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Abstract

This research examines the pre-purchase behaviour of families with children in the museum sector of the leisure market. It focuses on two related research questions. First, how do families with children make decisions to visit museums and second, what role do children play in such decisions? Previous quantitative evidence has found that family leisure and holiday choices tend to be joint decisions and that children exert a significant influence. Museums are an important subset of leisure choice and here studies have uncovered multiple reasons why families visit museums including child-related ones. However few studies have examined non-Western families and investigated the process involved in making such decisions with the focus to study a family including children as a whole unit.

In contrast to previous quantitative research, this study uses a qualitative method. Thirty-seven family groups were interviewed at four different museums in Taiwan with a particular emphasis on listening to the voices of child participants aged between 5 and 15 years. Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) was chosen as the analytic approach because of its emphasis on in-depth examination of how people experience the studied phenomenon and how they make sense of their experiences. A unique feature of IPA is that it facilitates the understanding of different viewpoints that might exist between adults and children and could help the researcher to uncover the ‘story’ behind the family decisions.

The findings overall are in line with the research studies found in Western literature. The findings further indicate a mixture of planned and impulse decisions and each of these can be made either exclusively by adults or jointly by adults and children. The active input from children across the process of the joint decisions is highlighted. Children’s interests, which were expressed either explicitly or implicitly, were a powerful trigger for family visits to museums. The findings also demonstrated a range of factors expressed by adults and children that influenced their selections. Among them, the entertaining features of a museum and the price factor gained the most weighting to the adults. Educational benefits that visiting a museum can offer to children tended to be expressed by the adults with a degree of subtlety. The family interactions in the decision-making process revealed cooperation, harmony and flexibility rather than competition, and the desire for a pleasant, relaxing and quality group experience. The contributions claimed by this thesis are two fold. First a deeper understanding of the role of children and family interactions in decision-making is offered. Second modifications in the form of additional stages are proposed for the existing theoretical decision-making models for further testing and development in future research.
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Part I: Introduction
Chapter 1 Introduction

Introduction

When a group of consumers, such as a family, needs to make a purchase choice, how do they select amongst hundreds of possible choices opened to them and eventually reach a decision? This research studies family consumers' leisure outing choices, and the type of family examined, here, is one with dependent children. Consumer behaviour theory is conceptualised into a 3-phases cyclical process, including the Pre-Purchase Phase, the Purchase Phase and the Post-Purchase Evaluation Phase (Assael 2004, Sheth et al. 2004), as Diagram 1 illustrates. The Pre-Purchase Phase refers to the behaviour before a purchase occurs, which covers topics, such as sources of information, choices of alternatives and final purchase decisions. While the Purchase Phase represents the actual consumption behaviour, the Post-Purchase Evaluation Phase refers to the feedback consumers received during the consumption. The cyclical process symbolises the experiences gained after the purchase is likely to affect the subsequent pre-purchase decisions. The focus of this research is therefore related to the Pre-Purchase decisions - that is, the process between the Pre-Purchase Phase and the Purchase Phase, as Diagram 1 illustrates here:

Diagram 1 The three phases of consumer behaviour

Family outing choices can be free or involve fees. Today's market offers a diversity and wide range of paid choices of activities for families to do; for example, visiting a visitor attraction (e.g. theme parks) or going to the cinema. This research focuses on the shared group consumption; more specifically: a family that
consumes a certain paid activity together, as a group. Museum products are chosen as the context of the family outing choices in this investigation.

According to the International Council of Museums,

'a museum is a non-profit making, permanent institution in the service of society and of its development, and open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits, for purposes of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of people and their environment (ICOM 2008).

This definition shows that the role of museums is not restricted to conservation; rather, it emphasises their multi-dimensional functions. A museum is an institution that promotes the natural and cultural heritage and offers opportunities for its visitors to understand and to enjoy one's inheritance (ICOM 2008). Museums are educational resources as well as leisure and tourist attractions, which aim to offer intangible leisure and cultural experiences to their visitors. The definition given by the American Association of Museums (2006) further acknowledges the variety type of museums:

'Their numbers include both governmental and private museums of anthropology, art history and natural history, aquariums, arboreta, art centers, botanical gardens, children's museums, historic sites, nature centers, planetariums, science and technology centers, and zoos.'

Museum-visiting is one popular leisure and tourism choice amongst family consumers. The purpose of this research is thus to understand the process involved in making family outing decisions to visit museums by trying to get inside of group interactions.

More specifically, regarding the investigation into what happened before family visits to museums - the Pre-Purchase Phase - previous museum studies tended to ask why families came to museums and their main visiting motivations through quantitative research methods (Baillie 1996, Moussouri 2003, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). However, little has been done even in the academic field to explore, through a qualitative approach, how this group makes the decision to visit a museum. The Consumer Pre-Purchase Decision-Making Theory (first proposed by Engel, Kollat and Blackwell (1968)) is selected to underpin this research, because of its emphasis on the evolution process of choice selection for satisfying consumers' needs.
Chapter 1 Introduction

This thesis reviews consumer literature on family leisure and holiday choices, on the one hand, and museum studies into family groups, on the other. As a result, this work discovers that a majority of these studies are done in Western, English-speaking countries (e.g. United States, United Kingdom and Australia). Interestingly, there is a lack of investigation into non-Western families regarding their leisure decisions, specifically the choices of museum participation. This thesis therefore extends to research on Taiwan as the main country for data collection.

With a total population of 22.99 million (National Statistics (Taiwan) 2008), Taiwan is one of few functioning democracies as well as one of the strongest economies in Asia (BBC News 2008). In the new millennium, the Taiwanese government introduced a two-day weekend policy, which increased the amount of free time enjoyed by workers, thus creating a change in leisure demands. There has been heavy investment in leisure, cultural and entertainment-related industries by government authorities, agencies and the private sector, since the 1990s. The growth of museum, specifically, has been rapid. As of 2007, there are now 580 museums in Taiwan, 85% of which were established after the 1990s (Chinese Association of Museums 2008). Museum participation is also high in Taiwan (Lin 2006). However, there is very little research studying the use of leisure time - in particular, participation in leisure activities associated with museums. Most importantly, there is no study examining family leisure decisions to visit museums exhibiting in Chinese literature. Although this research generated data from Taiwan, the results offer insight into the Pre-Purchase behaviour in the family leisure market.

1.1 Rationale for the study
The family market is an important segment of the leisure and tourism industry. This is evidenced by the distribution of household expenditure and the consumption contribution to this market. For example, the average household spending on recreation and culture, including leisure activities and holiday trips, was the second highest category, in a Western country, such as the United Kingdom, and in an Oriental country like Taiwan. Spending on leisure remains around 13% to 17% of the overall household expenditure, in the past decade, in both the UK and Taiwan (DGBAS 2007, National statistics online (UK) 2008). Moreover, according to Mintel (2005), 23% of the total 1.1 billion tourism day trips in the UK are made by those travelling with children and the amount of spending
on the journeys is estimated at over $60 billion. Families with children are the major and a fast-growing market segment, not only to museum sectors (Mintel 2004a), but also to other attractions, such as theme parks (Mintel 2008).

Family visitors with children are one of the largest market segments of the museum audiences (McManus 1994, Hopper-Greenhill 1994, Falk 1998, MORI 2001, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004). Regardless of what sort of scale a museum is, many museums target family groups and design family events in their programmes. Surprisingly, not many museums gather visitor figures specifying the proportion of family visitors who come with children. Only a small number of examples in Australia, for instance, are available to present the significant number of this distinct segment. According to the Australian Museum Audience Research Centre, there were over 400,000 people visiting an Australian museum, and 45-55% of these visits were made by family groups (AMARC 2005). The proportions of family groups were even higher in school holidays or during special exhibitions and events. For example, 75% of all visitors to an Australia Museum were family groups during peak holiday periods (Kelly et al. 2004). Additionally, MORI's (2001) national survey reported that adults with children make an average of between 2.42 and 2.59 museum visits a year. In particular, over 80% of parents with children aged 5 to 10 expressed that they often visited museums. Family groups with children are thus vital to museums, because of their numbers and the frequency of their visits. However, as Sterry (2004) criticises, little research has been carried out on understanding the distinct family groups involved, even though museum sectors recognise the need to understand this segment in order to deliver `satisfactory service.

Children - albeit with very limited financial resources - have an impact on family purchases not solely those designed for them specifically, but for a range of products. Indeed, more and more marketers take this advantage and employ different techniques to market to children (e.g. toys, fast food). As prospective sharers in the leisure consumption, children are also reported to exert a significant influence over family leisure and holiday choices, such as vacations, eating out and outside-the-home entertainment (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Hall et al. 1995, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2003, 2004b, Gram 2007). The influential aspects children have cover both active and passive aspect; that is, through direct involvement in the decision-making process; and as the object of parental considerations.
(Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Hall et al. 1995, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2003, 2004b). According to Mintel’s (2003, 2004b) survey, a considerable proportion of the parents reported that their children have had an influence on both longer family holidays and short breaks, accounting for 46% and 38% of the respondents, respectively. The influence of children accounts for approximately £16.4 million out of the total £37.4 billion generated by the UK family holiday market in 2003 (Mintel 2003, 2004b).

While early assumptions indicated that family decisions to visit museums were made by parents (Hooper-Greenhill 1994), two recent museum studies offered a glimpse of how the decisions were made (Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004). These were last-minute and compromise choices, triggered by a simple question. Many decisions to visit museums were generally made at the same day or the day before the visits (Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004), in response to questions as simple as: ‘Shall we go out today?’ (Sterry 2004)

Apart from responses to leisure outings, a small number of visits to museums are related to cultural tourism. For example, some visits were made because a museum was a must-see visitor attraction for the tourists (Sterry 2004). Evidence shows that some decisions were made with the involvement of both adults and children, which indicates the possibility of making a joint decision with the added inclusion of children (Sterry 2004). The choices were ultimately a compromise between the interests and needs of various family members (Kelly et al. 2004). On the other hand, the museum visits could be impulse choices (Kelly et al. 2004). However, several questions remain largely unknown; including, for example, questions as to how a museum emerges as a purchase option, how a consensus is reached by adults and children, before they set off on their visits, and what primarily triggered an impulsive visit.

Children are often cited as a main motive behind family visits to museums. Children not only contribute significantly to all visits made to museums and galleries. A ten year-long demographic study at the Smithsonian Institution, the largest museum complex in the world, based in Washington D.C. and New York City, found that the children between 5 and 12 years old, as an independent segment of the population, represented 30% of total museum audiences (Falk 1998). Apart from school trips, children and adolescents under 16 years old often
visit museums with their families. In fact, museum motivational studies show that family groups normally visit museums because of the children (Hooper-Greenhill 1994, MORI 2001, Kelly et al. 2004). According to Kelly et al.'s research (2004), seven out of ten visitors came to museums because of the interests of the children. MORI (2001) found that families normally visited museums when there were special events appealing to children. Additionally, children were found to have an impact on repeat visits, with a third of them choosing to go back, with their families, to the museums they had visited on school trips (MORI 2001). However, the role children played in family decisions to visit museums have been inadequately explored both theoretically and empirically.

Even though children are found to have influential power over family leisure choices and museum participation, research in family groups has been dominated by adults' perspectives. The voices of children under age of fifteen have been excluded in museum studies of family visitors. Indeed, little research has offered evidence of how children reckoned their involvements in family decisions to visit museums.

Nevertheless, understanding children's viewpoints can not only provides insights into the family decisions to visit museums, but also offers inspirations to shape museums into a more appealing leisure activity to meet the needs of future visitors. Furthermore, evidence shows that early childhood experience has a direct influence on leisure and recreational behaviour and increases the likelihood of involvement in the same activities in adult life (Hood 1993). Family museum visits that are made at a tender age strongly impact adults' museum participation as well as the frequency of their visits. Negative museum-going experiences in childhood, by contrast, increase the likelihood of an individual choosing not to visit museums as an adult (Hood 1989 & 1993, Hooper-Greenhill 1994). Therefore, it is vital for museum professionals to understand today's child visitors, as they are likely to become tomorrow's audiences.

In summary, there are several reasons why this researcher pays particular attention to the museum sector and families with children, in this research study. According to the ICOM definition of a museum, museums offer an intangible experience, combining pleasure and informal learning. This distinct characteristic, which distinguishes museums from other leisure choices (e.g. sport, eating out and other entertainment), is reinforced by most parents, who regard museum
visiting as a special family outing, which might benefit their children. Motivation studies of family visitors, furthermore, reveal that children play an important role in encouraging family groups to make single visits to museums as well as to make repeated visits. However, theoretical and empirical research into family leisure decisions to visit museums is, as yet, scarce.

Much evidence reveals that children have significant involvements over family leisure consumption (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Hall et al. 1995, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2003, 2004b, Wang et al. 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005, Gram 2007). Children are also vital to museums because their visits are made both on family trips and school outings. Few visitor studies have explored children’s voices in museum-related research, and very few have examined their potential influence over family leisure decisions. Moreover, a comprehensive understanding of customer behaviour has been shown as key to commercial business success (Sheth et al. 2004). Every leisure service needs to understand where its markets are and how existing and potential consumers perceive the service, in order to deliver an experience that responds to the needs of this marketplace. Families with children are, as such, vital museum audiences. It is crucial to study the nature of family leisure decision-making and to understand the role children play, in this process, in order to build a thorough picture of the Pre-Purchase behaviour of families within the leisure market.

1.2 Definition of family groups
A family is a group of two people or more (one of whom is the householder), related by birth, marriage, or adoption, who are usually in shared residence (Sheth et al. 2004, Blackwell et al. 2006). Museum studies show that adult family groups, excluding a child, behave similarly to other all-adult groups (Sandifer 1997, Falk and Dierking 2000). Hence, family visitors to museums are normally referred to as a multigenerational group.

People with any family relationship, who visit a museum as a group, could be considered family visitors. While some definitions of a family group are as simple as ‘an intergenerational social unit’ (e.g. McManus 1994), however, some definitions of the term and classifications of the family group are further clarified on the basis of the relationship among the group members - for example, those members sharing a close relational tie (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). A number of
researchers have urged the need to acknowledge the diverse forms of family consumers involved in a leisure institution such as a museum (Butler and Sussman 1989, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004, 2006).

Sterry (2004, 2006) employed a relatively more open description of a family group visitor than the other - one that mirrors the diversity of family visits to museums. She defines a family visitor as 'any multi-generational social group of up to 5-6 people, with children, (and) multi-family households of multi-ethnic societies that comes as a unit to a museum' - and highlights its potential composition of cross-household and multi-ethnic backgrounds (Sterry 2004: 278). The composition of a family group can be made up of those with a blood relationship (e.g. mothers/ fathers with their children, parents with children, three-generational groups, or grandparents with grandchildren), as well as mixed family members with non-family members (e.g. adults/children from other families) (Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004, Sterry and Beaumont 2006).

Additionally, Sterry’s definition reflects the non-static structure of family groups: ‘Families are in a continual process of change according to family type (Sterry and Beaumont 2006: 231)’. The priority of family needs shifts as children grow older (Sterry 2004). Kelly et al (2004) further added the flexibility of group composition, in museum participation, even within the same family. For example, a frequent family group often visited museums, as a nuclear family, but the grandparents occasionally joined them. The definition and findings, here, indicate that the capacity of museums to serve as leisure institutions invite adults and children, with any relationship to each other, to visit.

The definition of a family group in this research was adapted from Sterry, (2004, 2006) but without the restriction of group size. Previous definitions tended to limit the group size to a certain number - for example, to no more than 6 members (Falk 1992, Sterry 2004, Sterry and Beaumont 2006). Apparently, the restriction is associated with difficulties in conducting research on large groups (Sterry and Beaumont 2006) and the dominance of nuclear families in Western family structures. While the nuclear family refers, generally, to a family made up of a father, mother and children, the extended family refers to ‘the nuclear family together with other relatives such as grandparents, uncles and aunts, cousins and in-laws’ (Chisnall 1995:168). An extended family is very common, in many cultures these days, such as the East Asian (e.g. Taiwan), African and Indian
cultures. For example, according to the 2000 Population and Housing Census in Taiwan (National Statistics 2003), 17.1% of total households were the extended family type.

An extended family tends to have a strong network which is bound up with close relatives. A visit to a museum made by an extended family could consist of multiple households that are related by blood or marriage; for example, parents and children of one household with their uncles, aunts and cousins from other households. Here, a family group is defined as:

Any multi-generational and multi-household social group that visits a museum as a unit, which contains at least one adult and one child who have a family tie.

The definition aims to reflect a museum as a welcome-to-public leisure attraction, which can invite adults and children, with any family relationship to each other, to visit. It also attempts to capture the diverse composition of family groups within the target marketplace.

1.3 Research questions and objectives
This research has two aims. One is to understand how families with children decide to visit museums. The other is to identify the role children play in the decision-making process. The development of research objectives, here, is greatly affected by the gap in knowledge within and among the fields of family leisure studies, museum studies, as well as sociological reflections on the nature of a family unit. This research points out that previous studies have rarely dealt with a family including children as a whole study, on their own, as well as their interactive dynamics of the pre-purchase decision process. This research intends to explore how group members interact with each other when making purchase selection.

This research perspective on the family is influenced, in part, by an expert in family research Professor Kerry J. Daly (1992, 2007). In his view, a family is an intimate social group, in which its members are in committed relationships and have constant interactions within the family system. Such a family has a shared sense of personal history and a sense both of a collective as well as an individual interest(s) and experiences (Daly 1992). These characteristics indicate the intimate relationship among family members and their commitments to other members, which could impact on individuals' thinking and actions when making a family leisure choice – that is, a collective decision. Additionally, the earlier section
has indicated the potential influence children have over family leisure and museum choices as well as the lack of investigation into children's viewpoints. Therefore, the design of the research aims and the objectives is to reflect the nature of a family and to explore the perspectives both of adults and children about their experiences in making the decision to visit museums.

The logical flow decision model has been employed to underpin this research because of its emphasis on the progress involved before a purchase decision is made. This decision model can help to address museum choices, within the leisure and tourism context; that is, how the museum emerged as the final purchase choice. It can also assist one's understanding of a family decision dynamics as well as interactions among family members and between the family and those outside the core decision-making unit. A series of specific research foci have been developed, after reviewing previous studies and literature identifying the surrounding issues. The five research objectives thus encompassing this work's two research aims are as follows:

1. to identify how the decision to visit museums are made (planned or impulse choices, joint or individual choices) and with whose involvement;
2. to explore how adults and children interact with each other before decisions are reached;
3. to explore the key decision attributes (i.e. the type of needs, the information search behaviour, the evaluation behaviour) and the considerations that have been taken into account in the selection process (i.e. the evaluative criteria);
4. to identify the decision role children and adults played in the process;
5. to explore the nature of involvement children have (active or passive aspects)

1.4 Thesis structure
This thesis is divided into five parts: (i) an introduction (Chapter 1), (ii) analysis of literature review (Chapters 2 to 4), (iii) research methodology (Chapters 5 and 6), (iv) findings and discussion (Chapters 7 to 9), and (v) conclusion and reflection (Chapter 10). An overview of the structure is summarised as follows:

The three literature review chapters, Chapters 2 to 4, offer an overview of issues surrounding family leisure and holiday decisions. Chapter 2 focuses on museum studies, relating to family visitors with children, and presents the findings of why
family groups visit museums. This chapter shows that families visit museums with more than one motivational theme and these themes, if varied, are still interrelated. It also discusses the role children play in family museum participation. This chapter also points out a series of methodological issues associated with previous studies into family choices to visit museums, through a motivational approach. Chapter 3 introduces the individual logical-flow decision model and highlights its advantages in capturing the evolution process involved in making purchase choices. The individual logical-flow model influences much research into family leisure and holiday choices. The key findings of adults and children’s involvement in family leisure decisions are discussed. Similarly, this chapter concludes with a number of methodological issues embedded in previous research into family leisure-related decisions. Chapter 4 offers suggestions on those aspects which have been overlooked in previous museum and decision studies. A conceptual framework is then adapted from the theoretical household decision-making models and from the concept of multiple decision roles. Several decision attributes, which have rarely been explored before, are also added to the conceptual framework, in order to offer a more holistic picture of how family decisions to visit museums take place in general.

The two chapters on the research methodology, Chapters 5 and 6, show how the researcher determined the most appropriate research approach and developed a suitable form of data analysis, in order to make certain definitive determinations and conclusions as yet overlooked in related or similar studies. Chapter 5 shows varied philosophical stances amongst different research paradigms, including the positivism and the post-positivism, a critical paradigm and the interpretativism. It offers both a justification and a rationale for a set of specific critical inquiries that will occupy the scope of this thesis. It also presents the justification on the chosen inquiry strategy and data collection method. Thereafter, Chapter 6 presents how research on sampled family groups, from four museum sites in Taiwan, was conducted and how this generated verbal data attained from the sampled families. It, further, addresses certain research challenges both in data collection and data analysis. This chapter presents, specifically, how the researcher adjusted her interview skills and used ‘less theoretically-constructed questions to facilitate participants’ recollection on the decision-making process. It also shows how the researcher establishes, here, a unique perspective, organisation and analysis, since the data involves sequential orders and various viewpoints.
The three chapters on findings, Chapters 7 to 9, explain the context of family leisure/tourism decisions to visit museums – specifically, who is largely involved in decision-making, the roles played by adults and children, the key decision-making stages engaged upon and the interactions amongst family members. Chapter 7 establishes that decisions to visit museums are a mixture of planned and impulse decisions. The decisions were made upon jointly with the inclusion of children or yet made exclusively by the adults. This chapter reveals how family groups reach their final decisions in different decision patterns. These patterns present how adults and children interact with each other before final decisions are reached and show their active involvements at relevant decision-making stages. Chapter 8 illustrates the complex thinking behind planned decision-making and the attributes of impulse choices. It goes on to show a number of evaluative criteria used by adults and children in their selection and the perceived benefits and risks of certain museum choices. This chapter also presents what adults account for, when they are more likely to invite children’s active input in the decision-making process. It further illustrates how educational benefits are expressed implicitly by the adults in the family interviews without pressuring children in the decision-making process. Chapter 9 addresses and features the stages within family decision-making and the nature of children’s involvement in the process. This chapter highlights specific reasons why children play a significant role not only manifest in the decision to visit museums, but also in establishing a broad sense of family leisure through choices. The expansion of the theoretical model is thus shown and a number of ontological perspectives, derived from the data, are presented to this effect.

Chapter 10 then revisits the research questions and objectives and summarises the main arguments and discussions in this thesis. It then outlines primary contributions to knowledge, as well as their implications for museum practice. Finally, it presents the researcher’s reflection upon this academic journey and explains its limitations. The chapter also presents the difficulties the researcher faced when conducting children’s drawing method to generate decision-making data. Recommendations are then offered, in the hope that this study builds and reinforces a knowledge platform for future investigations into the Pre-Purchase decision behaviour of family consumers.
Part II: Literature Review

Chapters 2 to 4 offer an overview of the issues surrounding family decisions visit to museums and the process involved in making family leisure decisions. Chapter 2 presents the findings from previous museum studies on family visitors with children. Previous evidence shows that family groups visited museums for more than one reason and the motivational themes explored, we shall find, are interrelated. Based on the evidence from family motivations, it exemplifies the potential role children play in making family decisions to visit museums, which justifies the application of these research findings. Chapter 3 introduces the logical-flow decision-making model for individual purchase suggested by consumer behaviour literature, and highlights its advantages in capturing the evolution process involved in making purchase choices. The individual decision model has influenced much research into family leisure and holiday choices. The chapter presents the key findings on family leisure-related decisions and a number of methodological issues that existed in previous decision literature. Chapter 4 therefore offers suggestions on those issues that have been overlooked in previous studies. A conceptual framework is then adapted from theoretical household models and the concept of multiple decision roles. Several decision attributes being explored in individual decision behaviour are also added to the conceptual framework, in order to offer a more holistic picture of how families make their decisions to visit museums.
Introduction

This research explores how families reach the decisions to visit museums, which focuses exclusively on family pre-purchase behaviour. Previous museum studies into what happened before the family visits - the pre-purchase phase - tends to ask why this group visits museums and the investigation in the pre-purchase phase has been mixed with the other two consumption phases. A motivational approach has dominated the investigation the family pre-purchase behaviour and the main concern of the motivation is on its impact on family learning behaviour at museums (Falk and Dierking 1994, Baillie 1996, Moussouri 2003, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004, Dierking et al. 2005, Adams 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). The difference between the decision-making perspective taken by this research and the motivational approach employed by previous museum studies is that the former emphasises the search and selection progress of a purchase decision, such as visiting a museum, and the latter tends to treat motivations as the most important trigger for family visits to museums. Accordingly, the choices involved in museum-visiting are perceived, in previous museum studies, as a result of purposeful actions, such as seeking informal learning opportunities (McManus 1994, Baillie 1996) and the wilful intention to see museum exhibits (Moussouri 2003, Sterry 2004).

Although the selection progress has rarely been revealed in these motivational studies, their findings offer a glimpse of the potential desires behind family choices to visit museums and featured specific themes of visitors' values and perceptions relating to museum products. These motivational findings laid the groundwork for this exploratory research that focuses on the study of the pre-purchase decision-making process. This chapter starts with the presentation of the six themes related to the findings on family motivations to museum participation (Section 2.1). It debates the oversight of themes associated with seeking entertaining and quality experience (Section 2.2). According to the child-oriented theme, the potential role children played in family visits to the museum is highlighted (Section 2.3). Finally, several ambiguous issues emerging from previous studies are discussed (Section 2.4).
2.1 Multiple motivational themes

Previous museum studies have uncovered a certain extent of the family decisions to visit museums. Table 1 shows that, while Hood (1989) examined purely the leisure criteria (an important aspect of the Pre-Purchase behaviour), other research tended toward inquiry into the family pre-purchase choices of museum-visiting with other two theoretical phases of consumer behaviour (Baillie 1996, Moussouri 2003, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004, Dierking et al. 2005, Adams 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007).

For example, Bailie (1996) studies family motivations for visiting museums (the Pre-Purchase behaviour), the strategies adopted on family visits (the Purchase behaviour) and the recollection of family visits (the Post-Purchase behaviour). Those researches focus on the Pre-Purchase phase encompassing various aspects of the behaviour, including visiting motivations and reasons for them (Falk and Dierking 1994, Dierking and Falk 1994, Bailie 1996, Moussouri 2003, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004, Dierking et al. 2005, Adams 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007), the original purpose of the outings, (Kelly et al. 2004), the source of information (Sterry 2004), leisure criteria (Hood 1989), the plan for museum-visiting (Kelly et al. 2004), as well as the timing and the involvement of members in the decision-making (Sterry 2004).

Among them, studying visitor motivation is the most popular approach used by previous research inquiry into the pre-purchase behaviour regarding the family decisions to visit museums.

Table 1: The research focuses and covers consumption phases of previous museum studies, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>The research focuses</th>
<th>Associated consumption phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hood (1989)</td>
<td>Examines the leisure criteria, the psychographic characteristics and the motivations.</td>
<td>Pre-purchase phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baillie (1996)</td>
<td>Examines the motivation only.</td>
<td>Pre-purchase phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies adapt to family visits.</td>
<td>Purchase phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recollection of family visits.</td>
<td>Post-purchase evaluation phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moussouri (2003)</td>
<td>Examines family agenda before and after visits.</td>
<td>Mixture of 3 consumption phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examines family motivations and practical considerations of adults.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Pre-purchase phase</th>
<th>Purchase phase</th>
<th>Post-purchase evaluation</th>
<th>Pre-purchase phase</th>
<th>Purchase phase &amp; Post-purchase evaluation</th>
<th>Pre-purchase phase</th>
<th>Purchase phase &amp; Post-purchase evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dierking et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Evaluates family motivation for museum visits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briseño-Garzón et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Reasons for visiting and the pre-defined agenda.</td>
<td>Impact of the pre-defined agenda on learning experiences and learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2 Museum Studies on Family Visits

Family visitors gave a number of reasons for why they visited museums. Previous findings can be generalised into six major themes, even though a diverse set of motivational factors have been used and the investigations have covered the reasons for visiting different types of museums (e.g. science and art type). As Table 2 shows, the six themes include: (1) 'learning', (2) 'entertainment', (3) 'the role of children', (4) 'quality family time', (5) 'interest in museums', and (6) 'social interactions' (McManus 1989, 1994, Falk and Dierking 1994, Baillie 1996, MORI, 2001, Moussouri 2003, Kelly et al., 2004, Sterry, 2004, Dierking et al. 2005, Adams 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007).

Several museum researchers indicated that family visits are motivated with a specific reason in mind. For instance, some families with children visited museums for informal learning experiences (McManus 1989, Baillie 1996, Moussouri 2003, Kelly et al. 2004) or seeking enjoyment and relaxation (McManus 1989, Falk and Dierking 1994, Moussouri 2003, Sterry 2004, Dierking et al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). Some family visits were because of an interest in seeing museum exhibitions (Falk and Dierking 1994, Moussouri 2003, Sterry 2004, Kelly et al. 2004, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). Some motivations were child-orientated, for example, because children wanted to come (MORI 2001). Some visits were driven by the desire for a family day out (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007) or in response to the need for social outings (Sterry 2004). Beyond this, researchers have also used more than one theme to capture family motivations for visiting museums.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Learning</td>
<td>◦ To learn in general (Moussouri 2003, Dierking et al. 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ To learn about museum exhibits (Moussouri 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ To seek a stimulating day out (Kelly et al. 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ To see the real thing (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ To escape from every day life (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ For relaxation, enjoyment and entertainment (Briseño-Garzón</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Many researchers have revealed the family motivations by using combinations of the abovementioned themes, as Diagram 2 and Table 3 show. For example, McManus (1987-89) points out that the families have a ‘dual agenda’ when visiting museums: they are seeking enjoyment and an educational experience. This dual agenda mixes both the ‘learning’ and the ‘entertainment’ themes. Baillie (1996) presents a ‘trio motivation’ of wanting to learn together, in an enjoyable way, and enjoying being together, which mix the ‘learning’, ‘entertainment’ and ‘quality family time’ themes together. Another trio motivation, combining ‘entertainment’, ‘learning’ and ‘social interaction’ was found by Briseño-Garzón et al. (2007). On the other hand, Sterry (2004) indicates multiple expectations in the destination choices, such that families visit museums as the need for social outings that would improve children’s learning and would offer an entertaining visit for all the family, which combine five motivational themes. Even though the combinations of motivational themes varied, according to researchers’ definitions, the blending among the ‘learning’, ‘entertainment’, ‘role of children’ and ‘quality family time’ was particularly outstanding (see the orange lines in Diagram 2).
Diagram 2: The interlaced themes of family motivational factors

**Mixed motivational themes of family visits**

- **(1) Learning**
- **(2) Entertainment**
- **(3) Role of children**
- **(4) Quality family time**
- **(5) Interests in museums**
- **(6) Social interactions**

**Table 3: The list of interlaced themes of family motivational factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interrelated themes</th>
<th>Examined factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Learning + (2) Entertainment</td>
<td>- To seek enjoyment and educational experience (McManus 1989).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (1) Learning + (3) Role of children | - To enhance children’s learning (Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004).  
- Satisfying interests of others (e.g., children) and oneself, and expanding understanding (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007).  
- Offering children a learning opportunity for all, including children (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). |
| (1) Learning + (4) Quality family time | - To learn together (Falk and Dierking 1994, Kelly et al. 2004). |
| (1) Learning + (2) Entertainment + (4) Quality family time | - To learn together, in an enjoyable way, and enjoy being together (Baillie 1996). |
| (2) Entertainment + (3) Role of children | - To seek pleasant activities for children (Kelly et al. 2004).  
- To seek the enjoyment of children (Kelly et al. 2004).  
- To offer interesting things for children to see, touch, and do (Adams 2005). |
| (2) Entertainment + (4) Quality family time | - To seek opportunities to enjoy being together (Baillie 1996).  
- To seek opportunities to do something together that everyone would enjoy (Falk and Dierking 1994).  
- To spend a fun family day and to have fun as a group (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007).  
- To do something together as a family (Dierking et al. 2005). |
2.2 Seeking learning or entertainment?

The unique function of museums, in the leisure and tourism markets, is its educational role. Accordingly, more attention has been paid to the 'learning' theme amongst all motivational findings. Education is regarded as a central function by museum practitioners. Indeed, the American Association [of] Museums (2006) states that 'people of all ages and backgrounds come to learn from the collections, exhibits and programs created by museums through their research and scholarship.' This indicates that the core of museum service to the public is its educational role. Museums are constantly perceived as places for social learning by many researchers (McManus 1989, Falk and Dierking 1994, Dierking and Falk 1994, Kelly et al. 2004, Dierking et al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). As such, from parents' viewpoints, museums are perceived as an information resource and stimulating environment (Kelly et al. 2004). More specifically, museums are perceived, by parents, as important and trustworthy educational resources for their children outside school (MORI 2004). While Falk and Dierking (2000) state that most families come to museums 'to learn', they attach an additional assumption that the educational motivation is 'an implicit goal' rather than an explicit expression. They assume, naturally, that no family would wake up on Saturday morning with a declared intention to go to a museum to learn something today (Falk and Dierking 2000, p.93). Therefore, the questions needing to be explored further are: 'to what extent family groups visit museums, in pursuit of informal learning
experiences’ and ‘which members associate museums with educational resources and identify them as beneficial to groups, especially to children?’

Conflicting evidence has shown that not every family visited museums for learning purposes, and more significantly, the educational image of museums could be a barrier for increasing the frequency of museum participation among some groups. Early researchers argued that how family visitors valued educational motivations were different from the perspectives of most museum researchers, since families may decide to go to museums without consciously thinking that they are making educational visits (Leichter et al. 1989). Kelly et al. (2004) reveals that only a small number of families choose to visit museums solely in search of learning experiences or for educational reasons. Most family visitors, in the study, regarded the concept of educational purpose as ‘too serious’ to describe their visits. Additionally, Hood (1989) shows the leisure criteria of searching for learning opportunities and doing something worthwhile, which were only emphasised by frequent family visitors to museums. By contrast, the occasional family visitors considered the educational opportunities, stressed by museum professionals, as ‘a hurdle, not an asset (Hood 1983: 156)’. This finding is supported by a study of non-museum-visitors in Taiwan, which sampled adults of the most underrepresented group among museum audiences - those on a low income (Lin 2006). ‘Lack of interest’ was the most cited reason to deter from museums, which are motivated to be of interest to many people – to attract the already educated and cultured as well as invite in those without any exposure to art or education beyond what is already available elsewhere. To the non-visitors, museums are unattractive and uncomfortable places due to their strong association with an education institution (Lin 2006). Seeking a rather relaxing and enjoyable experience is what occasional visitors and non-visitors see what they want to pursue in their leisure experience (Hood 1983, Lin 2006).

The emphasis on seeking entertaining group experiences is an important reason behind some family visits to museums, especially among those occasional visitors and non-visitors. Most family visitors, according to Kelly et al. (2004), expressed the choices to visit museums for recreation and to have a stimulating day out, rather than as a conscious desire to be formally educated. Sterry (2004) indicates that one of the family expectations of museum visits was to receive an entertaining visit for all the family. Early research showed that, in regard to leisure criteria, the parents of primary school children, both those who have never been to museums and those who occasionally paid a visit, valued active participation, entertainment and social
interaction more than having learning opportunities (Hood 1986, 1989). The occasional visitors perceived museums as offering fewer leisure benefits, which they valued the more than other leisure choices. To these parents, 'a museum needs to be fun and engaging for children', as this quality of experience is an essential for family outings (Kelly et al. 2004:18). Lack of offering entertaining experience, particularly for children, was cited as the main reason why some parents were deterred from visiting certain museums (e.g. art museums) (Adams 2005). The non-museum visitors in Taiwan also expressed similar needs of wanting museum institutions to offer active participation and enjoyable group experiences for families (Lin 2006). It would be worth exploring to what extent the pursuit of entertaining experiences, particularly active participation, is indeed connected to outing purposes and the inclusion of children in the family groups.

The inconsistency in findings on educational and the entertainment motivations indicates a need for an in-depth exploration into the basis of family choices to visit museums. Baillie's (1996) criticism suggests that most museum professionals tend to concentrate museum missions on collection, preservation and interpretation; as a result, how effective an exhibition is presented to family visitors, as a learning experience, becomes a key interest. Without doubt, the educational function is the key attribute that distinguishes museums from most forms of leisure and tourism. Examining the family learning experience, in the Purchase Phase, and measuring the effectiveness of learning outcome is crucial to all types of museums. Nevertheless, Baillie (1996) argues that the overemphasis on the educational motivation of family visits would narrow one's understanding of family visitors. What needs to be explored, here, really is how adults and children of a family group actually evaluate the educational opportunities offered to them by museums and their pursuit of enjoyable and quality group experiences before decisions to visit museums are made.

2.3 Child-orientated motivations

Previous studies show that many family motivations for visiting museums related to the role of children played in the family choices of group outings. For example, some family visits were made in response to the needs, the interest or the request of their children (Hooper-Greenhill 1994, MORI 2001, Kelly et al. 2004). Others cited different reasons, combining two motivation themes (see Table 3), such as enhancing children's learning (Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004), seeking pleasant activities for children (Kelly et al. 2004), and offering interesting things for children to see and do.
(Adams 2005). The potential input from children over the choice to visit museums seems to cover both active and passive aspects.

Some family visits to museums were motivated by children's active requests. For example, MORI's (2001) survey reveals two active roles children manifested in family visits. Nearly half of the adults (48%) with children aged 5-10 visited museums primarily 'because the children [wanted] to come'. MORI's (2001) questionnaire survey with 2,531 school children between the ages of 11 and 16 showed that an average of one-third of children revisited the museums and galleries where they had been on school trips. Seven out of ten school children chose to go back to the museums with their parents, while 35% of them revisited with their siblings. The question, here, is how children actually make the requests to visit or revisit a museum and what triggers their requests.

Some family visits seem based on adults' considerations that museums are suitable options for children. Many adults regarded museums as stimulating environments and trustworthy educational resources (Falk and Dierking 1994, MORI 2004, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004), and visiting museums could be worthwhile (Kelly et al. 2004). Falk and Dierking (2000) assume that the decisions to visit museums are strongly influenced by the parents' positive perception of museum settings – that museums are good places to bring their children to learn. Seeking potential educational benefits, specifically to the children, has been stressed by many researchers (McManus 1989, Bailie 1996, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). However, according to Wolins' (1989) critique, "to most people, museums may well be in the category of things (that are considered as) 'good for you' but hardly yet in that of 'enjoyment' and still less fun (p.12)". The conflicting findings between seeking educational or entertaining experiences were also evident among child-orientated motivations.

Hooper-Greenhill (1994) assumes that one of major parental judgments over a visit to a museum is whether the visit would be both entertaining and educational for children. Indeed, one in five parents with children aged less than 4 years old in MORI's (2001) survey reported that they preferred not to visit museums because they felt their children might not be interested. Some parents made family visits to museums since they reckoned that their children might enjoy being in museums (Kelly et al. 2004, Adams 2005), or because there were special events appealing to the children (MORI 2001). These findings indicate that adults expected a family visit to a museum could
not only enhance children’s learning, but might also offer pleasant experiences to the
group members, including children (McManus 1989, Bailie 1996, Kelly et al. 2004,

A few questions need to be explored further here. First, one wonders how adults’
positive attitudes toward the potential educational benefits that museums can offer to
children unfold before decisions to visit museums are made. Second, when adult
family members judge museum-visiting as a potentially good choice of family outing
particularly for children, do they specify the educational benefits to the children? Third,
how do parents and other adults judge a museum as a suitable option? Lastly, what
museum features make them consider that it might be appealing to children?

2.4 Methodological issues of previous studies

Previous studies have already identified multiple reasons why family groups visited
museums. However, a number of methodological issues need to be taken into
account, before referencing the findings from the motivation-expectation approach to
this research and before justifying the subsequent research design. Methodological
issues refer to a series of philological views and procedures -- questions covering
three major elements (Creswell 1998, Denzin and Lincoln 2005):

- The ontological issue - the nature of reality (knowable) and how the world is
  perceived.
- The epistemological issue - the study of knowledge, what we accept as
  being valid knowledge, the relationship between the researcher (inquirer)
  and that being researched (knowable).
- The methodological issue - the process of conducting a scientific inquiry
  (gaining knowledge).

This section identifies the ontological views taken by previous museum studies, which
affected what has been counted as valid knowledge (the epistemological aspect) in
family pre-purchase behaviour and the research focus designing to inquire into such
questions. This section therefore attempts to specify the difference in ontological
views between the motivational approach, taken by previous museum studies, and
the decision-making approach employed in this research project.

2.4.1 The view of motivational studies

The motivational approach perceives consumers’ desires as the most important factor
affecting the choices to visit museums. As Falk and Dierking (1994) stated:
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The decision to visit a museum involves matching personal and social interest and desires with anticipated physical context and the associate activities of a museum. Two important considerations in leisure-time decision-making are the investment of time and money and the importance attached to the activity, in short, the costs and the benefits of any given choice (p. 13).

This statement indicates an ontological view that the decisions to visit museums are a result of matching the interests in museums and the desires directly associated with what museum products can offer to the consumers. The motivational study assumes that people who have the same desires or agenda with the research findings would lead to the choices of museum participation. The concept of the benefits-seeking behaviour also leads to the study of expectations and benefits associated with museum-visiting, such as learning. Therefore, previous researchers tend to take the motivation-expectation approach to study the family decisions to visit museums. Accordingly, inquiry into family Pre-Purchase behaviour (what happened before the family visits) tended to ask the reasons why family groups came to museums, their motivations for family visits and what one expected to do in museums (Dierking and Falk 1994, Falk and Dierking 1994, 2000, Baillie 1996, Moussouri 2003, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004, Adams 2005, Dierking et al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007).

Investigation into family motivations is often restricted to a couple of theoretically-constructed factors. Consequently, a widely divergent focus on motivations has been presented, depending on how the researchers constructed and examined the factors at hand.

Despite the fact that various reasons were given for why families visited museums, the educational motivation has gained the most attention by museum researchers and practitioners alike. This phenomenon relates to the purpose of investigation into family motivations. Such investigation into family motivations (the Pre-Purchase behaviour) mainly served to evaluate and to understand the impact of motivations on family visiting experiences inside museums (the Purchase Phase), especially their influence on family learning behaviour and their learning outcomes (Dierking and Falk 1994, Falk and Dierking 1994, 2000, McManus 1989, 1994, Baillie 1996, Moussouri 2003, Adams 2005, Dierking et al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). For example, how do individual agendas and motivations construct and affect the family learning and visiting strategy (Baillie 1996, Kelly et al. 2004, Adams 2005, Dierking et al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007) as well as the group interactions in the museums (Sterry 2004)? How do family agenda and expectations interplay with the museum agenda (Moussouri 2003) and respond to museum design and interpretation (Sterry 2004)?
The attention over the learning motivations was also associated with the researchers' and the practitioners' emphases on the educational role of museum products. The findings of these motivational studies help one's understanding of family learning behaviour in museums. However, a more holistic picture regarding how family groups reach the decisions to visit museums remains largely unknown.

The evidence derived from the motivational approach has rarely revealed museum products as part of choices available in leisure and tourism markets. This research phenomenon is influenced by the ontological view of previous museum researchers on museum decisions and the ways how family choices to visit museums were inquired. The decisions to visit museums tend to be studied in an exclusive museum context. That is to say, a museum has been assumed that it is the only option being considered by those families attending the museums. The motivational approach makes it difficult to acknowledge the nature of having abundant options in the leisure market. Little is known about how museums emerged as the choices of family outings and about what kind of process is involved in making the decision to pay a family visit. Finally, one inevitably asks how these motivational themes reveal during the process of reaching family decisions to visit museums.

2.4.2 Whose motivations were presented?

The second essential question regarding the motivational approach is: 'whose motivations were actually presented in previous museum studies about family visits to museums?' The representation of family groups has been prevailed by adults' viewpoints regarding their motivations to visit museums (Falk and Dierking 1994, Dierking and Falk 1994, Baillie 1996, Moussouri 2003, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004, Adams 2005, Dierking et al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). This research phenomenon has led to two issues regarding validity. First, the study of family group behaviour has been heavily derived from individual members' viewpoints. Second, the voice of children has been neglected in these findings. Therefore, it is difficult to judge to what extent these motivational findings, behind the decisions to visit museums, are part of adults' desires, children's wishes, or their collective goals as a group.

This research phenomenon is associated with the complexity involved in collecting information from a family group, which contains multi-members, and finding a research approach that can accommodate both adults and children (Sterry 2004, Sterry and Beaumont 2006). This issue is particularly significant within the constraints
of taking valid data from the data collection methods employed mainly by questionnaire surveys (Falk and Dierking 1994, McManus 1994, Baillie 1996, MORI 2001, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004, Dierking et al. 2005). The questionnaire method also leads to the difficulty of analysing and presenting conflicting opinions (Sterry 2004). Apparently, families are an intimate social group. Parents or other adult members could articulate the passive considerations they have taken for their children in making the decisions to visit museums and speak on behalf of their children, under some conditions. This might be, for example, when their children are rather young and cannot articulate that the family visits are based on their own requests. Despite this limitation, there is yet a need to explore how children perceive their own input and other family members' contributions in the decision to visit museums.

Previous studies reveal that many family visits to museums are related to child-orientated motives. However, the actual child involvement of the children is still vaguely determined. For example, some adult respondents in previous studies ticked their reasons for visiting museums as motivated by the interests of children (Kelly et al. 2004), their needs (Hooper-Greenhill 1994) and requests (MORI 2001). However, several questions remain largely unknown: how do children's needs, interests and requests unfold to parents and other adults? Do children directly ask their parents to pay a visit to a particular museum? Could the visits decided by adults respond to any needs and interest expressed by children implicitly? How do adults and children interact before decisions to visit museums are made? The explicit and implicit roles children play, in the 'purchasing' decisions to visit museums, have thus been under-researched.

Evidence shows that children have a different viewpoint from adults regarding their attitudes toward museums and museum experience. As mentioned earlier, parents and other adult members often perceive museums as a stimulating environment and an important and trustworthy educational resource for their children. Unlike adults, children seldom regard museums as their best learning resource outside school. Most child respondents, in MORI's (2001) survey, favoured libraries and the Internet more than museums, with 70% and 62% of the responses, given as such, respectively. Most children perceive their visits to museums as having fun and enjoying themselves with less emphasis on learning (Falk and Diering 1994). Children crave seeing more high tech and interactive exhibits, hands-on experiences and child-friendly interpretations in museums (Hooper-Greenhill 1994, Irvine 1999, MORI 2001). Children's perception of the museum experience and their expectation from museums
imply their emphases on seeking entertainment through leisure experiences. The inclusion of children, in family leisure consumption, is a simple fact. It is important to explore children’s views on how they evaluate museum products and how they respond to the choices of museum participation, no matter who makes the decisions. A more suitable data collection method to cope with the difficulties involving in researching multiple members and presenting conflicting opinions, will be discussed in Chapter 5.

2.4.3 Practical concerns

Previous studies have paid attention to the psychological attributes of family visitors, such as motivations, leisure values and psychographic criteria. Yet, how have potential practical considerations been taken into account, in making museum choices? Little research has, in fact, explored a number of practical issues being considered in family visits, including price factors, proximity, weather factors and museum service.

To begin with, researchers have revealed three price-related factors affecting family visits to museums, including the admission charges (Moussouri 2003), free programmes (Dierking et al. 2005) and discounts (e.g. special offers, Kelly et al. 2004, having coupons, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). Previous researchers view price factors, as influential elements determining the choices families make on such excursions (Moussouri 2003, Dierking et al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007), and their approaches to price factors include asking hypothetical questions, such as those involving adults’ willingness to pay for a museum visit (Hood 1986, 1989). Hood (1986) revealed that the admission fee is not the major factor determining whether or not to visit a museum. Conflicting evidence given by Kelly et al. (2004) shows that the admission charges of attractions is not only a potential factor associated with the frequency of family outing choices. The type of a regular family outing tends to be a free venue, such as a park, a beach or a free-entry cultural attraction. Their findings revealed that families in Sydney, for example, preferred to visit those venues when they had free tickets, special offers or annual memberships (Kelly et al. 2004). Since family groups consist of multiple numbers, it would be worthy to explore to what extent the price factors may be taken into account before the decisions to visit a museum are made.

