To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Hester A. Daves entitled "Children's Influences on Family Purchase Decisions: An Investigation of Grocery Products." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Textile, Retail, and Consumer Science.

Dr. Jinkook Lee, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Dr. Ann Fairhurst

Dr. Jan Allen

Accepted for the Council:

Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of The Graduate School

CHILDREN'S INFLUENCES ON FAMILY PURCHASE DECISIONS: AN INVESTIGATION OF GROCERY PRODUCTS

A Thesis
Presented for the
Master of Science
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Hester Alicia Daves
May 1998

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents and siblings

Mr. Gerald D. Daves

Mrs. Nancy H. Daves

Laura Daves Heinz

Mark R. Heinz

who gave me mental, emotional, and financial support throughout all my years of school and throughout this project in the Master's program at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are several people that I would like to thank for all of their help in completing this project. First, I would like to thank Dr. Jinkook Lee, the chair of my committee, for all of her help and support. I appreciate her sharing her ideas, suggestions, experiences, and time in accomplishing this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Lee for helping me throughout the entire two years of the master's program in which she has been not only a wonderful advisor but also a role model.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Ann Fairhurst and Dr. Jan Allen for sitting on my committee. I appreciate their time and involvement with this project as well as sharing their ideas and recommendations. Likewise, I would like to thank the departmental staff and students for their additional help when needed.

I would also like to thank my family for all of their support and motivation in this project as well as their encouragement throughout this program. I appreciate their time as well as their editorial advice and help in completing this project.

ABSTRACT

In the past, researchers have studied the influences of children on their parents, as well as other family influences. It has been shown over the years that children influence their parents in many areas, especially shopping and purchasing patterns. By investigating children's influences in the marketplace, retailers can be made more aware of these influences to better position themselves in targeting, reaching, and maintaining children as customers. Also, parents can be made more aware of these influences to prepare them for situations involving their children's influences in the marketplace.

In this study, several factors were investigated that have an effect on the amount of influence children have on their parents' purchases and on family decision-making. This study specifically focuses on grocery item purchases. This study examined factors such as parenting styles, communication styles, birth order of children, influencing strategies, parental employment, children's resources, product importance, and product knowledge. All of these factors were expected to be significant based on previous research.

The data for this study were obtained by distributing a questionnaire, designed for this topic, to high school students in Knoxville, Tennessee. Questions regarding the factors mentioned above were included in the instrument, and then the results were examined by compiling the responses to the questions. To analyze the results, factor analysis, regression analyses, ANOVA analyses, and MANOVA analyses were used.

Based on the results of this study, children who communicate with their parents in a pluralistic style, who consider a product to be important, who anticipate using the

product often, who live in a dual-income family, who live with unemployed parents, who have more resources, and who are knowledgeable of the product are likely to have more influence on their parents' grocery purchases.

This study found the following factors non-significant and did not affect the influences of children on their parents' grocery purchases. Parenting style, ordinal position, consensual communication style, protective communication style, and influencing strategy used do not affect the amount of influence that children have on their parents when purchasing groceries.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Retail companies are focusing on a segment of the population that has gained importance due to its influence on customer satisfaction and ultimately on purchasing: children (Zollo, 1995; Underhill, 1994; Stipp, 1993). Even companies that do not intentionally target children or do not sell their product to children are gaining parents' loyalty by childproofing their stores and adding child-friendly features (Underhill, 1994). Many fast food restaurants lure families into their stores by offering meals with toys for children. These toys usually revolve around the latest, most popular children's movies. Restaurants compete over having a superior selection of toys in an effort to attract children's interest.

Zollo (1995) explained the importance of children to retailers. First, children have real spending power. They spend nearly $100 billion each year, $63 billion of which is their own money (i.e. gifts or money earned through chores, etc.). Second, the children segment of the population is growing. Currently, the number of children (0-17 years of age) in the United States is approximately 69 million, accounting for approximately 26 % of the entire United States' population, which is almost 270 million people (U.S. Census Bureau, 1997). The number of children in the United States is expected to rise to almost 71 million by the year 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 1997).

The third reason retailers have an interest in children is because children are future spenders (Zollo, 1995). Companies target their young adult products toward children with the expectation that those children will continue to consume their products as the children get older. Finally, marketers pay attention to this segment because children are trendsetters. Children set trends for their peers, younger children, and adults. Children are more knowledgeable of the current trends and therefore persuade their parents to purchase the latest products. Many parents look to their children to discover what is "in."

There are several methods through which children obtain information. The most likely ways that children discover new products are through television, magazines, and the Internet. Because children watch approximately 20 to 26 hours of television per week, they see a vast number of advertisements through that medium (Stipp, 1993). Children are also bombarded with advertisements through magazines. Children buy magazines to discover what it is like to be "grown up." Due to the recent popularity surge of the Internet, children are discovering new ways to learn about new products and services through this new medium. Children constantly see advertisements that expose them to the latest styles, products, and services. The retailers who focus on these factors and make children a priority in their target marketing will be the most successful in reaching this growing segment of purchasers.

The impact of children on the retail industry is even greater considering their enormous influence over the purchasing decisions of household items because children greatly influence the way in which their parents spend money. Recent changes in

demographic and household structures appear to have increased children's impact on their parents' decisions and their general involvement in family decision-making (Foxman, Tansuhaj, & Ekstrom, 1989). For example, McNeal (1992[a]) asserted that children participate in household decision-making more due to increased responsibilities resulting from an increasing number of one-parent households or households where both parents work. Additionally, parents are having fewer children today, so each child receives more attention than if he or she had more siblings (McNeal, 1992[a]). Furthermore, parents are having children later in life, which means that the parents are more established, more able to give children attention, and more able to satisfy their children's "wants" and "needs" (McNeal, 1992[a]).

The effect children have on their parents' purchasing decisions is astonishing. Children influence approximately $132 billion per year in household purchases (Gregan-Paxton & John, 1995; McNeal, 1992[b]). Of this $132 billion, children influence household purchases in the following areas (this data does not include major categories such as family vacations) (McNeal, 1992[b]; Power, Atchison, & DeGeorge, 1991):

$82.4 billion on food and beverage purchases,
$16.9 billion on play items,
$13.2 billion on clothing,
$ 8.9 billion on automobiles,
$ 3.6 billion on electronics, and
$ 3.1 billion on health and beauty aids.

Despite the significance of children's importance in the marketplace, only limited research attention has been devoted to it. Addressing this important issue, this study will investigate the effect that children have on their parents' purchases. Children have influenced their parents' purchases of food, clothing, and other household products and

services. Among these purchase decisions, this study will specifically focus on their influence on groceries.

With an increasing number of women in the workforce and nontraditional families, more children are grocery shopping and choosing the products and brands that their families consume (Stipp, 1993; Hauser, 1986). Today's children are becoming more independent, also due to changing trends in households, which allows them to do more family shopping (Hauser, 1986). McNeal (1992[b]) estimated that children influence $53 billion of the total $315 billion per year spent on groceries, which is 17 %. Accordingly, children's influence on grocery shopping is an important phenomenon to study. Through investigating this aspect, this study will illustrate strategic implications for grocery retailers that will assist them in capturing the children's market.

Children also influence their family's purchasing decisions involving their parents' wardrobes as well. Children learn to function as a purchaser of clothes through consumer socialization as early as they learn to dress themselves (Sproles & Burns, 1994). Parents may learn from children regarding what to buy and how to wear their clothes through consumer socialization. In particular, there is greater parent-child interaction when purchasing clothing than for other goods because adolescents tend to shop for clothing jointly with adult family members (Sproles & Burns, 1994, p.145). Since children are concerned with purchasing "cool" brands to fit their image as well as being loyal to brands that make them look good, they may encourage their parents to buy trendier clothes or certain brands (Zollo, 1995).

Lastly, children influence their parents when purchasing household goods such as furniture, bicycles, and electronics (McNeal, 1992[b]). Children try to persuade their parents to purchase the "coolest" products for the household. As children have knowledge of the latest styles and products, they can even influence their parents purchasing decisions on some more expensive household items. For example, children are able to inform and influence their parents on the best computer to purchase. Parents allow their children to greatly influence them on purchases such as computers because computers are educational.

With the increasing influence of children in the marketplace, it is important for marketers and retailers to study children and their immense effect on the market. Because children influence their parents' purchases, they are becoming an important segment in the target market. This study will contribute to the existing literature on children's influences by investigating the specific impact that children have on the purchase of groceries. This study will also explore the various methods through which children influence family purchases. This will lead to strategies that retailers can utilize to increase their chances of grasping the attention of this influential group.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the past, most of the research on family purchase decision-making was focused only on parents and their purchasing decisions. However, researchers have started to pay attention to the influence of children on family decision-making and how children affect family purchasing decisions (Palan & Wilkes, 1997; Mangleburg, 1990). The amount of influence children have on their parents when involved in family purchase decisions varies, depending on the parent-child relationship of that particular family. When parents make family purchases, children often influence their parents on which products or particular brands of products they buy. Previous researchers have suggested the following factors as important determinates of children's influence on family decision-making: family characteristics, ordinal positions in the family, communication patterns, influence strategies, and children's characteristics. This chapter presents a review of the previous studies on children's influence on family decision-making and these factors that determine children's influences.

INFLUENCE OF CHILDREN

One of the reasons children are spending more of the family dollar is due to their increased responsibilities in the home (Hauser, 1986). Increased responsibility leads to children having more important family roles. When family members are making family decisions, they often assume a certain role or behavior in that decision-making process

(Wilkie, 1994; Lackman & Lanasa, 1993). While Lackman and Lanasa (1993) categorized family roles into five primary groups, Wilkie (1994) divided the roles into seven categories. Lackman and Lanasa's (1993, p.82) five roles include *gatekeeper*, *influencer*, *decision-maker*, *buyer*, and *user*. The *gatekeeper* refers to the initiator of the family decision-making process. The *influencer* is the family member whose opinion and input is sought and may affect the decision criteria. The one who ultimately makes the decision is the *decision-maker*. The *buyer* is the one who physically purchases the product, while the *user* consumes or uses the product.

Wilkie (1994) used basically the same roles as Lackman and Lanasa with slightly different terminology, and expanded Lackman and Lanasa's roles by adding two more roles. It is possible for the same family member to play more than one role, or for many members to be involved at various stages (Wilkie, 1994). The first of the seven different types of roles, according to Wilkie (1994), is the *stimulator*, who first raises the idea of a purchase. The second role is the *influential* member, whose opinions have either direct or indirect influences on the final purchase decision. These first two roles, *stimulator* and *influential*, are equivalent to Lackman and Lanasa's *gatekeeper* and *influencer*, respectively.

The third of these roles is the *expert*, who contributes information about the product, such as where it can be purchased. They also perhaps will shop around or consult *Consumer Reports* to obtain the information that will be given to other family members (Wilkie, 1994). The next role in family decision-making is the *decision-maker*, who makes the final decision on exactly what is purchased, again equivalent to Lackman and Lanasa's *decision-maker*. The fifth role is the *buyer*, who actually purchases the

product, pays for it, and either takes it home or arranges for delivery (Wilkie, 1994; Lackman & Lanasa, 1993).

The sixth role in this process is the *consumer*, who actually uses or consumes the product (Wilkie, 1994; Lackman & Lanasa, 1993). The final role in the family decision-making process, according to Wilkie (1994), is the *caretaker*, who undertakes various tasks to store the product, prepare it for use, and maintains it in operating condition. That is, Wilkie (1994) added the roles of *expert* and *caretaker* to Lackman and Lanasa's (1993) five roles.

It has been concluded that children have greater influence in the decision-making process for family purchases in the initiation stage rather than at the search or decision stages (Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Belch, Belch, & Ceresino, 1985; Mangleburg, 1990). Therefore, the level of children's influence would be greater when behaving as a *stimulator* or as an *influential*. The areas in which children have the least amount of influence are the decision areas regarding how much to spend or where to purchase the product or service (Belch et al., 1985). These types of decisions are likely out of the child's domain of interest and responsibility.

Children are increasingly taking the responsibilities of these roles and becoming more active as buyers and consumers; therefore, increasing attention is being given to children and their roles in family decision-making (Lackman & Lanasa, 1993; Wilkie, 1994). Although children have influence in purchases of a variety of products and services, they may play a different role across different types of products.

FACTORS THAT DETERMINE CHILDREN'S INFLUENCES IN FAMILY DECISIONS

There are several factors that determine the amount of children's influences on family decision-making. These factors are family characteristics, ordinal position in the family, communication patterns, influence strategies, children's characteristics, and parental responses to their child's requests.

Family Characteristics

Family characteristics can determine the impact of children's influences that affect their roles in the family decision-making process. For example, characteristics such as different parenting styles will affect children's influences on family decision-making (Baumrind, 1991; Baumrind, 1983; Lewis' study, as cited in Baumrind, 1983; Lackman & Lanasa, 1993; McNeal, 1992[a]; Baranowski, 1978). Lackman and Lanasa (1993, p.86), McNeal (1992[a]), and Baumrind (1991) identify four different parenting styles:

> *Authoritarian* – In the authoritarian family, parents seek a high degree of control over their children and expect unquestioned obedience. Parents discourage independence in their children and usually the parents make all the decisions for their children. Parents are obedience and status oriented. Parents provide an orderly environment, have clear sets of regulations, and monitor their children's activities.
>
> *Neglectful* – In the neglectful family, parents are distant from their children and do not exert much control over them. Parents show little concern for their children's development. Parents do not structure or monitor their children. Parents are not supportive and may reject or neglect childrearing responsibilities.

Authoritative – In the authoritative family, parents attempt to foster a balance between parents' and children's rights, encouraging self-expression and valuing autonomy. Yet, the parent expects mature behavior, with deviations subject to discipline. Parents are in charge but have flexible boundaries for their children that encourage autonomy. Parents monitor and impact clear standards for their children's conduct. Parents are assertive and supportive, not intrusive, not restrictive, and not punitive. Parents expect their children to take part in chores and promote respect for established authority.

Permissive – In the permissive family, parents try to remove as many restraints from their children as possible without endangering them, believing that children have adult rights, but few responsibilities. Parents avoid exercising any control over their children. Parents are nontraditional and lenient. Parents do not require mature behaviors and allow considerable self-regulation. Parents avoid confrontation.

Two other characteristics apparent in these parenting styles are demandingness and responsiveness (Paulson, 1994; Baumrind, 1991). *Authoritarian* parents are highly demanding but not responsive to their children. *Neglectful* parents are neither demanding nor responsive to their children. *Authoritative* parents are both highly demanding and responsive to their children. Finally, *permissive* parents are fairly responsive, but only moderately demanding of their children.

In *neglectful* and *permissive* families, children have direct control over most family purchases because these parents do not exert control over their children (Lackman & Lanasa, 1993). In *authoritative* families, children are expected to influence a majority of their family's purchases because these parents communicate with their children and foster a balance between their needs and their children's needs. Finally, children in *authoritarian* families are expected to exercise the least control or influence on family

purchases because these parents are so demanding and make all the decisions for their children.

Other family characteristics, classified by Anne Roze, are family category types such as *tactical*, *easy-going*, *autocratic*, and *malleable* (Narayan, 1997). Children in a *tactical* family, the "ideal" family, are heard by their parents and their views are also respected by their parents; however, their parents remain in control. Children are confident of their influence, which makes them more powerful. The second family type, according to Roze, is the *easy-going* family. These parents agree with their children most of the time. *Autocratic* families are the third category type. Parents in this type of family have authority and power.

