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An exploratory field study was conducted to examine internal and external factors that influence adolescents' consumer behavior when serving as the family purchasing agents. Demographic, lifestyle, and marketing activities were examined to determine the influences that affect whether the adolescent will purchase the preferred family brands or other brands.

Participating adolescents were sent by their parents to the grocery store on two separate occasions to purchase four preselected grocery items. The brands purchased were recorded and compared to the preferred brand names provided by the parents.

While no statistical significance was found, occasional trends were observed. The analysis indicated that adolescents who experience a pluralistic family communication style will purchase products other than the preferred household brands. Adolescents who are exposed to television and radio tend to deviate more from the preferred family brands more often than do adolescents with less media exposure.
Adolescents who work are more likely to go to the grocery store more often for their families than do nonworking adolescents. Also, adolescents seem to possess a price sensitivity to both high and low-involvement grocery items.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Because the household serves as the consumption unit for a majority of consumer goods and services, the family is a key element in the study of consumer behavior. The household serves as the consumption unit for a majority of consumer goods and services. As a constantly changing social structure, the family must be continuously monitored for a better understanding of the current roles and changing dynamics among decision makers within the family unit, of influences operating on the decision makers, and of the actual and preferred lifestyle of the family unit. The evolution and change of family dynamics may affect the way in which products and services are purchased.

A growing trend within the area of family purchasing is the increasing number of adolescents who are assuming some role in purchasing products for family consumption. Traditionally, most decisions and purchases were made by the parent or parents, usually the mother. Currently, due to changing dynamics in the family, purchasing responsibilities are, in many cases, shared with the adolescents in the home. Although the number of adolescents in the population has declined by six million from the high of thirty million in 1975, their influence on
how the family dollar is spent has increased (Trachtenberg 1986).

During the post-World War II period, adolescents have increasingly been viewed as potential marketing targets with discretionary income. Trachtenberg (1986) estimated that adolescents spent $30 billion of their own money in 1986 on products and services for themselves. In addition, it is estimated that 25.5 million teenagers are spending $40 billion of family funds (Hauser 1986). Most of these purchases involve groceries for the family's consumption.

The phenomenon of teens serving as purchasing agents for the family represents an emerging family purchasing pattern not yet documented in academic literature. Academic research, to date, has been centered on the influence adolescents exercise upon the purchase of personal products and services and on their consumer skills. Reports of the adolescent role as a family purchasing agent have been published in generalized consumer publications but definitive research on the subject has not been published in academic journals. Much of the research published in consumer publications has been contributed by Teenage Research Unlimited which conducts nationwide surveys of adolescent buying habits. This study is designed to explore the behavior of adolescents as purchasing agents for the family.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to examine internal and external variables that may influence an adolescent's behavior as a purchasing agent for the family. These variables include demographics, lifestyle factors, marketing activities, and peer group characteristics. Possible distinctions between those adolescents who are individualistic in their decision making and who, in turn, exhibit product purchase deviation from that of their parents and these teenagers who purchase only brands preferred by the family will be explored. The study will utilize frequently purchased high and low-involvement grocery items.

Operational Definitions

The study will focus on an examination of older adolescents ages 16 through 18. In the research, household brand will describe the brand typically purchased for the family by the parental purchasing agent. This brand is the preferred brand of the parent. Product purchase deviation will be used to describe the adolescent purchasing agent's act of purchasing brands other than the household brand.

Purchase involvement is the level of concern for, or interest in, the purchase process (Mitchell 1979). Typically, a high-involvement product is economically and/or psychologically important to the purchaser. The high-involvement product purchase situation will be
modified and defined to mean products in which the adolescent has an interest in and low-involvement products will refer to those products in which the adolescent has little interest.

Factors Influencing the Emergence of the Adolescent as a Family Purchasing Agent

Changes within the family are the primary forces underlying the changing role of adolescents as purchasing agents. One primary change is the increasing number of working mothers. Due to the increased time pressures placed on working women, it has become necessary to share the responsibilities of the home with other family members. Adolescents can share in the responsibility of family shopping because they are fairly independent, usually drive their own cars, often hold down full or part-time jobs, and are able to use various forms of credit (Hauser 1986).

Although the traditional family is defined as a husband, wife, and children under 18, changing family structure has also influenced the number of teenagers serving as purchasing agents for the family. An increased divorce rate, greater number of single parents, and a decrease in the number of traditional families has caused a shift in decision making and shopping activities within the family.
Working Women

An increase in the number of working women has affected the family lifestyle in dramatic ways. In 1985, 54.7 percent of women over the age of 16 were working (Otten 1986). The impact of this trend emerged as a research topic particularly during the late seventies and early eighties. Strober and Weinberg (1980) reported that in all income levels and life cycle stages, working wives appear to face greater time pressures than non-working wives. These additional demands forced working women to implement specific strategies in order to accomplish household tasks in less time.

One strategy employed by working women is the use of family labor substitutes. A study by Hoffman (1960) concluded that the husband increased his participation in household tasks when the wife was employed. Nichols and Fox (1983) concluded that the husband's hours of paid employment were a more significant determinant of his participation in household tasks, however, than was the wife's employment. Based on a survey of working wives, McCall (1977) concluded that working wives delegate 17 percent of the major food shopping duties to another person, usually the husband.

Working women also use children as labor substitutes. Cogel and Tasker (1982) studied children of full-time working mothers and reported that 88 percent of those
children participated in household tasks. Children between the ages of 15 and 17 had a high participation rate of 96 percent. The study also reported that 30 percent of the sample participated in shopping activities. Lazer and Smallwood (1977) also suggested that working wives use sons or daughter to shop for the family. Gray (1980) cited in her study of professional women that 88 percent of the women surveyed stated that family members share household tasks. Additional findings support the observation that working mothers' adolescent children help more around the house than do children of nonworking mothers (Cogel, Tasker, and Morton 1982; Propper, 1972).

Change in Household Structure

Changes in household structure in recent years have affected the delegation of household tasks to family members. A major trend is toward the single-parent household. In 1970, there were slightly over three million single-parent households compared to slightly over seven million in 1986 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1987a). This represents a 120 percent increase in single-parent families, a trend attributable to the rising divorce rate and the increasing number of children born to single mothers. With fewer adults to perform household duties such as shopping, children and teenagers have and will increasingly come to assume part of the household duties.
An increase in the number of single-parent families, single head-of-households, and childless couples has led to a decrease in the number of traditional families with children under 18. In fact only 28 percent of all family households in 1985 were traditional in this sense, compared to 40 percent in 1970 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1987a). Fifty-six percent of those existing traditional families have both parents employed outside the home (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1987a). It is logical that dual employment increases income and restricts time available for family and household-oriented activities. With the family structure thus changed, the question of who is participating in making the decisions and buying the family household products has become a major focus for marketing strategists. These changes also suggest that the results of previous research on making activities within the traditional family unit may no longer apply to today's family.

An Expanded Model of Consumer Purchasing Behavior

Before considering the conceptual model which will be utilized in this study, the abilities of the adolescent as a consumer need to be considered. Does the adolescent have the consumer skills necessary to act as a knowledgeable and rational decision maker? Most researchers agree that adolescents possess the needed consumer skills. Moschis and Moore (1979) concluded that young people acquire
sophisticated decision-making cognitions and skills by the time they reach early adolescence. Jean Piaget argues that formal operational thought becomes possible at or around puberty (Inhelder and Piaget 1958). John Coleman (1980, p.26) feels that the adolescent can construct alternative hypotheses to evaluate situations, an ability which permits an adolescent to compare brands, evaluate advertising, and discern between other marketing activities. In another study, conducted by Moschis and Moore (1978), older adolescents scored higher on brand knowledge, price accuracy, and legal knowledge than their younger counterparts.

Children learn through the socialization process, which may be defined as follows:

"the process by which individuals acquire knowledge, skills, and dispositions that enable them to participate as more or less effective members of groups and the society" (Brim 1966, p. 3).

This definition of socialization has been applied in a marketing context by Scott Ward (1974):

"Consumer socialization is defined . . . as processes by which young people acquire skills, knowledge, and attitudes relevant to their functioning as consumers in the market place" (p. 2).

Ward further refined the definition to acknowledge that the focus is on childhood socialization recognizing that not all learning takes places during this time period. The skills, knowledge, and attitudes considered as meaningful in the consumer socialization process are those that are
directly relevant to the enactment of a consumer role. Ward suggested skills at budgeting, pricing, knowledge of brands, attitudes and shopping outlets as examples of activities associated with the consumer role.

McNeal suggests that children learn consumer behavior through observation and participation (incidental learning) and intentional instruction (1987, p. 13). He suggests the following process:

FIGURE 1
Process on Children's Consumer Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intentional Instruction</th>
<th>Incidental Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialization Agent</td>
<td>Child Consumer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Teaching</td>
<td>Method of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium for Teaching</td>
<td>Medium for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Socialization Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Consumer</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The socialization agents are parents, peers, teachers, and businesses by way of advertising, stores, and products.
McNeal further suggests that the outcome of socialization is a consumer, or someone who has money, a willingness to spend it, and unsatisfied wants or needs. Teens and children, in a majority of cases, meet these requirements and may therefore be considered consumers by McNeal's model.

Conceptual Model of Consumer Socialization

A conceptual model for consumer socialization was first developed by Moschis and Churchill (1978). The model (Figure 2) describes the setting in which children learn to be consumers. Socialization occurs through socialization agents. These agents can be any person or organization based on frequency of contact with the learner, primacy over the individual, and control over rewards and punishments given to the person. Through these socialization agents, children learn in three ways -- by the process of modeling, reinforcement, and social interaction. Modeling is the imitation of behavior while reinforcement is the reward or punishment mechanisms used by the socialization agent. Social interaction is less specific and may include a combination of modeling and reinforcement.

The antecedents to this process are the social structure variables and the age or life cycle position of the adolescent. Moschis and Churchill (1978) identified social class and sex as variables of the social structure
FIGURE 2
Expanded Model of Consumer Socialization

and age as a determinate of the maturity of the individual. The outcomes are the consumer skills of the individual for purchasing and consuming. The literature supporting this model is contained in Chapter II.

Expanded Model

An expanded socialization model will be tested in the current research. Figure 3 demonstrates this approach to the consumer socialization model. The variables to be studied will be divided into the following four categories consistent with the consumer socialization model: (1) antecedent variables, (2) agent interaction, (3) learning properties and (4) consumer outcomes.

Antecedent Variables

Moschis and Churchill (1978) used the antecedents of social class, sex, and age in their model of consumer socialization. This study will expand the number of antecedent variables studied to include education and occupation of parents, teenage work experience, ethnic background, and prior purchasing experience. The addition of these independent variables will result in the development of more information that will be useful in strategic market planning.

Agent Interaction

Social learning theory suggests that learning takes place through other individuals or organizations relating to the adolescent. As the primary groups that shape and
FIGURE 3
Model Extension/Role Purchase Situation

facilitate the learning of consumer skills by adolescents, the mass media, school influences, peer influences, and family communication patterns will, therefore, be studied.

Learning Properties

The adolescent will use his or her learned consumer skills to perform the family role of purchasing agent. The adolescent, in fulfilling this role, may or may not be interested in the role or the products purchased while assuming the role. The adolescent's interest may be a function of the importance of the product to be purchased. The importance of the products will be measured by high or low involvement of the adolescent.

Outcomes

Two possible outcomes of the extended model are the adolescent either buying the preferred household brand or exhibit product purchase deviation. These outcomes are affected by the antecedent factors, the agent interaction, and the learning properties.

Research Hypotheses

Two major hypotheses are utilized in the study and supported through the literature review in Chapter II.

Hypothesis I: Adolescent Product Purchase Deviation

Teenagers that exhibit product purchase deviation will have higher family income, higher family education levels, pluralistic family communication, and prior purchasing experience.
Purchase deviation will occur in high-involvement purchase situations more often than low-involvement purchase situations.

