofstede 1980). These cultural values influence consumption related behaviors (Wang 1999). In western/individualistic cultures the role of children in decision making process would be encouraged, whereas in collectivistic cultures harmony and blending would be encouraged (Park and Jun 2003). Research has showed that with the convergence of cultures children in collectivistic cultures have started to wield decision making power.

Today children have more autonomy and decision-making power within the family than in previous generations. The amount of influence exerted by children varies by product category and stage of the decision making process. For some

products, they are active initiators, information seekers, and buyers; whereas for other product categories, they influence purchases made by the parents. This influence is termed as “Pester power” which refers to children’s’ ability to nag their parents into purchasing items they may not otherwise buy (Mintel 2002). Marketing to children is all about creating pester power as it is a powerful marketing tool. Contemporary researchers express that children constitute a major consumer market, with direct purchasing power for snacks and sweets, and indirect purchase influence while shopping for big-ticket items (Halan 2002; Singh 1998). Children exert this power on their parents as to what food will be purchased for the household (Darian 1998).

Potentially, children constitute the most lucrative market or many businesses (Refer to figure 1.1). Kaur and Singh (2006) point out those children constitute three different markets: the primary, the influencer, and the future market (figure 1). Certain products are simply children’s products for which they are the primary users/buyers. They sometimes either purchase a product themselves or select the product before it is purchased by the parents. For other products, such as ones which are used by the entire family unit, they may influence purchases made by the parents. There are some products where children wield direct influence or pester power by overtly specifying their preferences




Figure 1.1 (Source: Kaur & Singh, 2006)

and voicing them aloud. For other products, parents' buying patterns are affected by prior knowledge of the tastes and preferences of their children. This 'passive dictation' of choice is prevalent for a wide variety of daily consumed product items as well as products for household consumption

McNeal and Ji (1999) point out that children learn their consumer-related skills, knowledge, and attitudes through interaction with various social agents in specific social settings, a process that is usually termed consumer socialization (Ward 1974) or consumer development (McNeal 1964). McNeal (1998) notes that parents today worry that their children should have it as good as other children, and therefore are giving them more money, more things, and more opportunities to better compete. There is considerable evidence to suggest that family communication processes modify the effects of other socialization agents, in particular television (McLeod et al. 1982), and this parental mediation is often the result of a child's requests for advertised products (Atkin 1982) The purchasing act is governed by how the children have been socialized to act as consumers (Kaur and Singh 2006).

INVASIVE MARKETING AND CHILDREN

There is a deluge of information about products and services, bewildering range of options and alternatives, endless promotions and "special offers". Mitchell and Papavassiliou (2005) points out that confused consumers are more vulnerable to deceptive marketing practices and are not able to process information logically. Advertising is instrumental in extending consumer confusion through information overload brought about with too many complex and even conflicting messages. These weaken the effect and decrease the recall rate of individual messages thereby leading to more problems of decision making. There is great concern about children as viewers of advertisements primarily because young children are exposed to thousands of commercials each year in India (George 2003) as well as in the West (Kunkel et al. 2004). Marketing and advertising are accentuating customer confusions to levels where passive delegation of decision making has already been initiated.

More so quest for more disposable incomes and better life style has left the customer with very little time to be devoted to cognitive activity for decision making. Confused consumers can often involve another person (i.e. spouse, family member, and friend) in the purchasing decision or even delegate the task to them completely (Mitchell and Papalassiliou 2005). Increasing customer confusion and decreasing disposable time has thus lead to a state where in parents have started involving children in the purchase decision making process and have started passively delegating purchase decision responsibilities to their children. Approximately, 80% of all advertising targeted to children falls within four product categories: toys, cereals, candies, and fast-food restaurants (Kunkel and Gantz 1992)

According to Turner et al (2006), children are influenced by a number of socialization agents, which influence their purchase decisions. The cognitive-psychological model and the social learning model explain and predict how consumers make consumption-related decisions (Moschis and Churchill 1978). In communication and advertising research, the social learning model has often been a popular choice for explaining consumer behavior (Moschis and Smith 1985). Children try to emulate and develop general behaviors and attitudes by modeling the behavior of others (Bandura 1977). These models often become “role” models for the individual, influencing the career aspirations, educational objectives, and self-views of young people (Mitchell et al. 1979). Halan (2002) opines that “marketing to kids is no longer kid stuff”. This study reflected that parents considered the knowledge of children in terms of brands, models and latest trends was much higher then their own and hence sought their opinion in purchase decision of products..

