

Relationship between Legitimate and Expert Social Power Types of Preadolescent Children on the Influence Perception in their Mothers' Purchasing Behavior in Peruvian Toy Stores

ABSTRACT

This paper looks at the relationship between legitimate and expert social power types of preadolescent children over their perception of influence on their mothers' purchasing behavior in Peruvian toy stores. The literature review takes into consideration the concepts of Social Power and the Influence in Family Behavior to then focus on Social Power within Family Behavior with the purpose of mainly developing four hypotheses regarding purchasing behavior. The methodology followed a non-experimental transversal correlational design. A pilot sample size of 50 cases was used. The sample was based on an objective population of Peruvian mothers of families that live in northern Lima and that go to purchase toys with their children to major shopping centers. The results show that the expert social power as well as the legitimate social power has a strong relationship. In addition, both social have an impact on the perception of influence child-mother, but not on the perception of influence mother-child. However, the test of moderation of the expenditure level on toy purchases did not have an effect on the context that was studied. The contribution shows that important changes are happening on the consumption behavior on the aspect of children influencing mothers and that for Latin American contexts, the level of expenditure still does not crucially affect the causality demonstrated.

Keywords: Passive Social Power, Legitimate Social Power, Expert Social Power, Influence Perception

INTRODUCTION

Children should be seen as three markets in one (McNeal, 1999); the actual market that spends money on their desires, the potential market for the majority of goods and services, and an influence market that cause consumption in their parents. Children not only learn by copying their parents' consumption behavior (Turner et al, 2006), but they also apply pressure in the opposite direction; they influence their parents' final purchasing decision behavior in three basic categories: toys, cloths, and food (Nicholls & Cullen, 2004). Specifically, mothers are more likely to impulsively buy toys, clothing, and sweets for children (Turčínková et al, 2012).

Likewise, the socialization of the consumer as “processes through which young people acquire abilities, knowledge, and relevant attitudes for their functioning as consumers in the marketplace” (Ward, 1972) leads to that many children develop their own opinion and likes over the products that they want to buy (Turner et al, 2006).

Alonso and Grande (2013) argue that children influence purchasing in two manners. They induce the consumption of goods specific for them. In addition, we condition the purchases of goods in which children participate as consumers together with adults. They are able to influence in the purchases because they remember the existence of the products and act as prescribers. Furthermore, it is said that children influence in the purchase because in addition to remembering the existence of products they better retain the advertising messages. “It has been confirmed that the qualitative composition of the basket of goods is different when it is done in the presence of children at the point of sales” (Alonso & Grande, 2013).

Research has found that children have power over their parents in family consumption decisions. McNeal (1999) estimates that children between the ages of 4 and 12 influence on approximately 188 thousand millions US dollars annually on purchases related to the family in the United States of America. While in Peru, as per a study undertaken by the consulting company CCR for El Comercio (2014), children influence on the purchase of 62% of Lima households. The toy market moves approximately between 75 and 80 million US dollars (Andina, 2010). Consequently, the influence of children on the family consumption decisions is a topic that merits attention.

Being so, what is the relationship between the legitimate and expert social power types of the children on the influence perception of their mothers in Peruvian toy stores? This paper concentrates on Peruvian mothers living in the city of Lima, that have and live with their children who are in the preadolescent stage of development; meaning, between 8 and 11 years of age. Mothers were selected for this research for two main reasons. First, mothers are more often the receptors of influence attempts than fathers (Cowan & Avants, 1988; Cowan et al, 1984). And secondly, mothers are usually the agents for family purchases and are considered to be better familiarized with the purchase influence attempt of their children.

For methodological purposes, the last studied relationship regarding passive social power of children over the perception of influence from the mothers’ perspective (Flurry & Burns, 2005)

was used. Applying for the evaluation of these variables instruments already validated by their authors and which have been used in other researches.

SOCIAL POWER

Weber (1962) defines social power as “the probability that an actor within a social relationship is in the position of doing as he wills notwithstanding resistance, independently over the basis on which this probability stands.” Likewise, Cartwright (1959), after taking Lewinian’s theory (Lewin, 1951), established the definition of power as “the induction of forces by entity B over A and another to the resistance of this induction created by A.” Therefore, in accordance with this conceptualization, it is the degree to which agent B has control over A’s behavior depending on the magnitude of force that B can exert over A and over A’s resistance.