**Hypothesis IA: Adolescent Family Brand Purchase**

Teenagers that purchase the family brand will have lower family income, lower family education levels, protective family communication, and limited purchase experience.

Household brand purchasing will occur in low-involvement purchase situations more often than high-involvement situations.

**Importance of the Study**

The understanding of the factors that help explain why an adolescent might exhibit product purchase deviation is valuable in strategic marketing planning. With such information, market segmentation strategies can be more specific taking into account increased knowledge of adolescent shopping behavior for family products. The promotion mix strategy can also be improved, and the area of advertising and sales promotion appeals aimed at teenagers for household products can be refined and improved. Knowledge of the types of stores shopped may indicate areas of needed change within the distribution channel. Each of these areas of strategic planning may be improved with enhanced knowledge of factors contributing to adolescent product deviation.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

The literature review is contained in Chapter II and supports the phenomenon of adolescents as purchasing agents
for the family and consumer socialization. Chapter III explains the methodology of the study while Chapter IV contains an analysis of the data. Findings and implications for future research are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Extensive theoretical and empirical literature exists covering adolescent decision making. However, the majority of the literature does not deal with behavior in a consumer socialization context. Variables that affect socialization, such as advertising and social influences, shopping behavior, and information search have been researched and support the general framework of adolescent consumer socialization. Given the thrust of the current research, this literature review focuses on adolescent decision making in the context of consumer socialization.

The literature review of this study, begins with a focus on consumer socialization theory, followed by sections supporting the general framework of the model, antecedent variables, agent interaction, and learning properties.

Socialization Theory

Scott Ward (1974) traced the development of interest in consumer socialization and defined consumer socialization as:
"the processes by which young people acquire skills, knowledge, and attitudes relevant to their functioning as consumers in the marketplace" (p. 2).

Ward suggests that consumer socialization involves the understanding of the content of children's learning about marketplace interaction, the processes by which learning takes place, and the changes in content and learning processes that occur over time.

Moschis and Moore are the primary researchers in adolescent consumer socialization. Moschis first published his conceptual framework of consumer socialization with Gilbert A. Churchill in 1978 and has since developed a stream of research to support the model. The model is based on two major theories of human learning. The first theory, Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development, emphasizes changes in cognitive organization from infancy to adulthood. Social learning theory, the second theory, emphasizes sources of influence on learning. Moschis and Churchill identified social structure variables and age or life cycle variables as antecedents to consumer learning properties. A study of 806 adolescents supports their theory. Social class and sex were used to measure social structure variables and age to define maturation and position in the life cycle.

The socialization process was defined in terms of the agent-learner relationships and the type of learning that takes place. Agents are perceived as sources of influence
on individuals. In the model, the family, mass media, school, and peers are identified as the primary agents in the socialization process. Learning takes place through modeling, reinforcement, and social interaction. Moschis and Churchill define modeling as the imitation of the agent's behavior and reinforcement as the reward or punishment mechanisms used by the agent. Social interaction is not precisely defined and may be a combination of modeling and reinforcement that takes place during the interaction of the agent and the learner.

As perceived by the researchers, the final outcome to the socialization process is learning properties or consumer skills. Consumer skills include purchasing (spending/saving decisions, assortment decisions, product and brand decisions) and consuming.

Moschis and Moore (1979) also lent support to the consumer socialization theory. Their study of 734 adolescents examined the effects of socialization agents (mass media, parents, and peers) and antecedent variables (social class, sex, and age) on the decision-making process and sex role perceptions. The decision-making process was defined as information seeking, product evaluation, and purchase. Purchase was more precisely defined in terms of brand preferences and independent role purchases.

The results of the study suggest that young people have acquired fairly sophisticated decision-making
cognitions and skills by the time they reach early adolescence. The decision-making abilities are partially due to social influence, newspaper readership, adolescent and peer interaction, parental influence, and socioeconomic background. These variables support the model indicating social class, age, sex, and agent-learner relationships affect the consumer skills of adolescents.

Ward (1974) recognized the importance of learning the social significance of products. He noted that children learn to see goods as being instrumental in achieving goals, rather than as simply fulfilling a functional need. Consumption can be a "reward" or a "status symbol."

Mayer and Belk (1982) examined the symbolic meanings attached to adult products as a part of consumer socialization. It was found that consumption stereotypes typical of adults were established for the most part by sixth grade. The research indicates that preschoolers held few consumer stereotypes, but second graders had an idea of which products (cars and houses) belonged to people with a variety of characteristics. User types were most widely held for products belonging to a grandfather, a man with a lot of money, a man with a lot of new things, a mailman, and a doctor.

The study was also performed using children's products (Belk, Mayer, and Driscoll 1984). The results indicated that among children, groups more likely to own a product
held stronger stereotypes of the product's owners. The authors suggest that experience with a product may be more important than cognitive development in the acquisition of consumption-based symbolism.

Turner and Brandt (1978) developed a simulated market to measure children's use of the following selected consumer skills: (1) ability to determine and select a best buy and the willingness to work and save in order to purchase it, (2) ability to determine which package has more, and (3) ability to compute and compare unit price. Results suggest that consumer competence as measured by buying behavior of children varies directly with age, home responsibilities, and money experiences, and somewhat indirectly with time spent in decision making.

Consumer skills are formed in varying degrees based upon antecedent variables (social class, sex, and age) and the agent-learner relationships (parents, peers, mass media, and school). Consumer skills, such as product evaluation, product and brand selection, and purchasing are necessary in order to adequately perform the role of purchasing agent for the family. The current research examines these variables in order to establish factors that influence when an adolescent will more likely exhibit product purchase deviation when acting in this role.
Antecedent Variables

Antecedent variables can effect the outcome of consumer socialization by impacting directly or indirectly on the socialization process. Social class, sex, and age are the antecedents included in the socialization model. Each is examined in this section.

Social Class

The influence of social class on consumption has been suggested by Ward (1974) and Riesman, Glazer, and Denny (1956). Empirical studies suggest that social class is positively related to the acquisition of some consumer skills (Moschis 1978b; Moschis and Churchill 1978; Moschis and Moore 1978). Findings indicate that children in families of higher socioeconomic status have more opportunities for consumption and, therefore, may become socialized more rapidly than children from families of lower socioeconomic status. Adolescents and children from higher socioeconomic families are better able to manage consumer finances (Moschis and Churchill 1979), possess greater knowledge of economic concepts (Williams 1970), are more aware of available brands in the marketplace, can more easily price products and services, show a better understanding of consumer-legal matters, and recognize socially desirable consumer role expectations (Moschis and Moore 1978).
Children of higher social class families hold stronger product stereotypes than children of lower social class families (Belk, Mayer, and Driscoll 1984). This distinction was most evident in situations where ownership of the product by children in higher social class families was significantly greater than ownership of the product by children in lower social class families.

Significant negative relationships between social class and degree of adolescent independence have been found (Moschis, Moore, and Stephens 1977; Psathas, 1957). This finding was affirmed in purchases of health care items, shoes, coats, and sports equipment (Moschis, Moore, and Stephens 1977). Adolescents from lower-class families are perceived to have greater independence in purchasing than higher-class adolescents, possibly because of the tendency for greater involvement by members of upper-class families in products that reflect the parents' desire for their child's social competence, social acceptance, and well-being (Engel, Kollat, and Blackwell 1973).

The literature suggests that social class affects the consumption skills acquired by adolescents. Adolescents from higher social classes have learned more consumer skills, such as financial concepts, and brand and product awareness, and can more easily price products and services than can adolescents from lower social classes. The differences in the skills of higher and lower socioeconomic
adolescents may affect the behavior of the adolescents as purchasing agents of the family. Adolescents with greater consumer skills may exhibit more confidence in the role than adolescents with fewer consumer skills and, therefore, be more likely to exhibit product purchase deviation.

Although the literature suggests that children of lower social class families have greater independence in shopping, this trait does not necessarily suggest that children from lower social class families will exhibit product purchase deviation. The lack of knowledge and skills in the marketplace may inhibit independence of an adolescent in his or her role as family purchasing agent. The research currently available does not examine the adolescent in the purchasing agent role. Available studies also include only those products that are very personal to the adolescent (health care items) and those items that have social value (shoes, coats, and sports equipment). Higher socioeconomic families may allow more freedom in consumption areas that do not have social implications.

Sex

Differences between the sexes were found in the acquisition of consumer skills. Male adolescents appear to know more than their female counterparts about consumer matters such as knowledge of basic terms in economics, finance, real estate, and marketing, as well as knowledge of consumer legislation in the areas of unit pricing, bait
advertising, code dating, and remedies available to consumers. Males also hold stronger materialistic attitudes than do their female counterparts. Materialism refers to "orientations emphasizing possessions and money for personal happiness and social progress" (Moschis and Churchill 1978, p. 605).

Female adolescents are more likely to perform socially desirable consumer behaviors, such as self-expression through conspicuous consumption, than are male adolescents (Moschis and Churchill 1978). On the other hand, males appear to possess a greater ability to accurately price products and services in the marketplace and a higher level of legal knowledge (Moschis and Moore 1978).

Moschis and Moore (1979) suggested that young people have developed clear sex-role perceptions by adolescence. More specifically,

"adolescents of both sexes have accurate sex-role perceptions regarding the responsibility for decision making in traditional male or female activities. The sex of the respondent, however, does have some effect on his/her perception of spouse involvement in household decisions regarding economic, social, and common household activities (areas of less specialization)" (p. 110).

McNeal (1969) indicated that sex-role perceptions develop much earlier. In a study of children ages five, seven, and nine, McNeal found that children view shopping as a feminine role among grown-ups but do not make that same distinction among children. Other findings indicate that high school females express more enthusiasm than do
boys about the shopping process. A study of 500 high school students indicated that high school females shopped more than males (Powell and Gover 1963).

McNeal (1969) further found that independence in the shopping function is granted to the male earlier than to the female. A more detailed product study by Moschis, Moore, and Stephens (1977) found independence in the shopping function for males to be true for sports equipment while females were given more independence in purchasing health care items, shirts, and jeans. The subjects for the study included 205 middle school students and 402 high school students; however, the age when shopping independence began was not indicated in the research.

Sex differences were also found in the recognition of symbolism of children's products. Research indicates that females hold stronger stereotypes than do males. However, this distinction was the weakest of the relationships studied (Belk, Mayer, and Driscoll 1984).

The literature also suggests that limited differences exist between male and female adolescents in their roles as purchasing agents for the family. Both males and females have acquired consumer skills and, therefore, are able to serve as the family purchasing agent. Females may have more experience shopping for the family groceries, however, as this traditionally has been viewed as a woman's household task. Marketing News (1987) reported that half of the 1079
girls surveyed by Teenage Unlimited Research said they grocery shop for their family each week. A Young & Rubicam, Inc., study revealed that 34 percent of adolescent females and 18 percent of adolescent males do some major food shopping each month (Businessweek 1984). Product purchase deviation may be more evident in females than males because of previous shopping experience and because of the perception that shopping is considered a traditionally female household activity.

Age

Studies indicate that older adolescents have greater consumer affairs knowledge, and are better able to differentiate between product attribute information in advertisements, manage consumer finances, and seek information from a variety of sources prior to decision making than are younger adolescents (Moschis and Churchill 1979; Moschis and Moore 1978; Moore and Stephens 1975).

High school students seek more sources of information than do middle school students (Moore and Stephens 1975), but age has no impact on the number of attributes used in decision making among adolescents (Moschis and Moore 1979). Price and brand name are perceived as the most important evaluative criteria in decision making (Moschis and Moore 1979). This finding is in keeping with findings that many adult consumers select only limited amounts of information available and place substantial behavioral importance on
price and particularly brand name information in decision making (Jacoby, Szybillo, and Busato-Schach 1977).

