

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT

I
J
R
C
M



A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
Indexed & Listed at:

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, ProQuest, U.S.A., EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A., Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A.
as well as in Open J-Gate, India (link of the same is duly available at Infibnet of University Grants Commission (U.G.C.))

Registered & Listed at: Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland

Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than 1500 Cities in 141 countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

www.ijrcm.org.in

CONTENTS

Sr. No.	TITLE & NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S)	Page No.
1.	DO EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS MANIPULATE EARNINGS? <i>SEYED HOSSEIN HOSSEINI & MOHAMADREZA ABDOLI</i>	1
2.	MANAGEMENT EDUCATION – IMPACT OF VALUE ORIENTATIONS ON CAREER & BUSINESS <i>PUSHPA SHETTY</i>	7
3.	STRATEGIC GAINS OF BY-PRODUCT MARKETING: A STUDY ON SELECTED COMPANIES OF BANGLADESH <i>GOLAM MOHAMMAD FORKAN & TAHSAN RAHMAN KHAN</i>	13
4.	THE EFFECT OF CURRENCY DEVALUATION ON THE ETHIOPIAN ECONOMY'S TRADE BALANCE: A TIME SERIOUS ANALYSIS <i>FIKREYESUS TEMESGEN & MENASBO GEBRU</i>	17
5.	MUTUAL FUNDS IN INDIA: AN ANALYSIS OF INVESTORS PERCEPTIONS <i>DR. PRASHANTA ATHMA & K. RAJ KUMAR</i>	21
6.	FINANCES OF CENTRE FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION, OSMANIA UNIVERSITY, HYDERABAD, ANDHRA PRADESH: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY <i>G. VENKATACHALAM & P. MOHAN REDDY</i>	27
7.	THE INFLUENCE OF MARKETING ON CONSUMER ATTITUDE FUNCTIONS FOR KITCHENWARE, A STUDY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO KOCHI METRO <i>ANILKUMAR. N</i>	32
8.	BEHAVIOURAL FINANCE: A NEW PERSPECTIVE FOR INVESTMENT IN FINANCIAL MARKET <i>DR. SREEKANTH. M S</i>	39
9.	THE EFFECT OF MERGER AND ACQUISITIONS ON THE SHAREHOLDERS' WEALTH: EVIDENCE FROM THE FOOD INDUSTRY IN INDIA <i>DR. RAMACHANDRAN AZHAGAI AH & T. SATHISH KUMAR</i>	42
10.	WHETHER DIFFERENCES MAKE DIFFERENCES? A NEW PARADIGM ON WORKFORCE DIVERSITY <i>D. RAMADEVI & DR. S. A. SENTHIL KUMAR</i>	54
11.	CORPORATE SOCIAL ENGAGEMENT: NEW BASE LINE TO CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY <i>KAVITA MEENA</i>	59
12.	GREEN MARKETING <i>BRIJESH SIVATHANU PILLAI & KANCHAN PRANAY PATIL</i>	64
13.	MARKET EFFICIENCY AND INTERNATIONAL BENCHMARKS IN THE SECURITIES MARKET OF INDIA – A STUDY <i>DR. MUNIVENKATAPPA</i>	74
14.	CHALLENGE OF LIQUIDITY RISK AND CREDIT RISK IN INSURANCE COMPANIES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO INDIAN PUBLIC SECTOR GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANIES <i>AVINASH TRIPATHI</i>	82
15.	CONTEMPORARY ISSUE ON DEREGULATION OF SAVING ACCOUNT INTEREST RATE <i>DR. RAJIV GANDHI</i>	87
16.	A STUDY ON THE EFFECT OF FOOD ADVERTISEMENTS ON CHILDREN AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON PARENTS BUYING DECISION <i>GINU GEORGE</i>	92
17.	DETERMINANTS OF CORPORATE DIVIDEND POLICY IN SELECT PRIVATE SECTOR CEMENT COMPANIES IN TAMIL NADU - AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS <i>DR. V. MOHANRAJ & DR. N.DEEPA</i>	107
18.	THE ROLE OF 'FOLLOW THE NEIGHBOUR' STRATEGY AND FACTORS INFLUENCING INVESTMENT DECISION WITH REFERENCE TO NASIK CITY <i>BHUSHAN PARDESHI, PAVAN C. PATIL & PADMA LOCHAN BISOYI</i>	110
19.	IMPACT OF ADVERTISING ON BRAND RECALL AND BRAND PERSONALITY FORMATION: A STUDY OF ORGANISED FASHION RETAILING <i>HIMANSHU SHEKHAWAT & PREETI TAK</i>	116
20.	A CASE STUDY ON STRESS MANAGEMENT IN WORKING WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT\SEMI-GOVERNEMNT ENTERPRISES IN SHIMLA, (H.P.) <i>SHALLU SEHGAL</i>	122
21.	LEVERAGE ANALYSIS AND IT'S IMPACT ON SHARE PRICE AND EARNING OF THE SELECTED STEEL COMPANIES OF INDIA – AN EMPIRICAL STUDY <i>MUKESH C AJMERA</i>	129
22.	A STUDY ON LEVEL OF EXPECTATION OF MUTUAL FUND INVESTORS & IMPACT OF DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE ON PERIOD OF INVESTMENT IN MUTUAL FUND <i>TARAK PAUL</i>	136
23.	IMPACT OF MERGERS & ACQUISITIONS ON FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO TATA GROUP <i>NEHA VERMA & DR. RAHUL SHARMA</i>	140
24.	EXPLORING SERVICE INNOVATION PROCESS AND STRATEGY IN DEVELOPING CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP-WITH REFERENCE TO CENTURYBANK 'YES BANK' <i>SHILPA SANTOSH CHADICHAL & DEBLINA SAHA VASHISHTA</i>	144
25.	EMPLOYEE LOYALTY ABOVE CUSTOMER LOYALTY <i>AFREEN NISHAT A. NASABI</i>	152
26.	FDI IN MULTIBRAND RETAILING IN INDIA: PERCEPTION OF THE UNORGANISED RETAILERS IN BUSINESS CAPITAL OF UTTARAKHAND <i>DEEPAK JOSHI</i>	156
27.	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SELECTED PRIVATE SECTOR BANKS IN INDIA <i>NISHIT V. DAVDA</i>	161
28.	IMPACT OF HRM PRACTICES ON PERFORMANCE OF NON-ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES OF OPEN UNIVERSITIES IN INDIA <i>B. LAXMINARAYANA</i>	167
29.	POST-MERGER FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL OF ACQUIRING BANKS IN INDIA: A CASE ANALYSIS <i>AZEEM AHMAD KHAN</i>	172
30.	MANPOWER REQUIREMENT ASSESSMENT CONSIDERING THE MAKE OR BUY DECISION POLICY OF CENTRAL WORKSHOP IN AN INTEGRATED STEEL & POWER COMPANY <i>AKHILESH JHA, SOUPOARNO MUKHERJEE & RANDHIR KUMAR</i>	176
	REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK	181

CHIEF PATRON

PROF. K. K. AGGARWAL

Chancellor, Lingaya's University, Delhi
Founder Vice-Chancellor, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi
Ex. Pro Vice-Chancellor, Guru Jambheshwar University, Hisar

