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Abstract

The current study has been undertaken to investigate the effect of parents’ behavioral styles on the influence of teenagers in family consumption decisions. Parents’ behavioral styles include two dimensions of demand and response, as the extent of demand and response from parents towards children forms different styles of parenting; in this study, the relation between these two dimensions and the level of perceived power of parents by children is put under examination. Hence, children influence the household decisions based on the power they attribute to their parents. For this purpose, 382 students aging 11-16 from Uremia were selected using Stratified random sampling method, and the data were collected using questionnaires such as Sharon Paulson (1994) and Thomas Evins Smith (1970) survey data is collected. For reliability assessment, Cronbach’s alpha and test-retest of Al-F test was used, the results of which indicate used questionnaires results were reliable and acceptable. Data obtained were investigated using SPSS software and analyzing regression equations and confirmatory factor analysis was.
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Introduction

In their daily life, humans may confront numerous decisions that are directed towards actuating a goal or fulfilling a need. Excluding age, orientations, educations and ..., a common point between all people is that most of their decisions are influenced by their family, either directly or indirectly. Since the family is main center of purchasing and consuming goods, hence the vast majority of goods and services are usually purchased and used by the household. On the other hand, children can clearly manipulate household decisions. Even when they are not directly driving the process of deciding, they have the potential to ally with either of parents to create a majority of decisions (seyed Javadin, 1389, 258).

All the while, parental styles and also the perceived power of parents by children has a major effect on their upbringing and their influence on household decisions. For instance, a child with permissive parents has less perceived power and more freedom of action and a subsequent influence on decisions compared to a child with more dominating parents. The increased influence of children in decisions may lead to increased satisfaction from decisions by children. The current study intends to explore the role and extent of family members in household decisions.

The Literature

Parental styles

Parental style is a combination of parental behavior that is occurred in various situations and creates proven method of upbringing of the child. In other words, Parental style reflects the family’s social context in which the parents direct the manner of upbringing in a way that they will eventually be able to achieve the desired goals (Darling and Steinberg, 1993, 488).

Although the previous studies have attempted to define parental styles in various ways, experts in the field family sociology and nurturing psychology have defined parental styles as function with two dimensions of demandingness and responsiveness. Demandingness indicates a scale that parents can guide their children upbringing using close monitoring, puberty expectation, and if necessary, confrontations, responsiveness is an indicator that parents encourage their children individualization and dependence by knowing and providing their needs. (Bao et al., 2007, 674). Based on previous studies of parental behaviors, Becker introduced a 3D model in 1964. He stated that parents’ behavior can be reflected with three common dimensions: intimacy against hostility, strictness against leniency, and peacefulness towards aggression. The dimensions of intimacy against hostility reflects the acceptability by parents, compassionateness, and focus on children, responding, praising and scolding in children’s discipline. The dimension of leniency against strictness determines use of parents from limitations, and strictness towards children’s desire, protecting family members, obedience, and view towards piers, siblings and parents. The dimension of peacefulness against aggression is associated with contact with children, nurturing and care for children’s welfare.

Children influence

Two theoretical approaches have prominent role in studying the influence of children in household decisions:

1. Customer Socialization theory
2. Power relation theory

According to Peterson and Rollin (1987), in the theory of consumer socialization, children are considered as sociable beings and parents are the socializing agent (among other factors such as schools, piers, and transportations). Relative influence of children is the consequent of consumer socialization that occurs in social environments. According to this hypothesis, children are necessarily passive learners, and socialization is done is done by parents towards children unilaterally. Ward defines the socialization of consumer as follows: a process within which teenagers attempt to purchase based on their knowledge, skills and perspective (Ward, 1974).
Meanwhile, according to Peterson, the power relational theory considers the parents and children as independent partners. This theory associated children with significant power towards their parents and states that children utilize various techniques to influence their parents and their decisions. According to this theory, children are active participants in household consumption decisions and influence between parents and children are mutual (Bao, 2001, 2).

In the power relational theory, the perceived power of parents reflects the understand father/mother’s ability to influence the children in doing tasks that they won’t do them automatically. According to this theory, the perceived power of relative is consisted of four dimensions: outcome control, reference, legitimacy and power of expertise.

