

ROLE OF CHILD PERSUASIVE TECHNIQUE IN FAMILY BUYING DECISION

Dr. Kadambini Katke*

Abstract:

Changing socio-economic environment has pushed today's kid towards consumerism. The child exposure to Television commercials has greater trigger for his growing role in family buying decision. Before the age of understanding the commercial intentions of corporate houses, the child will get trapped into the vicious consumerism net. It influences the child psychological behavior pattern which enables him/her to 'Must Have' attitude. To ensure his/her wish list at top of family buying list, it starts playing different tricks. This study tries to find the various techniques used by child to influence the family buying decision.

Keywords: advertising, persuasive technique, child influence, family spending, family buying decision.

Introduction

Marketers have successfully established their presence in the life of the child right from the age less than even one year. The shrinking family size with more number of working women has pushed the child at early age towards television sets to get entertained. The moving pictures not only fascinate the child it gradually push the child towards consumerism. At early age of 2-3 child accompanies mother for shopping and that's the beginning of the customer relationship building.

* **Affiliation: Professor- Dayananda Sagar College of Arts, Science and Commerce, DSI.**

Studies conducted by Piaget, (1970); Selman, (1980); Barenboim, (1981); and John (1999), have found children's consumer socialization heading towards the child consumer buying process. Further, The changing socio- economic conditions of the society has given the greater influence on the family purchase decisions. Berkman et al., (1997); Berey & Pollay, (1968); Caruana & Vassallo, (2003); Chavda et al., (2005); Darley & Lim, (1986); Tufte, 2003; Ward & Wackman, (1972) expresses children influence on the family buying decision. Children have greater influence on family purchase decision when the product is to be used by the child (Ward and Wackma 1972)

Greater Media and advertisement exposure influences the child psychological behavior pattern which enables him/her to 'Must Have' attitude (Katke 2007, 2016). To ensure his/her wish list at top of family buying list, it starts playing different tricks. This study tries to find the advertisement impact and various persuasive techniques adopted by kids to influence the family buying decision.

Persuasive techniques by adopted by marketers to influence children behavior

Katke (2007, 2016) discussed various techniques used by advertiser to inject the desire for the product among the children. Kids represent an important demographic to marketers because they have their own purchasing power, they influence their parents' buying decisions (Bhattacharya 2007)

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. Gather their Pokemons or Power Ranger cards and strap on their Nike backpack, wear branded shoes like Reebok and head off to school. (Bhattacharya 2007) further the stimulus carries kid to ensure the consumption satisfaction for repeat purchase and brand loyalty.

Marketers' common persuasive techniques briefly listed as under-

- Cartoon-popular cartoon characters are used to lure the child customer.
- Attractive colors- for attracting attention of the child
- Celebrity endorsement-recording by celebrity push product acceptance by the kids

- Puffery advertisement- exaggerating the product promises.
- Promotional techniques- giving something free with product of product
- Music and jingles- for higher brand recall
- Humor- to develop positive attitude towards product, and to evoke stimulus
- Light fantasy- giving scope to dream or imagine a situation which induce the desirw for product.
- Greater frequency for higher brand recall

Persuasive techniques used by child to influence purchase decision of the family

Child adopts the influencing strategies according their ability, and type of situation in which child employ their influence strategies(Ben and Hogg 2011) further the study reveals that the child influence vary along the stages of decision making.

Past studies have reveals that strategies often used by kids often proved working (Palan and Wilkes, 1997; Wimalasiri, 2004). Cowan (1984) identified four dimensions of influence strategies among South African children namely direct –indirect strategies and bilateral – unilateral strategies (Bonn. 1995). Bargaining, persuasion, emotional and request strategies have been identified by parents (Palan and Wilkes. 1997)

Bilateral strategies are often used by kids to influence their parents through reasoning and expressing their opinion about the purchase (Shoham and Dalakas, 2006, Bonn 1995). This strategy is quite popular among adolescents because parents some time encourage adolescents to invest in this strategy because their input, knowledge and information are often welcomed by their parents (Thomson et al., 2007). Parents sometimes rely very much on the information from their adolescents especially when it involves purchasing decision that they are not familiar with especially those related to technology (Götze et al., 2009).

Joynath (2004) listed tactics used by children to influence their parents.