PATRON

SH. RAM BHAJAN AGGARWAL

Ex.State Minister for Home & Tourism, Government of Haryana
Vice-President, Dadri Education Society, Charkhi Dadri
President, Chinar Syntex Ltd. (Textile Mills), Bhiwani

CO-ORDINATOR

DR. SAMBHAV GARG

Faculty, M. M. Institute of Management, MaharishiMarkandeshwarUniversity, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana

ADVISORS

DR. PRIYA RANJAN TRIVEDI

Chancellor, The Global Open University, Nagaland

PROF. M. S. SENAM RAJU

Director A. C. D., School of Management Studies, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

PROF. M. N. SHARMA

Chairman, M.B.A., HaryanaCollege of Technology & Management, Kaithal

PROF. S. L. MAHANDRU

Principal (Retd.), MaharajaAgrasenCollege, Jagadhri

EDITOR

PROF. R. K. SHARMA

Professor, Bharti Vidyapeeth University Institute of Management & Research, New Delhi

CO-EDITOR

DR. BHAVET

Faculty, M. M. Institute of Management, MaharishiMarkandeshwarUniversity, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

DR. RAJESH MODI

Faculty, YanbuIndustrialCollege, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

PROF. SANJIV MITTAL

UniversitySchool of Management Studies, Guru Gobind Singh I. P. University, Delhi

PROF. ANIL K. SAINI

Chairperson (CRC), Guru Gobind Singh I. P. University, Delhi

DR. SAMBHAVNA

Faculty, I.I.T.M., Delhi

DR. MOHENDER KUMAR GUPTA

Associate Professor, P.J.L.N.Government College, Faridabad

DR. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE

Asst. Professor, Dept. of Commerce, School of Business Studies, Central University of Karnataka, Gulbarga

MOHITA

Faculty, Yamuna Institute of Engineering & Technology, Village Gadholi, P. O. Gadholi, Yamunanagar

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

PROF. NAWAB ALI KHAN

Department of Commerce, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P.

PROF. ABHAY BANSAL

Head, Department of Information Technology, Amity School of Engineering & Technology, Amity University, Noida

PROF. V. SELVAM

SSL, VIT University, Vellore

PROF. N. SUNDARAM

VIT University, Vellore

DR. PARDEEP AHLAWAT

Associate Professor, Institute of Management Studies & Research, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak

DR. S. TABASSUM SULTANA

Associate Professor, Department of Business Management, Matrusri Institute of P.G. Studies, Hyderabad

TECHNICAL ADVISOR

AMITA

Faculty, Government M. S., Mohali

MOHITA

Faculty, Yamuna Institute of Engineering & Technology, Village Gadholi, P. O. Gadholi, Yamunanagar

FINANCIAL ADVISORS

DICKIN GOYAL

Advocate & Tax Adviser, Panchkula

NEENA

Investment Consultant, Chambaghat, Solan, Himachal Pradesh

LEGAL ADVISORS

JITENDER S. CHAHAL

Advocate, Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh U.T.

CHANDER BHUSHAN SHARMA

Advocate & Consultant, District Courts, Yamunanagar at Jagadhri

SUPERINTENDENT

SURENDER KUMAR POONIA

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to recent developments & practices in the area of Computer, Business, Finance, Marketing, Human Resource Management, General Management, Banking, Insurance, Corporate Governance and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting Education; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Monetary Policy; Portfolio & Security Analysis; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Business Education; Management Information Systems (MIS); Business Law, Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labor Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; Public Administration; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism, Hospitality & Leisure; Transportation/Physical Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Digital Logic; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Multimedia; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic and Web Design. The above mentioned tracks are only indicative, and not exhaustive.

Anybody can submit the soft copy of his/her manuscript **anytime** in M.S. Word format after preparing the same as per our submission guidelines duly available on our website under the heading guidelines for submission, at the email address: infoijrcm@gmail.com.

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:**

DATED: _____

THE EDITOR
IJRCM

Subject: SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF

(e.g. Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/Economics/Psychology/Law/Computer/IT/Engineering/Mathematics/other, please specify)

DEAR SIR/MADAM

Please find my submission of manuscript entitled ' _____ ' for possible publication in your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published elsewhere in any language fully or partly, nor is it under review for publication elsewhere.

I affirm that all the author (s) have seen and agreed to the submitted version of the manuscript and their inclusion of name (s) as co-author (s).

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I/We agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of the journal & you are free to publish our contribution in any of your journals.

NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Designation:

Affiliation with full address, contact numbers & Pin Code:

Residential address with Pin Code:

Mobile Number (s):

Landline Number (s):

E-mail Address:

Alternate E-mail Address:

NOTES:

- a) The whole manuscript is required to be in **ONE MS WORD FILE** only (pdf. version is liable to be rejected without any consideration), which will start from the covering letter, inside the manuscript.
- b) The sender is required to mention the following in the **SUBJECT COLUMN** of the mail:
New Manuscript for Review in the area of (Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/Economics/Psychology/Law/Computer/IT/Engineering/Mathematics/other, please specify)
- c) There is no need to give any text in the body of mail, except the cases where the author wishes to give any specific message w.r.t. to the manuscript.
- d) The total size of the file containing the manuscript is required to be below **500 KB**.
- e) Abstract alone will not be considered for review, and the author is required to submit the complete manuscript in the first instance.
- f) The journal gives acknowledgement w.r.t. the receipt of every email and in case of non-receipt of acknowledgment from the journal, w.r.t. the submission of manuscript, within two days of submission, the corresponding author is required to demand for the same by sending separate mail to the journal.

2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be in a 12 point Calibri Font. It should be bold typed, centered and fully capitalised.

3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** The author (s) **full name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline numbers, and email/alternate email address** should be in italic & 11-point Calibri Font. It must be centered underneath the title.

4. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in fully italicized text, not exceeding 250 words. The abstract must be informative and explain the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a single para. Abbreviations must be mentioned in full.

5. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by a list of keywords, subject to the maximum of five. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stops at the end.
6. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in **BRITISH ENGLISH** prepared on a standard A4 size **PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER**. It must be prepared on a single space and single column with 1" margin set for top, bottom, left and right. It should be typed in 8 point Calibri Font with page numbers at the bottom and centre of every page. It should be free from grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors and must be thoroughly edited.
7. **HEADINGS:** All the headings should be in a 10 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.
8. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings should be in a 8 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.
9. **MAIN TEXT:** The main text should follow the following sequence:

INTRODUCTION**REVIEW OF LITERATURE****NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY****STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM****OBJECTIVES****HYPOTHESES****RESEARCH METHODOLOGY****RESULTS & DISCUSSION****FINDINGS****RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS****CONCLUSIONS****SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH****ACKNOWLEDGMENTS****REFERENCES****APPENDIX/ANNEXURE**

It should be in a 8 point Calibri Font, single spaced and justified. The manuscript should preferably not exceed **5000 WORDS**.

10. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, crystal clear, centered, separately numbered & self explained, and **titles must be above the table/figure. Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure.** It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.
11. **EQUATIONS:** These should be consecutively numbered in parentheses, horizontally centered with equation number placed at the right.
12. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript and they are supposed to follow **Harvard Style of Referencing**. The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per the following:
 - All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
 - Use (ed.) for one editor, and (ed.s) for multiple editors.
 - When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc, in chronologically ascending order.
 - Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
 - The title of books and journals should be in italics. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
 - For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parentheses.
 - The location of endnotes within the text should be indicated by superscript numbers.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:**BOOKS**

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio" Ohio State University, Nigeria.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

CONFERENCE PAPERS

- Garg, Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19-22 June.

UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS AND THESES

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

ONLINE RESOURCES

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

WEBSITE

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Natural Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on January 01, 2012 <http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp>

A STUDY ON THE EFFECT OF FOOD ADVERTISEMENTS ON CHILDREN AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON PARENTS BUYING DECISION

GINU GEORGE
ASST. PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM STUDIES
CHRIST UNIVERSITY
BANGALORE

ABSTRACT

In today's scenario children are considered as an important target in the market segment from a marketing perspective. A tremendous change has taken place in advertisements; children are targeted not only for child oriented products but also for other products. The role that children play in making purchase decisions concerning the entire family unit has driven in doing a research towards the study of food advertisement influence on children and in turn their influence on parents buying decisions with reference to India. Indian society vastly differs from the West in terms of family composition and structure, values, norms, and behaviour, which affect the role that children play in purchase decision making in families. Hence, the aim of this paper is to study whether children falling in age groups between 13yrs-15yrs have influence on parents' buying decision in food products and also aims in identifying which gender and age groups of children have more influence. The study was conducted in Bangalore with the help of a questionnaire aimed to a sample size of 180 children and 180 parents (father or mother) of the same children.

KEYWORDS

Children, food advertisements, parents.

INTRODUCTION

Advertising is a mode of communication used by the marketers which results in persuading the audiences to take some action like buying of products, ideas or services. The main objective of advertisements is to drive customers towards commercial offerings. Advertising messages communicated to the customers are paid for by sponsors and viewed through different media such as newspaper, magazines, television commercials, radio, outdoor or direct mail or new media such as websites and text messages. Every company to survive in market has to advertise their products or services. Today where ever people go they see some type of advertisements. People are bombarded with advertisements everywhere. The advertisement has become so intense and its influence is very common in everybody's life including children and adults.

Advertisements pattern has changed tremendously in today's scenario, earlier advertising children oriented products such as toys or food products are always shown and messages conveyed are only to parents. There were hardly any children oriented advertisements, because advertisements were limited to display in store, a newspaper advertisements or a television advertisements as there was no much competitors in markets. Children today spend more time watching televisions than children did in the early days, this to a great extent contributed to the change in pattern of advertisements made. Also children of now are so technology oriented than parents where they spend hours together online where advertising is prevalent as well. Therefore advertising messages that are conveyed are more sophisticated, pervasive and are targeted directly at children at a very early age.

From a study by Law 2003, it was found Advertisers spent \$105.97 billion in 1980. This number more than doubled in 2001 when it reached \$230 billion. In the year 2000, the Census reported 105 million households in America, meaning advertisers spend an average of \$2,190 on one household per year. Advertisers spend this much money because of television. The average child sees an estimate of more than 20,000 commercials every year - that works out to at least 55 commercials per day. Children will insist their parents purchase what they see or hear on television. As a result, advertising pattern focuses on children as the main target and this lead to a drastic change in the role of children in family purchase decisions.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Halan, 2002; Singh, 1998 it was determined that children forms a major consumer market, with direct purchasing power for snacks and sweets, and indirect purchase influence while shopping for big-ticket items

Bhushan (2002) found Indian children have recently attracted considerable attention from marketers because the market for children's products offers tremendous potential (pegged at Rs. 5000 crore/\$1110mn) and is rapidly growing. According to available industry data, the chocolate and confectionary market is estimated at Rs. 1300 crore/\$290mn, the apparel market at Rs. 480 crore/\$110mn and kids footwear at Rs. 1000 crore/\$220mn

There are many studies done in foreign countries on children influence on parents purchase decision and from the review done it was reported that children have lot of influence in purchase decisions for children products such as snacks (**Ahuja and Stinson, 1993**); toys (**Burns and Harrison, 1985; Jensen, 1995; Williams and Veeck, 1998**); children's wear (**Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988; Holdert and Antonides, 1997**); and cereals (**Belch et al., 1985; Berey and Pollay, 1968**). Children have been observed to influence decisions for family products also, such as holiday/vacations (**Ahuja and Stinson, 1993; Belch et al., 1985; Dunne, 1999; Holdert and Antonides, 1997; Jenkins, 1979**); and eating at particular restaurants or even decision making for the family to eat out (**Filiatrault and Ritchie, 1980; Williams and Veeck, 1998**).

With respect to demographic variables of children there was many studies were done in many of the foreign countries and following were some findings of the researches. According to many researchers such as **Ward and Wackman (1972), Jenkins (1979) & Moschis and Mitchell (1986)** it was found childrens' age constitute as an important factor which affects childrens' influence in family decision making.

Ward and Wackman (1972) found that young children aged between 5 to 7 tend to have more influence for game and toy purchases, while older children aged between 11 to 12 found to have more influence attempts for clothing and record albums. In another study by **Ward and Wackman, 1972; Mangleburg, 1990** it was found that when compared to younger children, older children have more knowledge and experience of the products and they are more customers socialized.

NEED OF THE STUDY

Children are emerging as strong consumer segment which has a high influence on the parents buying decision with respect to items of own consumptions and also items for common consumption of the family. Marketers are striving to attract this segment through various advertising media. It was found from the literature review, that children's influence on family decision making has been well documented in western countries, where most of the research done had several variations affecting the degree of children's influence, including product category, decision stage, children's resource, family structure and socio-economics. However, there are only few researches done on children's influence on family decision making in India. This study aims to investigate the influence of food advertisements on children in India and their influence on parents buying decision making and also to find out which gender & age groups of children has more influences on parents buying decisions.

OBJECTIVES

- a) To find out the childrens’ & parents’ attitude towards TV advertisements.
- b) To identify the most attractive advertisement media for children
- c) To recognize the important aspect that attracts children in food advertisements
- d) To identify which food product children have higher influence on parents buying decision
- e) To analyze whether gender of child has impact on parents’ buying Decision
- f) To recommend strategies to marketers for higher effectiveness

HYPOTHESIS

- H1: There is no significant difference between children’s gender & their perception on attractive aspects in food advertisements
- H2: There is no significant difference between children’s age & their perception on attractive aspects in food advertisements
- H3: There is no significant difference between children’s gender & on their preferred TV shows
- H4: There is no significant difference between children’s age & on their preferred TV shows
- H5: There is no significant difference between children’s gender & their perception towards advertisements
- H6: There is no significant difference between children’s age & their perception towards advertisements

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted for sample size of 180 children of various schools in Bangalore and 180 parents (either mother or father) of the same child. Sampling method adopted was convenience and stratified sampling as equal proportion of questionnaire was given to both gender, also between the three age groups 13yrs, 14yrs & 15yrr old children. The data was collected through a questionnaire which was validated by conducting a pilot study first for a sample size of 30. The validation was done with the help of reliability test and Cronbach's Alpha value was .707. Also Rossiter scale (1977) comprises 7 items on a five-point Likert scale was adopted for the study to measure parents’ and childrens’ attitude towards television advertisements. The statistical techniques used for analysis of data were Chi square test, ANOVA, Friedman rank test and Descriptive statistics.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION

Food: In this study food refers to confectionery, snacks, juice, soft drinks, bread, jam & ketchup.