The theorists of social power of the 50’s and 60’s have differed over the diverse aspects of the conceptualization of social power. However, Smith (1970) says that these theorists agree in two basic concepts of the definition. One, social power is the potential of one person to exert a force towards change in another person. And two, social power is not simply based on one quality or qualities that the powerful person possesses rather by complex conditions that rule the interdependence of the persons in a social relationship. Additionally, Elias (2008) mentions that since French and Raven (1959), power is quantified in the capacity of a power possessor to persuade an identified objective, being the maximum influence possible that he or she can exert, even though he or she cannot utilize all of his or her power in a given situation.

French’s taxonomy (1956) is composed of five types of power: reward, coercive, legitimate, expert, and referent. The first one, reward, is “based on the perception of A, where B has the ability to mediate rewards for A”. The coercive power, is “based on the perception of A, where B has the ability to mediate punishments for A”. The legitimate power is “based on A’s perception where B has a legitimate right of prescribing the behavior for A”. The expert power is “based on A’s perception, where B has a special knowledge or expertise”. And finally, the referent power is “based on the identification of A with B”.

Social Power in Family Behavior

The previously explained theory also considers the fathers and the children in a relationship of interdependence with a different level of power. When there is a conflict between the children and the parents’ perspective with respect to a consumption decision as, for example, the possibility of

purchasing a product, what brand to buy, how much to buy, among others; the children could strategically use their power to persuade the parents, so gaining influence in the decision making process. (Cowan & Avants 1988; Cowan et al, 1984; Kim et al, 1991).

As per Flurry and Burns (2005), the theory of social power suggests that the five bases can be used in family behavior in two ways: active and passive. Using power to influence is commonly considered active, although sometimes it can be passive, like when the mere presence of the power is influential (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985; French & Raven, 1959). Both forms of power, active and passive, contribute to the potential of a person to achieve a result in accordance to his or hers own reference. Hence, Flurry and Burns (2005) and Williams and Burns (2000) argue that children exercise influence through active social power and/or passive social power.

When there is no evidence of spoken words or manifested actions by the child, it is said that the exerted influence by him or her can also be passive. Consequently, the passive sources of power only need to be possessed in order to have an effect (Corfman & Lehman, 1987). Then, for a child, a source of power is passive if his or her parent infers its presence and acts upon it instead of upon any action by the child. This is known as child's influence on the parents or the parent perceptions of the child's undeclared preferences (Wells, 1965). As these children grow, they influence family purchasing decisions in a more passive manner, since the parents learn the likes and dislikes of their children and make buying decisions based on that (Roedder, 1999).

Being so, when talking about expert power, this means providing knowledge and superior ability to the influenced person; for which the child can possess more knowledge in determined categories of products such as clothing and toys, among others (Flurry & Burns, 2005). On the other hand, when talking about legitimate power, one perceives the right to control the opinion or behavior of the other person (Flurry & Burns, 2005). This power is derived from a justifiable right (Elias, 2008). A child has legitimate power when he perceives that he has the right to make a decision based on his or her interests. Being so, the following hypothesis arises:

H1: There exists a direct relationship between passive expert social power and passive legitimate social power of preadolescent children as mother's perception in the toy stores context.

INFLUENCE PERCEPTION IN FAMILY PURCHASING BEHAVIOR

While social power is “the potential influence of one person over another one” (Cartwright & Zander, 1968; Cartwright, 1965), Swasy (1979) defines the influence perception as a change in cognition, attitude, behavior, or the emotion of a person that can be attributed to another agent.

Influence is defined as the use of power to achieve a result (Coleman, 1973). At the same time, influence could only be attained as a result of a reciprocal exchange process between two or more parties (Sprey, 1975). Olsen et al (1975) claim that the use of power exerts an influence known as “circular causal process,” for which the resulted attributed power to any of the parts is a fusion the perspectives of all of the parts involved in the decision making process.

Flurry and Burns (2005), quoting Olson et al (1975), say that given the reciprocal nature of the influence, if measuring the influence is wanted, it is necessary to measure the perspectives of all the significant members of the decision making process. Also, French and Raven (1959) say that it is to be expected that the perceptions of the parts will be similar but not identical. That is why it is important to consider that in the families that face a social power that could be exerted by a child, the mother could very well influence on its decision. For this reason, the following is considered as the second hypothesis:

H2: The passive social power, expert and legitimate, of preadolescent children have a direct effect on mother's perception of the child's influence (from mother to child) in a toy purchase.