Belk, Mayer, and Driscoll (1984) suggested that older grade students have stronger stereotypes than do younger grade students. This tendency for stereotyping is especially true if the age group most likely owns the product.

The current research examines only 16, 17, and 18-year-old adolescents. Therefore, age will not be a factor in product purchase deviation for this study. Older adolescents have developed the necessary skills (the abilities to differentiate between attribute information, manage consumer finances, and seek information) in order to serve as purchasing agent for the family. Age would be a variable only if younger adolescents, ages 12 through 15, were included in the study.

Agent-Learner Relationships

The consumer socialization process takes place through the agent-learner relationships that surround the adolescent. These agent-learner relationships include the family, mass media, peer groups, and school influences.

Family Influences

The family is the primary mechanism through which cultural and social class values and behavioral patterns are passed on to the next generation (Hawkins, Best, and
Purchasing and consumption patterns are categories of behaviors influenced by the family.

During the last 30 years, the influence of parents on their adolescent children has decreased. A study conducted in 1961 indicates that the parents were the most influential on the purchasing behaviors of adolescent males and females for personal clothing, toiletry articles, sports equipment, small appliances, insurance policies, and forms of transportation (Gilkison 1973). Gilkison replicated the study in 1971 and found that parental influence had decreased in all product categories except insurance policies.

Moschis and Churchill (1978) determined that families teach rational aspects of communication. However, Moschis and Moore (1978) determined that family interaction about consumption skills did not relate to any consumer skill studied except legal knowledge. Legal knowledge refers to the understanding of consumer legal rights in the marketplace and to sources of consumer remedy. This finding suggests that other agent-learner relationships may be more effective in learning other consumer skills such as brand knowledge or price accuracy.

Family communication does affect socialization of children. According to Stone and Chaffee (1970), the two-family communication dimensions are (1) socio-orientation and (2) concept-orientation.
"In the socio-oriented family, the parents frequently stress that their children should avoid social conflict, give in on arguments to avoid antagonizing others, defer to their elders and generally stay away from interpersonal 'trouble'" (p. 240).

"In the concept-oriented family, the emphasis is on considering all sides of an issue before taking a side, and on expressing one's opinion even if it is opposed to others; the child is often exposed to different sides of a question, sometimes because one parent deliberately plays a 'devil's advocate' role to show the 'other side'" (p. 240).

Based on Newcomb's model, McLeod and O'Keefe (1972) developed a typology of parent-child communication structures and patterns. Laissez-faire families do not emphasize a socio-orientation or concept orientation in the family and therefore exhibit little parent-child communication. Protective families stress obedience and social harmony, pluralistic families encourage open communication and discussion with an emphasis on mutual respect and interests, and consensual families stress both a socio-orientation and a concept-orientation in the family's communication. See Figure 4.
Moschis (1985) used this typology in the study of consumer socialization. He set forth several propositions that suggest the manner in which family communication processes affect consumer learning. Moschis suggested that parental influence on the consumer behavior of their children is situation-specific and varies across products, stage in the decision making process, and consumer characteristics. The influence of parents can be both direct and indirect and also influence the child's interaction with other sources of influence. Moschis, Prahasto, and Mitchell (1986) found that children from
families that use a pluralistic form of communication are the most competent consumers while the laissez-faire families seem to be the least competent.

Family communication patterns also influence the mother's response to children's requests and their efforts to mediate effects of media exposure on children (Grossbart, Carlson, and Walsh 1987). Results indicate that pluralistic and consensual mothers engage in coviewing and discussion of advertisements with children more often than do laissez-faire or protective mothers. Protective and consensual mothers refuse requests more often than laissez-faire mothers. The findings support the theory that concept-oriented mothers are more likely to trust their children's choices and attempt to share media content with them. Socio-oriented mothers tend to restrict children's choices.

The literature suggests that adolescent from families that have a pluralistic family communication style will exhibit more product purchase deviation than children from laissez-faire families. Children from laissez-faire families exhibit the least consumer competence and, therefore, will have less confidence in the role of purchasing agent and demonstrate less product purchase deviation than other children. Adolescents from consensual families may exhibit slightly more product purchase deviation than do adolescents from protective families.
This is due to the additional emphasis on open communication in the consensual family that does not exist in the protective family.

Mass Media

A major consideration in the consumer socialization process is the influence of mass media on children. Moore and Moschis (1983) suggest that cognitive skills are likely to be learned from newspaper and television contact. This does not necessarily assure greater participation in household decision making, however a study of children's roles as purchase initiator, influencer, decider, and purchaser determined that television advertising viewing was not associated with the measure of children's participation in household decisions (Moschis and Mitchell 1986). Adolescents appear to learn from television socially desirable cognitions and consumer behaviors (Churchill and Moschis 1979; Moschis and Churchill 1978; Moschis and Moore 1978; Ward and Wackman 1971). Television also appears to stimulate conversations about consumption with parents, thereby contributing to the learning of "rational" elements of consumption (Churchill and Moschis 1979; Ward and Wackman 1971).

Amount of exposure to television has been found to be a predictor of brand attitudes (Moschis 1978). However, Ward and Wackman (1971) reported that media exposure time is not a powerful explanatory variable of communication
effects. They do acknowledge, however, that attitudes toward television advertising and a materialistic orientation are functions of the adolescent's reasons for viewing commercials.

Family communication patterns affect the viewing habits of adolescents. Adolescents from socio-oriented families tend to vary their viewing patterns more in the direction of their parents than do adolescents from concept-oriented families (Chaffee, McLeod, and Atkin 1971; Chaffee and Tims 1976). This may suggest that attitudes toward advertising may also be more in the direction of parents in socio-oriented families.

A study of five, seven, and nine-year-old children reported negative feelings toward television advertisements (McNeal 1969). Half of the five and seven-year-olds and 75 percent of the nine-year-olds believe commercials are untruthful, annoying, and time-consuming in relation to the programs with which they are associated. However, over half of each age group asked parents to buy many of the goods they see advertised.

Because there is a discrepancy in the literature regarding communication effects and exposure to advertising, the current research will also examine attitudes toward radio and television advertising. The hours of exposure or attitudes are not expected, however, to influence the current study. The literature suggests
that adolescents view television advertising because of their materialistic orientation. For example, grocery items have no social value; therefore, hours of exposure to television and radio and attitudes toward advertising are not expected to increase or decrease adolescent product purchase deviation in regard to such items.

Peer Influence

The importance of peer influence has been studied in many different contexts. The following discussion, while citing literature from psychology and sociology, focuses primarily on studies reported in the marketing literature. An emphasis on consumption patterns influenced by peers found in the marketing literature is more applicable to the present study than other types of adolescent peer situations as seen in the sociology and psychology literature.

Several studies from the sociology and psychology areas indicate that parental influence may be more important than peer influence in situations that have implications for future status while peer influence is more important in areas of current status and identity needs (Brittain 1963; Sebald and White 1980; Wilks 1986). Larson's (1972) findings do not support this view and suggest that there is little difference in the responses of youth in a future- and current-oriented decision. Larson's study does indicate, however, that parent-oriented youth
tend to make parent-compliant choices while best friend-oriented youth tend to make best friend-compliant choices. This was only true in situations of low priority content alternatives that have a temporary impact.

Peer orientation appears to increase with age until the tenth grade at which time the peer orientation levels off for male adolescents and reduces for female adolescents (Floyd and South 1972). McNeal's (1969) study of seven and nine-year-old children indicates that girls are more susceptible than boys to direct influence of peers. This may be due to the earlier maturation of girls and the inclination for social comparison. This again would result in an earlier "peak" of peer orientation and a reversion to parent orientation (Floyd and South 1972).

Results reported in the marketing consumer socialization literature reveal substantial peer influence on the consumer process. Gilkison (1973) determined that adolescents used peers as a frame of reference. In 1962, he found that adolescents used parents as a source of influence, representing a shift from parental influence on adolescents to increased peer influence on adolescents. Moschis (1978b) found that interaction with peers leads to the adolescent's greater awareness of brands in the marketplace, of the cost of such goods and services, and to greater legal knowledge. This finding is supported by Moschis and Churchill (1978). Studies indicate that
communication with peers about consumption matters centers on the social importance of goods and services (Moschis and Churchill 1978; Moschis and Churchill 1979). Research further suggests that peer influence may occur at the product evaluation stage of the decision making process (Moschis and Moore 1979).

The literature suggests that peers may influence adolescents and increase the likelihood of product purchase deviation. Interaction with peers leads to the adolescent's awareness of products and brands available in the marketplace. As adolescents serve as purchasing agents for the family, peers will influence the products purchased even though the products purchased in this role will have little or no social value.

School Influences

There is little support in the literature that school influences the consumption skills of adolescents. Powell and Gover (1963) determined that adolescents who had studied the handling of money were more apt to engage in the recommended money practices than those who had not had such work in school. Other findings indicate that formal education does not contribute to the adolescent's learning of consumer skills (Moschis and Churchill 1978; Moschis and Moore 1978).

Measurement of school influences is difficult because of an inability to determine specific consumption schools.
attributed to a specific class or activity. Enrollment in
classes reveals possible exposure to consumption concepts.
Actual understanding by the adolescent of information
presented in classes can not be measured by enrollment of
the adolescent in the class. Therefore, because of the
inability to accurately measure school influences, the
current research will not study school influences
supporting product purchase deviation or household brand
purchasing.

Learning Properties

Learning properties are the outcomes of the
socialization process: the consumption skills related to
purchasing and consuming. Moschis and Churchill (1978)
studied (1) consumer affairs knowledge, (2) consumer
activism, (3) ability to manage consumer finances, (4)
attitudes toward prices, (5) materialistic attitudes, (6)
economic (rational) motivations for consumption, and (7)
social (nonrational) motivations for consumption. Moschis
and Churchill examined the effect of antecedents and
agent-learner relationships on these select consumer
skills.

These outcomes or consumer skills allow the adolescent
to serve the family as purchasing agent. The skills enable
the adolescent to seek information, evaluate products,
understand attribute and price differences, and purchase
products for the family.
Extended Model

The present study extends the Moschis and Churchill model, with the adolescent serving as a purchasing agent for the family. The adolescent is seen as having gained consumer skills through the socialization process and is therefore able to serve the family in a purchasing agent capacity. The extension of the model will examine the effect of antecedent variables and agent-learner relationships on the adolescent as a purchasing agent for the family.

Summary

This chapter has examined the elements of the consumer socialization model. Antecedent variables and agent-learner relationships were detailed as to their influence on the socialization process as suggested by the literature. Chapter III sets forth the methodology of the research.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the methodology used in the study. The first section describes the type of research conducted. Additional sections include data collection techniques, variables examined, and a description of the statistical analysis.

Research Design

The current research was an exploratory field study designed to examine the adolescent in the role of purchasing agent for the family. Past research in the area of adolescent consumer behavior has relied heavily on self-reported questionnaires in order to derive relevant data. These data have been used predominantly to determine adolescent consumer socialization and behavior in the purchase of the adolescent's personal use products. No academic research has been reported on the behavior of adolescents in the role of purchasing agents for the family, an evolving role for them. The current study has focused on observing the new phenomenon, providing empirical data for use in constructing theories in the
specific area of behaviors of the adolescent consumer as a purchasing agent.

Structured observation is an appropriate tool when the problem has been defined precisely enough so that behaviors to be observed can be specified beforehand as can the categories that will be used to record and analyze the situation (Churchill 1988). In the current research, the behavior observed was the actual brand purchased by adolescents in his or her role as purchasing agent. Wells and LoScuito (1966) support the use of observation.

"It does not depend on the respondent's ability to interpret a questionnaire question correctly, or on the respondent's memory of a not very important and perhaps not very recent event. It is not influenced by the tendency to rationalize behavior to make it appear in the best light" (p. 228).