Children are very susceptible to advertising, for example, McDonalds’ Happy Meals came with a free “Smurf” character in July 2002, one of nine characters which children were encouraged to collect (Parents’ Jury 2002). Solomon (1996) argues that children are targeted directly with messages of what food products to buy, which will influence them to pester their parents when shopping. Parents often find it difficult to deny their children food that features their favorite cartoon characters or celebrities that they have seen on television (Keane and Willetts 1994). Jensen (1995) also found that purchase requests

by children are strongly stimulated by commercials or by friends who have purchased the product. The Indian context is replete with practical examples of success of advertisements targeting children. The Asian paints kid's creative advertisement, Esteem's "my daddy's big car", Mc Donald's *happy meal*, surf excel 'Daag Achchey hain' advertisement, and 'my Daddy strongest', *Dhara cooking oil* are examples of such advertisements popular in India. Though critics have strongly condemned merchandising of teletoys via food chains like McDonald and Burger king, but this has not prevented the cross promotion. According to Kaur and Singh advertising to children avoids any appeal to the rational, emphasizing instead that ads are for entertainment and "enjoyable for their own sake" as opposed to providing any real consumer information. The most common persuasive strategy employed in advertising to children is to associate the product with fun and happiness, rather than to provide any factual product-related information. Hence, children in the age category 8-10 years have a positive attitude towards advertisements (Seiter 1993). Advertisements have contributed to the convergence of cultures to a great extent. Cultures today are losing their ethnicity and identity and becoming more 'popular' cultures wherein the style of living is perpetrated by the advertisements (Schlosser 2001). Aggressive marketing of food products via children has led to a nation of obese younger generation both in U.S.A (Schlosser 2001) and India (India Today, March 2004). Hastings et al. (2003) points out that children receive advertising messages which have more to do with fantasy and fun than health and nutrition. According to the Canadian Pediatric Society, most food advertising on children's TV shows is for fast foods, soft drinks, candy and pre-sweetened cereals?while commercials for healthy food make up only four per cent of those shown.

PESTER POWER VERSUS PARENTAL INFLUENCE

The impressionistic minds of children try to force their parents to buy the promoted products (Moschis and Churchill 1978; Moschis and Moore 1982; O'Guinn and Shrum 1997). McNeal and Yeh (1997) demonstrate that children have great influence

on their parents' spending. 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; Bery 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) McNeal and Ji (1996) point out that children have substantial input into their parents' decision making related to weekend activities inside and outside home. Comparatively in India, there is not much research done on the Indian sample investigating the role of children in family decision. Singh (1992) studied the role played by family members while purchasing a television across five occupational categories: teachers, doctors, businesspeople, lawyers, and engineers. Bery and Pollay (1968) studied mother and child dyads making purchases of ready-to-eat breakfast cereals. The extent of influence a child may have on a parent's purchase decision depends on at least two factors: the child's assertiveness and the parent's child-centeredness. (Kaur and Singh 2006). This influence can be at different stages of the decision making process of families ranging from the stage of creating awareness to the stage of actual buying behaviour. St.Elmo Lewis proposed a selling model in the 19th century (Strong 1925) which was related to the decision making process for product purchase. The stages, Attention, Interest, Desire, and Action, form a linear hierarchy. Simply put, in order to be motivated to actually make a purchase, Lewis believed that the fourth stage, Action, would come as a natural result of movement through the first three stages; i.e., desire leads to action.