However, demographical and structural changes in the households have changed children's roles in families' buying activities, increasing both their participation in family decision making processes as well as their purchasing power (Flurry & Burns, 2005; Williams & Burns, 2000). At the present time, in many societies, both parents work. Therefore, Sellers (1989) states that the parents, with time limitations to go shopping, permit or even encourage their children to participate in the process of making decisions.

Wimalasiri (2000) says that influence is a term used to describe the interaction between the parents and their children. But at the same time, influence happens when the child tries to change the thoughts, feelings, or behaviors of the parent. Children constitute a large secondary market that influences the family purchase (McNeal, 1988). Research has concluded that children tend to influence more on the purchasing decisions of products that directly relate to them, or that even

affect them (Arzu, 2011; Sener, 2011; Foxman et al, 1989b; Atkin, 1978). Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3: The passive social power, expert and legitimate, of preadolescent children have a direct positive effect on mother's perception of the child's influence (from child to mother) in toy stores.

On the other hand, it has been found that children have a lesser degree of influence in the decisions regarding products that have high costs and that are used by all the family (Foxman et al, 1989a). At the age of eight, most children become socialized consumers and enjoy having discretion to spend their own money (McNeal, 1992a; 1992b; Isler et al, 1987). Based on this, the fourth hypothesis arises:

H4: The direct positive effect of the passive social power, expert and legitimate, of preadolescent children on mother's perception of the child's influence (from child to mother) are moderate negatively for the purchase amount in the toy stores.

METHODOLOGY

The research undertaken has a non-experimental transversal correlational design. It is non-experimental given the fact that the unit is observed in its reality. Meaning that the behaviors of the independent variables studied have already occurred, reason for which they have not been nor could have been manipulated. In addition, it is a transversal study because the data collection was done at a determined moment in time. Finally, it is correlational because it describes the relationship that exists between Legitimate and Expert Social Power Types and the Perception of Influence in the mothers' purchasing behavior.

Sample

The target population for this study was mothers of Peruvian families that reside in Lima and go to purchase toys with their preadolescent children to the major shopping centers.

The sampling method is probabilistic by clusters, where the units of analysis are encapsulated in various physical locations. Among all the possible clusters, toy stores of Northern Lima shopping centers were chosen where the units of analysis were found; the mothers with kids between the ages of 8 and 11 years old.

The National Institute for Statistics and information, "Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática", (INEI, 2015b) indicates that the Peruvian population reached 31,151,643 inhabitants;

considering that, on average, there are 4 members per household (Ipsos Peru, 2015), where Peruvian women have an average of 2.6 children (Andina, 2013; INEI, 2015a), and the population of preadolescent children between 6 and 11 years of age is of 942,000 (INEI, 2015c).

Moreover, it was evidenced that the population of Metropolitan Lima is of 9,752,000 inhabitants, of which more than half of them live in Lima Este and Lima Norte (INEI, 2015c). Being Lima Norte represented by 25.5% of the total population of Metropolitan Lima, where the predominant socio economic levels are C (39,6%) and D (37,7%); having San Martin de Porres and Comas as the districts with larger populations.

Due to the fact that this is a preliminary research, a pilot sample of 50 participants was chosen with the purpose of testing the research model.

Measurements

For the elaboration of the questionnaire, the scales of Swasy (1979) and from Beatty and Talpade (1994) were used as the basis (See Appendix 1 and 2). These were adapted for the purpose and context of this research project (See Appendix 3). The measuring instrument for social power is based on adaptations of Swasy (1979) from scales used to measure the perception of mothers according to the two types of passive social power selected: legitimate and expert. While for the measurement of the mother's perception of influence, an adaptation of Beatty and Talpade (1994) was used, which are two scales of relative influence; one based on the Initiation Stage and the other on the Search/Decision Stage. All this is summed up in a questionnaire that consists of closed questions, which are the filter questions, with a Likert scale of 1 to 5.

