

The Normative Influence of Shopping Companions on Impulsive Urges and Purchases

Maryse Côté-Hamel

A Thesis

In

The John Molson School of Business

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Science in Administration (Marketing) at

Concordia University

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

July 2012

© Maryse Côté-Hamel, 2012

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Maryse Côté-Hamel

Entitled: The Normative Influence of Shopping Companions on Impulsive Urges and Purchases

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science in Administration (Marketing)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

Dr. Christopher A. Ross Chair

Dr. H. Onur Bodur Examiner

Dr. Darlene Walsh Examiner

Dr. Bianca Grohmann Supervisor

Approved by Dr. Harjeet Bhabra
Chair of Department or Graduate Program Director

Dr. Steve Harvey
Dean of Faculty

Date July 2012

Abstract

The Normative Influence of Shopping Companions on Impulsive Urges and Purchases

Maryse Côté-Hamel

In research by Luo (2005), peers and family members were found to influence impulsive urges and impulsive purchases. The present thesis replicated and extended Luo's (2005) research to investigate the influence of significant others, buying impulsiveness and consumer susceptibility to informational and normative influences on impulsive urges and impulsive purchase decisions.

When controlling for buying impulsiveness and consumer susceptibility to informational and normative influences, consumers shopping with a friend experienced stronger impulsive urges than those shopping with a family member or alone. Consumers shopping with their significant other also experienced stronger impulsive urges than those shopping with a family member. Considering that impulsive urges could mediate the relationship between shopping companions and impulsive purchase decisions, this research suggests that the type of shopping companionship could explain, at least partially, impulsive purchase decisions.

Findings of this thesis represent a new explanation of the variation in individual susceptibility to impulsive purchase behavior based on the type of companions the consumer is shopping with, a concept that was not explored by previous researchers other than Luo (2005).

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	3
Impulsive purchase	3
Impulse Buying Tendency (Buying Impulsiveness).....	6
Consumer Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence.....	8
Shopping Companions.....	11
Family and friends	14
Significant other.....	15
Gender.....	17
Age.....	18
Education	19
Objectives	20
Methodology.....	21
Analysis and Results.....	27
H1 (a) Shopping companions and impulsive urges	27
H1 (b) Shopping companions and impulsive purchase decisions.....	28
H1 (c) and H 1 (d) Types of shopping companions and impulsive urges.....	30
H1 (e), H1 (f) and H1 (g) Types of shopping companions and impulsive purchase decisions.....	32
H2 (a) Gender and impulsive urges of accompanied consumers.....	34
H2 (b) Gender and impulsive purchase decisions of accompanied consumers.....	35
H3 (a) Age and impulsive urges of accompanied consumers.....	36
H3 (b) Age and impulsive purchase decisions of accompanied consumers.....	38
H4 (a) Education and impulsive urges of accompanied consumers.....	41
H4 (b) Education and impulsive purchase decisions of accompanied consumers.....	42
Summary of hypotheses.....	43
Additional analyses.....	45
Size of the shopping party.....	45
Shopping intentions	47
Shopping urges.....	51
Discussion.....	53
Limitations	55
Implications.....	58
Managerial	58
Theoretical	60
Future Research	61
Conclusion	62
References.....	64
Appendix 1: Consent Form.....	72
Appendix 2: Questionnaire (English)	74
Appendix 3: Questionnaire (French)	78

List of Tables

Table 1: Demographic Statistics of the Sample.....	22
Table 2: Reliability Tests of Measurement Scales.....	26
Table 3: ANCOVA of the effect of shopping accompanied (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV)	27
Table 4: Logistic regression predicting the effect of shopping accompanied (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV)	29
Table 5: ANCOVA of the effect of the types of shopping companions (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV).....	30
Table 6: Adjusted means of the types of shopping companions (IV) on impulsive urges (DV)	31
Table 7: Logistic regression predicting the effect of the types of shopping companions (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV)	33
Table 8: ANCOVA of the effect of gender (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV)	34
Table 9: Logistic regression predicting the effect of gender (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV)	35
Table 10: ANCOVA of the effect of age (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV).....	37
Table 11: Adjusted mean scores of age (IV) on impulsive urges (DV).....	37
Table 12: Logistic regression predicting the effect of age (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV)	39
Table 13: Logistic regression predicting the effect of age (IV) on not having made a planned purchase (DV)	41
Table 14: ANCOVA of the effect of education (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV)	41
Table 15: Adjusted mean scores of education (IV) on impulsive urges (DV).....	42
Table 16: Logistic regression predicting the effect of education (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV).....	43
Table 18: ANCOVA of the effect of the size of the shopping party (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV).....	45
Table 19: Logistic regression predicting the effect of the size of the shopping party (IV) on impulsive urges (DV).....	46
Table 20: ANCOVA of the effect of shopping intentions (main reasons for visiting the mall) (IVs) on impulsive shopping urges (DV)	47
Table 21: Logistic regression predicting the effect of shopping intentions (IVs) on impulsive purchase (DV)	50
Table 22: Logistic regression predicting the effect of impulsive urges (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV).....	51
Table 23: Logistic regression predicting the effect of impulsive urges (IV) on not having made a planned purchase (DV).....	52

Introduction

Impulsive purchase “behaviors can range on a continuum from mild forms often considered humorous to severe cases that warp and disrupt a person’s everyday functioning” (Kwak et al. 2006, p.61). Consumers in the upper extreme of this continuum are referred to as compulsive buyers (d’Astous 1990).

Compulsive buying is a chronic loss of self-control over the extent of one’s own buying pattern leading to severe negative consequences, financial, psychological or social, for the consumer (Dittmar and Drury 2000; Faber and O’Guinn 1988; O’Guinn and Faber 1989; Valence, d’Astous and Fortier 1988; Wang and Xiao 2009). This type of repetitive purchase behavior affects about 5 to 10 percent of the population in North America (Faber and O’Guinn 1992; Koran et al. 2006; Ridgway, Kukar-Kinney and Monroe 2008). However, one does not become a compulsive buyer in a day (d’Astous 1990; Dittmar and Drury 2000; O’Guinn and Faber 1989). “The extent to which consumers tend to make unplanned purchases [is] a significant predictor of their compulsive purchase tendencies. Consumers, who make more unplanned purchases, [are] significantly more likely to exhibit compulsive tendencies” (Shoham and Brencic 2003, p.132).

While impulsive purchases may lead to severe compulsion among consumers, their consequences for retailers and consumer good companies are far more positive.

According to Beatty and Ferrell (1998), Rook (1987) and Wood’s (1998) estimations, about 20 to 40 percent of the population buy on impulse at least occasionally. As a result, impulsive purchases are responsible for a high percentage of sales in almost every product line, since this form of impulsivity is not confined to any particular product

category (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Bellenger, Robertson and Hirschman 1978; Clover 1950; Cobb and Hoyer, 1986; Kollat and Willet 1967, 1969; Prasad 1975; Rook 1987; Rook and Fisher 1995; Rook and Hoch 1985; Stern 1962; West 1951). For instance, Bellenger, Robertson, and Hirschman (1978) estimated that between 27 and 62 percent of consumers' department store purchases are made on impulse.

While many studies focused on the individual characteristics responsible for such episodes, very few tried to understand the impact of the presence of other shoppers on impulsive buying behavior. Among researchers who did try to investigate this phenomenon, Agrawal and Schmidt (2003), Luo (2005), and Park and Lennon (2006) found that the presence of others acts as an impulse trigger in a shopping context. Even the mere presence of others influences purchase decisions since consumers are trying to adapt their personal goals to those of the group (Argo, Dahl and Manchanda 2005; Ariely and Levav 2000).

The purpose of this thesis was to replicate and to extent research regarding the influence of shopping companions on impulsive urges and purchases by Luo (2005), who found in a laboratory setting that consumers shopping with friends are more likely than consumers shopping with family members to experience impulsive urges and impulsive purchases, and that the effect of the presence of shopping companions is even greater when consumers are highly susceptible to interpersonal influence.

The present thesis built on Luo's (2005) research on friends and family members by studying whether the findings hold in a real shopping environment rather than in a laboratory. It also extended Luo's (2005) work by investigating the interpersonal

influence of significant others, who are known to play an important role in overall purchase decisions (Prus 1993), gender, age and education, while controlling for buying impulsiveness and both dimensions of consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence (i.e., informational and normative influences) as separate covariates.

Literature Review

Impulsive purchase

Scholars have been studying impulsive purchases for more than 60 years (Clover 1950; Kollat and Willet 1967, 1969; Stern 1962; West 1951), and the definition has not stopped evolving over the years. It was first characterized by an absence of planning, as suggested by Applebaum (1951), Bellenger, Robertson and Hirschman (1978), Cobb and Hoyer (1986), Kollat and Willet (1967, 1969), Stern (1962) and West (1951), and then became an unplanned, extraordinary and exciting experience breaking from a normal buying pattern and resulting in a “sudden, often powerful and persistent urge to buy something immediately” (Rook 1987, p.191; see also Baumeister 2002; Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Dholakia 2000; Dittmar and Drury 2000; Hoch and Loewenstein 1991; Piron 1991; Rook and Hoch 1985; Thompson, Locander and Pollio 1990; Verplanken and Herabadi 2001). Indeed, the stronger urges consumers experience while shopping, the more likely they are to make an impulsive purchase (Beatty and Ferrell 1998).

To be considered an impulsive purchase instead of a simple unplanned purchase, it must also include a hedonic or affective component, usually an emotional attraction to the product (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Dittmar and Drury 2000; Puri 1996; Rook 1987;

Rook and Fisher 1995; Rook and Hoch 1985; Thompson, Locander and Pollio 1990; Verplanken and Herabadi 2001; Weinberg and Gottwald 1982; Zghal and Aouinti 2010). Consumers must have “no pre-shopping intentions either to buy the specific product category or to fulfill a specific buying task” such as buying a gift for someone (Beatty and Ferrell 1998, p.170; see also Jones et al. 2003; Weun, Jones and Beatty 1998). An impulsive purchase is thus decided on the spot, immediately upon the first exposure to the product or the stimulus representing the product and after experiencing an urge to buy (Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Dholakia 2000; Rook and Fisher 1995; Rook and Hoch 1985; Thompson, Locander and Pollio 1990; Weun, Jones and Beatty 1998; Wood 1998). Indeed, according to Rook (1987), consumers have the most difficulty resisting their impulsive urges immediately after being exposed to the product for the first time since their reference point changes and they “partially adapt to the notion of owning or consuming the product” (Hoch and Loewenstein 1991, p.494). As a result, they desire “to purchase or consume the object as quickly as possible so as to terminate the stream of deprivation” (Hoch and Loewenstein 1991, p.496).

Therefore, the purchase of reminder items, that are out-of-stock at home or that consumers had prior experience with, would not be considered an impulsive purchase (Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Miller 2002; Stern 1962; Weun, Jones and Beatty 1998). Buying what Stern (1962) called “suggestion items”, items that consumers had no previous knowledge of but visualize a need for when seeing it for the first time, would not be considered impulsive either (Rook and Hoch 1985), nor would be fulfilling planned tasks (Beatty and Ferrell 1998) or having “the expectation and intention to make

other purchases that depend on price specials, coupon offers, and the like” (Stern 1962, p.60).

Moreover, an impulsive purchase is spontaneous and unanticipated, decided rapidly, and results in an absence of careful evaluation and deliberate consideration of alternative information and choices (Baumeister 2002; Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Dholakia 2000; Dittmar and Drury 2000; Hausman 2000; Hoch and Loewenstein 1991; Piron 1991; Rook 1987; Rook and Hoch 1985; Thompson, Locander and Pollio 1990; Weinberg and Gottwald 1982; Weun, Jones and Beatty 1998; Wood 1998; Zghal and Aouinti 2010). It generally entails diminished regards for its consequences in favor of immediate possession (Baumeister 2002; Rook 1987; Rook and Hoch 1985; Piron 1991; Puri 1996).

“The impulse to buy is hedonically complex and may stimulate emotional conflict” (Rook 1987, p.191; see also Rook and Hoch 1985). Consumers are in a “state of psychological disequilibrium” (Rook and Hoch 1985, p.23), being conflicted between their desire for immediate gratification and their willpower to resist it (Baumeister 2002; Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Dholakia 2000; Dittmar and Drury 2000; Hoch and Loewenstein 1991; Rook 1987; Rook and Fisher 1995; Piron 1991; Vohs and Faber 2007). Therefore, the weaker the consumers’ self-control resources, the more likely they are to experience strong impulsive urges and to make impulsive purchases (Baumeister 2002; Vohs and Faber 2007).

Consumers may give in to their impulsive urges in an attempt to elevate their mood (Baumeister 2002; Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Dittmar and Drury 2000; Elliot 1994;

Gardner and Rook 1988; Mick and DeMoss 1990; O'Guinn and Faber 1989; Rook 1987; Tice, Bratslavsky and Baumeister 2001; Verplanken and Herabadi 2001; Verplanken et al. 2005; Youn and Faber 2000), since they usually feel uplifted or energized after having made a purchase (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Cobb and Hoyer 1986; Dittmar and Drury 2000; O'Guinn and Faber 1989; Rook 1987).

They may also make impulsive purchases to reward themselves when they are in a good mood, as a result of feeling unconstrained (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Hausman 2000; Mick and DeMoss 1990; Youn and Faber 2000). Donovan and Rossiter (1982) even found that pleasure is positively associated with the likelihood of overspending in the shopping environment. Indeed, consumers in more positive emotional states tend to reach a decision faster and more efficiently (Isen 1984).

Impulse Buying Tendency (Buying Impulsiveness)

Impulse buying tendency (IBT), or buying impulsiveness, is considered a consumer personality trait (Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Hausman 2000; Rook 1987; Rook and Fisher 1995; Rook and Hoch 1985), and varies across individuals (Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Dittmar and Drury 2000; Hausman 2000; Puri 1996; Rook 1987; Rook and Fisher 1995; Verplanken and Herabadi 2001; Weun, Jones and Beatty 1998). It “can be defined as the degree to which an individual is likely to make unintended, immediate, and unreflective purchases (i.e., impulsive purchases)” (Jones et al. 2003, p.506; see also Weun, Jones and Beatty 1998). This ability to control impulsive urges is assumed to exert a significant influence on the likelihood of making impulsive purchase decisions (Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Dholakia 2000; Puri 1996; Rook and Fisher 1995; Rook and Hoch 1985).