Researchers have revealed accessibility, weather factors and museum service all influence family visits. Some family groups attend museums because of the proximity
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to the museums (Moussouri 2003, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). The time available is also a consideration (Moussouri 2003). Weather conditions contribute certain considerations behind family visits (Dierking and Falk 1994, Moussouri 2003), particularly adverse weather (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). The service a museum offers is also a passive concern that parents make for the children's sake. For example, parents reported that they went to museums because they were safe places for children (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). Apart from judging whether a visit to the museum would be both entertaining and educational for the children, Hooper-Greenhill (1994) assumes that parents would consider whether the visits will be stressful and whether the catering service can cope with the demands of youngsters. The evidence suggests that an omnibus of considerations over these practical issues might most likely be evaluated by adults. What needs to be explored, in detail, is how these practical considerations could possibly affect the interactions between adults and children before reaching a final decision about visit museums.

2.4.4 The unplanned decisions

Are family visits always a purposeful leisure choice as previous studies indicated? Many museum studies assumed that family visits to museums were purposeful behaviour (Falk and Dierking 1992, McManus 1989, 1994, MORI 2001, Moussouri 2003, Dierking et al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). Limited research has, in fact, offered evidence of impulsive visits (Kelly et al. 2004). Many studies conceptualised motivations and psychological considerations in the pre-purchase behaviour as family agendas (Falk and Dierking 1994, McManus 1989, 1994, Moussouri 2003). Visitor agendas are referred to 'a set of desires, needs, motivations and expectations for what the visits will hold (Falk and Dierking 1994: 61 and Moussouri 2003: 478). The term 'agenda' suggests that the family choices regarding museum-visiting are intentional – to achieve specific tasks and to receive certain benefits. The concept of an agenda, however, might not be applicable to every family group when making decisions about museum participation.

Australian research illustrated that a large proportion of family groups decided to visit the museums without planning (Kelly et al. 2004). These visits were incidental, since families that passed by the museums and were curious to see what is on inside the museums or to do something different caused them to enter as the alternative to the constraints of poor weather (Kelly et al. 2004). The impulsive decision had a weak association with the educational purpose (Kelly et al. 2004). Therefore, it is needed to
explore the possibility of unplanned decisions to visit museums and to study the potential influence children and other elements might have in impulsive choices.

In summary, this research takes a different approach from previous museum research to study the family Pre-Purchase behaviour. The purchase decision-making approach, derived from consumer behaviour theory, is taken to fulfil the aim to investigate how family groups reach the decisions to visit museums. Consumer behaviour theory (Assael 2004, Sheth et al. 2004) treats the making of a purchase decision as a process which involves several stages of action. A purchase decision-making process is conceptualised in a 4-stage model, which will be explained further in Chapter 3. This model indicates that, when consumers recognise the need for a particular product or service, they start gathering information and make a deliberate choice after evaluating various alternatives. According to the purchase decision-making model, motivations are only part of the key elements behind a purchase choice. Most importantly, the decision-making model suggests a purchase choice is not merely a result of responding to consumers' desires, but the outcome of selection and evaluation processes. Therefore, taking the motivation-expectation approach and using theoretical-constructed motivational factors to study family decisions to visit museums might de-contextualise the complex behaviour behind consumer choices and limit the understanding of family Pre-Purchase behaviour.

There are, as yet, several advantages to taking the purchase decision-making approach to studying family visits to museums. This approach can help the researcher to acknowledge the social reality of the leisure market the family consumers faced and to identify the involvements adults and children both have over the selection process. Moreover, evidence has shown that some family visits are motivated because of the previous positive museum experiences (MORI 2001, Mousouri 2003, Dierking et. al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et. al. 2007). This indicates that a museum visit can affect subsequent museum participation. Yet, the impact of previous museum experiences, on later decisions to visit museums has rarely been highlighted in previous studies. The cyclical model of consumer behaviour therefore has one distinctive benefit: to address the impact of a purchase experience on future pre-purchase decisions.
Summary

This chapter presents the findings of previous museum studies, which offering insights into what happened before family visits to museums. The researcher identifies that previous findings on family motivations to visit museums are intertwined with six major themes, including: learning, entertainment, the role of children, quality family time, interest in museums and social interactions. The report of family motivations ranges from the pursuit of an informal learning experience to seeking an enjoyable and quality group experience. Some family visits to museums are motivated by children's active requests, and some are made based on adults' views that museums might be suitable options for children to obtain educational benefits and to have fun. This chapter identifies a number of questions that, however, need to be explored further about family decisions to visit museums. For example, how do children make the requests to visit or revisit a museum? How do adult and child family members evaluate museum products, when the options emerge for a particular outing? The chapter, moreover, specifies the difference in ontological views between the motivational approach taken by previous studies and the decision-making approach employed in this research. Previous researchers have tended to take an ontological view that the decisions to visit museums are a result of matching visitors' desires that are directly associated with what museums can offer to them. Accordingly, the inquiry into the family Pre-Purchase behaviour has been dominated by the motivation approach, and the learning theme has gained more attention. The picture of family visits is vague about whose motivations are actually presented in previous museum studies, since they were prevalent by adults' viewpoints. The explicit and implicit roles children played in the purchase decisions to visit museums remained largely unknown, even though there is evidence of child-orientated motivation. How museums thus emerge as the choices of family outings and how adults and children interact, before the decisions to visit museums are made, remains under-explored. Little is known how practical considerations are judged and could possibly affect the interactions between adults and children. There is evidence of impulsive family visits, but little attention has really been paid to unplanned decisions to visits museums. The chapter therefore concludes by highlighting the advantages of taking a purchase decision-making approach to address these unknown questions and to fulfil the research aim to study the processes involved in how family groups ultimately decide to visit museums.
Introduction

This chapter introduces the theoretical logical-flow decision model for consumer pre-purchase choices and presents the key findings of the involvement adults and children have in family leisure and holiday decisions. Since the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s, many decision models have been developed to conceptualise individual consumer's purchase choices and these are particularly influenced both by economics and psychology. Most of these models of individual purchase decisions consist of various internal and external factors impacting consumer choices, such as learning and memory, attitudes, social and cultural factors. These theoretical models seek to explain the complicated relationships between different variables influencing consumer behaviour. Among these models, the logical-flow decision model for individual purchases, proposed by Engel-Kollat-Blackwell (originally proposed in 1968) conceptualises purchase decision-making as an act of problem-solving. This model has a distinct feature: highlighting the key stages that would involve before the decision to make a purchase is made. The influence of this model on one's understanding of the decision-making context is significant, not only because of its impact on the later development of the household decision-making model, but also because of its wide application to research on family decision behaviour.

The chapter begins with the introduction of the theoretical model of the logical-flow decision process. It discusses the great influence of this model upon the research into family leisure and tourism decisions (Section 3.1). Two important characteristics associated with family leisure-related decisions are presented, including the likelihood of joint decisions and the significant influence of children (Section 3.2). Next, the chapter presents evidence on how children influence the family decision-making process and the nature of their influences, including both active and passive behaviour. Major factors determining the level of their influence are discussed (Section 3.3), followed by a series of methodological issues mentioned in previous studies of family leisure and tourism behaviour (Section 3.4).
3.1 The theoretical decision-making model

The Engel-Kollat-Blackwell’s (1968) decision process model conceptualises consumers as problem-solvers and emphasises the evolution of the choice process. This model illustrates the three-phase consumer behaviour, broken down into a six-stage cyclical process. It suggests that there are four major decision-making stages involved in Pre-Purchase behaviour, that is, ‘Need Arousal’, ‘Information Search’, ‘Alternative Evaluation’ and ‘Purchase Decision’. Diagram 3 illustrates the flow of three-phase consumer behaviour (the top section), and a four-stage process of the pre-purchase decision-making as well as its relationship with the consumer phases (see Stages 1 to 4, within the bottom red textbox of the diagram).

Diagram 3 The three phases of consumer behaviour and the pre-purchase decision making model

This research aims to study how a family with children makes a decision to visit a museum. The logical-flow decision model has one major virtue in facilitating the understanding of what happened before the final purchase decisions to visit museums are made. The Need Arousal (stage 1) represents the situation when consumers recognise the inconsistency between the actual state and the desired state of being (Assael 2004, Sheth et al. 2004) (e.g. needs for hunger, or desires to outing), which lead to the motivation to solve this ‘problem’. Subsequently, consumers start actively collecting information about available product options, from internal memories or external sources - the Information Search (stage 2). Next, the Alternative Evaluation
(stage 3) refers that careful evaluations would be engaged to compare various products and services options. The evaluation is not among all alternatives available to consumers, but covers those options being discovered, in the Information Search stage, and being considered for making a purchase. The model also suggests additional information searches if evaluation of the search results is unsatisfactory. Finally, a final purchase choice is made after the assessment of different options (the Purchase Decision, stage 4). The cycling aspect refers to how the experiences of consuming the purchase choices would affect the future selection of purchase decisions.

The theoretical individual model has dominated the investigation into family-planned purchase choices. The application of the individual model was evident among those comparative studies which evaluated family leisure and holiday decisions with a wide range of product categories (Davis 1974, Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Hall et al. 1995, Mintel 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005), and among those studies which purely focused on a family leisure and travel context (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Darley and Lim 1986, Nichols and Snepenger 1988, Howard and Madrigal 1990, Mottiari and Quinn 2004, Wang et al. 2004). The following sections introduce the key findings of previous decision studies on family leisure choices.

3.2 Family leisure choices

Just as the research phenomenon appeared among empirical studies into family purchases of other product categories, early attention to family leisure and travel behaviour has been focused exclusively on the spousal dynamics – that is, the role of the husbands and wives (or the parents) (Davis 1970, 1971 and 1976, Jenkins 1978). Later, this work will examine the ways in which a rising number of scholars and researchers have began to explore the significant influence of children and adolescents on family purchases, including leisure and holiday choices (Ward and Wackman 1972, Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Foxman et al. 1989, Beatty and Talpade 1994, Hall et al. 1995, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2003, 2004b, Wang et al. 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005, Gram 2007). The following sections integrated the findings of the joint decisions and the influence of children which generates both from the parent-only research and those studies with including children.
3.2.1 Likelihood of joint decisions

The possibility of joint decisions is one of the key characteristics that distinguish family buying decisions from those of individuals. Joint decision-making is strongly linked to the nature of the family purchase. A joint decision is more likely to happen when the proposed purchase is important to the household, contains high risks, or is intended for shared consumption, such as family leisure (Assael 2004, Sheth et al. 2004). Two popular approaches have been applied to examine the likelihood of joint decisions both in family leisure and travel contexts. One was examining the key decision-making stages (e.g. the Information Search, the Alternative Evaluation and the Purchase Decision). The other was studying a series of sub-decisions (e.g. where to go, what to do, when to go, when and how much to spend). Much evidence derived from both approaches has shown a common pattern: family leisure-related choices tend to be made jointly between the parents.

To begin with, joint decisions between parents were found among those investigations into their involvements at all stages of decision-making (Davis 1976, Nichols and Spenger 1988, Litvin et al. 2004, Mottiari and Quinn 2004, Wang et al. 2004), although there was conflicting evidence about who is actually in charge of particular decision-making moments. For example, some spouse-only research shows that fathers tend to dominate the overall decision-making process (Jenkins 1978) as well as the Information Search (stage 2) (Jenkins 1978, Litvin et al. 2004). By contrast, others indicate that mothers tend to exercise more influence over the Need Arousal (Stage 1) (Mottiari and Quinn 2004), the Information Search (Stage 2) (Howard and Madrigal 1990 in family leisure choices, Mottiari and Quinn 2004 in family holiday planning, Wang et al. 2004 in the selection of group package tour) and the Final Purchase Decisions (Stage 4) (Howard and Madrigal 1990). Then, a rather consistent picture of joint decisions was evident among ‘where-to-go’ and ‘what-to-do’ sub-decisions (Jenkins 1978, Litvin et al. 2004, Mottiari and Quinn 2004, Wang et al. 2004).

3.2.2 Significant influence of children

Overall, the involvement of parents is reported to be greater than that of children (Belch et al. 1985, Wang et al. 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005, Gram 2007). But it is important to note that research has shown that children exert a significant influence both over family leisure choices (e.g. the outside-the-home entertainment/activities)
and vacation selections (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Hall et al. 1995, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2003, 2004b, Wang et al. 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005, Gram 2007). For example, Dunne (1999) presents that over 84% of the parents state that their children have certain level of involvement over family holiday selection. Much quantitative research compares the degree of the influence children have on their own and this has revealed a consistent pattern that children exercise more influence over specific areas.

The comparative results present a significant impact that children have on family leisure-related decisions, in term of their overall influence and their power over some key decision-making stages as well as a number of sub-decisions. Firstly, when comparing the level of influence children have among a wide range of product categories, children exert the greatest degree of influence over family leisure and holiday choices than the rest of selected family purchases. As Section A of Diagram 4 illustrates, the level of influential power children have over family leisure decisions is only lower than it is for child-centred products (e.g. toys and cereal), but it is much greater in this area than it is for durable products (e.g. cars and televisions) (Jenkins 1978, Belch et al. 1985, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Hall et al. 1995, Mintel 2003, 2004b, Shoham and Dalakas 2005).

Secondly, children are reported to have more influence at the initial decision-making stage (see Section B of Diagram 4). Even though previous researchers selected different sets of the key decision-making stages, the mathematical and statistical evidence has repeatedly shown that the level of the influence children have is greatest at the Need Arousal (Stage 1), followed by the Purchase Decision (Stage 4). The influence of children is at its least at the Information Search and the Evaluation (Stages 2 and 3) (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Wang et al. 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005). Thirdly, as Section C of Diagram 4 illustrates, children exercise a greater degree of influence over the destination-related and the activities-related sub-decisions, such as where to go (Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987), the type of service (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977) and what kind of activities to do (Wang et al. 2004). Their level of influence is lowest over the price-related sub-decisions, such as ‘when to buy’ and ‘how much to spend’, which usually fall within the parents’ domain (Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Wang et al. 2004).
Thomson et. al. (2007) also offers qualitative evidence suggesting that adolescents are involved in the destination and activities selections, when making family holiday choices.

Diagram 4 The empirical evidence of the level of influence children have on family leisure decisions

(A) Comparison across various product categories

(Highest)  (Higher)  (Lowest)
Child-centred products (e.g. toys)  Family leisure (e.g. out-of-house entertainment)  Durable products (e.g. cars)
Adult-centred products (e.g. parents' clothing)

(B) Influence over the theoretical decision-making stages

(Highest)  (Lowest)  (Lowest)  (Moderate)
(Stage 1) Need arousal  (Stage 2) Information search  (Stage 3) Alternative evaluation  (Stage 4) Purchase choice

(C) Influence over sub-decisions

(Higher)  (Lower)
•What to do? (activity selection)  •How much to spend?
•Where to go? (destination selection)  •When to go?

The nature of joint decision-making is distinct within family purchasing behaviour. There is abundant evidence revealing the significant influence children have over family leisure and travel decisions, both from the aspects of decision-making stages and the series of sub-decisions. However, only few researchers acknowledge children as key actors within family leisure-related purchases (Thomson et al. 2007) or consider children as joint decision-makers (Dunne 1999). Dunne (1999) offered quantitative evidence in her study that, while 43% of family holiday choices were made jointly between parents, 48% of such choices were made jointly with their children. The finding further indicates that joint decisions are not restricted by parents only. There is a need to stress the important role played by children in the joint decision-making for out-of-house leisure.
3.3 How do children influence the decision process?

Consumer literature (Assael 2004, Sheth et al. 2004) summarises that children exert influence on household purchasing in three ways: (1) by simply asking for own-use products (e.g. toys, candies, sports equipments) or expressing specific preferences for certain products paid for and bought by parents; (2) by exerting influence on parents' choices of family-shared consumption products or services (e.g. television, family vacations); (3) by acting as consultants for products used by their parents (e.g. adult clothing, cosmetics). Before introducing the findings of the influential behaviour children have over family leisure-related decisions, it is important to distinguish the nature of influence first.

According to Mangleburg (1990), the extent of influence children exert can be classified into active and passive aspects. The former refers to the direct involvements or efforts children exercise during family purchase decision-making. By contrast, the passive dimension relates to the unstated needs of children being taken into consideration by parents or other family members, when making a purchase (Mangleburg 1990). The term ‘influence’ combines both aspects in previous findings.

3.3.1 Active influences

The active input children have demonstrated in previous family leisure and travel decisions includes putting in purchase requests and making purchase suggestions. Children's request behaviour is not only constrained within those products used by them. In Chapter 2, museum studies reveal that child-related motivations for some family visits to museums are made in response to children's requests, specifically (MORI 2001). This indicates a form of active influence children manifest over the Need Arousal stage, through request behaviour. Even though there is no research exploring children's request behaviour, in a family leisure and tourism context, two studies offer a glimpse into children's active requests over family holiday choices (Thornton et al. 1997, Gram 2007). Children not only request to make a single visit to holiday destinations (e.g. a visitor attraction) and tourism products (e.g. resorts and accommodations) but also demand repeat visits (Thornton et al. 1997, Gram 2007). MORI (2001) already shows children's revisit behaviour to museums where they had been previously, on school trips. It would be interesting to know, therefore, whether children request revisiting certain museums where they have already been with their
Apart from making purchase requests, children sometimes make purchase suggestions to their parents. This behaviour has been particularly salient among adolescents. Research on family holiday choices have revealed similar evidence of suggestive behaviour, although their studies have different specific research foci -- for example, research into family holiday planning (Dunne 1999 and Mintel 2003, 2004b) and a space-time diary survey of activity selection among those families with children on vacation (Thornton et al. 1997). According to parents' viewpoints, children, particularly adolescents, exercise more active input by offering ideas and purchase suggestions after being consulted by them (Thornton et al. 1997, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2003, 2004b).

A small number of research papers also indicates the likelihood of children's involvement in making final purchase decisions. The relative influence approach shows that children have a certain extent of influence over the Purchase Decision (stage 4) (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Wang et al., 2004). Very little research, however, offers supporting evidence that some children have direct involvement in making the final destination choice for family holidays (Dunne 1999). Further investigation needs to be made to explore the potential active input children make through purchase requests and suggestions, which might have sway over the final purchase choices to visit museums.

### 3.3.2 Active influential strategies

The influential strategies children employed on family purchase decisions are not limited to simple requests or making suggestions. Children develop from making simple requests in their infancy to more sophisticated strategies as they grow up (John 1999). Children's pestering power, a common behaviour in grocery shopping settings which refers to a child insisting on getting his or her will, has been found in the family holiday context showing several repeat requests to a visitor attraction (Gram 2007). Thomson et al.'s (2007) study depicts adolescents not only as manifesting a range of sophisticated involvement in family holiday choices; they also present a gradual approach to justifying their active involvements through making purchase suggestions about family holidays. These findings show that adolescents go further,
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from making suggestions and selling the ideas to individuals to identifying a mutual need for a purchase, among more than one member, and ultimately forming coalitions with siblings and parents. Research into the influential behaviour of child-used products has shown that adolescents employ much more complex approaches to getting something they want.

Researchers have found that adolescents use a wider and more tactical range of strategies to influence their parents to purchase something for them, such as clothing, electronics and computing products (Palan and Wilkes 1997, Williams and Burns 2000). The direct influence adolescents engage in ranges from politely making a request to a more aggressive level, demonstrating more pester ing power. These direct attempts can be classified into four major categories, including: ‘request’, ‘persuasion’, ‘bargaining’ and ‘emotional manipulation’. Within each category there are different levels of behaviour employed by children, as follows:

1. The ‘request strategy’: refers to simply requests without using any emotion, including ‘just ask’ (making a simple request), ‘ask nicely’ (politely making a request) and ‘express wants’ (stating a purchase need and want without reasons);

2. The ‘persuasion strategy’: refers to the attempt to convince an opposing member of the family, including ‘persistence’ (asking repetitively without irritation), ‘begging’, ‘whining’ and ‘deceiving’ (attempting to trick or deceive);

3. The ‘bargaining strategy’: refers to the attempt to reach mutual agreement, including ‘money or other deals’ (offering money or labour in exchange for getting one’s will), ‘reasoning’ (logical and practical arguments), ‘negotiation’ (compromising on purchase option);

4. The ‘emotional strategy’: refers to attempts to use emotion as a tactic to influence other members, including ‘sweet talk’ (acting affectionate in verbal expression or behaviour), ‘anger’ (display anger verbally or non-verbally) and ‘crying and pouting’.

(Palan and Wilkes 1997, Williams and Burns 2000)

Palan and Wilkes (1997) also found out how parents respond to the influential attempts the adolescents use. Two influential strategies the parents employed were similar to those children used, which are ‘reasoning’ and ‘negotiation’ through the ‘bargaining’. The rest of these strategies were particular to parents, including only a
more authoritative tone, for example:

1. The ‘bargaining strategy’ includes: ‘reasoning’, ‘negotiation’ and ‘alternatives’ (suggesting other choices);

2. The ‘emotional strategy’ includes: ‘ignoring’ and ‘shaming’ (embarrassing children purposefully);

3. The ‘expert strategy’ refers to attempts to contribute knowledge to other members, such as ‘teaching skills’ (like conveying knowledge of price-value relationship);

4. The ‘legitimate strategy’ refers to the use of unilateral and an authority’s declaration instead of mutual discussion, including a ‘cannot afford’, ‘delay’ and ‘simple answer’ (stating yes or no without reasons) response.

According to these findings, children’s active influential behaviour over family leisure decisions is comparatively less aggressive than that use over child-used products. Since this research only sampled adolescents, there is a need to explore younger children’s behaviour over shared family leisure consumption, such as visits to museums. There is also a need to expand the study of adult-child interactions and their approaches in family outing choices to visit museums.

### 3.3.3 Passive influences

Apart from direct involvements, previous studies into family holiday planning offer some guidelines for passive considerations parents take into account about their children, which were beyond the evidence offered by museum literature. Some passive aspects of the parental considerations include thinking about their children’s preferences and needs, on the one hand, and finding places that can satisfy children, on the other. The findings of passive considerations over children in the Pre-Purchase Phase show a strong association with the nature of children and their impact upon family consumption (the Purchase Phase), and also reflect the guilt attitudes of parents who feel obliged to consider the needs of their children when planning family outings.

Research into family leisure and holiday planning indicates that parental consideration for one’s children entails more than thinking about what children want. Evidence shows that, when planning shared activities, such as family holidays, children’s preferences and wishes become important concerns for parents (Dunne 1999, Mintel...
Parents also tend to consider the physical needs of their children and the service capacity to cope with children's needs. For example, Mintel (2003, 2004b) shows that 31% of parents stated they considered the specific needs of their children, on certain occasions, such as distance to be travelled and holiday facilities available. Furthermore, the desire for children to enjoy themselves, on family holidays, is expressed by parents with dependent children at all ages (Dunne 1999, Mintel 2004c, Gram 2007). In Dunne’s study (1999), the mothers commented at the focus groups that ‘the holiday is for the kids - they come first because it is got to be what they want- we do not really come into it’. To parents, their children and their enjoyment, in a particular place, far outweigh their own enjoyment.

Picking a ‘correct’ choice to keep children happy in chosen places is the deepest desire and most important considerations that parents express. According to Mintel (2004c), the ‘interest (of an attraction) to the children’ has been cited as the second most important factor (48%) for family groups when choosing where to go on a day out. Museum studies also support similar evidence that some families visit museums because of the adults’ considerations that the exhibitions could be an appealing option for children (MORI 2001). More importantly, parents voice the need to ensure that the chosen place offers plenty for children to do (Dunne 1999) and is capable of keeping children happy if they want to pay a visit (Mintel 2004c). The holding power of a visitor attraction echoes back to that which museum scholars, Falk and Dierking (1994), refer. The considerations for finding a place that can satisfy children is strongly associated with the nature of children and their great impact on the family time spent on chosen attractions. Parents state that their children need to be entertained constantly when taking independent holidays, and the reasons are because children get bored easily (Mintel 2004c) and ‘if children have a bad time, you (as the parents) have a bad time’ (Dunne 1999). Parents feel pressure if they fail to make the right choices (Dunne 1999).

Parental guilt is a factor implying that children might have both direct and indirect involvement in family leisure choices. The former refers to parents who feel they ‘should’ consult their children's opinions, when making a purchase selection. The latter indicates significant passive influence children have, even without any active input whatsoever. The passive influence children have is linked to three other elements: first, their presence as co-consumers; second, the desires to seek children’s enjoyment, which parents reveal; and third, their greatest impact on family time: spending in the Purchase Phase. It is worth exploring what sort of passive
considerations parents and other adult family members have taken before the museum choices are made.

3.3.4 Major factors affecting the level of influence

Empirical evidence has identified that the degree of influence children have depends on several variables, such as the age of children, the type of product categories and the products in which children are involved, children's product knowledge, family demographics, socio-economic characteristics and parental style (Jenkins 1979, Moschis 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Carlson and Grossbart 1988, Foxman et al. 1989, Mangleburg 1990, Beatty and Talpade 1994, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2003, Wang et al. 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005). Following discussions exclude the discussion on the 'background factors' (Park et al. 1991), such as demographic and socio-economic characteristics of a family, as well as parental style, and purely focuses on the three factors directly related to children, themselves – their ages, their product involvement and product knowledge.

(A) The age of a child

Despite the fact that researchers used different age ranges to compare the level of the influence children have over family leisure and holiday purchases, a common pattern has shown that children over school age exerted more influence than younger children, on family leisure and holiday decisions. The correlation between a child's age, on the one hand, and leisure and amusement decision-making, on the other, has been detected and is determined by the age of the child and the degree of influence he or she has on the family (Jenkins 1979, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Howard and Madrigal 1990, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2003, 2004b, Wang et al. 2004). By comparing the influential behaviour among three age groups, evidence shows that adolescents exercised more active input than younger people thorough offering purchase suggestions after being consulted by their parents (Thornton et al 1997, Dunne 1999, Gram 2007).

Young children have rarely been reported as exercising active inputs, but they revealed significant influence through a passive form of influence. The extent of influence pre-schoolers (aged 0-5 in Thornton et al. 1997) and primary schoolchildren (aged 6-11 in Dunne 1999) have is, however, not based on their capacity to negotiate. For example, according to the verbal account from one mother, 'a child was too young
to read up on things, but she makes her views known in other ways' (Thornton et al. 1997). The physical strength of certain children also affects the type of activities families chose to do, while travelling, and leads to the avoidance of certain activities (e.g. walking or visiting historic sites and heritage attractions) (Thornton et al. 1997). Thornton et al. (1997) also stresses that the passive influence the pre-schoolers have is simply due to their presence and participation in shared holiday activities.

(B) Product involvement

As mentioned earlier, it has been determined that children have a greater influence in the purchasing of child-relevant products than in other shared forms of consumption, such as family leisure-related choices. According to Mangleburg’s (1990) assertion, the level of the product involvement is the key variable affecting the degree of influence children have across different product types. The level of the product involvement can be determined more clearly by asking: whether children are the ‘users’ of a product or service. Therefore, the degree of influence children have over family leisure decisions (e.g. out-of-house entertainment, holidays) is less than child-orientated products (e.g. toys). But the degree of their influence over family leisure decisions is much greater than that over durable products (e.g. cars) or adult-orientated products (e.g. clothing), since children not only act as users in family leisure activities (e.g. days out and vacation), but are also highly involved in shared consumption.

(C) Product knowledge

Research has shown that children with greater product knowledge exert more influence over a purchase decisions. Research into general family purchases has revealed that children’s product knowledge is one of the important factors affecting their level of influence (Foxman et al. 1989, Beatty and Talpade 1994). Even though there is only one research study showing how children’s product knowledge affects their influential power over the family leisure-related decisions, Thomson et al. (2007) concludes that the product knowledge and information children have are keys to their active influence over family holiday decisions. Product knowledge refers to ‘the expertise or experiences internalised by the children that they articulated when a purchase was being made’ (Thomson et al. 2007:187). Thomson et al. (2007) further suggests that adolescents engage in external searches from various sources, including the Internet and the experiences from peer groups, as ways to collect
information on the alternatives, and then present the search results to their parents. The more knowledgeable children become, the more active influence they exercise over family purchase decision-making. Gaining more product knowledge enables children to stress the benefits and offer reasoning to back up their suggestions; as a result, parents value their suggestions and take their ideas more seriously. The study of the product knowledge factor has been limited to adolescents only, and there is a need to expand that investigation to include primary-school aged children.

There is no research indicating children’s product knowledge affects their active input over family outing decisions, such as visiting museums. MORI’s (2001) finding demonstrates children’s purchase request behaviour in making a first family visit to the museums where they had been to in school trips. This implies that the active influence of children on the choices to visit museums is potentially affected by children’s product knowledge about a museum. What would be interesting to know is the extent to which children reveal a similar pattern of exerting more active influence over family museum-visiting decisions, when they have more experience of museum visiting. Also, the researcher wonders to what extent children’s product knowledge facilitates their ability to distinguish the quality of museums, when they are involved in the decision to visit museums.

3.4 Methodological issues of previous studies

This section intends to identify ontological views of family pre-purchase decisions and how they have affected studies on family behaviour and their design of specific questions and inquiries. By and large, many researchers tend to treat group members as competitive parties when making a family purchase decision. The view of a competition affects their research foci on the efforts made by individual members, and their use of individual perspective to explore and examine family group decisions. Little has been explored on the processes of the decision-making process, namely, the story of how a family forms the final purchase decision from start to finish.

3.4.1 The view of competitive process

Park et al. (1991) criticises the application of family decision studies employed by previous researchers, which have taken the concepts of power from political and sociological disciplines, which is used to describe political settings or more formal relationships (e.g. employment). Previous researchers tend to view family purchase
decisions as a competitive progress and potentially conflict-ridden in joint decision-making, since each member has divergent self-interests and desires about alternatives (Park et al. 1991, Commuri and Gentry 2000). Accordingly, the research focus has been paid to the power structure. The inquiry tends to be surrounded by ‘who dominates’, ‘who decides’ and the use of relative influence approaches to reaching a consensus.

(A) Employs the individual model

The individual perspectives have governed the research foci of previous investigations into family purchase decision-making behaviour and their formation of the research hypothesis. As mentioned above, previous researchers tend to perceive the making of family purchase decisions as a result dominated by individual members. Accordingly, the investigation into family purchases in terms of decision-making stages involved is mainly based on the individual logical-flow decision model (Engel-Blackwell-Kollat 1968) (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Howard and Madrigal 1990, Mottiari and Quinn 2004, Wang et al. 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005. Gram 2007). Potential interactions among members, an important feature that distinguishes family purchase decisions from an individual determination, have rarely been revealed.

Some researchers used their own terminology to name the examined decision-making stage, but this, in fact, reflects a similar concept called the logical-flow model. For example, the Initiation stage (used by Belch et al. 1985, Mottiari and Quinn 2004) or taking initiative (used by Gram 2007) was relevant to the theoretical Need Arousal (Stage 1), where the Final Destination Selection (used by Nichols and Spenger 1988) was equivalent to the Purchase Decision (Stage 4). Thirdly and also meaningful, the theoretical Alternative Evaluation (Stage 3) of the individual model tends to be skipped in the investigation (Davis and Rigaux 1974, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Howard and Madrigal 1990, Wang et al. 2004), or blurred, due to the combinations with the Information Search (Stage 2) (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Belch et al. 1985, Shoham and Dalakas 2005). This led to a vague image of how the evaluation was engaged upon, with both direct and indirect involvements.
(B) Studies who dominates and the relative influence

The focus of previous decision studies has been dominated by the study of the influential power the examined family members have over the decision-making process. There are two prevalent research foci at issue: first, ‘who makes’ the purchase decisions, in terms of buying certain product categories (like cars, property, food and family leisure and holidays); second, measuring the perception of the ‘relative influence’ among family members, that is, whose input is stronger over the examined decision areas.

Much research into family leisure and tourism decisions has only considered the spouses (the husbands and the wives in families without children) and the parents (in families with children), as the members of a decision unit. Such research has focused on the decision dynamics between them. The husband-and-wife dyad affects the initial definition of the relative influence approach. The relative influence refers to:

‘[T]he perception of action taken by one spouse to obtain his/her most preferred decision outcome while simultaneously stopping the attainment of their spouses’ most preferred outcome (Qualls 1988: 443).’

Under the concept of the relative influence, only three categories are used to classify the decision types in such studies, namely, the husband-dominant, the wife-dominant and the joint decisions. Early spouse-only studies (e.g. Davis 1970, 1971, 1976, Davis and Rigaux 1974) significantly affected the analysis and conclusions of later research on how family leisure and holiday decisions were made (e.g. Jenkins 1978, Litvin et al. 2004). The study of the relative influence between spouses or parents has been taken through a comparative study among a wide range of product categories, including family vacations (e.g. Davis 1976, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Shoham and Dalakas 2005), and those focus on the leisure and tourism context (Jenkins 1978, 1979, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Howard and Madrigal 1990, Litvin et al. 2004, Mottiari and Quinn 2004, Wang et al. 2004, Gram 2007). That is to say, the role children play, in the likelihood of joint decisions on family leisure and holiday consumption, has been neglected among those spouse-only research studies.

The inquiry approach into the relative influence has been used to examine certain decision-making stages of the planning process (Belch et al. 1985, Mottiari and Quinn 2004, Wang et al. 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005, Garm 2007) and a series of sub-decisions (Jenkins 1978, Litvin et al. 2004 Mottiari and Quinn 2004). This approach has also been applied on the study of the influence children have over
family leisure and holiday decisions (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard & Sim 1987, Hall et al. 1995, Dunne 1999, Wang et al. 2004, Gram 2007). The approach both of the 'who dominants' and 'the relative influence' emphasises the force used by one member to prevent another member's preference and to control the final outcome bent toward one's own preferred options.

(C) Views children as an influential force

The prevalence of the competitive view also affects how children are conceptualised in family leisure and holiday decision studies. Children tend to be viewed as an independent variable impacting family purchases and as an influential force upon parents (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Hall et al. 1995, Dunne 1999, Wang et al. 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005, Gram 2007). Consequently, an investigation into the role children play over family leisure decisions has been centred on the degree of their relative influence rather than on how they are involved in the decision-making process. As Thomson et al. (2007) criticises, little is known about the nature of influence behaviour, in and of itself.

Even though the role of children has been investigated in some research, only few researchers explore the 'joint decision attribute' which includes children (Thornton et al. 1997, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2004c). This research reveals that many parents reckon they should consult children's opinions (Dunne 1999) and involve their children in the decision-making process, especially families with children aged over 10 (Mintel 2004c). However, only one recent study treats a child as an active participant in family purchase decisions (Thomson et al. 2007). Viewing children as members of family decision unit and investigating the conditions when adult members would otherwise consult children's opinions have rarely been highlighted as a key area to study further.

(D) Focuses on the outcome and certain decisions

More attention has been paid to the decisions outcome and certain sub-decisions rather than on the process of decision-making, as a whole. Some researchers focus on the outcome studies of purchase decisions – those which decipher who ultimately made final purchase decisions (Davis 1976, Jenkins 1978, Litvin et al. 2004, Wang et al. 2004). Some researchers, in fact, studied a number of sub-decisions related to family leisure and holiday choices. Previous researchers primarily tended to examine
a different combination of sub-decisions, but, the scope of examined sub-decisions in family leisure and tourism texts has tended to be limited to destination selection, activities selection and price-related decisions, such as travel budget, and information search behaviour (Jenkins 1978, Thornton et al. 1997, Litvin et al. 2004, Mottiari and Quinn 2004, Wang et al. 2004). Some examined sub-decisions associated distinctively with holidays, over a period of time (e.g. accommodation, air ticket booking), instead of the decisions to visit a particular service product, such as museums. Criticism has been constructed such that the holistic picture of the decision-making processes has rarely been revealed – that is, how family consumers reach the final purchase decisions (Commuri and Gentry 2000, Thomson et al. 2007).

3.4.2 The validity issues

The ontological views and epistemological concerns of previous researchers also affect their methodological approach, especially the validity of the empirical evidence. The validity issues, here, have covered how data was produced, who was sampled and what has been studied.

(A) Based on general perceptions

All previous research into family purchase decision-making processes have primarily generated data from the consumers' general perceptions of how family decisions are made and what their perceived levels of relative influence on family members (e.g. the father, the mother and the children) have over the decisions. For example, respondents have been asked to answer broad questions such as 'what kinds of influence do your children have on family decision making' (Gram 2007) or were asked to rate a series of statements like 'my children always involved in helping choose our family holiday' (Dunne 1999). No research collects data from the participants' recollection of a freshly-made decision. As a result, a major question on general findings have resulted from a theory-testing approach and non-fresh recollection may be, for example, to what extent these findings reflect the reality consumers have been experiencing when making purchasing decisions.

(B) The examined product categories

Many comparative studies have studied 'high-involvement' and the 'low-involvement' purchases together. The high-involvement purchases refer to those high-cost and high-risk products for which consumers need to perform an intensive information
search and alternative comparisons (e.g. property and cars). By contrast, low-involvement purchases are those low-cost and low-risk products for which less information search behaviour is needed (e.g. food and grocery shopping) (Assael 2004, Sheth et al. 2004). For example, while Thomson et al. (2007) focuses on high-involvement products, including holiday choices, much research into family leisure-related choices has been studied alongside other high-involvement purchases, such as financial products and durable products (e.g. cars, furniture), as well as low-involvement purchases, such as children's products (e.g. toys) and non-durable products (e.g. food, clothing) (Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Hall et al. 1995, Mintel 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005). Mixing both high-involvement and low-involvement purchases is also evident among those studies which focus on the leisure context. For example, family holiday planning tends to be a high-involvement purchase (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Jenkins 1978, Belch et al. 1985, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Hall et al. 1995, Mintel 2004). On the other hand, the selection of day outing activities (e.g. eating out, beach-going, zoo-going) tend to be a low-involvement purchase (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Darley and Lim 1986).

Furthermore, various types of the examined purchase categories have also been covered among those researches, which purely focused on the leisure and tourism context. For example, the examined service types include a particular leisure category (e.g. public recreational services by Howard and Madrigal 1990), a particular tourist product, in the family longer-break choices (e.g. the group package tour by Wang et al. 2004), the pre-travel holiday planning, (e.g. destination selection and other sub-decisions by Dunne 1999, Kang and Hsu 2004, Litvin et al 2004, Mattiarr and Quinn 2004, Gram 2007), and on-vacation behaviour (e.g. activities selection by Thornton et al. 1997 and stop decisions by Nickerson and Jurowski 2001). This research phenomenon might, therefore, produce some misunderstanding about family leisure-related decision behaviour.

Family groups might reveal dissimilar decision-making patterns, when making purchase decisions among different product categories. For instance, consumers' involvement in choosing holiday destinations might be more complex than deciding which day outing choices are made (e.g. which museums to visit or which restaurants to dinner). Many researchers tend to pose the same theoretically-framed questions toward all the product categories they examine. However, little research has used the decision-making approach to study purely culturally-related leisure choices, such as museum-visiting. The researcher argues that the investigation on one specific family
leisure decision (such as the decisions to visit museums) is needed. The researcher argues that studying family pre-purchase behaviour within a single product category can not only avoid such methodological problems occurred in a global examination across various categories, but also helps with the identification of those characteristics embedded in a single product category.

(C) Relied on certain member's perspectives

Criticism has been made that previous researchers tended to generate data from one or two family members but the findings were employed to represent the entire family (Kang and Hsu 2004). For example, the measurement of relative influence family members had over purchase decisions was often constrained within one or two member’s viewpoints. Many researchers have excluded children in their data collection and sampled only parents (Jenkins 1979, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Shoham and Dalakas 2005), especially the mothers (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Darley and Lim 1986, Dunne 1999, Wang et al. 2004). The decision literature has been dominated by how parents perceive both their own involvement and that of other members (e.g. children). The limitation of parents-only surveys is that they might either overestimate or underestimate active and passive input the other partner or their children have over the entire family consumption decision process.

Some studies have sampled children in their research, but the child respondents have tended to be pre-teens and adolescents; those 10 years and over (Belch et al. 1985, Hall et al. 1995, Wang et al. 2004, Gram 2007, Thomson et al. 2007). Similar to other research on general family buying decisions, this has focused on adolescents rather than young children (Foxman et al. 1989, Beatty and Talpade 1994, Palan and Wilkes 1997). The reasons for sampling older children might only be because of doubts that younger children have less cognitive ability and inadequate reading and writing capabilities necessary to provide valid responses, especially in a questionnaire survey.

The parents-only or adolescents-only surveys might be unable to reflect the actual setting of how family leisure decisions were made, i.e. in a context that multiple members, including children, are involved. Moreover, little research has revealed how different children among those families that have more than one child perceive their own involvements as well as input by their parents and siblings. Although research with adolescents is assumed as comparatively easier than those conducted on
younger children, it is worth exploring how school-age children and even pre-schoolers perceive making leisure and holiday decisions, as they are also users of shared consumption activities.

(D) A vague definition of the influence

Much research on the influence of children has failed to distinguish between active and passive definitions of ‘influence’ – that is, through direct involvement and as the objective of parental considerations. Some researchers state that their studies centre on the active perspective of the influence children have over family leisure choices (e.g. Belch et al. 1985), whereas some covers both active and passive dimensions (e.g. Szybillo and Sosanie 1977). Still, the majority tends to use a vague definition of the term. This issue was once pointed out by Mangleburg (1990), after reviewing all of the research on children’s influence on family purchases, conducted in the 1970s and 1980s. The use of blurred definitions is yet still evident among recent studies (Mintel 2004, Wang et al. 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005, Gram 2007, Thomson et al. 2007). For example, Thomson et al. (2007) gives no specification on the distinction between active and passive aspects of influential behaviour children have on research design, but their findings mainly present the active aspects of the behaviour. A vague definition would naturally result in ambiguous data, which is unreliable in analysis, and the knowledge produced equally unreliable. It is therefore important for future researchers to make their definitions of terms explicit before embarking on data collection and follow-up analysis.

Many families have more than one child. However, the approach to study families with multiple children is problematic, in term of their validity in reflecting the nature of family decisions. The majority of the previous questionnaire surveys applied a sum of multiple children’s impacts, so as to arrive at an aggregate measurement. Two major issues emerged in taking such an approach. The potential different levels of influence wielded by older and younger children have been lumped together (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985, Hall et al. 1995). However, this fails to distinguish the role that individual child members have played among families which have more than one child.

In brief, the knowledge demonstrated in decision literature has tended to reveal a de-contextualised snapshot and a detached picture of what happens in family decision-making behaviour. If the process involved in reaching final purchase
decisions is viewed as a journey, the focus of previous decision studies remains on the influential power the family members have over certain decisions areas (e.g. the decision outcomes, the decision-making stages, a number of sub-decision) and only certain members have been sampled, resulting in an incomplete picture of how the journey has been made. There are needs to investigate the whole process – that is, to study how the final decision are reached, with whose direct and indirect inputs, and to explore how family members interact with each other before the decisions are made. Chapter 4 presents a conceptual model, which aims to capture the nature of family purchases and to answer the central research question in this thesis.
Summary

This chapter briefs the individual logical-flow decision model and highlights its advantages in understanding the pre-purchase decision-making process. The model suggests, moreover, that there are 4 major stages involved in making an individual purchase choice. Previous decision studies have shown that making leisure choices tend to be joint decisions. Mathematical evidence repeatedly reveals that the influence of children is particularly salient in family leisure choices. Children have been reported exercising more influential power over the theoretical Need Arousal stage as well as over destination choices and activity selection. The influential dimensions children have had to cover not only include the active aspects through making purchase requests and purchase suggestions. Children's needs, preferences and their potential enjoyments, in an attraction, have been passively considered by their parents. A wide range of influential strategy children use to exercise active involvement in family purchase decisions has been presented. The findings on the influential strategy children engage in and the response strategy parents report offer a glimpse of family interactions within the decision-making process. Statistical evidence has also identified that children have influential power over family leisure choices when they grow older and have more product involvement and knowledge in the considered purchase categories.

The chapter points out that a number of methodological issues exist in previous decision research. Most profoundly, the ontological view of family purchase decision has been dominated by a competitive perspective. The investigation into family purchases has mainly used the individual decision-making model instead of the household model. Children are often viewed as an influential force against parents, a force that has been excluded in the family decision-making unit. Yet, most researchers have focused on the study of decision outcomes rather than on process. More attention has been paid to who is more dominant and more influential over the examined decision-making areas. Previous research also has some validity issues. For example, the findings are often generated from the respondents' general perceptions, rather than from recollection of a freshly-made decision. The examined product categories, in effect, vary in nature. The data heavily relies upon adults and adolescents' viewpoints, and a vague definition has been used to study the influence children have and what is likely to happen among those families with multiple children.
Chapter 4 Rethinking Family Decision Making

Introduction
This chapter presents a series of suggestions, given both by scholars and the author, for the inquiry into family purchase decisions. These suggestions highlight the nature of family purchase and intend to fulfill the knowledge gaps in previous literature (Section 4.1). The researcher, in this case, has taken these suggestions into account in order to justify her development of the conceptual model and her research foci. The theoretical models for household decision-making process and the concept of multiple decision roles have been reviewed (Section 4.2). Finally, a conceptual framework for family museum choices is offered, derived from the four extended concepts and models for family pre-purchase behaviour. The development of the conceptual model aims to explore the process involved in reaching family decisions to visit museums more, in detail, and to offer a more holistic understanding of family behaviour (Section 4.3).

4.1 Research suggestions

Previous research tended to take individual and competitive views to studying family leisure decisions and, as such, has focused on the snapshot process. Several suggestions have been made by scholars, after reviewing previous research into family pre-purchase behaviour (Park et al. 1991, Mangleburgh 1990, Commuri and Gentry 2000, Nanda et al. 2006, Hamilton and Catterall 2008). The following sections present those scholars’ suggestions with the researcher’s. They include considering a family as a whole, with the inclusion of children; re-thinking the role of children played in family decisions; exploring the cooperative process of the decision-making; acknowledging the nature of family consumption; exploring family interactions over the decision-making process; considering impulse choices; and studying the process of family consumption, as a whole.

4.1.1 Explore the cooperative and harmonic aspect

Is the process of making family leisure decisions as competitive as previous research suggests? Previous studies have been dominated by viewing family decision-making
as a competitive process (shown in Section 3.4.1). According to Fisher and Grégoire (2005),

‘cooperation exists when people work together to achieve a mutually satisfying outcome, while competition can be characterized as a zero sum game in which one person wins and the other loses. From this perspective, consumers in a decision-making dyad cooperate when they seek a mutually satisfactory purchase outcome that reflects the preferences of both parties, and they compete when they attempt to impose their preferences on each other (p.311)’

In a competitive concept, the interactive dynamics focus on ‘an influencing agent’ (e.g. a child) attempts to impose his/her preference on ‘an influence target’ (e.g. parents), who has more power to resist or reject the influence (John 1999, Fisher and Grégoire 2005). Commuri and Gentry (2000) argue that taking an individual perspective and treating the members of family consumers as competitive objects is the key barrier to understand family decision behaviour. Park et al. (1991) urges future research to explore the cooperative aspect of family purchase decisions. A number of recent research publications have offered evidence showing counter findings to the competition perspective.