- The power of outcome control relates to the ability of parents in influencing or controlling their children using positive and negative practices such as praising and punishing.
- The referent power indicates the ability of parents to represent a solid and formidable role model for the guidance of children.
- The legitimacy power points to the perception of children about their parents having the right to control their beliefs.
- The power of expertise reflects the ability of parents to provide superior knowledge and skills for their children (Bao et al., 2007, 674).

By the same token, Smith (1970) studied the influence of adolescents, perception of the influence of parents to influence parents in school life and relationship with the opposite. He found out that each of four dimensions of parents’ power have positive independent co-dependence with each other and parents’ influence. Moreover, the findings suggest that the relative influence of children is changed depending on the type of product, the decision, age and sex of the child. Also, children are more influential in the initial phases of deciding (during gathering data). Also, elder children have more skills and experience than younger children and hence are more influential in decision makings (Bao et al., 2007, 623).

Children satisfaction

According to the Expectation theory (Anderson, 1973) consumer satisfaction from a product is the result of comparing expected performance and real performance. On the other children may be satisfied or unsatisfied in household decisions. But it is worth noting that their satisfaction not only refers to the satisfaction of the product, but more often it is focused on the process of making decisions. When children are involved in household decisions, they believe that parents may accept their request or offer (like going to a fast food restaurant; either fully or partially). As parents take their children’s recommendations more often, the distance between their expectation and reality and thus they will be more content (Bao et al., 2007, 675).

Hypotheses and theories that are targeted by the researcher in this study is shown in the conceptual mode of the research in fig.1.

According to the literature on the subject of this study is to examine the following hypotheses.

**The first hypothesis** - higher demandingness in parental style leads to more perceived power of parents in children

**The second hypothesis** - higher responsiveness in parental style leads to more perceived power of parents in children

**The third hypothesis** - children that have a greater understanding parents’ the power have less influence in decisions taken by the family

**The fourth hypothesis** - the more the influence of children in the decisions taken by their families the more they are content with the decisions.

**Methods**

This research is part of the field research that utilizes data from the questionnaires collected from the target population. On the other hand, this study is a Descriptive survey and due to the use of regression for testing the hypothesis that the effect of each variable, it can be considered causal. Although the purpose of this research is practical.

This standard questionnaire was used to measure the variables to such extent that each of structures had separate question designed and delivered by experts. In order to localize measures, initially each of them directly translated and after checking the validity and reliability, they were used to measure the structures of the model. Survey Questionnaire measures 5 indexes of
parental demandingness parental responsiveness, parents’ perceived power, children' influence, and satisfaction. The weight of each item is consisted of 1. Strongly disagree, 2. Disagree, 3. Somewhat Agree, 4. Agree, 5. Strongly agree (in accordance with the Likert 5 degrees)

Table 1: Indicators of the questionnaire and questions about each of them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents demandingness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sharon Paulson (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents responsiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children influence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yeking Bao (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children contention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluating reliability and validity

- Content validity

Since the tools used in this study are standard questionnaires that are frequently used by societies, reliability was only tested as a precaution. Hence, various Persian and English literature M.As were asked to study the questionnaire and confine its editorial or translation errors. After confirming the properness of items for measuring targeted indexes, it was exposed to various experts from the field of sociology to have it validity confirmed.

- Internal consistency reliability

Cronbach’s alpha was used to assess the reliability of questionnaires. For this purpose, the questionnaire was initially used on a group of 34 people as pretest. Results showed that the proposed tools had acceptable levels of reliability, and Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to be 0.71 using SPSS 20.

Test re-test

In this research we use test retest beside methods mentioned above for ultimate evaluation of questionnaire. To do this, questionnaire were done 2 times in a same condition which 10 days were between them and 34 persons were involved and then the codependency of result were assessed. The results from test retests showed that there is high codependency between answers of students and thus the questionnaire is satisfactory and time will not interrupt the results.