Because of the nature of the products purchased by the adolescent in their role as family purchasing agent (grocery items that have no social value, for example), self-reported information may not be accurate. Adolescents may not recall brand purchases because of the "insignificance" of the purchase. Actual observation on the other hand, yields more accurate results. Disguised observation in a natural setting was used so that the behavior of the adolescent would not be altered. If the adolescent had realized his or her purchases were being recorded, it might have affected the number of product purchase deviations.
Because of the exploratory nature of the study, no explicit experimental design was implemented. An experimental design was not possible because of the lack of a treatment or the manipulation of variables. Churchill (1988) states that experiments are scientific investigations in which an investigator manipulates or controls one or more independent variables and observes the change in the dependent variable. The adolescent was observed in a natural setting, and various antecedent, agent-learner relationships, and past experiences were measured. There was no removal of treatments or manipulation of marketing activities.

Data Collection Technique

This section begins with a discussion of sample selection followed by the procedures for data collection and the explanation of the pilot study.

Sample Selection

A convenience sample of 46 families was used in the study. The sample consisted of both single-parent and traditional households with at least one adolescent aged 16, 17, or 18 living in the home. This age range was selected because of the ability of adolescents to obtain a driver's license during this time. A driver's license would allow the adolescents to go to the grocery store without assistance from their parents.
The sample consisted of 28 male and 18 female adolescents and was 83 percent white. Minorities and nonreported data comprised the remaining 17 percent. Forty-eight percent of the sample held jobs outside the home and worked an average of 15 hours per week.

Results of a pilot study, discussed later in this section, indicated that church groups serve as a contact for identifying potential sample participants. However, on a large scale this data collection method was not effective.

The Denton Independent School District was contacted for permission to survey junior and senior high school students. The study was approved for the classes of economics, foods and clothing, marketing, social studies, and business management.

Data Collection

Denton High School teachers administered the questionnaires during classes (Appendix A). The questionnaire indicated family communication patterns, media habits, shopping experiences, work experience, household activities, and demographic information for the adolescent.

Three hundred students completed the questionnaires. Twenty-one percent of the families contacted agreed to participate. Fifteen percent of the families contacted finished the first shopping trip. Eight percent of the
original 300 families completed both the first and second shopping trips.

Families of the students that completed the questionnaire were contacted by letter explaining the study. Sufficient time was allowed between the completion of the adolescent questionnaire and the mailing of the letters to the parents to dispel any connection between the two events. A telephone follow up was utilized to increase the participation rate and insure the parents of the legitimacy of the study.

Parents were asked to participate in the study but adolescents in the household were not told of their participation in the study until all observations had been completed.

The parents completed a pre-study questionnaire (Appendix B) that included information on preferred brands for four pre-selected grocery items. The four products typically purchased by the family each week were laundry detergent, paper towels, snacks, and sandwich bread. Laundry detergent and paper towels were used as low-involvement products for the adolescent. Snacks and sandwich bread were used as high-involvement products for the adolescent. The parents identified the snacks generally purchased for the family and the brand names of the items. Fruit was not included because of the lack of consistently available national brands.
Using this information, a grocery list for each family was developed. The parent sent the adolescent to the grocery store to shop for these four items. Brand preferences were not conveyed to the adolescent by the parent. The adolescent chose the brand that he or she wanted to buy without direct influence from the parent before the shopping trip. The parent recorded the actual brand purchased and returned the information by mail (Appendix C).

A second shopping trip was repeated with the same instructions. The parent again recorded the brand purchased. After the conclusion of the second shopping trip, parents asked reasons for any products purchased other than the preferred household brands for both shopping trips (Appendix D). The information was recorded and returned by mail.

Receipts were returned with the shopping information as a means of verifying that the products recorded were the same products that were purchased. Because of the UPC codes used by grocery retailers in the area, it was possible to check the brand names on the receipt against the information reported by the parents.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to test the proposed study. A convenience sample of 15 families was obtained through personal contacts and a local church. The sample,
consisting of five Black families, one Hispanic family, and nine Caucasian families was contacted by telephone or through the pastor. The study was explained and names and addresses were obtained. The pre-study questionnaires were returned from all families; however, the final shopping trips were not completed. Families contacted through the church failed to complete the study. As a result, statistical analysis could not be conducted on the pilot study data.

Research Variables

In the research design, the dependent variable was the adolescent's purchase decision when acting as a purchasing agent for the family. The adolescent purchased either the preferred household brand or exhibited product purchase deviation.

The independent variables studied can be categorized as antecedent variables, agent-learner relationships, consumer and work experiences, and product classification variables. Figure 5 illustrates the theoretical model supporting the use of the research variables.
FIGURE 5
A Conceptual Model of Consumer Socialization

Source: Moschis and Churchill (1978)

Antecedent Variables

Socioeconomic status, age, and sex were the antecedent variables examined. Parent's occupation was used to determine the socioeconomic status of the family. The use of education and income as a measure of socioeconomic status of an occupation is prevalent in the literature (Duncan 1961). However, because of the sensitivity of these variables, Duncan's Socioeconomic Index (1961) was used. The index employs the occupation of the father as a means of determining the socioeconomic status of the
family. The pilot study revealed a sensitivity to income. Measurement of income may have prevented families from participating in the study; therefore, household income was not obtained. The father's education level was determined and was used as a separate variable.

Age and sex of the adolescent were self reported by the adolescent. Age was used as a control to ensure that participants of the study were 16 through 18 years of age. The sex of the adolescent was collected because the literature suggested that female and male adolescents would exhibit different shopping behaviors.

Agent-Learner Relationships

Four agent-learner relationships were examined: (1) family, (2) mass media, (3) peer influences, and (4) school influences. Family communication is considered an especially important variable in adolescent consumer orientation and the communication pattern of the family was measured using the Moschis, Prahasto and Mitchell (1986) adaption of the McLeod and O'Keefe (1972) parent-child communication structures and patterns. See Appendix E. The scale provides two dimensions of communication, socio-oriented and concept-oriented, allowing for four possible family communications structures: laissez-faire, protective, pluralistic, and consensual. A score for each family was obtained and a communication structure determined.
The use of the mass media was determined by the exposure of the adolescent to television and radio and the attitude adolescents have toward television and radio advertising. Exposure was measured by the average number of hours adolescents watched television per week and the number of hours adolescents listened to the radio per week.

Ward and Wackman (1971) report that attitudes toward television advertising and materialism are functions of the adolescents' reasons for viewing commercials. Attitude toward radio and television advertising were measured by a Likert scale. (See Appendix F.) A factor analysis on the scale yielded three different factors. A Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis revealed one factor to be more reliable than the other two factors. Therefore, advertising attitude was measured by an average of scores on the following statements: (1) Advertisements make people buy the things they don't really need; (2) Advertisements help people buy the things that are best for them; and (3) Most advertising tells the truth.

The Cronbach's alpha was .52. Reliabilities above .50 are sufficient for constructs in the early stages of research (Nunnally 1967).

Informal questioning of the adolescents by the parent was used to determine if the product purchase deviation occurred was a function of recalled advertisements. Statements such as "I saw that brand on television" or "I
heard about it on the radio" were recorded on the questionnaire as a direct influence on the study product purchase deviation.

The presence of peer influence was measured with an index. (See Appendix G). The index determined peer influence present in the purchase of the four items in the study. An expansion of a peer influence index by Moschis (1978a) was utilized. The index scale ranged from zero to twenty, with zero indicating no influence and twenty indicating high peer influence. The current study was concerned with only the peer influence on products purchased by the adolescent as purchasing agents for the family. Fifty-seven percent of the sample indicated no peer influence while ninety percent of the sample indicated a very small influence (index less than or equal to 6).

Informal questioning of the adolescent was also used to determine if the product purchase deviation occurring during the study was a function of peer influence. Replies such as "my friend uses this product" or "I tried this at my friend's house" were recorded as peer influence on the study product purchase deviation.

Previous research has measured school relationships by the number of consumer-related courses the adolescent has taken. Because influence of the particular course cannot adequately be measured by using enrollment, the current research did not attempt to use this measurement as an
indication of influence on the shopping behavior of the adolescent. Enrollment in a course does not assure that consumer-related topics were learned. The present study did not allow adequate measurement of school-related consumer knowledge because of the differences in consumer courses, instructors of the courses, and the educational systems presenting the courses.

Shopping and Work Experiences

Shopping experiences were measured by a Likert scale (Appendix H) to determine the independence of adolescents in purchasing clothing. The independence of the adolescent in shopping for clothing is an indication of experience in the marketplace. The parent allows greater independence as the adolescent gains money experience and consumer skills. The greater the experience and competence in consumer skills, the more likely that the adolescent will feel confident in the role of purchasing agent for the family and that he or she will exhibit product purchase deviation.

A factor analysis was performed on the shopping independence scale. Two factors emerged. Financial shopping independence ("I use my own money to purchase clothing" and "the money used to buy my clothing is from the family budget") had a Cronbach alpha of .67. Purchasing independence ("I shop for clothing without my parents" and "I purchase clothing without my parents seeing
the items") had a Cronbach's alpha of .75. Work experiences was measured by whether or not the adolescent currently worked outside the home.

Product Classification

The four consumer products in the study were classified as high or low-involvement products. Mitchell (1979) defines purchase involvement as the level of concern for, or interest in, the purchase process. High involvement products were products in which the adolescent had an interest and low-involvement were products the adolescent had little or no interest. Therefore, snack foods and sandwich breads were used as high-involvement products while laundry detergent and paper towels were used as low-involvement products.

Moschis, Moore, and Stephens (1977) used snacks to study adolescent independence in shopping behavior. Sixty-nine percent of the sample purchased snacks alone or with friends. Bread was used by Moore and Stephens (1975) as a product that adolescents either purchase alone or about which they have some purchase influence. These two studies suggest that bread and snacks are products in which adolescents would be interested.

Hoyer (1984) used laundry detergent in a direct observation study for common repeat purchase products. Detergent is generally a low-involvement product with a wide variety of available brands. Paper towels were also
chosen as a low-involvement product because of the large number of available brands.

Research Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses are categorized by antecedent variables, agent-learner relationships, shopping and work experiences, and product classifications. All hypotheses refer to the adolescent in the role of family purchasing agent.

Antecedent Variables

H-1A: Adolescents from higher socioeconomic status families will tend toward product purchase deviation.

H-1B: Adolescents from lower socioeconomic status families will tend toward preferred household brand purchasing.

H-2A: Adolescents from families with higher education levels will tend toward product purchase deviation.

H-2B: Adolescents from families with lower education levels will tend toward preferred household brand purchasing.

H-3: Female adolescents will exhibit greater product purchase deviation than male adolescents.

Agent-Learner Relationships

H-4A: Adolescents from families that have pluralistic family communication will tend toward product purchase deviation.

H-4B: Adolescents from families that have protective family communication will tend toward preferred household brand purchasing.
H-5: There will be no significant difference in the number of hours exposed to radio and television between adolescents who exhibit product purchase deviation and adolescents who purchase the preferred household brand.

H-6: There will be no significant difference in the attitude toward radio and television advertising score between adolescents who exhibit product purchase deviation and adolescents who purchase preferred household brands.

H-7A: Adolescents who interact with peers about products purchased will tend toward product purchase deviation.

H-7B: Adolescents who do not interact with peers about products purchased will tend toward preferred household brand purchasing.

Shopping and Work Experiences

H-8A: Adolescents with high shopping experience will tend toward product purchase deviation.

H-8B: Adolescents with low shopping experience will tend toward preferred household brand purchasing.

H-9A: Adolescents with work experience will tend toward product purchase deviation.

H-9B: Adolescents with little or no work experience will tend toward preferred household brand purchasing.