According to Rook and Fisher (1995), “impulsive buyers are more likely to act on whim and to respond affirmatively and immediately to their buying impulses” (p.306). This lack of control leads them to engage in browsing, to be influenced by marketing stimuli, and to respond to their impulsive buying urges (Youn and Faber 2000). Being drawn to the product, they are less likely to deliberate or to consider the consequences of their impulsive purchases since they are focused on immediate gratification (Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Hoch and Loewenstein 1991; Rook 1987).

This form of self-control, or lack thereof, is not restricted to any specific product categories (Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Jones et al. 2003; Rook and Fisher 1995; Weun, Jones and Beatty 1998). Indeed, “consumers possessing a high impulse buying tendency should demonstrate a general tendency to purchase items of all product categories (within reason) on impulse” (Jones et al. 2003, p.506).

However, even highly impulsive shoppers do not give in to all of their impulsive buying urges (Rook and Fisher 1995). Several factors, such as financial resources, time pressure or social visibility, may prevent or increase the probability that impulsive buyers will act on their impulses (Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Hoch and Loewenstein 1991; Prus 1993; Rook and Fisher 1995). For instance, the more time consumers have when shopping, the more time they are likely to spend browsing which, as a result, lead them to experience stronger impulsive urges (Beatty and Ferrell 1998). Therefore, browsers are more likely to “engage in unplanned shopping and purchasing” (Jarboe and McDaniel 1987, p.49), since consumers spending more time shopping are more likely to purchase more than they initially planned to (Granbois 1968).

According to Rook and Hoch (1985), highly impulsive consumers enjoy shopping at night, are less likely to schedule shopping on specific days or to write out shopping lists, and enjoy shopping more than those who are less impulsive. They thus fall into Bellenger and Korgaonkar's (1980) definition of recreational shoppers, "those who enjoy shopping as a leisure-time activity" (p.78). Recreational shoppers go on shopping trips without a pre-planned purchase in mind, spend more time shopping per trip, shop longer after making a purchase, spend less time deliberating before making a purchase and make more impulsive purchases. They also obtain more gratification from the process of shopping than from the products purchased (Westbrook and Black 1985).

Consumer Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence

The probability of consumers making an impulsive purchase depends on both their impulse buying tendency and their susceptibility to interpersonal influence, that is their need to identify with and/or enhance their image in the eyes of others through the acquisition and use of products and brands, to observe, to seek information and to conform to others' expectations (Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989). Indeed, consumers' decisions are strongly influenced by their reference group (Childers and Rao 1992), which is defined as an "individual or group conceived of having significant relevance upon an individual's evaluations, aspirations, or behavior" (Park and Lessig 1977, p.102).

The effect of reference groups on impulsive purchases is likely to be more important for consumers highly susceptible to interpersonal influence (McGuire 1968). These consumers, to fulfill their desire for respect and their sense of belonging, are more likely

to “buy products that they believe their desired in-group approves of” (Martin, Wentzel and Tomczak 2008, p.31). Their purchase acts as a signal for possible status and self-esteem enhancement (Batra, Homer and Kahle 2001). They are also more likely to avoid presenting themselves in a way that may result in social disapproval (Wooten and Reed 2004).

However, reference-group influence varies for products consumed publicly versus privately, for products considered luxuries versus those considered necessities (Bearden and Etzel 1982), and depends on reference group salience (Orth and Kahle 2008).

Consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence is an individual construct consisting of two dimensions: informational influence and normative influence (Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989; Burnkrant and Cousineau 1975; Deutsch and Gerard 1955; McGuire 1968). Informational influence refers to the tendency to trust the information obtained from others and to internalize it as an accurate representation of reality (Burnkrant and Cousineau 1975; Deutsch and Gerard 1955). This transfer of knowledge from group members to an individual may occur through verbal communication or observation (Park and Lessig 1977). However, this dimension has not been extensively studied in the context of impulsive purchase, and is not as good a predictor of consumer behavior as normative influence (Schroeder, 1996), the second dimension of susceptibility to interpersonal influence. Normative influence refers to the tendency to conform to the norms and expectations of others (Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989; Burnkrant and Cousineau 1975; Deutsch and Gerard 1955; Fisher and Ackerman 1998; White, Hogg and Terry 2002). It can be further subdivided into value expressive and utilitarian influences (Bearden and Etzel 1982; Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989; Park and Lessig

1977), although “these two types of influence are not empirically distinct in tests of discriminant validity” (Martin, Wentzel and Tomczak 2008, p.30-31; see also Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989).

Value expressive refers to the desire to enhance or maintain one’s self-concept, and results in the person adopting the behavior or opinion of the group he or she evaluates positively (Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989; Park and Lessig 1977). As a result, consumers buy products they believe others will approve of, leading to possible status and self-esteem enhancement (Batra, Homer and Kahle 2001).

On the other hand, utilitarian influence refers to one’s desire to comply with others’ norms and expectations to be rewarded or to avoid punishments (Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989; Park and Lessig 1977). This influence is especially apparent when the behavior is known or visible to others (Batra, Homer and Kahle 2001; Burnkrant and Cousineau 1975).

Depending on who they are shopping with, consumers may want to control their impulsive tendencies in order to avoid being perceived as immature, irrational, wasteful, risky and lacking in self-control in the eyes of their shopping companions, since impulse buying is usually considered normatively wrong (Rook 1987; Rook and Fisher 1995; Rook and Hoch 1985; Hausman 2000). Indeed, only in some situations, for instance when virtuously motivated or in specific contexts where it is the norm such as “amusement parks, vacation venues, sales events, gaming casinos, craft fairs and swap meets”, is impulsive purchase socially accepted (Rook and Fisher 1995, p.312). “In these settings, consumers are invited and encouraged to act on their impulses and, accordingly, their

impulsive trait tendencies are likely to be good predictors of their buying behavior” (Rook and Fisher 1995, p.312).

These normative evaluations, defined by Rook and Fisher (1995) as “consumers’ judgments about the appropriateness of making an impulsive purchase in a particular buying situation” (p.306), have the potential to influence the likelihood that an impulsive purchase is made, since they moderate the relationship between impulse buying tendency and impulsive purchase decisions (Rook and Fisher 1995). “When a generally impulsive consumer experiences an impulse buying stimulus, and subsequently evaluates the prospective purchase as appropriate, both trait and normative influences are harmonious, thereby making an impulsive purchase likely” (Rook and Fisher 1995, p.305). However, in situations when impulsive purchases are frowned upon, even the most impulsive shopper will try to resist his or her impulsive urges in order to avoid being disapproved of (Rook 1987; Rook and Fisher 1995).

Shopping Companions

As previously mentioned, highly impulsive shoppers share many characteristics with recreational shoppers. Bellenger and Korgaonkar (1980) found that recreational shoppers are more likely to shop with others, a conclusion supported by Prus (1993). They are also more likely to make purchases on the spur of the moment (Bellenger and Korgaonkar 1980), thus potentially uncovering a relationship between shopping companions and impulsive purchases.

Moreover, a high interest in the shopping activity is related to impulsive purchases (Rook and Hoch 1985). Shopping is often a way for consumers to alleviate loneliness,

depression and boredom by being in contact with other people (Dittmar and Drury 2000; Park and Lennon 2006; Tauber 1972). This social interaction leaves many consumers feeling uplifted or energized after a shopping experience (Cobb and Hoyer 1986; Dittmar and Drury 2000; Rook 1987).

The satisfaction of social needs “to interact and garner approval from a significant other or a group” is the most commonly expressed reason to succumb to impulsive purchase behavior (Hausman 2000). Indeed, shopping with others allows building or maintaining bonds with companions, on top of being entertained (Prus 1993; Tauber 1972).

When in a good mood, consumers are more likely to overspend (Donovan and Rossiter 1982) since impulse buying satisfies a number of hedonic desires for fun, novelty and variety, especially for highly impulsive shoppers (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Hausman 2000; Rook 1987; Thompson, Locander and Pollio 1990). Beatty and Ferrell (1998) even found a positive relationship between positive affective reactions, such as enjoyment, and the urge to buy impulsively.

Consumers, in an attempt to get insight into the type of products they should buy and/or to obtain general assistance, may decide to bring along friends, family members or their significant other on their shopping trip (Prus 1993). It allows reducing the level of uncertainty associated with purchase decisions (Lee and Kacen 2008; Prus 1993). Indeed, shoppers perceive such sources as more credible than salespersons or other forms of “marketer-driven point-of-purchase information” (Lee and Kacen 2008; Prus 1993). Therefore, shopping becomes “a medium of information exchange about what is new/different in the contemporary scene” (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998, p.109), which

explains why consumers shopping with others shop longer and spend more than unaccompanied shoppers (Granbois 1968; Kahn and McAlister 1997 cited by Inman, Winer and Ferraro 2009; Sommer, Wynes and Brinkley 1992; Woodside and Sims 1976). It is also a way to preserve their status by establishing their identity and avoiding being left behind (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Hausman 2000). Indeed, “to return home empty handed is to experience a sense of loss of self-esteem (imagination, decisiveness) and a weakening of [their] ability to stay apace of contemporary society” (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998, p.109). Purchases may therefore represent a way to project an ideal self-image, both in the eyes of others and of consumers themselves (Dittmar and Drury 2000; Hausman 2000; Prus 1993).

However, shopping with other people does not offer “one on one” quality time to reflect on the merchandise and make wise decisions (Prus 1993), which may lead to more impulsive purchases. This should be especially true for highly impulsive shoppers since the presence of others enhances preexisting dispositions (Zajonc 1965). Indeed, shopping companions may be considered a distraction, thereby making the buying decision more complex (Prus 1993). Shoppers, in an attempt to avoid appearing as cheap and/or as a result of their susceptibility to interpersonal influence, may also be more likely to make purchases they would not have necessarily made had they been alone (Prus 1993).

However, Stern (1962) suggests that the simpler the buying decision process (i.e., the less mental effort required), the more likely consumers are to buy on impulse.

Overall, when shopping accompanied, the probability of consumers making an impulsive purchase increases 1.45 times (Zghal and Aouinti 2010). However, Inman, Winer and Ferraro (2009) did not get significant results when analyzing the likelihood of consumers

shopping with others to make unplanned purchases even though the direction was consistent with Zghal and Aouinti's (2010) findings. Moreover, in a study with consumers from United States, China and Hong Kong, only in Hong Kong did shopping companions have an influence on buying decisions (Zhuang et al. 2006).

Moreover, being aware that other people observe them may lead consumers to alter their purchase decisions by inducing impression-management (Aaker 1999; Ratner and Kahn 2002). Indeed, "some group exchanges can be sufficiently perplexing to dissuade them from pursuing anticipated purchases" (Prus 1993, p.104), thus reinforcing the potential influence of shopping companions on impulsivity. According to Rook and Fisher (1995), this change of plans is considered an impulsive decision. Indeed, consumers shopping with others make more changes in shopping plans than consumers shopping alone (Granbois 1968). They are more likely to buy more or less than they initially planned to (Granbois 1968) since "situational norms moderate the extent to which consumers act on their buying impulses" (Rook and Fisher 1995, p.311).

Family and friends

Consumers may be skeptical of the abilities of their shopping companions. For instance, if consumers do not appreciate their shopping companions' comments (Prus 1993), they may not necessarily make an impulsive purchase. Therefore, for a shopping companion to have an influence on impulsive purchases, he or she must have similar viewpoints regarding consumption and trends, good taste, a similar interest and intensity in the shopping activity, on top of attending to their well-being (Prus 1993).

Therefore, the influence of others on impulse buying may vary according to the type of shopping companions. Indeed, reference groups are more likely to influence behavior for individuals who identify strongly with the group (Terry and Hogg 1996). For instance, when shopping with their children, consumers are more likely to purchase less than they initially planned to (Granbois 1968).

However, Luo (2005) is one of the few researchers who investigated the influence of the type of shopping companions on impulsive urges and impulsive purchases. The researcher found that peers increase impulsive urges and impulsive purchases, and family members decrease them both. The impact of peer and family presence is even more important when consumers are close with their shopping companions.

Significant other

Companions must have a similar financial consonance, which makes significant others likely to lead to impulsive purchases especially if they are financially interdependent (Dittmar and Drury 2000; Prus 1993). Indeed, some consumers feel that they have to consume at the level of their partner or their peers, which often leads to impulsive purchases (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998). Therefore, consumers feel better about themselves when shopping with people with similar financial abilities since they do not feel pressured to purchase or do not feel bad about spending too much (Prus 1993). Moreover, “having additional shoppers present, particularly members of the same household, leads to a higher incidence of need recognition” (Inman, Winer and Ferraro 2009, p.22).

However, some companions may also restrain their significant other in their purchases, especially if they consider their partner to be too impulsive (Prus 1993), which could limit impulsive purchases. Moreover, consumers, in an attempt to manage the impression they project, may be influenced by their significant other when shopping, especially for high-priced products (Dittmar and Drury 2000; Prus 1993). Consumers may also ask the approval of their significant other before making a purchase in order to avoid making a bad decision (Davis and Rigaux 1974).

Therefore, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H1 (a) Consumers shopping with a companion tend to experience stronger impulsive urges compared to consumers shopping alone.

H1 (b) Consumers shopping with a companion are more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to consumers shopping alone.

H1 (c) Consumers shopping with a friend tend to experience stronger impulsive urges compared to consumers shopping with a family member.

H1 (d) Consumers shopping with their significant other tend to experience stronger impulsive urges compared to consumers shopping with another type of companions.

H1 (e) Consumers shopping with a friend are more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to consumers shopping with a family member.

H1 (f) Consumers shopping with their significant other are more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to consumers shopping with another type of companions.

H1 (g) Consumers shopping with their significant other are less likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to consumers shopping with another type of companions.

Gender

Recreational shoppers, as previously discussed, may be more likely to make impulsive purchases than economic shoppers since they spend more time shopping and enjoy it more. Considering that they are more likely to shop with others and that more of them are women (Bellenger and Korgaonkar 1980), it suggests a relationship between impulsive purchases, shopping companions and gender. Indeed, women spend more time shopping per visit (Sommer, Wynes and Brinkley 1992), make more unplanned (Granbois 1968; Inman, Winer and Ferraro 2009) and impulsive purchases than men and buy different types of goods on impulse (Dittmar and Drury 2000). According to Wood (1998), women are 1.7 times more likely than to men to make “once in a while” impulsive purchases.

Women are also more likely to experience compulsive purchase behavior, a compulsion deriving from impulsive purchase behavior (Roberts and Pirog 2004; Shoham and Brencic 2003). According to Dittmar and Drury (2000), excessive shoppers are two-and-a-half-times more likely to be women.

On the other hand, women are more likely “to exhibit some element of planning prior to entering the store” (Cobb and Hoyer 1986, p.406), which does not necessarily stop them from making impulsive purchase decisions.