Table 2: results from validity assessment and tool constant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exam Name</th>
<th>Step test</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>The number of subjects</th>
<th>The value obtained</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal consistency reliability</td>
<td>Cronbach</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71/0 Good reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The final test</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>74/0 Good reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test-retest reliability</td>
<td>Test-re-Test</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>93/0 Good reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content validity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Appropriate credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population and sample

The statistical population of this research is teenagers among 11 to 16 in city of Uremia which according to census Statistical Center of Iran (1390), 61 203 people have been announced. To select samples stratified random sampling method was used. For this purpose, from the institutions in the city, 5 Institute of randomly selected (SID language institute, Kanoon, AVatak, Iran Adib language institute) and 382 students were selected randomly from them, and finally in July of 1393 questionnaires were distributed among this people.

- Analysis of the data

In the present study to analyze the information obtained, descriptive statistics and inferential methods were used and in the descriptive analysis frequency distribution table, index, dispersion were used, while in inferential analysis confirmatory factor analysis and analysis of the regression equations.

Descriptive analysis of data

The results showed that the mean values of all the items Is larger mean value of 3, this means that most respondents have chosen agree or strongly agree option. About The middle column it can be said that mean of 2 items less than 3 items and for 3 items are more than 4. In Respect of the mode index it can be said that the greatest mode is influence on children.
item and its value is equal to 4.60. The highest standard deviation and variance belongs the item parents demands and the lowest standard deviation and variance belongs to parents’ perception. The analysis of analytical data

- **Confirmatory factor analysis**

The purpose of this study was to examine the appropriateness of the factor structure, which was done by the help of Amos software. Results of the Confirmatory factor analysis is given below. As reported in Table base \( t \) for questions 5 and 9 is smaller than 1.96. In other words, the statistics \( t \) with a confidence level of 99% is not valid for this question. On the other hand, the highest loadings to Question 1 and the lowest load factor is for question 5. In fact, it can be concluded that the greatest role in explaining the variable is Question 1 while Question 5 has the lowest influence on the variable.

### Table 3 - Results of confirmatory factor analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Statistics ( t )</th>
<th>Level of confidence</th>
<th>Load factor</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Statistics ( t )</th>
<th>Level of confidence</th>
<th>Load factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents demand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.798</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td>Children penetration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.481</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.947</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.847</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.387</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.972</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.858</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.958</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0174</td>
<td>0.0862</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.775</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet the parents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.421</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>Understanding the Power of Parents</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.398</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.610</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.367</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.598</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.560</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.445</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>-0.392</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.724</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.802</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.415</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.798</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.798</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.770</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.770</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.795</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.795</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.744</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.744</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.329</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.329</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.279</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.279</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.536</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.536</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.360</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.683</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.360</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>-11.567</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>-11.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.806</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.806</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.729</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.729</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results of statistic, values \( t \) Calculated for all questions except for question 29 are larger than 1.96. Thus, one can say with 99% confidence that the results are valid. Moreover, the values for loading factor column can show the impact of the question. E.g. in children satisfaction factor Question 29 has the highest influence and in children penetration, Question 14 has the least.

- **Testing hypotheses**

In this section hypothesis are tested and evaluated by regression equations. Also In order to evaluate the impact of variables on other variables in the regression model, the fit is analyzed measures were calculated for each hypothesis and are reported in Table 4.
Table 4: The results of hypothesis tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test result</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Statistics t</th>
<th>Load factor (B)</th>
<th>Coefficient of determination (R)</th>
<th>Adjusted coefficient determination (R &amp; Adj)</th>
<th>Multiple correlation coefficient (R)</th>
<th>As hypothesized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first hypothesis is confirmed</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>Higher demands on the perceived impact of parental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second hypothesis is confirmed</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>Parental influence on the perceived parental responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third hypothesis is confirmed</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>The impact of perceived parental influence on children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fourth hypothesis</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>Children's influence on children's consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that the first hypothesis, the standard rate B is equal to 0.47, which indicates, with change (increase) by single unit in parents demand a change of 0.47 units of perceived parental variables (increase) is observed. On the other hand, the multiple correlation coefficient of 0.477 indicates a relatively strong relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable demand parental understanding of parenting. On the other Hand we can say that 22 percent of parent’s perception power is dependent on parents demand variable.