Product Classification

H-10A: Adolescents will tend toward product purchase deviation when purchasing high-involvement products.

H-10B: Adolescents will tend toward preferred household brands when purchasing low-involvement products.

Statistical Analysis

A discriminant statistical technique was used to analyze the data. Discriminant analysis is used to
establish procedures for classifying individuals into groups based on their scores on several variables. It is most appropriate where there is a single categorical dependent variable and several metrically scaled independent variables (Hair, Anderson, and Tatham 1987). In the current study, two dependent categorical groups were determined: (1) adolescents who purchase the preferred household brand, and (2) adolescents who do not purchase the preferred household brand.

The following variables were entered into the discriminant function: (1) socioeconomic status, (2) parental education level, (3) socio and concept-oriented household communication scores, (4) hours of exposure to television and radio, (5) attitude toward advertising score, (6) financial shopping independence score, and (7) purchasing independence score.

The expected results from the discriminant analysis are:

**Group I: Adolescent Product Purchase Deviation**

Teenagers that exhibit product purchase deviation will have higher family income, higher parental education levels, pluralistic family communication, and prior purchasing experience.

**Group II: Adolescent Household Brand Purchase**

Teenagers that purchase the preferred household brand will have lower family income, lower parental education levels, protective family communication, and have limited purchase experience.
Chi square analysis was implemented to determine if significant differences in product purchase deviation exist between male and female adolescents. When frequencies of the data are in discrete categories, the chi square test may be used to determine the significance of the differences among the groups (Siegel 1956). The null hypothesis was:

\[ H_0: \text{There is no significant product purchase deviation between male and female adolescent.} \]

Chi square analysis was also used to determine differences between working and nonworking adolescents and their product purchase deviation leading to the null hypothesis:

\[ H_0: \text{There is no significant product purchase deviation between working and nonworking adolescents.} \]

Differences between high and low-involvement purchases and product purchase deviation were also analyzed with the chi square test. The null hypothesis was:

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference between product purchase deviation and high and low-involvement products.} \]

A t-test statistic was utilized to determine if a difference existed in media exposure between adolescents who deviate from the preferred household brand and adolescents who purchase the preferred household brand, leading to the null hypothesis:

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference in the mean number of hours of mass media exposure between adolescents who purchase preferred household brands and adolescents who do not.} \]
Summary

This chapter discussed the methodology for the research study, the variables examined, and the research hypothesis. Chapter 4 presents the statistical analysis performed on the collected data.
CHAPTER IV

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

This chapter presents the statistical analyses performed to test the hypotheses stated in Chapter III. The major analyses discussed are (1) the discriminant analysis to determine the factors that contribute to the adolescent purchasing preferred household brands or brands other than the preferred household brand, (2) the chi square analysis to determine if there are differences in brand shopping behavior between male and female adolescents and working and nonworking adolescents, (3) t tests to determine differences in brand shopping behavior and media exposure among respondents, and (4) frequency analysis of reasons cited for product purchase deviation. The SPSSx (1988) statistical package was used for all analysis except when noted.

Discriminant Analysis

A discriminant analysis was performed on the data for each of the eight shopping trips completed by the sample. The two groups for the discriminant analysis were defined by the actual purchase of the product by the adolescents (preferred household brand or nonpreferred household brand). The independent variables were analyzed to
determine how each variable contributes to the decision made.

Because of the small number of complete observations (24 to 46 range), a holdout sample was not possible to validate the discriminant function. Therefore, the BMDP Statistical Software (1985) package was used to perform a jackknife stepwise discriminant function. This procedure eliminates one observation from the computation of the group means and cross products. The distance and the posterior probabilities are computed for the distance from the case to the groups formed by the remaining observations (Lachenbruch and Mickey 1968). The jackknife is a useful procedure to determine a nearly unbiased estimator through sample reuse (Crask and Perreault 1977).

The parameters specified in the jackknife discriminant were an F-to-enter and F-to-remove of 1.0, a tolerance of .001, and prior probabilities of the sample from each of the eight shopping trips. An F value approaching one indicates that a linear model is appropriate while the tolerance of .001 will allow predictors to enter the model with some multicolinearity (Hair, Anderson, and Tatham 1987).

Means were substituted for missing data among the discriminating variables. Cohen and Cohen (1983) suggest the use of mean substitution for missing values to avoid nonrepresentativeness of the subjects and loss of
statistical power because of a decreased \( n \), and to capitalize on the information present in other variables.

The variables entered into each of the eight discriminant analyses were the families' socioeconomic status, the parental education level, the number of hours of radio and television exposure, the family communication scores for socio-orientation and concept-orientation, the attitude toward advertising score, and the financial shopping and purchasing independence scores. Appendix I illustrates the simple correlation matrix of these variables. Appendix J lists the scales values and the interpretation of the values.

Low-Involvement Purchase: Paper Towels

The discriminant analysis for the purchase of paper towels (low-involvement purchase) during the first shopping trip was performed. Two of the independent variables were retained in the discriminant function. The means and standard deviations of the responses to each of these variables by each group are provided in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Purchased Household Brand</th>
<th>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>60.86 (22.13)</td>
<td>67.67 (21.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-oriented Communication</td>
<td>3.67 (0.721)</td>
<td>3.43 (0.658)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis yielded a discriminant function of

\[ Z = -1.89 - 0.172 X_1 + 0.731 X_2 \]

where:

- \( Z \) = the discriminant score
- \( X_1 \) = socioeconomic status
- \( X_2 \) = socio-oriented family communication.

The function suggests that the lower the socioeconomic status and the higher the socio-oriented family communication style, the more likely that the adolescent will purchase the preferred household brand. However, the function is not statistically significant. Further classification analysis suggests little reliable prediction. Table 2 displays the jackknife classification matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases Classified into</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Household Brand</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportional chance criterion used for unequal group sizes yields a 50.3 percent chance. The percentage of
correct classifications is 58.7 percent. This low percentage does not reflect the ability of the discriminant function to distinguish between those adolescent who purchased the preferred household brand and those that did not. This finding is further emphasized by the resulting canonical correlation of .24. Overall, the function explained only five percent of the variation.

Discriminant analysis was performed on the same low-involvement product (paper towels) purchased during the second shopping trip. Because of the number of participants who failed to complete the study, the resulting number of participants was 25. This analysis retained four of the independent variables. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Purchased Household Brand</th>
<th>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Independence</td>
<td>2.82 (0.337)</td>
<td>2.36 (0.535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>4.27 (1.42)</td>
<td>5.21 (2.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept-oriented Communication</td>
<td>2.64 (0.609)</td>
<td>3.02 (0.543)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing Independence</td>
<td>2.55 (0.850)</td>
<td>2.67 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis yielded the following discriminant function:

\[ Z = -.394 - 5.07 X_1 - .39 X_2 -.19 X_3 + X_4 \]
where: \( Z \) = discriminant score  
\( X_1 \) = parental education level  
\( X_2 \) = concept-oriented family communication  
\( X_3 \) = purchasing independence  
\( X_4 \) = financial shopping independence.

The function is significant (\( p = .05 \)) and explains 36 percent of the variance. The discriminant findings suggest that the lower the education level of the parent, the lower the concept-orientation style, the higher the purchasing independence of the adolescent, and the lower the financial shopping independence, the more likely it is that the adolescent will purchase the preferred household brand. The classification matrix is presented in Table 4.

**TABLE 4**
Jackknife Classification Matrix for Paper Towels II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percent Correct</th>
<th>Purchased Household Brand</th>
<th>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Household Brand</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The jackknife classification matrix reveals a 60 percent correct classification. The proportional chance
is 50.7 percent. The 10 percent difference, however, is not meaningful. Hair, Anderson, and Tatham (1987) suggest that the classification accuracy should be at least 25 percent greater than that achieved by chance. The current finding does not meet that criterion.

A major limitation in comparing the results of the two discriminant analyses on the same product (paper towels) over two shopping trips is the notable difference in the sample sizes. Also, the differences in the variables retained in the discriminant functions suggest an instability of the function to discriminate between adolescents who buy the preferred household brand and adolescents who purchase other brands.

Low-Involvement Purchase: Laundry Detergent

The discriminate analysis for the product category laundry detergent yielded the following function:

\[ Z = 2.12 - 11.62 \times X_1 \]

where:

- \( Z \) = the discriminant score
- \( X_1 \) = parental education level.

The function suggests that the lower the education level, the more likely that the adolescent will select the preferred household brand. However, the discriminant function was not statistically significant and produced a low correct classification. The jackknife classification matrix is illustrated in Table 5.
TABLE 5
Jackknife Classification Matrix for Detergent I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percent Correct</th>
<th>Purchased Household Brand</th>
<th>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Household Brand</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discriminant analysis performed on the data collected during the second shopping trip for laundry detergent yielded a significant discriminant function (p < .10) and a high classification rate. The means and standard deviations for the retained variables are contained in Table 6.

TABLE 6
Means and Standard Deviations for Detergent II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Purchased Household Brand</th>
<th>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio Economic Status</td>
<td>75.20 (10.98)</td>
<td>61.88 (29.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept-oriented</td>
<td>2.78 (0.597)</td>
<td>3.06 (0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.04 (0.547)</td>
<td>3.29 (0.486)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward</td>
<td>5.00 (1.73)</td>
<td>4.50 (2.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The function defined by the analysis is

\[ Z = 4.56 - 5.27 X_1 + .456 X_2 - .667 X_3 - 1.48 X_4 \]
where: \( Z \) = the discriminant function
\( X_1 \) = parental education level
\( X_2 \) = socioeconomic status
\( X_3 \) = concept-oriented communication
\( X_4 \) = attitude toward advertising.

The function suggests that the higher the socioeconomic status of the family, the lesser the degree of concept orientation communication, the more positive the attitude toward advertising, and the higher the parental education level, the more likely it is that the adolescent will purchase the household brand. The indication that a higher parental education level will lead to a greater probability of purchasing the household brand conflicts with the previous analyses of shopping trip I for laundry detergent and of both shopping trips for paper towels. This again suggests an instability of the coefficients despite a higher classification percentage and a 36 percent explained variation. Table 7 illustrates the classification matrix.
TABLE 7
Jackknife Classification Matrix for Detergent II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases Classified into</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Correct</td>
<td>Purchased Household Brand</td>
<td>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Household Brand</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High-Involvement Purchase: Sandwich Bread

The discriminant analysis for the purchase of sandwich bread for the first shopping trip retained attitude toward advertising in the discriminant function. The function is

\[ Z = 6.34 - 1.82 \times X_1 \]

where: \( Z \) = the discriminant score

\( X_1 \) = attitude toward advertising.

The function suggests that the more positive the attitude toward advertising, the more likely that the individual would purchase the preferred household brand. The function is statistically significant (\( p < .10 \)); however, it explains only seven percent of the variation. The classification matrix is illustrated in Table 8 and yields a high correct classification of 75 percent. This classification percentage is 13 percent above the proportion chance of 62 percent but does not satisfy the
criteria of 25 percent greater than the proportion chance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percent Correct</th>
<th>Purchased Household Brand</th>
<th>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Household Brand</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discriminant analysis of the second shopping trip for the product sandwich bread retained three variables. The means and standard deviations are shown in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Purchased Household Brand</th>
<th>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Radio Exposure</td>
<td>12.15 (6.14)</td>
<td>13.00 (7.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-oriented Communication</td>
<td>3.69 (0.461)</td>
<td>3.30 (0.862)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Advertising</td>
<td>3.05 (0.487)</td>
<td>3.18 (0.565)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discriminate function is

\[ Z = .09 - .06 X_1 + .87 X_2 - 1.44 X_3 \]
where:  
\[ Z = \text{discriminant score} \]
\[ X_1 = \text{Hours of radio exposure} \]
\[ X_2 = \text{Socio-oriented communication} \]
\[ X_3 = \text{Attitude toward advertising}. \]

The function suggests that the fewer the hours of radio exposure, the greater the socio-oriented family communication, and the more positive the attitude toward advertising the greater will be the likelihood of the adolescent purchasing the family brand. The function is not statistically significant, however, and explains only 17 percent of the variation. The classification matrix for the discriminant function is illustrated in Table 10.