Based on the relatively limited research on gender and impulsivity, the following exploratory hypotheses were proposed:

H2 (a) When shopping with a companion, women tend to experience stronger impulsive urges compared to men.

H2 (b) When shopping with a companion, women are more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to men.

Age

Older consumers spend more time shopping per visit than their younger counterparts (Sommer, Wynes and Brinkley 1992), even if younger consumers are more likely to be “browsers” (Jarboe and McDaniel 1987). However, younger consumers are generally more susceptible to the influence of others regarding their purchase decisions (Park and Lessig 1977), and are more likely to make unplanned (Granbois 1968) and impulsive purchases (McGoldrick, Betts and Keeling 1999; Rook and Hoch 1985) than older consumers.

Moreover, the relationship between age and impulse buying tendency is curvilinear (Bellenger, Roberston and Hirschman 1978; Wood 1998). Indeed, according to Wood (1998), “the odds of impulse buying increase modestly with increasing years of age between 18 and 39, and thereafter decline” (p.314). Similarly, Bellenger, Roberston and Hirschman (1978) found that consumers over 65 of age and those under 35 are more impulsive than those 35 to 65 years old.

Based on the relatively limited research on age and impulsivity, the following exploratory hypotheses were proposed:

H3 (a) When shopping with a companion, consumers under 35 years old and those over 65 years old tend to experience stronger impulsive urges compared to consumers between 35 and 64 years of age.

H3 (b) When shopping with a companion, consumers under 35 years old and those over 65 years old are more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to consumers between 35 and 64 years of age.

Education

Members of families with white-collar heads of households are more frequently recreational shoppers than members of families with blue-collar heads of household (Bellenger and Korgaonkar 1980), which could suggest a relationship between education and impulsive purchase.

Education is related to “once in awhile” impulse buying, with consumers having some college experience but lacking a college degree being the most likely to buy on impulse (Wood 1998). Therefore, the level of education should be positively related to impulsive urges and impulsive purchase decisions.

Based on the relatively limited research on education and impulsivity, the following exploratory hypotheses were proposed:

H4 (a) When shopping with a companion, consumers' education level is positively related to impulsive urges.

H4 (b) When shopping with a companion, the consumers' level of education is positively related to the likelihood of making an impulsive purchase decision.

Objectives

While many studies focused on the individual characteristics responsible for impulsive purchase decisions, very few tried to understand the impact of the presence of other shoppers on such behavior. Among researchers who investigated this phenomenon, Agrawal and Schmidt (2003) found that the presence of others acts as an impulse trigger in a shopping context. Park and Lennon (2006) also pointed out that interacting with salespeople increases the likelihood of purchasing on impulse. Even the mere presence of others influences an individual's purchase decisions since consumers are trying to adapt their personal goals to those of the group (Argo, Dahl and Manchanda 2005; Ariely and Levav 2000). For instance, consumers increase their consumption of food when other people are present (de Castro 1994; de Castro and de Castro 1989).

The purpose of this research was to replicate and to extent research by Luo (2005) regarding the influence of shopping companions on impulsive purchases. Luo (2005) found that consumers shopping with friends are more likely than consumers shopping with family members to experience impulsive urges and impulsive purchases, and that the effect of the presence of shopping companions is even greater when consumers are highly susceptible to interpersonal influence.

The present study contributed to knowledge regarding the influence of shopping companions by investigating the informational and normative influences of significant others, a type of shopping companions not studied by Luo (2005). Indeed, significant

others are known to play an important role in overall purchasing decisions and in impulsive consumption behavior (Prus 1993). The interpersonal influence of friends and family members on impulsive urges and purchase decisions was also carefully studied, as were gender, age and education, three demographic variables not considered in Luo's (2005) research.

In contrast to Luo (2005), both dimensions of consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence (i.e., informational and normative) were also treated as separate covariates, since previous research pointed that each subscale does not correlate to the same extent with measures of purchase behavior (Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1990; Schroeder 1996). Buying impulsiveness was also added as a covariate.

To do so, in contrast to Luo (2005) who conducted an experimental research using a sample of university students and asked them to imagine themselves in different shopping situations previously developed by Rook and Fisher (1995), adult consumers of all age groups shopping alone, with friends, with family members or with their significant other were intercepted in malls. Instead of having to imagine themselves as a 21-year old fictional shopper named "Mary" with restricted financial resources and going shopping with friends or family members, consumers had to answer questions regarding their shopping experience on the day they were intercepted to increase the external and internal validity of the results.

Methodology

Consumers shopping alone, with friends, with family members or with their significant other were intercepted over the course of one month in two regional malls in Québec city

in the Canadian province of Québec. Interviewing was done within the malls, when consumers were ready to leave, on different days of the week, during different time periods, and respondents were randomly selected at different exits to ensure representativeness. Having made a purchase was not a prerequisite for participating in the study to avoid excluding non-impulsive buyers from the sample. Incomplete questionnaires were discarded, which resulted in a sample of 328 respondents aged 18 to 86. Demographic statistics of the sample are available in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Statistics of the Sample

	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
18-24	88	26.8
25-34	68	20.7
35-44	49	14.9
45-54	45	13.7
55-64	55	16.8
65 and over	23	7
Education		
Elementary School and High School	62	18.9
College or Technical	117	35.7
Undergraduate (certificate or bachelor's)	98	29.9
Graduate (Master's or Ph.D.)	51	15.5
Gender		
Male	134	40.9
Female	194	59.1
Shopping Intentions		
Looking and browsing	58	17.7
Meeting someone	15	4.6
Making a specific purchase	224	68.3
Filling in time or walking around	86	26.2
Accompanying someone	56	17.1
Eating	20	6.1
Doing a specific activity (e.g. optician appointment)	11	3.4
Shopping Companions		
Alone	72	22
Significant Other	102	31.1
Family Member	83	25.3
Friend	90	27.4

	Frequency	Percentage
Number of shopping companions		
0	72	22
1	197	60.1
2	38	11.6
3	14	4.3
4 or more	7	2.1

The protocol was approved by Concordia University Human Research Ethics Committee. All participants volunteered to participate in the study, for which they did not receive a monetary compensation. They all signed a consent form (Appendix 1) before filling out the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was translated from English to French using a translation/backtranslation procedure to ensure equivalence. Only minor modifications were made to the translated version. Although both the English (Appendix 2) and the French (Appendix 3) versions of the questionnaires were available to respondents, all filled it out in French.

Moreover, respondents were given the choice to fill out the questionnaire by themselves or with the help of the researcher who would read the questions out loud, at a distance from the other companion(s), and write down their answers. Of the 328 participants, 124 chose to fill out the questionnaire alone.

The questionnaire consisted of 32 questions, including a question regarding their motivation for going to the mall that day, a question regarding whether or not they had bought any items that they did not plan on buying but could not resist buying (to determine whether or not they made an impulsive purchase) and if so, what was the approximate value (in dollars) of their impulsive purchase. It was followed by a question

regarding whether or not they purchased everything they were planning on buying, and if not, what was the approximate value (in dollars) of the planned purchase they did not make. Indeed, according to Rook and Fisher (1995), the decision not to make a planned purchase is considered to be an impulsive one.

Luo's (2005) seven-point four-item Likert scale was then used to assess respondents' level of impulsive urges during their shopping experience on that day. The measurement scale was anchored from 1: "strongly disagree" to 7: "strongly agree". The coefficient Cronbach's α estimate of these four items was .90, which was acceptable in terms of reliability. It is even slightly higher than Luo's (2005) (Cronbach's $\alpha = .83$). This difference might be explained by the larger sample size of the present study ($n = 328$ in contrast to $n = 152$). For subsequent statistical analyses, a composite score of the four-item scale was created.

The composite score of Rook and Fisher's (1995) five-point nine-item Likert scale anchored from 1: "strongly disagree" to 5: "strongly agree" was used to assess respondents' level of buying impulsiveness, which would be used as a covariate in subsequent statistical analyses. The Cronbach's α estimate was .78, slightly lower than Rook and Fisher's (1995) .88 (first administration) and .82 (second administration). The composite score was used for logistic regression analyses, and a median split was made to differentiate between the high ($M_{\text{high}} = 3.01$, $SD_{\text{high}} = .72$) versus low ($M_{\text{low}} = 1.67$, $SD_{\text{low}} = .32$; $t(326) = -21.94$, $p < .001$) buying impulsiveness groups for ANCOVA analyses.

A third scale by Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel (1989) was also used to assess consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence. This scale was selected over Park and Lessig's (1977) consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence scale, because it was not product and situation specific, and that reliability, validity and dimensionality of the scale were reported. It also was further validated by several other studies (e.g. Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1990; D'Rozario 2001; Kropp, Lavack and Holden 1999).

Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel's scale (1989) consisted of twelve seven-point items, anchored from 1: "strongly disagree" to 7: "strongly agree", on two dimensions: consumer susceptibility to informational influence and consumer susceptibility to normative influence. Indeed, value-expressive and utilitarian influences were initially considered as two separate factors, but they were later regrouped into one (i.e., normative influence) by Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel (1989) due to a lack of empirical discriminative evidence.

The first factor of the scale, which consisted of four items, was used to determine the susceptibility to informational influence of respondents (Cronbach' α of the present research of .75, slightly lower than Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel's (1989) $\alpha = .83$ (first administration) and .82 (second administration)). The second factor, which consisted of eight items, was used to determine the general level of susceptibility to normative influence of respondents. The Cronbach' α of the present study was .88, similar to Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel's (1989) $\alpha = .87$ (first administration) and 0.88 (second administration). The bivariate Pearson correlation coefficient between both subscales of consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence was .50 ($p < .001$), similar to Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel's (1989) correlation coefficient of .44.

The composite score of each separate factor was used as a covariate in the statistical analyses of the present research since each subscale did not correlate to the same extent with measures of purchase behavior (Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1990; Schroeder 1996).

These composite scores were used for logistic regression analyses, and a median split was also made to differentiate between the high ($M_{\text{high}} = 4.44$, $SD_{\text{high}} = .78$) versus low ($M_{\text{low}} = 2.38$, $SD_{\text{low}} = .69$; $t(326) = -25.19$, $p < .001$) consumer susceptibility to informational influence, and the high ($M_{\text{high}} = 2.66$, $SD_{\text{high}} = .81$) versus low ($M_{\text{low}} = 1.22$, $SD_{\text{low}} = .23$; $t(326) = -21.91$, $p < .001$) consumer susceptibility to normative influence for ANCOVA analyses.

Table 2 presents the results of reliability tests for all scales used in this study.

Table 2: Reliability Tests of Measurement Scales

Measurement Scales	Author	Cronbach's α	
		Past Study	Present Study
Impulsive urges	Luo (2005)	.83	.90
Buying impulsiveness	Rook and Fisher's (1995)	.88 and .82	.78
Consumer susceptibility to informational influence	Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel (1989)	.83 and .82	.75
Consumer susceptibility to normative influence	Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel (1989)	.87 and .88	.88

Questions regarding the shopping party (i.e., whether respondents were shopping alone or with a companion and if so, how many companions they were shopping with and what was their relationship with the companion(s): significant other, friend or family member) were also included. They were followed by three demographic questions to assess the

gender, the year of birth (used to calculate the age) and the education level of respondents.

Analysis and Results

H1 (a) Shopping companions and impulsive urges

Hypothesis 1a predicted that consumers shopping with a companion would experience stronger impulsive urges compared to consumers shopping alone. To address this hypothesis, a one-way ANCOVA test of the effect of the independent variable “shopping companionship” (i.e., alone or with a companion) was performed on the dependent variable “impulsive urges”, measured by the average score on Luo’s (2005) 4-item 7-point scale when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences. Table 3 presents the results of this ANCOVA test.

Table 3: ANCOVA of the effect of shopping accompanied (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV)

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	221.91 ^a	4	55.48	21.55	< .001	.21
Intercept	397.33	1	397.33	154.35	< .001	.32
Covariates						
Buying impulsiveness	149.75	1	149.75	58.17	< .001	.15
Susceptibility to informational influence	1.66	1	1.66	.65	.42	.002
Susceptibility to normative influence	11.31	1	11.31	4.40	.04	.01
Main effect						
Shopping with a companion	8.10	1	8.10	3.15	.08	.01
Error	831.49	323	2.57			
Total	4152.69	328				
Corrected Total	1053.40	327				

^a R Squared = .21 (Adjusted R Squared =.20)

After adjustment by the covariates, the main effect of shopping companionship on impulsive urges was found to be marginally significant ($F(1, 323) = 3.15, .1 > p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$). However, the strength of the association between shopping companionship and the measure of shopping impulsive urges was not strong with a partial $\eta^2 = .01$. The explanation for this lack of strength is that one of the covariates, buying impulsiveness, accounted for most of the variance in the dependent measure ($\eta^2 = .15$). Indeed, impulsive urges significantly covaried with the buying impulsiveness of the participant ($F(1, 323) = 58.17, p < .001$). This covariate alone explained about 15% of the variance in impulsive urges. The dependent measure also significantly covaried with consumer susceptibility to normative influence ($F(1, 323) = 4.40, p < .05, \eta^2 = .01$), although this covariate only explained less than 1% of the variance in impulsive urges.

Although hypothesis 1a was only marginally supported, the direction of the relationship was inline with the hypothesis. Indeed, consumers shopping with a companion reported on average higher levels of impulsive urges (adjusted $M = 3.16, SD = .10, n = 256$) than consumers shopping alone (adjusted $M = 2.78, SD = .19, n = 72$).

H1 (b) Shopping companions and impulsive purchase decisions

Hypothesis 1b predicted that consumers shopping with a companion would be more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision (i.e., to make an impulsive purchase or not to make a planned purchase) compared to consumers shopping alone.

To test this hypothesis, a logistic regression analysis was performed to predict the likelihood that a participant would make an “impulsive purchase” based on his or her “shopping companionship” status (i.e., alone or with a companion) when controlling for

“buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences.

A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 328) = 44, p < .001$. The model correctly classified 38.1% of the 126 participants who made an impulsive purchase and 85.1% of the 202 who did not, for an overall success rate of 67.1%.

Table 4 shows the results of the logistic regression. The main effect of shopping with a companion ($\chi^2(1) = .02, p > .05$) was not significant. Hypothesis 1b was not supported.