Children passively generate awareness, interest and the desire towards products. For family activities, such as choice of vacations and restaurants and consumer durables, research has shown that the influence exerted by children is more in the

problem recognition stage and search stages and decreases considerably in final decision making (Belch et al 1985; Filiatrault and Ritchie 1980; Hempel 1974). However a study done by, Holdert and Antonides (1997) reported that children's influence was higher in the later stages of the decision making process- that is, at the time of alternative evaluation, choice, and purchase, for four purchases (holidays, adult and child clothing, and sandwich filling). The buying intentions may be mediated by parents. Thus parental authority holds significance in the purchase decisions. Parents of young children have an important role to play in protecting their kids from invasive marketing, and in educating them about advertising from an early age. Chan and McNeal (2003), in a study on Chinese parents, also reported that parents indulged in considerable gate keeping for children's products. They allowed some freedom to their children to choose brands but only for products that they wanted their children to buy thereby keeping strict control on what kind of products were bought by or for the child. Belch et al. (2005) proposed that since teenagers are high users of the internet, they have greater access to market information which could impact their influence in family decision making. They found that teens who perceive themselves to be 'internet mavens' (individuals who are relied upon more for providing information from the virtual marketplace), as well as their parents, believed that teens were more influential in all stages-initiation and information search, and alternative evaluation and final decision stages. Researchers have tried to study the influence of children across product categories and parental responses. Ward and Wackman (1972) investigated children's purchase influence attempts and parental yielding. Jensen (1995) studied purchase influence attempts by children in Denmark; the location and cause of requests and parental responses to the same. Atkin (1978) observed parent-child interaction in the supermarket for purchase of cereals and snacks Williams and Burns (2000) explored the dimensionality of children's direct influence attempts.

The question under consideration is if the children are able to lure parents to the extent of buying products or if the parental atmosphere is able to buffer the impact of these invasive marketing campaigns. Research has pointed out that there are primarily four types of parenting styles that differ in the amount

of responsiveness and control exercised by the parents. This typology categorizes them into indulgent, authoritarian, authoritative, and uninvolved parenting styles (Baumrind 1971, 1983, 1991a, 1991b, 1996). Each of these parenting styles reflects different naturally occurring patterns of parental values, practices, and behaviors (Baumrind 1991) and a distinct balance of responsiveness and demandingness. According to Kaur and Singh (2006) socialization of children is a function of parental style. Parental style is a “constellation of attitudes toward the child that are communicated to the child and that, taken together, create an emotional climate in which the parent’s behaviors are expressed” (Darling and Steinberg 1993). Differences in parental styles account for differences as regards to the way parents attempt to control children’s behavior through use of emotions, use of authority, etc. at the time of socializing them.

The socialization models of child development point at the impact of these socialization agencies. Belsky’s (1984) process model points out that optimal need gratification is necessary for child development, and at the same time exonerates the child’s role in his poor outcomes and places thrust on the parental role. Thus these models of child socialization and development lay emphasis on the role of parental influence. Not only are the children impacted upon by the socialization agents, the families are also impacted upon by these agencies. According to sociologist Bronfenbrenner (1977) individuals are like a “set of nested structures, each inside the next, like a set of Russian dolls”. In studying human development, one has to see within, beyond, and “across” how the several systems interact (family, workplace, and economy). Bronfenbrenner’s framework points out the four systems of influence on the child and his family- which are- the micro-system-which is related to the interpersonal interactions with the child, the meso-system-which consists of the interrelationships among settings (i.e. the home, a day-care centre, and the schools), the exo-system-which includes agencies outside the home like parental workplace, school boards, social service agencies, and planning commissions. The impact of invasive marketing on the children, parents, families and the nation becomes a prerogative of the exosystem, wherein the social agencies attempt to intervene and

initiate the required moves to prevent this potentially negative impact.