Food Advertisements: Refers to advertisements which promote food products through different media such TV, radio, magazines, pamphlets etc.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

HYPOTHESIS BASED RESULTS & DISCUSSION

1.1 GENDER OF CHILDREN & THEIR PERCEPTION ON ATTRACTIVE ASPECTS IN FOOD ADVERTISEMENTS

1.1 Crosstab

			aspects attracts in food advertisements				Total
			celebrity	music	song	cartoon character	
Gender	male	Count	39	9	10	30	88
		% within Gender	44.3%	10.2%	11.4%	34.1%	100.0%
	female	Count	46	21	11	14	92
		% within Gender	50.0%	22.8%	12.0%	15.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	85	30	21	44	180
		% within Gender	47.2%	16.7%	11.7%	24.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.159 ^a	3	.011
Likelihood Ratio	11.427	3	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.299	1	.021
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.27.

INTERPRETATION: There were significant differences between boys and girls in their perception of attractive aspects in food advertisements. Boys had a higher preference for cartoon characters in advertisements than girls, while girls had a higher preference for music and celebrities in advertisements than boys. Therefore hypothesis 1(Null hypothesis) is rejected

1.2 AGE OF CHILDREN & THEIR PERCEPTION ON ATTRACTIVE ASPECTS IN FOOD ADVERTISEMENTS

Age * aspects attracts in food advertisements Cross tabulation

			1.2 aspects attracts in food advertisements				Total
			celebrity	music	song	cartoon character	
Age	13 yr.	Count	24	5	9	23	61
		% within Age	39.3%	8.2%	14.8%	37.7%	100.0%
	14 yr.	Count	24	15	6	15	60
		% within Age	40.0%	25.0%	10.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	15 yr.	Count	37	10	6	6	59
		% within Age	62.7%	16.9%	10.2%	10.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	85	30	21	44	180
		% within Age	47.2%	16.7%	11.7%	24.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.659 ^a	6	.003
Likelihood Ratio	20.482	6	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.236	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.88.

INTERPRETATION: There were significant differences across age groups in their perception of attractive aspects in food advertisements. 13-yr.-olds had a higher preference for cartoon characters in advertisements than other age groups, 14-yr.-olds had a higher preference for music in advertisements than other age groups, and 15-yr.-olds had a higher preference for celebrities in advertisements than other age groups. Therefore hypothesis 2 (Null hypothesis) is rejected

1.3 CHILDREN'S PREFERENCES FOR TV SHOWS: FRIEDMAN TEST WITH RESPECT TO GENDER

Ranks

	Mean Rank
extent of preferences for movies	3.13
extent of preferences for reality shows	2.59
extent of preferences for adventure Shows	3.11
extent of preferences for comedy program	3.18
extent of preferences for cartoon	2.99

Test Statistics ^a

N	180
Chi-Square	20.454
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Friedman Test

Mean

	Gender		
	male	female	Total
extent of preferences for movies	3.18	3.05	3.12
extent of preferences for reality shows	2.65	2.72	2.68
extent of preferences for adventure Shows	3.11	2.92	3.02
extent of preferences for comedy program	3.13	3.17	3.15
extent of preferences for cartoon	2.90	2.96	2.93

INTERPRETATION: The most preferred TV shows according to the children's perceptions were reality shows, followed by cartoons, adventure shows, movies, and, lastly, comedy programmes. However, these preferences differed by gender and age: boys preferred comedy programmes to movies, while girls preferred adventure shows to cartoons; Therefore there is significant difference between gender factor of children & on their preferred TV shows therefore hypothesis 3 (Null hypothesis) is rejected.

1.4 CHILDREN'S PREFERENCES FOR TV SHOWS: FRIEDMAN TEST WITH RESPECT TO AGE

Ranks

	Mean Rank
extent of preferences for movies	3.13
extent of preferences for reality shows	2.59
extent of preferences for adventure Shows	3.11
extent of preferences for comedy program	3.18
extent of preferences for cartoon	2.99

	Ag			
	13	14	15	Tota
extent of preferences for movies	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.1
extent of preferences for reality shows	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6
extent of preferences for adventure Shows	3.1	2.7	3.1	3.0
extent of preferences for comedy program	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.1
extent of preferences for cartoon	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.9

INTERPRETATION: The most preferred TV shows according to the children's perceptions were reality shows, followed by cartoons, adventure shows, movies, and, lastly, comedy programmes. 13-yr.-olds preferred movies to cartoons, 14-yr.-olds preferred cartoons to reality shows and adventure shows, while 15-yr.-

olds' preferences reflected the overall pattern. Therefore there is significant difference between age factor of children & on their preferred TV shows therefore hypothesis 4 (Null hypothesis) is rejected.

1.5 CHILDREN PERCEPTION TOWARDS TELEVISION ADVERTISEMENTS WITH RESPECT TO GENDER

Report

		Gender		
		male	female	Total
child perception_Television commercials tell the truth	Mean	3.44	3.55	3.50
	Std. Deviation	.859	.830	.844
child perception_Most television commercials are in poor taste and very annoying.	Mean	3.06	2.77	2.91
	Std. Deviation	.914	.866	.899
child perception_TV commercials tell only the good things about a product; they don't tell you the bad things.	Mean	3.69	3.72	3.71
	Std. Deviation	1.281	1.295	1.285
child perception_I like most television commercials	Mean	2.93	2.85	2.89
	Std. Deviation	1.059	.925	.991
child perception_Television commercials try to make people buy things they don't really need.	Mean	3.52	3.42	3.47
	Std. Deviation	1.222	1.008	1.116
child perception_You can always believe what the people in commercials say or do	Mean	3.85	3.60	3.72
	Std. Deviation	.781	.826	.812
child perception_The products advertised the most on TV are always the best to buy.	Mean	3.56	3.12	3.33
	Std. Deviation	.933	.924	.951

		Sum of squares	df	Means square	F	sig.
Child perception_Television commercials tell the truth* Gender	between the groups (combined)	.618	1	.618	.867	.353
	within group	126.131	177	.713		
	total	126.749	178			
child perception_Most television commercials are in poor taste and very annoying.* Gender	between the group(combined)	3.655	1	3.655	4.617	.033
	within group	140.922	178	.792		
	total	144.578	179			
child perception_TV commercials tell only the good things about a product; they don't tell you the bad things.* Gender	between the group(combined)	.026	1	.026	.016	.900
	within group	295.368	178	1.659		
	total	295.394	179			
child perception_I like most television commercials* Gender	between the group(combined)	.317	1	.317	.016	.571
	within group	175.460	178	.986		
	total	175.778	179			
child perception_Television commercials try to make people buy things they don't really need. * Gender	between the group(combined)	.439	1	.439	.351	.554
	within group	222.422	178	1.250		
	total	222.861	179			
child perception_You can always believe what the people in commercials say or do * Gender	between the group(combined)	2.912	1	2.912	4.499	.035
	within group	115.199	178	.647		
	total	118.111	179			
child perception_The products advertised the most on TV are always the best to buy. * Gender	between the group(combined)	8.599	1	8.599	9.978	.002
	within group	153.401	178	.862		
	total	162.000	179			