### TABLE 10
Jackknife Classification Matrix for Bread II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percent Correct</th>
<th>Purchased Household Brand</th>
<th>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Household Brand</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only variables retained for both weeks for the product sandwich bread was the attitude toward advertising.
All other variables were different. Again this suggests an instability of the discriminant functions.

High-Involvement Purchase: Snack Foods

A discriminant analysis was performed for the purchase of snack foods for shopping trips I and II. The analysis for shopping trip I retained four independent variables in the discriminant function. Table 11 presents the means and standard deviations for the retained variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 11</th>
<th>Means and Standard Deviations for Snacks I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Purchased Household Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>62.86 (22.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>4.42 (2.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Advertising</td>
<td>3.23 (0.472)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Shopping Independence</td>
<td>2.67 (0.530)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discriminant function is

\[ Z = -6.55 + 11.97 X_1 - .1496 X_2 + 1.25 X_3 + X_4 \]

where:
- \( Z \) = the discriminant score
- \( X_1 \) = Parental education level
- \( X_2 \) = Socio economic status
- \( X_3 \) = Attitude toward advertising
- \( X_4 \) = Financial Shopping Independence.
The function suggests that adolescents who are from families with higher education levels, and lower socioeconomic status, and who have more negative attitudes toward advertising, and lower financial shopping independence will be more likely to purchase the preferred household brand. The implications contradict because an increase in education level typically increases the socioeconomic status of the family. The function is not significant, however, and explains only 25 percent of the variation. The classification matrix is shown in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cases Classified into</th>
<th>Percent Correct</th>
<th>Purchased Household Brand</th>
<th>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Household Brand</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four variables were retained in the discriminant analysis for snacks during the second shopping trip. The means and standard deviations are reported in Table 13.
TABLE 13
Means and Standard Deviations for Snacks II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Purchased Household Brand</th>
<th>Did Not Purchase Household Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours TV Exposure</td>
<td>9.00 (6.65)</td>
<td>10.58 (5.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>5.42 (1.67)</td>
<td>4.16 (2.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Radio Exposure</td>
<td>11.42 (6.10)</td>
<td>14.67 (6.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing Independence</td>
<td>2.75 (1.12)</td>
<td>2.41 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discriminant function is

\[ Z = -0.893 + 10.25 X_1 - 0.814 X_2 - 0.091 X_3 + 0.255 X_4 \]

where:

- \( Z \) = the discriminant score
- \( X_1 \) = parental education level
- \( X_2 \) = television viewing hours
- \( X_3 \) = radio listening hours
- \( X_4 \) = purchasing shopping independence.

The function is statistically significant (\( p < .10 \)) and explains 34 percent of the variation but exhibits a low correct classification. The function suggests that adolescents who are exposed to fewer hours of television and radio, are from more highly educated families, and exhibit low purchase shopping independence will more likely purchase the preferred household brand.

The classification matrix for the discriminate analysis is found in Table 14.
Parental education level was retained in both functions for the product snacks; however, other retained variables were different. These findings again suggest an instability among the variables.

Chi Square Analysis

A chi square analysis was performed to determine if any differences existed between male and female adolescents and their brand purchasing behavior. An analysis was performed on each of the four product categories over the two shopping trips for a total of eight chi square analyses. No significant differences were found between male and female adolescents among any of the product categories for either shopping trip.

Analysis on nonworking and working adolescents were also performed in like manner. Again no significant
differences were found among any of the product categories for either shopping trip.

A chi square analysis was performed to determine if there were significant differences between the product purchase deviation for high and low-involvement products. A significant difference in the purchase of paper towels and snack foods (p < .05) was found. Product purchase deviation occurred more often with paper towels than with snack foods. No other significant differences were found.

T-Test Analysis

A t-test was performed to determine if there any differences existed between the number of hours of exposure to television and radio and product purchase deviation. The analysis was conducted for the four product categories occurring for the first shopping trip for both radio and television exposure. No significant differences at a five percent level were found with either media for any of the four product categories.

Frequencies

To determine the reasons for product purchase deviation, adolescents were asked the reason for purchasing a different product than the preferred family brand. Tables 15, 16, 17, and 18 list the frequencies for the reasons for product purchase deviation for each of the four product categories.
TABLE 15
Reasons for Product Purchase Deviation:
Paper Towels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Cited</th>
<th>Trip I</th>
<th>Trip II</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less expensive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes better</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw ad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First one seen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 16
Reasons for Product Purchase Deviation:
Laundry Detergent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Cited</th>
<th>Trip I</th>
<th>Trip II</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of Stock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less expensive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes better</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw ad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First one seen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized brand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used coupon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 17
Reasons for Product Purchase Deviation:
Sandwich Bread

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Cited</th>
<th>Trip I</th>
<th>Trip II</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of Stock</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less expensive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes better</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First one seen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used coupon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18
Reasons for Product Purchase Deviation: Snacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Cited</th>
<th>Trip I</th>
<th>Trip II</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of Stock</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less expensive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes better</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw ad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen at home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequently cited reason for buying a brand other than the preferred household brand was that the brand purchased was less expensive. This occurred the most frequently in all product categories except in snacks where the most frequently cited reason was "I like it better." Some products were mentioned as being unavailable. This occurred more frequently for laundry detergent and sandwich bread than for the other products. Advertising was not mentioned often; however, in the laundry detergent category, it was mentioned by 22 percent of the respondents.

Summary

This chapter contained the statistical analyses for the hypotheses stated in Chapter III. While the analyses failed to give statistical support, trends in the data emerged. A discussion of the findings, limitations of the research, and implications for future research are included in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This research was guided by the adolescent consumer socialization theory as set forth by Moschis and Churchill in 1978. An expansion of the model was attempted to examine the socialization factors as they pertain to the adolescent serving as purchasing agent for the family. This chapter discusses the findings of the research, the limitations of the study, and concludes with suggestions for further research.

Findings

The socialization model suggests that consumer skills are influenced by antecedent variables and agent-learner relationships. The extended model suggests that these influencing factors affect the brand selection outcome of the adolescent family purchasing agent. Little statistically significant support was found from the data analysis; however, occasional trends were observed.

The analysis indicated that adolescents who experience a protective family communication style will purchase the preferred household brand while adolescents who experience a pluralistic family communication style will purchase products other than the household brand. Adolescents who
are exposed to television and radio tend to deviate more from the preferred household brand more often than do adolescents with less media exposure.

Adolescents who work are more likely to go to the grocery store more often for their families than do non-working adolescents. Also, adolescents seem to possess a price sensitivity to both high and low-involvement grocery items.

Antecedent Variables

The antecedent variables explored were the family's socioeconomic status, parental education level, sex, prior purchasing experience, and work experience. Age was used as a control for the sample respondents but was not considered as a research variable.

It was hypothesized that adolescents from lower socioeconomic status families would more likely purchase the preferred household brand than would adolescents from higher socioeconomic-status families. This was not supported from the findings. In the purchase of laundry detergent, it was found that a high socioeconomic status indicated a more likely purchase of the preferred household brand. Regarding the purchase of paper towels and snacks, the findings suggested that a lower socioeconomic status adolescent would more likely purchase the preferred household brand. While no specific trends could be gained from the analysis of this study, it would be imprudent to
assume that socioeconomic status does not influence the brand purchase behavior of adolescents acting as purchasing agents for their families. Previous research has indicated that socioeconomic status does influence purchasing (Moschis 1978b; Moschis and Churchill 1978 and 1979; Moschis and Moore 1978; Riesman, Glazer, and Denny 1956; Ward 1974; Williams 1970).

Adolescents from lower socioeconomic-status families may be more aware of prices than brands and simply "buy the cheapest" because of parental price consciousness. Saving money may preclude other variables, such as brand preference, pertaining to the purchase of an item. Gagmon and Osterhaus (1985) studied the use of point-of-purchase displays on the sales of retail products and concluded that floor displays generate more sales, especially in high volume grocery stores. Adolescents may also be susceptible to point-of-purchase displays or attention-producing product packaging.

No specific trends were found concerning parental education levels and adolescent brand purchase behavior. Both high and low parental education levels were found in the purchase of preferred family brands across all product categories studied except sandwich bread, which had no parental education influence. The results, however, are consistent with the mixed results concerning socioeconomic status. It would be expected that the analyses of
education and socioeconomic status would be similar because of the correlation between education and socioeconomic status.

It was hypothesized that females would more likely exhibit product purchase deviation than would males in serving as family purchasing agents. There were no differences found between male and female shoppers among any of the study product categories. It has been reported that teenage grocery shopping is most common when a 16 to 19-year-old female lives in the household while 16 to 17-year-old males are the least likely to do family grocery shopping (Hauser 1986). Twenty-five percent of the male respondents indicated that they go to the grocery store at least once a week compared to only 17 percent of the female respondents. Twenty-one percent of the males reported as never going to the grocery store while 33 percent of the females never go. This suggests that the sample may be biased upward in terms of the number of males who actually grocery shop for their families. Therefore the hypothesis was not supported with the current research.

Prior purchasing experience was measured by financial purchasing independence and actual purchasing independence in the area of clothing for the adolescent. It was proposed that greater shopping independence would indicate greater product purchase deviation. While the analysis performed on the data was not statistically significant, a
trend of lower independence in shopping produced more preferred household brand purchasing. This trend was evident in the purchasing of paper towels and snacks, a high and low-involvement purchase.

Adolescents who have little experience with the evaluation of product attributes, price and quality comparisons, or actual purchase of products would therefore be more likely to purchase what they had previously seen at home. This reduces the risk involved with the purchase of the family products.

It was hypothesized that adolescents with work experience would more likely exhibit product purchase deviation. This hypothesis was not supported. There were no differences found between adolescents who work outside the home and adolescents who do not work outside the home.

The findings do, however, suggest that working adolescents shop more often for their families than do nonworking adolescents. Thirty-two percent of the adolescents who work go to the grocery store at least once a week, while only thirteen percent of the working adolescents participate in the family shopping. Significantly more nonworking adolescents do not grocery shop for their families or only go to the grocery store once a month than do working adolescents ($p < .05$).

While there is little evidence to support that lower socioeconomic status and parental education levels will
influence the adolescent to purchase the preferred household brand, these variables may be valid indicators of behavior. Sample difficulties may have affected the significance level in the analysis. A more thorough discussion of this possibility is presented in the limitation section of the chapter. These difficulties may also influence the analysis involving female and male, working and nonworking adolescents.

Agent-Learner Relationships

The family communication pattern, mass media, and peer influences were studied to determine influences on the brand purchasing by adolescent purchasing agents. While school influences are stated in the adolescent socialization model, there has been little empirical evidence to support school as a viable influence. Because of the inability to accurately measure school influences, the variable was not considered in the current study.

The research hypotheses stated that adolescents that have a pluralistic family communication pattern will tend toward product purchase deviation while adolescents that have a protective family communication will tend toward preferred household brand purchasing. While this was not statistically supported from the research, the trend was apparent. Protective family communication which stresses obedience and social harmony was supported as a factor in the adolescent's purchase of preferred family brands.
Pluralistic family communication which encourages open communication and discussion with an emphasis on mutual respect and interest was supported in the adolescent's purchase of other brands. Openness allows the adolescent to discuss ideas, formulate ideas, and purchase products evaluated to be superior. This trend was indicated in both low and high-involvement products.