This study attempts to present child's contribution in the information, interest, desire and actual buy (AIDA; Strong 1925) of the food product in the Indian and American sample. The study also attempts to investigate the parental authority styles in the two countries and study the (AIDA) in relation to parenting in the two contexts as, parenting is emerging as a potential buffering variable, in the face of strong invasive marketing towards children. There are cultural differences in parenting styles. Differences between groups in childrearing goals and socialization practices reflect culturally specific adaptive solutions to problems posed by the demand characteristics of particular environments (Baumrind 1971; Belsky et al 1991; Ogbu 1981). Parenting in collectivistic cultures (as in Asian culture) is higher on demandingness than western parenting style (eg. Chao 1994; Harwood et al 1999). Bredehoft et al (1998) pointed out that western culture is high on over indulgence. Since cultural values influence consumption related behaviors (Wang 1999) it can be hypothesized that relationship between actual buying behaviour of parents and level of parental over indulgence would be significant in the western culture where purchasing power coupled with indulgent parenting style would make parents indulge in higher frequency of buying of (food) products as a result of pester power of children. Such pester power would not be very effective in authoritarian parenting cultures.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The study is a cross cultural causal study. The sample was parents of children in the 8-11 age groups. Two cultural samples were taken (N = 117). In case of American sample the sampling was purposive. In the first stage, parents of 8-11 year olds were selected out of a group of 130 employees of a MNC in oil sector in Houston, America. Out of these 40 were selected randomly. Similarly 77 Indian parents were randomly selected from amongst 160 employees in three MNCs in oil sector. This age group was selected as 'tweens' (age group-8-11 years) is an

important target segment of marketers today. To assess the level of AIDA, a 12 items questionnaire was constructed and parental authoritativeness, authoritarianism and overindulgence levels were tapped using an adapted version of Buri's (1991) parental authority style questionnaire which had a reported reliability of 0.84. The data was subjected to bivariate and multivariate analysis using correlation tests, regression analysis and t-test.

HYPOTHESES

H1: There is a significant difference between the influence of children in the levels of awareness, interest, desire and intentions of actual buying decision (AIDA) in Indian and American samples in relation to packaged food products

H1a: There is a significant difference between the levels of awareness generated by children of Indian and American parents in relation to packaged food products.

H1b: There is a significant difference between the levels of interest generated by the children of Indian and American parents in relation to packaged food products.

H1c: There is a significant difference between the levels of desire created by the children of Indian and American parents in relation to packaged food products.

H1d: There is a significant difference between the levels of influence of children on the actual buying decision of Indian and American parents in relation to packaged food products

H2: There is a significant difference in the level of overindulgence in the parenting style of the Indian and American sample.

H3: There is a positive relationship between level of overindulgence in parenting style and level of influence of children in actual buying decision of parents

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis H1 was partially supported and partially rejected. There was no significant difference in the level of interest, awareness and desire generated by the children in both the

cultures but there was a significant difference in the level of actual buy in the two cultures(refer to table1, figure1). The American parents tend to be more cautious and adopt a balanced approach. They entertain requests, by finding out about the products but if it is detrimental to the interest of the child they practice restrain. Interestingly the Indian parents go ahead and buy the products for the children. According to Bredehoft et al (2002) indulgent parents may try to compensate for their own deprivation. With the Indian economy surging high, the purchase power of Indians have gone up and they are pampering their children with it, in contrast to previous studies on Indian parents (Thakur 2005). According to Kaur and Singh (2006) Indian society vastly differs from the West in terms of family composition and structure, values, norms, and behavior, which affect the role that children play in purchase decision making in families Indian parents are more indulgent today and the trend is alarming, as it is slowly eroding the cultural ethos.(refer to figure 2) Kaur and Singh (2006) opine that in metropolitan areas, extensive foreign media exposure and the Internet revolution have contributed to the emergence of a new social attitude which accepts Western values and culture.

In a developing economy like India parents are more concepts oriented and hence try new concepts while making decisions for purchase .Parents in light of modernity want their children not only to be aware about latest concepts but also consume goods and services that are latest, up-market, imported from the west and hyped by media. The sense of gratification for parents today is in making available best possible for their children in diverse product categories without pondering over the implications of use and disposal. Bredehoft et al (1998) points out that overindulgent parents inundate their children with family resources such as material wealth, time, experiences, and lack of responsibility. They give children too much of what looks good, too soon, too long and at developmentally inappropriate times. Overindulgent parents may overindulge to meet their own needs, not the needs of their children. For example, they may have grown up in poverty and do not want their child to experience the same. Children are effectively fitting into the consumer role owing to time pressures and income effects in dual career families.