The instruments for constructs and items utilized in this study have been previously validated by the authors of said concepts for Social Power and Influence in Purchasing; going from 150 items (French & Raven, 1959) to 85 items with 31 validated items (Swasy, 1979), considering the items of Expert Social Power (8items) and Legitimate Social Power (3items) for the Social Power. And going from 26 items to 16 items with 9 validated items (Beatty and Talpade, 1994), considering and adapting the items of Initial Influence Stage (4items) and Search/Decision Influence Stage (5items) for the Influence in Purchasing. The items, originally in English, were translated by a specialist and revised by three bilingual university professors in the field of Marketing.

Passive Social Power (Expert Social Power - ESP & Legitimate Social Power - LSP), In accordance with Flurry and Burns (2005), it is the degree to which a person is perceived that has

the right to exert influence or the right that a person has of influencing on the behavior and/or beliefs of the other person. This variable will be measured through a basic Likert scale of five points, instrument elaborated and validated by Swasy (1979), which was adapted for the purpose of this study.

Influence in Purchasing (Initial Influence in Purchasing – IIP & Decisional Influence in Purchasing- DIP), Influence is defined as the use of power to achieve a result (Coleman, 1973), in this situation, the purchase. In turn, by definition, the influence could only be achieved as a result of a process of exchange between two or more parts (Sprey, 1975). This variable will be measured over a frequency range of 5-point Likert instrument developed and validated by Beatty and Talpade (1994), which will be adapted for the study

In addition, there is the variable of influence of the child towards the mother on the purchase of a toy (**INFLU**). For this variable, a Likerts scale of 1-5 was used so that the results could be crossed with the other two scales previously described.

Control Variables, Apart from the central variables to measure, various papers present other variables. The authors recommend considering and evaluating them to know the context upon which the central variables are given. These control variables are demographic variables: age, gender, and *expenditure (purchase amount)* per toy. This last control variable is used as dummy variable in order to measure the moderation in two moments, lower or higher than S/.100 (**Dummy Purchasing 100**).

Procedure

SPSS software was used to process the data. This way, a non-parametric analysis of the variables of social power with the perception of influence to establish the degree and direction (positive or negative) of the relationship was possible.

In the first place, to determine Passive Social Power and Influence in Purchasing, a factor analysis was performed in order to reduce the number of variables, in addition to verifying that the items related to the described dimensions by the authors.

According to KMO and the Barlett test, which is based on whether the contrasts among the partial correlations and the variables is sufficiently small; it can be said that a relationship among these

variables exists. Having obtained a KMO index = 0.845 > 0.5, a factorial analysis can be used, and at the same time, group the variables for data interpretation.

The Barlett's sphericity test proves the null hypothesis that the correlations matrix is equal to the identity matrix. Then, being the identity matrix different to the correlations' one, this allows the performance of factorial analysis. As the Sig. = 0.00 < 0.05, factor analysis is supported.

Similarly, the correlations' matrix for the Perception of Influence presents that the determinant is 0.00; therefore, it can be concluded that there is correlations among the variables and so, factorial analysis can be used.

Also, in accordance to the total variance resulting from the data, for the Passive Social Power two self-values were determined that explain the 68.362% of the total variance of the original data. As for the Perception of Influence, two self-values were determined that help explain the 64.694% of the total variance of the original data.

Later, in the Rotated Component Matrixes were generated the factors of Expert Social Power - ESP (7items), and Legitimate Social Power - LSP (2items) of a total of 11 items of Passive Social Power, as well as the factors of Initial Influence in Purchasing - IIP (3items) and Decisional Influence in Purchasing - DIP (5items) of a total of 9 items of Influence in Purchasing.

Pasive Social Power			Influence in Purchasing		
Rotated Component Matrix ^a			Rotated Component Matrix ^a		
	Component			Component	
	1	2		1	2
ESP_1	.764	.199	IIP_2	.940	.158
ESP_2	.681	.322	IIP_3	.787	.228
ESP_3	.748	.233	IIP_4	.940	.158
ESP_4	.866	.086	DIP_1	.452	.646
ESP_5	.772	.408	DIP_2	.483	.720
ESP_6	.864	.123	DIP_3	.282	.648
ESP_8	.772	.017	DIP_4	.031	.851
LSP_2	.463	.735	DIP_5	.064	.813
LSP_3	-.009	.919			
α Cronbach	.911	.677	α Cronbach	.907	.841
Eigenvalue	5.089	1.192	Eigenvalue	4.254	1.498
%Var. Explained	56.547	13.243	%Var. Explained	53.170	18.728
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.			Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.			a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.		