The mass media was examined to determine the influences on adolescent brand purchasing behavior. It was hypothesized that the exposure to radio or television would not affect the purchase of the preferred family brand. Adolescents who purchased the preferred household brand did have less exposure to radio and television than did adolescents that purchased other brands. This occurred only in the high-involvement products, however. No media effect occurred in the low-involvement products. This suggests that adolescents may pay attention to advertisements for products that they are interested in and ignore other product advertisements. While this does not support the research hypothesis, it does support the study conducted by Moschis (1987) that television is more likely to influence the development of affective orientations toward brands when the advertisement is relevant to the child's needs.

Adolescents that purchased the preferred household brands of detergent and bread had more positive attitudes
toward advertising. More negative attitudes toward advertising were held by adolescents who purchased the preferred household snack. This suggests that attitude toward advertising is inconsistent across product categories, including both high and low-involvement products, and may not influence the purchase of preferred household brands or other available brands.

Peer influences had no effect on purchasing any of the product categories. Slightly over 56 percent of the respondents indicated no peer influence at all while an additional thirty seven percent of the respondents indicated only a slight peer influence. The hypothesis that adolescents who interact with peers are more likely to exhibit product purchase deviation was not supported because no peer influence is evident among the product categories studied. This finding may have resulted because the products studied had no social significance. Previous research indicated evidence of peer influence on product categories such as clothing (Moschis and Moore 1979; Saunders, Samli, and Tozier 1973).

Product Classification

It was hypothesized that adolescents would deviate from the preferred household brand more often for high-involvement products than for low-involvement products. The analysis indicated that there was a difference between the product categories of paper towels and snacks.
Adolescents purchased the preferred household brand more often for snacks than paper towels. While this finding does not support the hypothesis, it does suggest that adolescents influence the purchase of items in which they are interested. The parent may currently purchase items previously requested by the adolescent. That requested brand then becomes the preferred household brand. Therefore, deviation from that purchase would not occur as often.

Reasons for Product Purchase Deviation

The findings from direct questioning of the adolescent as to the reasons for purchasing a brand other than the preferred household brand suggest a price sensitivity among the respondents. Adolescents stated in all product categories that the product purchased was less expensive than the preferred household brand.

Advertising was not cited frequently as a reason for product purchase deviation, except in the laundry detergent category. This may be due to the extensive television advertising in this particular category. Location of the product seemed to influence adolescent purchasing in all product categories studied except snacks, which suggests that adolescents may take more time and expend more energy in this particular high-involvement category.
Limitations

Limitations exist in the current study. Caution must be employed in utilizing the findings because of methodological and sample limitations.

Field studies have the ability to observe behavior in a natural setting but there is no control over any extraneous variables. Examples of these variables would be the household climate on the day of the shopping trip or an argument between parents and adolescents may have resulted in different purchasing behaviors. The rebellious mood of the adolescent on the shopping day may have resulted in greater product purchase deviation than on other days. There is also no control for the visual influences in the stores, such as point-of-purchase displays, special sales, or events. Nor can individual adolescent characteristics, such as personality or heightened sensitivity to a particular product category, be controlled or measured. Further, repeated shopping trips gave the adolescent more experience and therefore allowed a "maturation" bias in the study which threatens internal validity.

A major limitation to the study was the selected sample. The parental education level was high, with 30 percent of the fathers in the sample having had some college education and an additional fifty-six percent of the sample having at least a college education. This
exhibits a definite upward bias in the sample in terms of parental education level.

Higher education typically leads to higher incomes and socioeconomic status. This finding was evident in the socioeconomic status of the respondent families. Forty-four percent of the families fell into the upper third of the occupation index. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents were in the upper half of the occupation index. This also represents an upward bias in the sample. Because of the lack of disparity among the respondent families, limited differences were found among the adolescents with respect to their purchasing behavior.

The small size of the sample is also a limitation to the study. A larger sample size may have yielded significant results. Because the extensive involvement of the parent and the adolescent was necessary, many families chose not to participate. Further problems resulted as families who initially chose to participate failed to complete the study. Comparison of the same product over the two shopping periods was hampered because of the loss of participants. Contradictions and instable coefficients resulted. No incentives were given to encourage participation which contributed to the small sample size.

There is limited external validity and the results are not generalizable for all adolescents due to the use of a convenience sample. While the Denton Independent School
District serves all high school students in the area, Denton itself may not be a true representative of the population at large. Two universities, major employers within the area, are within the city limits which suggests a possible upward bias in parental educational levels and socioeconomic status.

Implications for Extended Research

While the research hypotheses were not generally supported by the study, there is basis for extended study of the adolescent purchasing agent.

Because of the sampling constraints, replication of the study among a more heterogeneous population would be useful. The research hypotheses may be supported with a more diverse group of families, such as a broader range of ethnic, lifestyle, and socioeconomic and educational backgrounds. Further replications in other geographical areas may lend support to the study and increase the generalizability of the research hypotheses.

A longitudinal study may be necessary for support of the hypotheses. Observing the brand purchases over time would more accurately depict adolescent purchase behavior. Perhaps studies covering six months to a year would be more appropriate in terms of understanding true decision making among adolescents during the different aspects of their lives (for example, school vs. summer). There are also specific marketing implications that warrant extensive
individual study. Pricing, point-of-purchase, and advertising may be important strategy variables in influencing the adolescent purchasing agent.

The price awareness evidenced among the adolescents that purchased brands other than the preferred household brand is notable. This finding suggests that adolescents not only are aware of price differences, but actually search for the information. Research to determine the range of perceived price differences by adolescents may be helpful to marketing strategists in determining the point at which a difference in price will cause a change in purchase behavior. Further research would be necessary to investigate how much information-seeking behavior is exhibited among adolescents. Is the use of unit pricing prevalent in certain product categories? Does a "sale" indicate the lowest cost to adolescent purchasing agents or do they seek further information before making a decision? Does this differ by the sex or socioeconomic status of the individual?

Pricing studies would be helpful across all product categories, including high and low-involvement purchases. As noted in the analysis, price was not a major issue in deciding on snack foods. This finding suggests that price may not be important in all categories of product the adolescent purchasing agent will buy. However, Moschis and Moore (1979) imply that price and brand name were perceived
as the most important evaluative criteria in purchasing decisions.

Point-of-purchase influences were also prevalent among adolescents exhibiting product purchase deviation. "It was the first one I saw" was stated as a reason for purchasing in all product categories except snack foods. This indicates that adolescent purchasing agents may view some products as homogeneous with little or no differentiation between brands.

Future research should concentrate on the types of displays that would gain the attention of the adolescent and alter purchase behavior. Does the use of color, intensity of the color, humor, movement, music, or pictures of well known personalities attract attention?

Location of products in specific areas of the retail stores may also produce different buying behaviors. The use of end of aisle and precise shelf space (eye level, low or high) to exhibit products may lend specific information for marketing strategies.

Understanding how adolescents categorize products might be useful in locating of specific products throughout the store, as well. Where do adolescents expect to find specific products in the store? For example, is catsup a dressing or located with other tomato products such as tomato paste or sauce? Dual placement of certain products
may be necessary in order to assist adolescents in locating products easily.

Mass media implications are also in need of further research. The trend found in the current study suggests that higher exposure to radio and television may increase the individual decision making by the adolescent purchasing agent. However, previous research does not support any specific theory in relation to media exposure and adolescent consumption and allows much discrepancy and incongruencey. The amount of television adolescents viewed was found to be a predictor of brand attitudes in one study by Moschis (1978b). However, Ward and Wackman (1971) reported that media exposure is not a powerful explanatory variable of communication effects.

These disparities as well as the media trends found in the current study warrant further investigation of radio and television influences on adolescents. These studies may be more meaningful if measured within the realm of products that would be purchased by the adolescent purchasing agent as opposed to social products that have a perceived risk.

While Moschis and Churchill (1978) suggested that media exposure predicts the respondent's social motivations for consumption and materialistic attitudes, in the adolescent's role of purchasing agent, social motivations may not exist in the purchase of many household items.
Research is needed to examine the rational implications and influences the mass media may have on adolescent purchasing agents. Further investigation is needed to determine if mass media is considered a viable source of information and if so, what specific information is desired by the adolescent.

The role of adolescents in the family is changing. These changing roles may affect the influence the adolescent has on the family. A majority of the respondents in the current study indicated that they prepare family meals and clean the home. As participants in these household activities, adolescents may begin to influence the purchase of specific products necessary to perform these household tasks. As purchasing agent, they may have more influence and control of the products purchased.

New products may need to be developed to assist in easy preparation of meals. Advertising recognizing the changing roles adolescents play in their families will need to be tested as to persuasiveness and learning of brand information.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine internal and external variables that may influence an adolescent's behavior as a purchasing agent for the family. Demographics, lifestyle, peer group, and marketing
influences were examined to discriminate between those adolescents who are individualistic in their decision making and, who in turn, exhibit product purchase deviation from those of their parents, and those adolescents who purchase brands preferred by the family. While it was not possible to discriminate between the two groups in the current study, the analysis implies that further research is needed to understand the evolving role of adolescents as family purchasing agents. Further research should focus on the price awareness, point-of-purchase influences, mass media influences, and the changing roles of the adolescent within the family structure to better understand the purchase behavior of adolescent purchasing agents.
APPENDIX A

ADOLESCENT QUESTIONNAIRE
ADOLESCENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

The survey is designed to explore your attitudes toward shopping and advertising. The study further explores your household participation and family communication patterns. There are no wrong or right answers. Complete the information requested and answer all questions.

CONSENT FORM

I have read a clear explanation and understand the nature of the research. I understand that my parents will be contacted for further information regarding family brand purchasing and shopping behavior. I may refuse to participate without prejudice or penalty. I agree that information from this survey will be grouped for analysis and can be used for publication or educational purposes.

With my understanding of this, having received written instructions and satisfactory answers to questions I may have, I voluntarily consent to participate in the study.

Date Signature
ADOLESCENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

I. Work Experience
   A. Do you work? Yes ____ No ____
      If yes:
      1. Type of work ____________________________
      2. Hours per week:
         Less than 5 ____ 16 - 20 ____
         5 - 10 ____ 21 - 30 ____
         11 - 15 ____ 31 - 40 ____
      3. Salary per week:
         Less than $25 ____ $51 - $75 ____
         $26 - $50 ____ Over $75 ____

   B. Household Activities
      1. Which of the following activities do you participate in two or more times per month in your home?
         Washing dishes ____ Laundry ____
         Lawn care ____ Cleaning room ____
         Washing car ____ Taking out garbage ____
         Babysitting ____ Preparing meals ____
         Cleaning home ____ Running errands ____
         Other (please specify) ______________________

II. Income
   A. Do you receive a weekly allowance? Yes ____ No ____
      If yes, how much is the allowance? ______________________
   B. How often do your parents pay you for performing household activities?
      Never ____ Occasionally ____ Often ____
      What is the average amount you are normally paid? ____
III. Shopping Experience

Read each sentence and mark the block that is the most accurately describes your feelings.

SA = strongly agree, A = agree, N = no opinion
D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree

1. I shop for clothing without my parents. ______ _____ _____ _____
2. I purchase clothing without my parents seeing the items. ______ _____ _____ _____
3. The money used to buy my clothing is from the family budget. ______ _____ _____ _____
4. I use my own money to purchase clothing. ______ _____ _____ _____
5. My parents allow me to make decisions in purchasing my clothing. ______ _____ _____ _____

How often do you go to the grocery store for your parents during the school year (September - May)?

Once a week ______ Once a month ______
Twice a month ____________________________ Never ______
Other (please specify) __________________________

How often do you go to the grocery store for your parents during the summer months (June - August)?

Once a week ______ Once a month ______
Twice a month ____________________________ Never ______
Other (please specify) __________________________

IV. Media Exposure

1. How many hours per week do you watch TV during the school year?

Less than 5 ______ 11 - 15 _____
5 - 10 ______ 16 - 20 _____
Other (please specify) __________________________
2. How many hours per week do you watch TV during the summer months?