When children are overindulged, they develop in an environment which is not realistic since they do not learn skills such as perseverance, coping with failure in effective ways, and compromising. Overindulgence hinders children from completing their developmental tasks and prevents them from learning necessary life lessons and so it is conceptualized as a form of child neglect (Bredehoft 1998).

Belsky (1991) points out that an optimal level of gratification is best for child development. Indian parents are crossing the border and heading towards overindulgence for which marketers targeting child segment are to be held responsible. The social agencies in the exosystem (Bronfenbrenner 1977) of the families need to take notice of this potential threat posed by invasive marketing towards society.

Hypothesis H₂ was accepted as there was a significant difference ($t = 8.7, p < 0.01$) (refer to table 2) in the level of overindulgence in the parenting style of parents in India. The level of overindulgence was higher in Indian sample ($M = 3.33, S.D. = 1.7$) than the overindulgence level of American parents ($M = 2.02, S.D. = 1.86$) (figure 2, table 3). This can be attributed to the post modern era which is characterized by pluralism, democracy, religious freedom, consumerism, mobility, and increasing access to news and entertainment. Indians are inundated by stimuli from around the world and slowly the cultural legacy of nurturant parenting is being mitigated by western influence and import of western culture via advertisements and media. Earlier the eastern parenting style used to be primarily authoritarian and nurturant (Kakkar, 1978) but today parents are giving in to western influences. The level of overindulgence practiced by parents was found to be responsible for 30.3% of variance in actual buying behaviour of parents in packaged food products (refer to table 4). Thus hypothesis H₃ is accepted as it was found that overindulgence of parents is a predictor of actual buy. According to Kaur and Singh (2006) children in India may not have the purchasing power comparable to their Western counterparts, but they are still the center of the universe in the Indian family system, and they can actually pull the parents to visit a place time and again. Children are an enormously powerful medium for relationship building in India. They not only influence markets in terms of the parental decision-making

to buy certain kinds of products, they are also future consumers. With the booming economy, Indian parents are raring forward in the race of acquiring material possessions for their children which was not found to be in the American parent sample. When country and level of indulgence both were entered as independent variables (Refer to Table 5), the results showed that the country effect does not moderate the parental Indulgence effect since the indulgence effect remains significant even when country is added. Country was masking the parental indulgence effect since the beta for parental indulgence goes up when you include country. Thus parenting style may act as a potential firewall against the influence of invasive marketing.

IMPLICATIONS

This study has implications not only for the social agencies, who need to check the level of impressionable advertisements but also has implications for the parents themselves. While championing the cause of democracy Alfred Adler suggested that if a nation is to prosper, then each citizen needs to develop a democratic character within, and the inculcation of this democratic character and values are first imbibed from democratic (authoritative) parenting. He suggested that the parents need to be educated about the benefits of democratic parenting where in values get institutionalized within the child and the child requires no policing. Thus democratic families lead to democratic nations (Stein 2001). He warned against the detrimental impact of overindulgent parenting. The results of this study have social implications and point out at the alarming increase in overindulgence in the parenting style perpetrated by an era cloaked in a conspiracy of invasive marketing and aggressive advertising all over the globe.

RESULTS




Figure 1. Showing Levels of Awareness, Interest, Desire and Action (AIDA) Brought by Children in Two Cultures Regarding Packaged Food Products




Figure 2. Showing Levels of Authoritarianism, Authoritativeness, Overindulgence Practiced by Parents

Table 1. Showing the Difference of Means (t test) of Levels of AIDA between American and Indian Parents