The suggestion to consider the affective dimensions of family decision behaviour has been made after rethinking what kind of relationship a family is all about. Park et al. (1991) discusses the definitions and the functional values of a family and identifies the salient feature of affection embedded in family relationships. As they indicate, a family relationship is a permanent bond which members have a long-term commitment to each other and tie up with three affective components – ‘love, affection and intimacy’. Such a relationship also shares a care-taking function among the members. These affective characteristics distinguish families from other social relationships. Fisher and Grégoire (2005) believe that cooperative decisions take place, when group members are ‘positively interdependent’. Park et al. (1991) also assumes that relationship with high intimacy, like a family, might take a more cooperative manner to solve conflict when making purchase decisions. Conversely, relationships with low intimacy might take a more authoritative approach. Therefore, Park et al. (1991) suggests that future researchers should explore the dimensions of affection in order to facilitate our understanding about, and interpretation of, the interactions and dynamics of family decision-making processes.

Recent research, in fact, has offered solid evidence to support the cooperative dimension of family interactions when making family purchase decisions (Gram 2007,
Thomson et al. 2007, Hamilton and Catterall 2008). Firstly, parents reveal a positive and welcoming attitude toward their children’s active input in the selection of family holiday decisions through offering their knowledge and information (Thomson et al. 2007). Secondly, Gram (2007) discovers that even though parents name themselves as the key decision-makers, who often control decision outcomes when planning family holiday choices, passive considerations have been taken for their children (e.g. caring children’s voices and thinking what children may need and like). The passive consideration illustrates a cooperative and attentive manner parents have. Thirdly, Hamilton and Catterall’s findings (2008) show that the interactions between parents and children in the selection of other family-shared purchases (food shopping) are an act of conveying consumer knowledge to children, which parents employ, helping children to enhance their understanding both of product knowledge and the value of money, as well as to stress the importance of comparing alternatives. Therefore, there is a need to investigate the cooperative and attentive aspects, demonstrating parent-child interactions and parents’ attitudes toward the active and passive roles their children play in reaching the decisions to visit museums.

There is evidence suggesting that making family purchase decisions is more than a cooperative process, but, more importantly conflict avoidance and resolution. Firstly, Hamilton and Catterall (2008) present that there were indeed different preferences between parents and children, when choosing family-shared products; however, no serious conflict was provoked. According to parent-child interactions, ensuring cooperation and conflict avoidance are more notable themes than competition behaviour during decision-making. The conflict avoidance, Hamilton and Catterall (2008) reveal, might associate with the affection dimension, pointed out by Park et al. (1991). Secondly, Thomson et al. (2007) reveals that adolescents form coalitions with their siblings and parents, when deciding shared-purchase decisions such as family holidays. Forming coalition with siblings and parents is therefore reported as an effective strategy to reach a final decision; meanwhile, one avoids conflict among family members. Moreover, while those findings on the influential strategy children employ suggest a tactical approach to having an impact on purchase decisions (mentioned in Section 3.3.2), Thomson et al. (2007) indicates that the nature of coalition behaviour is such that children remain open and peaceful; moreover, its purpose is less explicit and less tactical. Therefore, there is a need to explore the harmonious and open dimensions involved in making choices of museum-visiting.
4.1.2 Consider a family as a whole and rethink the role children play

It is assumed that families normally act as a single decision-making unit, when making many leisure purchases (Morgan 1996); however, few researchers have considered examining family groups including children, as a whole. When a family with children considers doing shared activities (e.g. visiting a museum or going to cinema), there is more than one member, including children, participating in the consumption phase (the Phase II). Previous research (Thomson et al. 2007) already indicates that the level of influence children have would increase, when their product involvement is higher (e.g. leisure outings and vacation trips). Chapter 3 has argued that children have the greatest degree of influence over the ‘where to go’ and ‘what to do’ decisions. This finding is particularly significant. Museums are one of the choices among a wide range of available leisure activities. That is to say, how children perceive museum visits and their preferences for different leisure alternatives might affect their active input, in the selection of a ‘where to go’ decision. As an important member of shared activities, such as visiting a museum, the researcher presumed that children might express their preferences or convey their values and perceptions of a product/service to their parents, if they are involved in the decision-making process. Museum scholars (Sterry and Beaumont 2006) have also argued the need to investigate the implicit and explicit roles of family members, in decision-making. Therefore, there is a need, here, to consider a family unit as a whole, with the inclusion of children.

Scholars have suggested that more attention needs to be paid to how children exercise ‘influence’ over the family purchase decision-making process as well as the impact that the presence of children has on family leisure choices (Commuri and Gentry 2000, Nanda et al. 2006). As discussed in the Sections 3.4.1 and 4.1.1, children tend to be viewed as an influential agent or force against an influence target (e.g. parents), in the competitive perspective. However, when children are treated as an active participant, in family purchasing (Thomson et al. 2007), research has found a more peaceful and cooperative process in the parent-child interactions. Therefore, the researcher considers it essential to view children as a potential active participant and to explore the nature of their input over the decision in this thesis. The researcher argues that it is also important to consider every child within a family group as an important element of the decision-making unit, and to study their individual involvements therein. A series of questions need to be explored further, however. What kind of decision roles do children play in the family selection? How are they involved in the decision-making process, both actively and passively? How do they request to visit a museum or respond to the option to visit a museum, if that were
proposed by their parents? What are the conditions, when adult members consult children’s opinions? To what extent does the presence of children have an impact on the family leisure choices, from the adult members’ perspectives?

4.1.3 Focus on a product category

There is a need to investigate family leisure choices with a pure focus on examining a particular product category (e.g. museums) within the context of family days out and weekend trips. The members of a family group might vary their levels of involvement in family leisure decisions, depending on the nature of the proposed suggestions (e.g. visiting museum, sight-seeing and visiting theme parks). Nanda et al. (2006) urges the need to focus on a particular product category of the leisure and tourism marketplace, and to explore various decision-making roles may be played by each family member within a given context. The researcher assumes that such considerations and the evaluative criteria may change depending on the period of travelling time. For example, the aspects that need to be taken into account when making a family decision related to travel abroad would be different from making a selection for a day outing. The former includes more considerations, such as accommodation, use of travel agents, and channel of air ticket booking, need to be taken. The latter may cover issues such as the type of venues (indoors or outdoors) and activities. In addition, different sets of evaluative criteria might be applied, when choosing different product categories (e.g. museum-visiting, cinema-going or holiday activities choices). Therefore, there is a need to focus on a single product category.

4.1.4 Explore group interactions

Since multiple members are involved in the theoretical Purchase Phase, it is important to acknowledge the characteristics of group consumption and to study the interactions within the group. The majority of previous studies, both in museum and consumer decision literature, tend to sample only one or two members of a group of family consumers (mentioned in Sections 2.4.2 and 3.4.2). Museum researchers (Sterry and Beaumont 2006) specifically criticise that ‘family decision making is an interactive process and investigating only one respondent in a family ignores the dynamic nature of family influence within a single decision context (p.233)’. Thornton et al. (1997), a study on the activities’ selection among those tourist groups who travel together, is one of the few to acknowledge the nature of group consumption. First, the research recognises that the composition of a family traveller is conducted by individuals who have their own preferences. Second, it offers evidence that making holiday decisions
involves both constant and complex negotiations between individuals. Evidence of constant negotiations may be a distinct attribute associated with family travel over a period of time, which might not be applicable in this case. Nevertheless, Thornton et al.'s (1997) findings on the intense interactions among members, during the decision-making process, are applicable to the investigation into the family decisions—something necessary to experience shared activity such as visiting museums.

Researchers have indeed been strongly urged to study family interactions during the decision-making process, after reviewing decision-making and museum literature (Park et al. 1991, Nanda et al. 2006, Sterry and Beaumont 2006). Making family leisure choices clearly involves more than one member; therefore, it is more complex than individual choices, since more interactions, among family members, might be taken. However, very little research into family holiday decisions highlights the interactions between parents and children, when planning family holiday decisions and making on-vacation choices (Thornton et al. 1997, Dunne 1999). In brief, there is a need to view the process involved in making family purchase decisions, as a whole. It is important to explore how family members select purchase options and interact with each other, before one arrives at final decisions; therefore, aggregate knowledge produced can better address the whole decision-making context while also reflecting the entire marketplace with which consumers contend.

4.1.5 Explore impulse choices

Do family leisure and travel decisions always result from a careful planning behaviour? Compared with a bulk of research into the pre-planning behaviour mentioned in Chapter 3, the possibility of unplanned decisions has often been neglected. Only a few studies show that family travel decisions involve a certain degree of impulse and incidental behaviour (Rook and Gardner 1993, Nickerson and Jurowski 2001, Becken and Wilson 2006). One comes across impulse decisions made on sudden, but powerful, whims to visit the attractions (Rook and Fisher 1995). For example, Becken and Wilson (2006) reveal that a majority of holiday travellers have planned their routes and itineraries roughly in advance. However, their plans often change to due to adverse weather and new information received. The level of impulse choices thus increase when the travellers face an unknown environment (Rook and Gardner 1993).

The investigation into family leisure and holiday decision-making should not be constrained by pre-planning behaviour. Even though there is evidence of incidental
and impulsive visits to museums (Kelly et al. 2004) and to other destinations, the differentials in impulse decisions have rarely been highlighted. What kinds of incentives, therefore, trigger an impulse visit to museums? Is there any similarity or difference between planned and impulse decisions?

4.2 Applying family decision-making models

Based on the above suggestions, it is important to consider the application of a family decision-making model to study family behaviour and highlight the nature of group decisions. Currently, there is no specific model illustrating either family choices, on service product, or leisure/tourism products. A conceptual model has been developed for the investigation into the family planned decision-making process. The conceptual model is derived from four theoretical models. Model 1 suggests the stages involved in making a family purchase decisions (Sheth et al. 2004). Model 2 is the concept of multiple decision roles that would involve in family joint decision-making (Assael 2004). Model 3 illustrates the overall dynamics in family purchase decision making. Model 4 brings out more in-depth decision attributes, which have been widely explored in individual pre-purchase behaviour. Finally, the conceptual model includes the impulse aspect to reflect evidence of unplanned choices.

4.2.1 Reference model 1: the decision-making stages

Reference model 1 is proposed by Howard and Sheth (1969) (in Sheth et al. 2004), which aims to identify potential decision-making stages involved in making a family purchase decision. Based on similar concepts of the individual logical-flow model (Engel-Kollat-Blackwell 1968), the theoretical household model intends to capture the characteristics of the joint decisions and conceptualises the family purchase behaviour into a five-stage model, covering two purchase phases (Sheth et al. 2004). The five stages include the ‘Initiation of Purchase Decision’ (stage 1), the ‘Gathering and Sharing Information’ (stage 2), the ‘Evaluating and Deciding’ (stage 3), the ‘Shopping and Buying’ (stage 4) and the ‘Conflict Management’ (stage 5). The stages 1 to 3 of the household model are related to the pre-purchase decision. The left column of Table 4 refers to the five stages suggested by the theoretical household decision-making process, while the blue texts indicate their relationship within 3-phase consumer behaviour. The right column shows the relevance of the household model to the individual one. Diagram 5 illustrates, within the 3-phase consumer behaviour (Section A), the comparison between the flow of the individual decision-making model (Section B) and the flow of the household model (Section C).
Table 4  The relationship between the household decision model and the individual decision model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household decision-making model</th>
<th>Individual decision model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-purchase phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pre-purchase phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Initiation of Purchase Decision</td>
<td>Stage 1: Need Arousal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: Gathering and Sharing Information</td>
<td>Stage 2: Information Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3: Evaluating and Deciding</td>
<td>Stage 3: Alternative Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchase Phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purchase Phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4: Shopping and Buying (uncertain consumer phase)</td>
<td>Stage 5: Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5: Conflict Management</td>
<td>Stage 6: Post-Purchase Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 5  The comparisons between the theoretical household and individual decision models

The theoretical household decision-making model contains two features that differ from the individual one. First, the Gathering and Sharing Information (stage 2) suggests potential interactions at the Information Search (stage 2) of the individual model. Second, the Conflict Management (Stage 5) indicates conflicting opinions among members when the decision is made jointly. This household model assumes that each family member has well-developed perceptions, interests and opinions relating to specific products or brands. The disagreement among family members may
emerge due to different attitudes, preferences and perceptions about decision alternatives and dissimilar criteria used when evaluating these alternatives (Assael 2004, Sheth et al. 2004).

There are five issues associated with the theoretical household framework (Sheth et al. 2004). The first stage of the household model was termed the Initiation of the purchase decision, rather than the Need Arousal of the individual one. The researcher assumes that an emerged need or desire might not always lead to the following process and suggests a purchase decision should be made. Therefore, the term of the first stage will remain the same with the individual model in the conceptual framework. Secondly, the Alternative Evaluation and the Decision of the individual model (stages 3 and 4) are integrated into one: the Evaluating and Deciding in the family model (stage 3). However, those members involved in the evaluation stage may be different from decision-makers. A separation of these two stages would assist in the understanding of family interactions. Thirdly, the term ‘Conflict Management’ (stage 5) suggests serious arguments might occur among family members. However, as Hamilton and Catterall (2008) argue, research into family purchase decisions needs to be cautious when using the term ‘conflict’, as the concept of the conflict refers to serious disagreements among family members. There is a need to explore how a potential ‘conflict’ occurred and managed among the group members who have a family relationship, which involves the affective dimensions, before the final purchase choice has been made.

Fourth, the household model conceptualises children as an independent force influencing family purchase decision-making and their potential input has been excluded within the family decision-making stages. Much empirical evidence reveals that children not only play an important role in family consumption decision-making, but also have significant involvement over different decision-making stages, as discussed in Chapter 2. Finally, the impact of the Post-Purchase evaluation (the stage 5 of the individual model) is missing in the theoretical household model. As the individual model suggests that the satisfaction evaluation after the purchase would affect next pre-purchase decision-making. It would be useful to include the Post-Purchase evaluation and to study its impact. The adapted conceptual framework intends to address evaluation behaviour, potential conflict management, the role children play, in Pre-Purchase planning and the impact of Post-Purchase evaluation.
4.2.2 Reference model 2: the decision roles

A shared family consumption contains multiple members; accordingly, there is more than one decision role potentially involved when the purchase decision is decided jointly. Reference model 2 applied here, is the concept of multiple decision roles involved in family joint decisions. There are at least 6 definable decision roles, in accord with the stages of the decision process. They are 'initiators', 'information gatherers (or gatekeepers)', 'influencers', 'decider-makers', 'purchasers' and 'users' (Morgan 1996, Blackwell et al. 2006). The concept of the 'purchasers' (who acts as a purchasing agent, bringing the product into the home) is less important, in family leisure and holiday consumption, since, with a family with children wanting to consume a leisure service (e.g. museum-visiting), as a group, those payments related to purchases (e.g. admission fees, catering, souvenirs) are most likely to happen at the venue and are more likely to be parents or other adult members. On the other hand, the 'users' refer to people using the product and feedback on the purchase experiences. Regarding shared family leisure consumptions, all adult and child members, who participate in the consumptions, are users. Therefore, the role of the purchaser and the user, respectively, will not be highlighted in this research.

The rest of the four decision roles are important concerns when studying Pre-Purchase decisions. The definitions of each decision role are:

- The 'initiators' refer to the person who proposes or suggests potential purchase.
- The 'information gatherers' (or the 'gatekeepers') are the party(ies) with the greatest expertise in processing information and controlling the type of stimuli to which the family is exposed.
- The 'influencers' are the party(ies) which, consciously or unconsciously, set up certain criteria, in comparing the option, and affect other members' evaluation processes.
- The 'decision-makers' refer to the party(ies) who decide which option to purchase, and perhaps, because he/she has financial power, hold the power to choose how the family's money will be spent and on which products or services.


It is very common that one decision role can be undertaken by the same person, or different members play various roles. Moreover, one family member could perform multiple roles during the decision-making process. The holders of these different roles
might have different leisure needs and they might use different criteria to evaluate the available leisure choices. The final purchase choice may ultimately need to cater to the diverse requirements of various individual members and their respective roles.

The definitions of the ‘gatekeepers’ and the ‘decision-makers’ indicate the great degree of power to control these roles has over information collection and the approval of final decisions. Qualitative evidence indicates that parents act as the decision-makers, when planning family holidays. Parents report themselves to have the ‘decisive vote’, because they perceive themselves as having a better level of ‘decision knowledge’, in terms both of what is best for everyone and in terms of the value for their money (Gram 2007). On the other hand, Chapter 3 offers abundant evidence that children act as the influencers in family leisure decisions, both actively and passively. Even though parents name themselves as the key decision-makers, who often control the decision outcomes, their considerations for children can affect how they evaluate different options. It is worthy to investigate the extent to which the role of decision-makers goes beyond the power of financial authority, since some evidence has shown that children have involvement over the final purchase decision stage (e.g. Dunne 1999, Wang et al, 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005). The concept of decision roles is included in the conceptual model and would facilitate the investigation into active and passive roles of different members.

4.2.3 Reference model 3: the decision pattern

Model 3 illustrates the division of decision pattern into individual and joint decisions after the Need Arousal Stage (stage 1) (Assael (2004). Diagram 6 indicates the relationship between the 3-Phase consumer behaviour (Section A) and the model of household Pre-Purchase decision patterns (Section B). Within Section B of this diagram, Assael (2004) suggests family decisions can either lead to individual or joint decision-making processes. Next, the Role Specification among family members occurs if joint decision-making is involved. Potential conflict resolution, similar to conflict management of the household model (Sheth et al. 2004) among family members, is needed before purchase decisions are made. It is necessary for exploring whether there is such distinct division between individual or joint decision-making, involved in family leisure and holiday choices, and whether role specification is engaged in among family members.
4.2.4 Reference model 4: exploring decision attributes in a family context

Model 4 brings out several attributes of the key decision-making stages, that have been widely explored in individual purchase decisions, but which remain largely unknown in the context of family leisure decisions and in museums visits. Additional investigations into the attributes of the key decision-making stages would offer a more holistic picture of the family decision-making process, and thereby gain a more comprehensive understanding about the complexity of family leisure choices to visit museums.

(A) The type of needs

Researchers have revealed a series of needs associated with family leisure and museum choices, even though such needs for service product might be subtle and not easy to articulate, such as the needs for durable products or those which satisfy the psyche or stomach (e.g. new shampoo, books, movies or hunger). Sterry (2004) found out that the decisions to visit museums are often triggered by a simple question: 'Shall we go out today?' This echoes to the Need Arousal (Stage 1) of the decision-making model and indicates that the choices of museum-visiting might start from recognising the needs/ desires to have an outing. Decision literature offers a number of desires families want to pursue from a family shared consumption standpoint, such as holidays, which are referenced in the research.
To parents, a shared consumption, like a family holiday, is all about seeking quality family time, entertaining experiences and the enjoyment of children. These three fundamental desires echo back to the motivational themes being discussed in Section 2.1. Many parents state that having quality time together is the primary goal of family holidays (Mintel 2004c, Gram 2007). Family holidays are for relaxing and unwinding (Mintel 2004c); therefore, what parents want is a peaceful and stress-free time (Gram 2007). Most importantly, a family holiday is primarily for children, if families have them. Children are not, however, the only the primary focus when planning a family excursion (Dunne 1999, Mintel 2004c). Finding a place to please children and keeping them happy are also regarded as top priorities for parents (Thornton et al. 1997, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2004c, Gram 2007). The question that now needs to be explored, here, first, is to what extent the process involved in reaching a family decision to visit a museum, reflects a more than simple desire to have an outing in pursuit of relaxing and quality family time and the enjoyment of children.

(B) Search behaviour

The type and the source of information are two important features about information search behaviour. The former refers to scope of search which can be done from internal memories or external sources; that is, scanning product knowledge or past purchase experiences stored in memory or obtaining information from the market place or reference groups. The latter refers to the type of information used, such as that attained from personal sources, marketing or non-marketing sources (Assael 2004). The source of information has been touched on by a couple of museum studies (Falk and Dierking 1994, Dierking and Falk 1994, Sterry 2004) and decisions research publications (Dunne 1999, Thomson et al. 2007). Researchers have revealed that external information search from personal networks (e.g. friends and relatives) and their word-of-mouth recommendations have often been used as the primary source of information for museum visits (Falk and Dierking 1994, Dierking and Falk 1994, Sterry 2004, Dierking et al. 2005) as well as for planning family holidays (Mintel 2004c). Surprisingly, only a small number of family visitors were encouraged by the museum marketing information (e.g. publicity material) (Sterry 2004). Museum websites have rarely been used as a tool for external information search before visits (Sterry 2004). All of these findings of the information sources imply the dominance of external search family groups used.

Although previous researchers have reported the sources of information used by family groups, the information sources tend to be treated as an influential element
affecting the family choices, rather than investigation into how these sources are used in the pre-purchase decision context. Consumer literature suggests that when an internal search of the potential option is ineffective, it would lead to an additional information search, mainly from an external type, for the purpose of making a better purchase decision (Assael 2004, Blackwell et al. 2006). The conditions surrounding the information search has rarely been explored in previous research. Therefore, the type of information search and its sources, as well as the possibility of engaging additional information searches, are included in the conceptual model to help the understanding of the search behaviour that family groups used.

(C) Evaluation behaviour

The study of the Alternative Evaluation stage can be further explored by applying two key concepts derived from individual purchase research; that is, the selection of purchase options under consideration and the evaluative criteria being used facilitate the selection. Consumer literature distinguishes the purchase options into those consumers are aware of and those they are unaware of – namely, 'the awareness set' and 'the unawareness set'. Those purchase alternatives being recalled from the awareness set and being seriously considered, as potential purchase options, are called 'the consideration set' (proposed by Howard 1963, Howard and Sheth 1969). Some options consumers are aware of, but to which they remain indifferent, are called 'the inert set'. Those options consumers recognise, but reject in their considerations, are called 'the inept set' (proposed by Narayana and Markin 1975). Diagram 7 presents the relationship between these choice sets. The concept of choice sets can help the researcher to address the nature of the leisure market today's families face and reflect the processes involved in making purchase decisions from abundant options open to them.

The theory suggests that consumers hold a series of evaluative criteria to guide their selection from the above choice sets to the arrival of final purchase decisions. Previous research has offered a glance at the evaluative criteria reported by the parents and briefed the characteristics of attractions they normally avoid. These evaluative criteria are surrounded and broken into two categories – (1) practical concerns and (2) passive considerations for children. For example, price and accessibility factors have been reported as important concerns, for family visits to museums and for planning shared-purchase decisions (e.g. days out and holidays), such as affordability (Mintel 2004c), admission charges and discounts (Dunne 1999, Moussouri 2003, Kelly et al. 2004, Dierking et al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007),
as well as location (Dunne 1999, Moussouri 2003, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). Parents also report a number of child-centred criteria they have taken into account, including the interest of children (Mintel 2004c), the holding power of an attraction to keep a child happy (Mintel 2004d), safe places for children (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007) and catering service to cope with the demands of children (Hooper-Greenhill 1994). Some child-centred criteria are used to describe those attractions the parents want to avoid – the concept of the ‘inept set’. For example, parents tend to reject going to places where there is a lack of activities designed for children (Mintel 2004d) or doing something that children might not be interested in (Gram 2007). Seeking the best value deals and ensuring every member in the group, particularly the children, would be enjoying themselves during days out seems to be important evaluative criteria for adults’ judgements. However, previous studies of leisure criteria have rarely been examined in the context of the decision-making process. The investigation has rarely explored into the criteria children might have.

Diagram 7: The choice set of the individual decision-making process model

Early museum researchers argue that family visits to museums could be conditional choices, which mean they are specific decisions to go to a ‘particular’ museum at a ‘particular’ time (Leichter et al. 1989, p.16). Dierking and Falk (1994) report a disproportion of family visitors in different type of museums. According to their reports, family visitors including children make up 80% of the total visitors of science museums, but fewer families visit history museums. It is rare to see families with children in arts museums or galleries. Previous researchers tend to ask for reasons why visitors do not visit museums (Hood 1986, 1989, Lin 2006, Adams 2005). While Hood (1986, 1989) investigates the leisure criteria and values that family museum visitors and non-visitors have, revealing the importance of seeking entertaining experiences,
Adams (2005) assumes that non-participation behaviour is based on adults' judgements that museums are inappropriate for children. But little is known about why families avoid visiting certain museums.

Applying the concept of the consideration set and the inept/inert sets can help the researcher to explore several questions which have remained, as yet, largely unknown. The concept could be useful to study how museum products and other product options have emerged as a family's consideration set, and to probe into consumers' consideration at the Alternative Evaluation stage. It can, furthermore, facilitate the investigation into what sort of evaluative criteria are being employed by adults and children in judging which particular museums to visit or not. It might assist the researcher to explore the reasons behind the 'conditional' visits, at particular stage of family life cycle. The application of the choice sets can help one gain a better understanding of the evaluation behaviour.

### 4.3 The conceptual model and research foci

An adapted framework is developed after reviewing the ontological issues and the existing theoretical models for family purchase decisions. The conceptual model intends to capture both planned and impulse choices. Under the planned decision process, the model emerges with the advantages of both individual and household models, and covers a series of research foci: (1) the key decision-making stages that would be involved in family pre-purchase planning, (2) the decision attributes of each stage, (3) the likelihood of joint decisions, (4) the relevant decision roles, and (5) the potential active and passive involvement children exercise. After reviewing previous research and the existing theoretical decision-making models, a series of research foci have been established, in accordance with research questions.

#### 4.3.1 The conceptual framework

Diagram 8 illustrates the conceptual model of family leisure decisions developed by the researcher. Section A indicates the planned decisions, whereas Section B represents impulse choices. Section A1 shows the key stages that would be involved in a planned decision. The first stage is termed by the Need Arousal, rather than the Initiation of purchase suggestion, as the theoretical model (Sheth et al. 2004). The Evaluating and Deciding stage of the theoretical household model is divided into two, since the division would help the investigation into what considerations are taken in the evaluation stages and how a consensus is made, in the final decision stage. The
Diagram 8 The conceptual model developed by the researcher

(A) Planned decisions

(A1) Decision stages
- Stage 1: Need Arousal (initiators)
- Stage 2: Information Search & Share (information gatherers)
- Stage 3: Alternative Evaluation (influencers)
- Stage 4: Purchase Decision (decision-makers)

(A2) Decision dynamic
- Individual decision-making
- Joint decision-making
- Stage XI: Role Specification
- Stage XII: Conflict Resolution

(A3) Decision attributes
- Type of needs
  - Type of search (internal or external)
  - Source of Information
- All potential alternatives
- Unawareness set
- Awareness set
- Inept set
- Inert set
- Consideration set

(B) Impulse decisions

(C) Input from children (active and passive aspects)
The research questions and the research foci are:

**Research questions:**
Q1: How do families with children make the decisions to visit museums?
Q2: What role do children play in family decisions to visit museums?

**Research foci:**

### Overall decision type

- How have decisions been made? Are they planned or impulse choices? Are they made jointly or individually?
- What stages are involved in the decision process, and by whose active and passive involvements?

### Key decision attributes and decision roles

- (Stage 1) To explore the type of needs and any master desires revealed by adults and children.
- (Stage 2) To explore the information search behaviour: internal search or external search, and the source of information.
- (Stage 3) What is included in the consideration set? What are: the size of the 'consideration set', the possible 'inept set' and the evaluative criteria used by adults and children?
- Who act as the initiators, the information gatherers, the influencers and the decision-makers?

### The adult-children interaction and the role children play:

- How do adult and child members interact with each other?
- How do children participate in the decision process?
- What sort of active and passive inputs each child within a family have?
- Why adults engage in passive consideration for children?
Summary

This chapter offers several suggestions about what needs to be explored in family pre-purchase decision behaviour. They include considering a family, as a whole, with the inclusion of children, and exploring a cooperative view of the decision-making process. The researcher, in this case, suggests this study of the purchase decision-making process needs to include a view of the process that involves making family decision as a whole. It is important to explore how family members select purchase options and interact with each other before the arrival of the final purchase decisions. Therefore, the knowledge produced can not only address the decision-making context, but also reflect the market that consumers face. Impulse choices need to be explored, as they have been neglected, both in the decision research and museum studies.

The development of a more suitable conceptual framework to study family pre-purchase behaviour has been discussed. The conceptual model is derived from four theoretical models that feature family decision-making and aims to offer a more in-depth investigation of the family pre-purchase behaviour. A series of research foci are offered, covering both planned and impulse choices regarding family leisure and tourism. In addition, potential active and passive impact from children over the decisions is considered. Planned decisions contain a wide range of foci, including key decision-making stages that would be involved as well as the relevant decision roles, the decision attributes of each stage and the likelihood of a joint decision.
Part III: Methodology

The two methodology chapters here show how the researcher critically selected a most appropriate research paradigm and methods, and developed a suitable way to analyse the data, in order to answer her research questions and interests. Accordingly, the two chapters are divided into two sub-sections. Chapter 5 contains the choice of research paradigms (Section I) and the choices of data collection methods and sampling strategies (Section II). Chapter 6 presents the data obtained from field work (Section III) and the implementation of data analysis (Section IV).
Introduction

Just as life is a journey full of a series of choices, so is doing research. This research examines how families make leisure choices. This chapter shows the rationale in how the researcher makes the most appropriate choice amongst a diversity of research paradigms and methods in order to address both her research interests and foci. Judgements over a suitable research paradigm are thus based on a researcher’s foci and interests in the studied phenomenon (Creswell 1998, Daly 2007). The chapter begins with a discussion on the nature of the research questions and the researchers’ interests. Next, it illustrates justifications among four major research paradigms, including positivism, post-positivism, critical theory and interpretivism, and explains why the researcher decided to take an interpretivist paradigm (Sections 5.1). Further considerations are shown, among the employment of potential qualitative inquiries, including event structure analysis, biography, ethnography, phenomenology and hermeneutics, interpretative phenomenological analysis (Section 5.2), and the choices of two data collection methods (Section 5.3). Finally, it discusses the quality criteria for conventional positivism and introduces a different set of criteria for assessing interpretivist research that aims to achieve trustworthiness (Section 5.4).

5.1 Choices of research paradigms

There is a possibility that, even if two research projects study the same social phenomenon, the knowledge they produce would end up with a dissimilar picture. The reason for such possibility is due to their differing perspectives embedded in the chosen research paradigms. In brief, the term ‘paradigms’ refers to ‘a set of (shared) belief’ (Daly 2007) and ‘models of thinking’ (Godfrey-Smith 2003). Paradigms indicate a package of world-views, methods of scientific inquiry and evaluation criteria that are shared by the scientific or any other scholarly community (Godfrey-Smith 2003). The researcher believes that no research paradigm is superior to another; rather that each has major philosophical concerns and emphases - the ontology, the epistemology and the methodology - differing from each other. These different beliefs and concerns lead a researcher to a different view of landscape in which the particular phenomenon is to be studied. As Daly (2007) indicates, ‘paradigms serve as a means to understand different types of scientific activity and belief (p. 26)’. 77
There are two major philological traditions — realism and relativism (also called post-modernism) and four major research paradigms in social science inquiry — positivism, post-positivism, critical theory and interpretivism (Guba and Lincoln 2005). Realism perceives the social world as existing independently from the purely subjective and is organised in definite patterns. Relativism is an inter-subjective standpoint that challenges such authority and absolute certainty, emphasising the diversity of any objective reality (Guba and Lincoln 1994, Daly 2007). According to Guba and Lincoln (2005), positivism suggests a naïve realism and ontological view, whereas post-positivism operates from a critical realism stance. The ontology of critical theory is historical realism and perceives that reality is shaped by different social values. The ontological standpoint of interpretivism entails the relativism tradition and upholds and supports socially co-constructed realities.

The justification for such research paradigms and approaches is therefore the most appropriate, according to the design of a research project, which shall be based on a researcher’s primary focus within the given research topic (Creswell 1998, Daly 2007). More specifically, the choice among various paradigms should depend on the nature of the inquiry, the research purposes and questions as well as the available resources (Silverman 2005:14). The following sections start with a discussion on the nature of research questions, themselves, and the specific research interests of this study. Next, it presents the dominant positivist paradigm, amongst previous decisions literature and museum studies, to demonstrate various philosophical views of positivism, which are yet similar to positivism but more critical. Next, it discusses another philosophical school, post-modernism, and briefs the acceptance of post-modernist ontology embedded in the other two paradigms. Subsequently, justifications are shown for why the interpretivist paradigm, or the ‘paradigm of interpretivism’, was chosen among other alternative paradigms, including post-positivism, a critical paradigm, and post-modernism. Next, it addresses the application of a number of potential inquiries within the chosen paradigm.

5.1.1 Nature of research questions
Before choosing a suitable alternative paradigm, it is important to clarify the specific nature of research questions and the researchers’ interests, in the studied phenomenon. Research into family decision-making process, for instance, has four aspects: (1) family relationships, (2) the character of the leisure market, (3) making a
purchase decision for a group, and (4) the family decision-making unit, as the colour circles show in Diagram 8. Considerations into the attributes of these four aspects can assist both the researchers' judgments and paradigm selection.

Diagram 9 Nature of research questions

Families are more than intimate social groups. When studying family issues, the researcher acknowledges that it is important to consider the collective and intimate characteristics, as well as its shared meaning structure that distinguishes families from other social groups. These include committed relationships and intense involvements among members, a private and intimate domain, a shared sense of personal history, and a collection of individual interest and experiences (Gilgun 1992, Daly 1992). Additionally, 'family members participate in and [continuously] reconstruct a meaning system that is part of their collective identity as a family... It involves participation in collective activities that produce shared meanings and a collective bank of memories' (Daly 2007:72). These attributes, embedded in family relationships, not only indicate intensive and constant interactions among members, within a family system, but also the commitment family members have and the collective construction of shared meanings that would impact individuals' thinking and actions, as well as how they interact with each other.

Making a family outing choice from abundant choices involves subjective evaluations between different alternatives. The nature of the external market, in which family consumers live, is constructed by numerous competing options. Each product and service endeavours to capture the attention of consumers, in order to be the consumers' final purchase choices. If a family intends to have an outdoor activity together, at least one purchase option or more would be proposed. Nevertheless, as
the theoretical decision-making model suggests, not every purchase suggestion could successfully turn into the final purchase decision. Some options would gain support from individual or multiple members and retain the possibility of being considered as the final purchase decisions, whereas some options would be abandoned. Accordingly, making a purchase selection involves a considerable degree of subjective judgements by those involved in decision-making, and these judgments are influenced by the members’ beliefs, perceptions and values toward purchase suggestions.

The types of families this research studies are not only formed by multiple members; they are, most importantly, those which include children in the family, wherein out-of-house consumption is a simple fact. Previous family decision-making research has tended to view a family as a group that is composed of individuals, rather than ‘a sum of more than two individuals’, as Commuri and Gentry (2000) referred to them. A key challenge faced by any family studies is the consideration of the ‘unit’ of analysis, Daly (2007) states. Commuri and Gentry (2000) further urge that family decision-making research should consider a family including children as a unit of analysis. Daly (2007) advises that family studies need to consider how all family members are involved in the creation of the collective meaning and to perceive children ‘as active agents in the construction of family worlds’ rather than ‘as passive receptacles of socialisation efforts by parents and other adults’ (p.73). The researcher considers that such a perspective shall be expanded, from data analysis, to the whole research design and approach. Therefore, this research views a family group with children as a research unit. There is a need to explore the active roles children play in family outing decisions, in terms of forming the research questions, collecting and analysing the data.

Previous decision studies suggest that family leisure choices tend to be joint decisions. The joint decisions imply that a certain degree of consensus might need to be achieved, when a family intends to have a shared form of out-of-house leisure consumption or leisure activities together (e.g. visiting a museum). Families are intimate social groups, and making a family leisure choice that ultimately satisfies the need of the group members would involve a certain extent of discussion among family members, before the final decision is made. Moreover, the researcher assumes that, while choosing a family outdoor entertainment, everyone, even a toddler, can be an expert in proposing places where he or she considers a good choice for the family to go. How does a family form their selections, if any members within the family unit think
differently about what a 'good' choice is, based on their subjective judgements? Daly (2007) points out that it is important to study the dynamic relationship between family members and the people outside of families. More significantly, he urges researchers to highlight 'the direction of influence', in which an individual exercises authority or power over another, since it will help the understanding of how meanings are shaped in family relationships.

This research aims to unfold an in-depth and holistic picture of how a museum has been chosen as the final purchase decision and how family members reach a consensus. It focuses on a single decision-making episode; that is, the process involved in making a family leisure decision to visit a museum. If the decision-making process is conceptualised as a series of continuous 'motion pictures', over a particular time, it shall be composed of a series of scenarios, which are shaped by the actions and subjective judgements of those family members involved in the process. Therefore, the researcher needs to select an appropriate paradigm, which can facilitate her inquiry into the evolution process of the decision-making and can assist with the investigation into the subjective judgements of group members as well as study family interactions in the decision process.

5.1.2 Positivism

The ontological views of the positivism paradigm lead its epistemology and methodology toward a degree of control and certainty in being objective (Daly 2007). Positivism assumes that both nature and social reality are outside the inquirers' mind and implies a world organised in patterns that can be measured and predicted. Therefore, the human world could be explained by certain fixed laws and causal relationships, as in the natural world (Gephart 1999, Ritchie and Lewis 2003, Saunders et al. 2003). The purpose of scientific inquiry is to achieve accuracy in the explanation of reality. Accordingly, its epistemological standpoints emphasise being objective as well as the separation between researchers' perceptions and their respective realities. It aims to minimise the impact of biases a researcher might have on the outcome of the knowledge produced. The methodological guideline suggests that valid knowledge can be produced, through reducing the social phenomena into observable and measurable elements, and refined through testing theories repeatedly. Therefore, positivism tends to employ quantitative data collection methods with mathematical and statistical analysis in order to identify causal relationships. The use of quantifiable observations and the accumulated knowledge enables researchers to
explain key factors affecting human behaviour and to generalise the measurement, in
order to assist further theory-verifying, and ultimately reach a precise prediction

Like most management disciplines, between the 1970s and the early 1990s, previous
consumer research into family decision-making behaviour was dominated by the
viewpoints of the positivist paradigm and the use of quantitative methods (mainly by
questionnaire surveys). Most researchers have used questionnaire surveys to study
decision dynamics and the influence of parents and children on family leisure
consumer decisions (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Jenkins 1979, Belch et al. 1985,
2003, 2004b). A similar phenomenon is evident among previous museum research
into what happens before family visits. Previous museum studies are also investigated
by quantitative questionnaire surveys (Falk & Dierking 1992, McManus 1994, Baillie
surveys have the distinct advantages of reducing time and cost, and of reaching a
large sample size. There are several contributions made by previous positivist
research into family leisure and holiday decisions. First, they identify the likelihood of
joint decisions involved in making leisure and holiday choices and the relative
influence both parents and children have over different stages of the decision-making
process. Second, mathematical evidence reveals that the influence of children, over
leisure and holiday choices, is particularly salient, when compared with a range of
other family purchase decisions. Third, the statistical evidence suggests a series of
variables affect family purchase choices (such as gender, social class, economic and
ethnical background etc) and the level of influence children have over family leisure
choices (such as product involvement, the age of a child, and family characteristics).
On the other hand, museum studies have also found a number of motivations behind
why families visit museums, and these suggest very likely a major role played by
children.

The dominant positivist approach throws up several issues offering some
understanding of family behaviour. While reviewing previous consumer behaviour
research, Hirschman (1993) criticises that consumers are often treated as 'cold and
inhuman' computer-like information processors in previous positivist research' (p.15).
This has led to the investigation that mainly focuses on the relative input of family
members over the outcome of the decisions, the key decision-making stage, and a
series of sub-decisions, rather than on the process. The use of a theory-testing
approach has also constrained the design of the questionnaire survey. The investigation into the family decision-making process has been governed by explicitly stated hypotheses and repeatedly testing the existing model. However, there is much room for doubt whether making family choices is actually proceeded by the theoretical model suggested.

Positivist researchers have attempted to adapt an objective and unbiased role, in their scientific inquiries. However, the selection of what needs to be measured and the formation of examined factors contain the values and interests of a researcher which produce potential research biases (Collis and Hussey 2003). For example, the investigation into what happens before a family makes a visit has been limited to within a series of motivational factors set up by the museum researchers. Commuri and Gentry (2000) also argue that the research participants, who actually experience the family decision-making process, might hold a different interpretation of those theoretical-composed questions (e.g. the relative influence of family members) from what is normally defined as the research. Such a research approach might significantly lead to the danger of prescriptive knowledge.

Some major limitations, embedded in the data collection of a positivist paradigm, include the difficulties in coping with the nature of a family group and in unpacking the complexity of consumer choices. Firstly, the participants' recollection of the studied topic tends to focus on their general perceptions in questionnaire surveys. Secondly, a family group is formed by multiple members including children. The use of questionnaire survey is difficult to generate children's answers, especially young children due to their cognitive and reading abilities. Thirdly, the data can only be generated by individual family members and then presented as the findings by the entire family. Therefore, the picture of making family leisure decisions as well as choices in museum-visiting tend to be fragmented and limited to the illustration of causal relationships among different variables.

If the goal of a positivist paradigm is to achieve accuracy in the study of certain phenomena, contraction is made in the knowledge produced by quantifying human behaviour. Hirschman (1993) criticises the previous positivist approach as ‘a drive towards quantification de-contextualises entities and constructs artificial linkages between them on the basis of ‘worth’ or ‘utility’ (p.15). Wagner (1997) reinforces the argument by highlighting the artificiality of the laboratory environment, in positivist research, which requires the researcher to isolate and reduce behaviours into ‘units of
research', in order to make them quantifiable and controllable. Consequently, the knowledge produced by previous research tends to reveal a de-contextualised snapshot and a detached picture from what actually happens in family decision-making behaviour.

5.1.3 Post-positivism

Post-positivism can be described as a modified version of positivism. Post-positivism holds the same ontological view as positivism, which suggests both that social reality is beyond inquirers’ minds and is measurable. This research paradigm also takes an objective standpoint. But little attention has been paid to the search for an accurate and conclusive reality, through the process of theory-testing – an accumulation of confirmations (Godfrey-Smith 2003). By contrast, post-positivism admits ‘the process of falsification’, introduced by Sir Karl Raimund Popper (1902-1994). Popper argues that observations and experiments always involve existing expectations. The formation of universal statements and their inference are only based on the idea of probability without proper justification (Delanty and Strydome 2003, Godfrey-Smith 2003). Therefore, scientific theory and hypotheses must be rigorously tested and refuted by a set of logical observations. A highly ‘falsifiable’ theory is the better. Ultimately, the theories that survive severe falsification could be concluded as corroborated and can be tentatively accepted as reliable theory (Delanty and Strydome 2003, Godfrey-Smith 2003).

The absolute certainty held by positivism is substituted by falsifiable knowledge in post-positivism. Post-positivism also acknowledges researchers’ values and the theoretical conception that has an impact on how such reality is explained. The primary concern of post-positivism is with testing the relationship among different variables and to create causal explanations of the social reality. That is to say, if this research were to take a post-positivism paradigm, the inquiry process would be more about exploring the causal relationship of family characteristics and the relative influence of both adults and children. In such cases, not only is one unable to expand the limitations of previous studies, but neither research foci on family interactions nor on the decision-making process would be achieved.

Post-modernism challenges the authority and the absolute certainty that adheres to positivism. Post-modernism embraces diverse interests and standpoints on any single issue. It accepts the possibility of competing and changeable social knowledge (Daly
Therefore, the purpose of scientific inquiry is to understand the diverse perspectives embedded in social reality and focuses on how these different perspectives are formed and social meanings are produced. Language and text serve as windows through which to examine ‘how individuals construe their reality’ rather than ‘what the reality is’ (Daly 2007: 39). Post-modernism acknowledges the involvement of participants and researcher, alike, in the scientific inquiry, but questions the authority a researcher has over the creation of the knowledge. Hence, it emphasises the transparency and reflexivity of certain values.

Previous positivist research placed emphases on taking objective standpoints and used a series of factors and snapshot findings to explain the complexity of family leisure decision-making behaviour. What seems lacking, however, is a more holistic picture of how family members, both adults and children, think and interact across the decision-making process, and how they reach a consensus. Two alternative research paradigms hold a very different philosophical viewpoint, from positivism and post-positivism, about how the human sphere is constructed and how scientific knowledge shall be inquired. They are critical paradigm and interpretivism.

5.1.4 Critical paradigm

The world-view of a critical paradigm is very different from positivism and post-positivism, in that it perceives the social world as formed by unequal power relations and competing interests. Since its ontological view regards the social world as both conflict and injustice, scientific inquiry serves as a mean to reform the conceptual social inequality into a more equitable status (Daly 2007). Accordingly, its epistemological interests tend to focus on the elements of power structure (e.g. race, class and gender) and critically review how inequality has formed over time. Methodologically, the role of the researcher is to act as a representative of the oppressed group and works with the participants, in order to find a possible solution to change its existing social status (Daly 2007).

In taking a critical paradigm, first of all, the researcher needs to regard family members as individuals with competing interests. Potential injustice might exist among inferior members, such as children, who have less financial power and social authority than adults, who are entitled by culture. The research foci would then switch to the dynamics of power, in family relationships, and study the conditions associated with power relations (such as income, family roles, or social class factors). Ultimately,
the research would create a strategy for children or women to have more influential power over family leisure decisions. It is even possible to use a critical paradigm to study family leisure decisions; however, the research interests discussed earlier have to result in a profound degree of change.

5.1.5 The chosen paradigm - Interpretivism

Interpretivism upholds that reality is socially constructed and human behaviour and action are deeply generated from the human mind (Creswell 1998, Silverman 2005, Denzin and Lincoln 2005). The beliefs of interpretivism stress the importance of social aspects of the constructed reality and assume that the meanings of the social world are established through the process of interactions (Daly 2007). Accordingly, the subjective meaning-making process, in scientific inquiry, is an interactive and co-constructed process between researchers and participants (Denzin and Lincoln 2005, Daly 2007). It acknowledges the influence both of the participants and the researcher over the creation and the interpretation of social reality. The goal of interpretivism is to understand how people experience particular phenomenon and how they make sense their own experiences of reality, specifically, at the period of inquiry (Daly 2007).

The way the interpretivists view human behaviour is close to the researcher's views about family relationships and the complex leisure market family that consumers face. The researcher recognises that making a purchase decision involves subjective judgments influenced by interactions with other members, both within and outside family system. Consumers tend to be treated as computer-like information processors in previous positivist research (Hirschman 1993). Positivist researches have seldom captured the social actors' perspectives (Denzin and Lincoln 2000) as well as revealed the complex nature of human behaviour or social phenomena, such as purchase decision-making processes. Comparatively speaking, the ontological assumptions of interpretivism provide a better reflection on the nature of socially constructed reality faced by family consumers, and reveals the linkage between human mindset and their behaviour. The goal of the interpretivism paradigm is compatible with the main focus of this research, which is to understand participants' interpretation about a specific aspect of their family lives, that is, the experience of making outing decisions to visit museums.

Interpretivism has two major epistemological concerns. One is its endeavour to
minimise the distance between participants and researcher; the other is the search for patterns of meanings that contribute to an understanding of the research phenomenon (Daly 2007). As Commuri and Gentry (2000) urge, research-imposed definitions of the decision making process (e.g. the relative influence, the decisions made on the ‘convenience’ basis) need to be avoided, in data collection, since the terms used by the researcher might be different from how consumers interpret these concepts, in reality. This epistemological attempt of interpretivism allows the researcher to explore family interactions through directly consulting participants’ definitions about their experiences of how they reached the final purchase decisions and by way of who is involved in the process. It can also minimise the distance between theory and reality and represent the meaning embedded in decision-making processes through inquiry.

Interpretivism stresses that the role of researcher is important in the inquiry process, since it recognises that the reality is subject to the interpretation of the participants, while the co-construction process involves both participants and researchers (Daly 2007). Another epistemological concern of interpretivism is taking the role of inquirers as an ‘analytic actor’ wanting to understand the ‘true’ social actors, one who experiences the studied phenomena (Gummensson 2000). The intention of interpretivists could be stated as an analytic actor, who attempts to re-construct what the social actors have experienced in reality, through data collection and analysis, and who aims to re-present the social actors’ experiences in data presentation. Different from how positivists have taken the inquirers’ role as an external spectator, the interpretivists’ stance enables the researcher to approach the mindset of family consumers and, accordingly, to produce a better understanding of the decision-making behaviour from an insider’s perspectives. Through the interaction with that research, the interpretivist paradigm acknowledges the involvement of researchers in the inquiry progress. The epistemological concerns of interpretivism allow the researcher to broaden the existing theory and to demonstrate multiple perspectives, including both the participants and the researcher.