So as to verify de degree of relationship of the values of the variables, the Pearson coefficient of correlation was applied; this to determine the linear dependency between the two variables. The

mathematical expression of said coefficient takes into account the covariance and the variance of the two variables expressing them as follows:

$$r_{wz} = \frac{Cov(xz)}{\sqrt{Var(x) Var(z)}}$$

The values that r_{wz} can have are in the range of [-1,1], so there is no correlation between the variables if $r_{wz} = 0$, while the correlation will be perfectly positive $r_{wz} = 1$ or perfectly negative if $r_{wz} = -1$.

Pasive Social Power - Pearson Correlations									
N = 50	ESP_1	ESP_2	ESP_3	ESP_4	ESP_5	ESP_6	ESP_8	LSP_2	LSP_3
ESP_1	1								
ESP_2	,478**	1							
ESP_3	,511**	,556**	1						
ESP_4	,529**	,542**	,818**	1					
ESP_5	,607**	,725**	,553**	,628**	1				
ESP_6	,720**	,508**	,599**	,725**	,690**	1			
ESP_8	,615**	,488**	,410**	,593**	,597**	,580**	1		
LSP_2	,492**	,462**	,460**	,444**	,660**	,546**	,322*	1	
LSP_3	.202	.235	.242	.124	,291*	.100	.115	,517**	1
Mean	3.620	3.440	3.280	3.300	3.38	3.540	4.160	2.880	2.100
St. Dev.	1.028	1.053	1.178	1.266	1.086	1.110	1.131	1.118	0.974
** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).									
* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).									

For the analysis of Passive Social Power, the correlations are significant among the items that correspond to Expert Social Power (ESP) and Legitimate Social Power (LSP) as independent factors. Both studied dimensions of Passive Social Power correlate according the bilateral significance with the majority of the items.

Influence in Purchasing - Pearson Correlations								
N=50	IIP_2	IIP_3	IIP_4	DIP_1	DIP_2	DIP_3	DIP_4	DIP_5
IIP_2	1							
IIP_3	,648**	1						
IIP_4	1,000**	,648**	1					
DIP_1	,452**	,459**	,452**	1				
DIP_2	,511**	,497**	,511**	,799**	1			
DIP_3	,313*	,457**	,313*	,400**	,541**	1		
DIP_4	.263	.136	.263	,425**	,536**	,482**	1	
DIP_5	.238	,285*	.238	,454**	,486**	,395**	,643**	1
Mean	3.420	3.460	3.420	3.800	3.840	3.340	3.580	3.660
St. Dev.	1.126	1.129	1.126	.969	.934	.917	.883	1.002
** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).								
* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).								

With respect to the Influence in Purchasing, the correlations are significant among the items that correspond to the factors of Initial Influence in Purchasing (IIP), and Decisional Influence in Purchasing (DIP), respectively.

RESULTS

As per the results, the correlation analysis of the variables of expert and legitimate social powers, both passive, present a correlation of 0.188 with Sig. level < 0.01, for which H1 is supported.

Pearson Correlations					
N=50	ESP	LSP	INFLU	IIP	DIP
ESP	1				
LSP	,488**	1			
INFLU	,554**	,675**	1		
IIP	.235	.084	.154	1	
DIP	.106	.019	.105	,501**	1
Mean	3.531	2.490	3.480	3.433	3.644
St. Dev.	.907	.912	.886	1.035	0.737

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Nevertheless, both variables present correlations under 0.5 with regards to the variables of mother-child perception of influence with Sig. levels > 0.05, already demonstrating that there is no relationship between said variables deeming unnecessary the regression analysis that looks at the causality of said variables. Consequently, H2 is not supported.

On the other hand, both variables have correlations higher than 0.5 with regards to the influence variable child-mother with Sig. levels > 0.01; this demonstrates that there is a relationship between expert and legitimate social power variables with the perception of influence child-mother. The previous allows the next step, a regression test with the purpose of determining the existence of causality.

Model Summary ^b					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	,723^a	.522	.502	.625	2.288

a. Predictors: (Constant), LSP, ESP
b. Dependent Variable: INFLU

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.177	.369		3.192	.003
	ESP	.288	.113	.295	2.551	.014
	LSP	.517	.112	.532	4.604	.000

a. Dependent Variable: INFLU

Looking at the regression analysis, it can be appreciated that the independent variables of expert and legitimate social powers do affect the perception of influence child-mother, having an $R^2 = 0.502$, and Sig. levels < 0.05 for both independent variables as predictors of the dependent variable, for which H3 is supported.