Less than 5  11 - 15
5 - 10  16 - 20
Other (please specify) __________

3. How many hours per week do you listen to the radio during the school year?

Less than 5  11 - 15
5 - 10  16 - 20
Other (please specify) __________

4. How many hours per week do you listen to the radio during the summer months?

Less than 5  11 - 15
5 - 10  16 - 20
Other (please specify) __________

Read the following statements and mark the block that most accurately describes your feelings.

SA = strongly agree, A = agree, N = no opinion
D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree

1. Advertisements make people buy things they don't really need.

SA    A    N    D    SD

2. Advertised brands are better than those not advertised.

SA    A    N    D    SD

3. Most television commercials are fun to watch.

SA    A    N    D    SD

4. Advertisements help people buy the things that are best for them.

SA    A    N    D    SD
SA = strongly agree, A = agree, N = no opinion
D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree

5. Most radio commercials are annoying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. I think there should be less advertising than there is now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Most advertisements tell the truth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. I don't pay much attention to advertising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Read the following list of statements and check whether your parents say or do it very often, often, sometimes, rarely, or never.

Your parents . . .

1. Tell you what things you should or shouldn’t buy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very often</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Say you should decide yourself how to spend your money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very often</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Want to know what you do with your money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very often</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Say that buying things you like is important even if others do not like them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very often</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5. Complain when they don't like something you bought for yourself.
   very often  often  sometimes  rarely  never

6. Say you should decide what things you should or shouldn't buy.
   very often  often  sometimes  rarely  never

7. Say that you shouldn't ask questions about things that teenagers like you don't normally buy.
   very often  often  sometimes  rarely  never

8. Ask you for advice about buying things.
   very often  often  sometimes  rarely  never

9. Say you may not buy certain things.
   very often  often  sometimes  rarely  never

10. Ask you what you think about things they buy for themselves.
    very often  often  sometimes  rarely  never

11. Ask you to help them buy things for the family.
    very often  often  sometimes  rarely  never

12. Say that they know what is best for you and you shouldn't question them.
    very often  often  sometimes  rarely  never
VI. Read the following statements and mark the product that applies to the statement. You may mark any or all of the products. If the statements do not apply to the products, leave the space blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before buying:</th>
<th>Snacks</th>
<th>Laundry</th>
<th>Detergent</th>
<th>Sandwich</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Towels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If it is important to know:

What friends think of different brands of products. 

Guarantees on different brands.

What kinds of people buy certain brands or products.

The name of the company that makes the product.

Whether any brands are on sale.

What others think of people who use certain brands or products.

What brands or products make good impressions on others.

VII. Demographic Information

What is your name? ___________________________ Sex? M ____ F ___

What grade are you in? ___________ Age? ______ Race? ______

What does your father do for a living? ______________________________________

What does your mother do for a living? ______________________________________

What is the name and address of your parents or guardians?

Name ___________________________ Phone Num. ___________________________

Street ________________________ City ____________ Zip _______
APPENDIX B

PARENT PRE-STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
ADOLESCENT DECISION MAKING IN THE HOME

INSTRUCTION SHEET

The study is designed to explore the behavior of adolescents when they purchase grocery items for the family. You will send your teenager to the grocery store on two separate occasions to buy four items (paper towels, snacks, sandwich bread, and laundry detergent). You will record the brand names purchased on a questionnaire to be provided. The information will be returned in envelopes provided by the researcher.

All information is confidential and will be grouped for analysis. Completion of all steps of the study is important. Thank you for agreeing to participate.

CONSENT FORM

I have read a clear explanation and understand the nature of the research. I further understand that I may withdraw at any time. I will fund the shopping trips and will therefore have full use of the products purchased. My adolescent has my permission to go to the grocery store for the purposes of the study. The information is confidential but may be grouped and used for publication or educational purposes.

With my understanding of this, having received written instructions and satisfactory answers to my questions that I may have, I voluntarily consent to participate in the study and give permission for my adolescent _________ to participate.

Date __________________ Signature __________________

103
Family ________________________________

I. Biographical Information: Father
   A. Occupation ___________________________________________
      If retired, please give occupation before retirement.
      Full Time ____  Part Time ____  Not Employed ____
   B. Education
      Attended High School ____  Post Graduate Work ____
      High School Graduate ____  Master's Degree ____
      Some College ____  Doctorate Work ____
      College Graduate ____  Doctorate Degree ____

II. Biographical Information: Mother
    A. Employed outside the home: Yes ____  No ____
    B. Occupation _________________________________________
       If retired, please give occupation before retirement.
       Full Time ____  Part Time ____  Not Employed ____
    B. Education
       Attended High School ____  Post Graduate Work ____
       High School Graduate ____  Master's Degree ____
       Some College ____  Doctorate Work ____
       College Graduate ____  Doctorate Degree ____

III. Please list the ages of your children presently living at home.

_________________________________________________________________

IV. What is the average number of times do you or someone in your family go to the grocery store during the month? ________
V. Family Grocery Information

A. What store will your teen be shopping during the study?

Name

Street Location

City

B. The following items are household products typically purchased for the family. Please indicate the brand name of each of the following items you usually purchase when shopping at the above store.

Paper towels

Laundry Detergent

Sandwich Bread

Snacks (Identify the type of snacks you purchase for your family and the brand name for that snack.) Please do not use fresh fruit.


Would you like a copy of the results of the study?

Yes ____  No ____

Thank you for participating!!!
APPENDIX C

DATA COLLECTION FORM I
FAMILY

WEEK ONE

INSTRUCTIONS: Send your teenager to the grocery store to purchase the following items. Do not give the brand names of the items. If more items are to be purchased simply blend in the study items with your normal grocery list.

Fill out the following information after the shopping trip:

1. Did your teenager buy the following items:
   a. ______ paper towels  Yes ___ No ___
      If no, what did they buy? ______________________
   b. ______ laundry detergent  Yes ___ No ___
      If no, what did they buy? ______________________
   c. ______ bread  Yes ___ No ___
      If no, what did they buy? ______________________
   d. ______ snacks  Yes ___ No ___
      If no, what did they buy? ______________________

Date of shopping trip ______________________

Please use the attached envelope and mail within 24 hours of the shopping trip.
APPENDIX D

DATA COLLECTION FORM II
FAMILY

WEEK TWO

INSTRUCTIONS: Send your teenager to the grocery store to purchase the following items. Do not give the brand names of the items. If more items are to be purchased simply blend the study items with your normal grocery list.

Fill out the following information after the shopping trip:

Did your teenager buy the following items:

1. ______ paper towels  Yes __ No ___
   If no, what did they buy? __________________________
   If no, what was the reason given for the different purchase?

   Please check one.
   Out of stock on item requested _____
   Found cheaper product _____
   A friend uses this product _____
   Saw an ad on TV _____
   Other (be specific) _____

2. ______ laundry detergent  Yes __ No ___
   If no, what did they buy? __________________________
   If no, what was the reason given for the different purchase?

   Please check one.
   Out of stock on item requested _____
   Found cheaper product _____
   A friend uses this product _____
   Saw an ad on TV _____
   Other (be specific) _____
3. ______ bread Yes No

If no, what did they buy? __________________________

If no, what was the reason given for the different purchase? Please check one.

Out of stock on item requested ______
Found cheaper product ______
A friend uses this product ______
Saw an ad on TV ______
Other (be specific) ______

________________________________________

4. ______ snacks Yes No

If no, what did they buy? __________________________

If no, what was the reason given for the different purchase? Please check one.

Out of stock on item requested ______
Found cheaper product ______
A friend uses this product ______
Saw an ad on TV ______
Other (be specific) ______

________________________________________

Date of shopping trip __________________________

During the first shopping trip your teenager purchased the following items. Please ask if they remember the reasons why they purchased the items.

1. __________________________

Please check one.

Out of stock on item requested ______
Found cheaper product ______
A friend uses this product ______
Saw an ad on TV ______
Other (be specific) ______

________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________

Please check one.

Out of stock on item requested
Found cheaper product
A friend uses this product
Saw an ad on TV
Other (be specific)

3. ____________________________________________

Please check one.

Out of stock on item requested
Found cheaper product
A friend uses this product
Saw an ad on TV
Other (be specific)

4. ____________________________________________

Please check one.

Out of stock on item requested
Found cheaper product
A friend uses this product
Saw an ad on TV
Other (be specific)

Please use the attached envelope and mail this form along with the sales receipt within 24 hours of the shopping trip.
APPENDIX E

HOUSEHOLD COMMUNICATION MEASURES
APPENDIX E

Household Communication Measures

Items used to measure socio-orientation are:

Your Parents . . .
Tell you what things you should or shouldn't buy.
Want to know what you do with your money.
Complain when they don't like something you bought for yourself.
Say that they know what is best for you and you shouldn't question them.
Say you shouldn't ask questions about things that teenagers like you don't normally buy.
Say you may not buy certain things.

Items used to measure concept-orientation are:

Your Parents . . .
Ask you to help buy things for the household.
Ask you what you think about things they buy for themselves.
Ask you for advice about buying things.
Say you should decide what things you should or shouldn't buy.
Say that buying things you like is important even others do not like them.
Say you should decide yourself how to spend your money.

APPENDIX F

Attitude Toward Radio and Television Advertising

strongly agree, somewhat agree, don't know
somewhat disagree, strongly disagree

1. Advertisements make people buy things they don't really need.
2. Advertised brands are better than those not advertised.
3. Most television commercials are fun to watch.
4. Advertisements help people buy things that are best for them.
5. Most radio commercials are annoying.
6. I think there should be less advertising than there is now.
7. Most advertisements tell the truth.
8. I don't pay much attention to advertising.
APPENDIX G

PEER INFLUENCE SCALE
APPENDIX G

Peer Influence on Grocery Packaged Goods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before buying:</th>
<th>Snacks</th>
<th>Laundry Detergent</th>
<th>Sandwich Bread</th>
<th>Paper Towels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is important to know:

What friends think of different brands or products.

What kinds of people buy certain brands or products.

What others think of people who use certain brands or products.

What brands or products to buy make good impressions on others.
APPENDIX H

SHOPPING INDEPENDENCE SCALE
APPENDIX H

Shopping Independence Scale

(strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree)

1. I shop for clothing without my parents.

2. I purchase clothing without my parents seeing the items.

3. The money used to buy my clothing is usually from the family budget.

4. The money used to purchase my clothing is from my allowance.

5. The money used to purchase my clothing is from my job and/or earnings from chores at home.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V89</th>
<th>V201</th>
<th>V202</th>
<th>V203</th>
<th>V204</th>
<th>V205</th>
<th>V31</th>
<th>V33</th>
<th>V91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V201</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V202</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V203</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V204</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V205</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V31</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V33</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.249</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V91</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V89 = socioeconomic status  
V91 = parental education level  
V201 = socio-oriented family communication  
V202 = concept-oriented family communication  
V203 = attitude toward advertising  
V204 = purchasing independence  
V205 = financial purchasing independence  
V31 = number of television viewing hours/week  
V33 = number of radio listening hours per week
APPENDIX J

VARIABLE SCALE VALUES AND INTERPRETATIONS
### APPENDIX J

**Variable Scale Values and Interpretations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>1 - 99</td>
<td>1 = low status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99 = high status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Education</td>
<td>0 - 9</td>
<td>0 = low education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 = high education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-oriented Family Communication</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1 = low socio-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = high socio-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept-oriented Family Communication</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1 = low socio-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = high socio-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising attitude</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1 = positive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = negative attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing/financial Independence</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1 = high independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = low independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television/radio exposure</td>
<td>1 - 20</td>
<td>1 = low exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 = high exposure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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