The final category type is the *malleable* family category (Narayanan, 1997). Children in this family type usually receive what they ask for if they keep insisting. This family type is the only type where parents spend more money on groceries when shopping with their children than they do when shopping without their children. In the other three family types, the parents spend more money when grocery shopping without their children than they do when grocery shopping with their children.

Roze believes these family types to be of importance for retailers to understand which family type is overpowering in the market place from which it attracts its customers (Narayanan, 1997). Therefore, by investigating these family category types, retailers will have a better understanding of how to target each type.

Ordinal Position in the Family

Another factor in determining the amount of children's influences on family decision-making is the order in which children are born. First-borns often have more influence on family decision-making than the middle or later-borns because first-borns receive more parental attention compared to later-borns (Peterson & Rollins, 1987; Mangleburg, 1990). First-borns and parents are often engaged in interactions which are more constant and intense than interactions between later-borns and their parents (Baranowski, 1978). First-borns may also have more opportunities to influence their parents than later-borns because first-borns are the first members of their generation to have the opportunity to influence their parents. Also, younger children often expect the oldest child to act as a leader in challenging parental directives. Older children also tend to have more influence in family purchase decisions because older children have greater cognitive ability, have more experience, and have learned more about consumer roles (Mangleburg, 1990). Therefore, parent-child relations appear to be much stronger with first-borns and their parents compared to those of later-borns and their parents.

Middle-born children often experience parental behavior falling somewhere between the experience of first and later-borns (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). Middle-borns often are unable to establish their uniqueness and may not experience the same status, recognition, or attention from parents as first-borns or last-born children. Therefore, they may have the least influence on their parents if they are receiving the least attention or recognition.

Communication Patterns

The third factor that may determine the effect that children have on family decision-making is the family's communication pattern. Communication is considered to be the most significant factor in personal interaction because it builds the character of mutual relations (Grygielski, 1993). Communication patterns within the family greatly affect the amount of influence that children have on family decision-making (Moschis, 1985). There are two types of family communication patterns (Moschis, 1985; Foxman, Tansuhaj, & Ekstrom, 1989). The first type of communication is *socio-oriented*, which is designed to produce praise and foster friendly and pleasant social relationships at home while the child avoids controversy and does not argue (Moschis, 1985; Foxman, Tansuhaj, & Ekstrom, 1989; Lackman & Lanasa, 1993). This type of communication focuses on orientation guided toward people (Grygielski, 1993).

The second type of communication patterns is *concept-oriented*, which is a pattern that focuses on positive constraints that helps children develop their own views and ideas (Moschis, 1985; Foxman, Tansuhaj, & Ekstrom, 1989; Lackman & Lanasa, 1993). *Concept-oriented* communication deals with an expression of orientation toward objects and ideas (Grygielski, 1993). Foxman, Tansuhaj, and Ekstrom (1989) show that children in a *concept-oriented* family will have greater influence on their parents in family purchase decisions and greater influence in the decision process than children in a *socio-oriented* family. Foxman, Tansuhaj, and Ekstrom (1989) conclude that the communication environment has a significant effect on children's influence over product purchases. When the *socio-oriented* and *concept-oriented* dimensions are combined, four distinct communication-pattern profiles are produced: *Laissez-faire*, *Protective*,

Pluralistic, and *Consensual* (Carlson, Grossbart, & Walsh, 1990; Easterling, Miller, & Weinberger, 1995) as shown by the following table:

Communication-Pattern Profiles

		Socio Orientation	
		Lower	Higher
Concept Orientation	Lower	*LAISSEZ-FAIRE*	*PROTECTIVE*
	Higher	*PLURALISTIC*	*CONSENSUAL*

There is little parent-child communication and interaction in *Laissez-faire* families, and these children have little opportunity to influence the family (Carlson, Grossbart, & Walsh, 1990; Easterling, Miller, & Weinberger, 1995). *Protective* families stress obedience and social harmony in their communication with their children, and these children are probably not influential in family resocialization. *Pluralistic* families encourage open communication and the discussion of ideas with their children; therefore, these children have the greatest opportunity to directly influence the family. This family type provides the most effective setting for children acting as information contributors (Easterling, Miller, & Weinberger, 1995). *Consensual* families stress both types of communication (Carlson, Grossbart, & Walsh, 1990). Children of *Consensual* families may be encouraged to discuss their ideas and thoughts with their parents (Easterling, Miller, & Weinberger, 1995).

Pluralistic and *Consensual* mothers consider children's opinions about family purchase decisions more seriously than *Laissez-faire* and *Protective* mothers (Carlson, Grossbart, & Walsh, 1990). *Pluralistic* and *Consensual* mothers take their children

shopping more often than *Laissez-faire* and *Protective* mothers. *Pluralistic* and *Consensual* mothers yield to their children's requests more frequently, yet *Protective* and *Consensual* mothers refuse their children's requests more frequently than *Laissez-faire* and *Pluralistic* mothers.

Therefore, the children that have the most influence in family purchases are the ones that communicate the most with their parents, the *Consensuals*, or those whose parents encourage them to develop their own ideas, like the *Pluralistics*. These two groups are both high *concept-oriented*. Accordingly, children have more influence in family purchase decisions in the *concept-oriented* communication environment (Palan & Wilkes, 1997).

Influence Strategies

A fourth factor in determining the amount of children's influence on family decision-making is the strategies that children use to influence their parents (Palan & Wilkes, 1997; Spiro, 1983). Different strategies used in parent-child interactions affect the purchases that parents make for the family. The first of the seven strategies used by Palan and Wilkes (1997) and Spiro (1983) is *bargaining*. Children use *bargaining* strategies to create agreement between family members based on mutual gain and mutually satisfying results. Children might say to their parents "If you buy this for me, I'll wash the dishes tonight." Children use different types of *bargaining* strategies, such as money deals, reasoning, and negotiating.

The second type of influence strategy is *persuasion* (Palan & Wilkes, 1997). Persuasion in family decision-making is convincing a contrasting family member to

resolve decision conflict to the persuader's benefit. Three types of persuasion strategies used by children are (1) persistence, when children repetitively make purchase influence attempts; (2) begging, when children plead for a purchase by saying "please" over and over; and (3) whining, when children use a distinct tone of voice different from the usual tone, involving nagging and begging.

The next influence strategy used by children is the *emotional strategy*, which involves the intentional use of emotion when trying to influence other family members in the purchase decision-making process (Palan & Wilkes, 1997; Spiro, 1983). Various implementation methods of this strategy are crying, pouting, withdrawing, anger, sweet talk, or the silent treatment.

The *request strategy* is the fourth influence strategy (Palan & Wilkes, 1997). Children often request certain products or services directly or in a demanding fashion. A direct request would be simply asking for it, such as, "Can I have this?". A more demanding request is, "Get this for me."

The fifth influence strategy is the *expert strategy* (Palan & Wilkes, 1997; Spiro, 1983). This occurs when children use their knowledge or perception of a product or service to persuade their parents. Examples of children using the expert strategy are children giving advice on the following: price-value relationship, branded products versus generic products, product quality, budgeting, money-saving skills, or purchasing skills.

Parents use the last two strategies when rejecting their child's requests. One of these influence strategies is the *legitimate strategy* (Palan & Wilkes, 1997; Spiro, 1983). Legitimate influence is based on the justifiable right of one individual to influence

another individual by illustrating the other's feelings concerning their role expectations (Palan & Wilkes, 1997; Spiro, 1983). For example, parents may use different tactics to say "no" when the child is requesting a certain product. Parents may explain to the child that the family cannot afford the item. Or, parents may delay a purchase decision until a later date, when the parent really has no intention of buying the product. Both parents and children usually believe that parents have legitimate authority over their children; however, parents also understand that as children age, legitimate authority declines.

The final influence strategy discussed by Palan and Wilkes (1997) is the *directive strategy*. This type of strategy is based on parental authority. In using this strategy, parents often ask for their child's opinion about a product or service. Parents may also try to determine "need" versus "want" when a child is requesting a certain product. For example, parents may require a reason for purchasing a product other than "because I want it."

Spiro's study (1983) involves two different strategies in addition to the four strategies of Palan and Wilkes (1997). First is the *reward/referent strategy*. Reward influence is based on an individual's ability to reward another. For example, children may reward their parents by doing something that their parents would enjoy in exchange for the parent purchasing the requested product or service. The referent strategy is based on the identification or feeling of oneness of one person with another. The other strategy is *impression management*. This includes premeditated persuasive attempts to strengthen one's influence. For example, parents may falsely claim that the child's preferred product was "out of stock."

Palan and Wilkes' study (1997) also determines which of the seven strategies are the most effective and least effective by the perception of children and parents. These results are summarized in a table found below. The most effective strategies according to the children, from most effective to least effective, are money deals (*bargaining*), reasoning (*bargaining*), and direct ask (*request*). The most effective strategies according to the mothers, from most effective to least effective, are reasoning (*bargaining*), reasonable request (*persuasion*), and other deals (*bargaining*). Finally, the most effective strategies according to the fathers, in descending order, are reasoning (*bargaining*), other deals (*bargaining*), and direct ask (*request*). Therefore, the most effective strategy according to the entire family is *bargaining*.

The least effective strategies, from most effective to least effective, according to the children are begging (*persuasion*), everyone else has it (*persuasion*), and anger (*emotional*) (Palan & Wilkes, 1997). The least effective strategies, from most effective to least effective, according to the mothers are whining (*persuasion*), everyone else has it (*persuasion*), and anger (*emotional*). Finally, the least effective strategies, from most effective to least effective, according to the fathers are begging (*persuasion*), anger (*emotional*), whining (*persuasion*), and demands (*requests*). Therefore, the least effective strategy according to the entire family is persuasion, followed by emotional. These results are shown in the following table.

Influence Strategies & Their Effectiveness

PERCEPTION OF WHICH FAMILY MEMBER	*MOST EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES*	*LEAST EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES*
CHILD	Bargaining, Request	Persuasion, Emotional
MOTHER	Bargaining, Persuasion	Persuasion, Emotional
FATHER	Bargaining, Request	Persuasion, Emotional, Request
ENTIRE FAMILY	Bargaining	Persuasion, Emotional

Other factors in influence strategies by children are their requesting styles and appeals that they use in parent-child interaction to influence their parents in family purchases (McNeal, 1992[a]). The style is the way of asking while the appeal is the reason for asking to increase the chances of obtaining the product or service requested. Children use different appeals when requesting purchases for themselves and the family. The following are examples of various appeals (McNeal, 1992[a], p.73):

- *Educational* – "You want me to learn don't you?"
- *Health* – "Don't you want me to be healthy?"
- *Time* – "It'll save you time."
- *Economy* – "It'll save you lots of money."
- *Happiness* – "You want me to be happy don't you?"
- *Security* – "You don't want me to get hurt do you?"

Children use these different appeals in attempting to persuade their parents to purchase a certain product or service for the family or for themselves. Along with different appeals, children have different styles that they use to influence their parents. McNeal (1992[a], p.73-74) uses the following examples to show the different styles:

- *Pleading* – repetition in words, also accompanied by such words as: "Puleeeze," "Help me," and "Mother, mother, mother."
- *Persistent* – repeating the request over and over. "I'm gonna ask you just one more time."
- *Forceful* – demonstrative style, uses loudness and forceful words. "Nothing will stop me from having it" or "I'll ask grandma if you don't buy it for me."
- *Demonstrative* – acting, going stiff, holding the breath, falling down on the floor, refusing to leave the store, refusing to talk or look at the parent, and using tears.

- *Sugar-coated* – using the words "love" and "wonderful." "I'll love you forever if you'll just get me one" or "Buying me one means you're the most wonderful father in the world."

- *Threatening* – focuses on the negative results that will occur if a purchase is not forthcoming. "I'll hate you forever if I don't get one" or "I'm gonna leave home if you don't buy me one."

- *Pity* – negative result for the child rather than the parent if the purchase is not made. "I'll be the worst-looking kid in school if I don't have one" or "Everyone has one except me."

Children often use one or all of these strategies, alone or in a combination. They test each of the styles and appeals, then make the decision as to which one(s) work(s) the best for their particular family. Children do this to obtain immediate gratification (McNeal, 1992[a]). When children make these requests, a positive response from their parents reinforces the particular style or appeal while a negative response suppresses it.

Children's Characteristics

The next factor in determining the amount of children's influence on family purchase decisions is children's characteristics. Factors such as product importance to the child (Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Belch et al., 1985) and anticipated level of usage by the child (Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Belch et al., 1985; Mangleburg, 1990) will affect how much influence children have on family decision-making. Other characteristics determining children's influence on family purchase decisions are employment status of the child's parents (Beatty & Talpade, 1994), the amount of resources the child has (Foxman, Tansuhaj, & Ekstrom, 1989), and the child's product knowledge (Belch et al., 1985; Foxman, Tansuhaj, & Ekstrom, 1989). First, the more important the product

category is to the child, the higher the likelihood he or she will be motivated to participate in the decision process for that product (Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Belch et al., 1985). Product importance is an ongoing concern about the product category and therefore, a long-term concern in which the person is involved.

Second, the higher the level of anticipated usage of a product by children, the higher their level of influence on the decision-making process for household products (Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Mangleburg, 1990). The more he or she will be affected by the purchase decision, the more effort the child exerts to greater influence the decision.

Third, many dual-income parents feel they have less time available than parents do in single-income households, so these parents are more likely to rely on other family members, such as their children (Beatty & Talpade, 1994). Parents in dual-income families often have more discretionary income and feel more guilt when rejecting their child's requests.

Fourth, children who have greater resources will often have greater influence in family decision-making (Foxman, Tansuhaj, & Ekstrom, 1989). Children's resources may include their income contribution, employment status, academic grades, or perceptions of parental love and confidence (Foxman, Tansuhaj, & Ekstrom, 1989, p.161).

Finally, children will have greater influence on family decision-making for product purchase decisions about which he or she has a high level of product knowledge (Foxman, Tansuhaj, & Ekstrom, 1989). When purchasing products that the child has knowledge of, parents have less influence. The more the child knows about a product or

service, the more they will be able to present a persuasive argument to their parents in trying to influence them.

Parental Responses to Children's Requests

The last factor in determining the amount of children's influences on family decision-making is how the parents respond to their children's requests. There are four basic responses that parents offer their children when the children request a certain product or service (McNeal, 1992[a]). First, parents may respond by making the purchase. Parents honor children's requests approximately half the time. Parents are more likely to make the purchase if it is requested in the retail environment rather than if it is requested at home. Second, parents may substitute another purchase. Simply because children request a certain product or service does not always mean that the parents agree. Parents may feel that the product or service is too expensive, of poor quality, or inappropriate. Therefore, they may offer a substitute. Third, parents may respond by postponing the purchase. Parents may do this for economic reasons such as waiting until their next paycheck arrives or waiting for another time that is better financially. In this situation, as well as above, parents are more likely to postpone a purchase if the request is made at home rather than in a store. Finally, parents may respond by ignoring or refusing the child's request. This may occur if the parents simply do not want to purchase a certain product or service for no particular reason.

The amount of influence that children have on their parents when purchasing household products is enormous. However, parents and marketers both have different goals and tactics in dealing with children's influence. The marketers prefer children to

have a large amount of influence while the parents prefer their children to have little influence. Children are becoming such a large segment of the market that marketers are trying to target them. Parents, on the other hand, will try to take steps to prevent their child's overpowering influence.