INTERPRETATION: There were significant differences between boys and girls in their perception that most TV commercials were in poor taste/annoying, their perception that they could believe what the people in TV commercials said or did, and their perception that the products advertised on TV are the best to buy. Boys found most TV commercials in poor taste/annoying more than girls, while boys believed what people in TV commercials said or did and that the products advertised on TV were the best more than girls. Therefore there is significant difference between gender of children & their perception towards food advertisements therefore hypothesis 5 (Null hypothesis) is rejected

1.6 CHILDREN PERCEPTION TOWARDS TELEVISION ADVERTISEMENTS WITH RESPECT TO AGE

		Age			
		13 yr.	14 yr.	15 yr.	Total
child perception_Television commercials tell the truth	Mean	3.48	3.42	3.59	3.50
	Std. Deviation	.965	.889	.646	.844
child perception_Most television commercials are in poor taste and very annoying.	Mean	3.00	2.95	2.78	2.91
	Std. Deviation	1.000	.852	.832	.899
child perception_TV commercials tell only the good things about a product; they don't tell you the bad things.	Mean	3.69	3.62	3.81	3.71
	Std. Deviation	1.397	1.209	1.252	1.285
child perception_I like most television commercials	Mean	2.92	3.12	2.63	2.89
	Std. Deviation	1.053	.940	.927	.991
child perception_Television commercials try to make people buy things they don't really need.	Mean	3.67	3.15	3.59	3.47
	Std. Deviation	1.106	1.219	.949	1.116
child perception_You can always believe what the people in commercials say or do	Mean	3.82	3.55	3.80	3.72
	Std. Deviation	.866	.852	.689	.812
child perception_The products advertised the most on TV are always the best to buy.	Mean	3.38	3.40	3.22	3.33
	Std. Deviation	.879	1.182	.744	.951

	Sum of squares	Df	Means square	F	sig.
Child perception_Television commercials tell the truth* Age	.945	2	.472	.661	.518
within group	125.804	176	.715		
total	126.749	178			
child perception_Most television commercials are in poor taste and very annoying.* Age	1.592	2	.796	.985	.375
within group	142.986	177	.808		
total	144.578	179			
child perception_TV commercials tell only the good things about a product; they don't tell you the bad things.* Age	1.180	2	.590	.355	.702
within group	294.214	177	1.662		
total	295.394	179			
child perception_I like most television commercials* Age	7.208	2	3.604	3.784	.025
within group	168.570	177	.952		
total	175.778	179			
child perception_Television commercials try to make people buy things they don't really need.* Age	9.531	2	4.766	3.954	.021
within group	213.330	177	1.205		
total	222.861	179			
child perception_You can always believe what the people in commercials say or do * Age	2.685	2	1.343	2.059	.131
within group	115.426	177	.652		
total	118.111	179			
child perception_The products advertised the most on TV are always the best to buy.* Age	1.137	2	.568	.625	.536
within group	160.863	177	.909		
total	162.000	179			

INTERPRETATION: There were significant differences across age groups in their liking of TV commercials and in their perception that TV commercials try to make people buy things they don't need. Liking for TV commercials was significantly higher for 14-yr.-olds than for other age groups, while the perception that TV commercials try to make people buy things they don't need was significantly lower for 14-yr.-olds than for other age groups. Therefore there is significant difference between age factor of children & their perception towards food advertisements therefore hypothesis 6 (Null hypothesis) is rejected.

OTHER FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Table 1.8 and 1.9 shows according to children's perception the most influential and attractive media about food products were televisions and the most attractive aspects in the advertisements was celebrity followed by cartoon characters and the least was song played in the advertisements. However the perception differed with respect to gender and age of children.

Table 1.10 and 1.11 shows children and parents' perception towards TV advertisements is same or different with help of a descriptive statistics. It showed that most of things they perceive are similar. Childrens' and parents' believed to a great extent that they could believe what people in commercials say or do, though they could almost equally perceive that TV commercials tell only good things about a product, not the bad things. And both of them believed to moderate extent TV commercials try to make people buy things they don't really need. And in case of liking of most TV commercials it was found that children expressed low extent of liking and parents expressed moderate extent of liking.

Both children and parents opinion were considered to find out whether children have any influence on food products in general, it was found in case of juice children have more say than parents followed by snacks, then confectionery and least influence on bread, jam & ketchup.

Table 1.12 & 1.13 shows gender of children both in childrens' and parents' opinion are same or different, and with the help of cross tab it was found in childrens' opinion that there was no significant difference between boys and girls in their participation in purchase of juice and soft drinks and bread, jam & ketchup. But in case of juice and soft drinks: boys had higher say than girls, and girls had higher say than boys in purchase of confectionery. In case of parents opinion it was found that there was no significant difference between boys and girls influence in purchase of juice, soft drinks, snacks, bread, jam, ketchup & confectionery.

Table 1.14 shows according to children opinion about the influence of food products in parents buying decision across the different age groups it was found that 15-yr.-olds had higher say than other age groups in purchase of juice and soft drinks and also in case of confectionery, and there is no significant differences between age groups in case of purchase of snacks and bread, jam, & ketchup.

Table 1.15 shows parents opinion about the influence of food products in parents buying decision across the different age groups of children and it was found that there is no significant difference in perception of children participating in purchase of juice and soft drinks, bread, jam, & ketchup but in case of snacks 14-yr.-olds tending to have more say than other age groups and 15-yr.-olds tending to have less say than other age groups for confectionery

RECOMMENDATIONS

Thus from the data analysis and interpretation done the marketers can consider the following suggestions for making the food advertisements on children more effectively.

The source which gives maximum information to children about the arrival of new food products is TV, followed by peer group references. Similarly the media which attract most is TV followed by pamphlets. And in TV advertisements the aspects that attract male children most are cartoon characters and in case female children higher preferences is celebrity and music. In case of age groups 13-yr.-olds had a higher preference for cartoon characters, 14-yr.-olds for music and 15-yr.-olds for celebrities in advertisements. Therefore while designing on the food advertisements for children the marketers can consider the above suggestion for making it more effective. The children most preferred program were reality shows, followed by cartoons, adventure shows, movies, and, lastly, comedy programmes. However, these preferences differed by gender and age: boys preferred comedy programmes to movies, while girls preferred adventure shows to cartoons; 13-yr.-olds preferred movies to cartoons, 14-yr.-olds preferred cartoons to reality shows and adventure shows, while 15-yr.-olds' preferences reflected the overall pattern. As a result the advertising agencies can try incorporating more of food advertisements & even advertisements of products targeting children in between the programs that is most preferred because they can reach a large number of children. It also showed that children and parents having more of a positive attitude towards advertisements as they feel TV commercials tell only good things about a product, not the bad things. They believed to a moderate extent that TV commercials tell the truth & expressed low extent of liking of most TV commercials.