Table 4: Logistic regression predicting the effect of shopping accompanied (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV)

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Covariates				
Buying impulsiveness	.79	25.84***	1	2.21
Susceptibility to informational influence	-.28	5.35*	1	.76
Susceptibility to normative influence	.18	1.27	1	1.20
Main effect				
Shopping with a companion	.04	.02	1	1.04

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

A second logistic regression analysis was performed to predict the likelihood that a participant would “not make a planned purchase” based on his or her “shopping companionship” status (i.e., alone or with a companion) when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences. According to Rook and Fisher (1995), this change of plans is considered to be an impulsive decision.

A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 328) = 6.77, p > .05$. Therefore, hypothesis 1b was not supported.

H1 (c) and H 1 (d) Types of shopping companions and impulsive urges

Hypothesis 1c and 1d predicted that the type of shopping companions would influence impulsive urges. Specifically, it was hypothesized that consumers shopping with a friend would experience stronger impulsive urges compared to consumers shopping with a family member (H1c), and that consumers shopping with their significant other would experience stronger impulsive urges than consumers shopping with another type of companions (H1d). To evaluate these predictions, an ANCOVA of the effect of the “type of shopping companions” (i.e., alone, significant other, family member and friend) was conducted on the dependent variable “impulsive urges” when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences (see Table 5). Participants shopping with more than one type of companions were excluded from this analysis.

Table 5: ANCOVA of the effect of the types of shopping companions (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV)

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	223.32 ^a	6	37.22	14.83	< .001	.23
Intercept	472.65	1	472.65	188.26	< .001	.39
Covariates						
Buying impulsiveness	111.03	1	111.03	44.23	< .001	.13
Susceptibility to informational influence	2.54	1	2.54	1.01	.32	.003
Susceptibility to normative influence	11.30	1	11.30	4.50	.04	.02

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F	Partial η^2
Main effect						
Type of shopping companion	36.60	3	12.20	4.86	.003	.05
Error	753.19	300	2.51			
Total	3834.81	307				
Corrected Total	976.50	306				

^a R Squared = .23 (Adjusted R Squared = .21)

As hypothesized, the main effect of the type of shopping companions on impulsive urges was significant ($F(3, 300) = 4.86, p < .01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .05$). The reported adjusted means for impulsive urges are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Adjusted means of the types of shopping companions (IV) on impulsive urges (DV)

Shopping Companion	Adjusted Mean	SD	N
Significant other	3.18 ^a	.17	85
Family member	2.63 ^a	.19	68
Friend	3.52 ^a	.17	82
Alone	2.77 ^a	.19	72

^a Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Impulsiveness = .49, Susceptibility to informational influence = .53, Susceptibility to normative influence = .51.

Reported shopping impulsive urges were significantly greater when participants were shopping with a friend, than when shopping with a family member ($p < .001$) or alone ($p < .01$). Hypothesis 1c is thus supported. Participants shopping with their significant other reported greater urges to purchase than when shopping with a family member ($p < .05$), thereby partially supporting Hypothesis 1d. No other relationship approached significance.

Even so, the strength of the association between the type of shopping companionship and the measure of shopping impulsive urges was not strong with a partial $\eta^2 = .05$. The explanation for this lack of strength is that one of the covariates, buying impulsiveness,

accounted for most of the variance in the dependent measure ($\eta^2 = .13$). Indeed, impulsive urges significantly covaried with the buying impulsiveness of the participant ($F(1, 300) = 44.23, p < .001$). This covariate alone explained about 13% of the variance in impulsive urges. The dependent measure also significantly covaried with consumer susceptibility to normative influence ($F(1, 300) = 4.50, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$), although this covariate only explained less than 2% of the variance in impulsive urges.

H1 (e), H1 (f) and H1 (g) Types of shopping companions and impulsive purchase decisions

Hypotheses 1e, 1f and 1g predicted that the type of shopping companions would significantly influence the likelihood of making an impulsive purchase decision. Specifically, it was hypothesized that consumers shopping with a friend would be more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision or not to make a planned purchase compared to consumers shopping with a family member (H1e), and that consumers shopping with their significant other would be more or less likely to make an impulsive purchase or not to make a planned purchase compared to consumers shopping with a friend or with a family member (H1f and H1g).

To test this hypothesis, a logistic regression analysis was performed to predict the likelihood that a participant would make an “impulsive purchase” based on the “type of shopping companions” (i.e., alone, significant other, family member and friend as dummy variables) he or she was shopping with when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences.

A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant, χ^2 (6, N = 328) = 44.30, $p < .001$. The model correctly classified 38.9% of the 126 participants who made an impulsive purchase and 85.6% of the 202 participants who did not, for an overall success rate of 67.7%.

Table 7 shows the results of the logistic regression. The main effects of shopping with a significant other (χ^2 (1) = .05, $p > .05$), a family member (χ^2 (1) = .32, $p > .05$) or a friend (χ^2 (1) = .07, $p > .05$) were not significant, thus hypotheses 1e, 1f and 1g were not supported.

Table 7: Logistic regression predicting the effect of the types of shopping companions (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV)

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Covariates				
Buying impulsiveness	.79	25.10***	1	2.21
Susceptibility to informational influence	-.28	5.46*	1	.76
Susceptibility to normative influence	.18	1.29	1	1.20
Main effects				
Significant other	.06	.05	1	1.07
Family Member	.18	.32	1	1.19
Friend	.08	.07	1	1.09

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

A second logistic regression analysis was performed to predict the likelihood that a participant would “not make a planned purchase” based on the “type of shopping companions” (i.e., alone, significant other, family member and friend as dummy variables) he or she was shopping with when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences. A test of the full

model versus a model with intercept only was not statistically significant, χ^2 (6, N = 328) = 10.01, $p > .05$. Therefore, hypotheses 1e, 1f and 1g were not supported.

H2 (a) Gender and impulsive urges of accompanied consumers

Hypothesis 2a predicted that, when shopping with a companion, women would experience stronger impulsive urges compared to men. To address this hypothesis, an ANCOVA of the effect of “gender” on “impulsive urges” for accompanied consumers was conducted when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences. Although the main effect of gender was not significant ($F(1, 251) = 1.30, p > .05, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$), the direction of the relationship was inline with the hypothesis (see Table 8).

Table 8: ANCOVA of the effect of gender (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV)

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	171.02 ^a	4	42.75	16.40	< .001	.21
Intercept	364.42	1	364.42	139.74	< .001	.36
Covariates						
Buying impulsiveness	124.01	1	124.01	47.56	< .001	.16
Susceptibility to informational influence	.38	1	.38	.15	.70	.001
Susceptibility to normative influence	5.01	1	5.01	1.92	.17	.01
Main effect						
Gender	3.39	1	3.39	1.30	.26	.01
Error	654.55	251	2.61			
Total	3409.06	256				
Corrected Total	825.56	255				

^a R Squared = .21 (Adjusted R Squared = .12)

Women reported higher estimated average scores on the measure of shopping impulsive urges (adjusted $M = 3.27^a, SD = .13, n = 157$) than men (adjusted $M = 3.03^a, SD = .17, n = 99$). (^a Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values:

Impulsiveness = .51, Susceptibility to information influence = .53, Susceptibility to normative influence = .52.) Hypothesis 2a was not supported, however.

H2 (b) Gender and impulsive purchase decisions of accompanied consumers

Hypothesis 2b predicted that, when shopping with a companion, women would be more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to men. A logistic regression analysis was performed to evaluate the effect of “gender” on the dependent variable “having made an impulsive purchase” for participants shopping accompanied when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences.

A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant, $\chi^2(4, n = 256) = 34.89, p < .001$. The model correctly classified 40.4% of the 99 participants who made an impulsive purchase and 81.5% of the 157 participants who did not, for an overall success rate of 65.6%. However, the main effect of gender was not significant ($\chi^2(1) = 2.50, p > .05$; Table 9), although the direction of the relationship was inline with hypothesis 2b.

Table 9: Logistic regression predicting the effect of gender (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV)

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Covariates				
Buying impulsiveness	.80	19.80***	1	2.21
Susceptibility to informational influence	-.21	2.27	1	.81
Susceptibility to normative influence	.02	.01	1	1.02

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Main effect				
Gender	.46	2.50	1	1.58

* p < .05. ** p < .01. ***p < .001.

Another logistic regression was performed to evaluate the effect of “gender” on the dependent variable “not having made a planned purchase” for participants shopping accompanied when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences. A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, n = 256) = 3.01, p > .05$. Therefore, hypothesis 2b was not supported.

H3 (a) Age and impulsive urges of accompanied consumers

Hypothesis 3a predicted that, when shopping with a companion, consumers under 35 years old and those over 65 years old would experience stronger impulsive urges compared to consumers between 35 and 64 years of age. To evaluate this prediction, an ANCOVA of the effect of “age” (i.e., “18 to 24 years old”, “25 to 34 years old”, “35 to 44 years old”, “45 to 54 years old”, “55 to 64 years old” and “65 years old and over” based on Bellenger, Robertson and Hirschman’s (1978) categorization) was conducted on “impulsive urges” for consumers shopping with a companion when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences. As mentioned in Table 10, the main effect of age was marginally significant ($F(5, 247) = 1.95, .1 > p > .05, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .04$) and the direction was inline with the hypothesis.

Table 10: ANCOVA of the effect of age (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV)

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	192.56 ^a	8	24.07	9.39	<.001	.23
Intercept	376.99	1	376.99	147.10	<.001	.37
Covariates						
Buying impulsiveness	121.61	1	121.61	47.45	<.001	.16
Susceptibility to informational influence	.09	1	.09	.04	.85	<.001
Susceptibility to normative influence	2.11	1	2.11	.82	.37	.003
Main effect						
Age	24.94	5	4.99	1.95	.09	.04
Error	633.00	247	2.56			
Total	3409.06	256				
Corrected Total	825.56	255				

^a R Squared = .23 (Adjusted R Squared =.21)

The reported adjusted means for impulsive urges are presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Adjusted mean scores of age (IV) on impulsive urges (DV)

Shopping Companion	Adjusted Mean	SD	N
18 to 24 years old	3.38 ^a	.19	78
25 to 34 years old	3.23 ^a	.23	50
35 to 44 years old	3.56 ^a	.26	38
45 to 54 years old	2.87 ^a	.28	33
55 to 64 years old	2.60 ^a	.25	42
65 and over	3.23 ^a	.42	15

^a Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Impulsiveness = .51, Susceptibility to informational influence = .53, Susceptibility to normative influence = .52.

Reported shopping impulsive urges were significantly lower for participants 55 to 64 years than for those aged 18 to 24 years old ($p < .05$), 25 to 34 years old ($p < .1$) and 35 to 44 years old ($p < .01$), thereby partially supporting hypothesis 3a. Moreover, participants aged 45 to 54 years old reported significantly lower shopping impulsive urges than those 35 to 44 years old ($p < .05$). No other relationship approached significance.

Once again, the strength of the association between age and the measure of shopping impulsive urges was not strong with a partial $\eta^2 = .04$. The explanation for this lack of strength is that one of the covariates, buying impulsiveness, accounted for most of the variance in the dependent measure ($\eta^2 = .16$). Indeed, impulsive urges significantly covaried with the buying impulsiveness of the participant ($F(1, 247) = 47.45, p < .001$). This covariate alone explained about 16% of the variance in impulsive urges.

H3 (b) Age and impulsive purchase decisions of accompanied consumers

Hypothesis 3b predicted that, when shopping with a companion, consumers under 35 years old and those over 65 years old would be more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to consumers between 35 and 64 years of age. A logistic regression analysis was performed to evaluate the effect of the dummy variables “age” based on Bellenger, Robertson and Hirschman’s (1978) categorization (i.e., “18 to 24 years old” (control variable), “25 to 34 years old”, “35 to 44 years old”, “45 to 54 years old”, “55 to 64 years old” and “65 years old and over”) on the dependent variable “having made an impulsive purchase” for participants shopping accompanied when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences. A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant, $\chi^2(8, n = 256) = 35.71, p < .001$. The model correctly classified 38.4% of the 99 accompanied participants who made an impulsive purchase and 81.5% of the 157 accompanied participants who did not, for an overall success rate of 64.8%. However, the main effects of all age groups were not significant (see Table 12).

Table 12: Logistic regression predicting the effect of age (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV)

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ^2	df	Odds Ratio
Covariates				
Buying impulsiveness	.89	22.68***	1	2.43
Susceptibility to informational influence	-.20	2.04	1	.82
Susceptibility to normative influence	.03	.03	1	1.03
Main effects				
25 to 34 years old	.58	2.08	1	1.79
35 to 44 years old	.17	.15	1	1.19
45 to 54 years old	.56	1.39	1	1.75
55 to 64 years old	.59	1.77	1	1.80
65 years old and over	.25	.13	1	1.28

* p < .05. ** p < .01. ***p < .001.

Moreover, the effect of the continuous variables “age” and “age squared” were also evaluated when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences. A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant, $\chi^2 (5, n = 256) = 33.04, p < .001$. The model correctly classified 38.4% of the 99 accompanied participants who made an impulsive purchase and 84.1% of the 157 accompanied participants who did not, for an overall success rate of 66.4%. However, the main effect of each independent variable, age ($\chi^2 (1) = .18, p > .05$) and age squared ($\chi^2 (1) = .09, p > .05$), was not significant. Therefore, hypothesis 3b was not supported.

A logistic regression analysis was performed on the dependent variable “not having made a planned purchase” to evaluate the effect of the dummy variables “age” based on Bellenger, Robertson and Hirschman’s (1978) categorization (i.e., “18 to 24 years old” (control variable), “25 to 34 years old”, “35 to 44 years old”, “45 to 54 years old”, “55 to 64 years old” and “65 years old and over”) for participants shopping accompanied when

controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences. A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was also statistically significant, $\chi^2 (8, n = 256) = 21.50, p < .01$. The model correctly classified 94.2% of the 172 accompanied participants who bought everything they were planning on buying and 13.1% of the 84 participants who did not make a planned purchase, for an overall success rate of 67.6%. Even so, hypothesis 3b was not supported. Indeed, only the main effect of being “25 to 34 years old” was significant ($\chi^2 (1) = 5.67, p < .05$), as mentioned in Table 13. Indeed, accompanied consumers 25 to 34 years old were 2.5 times more likely not to have made a planned purchase than all other consumers.

A similar logistic regression analysis was also performed to test for the effect of the continuous variables “age” and “age squared”. A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was marginally statistically significant, $\chi^2 (5, n = 256) = 9.72, .1 > p > .05$. The model correctly classified 100% of the 172 accompanied participants who bought everything they were planning on buying and 1.2% of the 84 participants who did not make a planned purchase, for an overall success rate of 67.6%. The main effect of age was not significant ($\chi^2 (1) = 2.6, p > .05$), while the quadratic effect of age (age squared) was marginally significant ($\chi^2 (1) = 3.52, .1 > p > .05$). This suggests a curvilinear effect of age on the impulsive purchase decision “not having made a planned purchase”, thereby partially supporting hypothesis 3b.