Different parenting styles (*authoritarian*, *neglecting*, *authoritative*, or *permissive*), as previously discussed, often affect which response parents offer their children when children are requesting a certain product or service (McNeal, 1992[a]; Lackman & Lanasa, 1993). *Authoritarian* parents are likely to discourage their children's requests while *permissive* and *authoritative* parents encourage the appeals. *Neglecting* parents usually do not respond to their children's requests. Marketers should target children of *permissive* and *neglecting* parents because children of *neglecting* parents often exert direct control over most family purchase decisions. Marketers should also target children of *authoritative* parents because these parents are likely to honor their children's purchase requests within certain guidelines. Finally, marketers should not target the children of *authoritarian* parents because these parents usually do not give their children any control over purchases, and the parents typically make all the decisions for their children.

Various behavioral outcomes arise when parents do not make the purchases requested by their children (McNeal, 1992[a]). Parent-child conflict is often created. Children have different reactions when this occurs, such as "in-store tantrums, going stiff, holding their breath, screaming, crying, threatening, throwing things, and humiliating their parents" (McNeal, 1992[a], p.79).

Marketers often add to this conflict, while damaging parent-child relationships, through their tempting advertisements. Therefore, parents should develop standards

when dealing with their children's purchase requests. Parents should also be consistent and establish the same standards for all of their children and for all types of products. This may prevent future conflict between parents and their children when shopping for household products.

Many studies have shown that children influence their parents' family purchasing decisions. The degree of influence depends on several factors. Parenting styles, ordinal position of the child, communication patterns within the family, influence strategies used by the children, and children's characteristics all affect parental responses to children's requests. These requests and responses, in turn, affect the relationship of the parents and children because conflict is likely to arise from these various situations. To prevent such conflict, parents should be aware of the various factors to help them determine the most effective strategy or the most appropriate standards to set when they are involved in family decision-making for household purchases.

HYPOTHESES

Based on the previous literature, the following hypotheses are developed to investigate the level of influence children have on family decision-making:

H1: Different parenting styles affect the amount of influence that children have on family decision-making.

- H1a: Children of neglectful and permissive parents will have the most influence on family decision-making.
- H1b: Children of authoritarian parents will have the least influence on family decision-making.

H2: Children's ordinal position affects the amount of influence that children have on family decision-making.

H2a: First-borns have more influence than later-borns on family decision-making.

H2b: Middle-borns have the least influence of all children on family decision-making.

H3: Family communication patterns affect the amount of influence that children have on family decision-making.

H3a: Children in consensual families have the most influence on their parents in family decision-making.

H3b: Children in pluralistic families have the second most influence on their parents in family decision-making.

H3c: Children in protective families have the next to least influence on their parents in family decision-making.

H3d: Children in laissez-faire families have the least influence on their parents in family decision-making.

H4: The type of influence strategy children use has an effect on the amount of influence they have on family decision-making.

H4a: Children have more influence on family decision-making when they use bargaining strategies than any other strategy.

H4b: Children have the least influence on family decision-making when they use persuasion strategies than any other strategy.

H5: Children's characteristics will have an effect on the amount of influence they have on family decision-making.

H5a: The more important products are to children, the more influence they will have on family decision-making.

H5b: The higher the anticipated level of usage of the product to children, the more influence they will have on family-decision making.

H5c: Children in dual-income families will have more influence on family decision-making than children do in single-income families.

H5d: The more resources children have, the more influence they will have on family decision-making.

H5e: The higher the level of product knowledge to children, the more influence they will have on family decision-making.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

INSTRUMENT

This study investigates children's influences on household purchase decisions, and specifically focuses on grocery purchases. In order to facilitate the respondents' prompt and accurate responses, questions regarding specific grocery items are employed. To determine which grocery items would be included in the instrument, a focus group of teenagers were asked what food items they eat and which food items they help their parents pick out. After narrowing the food items to seven items/categories, they were the items used in the instrument. A pilot study was used with this instrument, including the seven food items. After finalizing editorial and minor changes, the final instrument was given to the sample selection of teenagers. Finally, this data was analyzed to obtain the results of this study.

Focus Group

The focus group was used to determine the particular food items or food groups to include in the questionnaire. Nine teenagers were given a list of 56 food items and asked to choose column (1) whether they eat the particular food item and/or column (2) whether they help their parents choose the particular product (see Appendix A-1). The setting in which this procedure was conducted was at a local high school recreational activity.

Each column was totaled, arranged, and divided into groups from the most selected to the least selected by column 2, the "I help my parents pick out this product" column. Eight groups were formed from this process (see Appendix A-2). For the questionnaire, one food item was chosen from each group with the exception of the "0" group in column 2, which was the group where no teenagers helped their parents pick out the product in this group. Within each of these groups, the number of teenagers in column 1 who "Eat this product" ranged from nine to one. Some food items were chosen that had a nine in the "Eat this product" column, while some were chosen that had a five. This was done so that all items would not have either the most influence or the least influence, rather there would be a variety. The following seven food items, or food groups, were used in the questionnaire: cereals, chips, pasta, chicken, fresh vegetables, sports drinks, and frozen meals.

Questions

Next, each question in the instrument will be discussed by explaining the question asked, the source of the question, the kind of question, and whether it was revised for this study. Question 1 asked whether the teenager had been grocery shopping with his/her parents in the past couple of months. They had a choice to choose "Yes" or "No." If they chose "No," they were asked to write how long it had been. This question was designed to determine the reliability of the teenager's answers. If the teen had never been shopping with his/her parents, then he/she may not have been able to answer the questionnaire appropriately.

Question 2 asked whether, during their last grocery shopping experience, any of the seven particular food items listed had been purchased. They had the choice to choose any of the seven food items. This question was designed to determine whether the teen ate or purchased the food items involved in the questionnaire. If the teen had no involvement with these products, he/she would not be able to answer many of the questions in the questionnaire because they pertain to these particular food items.

Question 3 asked how often, on the average, the teenager goes grocery shopping *with* his/her parents. They had the choice of choosing "At least once per week," "At least once per month," "Once per two/three months," or "Hardly ever." This question's purpose was to illustrate frequency of their shopping trips with their parents.

Question 4 asked how often, on the average, the teenager went grocery shopping alone. They had the same choices as with question 3. This question was designed to determine to what extent a teenager plays the sole role of purchasing agent for his/her family's groceries.

Question 5 (parts A-G) asked the amount that the teen contributed, compared to his/her parents, in situations regarding purchases of the seven food items. These questions were taken from Beatty and Talpade's (1994) study; however, they were reworded to better fit the description of Wilkie's (1994) roles. Beatty and Talpade (1994) used nine scale items to rate their influence for the various stages, using a likert scale ranging from "I did not contribute at all" (0) to "The entire contribution was mine" (6), and the midpoint (3) represented "Equal contribution." In this study, the same scale headings were used to determine the amount of influence that the teenager had on each of

the seven products. In this study, the scale ranged from "The entire contribution was mine" (1) to "I did not contribute at all" (5), with the midpoint being "Equal contribution" (3). Some scale items from Beatty and Talpade (1994) were the same or similar to Wilkie's (1994) descriptions while others were reworded to better fit the description of Wilkie's (1994) roles. For example, both studies included the statement "Bringing up the idea to buy the product." Each of these scale items is described below to measure the influence of teenagers while playing each role.

Part A asked how much of a role the teen plays in bringing up the idea to purchase the seven food products.

Part B asked how much of a role the teen plays in offering to their parents opinions that influence the final purchase decision.

Part C asked how much of a role the teen plays in giving his/her parents specific information about this product, such as price, quality, brand, and where it can be purchased.

Part D asked how much of a role the teen plays in making the final decision on exactly what to buy or not to buy.

Part E asked how much of a role the teen plays in purchasing the product, paying for it, and either taking it home or arranging for delivery.

Part F asked how much of a role the teen plays in consuming the product.

Part G asked how much of a role the teen plays in undertaking tasks to store the product, prepare it for use, and maintain it in operating condition.

Question 6 was created to determine if the teen was likely to ask for specific brands of each of the seven food items listed. A likert scale was used to measure this ranging from "Very likely" (1) to "Very unlikely" (5), with the midpoint being "Neutral" (3).

Sample likert items from Spiro's (1983) study were used for question 7. Some of these items were slightly reworded to better suit this study. This question was to determine the type of influence strategy the teen uses. A likert scale was used ranging from "Strongly agree" (1) to "Strongly disagree" (5), with the midpoint being "Neutral" (3). A statement from each influence strategy, fitting the descriptions of Palan and Wilkes' (1997) and Spiro's (1983) definitions of influence strategies, was given and the teen was asked to circle the number most appropriate in relation to his/her family when involved in purchasing groceries. However, Spiro (1983) did not give a statement reflecting the request, directive, and persuasion strategies. In Palan and Wilkes' (1997) study, they rank the influence strategies from most effective to least effective according to the perception of children and parents, separately. These results included the bargaining, persuasion, emotional, and request strategies. Therefore, a statement was created for the persuasion and request strategies on the questionnaire to compare the results to Palan and Wilkes' (1997) results. By using the definitions of these strategies from Palan and Wilkes' (1997) study, these statements were created as follows: "You whined or begged your parents to purchase this item" (persuasion) and "You requested this item by asking or demanding your parents to purchase it" (request).

Question 8 (parts A and B) originated in Beatty and Talpade's (1994) study on adolescent influence in family decision-making. This question's purpose was to determine product importance (part A) and anticipated product consumption (part B) of each of the seven food items. Part A's statement came directly from Beatty and Talpade's (1994) study; however, part B was slightly reworded to better fit this study. A likert scale was used ranging from "Strongly agree" (1) to "Strongly disagree" (5), with the midpoint being "Neutral" (3).

Question 9 asked what the teen's overall knowledge was of the listed products; it was created to determine the teen's overall knowledge of the seven food items. This question used a likert scale ranging from "Very familiar with" (1) to "Not at all familiar with" (5), with the midpoint being "Neutral" (3).

Questions 10 and 11 originated in Paulson's (1994) study on parenting styles. This question asked how much the listed situations remind the teen of his mother and father, separately. This question was designed to determine the parenting style(s) that the teens' parents demonstrate. Question 10 (parts A-J) included statements regarding the mother. Question 11 is the same as question 10; however, it contains statements regarding the father. For both questions, a likert scale was used ranging from "Very unlike my mother/father" (1) to "Very like my mother/father" (5), with the midpoint being "Neutral" (3). These questions do not directly relate to shopping or purchasing, rather they relate to parenting practices.

Question 12, from Moschis, Moore, and Smith (1984) was used to determine the communication patterns between teens and their parents. Eleven statements were

implemented in this questionnaire; one-half of the questions pertain to a socio-oriented family while the other half relate to a concept-oriented family. These statements were slightly reworded from the original statements in Moschis, Moore, and Smith's (1984) study. For example, Moschis, Moore, and Smith's (1984) statements are worded "(Parents) tell (child) what things he should or shouldn't buy" while this study would state "Your parents tell you what things you should or should not buy." Moschis, Moore, and Smith (1984) used twelve statements in their study; however, only eleven were used in this study. This was due to the pilot study that was used to pre-test this questionnaire, which will be discussed later. The teenagers who completed the pre-test felt that the twelfth item was either confusing or irrelevant; therefore, that item was omitted, leaving the other eleven present in this study. Moschis, Moore, and Smith (1984) used a likert scale for these statements; however, in this study the teen was asked to choose all items that pertain to their family when shopping.

Question 13 (parts A-L) contains questions regarding demographics. Parts A-L were either fill in the blank or check the blank questions. Parts A-E asked the teens their zip code, race/ethnicity, gender, age, and whether they had a driver's license. These questions were designed to determine if geographic area, race/ethnicity, gender, or age have an effect on how much influence teens have on their parents' purchasing patterns. Additionally whether the teen had a driver's license may affect his/her roles in the family.

Part F in question 13 asked the ages of the teen's brothers and sisters. This was to determine if the ordinal position of the teen affects the amount of influence he/she had on his/her parents when shopping for groceries. Parts G and H asked with whom the teen

lives (i.e. two parents or a single parent) and whether the parents are employed. This was to determine if teens in single parent homes have more influence and play more family roles than teens who live with both parents. It also determined if teens in dual income families have more influence and play more family roles than teens in single income families.

Parts I-K in question 13 inquired about the teen's income or allowance. These questions were designed to determine if teens who have their own money have more or less influence on their parents when purchasing household goods than teens who do not have their own money. Part L asked the total income of their household per year in order to determine if teens differed in their influences depending on whether they live in a low, middle, or high-income household. Parts I-L originated in Ward, Scott, Wackman, and Wartella's (1977) book on how children learn to buy.

Pilot Study

A pilot study composed of a group of teenagers was used to both determine if the instrument was reliable and to uncover any necessary. One classroom in a Knoxville, Tennessee high school was used for this study. This sample questionnaire was administered in a classroom setting to 17 teenage students on December 16, 1998. It took approximately 20 minutes for the teenagers to complete the questionnaire. After reviewing the teenagers' results and comments, a few editorial changes were necessary. These changes were not substantive in nature except for one item that was omitted from question 12. The question from Moschis, Moore, and Smith (1984) contained twelve

items; however, this study only used eleven. The item that was omitted stated "(Parents) say (child) shouldn't ask questions about things teenagers do not usually buy." This was omitted due to responses from the pilot study.

There were also a few editorial changes made to the questionnaire. For example, in question 11, regarding the father's parenting styles, the word "her" was changed to "him." Additionally, the teenagers' answers to question 13, parts J and K, seemed unusual. This question asked the teenager how much money he/she received each week. Their results seemed unusually high; therefore, for the final questionnaire, the word "week" was capitalized for more emphasis. The questionnaire for the pilot study was five pages long with a cover letter (see Appendix B-1). The final questionnaire remained the same as it was for the pilot study with the exception of the few editorial changes. A cover letter explaining the purpose and the teenagers' rights (see Appendix B-2) was stapled in the top left corner of the final, five-page questionnaire (see Appendix C).

Sample Selection

Four Knoxville, Tennessee high schools were chosen for this study. Teenagers under the age of 18 needed their parents' consent in order to participate. The teenagers were given a letter, addressed to their parents, requesting permission for the child to participate in this study (see Appendix D). The teenagers were given this letter at school in a classroom setting and were given approximately one week to return the signed letter. If the teenagers returned a signed letter, they were given an option to participate. If the students were 18 years or older, they were able to participate without parental consent.

The questionnaires were delivered to the schools for the teenagers who agreed to participate and who either returned a signed parental consent or were 18 years or older. The questionnaires were administered in a classroom setting and took the students approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Procedure

At the first high school, 200 parental consent letters were given to the principal, which she distributed to a few teachers on February 7, 1998. The teachers distributed 130 parent consent letters to their students and 54 were returned signed (42%). On February 17, 1998, these teachers distributed 58 questionnaires to these students and received 57 in return (98%). The three students who did not have parental consent were 18 years old. In order to encourage students' participation, "Blow-Pop" suckers were given to the participants.

At the second high school, 100 parental consent letters were given to the principal on February 17, 1998. The principal gave these letters to a few teachers for them to distribute to their students. Of the 100 parental consent letters, 45 were returned (45%). These teachers then distributed 80 questionnaires (including ones for the 18 year olds) on February 19, 1998. Fifty-seven completed questionnaires were returned (71%).

At the third high school, 200 parental consent letters were given to the guidance counselor on February 9, 1998. She gave the parental consent letters to a few teachers, and the teachers distributed 174 parental consent letters to their students and received 20 signed (12%). The teachers distributed 44 questionnaires (including ones for the 18 year

olds) on February 13, 1998. Of the 44 questionnaires distributed, 42 were returned completed (95%).