After performing the regression analysis to test the moderation with respect to the social powers over the influence child-mother, in neither of the two cases the required level of Sig. < 0.05 in the regression coefficients is achieved; hence, H4 is not supported.

Model Summary ^b						Model Summary ^b							
Model	R	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson		Model	R	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson			
2a	.571 ^a	.326	.282	.751	2.161	2b	.683 ^a	.466	.432	.668	2.246		
a. Predictors: (Constant), ESP, Dummy Purchasing 100, ESP*DP1						a. Predictors: (Constant), LSP, Dummy Purchasing 100, LSP*DP1							
b. Dependent Variable: INFLU						b. Dependent Variable: INFLU							
Coefficients ^a						Coefficients ^a							
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta					B	Std. Error	Beta		
2a	(Constant)	1.000	.661		1.514	.137	2b	(Constant)	1.643	.446		3.683	.001
	ESP	.679	.176	.695	3.849	.000		LSP	.776	.179	.798	4.335	.000
	Dummy Purchasing 100	.985	.875	.524	1.125	.266		Dummy Purchasing 100	.301	.571	.160	.528	.600
	ESP*DP1	-.247	.238	-.496	-1.037	.305		LSP*DP1	-.172	.222	-.274	-.774	.443
a. Dependent Variable: INFLU						a. Dependent Variable: INFLU							

Said results demonstrate the lack of significant evidence pointing towards expenditure levels in purchases of products such as toys affect the relationship of passive social power, be it legitimate or expert, on the perception of influence child-mother.

DISCUSSION

Notwithstanding that the topic has been well addressed in the past, difficulties in finding specific resent sources about it were encountered. The topic has been left aside because the influence Child-Mother is assumed as being part of the direct reference group. It is recommended to test the whole model, that way more enriching findings regarding the topic in question can be attained.

Having been this research project a pilot to test the research model, it still remains a topic for future research. To start with, the sample size needs to be increased in order to have a fair representation of the Northern Lima market and validate the results of the pilot test.

Then, application of the model should be expanded to other areas of Lima to answer the question of do the results hold true for Southern Lima, Western Lima, and Eastern Lima? Any significant

differences can then be researched. After this, other provinces in Peru can be studied to compare results to Lima and amongst themselves to identify similarities and differences. The study could be replicated in other Latin American countries; to see ramifications within this context.

This study focused on children 8-11 years old, variable that can have affected the preliminary results in a specific way that might not be representative of younger as well as older children. Hence, research could also include the application of this model to a younger group of children as well as to teenage kids to better understand the mothers' perception of the relationship of their children influence with legitimate and expert social power types. Also, the application of the other three types of social power can be incorporated to the study. This to identify which one also applies in our local context. And even identify if any one of them weighs more on the influence of toy purchases and how they compare to the ones already identified.

Being that the test subjects for this research were mothers, it would be interesting to survey by gender to ascertain if this would render any differences, and if so, what level. Also, variables such as the level of expenditure, marital status, and the frequency of visits to toy stores could be included in future research projects.

And finally, the aspect of cultural differences and cultural contexts may very well arise as a result of expanding this study to other countries and regions. Where the differences could be studied from the perspective of cultural differences or even the level of socio-economic development of the country or region: developed countries, emerging countries, and underdeveloped countries.

CONTRIBUTION

The information that this study provides can provide a better understanding of consumer behavior for toys, providing insights into motivations and the purchasing process of toys. This then allows companies to better identify their target markets and develop better marketing programs for their target markets by taking into consideration the role that children have on the purchasing decision process due to their levels of influence, as perceived by the mothers. Specifically, the information resulting from this research can help design more effective and efficient marketing communication programs to better communicate with their target markets: children and mothers, and specifically take advantage of the mother-child binomial.

For one, toy stores should focus more on the binomial mother-child and the manner in which influence emerges. Having the legitimate passive social power more weight on the purchasing

influence means that there exists a possibility that the mother concedes to the child's purchasing attempt, but this must be worked by the stores, specifically by the salespeople. Talking should be done to the binomial, to the mother as well as the child, for even though one pays, the other is who will be the user, and if the user does not want it, the purchase will not be finalized. In addition, the final user might have a level of expertise regarding the toy and be in the position to influence the mother's purchasing behavior if she sees him or her as an expert on the subject.