Table 13: Logistic regression predicting the effect of age (IV) on not having made a planned purchase (DV)

Predictor	Not having made a planned purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Covariates				
Buying impulsiveness	.19	1.13	1	1.20
Susceptibility to informational influence	-.06	.17	1	.94
Susceptibility to normative influence	.15	.65	1	1.16
Main effects				
25 to 34 years old	.91	5.67*	1	2.50
35 to 44 years old	.27	.40	1	1.32
45 to 54 years old	-.02	.002	1	.98
55 to 64 years old	.15	.12	1	1.17
65 years old and over	-20.26	<.001	1	<.001

* p < .05. ** p < .01. ***p < .001.

H4 (a) Education and impulsive urges of accompanied consumers

Hypothesis 4a predicted that, when shopping with a companion, consumers' level of education would be positively related to impulsive urges. An ANCOVA test did not indicate significant differences in "impulsive urges" across the four different levels of "education" of accompanied consumers (i.e., "elementary school and high school," "college or technical," "undergraduate (certificate or bachelor's)," and "graduate degree (Master's or Ph.D.)") ($F(3, 249) = .53, p > .05$) when controlling for "buying impulsiveness" and consumer susceptibility to "informational" and "normative" influences (see Table 14). Therefore, hypothesis 4a was not supported.

Table 14: ANCOVA of the effect of education (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV)

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	171.80 ^a	6	28.63	10.91	<.001	.21
Intercept	359.47	1	359.47	136.91	<.001	.36

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F	Partial η^2
Covariates						
Buying impulsiveness	119.21	1	119.21	45.40	<.001	.15
Susceptibility to informational influence	.63	1	.63	.24	.63	<.001
Susceptibility to normative influence	5.64	1	5.64	2.15	.14	.01
Main effect						
Education	4.17	3	1.39	.53	.66	.01
Error	653.76	249	2.63			
Total	3409.06	256				
Corrected Total	825.56	255				

^a R Squared = .208 (Adjusted R Squared = .189)

The adjusted mean for impulsive urges was even contrary to what was hypothesized with consumers having higher levels of education experiencing lower levels of impulsive urges (see Table 15).

Table 15: Adjusted mean scores of education (IV) on impulsive urges (DV)

Shopping Companion	Adjusted Mean	SD	N
Elementary school or high school	3.38 ^a	.22	57
College or technical	3.20 ^a	.17	93
Undergraduate (certificate or Bachelor's)	3.04 ^a	.19	73
Graduate degree (Master's or Ph.D.)	3.06 ^a	.29	33

^a Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Impulsiveness = .51, Susceptibility to informational influence = .53, Susceptibility to normative influence = .52.

H4 (b) Education and impulsive purchase decisions of accompanied consumers

Hypothesis 4b predicted that, when shopping with a companion, the consumers' level of education would be positively related to the likelihood of making an impulsive purchase decision. A logistic regression analysis was performed to evaluate the effect of the dummy variables representing "age" (i.e., elementary school and high school (control variable, n = 57), college or technical (n = 93), undergraduate (certificate or bachelor's) (n = 73), graduate degree (Master's or Ph.D.) (n = 33)) on the dependent variable "having

made an impulsive purchase” for participants shopping accompanied when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences. A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant, $\chi^2(6, n = 256) = 35.18, p < .001$. The model correctly classified 37.4% of the 99 accompanied participants who made an impulsive purchase and 85.4% of the 157 accompanied participants who did not, for an overall success rate of 66.8%. However, none of the main effects of education categories was significant (see Table 16). Thus, hypothesis 4b was not supported.

Table 16: Logistic regression predicting the effect of education (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV)

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Covariates				
Buying impulsiveness	.83	20.51***	1	2.29
Susceptibility to informational influence	-.22	2.46	1	.81
Susceptibility to normative influence	.04	.05	1	1.04
Main effects				
College or technical	-.04	.01	1	.96
Undergraduate (certificate or bachelor's)	-.23	.33	1	.80
Graduate degree (Master's or Ph.D.)	.54	1.26	1	1.72

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

A similar logistic regression analysis was performed on the dependent variable “not having made a planned purchase”. A test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(6, n = 256) = 8.59, p > .05$. Thus, hypothesis 4b was not supported.

Summary of hypotheses

Overall, only hypotheses H1a, H1c, H1d, H3a and H3b were supported (see Table 17).

Table 17: Summary of hypotheses

Hypothesis	Confirmed ($p \leq .05$) / Marginally supported ($.05 < p \leq .1$) / Rejected ($.01 < p$)
H1 (a) Consumers shopping with a companion tend to experience stronger impulsive urges compared to consumers shopping alone.	Marginally supported
H1 (b) Consumers shopping with a companion are more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to consumers shopping alone.	Rejected
H1 (c) Consumers shopping with a friend tend to experience stronger impulsive urges compared to consumers shopping with a family member.	Supported
H1 (d) Consumers shopping with their significant other tend to experience stronger impulsive urges compared to consumers shopping with another type of companions.	Partially supported
H1 (e) Consumers shopping with a friend are more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to consumers shopping with a family member.	Rejected
H1 (f) Consumers shopping with their significant other are more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to consumers shopping with another type of companions.	Rejected
H1 (g) Consumers shopping with their significant other are less likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to consumers shopping with another type of companions.	Rejected
H2 (a) When shopping with a companion, women tend to experience stronger impulsive urges compared to men.	Rejected
H2 (b) When shopping with a companion, women are more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to men.	Rejected
H3 (a) When shopping with a companion, consumers under 35 years old and those over 65 years old tend to stronger impulsive urges compared to consumers between 35 and 64 years of age.	Marginally supported / Partially supported
H3 (b) When shopping with a companion, consumers under 35 years old and those over 65 years old are more likely to make an impulsive purchase decision compared to consumers between 35 and 64 years of age.	Marginally supported / Partially supported
H4 (a) When shopping with a companion, consumers' education level is positively related to impulsive urges.	Rejected
H4 (b) When shopping with a companion, the consumers' level of education is positively related to the likelihood of making an impulsive purchase decision.	Rejected

Additional analyses

Size of the shopping party

Impulsive urges

An ANCOVA was performed to investigate the possible effect of the “size of the shopping party” (i.e., one or more than one companion) on “impulsive urges” for participants shopping accompanied when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences. The relationship did not approach significance ($F(1, 251) = .25, p > .05$), as mentioned in Table 18.

Indeed, participants shopping with one companion (adjusted $M = 3.21^a$, $SD = .12$, $n = 197$) reported similar levels of impulsive urges to those shopping with more than one companion (adjusted $M = 3.08^a$, $SD = .21$, $n = 59$). (^a Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Impulsiveness = .51, Susceptibility to informational influence = .53, Susceptibility to normative influence = .52.)

Table 18: ANCOVA of the effect of the size of the shopping party (IV) on impulsive shopping urges (DV)

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	168.28 ^a	4	42.07	16.07	< .001	.20
Intercept	299.54	1	299.54	114.39	< .001	.31
Covariates						
Buying impulsiveness	130.79	1	130.79	49.95	< .001	.17
Susceptibility to informational influence	.54	1	.54	.21	.65	< .001
Susceptibility to normative influence	4.98	1	4.98	1.90	.17	.01
Main effect						
Size of the shopping party	.65	1	.65	.25	.62	< .001
Error	657.29	251	2.62			
Total	3409.06	256				
Corrected Total	825.56	255				

^a R Squared = .204 (Adjusted R Squared = .191)

Impulsive purchase decisions

Two logistic regression analyses were also performed to investigate the possible effect of the “size of the shopping party” (continuous variable) on impulsive purchase decisions (i.e., having made an impulsive purchase or not having made a planned purchase) for participants shopping accompanied when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences.

Regarding the dependent variable “impulsive purchase”, a test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant, $\chi^2(4, n = 256) = 32.23, p < .001$. The model correctly classified 37.4% of the 99 accompanied participants who made an impulsive purchase and 84.6% of the 157 accompanied participants who did not, for an overall success rate of 66.3%. However, the main effect of the size of the shopping party was not significant, as illustrated in Table 19.

Table 19: Logistic regression predicting the effect of the size of the shopping party (IV) on impulsive urges (DV)

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Covariates				
Buying impulsiveness	.79	25.80***	1	2.21
Susceptibility to informational influence	-.28	5.43	1	.76
Susceptibility to normative influence	.18	1.30	1	1.20
Main effect				
Size of shopping party	.06	.21	1	1.06

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Regarding the dependent variable “not having made a planned purchase”, a test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(4, n = 256) = 2.85, p > .05$.

Shopping intentions

Impulsive urges

An ANCOVA was performed to determine if accompanied participants' "motivations for visiting the mall" (i.e., the participants' main reasons for going to the mall: "looking and browsing", "meeting someone", "making a specific purchase", "filling in time or walking around", "accompanying someone", "eating" and "doing a specific activity (e.g. optician appointment)") had a significant influence on their reported level of shopping "impulsive urges" measured by their average score on Luo's (2005) 4-item 7-point scale when controlling for "buying impulsiveness" and consumer susceptibility to "informational" and "normative" influences. Only the main effect of going to the mall to "meet someone" ($F(1, 226) = 3.94, p < .05, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$), and the interaction between having been to the mall to "fill time or walk-around" and to "accompany someone" were significant ($F(1, 226) = 7.46, p < .01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .03$). All other main effects and interactions did not approach significance, as shown in Table 20.

Table 20: ANCOVA of the effect of shopping intentions (main reasons for visiting the mall) (IVs) on impulsive shopping urges (DV)

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F	Partial η^2
Corrected model	245.03 ^a	29	8.45	3.29	<.001	.30
Intercept	2.16	1	2.16	.84	.36	.004
Covariates						
Buying impulsiveness	125.65	1	125.65	48.92	<.001	.18
Susceptibility to informational influence	.02	1	.02	.01	.94	<.001
Susceptibility to normative influence	5.98	1	5.98	2.33	.13	.01
Main effects						
Looking and browsing	.44	1	.44	.17	.68	<.001
Meeting someone	10.12	1	10.12	3.94	<.05	.02
Making a specific purchase	2.62	1	2.62	1.02	.31	.004

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F	Partial η^2
Filling in time or walking around	2.93	1	2.93	1.14	.29	.01
Accompanying someone	.04	1	.04	.02	.90	<.001
Eating	4.12	1	4.12	1.60	.21	.01
Doing a specific activity (e.g. optician appointment)	2.29	1	2.29	.89	.35	.004
Interactions						
Looking and browsing x Meeting someone	.18	1	.18	.07	.79	<.001
Looking and browsing x Making a specific purchase	6.31	1	6.31	2.46	.12	.01
Looking and browsing x Filling in time or walking around	.62	1	.62	.24	.62	<.001
Looking and browsing x Accompanying someone	.24	1	.24	.09	.76	<.001
Looking and browsing x Eating	.01	1	.01	.004	.95	<.001
Looking and browsing x Doing a specific activity	.06	1	.06	.03	.88	<.001
Meeting someone x Making a specific purchase	3.89	1	3.89	1.51	.22	.01
Meeting someone x Filling in time or walking around	.89	1	.89	.35	.56	.002
Meeting someone x Accompanying someone	<.001	0	.	.	.	<.001
Meeting someone x Eating	2.37	1	2.37	.92	.34	.004
Meeting someone x Doing a specific activity	<.001	0	.	.	.	<.001
Making a specific purchase x Filling in time or walking around	2.87	1	2.87	1.12	.29	.01
Making a specific purchase x Accompanying someone	.20	1	.20	.08	.78	<.001
Making a specific purchase x Eating	.35	1	.35	.14	.71	<.001
Making a specific purchase x Doing a specific activity	.72	1	.72	.28	.60	<.001
Filling in time or walking around x Accompanying someone	19.16	1	19.16	7.46	<.01	.03
Filling in time or walking around x Eating	3.21	1	3.21	1.25	.27	.01

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F	Partial η^2
Filling in time or walking around x Doing a specific activity	.24	1	.24	.09	.76	<.001
Accompanying someone x Eating	.65	1	.65	.25	.62	<.001
Accompanying someone x Doing a specific activity	.14	1	.14	.05	.82	<.001
Eating x Doing a specific activity	1.38	1	1.38	.54	.46	.002
Error	580.54	226	2.57			
Total	3409.06	256				
Corrected Total	825.56	255				

^a R Squared = .30 (Adjusted R Squared = .21)

Impulsive purchase decisions

Two logistic regression analyses were performed to predict the influence of “shopping intentions” (i.e., the participants’ main reasons for going to the mall coded as dummy variables: “looking and browsing”, “meeting someone”, “making a specific purchase”, “filling in time or walking around”, “accompanying someone”, “eating” and “doing a specific activity (e.g. optician appointment)”) on impulsive purchase decisions (i.e., having made an impulsive purchase or not having made a planned purchase) for participants shopping accompanied when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences.

Regarding the dependent variable “impulsive purchase”, a test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant, $\chi^2(10, n = 256) = 55.26, p < .001$. The model correctly classified 86% of the 157 accompanied participants who did not make an impulsive purchase and 50.5% of the 99 accompanied participants who did, for an overall success rate of 72.3%.

The relationship between the independent variable going to the mall accompanied to “look and browse” and the dependent variable “impulsive purchase” was significant (χ^2 (1, n = 256) = 8.62, p < .01). The odds of making an impulsive purchase increased by 3.08 when going to the mall accompanied to browse and look around, as shown in Table 21. The relationship between the independent variable “eating” and the dependent variable “impulsive purchase” was also significant (χ^2 (1, n = 256) = 6.10, p < .05). The odds of making an impulsive purchase increased by 4.22 when going to the mall accompanied to eat. All other relationships between shopping intentions and impulsive purchase did not approach significance.

Table 21: Logistic regression predicting the effect of shopping intentions (IVs) on impulsive purchase (DV)

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Covariates				
Buying impulsiveness	.95	24.31***	1	2.59
Susceptibility to informational influence	-.18	1.52	1	.83
Susceptibility to normative influence	.01	.003	1	1.01
Main effects				
Looking and browsing	1.12	8.62**	1	3.08
Meeting someone	.17	.07	1	1.19
Making a specific purchase	-.36	1.03	1	.70
Filling in time or walking around	.14	.16	1	1.15
Accompanying someone	-.75	3.43	1	.47
Eating	1.44	6.10*	1	4.22
Doing a specific activity (e.g. optician appointment)	-1.01	1.21	1	.37

* p < .05. ** p < .01. ***p < .001.