At the fourth high school, 200 parental consent letters were given to a few teachers on February 10, 1998. These teachers handed out 165 parental consent letters to their students and 125 were returned signed (76%). On February 12, 1998, 159 questionnaires were distributed to the students (including ones for the 18-year-olds) and 155 were returned completed (98%).

Variables

In order to test the proposed hypotheses, the following variables were included in the analyses: parenting styles, ordinal position, communication styles, influencing strategies, teenagers' characteristics, and the roles that the teenagers play (see Appendix E). First, parenting styles were determined based on the questions of whether the mother and the father, each separately, were demanding or responsive parents, as suggested by Paulson (1994). The averages of the demanding and responsive results were taken and then compiled to create the four different parenting styles: authoritarian, neglectful, authoritative, and permissive. The parent was categorized as authoritarian if their demanding factor was greater than the mean and if their responsive factor was less than the mean; neglectful if their demanding factor was less than the mean and their responsive factor was less than the mean; authoritative if their demanding factor was greater than the mean and their responsive factor was greater than the mean; and

permissive was everything else as long as their responsive factor was greater than their demanding factor, and this was the variable used as a base.

Next, the variables were created to determine ordinal position. First, to determine if the child was an only child, he/she was asked if he/she had any brothers or sisters. Also, the students were asked all the ages of their brothers and sisters. If the students' ages were greater than all the ages of their siblings then they were coded as the eldest. If the students' ages were younger than all of their siblings then they were coded as the youngest. If the students' ages were between their siblings then they were coded as being in the middle of their siblings.

Variables were also created for the four different communication styles used within the families. The questionnaire contained eleven statements regarding socio and concept-oriented communication styles, adopted from Moschis, Moore, and Smith (1984). The averages were taken for each of the two styles and then used to create the four different communication styles within these two. The four styles were created as follows. The communication style was consensual if the socio factor was greater than the mean and the concept factor was greater than the mean; protective if the socio factor was greater than the mean and the concept factor was less than the mean; pluralistic if the socio factor was less than the mean and the concept factor was greater than the mean; and laissez-faire if the socio factor was less than the mean and the concept factor was less than the mean.

Next, the influence strategies used by the teenagers were determined. If the teenagers responded to the bargaining or persuasion statements that they either strongly

agreed or agreed then they were considered to use these strategies. All other strategies were grouped together as "others."

The teenagers' characteristics, such as product importance, anticipated usage of the product, income of the family, teenagers' resources, and product knowledge were also examined. First, product importance, anticipated consumption, and product knowledge were measured from 1 to 5 as an ordinal variable. Next, to determine if the teenager lived in a family where both parents were employed or lived in a family where both parents were unemployed, the following variables were created. The teenagers were asked if their mothers and their fathers were either unemployed or employed. These responses were used to determine if they lived in a family with both parents employed or with neither parent employed. Also, the children's resources were determined by asking them if they were employed, received an allowance, or received any other money from another source.

To determine the roles that the teenagers play when their parents are purchasing groceries, the teenagers' requests for brands, the influencing strategies used, product importance, anticipated usage, product knowledge, and parenting styles, an ordinal scale was used from 1 to 5. For the measurement of roles, product importance, anticipated consumption, product knowledge, and parts of the parenting style measurement, the numbers were reversed for the responses. For example, if the teenagers responded to 1 then their response would be coded as a 5, and vice versa. This was done so that the entire questionnaire would be consistent and the 5 responses would be coded as the "most" and the 1 responses would be coded as the "least."

Analysis

The following analyses were used to interpret the data from the questionnaire. First, the reliability of the instrument was examined by using correlation analysis. It was found by analyzing these results that the instrument was reliable. Next, to determine the underlying factors across different types of children's influences, factor analyses were used. Using principal factor analysis, it was found that one factor underlies all of the different dimensions of teenagers' influencing their parents, which was overall influence. By reviewing question 5 (parts A-G) of the questionnaire, regarding the various roles that children play when shopping for groceries, factor analysis was performed to determine the influence in these roles for each grocery item. For example, *factor a* was created to determine the overall influence that children have on their parents when shopping for cereals. Based on the eigenvalue, there was one underlying factor, overall influence, for each grocery item. Each grocery item then had its own factor for use when determining how much influence children have on their parents for this product. These results, in turn, were then used with other sections of the questionnaire to determine how other factors affect the influence on these grocery items.

Second, regression analysis was used to examine the proposed hypotheses. The dependent variables were the created factor scores of overall influence for each grocery item, *factor a* through *factor g*. The independent variables included parenting style, ordinal position, communication style, influencing strategy, product importance, anticipated consumption, product knowledge, parental employment, and teenagers' resources. The following set of dummy variables were included to examine the impact of

authoritarian, neglectful, and authoritative parenting styles with permissive parenting style as the base. A set of dummy variables was included for ordinal position: only child, eldest child, and youngest child with child in the middle as the base. Also, a set of dummy variables was used in examining the following communication styles: consensual, protective, and pluralistic with the base style of laissez-faire. Other variables included were influencing strategy used: bargaining strategy and persuasion strategy. Also, product importance, anticipated consumption, product knowledge, dual parental employment, and no parental employment were examined. The final variables included in this data were child's own money (employment income), child's allowance, and child's other money. Therefore, these results show how much each of these variables influences each of the factors (food items). For example, it would show how much influence a child had when purchasing cereals if the mother were an authoritarian mother.

Finally, MANOVA analysis was used. This multianalysis of variance shows how much each of the independent variables influences all the food items, overall. With all seven food items combined, the p-value for each independent variable was examined to determine the significance of the independent variables' influences on the groceries, as a whole. For example, these results show if the influence of the communication styles significantly affects the purchasing of groceries. For MANOVA analysis, overall product importance and knowledge measures were employed instead of specific product importance and knowledge measures for each grocery item. Specifically, using principal factor analysis, overall product importance and product knowledge measures were determined and utilized for MANOVA analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

Three hundred eleven Knoxville, Tennessee teenagers participated in this study. The demographic characteristics of this sample are as follows (see Appendix F-1). The ages of these teenagers were as follows: 37 students were 14 years old (12%); 96 students were 15 years old (31%); 41 students were 16 years old (13%); 58 students were 17 years old (19%), 62 students were 18 years old (20%), 13 students were 19 years old or older (4%), and four students did not respond to this question (1%). Of the 311 respondents, 111 were males (36%) and 195 were females (63%), and five students did not respond to this question (1%).

To determine the ordinal position of the child, the students were asked all the ages of their brothers and sisters. Twenty-nine students were the only children (9%), one hundred ten students were the eldest children (35%), 99 students were the youngest children (32%), and 73 students were in the middle of their siblings (24%).

Regarding the children's living arrangements, 207 students live with both a mother and a father (67%), ten students live with their father only (3%), 48 students live with their mother only (15%), 41 students live with someone other than the above mentioned (13%), and five students did not respond to this question (2%).

Two hundred sixty-eight students stated that they were non-Hispanic white (86%). Eighteen students were African American (6%), six students were Hispanic (2%), two students were Asian/Pacific Islander (1%), and ten students stated that they were something other than the above mentioned (3%). Seven students did not respond to this question (2%).

Of the 311 respondents, 181 children stated that both of their parents were employed (58%) while only 5 stated that neither of their parents were employed (2%). One hundred twenty-five stated that one of their parents was employed (40%).

Regarding the children's monetary status, 119 students were employed (38%), 139 students receive a weekly allowance (45%), and 109 students receive money each week from another source (35%). Of the 311 students, 142 students had a driver's license (46%) while 162 students do not (52%) with the other seven students not responding to the question (2%).

Seven students stated that their household income was below $15,000 per year (2%). Fifteen students' household income was $15,000 - $29,000 (5%), 29 students' household income was $30,000 - $44,000 (9%), and 35 students' household income was $45,000 - $59,000 (11%). Fifty-five students stated that their household income was above $60,000 (18%) while 156 students did not know what their household income was (50%) and 14 students did not respond to this question (5%).

Variables were created from questions 10 and 11 to determine parenting styles. From these variables, the following responses were determined. Sixty-nine students had *authoritarian* mothers (22%), 84 students had *neglectful* mothers (27%), 90 students had

authoritative mothers (29%), and 68 students had *permissive* mothers (22%). Fifty-nine students had *authoritarian* fathers (19%), 54 students had *neglectful* fathers (17%), 79 students had *authoritative* fathers (26%), and 119 students had *permissive* fathers (38%).

Variables were also created from question 12 to determine communication styles within the family. Sixty-seven students were involved in the *consensual* communication style with their parents (21%) and 71 students were involved in the *protective* communication style with their parents (23%). Also, 86 students were involved in the *pluralistic* communication style with their parents (28%) and 87 students were involved in the *laissez-faire* communication style with their parents (28%).

Influencing strategies were also determined from the questionnaire. One hundred fifty-nine students used the persuasion strategy (51%), 102 students used the bargaining strategy (33%), and 50 students used other influencing strategies (16%).

FACTOR ANALYSIS

To uncover the underlying factor across specific children's influences on each particular grocery item, principal factor analysis was run separately for each grocery item using SAS PROC Factor Procedure. The factor analysis results for each particular food item are as follows. Each result contains the eigenvalue and the squared multiple correlations of the variables with each factor (see Appendix G-1). For each grocery item an overall underlying factor was found, implying overall influence on a particular grocery item. Specifically, for cereals, the eigenvalue was 3.3612 with the squared multiple correlation of 0.8900. The eigenvalue and the squared multiple correlation of chips were

3.0916 and 0.8615, respectively. For pasta, the eigenvalue was 2.9077 and the squared multiple correlation was 0.8599. For chicken, the eigenvalue and the squared multiple correlation were 2.8742 and 0.8438, respectively. The eigenvalue and the squared multiple correlation for fresh vegetables were 3.0570 and 0.8573, respectively. The eigenvalue for sports drinks was 3.6010 and the squared multiple correlation was 0.8999. Finally, the eigenvalue and squared multiple correlation for frozen meals was 2.7651 and 0.8519, respectively.

REGRESSION RESULTS

Regression analyses were conducted to determine the significance of the independent variables, children's influences on specific grocery purchasing decisions, on the dependent variables, which were cereal and chips (see Appendix G-2). Thus, seven separate regression analyses were run for each particular grocery item. The results from the regression analysis show that the following variables had a significant affect ($p < .05$) on the amount of influence that children have on their parents when purchasing cereals: product importance (0.0005), anticipated consumption (0.0051), product knowledge (0.0032), dual parental employment (0.0474), and no parental employment (0.0441). All of these variables, except dual parental employment, had a positive parameter estimate value. Therefore, the more important the product is to the teenagers, the more influence the teenagers had on purchasing cereals. Also, the more they planned to consume the product, the more influence the teenagers had on purchasing cereals. In addition, the more the teenagers knew about the product, the more influence the teenagers had on

purchasing cereals. Finally, if neither parent was employed, then the teenagers had more influence on purchasing cereals. However, with both parents employed, there was a negative parameter estimate value and these teenagers were less likely to influence their parents in the purchase of cereals.

The significant factors that have an effect when purchasing chips were pluralistic communication style (0.0411), product importance (0.0029), and anticipated consumption (0.0330). Also found to be significant were product knowledge (0.0228) and no parental employment (0.0191). All of the parameter estimates for these variables were positive. Therefore, teenagers who communicate with their parents in a pluralistic style had more influence on their parents when purchasing chips. Also, the teenagers who considered the product to be important had more influence on their parents when purchasing chips. Those teenagers who planned to consume the product often had more influence on their parents when purchasing chips. In addition, the teenagers who knew a lot about the product had more influence on their parents when purchasing chips. Finally, the teenagers who had parents that were not employed had more influence on their parents when purchasing chips.

Regarding pasta, the significant factors were authoritarian father (0.0390), pluralistic communication style (0.0140), product importance (0.0008), and no parental employment (0.0253). The parameter estimate values for these variables were all positive. Therefore, the teenagers who communicate with their parents in a pluralistic style had more influence on their parents when purchasing pasta. Also, the teenagers who considered the product to be important had more influence on their parents when

purchasing pasta. Finally, the teenagers who had parents who were not employed had more influence on their parents when purchasing pasta.

The significant factors for chicken were pluralistic communication style (0.0495) and product knowledge (0.0003). These two parameter estimate values were positive; therefore, the teenagers who communicate with their parents in a pluralistic style and who know a lot about the product had more influence on their parents when purchasing chicken.

For fresh vegetables, the significant factors that affect the amount of influence were anticipated consumption (0.0001), product knowledge (0.0001), and no parental employment (0.0050). The parameter estimate values for these variables were all positive. Therefore, the more the teenagers planned to consume the product the more influence they had on their parents when purchasing fresh vegetables. The more the teenagers knew about the product the more influence they had on purchasing fresh vegetables. Also, the teenagers who had parents that were not employed had more influence on their parents when purchasing fresh vegetables.

The significant factors for sports drinks were product importance (0.0060), anticipated consumption (0.0219), product knowledge (0.0002), and no parental employment (0.0208). The parameter estimate values for these variables were also all positive. Therefore, the more important the product was to the teenagers, the more influence they had when purchasing sports drinks. The more the teenagers planned to consume the product, the more influence they had when purchasing sports drinks. Also, the more the teenagers knew about the product, the more influence they had when

purchasing sports drinks. Finally, the teenagers who did not have employed parents had more influence on their parents when purchasing sport drinks.

Finally, the following factors were found to be significant in affecting the influence of purchasing frozen meals. These factors were pluralistic communication style (0.0378), product importance (0.0011), product knowledge (0.0002), dual parental employment (0.0257), and no parental employment (0.0419). All of the variables, except dual parental employment, had a positive parameter estimate value. Therefore, teenagers had more influence on their parents when purchasing frozen meals if they communicate with their parents in a pluralistic style. Also, if they considered the product to be important, the teenagers had more influence on their parents when purchasing frozen meals. If the teenagers were knowledgeable about the product, they had more influence on purchasing frozen meals. Finally, if they did not have employed parents, then they had more influence when purchasing frozen meals. However, if both parents were employed, they were less likely to influence their parents on the purchase of frozen meals.

ANOVA RESULTS

ANOVA analyses were performed to determine the amount of influence children have on their parents when shopping for groceries by examining each variable and each food item. By examining the results from these analyses, the following conclusions were determined (see Appendix G-3). Regarding families purchasing cereals, the two variables that had a significant effect on the amount of influence children have on their

parents were parental employment (F-statistic = 5.04, p-value = 0.0071) and product importance (F-statistic = 9.15, p-value = 0.0027).

The following factors were found to significantly affect the amount of influence that children had on their parents when purchasing chips: parental employment (F-statistic = 4.04, p-value = 0.0187), product importance (F 14.98, p-value = 0.0001), and product knowledge (F-statistic = 10.55, p-value = 0.0013). Regarding pasta, the following factors were found to be significant: communication style (F-statistic = 3.62, p-value = 0.0138), parental employment (F-statistic = 3.18, p-value = 0.0433), product importance (F-statistic = 16.85, p-value = 0.0001), and product knowledge (F-statistic = 7.83, p-value = 0.0055).

Regarding purchasing chicken, the following factors were found to be significant: child's other money (employment) (F-statistic = 5.62, p-value = 0.0184), product importance (F-statistic = 25.73, p-value = 0.0001), and product knowledge (F-statistic = 10.08, p-value = 0.0017). When purchasing fresh vegetables, the following factors were found to be significant: parental employment (F-statistic = 3.61, p-value = 0.0285), product importance (F-statistic = 15.23, p-value = 0.0001), and product knowledge (F-statistic = 4.52, p-value = 0.0344).