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Initial info 3-	Equal variances assumed	10.926	.001	1.351	115	.179	.23	.170	-.107	.568
	Equal variances not assumed			1.606	114.593	.111	.23	.143	-.054	.514
Desire 1	Equal variances assumed	1.523	.220	1.133	115	.260	.23	.202	-.171	.628
	Equal variances not assumed			1.216	95.782	.227	.23	.188	-.145	.602
interest 2	Equal variances assumed	9.696	.002	1.552	115	.123	.27	.176	-.075	.620
	Equal variances not assumed			1.765	108.891	.080	.27	.154	-.034	.578
actual-buy 1	Equal variances assumed	1.903	.170	-7.931	115	.000	-1.33	.168	-1.665	-.999
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.775	103.095	.000	-1.33	.152	-1.633	-1.031

Table 2. Showing the Difference in Means of Level of Overindulgence in the American and Indian Parents

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
ind 1	Equal variances assumed	23.894	.000	-7.364	115	.000	-1.31	.178	-1.666	-.960
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.744	114.543	.000	-1.31	.150	-1.610	-1.015

Table 3. Showing Relationship between Level of Overindulgence Practiced by Parents and the Level of Actual Purchase Decision of Packaged Food Products

		actual buy1	ind1
Actual buy1	Pearson Correlation	1	.550(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	117	117
ind1	Pearson Correlation	.550(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	117	117

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4. Showing the Stepwise Regression of Level of Overindulgence of Parents on Actual Purchase Decisions

Model Summary(b)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.550(a)	.303	.296	.895	.303	49.887	1	115	.000

a Predictors: (Constant), ind1

b Dependent Variable: actual buy1

Table 5. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Parental Overindulgence and Country Predicting Buying Behaviour (N=117)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2.464	.234		10.526	.000					
	PARENTAL OVERINDULGENCE	.242	.067	.321	3.634	.000	.321	.321	.321	1.000	1.000
2	(Constant)	1.711	.290		5.905	.000					
	PARENTAL OVERINDULGENCE	.396	.074	.524	5.381	.000	.321	.450	.447	.727	1.375
	CULTURE (COUNTRY)	.735	.184	.389	3.995	.000	.115	.350	.332	.727	1.375

a Dependent Variable: BUYING BEHAVIOUR

Note. For step 1: $R^2 = 0.103$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.095$; For Step2: $\Delta R^2 = 0.11^{**}$ ($p < .01$), Adjusted $R^2 = 0.104^{**}$ ($p < .01$)

** $P < .01$; * $P < .05$

References

- 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.
- Alderson, W. (1957), *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action*, Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Atkin, C. (1978), "Observation of Parent-Child Interaction in Supermarket Decision-Effects of drug commercials on young viewers," *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 28, 71-9.
- Bagozzi, R. P., M. Gopinath, and U. N. Prashanth (1999). "The Role of Emotions in Marketing," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 27(2), 184-206.
- Bandura, A. (1977), *Social Learning Theory*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Baumrind, D. (1971), "Current Patterns of Parental Authority," *Developmental Psychology Monograph*, 4(1), 1-103.
- _____ (1983), "Rejoinder to Lewis's Reinterpretation of Parental Firm Control Effects: Are Authoritative Parents Really Harmonious?"

- Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 132-142.
- _____ (1991a), "Parenting Styles and Adolescent Development," in *The Encyclopedia on Adolescence*, R. Lerner, A. C. Petersen, and J. Brooks-Gunn eds. New York: Garland, 758-772.
- _____ (1991b), "The Influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence and Substance Abuse," *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56-94.
- _____ (1996), "The Discipline Controversy Revisited," *Family Relations*, 45, 405-414.
- Beatty, S. and S. Smith (1987), "External Search Effort: An Investigation across Several Product Categories," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 83-95.
- 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.
- Belch, Michael, Kathleen A. Krentler, and Laura A. Willis-Flurry (2005), "Teen Internet Mavens: Influence in Decision Making," *Journal of Business Research*, 58(5), 569-575.
- Chadha, R. (1995), *The Emerging Consumer — A Profile of Indian Housewife and Its Implications*, New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Ltd.
- Belsky, J. (1984), "The Determinants of Parenting: A Process Model," *Child Development*, 55, 83-96.
- _____, L. Steinberg and P. Draper (1991), "Childhood Experience, Interpersonal Development, and Reproductive Strategy: An Evolutionary Theory of Socialization," *Child Development*, 62, 647-670.
- 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.
- Bredehoft, D. J., S. A. Mennicke, A. M. Potter, and J. I. Clarke (1998), "Perceptions Attributed by Adults to Parental Overindulgence during Childhood," *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 16(2), 1998, 3-17.
- Bronfenbrenner, U (1979), *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Buri, J. R. (1991), "Parental Authority Questionnaire," *Journal of Personality and Social Assessment*, 57, 110-119.
- 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.
- Cahill, D. J. (1995), "We Sure as Hell Confused Ourselves, but What about the Customers?" *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 13(4),