Regarding the dependent variable “not having made a planned purchase”, a test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was not statistically significant, χ^2 (10, n = 256) = 11.98, p > .05.

Shopping urges

The influence of “impulsive urges” on impulsive purchase decisions (i.e., having made an impulsive purchase or not having made a planned purchase) was also evaluated when controlling for “buying impulsiveness” and consumer susceptibility to “informational” and “normative” influences.

Regarding the dependent variable “impulsive purchase”, a test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant, $\chi^2(4, n = 328) = 77.52, p < .001$.

The model correctly classified 83.7% of the 202 participants who did not make an impulsive purchase and 49.2% of the 126 participants who did, for an overall success rate of 70.4%.

The mean score on the impulsive urge scale was significantly different ($\chi^2(1, n = 328) = 30.34, p < .001$) between those who made an impulsive purchase ($M = 4.07, SD = 1.62, n = 126$) and those who did not ($M = 2.45, SD = 1.61, n = 202$), as mentioned in Table 22.

The average value of these impulsive purchases ($n = 126$) was reportedly \$79.08 ($SD = 125.9$). For one point increase on the average score on Luo’s (2005) 4-item 7-point shopping impulsive urge scale, the odds of making an impulsive purchase increased by 1.60.

Table 22: Logistic regression predicting the effect of impulsive urges (IV) on impulsive purchase (DV)

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Covariates				
Buying impulsiveness	.40	4.91*	1	1.49
Susceptibility to informational influence	-.28	4.97	1	.76

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Susceptibility to normative influence	.08	.23	1	1.09
Main effect				
Impulsive urges	.47	30.34***	1	1.60

* p < .05. ** p < .01. ***p < .001.

Regarding the dependent variable “not having made a planned purchase”, a test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was also statistically significant, χ^2 (4, n = 328) = 13.14, p < .05. The model correctly classified 97.3% of the 225 participants who bought everything they were planning on buying and 2.9% of the 103 participants who did not make a planned purchase, for an overall success rate of 67.7%.

The mean score difference on the impulsive urge scale between those who bought everything they planned (M = 2.85, SD = 1.73, n = 225) and those who did not make a planned purchase (M = 3.57, SD = 1.83, n = 103) was also statistically significant (χ^2 (1, n = 328) = 7.08, p < .01), as illustrated in Table 23. The average value of these planned purchases that were not made (n = 101) was reportedly \$168.83 (SD = 410). For one point increase of the average score on Luo’s (2005) 4-item 7-point shopping impulsive urge scale, the odds of not making a planned purchase increased by 1.23.

Table 23: Logistic regression predicting the effect of impulsive urges (IV) on not having made a planned purchase (DV)

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Covariates				
Buying impulsiveness	.01	.08	1	1.01
Susceptibility to informational influence	.06	.30	1	1.07
Susceptibility to normative influence	.10	.44	1	1.11

Predictor	Having made an impulsive purchase			
	β	Wald χ	df	Odds Ratio
Main effect				
Impulsive urges	.21	7.08***	1	1.23

* p < .05. ** p < .01. ***p < .001.

Discussion

When controlling for buying impulsiveness and consumer susceptibility to normative and informational influences, shopping companionship was not significantly related with impulsive purchase decisions. Indeed, accompanied participants were not more likely to have made an impulsive purchase or not to have made a planned purchase than those shopping alone, even if on average they experienced significantly stronger impulsive urges than consumers shopping alone. Considering that consumers experiencing strong impulsive urges were significantly more likely to have made an impulsive purchase, a conclusion inline with Beatty and Ferrell's (1998) findings, or not to have made a planned purchase than those who experienced weaker urges, it could suggest a mediating effect of impulsive urges.

Contrary to Luo's findings (2005), the relationship between the type of shopping companions and impulsive purchase decisions, when controlling for buying impulsiveness and consumer susceptibility to informational and normative influences, was not significant.

Discrepancies between Luo's results, who found that consumers shopping with friends are more likely than consumers shopping with family members to experience impulsive purchase decisions, and those of the current study may be explained by the nature of the

research (mall intercepts versus laboratory setting), the sample (adult consumers versus university students) and the method (questionnaire regarding the consumer's shopping experience versus imagined scenarios).

Still, even when controlling for "buying impulsiveness" and consumer susceptibility to "informational" and "normative" influences, the influence of the type of shopping companions significantly influenced impulsive urges. It could suggest once again a mediating effect of impulsive urges on impulsive purchase decisions. Consumers experienced higher levels of impulsive urges when shopping with their significant other than when shopping with a family member. Their impulsive urges were also stronger when shopping with a friend than when shopping with a family member or alone. These findings are consistent with those of Luo (2005), who found that consumers shopping with friends are more likely than consumers shopping with family members to experience impulsive urges.

The gender of accompanied shoppers did not significantly affect their likelihood of making an impulsive purchase decision, nor did it affect their level of impulsive urges.

Although age did not significantly affect the likelihood of making an impulsive purchase, it significantly influenced impulsive urges and the likelihood of not having made a planned purchase. Indeed, consumers 55 to 64 years old experienced significantly weaker impulsive urges than consumers 18 to 24 years old, 25 to 34 years old and 35 to 44 years old. Moreover, those aged 45 to 54 years old experienced weaker impulsive urges than consumers 35 to 44 years old. Moreover, age had a curvilinear effect on the likelihood of

not making a planned purchase, a conclusion consistent with Bellenger, Roberston and Hirschman (1978) and Wood's (1998) findings.

The level of education and the size of the shopping party did not affect the likelihood of making an impulsive purchase or not making a planned purchase, nor did it affect the level of impulsive urges experienced.

Shopping intentions were found to affect the likelihood of making an impulsive purchase and the level of impulsive urges experienced, even if they did not affect the likelihood of not making a planned purchase. When going to the mall accompanied to look and browse, the odds of making an impulsive purchase increased by 3.08, whereas the odds increased by 4.22 when going to the mall to eat. Moreover, impulsive urges increased when going to the mall to meet someone, or when going to the mall both to fill in time/walk-around and to accompany someone.

Limitations

It is important to address the fact that mall intercepts may have introduced a social desirability bias (Mick 1996), which could have had an influence on the outcomes of the study, especially for those who preferred to state their answers out loud to the researcher reading the questions.

Participants were invited to participate in the study while they were ready to leave the mall, which may have affected their level of interest in the study and the validity of their answers. Indeed, participants shopping with others to hang out appeared to be more

relaxed and more interested in spending time filling out the questionnaire than those who came to the mall alone to make a specific purchase.

Since the questionnaire was administered immediately after the participants responded to tempting situations, it did not allow them much time to reflect on the situation. On the other hand, the temporal proximity between their shopping experience and their participation in the study may in fact have reduced memory biases.

When asked to mention the approximate value (in dollars) of their unplanned purchases, some may have stated the value of their purchase before taxes, instead of including taxes, for impression management purposes or due to differences in reference frames used to assess spending.

While it is possible to question the influence of toddlers on shopping decisions, they were nonetheless considered shopping companions to adult respondents (as were children) since they may have had an influence on their purchases. The age of the children could thus be considered in future research to help determine at what age the presence of toddlers and children companions starts to influence impulsive urges and impulsive purchase decisions.

Visitors to Québec city, a predominantly French-speaking city, were also included in the sample, which raised the question of potential cultural differences in interpersonal influence. For instance, Murali, Laroche and Pons (2005) found that French Canadians were more susceptible to normative influence than English Canadians. Future research could further investigate such differences and their impact on impulsive urges and impulsive purchase decisions in the presence of shopping companions.

Considering the length of the questionnaire, questions regarding the closeness of the relationship between shopping companions (e.g. Luo 2005; Verplanken and Holland 2002) and financial resources (e.g. Stern 1962) were not accounted for, even if this information could have contributed to the results.

Another potential limitation of the study may be that consumers initially differed on characteristics, which would have prompted them to accept interpersonal influence to a greater extent (e.g. McGuire, 1968) and to shop with a specific type of companions.

These personal characteristics could have affected their likelihood of experiencing impulsive urges and impulsive purchase decisions. This limitation should be addressed by future research using a longitudinal measure of consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence since “one-time assessments of SNI may not be powerful enough predictors for the influence of reference group effects” (Batra and Homer 2004; Orth and Kahle 2008).

Consumers shopping with more than one type of companions were not included in the statistical analyses regarding the influence of the type of shopping companions due to the small number of participants in a similar situation.

The measurement instruments for consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and buying impulsiveness were neither product specific nor situation specific (Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989), which on one hand contributed to the scale’s general applicability, but on the other made the items vulnerable to consumer interpretation across situations and reference groups. Indeed, while some may have mentally replaced the word “others” with the person they were shopping with that day, others may have interpreted it across a wider range of situations and reference groups. To deal with this

limitation, a follow-up study asking consumers to report their score on this scale at different intervals should be conducted.

Implications

Managerial

Consumers shopping with their significant other reported significantly higher levels of impulsive urges than consumers shopping with family members. Similarly, when shopping with friends, consumers were more likely to experience strong impulsive urges to buy than when shopping alone or with family members. However, this urge did not necessarily translate into an impulsive purchase, considering that shopping with others did not affect impulsive purchase decisions.

Even if shopping companions were not found to affect impulsive purchase decisions per se, consumers experiencing strong impulsive urges were nonetheless more likely to have made an impulsive purchase or not to have made a planned purchase. Indeed, impulsive urges could mediate the relationship between shopping accompanied and impulsive purchase decisions. Consumers shopping accompanied had stronger impulsive urges than those shopping alone, and consumers who experienced stronger impulsive urges were more likely to have made an impulsive purchase or not to have made a planned purchase.

Considering that the presence of friends during the shopping experience positively affected impulsive urges, service providers, retailers and mall managers should encourage consumers to bring along a friend when visiting their stores in the hope that some shoppers would succumb to their urges and buy on impulse, especially highly visible

products (Batra, Homer and Kahle 2001; Burnkrant and Cousineau 1975) even if impulse buying is not restricted to any specific product categories (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Bellenger, Robertson and Hirschman 1978; Clover 1950; Cobb and Hoyer, 1986; Kollat and Willet 1967, 1969; Prasad 1975; Rook 1987; Rook and Fisher 1995; Rook and Hoch 1985; Stern 1962; West 1951).

Indeed, consumers shopping with a friend or their significant other could be open to new products that they had not previously thought of buying that day as a result of feeling unconstrained (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Donovan and Rossiter 1982; Hausman 2000; Mick and DeMoss 1990; Youn and Faber 2000), which could trigger impulsive urges and eventually lead to impulsive purchases. More research is needed to understand better this phenomenon, as well as the influence process.

There may also be a need for retailers and product managers to adapt their promotions and advertising strategies to the different shopping companions, as impulsive urges were more important when a friend or a significant other was present during the shopping experience than when shopping with a family member. For instance, they could take advantage of this information by presenting consumers of about the same age in their advertising campaigns (i.e., suggesting a friendship or love relationship between them) in order to elevate shopping urges and to create a positive mood surrounding their product or service to induce impulsive purchase and overspending (Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Beatty and Ferrell 1998; Donovan and Rossiter 1982; Hausman 2000; Rook 1987; Thompson, Locander and Pollio 1990).

Results of this study could also be useful for highly impulsive consumers and compulsive buyers. They should not visit the mall with a friend or their significant other if they know they have difficulty resisting their shopping urges. They would be better off shopping alone or with a family member in order to control their spending and their compulsive buying tendencies.

Theoretical

Impulsive purchase decisions have been the subject of research for decades. However, they have not been extensively studied from the angle of social influence. Indeed, very few studies have investigated the effect of interpersonal influence on impulsive buying behavior (Kwak et al. 2006; Rook and Fisher 1995), let alone the effect of shopping companions on impulsive buying behavior (Luo 2005). Findings of this study thus represent a step towards a new explanation of the variation in individual susceptibility to impulsive purchase behavior based on the type of companions the consumer is shopping with, a concept that was not explored by previous researchers other than Luo (2005).

The findings raise questions regarding the applicability of Luo's findings (2005) in a real-life setting. That knowledge in itself is an essential piece of information for marketing scholars interested in the impact of shopping companions on impulsive urges and impulsive purchase decisions.

This study also contributes to the knowledge regarding the influence of reference groups, specifically family, peer and couple on purchase decisions (e.g. Bayley and Nancarrow 1998; Bearden and Etzel 1982; Childers and Rao 1992; Davis and Rigaux 1974; Dittmar and Drury 2000; Granbois 1968; Hausman 2000; Inman, Winer and Ferraro 2009;

McGuire 1968; Park and Lessig, 1977; Prus 1993; Terry and Hogg 1996) when they are present at the point of purchase.

It is hoped that the findings of this study will enhance the knowledge of marketing researchers regarding the influence of shopping companions on impulsive urges and impulsive buying decisions, and lead to the development of marketing strategies to target shopping party appropriately. Indeed, researchers need to be aware of what triggers an impulsive purchase decision to develop strategies for consumers to control this behavior and for retailers to capitalize on it.

Future Research

The tendency to yield impulsive urges and purchase decisions changes with context, specifically with the type of shopping companions. However, this thesis did not examine when and how consumers shopping with others are more or less likely to be influenced (i.e., under what conditions). For instance, consumers may decide to bring along a specific type of companions to fulfill their specific shopping motive.

Consumers may engage in impulsive purchase decisions when accompanied for several reasons, and may be influenced differently by others depending on the assigned or enacted social roles of their companions, the closeness of their relationship with them, their time and financial resources, and so on. Therefore, further research should be conducted on the interpersonal influence process leading to impulsive urges and to purchase decisions in a social group context. The moderating role of the normative evaluations of their companions regarding the necessity of their impulsive purchase (Rook and Fisher 1995) and the potential mediating role of impulsive urges on the

relationship between shopping companions and impulsive purchase decisions should also be considered.

Follow-up studies should be conducted with a large enough sample of participants shopping with more than one type of companions to investigate the concept of social identity complexity (SIC), which “reflects the degree of overlap perceived to exist between groups of which a person is simultaneously a member” (Roccas and Brewer 2002, p.88). Indeed, while shopping with a significant other increases impulsive urges and shopping with a family member decreases it, what happens when a consumer is shopping with both types of companions at the same time? Does the influence of each companion cancel each one out? Is the level of impulsive urges similar to those shopping alone?