The main methodological concerns of interpretivism are ‘context-bound’ and aim to search the meaning of human behaviour. While positivism and post-positivism favour the use of a quantitative approach, interpretativist researchers prefer taking qualitative methods to study human behaviour. A qualitative approach is orientated toward exploration and discovery rather than testing (Collis and Hussey 2003, Gummensson 2000, Silverman 2005). Such methodological emphases enable the researcher to be
placed in a better position to understand the context of the decision-making process. It also facilitates the investigation into the meanings of family decisions to visit museums, such as what kind of leisure experiences family visitors seek and how they perceive museum products and other leisure choices, when making their family leisure decisions.

There are gaps in understanding the evolution of making family leisure decisions regarding the thinking of the family consumers and their interactions among family and non-family members, in previous positivist research. The research question and the foci of this research are thus more compatible with the philosophical assumptions of interpretivist paradigm. Interpretivism has the advantages of generating rich insights into the uniqueness and complexity of human behaviour (Ritchie and Lewis 2003, Saunders et al. 2003). This paradigm enables the researcher to explore the mindset of family consumers and to reveal the process involved, in making family decisions to visit museums, in its context. It could also help the researcher to explore the meanings and the diverse behaviour related to making such family choices.

5.2 Potential routes of research inquiry

Taking a qualitative approach to study family behaviour has a series of advantages. According to Daly's (2007) years of research experiences, a qualitative approach can assist the understanding of 'what do families do' from the perspective of family members, how meaning is embedded in a family's world and facilitate the study of 'interaction, dynamics, negotiations, (...) and the meanings of spatial and temporal contexts' (p.71). As previous family decision studies manifest, those works which involved qualitative data offered better evidences of family interactions occurring before and during family holiday travel (Thornton et al. 1997, Dunne 1999, Thomson et al. 2007). Daly (2007) further specifies that qualitative approaches not only allow research participants to adjust their levels of comfort to disclose their experiences to non-family members, and to speak such experiences in their own language in the data collection, but they are also capable of accommodating multiple perspectives in data analysis and presentations.

There are a whole range of qualitative research approaches (or the traditions of qualitative inquiries as Creswell (1998) refers) sharing similar ontological assumptions within the interpretivist paradigm that the reality of a situation is social constructed. Several approaches aim to understand human behaviour through social actors'
perspectives that can be employed as a potential route of investigating family decision-making behaviour related to museum participation, such as: event structure analysis, biography, ethnography, phenomenology, hermeneutics and interpretative phenomenological analysis. These approaches, although having some shared features, place slightly different emphases on each of their inquiry processes, such as identifying rules of the chronological structure (event structure analysis), seeking individual portraits (biography and ethnography), seeking meanings (phenomenology and hermeneutics) and understanding insiders' experiences (interpretative phenomenological analysis). The researcher argues that it is possible to take any of these approaches as a route of inquiry through the research questions. However, each approach might lead me, as a researcher, toward a different journey of inquiry and discover a dissimilar landscape of the reality. The following discussions focus on the application of these qualitative approaches in this thesis. Some approaches could only partially achieve the discovery tasks, whereas some of those involved technical difficulties in accessing the research participants. Finally, an approach that can, comparatively, maximise the exploration of the research questions has been chosen for this qualitative research.

5.2.1 Identifying rules of the chronological structure: event structure analysis

This research aims to discover how a family makes a choice to visit a museum. In addition, the temporal structure of the decision-making process is an important feature that needs to be understood. According to Tesch (1990), event structural analysis has three major methodological philosophical concerns: finding out the chronological order of events, identifying the linkages between/among the elements and drawing key rules that govern the actions. This approach also sketches the temporal structure embedded in the cultural dimension of the events. Since the core research question is regarding family decision-making behaviour, taking an event structure analysis approach has the major advantages of exploring the chronological order of the family decision-making process and identifying linkages among the elements of actions and interactions between family members. Any potential decision rules, such as source of information searches, as well as the key evaluative criteria and the strategy used to reach a consensus to guide the family members' action and their interactions across the decision process could also be investigated by taking an event structure analysis approach.
However, some weaknesses could be encountered in data collection and analysis, if the researcher were solely to employ the event structure analysis approach. First, one could hardly understand the thinking behind family selection of particular museum products; for example, how adults and children perceive the choice of museum-visiting, compared with other leisure choices, and what kind of belief, values or evaluation of past experiences they have that support or abandon a museum option. Secondly, the interactions among family members during the process involved in making family leisure decisions would not be emphasised. These psychological and interactive aspects are keys to the pre-purchasing behaviour of this consumer group and should not be neglected in data collection and analysis.

Despite all these considerations, the researcher judges that the technique of event structure analysis could be employed during data analysis. Since this analytic method acknowledges the distinct characteristic of temporal influence over a series of events, that is, certain points of an event create some conditions for the occurrence or possibilities of next events (Tesch 1990). The merit of this method has been adapted in designing the analytic procedure, in order to address the important sequential nature of making family leisure decisions to visit museums and to acknowledge the temporal structure of different leisure decision processes.

5.2.2 Individual portrait: biography and ethnography

According to Creswell (1998), the central focus of biography and ethnography is to provide a detailed description of an individual and a cultural group, respectively. A biographical approach studies a single individual and his/her life events, which situate this individual within his/her personal history. If taken from a biographical approach, this research could potentially examine adult and child participants within a single family group visitor. It could help the researcher to understand how this group makes its leisure consumption choices, and how adults and children reflect their museum experiences and examine their recollection of past leisure decision-making. However, taking a biographical approach would shift the research focus to the life of this particular group consumer purely on the biographical context of making leisure choices, rather than distinguishing the phenomenon behind family choices of museum-visiting.

Ethnography seeks to produce a holistic description and interpretation of a cultural/social group or system, and focuses on the meanings of behaviour, language and social interactions (Creswell 1998). The major concern for ethnographical research,
is that the researchers fully observe the everyday life of the group being studied in its naturalist setting over a long period of time (Collis and Hussey 2003, Creswell 1998). An ethnographical approach requires considerable time for gathering multiple data sources, such as participant observations, interviewing and other relevant materials. Similar to the biographical approach, taking ethnography as the route of inquiry would involve a different ontological assumption.

Ethnography would be more suitable for those researchers who treat family consumers with children as a particular social group, and who intend to study their everyday behaviour in terms of making any type of family buying choices. However, family participation in museum-visiting is not a daily behaviour. If the researcher were to take an ethnographical approach, the timing of the family decision to visit museums would be hardly distinguished during data collection. On the other hand, ethnography would also be suitable for those researchers who perceive museums, as part of a particular cultural system, within the leisure market, and those who treat museum visitors as constituents of a special cultural group going to this particular environment. Yet, a diverse motivation has been identified regarding families visits to museums. An ethnographical approach might be more suitable to study frequent family visitors to museums and to examine their whole purchase behaviour related to the museum environment (e.g. from making pre-purchasing decisions to visit museums, their visiting experiences, to their evaluation of post-purchase experiences). Taking an ethnographical approach for this research indeed has difficulties involved in data collections and only partial research questions would be answered.

5.2.3 Seeking meanings: phenomenology and hermeneutics

Both phenomenology and hermeneutics attempt to understand social phenomena and to seek the meanings encompassed in the phenomena from social actor’s own perspectives. Family decisions to visit museums are treated as a social phenomenon, if the researcher has taken a phenomenological or a hermeneutics view. But, the epistemological and methodological concerns of these two approaches are different. According to Creswell (1998) and Gummesson (2000), the central purpose of phenomenology is to understand how and what people perceive a concept or a phenomenon, and to comprehend the meanings of the experiences several individuals encountered about the phenomenon. Hermeneutics attempts to go beyond the observed experiences and seeks to explain the experience social actors describe. The focus of hermeneutic route is to search any relevant biographical and social
context surrounding a social phenomenon.

Phenomenology assumes that human experiences make sense to those who live them and can be consciously expressed (Creswell 1998), and regards the “individual [as] a conscious agent whose experience must be studied from the ‘first person’s’ perspective” (Smith 2004: 13). This approach focuses on a deep and practical understanding of the meanings and actions of social actors through immersion into the original data, with no intention to uncover the lawful relationship as positivists aim to do (Miles and Huberman 1994). The phenomenological approach instead allows researchers to gain an access into the insiders’ standpoint of how they make leisure choices and to search for themes, as Tesch (1990) claims, which offer a pathway to penetrating the meanings of phenomena being studied.

Phenomenology emphasises the psychological thinking and the emotional feelings of social actors and seeks to comprehend the essential structure that typifies the experiences all participants hold (Creswell 1998, Gummesson 2000). This research aims to study how family members, both adults and children, think and interact before the decisions to visit museums are made. The phenomenological approach provides a most straightforward stance for understanding the family purchase decision-making process (the studied phenomenon) from the perspectives of the family consumers (the individuals who experience the studied phenomenon).

Hermeneutics intends to interpret the biographical and social dimensions of the phenomenon described by social actors (Creswell 1998, Gummesson 2000). As mentioned earlier in Section 5.1.1, studying family leisure choices needs to address the impact of previous consumption experiences (the biographical context) and the nature of society the family consumers live with (the social context). Addressing the biographical and social context could widen the understanding of family decision-making behaviour that has rarely been tackled in previous positivist research.

By taking a phenomenological approach, the researcher can explore how family members perceive their experiences of making family leisure decisions to visit museums, and the psychological values and considerations that determine the decision, such as the needs, perceptions and alternative judgments. Alternatively, the researcher can explore the biographic and social aspects of the research topic by taking a hermeneutic approach. For example, a hermeneutic approach can assist the
investigation into how the history of previous family leisure choices or museum experiences, either experienced by an individual member or by the family group, shape the selection of museum products during the decision-making process. It can facilitate the study of how the interactions inside and outside the family unit (e.g. friends or relatives) and the society the family consumers live shape their choices of museum products. However, taking either a phenomenological or hermeneutic approach can only partially explore these research questions and the research foci discussed earlier.

5.2.4 Understanding and interpreting insiders’ experiences:

Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA)

Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) aims an in-depth examination of how social actors experience phenomenon in their lives and how they make sense of these experiences and events. Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) is a relatively new qualitative approach that was first introduced by Jonathan Smith within psychology field and has now been widely applied in other disciplines. IPA roots in the phenomenology tradition with a theoretical influence by hermeneutics and symbolic interactionism (Smith 1995, 2004, Smith and Eatough 2006). IPA's phenomenological origins pay regard to a connection that exists between what people say and the reality they experienced (Smith 1995, 2004).

IPA also assumes that human beings live in an interpreted world. IPA believes that the components and the complex meanings of the social actors’ experiences are not visible and easily accessible. Despite this fact, the understanding of what social actors experience in their lives and their sense-making faculties are accessible through two tactics: (i) by obtaining an insider’s point of view, and (ii) a sustained engagement with the verbal accounts (Smith 1995, 2004, Smith and Eatough 2006). IPA believes that an insider’s perspective can be obtained, firstly, through the interactions between the researcher and the research participants, and secondly, through the process of interpretation and critical questioning about the narratives of participants. Such a process is described as a ‘double hermeneutic’ (Smith and Osborn 2003), where the researcher attempts to understand and interpret the research participants’ understanding and their interpretation about their experiences.

The third theoretical influence on the IPA is symbolic interactionism. IPA recognises the ontological assumptions of symbolic interactionism. Symbolic interactionism
emphasises the way how social actors perceive themselves and interact with each other is continuously modified through the process of interpreting the meanings of other’s actions. The meanings that individuals ascribe to events and actions are constructed by their relationship with their social world and the process of role-taking. Symbolic interactionists focus on study how people create meanings during social interactions and how they present and construct themselves (Smith 2004). IPA analysis suggests that researchers explore the meanings of the participants’ experiences and their interpretations of the experiences.

The unique philosophical stance of the IPA allows the researcher to treat participants’ narratives as an entryway to comprehend their experiences of making family leisure choices. Through studying closely family consumers’ perspectives and the interpretative activities involved in an IPA approach, the researcher could, first, capture and explain the experiences of how family consumers decide upon a leisure choice to visit a museum and explore their thinking and interactions with their personal and social world. Second, IPA attempts to obtain an insider’s perspective; this echoes the suggestions given, by Commuri and Gentry (2000), about the epistemological and methodological stance of family decision-making research. The researcher argues that the insider’s viewpoints can be obtained from accounts given by family members regarding what they experiences during the decision-making process. Since the researcher is a single adult, the researcher can also compare what she thinks and her leisure decision-making experience, whether an individual choice, or a family and non-family group one, with what parents and children act and think regarding their family leisure choices.

Third, IPA suggests some questions a researcher could use during the process of interpreting the data in order to bring out hidden meanings in behaviour. Smith (2004) poses questions such as ‘what are the intentions of the person attempting to achieve at this stage?’, ‘what are the hidden purposes here that the participants themselves are less aware of?’ Such a process of interpretation and critical questioning about the narratives of the family consumers can help the researcher to understand how family members perceive their experiences of making family leisure decisions to visit museums. It can also enable the researcher to explore potential meanings behind their actions and interactions inside and outside of the family unit; additionally, one may address the biographical, social and cultural contexts that are embedded in the family decision process. IPA is considered the most useful approach to addressing the complex nature of family leisure decision-making process.
5.3 Choice of data collection – family interviews

This research aims to explore how families decide to visit museums, with particular focus on the role children played over those decisions. The nature of the decision process and the behaviour of family consumers are placed at the heart of this research. There are two types of data collection in qualitative research: naturally occurring data collection (observation, documentary analysis) and verbal data collection (interviews, focus group discussions, narrative) (Flick 2002). Practically speaking, observing the scenario of family decision-making process in day-to-day natural settings and recording how families reach their decisions is considered almost impossible to carry out (Gram 2007). Moreover, the formation of the perceptions that lie behind consumer behaviour is an intangible and unobservable process. By comparison, verbal collection methods have several advantages. They can generate rich information from the participants and their high flexibility enables participants to express directly their own meanings and interpretations, meanwhile, revealing insights into the perceptions behind certain forms of behaviour (Flick 2002, Ritchie and Lewis 2003). For these reasons, verbal collection methods are judged to be the best way of addressing these research questions.

The interview method is one of the best verbal data collection tools since it enables the researcher to identify personal opinions, beliefs and values and to clarify issues within a short period of time. According to Saunders et al. (2003), interviews can be categorised into three types, based on the degree of structure: structured (standardised set of questions), semi-structured (specific themes and questions) and unstructured (no pre-established questions that the interviewee talks freely about events, behaviour and beliefs related to the topic under discussion). Taking into account the complexity of behaviours and dynamics occurring in families, the structured interviews might constrain the investigation of what happens in real decision-making processes, based on the issues identified in the theoretical models and previous empirical findings. On the other hand, conducting unstructured interviews might encounter the risk of losing the focus of research questions. The flexibility of semi-structured interviews is judged as the best means to explore the research questions.

Semi-structured interviews are judged more likely to yield insights into the issues identified from marketing and museum literatures; meanwhile, one must obtain
realistic reports from the family consumers’ actual experiences. Semi-structured interviews can help the researcher to ‘reveal and understand the ‘what’ and the ‘how’, but also to place more emphasis on exploring the ‘why’ (of the human behaviour)” (Saunders et al. 2003: 248). It can offer a greater opportunity for the researcher to explore meanings behind certain answers, thereby enhancing the significance and strength of the data obtained and helping to address issues, which have not been considered previously. As suggested by Smith (1995, 2004), the flexibility of semi-structured interviews is a primary requirement to produce a detailed analysis, in an IPA approach. Semi-structured interviews can also facilitate the researcher to distinguish the relationships between the different themes identified in the literature, and find new insights from the real-life experiences of family consumers.

The interview data collection method has been used as the main tool to gain insights into how families decide to visit museums. The intention of the proposed research is to generate information about the decision behaviour of the family groups, from both the children’s and the parents’ (and other potential adult members’) perspectives. Sterry and Beaumont (2006) point out several advantages of using semi-structured interview to study family groups, in terms of gathering children’s viewpoints. The main strengths are, first, the capability, of the method, for allowing the researcher to be responsive to children; second, the flexibility in adjusting a rather conversational style to children’s language and probing further information from them. Furthermore, a couple of research inquiries into family holiday decisions have employed semi-structured interviews to generate data, and their findings have offered more insights into family pre-purchase behaviour and their interactions than those quantitative questionnaire surveys (Thornton et al 1997, Dunne 1999, Gram 2007, Thomson et al. 2007). Therefore, interviewing family visitors, as a group, can enable the researcher to understand family behaviour during the decision-making process, and to explore the reasons behind their actions in the decision-making context. Family interviews can also help the researcher to cope with the difficulties involved in researching multiple members. Potential conflicting opinions within family groups could be treated as the access to understanding the diverse perspectives of both the adults and children, with their distinct needs and the roles to play according to their status.

5.4 Quality Criteria for trustworthiness

Traditional quality criteria for evaluating positivist research are strongly associated
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with the purpose of seeking a single, one privilege reality. These criteria include ‘validity’ (both internal and external validity referring to the accuracy of reality - the data truly reflecting what happened), ‘reliability’ (meaning the consistency, predictability and reproducibility of findings, in different studies), and ‘generalisability’ (referring to the outcomes of research applied to a wider population and social setting) (Seale 1999, Flick 2002). The application of these three criteria is intended to guarantee the accuracy of the findings and to ensure repeated replication for knowledge confirmation. Subsequently, the alternative paradigms accuse the application of using the conventional positivist criteria to evaluate qualitative research, due to the different natures of these two modes of inquiry. As Morrow argues (2005),

‘qualitative research is idiographic and emic (focusing on one or a very few individuals, findings categories of meaning from the individuals studied) as opposed to nomothetic and etic (focusing on standardized methods of obtaining knowledge from large samples of individuals, using categories taken from existing theory and operationalized by the researcher (p.252).

The concept of trustworthiness is proposed as a replacement of the conventional quality criterion. Trustworthiness refers to the capability to display truth value and to offer information for external assessments about the consistency of the research procedures and the interpretation (Decrop 2004, Yeh and Inman 2007). Trustworthiness consists of four quality criteria - ‘credibility’, ‘transferability’, ‘dependability’, and ‘confirmability’, which are initially developed by Lincoln and Guba (1985), in corresponding to the validity and reliability criteria in positivism. First, credibility (parallel to the internal validity criterion) refers to the internal consistency among research questions, data and outcomes. Second, transferability (parallel to the external validity criterion) refers to applicability of knowledge to other similar contexts. Third, dependability (parallel to the reliability criterion) means the document of research process and logical inference. Fourth, confirmability (parallel to the objectivity criterion) refers to the track of evidential findings and of interpretation (Seale 1999, Flick 2002, Decrop 2004, Charmaz 2005, Morrow 2005).

Denzin and Lincoln (2005) suggest these four quality criteria to be used in evaluating interpretivism research. Conversely, Morrow argues (2005) that these four parallel criteria are initially suggested to evaluate a post-positivist research. ‘Logical inconsistencies’ could be produced when applying these criteria to outside post-positivist paradigms. Morrow (2005) and Yeh and Inman (2007) refine the quality criteria for trustworthiness in the interpretativist paradigm into ‘subjectivity and self-reflexivity’, ‘credibility and adequacy of data’, and ‘adequacy of interpretation’.
The ‘subjectivity and self-reflexivity’ refers that since the impact of subjectivity on an interpretivist inquiry is inevitable, it is important to monitor and report how a researcher might have an impact on the knowledge produced (Smith 2004, Morrow 2005, Smith and Eatough 2006, Yeh and Inman 2007). While Chapters 2 to 4 have shown how the researcher has developed her conceptual framework, Section 5.1.1 reinforces the way the researcher perceives the issues centred on the research questions.

Chapter 6 will present how the researcher has adjusted her initial interview questions after interacting with the sampled groups. The chapter will also show how the interpretative activity has been shaped by the researcher’s own experiences and observations when making group leisure-related decisions during the period of data analysis and the data presentation. The purpose of self-reflection is to ensure the findings and the interpretations represent the participants’ own realities. The researcher will suggest that the ‘dependability’ criterion mentioned earlier can be assessed by offering a record of research progress. The record of research inquiry, including the evolution of the research foci and the reflection notes on data analysis, will be included in Appendix A. While the ‘credibility and adequacy of data’ focuses on the richness of the data obtained, the ‘adequacy of the interpretation’ deals with the quality of data analysis, interpretation and presentation (Morrow 2005, Yeh and Inman 2007). Chapter 6 will blend the processes involved in data collection, analysis and interpretation and present a sense of self-reflection on ‘the credibility and adequacy of data’ and ‘the adequacy of interpretation’. A final note is made about the fact that, even though the transferability criterion has not been highlighted on the articles made by Morrow (2005), Yeh and Inman (2007), the researcher considers it important to include this specific issue and examines how far the research design and the findings can be transferred. Therefore, the applicability of the findings to other research, in similar settings, will be offered in Chapter 10 Conclusion and Recommendations.
Summary

This chapter discusses the possibility of taking alternative paradigms from the dominance of positivism in previous studies. Considerations into a number of paradigm choices are presented, which leads to the explanations of why the researcher decided to take interpretivism as the most appropriate paradigm in order to answer her research questions and interests. The ontological view of interpretivism of multiple realities, its subjective epistemology and the context-bound methodology all enable the researcher to study the subjective experience of the family groups - how they decided to visit museums (by way of participants' own definitions) - and to present multiple perspectives of interpretation, including both the participants' and the researcher's.

Subsequently, further considerations are shown among potential routes of qualitative inquiries. Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) has been chosen as the analytic approach, because of its emphasis on in-depth examination of how people experience the studied phenomenon and how they make sense of their respective experiences. A unique feature of IPA is that it facilitates the understanding of different viewpoints that might exist, between adults and children, and could help the researcher to uncover the 'story' behind the family decisions. Several advantages to using semi-structured interviews as the data collection methods are offered. Interviewing a family group together is considered an appropriate data collection method to generate subjective accounts from multiple members.

Reaching trustworthiness is a common quality criterion shared by many qualitative research paradigms. A refined set of the quality criteria for trustworthiness of the interpretativist paradigm, including subjectivity and self-reflexivity, credibility and adequacy of data, and adequacy of interpretation, is introduced. The self-reflection over the credibility of the data and the adequacy of the data interpretation quality will be presented in Chapters 6 and 10.
~ Chapter 6 ~

Methodical and Procedural Issues

Introduction

Literature on qualitative research suggests that how an inquiry being conducted has an impact on the quality of knowledge produced. This chapter begins with the experiences gained from the preliminary research and the piloting used to assist in the main fieldwork (Section 6.1) and then illustrates the sampling sites and the sampling strategy (Section 6.2). Next, it manifests a number of issues related to family interviews and researching children, as well as how the researcher has adjusted her interview skills and the composition of interview questions to ensure a better quality of the data (Section 6.3). Finally, it shows the analytic challenges faced in this research and the adapted strategies taken both from the Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis and the Event Structure Analysis. A number of innovations in the management of data analysis and the process of making sense of the data are also discussed (Section 6.4). The discussion integrates self-reflections on the quality of the data and the researcher’s interpretation, on the one hand, with the information on how the data was obtained and analysed, on the other.

6.1 Preparation for the fieldwork

A preliminary research and a piloting study were conducted before the main fieldwork. The ethical approval was granted for conducting both the preliminary research and the main fieldwork by the University of Sheffield, where the researcher studied her first year of PhD course before transfer to the University of Surrey. The purpose of the preliminary research is to help the researcher to refine the research questions and the initial interview questions, whereas the pilot research facilitated the researcher in testing the designed interview questions and improved research techniques with children and adults. Each family interview being conducted in the preliminary, the pilot and the main research was tape-recorded. This is so that: (i) the interview could be carried out as natural as possible, (ii) the interviewer could make supplementary field notes without interrupting the flow of the conversation, and (iii) each interview can be transcribed accurately (Saunders et al. 2003).

6.1.1 Preliminary research

The preliminary research sets out to gain a broad idea of the initial research questions.
through informal interviews. The Kelham Island Museum in Sheffield was chosen as the preliminary sampling site, as a convenient base. Three family interviews were completed on 17th July, 2005. Two interviews took place outside the museum Café shop, and the other one carried out in the resting area inside the museum site. The informal interviews have included recalling the decisions to visit the museum and the potential involvement of children in the decisions.

Prior to the preliminary research, semi-structured interviews were planned to engage with adults and children, separately, since the researcher attempted to hear the accounts from both the children and the parents related to the decision-making process. This initial plan was changed after experiencing great difficulties in obtaining information from children while interviewing them separately. For this reason, the design of the semi-structured interviews was adjusted to interviewing the sample family visitors, as a group. The plan for the main fieldwork was modified to interview child visitors individually in the presence of adult family members. In addition, the result of the preliminary research offers guidelines for refining the interview questions.

6.1.2 Piloting

Prior to the main fieldwork, a pilot study was administered at one of the sampling sites, the National Traditional Arts Center in I-Lan, Taiwan. Six family interviews were completed. The initial interview questions were designed in English, and then translated into Chinese, due to the fact that the main fieldwork was conducted in Taiwan where the official language is Chinese. To ensure the quality of wording and translation, the Chinese interview questions were tested in the piloting.

The attention of the piloting was paid to issues of the construction of the interview questions and the most effective wording, as suggested by Saunders et al. (2003). This has allowed the researcher to improve her interview skills, for example, ensuring that interviewees could understand the questions and detailed information related to the research questions could be effectively lured from the interviewees, and reducing the potential bias of the interviewer. Both the experiences gained from interviewing families as a group in the preliminary research, as well as the piloting offer guidelines for further improvement in the main fieldwork, thereby generating a better quality interview.
6.2 Sampling

The research questions aim to explore how families with children make the leisure decisions to visit museums and understand the role children and adults played during the decision-making process. Any family who ever visited a museum could be studied by the researcher. However, this takes into account that the capability of family recollection on the decision-making process. Directly recruiting those family visitors with children, who were visiting a museum, can maximise the validity of the recollection, since they had a more fresh and vivid memory of how their decisions to visit the museums were made.

6.2.1 Sampling sites

The main fieldwork was administered at four museum sites in North Taiwan. They were the Taipei Astronomical Museum, the Taipei Story House and the ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology and the National Traditional Arts Center. Table 5 presents the type of the selected museums and their respective regions. The selected regions are the most densely populated with museums in Taiwan, which are home to over fifty national, regional and independent museums of a variety of types (CAM 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling museums</th>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Type of museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taipei Astronomical Museum</td>
<td>Capital Taipei City</td>
<td>A large-scale science museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taipei Story House</td>
<td>Capital Taipei City</td>
<td>A small-scale historical house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology</td>
<td>Taipei County</td>
<td>A large-scale archaeological museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Traditional Arts Center</td>
<td>I-Lan County</td>
<td>A huge cultural complex containing exhibition hall, theatres, craft shops and outdoor features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four sampling museums have different characteristics in their exhibitions and settings. First, the Taipei Astronomical Museum is a large science museum containing an observatory and some recreational facilities (e.g. IMAX Theatre). Second, the Taipei Story House is a small Western-style historical building next to the Taipei Arts Museums. Third, the ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology is a large archaeological museum and located at the bank of Danshuei River. Fourth, The National Traditional Arts Center is a huge cultural complex covering an area of 24 hectares, which comprises of an exhibition centre, two theatres, three historical buildings and a row of
shops operated by craftsmen of various traditional arts. Appendix B offers more information about the background of these museums. The different forms and characteristics of the four sampling sites enabled the researcher to explore the common features shared among the family decisions to visit different museums.

Letters were sent to the curators of the proposed four museum sites explaining the research purpose, the research questions and the interview plan. The letters aimed to inquire gaining permission to conduct family interviews at the museum sites. The researcher had individual meetings with the staff of the four museums after receiving initial responses. The meetings attempted to explain more details on how family interviews would be conducted, and to look for ideal interview points in each museum. Also, advice given by museum staff suggested that family visitors with children normally visit museums at weekends. The researcher agreed to share the final outcome of this research with the staff of these four museums. The data collection was conducted during the weekends but including one week of holiday period (the Chinese New Year break) over a three-month period, from Sunday 4th December 2006 to 5th March 2007.

6.2.2 Sampling strategy and the samples

According to Saunders et al. (2003), sampling is generally divided into probability (representative) sampling and non-probability (purposive) sampling. The purpose and focus of the research are the key elements when choosing the sample selection technique. This research aims to understand the decision-making process of family visitors, and the involvement children have on the decision to visit museums. In-depth and rich information from the sampled families is therefore needed in this research. Hence, a purposive sampling technique has been chosen, instead of a statistically representative cross-section of the total population.

The sampling strategy entails directly recruiting family visitors with children at the selected sampling sites. Veal (2006) advises two samplings strategies to operating visitor study at leisure or tourism sites. One is a stationary interviewer and mobile users, on the one hand; the other is vice-versa. The researcher had taken into account that visitors normally spread throughout the museum sites and the flow of visitors greatly varies from individual to individual. The mobile interviewer method was considered to be most suitable technique for recruiting family visitors in the museum sites, and has been proven as an effective way to proceed during the preliminary
research and the piloting.

When the researcher approached any visitor groups containing children, first, she introduced herself, her research institution and her research topic. Second, she inquired whether the family groups met the sample criteria – that at least one adult and one child have a family tie. Their willingness to take part in an interview and available time for interviewing (e.g. they were not to leave the museum site in a hurry) were also considered. According to the experiences gained from sampling family groups during the preliminary research and piloting, those family groups who were taking a break during their visits as well as those who had already finished their visits in the main exhibition areas showed a much stronger willingness to be interviewed. In addition, longer interviews and richer information were more likely to be generated from these families. According to this observation, effective sampling locations were identified in each museum site.

Finding the effective sampling locations was adjusted in relation to the setting of each museum site and the visitor flow within each museum. Since the venues of the National Traditional Arts Center in Il-an, the Taipei Astronomical Museum and the ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology are huge venues, these museums are divided into several areas. Most visitors of these three sampling sites were normally busy in visiting the museum exhibitions and shops. It proved obviously that the catering areas (e.g. the restaurant or the café), the resting spaces, and the space near the ends of the main exhibition halls were the most effective sampling locations to recruit family visitors with children.

The other sampling strategy was ‘making an interview appointment’ with the spotted family groups. This strategy was particularly useful in a quiet and small museum (like the Taipei Story House) and was also employed in the other three museum sites. The researcher looked for any potential family visitors, either by standing at the entrance of the main exhibition area or by moving around the museum venues. Once a group with children was spotted, the researcher simply followed the spotted group quietly, but avoided disturbing their visiting experiences in the sampling sites. After the groups had browsed several museum objects, they were approached by the researcher and were asked about their willingness to participate in her research. Once confirmed that the group members met the sampling criteria and their willingness to be interviewed, the researcher made an interview appointment with the groups to carry out the
interview after they finished their visits in the museums.

At the beginning of each interview, the researcher introduced herself again and outlined her research foci to all the group members. The anonymity and the confidentiality of personal data (e.g. coded personal data but not identifiable), the use of the data in academic purpose only, the minimal amount of time required in an interview and the use of tape-recording were reported to the family groups. Considering the cognitive ability and the linguistic ability of young children, especially pre-schoolers, the researcher used the simplest form of language as possible to explain the purpose of collecting data for completing a doctoral research. For example, the researcher said to the young children: ‘the researcher is going to ask several questions, like “who said to you, today, that you were coming to this museum?”’, because the researcher needs to write a homework assignment and give it to my teacher’. Each interview only began after the oral consents were obtained both from the adult and child participants of a sampled group. The researcher further informed the participants that they had no obligation to take part in this research and were free to withdraw or stop the family interviews whenever they wanted.

The interviews were carried out in a group basis, in which both the adults and the children were interviewed together. The place for conducting family interviews was mainly adjusted to the situation of the sampling groups. When the sampled families were having a meal or refreshment, the family interviews mainly took place in the café (e.g. in the National Traditional Arts Center and the Taipei Story House) or the main resting area (e.g. in the Taipei Astronomical Museum). Some sampled families had a specific: preferring to be interviewed at the place where they were approached (e.g. at the corridor of the end of exhibition halls). In many cases, the researcher directed the sampled family groups to the ‘interview rooms’ of the museum venues, to which the staff had permitted the researcher to have access (e.g. the press conference room in the Taipei Astronomical Museum and the nursery room in the ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology). At the end of each family interview, small presents were given to each child participant, as incentives, to thank them for their time, effort and cooperation in this study.

A total number of thirty-seven family groups were obtained at four different museums. The data collection stopped when the researcher felt the status had reached ‘data saturation’ (Flick 2002), the point at which the information given becomes repetitive.
and one no longer hears new information. Two recent museum studies showed that
the composition of family groups revealed a wide range of variation (Kelly et al. 2004,
Sterry 2004). The initial grouping of the sampled groups was classified by the
characteristics of the companions (Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004). Even though the
sampled families were not randomly selected, they covered a diverse group
composition, in terms of the age of the children and the relationships among the
members. There were twenty-nine samples, composed of parents with children of
different ages, and two three-generational groups, composed of grandparents,
parents and their children. There was one group, composed of grandparents and their
grandchildren, and five groups composed of parents with their children and other
adults (see Appendix C for the full list).

6.3 Credibility and adequacy of data
The richness of the data and the analytical capability of the researcher are more
important than the sample size in a qualitative research (Flick 2002, Charmaz 2005,
Morrow 2005). Morrow (2005) points out that the adequacy of data needs to consider
its quality, length, richness and a variety of sources. This research intends to bring out
the voices of each adult and child member, in every sampled family group. This ideal
status faced three major challenges involved in interviewing multiple members. First, it
faced how to balance the accounts of multiple members; second, how to lure the
voice of children; and third, how to bring out rich data within a single family interview.
The following sections present how the family interviews were carried out (Section
6.3.1), the ethical considerations on conducting research with children, the difficulties
encountered therein (Section 6.3.2), as well as the researcher's reflexivity and
revision to the interview skills (Sections 6.3.3 and 6.3.4).

6.3.1 Conducting family interviews
As Daly (2007) points out, many families may have gatekeepers or spokespersons
who state family images to non-family members. While conducting the preliminary
research, the researcher observed that most accounts of the family interviews were
dominated by the adult members. The researcher noticed that when the
conversations were dominated by the adults, it was hard to hear the voices of the child
visitors, but this also affected the attention of child interviewees. In such cases, the
child interviewees started appearing bored and wandered away from the interview
sites. Two strategies of conducting the group interviews were developed to tackle
these problems in the administration of the main fieldwork.
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First, prior to each interview, the researcher stressed to the adult members her wishes to hear both the adults’ and the children’s viewpoints during the interview, especially the children. Normally, the adult members reinforced this point to child participants and encouraged the children to express their own opinions during the interviews. At the beginning of the interviews, the researcher emphasised again to the child participants, that their voices were very important to this research. The researcher kept seeking children’s opinions during the interviews. By doing it, the researcher found that the concentration and enthusiasm of the child interviewees were boosted and they demonstrated highly involvement in these family interviews.

Second, the person chosen to be initially interviewed depended on the age of children in the groups, but remained flexible according to the interview dynamic. According to the experiences gained from the pilot study, the researcher found out the young children, aged less than nine, were willing to talk more if the interviews started with talking to their parents, first, for two or three minutes. Unless some younger children eagerly responded to the interview questions right at the beginning of the family interviews, otherwise, in most cases the interviews began with the elder child. (e.g. the 9-year-old elder child of Family 12 and the 13-year-old elder child of Family 35) or the parents for one or two minutes, and then talking to the whole group. The interview strategy regarding who to be interviewed first at the beginning of each interview strongly linked to the attention of the children and their contributions during the family interviews. This strategy also boosted the building-up of the trust between the researcher and the interviewees, especially with the children, right from the start of each interview. After the first five minutes, the family interviews switched between talking to the adults and talking to the children.

6.3.2 Ethical issues of researching children

Ethical considerations relate to researching with children are taken account in this research, including assisting children’s well-being and the way the researcher addressed the adult-child power relations and worked with child participants during the family interviews. First of all, adult participants in every sampled family were first explained what the research was about and their agreement to permit the researcher to ask the children’s consent to take part in this research was gained. After the information regarding to basic ethical aspects has been given to the family groups (as shown in Section 6.3.1), the researcher further explained her wishes that this study
can benefit a family's and children's well-being at the beginning of each interview. For example, the researcher wished that the results of this research could enhance leisure marketers' understanding of family groups and children and might help them to offer a better service that meets their wishes and needs. These aspects echo back to 'the right to satisfactory development and well-being' addressed by Hill's (2005) ethical issues in conducting a research with children.

Robinson and Kellet (2003) point out a researcher's perspectives on children are central to the power relations that resulted between the researcher and the child participants. Many previous studies on family buying behaviour tended to view children as objects from others and deficient adults. Children were rather perceived as dependent and less capable to deal with information, rather than 'competent human beings in their own right' (Hill 2005: 62) (Robinson and Kellet 2003, Hill 2005). As a result, a number of previous researchers tended to obtain the accounts of caring adults, who interpret children's lives and experiences from adult perspectives. On the other hand, the researcher perceives each child participants as a social actor taking part in their family life (Robinson and Kellet 2003). As Hill (2005) suggested, children are viewed as creators and interpreters of the meanings in their lives and in this research, who play active roles in the process of cultural learning, rather than as objects of reflecting the meanings of adults. This also takes guidance from Alderson (2003), the researcher who acknowledged children's presence in family leisure consumption and their potential active and passive participation in the family leisure decision-making process.

Adults tend to have more power and authority over children culturally. Such 'generational ordering' and power relations refer to the authoritarian context and the power difference between adults and children in public and private settings. Accordingly, some children have a certain degree of fear to dissent with adults or to express something that is being judged as unacceptable (Robinson and Kellett 2003, Hill 2005). The impact of the interview location and context, at museums, on the imbalance of adult-child power, was less than in some settings, as, for example, in schools. As Robinson and Kellett (2003) argued, much school-based research has a great effect on both the nature and the results of doing studies with children, since adults have greater power and control over children's behaviour and their social interactions, in school settings, in particular. However, the researcher noticed that many adult participants tended to report what the child members of the group thought
on their behalf during the family interviews.

The researcher developed a number of strategies to lure children’s voices and to break the power imbalance during the family interviews. For example, when some children remained silent respondents over the first five to ten minutes of the interviews, the researcher started to seek children’s opinions. Talking to these children directly normally began with some warm-up questions, such as ‘how do you feel about this museum, or which part of the museum do you enjoy most?’ These general questions facilitated building rapport between the child participants and the researcher. Next, children were asked about what they thought or experienced about the process involved in making the decision to visit museums and the situation the researcher addressed in general leisure choices. The researcher also suggested to the child participant that they can say whatever they wanted. Moreover, their accounts were different from the adults that were fine in the interviews. The purpose of doing these was to minimise some children’s desires to please adults and their fears of offering different accounts from adult members. The researcher also showed her respect to the information given by the children, without judging whether their behaviour or attitudes were socially acceptable.

### 6.3.3 Revised interview questions and skills

This section demonstrates a self-reflection on how the interview skills had been improved throughout the data collection and assisted the lure of richness data regarding family decision-making processes. According to Saunders et al.’s (2003) guidelines, semi-structured interviews should start with general questions and then proceed to more purposive questions. The improvement has been particularly made up of the warm-up questions and the composition of the key interview questions. The researcher admitted that the interview questions used, to inquire both the adults and the children interviews, at the initial stage of the main fieldwork (the first ten family interviews) were very much theoretically-constructed and strongly influenced by a previous positivist approach. Table 6 shows an example of the theoretically-orientated interview questions; for example: ‘Who decided to visit the museums?’ ‘Who is in charge of the information search?’ ‘What role do you play in the decision-making process?’ ‘What influential strategies do you use?’ ‘Why did you propose to visit this museum? (See Appendix D for full list of the structured questions)
Table 6 The examples of the initial theoretical-constructed interview questions

- Who decided to visit the museums? Who normally decided general leisure choices?
- Could you recall the process involved in making this museum visit for me?
- Who normally ‘responsible’ for ‘information search’ when making leisure choices?
- What ‘role’ do you normally ‘play’ during the ‘decision-making process’?
- What is ‘the influence of children’ over the decision?
- Did you use any ‘influential strategies’ to affect the final choice?
- Why did you propose to visit this museum?

While transcribing the data right after the interviews, the researcher noticed that the data obtained regarding the decision-making process and the family interactions was very shallow and not as detailed as expected, as the following excerpts show. The researcher detected that these theoretically-oriented questions also produced certain biases and restricted respondents’ answers. Therefore, the researcher abandoned the pre-constructed interview questions and started to explore what kind of open questions work the best to detail of what happened before the family visits and how they made the decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Who decided to visit this museum?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>The dad decided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Who in charge of the information search?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>My wife and I do it together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Why did you decide to visit this museum today? Can you please recall the decision-making process for me?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Because this museum is famous, so we decided to come here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several improvements had been made since the 11th family interviews took place. The first major change was the composition of the interview questions. Plain language was used in the wording of the interview questions. The interviews began with asking whether the family members had been to the sampling museums before, and followed by the recollection of the decisions to visit the sampling museums. The theoretical terms were avoided, when questioning the interviewees, such as the ‘information
search stage’, the ‘alternative evaluations stage’, the ‘influence of children’ over the decisions. The details related to these theoretical concepts normally unfolded little by little, throughout the family recollections of how they made the choices. If the respondents had only mentioned the sampling site at the beginning of the interviews, the researcher started to probe a question such as ‘have you considered any other options today?’ In such cases, the family groups normally revealed more details about their selection process.

A list of effective questions had been found out, which can lure richer information from the adults and the children related to the decision making process; for example:

- What prompted today’s visit to this museum? (Or how did you come across to visit this museum?)
- Could you recall what happened before you decided to visit this museum?
- Who suggested visiting this museum?
- Any reasons prompt your suggestions to visit this museum?
- Have you heard of this museum before?
- Did your child get involved in the discussion?
- What did you think when (your child or your husband) suggest visiting this museum?
- Have you considered other options today?
- What would you do if you preferred to go somewhere else?
- Where do you normally take your children for family outings?
- What are the main concerns (or what do you valued most), when choosing a place for family outings?
- Could you give me some examples of when your children ever requested to visit any place previously?

After the researcher used daily spoken language to compose each interview question, both the adult and child respondents started to unfold more details about the decision-making process, as the following excerpt shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>How did you come across the idea of visiting this museum with your children today?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Because it’s raining today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>There are many other museums you can choose. Did you consider visiting other places this morning?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Father | We visited the Lantern Festival last night and we have been thinking of choosing one more places to visit today. Actually, my first choice was to take my children to visit the Y17 (Recreation Centre for Young People). Then, I phoned my sister and asked her opinions. She reckoned the Y17 is not suitable for the ages of my children. So we were thinking if there were other places more suitable for our children. |

Family 23

The second change was letting the interviewees themselves reveal their decision-making process through prompting them to explain more details. The researcher found out the interviewees' recollection of the decision-making was often a gradual process. This attribute was particularly salient, when dealing with the main research question - how each family decided to visit the sampling museums. The recollection of most family interviewees tended to begin with the outcomes of the decisions. For example, in the beginning of the family interviews, many participants simply replied that they decided to visit the sampling museums were due to the efforts of particular members, such as: ‘Oh, this was because of my wife (the mother) decided it’. More details about how the decisions were made gradually surfaced little by little, as the researcher explored more information throughout the family interviews. Such gradual recollection also happened when the researcher asked about the interviewers' previous museum experiences or the examples of making other family leisure decisions in the past.

One useful interview strategy has been developed by the researcher to tackle the characteristics of gradual recollection. The accounts given by the interviewees of each sampled family regarding how they made the decision to visit the sampling museums (as with other leisure decisions, if mentioned), were treated as a ‘story’. The researcher memorised the key ‘plots’ revealed by the family interviewees and then summarised them to the interviewees. During the family interviews, the researcher paid attention to what every interviewee said, even though some group members whispered while listening to other members' responses. At the same time, the researcher memorised the sequential orders of the key moments (‘what happened’ among family members before the final purchase decision was made), and then turned the information into questions. For example, the information obtained at the beginning of the interview with Family 32 was:
The researcher memorised the information as the 'scenario A'. Next, 'scenario B' unfolded five minutes later:

**Question** [Posed to the youngest child] Did you say you wanted to visit National Taiwan Science Education Center this morning?

**Younger child (11)** No, I did not.

Next, the researcher remembered that 'scenario B' did not occur according to 'scenario A', described by the mother. Therefore, the researcher asked more information about 'scenario A'.

**Question** [Posed to the children] So how did you make the suggestions to go to the other two places?

**Mother** Actually, this morning I considered that the weather today is lovely. So I asked them (my children) where do you want to go today? Then they suggested visiting the Taipei Astronomical Museum. I said, 'Fine'.

Next, the researcher remembered the new information, given as 'scenario C'; meanwhile, she placed this information according to the sequential order of the plots, as 'scenario C → Scenario A'. Then, the researcher summarised the sequential order of these and formed a question to ask for more detail. In such cases, the interviewees tended to clarify more about the reasons behind their actions or what actions they had also performed. The researcher repeated the process of "memorising → figuring the sequential order → summarising as a new question" until no new details were given by the interviewees. This strategy can also help the researcher to confirm what actually happened during the decision-making process with the interviewees.

Asking more details about what the interviewees had mentioned and using the terms to which the participants referred were also an effective means to revealing family considerations behind their leisure choices. For example, when the interviewees mentioned their previous experiences to visit museums or other visitor attractions
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(such as a theme park), the researcher simply asked more information about the key features related to the decision process and how they perceived the purchase experiences. Another example is that, when the father of Family 29 mentioned that he judged some purchase requests, suggested by his children, as 'meaningless', or when the elder daughter of Family 2 said sometimes her parents rejected her 'inappropriate' suggestions, the researcher asked for examples of what suggestions were considered as 'meaningless' or 'inappropriate'. Questions such as ‘You just said that you didn’t want to go to A venues; this is because...?’ was more effective to lure information out of them about considerations behind their decisions, instead of merely asking ‘why’ they did this.

The third major improvement was that the overall flow of the interview questions has shifted from the scheduled interview plan to an interviewees-orientated mode. During the first few family interviews, the flow of the interview questions was strongly guided by the scheduled plan, for example, asking general family leisure choices first and then moving toward how the decisions to visit museums were made. Since the 9th sampled family, the flow of the interview questions was central to the chunks of key research foci, but without placing them into a particularly order that which one should start with. The interview mainly centered on several issues, for example, the decisions to visit the sampling museums, the main considerations of leisure choices, and the examples of children’s purchase requests to other visitor attractions in the past. The focus of the interview questions only switched after more information about the previous topic had been revealed considerably by the interviewees. The interviewee-orientated approach allowed other issues related to each topic, that had not been considered by the researcher before, to be brought up and explored more in detail.

6.3.4 Interviewing children

The age of the children who were interviewed ranged from five to fifteen. Apart from the strategy of constructing the interview questions by daily spoken language, a number of strategies were found that can lure more accounts from the child participants in the family interviews. During the piloting, the researcher noticed that the concept of the 'decision-making process' was fairly abstract for the preschoolers and some primary school children to understand at the beginning of the each interview. Young children needed more time to enter the status of being interviewed by an unknown adult, the researcher, regarding a topic that they had rarely thought about
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(e.g. what happened before they visited the museums). Therefore, the researcher developed three strategies to cope with this issue including, (i) composing the questions as simply as possible, (ii) adjusting the formation of the interview questions according to their level of competence and linguistic understanding, and (iii) switching the flow of interview questions when necessary.