The following factors were found to significantly affect the purchase of sports drinks: product importance (F-statistic = 5.05, p-value = 0.0255) and product knowledge (F-statistic = 7.80, p-value = 0.0056). Finally, regarding purchasing frozen meals, the following factors were found to be significant: communication style (F-statistic = 4.04, p-

value = 0.0078), child's other money (employment) (F-statistic = 6.63, p-value = 0.0106), and product importance (F-statistic = 13.23, p-value = 0.0003).

MANOVA RESULTS

After examining the MANOVA analysis, the following variables were shown to have a significant effect on children's influences on their parents when purchasing groceries (see Appendix G-4). When children receive money each week, other than wages and allowances, they were likely to have more influence on their parents' grocery shopping (p-value = 0.0071). Also, the children's product knowledge of the grocery item had a significant effect on the children's influences on family grocery purchase decisions (p-value = 0.0104).

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSIONS

Previous research has focused on how and to what extent children influence their parents when purchasing household products. This study specifically focused on children's influences on their parents when shopping for grocery products. After analyzing the results, the hypotheses were investigated to determine if the particular variables had a significant effect on children's influences and were supported or not supported. Next, each hypothesis will be discussed along with the final conclusions regarding each hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1: Different parenting styles affect the amount of influence that children have on family decision-making. To examine this hypothesis, the MANOVA results were reviewed (see appendix G-4). The MANOVA analysis determined the effect that the specific independent variables have on children's influence on groceries as a whole. Thus, these results did not support this hypothesis because the p-value for the mother's parenting style was 0.3929 and the p-value for the father's parenting style was 0.7195, which were not significant ($p < .05$). Moreover, by examining the regression results (see appendix G-2), this hypothesis was not supported because only one parenting style had a significant effect on only one grocery item. Also, the ANOVA results were examined (see appendix G-3). There were no significant p-values for any of the grocery

items associated with parenting styles. Therefore, after reviewing the MANOVA results, the regression results, and the ANOVA results, hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Hypothesis 1a: Children of neglectful and permissive parents will have the most influence on family decision-making. To examine hypothesis 1a, the regression results were used. Hypothesis 1a was not supported because the results were not found influential due to the lack of significance on all of these variables.

Hypothesis 1b: Children of authoritarian parents will have the least influence on family decision-making. To determine if hypothesis 1b was supported or not, the regression results were examined. Authoritarian fathers had a significant p-value (0.0390) in relation only to purchasing pasta. This was the only significant factor for parenting styles. In order for this hypothesis to be supported, the p-value needed to be significant and the parameter estimate values needed to be negative, because that would indicate the teenagers with authoritarian parents had the least influence. Only three food items were negative for authoritarian mother and none were negative for authoritarian father, and none of these p-values were significant. Thus, hypothesis 1b was not supported.

Hypothesis 2: Children's ordinal position affects the amount of influence that children have on family decision-making. To determine if hypothesis 2 was supported, the MANOVA results were first examined. These results did not support this hypothesis

as the p-value of 0.7916 was much too high to be significant. Next, the ANOVA results were examined. For the birth order of the child, none of the p-values for any grocery item were significant; thus, these results did not support this hypothesis. Finally, the regression results were examined for the final test of hypothesis 2. Again, none of the p-values were significant for any grocery item. Therefore, by reviewing the MANOVA, ANOVA, and regression results, hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Hypothesis 2a: First-borns have more influence than later-borns on family decision-making. Hypothesis 2b: Middle-borns have the least influence of all children on family decision-making. To determine whether hypotheses 2a and 2b were supported, regression analyses were implemented. Again, none of these variables had a significant p-value for any grocery item. Therefore, hypotheses 2a and 2b were not supported.

Hypothesis 3: Family communication patterns affect the amount of influence that children have on family decision-making. To determine whether hypothesis 3 was supported, MANOVA and ANOVA results were examined. The p-value in the MANOVA results was not significant; therefore, this hypothesis was not supported (p-value = 0.1581). By examining the ANOVA results, the p-value was significant for communication patterns with pasta (p-value = 0.0138) and frozen meals (p-value = 0.0078). Thus, hypothesis 3 was only marginally supported by using the ANOVA results.

Hypothesis 3a: Children in consensual families have the most influence on their parents in family decision-making. To determine whether hypothesis 3a was supported, the regression results were examined. For the seven grocery items, none of the p-values for consensual communication were significant. Therefore, hypothesis 3a was not supported.

Hypothesis 3b: Children in laissez-faire families have the least influence on their parents in family decision-making. To determine whether hypothesis 3b was supported, the regression results were examined. Laissez-faire families were the dummy variable; therefore, the consensual families were compared to the laissez-faire families to determine whether children of consensual families have more influence or not. Because there were no significant p-values for the consensual families, it was not proven that children of laissez-faire families have the least influence of all. Therefore, hypothesis 3b was not supported.

Hypothesis 4: The type of influence strategy children use has an effect on the amount of influence they have on family decision-making. To determine whether hypothesis 4 was supported, the MANOVA and ANOVA results were analyzed. The MANOVA results show that this hypothesis was not supported because the p-value for influencing strategy was not significant (p-value = 0.1327). In addition, none of the p-values in the ANOVA results were significant, either; therefore, because the p-values were too high, hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Hypothesis 4a: Children have more influence on family decision-making when they use bargaining strategies than any other strategy. Hypothesis 4b: Children have the least influence on family decision-making when they use persuasion strategies than any other strategy. The regression results were examined to determine whether hypotheses 4a and 4b were supported. By reviewing the regression results of the influencing strategies, none of the p-values for any of the seven grocery products were significant for either strategy. Therefore, hypotheses 4a and 4b were not supported.

Hypothesis 5: Children's characteristics will have an effect on the amount of influence they have on family decision-making. To determine whether children's characteristics affect the amount of influence they have on family decision-making, results from hypotheses 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, and 5e were examined. After analyzing these results, hypothesis 5 was supported because each part of hypothesis 5 was supported, as described below.

Hypothesis 5a: The more important products are to children, the more influence they will have on family decision-making. To determine whether hypothesis 5a was supported, the MANOVA, ANOVA, and regression results were analyzed. The p-value for product importance on all groceries was 0.0662, which was marginal significance. Thus, the MANOVA results show that this hypothesis would be supported. Next, the ANOVA results were examined. All of the grocery items included a significant p-value for product importance to the teenagers and would strongly support hypothesis 5a.

Following are the significant p-values for each grocery item: cereal (p-value = 0.0027), chips (p-value = 0.0001), pasta (p-value = 0.0001), chicken (p-value = 0.0001), fresh vegetables (p-value = 0.0001), sports drinks (p-value = 0.0255), and frozen meals (p-value = 0.0003). Therefore, the ANOVA results support hypothesis 5a. Finally, regression results were analyzed to examine hypothesis 5a. Again, this analysis shows that hypothesis 5a was supported by the significant p-values. The p-values for the following grocery items, using regression, were significant: cereal (p-value = 0.0005), chips (p-value = 0.0029), pasta (p-value = 0.0008), sports drinks (p-value = 0.0060), and frozen meals (p-value = 0.0011). By reviewing the results from MANOVA, ANOVA, and regression, hypothesis 5a was strongly supported.

Hypothesis 5b: The higher the anticipated level of usage of the product to children, the more influence they will have on family-decision making. To determine whether hypothesis 5b was supported, the regression results were analyzed. This variable, anticipated usage, was not included in the MANOVA and ANOVA analyses because it was highly correlated with two other variables: product importance and product knowledge. The regression results show that this hypothesis was supported. The following grocery items included a significant p-value in relation to anticipated consumption and support hypothesis 5b: cereal (p-value = 0.0051), chips (p-value = 0.0330), fresh vegetables (p-value = 0.0001), and sports drinks (p-value = 0.0219). Therefore, hypothesis 5b was marginally supported because four out of seven grocery items had significant p-values.

Hypothesis 5c: Children in dual-income families will have more influence on family decision-making than children do in single-income families. To determine whether this hypothesis was supported, the results from the MANOVA, ANOVA, and regression analyses were investigated. First, the MANOVA results show that parental employment does not have a significant effect on children's influences (p-value = 0.1568). Thus, this hypothesis was not supported. However, by reviewing the ANOVA results, the following grocery items have a significant p-value for parental employment: cereal (p-value = 0.0071), chips (p-value = 0.0187), pasta (p-value = 0.0433), and fresh vegetables (p-value = 0.0285). Therefore, the ANOVA results show that this hypothesis was marginally supported. Finally, the regression results were reviewed. In these results, there was not a significant effect overall on dual parental employment compared to single parental employment. The following two grocery items had the only significant p-values: cereal (p-value = 0.0474) and frozen meals (p-value = 0.0257). However, the parameter estimate values for these two items was negative; therefore, this shows the opposite. If these teenagers have two employed parents, the teenagers are less likely to influence the purchases of cereals and frozen meals. Thus, hypothesis 5c was not supported by reviewing the MANOVA and regression results and was only marginally supported by the ANOVA results.

Hypothesis 5d: The more resources children have, the more influence they will have on family decision-making. To determine whether this hypothesis was supported, the results from the MANOVA, ANOVA, and regression analyses were analyzed.

However, children's resources included more than one variable, including children's income from employment, children's allowance, and children's other money. First, this hypothesis was not supported by the MANOVA results for children's employment and children's allowance. However, children's other money had a significant p-value of 0.0071, which was supported. Next, the ANOVA results were examined. None of the p-values for children's employment and children's allowance were significant. The following grocery items had significant p-values in relation to children's other money: chicken (p-value = 0.0184) and frozen meals (p-value = 0.0106). Therefore, children's other money was only marginally supported with only two grocery items out of seven being significant. Finally, the regression results show that this hypothesis was not supported because none of the p-values for all three variables were significant for any of the grocery items. After reviewing the results for all three variables, hypothesis 5d was not supported, with the exception of the slight significance when reviewing the ANOVA results.

Hypothesis 5e: The higher the level of product knowledge to children, the more influence they will have on family decision-making. To determine whether hypothesis 5e was supported, the MANOVA, ANOVA, and regression results were analyzed. First, the MANOVA results show that this hypothesis was supported with a significant p-value of 0.0104. Next, the ANOVA results were examined. The following grocery items had a significant p-value in relation to product knowledge: chips (p-value = 0.0013), pasta (p-value = 0.0055), chicken (p-value = 0.0017), fresh vegetables (p-value = 0.0344), and

sports drinks (p-value = 0.0056), with frozen meals having marginal significance (p-value = 0.0551). Therefore, by reviewing the ANOVA results, this hypothesis was supported. Finally, the regression results were used to determine the significance of product knowledge. These results show that hypothesis 5e was strongly supported because all grocery items had significant p-values: cereal (p-value = 0.0032), chips (p-value = 0.0228), pasta (p-value = 0.0001), chicken (p-value = 0.0003), fresh vegetables (p-value = 0.0001), sports drinks (p-value = 0.0002), and frozen meals (p-value = 0.0002). After reviewing the MANOVA, ANOVA, and regression results, hypothesis 5e was strongly supported.

LIMITATIONS

This study has several limitations. For example, this study is limited because it was limited to one area, one age group, and one product category. First, this study was limited to one specific geographic area, Knoxville, Tennessee. Thus, by researching only one city, these results may not be representative of other geographic areas. Children's influence may vary in different geographic locations.

Second, this study was limited to one specific age group, which was teenagers. The participants in this study were high school students whose ages range from 13 years old to over 19 years old. Therefore, the results may not be representative of all children, such as preschool age children, elementary school age children, or middle school age children.

Finally, this study was limited to grocery items as the product category. This limits the study because children would probably have different levels and types of influence for other products, such as toys, a car, or a stereo. Limiting this study to grocery items does not show the critical influences that perhaps a larger or more expensive item would. Grocery items may seem trivial to teenagers and therefore they may not try to influence their parents as much on such a small item.

CONCLUSIONS

After reviewing previous literature and studies, all of the hypotheses were expected to be significant. However, contrary to previous findings, only a few of the hypotheses were supported. Unexpectedly, one hypothesis that was supported was one found by previous researchers to be untrue. Hypotheses 3, 5, 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, and 5e were supported from marginally to strongly. The results show that communication patterns affect the amount of influence that children have on family decision-making (marginally supported). In addition, the more important products are to children, the more influence they will have on family decision-making (strongly supported). Furthermore, the higher anticipated level of usage of the product to children, the more influence they will have on family decision-making (marginally supported). Also, children in dual-income families will have more influence on family decision-making than children do in single-income families (only marginally supported). Likewise, the more resources children have, the more influence they will have on family decision-making (only marginally supported). Finally, the higher the level of product knowledge to children, the more influence they

will have on family decision-making (strongly supported). Thus, the results show that product importance and product knowledge have the most powerful effect in children's influences on family decision-making.

One factor that had a significant effect on children's influences, contrary to previous research, was whether both parents were unemployed. By analyzing the regression results, this variable, in comparison to single parental employment, was strongly supported. The following grocery items had significant p-values in relation to no parental employment: cereals (p-value = 0.0441), chips (p-value = 0.0191), pasta (p-value = 0.0253), fresh vegetables (p-value = 0.0050), sports drinks (p-value = 0.0208), and frozen meals (p-value = 0.0419).

There were also the hypotheses that were expected to be supported and to have a significant effect on children's influences. Rather, hypotheses 1, 1a, 1b, 2, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 4, 4a, and 4b were not supported. Therefore, these results show that parenting styles, ordinal position, consensual communication style, laissez-faire communication style, and influencing strategies used do not affect the amount of influence that children have on their parents when purchasing groceries. These hypotheses were expected to have a significant effect; however, contrary to previous research, they did not.

Ultimately, only seven out of 20 hypotheses were supported. Therefore, these findings were contradictory to previous findings in relation to this subject. The reasons for this could be due to the limitations or just to inconsistent findings by various researchers. There are limitations in every research study; therefore, to obtain the full

knowledge necessary to prove these hypotheses, a study would be required with minimal limitations.

IMPLICATIONS

After reviewing the results of this study, it was found that product importance and product knowledge significantly affect the amount of influence children have on their parents when purchasing groceries. Thus, there are several effects that retailers and parents should be aware of regarding children and parents' shopping patterns.

Retailers should understand that product importance and product knowledge are crucial to teenagers when shopping. Retailers should create strategies associated with providing teenagers with knowledge about the product and emphasize to them the importance of the product. Therefore, the retailers will be able to more efficiently and effectively reach the teenagers when targeting their products to them. Retailers also need to be aware of the increasing spending power of teenagers today and that this power is expected to rise in the future. With this increase in spending power, teenagers are a crucial segment of the market for retailers to target, reach, and maintain.

It is also important for parents, as well as retailers, to be aware of these facts. Parents should understand the significance of teenagers' power in the marketplace as well as in the home. Parents need to become aware of the methods and behaviors used by their own children to influence them. If parents realize some of the ways their children are persuading them to purchase certain products, they could prevent unnecessary purchases. They also need to realize the importance of their children's spending power in

the marketplace. Some parents may not approve of certain purchases; by realizing the extent of their child's influence, they may be able to have more control over where their money and their child's money is spent.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Baranowski, Marc D. (1978, Winter). Adolescents' Attempted Influence on Parental Behaviors. Adolescence, 13(52), 585-604.