- Pressure tactics- child use threats, intimidation
- Upward appeal- seek support of elder/older members of family, friend, and teacher
- Exchange tactics- ready to give service in exchange of purchase of his desired goods

- Coalition tactics-seeks aid of others to support his argument to win on parents
- Rational persuasion- use logical argument and factual evidence to influence
- Inspirational appeal- emotional appeal to parents' values and ideals.

Objectives of the study

From the above literature the objectives of the study are derived as under

- Different persuasive techniques used by child to influence family buying decision.
- To study the correlation between child influence on family buying decision and its impact on family welfare.

Research methodology

For the purpose of study simple random sampling method is used. The sample size of the survey is 100 parents in the age group of 25 years and above with income from Rs20000 per month and above is considered for the study. The parent means mother father guardians and grandparents of the children age group of 2-12 years. 3 respondents have one child, 50 have two children and 47 have single child. Questionnaire was structured to study the time spent by child watching television and his/her role in the purchase decision of various food products.

The present study parameters have derived from Joynaths studies conducted (2004) to study the strategies adopted by child to influence the family spending.

Simple mean method is used to find out and compare the child influencing techniques. And correlation method is used to find out the relationship between child influence on family buying and disturbing the family welfare.

In the study attempt is made to establish the correlation between the child influence on family buying decision and its impact on family welfare.

Research findings

1. Persuasive techniques used by child to influence family purchase decision.

Table: 1 Persuasive technique.

Persuasive techniques used by child to influence family purchase decision.	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Child use threats or intimidation to make me/us buy the product	3.84	100	0.873
Child uses tactics such as teacher or older member of family has recommended or approved to buy the product	3.79	100	0.967
Child asks you to buy the product in return of any favor from them	3.97	100	0.904
Child use arguments which are logical and factual to prove his point and make you buy the product	3	100	1.044
Child seeks to get you in a good mood or think favorably of him/her before asking you to comply with a request?	3.5	100	0.859
Child makes emotional appeal by appealing your values and ideas to make you buy the product?	2.73	100	0.75
Child uses the support of others as an argument for you to buy him a product?	3.36	100	1.124

This study reveal that child largely use- doing favor in exchange of purchase of the product. The mean of 3.97 is recorded by the study.

Working couple are opting out to have either one or at the most two children. The child is expected to fulfill the dreams of the parents in exchange of the facilities and comfort poured to the child. Knowingly or unknowingly parents are using this policy (strategy) to make kid perform according to their expectation. The similar kind of practices is followed by the child. When it learn that he/she will get something in exchange of favor to parents, it gets used to adopt this strategy to influence for his desired product.

Growing importance of child in the modern family has supported child confidence. The subconsciously child is aware of this. This study reveals that Child use threats or intimidation to make you buy the product. A mean of 3.87 is recorded.

Child many a time found using elderly family member/teacher (often influential) to getting their demand stronger and acceptable. Mean score of 3.79 is recorded in this study.

Elderly child understand the situations and influence the parent depending on the situations and mood of the parents. 3.5 mean is recorded in this study.

2. Co-relation between child pressurize for his/her desired goods and family welfare.

Table: 2-Correlation

	child pressurize for buying his/her desired goods	Does this action disturb the family welfare (irritating behavior displayed by child for not getting his desired goods?)
Does your child pressurize for buying his/her desired goods? N	Pearson Correlation 1 Sig. (2-tailed) .000 N 100	.349** 1 100
Does this action disturb the family welfare (irritating behaviour displayed by child for not getting his desired goods?) N	Pearson Correlation .349** Sig. (2-tailed) .000 N 100	1 100

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

Lee and Collions (2000) and Lee and Beatty (2002) recognized the potential for family coalitions to form within the families. This study also reveals there is significant relationship between child pressurizing for his/her goods and family welfare. Parents have experienced irritating behavior by the child when it experiences the rejection for his product demand.

Limitations of the study

Study has limited to Joynath (2007) listed tactics used by children to influence their parents buying decision. There are many other strategies adopted by children which have not been covered by the study. Limited Sample selected may not reflect the larger volume of kids.

Further scope for the study

It's very important for parents, corporate and at large the society to have check on the role of child in buying decision. Past studies have proved the adverse impact on child due to socialization and commercialization at early age. The child should be allowed to grow without involving into buying process.

Different socio-economic environment demands more studies to be conducted taking into consideration, family income, size of the family, number of children in family, parents social status, parents lifestyle etc. These studies can help us to understand the child influencing strategies.