On the other hand, in the second hypothesis, coefficients in the standard B are equal to 0.32 times the amount per unit change in the variable response of parents, 32% of change in variable of parents’ perception is made. The adjusted coefficient of determination listed in Table 4 is 0.1 which shows that 10 percent of parents know about parental response variable.

According to results listed in Table 4, the standard rate B for third hypothesis is equal to 0.26, which indicates that the perceived power to change a single parent 0.26 unit change in the variable's influence can be seen in children. The value of the coefficient of determination is 0.07, which indicates that 7% of the variable influence of children's perceived parents. As the amount of Statistics t in this hypothesis is Greater than 1.96 and it is a negative one, one can say that children have a greater understanding of the parents will have little influence on household decisions.

The fourth hypothesis test results show that the standard rate B is Equal to 0.42, which indicates that a change in the influence of child, a child's consent unit change of 0.42 in the variable can be seen. The amount for coefficients of determination is 0.17 indicating that 17 percent of consent depends on children influence.

Conclusion

Statistical analysis shows with 99% guarantee that parents’ demands have an impact on their perception power. In other words it can be said that higher demands leads to higher perception. These findings are compatible with Mccoby and Martin (1983) approach to study parents’ behavior on a request-response 2-d basis. More demanding parents impose more behavior rules on their children and punish them. However, kids can feel this behavior border through family-society processes and associate control power with imposer (e.g. parents). Thus they feel that parents have more power. The opposite site is when parents are less demanding. They feel less pressure in regard to their behavior and don’t consider their parents as the main imposing capacity. Thus it is recommended that parents moderate their demands and create a bilateral interaction among between themselves and their children and take better decisions for their family. Also by learning different methods of appropriate behavior, they can have a constructive role growth of their children.

Statistical analysis shows with 99% guarantee that parents’ responsiveness has an impact on their perception power. It can be said that results from former researches are compatible with findings of Carlson and Grossbart (1988) and parents’ being lenient in a purchase will lead to stronger interaction and ultimately children independency and increases the parents responsiveness in a positive manner. Like the 1st hypothesis, these findings are also compatible with Mccoby and Martin (1983) approach. For parents who are more responsive to supporting their growth of child's, value individuality and independence more. The parents who score are low, there is a distance between themselves and their children and do not deal with importance of the views of the child and rarely pay attention to the activities of their children. Therefore, the interaction between responsive parent and child is more than...
interaction between less responsive parent and child. This despite the fact that children with responsive parents may have a greater tendency to speak, the compare themselves with their parents and learn from them. As a result it would appear that parents have the responsibility of a higher authority. In addition, because responsive children have more interactions, these knowledge and skills are taught easier for parents of children to less responsive parents. The more interaction should lead to a greater understanding of the expertise of parent’s responsiveness Thus it is recommended that parents moderate their demands and create a bilateral interaction among between themselves and their children and take better buying decisions for their family. Also by learning different methods of appropriate behavior, they can have a constructive role growth of their children.

Statistical analysis shows with 99% guarantee that parents’ perception power has an impact on their children influence. It can be said that children whom have higher perception of parent’s power have less influence on family’s decision making. These findings are also compatible with Smith (1970) which studied the influence of parents in educational fields by opposite sex and showed that all four dimensions parents power are codependent with parents’ influence. Although his focus was not on family’s decision making, but results increases the probability of influence of perceived power on children impact. Thus it is recommended that parents teach and increase the knowledge of the children and balance the influence of themselves and their parent on decisions.

At last, Statistical analysis shows with 99% guarantee that children influence has an impact on their satisfaction. It can be said that children whom have higher influence on decision making are more satisfied. These findings are also consistent with Anderson (1973) which showed that satisfaction from product is resulted from expectancy and performance of that product. His study showed that satisfaction is not only derived by the product but also the very nature of making decision itself. Thus it is recommended that parents teach and increase the knowledge of the children and balance the influence of themselves and their parent on decisions. Thus it is recommended that parents moderate their demands and create a bilateral interaction among between themselves and their children and take better buying decisions for their family and make children more satisfied.
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