It was also proved that parents & children agree that children have more influence in parent's food buying decisions. It also proved that both male and female similarly different age groups 13th, 14th and 15th yr old children have almost same amount influence in parents buying decision without much significant difference. Therefore marketers have a good opportunity in promoting exiting and new food products if they are able to target these age groups including both male and female children more effectively. The frequency of shopping of children with parents is also another reason for influence in family decision making, In the study it revealed the most of parents take their children for buying food products atleast once a week, thus marketers can make use of this situation wherein they can make a direct promotion on the arrival of new food products when children comes for shopping along with parents, apart from other food products marketers can also develop and communicate healthy food products such as fruit and vegetables specially designed for children. Marketers can also create events or other child-related marketing activities in food shops to attract children's awareness.

To conclude marketers can target children both boys and girls equally falling into age groups between 13yrs-15yrs by designing advertisements more attractively according to their preferences which was found in the study. The food advertised to children should be products of high nutritional level and should not have a negative impact on health of children and also a negative influence on parents buying decision.

CONCLUSION

Children are to a great extent considered as a consumer and started playing a consumer role due to time pressures and income effects in dual career families. Similarly the children are exposed to a great extent to different mass media and also with the discussions with parents ensure that children are not only aware of the new brands available, but also know how to evaluate them on various parameters. The findings of a study clearly revealed that children have to a great extent influence on parents buying decision because of the attractive advertisements that are made to children through different media

Children in India may not have the purchasing power comparable to their Western counterparts, but they are still the center of the universe in the Indian family system, and they can actually pull the parents to visit a place time and again. Children are an enormously powerful medium for relationship building in India. They not only influence markets in terms of the parental decision-making to buy certain kinds of products, they are also future consumers. Therefore marketers can look at this target group as an opportunity and target them more effectively.

SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study concentrated on the influence of children falling in the age group between 13yrs-15yrs, younger age groups can be considered for further study by covering various other food products. Research can be done to see whether influence of children on parents buying decision of food products differ with respect to parents' education level and income level. Also a study can be extended to whether children have influence on other products apart from food products

REFERENCES

1. Ahuja, R. D. B. and K.M. Stinson. (1993). "Female-Headed Single Parent Families: An Exploratory Study of Children's Influence in Family Decision Making." *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol.20, pp. 469-474.
2. Belch, G., M.A. Belch, and G. Ceresino. (1985). "Parental and Teenage Influences in Family Decision-Making." *Journal of Business Research*, 13 (April), pp. 163 – 176.
3. Berez, Lewis A. and R.W. Pollay. (1968). "The Influencing Role of Child in Family Decision Making." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 5 (February), pp. 70-72.
4. Bhushan, R. (2002). "When Tots Call the Shots." <http://www.blonnet.com/catalyst/2002/05/09/stories/2002050900050100.htm>
5. Burns, A.C. and M.C. Harrison (1985). "Children's Self-Perceptions of Their Participation in Retail Store Patronage Decisions." *Advances in Consumer Research*, 12.
6. Dunne, M. (1999). "The Role and Influence of Children in Family Holiday Decision Making." *International Journal of Advertising and Marketing to Children*, 1, (3), 181-191.
7. Filiatrault, Pierre and J.R.B. Ritchie. (1980). "Joint Purchasing Decisions: A Comparison of Influence Structure in Family and Couple Decision-Making Units." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7 (September), 131- 140.
8. Foxman, Ellen and Patria S. Tansuhaj. (1988). "Adolescents and Mothers Perceptions of Relative Influence in Family Decisions: Patterns of Agreement and Disagreement." In *Advances in Consumer Research*, 15, Michael J. Houston (Ed.), Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 449-453.
9. Halan, (2002). "Why Kids Mean Business," *Indian Management*, December, 46-49.
10. Holdert, F. and G. Antonides. (1997). "Family Type Effects on Household Members' Decision Making," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 24, 48-54.
11. Jenkins, R. L. (1979). "The Influence of Children in Family Decision Making: Parents' Perceptions." In *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol.6, ed. William L. Wilkie, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 413-418.
12. Jensen, J.M. (1995). "Children's Purchase Requests and Parental Responses: Results from an Exploratory Study in Denmark." *European Advances in Consumer Research*, 2, 5
13. Mangleburg, T. (1990). "Children's Influence in Purchase Decisions: A Review and Critique," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 17, 813-825.

14. Moschis, G. P. and L.G. Mitchell. (1986). "Television Advertising and Interpersonal Influences on Teenagers' Participation in Family Consumption Decisions." *Advances in Consumer Research*, 13, 181-186.
15. Singh, D. (1998). "Children as Consumers." *Indian Management*, September, 78- 81
16. Ward, S. & Wackmann Daniel, B. (1972), TV advertising and intra-family influence: children's purchase influence attempts and parental yielding, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.9, pp 316-319.
17. Williams, L.A. and A. Veeck. (1998). "An Exploratory Study of Children's Purchase Influence in Urban China." *Asia Pacific Advances in Consumer Research*, 3, 13-19.

ANNEXURE

TABLE 1.8 SOURCES GIVING MAXIMUM INFORMATION AND ATTRACTIVE MEDIA

	TV	MAGAZINES	NEWSPAPER	IN STORE ADVERTISEMENT	PEER GROUP REFERENCES	TOTAL
Percent	71.7	7.2	5	6.7	9.4	100
frequency	129	13	9	12	17	180

TABLE 1.9 ASPECTS THAT ATTRACT IN FOOD ADVERTISEMENTS

	celebrity	music	song	cartoon characters	Total
percentage	47.2	16.7	11.7	24.4	100
frequency	85	30	21	44	180

TABLE 1.10 CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS TV ADVERTISEMENTS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation
child perception_Television commercials tell the truth	3.50	.844
child perception_Most television commercials are in poor taste and very annoying.	2.91	.899
child perception_TV commercials tell only the good things about a product; they don't tell you the bad things.	3.71	1.285
child perception_I like most television commercials	2.89	.991
child perception_Television commercials try to make people buy things they don't really need.	3.47	1.116
child perception_You can always believe what the people in commercials say or do	3.72	.812
child perception_The products advertised the most on TV are always the best to buy.	3.33	.951

TABLE 1.11 PARENTS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS TV ADVERTISEMENTS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation
parents perception_Television commercials tell the truth	3.79	.963
parents perception_ Most television commercials are in poor taste and very annoying	3.12	1.001
parents perception_ TV commercials tell only good things about product, they don't tell you the bad things	3.68	1.112
parents perception_ I like most television commercials	3.53	1.038
parents perception_Television commercials try to make people buy things they don't really need.	3.33	1.123
parents perception_You can always believe what the people in commercials say or do	3.93	.885
parents perception_The products advertised the most on TV are always the best to buy.	3.63	.991

TABLE 1.12 CHILDRENS' OPINION IN THEIR PARTICIPATION OF PURCHASE FOR FOOD PRODCUTS WITH REFERENCE GENDER OF THE CHILD (Crosstabs wrt. Childrens' gender)

Crosstab

1.12a			child opinion_ participating in purchase of juice and soft drinks					Total
			decisions are made only by me	I have more say than parents	I and my parents have equal say	my parents have more say than me	decisions made only by my parents	
Gender	male	Count	4	28	20	16	20	88
		% within Gender	4.5%	31.8%	22.7%	18.2%	22.7%	
	female	Count	8	32	22	12	18	92
		% within Gender	8.7%	34.8%	23.9%	13.0%	19.6%	
Total		Count	12	60	42	28	38	180
		% within Gender	6.7%	33.3%	23.3%	15.6%	21.1%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.284 ^a	4	.684
Likelihood Ratio	2.311	4	.679
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.455	1	.228
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.87.