Conclusion

Evidence was provided to indicate that shopping companions influence the level of impulsive urges, which in turns impacts the likelihood of making an impulsive purchase decision. It appears that consumers, when accompanied by a friend, experience stronger impulsive urges than when shopping with a family member or alone. Consumers shopping with their significant other also experience stronger impulsive urges than those shopping with a family member. Considering that consumers experiencing strong urges are more likely to make an impulsive purchase or not to make a planned purchase, it suggests that the type of shopping companion may explain, at least partially, impulsive purchase decisions.

“Planning is a relative term; consumers’ plans are sometimes contingent and altered by environmental circumstance” (Rook 1987, p.191). Future research should thus be conducted to understand how social factors contribute to impulsive urges and to the alteration of consumers’ purchase plans by buying more or less than they anticipated to. This information could contribute to the development of strategies by retailers, consumer good companies and advertisers to enhance these urges and to lead to more impulsive purchases by consumers. This information could also help highly impulsive consumers and compulsive buyers understand their urges better and find ways to avoid these stimuli in order to limit their impulsive purchases.

References

- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1999), "The Malleable Self: The Role of Self-Expression in Persuasion," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36 (1), 45–57.
- Agrawal, M.L., and Marcus Schmidt (2003), "Listening Quality of the Point of Service Personnel (PSPS) as Impulse Trigger in Service Purchase: A Research Framework," *Journal of Services Research*, 3 (1), 29-43.
- Applebaum, William (1951), "Studying Consumer Behavior in Retail Stores," *Journal of Marketing*, 16 (2), 172-178.
- Argo, Jennifer J., Darren W. Dahl, and Rajesh V. Manchanda (2005), "The Influence of a Mere Social Presence in a Retail Context", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (2), 207-212.
- Ariely, Dan, and Jonathan Levav (2000), "Sequential Choice in Group Settings: Taking the Road Less Traveled and Less Enjoyed," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (3), 279–290.
- Batra, Rajeev, and Pamela Miles Homer (2004), "The Situational Impact on Brand Image Beliefs," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14 (3), 318–330.
- Batra, Rajeev, Pamela Miles Homer, and Lynn R. Kahle (2001), "Values, Susceptibility to Normative Influence, and Attribute Importance Weights: A Nomological Analysis," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 11 (2), 115–128.
- Baumeister, Roy F. (2002), "Yielding to Temptation: Self-Control Failure, Impulsive Purchasing, and Consumer Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (4), 670–676.
- Bayley, Geoff, and Clive Nancarrow (1998), "Impulse Purchasing: A Qualitative Exploration of the Phenomenon," *Qualitative Market Research*, 1 (2), 99-114.
- Bearden, William O., and Michael J. Etzel (1982), "Reference Group Influence on Product and Brand Purchase Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (2), 183-194.
- Bearden, William O., Richard G. Netemeyer, and Jesse E. Teel (1989), "Measurement of Consumer Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (4), 473-481.
- Bearden, William O., Richard G. Netemeyer, and Jesse E. Teel (1990), "Further Validation of the Consumer Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence Scale", *Advances in Consumer Research*, 17 (1), 770-776.
- Beatty, Sharon E., and M. Elizabeth Ferrell (1998), "Impulse Buying: Modeling Its Precursors," *Journal of Retailing*, 74 (2), 169-191.

- Bellenger, Danny N., and Pradeep K. Korgaonkar (1980), "Profiling the Recreational Shopper," *Journal of Retailing*, 56 (3), 58-81.
- Bellenger, Danny N., Dan H. Robertson, and Elizabeth C. Hirschman (1978), "Impulse Buying Varies by Product," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 18 (6), 15-18.
- Burnkrant, Robert E., and Alain Cousineau (1975), "Informational and Normative Social Influence in Buyer Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2 (3): 206-215.
- Childers, Terry L., and Akshay R. Rao (1992), "The Influence of Familial and Peer-Based Reference Groups on Consumer Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (2), 198-211.
- Clover, Vernon T. (1950), "Relative Importance of Impulse Buying in Retail Stores," *Journal of Marketing*, 15 (1), 66-70.
- Cobb, Cathy J., and Wayne D. Hoyer (1986), "Planned Versus Impulsive purchase Behavior," *Journal of Retailing*, 62 (4), 384-409.
- d'Astous, Alain (1990), "An Inquiry into the Compulsive Side of "Normal" Consumers," *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 13 (1), 15-31.
- D'Rozario, Denver (2001), "The Structure and Properties of the Consumer Susceptibility to Interpersonal Sclae in Two Immigrant Populations in the U.S.," *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 13 (2), 77-101.
- Davis, Harry L., and Benny P. Rigaux (1974), "Perception of Marital Roles in Decision Processes," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1 (1), 51-62.
- de Castro, John M. (1994), "Family and Friends Produce Greater Social Facilitation of Food Intake than Other Companions," *Physiology and Behavior*, 56 (3), 445-555.
- de Castro, John M., and Elizabeth S. de Castro (1989), "Spontaneous Meal Patterns of Humans: Influence of the Presence of Other People," *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 50 (2), 237-247.
- Deutsch, Morton, and Harold B. Gerard (1955), "A Study of Normative and Informational Social Influences Upon Individual Judgment," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 51 (3), 629-636.
- Dholakia, Utpal M. (2000), "Temptation and Resistance: An Integrated Model of Consumption Impulse Formation and Enactment", *Psychology & Marketing*, 17 (11), 955-982.

- Dittmar, Helga, and John Drury (2000), "Self-Image - Is it in the Bag? A Qualitative Comparison Between "Ordinary" and "Excessive" Consumers," *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 21 (2), 109-142.
- Donovan, Robert J., and John R. Rossiter (1982), "Store Atmosphere: An Environmental Psychology Approach," *Journal of Retailing*, 58 (1) 34-57.
- Elliott, Richard (1994), "Addictive Consumption: Function and Fragmentation in Postmodernity," *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 17 (2), 159-179.
- Faber, Ronald J., and Thomas C. O'Guinn (1988), "Compulsive Consumption and Credit Abuse," *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 11 (1), 97-109.
- Faber, Ronald J., and Thomas C. O'Guinn (1992), "A Clinical Screener for Compulsive Buying," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (3), 459-469.
- Fisher, Robert J. and David Ackerman (1998), "The Effects of Recognition and Group Need on Volunteerism: A Social Norm Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25 (3), 262-275.
- Gardner, Meryl Paula, and Dennis W. Rook (1988), "Effects of Impulsive purchases on Consumers' Affective States," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 15 (1), 127-130.
- Granbois, Donald H. (1968), "Improving the Study of Customer In-Store Behavior," *Journal of Marketing*, 32(4), 28-32.
- Hausman, Angela (2000), "A Multi-method Investigation of Consumer Motivations in Impulse Buying Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 17 (5), 403-417.
- Hoch, Stephen J., and George F. Loewenstein (1991), "Time-inconsistent Preferences and Consumer Self-Control," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (4), 492-507.
- Inman, Jeffrey, Russell S. Winer, and Rosellina Ferraro (2009), "The Interplay Among Category Characteristics, Customer Characteristics, and Customer Activities on In-Store Decision Making," *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (5), 19-29.
- Isen, Alice (1984), "The Influence of Positive Affect on Decision Making and Cognitive Organization," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 11 (1), 534-537.
- Jarboe, Glen R., and Carl D. McDaniel (1987), "A Profile of Browsers in Regional Shopping Malls," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 15 (1), 46-53.
- Jones, Michael A., Kristy E. Reynolds, Seungoo Weun, and Sharon E. Beatty (2003), "The Product-Specific Nature of Impulse Buying Tendency", *Journal of Business Research*, 56 (7), 505-512.

Kacen, Jacqueline J., and Julie Anne Lee (2002), "The Influence of Culture on Consumer Impulsive Buying Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12 (2), 163-176.

Kahn, Barbara E., and Leigh McAlister (1997), *Grocery Revolution: The New Focus on the Consumer*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. Cited by Inman, Jeffrey, Russell S. Winer, and Rosellina Ferraro (2009), "The Interplay Among Category Characteristics, Customer Characteristics, and Customer Activities on In-Store Decision Making," *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (5), 19-29.

Kollat, David T., and Ronald P. Willett (1967), "Customer Impulse Purchasing Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 4(1), 21-31.

Kollat, David T., and Ronald P. Willett (1969), "Is Impulse Purchasing Really a Useful Concept for Marketing Decisions?," *Journal of Marketing*, 33 (1), 79-83.

Koran, Lorrin M., Ronald J. Faber, Elias Aboujaoude, Michael D. Large, and Richard T. Serpe (2006), "Estimated Prevalence of Compulsive Buying Behavior in the United States," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 163 (10), 1806-1812.

Kropp, Fredric, Anne M. Lavack, Stephen J.S. Holden (1999), "Smokers and Beer Drinkers: Values and Consumer Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence," *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 16 (6), 536-557.

Kwak, Hyokjin, George M. Zinkhan, Denise E. DeLorme and Trina Larsen (2006), "Revisiting Normative Influences on Impulsive Buying Behavior and an Extension to Compulsive Buying Behavior: A Case from South Korea," *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 18 (3), 57-80.

Lee, Julie Anne, and Jacqueline J. Kacen (2008), "Cultural Influences on Consumer Satisfaction with Impulse and Planned Purchase Decisions," *Journal of Business Research*, 61 (3), 265-272.

Luo, Xueming (2005), "How Does Shopping With Others Influence Impulsive Purchasing?," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15 (4), 288-294.

Martin, Brett A. S., Daniel Wentzel, and Torsten Tomczak (2008), "Effects of Susceptibility to Normative Influence and Type of Testimonial on Attitudes Toward Print Advertising," *Journal of Advertising*, 37 (1), 29-43.

McGoldrick, Peter J., Erica J. Betts, and Kathleen A. Keeling (1999), "Antecedents of Spontaneous Buying Behavior During Temporary Markdowns," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 26, 25-32.

McGuire, W. J. (1968), "Personality and Susceptibility to Social Influence" in *Handbook of Personality Theory and Research*, eds. E. F. Borgetta, and W. W. Lambert (Eds.), Chicago: Rand McNally, 1130-1187.

- Mick, David Glen (1996), "Are Studies of Dark Side Variables Confounded by Socially Desirable Responding? The Case of Materialism," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 23 (2), 106-119.
- Mick, David Glen, and Michelle Demoss (1990), "Self-Gifts: Phenomenological Insights from Four Contexts," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (3), 322-332.
- Miller, Rachel (2002), "In-Store Impact on Impulse Shoppers", *Marketing*, (November 21), 27-28.
- Mourali, Mehdi, Michel Laroche, and Frank Pons (2005), "Individualistic Orientation and Consumer Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence," *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 19 (3), 164-173
- O'Guinn, Thomas C., and Ronald J. Faber (1989), "Compulsive Buying: A Phenomenological Exploration," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (2), 147-157.
- Orth, Ulrich R., and Lynn R. Kahle (2008), "Intrapersonal Variation in Consumer Susceptibility to Normative Influence: Toward a Better Understanding of Brand Choice Decisions," *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 148 (4), 423-447.
- Park, C. Whan, and V. Parker Lessig (1977), "Students and Housewives: Differences in Susceptibility to Reference Group Influence," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 4 (2), 102-110.
- Park, Jihye, and Sharron J. Lennon (2006), "Psychological and Environmental Antecedents of Impulse Buying Tendency in the Multichannel Shopping Context," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 23 (2), 58-68.
- Piron, Francis (1991), "Defining Impulse Purchasing", *Advances in Consumer Research*, 18 (1), 509-514.
- Prasad, V. Kanti (1975), "Unplanned Buying in Two Retail Settings," *Journal of Retailing*, 51 (3), 3-12.
- Prus, Robert (1993), "Shopping with Companions: Images, Influences and Interpersonal Dilemmas," *Qualitative Sociology*, 16 (2), 87-110.
- Puri, Radhika (1996), "Measuring and Modifying Consumer Impulsiveness: A Cost-Benefit Accessibility Framework," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 5 (2), 87-113.
- Ratner, Rebecca K., and Barbara E. Kahn (2002), "The Impact of Private Versus Public Consumption on Variety-Seeking Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (2), 246-257.

- Ridgway, Nancy M., Monika Kukar-Kinney, and Kent B. Monroe (2008), "An Expanded Conceptualization and a New Measure of Compulsive Buying," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35 (4), 622-639.
- Roberts, James A., and Pirog III, Stephen F. (2004), "Personal Goals and Their Role in Consumer Behavior: The Case of Compulsive Buying," *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 12(3), 61-73.
- Roccas, Sonia, and Marilynn B. Brewer (2002), "Social identity complexity," *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6 (2), 88-106.
- Rook, Dennis W. (1987), "The Buying Impulse," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14 (2), 189-199.
- Rook, Dennis W., and Robert J. Fisher (1995), "Normative Influences on Impulsive Buying Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22 (3), 305-13.
- Rook, Denis W., and Stephen J. Hoch (1985), "Consuming Impulses," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 12, 23-27.
- Schroeder, Jonathan E. (1996), "An analysis of the Consumer Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence Scale," *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 11 (3), 585-599.
- Shoham, Aviv, and Maja Makovec Brencic (2003), "Compulsive Buying Behavior," *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 20 (2), 127-138.
- Sommer, Robert, Marcia Wynes, and Garland Brinkley (1992), "Social Facilitation Effects in Shopping Behavior," *Environment and Behavior*, 24 (3), 285-297.
- Stern, Hawkins (1962), "The Significance of Impulse Buying Today," *Journal of Marketing*, 26 (2), 59-62.
- Tauber, Edward M. (1972), "Why do people shop?," *Journal of Marketing*, 36 (4), 46-49.
- Terry, Deborah J., and Michael A. Hogg (1996), "Group Norms and the Attitude-Behavior Relationship: A Role for Group Identification," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22 (8), 776-793.
- Thompson, Craig J., William B. Locander, and Howard R. Pollio (1990), "The Lived Meaning of Free Choice: An Existential Phenomenological Description of Everyday Consumer Experiences of Contemporary Married Women," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (3), 346-61.
- Tice, Diane M., Ellen Bratslavsky, and Roy F. Baumeister (2001), "Emotional Distress Regulation Takes Precedence over Impulse Control: If You Feel Bad, Do It!," *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 80 (1), 53-67.

Valence, Gilles, Alain d'Astous, and Louis Fortier (1988), "Compulsive Buying: Concept and Measurement," *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 11 (4), 419-433.

Verplanken, Bas, and Astrid Herabadi (2001), "Individual Differences in Impulse Buying Tendency: Feeling and No Thinking," *European Journal of Personality*, 15 (1), Special Issue on Personality and Economic Behavior, S71-S83.