Different psychological dimensions of parents and child has to considered for further clarity about 'why they act in a specific manner'

Conclusion

Child being sensitive member of the society needs to grow naturally rather than getting influenced by commercial intentions of the corporate houses. The society is responsible to have watch on the commercial actions of the business and its impact on the child health and psychology. Corrective measures can be designed based on the degree of impact on the child health and psychology.

Every member of the society should resume his/her role in protecting the child from the adverse impact of commercialization of child.

References:

1. Barenboim, C. (1981). The development of person perception in childhood and adolescence: From behavioural comparisons to psychological constructs to psychological comparisons, *Child Development*, 52 (March), pp. 129-144.
2. Berkman, H.W., Lindquist, J.D., Sirgy, M.J. (1997). *Consumer Behavior*, NTC Publishing Group, Chicago, IL
3. Bhattacharyya, Ritu. & Kohli, Sangita. (2007) Target Marketing to Children – The Ethical Aspect International Marketing Conference on Marketing & Society, 8-10 April, 2007, IIMK
4. Berey, L.A. & R.W. Pollay (1968). The influencing role of the child in family decision making, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 5 (February), pp. 70-72.
5. Ben, K., Hogg, M. (2011) How Best to Get their Own Way? Children's Influence Strategies within Families *Advances in Consumer Research* (Volume 39) /pp 367
6. Bonn, M. (1995) Power strategies used in conflict resolution by popular and rejected black South African children. *Early Child Development and Care*. Vol. 114, pp 39 – 54.
7. Caruana, A. & R. Vassallo (2003). Children's perception of their influence over purchases: the role of parental communication patterns, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 20 (1).
8. Chavda, H., M. Haley & C. Dunn (2005). Adolescents' influence on family decision making, *Young Consumers*, quarter 2, pp. 68-78.
9. Cowan, G., Drinkard, J. and MacGavin, L. (1984) The Effect of Target, Age, and Gender on use of Power Strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 47, pp 1391-1398.
10. Darley, W.K. & J.-S.Lim (1986). Family decision making in leisure-time activities: An parental type on perceived child influence, pp. 370-374.
11. Götze, E., Prange, C. and Uhrovská, I. (2009) Children's Impact on Innovative Decision Making: A Diary Study. *European Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 43 (1/2) pp. 264-295.

12. John, R.D. (1999). Consumer socialization of children: A retrospective look at twenty-five years of research, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26, pp. 183-213.
13. Joyantha, S. W (2004). Tactics used by children to influence their parents, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* Vol.21. No. 4 (Cross Reference)
14. Katke, K.,(2007) Impact of advertisement on child health and family spending. D-Space, IIMK. Marketing and Society International Conference proceeding. 2007
15. Katke, K.,(2016)Impact of pediatric advertisement on child health: A case study., *International Journal of Management, IT & Engineering* Vol. 6 Issue 9, September 2016,pp 166-175
16. Lee, C. K. C. and Beatty, S. E. (2002) Family Structure and Influence in Family Decision Making. *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*. Vol 19 (1) pp 24 – 39.
17. Lee, C. K. C. and Collins, B. A. (2000) Family Decision Making and Coalition Patterns. *European Journal of Marketing*. Vol.34 (9) pp 1181 – 1198.
18. Palan, K. M. and Wilkes, R. E. (1997) Adolescent-Parent Interaction in Family Decision Making. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Vol. 24, pp 159 – 169.
19. Piaget, J. (1970). The stages of intellectual development of the child and Piaget's theory. In P. Mussen, J. Conger & Kagan (ed.), *Readings of child development and personality*, New York: Harper and Row. (cross reference)
20. Selman, R.L. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding*, New York:Academic Press.
21. Shoham, A., Dalakas, V. (2003), Family consumer decision making in Israel: the role of teens and parents, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 20 (3), pp. 238-51.
22. Thompson, E. S., Laing, A. W. and McKee, L. (2007) Family Purchase Decision Making: Exploring Child Influence Behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*. Vol. 6, pp. 182- 202.
23. Tufte, B. (2003). Children, media and consumption, *Advertising and Marketing to Children*, October-December, pp. 69-76.
24. Ward, S. (1980). Consumer socialization, In H.H. Kassarijn & T.S. Robertson (ed.), *Perspective in Consumer Behaviour*. Glenville, IL: Scott, Foresman & Co., pp. 380-396.
25. Ward, Scott and Daniel B. Wackman. (1972) "Children's Purchase Influence Attempts and Parental Yielding," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9,316-319.