The following is an example of the adapted interview questions for children aged between five and nine:

- Do you know who said 'let us visit this museum today'?
- What did your dad and mum say, when they told you about the idea of visiting this museum/ or when they say you can not go to the place you ask to go?
- What did you say when you told your dad and mum that you wanted to visit this museum?
- What did you think when your brother/sister told you about this idea (of visiting a museum)?
- Did your dad and mum ask you 'where do you want to go'?
- Where do your dad and mum normally take you out for ‘fun’* on weekends? (* Note: the 'out for fun' is a Chinese expression for outings.)

Which interview questions shall pose to the children was constantly adjusted while listening to the children's answers. For example, if a child answered 'I have no idea' in response to three to five questions the researcher asked, the researcher recognised that the topic needed to be changed to something else that the child can easily answer first, for example, asking his or her previous experiences related to leisure outing. After that, the researcher returned the topic of the interview questions to the previous one. It was also useful to summarise those events/action pointed out by the adult participants, and then turned the summary into questions asking the children about their understanding of 'the storyline'.

Even though the overall the accounts offered by the child participants were relatively less rich compared to their adult members, children offered significant contribution to the richness of the data. A simple fact is that the child interviewees often offered an interesting perspective, sometimes more honest, about what they 'saw' regarding what happened, when making the family leisure choices, from their own child's-eye perspective. Moreover, their thinking and actions over leisure options could be constructed and investigated both from their own 'little', but valuable, accounts and through the narratives given by their parents or other adult members.
One major difficulty encountered was the disturbance of some whining children, during the family interviews. Some toddlers and pre-schoolers, even a few primary school children, constantly threw a tantrum in the middle of the interviews, which distracted the adults from being interviewed. According to the adult members, such behaviour was caused by hunger, fatigue and feeling less involvement in the interviews. On most occasions, the researcher gave the children the papers and colour pens prepared for the drawing method and told them to draw whatever they wanted. This tactic was useful in soothing children's emotions and enabled one to conduct the family interviews. However, this tactic failed to please a few children, which forced the swift termination of these interviews.

6.3.5 Overall quality of the interviews
The length of the interview varied from 15 to 150 minutes. The average length was around 30 minutes and more than ten interviews were over an-hour long (See Appendix C – far right column). The length of the interview was mainly decided by the sampled family’s available time. The interviews finished whenever the sampled families needed to head off to their next planned activities; for instance, catching a performance show in the museum sites, or leaving the museums. Otherwise, the family interviews were continued until all research questions had been explored.

There are two main reasons to stop an interview within 30 minutes. One is the whinging behaviour of some children and the other is the families having scheduled plans after the visits. The data collection stopped at the 37th interview, since the researcher felt the ‘data saturation’ had been attained, having sufficient data to answer research questions and no new information was obtained (Charmaz 2005). The richness of the data was particularly salient, when compared with the accounts given at the beginning of the interviews (within the first five minutes). When the interviewees were asked to recall how the decisions to visit the museums were made, the initial responses tended to be very brief; for example, “we didn’t plan it” or “the father decided to come”. More details were given, and the story of the decision-making process tended to be unpacked throughout the mean of the semi-structured family interviews and the researcher’s probe.

Family interviews were concluded as an effective tool to uncover decision making processes because they offered a platform for collective memory among the family
participants. An intensive interaction was often demonstrated among the group members; for example, one member responded to the keywords or the events, while listening to each other. Sometimes there was evidence of little debates about different perceptions of the decision-making process. All these interactions among the participants enabled the researcher to probe for more details about the phenomenon and the concerns, as well as the values of the participants. Overall, the data obtained from semi-structured family interviews offered an indirect portal and rich information to understand family leisure pre-purchase behaviour and reveal the values and ideas behind the groups' perceptions and evaluations in a decision-making process, which has rarely been investigated in previous quantitative studies.

6.4 Data analysis and adequacy of interpretation

Adequacy of interpretation refers to the quality of data analysis, interpretation and presentation (Morrow 2005, Yeh and Inman 2007). The purpose of the IPA approach is an in-depth examination of how people experience the studied phenomena, in their lives, and how they make sense of these experiences. The data analysis of IPA is made in seeking themes that penetrate the meanings of the phenomenon under examination. Overall, there are five basic analytic steps involved in an IPA analysis and interpretation:

- Step 1: Fully immerse one's self in a transcript, by several close and detailed readings, and note down any interesting or significant points about the account of the respondents.
- Step 2: Document emerging theme titles by using keywords and initial analytic comments to capture the essential quality of the text.
- Step 3: Look for connections between themes and cluster them together or group them into over-arching themes.
- Step 4: Waive the researcher's interpretations and the participant's accounts, in his/her own words, together.
- Step 5: Compare patterns across the over-arching themes of each interview and produce a master table of comparative themes.

(Smith 1995, 2004; Smith and Eatough 2006, Smith et al. 2006)

The principle of the IPA analytic guidelines was taken in the data analysis, but a series of strategies and analytic procedures have been developed by this research in order to cope with the challenges of the studied phenomenon. There are three large challenges in data analysis. The first is how to cope with the nature of memory in data
collection, and second is how to reconstruct the sequential order of the events in the interpretation and presentation. Third is how to analyse and interpret interviews that involved multiple participants.

The interviewees' recollections on how they decided to visit the sampling museums normally started from the outcomes of the decisions, and then gradually revealed a more holistic picture of how actually happened, which has been mentioned in Section 6.3.3. That is to say, in most cases, the information given in the later stage of the interviews regarding the decision process contains many clarifications on what they, or other members, had said previously. The researcher consulted the technique of the Event Structure Analysis and developed two strategies to cope with the gradual recollections attributed and then attempted to reconstruct the temporal structure of the decision-making process. First, an analytic transcript is produced in each sampled family before further analysis. Secondly, a series of visual display method is developed to assist the understanding of the family decisions-making process in the data analysis and the data interpretation.

6.4.1 Analytic strategies and procedures
The total 37 sampled families are divided into three analytic groups in data analysis. The primary selection criterion was the richness of the family recollections of decisions to visit the museums. The degree of richness in data decreases from Group A to Group C (see Appendix E). The Analytic Group A contains 22 interviews, which included the richest data, and is used for in-depth analysis at the first phase of the data analysis. The Analytic Group B includes 11 interviews, with medium richness of the data, and is used for comparison with the Analytic Group A. The Group C contains 4 interviews and is excluded in detail analysis, due to less richness of the data. However, the Group C is compared with Groups A and B. The researcher developed two innovations to cope with the sequential nature of decision-making. First is the use of Microsoft Excel package to manage data analysis; second is the use of visual display to assist in understanding of the data.

According to Miles and Huberman (1994), qualitative data analysis mainly involved three analytic phases: data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing and verification. The three analytic phases developed in this research were inspired by the guidelines provided from three major sources: Miles and Huberman (1994), the IPA (Smith 1995, 2004; Smith and Eatough 2006) and the Event Structure Analysis (Tesch
At the beginning of the data analysis, this researcher used a qualitative assisted computer package ATLAS.ti to organise the analysis on the first two samples. However, the researcher experienced huge difficulties both in making sense of family interactions and in gaining a holistic picture of the temporal structure of the decision data. Subsequently, the researcher has attempted many ways of doing this by using Microsoft Word package in the employment of manual analysis. After a significant number of trials and modifications, the researcher had built a most effective and systematic procedure by using three Microsoft Office packages - Word, Excel and PowerPoint – to deal with the management of data analysis. The following sections illustrate the main tasks involved in analysing each analytic sample family and cross comparison among different samples.

6.4.2 Analytic procedures

The three analytic phases - data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification – were not carried out through a direct jump from one to another. The process was, rather, iterative throughout the researcher’s sense-making growth from time to time.

Analytic Phase I: Data reduction

Main task: forms analytic transcripts and initial categorisations

In order to achieve an in-depth investigation, Smith (1995) strongly recommends that analysts look at one transcript, in detail, before moving on to others. The need for reading a transcript several times is essential because new insights are more likely to emerge from each reading, and a more holistic and grounded picture with the participant’s accounts can be obtained (Smith 1995, 2004; Smith and Eatough 2006, Smith et al. 2006). Immersion into data through repeat readings on transcription is the initial step for achieving adequacy in interpretation (Morrow 2005).

A strategy was developed, in the ‘Data Reduction’ phase, aiming to tackle the nature of family recollection, which is transforming each interview transcript into an analytic script. This step has taken the technique from the Event Structure Analysis, and the purpose is to isolate each event emerged in the data (equivalent to Miles and Huberman’s (1994) data reduction phase). After several readings of the original transcript and getting familiar with the ‘stories’ of each sampled family, the researcher identified the sequential and non-sequential type of data, within each interview transcript. Next, the two types of data were copied and pasted into a Microsoft Excel
file and further divided into separate Excel spreadsheets, with an labelled category, such as: ‘decisions to visit museums’, ‘general leisure choices’, ‘past museum experiences’. Additionally, since the sampled families were interviewed on a group basis, the voices given in the data consisted of more than two interviewees and a mixture of adults and children. The order of the accounts given by the adults and children remained the same among the sequential data (e.g. the decisions to visit museums), which aims to show the group interactions during the decision process. Otherwise, the accounts of the adults and the children would be separated in the Excel worksheet, in order to identify that potential different perspectives existed between adults and children.

Diagram 10 An example of using Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to assist the data analysis within a single sample

The main tasks of the Data Reduction Phase include: coding the text, producing summaries, and writing memos and comments (Miles and Huberman 1994, Smith 1995, 2004; Smith and Eatough 2006). After more than a year’s trial, the researcher found out that using Microsoft Excel spreadsheets to code and classify data of the analytic transcript was more effective than creating tables in Microsoft Word. There are three most significant benefits. First, an Excel document can hold many worksheets and enable the researcher to gain a holistic view of different data.
categories, in each sampled family. Second, the existing columns and rows in an Excel document can assist with taking and editing analytic codes and memos. Finally, it was easier to move and modify both the quotations and the analytic memos, as a chunk within each single sample, and to assist with subsequent cross-comparisons among different samples. Diagram 10 presents the use of Excel worksheet to manage the data analysis within a single sampled family.

**Analytic Phase II: Data display**

**Main task: abstracts data and analytic codes**

Visual data display methods were employed to help the researcher to make sense of the data. Step 3 of the IPA analytic guideline is to search for themes and connections by engaging with the original text. During this step, a researcher can also make sense of the data (Smith 1995, 2004; Smith and Eatough 2006). On the other hand, the main task of the Analytic Phase II 'Data Display', suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), is to make sense of the data through graphs and tables. This method is also echoed by the Event Structure Analysis, in discerning the linkage among each event, through displaying data in graphs (Tesch 1990). Two models, suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), were adapted to the data analysis: the decision tree modelling and the event flow network diagrams.

Decision tree modelling is a flow chart tracking how a decision is made, as shown in Diagram 11. Decision tree modelling has the advantages of displaying the routes toward final decision outcomes and outlining the conditions of each decision step. It is particularly useful in examining how an individual decision has been made. On the other hand, the event flow network is a diagram indicating events (e.g. experiences or incidents) in sequential order, and is particularly useful in showing the interviewees' previous visiting experiences with the sampling museums. However, both the tree modelling and the event flow networks were considered as almost incomparable to the theoretical model, and it is difficult to discern the key considerations behind each step or each event. The event flow network and the decision modelling therefore offer inspiration to the researcher, in developing her own diagrammatic display methods.
The researcher has invented a series of visual data displays that relate to the conceptual framework, through the use of the Microsoft PowerPoint package. The visual display started from a descriptive level and moved toward an analytic level. The purpose of drawing decision-related diagrams is to identify the key decision-making stages involved in a process and the interactive dynamic inside and outside the family groups.

- The first diagram is a summary of the overall decision-making process. The elements include what kind of actions (or interactions) take place, when the actions occurred and by whose effort, and the considerations behind the actions.

- Based on the first diagram, the second diagram moves to a more analytical level which reveals how decision-making stages were labelled, according to the conceptual family decision making model. New codes of decision-making stages were added whenever applicable, as Diagram 12 shows.

- The third diagram is a summary of the emerged consideration set, as Diagram 13 shows. It allows the researcher to track which museums and other leisure options were proposed but abandoned before the final decision was made.

- The fourth diagram aims to illustrate the interactive dynamics among family members. It also helps to identify who was involved in a joint decision and the shifting dynamics between individual and group levels, as Diagram 14 illustrates.
Chapter 6 Methodical and Procedural Issues

Diagram 12 An example of the analytic diagram illustrated the evolution of the decision-making stages

Family 13 - The stages of making the decision to visit the ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology (abbreviated as SMA)

(Time: 9 days before the visit)

Stage: Information
Stimulus (raise interest)
Father saw the TV news about the special exhibition of the SMA

Stage: Information Evaluation
Father judged the special exhibition appealing to children

Stage: Initial Decision
Father judged if possible, he could take his children to visit the SMA

Stage 1: Need arousal
Father asked "shall we go out today?"

Stage 2: Information Search
(Father recalled his decision the week before)

Stage 3: Purchase suggestion
Father suggested to visit the SMA to mother

Stage 4: Suggestion evaluation
Mother thought it was a good idea

Stage 5: Final decision
Parents decided to visit the SMA

Stage 6A: Informing children
Parents informed children about visiting the decision

Key:
The actual stage of the decision making
(T ime of the actions)
The action of / interactions between the family members

(Time: on the morning before the visit)

Viewing guide of the flow chart:
1. Start from the top left green text and then read the yellow textbox with the blue textbox together
2. Follow the arrows
3. Move to the next green text, repeat the Step 1 & 2

Diagram 13 An example of the analytic diagram illustrating the consideration set

An example of the emerged consideration sets

Family 24 Decision making process
Stage 1 Need Arousal
Search setting
Stage 2 Information Search (Internal)
Stage 3 Purchase Suggestion
Stage 4 Suggestion Evaluation
Stage 5 Final Purchase Decision

Family 24 Consideration sets
Indoor venues
1st search
Category A: Cinema
The Chronicles of Narnia

2nd search
Category A: Cinema
(Option A2 - another film)
Memoirs of a Geisha

3rd search
Category B: Museums
National Palace Museum
Taipei Astronomical Museum
(Option B2)
Decision - Taipei Astronomical Museum (B2)

123
The researcher discovered that couple advantages in using visual display methods to help the understanding and making sense of the data. They facilitated the researcher not only in maintaining the sequential nature of making family leisure choices to visit museums, but also in gaining a holistic view about the data and their inter-connections. The researcher also noted down the keywords used and wrote her memos on her own innovated decision-making flow charts, which helps the research effectively organise and make sense of the data. The visual display methods provide an abstract of the decision-making stages and lodge family interactive dynamics within a conceptual framework. The abstract process enables the researcher to search patterns of meanings and themes effectively. It can also produce a better means of achieving the final analytic phase (Miles and Huberman 1994). The process of articulating the analytic framework is another key strategy for achieving the adequacy of interpretation (Morrow 2005, Yeh and Inman 2007).

Analytic Phase III: Conclusion drawing and verification

Main task: repeat cross-comparisons and refine the emerged themes

The adequacy of interpretation can be achieved by two strategies: first, via repeat comparisons and constant revision of data coding and categorisation; second, by identifying discrepant evidence (Morrow 2005, Yeh and Inman 2007). The researcher would like to add one more strategy, which is to engage with self-observations about the study’s reflection on the research topic. First, cross-comparisons among different samples, and the search for the shared meanings across samples, are an on-going process throughout the data analysis and interpretation. Microsoft Excel spreadsheets were also employed over the period of the cross-comparisons, as Diagram 15 shows.
The Excel matrices enabled the researcher to find out common themes emerging from different samples and the choice of best quotations from similar data.

Second, the researcher has modified more than five drafts of the Findings and Discussion – Chapters 7 to 9 – before the submission of this thesis. The revisions were made on three aspects: (i) the chapter structures, (ii) dealing with any discrepant evidence, and (iii) the interpretation of text, in the chapters. During each revision, this researcher re-examined the analytic coding and the categories, at both micro and macro levels (each sampled family and the integration of different families to relevant topics). Unlike the positivist approach, which rejects a potential ‘negative case’ based on explanations of theories, this researcher treated those contradictory or uncertain cases as an opportunity to further refine analytic coding and categories, during the interpretation process. These repeat comparisons and refinements attempt to achieve a better interpretation that can bring out key meanings embedded in the family decision-making process.

Diagram 15 An example of using Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to assist cross-comparisons among the data
During the data analysis, interpretation and presentation processes, the researcher has constantly engaged in self-reflection and observations about one's own experiences in making group outings choices with family members and friends (such as visiting museums, eating-out and cinema-going). Notes were taken about how decisions were made and which decision-making stages experienced, as well as about the interactions between group members. These observations of daily experiences help the researcher to refine categories of data analysis and to interpret the data more closely to the reality. For example, one of the key observations entailed quick conversations, among group members, that were often made when proposing suitable purchasing options (the consideration set) and deciding the final decisions. However, how the group members' values and judgements about the proposed options and those exclusions (the 'inept set' and the 'inert set') had rarely been explained. This observation has led the researcher to re-coding the data and to separate the participants' psychological considerations from what they were actually discussing among group members. The process of modification of analysis and interpretation achieved the benefits pointed out by Morrow (2005), which facilitates the production of a richer explanation of the studied phenomena.
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Summary

This chapter presents the process of how the data of this research was collected and analysed. Several discussions are made over self-reflexivity about how to conduct the chosen data collection methods, the quality of the data obtained, and the implementation of data analysis and interpretation. It illustrates the experiences gained from both the preliminary research and the piloting that had assisted the researcher in finding a better sampling strategy to recruit family groups, when conducting the main fieldwork in four sampled museum sites, in Taiwan. Ethical considerations for researching with child participants, during family interviews, are presented, particularly the address to the adult-child power relations. Self-reflections and improvements on interview skills are made. The key enhancement included using daily spoken language to compose the interview questions instead of theoretical-orientated questions, adjusting the composition of the interview questions for children in order to accommodate the level of competence and linguistic understanding, particularly those young children, and letting the interviewees speak of their recollection on the decision-making processes and other related experiences. Moreover, the researcher developed a series of strategy to tackle the nature of gradual collection regarding what happened before the final decisions to visit museums were made.

The data obtained from family interviews provided rich information about adult and child participants' perspectives and their interactions, at the decision-making level. Due to the nature of the gradual collections embedded in the data, the researcher adjusted the analytic steps, suggested by Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis, and consulted the analytic techniques that illustrate data through Event Structure Analysis. At the initial data analysis stage, the researcher experienced difficulty in making sense of the data, by the application of qualitative data analysis software ATLAS.ti. After more than a year's trial, the researcher developed her own analytic steps by using the Microsoft Word and the Microsoft Excel package to manage data analysis and applying visual data displays to assist with understanding family interactions throughout the decision-making process.
Part IV: Findings and Discussion

The three findings chapters illustrate the context of family leisure/tourism decisions to visit museums. Chapter 7 presents the process how museums and other leisure service products emerged as the potential purchase options and how the family groups reached their final purchase decisions to visit the sampling museums with whose active and passive inputs. The data presents a mixture of planned and impulse decisions, which were made jointly with the inclusion of children or exclusively by the adults. The chapter focuses on the presentation of different decision patterns and demonstrates the interactions among family members and with an external network outside the core family system. Chapter 8 presents the family group's elaborations on the reasons behind their planned and impulse decisions. The chapter reveals a list of similar desires and evaluative criteria used by the adults and children who had direct inputs in the planning process. The power dynamics and the decision roles of the parents are discussed. It also shows how much information about the decisions to visit museums the adults gave to children despite the extensive passive consideration they had taken for children in the planned decisions. Finally, the key desire behind the impulse decisions is illustrated. The chapter finishes with the common desire behind both the planned and the impulse decisions. Chapter 9 presents several decision characteristics of the family leisure weekend outing decisions to visit the museum, how the decisions were made, and the characteristics of family interactions. The chapter discusses the features of key decision-making stages, such as the type of desires that emerged, the information search behaviour and the evaluation behaviour. The revisions of the conceptual model and the definitions of the decision roles were made. It reveals the important role children played and the nature of their inputs over the planned decisions.
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~ Chapter 7 ~

Planned and Impulse Decisions

Introduction

This chapter presents the decision context of making family leisure/tourism decisions to visit the sampling museums and the interactions among family members at the decision-making level. It reveals three decision dimensions with supporting interview excerpts. Firstly, it illustrates how museums and other leisure service products emerged as the consideration set (the options being considered as the potential purchase choices). Secondly, it presents how the sampled families reached their final purchase decisions to visit the sampling museums. Finally, it shows whose direct and indirect involvements were engaged in the selection process. The data presented a mixture of planned and impulse decisions.

The planned decisions refer to the final choices to visit the museums that were made in the pre-planning stage. The emphasis, here, is the involvement of information search and alternative considerations that the final chosen museums had emerged and discussed as potential purchase options during the planning process. The decision patterns being identified in the planned decisions varies with different decision roles played by adults and children. The planned decisions were mainly made in last minutes, either on the day or the day before the visits, which support the findings of previous museum studies (Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004).

The impulse decisions refers to no pre-planning process is involved, among the family members, that associates with the specific museums the families chose to visit on the days of their outings and trips. One point needs to be clarified about the definition here: that is that the visit is based on the family group’s perspective, rather than from the sampled museum’s perspective, as previous museum studies have shown (Kelly et al. 2004). This definition reflects the idea of lacking pre-planning activities involved prior to the trips used by Becken and Wilson (2006), but the researcher further specifies its lack of pre-planning activity with the particular museums the families visited, at the end of the day. That is to say, the definition is better to mirror the fact that some families actually had planed to visit
other destinations earlier than their impulse choices determined. The distinction between the planned and the impulse choices can assist in the understanding of the nature embedded in family leisure decisions.

Table 7 briefs the type of family decisions to visit the museums made by the sampled families. There are twenty-three planned decisions and nine impulse decisions. The type of the impulse decision varies from a pure impulsive one, to an alternative to a planned decision. The rest of five families' visits were part of organised tours. For example, the father of Family 9 stated that:

'Today we came to the National Center for Traditional Arts because our company organised a lunch party here. We were told to bring our own family members to join the event'.

These family decisions to join the organised tours were mainly made by the parents. The decision pattern of these five families was less emphasised on the discussion, here, due to their purchase choices to visit the attractions were decided by the organised institutions/groups rather than the families, themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7 The summary of the type of family decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The planning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulse decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pure impulse decisions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alternatives to planned decisions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Substitutes for frustrated planned decisions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chapter is divided into two parts: the planned decisions (Part I - Sections 7.1 and 7.2) and the impulse decisions (Part II Sections 7.3 and 7.4). Since couples' impulse decisions involved pre-planning choices to visit other attractions, their decision patterns have been integrated with the discussion on the planned decisions. Each part is further classified into 'the joint decisions' and 'the adult-made decisions', with a series of decision patterns identified by the researcher (see Diagram 16 the structure of this chapter).

The joint decisions, here, refer to those purchase choices made by the parents/other adults and the children together. Whereas the evidence of the joint
decisions, offered by previous decision research (Section 3.2.1), tended to exclude children, Sterry (2004) indicates that some family decisions to visit museums were made with the involvements from children and adults. The definition of the joint decision and its supporting evidence stresses the children’s direct involvements in the joint attributes. Conversely, the adult-made decisions refer to the purchase choices made exclusively by the parents and other adult members, without any direct input from children. Since the data indicates that children played important roles in family leisure decision-making process, therefore, children are treated as vital participants of the family decision-making unit in this research. Every child’s active and passive involvements are viewed as contributions to the whole decision-making process, rather than as influential forces against parents, as discussed in Section 3.4.1.

Diagram 16 The structure of Chapter 7

The presentation of this chapter focuses on who was directly involved in the decisions at what decision-making stages, and demonstrates the interactions among family members and with the external network outside the core family system. The evaluative criteria used by adults and children, such as practical concerns, will be elaborated in Chapter 8. Appendix F presents a full list of which family group’s decision is planned and which is impulsive.
Part I – The planned decisions

The section presents those decisions being made with pre-planning activities. The theoretical logical-flow model conceptualises consumer purchase decision-making as an act of problem-solving. According to the model, a purchase decision starts from the aroused needs or desires the consumers held in mind (Stage 1) and follows by searching available options from internal memory or external sources and sharing the search results (Stages 2). After evaluating those considered purchase options (Stage 3), the final purchase decision was made, which means the problem was solved (Stage 4). The data indicated that making family leisure decisions, such as visiting museums, were triggered by different forms of needs, including the desire to visit or to revisit particular museums, the desire to have a family day out (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007), the desire to find a place to visit in a weekend tourism trip and the desire to offer children knowledge stimulation or a meaningful day out.

The following sections present how these desires were manifested in different decision patterns, and how adults and children interacted before they reached the final decisions to visit the museums. Some decisions were made with the direct input from children (Section 7.1) and some without (Section 7.2). The data indicates that children played important roles in the family decisions to visit the museums, no matter how the decisions were made. The planned decision-making process suggests that the family visits to museums did not always begin with a clear and purposeful intention directly associated with museum products, as the museum literature presumed.

It should be noted that a number of additional stages expanding from the conceptual model are used in the illustration of a joint planning process. These additional decision-making stages were found out during the period of data analysis and interpretation. The proposed stages aim to clarify the interactions among family members, at the Pre-Purchase behaviour level, and highlight the active roles children played in the decision-making process. They include the ‘Purchase Request’ stage, the ‘Consulting Children’ stage and the ‘Purchase Suggestion’ stage. The Children's Request refers to the stage where children make requests to their parents, without being consulted, after the Need Arousal stage (Stage 1) of the conceptual model, which has been marked as Stage 2-2A in the diagram presentation. The Consulting Children stage refers to the stage
where children are consulted by the adult members, about their preferences, which has been marked as Stage 2-1A in the diagram presentation. The Purchase Suggestion refers to the stage where one group member suggests his/her results of information search to another member, which has been marked as Stage 2-2B in the diagram presentation.

### 7.1 Joint planned decisions

The first type of the decisions to visit the museums was made jointly between parents/grandparents and children. The joint attribute of family leisure planning behaviour identified in previous research tended to be limited to the role of parents (Nichols and Spenger 1988, Litvin et al. 2004, Mottiar and Quinne 2004, Wang et al. 2004). The significant influence of children and adolescents over family leisure and holiday choices has been identified in previous research; however, the intensive interactions among family members have rarely been presented. The planned decisions here highlight the interactive dynamics of the joint decisions, with the inclusion of children.

The order of the joint planned decisions presented, here, is based on who initiated the Need Arousal Stage and the involvements the adult and child members had. Section 7.1.1 reveals those decisions requested by children to visit/revisit the museums they were interested in, and then decided by the parents (Families 28, 32, 35 and 36), which has been labelled as ‘a child requested, parents decided’. Sections 7.1.1 to 7.1.4 present those decisions initiated by the parents (Families 1, 2, 7, 18, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 32 and 35), with the direct involvement from children, through making purchase suggestions and deciding the final purchase choices. These decision patterns have been labelled as follows: ‘parents consulted a child, parents decided’ (Section 7.1.2), ‘parents searched/consulted a child, a child decided’ (Section 7.1.3) and ‘parents searched, decided together’ (Section 7.1.4).

#### 7.1.1 A child requested, parents decided

This section features those joint decisions that are made in response to the children’s purchase requests to visit or revisit particular museums (MORI 2001). The request behaviour supports the evidence of children’s active involvement in the Need Arousal Stage of family leisure decisions (e.g. Belch et al. 1985, Darley and Lim 1986, Swinyard and Sim 1987, Wang et al, 2004, Shoham and Dalakas 2005). There were two sources stimulating these children’s desires and their
subsequent purchase requests to visit or revisit the museums: (i) the information stimulus from school curriculum, and (ii) the positive experiences in previous visits.

The 10-year-old younger child of Family 35 and the 11-year-old elder child of Family 36 demonstrated the same purchase request being stimulated by a subject covered in school curriculum. Both children who were at the Grade 5, of different primary schools, learned about the same prehistoric culture in their Social Studies classes. The subject both children learned directly linked to the ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology. After their teachers’ recommendations, the children transformed their desires to see this museum (see Stage 1 of Diagram 17) into purchase requests (see Stage 2-2A of Diagram 17). The request behaviour, which the children made to their parents, supports one of the family motivational themes, ‘interests in museums’: that is, the desire to see museum collections and exhibitions (Falk and Dierking 1994, Moussouri 2003, Sterry 2004, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). The request approach both children used was ‘just ask’ (Palan and Wilkes 1997, Williams and Burns 2000), however, with additional ‘briefings’ (specifying the subject they learned from the schools and briefing the content of the museum). Next, the parents acted as the evaluators and the decision-makers to evaluate their children’s requests.

The following excerpt illustrates how the family interactions, between parents and children, manifested. Diagram 17 illustrates the key features of this decision pattern visually. Row A of this diagram represents the decision-making stages involved, whereas Row B indicates who was involved in the relevant stage, and the interactions between the parents and the child, for example, the child request to the parents, at the Purchase Request Stage. Row C presents the type of the desire echoing to the motivational theme ‘interests in museum’, which the child arouse at the Need Arousal stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Who proposed to visit this museum?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elder son (11)</td>
<td>[points to himself] Me! Because this semester our Social Studies textbook mentioned the history of the Shihsan-Hang culture. Our teacher said when we were free we can visit the ShihSanHang Museum of Archeology. There are many things inside the museum, which are beyond the sketch of the textbook. (After the class), I told mum and dad that I want to visit this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
museum and briefed what kind of exhibits was on display inside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Yesterday my elder boy mentioned that he wanted to visit this museum. I said, 'alright'!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Family 36

**Diagram 17** The decision-making stages and the interactive dynamics of the joint decision pattern ‘a child requested, parents decided’

(A) The decision-making stages

1. Stage 1: Need Arousal
2. Stage 2-1: Information Search
3. Stage 2-2A: Purchase Request
4. Stage 3: Alternative Evaluation
5. Stage 4: Purchase Decision

(B) Active inputs & Interactions

- One child
- The child
- The child to the parents
- The Parents
- The Parents

(C) Motivational theme

- Interests in museums

(Example: Family 36)

Not every child’s purchase request has been successfully approved by their parents. Children of Families 28 and 32 demonstrated that their desires to revisit particular museums were stimulated by the positive experiences they had before in family visits. The request to revisit an attraction or a service product supports previous evidence, offered by family holiday research (Thornton et al. 1997, Gram 2007), but expands the evidence of revisiting the museums motivated by previous school trips (MORI 2001) to family visits. However, both mothers rejected their children’s initial requests, due to some practical concerns. The practical criteria will be explained further in Chapter 8. After receiving firm rejections from their parents, both children retained their desires to revisit the museums without further requests. Both children proposed revisiting the museums again, after a couple of days, when they were consulted about where they wanted to go for outings (the Purchase Suggestion Stage) (see next section 7.1.2).

7.1.2 Parents consulted a child, parents decided

Sections 7.1.2 to 7.1.5 present those decisions were made in response to the desires to find a place to visit in day outings and for tourism trips raised by the adult members (the Need Arousal stage), with the active input from children across the rest of the decision-making stages. Where previous quantitative research shows that the influence of children over family leisure decisions at the
Information Search Stage was at its lowest (e.g. Belch et al. 1985, Shoham and Dalakas 2005), conflicting evidence shows that children exercised more input over destination-related and activities-related sub-decisions such as where to go (e.g. Jenkins 1979, Wang et al. 2004). The second decision pattern here offers evidence that children were involved in making purchase suggestions for outings or for tourism trips, after being consulted by their parents and grandparents (Families 2, 7, 28, 32).

The findings on children's suggestion behaviour expand previous evidence on high-involvement type of decisions (e.g. holiday planning decisions, Thornton et al 1997, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2003, 2004b) to low-involvement decisions (e.g. days out and weekend trips). More significantly, while previous evidence shows that the suggestion behaviour was particularly salient among adolescents, the data shows that the ages of those children, who were consulted, went down to as young as 11-years-old (Family 2). The consideration set proposed by children were then evaluated and decided by the parents and the grandparents, who claimed that they would normally yield to their children/grandchildren's suggestions; if they judged the proposed options were acceptable. The following extract exemplifies how a family interacted in this type of decision pattern. Diagram 18 presents the interactive dynamic visually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>In general, when we want to have a day or half-of-the-day outing at our home county, we let our children decide.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>We would ask our children 'where do you want to go today?' We normally ask our elder daughter, because her sister is still little.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder daughter (11)</td>
<td>Today, I told mum, 'let us go to the National Centre for Traditional Arts first, and then go somewhere else in the evening'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>As long as my children's suggestions are acceptable and feasible, we take them wherever they want to go.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family 2, with children aged 11 and 6
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Diagram 18 The decision-making stages and the interactive dynamics of the joint decision pattern, 'parents consulted children, parents decided'

- Joint planned decisions -
  (2) Parents consulted children, parents decided

(A) The decision-making stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2-1</th>
<th>Stage 2-1</th>
<th>Stage 2-2B</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need Arousal</td>
<td>Consulting Children</td>
<td>Information Search</td>
<td>Purchase Suggestion</td>
<td>Alternative Evaluation</td>
<td>Purchase Decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Active inputs & Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Parents to one child</th>
<th>The child</th>
<th>The child to parents</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(C) Motivational theme

| Desire to day out |

(Example: Family 2)

7.1.3 Parents searched/consulted a child, a child decided

No previous museum research has shown that some family visits to museums are decided by children. This decision type particularly stresses that children acted as the decision-makers, who made the decisions from a sibling’s (Family 24) or from their parents’ (Families 22 and 29) purchase suggestions. This section gives details to support decision literature about the influence of children over the Purchase Decision stage (e.g. Szybillo and Sosanie 1977, Dunne 1999).

The first case shows how a child naturally becomes the decision-maker (Family 24). The decision-making stages before the Final Purchase Decision were same with Section 7.1.2, wherein a child was consulted by the parents. The final purchase decisions was reached, since the 12-year-old younger child of Family 24 gave an instant and positive response to one of the museums his sister proposed; meanwhile, he expressed his lack of interests in visiting the other option. Diagram 19 presents the decision-making stages, the type of the desire and the interactive dynamics of this decision pattern visually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>(We said to our daughter) 'Someone has to suggest a place where we can go,' and then she came up with the idea of either visiting the National Palace Museum or the Taipei Astronomical Museum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger child (12)</td>
<td>(When my sister mentioned the Taipei Astronomical Museum) I said I had been there before. It was great fun!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mother [talks to his son] You did say something like, ‘Taipei Astronomical Museum is quite good’. But he does not fancy going to the National Palace Museum. That is why we came here (the Astronomical Museum) today.

Family 24, with children aged 15 and 12

Diagram 19 The decision-making stages and the interactive dynamics of the joint decision pattern, ‘parents consulted a child, a child decided’

- Joint planned decisions -
(3) Parents consulted children, a child decided

(A) The decision-making stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 Need Arousal</th>
<th>Stage 2-1 Consulting Children</th>
<th>Stage 2-1 Information Search</th>
<th>Stage 2-2B Purchase Suggestion</th>
<th>Stage 3 Alternative Evaluation</th>
<th>Stage 4 Purchase Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(B) Active inputs & Interactions

Parents | Parents to children | One child | One child to parents | Another child | Another child |

(C) Motivational theme

Desire to day out

(Example: Family 24)

The second case shows children’s active involvements were intentionally invited by their parents, who carefully selected a couple of attractions (the consideration set) and suggested them to their elder children (Families 22, 29). Next, the decisions were made to wherever the elder children picked. This decision pattern was called ‘parents searched, a child decided’ to specify parents’ control on the selection of the consideration set. The age of the decision-makers presented in this section was as young as 7 years old (Family 29). Diagram 20 presents the decision-making stages and the interactive dynamics of this decision pattern visually.

Mother Today we (the parents) came up with three options: the National Palace Museum, the National Taiwan Science Education Centre and the Taipei Astronomical Museum. Then we asked our elder child whether he was interested in visiting any of these three places and let him pick the one he wanted to go to.

Elder son (11) Mom asked me this morning where I wanted to go today. When she mentioned the Taipei Astronomical Museum, I just replied that I wanted to go to the Astronomical Museum.

Family 22, with children aged 11 and 5
Diagram 20  The decision-making stages and the interactive dynamics of the decision pattern ‘parents searched, a child decided’

(A) The decision-making stages

1. Stage 1: Need Arousal
2. Stage 2-1: Information Search
3. Stage 2-2B: Purchase Suggestion
4. Stage 3: Alternative Evaluation
5. Stage 4: Purchase Decision

(B) Active inputs & interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Parents to elder child</th>
<th>The child</th>
<th>The child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) Motivational theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Desire to day out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Example: Family 22)

7.1.4 Parents searched, decided together

This decision pattern particularly stresses the active inputs from the entire adult and child members of the groups in making the final purchase decisions after the purchase suggestions were given (Families 1, 18, 30 and 35). A simple voting system was employed during the Alternative Evaluation (stage 3) and the Purchase Decision (stage 4), in response to satisfy the desires for a day outing (Family 18) and for touring (finding an attraction to visit in the weekend trip, Family 1) as well as the changed plan for an outing (finding an alternative place to visit, Family 35). The voting was also employed in making a cross-family decision for the place to carry out the children’s school project (three 11-year-old children from three families, Family 30). The purpose of the voting was to consult every member’s interest in visiting the proposed attractions, and the final decision was reached because every one in the group was happy about it. The finding adds a new aspect of using a voting system with the inclusion of children to reach the final decisions. The youngest child, who was reported to participate in the voting, was the 3-year-old child (Family 18). Diagram 21 presents the interactive dynamics of this decision pattern visually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>This weekend we came to Yi-Lan and stayed overnight. Last night we were discussing today’s itinerary, and I proposed taking this opportunity to visit the National Centre for Traditional Arts. We used voting to consult every member’s interests in visiting the place. My child got one vote too.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family 1, with only child aged 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Diagram 21 The decision-making stages and the interactive dynamics of the joint decision pattern 'parents searched, decided together'

7.2 Adult-made planned decisions

This type of decision was made exclusively by the adults. Even though the children of these families had no direct input in these adult-made decisions, the parents and other adult members revealed many passive considerations for their children. The order to the adult-made planned decisions is based on who participated in the decision-making process. Section 7.2.1 reveals those individual decisions made by a parent (Families 14, 19, 21, 27 and 33). Section 7.2.2 presents those joint decisions made between the parents (Families 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, 23 and 25). Section 7.2.3 shows cross-family decisions that made between a parent of a family and a husband of another family (Families 20 and 31).

7.2.1 Individual decisions

This decision pattern extends previous findings on the joint decisions and shows that family choices to visit museums can be made by individual members (the mothers of Families 21, 27, 33, and the aunt of Family 19). The individual decisions were made mainly due to the absence of the other parents, in the planned travelling days. The process of the decision making began with the desires to find a place to visit for a day out with a nephew (Family 19) and for a family weekend trip (Families 14 and 27). Both desires have been covered in Section 7.1 (the joint planned decisions). Here, the presentation intends to highlight those decisions being made to meet the parental desires to offer knowledge stimulation to their children and to satisfy children's personal interests.

These parents expressed that their final decisions to visit the museums, specifically the Taipei Astronomical Museum, were made, since the content of the
museum was related to the subjects of their children's interests and school learnings. The motivation of satisfying the interest of children echoes back to previous museum studies (Kelly et al. 2004, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). The data offers more details on how the parents detected 'the interest of their children' and subsequently chose to visit a particular museum that responded to the 'interests'. The examples of the interactive events between the parents and the children include:

- a child asked his parents some questions about the subject he was curious about (e.g. the 5-year-old child of Family 23 asked 'what is inside the Earth?');
- a child shared the joy of learning an interesting subject with her parents, after the lesson (e.g. the 9-year-old child of Family 27 told to her parents about learning galaxy at school);
- a child shared the subject he learned from school with his parents, meanwhile, he also read relevant books and inquired relevant questions regarding the subject (e.g. the 3-year-old child of Family 21 learned nature science and asked questions regarding space man);
- the parents noticed the reading interests of their child (e.g. the 10-year-old child of Family 33 liked to read books about horoscopes) or the subject their children learned from schools, with no direct information from the children (e.g. after the parents of Family 25 signed their children's 'the Teacher-Parent's Daily Communication Book').

After these interactive events, the parents raised the desires to offer knowledge stimulation to their children (the Need Arousal Stage) and recalled that there was a museum associating with the subjects of children's school learning and personal interests (the Information Search stage), when they had the product knowledge (Families 21 and 33). The decisions to visit the museums were arrived at when the emergent museum was judged as suitable to the children. Diagram 22 presents the decision-making stages involved in the individual decision visually. This type of adult-made decision answers the question about whose motivations were presented, in reports of satisfying the interests of children (Kelly et al. 2004, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). Unlike Section 7.1.1 showing children's purchase requests to visit the museums they were interested in, the decision pattern presented, here, illustrates how the parents' responses to the interests of children
had been expressed implicitly through a casual format of family interactions.

Mother | My younger boy is keen on nature science. His teacher introduced many books to them at school. Recently, he likes to ask us some questions about space men and how to travel to space. I know the Taipei Astronomical Museum because I ever visited it once, when I studied in Taipei. These two weeks I had been thinking to take my children to this museum on a coming weekend. So the boy can see something related to his interests.

Family 21, with children aged 5 and 3

Diagram 22 The decision-making stages of the adult-made individual decision

Not every parent showed an immediate decision to bring his or her children to visit a relevant museum, after they discerned what their children learned or were interested in. This was because the parents lacked the product knowledge related to the existence of any relevant museums (Family 27). Even though some parents recognised a relevant museum and even considered visiting the museum with their children (Families 23 and 25), their final decisions were pending due to weak motivations to make a trip to visit the institution purposefully. These parents’ desires to show children knowledge stimulation were raised, and their subsequent decisions to visit the relevant museum were made after they consulted external sources to respond to their needs for later tourist trips. A rather more complex process will be explained in next section.

7.2.2 Joint decisions between parents

This section presents those joint decisions made between the parents with the passive considerations for the children (Families 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, 23 and 25). The first case demonstrates how the parents decided to visit the museum in response
to their outing desires, with an internal information search. For example in Family 13, the museum was proposed due to the father’s consideration that the interactive exhibit of the special exhibition, which he saw on the news, might be attractive to his children. The parent’s judgement supports previous findings that some family visits were motivated by special exhibitions appealing to children (MORI 2001) and the chance to offer interesting things for children to see and do (Adams 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Last week I saw a television news report about the mayor visiting the ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology for the laser-fishing game (of the special exhibition). It left me an impression that the laser-fishing game might be suitable for my children. This morning I said (to my wife), ‘shall we go out today?’ and ‘how about go to the ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology?’ My wife and I briefly discussed it and then we just set off. My children did not take part in the discussion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family 13, with children aged 9 and 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second and a rather complex process involved in the parental joint decisions, due to the parents’ initial purchase choices that were judged as inappropriate by external sources. Previous evidence has shown that the word-of-mouth recommendations from a personal network (e.g. friends and relatives) have often been used as the primary source of information for museum visits (Falk and Dierking 1994, Dierking and Falk 1994, Sterry 2004, Dierking et al. 2005) and planning family holidays (Mintel 2004c). Here, the data demonstrates further details on the interactions between the parents and their personal networks to reach the decision to visit a museum in their weekend trips, and how the parents raised the desires to offer their children knowledge stimulation by paying a visit to the museum. For example, after the parents of Families 23 and 25 reached their initial purchase decisions choices, deriving from the internal information search, their choices were judged as inappropriate for the age of the children (Family 23) and less practical (Family 25) by close relatives’ recommendations. Therefore, the parents engaged further information search either internally (Family 23) or externally (Family 25) (see additional information search of Diagram 23). Next, the Taipei Astronomical Museum emerged as a better alternative, and the final decisions were thus reached. Unlike Section 7.2.1, the parents only recalled the connection between the alternative museum and their children’s personal
interests/school learning and raised the desires to offer their children a chance for knowledge stimulation, until the second Information Search and the Purchase Suggestion took place (see Diagram 23).

**Father**
Actually, my first choice was to take my children to visit the Y17 (Recreation Centre for Young People). Then, I phoned my sister, since she lives in Taipei and had visited the Y17 before. My sister said the Y17 is not suitable for my children, at their ages. So we were thinking if there were other places more suitable for our children.

**Mother**
After that, I suggested visiting the Taipei Astronomical Museum, because I recalled that my elder boy recently is very curious about astronomy. [says to the dad] Then you said 'let us go to the astronomical museum.'

**Father**
Exactly! (After mom's suggestion,) I remembered my elder boy loves astronomy. There were models of the Earth and the Moon in the astronomical museum that he can see.

**Family 23, with children aged 5 and 3**

Diagram 23 The decision-making stages and the interactive dynamics of the adult-made joint decision

- Adult-made planned decisions -
  (2) Joint decisions between parents

- **(A) The decision-making stages**
  - Stage 1: Need Arousal
  - Stage 2-1: Information Search
  - Stage 2-2B: Purchase Suggestion
  - Stage 3: Alternative Evaluation
  - Stage 4: Purchase Decision

- **(B) Active inputs & interactions**
  - Father and mother
  - Father
  - Father to mother
  - Father and mother

- **Mother to father**
  - Mother
  - Mother to father

- **(C) Motivational theme**
  - Weekend tourism trip
  - Enhance children's knowledge

(Example: Family 23)
7.2.3 Cross-family joint decisions

This section presents the adult-made decisions made jointly across two families, among the parents and the extended family members (the grandparents and the aunt, Family 31), and between the parent and a non-family adult member (Family 20). This section particularly highlights the decision pattern showing how an adult of one family, who frequently visited museums, suggested it to another family, who had never been to any museums before (Family 20). Family 20 supports the example of a family visit which was proposed by a parent's friend, who had no children (Kelly et al. 2004). The composition of this family group contained two neighbouring families (here refers to Families X and Y). The husband of the Family X, who was a frequent visitor to many museums, often suggested to his adult acquaintances to bring their children to visit some museums that he considered as suitable places for their children.

The frequent visitor's suggestions were often made when he encountered other parents with their children and showed his attentive attitude of concern, regarding what sort of leisure activity the families have done, and the attractions they planned to visit. His recommendations were a sort of information sharing with other parents. The intention behind the frequent visitor's suggestion behaviour is similar to the parental desires to offer children knowledge stimulation mentioned in Sections 7.2.1 and 7.2.2, but indicates a stronger value that he believed museum-visiting was a more meaningful leisure activity for children. Like the mother of the Family Y, most parents responded positively toward the suggestions and normally made their first museum visits with him. Diagram 24 presents the decision-making stages and the interactive dynamics of this decision pattern visually.
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Question Who propose to visit the Taipei Astronomical Museum?

The husband of Family Y It is me! I suggested to the mother (of Family Y) and then she agreed to visit this museum. I visit museums very often, particularly this one. I also take some children of my acquaintances to visit this museum or suggest to the parents to bring their children here. Sometimes, when I encounter my neighbours or friends, I ask them 'where are you going to do later with your children?' The parents may answer, for example, 'today we are going to department stores or cinema'. Next, I would say, 'I know a lovely place you can visit with your children on your free time. That place is more meaningful to your children. I will just tell them the name of the place. If the parents do not know the place and how to get there, I just offer to accompany their visits.

Family 20, a parent with children aged 5 and 4 (Family Y) with a married couple without children (Family X)

Diagram 24 The decision-making stages and the interactive dynamics of the adult-made decision made across two families
Part II – The impulse decisions

The second part of this chapter presents those impulse decisions to visit the sampled museums. These visits are incidental and situational (Kelly et al. 2004, Becken and Wilson 2006), and the decisions were made in the middle of their trips, for days out and weekend travel. The major trigger for such impulsive decisions was the external information stimuli - the museum itself. This echoes back to previous research (Kelly et al. 2004) that the impulsive visits were decided when the families either walked past (Family 8) or drove past the museum buildings (Families 5, 6, 7, 16, 17), or when they spotted the road sign of the museum (Family 4). The data further indicates that a couple of impulsive visits were made because the families had other activities nearby the museums (Families 18, 37). The majority of the family groups, who made the impulsive choices, were mainly first-time visitors to the museums they dropped in on, except one family (Family 5). The presentation of the impulse decisions is divided into the joint decisions (Section 7.3) and the adult-made decisions (Section 7.4).