Verplanken, Bas, and Rob W. Holland (2002), "Motivated Decision Making: Effects of Activation and Self-Centrality of Values on Choices and Behavior," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82 (3), 434-447.

Verplanken, Bas, Astrid G. Herabadi, Judith A. Perry, and David H. Silvera (2005), "Consumer Style and Health: The Role of Impulsive Buying in Unhealthy Eating," *Psychology and Health*, 20 (4), 429-441.

Vohs, Kathleen D., and Ronald J. Faber (2007), "Spent Resources: Self-Regulatory Resource Availability Affects Impulse Buying," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (4), 537-547.

Wang, Jeff, and Jing J. Xiao (2009), "Buying Behavior, Social Support and Credit Card Indebtedness of College Students," *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33 (1), 2-10.

Weinberg, Peter, and Wolfgang Gottwald (1982), "Impulsive Consumer Buying as a Result of Emotions," *Journal of Business Research*, 10 (1), 43-57.

West, C. John (1951), "Results of Two Years of Study Into Impulse Buying," *Journal of Marketing*, 15 (3), 362-363.

Westbrook, Robert A., and William C. Black (1985), "A Motivation-Based Shopper Typology," *Journal of Retailing*, 61 (1) 78-103.

Weun, Seungoog, Michael A. Jones, and Sharon E. Beatty (1998), "The Development and Validation of the Impulse Buying Tendency Scale," *Psychology Report*, 82, 1123-1133.

White, Katherine M., Michael A. Hogg, Deborah J. Terry, (2002), "Improving Attitude-Behavior Correspondence Through Exposure to Normative Support from a Salient Ingroup," *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 24 (2), 91-103.

Wood, Michael (1998), "Socio-Economic Status, Delay of Gratification, and Impulse Buying," *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 19 (3), 295-320.

Woodside, Arch G., and Sims, J. Taylor (1976), "Retail Sales Transactions and Customer 'Purchase Pal' Effects on Buying Behavior," *Journal of Retailing*, 52 (3), 57–64, 95.

Wooten, David B., and Americus Reed II (2004), "Playing It Safe: Susceptibility to Normative Influence and Protective Self-Presentation," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (3), 551–556.

Youn, Seounmi, and Ronald J. Faber R. (2000), "Impulse Buying: Its Relation to Personality Traits and Cues," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 27 (1), 179-185.

Zajonc, Robert B. (1965), "Social Facilitation," *Science*, 149 (3681), 269–274.

Zghal, Mustapha, and Najla Aouinti (2010), "Le rôle des facteurs situationnels et personnels dans l'explication de la réalisation d'un achat impulsif: Une application du modèle S.O.R.," *La Revue des Sciences de Gestion : Direction et Gestion*, 45 (242), 113-121.

Zhuang, Guijun, Alex S. L. Tsang, Nan Zhou, Fuan Li, J. A. F. Nicholls (2006), "Impacts of Situational Factors on Buying Decisions in Shopping Malls – An Empirical Study With Multinational Data," *European Journal of Marketing*, 40 (1/2), 17-43.

Appendix 1: Consent Form

Formulaire de consentement de participation à une recherche

Par la présente, je déclare consentir à participer à un programme de recherche mené par Maryse Côté-Hamel du John Molson School of Business de l'Université Concordia (m_coteha@jmsb.concordia.ca), sous la supervision de Bianca Grohmann du département de Marketing de l'Université Concordia (bgrohmann@jmsb.concordia.ca, 514-848-2424 poste 4845).

A. BUT DE LA RECHERCHE

On m'a informé-e du but de la recherche, soit évaluer les habitudes de magasinage des consommateurs fréquentant les centres commerciaux.

B. PROCÉDURES

Je comprends qu'en signant le présent formulaire de consentement, j'accepte de répondre à un questionnaire d'une durée approximative de cinq minutes. Le questionnaire est composé de questions générales sur mes habitudes de consommation, mes achats, ainsi que mes données démographiques. Toutes mes réponses demeureront anonymes et ne pourront être retracées jusqu'à moi.

C. RISQUES ET BÉNÉFICES

Il n'y a aucun risque associé au fait de participer à cette recherche. Je n'ai pas à répondre à une ou des questions auxquelles je ne souhaite pas répondre et je suis libre de me retirer de l'étude à n'importe quel moment. Cette recherche est effectuée dans un cadre académique et aidera la chercheuse à mieux comprendre la manière dont les gens prennent des décisions de consommation.

D. CONDITIONS DE PARTICIPATION

- Je comprends que je peux retirer mon consentement et interrompre ma participation à tout moment, sans conséquences négatives.
- Je comprends que ma participation à cette étude est ANONYME.
- Je comprends que les données de cette étude puissent être publiées.
- Je comprends le but de la présente étude; je sais qu'elle ne comprend pas de motifs cachés dont je n'aurais pas été informé-e.

J'AI LU ATTENTIVEMENT CE QUI PRÉCÈDE ET JE COMPRENDS LA NATURE DE L'ENTENTE. JE CONSENS LIBREMENT ET VOLONTAIREMENT À PARTICIPER À CETTE ÉTUDE.

NOM (caractères d'imprimerie)

SIGNATURE

Si vous avez des questions concernant le **fonctionnement** de l'étude, S.V.P contacter la responsable du projet, Bianca Grohmann Ph.D., professeure associée au département de marketing de l'Université Concordia, au 514-848-2424 poste 4845 ou par courriel au bgrohmann@jmsb.concordia.ca

Si vous avez des questions concernant vos **droits** en tant que participants à l'étude, S.V.P. contactez Brigitte Des Rosier Ph.D., conseillère en éthique de la recherche à l'Université Concordia, au 514-848-2424 poste 7481 ou par courriel au bdesrosi@alcor.concordia.ca

Appendix 2: Questionnaire (English)

Research Regarding Consumers Shopping Habits

Hi, my name is Maryse Côté-Hamel, and I am a student in the Master program in marketing at Concordia University. I am currently conducting a study among consumers as part of my Master thesis. Would you be willing to answer a few questions about your shopping habits? The questionnaire will not take more than 5 minutes of your time. All your answers will be kept confidential.

Are you 18 years old or over?

Yes *Continue*

No *Thank the respondent and end the interview*

1. What brings you to the mall today?

2. a) Did you buy any items today that you did not plan on buying but could not resist buying?

Yes 0

No 1

b) *(If yes)* What is the approximate value (in dollars) of your unplanned purchases?

3. a) Did you purchase everything you were planning on buying?

Yes 0

No 1

b) *(If no)* What is the approximate value (in dollars) of what you were planning on buying but did not actually buy? _____

Regarding your shopping experience today, to what extent do you agree with the following statement on a seven point-scale (1 to 7), 1 standing for strongly disagree and 7 for strongly agree.

	<i>Strongly disagree</i>					<i>Strongly agree</i>	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I experienced a number of sudden urges to buy.							
5. I wanted to buy things even though they were not on the shopping list.							
6. I had strong urges to make impulsive purchases.							
7. I felt a sudden urge to buy.							

Regarding your shopping habits, to what extent do you agree with the following statement on a five point-scale (1 to 5), 1 standing for strongly disagree and 5 for strongly agree.

	<i>Strongly disagree</i>			<i>Strongly agree</i>	
	1	2	3	4	5
8. I often buy things spontaneously.					
9. "Just do it" describes the way I buy things.					
10. I often buy things without thinking.					
11. "I see it, I buy it" describes me.					
12. "Buy now, think about it later" describes me.					
13. Sometimes I feel like buying things on the spur-of-the-moment.					
14. I buy things according to how I feel at the moment.					
15. I carefully plan most of my purchases.					
16. Sometimes I am a bit reckless about what I buy.					

Still regarding your shopping habits, to what extent do you agree with the following statement on a seven point-scale (1 to 7), 1 standing for strongly disagree and 7 for strongly agree.

	<i>Strongly disagree</i>						<i>Strongly agree</i>	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
17. I often consult other people to help choose the best alternative available from a product class.								
18. If I want to be like someone, I often try to buy the same brands that they buy.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
19. It is important that others like the products and brands I buy.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
20. To make sure I buy the right product or brand, I often observe what others are buying and using.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
21. I rarely purchase the latest fashion styles until I am sure my friends approve of them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
22. I often identify with other people by purchasing the same products and brands they purchase.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
23. If I have little experience with a product, I often ask my friends about the product.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
24. When buying products, I generally purchase those brands that I think others will approve of.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
25. I like to know what brands and products make good impressions on others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
26. I frequently gather information from friends or family about a product before I buy.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
27. If other people can see me using a product, I often purchase the brand they expect me to buy.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
28. I achieve a sense of belonging by purchasing the same products and brands that others purchase.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
29. a) Were you shopping alone or with other people today?								
Alone		0						
With other people		1						

b) (*If not alone*) How many persons were you shopping with? _____

c) What is your relationship with these shopping companions?

Number of shopping companions

Significant other (spouse / life partner)	1					
Family member	1	2	3	4	5	6
Friend	1	2	3	4	5	6
Other (specify): _____	1	2	3	4	5	6

30. What is the highest education level you have completed?

Elementary school or high school	1
College or technical	2
Undergraduate (certificate or Bachelor's)	3
Graduate degree (Master's or Ph.D.)	4

31. In what year were you born? _____

32. Note the respondent's gender

Male	0
Female	1

Appendix 3: Questionnaire (French)

Recherche concernant les habitudes de magasinage des consommateurs

Bonjour/Bonsoir, je m'appelle Maryse Côté-Hamel et je suis une étudiante au programme de maîtrise en marketing à l'Université Concordia. J'effectue présentement une recherche dans le cadre de mon mémoire de maîtrise. Accepteriez-vous de répondre à quelques questions concernant vos habitudes de magasinage? Le questionnaire ne prendra pas plus de cinq minutes de votre temps. Toutes vos réponses demeureront confidentielles.

Avez-vous 18 ans ou plus?

- Oui *Continuez*
Non *Remerciez le répondant et terminez l'entrevue*

1. Qu'est-ce qui vous amène au centre commercial aujourd'hui?

2. a) Vous êtes-vous procuré des articles que vous n'aviez pas planifié acheter, mais auxquels vous n'avez pas pu résister?

- Oui 0
Non 1

b) (*Si oui*) Quelle est la valeur approximative (en dollars) de ces achats non planifiés? _____

3. a) Vous êtes-vous procuré tout ce que vous aviez planifié acheter?

- Oui 0
Non 1

b) (*Si non*) Quelle est la valeur approximative (en dollars) de ce que vous aviez planifié acheter, mais que vous ne vous êtes pas procuré? _____

En ce qui concerne votre expérience de magasinage d'aujourd'hui, à quel point êtes-vous en accord avec les affirmations suivantes sur une échelle de sept points (1 à 7), 1 signifiant fortement en désaccord et 7 fortement en accord.

	<i>Fortement en désaccord</i>					<i>Fortement en accord</i>	
4. J'ai éprouvé plusieurs envies soudaines d'acheter.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. J'ai voulu acheter des choses, même si elles n'étaient pas sur la liste d'achats.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. J'avais des envies fortes de faire des achats impulsifs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. J'ai ressenti une envie soudaine d'acheter.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

En ce qui concerne vos habitudes de magasinage, à quel point êtes-vous en accord avec les affirmations suivantes sur une échelle de cinq points (1 à 5), 1 signifiant fortement en désaccord et 5 fortement en accord.

	<i>Fortement en désaccord</i>			<i>Fortement en accord</i>	
8. J'achète souvent des choses spontanément.	1	2	3	4	5
9. "Fais-le donc" (Just do it) décrit la façon que j'achète des choses.	1	2	3	4	5
10. J'achète souvent des choses sans réfléchir.	1	2	3	4	5
11. "Je le vois, je l'achète" me décrit.	1	2	3	4	5
12. "Achète maintenant, pense-y plus tard" me décrit.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Il m'arrive parfois d'avoir envie d'acheter des choses sous l'impulsion du moment.	1	2	3	4	5
14. J'achète des choses selon mon humeur du moment.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Je planifie attentivement la plupart de mes achats.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Je suis parfois insouciant(e) à propos de ce que j'achète.	1	2	3	4	5

Toujours en ce qui concerne vos habitudes de magasinage, à quel point êtes-vous en accord avec les affirmations suivantes sur une échelle de sept points (1 à 7), 1 signifiant fortement en désaccord et 7 fortement en accord.

	<i>Fortement en désaccord</i>					<i>Fortement en accord</i>	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Je consulte souvent d'autres personnes afin de m'aider à choisir la meilleure alternative disponible d'une classe de produits.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Si je veux ressembler à quelqu'un, j'essaie souvent d'acheter les mêmes marques qu'ils achètent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. C'est important que les autres aiment les produits et les marques que j'achète.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Pour m'assurer que j'achète le bon produit ou la bonne marque, j'observe souvent ce que les autres achètent et utilisent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Je me procure rarement les derniers styles à la mode avant d'être certain que mes amis les approuvent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Je m'identifie souvent à d'autres personnes en me procurant les mêmes produits et les marques qu'ils achètent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Si j'ai peu d'expérience avec un produit, j'interroge souvent mes amis à propos de ce produit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Lorsque j'achète des produits, je me procure généralement les marques qui, je pense, seront approuvées des autres.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. J'aime savoir quelles marques et quels produits font bonne impression auprès des autres.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Je recueille fréquemment de l'information de mes amis ou de ma famille concernant un produit avant d'acheter.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Si d'autres personnes peuvent me voir utiliser un produit, je me procure souvent la marque qu'ils s'attendent que j'achète.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Je développe un sentiment d'appartenance en me procurant les mêmes produits et les marques que les autres achètent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

29. a) Aujourd'hui, magasiniez-vous seul ou avec d'autres personnes?

Seul	0
Avec d'autres personnes	1

b) (*Si pas seul*) Avec combien de personnes magasiniez-vous? _____

c) (*Si pas seul*) Quelle est votre relation avec ces compagnons de magasinage?

	Nombre de compagnons de magasinage					
Conjoint / partenaire amoureux	1					
Membres de la famille	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ami	1	2	3	4	5	6
Autre (précisez): _____	1	2	3	4	5	6

30. Quel niveau de scolarité avez-vous complété?

Primaire ou secondaire	1
Collégial ou technique	2
Premier cycle (certificat ou Baccalauréat)	3
Deuxième ou troisième cycle (Maîtrise ou Doctorat)	4

31. En quelle année êtes-vous né? _____

32. Notez le sexe du répondant

Homme	0
Femme	1