- 5-9.
- Chan, K. and J. U. McNeal (2003), "Parent-Child Communication about Consumption and Advertising in China," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 20(4), 317-334.
- Converse, P. D. and C. M. Crawford (1949), "Family Buying: Who Does It? Who Influences It?" *Current Economic Comment*, 11(November), 28-50.
- Darian, J. C. (1998), "Parent-Child Decision Making in Children's Clothing Stores," *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 26(11), 421-428.
- Darley, W. F. and S. Lim (1986), "Family Decision Making in Leisure Time Activities," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 7(September), 131-140.
- Dawar, N. and P. Parker (1994), "Marketing Universals: Consumers' Use of Brand Name, Price, Physical Appearance, and Retailer Reputation as Signals of Product Quality," *Journal of Marketing*, 58(2), 81-95.
- Derbaix, C. and M. T. Pham (1991), "Affective Reactions to Consumption Situations," *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 12(2), 325-355.
- Dubois, B. (2000), *Understanding the Consumer*, Harlow, UK: Prentice Hall.
- Foxman, Ellen and Patriya S. Tansuhaj (1988), "Adolescents and Mothers Perceptions of Relative Influence in Family Decisions: Patterns of Agreement and Disagreement" in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Michael J. Houston ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 15, 449-453.
- George, A. (2003), "Your 'T. V. Baby,' Ad Man's Delight," <http://www.hindu.com/thehindu/mp/2003/12/22/stories/200312220140020.htm>
- Grunert, K. G. (1996), "What's in a steak? A Cross-Cultural Study on the Quality Perceptions of Beef, MAPP Working Paper, 39, Arhus School of Business, Arhus, Denmark.
- Halan, Deepak (2002), "Why Kids Mean Business," *Indian Management*, December, 46-49.
- Hansen, T. (2005), "Perspectives on Consumer Decision Making: An Integrated Approach," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 4(6), 420-438.
- Hastings, G., M. Stead, L. McDermott, A. Forsyth, A. MacKintosh, M. Rayner, C. Godfrey, M. Caraher, and K. Angus (2003), *Review of Research on the Effects of Food Promotion to Children*, Centre for Social Marketing, Glasgow: University of Strathclyde, 1-218.
- Hempel, Donald J. (1974), "Family Buying Decisions: A Cross Cultural Perspective," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 11(August), 295- 302.