Regarding part of the aspect store layout, the objective can be to make each toy store a space full of experiences for the children since the majority of mothers enter a toy store for the simple fact that their child will entertain itself in the store. For which the following proposal: provide spaces where children can play with the toys, allowing them to test toys, and the mother as well as the child tests and experiments with the toys. This even allows them, mother and children, to spend time together; providing mother with more insight into their children's likes and preferences.

CONCLUSIONS

The passive Expert Social Power does not positively correlate to any of the dimensions of the Influence in Purchasing (Mother-Child). The passive Legitimate Social Power does not positively correlated to any of the dimensions of the Influence in Purchasing (Mother-Child). In conclusion, the results of Flurry & Burns (2005) are not supported in this international context.

Additionally, taking as external dependent variable the Influence in Purchasing (Child-Mother) of a toy, the result of crossing it with the four dimensions, this variable correlated more with the Passive Social Power, Expert Social Power and Legitimate Social Power, than with the Influence in Purchasing (Mother-Child), Initially Influence in Purchasing and Decisional Influence in Purchasing. So that, we can say that the Passive Social Power has the two independent dimensions significant for the present study.

Specifically, within the construct of Passive Social Power, the dimension with the best correlation is the passive Legitimate Social Power. Basing ourselves on the theory (Flurry & Burns, 2005; Swasy, 1979; French & Raven, 1959), it is an innate power that is found in the person that exerts the power because the person only has in common with the other person a strong link, in this case of Child-Mother.

REFERENCES

- Alonso Rivas, J., & Grande Esteban, I. (2013). *Comportamiento del Consumidor: Decisiones y estrategias de Marketing*. (7ma ed.). España: Gráficas Dehon.
- Andina. (17 de Junio de 2010). *Gestión*. Recuperado el 11 de Noviembre de 2015, de Gestión: <http://gestion.pe/noticia/496628/mercado-juguetes-mueve-us-80-millones-anuales-peru>
- Andina. (29 de Abril de 2013). *Los Andes*. Recuperado el 11 de Noviembre de 2015, de Los Andes: <http://www.losandes.com.pe/Nacional/20130429/70931.html>
- Arzu, S. (2011). Influence of Adolescents on Family purchasing behavior: Perceptions of adolescents and parents. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 747-754.
- Atkin, C. (1978). Observation of parent-child interaction in supermarket decision-making. *Journal of Marketing*, 41-5.
- Beatty, S. E., & Talpade, S. (1994). Adolescent influence in family decision making: a replication with extension. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 332-41.
- Cartwright, D. (1959). A field theoretical conception of power. *Institute for Social Research*, 183-220.
- Cartwright, D. (1965). Influence, leadership, control. En R. McNally, *Handbook of Organizations* (págs. 1-47). Chicago.
- Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (1968). *Group dynamics: Research and theory* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Coleman, J. (1973). *The mathematics of collective action*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Corfman, K., & Lehman, D. (1987). Models of cooperative group decision-making and relative influence: an experimental investigation of family purchase decisions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1-13.
- Cowan, G., & Avants, S. (Oct. de 1988). Children's Influence Strategies: Structure, Sex Differences, and Bilateral Mother-Child Influence. *Child Development*, 59(5), 1303-1313.
- Cowan, G., Drinkard, J., & McGavin, L. (1984). The effects of target, age, and gender on use of power strategies. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 1391-1398.
- Elias, S. (2008). Fifty years of influence in the workplace. *Journal of Management History*, 14(3), 267-283.
- Flurry, L., & Burns, A. C. (2005). Children's influence in purchase decisions: a social power theory approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 593-601.
- Foxman, E., Tansuhaj, P., & Ekstrom, K. (1989a). Adolescents' influence in family purchase decisions: A socialization perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 159-172.
- Foxman, E., Tansuhaj, P., & Ekstrom, K. (1989b). Family members' perceptions of adolescents' influence in family decision making. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 482-491.
- French, J. (1956). A formal theory of social power. *Psychological Review*, 90, 181-194.
- French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). *The bases of social power*. (D. P. Cartwright, & A. Arbor, Edits.) MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- INEI. (2010). *INEI Publicaciones Digitales*. Recuperado el 11 de Noviembre de 2015, de INEI Publicaciones Digitales:

- http://www.inei.gov.pe/media/MenuRecursivo/publicaciones_digitales/Est/Lib0015/cap-57.htm
- INEI. (17 de Enero de 2015a). *INEI Prensa*. Recuperado el 17 de Enero de 2015, de INEI Prensa: <http://www.inei.gov.pe/prensa/noticias/9-millones-752-mil-limenos-celebran-480-anos-de-fundacion-de-la-ciudad-de-lima-8173/>
- INEI. (6 de Junio de 2015b). *INEI Prensa*. Recuperado el 11 de Noviembre de 2015, de INEI Prensa: <http://www.inei.gov.pe/prensa/noticias/en-el-peru-15-millones-de-mujeres-celebran-su-dia-8247/>
- INEI. (09 de Julio de 2015c). *INEI Prensa*. Recuperado el 30 de Junio de 2015, de INEI Prensa: <http://www.inei.gov.pe/prensa/noticias/al-30-de-junio-de-2015-el-peru-tiene-31-millones-151-mil-643-habitantes-8500/>
- Ipsos Perú. (2015). *Perfiles Zonales - Lima Metropolitana 2015*. Lima: Ipsos Marketing.
- Isler, L., Popper, E., & Ward, S. (1987). Children's purchase requests and parental responses: results from a diary study. *Journal of Advertisement Research*, 28-39.
- Kim, C., Lee, H., & Hall, K. (1991). A study of Adolescents' Power, Influence Strategy, and Influence on Family Purchase Decisions. *Marketing Theory Applications*, 2, 37-45.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper.
- McNeal, J. (1992a). *Kids as customers: a handbook of marketing to children*. New York: Lexington Books.
- McNeal, J. (1992b). The Little Shoppers. *American Demographics*, 48-53.
- McNeal, J. (20 de Abril de 1998). Tapping the Three Kids' Markets. *American Demographics*, 37-41.
- McNeal, J. (1999). The kids market: myths and realities. (pág. 272). New York: Paramount Market.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power In and Around Organizations*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Nicholls, A. J., & Cullen, P. (Marzo de 2004). The child–parent purchase relationship: ‘pester power’, human rights and retail ethics. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 11(2), 75-86.
- Olson, D., Cromwell, R., & Klein, D. (1975). Beyond family power. En R. Cromwell, & D. Olson, *Power in families* (págs. 235-40). New York: Wiley.
- Podsakoff, P., & Schriesheim, C. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: critique reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 387-411.
- Raven, B. (1993). The Bases of Power: Origins and Recent Developments. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49, 227-251. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1993.tb01191.x
- Roedder, J. (1999). Consumer socialization of children: a retrospective look at twenty-five years of research. *J Consum Res*, 26(3), 183-213.
- Sellers, P. (1989). The ABC's of Marketing to Kids. *Fortune*, 119(10), 114-118.
- Sener, A. (2011). Influences of adolescents on family purchase behaviour: perceptions of adolescents and parents. *Social Behavior and personality*, 39(6), 747-754.
- Smith, T. E. (1970). Foundations of Parental Influence Upon Adolescents: An Application of Social Power Theory. *American Sociological Review*, 860-873.

- Sprey, J. (1975). Family power and process: Toward a conceptual integration. (R. E. Cromwell, & D. H. Olson, Edits.) *Power in Families*, 61-79.
- Swasy, J. L. (1979). Measuring the Bases of Social Power. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 6(1), 340-346.
- Turčínková, J., Brychtová, J., & Urbánek, J. (2012). Preferences of men and women in the Czech Republic when shopping for food. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis*, 60(7), 425-432.
- Turner, J., Kelly, J., & McKenna, K. (2006). Food for thought: Parents' perspectives of child influence. *British Food Journal*, 108(3), 181-91.
- Ward, S. (1972). Children's reactions to commercials. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 12, 37-45.
- Weber, M. (1962). *Basic concepts in sociology*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Wells, W. D. (1965). Communicating with Children. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 5(2), 2-14.
- Williams, L., & Burns, A. (2000). Exploring the dimesionality of children's direct influence attemps. *Advertisement Consumer Research*, 64-71.
- Wimalasiri, J. (2000). A comparison of Children's Purchase Influence and Parental response in Fiji and United States. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 12(4), 55-73.