Crosstab

1.12b			child opinion_ participating in purchase of snacks like chips, biscuits and other snacks					Total
			decisions are made only by me	I have more say than parents	I and my parents have equal say	my parents have more say than me	decisions made only by my parents	
Gender	male	Count	0	3	27	22	36	88
		% within Gender	.0%	3.4%	30.7%	25.0%	40.9%	
	female	Count	5	5	41	21	20	92
		% within Gender	5.4%	5.4%	44.6%	22.8%	21.7%	
Total		Count	5	8	68	43	56	180
		% within Gender	2.8%	4.4%	37.8%	23.9%	31.1%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.895 ^a	4	.012
Likelihood Ratio	14.910	4	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.041	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.44.

Crosstab

1.12c			child opinion_ participating in purchase of bread, jam & ketchup					Total
			decisions are made only by me	I have more say than parents	I and my parents have equal say	my parents have more say than me	decisions made only by my parents	
Gender	male	Count	8	16	30	23	11	88
		% within Gender	9.1%	18.2%	34.1%	26.1%	12.5%	
	female	Count	11	10	31	29	11	92
		% within Gender	12.0%	10.9%	33.7%	31.5%	12.0%	
Total		Count	19	26	61	52	22	180
		% within Gender	10.6%	14.4%	33.9%	28.9%	12.2%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.479 ^a	4	.648
Likelihood Ratio	2.494	4	.646
Linear-by-Linear Association	.118	1	.731
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.29.

1.12d

Crosstab

			child opinion participating in purchase of confectionery					
			decisions are made only by me	I have more say than parents	I and my parents have equal say	my parents have more say than me	decisions made only by my parents	Total
Gender	male	Count	9	1	10	31	37	88
		% within Gender	10.2%	1.1%	11.4%	35.2%	42.0%	100.0%
	female	Count	23	6	13	21	29	92
		% within Gender	25.0%	6.5%	14.1%	22.8%	31.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	32	7	23	52	66	180
		% within Gender	17.8%	3.9%	12.8%	28.9%	36.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.898 ^a	4	.012
Likelihood Ratio	13.510	4	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.905	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.42.

1.13 PARENTS OPINION IN CHILDREN PARTICIPATION IN PURCHASE OF FOOD PRODCUTS WITH REFERENCE GENDER OF THE CHILD (Cross tabs wrt. Childrens' gender)

1.13a

Crosstab

			parents opinion on child participating in purchase of juice and soft drinks					
			decisions are made only by me	I have more say than children	I and my children have equal say	my children have more say than me	decisions made only by my children	Total
Gender	male	Count	1	18	30	22	17	88
		% within Gender	1.1%	20.5%	34.1%	25.0%	19.3%	100.0%
	female	Count	2	30	28	18	14	92
		% within Gender	2.2%	32.6%	30.4%	19.6%	15.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	3	48	58	40	31	180
		% within Gender	1.7%	26.7%	32.2%	22.2%	17.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.006 ^a	4	.405
Likelihood Ratio	4.043	4	.400
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.960	1	.085
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.47.

Crosstab

		parents opinion on child _ participating in purchase of sancks like chi biscuits and other snacks					Total
		decisions are made only by me	I have more say than children	I and my children have equal say	my children have more say than me	decisions made only by my children	
Gender	male	Count	0	7	20	38	88
		% within Gender	.0%	8.0%	22.7%	43.2%	26.1%
	female	Count	4	4	21	40	92
		% within Gender	4.3%	4.3%	22.8%	43.5%	25.0%
Total		Count	4	11	41	78	180
		% within Gender	2.2%	6.1%	22.8%	43.3%	25.6%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.807 ^a	4	.308
Likelihood Ratio	6.361	4	.174
Linear-by-Linear Association	.248	1	.619
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.96.

Crosstab

		parents opinion on child _ participating in purchase of bread, jam & ketchup					Total
		decisions are made only by me	I have more say than children	I and my children have equal say	my children have more say than me	decisions made only by my children	
Gender	male	Count	7	12	36	15	88
		% within Gender	8.0%	13.6%	40.9%	17.0%	20.5%
	female	Count	8	17	42	15	92
		% within Gender	8.7%	18.5%	45.7%	16.3%	10.9%
Total		Count	15	29	78	30	180
		% within Gender	8.3%	16.1%	43.3%	16.7%	15.6%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.589 ^a	4	.464
Likelihood Ratio	3.624	4	.459
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.442	1	.118
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.33.

Crosstab

		parents opinion on child _ participating in purchase of confectionery					Total
		decisions are made only by me	I have more say than children	I and my children have equal say	my children have more say than me	decisions made only by my children	
Gender	male	Count	10	5	17	24	88
		% within Gender	11.4%	5.7%	19.3%	27.3%	36.4%
	female	Count	24	6	12	24	92
		% within Gender	26.1%	6.5%	13.0%	26.1%	28.3%
Total		Count	34	11	29	48	180
		% within Gender	18.9%	6.1%	16.1%	26.7%	32.2%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.253 ^a	4	.123
Likelihood Ratio	7.430	4	.115
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.731	1	.030
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.38.

1.14 CHILDREN OPINION_IN PARTICIPATION OF PURCHASE OF FOOD PRODUCTS WITH REFERENCE TO CHILDREN AGE

1.14a Crosstab

		child opinion_ participating in purchase of juice and soft drinks					Total	
		decisions are made only by me	I have more say than parents	I and my parents have equal say	my parents have more say than me	decisions made only by my parents		
Age	13 yr.	Count	1	20	14	10	16	61
		% within Age	1.6%	32.8%	23.0%	16.4%	26.2%	100.0%
14 yr.	Count	8	12	14	12	14	60	
	% within Age	13.3%	20.0%	23.3%	20.0%	23.3%	100.0%	
15 yr.	Count	3	28	14	6	8	59	
	% within Age	5.1%	47.5%	23.7%	10.2%	13.6%	100.0%	
Total	Count	12	60	42	28	38	180	
	% within Age	6.7%	33.3%	23.3%	15.6%	21.1%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.659 ^a	8	.024
Likelihood Ratio	18.176	8	.020
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.272	1	.022
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 3 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.93.