Baumrind, Diana. (1983). Rejoinder to Lewis's Reinterpretation of Parental Firm Control Effects: Are Authoritative Families Really Harmonious? Psychological Bulletin, 94(1), 132-142.

Baumrind, Diana. (1991, February). The Influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence and Substance Use. Journal of Early Adolescence, (11)1, 56-95.

Beatty, Sharon E. & Talpade, Salil. (1994, September). Adolescent Influence in Family Decision Making: A Replication with Extension. Journal of Consumer Research, 21, 332-341.

Belch, George E., Belch, Michael A., & Ceresino, Gayle. (1985). Parental and Teenage Child Influences in Family Decision Making. Journal of Business Research, 13, 163-176.

Carlson, Les, Grossbart, Sanford, & Walsh, Ann. (1990). Mothers' Communication Orientation and Consumer-Socialization Tendencies. Journal of Advertising, 19(3), 27-38.

Easterling, Debbie, Miller, Shirley, & Weinberger, Nanci. (1995, September). Environmental Consumerism: A Process of Children's Socialization and Families' Resocialization. Psychology & Marketing, 12(6), 531-550.

Foxman, Ellen R., Tansuhaj, Patriya S., & Ekstrom, Karin M. (1989). Adolescents' Influence in Family Purchase Decisions: A Socialization Perspective. Journal of Business Research, 18, 159-172.

Gregan-Paxton, Jennifer & John, Deborah Roedder. (1995, March). Are Young Children Adaptive Decision Makers? A Study of Age Differences in Information Search Behavior. Journal of Consumer Research, 21, 567-580.

Grygielski, Michal. (1993). Parental Communication Patterns and Adolescents' Identification with Parents. Polish Psychological Bulletin, (24)3, 231-241.

Hauser, Grady. (1986, December). How Teenagers Spend the Family Dollar. American Demographics, 8(12), 38-41.

Lackman, Conway & Lanasa, John M. (1993, March/April). Family Decision-Making Theory: An Overview and Assessment. Psychology & Marketing, 10(2), 81-93.

Mangleburg, Tamara F. (1990). Children's Influence in Purchase Decisions: A Review and Critique. Advances in Consumer Research, 17, 813-825.

McNeal, James U. (1992). Kids As Consumers: A Handbook of Marketing to Children. New York: Lexington Books.[a]

McNeal, James U. (1992, February). The Littlest Shoppers. American Demographics, 14(2), 48-53.[b]

Moschis, George P. (1985). The Role of Family Communication in Consumer Socialization of Children and Adolescents. Journal of Consumer Research, 11, 898-913.

Moschis, George P., Moore, Roy L., & Smith, Ruth B. (1984). The Impact of Family Communication on Adolescent Consumer Socialization. Advances in Consumer Research, 11, Thomas C. Kinnear, ed., Chicago, IL: Association for Consumer Research, 314-319.

Narayanan, Subha. (1997, March 24-28). Category Type Determines Who Makes the Decisions. Retail World, 50(5), 7-8.

Palan, Kay M. & Wilkes, Robert E. (1997, September). Adolescent-Parent Interaction in Family Decision Making. Journal of Consumer Research, 24, 159-169.

Paulson, Sharon E. (1994, May). Relations of Parenting Style and Parental Involvement with Ninth-Grade Students' Achievements. Journal of Early Adolescence, 14(2), 250-267.

Peterson, Gary W. & Rollins, Boyd C. (1987). Parent-Child Socialization. In M.B. Suseman & S.K. Steinmetz (Ed) Handbook of Marriage and Family. New York: Plenum.

Power, Christopher, Atchison, Sandra, & DeGeorge, Gail. (1991, September 9). Getting 'Em While They're Young. Business Week, n3230, 94-95.

Spiro, Rosann L. (1983). Persuasion in Family Decision-Making. Journal of Consumer Research, 9, 393-402.

Sproles, George B. & Burns, Leslie Davis. (1994). Changing Appearances: Understanding Dress in Contemporary Society. New York: Fairchild Publications.

Stipp, Horst. (1993, August). New Ways to Reach Children. American Demographics, 15(8), 50-56.

Underhill, Paco. (1994, June). Kids in Stores. American Demographics, 16(6), 22-26.

U.S. Census Bureau; "Resident Population of the United States: Estimates, by Age and Sex" (Numbers in Thousands; consistent with the 1990 census, as enumerated). [On-line], January 19, 1998; 5:29 p.m., Available: <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/nation/intfile2-1.txt>

U.S. Census Bureau; "Resident Population of the United States: Middle Series Projections, 1996 - 2000, by Age and Sex." [On-line], January 19, 1998; 5:29 p.m., Available: <http://www.census.gov/population/projections/nation/nas/npas9600.txt>

Ward, Scott, Wackman, Daniel B., & Wartella, Ellen. (1977). In How Children Learn to Buy (Appendix A). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Wilkie, William L. (1994). Consumer Behavior (3rd ed.). Canada: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Zollo, Peter. (1995, November). Talking To Teens. American Demographics, 17(11), 22-28.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CHOOSING FOOD ITEMS FOR THE INSTRUMENT

A-1. List of Food Items for the Focus Group

The information on this questionnaire will be used only for research purposes for my thesis at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Be assured that your responses are <u>completely confidential</u>. Neither your name nor your signature is required. This questionnaire is anonymous.

I eat this product	I help my parents pick out this product		I eat this product	I help my parents pick out this product	
_____	_____	peanut butter	_____	_____	tea
_____	_____	granola bars	_____	_____	cereals
_____	_____	macaroni & cheese	_____	_____	popcorn
_____	_____	can soups	_____	_____	jelly
_____	_____	toaster pastries (i.e. Pop Tarts)	_____	_____	oatmeal
_____	_____	soft drinks	_____	_____	bagels
_____	_____	ice cream	_____	_____	candy
_____	_____	frozen pizza	_____	_____	chips
_____	_____	frozen items (i.e. Hot Pocket)	_____	_____	juice
_____	_____	cookie dough	_____	_____	milk
_____	_____	packaged cookies	_____	_____	cheese
_____	_____	sandwich meats	_____	_____	bread
_____	_____	energy bars (i.e. Power Bar)	_____	_____	pudding
_____	_____	waffles (i.e. Eggos)	_____	_____	coffee
_____	_____	Toaster Strudels	_____	_____	donuts
_____	_____	gelatin (i.e. Jello)	_____	_____	pasta
_____	_____	snack cakes (i.e. Little Debbie)	_____	_____	rice
_____	_____	canned fruit	_____	_____	chicken
_____	_____	cakes/frostings	_____	_____	steak
_____	_____	salad dressings	_____	_____	pork
_____	_____	frozen meals (i.e. Lean Quisine)	_____	_____	hamburgers
_____	_____	spaghetti sauce	_____	_____	fish
_____	_____	canned biscuits/rolls	_____	_____	popsicle
_____	_____	cereal bars (i.e. Nutri Grain)	_____	_____	crackers
_____	_____	sports drinks (i.e. Gatorade)	_____	_____	fresh fruit
_____	_____	fresh vegetables	_____	_____	rice cakes
_____	_____	canned vegetables	_____	_____	hot dogs
_____	_____	prepared lunch items (i.e. Lunchables)	_____	_____	Kool-Aid
_____	_____	Other: _____			

A-2. Groups of Food Items

FOOD ITEM/CATEGORY	I EAT THIS ITEM	I HELP CHOOSE ITEM	CHOSEN ITEM
CEREALS	***9***	***8***	☆
Soft Drinks	9	6	
Fresh Fruit	9	6	
Sandwich Meats	7	6	
CHIPS	***7***	***6***	☆
Candy	7	6	
Toaster Pastries (i.e. Pop Tarts)	6	6	
Juice	8	5	
Ice cream	8	5	
FROZEN MEALS (i.e. LEAN QUISINE)	***6***	***5***	☆
Bread	9	4	
Milk	8	4	
Salad dressings	7	4	
Popsicle	7	4	
Frozen items (i.e. Hot Pocket)	7	4	
Can soups	7	4	
Packaged cookies	6	4	
SPORTS DRINKS (i.e. GATORADE)	***5***	***4***	☆

A-2. Groups of Food Items (continued)

FOOD ITEM/CATEGORY	I EAT THIS ITEM	I HELP CHOOSE ITEM	CHOSEN ITEM
PASTA	***8***	***3***	☆
Toaster Strudels	6	3	
Kool-Aid	6	3	
Cakes/frostings	6	3	
Snack cakes (i.e. Little Debbie)	5	3	
Prepared lunch items (i.e. Lunchables)	3	3	
Granola bars	3	3	
Macaroni & cheese	9	2	
Waffles (i.e. Eggos)	8	2	
Rice	8	2	
Popcorn	8	2	
Frozen pizza	8	2	
FRESH VEGETABLES	***8***	***2***	☆
Donuts	7	2	
Cheese	7	2	
Canned biscuits/rolls	7	2	
Pudding	6	2	
Bagels	6	2	
Canned fruit	5	2	
Gelatin (i.e. Jello)	4	2	

A-2. Groups of Food Items (continued)

FOOD ITEM/CATEGORY	I EAT THIS ITEM	I HELP CHOOSE ITEM	CHOSEN ITEM
Cookie dough	4	2	
Cereal bars (i.e. Nutri Grain)	4	2	
Oatmeal	3	2	
CHICKEN	***9***	***1***	☆
Spaghetti sauce	8	1	
Peanut butter	8	1	
Jelly	8	1	
Crackers	6	1	
Fish	5	1	
Canned vegetables	4	1	
Energy bars (i.e. Power Bar)	1	1	
Steak	9	0	
Hot dogs	8	0	
Hamburgers	8	0	
Pork	7	0	
Tea	6	0	
Rice cakes	4	0	
Coffee	1	0	

APPENDIX B

LETTERS TO STUDENTS INCLUDED WITH THE INSTRUMENT

B-1. Letter to Student for Pilot Study

HESTER A. DAVES

School Address:
230 Jesse Harris Building
College of Human Ecology
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
974-2141 Phone

December 16, 1997

_____ High School Students
Knoxville, Tennessee

RE: Questionnaire for Thesis

Dear Student:

I am a graduate student at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and am in the process of gathering data for my thesis. I am working on my master's degree in Retail and Consumer Sciences, in the college of Human Ecology. I am interested in learning how you and your parents shop for groceries.

I am distributing this questionnaire to approximately 500 teenagers in the Knoxville area to examine their perspectives. Hopefully, with the help of you and your schoolmates, I will be able to reach my goal.

This questionnaire is completely anonymous. Neither a name nor a signature is required. The responses and results will only be used for research purposes.

The questionnaire should take approximately 10 minutes. Your help is greatly appreciated.

Thank you,

Hester A. Daves

B-2. Letter to Student Attached to Instrument

February 9, 1998

High School Students
Knoxville, TN

RE: Questionnaire for Thesis

Dear Student:
I am a graduate student at the University of Tennessee, and am in the process of gathering data for my thesis. I am working on my master's degree in Retail and Consumer Sciences, in the college of Human Ecology. I am interested in learning how you and your parents shop for groceries.

I am distributing this questionnaire to several hundred teenagers in the Knoxville area to examine their perspectives. Hopefully, with the help of you and your schoolmates, I will be able to reach my goal.

This questionnaire is completely anonymous. Neither a name nor a signature is required. Therefore, by returning a completed questionnaire, this constitutes your consent to participate. The responses and results will only be used for research purposes. The name of the school will not be used in this research.

The information in the study records will be kept confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study unless you specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study.

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at anytime without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be returned or destroyed. If you choose not to participate, you may resume normal activity and either review class notes or work on uncompleted homework assignments.

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Hester Daves, at (phone). If you have questions about your rights as a participant, contact the Compliance Section of the Office of Research at (423) 974-3466.

The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes. Your help and cooperation are greatly appreciated.

Thank you,

Hester A. Daves

Enclosure (1)
cc: _____ High School Students

APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENT

C. Instrument

1. In the past couple of months, have you been shopping with your parents for groceries?

_____ Yes _____ No

If no, how long ago was your last grocery shopping experience with your parents? _____

2. Recalling this last grocery shopping experience, did your family purchase any of the following? Check all that apply.

_____ Cereals
_____ Pasta
_____ Fresh Vegetables
_____ Chips
_____ Chicken
_____ Sports Drinks (i.e. Gatorade)
_____ Frozen Meals (i.e. Lean Quisine, pizza)

3. On the average, how often do you go grocery shopping WITH YOUR PARENTS?

At least once per week _____ Once per two/three months _____
At least once per month _____ Hardly ever _____

4. On the average, how often do you go grocery shopping ALONE?

At least once per week _____ Once per two/three months _____
At least once per month _____ Hardly ever _____

5. How much advice do you contribute to each grocery purchase compared to your parents in the following situations (A – G)? Circle the ONE best number in relation to you for each product.

A. Bringing up the idea to buy the product.

		The entire contribution was mine	Most of the contribution was mine	Equal contribution as parents	I contributed some	I did not contribute at all
a)	Cereals	1	2	3	4	5
b)	Chips	1	2	3	4	5
c)	Pasta	1	2	3	4	5
d)	Chicken	1	2	3	4	5
e)	Fresh vegetables	1	2	3	4	5
f)	Sports drinks	1	2	3	4	5
g)	Frozen meals	1	2	3	4	5

B. Offering opinions that have influences on the final purchase decision.

		The entire contribution was mine	Most of the contribution was mine	Equal contribution as parents	I contributed some	I did not contribute at all
a)	Cereals	1	2	3	4	5
b)	Chips	1	2	3	4	5
c)	Pasta	1	2	3	4	5
d)	Chicken	1	2	3	4	5
e)	Fresh vegetables	1	2	3	4	5
f)	Sports drinks	1	2	3	4	5
g)	Frozen meals	1	2	3	4	5

C. Giving your parents specific information about this product, such as price, quality, brand, where it can be purchased, etc.