Museum literature has rarely revealed the main purpose of the outings and trips behind the unplanned visits and the pre-planning activities, prior to the impulse decisions. A decision study reveals that the overall plans for holiday travellers tend to be a mixture nature of planned and unplanned decisions (Becken and Wilson 2006). Those families, who made the impulse decisions to visit museums, disclosed all sort of reasons why they came to the surroundings of the museums and their initial purposes behind their trips. The reasons included: having activities at the surrounding areas of the museums (e.g. lunched out, Families 17, 16, 18; inspected the route of a sport event, Family 37), on their ways to the planned choices (Families 7, 8), and that they were on a road trip after other plans (Families 4, 5). That is to say, the primary intentions behind their travels and the impulsive visits were not purposefully associated with museum-visiting. According to their pre-planning activities prior to the impulse decisions, the findings show that the impulse decisions range from 'a pure impulsive decision' (referring to the travel without any plan to visit particular attractions in mind), to 'an alternative to planned decisions' (referring to the families voluntarily abandoned their initial planned choices) to 'a substitute for frustrated planned decisions' (referring to the families forced to discard their initial planned choices).
7.3 Joint impulse decisions

This section presents those impulse decisions made jointly between the parents and their children, and highlights the active participation of the children, in the impulse decisions, which has rarely been revealed in previous studies. The extent of the active inputs the children had, in these impulsive decisions to visit the sampled museums, was less than those planned decisions (Section 7.1). There was no evidence of either purchase requests or suggestion behaviour from the children, when the families encountered the museums. Section 7.3.1 presents the impulsive decision that was inspired by the positive experiences to the attraction shared by a child (Family 5). Section 7.3.2 shows that children supported their parents' sudden ideas to drop-in the museums (Families 7, 17 and 18).

7.3.1 A child shared, parents decided

This section presents how the impulsive decision was made because of the direct input from a child, who shared his previous visit to the attraction with his parents (Family 5). The 8-year-old only child recalled his previous visit, when the family drove past the National Centre for Traditional Arts, during a road trip. Next, the boy passionately shared with his parents, about his positive memory of the previous visit, which he made with his extended-family. The child's experience-sharing behaviour showed no particular intention to request that his parents revisit the institution, unlike the request behaviour mentioned in Section 7.1.1. But the positive experience the child had inspired the parents, who decided to drop in the museum. The pure impulse decision described, here, was not an exceptional case. The decision pattern Family 2 demonstrated on the sampling day was the 'parents consulted a child, parents decided'; however, this group echoed the same decision pattern of the impulse choices to make their first family visit to the museum, during the family interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>When we drove past here (the National Center for Traditional Arts), my son mentioned that he ever visited this place.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only son (8)</td>
<td>Last time my nanny, aunt and granduncle took me here. When we passed by the outside (of the museum building), I told mom and dad that the puppet souvenir I had was bought from here, and there were glove puppetry performances inside this place. So dad and mom brought me here and took another look.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3.2 Parents proposed, children supported

This section shows that the interests of children in dropping in on the museum were consulted by their parents, when making the impulse decisions. Becken and Wilson (2006) show that some family travellers changed their holiday plans due to new information received, even though a majority of them had planned their routes and itineraries in advance. The data shows similar pattern, in the context of family day outing and weekend travel. Right after the families encountered the Taipei Story House, the parents of Families 7 and 17 raised the whims to see the museum and suggested the ideas to the rest of the group members, including the children. The impulse decisions were made, since all group members were happy to pay a visit. The nature of the impulse decisions can be a purely impulsive one (Family 17) or an alternative to a planned decision (Family 7). The situation of Family 7 particularly support Rook and Gardner’s finding (1993) that the level of impulse choices increased when the travellers face an unknown environment, just as this family travelled away from home to visit the capital.

7.4 Adult-made impulse decisions

All these adult-made decisions were decided jointly, between the parents, and their natural range from a pure impulse choice (Families 4, 37) to an alternative, to a planned decision (Family 8). This section particularly emphasises the impulse decision as the substitutes for frustrated planned choices, due to adverse weather, which has been overlooked, across museum studies and leisure decision literature. Only one museum research investigation reveals that one motivation behind the unplanned visits was the choice of alternatives for rainy days (Kelly et al. 2004). Becken and Wilson (2006) also show that family holiday travellers change their plans due to weather conditions. Families 6 and 16 demonstrated that, since their initial planned choices were both upset by the weather factors,
these two families took road trips in search of substitutive indoor venues. Their impulsive visit to the Taipei Story House and the ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology, respectively, were made as the substitutes for the frustrated planned choices, and the decisions were taken without consulting the children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Today our plan was visiting the Window on China Theme Park but it rained.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>We have no specific ideas where we can go instead. We just decided to drive west toward the coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Later on, we had a thought that we could come to the Ba-Li riverside for cycling. But the rain did not stop. So we made a snap decision to drop in this museum (the ShihSanSan Museum of Archeology), as it is nearby.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family 6
Summary

This chapter presents a mixture of planned and impulse decisions and the variations of making the decisions with and without active input from children. It offers a more in-depth picture of how family groups interacted with each other and with people outside the core family unit before the final decisions to visit museums were made. The joint planned decisions, here, highlight the direct involvements of children at different decision-making stages. Some children acted as the initiators, who simply requested their parents to visit or revisit particular museums, in association with their school curriculum and the positive experience they had previously. Some children were consulted by the parents and the grandparents to exercise direct input in suggesting potential outing choices, and in making the final purchase decisions among those consideration sets proposed by their parents. The chapter offers evidence showing the direct input from young children, at pre-school age and primary school age, in the jointly planned decisions. Next, the chapter illustrates those planned decisions made entirely by the adults, but the passive considerations for the children had been taken. The adult-made decisions range from individual choices to joint decisions, between parents, and in across-family joint decisions.

The chapter also reveals those impulse decisions to visit museum with no pre-planning activities specifically associated with the museums the families visited, at the end of the sampling days. These impulse choices were incidental and were made based on a whim, after receiving external information stimuli associated with the museum buildings, or having activities in the surroundings of the museums. The impulse decisions argue the long-term assumptions, in museum literature, that family visits to museums were forms of purposeful behaviour. Families came to the surroundings of the museums for all sorts of reasons, and some had plans to visit other attractions prior to the impulsive visits. The extent of the active inputs children had, in these impulsive decisions to visit the sampled museums, was less than those planned decisions. There was no evidence of either purchase requests or suggestion behaviour from children when the families encountered the museums. The passive considerations for children had rarely been revealed among these impulse decisions.
Chapter 8 Understanding the Decisions

Introduction
This chapter presents the family group's elaborations on the reasons behind their planned and impulse decisions. The chapter is divided into two parts: the planned decisions (Part I) and the impulse decisions (Part II). The first part of this chapter presents the adults and children's considerations behind the planned decisions and shows the power dynamics between the adults and the children at the planning process. Section 8.1 reveals a list of similar desires and evaluative criteria reported by the adults and the children, who had the direct input in the selection process. Based on the adult respondents' elaborations, Section 8.2 reveals the hidden power the parents had in their control over when to invite the children's active inputs, on the one hand, and their roles as the gatekeepers, in family leisure choices, on the other. Adults also expressed their implicit attitudes towards the educational benefits museum-visiting can offer to the children. The data shows that passive influence of the children was evident in the planned decisions, no matter whether the choices were made jointly or exclusively by the adults. Section 8.3 reports the key motivation of the decisions to drop-in to the museums, with little expectation and consideration. Finally, seeking quality family time had been reported by the parents who made the planned and impulse decisions (Section 8.4).

Part I – The Planned decisions

Chapter 7 presents that the planned decisions tend to be decided at last-minute, and the overall process involved in the planned decisions was less complicated in term of the effort and time spent on search and evaluation. The majority of those families, who reached a planned decision to visit, did not start discussing where they wanted to go until the morning before the outings/trips or the day before. This finding supports recent research that explored the issues of family decisions to visit museums (Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004). There was neither serious debate among the family members nor the application of rigorous comparison before the final decisions were reached. The prevalent scenarios of the planned decision-making were, for example, that one member proposed visiting an attraction X, and then another member said 'fine!' The final choice was reached
fairly quickly. Nevertheless, the interviewees' elaborations, during the family interviews, demonstrated a rather complex thinking and value system behind the quick selection of the consideration set and the final purchase decisions.

Similar desires and evaluative criteria were uncovered by the adults and the children who played different decision roles (e.g. the initiators, the information gatherers, the decision-makers), at those various patterns presented in the planned decisions. That is to say, these common desires and criteria were reported both by those children who had active involvements in the joint decisions, and by the adults both in the joint decisions and the adult-made decisions. Some parents offered accounts of their assumptions about what their children's motivations and judgements might be in these joint decisions, which have been echoed back to the accounts given by the children. Secondly, it reveals a different emphasis on the practical issues and the educational benefits mentioned by the adults only (Section 8.1). The issues which adults take into account are more comprehensive than those reported by children as one can well imagine. The decision relationship between the adults and the children in the family leisure choices is revealed through the conditions given about when the adults are more likely to consult children's active inputs and what information is given to children about those adult-made decisions (Section 8.2).

8.1 Desires and evaluative criteria

The researcher distinguishes between the 'primary desires' and 'subtle desires' of the respondents from the 'evaluative criteria' used by them during the selection process. Such distinction had emerged from the process of data analysis and interpretation. The concept of 'evaluative criteria' (mentioned in Section 4.2.4C) refers to a series of decisive principles that tend to be cited as the factors influencing their selection among alternatives, and assisting their judgements over the proposed consideration set. For example, a mother refused her son's purchase suggestion to visit an aquarium because she reckoned the admission charge was too expensive. Factors like this price concern affects the adults' selection of the consideration set and the evaluation process, both in the joint decisions and the adult-made decisions. The application of these factors had been reinforced among those examples given by both the adults and the children as the inept and the inert set (those attractions they knew of, but tended to avoid visiting, or had no interest in visiting). Therefore, these factors are referred to as
the 'evaluative criteria'.

On the other hand, the 'primary desires' are those motivations that emerged during the selection and evaluation process. For example, a child expressed that his request to visit a museum was because he was interested in the attraction. The 'subtle desires' particularly refer to the adults' wishes, which they hope to obtain from making the family visits to museums, including educational benefits for children. These primary and subtle desires show that the motivations extend from the Need Arousal stage to the other stages, depending on which decision-making stage in which the members started to show active involvements.

Entertainment for children (Section 8.1.1) and children's personal interests (Section 8.1.2) had been reported by both the children and the adults, both as the desires and evaluative criteria in their planning process. A series of museum features linked to the entertaining theme are offered. Section 8.1.3 illustrates a number of practical issues, which had been used as the evaluative criteria mainly by adults. The desires to seek potential educational benefits from the museum-visiting, particularly for children, had also been expressed implicitly mainly by the adults (Section 8.1.4).

### 8.1.1 Offering entertainment for children (by children and adults)

Seeking enjoyable experiences has been identified as a key motivation behind family visits, in previous museum literature (e.g. Moussouri 2003, Sterry 2004), but little clarification was given as to which family members had this motive and why this aspect has an important factor. Previous decision studies have also shown that finding a place to please children and keep them happy is regarded as the top priority for parents, when planning family holidays (Dunne 1999, Mintel 2004c, Gram 2007). The finding shows that the entertainment theme was reported not only as a key motivation to visit the chosen museums most significantly, it has also been reported as an evaluative criterion used by the children and the adults, to assist in their selection and decisions. The entertainment theme is particularly associated with the participation of children in the family consumption; therefore, is actually represents a combination of the motivational theme 'entertainment' and the 'role of children' themes together (mentioned in Section 2.1).
The entertainment theme is strongly embedded in perceived experiences that an attraction, like a museum, can offer to the visitors. The perceived image of the museum experiences that both the children and the adults revealed, here, is strongly linked with the design of the museums and the atmosphere created in the place, as well as the level of diversity and the dynamic programmes provided. According to the accounts given both by the children and the adults, museums with one of the following features tend to gain positive evaluations in the following entertainment criteria:

- the entertaining and recreational features
- the interactive experiences and active participation (e.g. hands-on displays)
- a dynamic programme (e.g. story-telling, live performance)
- the atmosphere of the museum (e.g. colourful interior and welcomes children to explore, to touch and to have fun).

These features were reported both by the children and the adults as their evaluative criteria both in the joint decisions and adult-made decisions. Those children who involved in the joint decisions by proposing or deciding to revisit the museums, particularly highlighted their pleasant experiences and the enjoyment they had previously. These children demonstrated the extent of yearning to revisit the museums, where they enjoyed their previous visits but had not visited the museums for a long time. Similarly, children, who show no active involvement in the adult-made decisions and had never visited the chosen museums, were fascinated and generated strong interest in visiting the attraction, when the adult members enticed them by sharing the entertaining features of the chosen museums (e.g. story-telling and interactive exhibits). As the 9-year-old child of Family 13 states, ‘dad always briefs where we are going (for outing). If there was nothing interesting there, I would not want to go’.

When the parents and other adult members considered passively that a museum was suitable for children and appealed to them, they suggested that it was because that the museum contains at least one or more of the above entertaining features. Therefore, the adults can perceive the museum has more ‘holding power’ (Falk and Dierking 1994) to keep children’s attention. Most importantly, the adults’ accounts extend the definition of holding power to the capability of an attraction to entertain children, of different ages, and extend their enjoyment
during their visits, which reflects upon previous decision studies (Dunne 1999, Mintel 2004c and 2004d, Gram 2007). Adults perceived a higher possibility of having a satisfactory and enjoyable experience they and their children might have, when choosing to visit museums with the listed entertaining features. The following excerpt presents an adult’s passive considerations into the entertainment aspects for the children. The brown texts, at the top row, indicate the decision role the adult played that coded by the researcher.

A non-family adult acted as the initiator and the information gatherer, in an adult-made decision.

The husband of Family Y

From a child’s point-of-view, the content of the exhibitions displayed, at the Taipei Astronomical Museum, is easy for them to digest, since there are many interactive and dynamic features here. There are some animations and movies for them to watch in the IMAX Theatre. (Based on my previous experiences), too, children are comparatively more patient when they visit this museum than the others.

Family 20, single parent with children aged 5 and 4 (Family X), with a couple married without children (Family Y)

The entertaining criteria were reinforced by the reasons why both the children and the adults rejected some museums they had been aware of, which reflect the concept of ‘the inept set’, and why they abandoned those proposed options “not-to-purchase [the] consideration set” (alternatives being proposed but being discarded at the end). Both children and adults used words such as ‘fun’, ‘cool’, ‘lively’ and ‘appealing’ to describe the museums they wanted to visit, which offer the above entertaining features. By contrast, negative interpretations were used to describe the poor design of those museums, which had been included in the consideration set but had been abandoned, as ‘boring’, ‘static’ and ‘informational’. Children revealed similar features of those attractions they disliked visiting: they were described as ‘places without any things to play with’ or ‘having boring experiences’ previously. These findings show that children are capable of distinguishing a ‘fun’ and a ‘boring’ museum.
The elder child acted as the information gatherer, where the younger child acted as the decision-maker.

Younger son (12) 
(When my sister mentioned the Taipei Astronomical Museum), I remember my previous visit to the museum with my school. I had a chance to take the Cosmic Adventure Dark Ride. We also watched the IMAX Theatre. Wow, it was so cool! The theatre was terrific! There are some hands-on facilities, like a typhoon device, inside which you can play.

Elder daughter (15) 
The National Palace Museum sounds ancient. I feel bored once I hear this museum.

Younger son (12) 
Just a gut feeling tells me that the National Palace Museum is bad. Because you feel like you can only keep browsing and browsing (in the museum), and there is nothing for you to play with.

Previous museum studies have shown that parents tend to avoid visiting certain museums which they reckoned as inappropriate for children (MORI 2001, Adams 2005). The adults also used phrases like ‘the content of the museum is difficult for children to understand’ or ‘a visit to that museum ended up with children falling into sleep’ to express their previous unpleasant experiences at some museums. The adults perceived the passive design of the museum was most likely to fail in generating their children’s interests and intentions to pay a visit. The children and their parents tend to name such museums as ‘the pure-browsing type’. The perceived image of such museum that the adults and the children wanted to avoid was strongly associated with the design of these museums, which lacked of offering dynamic programmes and interactive experiences. This finding reminds one of previous decision studies that parents tended to reject going to places which lacked activities designed for children (Mintel 2004d).

Specific examples and particular museums (e.g. history museums, arts museums, and galleries) were named both by the adults and the children, as the inept set and the inert set, which they want to avoid visiting. The adults also pointed out that ‘difficulties’ would be involved when they wanted to explain the attractions to the children in an adult-made decision to visit these places, since very little features from these static-orientated attractions can generate the interest of children and their willingness to visit the museums. While Lin (2006) found that
the lack of interest in visiting museums was associated with the educational images of the museums, this finding indicates that the reluctance expressed by the adults and the children, in visiting certain museums, was associated with their perceived image that the design of these museums lacks offering entertaining experiences to them.

The entertainment theme cited by the adults and the children is particularly associated with the nature of children and their impact on an intimate, shared form of consumption. The reasons why the entertaining aspects of an attraction, such as a museum, were used as criteria are related to the leisure experiences children themselves like to pursue, and the adult members' understanding about the characteristics of children behaviour and the purchase experiences their children would most likely to enjoy. While a previous study shows that children need to be constantly entertained, since they get bored easily (Mintel 2004c), many adult members echoes this aspect but further stated a number of features related to the nature of children. These statements include that 'children, in general, tend to be very active and energetic, and likely to make noise when they are excited' (the parents of Family 29). 'Children love to touch everything they see and play with objects and run around in free space' (the parents of Family 23). Meanwhile, 'children lose their attention quickly and easily when they feel bored' (the father of Family 13). Therefore, adults felt troubled if children are bored (Dunne 1999), when visiting a museum which lacks any active participation or interesting features.

Secondly, the finding shows that since a family with children is doing shared activity together, like visiting a museum, any negative reactions of one member, particularly from the children, would greatly impact on the rest of the group members during a visit. As learned from their outings experiences with children, many adults pointed out that they felt embarrassed when their children were too active and noisy in an environment in which the atmosphere did not welcome children to have fun. For example, “inside arts museums, adults are quietly looking at the art pieces. We are worried that the noises our kids make would disturb other visitors” (Family 29). Therefore, the entertaining theme of a museum is important, due to its capability to accommodate the nature of children and to create positive and enjoyable experiences that the adults and the children want to pursue as a group.
8.1.2 Catering to children’s interest in the museums and relevant subjects (by children and adults)

The theme of ‘interests in the museums’ was reported as the desires behind children’s active input in joint decisions. The ‘interests in the museums’ revealed by the children echoes back to museum literature on motivational factors, such as ‘to see specific objects’ (Moussouri 2003) and ‘to see the general collection’ (Sterry 2004), which have been reported by the adults in previous studies. The analysis further clarifies that this theme was particularly evident among those children, who made purchase requests (Families 35, 36) and purchase suggestions (Family 7) to pay for a first visit to the museums, since the museum exhibitions related to their school curriculum. These children explained that their requests and suggestions were their voluntary acts not demanded by teachers. For example, ‘(the request) was purely because I wanted to come and see the museum’ (11-year-old elder child of Family 36, who acted as the initiator who made purchase request). Children’s interests in an attraction have been supported by their parents; therefore, this theme was an evaluative criterion used by the parents, in judging whether or not to approve the proposed museums children made.

The ‘interest of children’ (being classified under the ‘role of children’ theme in Section 2.1) has been reported previously as a family motivation to visit museums, from adults’ perspectives (Kelly et al. 2004). Here, the interest of children was reported both as the desires and as the evaluative criterion, both by those children who had active inputs in the joint decisions and by those adults who engaged the passive consideration, in both the joint decisions and the adult-made decisions. The meaning of the interest of children, here, has been specified as ‘children’s personal interests in the subjects relevant to the museum content’. For example, children who have broad interests in astrology and the universe request to visit an astronomical museum. Some children revealed the linkage among their personal interests and their motivations and judgements behind their active inputs in the joint decisions. The parents who participated in those adult-made planned decisions (Sections 7.2.1 and 7.2.2) have revealed that the proposed museums were suggested and chosen in response to their observations related to their children’s personal interests. Therefore, children’s personal interests can not only be a motivation behind a purchase decision, but also an evaluative criterion used by children and adults.
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The child acted as the decision-maker

Mother

The reason why my elder son chose the Taipei Astronomical Museum, among those three options proposed by his dad, maybe because he is interested in astrology.

Elder son (aged 7)

[spontaneous responds to his dad] I like to borrow some books like The Wonders of the Universe (from libraries).

8.1.3 Practical concerns (mainly by adults)

A number of practical issues had been used as the evaluative criteria mainly by the adults to assist their own selection and decisions (both in the joint and the adult-made decisions) and to response to children's active input in these joint decisions. There are five aspects of the practical considerations taken by the adults:

- Weather conditions
- Time and location: Available time for travel and travelling distance
- Accessibility to an attraction: public transportation and parking
- Passive considerations for children: safety and catering service for children
- Price: admission charges and value for money

Firstly, museums tend to be proposed by the adults in both the joint decisions and the adult-made decisions in the case of adverse weather, when they limited their information searches for the consideration set within the indoor venues. The data shows that the adverse weather, reported by Briseño-Garzón et al. (2007), was often cited as a main reason for the parents to reject their children's purchase requests and suggestions to visit museums and other leisure attractions in the joint decisions. Secondly, literature shows that location of an attraction (Dunne 1999, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007) and time available (Moussouri 2003) are factors influencing family leisure choices and family visits to museums. The adults supported that the same considerations over the available time for travelling and the travelling distance to an attraction had been taken into account when selecting the consideration set, and when evaluating children's purchase requests and suggestions. Meanwhile, they tend to avoid visiting those attractions where involved distant travelling (e.g. theme parks).
Thirdly, the accessibility factor that has rarely been revealed in previous studies, in fact, covers two aspects: first, the level of convenience in accessing an attraction by public transportation; second, the ease of parking in an attraction. Based on the same condition of being an indoor venue, those museums where involved a shorter travelling distance (e.g. within an hour’s drive) and are easily accessed by public transportation, particularly the metro, and with greater parking availability were more favoured by the adults. Fourthly, two practical concerns related to the passive considerations for children are the safety issue (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007) and the catering service of an attraction (Hopper-Greenhill 1994). The adults expressed that they normally felt reluctant to visit places they considered as ‘dangerous’ for children (e.g. theme parks). When visitor attractions like a theme park being proposed by a child, the parents tend to reject the options. No adults have associated museums with this practical aspect. Those parents tend to agree paying repeat visits to a museum and other attractions when they knew the catering services are convenient, the toilet facilities are hygienic and handy to taking care of their children during their visits. A variety of food and refreshment catering to the needs of children was also attractive feature for the adults.

Finally, literature shows that a number of price-related factors the adults take into account behind family leisure and holiday planning and family visits to museums, including affordability (Mintel 2004c), admission charges and discounts (Dunne 1999, Kelly et al. 2004, Dierking et al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). The parents and other adults expressed that their judgements over the price factors were particularly related not only to the level of admission charges, but also their value for money. The adults tend to weigh their perceived experiences they would have or they had before, against the admission charges. This principle of finding a good value for money was applied, regardless of how big the size of the consideration set was.

Parents also gave repeat rejections over their children’s requests and suggestions to revisit those museums with high admission charges but having poor content. The rejection strategy the parents reported echoes to previous research, including ‘reasoning’ and ‘offer alternatives’ approaches (Palan and Wilkes 1997). Therefore, when the adults faced similar practical conditions among their consideration set containing two or more alternatives, for example, these options
were all indoor venues to cope with poor weather conditions and within acceptable travelling distances; the price factors were the key for one product to win their approvals and the word-of-mouth recommendations from other adults, who were outside the core family decision-making unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Younger son (11)</th>
<th>The parent acted as the evaluator and the decision-maker over a child’s purchase requests and suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mom kept saying that the entry fee of the Taipei Sea World is too expensive. She did not fancy going to the place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[says to the researcher] You know the Taipei Sea World is only a building containing many boxes of aquariums. We ever brought our children there once, when they were very little. My younger boy has been thinking to revisit it all the time. But I reckon the admission is simply too high. If my family wanted to visit there, the total charges for four of us would be more than TW$2,000 (£30.4) every visit we make! (Comparatively,) children were almost free to enter the Taipei Astronomical Museum. We only need to pay the IMAX Theatre or the 3D Theatre, if we wanted to watch the movies, and the costs were really low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taipei Sea World</th>
<th>Taipei Astronomical Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWD</td>
<td>GBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>$480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions (Children)</td>
<td>$430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Exhibition</td>
<td>TWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 6-12 years</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D Theater/IMAX Theater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 12 years</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sources: Websites of the Taipei Astronomical Museum and the Taipei Sea World)

One significant finding is that children above school-ages reveal their awareness that the price factors were an important concern not only for their parents but also their interactions with younger siblings’ purchase requests. Some children reported that they tried not to propose visiting those options with high admission charges, if they were aware of the price levels, since they knew that their parents tend to refuse such requests and suggestions, for the sake of the whole family. Children also exemplified an exchange of ideas of visiting those attractions they
were interested in with their siblings before they talked to their parents. Older siblings, in adolescence, stated that they tend to filter out their younger siblings' purchase requests, if they know the admission charges of the desired attractions are high, such as theme parks. The admission charges had been used as an evaluative criterion, by elder siblings, to filter unsuitable options younger siblings want to request.

Why is a price factor such a crucial concern for adults? The judgements reflect to the characteristics of family leisure consumption or group consumption. Firstly, family outings involved multiple members, and the needs for outings and travelling are frequent one. As many parents expressed, the overall expenses spending on a family visit to an attraction include admission prices, travel expenses and refreshments. All these expenses need to be taken into account, when making a purchase decision. Secondly, the considerations for the expenses were not a matter of 'affordability' (Mintel 2004c). The adults claimed that they can afford to visit any pricey attractions, on some occasions. Since the need for outings is a constant and on-going requirement, the parents and other adults judged that they can achieve their leisure purposes among the majority of the outings, in a more economic way, in order to balance accumulative expense spending on family leisure.

Overall, the analytic finding indicates that the entertaining features and the price factors weighed in most, for the adults, according to their information selection and their response toward children's active input. For example, although many art galleries and history museums charged very little in Taiwan (e.g. £0.30-0.60), adults tend to exclude them, due to the poor holding power and lack of offering entertaining experiences for family, as a group. On the other hand, the adults liked to cite two museums as examples: a science museum the National Taiwan Science Education Centre, and an aquarium the Taipei Sea World. These two museums tended to be rejected as the purchase decisions, even though they were judged as capable of offering enjoyment to children, due to their high admissions and the poor value for money. Therefore, these two criteria are indispensable for adults.
8.1.4 Potential educational benefits to children (mainly by adults)

While museum literature stresses that the 'learning' motivational theme was the key trigger for family visits to museums, the data shows that the learning motive has been expressed implicitly, as a subtle desire mainly by the adults. Some examined learning factors, in previous studies, are more general (e.g. obtaining informal learning experiences, McManus 1989, 1994, Baillie 1996, Falk and Dierking 1998, Moussouri 2003); some are related to children (e.g. enhancing children's school learning, Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). The data reveals that the potential educational benefits adults pointed out particularly referred to children.

There were different levels of expectations on the educational benefits to children, depending on who proposed the museums and the main motivations behind the propositions. The following section begins with the stronger desires related to the educational benefits to their children, and then moves on to those offering the least. Next, it demonstrates the adults' realistic views on how much they reckoned children could learn from a single museum visit. Finally, it presents adults' opinions on why they decided to visit the museums, given the existence of these concerns.

More specific and stronger desires to enhance children's school learning have been expressed by those parents who approved of their children's requests or suggestions to visit museums in the joint decisions, when the children's suggestions directly linked with school curriculum. The parents tended to think that, when their children shared in the subject they learned from schools, and subsequently requested/suggested to visit relevant museums, the visits must be demanded by their teachers for completing school assignments. One parent admitted that he quickly approved his child's request without realising that the request was, in fact, a voluntary act instead of a demand for school work until the issue had been clarified during the family interview (e.g. Family 36). All these parents tended to show a strong desire that the visits to the museums would definitely enhance their children's school learning and their understanding toward the particular subject.

Comparatively, those adults in all the adult-made decisions and those adults with young children (e.g. pre-schoolers and children at early stage of primary school)
in the joint decisions showed little expectation on the educational benefits to their children. Even though these adults showed extensive passive considerations for the children in their suggestions to visit museums, for example, catering children's personal interests or their previous school learning, the desires that visiting museums can be stimulating to their children tend to be an implicit wish.

By and large, the parents and other adults revealed a realistic view about how much they reckoned children could learn from a museum visit, particularly those adults who visited with young children aged less than 8. The adults believed that the depth of the knowledge the children can learn from the museums was likely to be shallow, and show anxieties about the choices to visit museums might not be suitable for their children at pre-school age. These practical views and perceived risks were strongly related to the adults' understanding about the nature of the children. As mentioned earlier at Section 8.1.1, the adults recognised that the attention of young children, upon an object, tends to be short. This characteristic is applicable when children view museum exhibits. The adults considered that the context of museum exhibitions was too difficult for children to understand: therefore, they supposed young children would spend most of their visits jumping from touching and playing from one exhibit to another. The adults also showed their fears that the children could be 'subversive' in behaviour at a museum, since sometimes they destroyed museum exhibits. Nevertheless, why did the adults decide to visit the museums with the children, despite having worries about how visiting museums can fit with the energetic nature of children and perceiving that what children can learn from a visit to a museum is actually very limited?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The parent in an adult-made decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In museums, children's attentions on (museum exhibits) only last around one or two minutes. Children feel exciting when they can handle something or see something is moving. (But), children only glance at museum exhibits and have a superficial understanding from their visits. Normally, these kids tend to be destructive in museums. They are the ones who destroy exhibits and facilities. In fact, what they learn (from visiting museums) is not really much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 23, with children aged 5 and 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasons why the adults decided to make the visits, after all, were related to their positive attitudes toward museums, which encouraged them to give it a go.
The adults also showed a wide range of low expectations that the children of the groups might receive potential educational benefits from the visits. Many adults regarded museum-visiting as 'a meaningful, inspirational and informative leisure activity' (e.g. the father of Family 24), compared with other leisure choices, such as shopping or visiting a theme park. Notwithstanding the realistic views on what children take from visiting a museum, a number of hierarchical desires, related to the educational benefits to their children, have been expressed. The expectations can be as simple and straightforward as 'to introduce the children to more about the subjects they were interested in at their current stage in life', or 'to offer them a chance to see special things'. The examples of higher desires included the wishes that the visit might expand children’s knowledge in relevant subjects (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007), enhance their learning in a broader context (Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004), and potentially benefit the school children’s exam preparation. The scope of the educational benefits is not restricted to the focus of previous museum literature on children’s current learning only.

The adults also expressed other potential educational benefits to the children, which have expanded the previous learning theme to sow the seeds for a potential long-term impact. A number of wishes had been cited, such as that visits might build up children’s first impressions that they had ever been to the museums in their childhood, and might help them to be familiar with museum settings and to be aware that museums can be used as an information resource to assist in their future learning. Those adults who decided to visit a museum that offers recreational and interactive experiences (e.g. the Taipei Astronomical Museum and the special exhibition of the ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology), particularly eased their anxieties, since they considered that their children could gain at least an enjoyable experience, during their visits. The adults claimed that, even though the children might end up playing around at the chosen museums and obtain shallow understanding about the museum content, they believed that the children’s knowledge of relevant subjects could be enriched to some extent.

On the other hand, more ambitious desires had been expressed by those adults, who made the decisions exclusively by themselves, in response to their passive considerations for satisfying the personal interests of their children. For example, they expressed that the visits might cultivate children’s continuing interests and, hopefully, benefit their future studies in relevant subjects, and even brighten their
ability to compete in the future. Based on these accounts, the researcher suggests that the learning theme reported by previous museum literature can be termed as ‘potential enrichment to children’s education and development’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The parent in an adult-made decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family 21, with children aged 6 and 3

Diagram 25 The key features of the four desires and criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The desires and evaluative criteria reported by the children and adults who involved in the planned decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entertainment for children</strong> (Section 8.1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Entertaining and recreational facilities, ✓ Interactive experiences and active participation ✓ A dynamic programme ✓ Atmosphere of the place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Function: Desires and criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who reported: Children (active inputs) &amp; adults (passive consideration for children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical issues</strong> (Section 8.1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Weather condition ✓ Time and location ✓ Accessibility to an attraction ✓ Safety and catering service for children ✓ Price and value for money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Function: Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who reported: mainly adults and some older children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest of children</strong> (Section 8.1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Generates children’s interests in visiting ✓ Caters children’s personal interests &amp; enhances their knowledge (museums)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Function: Desires and criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who reported: Children (active inputs) &amp; Adults (passive consideration for children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential enrichment to children’s education and development</strong> (Section 8.1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Function: Subtle desires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who reported: adults</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the key features of these four desires and criteria - ‘entertainment’, ‘interests of children’, ‘practical concerns’ and ‘potential enrichment to children’s education and development’ - is summarised in Diagram 25, including their nature.
and who reported them. As the diagram represents, the importance of the entertainment and the practical concerns, the top textboxes, outweigh the interest of children among most planned decisions. Comparatively, the potential enrichment to children’s learning and development was less explicit as most museum studies indicate.

8.2 Adult-child decision roles

The analytical data shows that the parents and other adults demonstrated attentive manners according to a number of their passive considerations taken for the children, but the adults exercised a certain degree of control power over both the adult-made planned decisions and the joint decisions. This statement is drawn from further data analysis on how the joint decisions were made with whose authority or power being exercised over another, the ‘direction of influence’ (Daly 2007) and on how the children’s active input was evaluated by the adults. This section begins with presenting the tendency to feel that the parents act as the gatekeepers in the joint planned decisions (Section 8.2.1). Next, it portrays the conditions when parents are most likely to seek their children’s active inputs in the planning process and their attitudes toward children’s inputs (Section 8.2.2). Finally, it shows how little information the adults gave to the children about the adult-made decisions to visit museums, after all these passive considerations have been taken for the children (Section 8.2.3).

8.2.1 Parents’ control role

The powerful role the adults played was evident in all the adult-made planned decisions. However, according to the decision patterns shown in Section 7.1 and the practical criteria parents used to evaluate children’s active input, those parents who involved in the joint decisions revealed a great power over the selection of the consideration set and the approval of final purchase decisions. The ‘influencer’ role refers to the person who consciously or subconsciously sets up certain criteria, in comparing the options and affects other member’s evaluation process (Blackwell et al. 2006). The term ‘evaluator’ is added by the researcher to further clarify who directly executes the Alternative Evaluation process, while the role of ‘influencer’ (e.g. children) affects how the evaluator assesses the consideration set. This finding supports previous decision literature (Palan and Wilkes 1997, Gram 2007).
Firstly, parents' information search behaviour demonstrates that they acted as the 'gatekeepers', who carefully filter out those attractions they judged as inappropriate and less feasible ('the inept set', those options they definitely excluded from considerations), and then proposed the attractions they wanted to go with their children (e.g. Families 1, 22, 24 and 29 mentioned in Sections 7.1.3 and 7.1.4). Secondly, the parents acted as the 'evaluators' and the 'decision makers' over children's purchase requests (e.g. Families 28, 32, 35 and 36 mentioned in Section 7.1.1) and over children's purchase suggestions after consulting their preferences (e.g. Families 2, 7, 28, 32 mentioned in Section 7.1.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The parent acted as the gatekeeper in a joint decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family 29, with children aged 7 and 5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The application of the practical criteria and the passive consideration the parents and other adults demonstrated, over the entertainment for children and the interest of their children, was evident among their formation of the consideration set and their evaluations over children's requests and suggestions to visit museums (Sections 7.1.1 and 8.1). This finding supports previous studies that parents reported themselves to have the decisive vote, since they perceived themselves having better decision knowledge of what is best for everyone and good value for their money (Gram 2007); they also report using an 'expert strategy' to respond to children's active inputs (Palan and Wikles 1997, Williams and Burns 2000). Parents’ knowledge and their control over the decision outcomes were also evident among those examples given by the children and the adults regarding children's past purchase requests and suggestions, for example, doing particular activities (e.g. swimming, shopping and picnic), visiting other types of attractions (e.g. theme parks) and travelling away from home (e.g. a foreign country).
8.2.2 The invitation of children's active inputs

Parents' decisive roles also manifested themselves through the reported conditions of when to consult children's active inputs. Decision literature has revealed that children, particularly adolescents, exercised more active inputs through offering ideas and purchase suggestions, particularly when they have greater product knowledge (Thornton et al 1997, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2003, 2004b). The data shows that the perceived level of product knowledge children have was the key condition behind their children's active input in joint decisions. In two cases, the parents and the grandparents expressed that they were more likely to consult their children's and their grandchildren's opinions about where they wanted to go. The first condition was when the family leisure decisions were related to day outing decisions, particularly travel within the home regions. Children were invited to act as the 'information gatherers' for proposing their preferred attractions and leisure activities (the elder child of Family 2, and the both children of Families 28 and 32) and for brainstorming possible options, especially when parents were short of ideas (the elder child of Family 24). Secondly, children were invited to act as the 'decision-makers' for making the final purchase decisions from the parents' proposed consideration sets, because they were familiar with the proposed attractions (the elder children of Families 22 and 29).

On the other hand, the parents articulated that they tend to simply make their decisions and take their children to the chosen attractions, without consulting their children's inputs, when the choices were related to: (i) outdoor attractions and sightseeing, and (ii) tourism choices to attractions outside the home region. This judgement was because, firstly, the parents considered that their children have limited sources of information and limited product knowledge of the leisure and tourism market regarding these two choices. The parents cited that their children's main information sources were mostly restricted to those places they had been to, on family visits or school trips, or which were discussed by their peers.

Secondly, the data further presents a new aspect why the parents felt reluctant to seek their children's inputs when they wanted to travel away from their home regions. This was because they reckoned children have not developed a good cognitive knowledge of geographic distance. This issue particularly affected the feasibility of travelling a long distance that their children requested or suggested.
In comparison, the parents stated that eating-out choices were relatively easier for their children to select among a variety of product categories, and children were more capable of naming a feasible option for the families. The factor of geographic sense has been overlooked in previous studies.

Mother: When we ask our elder daughter 'where do you want to go today?' sometimes she suggests a place that is far away. My children do not really have a good grasp of geographical location of a place and its distance.

Father: When the decisions are related to choosing places (to visit), for example, going to a tourist attraction in Hsin-Chu County. The concept of Hsin-Chu County is too complex for my children to understand.

Mother: We tend to ask children about eating-out choices, such as 'which restaurant should we go?' She would say something like: 'how about the one we went last time?'

Father: Children are good at picking an option, among different categories concerning eating-out choices. Food varieties are less complicated for them, for example eating at McDonalds, or an all-you-can-eat buffet.

Previous research has found that older children and adolescents exercise a greater degree of influence over family leisure decisions than young children; however, methodologically, they have rarely distinguished the input of every child among those families with more than one child (e.g. Hall et al. 1995). The data shows that the parents/grandparents tend to consult their eldest child/grandchild's input regarding their outing choices, once again, because of their better product knowledge and better cognitive ability in a geographical sense, than younger siblings. This was particularly true among those families with pre-schoolers, or having a big age gap among children (Families 2, 7, 22, 28, and 29). Moreover, the parents argued that sometimes the younger children (range from 4-6 years) tended to propose some activities or places which were judged as less exciting for the families (e.g. playing slides in a park). The age of the eldest child seems not a particular factor determining their direct input in the joint decisions, as that varied from 7 years (Family 29) to 13 years (Family 28).
The parents showed ambivalence toward their children's direct input by making purchase requests and purchase suggestions. The parents occasionally consulted their children's opinions and normally yielded to their input; however, a child's say seems to be confined within an acceptable level. The parental use of the 'emotional manipulation' approach (e.g. using anger) has extended from responding to their children's active input (Palan and Wilkes 1997, Williams and Burns 2000) to the responses toward children who repeatedly made suggestions to visit impractical options (Family 32), and who employed too much input, without considering the interests of other family members (Family 2). Parents' yielding behaviour to their children's input was conditional upon: (i) practically achievable and good value for money, and (ii) catering to the interests of majority of the group members.

8.2.3 Notifications about the adult-made decisions

Previous studies have rarely revealed children's awareness of who made the purchase decisions, and what information they knew about the choices. Even though the parents and other adults have revealed thorough concerns, in picking a suitable place for the whole family and many passive considerations they have taken for the children (e.g. satisfying their interests and hoping them would enjoy the chosen museums), they gave very little information to their children about the
Amongst those adult-made decisions, most children were ignorant of the decisions. For example, a 7-year-old child stated: ‘I have no idea (where we are going today). I did not say I want to visit this museum. It is mom who wanted to come (Family 27)!’ Some of the parents claimed that they gave no messages about the decisions to avoid any disappointments they might cause the children if they changed their plans on the day. Other parents expressed that their children can only understand something about certain leisure choices, such as mountain climbing and visiting theme parks. These parents claimed that, what their children understood was that the families were heading somewhere out-of-house ‘for fun’. The choices, like visiting museums, were beyond most children’s cognitive abilities to comprehend what museums are, particularly for those pre-schoolers. Therefore, many parents, who involved in the adult-made decisions, simply took their children to the final chosen museums without informing their children where they were going.

Only a few school-age children revealed a vague idea that their families wanted to go to museums, since their parents and their siblings briefed them. For example, a 10-year-old child stated: ‘I only knew it was a museum. My elder brother said he wanted to take a look there (Family 36)’. The notification had no intention of seeking further input or agreements from children. Apart from informing the name of the chosen museums, the other two types of messages were particularly used in the briefing: (i) the entertaining features of the museums, and (ii) the tools of travelling.

The recreational and entertaining features related to the museum programmes and facilities were highlighted for these children. These parents and adults then enticed them by showing their most appealing features that cater to the personal interest of the children and the features they reckoned the children might be interested in (e.g. the IMAX Theatre, the story telling). Adults also used plain language to explain all about visiting the chosen museums, and linked the content and the programmes of the museums with children’s daily life and their knowledge. For example, ‘we were going to visit a place you can see stars and watch movies about animals’ (the mother of Family 33). Finally, the fun experiences regarding
the travelling to the destinations (e.g. taking a boat ride) were stated, which were less relevant to the museums themselves. Some parents avoided visiting certain museums (e.g. art museums), since it was difficult to inform their children about the choices and to generate their interests. Parents’ emphasis on the entertaining features related to the chosen museums was mainly to boost children’s interests and their willingness to invite children to visit the chosen museums.

Seeking learning experiences and benefits has gained most attention by previous museum researchers and practitioners in their understanding of family visits; however, the data shows that this aspect tended to be ignored, when the adults informed the children about the decisions to visit the chosen museums. The adults believed that museum participations would be stimulating and inspirational to their children and disclosed a number of expectations about the potential educational enrichment to children and their development (as mentioned in Section 8.1.4). However, no adults instructed the educational benefits to the children about museum-visiting -- neither among the joint decisions nor among the adult-made decisions. This finding supports Falk and Dierking’s (2000) assumption that the educational motivation to go to a museum is an implicit goal, rather than an explicit expression. The potential educational benefits to children have only been specified in one family; for example, the frequent museum visitor specified to the parent that children can see and learn a lot when visiting the museum he suggested (Family 20). The rest of the word-of-mouth recommendations from a close network merely named the practical issues and the entertaining features of the museums (Families 23, 25, 27). The exclusion of informing educational benefits and the emphasis of the entertaining and recreational features reinforced the leisure experiences most children want to pursue and the adults’ recognition of using such characteristics the children have to promote their selection and to make decisions to visit museums.

**Part II – The impulse decisions**

Chapter 7 already revealed that the primary intentions of the family outings and the trips behind these impulsive decisions to visit museums were not purposefully associated with museum products. Unlike the complex considerations behind the planned decisions, the impulse decisions were mainly triggered by curiosity. No passive consideration for children was demonstrated, among those adults who
made the impulse decisions. Very few educational benefits to children have been mentioned by the adults.

8.3 Curiosity with least expectations

The curiosity to see what is inside the museums they encountered (Kelly et al. 2004) was the most powerful motivation behind the impulsive visits. Both the children and the parents articulated all sorts of reasons related to their curiosity. An attraction with an impressive outlook (e.g. the Taipei Story House) can generate the curiosity of a child who had no previous knowledge about the desire to visit the attraction, by glancing at the architecture itself. On the other hand, the adult members showed that they had recognised the museums, therefore, they decided to pay impulsive visits. Adults’ awareness of the museums was generated through various information sources, such as media coverage (Families 5, 6, 7 and 37 - the archaeological museum) and the Television commercial (Family 4 - the traditional arts center), the word-of-mouth of previous visitors like friends (Family 5 - the traditional arts center), the childhood memory of the local landmark (Families 8 and 17 - the story house) and driving past by the museum on previous weekend trips (Family 6 - the archaeological museum). After encountering the museum buildings and having activities at the surrounding area, their impulse decisions to visit the museums were a chance to satisfy their long-term curiosity and to see what was inside the buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>In general, we all have a certain degree of curiosity about any heritage sites or buildings. When we see an old building, we all want to glance inside if we can. Many people like me are curious about this building, since we all knew this house since our childhood.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family 17, parents with children aged 8 and 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparison with the planned decisions, practical issues and the passive consideration for children were less mentioned among those adults who made the impulse decisions. More interestingly, the sudden whims to glance at attractions seems to outweigh the important practical considerations the adults revealed in the planned decisions, such as the price factors (the level of admission charges and the value for money). No educational benefit to their children was expected from the parents in the impulsive visits.
Part III – Family outing purposes

Seeking a quality, enjoyable and relaxing family time in their leisure outing time has been reported by the parents and other adults as a common theme, no matter how the visits to the museums were planned, impulsive or organised by third parties. This theme of spending quality family time together reflects back upon previous findings on the motivations behind family visits (Moussouri 2003, Kelly et al. 2004, Adams 2005) and to previous decision literature on the primary goal for family holidays (Mintel 2004c, Gram 2007). The desire to have an enjoyable group experience also supports previous motivational factors ‘to seek opportunity to enjoy doing something and being together’ (Falk and Dierking 1994, Baillies 1996, Dierking et al. 2005), which combines two motivational themes, together: the ‘entertainment’ theme and ‘the quality family time’ theme. The data further discovers that seeking quality family time was associated with the lifestyle the Taiwanese children have nowadays.

8.4 Seeking quality family times

The data expands the theme of having quality family time together to two aspects of parental considerations parents take for children – regarding family outing as a chance to drag children away from sedentary home activities, thereby offering relaxation for children. Firstly, many parents admitted that their children spent a considerable amount of their free time perched in front of television or playing computer games. These parents regarded any outing choice as a wonderful opportunity for tackling children’s habit of sedentary activities and offering them a chance to spend their family time together. Sometimes there were tensions between parents and children, when the parents wanted to drag their children away from television-viewing and game-playing. Therefore, those parents particularly felt encouraged, when their children requested to visits places like museums. The children’s requests were regarded as a great chance for their
children to leave the house, if requests were appropriate and practically achievable.