1.14b Crosstab

		child opinion_ participating in purchase of snacks like chips, biscuits and other snacks					Total	
		decisions are made only by me	I have more say than parents	I and my parents have equal say	my parents have more say than me	decisions made only by my parents		
Age	13 yr.	Count	2	1	23	14	21	61
		% within Age	3.3%	1.6%	37.7%	23.0%	34.4%	100.0%
14 yr.	Count	3	3	18	18	18	60	
	% within Age	5.0%	5.0%	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%	100.0%	
15 yr.	Count	0	4	27	11	17	59	
	% within Age	.0%	6.8%	45.8%	18.6%	28.8%	100.0%	
Total	Count	5	8	68	43	56	180	
	% within Age	2.8%	4.4%	37.8%	23.9%	31.1%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.542 ^a	8	.382
Likelihood Ratio	10.207	8	.251
Linear-by-Linear Association	.562	1	.453
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 6 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.64.

1.14c

Crosstab

		child opinion_ participating in purchase of bread, jam & ketc					Total	
		decisions are made only by me	I have more say than parents	I and my parents have equal say	my parents have more say than me	decisions made only by my parents		
Age	13 yr.	Count	5	9	17	22	8	61
		% within Age	8.2%	14.8%	27.9%	36.1%	13.1%	100.0%
	14 yr.	Count	12	7	23	10	8	60
		% within Age	20.0%	11.7%	38.3%	16.7%	13.3%	100.0%
	15 yr.	Count	2	10	21	20	6	59
		% within Age	3.4%	16.9%	35.6%	33.9%	10.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	19	26	61	52	22	180
		% within Age	10.6%	14.4%	33.9%	28.9%	12.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.902 ^a	8	.061
Likelihood Ratio	15.407	8	.052
Linear-by-Linear Association	.003	1	.959
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.23.

1.14d

Crosstab

			child opinion_ participating in purchase of confectionery					Total
			decisions are made only by me	I have more say than parents	I and my parents have equal say	my parents have more say than me	decisions made only by my parents	
Age	13 yr.	Count	12	1	8	12	28	61
		% within Age	19.7%	1.6%	13.1%	19.7%	45.9%	100.0%
	14 yr.	Count	4	4	7	22	23	60
		% within Age	6.7%	6.7%	11.7%	36.7%	38.3%	100.0%
	15 yr.	Count	16	2	8	18	15	59
		% within Age	27.1%	3.4%	13.6%	30.5%	25.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	32	7	23	52	66	180
		% within Age	17.8%	3.9%	12.8%	28.9%	36.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.901 ^a	8	.044
Likelihood Ratio	17.094	8	.029
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.022	1	.082
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 3 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.29.

1.15 PARENTS OPINION_ IN CHILDREN PARTICIPATION OF PURCHASE OF FOOD PRODUCTS WITH REFERENCE TO CHILDREN AGE

1.15a

Crosstab

			parents opinion on child _ participating in purchase of juice and soft drink					Total
			decisions are made only by me	I have more say than children	I and my children have equal say	my children have more say than me	decisions made only by my children	
Age	13 yr.	Count	0	19	21	9	12	61
		% within Age	.0%	31.1%	34.4%	14.8%	19.7%	100.0%
	14 yr.	Count	2	11	15	19	13	60
		% within Age	3.3%	18.3%	25.0%	31.7%	21.7%	100.0%
	15 yr.	Count	1	18	22	12	6	59
		% within Age	1.7%	30.5%	37.3%	20.3%	10.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	3	48	58	40	31	180
		% within Age	1.7%	26.7%	32.2%	22.2%	17.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.537 ^a	8	.129
Likelihood Ratio	13.701	8	.090
Linear-by-Linear Association	.633	1	.426
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 3 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .98.

1.15b

Crosstab

			parents opinion on child _ participating in purchase of sancks like chips, biscuits and other snacks					Total
			decisions are made only by me	I have more say than children	I and my children have equal say	my children have more say than me	decisions made only by my children	
Age	13 yr.	Count	0	6	12	28	15	61
		% within Age	.0%	9.8%	19.7%	45.9%	24.6%	100.0%
	14 yr.	Count	3	3	21	14	19	60
		% within Age	5.0%	5.0%	35.0%	23.3%	31.7%	100.0%
	15 yr.	Count	1	2	8	36	12	59
		% within Age	1.7%	3.4%	13.6%	61.0%	20.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	4	11	41	78	46	180
		% within Age	2.2%	6.1%	22.8%	43.3%	25.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.545 ^a	8	.003
Likelihood Ratio	24.743	8	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	.296	1	.586
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 6 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.31.

1.15c

Crosstab

			parents opinion on child _ participating in purchase of bread, jam & ketchu					Total
			decisions are made only by me	I have more say than children	I and my children have equal say	my children have more say than me	decisions made only by my children	
Age	13 yr.	Count	2	9	28	11	11	61
		% within Age	3.3%	14.8%	45.9%	18.0%	18.0%	100.0%
	14 yr.	Count	7	11	20	12	10	60
		% within Age	11.7%	18.3%	33.3%	20.0%	16.7%	100.0%
	15 yr.	Count	6	9	30	7	7	59
		% within Age	10.2%	15.3%	50.8%	11.9%	11.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	15	29	78	30	28	180
		% within Age	8.3%	16.1%	43.3%	16.7%	15.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.525 ^a	8	.481
Likelihood Ratio	8.158	8	.418
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.551	1	.110
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.92.

1.15d

Crosstab

			parents opinion on child _ participating in purchase of confectionery					Total
			decisions are made only by me	I have more say than children	I and my children have equal say	my children have more say than me	decisions made only by my children	
Age	13 yr.	Count	11	5	10	11	24	61
		% within Age	18.0%	8.2%	16.4%	18.0%	39.3%	
	14 yr.	Count	6	4	7	20	23	60
		% within Age	10.0%	6.7%	11.7%	33.3%	38.3%	
	15 yr.	Count	17	2	12	17	11	59
		% within Age	28.8%	3.4%	20.3%	28.8%	18.6%	
Total		Count	34	11	29	48	58	180
		% within Age	18.9%	6.1%	16.1%	26.7%	32.2%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.021 ^a	8	.042
Likelihood Ratio	16.890	8	.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.036	1	.081
N of Valid Cases	180		

a. 3 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.61.

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

Dear Readers

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue as well as on the journal as a whole, on our E-mail i.e. infoijrcm@gmail.com for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries please feel free to contact us on our E-mail infoijrcm@gmail.com.

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

Academically yours

Sd/-

Co-ordinator

ABOUT THE JOURNAL

In this age of Commerce, Economics, Computer, I.T. & Management and cut throat competition, a group of intellectuals felt the need to have some platform, where young and budding managers and academicians could express their views and discuss the problems among their peers. This journal was conceived with this noble intention in view. This journal has been introduced to give an opportunity for expressing refined and innovative ideas in this field. It is our humble endeavour to provide a springboard to the upcoming specialists and give a chance to know about the latest in the sphere of research and knowledge. We have taken a small step and we hope that with the active co-operation of like-minded scholars, we shall be able to serve the society with our humble efforts.

Our Other Journals