		The entire contribution was mine	Most of the contribution was mine	Equal contribution as parents	I contributed some	I did not contribute at all
a)	Cereals	1	2	3	4	5
b)	Chips	1	2	3	4	5
c)	Pasta	1	2	3	4	5
d)	Chicken	1	2	3	4	5
e)	Fresh vegetables	1	2	3	4	5
f)	Sports drinks	1	2	3	4	5
g)	Frozen meals	1	2	3	4	5

D. Making the final decision on exactly what to buy or not to buy.

		The entire contribution was mine	Most of the contribution was mine	Equal contribution as parents	I contributed some	I did not contribute at all
a)	Cereals	1	2	3	4	5
b)	Chips	1	2	3	4	5
c)	Pasta	1	2	3	4	5
d)	Chicken	1	2	3	4	5
e)	Fresh vegetables	1	2	3	4	5
f)	Sports drinks	1	2	3	4	5
g)	Frozen meals	1	2	3	4	5

E. Purchasing the product, paying for it, and either taking it home or arranging for delivery.

		The entire contribution was mine	Most of the contribution was mine	Equal contribution as parents	I contributed some	I did not contribute at all
a)	Cereals	1	2	3	4	5
b)	Chips	1	2	3	4	5
c)	Pasta	1	2	3	4	5
d)	Chicken	1	2	3	4	5
e)	Fresh vegetables	1	2	3	4	5
f)	Sports drinks	1	2	3	4	5
g)	Frozen meals	1	2	3	4	5

F. Consuming the product.

		The entire contribution was mine	Most of the contribution was mine	Equal contribution as parents	I contributed some	I did not contribute at all
a)	Cereals	1	2	3	4	5
b)	Chips	1	2	3	4	5
c)	Pasta	1	2	3	4	5
d)	Chicken	1	2	3	4	5
e)	Fresh vegetables	1	2	3	4	5
f)	Sports drinks	1	2	3	4	5
g)	Frozen meals	1	2	3	4	5

G. Undertaking tasks to store the product, prepare it for use, and maintain it in operating condition.

		The entire contribution was mine	Most of the contribution was mine	Equal contribution as parents	I contributed some	I did not contribute at all
a)	Cereals	1	2	3	4	5
b)	Chips	1	2	3	4	5
c)	Pasta	1	2	3	4	5
d)	Chicken	1	2	3	4	5
e)	Fresh vegetables	1	2	3	4	5
f)	Sports drinks	1	2	3	4	5
g)	Frozen meals	1	2	3	4	5

6. How likely are you to ask for specific kinds or brands of:

		Very Likely	Likely	Neutral	Unlikely	Very Unlikely
a)	Cereals	1	2	3	4	5
b)	Chips	1	2	3	4	5
c)	Pasta	1	2	3	4	5
d)	Chicken	1	2	3	4	5
e)	Fresh vegetables	1	2	3	4	5
f)	Sports drinks	1	2	3	4	5
g)	Frozen meals	1	2	3	4	5

7. In the following situations, circle the number most appropriate in relation to your family when involved in purchasing the groceries previously listed.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a)	When discussing this purchase with your parents, you related this discussion to similar ones in which you had demonstrated your expertise.	1	2	3	4	5
b)	You tried to convince your parents to accept your judgment because "you know more about this item than your parents."	1	2	3	4	5
c)	You offered to do something your parents wanted if they would agree to your decision on this.	1	2	3	4	5
d)	You made a point of pleasing your parents prior to this decision so that they would be more likely to give in to you.	1	2	3	4	5
e)	You used the silent treatment or pouted.	1	2	3	4	5
f)	You whined or begged your parents to purchase this item.	1	2	3	4	5
g)	You misrepresented what you knew about the other alternatives in order to convince your parents.	1	2	3	4	5
h)	You requested this item by asking or demanding your parents to purchase it.	1	2	3	4	5

8. In the following examples, circle the number most appropriate in relation to you and the groceries.

a) "This product is very important to me."

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1)	Cereal	1	2	3	4	5
2)	Chips	1	2	3	4	5
3)	Pasta	1	2	3	4	5
4)	Chicken	1	2	3	4	5
5)	Fresh vegetables	1	2	3	4	5
6)	Sports drinks	1	2	3	4	5
7)	Frozen meals	1	2	3	4	5

b) "I plan to consume this product often."

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1)	Cereal	1	2	3	4	5
2)	Chips	1	2	3	4	5
3)	Pasta	1	2	3	4	5
4)	Chicken	1	2	3	4	5
5)	Fresh vegetables	1	2	3	4	5
6)	Sports drinks	1	2	3	4	5
7)	Frozen meals	1	2	3	4	5

9. What is your overall knowledge of the following products?

		Very familiar with	Familiar with	Neutral	Not familiar with	Not at all familiar with
a)	Cereal	1	2	3	4	5
b)	Chips	1	2	3	4	5
c)	Pasta	1	2	3	4	5
d)	Chicken	1	2	3	4	5
e)	Fresh vegetables	1	2	3	4	5
f)	Sports drinks	1	2	3	4	5
g)	Frozen meals	1	2	3	4	5

10. How much do the following situations remind you of your mother? (Circle one per item please).

		Very unlike my mother	Unlike my mother	neutral	Like my mother	Very like my mother
a)	I would describe my mother as a strict parent.	1	2	3	4	5
b)	My mother expects me to tell her when I think a rule is unfair.	1	2	3	4	5
c)	My mother usually wants to know where I am going.	1	2	3	4	5
d)	My mother encourages me to talk with her about things.	1	2	3	4	5
e)	My mother gives me chores to do around the house routinely.	1	2	3	4	5
f)	My mother expects me to do what she says without having to tell me why.	1	2	3	4	5
g)	My mother has few rules for me to follow.	1	2	3	4	5
h)	My mother seldom praises me for doing well.	1	2	3	4	5
i)	It is okay with my mother if I do not follow certain rules.	1	2	3	4	5
j)	My mother usually tells me the reasons for rules.	1	2	3	4	5

11. How much do the following situations remind you of your father? (Circle one per item please).

		Very unlike my father	Unlike my father	neutral	Like my father	Very like my father
a)	I would describe my father as a strict parent.	1	2	3	4	5
b)	My father expects me to tell him when I think a rule is unfair.	1	2	3	4	5
c)	My father usually wants to know where I am going.	1	2	3	4	5
d)	My father encourages me to talk with him about things.	1	2	3	4	5
e)	My father gives me chores to do around the house routinely.	1	2	3	4	5
f)	My father expects me to do what he says without having to tell me why.	1	2	3	4	5
g)	My father has few rules for me to follow.	1	2	3	4	5
h)	My father seldom praises me for doing well.	1	2	3	4	5
i)	It is okay with my father if I do not follow certain rules.	1	2	3	4	5
j)	My father usually tells me the reasons for rules.	1	2	3	4	5

12. Which of these shopping situations reminds you of your family when shopping? Check ALL that apply please.

Your parents tell you what things you should or should not buy.	____	
Your parents ask you to help them buy things for the family.	____	
Your parents want to know what you do with your money.	____	
Your parents ask you what you think about things they buy for themselves.	____	
Your parents complain when they do not like something that you bought for yourself.	____	
Your parents say you should decide about things you should or should not buy.	____	
Your parents say they know what is best for you and you should not question them.	____	
Your parents say that buying things you like is important even if others do not like them.	____	
Your parents say you should decide yourself how to spend your money.	____	
Your parents say you may not buy certain things.	____	
Your parents ask you for advice about buying things.	____	

13. Please answer the following questions about your family characteristics. Check or fill in the blank.

a) What is your zip code? _____

b) What is your race/ethnicity?
_____ White/Non Hispanic
_____ Black/African American
_____ Hispanic
_____ American Indian/Alaskan Native
_____ Asian/Pacific Islander
_____ Other

c) What is your gender? _____ Male _____ Female

d) How old are you? _____

e) Do you have a driver's license? _____ Yes _____ No

f) What are all the ages of your brothers and sisters?

SISTER:	BROTHER:	NONE:
_____ (age)	_____ (age)	_____
_____ (age)	_____ (age)	
_____ (age)	_____ (age)	

g) Who do you live with?
_____ Father only
_____ *Both* mother & father
_____ Mother only
_____ Other (and list who): _____

h) Of the parent(s) you live with, who is employed?

MOTHER:	FATHER:
_____ Employed	_____ Employed
_____ Unemployed	_____ Unemployed

i) Are you employed? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, how much do you make per hour? _____
If yes, how many hours per week do you work? _____

j) Do you get an allowance each WEEK? _____ Yes _____ No
If yes, how much? _____

k) Do you receive any other money each WEEK? _____ Yes _____ No
If yes, from what? _____
How much? _____

l) What is the approximate TOTAL income of your household per year?

_____ Below $15,000
_____ $15,000 – $29,000
_____ $30,000 – $44,000
_____ $45,000 – $59,000
_____ Above $60,000
_____ Do not know

APPENDIX D

PARENT CONSENT LETTER

D. Parent Consent Letter for Student Participation

February 9, 1998

Parent(s) or Guardian(s)
Selected _____ High School Students

RE: Questionnaire for Thesis Research

To Whom It May Concern:
My name is Hester Daves and I am a master's student at the University of Tennessee. I am conducting research for my thesis and would appreciate your permission for your child to participate in a research project that involves filling out a questionnaire. My thesis is on children's influences on family purchase decisions.

This questionnaire is not sensitive in any manner and involves questions regarding grocery store shopping habits of the child and his/her family. It also includes questions regarding communication patterns between the child and his/her parents.

This questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes. Neither your child's name nor signature is required. This questionnaire is completely anonymous. The school's name will not be included in my study. Only the students who have parental permission will be allowed to fill out the questionnaire and even then have the option to refuse or withdraw from the study. It is completely voluntary and your child will not be penalized if he/she does not participate. The results will only be used for my research. If your child does not choose to participate, he/she will have the option to either review class notes or work on uncompleted homework assignments.

(Principal) will deliver the questionnaire to teachers of her choosing and the teachers will administer this questionnaire to approximately 200 students at _____ High School. Approximately 500 other students from ___ High School, _____ High School, and _____ High School will also participate. Your child was simply chosen because he/she was registered in the classes that (Principal) chose to participate.

Your signature is required for permission for your child to complete this questionnaire. This permission form will be stored in a locked file at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville for three years after the completion date of my study, which will be in May 1998.

Your permission is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions regarding this matter, you may contact me at
(phone) during the day, or my faculty advisor, Dr. Jinkook Lee at (phone). Again, thank you for your permission in this matter; it is extremely helpful.

Sincerely,

Hester A. Daves

I, _____, GRANT PERMISSION FOR MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN A STUDY CONDUCTED BY HESTER A. DAVES. MY CHILD, _____, IS ALLOWED TO FILL OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IF HE/SHE CHOOSES.

PARENT SIGNATURE_____ DATE _____

APPENDIX E

VARIABLES IN REGRESSION ANALYSIS

E. Variables

Variables:	Description of Variables:
Parenting Styles:	
Authoritarian Parent	if average demandingness score > mean demandingness and average responsiveness score < mean responsiveness then authoritarian parent=1; else authoritarian parent=0;
Neglectful Parent	if average demandingness score < mean demandingness and average responsiveness score < mean responsiveness then neglectful parent=1; else neglectful parent=0;
Authoritative Parent	if average demandingness score > mean demandingness and average responsiveness score > mean responsiveness then authoritative parent=1; else authoritative parent=0;
Permissive Parent	if average demandingness score < mean demandingness and average responsiveness score > mean responsiveness then permissive parent=1; else permissive parent=0; (omitted)
Birth Order:	
Only child	if only child, then onlychld=1; else onlychld=0;
Eldest child	if eldest child, then eldest=1; else eldest=0;
Youngest child	if youngest child, then youngest=1; else youngest=0;
Middle child	if child is in middle of siblings, then middle=1; else middle=0; (omitted)

E. Variables (continued)

Variables:	Description of Variables:
Communication Styles:	
Consensual communication	if socio-orientation > mean of socio-orientation and concept-orientation > mean of concept-orientation then consensual=1; else consensual=0;
Protective communication	if socio-orientation > mean of socio-orientation and concept-orientation < mean of concept-orientation then protective=1; else protective=0;
Pluralistic communication	if socio-orientation < mean of socio-orientation and concept-orientation > mean of concept-orientation then pluralistic=1; else pluralistic=0;
Laissez-Faire communication	if socio-orientation < mean of socio-orientation and concept-orientation < mean of concept-orientation then laissez-faire=1; else laissez-faire=0; (omitted)
Influence:	
Bring up idea to purchase item	ordinal, entire contribution was mine (1) to I did not contribute at all (5)
Offer opinions about item	ordinal, entire contribution was mine (1) to I did not contribute at all (5)
Give parents information	ordinal, entire contribution was mine (1) to I did not contribute at all (5)
Make final decision	ordinal, entire contribution was mine (1) to I did not contribute at all (5)
Purchase product	ordinal, entire contribution was mine (1) to I did not contribute at all (5)

E. Variables (continued)

Variables:	Description of Variables:
Influence (continued):	
Consuming product	ordinal, entire contribution was mine (1) to I did not contribute at all (5)
Undertaking tasks with product	ordinal, entire contribution was mine (1) to I did not contribute at all (5)
Overall influence on specific product	factor score of 7 specific types of influences on a particular product
Product importance of specific product	ordinal, strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5)
Overall product importance	factor score of product importance across 7 grocery items
Anticipated consumption	ordinal, strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5)
Knowledge of specific product	ordinal, very familiar with (1) to not at all familiar with (5)
Overall knowledge of products	factor score of product knowledge across 7 grocery items
Influencing Strategy:	
Bargaining	if child used bargaining strategy then bargain=1; else bargain=0;
Persuasion	if child used persuasion strategy then persuad=1; else persuad=0;
Others	if child used other strategies then other=1; else other=0;

E. Variables (continued)

Variables:	Description of Variables:
Parent Employment Status:	
Dual income family	if both parents are employed then dualemp=1; else dualemp=0;
No employment	if both parents are not employed then noemp=1; else noemp=0;
One parent employed	if one parent, father or mother, is employed then oneemp=1; else oneemp=0; (omitted)
Child's Resources:	
Wage	Dollar amount per hour X's Number of hours
Allowance	=1 if receive allowance, =0 otherwise
Receive other money	=1 if receive other money, =0 otherwise

APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

F. Demographic Characteristics of Sample

Demographic Characteristics	Number of Students	Percent of Total Students
School		
#1	57	18%
#2	57	18%
#3	42	14%
#4	155	50%
Total	*311*	*100%*
Age		
14	37	12%
15	96	31%
16	41	13%
17	58	19%
18	62	20%
19+	13	4%
missing	4	1%
Total	*311*	*100%*
Gender		
Male	111	36%
Female	195	63%
missing	5	1%
Total	*311*	*100%*
Birth Order		
Only Child	29	9%
Eldest	110	35%
Youngest	99	32%
Middle	73	24%
Total	*311*	*100%*

F. Demographic Characteristics of Sample (continued)

Demographic Characteristics	Number of Students	Percent of Total Students
Living Arrangement		
Both Mom & Dad	207	67%
Father Only	10	3%
Mother Only	48	15%
Other	41	13%
missing	5	2%
Total	*311*	*100%*
Race/Ethnicity		
Non Hispanic White	268	86%
African American	18	6%
Hispanic	6	2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	1%
Other	10	3%
missing	7	2%
Total	*311*	*100%*
Parent Employment Status		
Both Employed	181	58%
Neither Employed	5	2%
One Employed	125	40%
Total	*311*	*100%*
Child Own Money		
Employed	119	38%
Receive Allowance	139	45%
Receive Other Money	109	*35%*
Driver's License		
Yes	142	46%
No	162	52%
missing	7	2%
Total	*311*	*100%*

F. Demographic Characteristics of Sample (continued)

Demographic Characteristics	Number of Students	Percent of Total Students
Household Income		
Below $15,000	7	2%
$15,000 - $29,000	15	5%
$30,000 - $44,000	29	9%
$45,000 - $59,000	35	11%
Above $60,000	55	18%
Do not know	156	50%
missing	14	5%
Total	*311*	*100%*
Parenting Styles		
Authoritarian Mother	69	22%
Neglectful Mother	84	27%
Authoritative Mother	90	29%
Permissive Mother	68	22%
Total	*311*	*100%*
Authoritarian Father	59	19%
Neglectful Father	54	17%
Authoritative Father	79	26%
Permissive Father	119	38%
Total	*311*	*100%*
Communication Styles		
Consensual	67	21%
Protective	71	23%
Pluralistic	86	28%
Laissez-Faire	87	28%
Total	*311*	*100%*
Influencing Strategies		
Persuasion	159	51%
Bargaining	102	33%
Others	50	16%
Total	*311*	*100%*