Secondly, Mintel (2004c) reports that family holiday time is intended for relaxation and unwinding, from adults’ point-of-views, whereas Briseño-Garzón et al. (2007) reveals the same finding on family motivations to visit museums. Many parents in this research stressed that the main purpose of doing family leisure activities together is to relax and to release work pressure. Many parents stated, furthermore, that they intend to have a family day out or a weekend trip as often as possible, which the major rationale is to entice their children to relax and to have fun. According to many child respondents and their parents, children's free hours outside the school timetable were heavily occupied by many extra-curriculum activities, which were arranged by the parents, such as attending private tuitions and a wide range of after-school clubs (e.g. English tuition, arts classes and sport clubs). Some children even have two versions of homework to study every day: one from the school and the other from the private tuitions. This social phenomenon is also common among children in other Asian countries (e.g. China, Japan and Korea). Therefore, many parents showed passive considerations over the intensive pressures their children had on study and the hectic weekly schedule. Some parents stated that they felt guilty if they failed to take their children out sometimes to have fun and to relax on weekends.

Since many families have dual-workers, the parents pointed out that they wanted to take weekend outings/trips as opportunities to 'accompany their children and to enhance their relationship with children'. As a couple of parents stated, they always wish to "find a place where the grown-ups can have fun with the children together" on their weekend outings and trips. Those parents who made impulse decisions reinforced that the type of the activities and attractions they chose to do or go to were less vital. Therefore, the pursuit of quality time and entertaining experiences for the family, as a whole, was a major desire most parents wanted to achieve, when having a weekend outing. The parental desire to offer an enjoyable leisure experience for their children and themselves mirrored the reasons why the entertaining features of a museum was an important criterion for them, and the potential for receiving other educational and physical benefits was expressed implicitly as secondary concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Both my children and I are only free over weekends. But mom sometimes has to work during weekends. It is difficult for the whole family to spend weekends together. So it does not really matter where we go, we're happy, as long as everyone is out-of-house and the grownups can take chances to relieve stress from work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Since the four of us rarely have time to be together, we are very flexible in the places we go and the activities we do, when going out (as a group). Enjoying the time we spend together is more important than where we go.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family 4, parents with children 10 and 7
Summary

This chapter reveals that a number of similar desires and evaluative criteria were uncovered by the adults and the children who played different decision roles, both at the joint and the adult-made planned decisions. The data shows that offering entertainment for children and catering children’s personal interests were not only key motivations behind the planned decisions, but has also been used as evaluative criteria, by the children and the adults, to assist in their selection and decisions. Adults and children tend to favour a museum, when it generated children’s interest in making a visit, and when its content catered to the personal interests of children. A number of practical issues, such as weather conditions, time and locations, accessibility and price have been used as the evaluative criteria, mainly by adults. Overall, the entertaining features of a museum and the price factors gain most weight for the adults. Receiving potential educational benefits for children, from the chosen museums, has been expressed implicitly, mainly by the adults. Many adults revealed a realistic view on how much children can learn from visiting a museum, particularly those groups with young children.

The adults tend to acted as the gatekeepers and the decision-makers, who carefully filtered out those attractions they judged as inappropriate and less feasible. The perceived level of product knowledge children have as well as their geographic sense was key conditions behind parents’ invitations to seek children’s active input in the joint decisions. The eldest child of a family, even as young as 7 years, tended to have more input than younger siblings. The curiosity to see what was inside the museums was the most powerful motive to trigger the impulse decisions. Adults who made impulse decisions mentioned less consideration over practical issues and the role of their children. Generally, enjoying quality and relaxing time together, with their children, appeared to be a common desire by the adults, no matter what sort of activities and attractions family groups chose to do.
Chapter 9 Decision Attributes and Structures

Introduction

This chapter discusses the decision attributes of the process involved in reaching family leisure decisions to visit the museums. This chapter discloses why children played such a significant role in the decision process, as shown in Chapters 7 and 8. The chapter is divided into two parts. The first part starts with the overall decision features of the outing choices, in terms of the efforts spent on the decisions. While decision literature has been dominated by the view that the family purchase decision-making is a competitive process, the data reveals that the interactive dynamics among family members is a rather cooperative process (Section 9.1). The attributes of the key decision-making stages, regarding the type of needs aroused, and the search and the evaluation behaviour are pointed out (Section 9.2).

The second part of this chapter is devoted to the revisions of the theoretical model for family purchase decision process. The revisions include suggestions made in additional decision-making stages, such as the planning decisions, the discussion over interactive dynamics, and a review of the definition of decision roles (Section 9.3). The final part of the chapter stresses the important role children played in planning for family leisure decisions. Children’s active and passive input on the planned decisions, both over the joint decisions and the adult-made decisions, are discussed. It further clarifies the nature of input among those families with more than one child. Explanations are given as to why the adults had taken, to a great extent, passive considerations for the children when making family outing choices (Section 9.4). Children were found as powerful triggers for generating many family journeys to museums (Section 9.5).

Part I – Decisions features

This section illustrates several decision characteristics of the family leisure outings based on when the decisions started, the time spent to reach the final decisions, the characteristics of family interactions and how the final decisions were made. Consumer behaviour literature (Assel 2004, Blackwell et al. 2006) suggests that more complex decision-making tends to be involved, when the purchase is expensive and
when the consumers lack previous purchase experiences (e.g. holiday planning, financial products). On the other hand, a limited type of decision-making process is more likely to occur, when the purchase is less expensive or when consumers have more experiences regarding the purchase products. This section presents a number of analytic results suggesting that the planning process involved in the family decisions to visit museums is related to the 'limited type of decision making'.

9.1 Overall attributes

This section suggests that the process involved in making family leisure decisions, such as visiting museums, is a less complex process. This statement is generated from both the accounts given by the adults and the analytic results on how much effort and time family groups had spent on searching and evaluation (Section 9.1.1). In contrast with the dominance of competitive and conflict-ridden perspectives, this data shows that the interactive dynamics of family members before final decisions to visit museums is rather harmonious and attentive (Section 9.1.2).

9.1.1 Less complex and flexible

As many parents expressed, a more complex decision-making process tends to be involved, when planning longer breaks decisions (e.g. a week-long holiday like Chinese New Year Break) and travelling abroad. The complex pre-planning activities refer to the complexity involved in the information search and the deliberate attitudes reflected in the evaluation. A wider range of external information sources was consulted, as well (e.g. the Internet, travel guide books, advice from travel agencies, word-of-mouth recommendations from close relations). Repeat information searches and discussions, among family members, were needed. Many rational considerations and careful planning need to be taken into account in a series of purchase decisions when planning such high-involvement purchases.

Based on the adults’ accounts, children tend to have less direct involvement when making holiday decisions. Making family decisions for day outings and weekend trips tend to be last-minute decisions, in comparison with the longer break decisions. As the planned decision-making process presents in Chapter 7, little time and effort, on the information search, is involved in the decisions to visit museums. The final purchase choices tend to be quickly reached from a small number of consideration sets. Children’s direct input in the family leisure outing decisions is evident. These features might be because family leisure outing choices are less expensive. Since the
available time for travelling only takes one or two days in the case of family weekend outings and trips, furthermore, the impact of such purchase decisions was much lower than on longer holidays or traveling abroad. It might be because family consumers have more experience in family outings and weekend trips.

The flexibility of weekend family outing choices manifests through the changes in planned decisions. There is evidence of last-minute changes, in the abandonment of initial planned decisions, right before the family heads out. Impulse decisions can also be made during the journeys, as the alternative planned decisions. Such evidence indicates that family leisure decisions are flexible and allow one to change and travel with a whim. Conversely, a frustrated impulse decision can also lead to a later planned decision (as Appendix F shown).

### 9.1.2 Cooperative, harmonic and considerate process

According to family interactions at the planned and the impulse choices, making family decisions for a weekend outing is a cooperative and attentive process, rather than a competitive perspective, as recent evidence suggested (Gram 2007, Thomson et al. 2007, Hamilton and Catterrall 2008). Many sampled families with children worked as a team and used a brainstorming strategy, in their information search and purchase suggestion stages. The decision-making process was carried out through casual discussions.

The parents and other adults also showed a cooperative and attentive manner toward children and their participation, as users in the shared leisure consumption. Seeking children's opinions and active input had been shown among the adult members. Even though the parents and other adults demonstrated more active involvement than children, both in joint decisions and adult-made decisions, they presented a great deal of passive considerations on behalf of the children. These findings support previous studies that, even though parents often control decision outcomes, they welcome children's input (Thomson et al. 2007) and reveal passive considerations they have taken for children (Gram 2007). These passive considerations have mastered the adults' judgments in seeking a place that can offer children enjoyment, serve their best interest, and given them potential benefits.

The way in which family groups reach their final decisions to visit museums is a peaceful process and is normally engaged upon through casual discussions. Except
in those decisions made by individual members, the final purchase decisions to visit museums tend to be reached when more than one member expresses strong and positive attitudes toward one of the proposed museums. There have been neither further suggestions nor disagreements among the group members. The joint planned decisions tend to be engaged upon in a casual discussion and, in most cases, without serious face-to-face meetings among the group members. Therefore, not every member is fully aware of his/her direct input, in the final purchase choice, even the decision-maker, himself. For example, the 12-year-old younger child of Family 24 did not understand that the family decision to visit the Astronomical Museum was made because of the positive responses he gave spontaneously until the family interview.

No serious conflict among the family groups is found before the final decisions to visit museums were made. As many parents expressed similar views that when their families need to make outing choices, 'involving complex discussion is totally unnecessary (Family 4). 'It is unworthy to spend time on serious arguments over an outing decision (Family 13)' The findings support Park et al.'s (1991) suggestions that a more cooperative approach to solve conflicting opinions is likely to happen in a relationship which involved high intimacy and affection, such as a family. Furthermore, there is evidence of using families with children in the planned decision-making process (Families 1, 18, 22 and 35), which aims at checking the interests of those members being invited to discuss visiting the proposed attractions. Searching a consent and compromise result, that can satisfy all members involved in the final consumption, is a prevalent phenomenon.

9.2 The attributes of decision-making stages

This section focuses on the features of the key decision-making stages of planned decisions. It presents the type of desires that emerged at the planned decisions and the impulse decisions. It also reveals a master desire that family groups want to achieve in their leisure experiences. It further shows the search behaviour and the sources of information being used, as well as the evaluation behaviour of planned decisions.

9.2.1 Type of the needs

Previous museum studies have shown that family groups visit museums with more than one motivation, and these desires are surrounded by six major themes
2.1). However, the picture of how these desires manifest, across the decision-making process, is vague. Chapter 7 has revealed a series of primary desires associated with the planned (particularly the Need Arousal stage) and the impulse decisions. A range of hierarchical needs (primary, secondary and overarching needs) was covered by the adults and the children at the process involved, in the decision to visit museums and general leisure purposes. There was, in fact, more than one kind of desire aroused, at different decision-making stages, within a single decision-making process. These findings have rarely been seen, in previous studies.

A. Primary desires

Chapter 7 has, thus far, revealed a series of primary desires which are associated with the Need Arousal stage of the planned decisions. Only those children who requested visiting the museums (Section 7.1.1) showed a primary desire to visit/revisit particular museums, that directly associate with the ‘interests in museums’ theme (Moussouri 2993, Sterry 2004, Kelly et al. 2004, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). Some parents have demonstrated a primary desire to satisfy the personal interests of their children and offer knowledge stimulation (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007), which combines the ‘learning’ and the ‘role of children’ theme. The primary desires of most family groups, in the planned decisions, were triggered by the need to find a place in family weekend day out and weekend tourism trips (the Need Arousal stage). The findings echo back to recent museum studies (Kelly et al. 2004, Sterry 2004), showing that some families visit museums, in response to their outing needs, through posing a simple question (Sterry 2004). The example of the initiative questions include: ‘Shall we go today?’ , ‘Where shall we go today?’ and ‘Where do you want to go today?’

While the finding at the desire to have a family day out supports a previous study (Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007), the desire associated with a tourist trip was not as strong as previous evidence, which has been directly association with culture tourism (for example, the family visits were made because the museum was a must-see visitor attraction for tourists (Sterry 2004). There were all sorts of purposes behind the tourism trips including: going purely for a short break (Family 25), attending an event (e.g. Family 23 visited the Lantern Festival), and managing an errand (e.g. Family 27 visited the child’s dentist). No matter what the purpose was, the desire to find a place with their children on the second day of the tourism trip was common among these families, and such findings have rarely been revealed in previous museum studies.
B. Different desires between the adults and the children

Diagram 26 illustrates the examples of different desires, shown by the adults and the children, at different decision-making stages (the blue textboxes within Section B of the diagram), in comparison with the theoretical model (Section A of the diagram). For example, a joint planned decision (the first left column next to Section B) was triggered when one family member aroused a primary desire to find a suitable place both for family day out and tourism trips (the top row of Section B). After particular museums were suggested to the group level, as a consideration set, the parents revealed a secondary desire to offer children knowledge stimulation, via the evaluation and final purchase decision stages, at one hand. The children demonstrated a secondary desire to have fun in the proposed attractions, at the other (the bottom row of Section B). The examples of these expressed desires demonstrate that the emerged desires and motivations expand from the Need Arousal stage to the rest of the decision-making stages. Furthermore, there were different desires between adults and children.

Diagram 26 Examples of the types of the desires shown by the adults and the children at different decision-making stages

(A) The theoretical family planned decision-making model

- Stage 1: Need Arousal
- Stage 2: Information Search & Share
- Stage 3: Alternative Evaluation
- Stage 4: Purchase Decision

(B) Findings of different type of needs across the decision process

- **Primary desire**
  - Find a suitable place for family outings (Adults)
  - After a museum being proposed

- **Secondary desire**
  - Offer children knowledge stimulation (Adults)
  - Have fun in the proposed museum (Children)

- **The master desires** (both planned and impulse)
  - Adults: to relax, seeking the enjoyments of children, Have a quality and pleasant family time (Adults), Finding a feasible option with good value for money
  - Children: to have fun

C. Master desires

An overarching desire had mastered the whole decision-making process, particularly affecting the evaluative criteria used by adults and children. According to the
Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis approach, these are called the overarching themes. Regardless of how the final decisions to visit museums were made with planning or without, a few overarching desires have been detected from data analysis among the majority of sampled families. The overarching needs indicate the purpose of leisure outings and the leisure experience family groups wanted to pursue on family days out and trips. To children, the experiences they want to pursue are mainly to have fun. For parents, the family leisure outings and tourist trips are all about relaxation (Mintel 2004c, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007) and to have quality family time (Mintel 2004c, Gram 2007) as well as to seek children’s enjoyment (Thornton et al. 1997, Dunne 1999, Mintel 2004c, Gram 2007). Since practical issues are adults’ important concerns for adults, who have a decision vote to filter unwanted options, the general leisure experience the families with children desire pursuing are to have an enjoyable, quality and relaxing group experience, which are feasible, practical and offer good value for the money.

9.2.2 Information search behaviour
The theoretical model suggests that, once the need for a product/service is raised, consumers would start searching for what purchase options are available or whatever they can recall/find from internal memory (internal search) or external resources (external search). When being asked about the tourism choices, many adult respondents clearly specified that extensive external searches, from different sources, were engaged. Comparatively, all sampled families did not articulate that their search behaviour related to the family outings choices. The evidence of information search behaviour was detected after unpacking how each sampled family reached their final decision during the data analysis. The search behaviour of making weekend outings choices to visit museums contains few general characteristics: the dominance of the internal search; consulting limited information sources in an external search; when to engage in an additional information search; and the use of museum websites in external search behaviour.

A. The dominance of the internal search
Firstly, the internal information search, from memory, was mostly used both by the adults and the children who were involved in those planned decisions and among those external sources the family consulted. This search attributes might link the nature of family day out and short trips - a rather low-involvement decision. As mentioned earlier, the adults specified the unnecessary task of spending much time
and efforts, when planning a day out or a trip. The use of internal searches might be because it is less time consuming and much easier for the family to form the consideration set for further discussion. The information sources of internal searching included existing product knowledge and past experiences, both memories from primary experience (the consumers' personal experience) and second-hand experiences (what they heard from others' experiences and information). The dominance of internal searches has been overlooked in museum studies and decision literature.

A basis search setting has been found at internal search behaviour, particularly by the adults. Practical issues (e.g. weather, accessibility, travelling time and distance involved) and the passive considerations for children (e.g. the entertaining criteria for children, the interest and the nature of children) had been manifested by the adults, as search criteria, to assist in their internal searches. For example, the adults confined their search within 'indoor venues', due to adverse weather. Arts museums and galleries had been excluded as the inept and the inert set, since the adults generally want to search for a place that is suitable for children – that is, capable of offering entertaining experiences to children.

B. External search behaviour
External consultation behaviour is particularly evident among those parents who travel away from their home regions. The external searches occurred mainly when the parents (i) were uncertain about the initial purchase choices regarding the suitability for their children, due to no primary experiences to the attractions they proposed, and (ii) had insufficient product knowledge of suitable places for family and for children available in the leisure market. Limited sources were used in the external search behaviour and mainly relied on the word-of-mouth recommendations from close relations. Furthermore, external consultation was mainly demonstrated by adults. The examples of the personal sources included extended-family members (Families 23, 25), and non-family members, e.g. the close friends (Family 27) and the neighbour (Family 20). Findings on the use of the recommendations from close relations, as the primary sources, support previous museum studies (Falk and Dierking 1994, Sterry 2004, Dierking et al. 2005). The data also shows that word-of-mouth recommendations are important triggers for first-time family groups, who had never visited any museums before (Families 20, 23, 25, 27).
Sterry (2004) found that museum websites have rarely been used before family visits. The data supports that engaging an external information search from museum websites had rarely been used among those planned decisions. Checking websites of chosen museums had mainly been conducted after final purchase decisions were made, and its main purpose was searching travelling information, particularly travelling by public transportation. Those members who searched websites also took a look at museum facilities, what was on display in the museum exhibits, and other events and programmes.

C. Other features of the internal searches

Three interesting points about internal search behaviour were discerned, including the use of repeat searches by the sampled families, the internal searches manifested by external sources and the rudimentary product knowledge, among some who engaged in internal searches and made the purchase suggestions. Firstly, while consumer literature suggests additional information search occurs after the Alternative Evaluation (Assael 2004). The evidence of repeat information searches, here, occurred not only after the Evaluation stage but also after the initial Purchase Decision was made (e.g. Families 23, 25) (see the red line within Section A of Diagram 27). Repeat information searching, also mainly derived from internal memory, and happens when the initial purchase suggestions / purchase decisions were judged as practically unfeasible and unsuitable for the children (Families 23, 24, 25 and 35).

Although internal searches were engaged in and the purchase decisions were made; consequently, some members, who were involved in internal searches did not have full knowledge about what kinds of facilities and programmes were offered by the museums they propose. This is particularly evident among those members who lacked the primary experience of visiting the proposed/chosen museums. The product knowledge was rudimentary as are the most famous features of the attractions. The judgement on suitability of an attraction, like a museum, was based on the name of the service product (Families 25, 33). For example, the astronomical museum is a place to see stars. According to the name of the institution, the display is related to a science subject and should be capable of generating the interest of children in a visit. No external information search (e.g. from websites) was used, even with uncertainty about the museum facilities.
9.2.3 Evaluation behaviour

Chapter 8 already covers the evaluative criteria used by the children and the adults in the Alternative Evaluation Stage. This section here focuses on the size of the consideration set and the strategies used when forming the consideration set. Firstly, a limited number within the consideration set are notable features in the planned decision-making process. As shown in Chapter 7, many sampled families simply had only one option being considered, and some included only two to three options after the Information Search Stage.

Three distinct strategies were employed in the formation of the consideration set, particularly those used by adults. Diagram 27 presents the strategies applied in selecting the consideration set (Section B of the diagram), in comparison with the theoretical model (Section A of the diagram). First of all, the selection began with a particular attraction district. Many parents and other external sources started their internal searches within a particular famous tourist area near their destinations (e.g. the Shih-Lin District of the Capital Taipei, as the first row of Section B illustrates). A brainstorming strategy was used to bring up potential options, within the district, the consideration set (see the product options of the first row within Section B), from the selection criteria, such as famous attractions and suitable places for family and children (e.g. Families 22, 23, 25, 27). Two children also revealed using the same strategy to propose attractions, within the same district, when being consulted by their parents and grandparents (e.g. Families 28 and 32).

The second strategy is starting from particular product categories which moved to particular attractions within the sub-product categories (see the second chunk of Section B of Diagram 27). The most common pattern emerged from the planned decisions and this entailed starting from indoor venues, due to poor weather. Subsequently, particular museums (e.g. Families 22, 25, 29) or particular movies (e.g. Family 24) were proposed to the group levels, as one of the indoor venues (see the First Search of the second chunk, within Section B). This pattern had also been applied when the initial planned decisions were frustrated, due to weather factor (e.g. Families 6, 16). Other product categories included a particular membership scheme (Family 29) or places that appeal to children (Family 23).

Thirdly, changes in the sub-product categories occurred, when the initial consideration set or the initial product category was unfeasible. For example, watching two
particular movies within the cinema sub-category was unfeasible, two particular museums were proposed in replacing the initial sub-category (Family 24) (see the Second and the Third Search of the second chunk, within Section B of the Diagram). These three features were less applicable to those purchase requests made by children. Based on the examples given by the children and their parents, the consideration set included in the children’s requests tend to cover a wide range of product categories and activities (e.g. sports, shopping mall, theme parks and eating-out in McDonald’s); these mainly depend on their emerged desires and personal interests.

Diagram 27 The selecting strategies applied in the form of a consideration set

Part II – Decision Structure

The theoretical model suggests family purchase behaviour involves five major stages. These are: the Need Arousal (Stage 1), the Information Search and Sharing (Stage 2), the Alternative Evaluation (Stage 3), the Purchase Decision (Stage 4) and the Post-Purchase Evaluation (Stage 5). This part focuses on revisions of the theoretical model for the family purchase decision process. The scope of the revisions covers additional decision-making stage of the Pre-Purchase behaviour and the impact of the
Post-Purchase Phase. The decision dynamics and the decision roles involved in the joint decisions have been discussed. By and large, there was no evidence of the Conflict Management stage that occurred after the purchase decisions were made.

9.3 Expansion of the planned decision models

Additional decision-making stages were discerned in both the joint and adult-made planned decisions. The term of the proposed stages intend to specify the family interactions between adults and children, which are made before and after the Purchase Decision, and to highlight the roles children played in the decision process. The data also found that events occurred prior to the Need Arousal stage and the extended impact of the Post-Purchase Evaluation (Section 9.3.1). The reason for making individual decisions was presented. The interactive dynamics among group members in the joint decision-making is discussed (Section 9.3.2). These findings reveal that making a family decision is not a linear process, as the theoretical model suggested. The definition of the decision roles has been examined with a new revision (Section 9.3.3).

9.3.1 Additional decision-making stages

Chapter 7 already introduces three additional stages to illustrate the various decision patterns in the joint decisions: the Children’s Purchase Request, the Purchase Suggestion Stage, and the Consulting Children stage. Here, the Informing Children stage is added to reflect the passive role children had in the adult-made decisions. This section highlights the purposes of these additional decision-making stages. It further shows that the family joint decision can be simplified into four major decision structures, which encompass the decision patterns discussed in Chapter 7.

Purchase Suggestion Stage

The Purchase Suggestion Stage aims to address family interactions between the Information Search and Share (Stage 2) and the Alternative Evaluation (Stage 3), in all joint decisions. This stage refers to the consideration set (the search results), which were proposed to the group levels. The Purchase Suggestions Stage is particularly useful to distinguish who was actually involved in the search (e.g. a child or a parent) and to whom the consideration set was proposed (e.g. a parent), and clearly demonstrates the family interactions involved (e.g. a child suggested to the parents). It can help to identify the potential involvement of external sources. For example, when one family member engaged in the external information search, followed by the
purchase suggestions made by external sources (e.g. a mother’s friend proposed toward the mother).

**Children’s Purchase Request stage**
Both the Children’s Purchase Request stage and the Consulting Children Stage aim to highlight children’s active inputs in joint decisions. The Children’s Purchase Request stage was mainly to illustrate children’s active inputs between the Need Arousal (Stage 1) and the Alternative Evaluation (Stage 3). It distinguishes the active input a child might exercise in the Purchase Suggestion Stage, in which the children were consulted by the adult members. This stage assists in identifying which child of a family made the request (e.g. a younger child) and the persons to whom the child appealed (e.g. the parents or the grandparents).

**Consulting Children stage**
The Consulting Children stage actually happened before the Purchase Suggestion or after. Since the decision structure remains the same, after children are invited to exercise their active inputs in the Evaluation (Stage 3) and the Purchase Decision (Stage 4), the Consulting Children stage, here, aims to particularly capture the invitations of children’s active involvements in the Information Search stage, when the families reach the desires to find a place to visit for a day out or a tourism trip. Next, the Children’s information search and their purchase suggestions occurred accordingly. This stage also assists in identifying which child of a family is being consulted.

**Informing Children Stage**
The Informing Children Stage aims to reflect the passive roles of children in the adult-made decisions and refers to the step when the adults inform children about their final purchase decisions. This stage can apply to the adult-made choices made both by individual parent/ adult members and those made jointly between the parents/ and other adults involved. This stage can help to identify what information adults have given to children to generate their interests to visit the chosen museums or attractions.

Diagram 28 illustrates the five revised decision structures, with the additional stages, that has been generated from the planned decisions (Section B of the diagram), in comparison with the theoretical model (Section A of the diagram). The first three structures capture those joint decisions that are made with the inclusion of children.
(the blue texts within the far left column of Section B), whereas the last two presents those adult-made decisions (the black texts within the far left column of Section B). The difference between these revised decision structures is as below. The yellow textbox indicates the active input from the children. The green textbox refers to the active input from both the adults and the children. The white textbox refers to the active input from the adult only.

- The first structure (see the first row of Section B) illustrates the type of joint decisions that were made in response to a child’s purchase request, which reflects the decision pattern discussed in Section 7.1.1. This structure highlights the active inputs of children through a form of making Purchase Request (revised stage 2-2A) in the theoretical Information Search and Share (theoretical stage 2).

- The second structure (see the second row of Section B) illustrates the type of the joint decisions made with a child’s purchase suggestion. This structure reflects the decision pattern discussed both in Sections 7.1.2 and 7.1.3. It highlights active inputs of children in the theoretical Information Search and Share (theoretical stage 2) after being consulted by the adult members. Therefore, this structure particularly specifies a child’s direct input in the additional stages: Consulting Children → Information Search → Purchase Suggestion. The role of the evaluators and decision-makers can be played by a child or adults.

- The third structure (see the third row of Section B) illustrates the type of the joint decisions made, with adults’ strong active input across the major decision-making stages. It can also be used to identify children’s active input in the final purchase decision, from the proposed consideration set made by the adults (the green textboxes). This structure reflects the decision pattern discussed in Sections 7.1.4.

- The final two structures (see the last two rows of Section B) illustrate those adult-made decisions decided individually or jointly, without any input from children, and reflect all the decision patterns discussed in Sections 7.2. Informing children (revise stage 4A) about the purchase decisions can occur or not.
9.3.2 Decision dynamics: individual or joint decisions

The theoretical Model 3 'family decision dynamics' proposed by Assael (2004) suggested two attributes occurred after the Need Arousal stage: firstly, the divisions of the decision types, and secondly, decision role specification was involved after the direction to the joint decisions. The joint decisions presented in Chapter 7 refer to the involvement of both adults and children. According to the adults, most of their family outing choices or tourism decisions need to involve joint discussion among the adult family members (e.g. the father and the mother). The finding supports the decision dynamics model which the division into the individual decisions or the joint decisions occurred after the Need Arousal stage. However, the data further specifies the condition of an individual choice and whether the Role Specification stage was involved.

The main reason why individual choices occurred was due to the absence of the other parents in their planned trips. Except for those individual decisions, the interactive dynamics moved between the individual level and group level, among those adult-and-child joint decisions and the adult joint decisions. The group interactions of
the joint decision-making also shifted amongst different family members, including children. Secondly, the data reveals that no particular decision role was specified, after the Need Arousal stage. The participation of a member at subsequent decision-making stages (e.g. the Information Search and the Purchase Suggestions Stages, the Alternative Evaluation Stage and the final Purchase Decisions) occurred in a rather organic way.

9.3.3 Prior to the Need Arousal Stage
Many sampled families revealed that their leisure decisions to visit museums did not start from the aroused needs or desires, as the theoretical model suggested. The reasons why particular museums were proposed as the consideration set and consequently turned into the purchase choices were associated with the Information Stimuli and Storage which occurred prior to the Need Arousal Stage. The Information Stimuli and Storage refers to individual family members or the family groups that received the information directly linked to a particular museum or relevant with a museum.

Information Stimuli and Storage
Diagram 29 illustrates the linkages of the Information Stimuli and Storage (the bottom-left Section C) with the one of the revised decision structures (the top-left Section B), in comparison with the theoretical model (the top-left Section A). The association of the Information Stimuli and Storage manifested across the Need Arousal, the Information Search, the Purchase Suggestion and the Alternative Evaluation. For example, the received information and the evaluation results of the Stimulus could lead to children's purchase requests and adults' purchase suggestions. For example, the parents received marketing information regarding a museum (e.g. TV news coverage), and they tended to evaluate how suitable this leisure option to their children was, according to the stimulated information. If the parents judged the content and the leisure experience, offered by the museums, as suitable for children, they 'categorised' the museums as an appropriate option and 'stored' the information for future use. Subsequently, the museums were proposed as the consideration set, when there were desires to find a place for family outings and trips (e.g. Families 7 and 13). Secondly, when the information stimuli were received by the children, from school curriculum that was directly associated with particular museums, the children revealed purchase request behaviour to their parents, asking to pay a visit to the museums afterwards, if they raised curiosity and interests in the subject and the
museums (e.g. Families 7, 12, 35, 36).

Thirdly, the information stimuli can happen in casual family interactions, as well. For example, children casually shared with their parents the subjects they learned from school, or the parents discerned what their children’s personal interests and school learning were. The parents received the information stimuli and stored the information, which related to their interactions with children. These interactions and stored information can trigger a subsequent Need Arousal, when the parents raised the desire to offer children knowledge stimulation, through visiting relevant museums, if they had the product knowledge. It can link to a later Alternative Evaluation stage, when parents received purchase suggestions from external sources, and recalled the connection between children’s interests and school learning within the proposed consideration set.

Diagram 29 The Information Stimuli and Storage occurred prior to the Need Arousal Stage

9.3.4 The Impact of the Post-Purchase Evaluations

Museum researches have shown that some family visits were motivated because of the positive museum experiences they previously had (MORI 2001, Mousouri 2003, Dierking et al. 2005, Briseño-Garzón et al. 2007). The impact of the previous museum experiences support the cycle of the theoretical decision model, which indicates that the level of satisfaction with the consumption experience, in a product/service, during the Post-Purchase Evaluation (Stage 5), affects the Need Arousal (Stage 1) of the future pre-purchase decision-making process. The findings of this research revealed
that the impact of the Post-Purchase Evaluation was beyond that on the Need Arousal stage only.

The data shows, rather, that the results of previous museum experiences (the Post-Purchase Evaluation stage) can affect all the next pre-purchase decision-making stages. Diagram 30 illustrates the revised impact of the Post-Purchase Evaluation Phase over the Pre-Purchase Phase (Section B), compared with the theoretical model (Section A). Firstly, particular museums can emerge from the Information Search stage, but be excluded as the inept/inert set, in the Purchase Suggestion stage, due to the fact that information gathers have negative experiences in some of the museums. Secondly, some family members showed positive responses to a museum, during the Alternative Evaluation Stage, because they had a wonderful time before.

Thirdly, the impact of Post-Purchase Evaluation was not constrained to the options the consumer choose (e.g. an art gallery or a history museums). The level of impact extends to the choices of relevant product category (e.g. all arts museums and all history museums). For example, a poor experience, at one art gallery, has an impact on all. Finally, the results of the Post-Purchase Evaluation were not limited to primary experiences (e.g. the family had visited a museum before). Others' experiences (e.g. a friend of a family member visited another museum before, but not the family itself) - a form of word-of-mouth recommendations - also affect the choices of a family, at the Purchase Suggestion Stage and the Alternative Evaluation Stage.

Diagram 30 The revised impact of the Post-Purchase Evaluation Phase over Pre-Purchase behaviour

(A) The theoretical family planned decision-making model

(B) The revised family planned decision-making model
9.3.5 Definition of the decision roles

According to the family interactions across the joint decision-making process, the definitions of a few decision roles have been re-clarified, as Table 8 lists. Firstly, the information gather is referred to as the person who is in charge of the information search. This role is called the 'gatekeeper' (Blackwell et al. 2006). The gatekeeper is particularly useful, when this role is played by the parents and other adult members, who have greatest expertise in processing information. But the concept of the control power, over the type of stimuli the family is being exposed to, is less applicable (Blackwell et al. 2006). The researcher argues one reason why the 'gatekeeper' role tends to be played by adults and that is due to their product knowledge and their distinctive value system on what sort of attractions are considered as 'good and suitable' choices.

Secondly, the literature's definition of the influencer role refers to the person who consciously or unconsciously sets up certain criteria in comparing the options, and meanwhile, affects other members' evaluation (Blackwell et al. 2006). A decision role 'evaluator' is added, here, to further clarify who directly executes the Alternative Evaluation process, whereas the 'influencer' refers to the person whose needs and presence passively affects how the evaluator assesses the consideration set (e.g. children). Finally, the aspect of having product knowledge is added into the definition of the decision-maker. That is to say, the role of the decision-maker cannot only be played by the person who has the financial power (e.g. a parent), but also by the person who has sufficient product knowledge to become involved in deciding how the family's money will be spent to (e.g. a child).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision roles</th>
<th>Literature definitions</th>
<th>Revised definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>initiator</td>
<td>the person who proposes or suggests potential purchase.</td>
<td>(Same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information gatherer</td>
<td>who has greatest expertise in processing information and controlling the type of stimuli to which the family is exposed.</td>
<td>Information gather is the person who carries out information search. Gatekeeper is the person who has better expertise in processing information and a distinctive value system in judging an appropriate option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or gatekeeper)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Evaluator
Evaluator is the person who executes the Alternative Evaluation process.

(new) X

influencer
Influencer is the person whose needs and presence passively affect other members' evaluation processes.

who consciously or unconsciously sets up certain criteria, in comparing the option and affecting other members' evaluation processes.

Decision-maker
Decision-maker is the person who has the financial power or sufficient product knowledge to choose how the family's money will be spent.

who decides which option to purchase and, perhaps, because he/she has the financial power to choose how the family's money will be spent and on which products or services.

Part III – Importance of children

This part stresses the important role children played over the planned decisions. Criticism has been made in regard to this vague definition of the terms: 'the influence of children', among previous consumer research, upon the role children played in family leisure and holiday choices (Mangleburg 1990). Many researchers do not distinguish between the active and passive dimensions of 'the influence'. This part focuses on the role children had played and clarifies their active and passive input over the decision-making process. It further presents two issues, which have been overlooked in previous museum and decision literature. Firstly, it explains why adults tend to take passive considerations for the children when making family leisure decisions. It concludes with the fact that the presence of children, in family leisure consumption, is often a vital trigger for adults to make their first planned visits to museums.

9.4 The nature of input

Chapter 7 has already shown that children exercise active inputs in those joint decisions. The passive considerations the adults have taken for all children of the group have been evident both in the joint decisions and in the adult-made decisions. Section 9.4.1 presents a number of features related to the direct involvements children exercised in the joint decisions. Section 9.4.2 explains the passive aspect is simply related to the fact that children are included as users of shared family leisure consumption, no matter what choices the family group decides at the end. Section 9.4.3 reveals that there is further variation, between direct and indirect input exercised
by different children, within the same family.

### 9.4.1 Active input

This researcher discovers that children exercise much active input over family day outing planned decisions, particularly when the travelling plans are within their home counties. Firstly, section 7.1 has demonstrated children's request to visit/revisit particular museums. Children's request behaviour has little association with their ages. Every child above the ages of toddlers started to make all sort of purchase requests for family outings and travelling. According to the examples of previous purchase requests reported by children themselves and by their parents, children's purchase requests covered a wide range of different leisure and cultural products at home and abroad (e.g. children's drama, theme parks, restaurants, travelling overseas and visiting a special visitor attraction such as Disneyland).

Secondly, the parents and other adults, however, did not report the quilt factor, that is, they felt that they should consult their children when making leisure decisions (Dunne 1999). Decision literature reports that adolescents tend to have more influence than younger children. In Chapters 7 and 8 those children who demonstrated active input in the joint decisions (especially the Information Search, the Alternative Evaluation and the Purchase Decision) tend to be the eldest child of the family. The child who acted as the only decision-maker was as young as 7 years (Family 29). The youngest child who participated in making the final decisions to visit the proposed museums through a voting system was 3-year-old child (Family 18). These significant findings extend the age of children involved, who have active input from adolescents (Thomson et al. 2007), to young children at the pre-school and primary school age levels.

The reason why children demonstrated direct involvement in making outing decisions is primarily due to their product involvement and product knowledge (information and past experiences) in the shared family leisure consumption (Thomson et al. 2007). The data further reveals that the active input children have is also associated with their cognitive development of a geographical sense, which has been over looked in previous studies.

The data shows that the most common approach children used, in exercising active input, was a request strategy, especially 'just ask' and 'express wants' (Palan and Wilkes 1997, Williams and Burns 2000). The most popular response approach the
parents and the grandparents used to approve of children's purchase requests and suggestions was 'simply agree'. Instead of directly saying 'no' to their children, the 'bargaining strategy' tends to be used when parents have judged that the consideration set proposed by their children was unfeasible enough to meet some practical criteria. A gradual approach has thus been found among parents' responses toward children's unfeasible requests and suggestions. The 'reasoning' strategy (practical explanations) was normally used first. The 'alternatives' strategy (suggestion other options) was employed if the children proposed the unfeasible and less practical option again. The interactions, between parents and children, were an act of conveying consumer knowledge to children and enhancing their understanding of both product knowledge and value of money (Hamilton and Catterall 2008). The use of an 'emotional' strategy, such as 'anger', was evident when parents found that a child had too much active input in a single decision. This finding extends the person who uses the 'emotional' strategy from the scope of children to parents (Palan and Wilkes 1997, Williams and Burns 2000).

9.4.2 Passive input

The data shows that children are one of the central focuses of adults' passive considerations. The extent of the passive considerations the adults take for the children were particularly evident in the planned decisions, both at the joint decisions and the adult-made decisions. The parents did not report having pressures to pick a correct choice for their children as a previous study had shown (Dunne 1999). Considerations over the nature of the children were evident. The adults recognised that children tend to be very active, energetic and full of curiosity. Moreover, children lose their attention quickly and easily when they feel bored. Therefore, finding a place where children are welcomed and where they are able to have fun, and meanwhile, avoiding visiting places that might fail to generate the interest of children is the biggest concern for the adults.

For those families with more than one child, selecting a chosen attraction that can fit in all children of different ages is a desired outcome and an important concern for the adults. Other considerations, including children's physical needs, the catering service, and wish to visit a safe attraction all rise to the surface. Comparatively speaking, seeking educational benefits to children had not been emphasised as a primary consideration by adults when museums were proposed and included in the consideration set. These passive considerations influenced judgements on which
attractions to include, in the consideration set, and how to select final purchase decisions.

The importance of considering the interest of children
Decision literature has pointed out that the interest of children was the second most important factor affecting family choices of where to go on a day outing – second, after a price factor (Mintel 2004c) -- and the negative impact parents might receive, if they visit a place that fails to generate the interests of children (Dunne 1999). The data confirmed that interests of children had indeed been taken into account, by the parents and other adults, as a vital concern. The passive considerations over the interest of children were not only manifested in the single decision context, that is involved in the museum choice, but these were reported to be applied to general decision-making for family leisure choices.

The data shows that the interests of children cover two aspects: (i) the explicit expression - the personal interests of the children in a particular attraction, such as a museum or, in relevant subjects, and (ii) the passive assumptions adults demonstrated that an attraction might be of interest to children. Adults cited a number of advantages to choosing an attraction that can cater to the personal interests of children, or which children might be interested in visiting. Catering to the interests of/to children in Pre-Purchase decision behaviour, was strongly related to the consumption experiences the adults foresaw in the family group which might have sway in a subsequent Purchase Phase.

The adult members foresaw that children would be less likely to feel bored during the visit under two conditions: first, when children expressed active interests in visiting an attraction (e.g. a particular museum), or second, when they judged an attraction is capable of being interesting to children. The adults learned from their past outing experiences with children that the interest of children in an attraction can also extend their attention span at the chosen museums, and enhance the level of their enjoyment during the visits. In such cases, the adults assumed that the level of knowledge stimulation children received in an informal learning environment such as a museum would increase. Otherwise, as one parent stated, the visits to a museum could be pointless no matter how beneficial to informal leaning that adults imagined them experiencing during a visit to a museum.
The adults considered that yielding to the active interests of children and avoiding places where they judged that children might dislike would increase the level of quality and satisfactory family time they would have in chosen attractions. This finding supports a previous study showing that parents learn from prior outing experiences with children, that, if their children are not interested in an activity or an attraction, they would avoid going, since children would impact the level of pleasure experiences the family might have (Gram 2007). Here, the adults believed that, if they forced the children to visit somewhere, where children dislike or lack of interest, it would become a hassle for the adults and end up as an unpleasant trip.

Seeking the enjoyment of the children was one of the overarching desires the adults wanted to pursue from any family outings. This echoes back to Hood's (1986) evidence, showing that the parents with primary school children emphasised the leisure values of active participation and entertainment, rather than having learning opportunities in visiting leisure service products, like museums. But the finding was evident among parents with dependent children of all ages. This is the reason why catering to the interests of children and seeking their enjoyment was an important passive consideration the adults taken for the children, which affected the adults’ judgements in making the ‘best’ decisions, in all joint decisions, as well as in exclusively adult-made decisions.

### 9.4.3 Fluctuating patterns over the joint decisions

Among those joint decisions made between adults and children, children exhibited a ‘fluctuating’ pattern across the decision-making process. The fluctuating nature refers to the active input of children who were not consistent across the whole process – the involvement of children that were a mixture of passive and active aspects across different decision-making stages. The fluctuation can be from passive aspects to active aspects, or vice-versa. The emphasis, here, is the extent of the input from children both actively and passively over the whole decision-making process, instead of presenting their influence on one decision-making stage or another, as the decision literature has shown. Diagram 31 portrays the influential dimensions children had over different types of the decisions (Section C of the diagram) and presents the relationships of these dimensions in comparison with the revised family planned decision-making model (Section B of the diagram) and the theoretical model (Section A of the diagram).
From active input to passive input

As the first row of Diagram 31 illustrates, those children who requested to visit the museums in the joint decisions demonstrated a fluctuating pattern from having active inputs in the first three stages of the revised model, that is, the Need Arousal (Stage 1), the Information Search (Stage 2-1) and the Purchase Request (Stage 2-2A). Next, the parents and other adults manifested passive considerations over children's requests, for example, the holding power of the proposed museums and the potential educational benefits to them.

Diagram 31 The dimensions of children's input over the decision process

- **Diagram 31**
  - **A** The theoretical family planned decision-making model
    - Stage 1: Need Arousal
    - Stage 2: Information Search & Share
    - Stage 3: Alternative Evaluation
    - Stage 4: Purchase Decision
  - **B** The revised family planned decision-making model
    - Stage 1: Need Arousal
    - Stage 2-1: Information Search
    - Stage 2-2: Purchase Request/Suggestion
    - Stage 3: Alternative Evaluation
    - Stage 4: Purchase Decision
  - **C** The involvement dimensions of the children
    - Joint decisions
      - (1) Purchase requests: Active (a child) | Passive (all children)
      - (2) Being consulted to make suggestions: Passive (all children) | Active (particularly the eldest child) | Passive (all children)
      - (3A) A child proposed and another decided: Passive (all children) | Active (a child) | Passive & Active (all children) | Active (another child)
      - (3B) Being invited to make the decisions: Passive (all children) | Active (particularly the eldest child)
    - Joint decisions & Adult-made decisions: Consistent passive (all children)

Change between passive and active input

The fluctuating patterns between the passive and active input from children demonstrate at the rest decision patterns of the joint decisions (see the second, third and fourth rows of Section C in Diagram 31). The passive considerations manifested in the Need Arousal stage refer to when the adult members wanted to take their children to be out-of-house and away from indoor lives in the outing purposes. Next, there were three variations of this fluctuating pattern depending on when the children were invited to participate in the joint decision making. The first one refers to the
pattern when children were consulted by making active input into the Information Search and the following Purchase Suggestions, and then, the adults evaluated the proposed suggestions, by considering the passive roles of children (see the second row of Section C). Children’s active input extends from the second pattern to the third pattern, when they participated in deciding the final purchase choices (see the row of 3A within Section C). The last pattern refers that the passive considerations over finding suitable places for children were demonstrated by the adults’ selection of the consideration set, and then children were invited to exercise active input both during the Evaluation and the final purchase decisions (see the row of 3B within Section C).

9.4.4 Families with more than one child

Differing influential dimensions by different children were discerned among the joint decision, which has been neglected in previous research. In most cases, the older children had a more active role than their younger siblings, as they tend to be consulted by their parents about their preferences, first. Some joint decisions had active input from only one child, through putting in purchase requests, making purchase suggestions, and deciding the final purchase decisions. Their siblings, although having no direct input at all, did exhibit passive input, however, over the final choice. For example, in response to the elder son’s purchase request, the parents of Family 36 considered that, even though the 10-year-old younger daughter had not learned about the subject of the chosen museum, travelling to the chosen museum by boat would be fun for her.

Some cases revealed that more than one child demonstrated active roles in the final decision among the families with two or three children (see the row of 3A within Section C). However, their active input could be different, depending on which decision-making stages they were involved in. For example, the 15-year-old elder daughter of Family 24, acted as a consultant, when her parents needed to brainstorm about alternative indoor venues. The 12-year-old sibling took part in a later decision-making stage and acted as the decision-maker, in that case.

Among those families with more than one child, the children all exhibited passive influence over both the joint decisions and the adult-made decisions (see the last row of Section C). What emerges, as the most interesting element of this discussion, is that the adult members tend to agree to visit a museum if they believed the museum would be of interest to all their children since the outing would be a shared family visit.
9.5 Powerful triggers for family planned visits

The analytical finding indicates that the inclusion of the children in the current family life stage was a main reason why some parents decided to make their first visits to the museums. Museum literature has rarely revealed that children are powerful encouragements for adults' museum participation, particularly in generating the non-visitor parents to make their first visits to the sampling museums. This significant feature was concluded from further analysis on the following three aspects of both the joint decisions and the adult-made decisions: (a) the parents’ museum participation before and after the presence of children, (b) comparing the parents’ awareness of the museums, as well as (c) the main reasons to make their first visits, reinforced by the parents.

9.5.1 Museum participations before and after the birth of children

Family life cycle was an important aspect of family choices of museum-visiting. According to the parents, the presence of children increased their frequency of having family outings and trips in general. This phenomenon was particularly apparent when a family contained pre-school children. Most parents of the sampled families admitted that they had rarely visited any museum before the presence of their children. Due to the inclusion of children in the family shared leisure and tourism activities, many parents asserted, “it is essential to consider the participation of our children in family leisure and holiday choices”. A series of child-centred statements were offered as elaborations why the parents considered visiting the museums, such as ‘museums are places suitable for children to go’, and ‘museums are places where children should come’. The constant passive considerations of the children were important incentives for why the parents and other adult family began to visit museums.

Although the parents increased their museum participations, after the presence of children in family leisure/holiday consumption, museum-visiting was a rare choice for the sampled families. Almost all sampled families expressed a wide range of out-of-house leisure options and activities they did more regularly; for example, visiting parks, sport activities, entertainment (e.g. watching movies) and recreation (e.g. visiting theme parks), and inspirational activities (e.g. visiting bookstores). Both the adult and the child respondents expressed that visiting museums was not a popular among these families, according to the frequency of visits in a year. The families tend to visit certain museums only (those offering entertaining features or
catering to the interest of children) and avoid visiting particular types of museums (e.g. art museums), which had been explained earlier.