- Hofstede, G. (1991), *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, London: McGraw-Hill.
- Holdert, F. and G. Antonides (1997), "Family Type Effects on Household Members' Decision Making," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 24, 48-54.
- India Today, march 2004. TransAsian MediaNew Delhi
- Ippolito, P. M. and A. D. Mathios (1994), "Nutrition Information and Policy: A Study of US Food Production Trends," *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 17(3), 271-305.
- Isler, L., H. T. Popper, and S. Ward (1987), "Children's Purchase Requests and Parental Responses: Results from a Diary Study," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 27(5), 28-39.
- Jenkins, R. L. (1979), "The Influence of Children in Family Decision Making: Parents' Perceptions," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, William L. Wilkie ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 6, 413-418.
- 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.
- Kakkar, S. (1978), *Indian Childhood*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Kaur, B and R. Singh (2006), "Children in Family Purchase Decision Making in India and West," *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 8, 1-30.
- Keane, A., A. Willetts (1994), "Factors that Affect Food Choice," *Journal of Nutrition & Food Science*, 94(4), 15-17.
- Kim, D., Y. Pan, and H. S. Park (1998), "High- Versus Low Context Culture: A Comparison of Chinese, Korean, and American Cultures", *Psychology & Marketing*, 15(6), 507-521.
- Kunkel, D., and W. Gantz (1992), "Children's Television Advertising in the Multi-Channel Environment," *Journal of Communication*, 42 (3), 134-152.
- _____, B.L. Wilcox, J. Cantor, E. Palmer, S. Linn, and P. Dowrick (2004), "Psychological Issues in the Increasing Commercialization of Childhood," Report of the APA Task Force on Advertising and Children.
- Lavidge, R. and G. A. Steiner (1961), "A model for Predictive Measurements of Advertising," *Journal of Marketing*, 25(6), 59-62.
- Fitzpatrick, M., C. Glynn, and S. Fallis (1982), "Television and Social Relations: Family Influences and Consequences for Interpersonal Behavior," in *Television and Behavior*, K. Pearl ed. Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services, 272-86.
- McNeal, J. U. (1964), *Marketing Study Series: Children as Consumers*, University of Texas, Austin, TX: Bureau of Business Research, 9.

- _____ (1998), "Tapping the Three Children's Markets," *American Demographics*, 1-8.
- _____ and M. F. Ji (1996), "Children's Influence on Chinese Families' Newfound Leisure Time and Its Marketing Implications," *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 8(3), 32-57.
- _____ and C. H. Yeh (1997), "Development of Consumer Behavior Patterns among Chinese Children," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 14(1), 45-57.
- Miller, G. A. (1956), "The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two: Some Limits on Our Capacity for Processing Information," *Psychological Review*, 63, 81-92.
- Mitchell V. W. and V. Papalassiliou (2005), "Marketing Causes and Implications of Customer Confusion," *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 8(4), 319-342.
- Mitchell, A. M, B. G. Jones and J. D. Krumboltz (1979), *Social Learning and Career Decision Making*, Cranston, RI: Carroll Press.
- Moschis, G. and G. A. Churchill Jr. (1978), "Consumer Socialization: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 15, 599-609.
- _____ and R. L. Moore (1982), "A Longitudinal Study of Television Advertising Effects," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, 279-87.
- Park, C. and Jong-Kun Jun (2003), A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Internet Buying Behavior Effects of Internet Usage, Perceived Risks, and Innovativeness, *International Marketing Review*, 20(5), 534-553.
- Seiter, E. (1993), *Sold Separately: Children and Parents in Consumer Culture*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Steenkamp, J. B. E. M. (1989), *Product Quality: An investigation into the Concept and How it is Perceived by Consumers*, Herndon, VA: Books International.
- Stein, H. T. (1999), *Psychology for Democracy: Presentation given at the 21st International Congress of Individual Psychology*, Oak Brook, Illinois.
- Strong, E. K. (1925), "Theories of Selling," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 9, 75-86.
- Thakur, M. S. (2005), "Correlates and Predictors of Empowering Leadership Style: A Study on Indian Managers," Doctoral Dissertation, Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi.
- Wang, C. C. L. (1999), "Issues and Advances in International Consumer Research: A Review and Assessment," *Journal of International Marketing and Marketing Research*, 24(1), 3-21.
- 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. C. Burns (2000), "Exploring the Dimensionality of Children's Direct Influence Attempts," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 27, 64-71.
- _____ and A. Veeck (1998), "An Exploratory Study of Children's Purchase Influence in Urban China," *Asia Pacific Advances in Consumer Research*, 3, 13-19.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1980) "Feeling and Thinking: Preferences Need no Inferences," *American Psychologist*, 35,151-175.
- _____ and Markus, H. (1982), "Affective and Cognitive Factors in Preferences," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(2), 123-131.

Received June 23, 2008

Revision received October 17, 2008

Accepted January 16, 2008