APPENDIX G

RESULTS OF ANALYSES

G-1. Factor Analysis Results

	Cereal	Chips	Pasta	Chicken	Fresh Veggies	Sports Drinks	Frozen Meals
Eigenvalue	3.3612	3.0916	2.9077	2.8742	3.0570	3.6010	2.7651
Squared Multiple Correlations	0.8900	0.8615	0.8599	0.8438	0.8573	0.8999	0.8519
Factor Pattern:							
Bring up idea for product	0.8028	0.7698	0.7150	0.6708	0.7295	0.8160	0.7731
Offer opinion for product	0.8671	0.8125	0.8490	0.8004	0.8277	0.8896	0.8372
Give information on product	0.6893	0.6563	0.6694	0.7515	0.6928	0.7231	0.3006
Make final decision on product	0.8152	0.7567	0.7696	0.7393	0.7193	0.7593	0.7655
Purchase product	0.3850	0.4104	0.3544	0.4960	0.4890	0.4156	0.3815
Consume product	0.5877	0.5857	0.4791	0.4323	0.5052	0.7024	0.6071
Undertake tasks for keeping product	0.5751	0.5692	0.5293	0.4893	0.5899	0.6151	0.5253

G-2. Regression Results: Parameter Estimates (P-Value)

Independent Variables	Cereal	Chips	Pasta	Chicken
Intercept	-1.8051 (0.0001)	-1.6217 (0.0001)	-1.9029 (0.0001)	-1.4864 (0.0001)
Authoritarian Mom	-0.1726 (0.2396)	-0.0808 (0.6015)	0.0250 (0.8705)	0.0937 (0.5603)
Neglectful Mom	0.0334 (0.8133)	-0.0478 (0.7463)	-0.0223 (0.8788)	0.1751 (0.2542)
Authoritative Mom	-0.0728 (0.6166)	-0.0826 (0.5877)	-0.0939 (0.5319)	0.0059 (0.9701)
Authoritarian Dad	0.0605 (0.6539)	0.1151 (0.4205)	**0.2929 (0.0390)***	0.0865 (0.5615)
Neglectful Dad	0.0357 (0.7936)	0.2417 (0.0946)	0.0493 (0.7277)	0.0718 (0.6334)
Authoritative Dad	0.1379 (0.3255)	0.1927 (0.1947)	0.1337 (0.3606)	0.0621 (0.6884)
Only Child	0.0305 (0.8680)	-0.1282 (0.5119)	-0.0187 (0.9226)	0.1088 (0.5912)
Eldest Child	-0.1134 (0.3436)	-0.1495 (0.2409)	-0.0056 (0.9644)	-0.0257 (0.8455)
Youngest Child	-0.0764 (0.5445)	-0.0804 (0.5455)	0.0322 (0.8065)	-0.0432 (0.7578)
Consensual Communication	0.0282 (0.8396)	-0.0678 (0.6448)	0.0935 (0.5259)	-0.1024 (0.5062)
Protective Communication	0.0359 (0.7915)	0.0059 (0.9672)	0.1465 (0.2945)	0.1425 (0.3359)
Pluralistic Communication	0.1899 (0.1423)	**0.2846 (0.0411)***	**0.3327 (0.0140)***	**0.2796 (0.0495)***

***p < .05**

G-2. Regression Results: Parameter Estimates (P-Value) (continued)

Independent Variables	Cereal	Chips	Pasta	Chicken
Bargaining Strategy	0.1541 (0.1443)	-0.0144 (0.8989)	-0.0001 (0.9991)	-0.0894 (0.4446)
Persuasion Strategy	-0.1620 (0.1138)	0.0010 (0.9931)	-0.0137 (0.8983)	-0.0974 (0.3987)
Product Importance	**0.1921 (0.0005)***	**0.1877 (0.0029)***	**0.1983 (0.0008)***	0.1093 (0.0648)
Anticipated Consumption	**0.1569 (0.0051)***	**0.1381 (0.0330)***	0.0876 (0.1474)	0.0841 (0.1666)
Product Knowledge	**0.1748 (0.0032)***	**0.1384 (0.0228)***	**0.1984 (0.0001)***	**0.1976 (0.0003)***
Dual Employment	**-0.1972 (0.0474)***	-0.1426 (0.1746)	-0.0905 (0.3817)	0.0146 (0.8937)
No Employment	**0.7405 (0.0441)***	**0.9185 (0.0191)***	**0.8613 (0.0253)***	0.9308 (0.0217)
Child Own Money	-0.0001 (0.7951)	-0.0004 (0.4467)	0.0007 (0.2035)	0.0004 (0.5075)
Allowance	-0.1394 (0.1389)	-0.0610 (0.5384)	0.0474 (0.6285)	-0.0002 (0.9988)
Other Money	0.0574 (0.5696)	-0.0076 (0.9432)	-0.0981 (0.3558)	-0.1929 (0.0852)
F Value	6.903	4.862	5.532	3.36
Prob>F	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
Adj R-sq	0.3153	0.2315	0.2612	0.1555

***p < .05**

G-2. Regression Results: Parameter Estimates (P-Value) (continued)

Independent Variables	Fresh Veggies	Sports Drinks	Frozen Meals
Intercept	-1.9167 (0.0001)	-1.7925 (0.0001)	-1.2404 (0.0001)
Authoritarian Mom	-0.1215 (0.4156)	0.2098 (0.1546)	0.0489 (0.7405)
Neglectful Mom	-0.0439 (0.7562)	-0.0690 (0.6212)	-0.1910 (0.1752)
Authoritative Mom	-0.0728 (0.6186)	-0.0410 (0.7763)	-0.0411 (0.7772)
Authoritarian Dad	0.1590 (0.2489)	0.1414 (0.3042)	0.2243 (0.1043)
Neglectful Dad	0.1876 (0.1759)	-0.0009 (0.9951)	0.1760 (0.2005)
Authoritative Dad	0.0833 (0.5616)	0.1026 (0.4672)	0.1596 (0.2602)
Only Child	0.1841 (0.3306)	0.1635 (0.3762)	-0.1045 (0.5741)
Eldest Child	-0.0450 (0.7147)	-0.0312 (0.7961)	-0.0968 (0.4278)
Youngest Child	-0.1047 (0.4149)	0.0671 (0.5960)	-0.0537 (0.6751)
Consensual Communication	-0.0951 (0.5055)	-0.1016 (0.4679)	-0.0919 (0.5134)
Protective Communication	-0.0354 (0.7970)	-0.0645 (0.6405)	-0.1539 (0.2574)
Pluralistic Communication	0.1522 (0.2526)	0.1138 (0.3775)	**0.2720 (0.0378)***

***p < .05**

G-2. Regression Results: Parameter Estimates (P-Value) (continued)

Independent Variables	Fresh Veggies	Sports Drinks	Frozen Meals
Bargaining Strategy	0.0091 (0.9327)	0.0912 (0.3941)	0.0683 (0.5250)
Persuasion Strategy	-0.0227 (0.8276)	-0.0535 (0.6098)	-0.0621 (0.5530)
Product Importance	0.0852 (0.1100)	**0.1706 (0.0060)***	**0.1976 (0.0011)***
Anticipated Consumption	**0.2446 (0.0001)***	**0.1368 (0.0219)***	0.0865 (0.1142)
Product Knowledge	**0.1935 (0.0001)***	**0.1941 (0.0002)***	**0.1832 (0.0002)***
Dual Employment	0.0223 (0.8255)	-0.1786 (0.0739)	**-0.2242 (0.0257)***
No Employment	**1.0548 (0.0050)***	**0.8622 (0.0208)***	**0.7576 (0.0419)***
Child Own Money	0.0008 (0.1592)	-0.0007 (0.1685)	-0.0006 (0.2874)
Allowance	0.0445 (0.6433)	0.0601 (0.5235)	-0.0205 (0.8295)
Other Money	-0.0219 (0.8312)	0.0458 (0.6530)	-0.1903 (0.0648)
F Value	6.29	7.456	6.478
Prob > F	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
Adj R-sq	0.2921	0.335	0.2994

***p < .05**

G-3. ANOVA Results:
Examining Various Factors' Effects on Each Grocery Item

Dependent Variable Cereal:

DF	F Value	Pr > F	R-Square
21	2.25	0.0017	0.1536

Independent Variable:	DF	Type I Error	F Value	Pr > F
Mother Parenting Style	3	3.0629	1.29	0.2766
Father Parenting Style	3	1.0735	0.45	0.7148
Communication Style	3	4.5136	1.91	0.1286
Birth Order of Child	3	4.5325	1.92	0.1273
Influencing Strategy	2	4.3228	2.74	0.0663
Parent Employment	2	7.9467	5.04	**0.0071**
Child Employment	1	1.7815	2.26	0.1340
Child Allowance	1	0.9170	1.16	0.2818
Child Other Money	1	0.1873	0.24	0.6264
Product Importance	1	7.2097	9.15	**0.0027**
Product Knowledge	1	1.7777	2.25	0.1344

***p < .05**

G-3. ANOVA Results:
Examining Various Factors' Effects on Each Grocery Item (continued)

Dependent Variable Chips:

DF	F Value	Pr > F	R-Square
21	2.25	0.0017	0.1533

Independent Variable:	DF	Type I Error	F Value	Pr > F
Mother Parenting Style	3	2.3808	1.01	0.3890
Father Parenting Style	3	0.7184	0.30	0.8220
Communication Style	3	2.5170	1.07	0.3634
Birth Order of Child	3	0.7668	0.33	0.8072
Influencing Strategy	2	2.0442	1.30	0.2742
Parent Employment	2	6.3523	4.04	**0.0187**
Child Employment	1	1.8942	2.41	0.1218
Child Allowance	1	0.3902	0.50	0.4817
Child Other Money	1	0.0247	0.03	0.8594
Product Importance	1	11.7722	14.98	**0.0001**
Product Knowledge	1	8.2940	10.55	**0.0013**

***p < .05**

G-3. ANOVA Results:
Examining Various Factors' Effects on Each Grocery Item (continued)

Dependent Variable Pasta:

DF	F Value	Pr > F	R-Square
21	2.46	0.0005	0.1651

Independent Variable:	DF	Type I Error	F Value	Pr > F
Mother Parenting Style	3	3.0140	1.27	0.2837
Father Parenting Style	3	2.1474	0.91	0.4379
Communication Style	3	8.5593	3.62	**0.0138**
Birth Order of Child	3	0.3585	0.15	0.9287
Influencing Strategy	2	0.7778	0.49	0.6113
Parent Employment	2	5.0132	3.18	**0.0433**
Child Employment	1	0.8017	1.02	0.3143
Child Allowance	1	0.0129	0.02	0.8985
Child Other Money	1	0.5467	0.69	0.4058
Product Importance	1	13.2851	16.85	**0.0001**
Product Knowledge	1	6.1740	7.83	**0.0055**

***p < .05**

G-3. ANOVA Results:
Examining Various Factors' Effects on Each Grocery Item (continued)

Dependent Variable Chicken:

DF	F Value	Pr > F	R-Square
21	2.78	0.0001	0.1829

Independent Variable:	DF	Type I Error	F Value	Pr > F
Mother Parenting Style	3	0.7641	0.34	0.7966
Father Parenting Style	3	0.1269	0.06	0.9824
Communication Style	3	4.1117	1.83	0.1424
Birth Order of Child	3	1.3113	0.58	0.6266
Influencing Strategy	2	3.2209	2.15	0.1188
Parent Employment	2	2.8509	1.90	0.1514
Child Employment	1	0.3039	0.41	0.5249
Child Allowance	1	0.0313	0.04	0.8382
Child Other Money	1	4.2169	5.62	**0.0184**
Product Importance	1	19.2893	25.73	**0.0001**
Product Knowledge	1	7.5606	10.08	**0.0017**

***p < .05**

G-3. ANOVA Results:
Examining Various Factors' Effects on Each Grocery Item (continued)

Dependent Variable
Fresh Vegetables:

DF	F Value	Pr > F	R-Square
21	2.24	0.0018	0.1529

Independent Variable:	DF	Type I Error	F Value	Pr > F
Mother Parenting Style	3	1.7966	0.76	0.5200
Father Parenting Style	3	2.2467	0.94	0.4194
Communication Style	3	5.2137	2.19	0.0893
Birth Order of Child	3	2.4881	1.05	0.3725
Influencing Strategy	2	3.6708	2.32	0.1007
Parent Employment	2	5.7150	3.61	**0.0285**
Child Employment	1	0.1077	0.14	0.7128
Child Allowance	1	0.2465	0.31	0.5775
Child Other Money	1	0.1949	0.25	0.6204
Product Importance	1	12.0726	15.23	**0.0001**
Product Knowledge	1	3.5828	4.52	**0.0344**

***p < .05**

G-3. ANOVA Results:
Examining Various Factors' Effects on Each Grocery Item (continued)

Dependent Variable
Sport Drinks:

DF	F Value	Pr > F	R-Square
21	1.63	0.0438	0.1156

Independent Variable:	DF	Type I Error	F Value	Pr > F
Mother Parenting Style	3	6.0772	2.36	0.0718
Father Parenting Style	3	0.8550	0.33	0.8021
Communication Style	3	1.2833	0.50	0.6836
Birth Order of Child	3	1.7690	0.69	0.5605
Influencing Strategy	2	2.7810	1.62	0.1997
Parent Employment	2	1.7950	1.05	0.3528
Child Employment	1	2.2437	2.62	0.1071
Child Allowance	1	0.5478	0.64	0.4250
Child Other Money	1	0.9051	1.05	0.3053
Product Importance	1	4.3302	5.05	**0.0255**
Product Knowledge	1	6.6947	7.80	**0.0056**

***p < .05**

G-3. ANOVA Results:
Examining Various Factors' Effects on Each Grocery Item (continued)

Dependent Variable
Frozen Meals:

DF	F Value	Pr > F	R-Square
21	2.4	0.0007	0.1620

Independent Variable:	DF	Type I Error	F Value	Pr > F
Mother Parenting Style	3	3.0282	1.29	0.2779
Father Parenting Style	3	0.6327	0.27	0.8472
Communication Style	3	9.4846	4.04	**0.0078**
Birth Order of Child	3	0.2290	0.10	0.9613
Influencing Strategy	2	3.2757	2.09	0.1251
Parent Employment	2	3.8948	2.49	0.0848
Child Employment	1	0.4545	0.58	0.4464
Child Allowance	1	0.0201	0.03	0.8727
Child Other Money	1	5.1838	6.63	**0.0106**
Product Importance	1	10.3458	13.23	**0.0003**
Product Knowledge	1	2.9018	3.71	0.0551

***p < .05**

G-4. MANOVA Results

Variable	Wilks' Lambda	F Value	DF	Pr > F
Mother Parenting Style	0.9180	1.0553	21	0.3929
Father Parenting Style	0.9369	0.8017	21	0.7195
Communication Style	0.8994	1.3121	21	0.1581
Birth Order of Child	0.9414	0.7413	21	0.7916
Influencing Strategy	0.9257	1.4338	14	0.1327
Parent Employment	0.9282	1.3825	14	0.1568
Child Employment	0.9747	0.9446	7	0.4726
Child Allowance	0.9875	0.4632	7	0.8606
Child Other Money	0.9276	2.8447	7	**0.0071**
Product Importance	0.9498	1.9237	7	**0.0662**
Product Knowledge	0.9312	2.6927	7	**0.0104**

VITA

Hester Alicia Daves was born in Knoxville, Tennessee, on May 23, 1974. She graduated from South-Doyle High School in Knoxville in May 1992. She entered the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, and received a Bachelor of Science with a concentration in Marketing in May 1996. She entered the Master's program in Retail and Consumer Sciences in August 1996 and received a Master of Science Degree in Textiles, Retail, and Consumer Sciences with a cognate area in Child and Family Studies in May 1998.