9.5.2 The main reasons to make their first visits
Recognition of a visitor attraction does not always guarantee the inclusion of the place in the consumers' consideration set (the options consumers were aware of and intend to purchase) or lead to final purchase choice. Except the Taipei Story House, many parents admitted that they had been aware of the rest of the three sampling sites for years since they were launched and they held positive attitudes toward museum-visiting, in general. Even though some parents could not articulate what was on display and the facilities of these museums contained, they all showed adequate product knowledge of the key features of the museums. For example, the ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology is an archaeological site, and the building is famous for its architecture design (e.g. cited by the parents of Families 13, 35 and 36). The Taipei Astronomical Museum is a place where you can observe stars (e.g. Families 21, 23, 25, 33). However, the parents' recognitions of the sampling sites and their positive attitudes toward museum-visiting had not been transformed into any purchase decisions to visit the museums.

That is to say, these sampling museums had been categorised in these parents' inert set and their inept set for a long time until some child-related incentives. For example, many parents made a number of rather diplomatic excuses for being reluctant to take their children to visit the archaeological museum. These, for example, included: 'a lack of time', and 'the museum and its surroundings were less appealing to the ages of my children' (e.g. Families 13, 35, 36). The interest of children, both being expressed actively by a child, and being assumed passively by adults, were powerful forms of encouragement to convince these parents to make their first family visits to the museums, which they previously judged as an inappropriate option for their children.

The interests of children were the major trigger the parents used to reinforce why they decided to visit or to re-visit the museums with their children, no matter the interests that were expressed, in active or passive form. According to the parents, the first reason given was related to the active inputs of children, including the support of children's purchase requests (e.g. Families 2, 7), their purchase suggestions (e.g. Families 28 and 32) and the positive response a child showed to one of the proposed
museums (e.g. Families 22, 24, 29) or the museum they encountered (e.g. Family 5). Most significantly, the parents, who had rarely visited any museums, previously reacted enthusiastically to their children’s requests, particularly when the demands were associated with school curriculum (e.g. Families 35, 36) and exam preparation (e.g. Family 12). Even though the parents had formerly received negative word-of-mouth views from other parents, who visited the museum with their children (Family 35), the warning did not stop the parents from paying their first family visits to the archeological site, due to the inputs of the children related to school learning.

The second reason was related to the passive input of children over adult-made decisions. The parents changed their previous assumptions on judging the museums as an suitable option for children and decided to make their first family visits to both museums because the attraction: (i) provided interactive and entertaining experiences for children, in the special exhibition (e.g. Family 13), (ii) catered to the recent interests of their children (e.g. Families 21, 23, 33) and their past school learning (e.g. Families 25, 27), and (iv) a frequent museum visitor recommended that visiting museums was a more meaningful activity for children (Family 20). All these passive inputs children had were significantly highlighted by the parents about their unusual decisions to visit the museums, when they compared their regular family leisure options and activities.
Summary

This chapter shows that the findings of making family leisure decisions to visit museums were more related to the limited types of the decision-making process. The interactions among adults and children suggests that the decision process involved, before the final decisions to visit museums being made, was a rather cooperative, harmonious, attentive and peaceful process. The purchase choices were flexible and were allowed to change during the journey. The data revealed that more than one desire was aroused by different group members, within one decision-making process. While the overarching desire of the children was mainly to have fun in an outing, parents tend to seek a practical and relaxing choice and to have a quality and pleasant time with children. An internal information search was mainly used by the adults and the children. The external searches mainly happened due to insufficient product knowledge and uncertainty, and heavily relied on the word-of-mouth recommendations from close relations. Repeat searches occurred when the first consideration set was judged as unfeasible or unsuitable for children, which suggested that sometimes making family leisure decisions could involve complex processes, even though the impact of the decision is short-term.

Several extensions were made upon the theoretical models. Additional decision-making stages were proposed to re-clarify the family interactions during the decision-making process and to highlight the significant role children played in the decision process. The events occurred prior to the Need Arousal stage were revealed. The impact of the theoretical Post-Purchase Evaluation Stage was beyond the primary experiences the family consumers had. Finding a suitable place for children to have fun and avoiding places that might not generate the interests of children, during their visits, were the biggest concerns for adults. Children’s inputs over the joint decisions demonstrated fluctuating patterns, moving from passive to active, and vice-versa. The fluctuating features emphasise the input of children over the whole process. Among those families with two or three children, the children all exhibited passive input over the adult-made decisions. Several advantages of catering for the personal interest of children and finding a place children might be interested to visit were cited, which explain why passive considerations over the interests of children are important concerns for adults. Most significantly, the presence of children, in family leisure and their interests, had compelled many parents to make their first planned visits to museums.
10.1 Recap research questions and objectives

The premise of this research is not to prove a model but to explore new ground, since little is known about how family members interact with each other when making a family leisure purchase decision, such as visiting a museum. This research aims to answer two questions: first, how families with children decide to visit museums; second, what role children played in the decision-making process. Chapter 1 offers the research rationale for this thesis, including the significance of family segment, the importance to study family consumers and the need to study children’s involvement in leisure and museum choices. The logical-flow decision-making model has been used to underpin this research, because of its emphasis on the process involved before a purchase decision takes place. The chapter defines a family group and further outlines five research foci as follows:

1. to identify how the decisions to visit museums are made (planned or impulse choices, joint or individual choices) and with whose involvement;
2. to explore how adults and children interact with each other before the decisions are reached;
3. to explore the key decision attributes (the type of needs, the information search behaviour, the consideration set) and the considerations that been taken into account in the selection process (the evaluative criteria);
4. to identify the decision role children and adults played in the process;
5. to explore the nature of involvement children have (active or passive aspects).

Chapter 2 reviews previous museum studies on pre-purchase behaviour. The motivational approach has dominated the study of the family choices to visit museums. Evidence of the family motivations to visit museums intertwines with six major themes, including: learning, entertainment, the role of children, quality family time, interest in museums and social interactions. However, the picture of family visits is vague about whose motivations are actually presented, since they are prevalent among adults’ viewpoints. The process of how a family reaches its decision to visit museums remains under-researched among these previous motivational studies. Little attention has been paid both to the explicit and implicit role children play in the purchase decisions to visit museums, even though there is evidence of child-orientated motivation.
Chapter 3 reviews the decision literature on family leisure-related decisions and introduces the logical decision-making model. The model suggests that there are 4 major stages involved in making purchase choices. Previous decision literature shows that making leisure choices tends to be a joint decision. Research reveals that children, in particular, tend to have a salient influence over the Need Arousal stage as well as over destination choices and activity selection. The influential dimensions children have cover both active and passive behaviour. However, making family purchase decisions, in and of itself, tends to be viewed as a competitive process. The investigation into family purchases has mainly used the individual logical-flow decision model instead of the household model. Most researchers have therefore focused on who has more influential power on the decision outcomes. Children are often treated as an influential force working against parents, having previously been excluded in the family decision-making unit.

Chapter 4 offers a number of suggestions about what needs to be explored in family pre-purchase decision behaviour. These include considering a family including children as a whole and exploring the cooperative perspective of the decision-making processes. The researcher suggests the study of the purchase decision-making process therefore must view the process as a whole. It is important to explore how family members select purchase options and interact with each other before the arrival at final decisions, and to explore the possibility of impulse choices, as well. A conceptual model has been developed, based on four theoretical models that feature family decision-making and multiple decision roles involved in joint decisions. As such, the conceptual model aims to offer a more in-depth investigation of the family pre-purchase behaviour.

Chapters 5 and 6 present considerations that have been dominant in a number of research paradigms, and which explain why the researcher decided to take interpretivism as a select methodology by which to answer her research questions and fully explore germane interests. The ontological view of interpretivism, on multiple realities, its subjective epistemology and context-bound methodology, enables the researcher to study the experiences of families who decide to visit museums from the participants’ own definitions. The paradigm also facilitates the presentation of multiple perspectives and interpretations, including the participants’ and the researcher’s. Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) has been chosen as the main route of inquiry because of its emphasis on in-depth examination of how people experience the studied phenomena. Semi-structured family interviews, with the inclusion of children,
Chapter 10 Conclusion and Reflection

were chosen as the data collection method. The data obtained from family interviews has thus provided rich information about adult and child participants' perspectives and their interactions within the decision-making process.

The findings overall are in line with research studies found in Western literature. A series of new findings further clarify the gap in literature. Chapter 7 demonstrates that family decisions to visit museums were a mixture of planned decisions and impulse decisions. The planned and the impulse decisions have been further classified into joint decisions and adult-made decisions. The definition of joint decisions particularly highlights the active input from children. Four decisions patterns, in particular, capture the direct involvements of children and adults across a range of processes involved in jointly planned decisions. On the other hand, the type of the impulse decision varies from a purely impulsive one to an alternative to a fully planned decision. The major trigger for impulsive decisions was the external information stimuli related to the museum buildings. The chapter thereby offers a clear picture how adults and children interact before both planned and impulse decisions are made.

Chapter 8 presents family groups' perception and their value systems behind both planned and impulse decisions. Similar desires and evaluative criteria have been shared by the adults and the children who played different decision roles at the joint and the adult-made planned decision-making levels. Offering entertainment for children and catering for children's personal interests are not only proven as key motivations behind family decisions to visit museums, but have also been used by both adults and children as evaluative criteria to assist in their selection. Children are capable of distinguishing between a fun and a boring museum experience. Those museums which offered recreational facilities, interactive experiences and dynamic programmes, and those which create child-welcoming atmospheres are judged as more appealing to children. A number of practical issues are concerned, such as the weather condition, time, locations, accessibility and price; these have been used as the evaluative criteria mainly by adults. Overall, the entertaining features of a museum and the price factors far outweigh other criteria, for adults. Potential educational benefits to children, offered by chosen museums, have been expressed implicitly as subtle desires mainly by adults in choosing these venues. A realistic view on how much children can learn from visiting a museum has also often been expressed by adults, particularly those groups including young children. Unlike the complex considerations behind the planned decisions, the mere curiosity to see what is inside the museums has been the most powerful motive to trigger impulse decisions to enter them. A less
practical evaluation and a less passive consideration for children including the potential educational benefits have thus been mentioned by adults who made these impulse decisions.

Chapter 9 shows that little time and effort has been spent in the planning process, and the final purchase decisions have been quickly reached from a small number within the consideration set. According to the family interactions and the decision dynamics, making family weekend outing decisions is a cooperative and attentive process, rather than a purely competitive one. Parents and other adults seem to present an attentive manner for children’s participation, as they are important users, in family outings. Therefore children’s opinions and their active input are consulted at some situations. Meanwhile, many passive considerations had been taken for children both in the joint decisions and the adult-made planned decisions. There is very little evidence of arguments among family group members. However, a range of hierarchical needs, associated both with the planned and the impulse decision, have been discussed. Internal information searches are mostly used both by the adults and the children who involved in those planned decisions. Limited sources have been consulted to investigate external search behaviour; mainly one has relied more heavily on the assurance of word-of-mouth recommendations from close relations. Additional decision-making stages are proposed to further clarify family interactions before and after the Purchase Decision are made and to highlight the role children often played in the decision-making process. The findings reveal that making family decisions are not part of a linear process as the theoretical model suggests.

The data suggests, moreover, that children play an important role in influencing family decisions to visit museums, particularly planned decisions. Adults tend to play the gatekeepers and decision-makers, who carefully filter out those attractions they judge as inappropriate and less feasible. The perceived level of product knowledge that children have is then a key condition behind their children's active inputs into the joint decisions. The eldest child of a family tends to have more input than younger siblings. Children who have active input in those joint decisions exhibit a fluctuating pattern across the decision-making process. Among those families with more than one child, all the children exhibit indirect input over the planned decisions. Museum literature has rarely revealed that some parents decide to make their first family visits to museums, due to the presence of the children in shared family leisure consumption. The researcher discovers that both the active input from children and the passive considerations for children become powerful forms of encouragement for family visits.
to museums, particularly in generating the non-visitor parents to make their very first visits and willingness to sample what museums have to offer.

10.2 Contribution to knowledge

This research identifies the gap in the knowledge of family pre-purchase behaviour of leisure choices and the need to study a family with the inclusion of children, as a group. It employs an interpretativist stance to facilitate the exploration into the interactive process involved in making a group purchase decision, which has been previously dominated by the positivist paradigm. This research collects data from a freshly-made decision and focuses on a single decision scenario - the family choice to visit a museum - through a qualitative group interview with the inclusion of children. It offers opportunities for children aged from five to fifteen to speak about their understanding of how family decisions to visit museums are made. The age range of child respondents is much younger than in previous research. The verbal accounts given by primary-school children and adolescents contribute new insights into how children understand family leisure decisions to visit museums.

This research offers an in-depth picture of how family members interact with each other as well as consult external sources before the final purchase decisions to visit museums are reached. How museums and other leisure service products have emerged as potential purchase options is also demonstrated. The findings of this research present that the decisions to visit museums are a mixture of planned and impulse decisions. The range of the impulse decisions suggests that family leisure choices are flexible and allow to be changed.

The findings offer evidence to support the cooperative, harmonic and attentive aspects of those previously misunderstood family decision processes. The important role children played, both implicitly and explicitly, over family outing choices has been highlighted and the active involvement of children in the joint decisions has been presented. This research further clarifies the vague picture of family motivations for visiting a museum. A number of evaluative criteria used by children and adults to assist their selection process have been identified. The outcome of this research thereby expands the conceptual model which has been integrated from and adapted to existing models for family purchase decisions. A series of revisions has been offered to the conceptual model for family leisure planning behaviour, which specifies the interactive dynamics across different decisions patterns and the fluctuating patterns of the inputs.
children have over family leisure choices. These revisions can be further tested or explored in future research.

This research may thus help museum practitioners to design a more appealing and comprehensive museum programmes that can cater to the needs of children and family groups, alike, and meet their evaluative criteria on many levels. Finally, these research findings may inspire museum professionals to tackle the issue of audience development from the children's perspective, which is a particularly useful advantage in the competitive field of the leisure activity marketplace. The knowledge accrued and results produced can also offer groundwork for further research into other family leisure purchases involving low-risk and sharing, such as eating out and cinema-going.

10.3 Implications for museums

The data clearly shows that children play a significant role in family leisure decisions. Children's active inputs are evident at all stages of the joint planned decisions. They can participate in making purchase requests or purchase suggestions to visit museums, and they can even have involvement in the final decisions. A child's request to pay a first visit to a museum is particularly evident, when museums are mentioned in the school curriculum and are recommended by teachers. Moreover, the findings demonstrate that children are capable of judging how fun a museum can be, to satisfy their primary goals for family outings. The power exercised by children to request repeat visits also indicates that museums need to ensure that they offer enjoyable and interactive activities available to every single child who encounters a museum, whether it is with school trip or a family visit.

Most importantly, the extensive passive considerations adults take for children are evident both in the joint decisions and the adult-made planned decisions. How well a museum appeals to children of all ages is an important consideration and such judgements are particularly related to the perceived image of entertaining experiences offered. As the adults expressed, the level of enjoyment a child member has makes a significant impact on the whole family group during a visit to any attractions including museums. The findings of this research suggest that family outing decisions tend to be made quickly. The family groups clearly demonstrated that those museums which offer fun and dynamic experiences easily stand out as a favourable purchase decision, no matter how many purchase suggestions were proposed. The feedback from a museum experience also affects a family's intention to revisit the attractions in the future.
UK surveys show that the segment of families with babies and small children is one of the under-represented museum audiences (MLA 2001, 2004). The entertainment criteria reinforce that family groups are deterred from the 'boring' and 'pure browsing' types of museums, particularly those families with pre-schoolers. The energetic behaviour of this age group is perceived as less welcomed in the museum settings. The data shows, furthermore, that the lack of interest, in visiting certain types of museums, among families with pre-schoolers, are mainly due to the scarcity of offering entertaining experiences and active participation. It is therefore very important that museum curators and practitioners make sure their institutions offer loads of fun and exciting programmes for the whole family.

The design of museum programmes and special exhibitions needs to be considered from children’s perspective and to ensure that the displays and the interpretations of museums can hold their attention. Sometimes what adult museum staffs consider to be ‘fun’ might suffer from being seen as boring from children’s perspective. Such implementation can be carried out by seeking collaborations with children and by inviting children’s participation in the trial and the evaluation of an exhibition before a launch. Museums can also explore what would be really fun and interesting in their programme design beside those activities that have been offered now (e.g. hands-on participation, recreational facilities, craft workshop, story-telling events and live performance). Finally, a museum’s capacity to offer entertaining and quality time to all ages and to the group members, as a whole, needs to be stressed upon the attachment of distinctive, informed learning functioning in all sorts of marketing information and press releases. Museums can also try to market children to boost their potential input in the family leisure choices.

Admission charges and the value for money are great practical concerns for adults who wish to take children for an outing. Since family visits involve multiple members and the need for outings is a constant and on-going desire, it is important for all museums to offer group packages for families with children, or any group containing adults and children. Some museums do offer family tickets, but they tend to restrict the number of adults and children for discount eligibility; for example, ‘1 adult and 3 children’ or ‘2 adult and 2 children’. Some museums also provide group discounts, but normally apply for 10 or more visitors. Family groups with children sometimes can make up between 5 and 10 members. It would be better if museums can offer flexible combinations of the number of adults and children, or introduce percentage discounts.
to reward a larger family group. For example, a group containing more than 3 children are eligible for a further 10-20% discount per child. Finally, the convenience of both accessing museums, by public transportation and parking services, needs to be maximised, based upon the resources museums have.

Apart from museum products, most leisure services and visitor attractions shall ensure that the admission charge and any extra fees involved in a visit to their institutions is affordable for family groups. Most importantly, practitioners of leisure and tourism sectors need to ensure that they are capable of providing a quality, relaxing and enjoyable group experience, for family groups, as well as offer a great value for the money the groups spend. Finally, if practitioners hope their service can not only enter family consumers’ consideration set but also be their final purchase decisions, they can be very creative in exploring how to target both adults and children and to ensure that they receive information about the wonderful experiences offered by their service.

10.4 Reflection and limitations

Qualitative research literature suggests that data generated from multiple sources can enrich the ‘validity’ of a research (Denzin and Lincoln 2005, Daly 2007). Multiple data sources can enrich the adequacy of the data criteria (Morrow 2005). The original research design of the data collection methods contains two sources; first, verbal data from family interviews, and, second, visual and verbal data from a children’s drawing method. The first section explains the difficulties the researcher encountered when conducting the children’s drawing method (Section 10.4.1).

The impact of the subjective on an interpretivist inquiry is inevitable. The influence a researcher has entails not only the data analysis, but also it takes place throughout the entire inquiry process. Therefore, it is important to monitor and report how a researcher might impact the knowledge produced. The purpose of self-reflection is to ensure the findings and interpretations represent the reality of participants (Morrow 2005, Yeh and Inman 2007). The second section presents the self-reflexivity of the potential impact of my own role, as the researcher, in shaping knowledge produced in this study (Section 10.4.2).

10.4.1 Conducting children’s drawing method

Museum research has revealed that some young children have difficulty in understanding the adult point of view, in child-adult interviews, with open-ended
questions (Massey 1996, Piscitelli et al. 1999). This is because that young children normally lack meta-conceptual awareness and are sometimes confused about the time scale of their own behaviour (Massey 1996). Therefore, the children’s drawings method has been initially designed as the supplementary tool for family interviews (Rennie 1995, Massey 1996, Dove 1999). The instruction for the drawing method was by asking the elder children of family groups, aged over 9: ‘To draw the scenarios they remember about their family, before the decision to visit a museum is made, and to show how children and their parents (or other family members) were doing’. However, the researcher abandoned the drawing method after experiencing enormous difficulties, while carrying it out.

The first difficulty is related to the sampling places in a museum. Since most visitors prefer ambling around in the museums, the place where a family is sampled varies from case to case. After the researcher has approached the sampled families, some are willing to move to a space with tables, which assist in the execution of the children’s drawings. But some families prefer to be interviewed right on the spot where there was no table. This has consistently failed in the execution of the drawing method. Most significantly, among those children who have been asked to draw anything they can think of, what happens, before the decisions to visit museums are made, is that most children report a great difficulty in this task. For example, as the 10-year-old girl of Family 4 expresses, ‘I have no idea what to draw’. The researcher assumes the decision-making process is too abstract for most children to visualise and to present on a paper. Even though the drawing method was given up at the middle stage of the fieldwork, the researcher had found out this method to be an effective tactic to soothe the emotions of those pre-schoolers who felt bored with family interviews.

### 10.4.2 Influence on the inquiry process

Scholars have suggested that the key influential sources from a researcher need to be reported in qualitative research, which would employ as researcher’s background, prior knowledge, own experiences and some assumption about the research phenomenon (Morrow 2005, Yeh and Inman 2007). IPA also suggests that access to the respondent’s psycho-social world depends on three conditions. They are: the researcher’s conceptions and the conceptual framework, interactions with the participants, and the interpretative activity that shapes his/her understanding of how participants make sense of their experiences (Smith 2004, Smith and Eatough 2006). Therefore, it is important for a researcher to reflect and explicitly address the issues involved in shaping final results of the inquiry throughout the research project.
Chapter 10 Conclusion and Reflection

There are three major sources of influence on the inquiry process: my status as a young single female, my occasional museum participation, and my on-going reflection about research questions and the literature. Since the fact is that I have no children, it helps me to detect the main difference between making a leisure-related decision purely for myself or for group consumption (e.g. with my friends) and making a leisure-related decision for a family with children. For me, the gap in between which might be the answers, for example, the passive considerations taken for children in a family purchase decision.

My reflection on the literature and 'unofficial' data collection heavily influences the questions I pose to the literature as well as the production of my data analysis and data interpretation. Before conducting the fieldwork, my conception about the research topic had been strongly influenced by the decision and museum literature. For example, my initial research proposal for PhD programme focused on the influence of children over family decisions to visit museums. Prior to embarking on my fieldwork, children were viewed as an influential source potentially against the parents. After I had thought over the nature of a family group and the characteristics of family purchase decisions, the research questions and objectives had evolved to the focus on studying the family as a whole and to study family interactions. Since a picture of the process involved in making a group decision to visit museums was largely unknown, I had been constantly thinking how those motivational themes are identified by museum literature and how they manifest in a family decision process. What does a family discuss before they decided to visit museums?

My reflection on literature and the theoretical decision-making model has been carried out in many ways. First, I looked back upon my own museum experiences, since I have been an occasional visitor to museums for a long time. I recalled how my decisions were made and checked; for example, to what extent my own motives for visiting museums echo back the learning theme, which has been emphasised by museum literature. Second, the data obtained from the main fieldwork was the primary resource for this research. During the main fieldwork, I had constantly talked with my close relations (e.g. friends, relatives and neighbours), who were in parental positions, and discussed their experiences and the decisions to visit museums with their children. I also explored my interview questions with my young cousins and friends' children. These casual conversions helped me to develop an idea about my research topic, and adjusted the way I composed my interview questions. The casual conversation.
continued throughout the period of my data analysis and interpretation; for example, I talked with those family groups I encountered when visiting museums in London. The experiences obtained at the initial stage of data coding informing me that the way I coded my data and the way I explained it depend on my understanding of the research subject. Therefore, I determined that it might be risky if I coded and interpreted the data completely relying on information offered by the literature and theoretical models.

The information obtained from casual conversation with people and the on-going reflection gave me inspiration to code and to organise my data appropriately. For example, both my data and casual conversation with other people informed me that families rarely discussed the learning theme when they decided to visit a museum. But one wonders why learning has been repeatedly reported in museum literature. The scope of my reflection therefore expanded from decisions to visit museums to other purchases; for example, fair-trade products. Many people I have spoken to show positive attitudes toward the concept of fair-trade. I asked how come some of my friends buy fair-trade products, but some do not. Then I realised that even though people had a positive attitude toward a product such as the museum, they might not consider visiting a museum. The reservation might be having other concerns toward the product, for example, they perceived museums are boring places. Information like this has guided me to look at my data and investigate any common evaluative criteria that may have been used by family groups and then find out what lies behind their decisions to visit the museums, thus offering living examples both of the 'inept and the 'inert' set. That is to say, these observations led to many occasions in which I needed to de-construct my analytic codes and to re-organise the data completely, according to my latest reflection, even though the process itself was both exhausting and time-consuming. All these on-gong observations and reflections have shaped my understanding about the data as well as my interpretation of events. The purpose of doing this lies in the hope of bringing out a picture that is closer to the real answers to my inquiries.

Each research paradigm and data collection method has its strengths and weaknesses. It is difficult for this interpretivist inquiry to make generalisations from the findings, due to its epistemological and methodological concerns, as well as to the small sample size. The findings of this research have therefore reported some association among factors that have been taken into account, in the decisions to visit museums; however, the causal relationships among these factors cannot be thoroughly explained – for example, the age of the children and their active input in the joint decisions. Some
factors, such as this, have been excluded in the discussion. Another example would be the reasons why eldest children tend to be consulted in making active inputs, by their parents and grandparents, and both how and why these were related to the cultural background of certain Taiwanese families strongly influenced by the culture of Confucianism. However, the extent of the cultural factor has not been discussed due to the limitations of taking a small sample in the study.

The data obtained in this research heavily relies on the respondents' subjective recollections about how they came to the decision to visit museums. Since the research questions in this thesis have been perceived as a casual topic, by all the family groups, rather than a controversial and sensitive issue, the potential deceit, on part of the participants is highly unlikely. The interviews have been engaged in, on the group basis; as a result, the accuracy of such recollection has been maximised. However, the possibility of a recollection (or memory) error, regarding what happened before the decisions being made could be inevitable. The study of family interactions in the decision process mainly relies on the verbal accounts given by the respondents, instead of visual data (e.g. video recording). That is to say, the data is purely relied upon by the information the respondents talked about, in their experiences of reaching family decisions to visit museums, rather than upon the experience itself. Besides, the researcher assumes that some ‘hidden scenarios’ of group interactions might have not been reported during family interviews.

10.5 Directions for future research

The researcher urges that future investigation into family group decisions needs to take place, to continue the study on family interactions including children. The research findings, here, need to be further examined both in the museum context and other leisure choices (e.g. the cinema, theme parks and dining out). The findings of decision attributes, such as the decision patterns identified in the joint decisions, and the fluctuating patterns of the input children have over family leisure choices, need to be further studied by quantitative and qualitative approaches. The expansion of the conceptual model for family leisure decisions (e.g. the additional decision-making stages) and the change between planned and impulse decisions needs to be further developed through a grounded theoretical approach, or to be tested through quantitative surveys. Comparative studies need to be done to explore any similarities or differences among family consumers in different countries and to explore the cultural factors affecting family interactions.
The data suggests, furthermore, that grandparents tend to yield to grandchildren’s request behaviour; therefore, further investigation can be done to explore potential differences in the interactive dynamics, and the decision roles played between the grandparents-and-grandchildren groups as well as nuclear families. The data also suggests that parents report that they, themselves, had very little active input in their childhood in comparison with their own children, who enjoy more ‘power’ and who are often being consulted when making family leisure choices and other purchase decisions. As such, there are generational changes. It is worth considering the relationship between the socio-economic development of a culture, country or mobile class, on the one hand, and the active inputs of children in joint planned decisions, on the other. Further investigation can also be done to explore any common features among those leisure service products or leisure activities requested by children and the reasons why some parents approve of them.

Finally, the data shows that the evaluative criteria such entertainment features and the value for money reported by the children and the adults were, in fact, intangible criteria. For example, when a group member who had never been to a museum before judged a museum is ‘fun’, how did the member derive such an intangible experience? The analysis offers a glimpse on a number of ‘surrogate indicators’, which has been used to assist the judgement of the intangible features of an attraction, such as a museum. The surrogate indicator refers to an attribute used to indicate another intangible attribute (Sheth et al. 2006). For example, the data suggests that one of the key surrogate indicators for the ‘entertainment’ criterion was the type of the museums (e.g. science, history museums). The analysis shows that the key intangible criteria and their surrogate indicators were slightly altered when choosing different product categories of visitor attractions (e.g. theme parks, museums) and leisure service products (e.g. cinema). The sources of their evaluations were heavily relied on the perceived image of an attraction and the previous consumption experiences the family members had to the museums or similar attractions. Future research can explore what sort of the surrogate indicators have been used in leisure selection among different product categories and how they are used by family consumers. All these suggestions for future research can assist with our understanding about family pre-purchase behaviour in leisure and tourism context.
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Appendix A - The Evolution of the Research Foci

The development of the research foci for answering the two major aims has been evolved through out the research project, according to the researcher's understanding about the family decisions and the role children played during the decision-making process. The following sections present the evolution of the key changes.

Time: 6th September 2005
Research progress: The completion of upgrade report
The researcher's views about family pre-purchase decision-making behaviour and the role children played during the decision process were significantly influenced by the positivist paradigm and previous research. The weighting of the research foci was more inclined to the influence of children over the decision-making process. Children were regarded as an influential force against the parents and other adult members. The research objectives at that moment were as below.

Q1: How does a family with young children make the decision to visit a museum, from the various leisure choices available to them?
Q2: What role of children played in the family's decisions to visit museums?
  ◦ To examine the potential influence of the children on the family decision to visit a museum from both active and passive aspects
  ◦ To identify the influential behaviour children have at different stages of the decision-making process,
  ◦ To identify any potential impacts of these influential behaviour on family interactions during the decision-making process
  ◦ To examine the impact of children's past museum experiences, both from school trips and family visits, on the level of their influence over the decision-making process

Time: 7th September 2005
Research progress: Feedback from the upgrade seminar
Two major changes were made on the research foci after receiving the feedback from the examiners of my upgrade seminar. One was to stress the evolution processes of the family leisure decision. The other was to explore the interactions amongst the family members during the process.

Time: 26th June, 2006
Research progress: Preliminary summary of the data (before analysis),
Revision to both the ontological stance and the weight of the two research aims had
been made over the period of data collection. Instead of solely studying the influence of children over the family decision-making process like previous research, the ontological alternations were (i) viewing and examining the family as a whole, and (ii) studying the entire decision-making journey involved before the final decisions to visit particular museums were made. Namely, identifying the decision roles children and other adults played, after the entire decision-making process and the family interactions were studied at the data coding phase. The researcher’s views of the children remained the same. The revised research questions and sub-questions were:

Q1: How did a family with children decide to visit a museum?
   1.1 How did the decision-making evolve from the initiation stage to the final decision stage, by whose actions (parents, children or other adult family members), and why? (the source of information and the evaluative criteria)
   1.2 How was a consensus reached when disagreements between family members arose – the conflict resolution?

Q2: What were the roles of children act in the decision-making to visit the museums, and what was their influence?
   2.1 What was the nature of influence children have over the decision-making, that is, active, passive or a mixture of dual aspects?
   2.2 What was the influential behaviour and strategy exerted with the intention to influence the outcome of the final decision between parents and children?

Time: 2007- April 2008
Research progress: Data analysis and writing up the Finding and Discussion chapters
Several findings had been discovered throughout the data analysis and the structure planning for the three finding and discussion chapters. They included: additional decision-making stages expanding from the conceptual model, the evidence of the impulse decisions, the common evaluative criteria and desires different adults and children revealed, the difference between the family groups’ desires and evaluative criteria from the motivational themes identified in museum literature, the fluctuating patterns of the children’s inputs, the attentive manners of adults’ passive considerations and the inclusion of children in the joint decisions. There were similarity between those options being proposed and those options that the family
groups excluded in the selection. Therefore, further decision literature had been consulted, including the impulse choices, the concept of choices set and the cooperative aspect of family decision-making, the attentive manner the parents shown and the view of children as an active participant rather than as an influential agent. The analytic foci I had developed over the period of data analysis and the thesis writing up were as below.

**Finding Chapters – ‘how’ families make the decisions to visit museums**
- Stresses the whole ‘story’ before the final decisions to visit museums were made - how the sampled museums turned into the final purchase decisions
  - the planned decisions and the impulse choices
  - divided by the active involvement and the passive involvement children had over the museum decisions, namely, the adult-and-child joint decisions and the adult-made decisions
  - briefs the decision roles and interactive dynamics among the family members

**Discussion chapter - Compare the planned decisions and the impulse decisions**
- The decision flow
  - Compares the emerged decision-making stages with the theoretical model
  - Presents the involvement the adults, the children and other family and non-family members had in the decision-making process
- Key decision features
  - the search behavior (internal search or external search) and the source of information
  - the consideration set (those options being purposed), the inept sets and the inert sets (those been excluded in considerations), and those been rejected
  - the weighting of the key evaluative criteria the adults and the children used to assist their selection and the source of their evaluation
  - how ‘the motivational’ themes identified by museum literature manifested at each decision-making stage
  - The purpose of leisure and tourism trips

**The decision roles children and the adults played**
- Who were the initiators, the gatekeepers, the influencers, the evaluators and the decision-makers?
- What strategies the adults and the children used when proposing the options and rejecting the options
- The conditions when children have direct involvements
- Which child were more likely to be consulted by the parents
- Key evaluative criteria of
The involvement of children

- The nature of their involvement (identifies the active and passive of each children had within a family)
- Previous purchase requests of children
- Did the child's previous purchase requests successful or failed?

Children as an important trigger for first family visits to museums

- Compared with the museum participations of the parents before the birth of the children
- Compared the awareness of the parents - what they knew about the museums, and why they had never visited the museums even they were aware of the museums
- Why the interest of children and the power of an attraction to grab children's attention were so important for adults?
Appendix B - The Background of the Sample Museums

(1) The Taipei Astronomical Museum is a large and one of the oldest science museums in Taipei City. It owns one of the few observatories and the IMAX Theatre in Taiwan. The other three sampling museums are relatively new tourist attractions in comparison to the Taipei Astronomical Museum.

(2) The Taipei Story House is a small Western-style historical house next to the Taipei Fine Arts Museum and was originally owned by a prominent tea merchant in 1913, under Japan's colonial period. The House was purchased by the Taipei City Government in 1979 and turned into a new museum in 2003, under an effort to promote the revival of historical sites.

(3) The ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology is a large archaeological museum, which is located near the mouth of the Danshui River in the Bali Township within the Taipei County. The archaeological site dates back some 500 to 1800 years, to Taiwan's prehistoric time. After the site was excavated under a sewerage plant in the late 1980s, there was a huge debate on media coverage regarding the construction between the sewerage factory and the archaeological site. The ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology was launched in 2003 and its building had won many architecture design awards.

(4) The National Traditional Arts Center is a huge cultural complex covering an area of 24 hectares above the Tungshan River and Chingshui Park in I-Lan County. The Traditional Arts Center was launched in 2002. It comprises of an exhibition centre, two theatre halls, the Graduate School of Traditional Arts, a Library, three historical buildings, an array of artistic studios operated by craftsmen of various traditional arts and food stands. It also includes an outdoor theatre and plaza, a botanical garden, wetlands and inner river banks.
Appendix C - Composition of the Sampled Family Groups

* Abbreviation of the sample museums: Taipei Astronomical Museum (TAM); ShihSanHang Museum of Archaeology (SMA); National Centre for Traditional Arts (NCTA) and Taipei Story House (TSH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sampled museums*</th>
<th>Adult interviewees (age)</th>
<th>Child interviewees (age)</th>
<th>Purpose of the outing</th>
<th>Interview duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents with children – 29 samples</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preschoolers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM21</td>
<td>2006-02-18</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Father (39), mother (36)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (6) Kindergarten 3, younger son (3) Preschool</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>35 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM23</td>
<td>2006-02-19</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Mother (35)</td>
<td>Elder son (5), Kindergarten 2, younger son (3) Kindergarten 1</td>
<td>Tourism/ visited the Lantern Festival</td>
<td>67 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM37</td>
<td>2006-03-05</td>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>*Father (39), mother (34)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (4) Kindergarten 1, younger son (4) Kindergarten 1</td>
<td>Passed by the museum</td>
<td>23 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary school children with kindergarten siblings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM3</td>
<td>2005-12-04</td>
<td>NCTA</td>
<td>Father (39), mother (35)</td>
<td>Elder son (7), Grade 1 of primary school, younger son (5) Kindergarten 3</td>
<td>Tourism/ organised tour</td>
<td>16 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM6</td>
<td>2005-12-10</td>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Father (35), mother (31)</td>
<td>Elder son (6), Grade 1 of primary school, younger son (1)</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>58 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM7</td>
<td>2005-12-10</td>
<td>TSH</td>
<td>Father (40) mother (38)</td>
<td>Eldest daughter (11), Grade 6 of primary school, elder son (9), Grade 2 of primary school, youngest son (5) Kindergarten 2</td>
<td>Tourism/ the father attended a conference</td>
<td>32 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM12</td>
<td>2006-01-14</td>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Mother (38)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (10), Grade 4 of primary school, younger son (6) Kindergarten 3</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FM13</th>
<th>2006-01-14</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Father (42), mother (41)</th>
<th>Elder daughter (9). Grade 3 of primary school, younger daughter (6), Kindergarten 3</th>
<th>Leisure day-outing</th>
<th>105 mins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FM17</td>
<td>2006-01-22</td>
<td>TSH</td>
<td>Father (46), Taiwanese, mother(42), Japanese</td>
<td>Elder son (8). Grade 2 of primary school, younger daughter (6), Kindergarten 3</td>
<td>Eating-out/ passed by the museum</td>
<td>92 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM22</td>
<td>2006-02-18</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Father (39), mother (40)</td>
<td>Elder son (11). Grade 4 of primary school, younger son (5) Kindergarten 2</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>50 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM25</td>
<td>2006-02-25</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Father (35), mother (35)</td>
<td>Eldest son (10) Grade 4 of primary school : second son (8) Grade 2 of primary school : youngest son (6) Kindergarten 3</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM29</td>
<td>2006-02-26</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Father (36), mother (36)</td>
<td>Elder son (7) Grade 1 of primary school, younger daughter (4) Kindergarten 1</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>40 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM33</td>
<td>2006-03-04</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Father (40), mother (36)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (10) Grade 3 of primary school, younger son (5) Kindergarten 2</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>33 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary school children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FM4</th>
<th>2005-12-04</th>
<th>NCTA</th>
<th>Father (35), mother(33)</th>
<th>Elder daughter (10). Grade 4 of primary school, younger daughter (7). Grade 1 of primary school</th>
<th>Tourism/ passed by the parents attended a wedding the day before</th>
<th>35 mins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FM5</td>
<td>2005-12-04</td>
<td>NCTA</td>
<td>Father (28), mother(29)</td>
<td>Only son (8). Grade 2 of primary school</td>
<td>Tourism/ visited the relatives at I-Lan</td>
<td>40 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM8</td>
<td>2005-12-12</td>
<td>TSH</td>
<td>Father (49), mother (45)</td>
<td>Younger son (10). Grade 4 of primary school</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>86 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM10</td>
<td>2006-01-08</td>
<td>NCTA</td>
<td>Father (38), mother(38)</td>
<td>Eldest daughter (11) Grade 5 of primary school, second daughter (9) Grade 3 of primary school, youngest son (4)</td>
<td>Annual classmate-gathering of the father &amp; leisure day-outing</td>
<td>70 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM11</td>
<td>2006-01-08</td>
<td>NCTA</td>
<td>Father (39), mother(39)</td>
<td>Only son (9). Grade 3 of primary school</td>
<td>Annual classmate-</td>
<td>150 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM14</td>
<td>2006-01-21</td>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Mother(38)</td>
<td>Younger daughter (10) Grade 3 of primary school</td>
<td>gathering of the father &amp; leisure day-outing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM15</td>
<td>2006-01-21</td>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Father (40), mother(39)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (12) Grade 5 of primary school, younger sister (10) Grade 3 of primary school</td>
<td>Tourism/ a weekend trip to Taipei</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM16</td>
<td>2006-01-22</td>
<td>TSH</td>
<td>Father (42), mother(38)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (11) Grade 5 of primary school, younger daughter(8) Grade 2 of primary school</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>17 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM26</td>
<td>2006-02-25</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Mother (29)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (9) Grade 2 of primary school</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM27</td>
<td>2006-02-25</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Mother (29)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (9) Grade 3 of primary school, younger son (7) Grade 1 of primary school</td>
<td>Tourism/ the younger son visited the dentist in Taipei</td>
<td>18 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM31</td>
<td>2006-02-26</td>
<td>A Tea House</td>
<td>Mother (38)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (10) Grade 4 of primary school, younger daughter (7) Grade 1 of primary school</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing to the TAM</td>
<td>100 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM36</td>
<td>2006-03-05</td>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Father (45), mother (36)</td>
<td>Elder son (11) Grade 5 of primary school, younger daughter (10) Grade 4 of primary school</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>60 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adolescents with young siblings

<p>| FM1 | 2005-12-04 | NCTA | Father (40), mother(38) | Only daughter (12), Grade 1 of junior high | Weekend tourism trip | 30 mins |
| FM24 | 2006-02-19 | TAM | Father (46), mother (42) | Elder daughter (15), Grade 3 of junior high, younger son (12), Grade 6 of primary school | Leisure day-outing | 100 mins |
| FM32 | 2006-03-04 | TAM | Mother (41) | Elder son (13) Grade 1 of junior high, younger son (11) Grade 4 of primary school | Leisure day-outing | 80 mins |
| FM35 | 2006-03-05 | SMA | Father (42), mother (42) | Elder daughter (13) Grade 1 of junior high, younger daughter (10) Grade 5 of primary school | Leisure day-outing | 55 mins |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FM9</td>
<td>2006-01-08</td>
<td>NCTA</td>
<td>Grandmother (57), father (37), mother (37)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (10) Grade 4 of primary school, younger son (5), Kindergarten 2</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>38 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM2</td>
<td>2005-12-04</td>
<td>NCTA</td>
<td>Grandmother (57), father (37), mother (37)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (11), Grade 5 of primary school, younger daughter (6), Kindergarten 2</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM28</td>
<td>2006-02-25</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Maternal grandfather (71), maternal grandmother (67)</td>
<td>Elder daughter (13) Grade 2 of junior high, younger daughter (9) Grade 4 of primary school</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>26 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM18</td>
<td>2006-01-22</td>
<td>TSH</td>
<td>(Family Y) a friend of the father (51)</td>
<td>(Family X) The eldest daughter of three siblings (9) Grade 4 of primary school</td>
<td>Eating-out near the TSH</td>
<td>68 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM20</td>
<td>2006-02-18</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>(Family X) Mother (27), (Family Y) married couples without children, husband (40), wife (28) / neighbour</td>
<td>(Family X) Elder daughter (5) Kindergarten 3, Younger son (4) Kindergarten 2</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>27 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM30</td>
<td>2006-02-26</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>(Family X) Mother (40)</td>
<td>(Family X) younger daughter (11) Grade 4 of primary school, with classmates B (11) and C (11)</td>
<td>For school project</td>
<td>28 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM19</td>
<td>2006-02-18</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Auntie (30), relative</td>
<td>Only son (5) Kindergarten 3</td>
<td>Leisure day-outing</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM34</td>
<td>2006-03-05</td>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Auntie (40) single</td>
<td>Eldest son (10), Grade 3 of primary school</td>
<td>Organised tour by a church</td>
<td>18 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D - The Initial Design of the Fieldwork Plan

Date: 22/11/2005

I. Order of family interviews:
Phase 1: Drawing discussions and semi-structured interviews with children
Phase 2: Semi-structured interviews with parents or other adult family members
Phase 3: In-depth interviews with children and parents together

II. Interview questions:
Prior to family interviews:
• Identify the researcher and explain the research objectives and the order of family interviews
Q: Could you please tell me your relationship?
Q: Have you been to this museum before?

Phase 1: Drawing discussions and interviews with children
Q: Could you recall how your family decided to visit this museum?
Q: How do you perceive your parents (or siblings and other adult family members involved) played when making the decision to visit the museum? Are there any influences exerted by them over this decision?
Q: How do you perceive your own role during the decision-making to visit the museum? Are there any influences exerted by you over this decision?

Drawing instruction:
Q: Could you draw the scenarios they remember about their family, before the decisions to visit a museum is made, and to show how children and their parents (or other family members) were doing on the paper?
Q: Could you tell me what the story was on your drawing?

Phase 2: Semi-structured interviews with parents (or other adult family members)
Q: Could you recall how your family decided to visit this museum among various leisure choices? Especially, I’d like to know the decision-making process from the start to the final choices (the museum).
Q: How do you perceive your children (or other family members involved) played when making the decision to visit the museum? Are there any influences exerted by them over this decision?
Q: How do you perceive your own role during the decision-making to visit the museum? Are there any influences exerted by you over this decision?

Q: How will you describe your family interaction when making the decisions to visit the museum? Is there any conflict during the decision-making?

**Phase 3: In-depth interviews with children and parents together**

- Based on the verbal and visual report obtained from Phase 1 and 2, clarify any discrepancies about the family decision-making process, the roles different members played (parents and children) and the family interaction during the decision-making process.

Q: Have your children ever mentioned their schools trips to museums to you before?

Q: Have your children ever chosen to revisit the museums then had been to in school trips or family visits before?

Q: What do you like to do most in your family leisure time, especially in weekends?

Q: In general, when you decided a family leisure outing, how do you make your choice? Is there any difference from the decision to visit the museum?

Q: In general, how will you describe your family interaction when making family leisure decisions?

Q: In general, how do you perceive each of your family members (parent and children) played when making a leisure outing decision?

Q: What do you think is the most important thing to consider when making a family leisure decision? Is there any special concern of your child/children's need, if so, what are these concerns?
Appendix E – The Three Analytic Groups

- Selective criteria: according to the richness of the interview data
- Category of the analytic groups:
  - Group A (22 interviews): the most richness interviews
  - Group B (11 interviews): medium richness interviews
  - Group C (4 interviews): too short to be included in detail analysis
- Analysis phases:
  - Group A: employed in-depth analysis, 1st phase of the analysis
  - Group B: comparison with Group A, 2nd phase of the analysis
  - Group C: comparison with Groups A and B, final stage of the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family 6</td>
<td>Family 2</td>
<td>Family 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 7</td>
<td>Family 4</td>
<td>Family 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 8</td>
<td>Family 5</td>
<td>Family 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 11</td>
<td>Family 9</td>
<td>Family 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 12</td>
<td>Family 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 13</td>
<td>Family 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 18</td>
<td>Family 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 20</td>
<td>Family 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 21</td>
<td>Family 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 22</td>
<td>Family 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 23</td>
<td>Family 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 interviews 11 interviews 4 interviews
**Appendix F - Summary of the Decision Types**

**Summary of the family decisions to visit the sampling sites**

### Planned Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult-child joint decisions</th>
<th>Adult-made decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) <strong>A child requested, parents decided</strong> (Families 28, 32, 35, 36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) <strong>Parents/grandparents consulted a child, parents decided</strong> (Families 2, 7*, 28, 32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) <strong>Parents consulted a child, a child decided</strong> (Family 24) / <strong>parents searched, a child decided</strong> (Families 22, 29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) <strong>Parents searched, decided together</strong> (Families 1, 18*, 30, 35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impulse Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult-child joint decisions</th>
<th>Adult-made decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) <strong>Individual decisions</strong> (Families 14, 19, 21, 27, 33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) <strong>Parental joint decisions</strong> (Families 6*, 8*, 13, 15, 16, 23, 25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) <strong>Cross-family joint decisions</strong> (Families 20, 31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Pure impulsive visits
   - **A child shared, parents decided** (Family 5)
   - **Parental joint decisions** (Families 4, 37)

### Planned decisions → Impulse decisions

2A. Alternatives to a planned decision
   - **Parents proposed, children supported** (Families 7, 18)
   - **Parental joint decisions** (Family 8)

2B. Substitutes for frustrated planned decisions
   - **Parental joint decisions** (Families 6, 16)

### Impulse Decisions → Planned decisions

- **A child requested, parents decided** (Family 12)
- **Parent proposed, decided together** (Family 26)

---

**Key**

- Planned or impulsive decisions
- Joint decisions, with the active input from children
- Adult-made decisions, without the active input from children
- (Sampled family)
- Type of impulse decisions
- Family No* refers to the change from the planned decisions to the impulse decisions