



Controlling Adolescent Purchases: The Role of Authoritative Parenting in Reducing Impulsive and Compulsive Buying

Retno Mangestuti

Department of Psychology, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.

Corresponding author: Retno Mangestuti, mangestuti@uin-malang.ac.id, Department of Psychology, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Jl. Gajayana No. 50, Malang, East Java, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: 22 April 2025

Revised: 28 June 2025

Accepted: 12 July 2025

Keywords:

Authoritative parenting;
Compulsive buying; Consumer
behavior; Impulsive buying;
Parenting style

Kata kunci:

Pembelian impulsif; Pembelian
kompulsif; Perilaku konsumen;
Pola asuh Otoritatif; Pola
asuh orangtua

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine whether authoritative parenting reduces impulsive and compulsive buying in early adolescents. Using a quantitative correlational design, two separate analyses were conducted on a sample of 408 junior high school students (ages 12–15), divided into two groups. The first analysis assessed the relationship between authoritative parenting and impulsive buying, while the second examined its relationship with compulsive buying. the Authoritative Parenting Scale was used to measure authoritative parenting, while the Buying Impulsiveness Scale (BIS) and the Compulsive Buying Scale (CBS) were used to measure impulsive and compulsive buying, respectively. The results showed a negative and significant relationship between authoritative parenting and both impulsive ($R = -.159$, $R^2 = .025$, $p = .023$) and compulsive buying ($R = -.219$, $R^2 = .048$, $p = .002$). However, Fisher's r -to- z test indicated no significant difference between the two effects ($z = 0.59$, $p = .553$). These findings suggest that authoritative parenting may protect adolescents from problematic buying tendencies and support early interventions targeting financial habits.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguji apakah pola asuh otoritatif mengurangi pembelian impulsif dan kompulsif pada remaja awal. Menggunakan desain korelasional kuantitatif, dua analisis terpisah dilakukan pada sampel 408 siswa sekolah menengah pertama (usia 12-15), dibagi menjadi dua kelompok. Analisis pertama menilai hubungan antara pola asuh otoritatif dan pembelian impulsif, sementara yang kedua menguji hubungannya dengan pembelian kompulsif menggunakan. Authoritative Parenting Scale digunakan untuk mengukur pola asuh otoritatif, sementara Buying Impulsiveness Scale (BIS) dan Compulsive Buying Scale (CBS) digunakan untuk mengukur pembelian impulsif dan kompulsif, masing-masing. Hasilnya menunjukkan hubungan negatif dan signifikan antara pola asuh otoritatif dan pembelian impulsif ($R = -.159$, $R^2 = .025$, $p = .023$) dan pembelian kompulsif ($R = -.219$, $R^2 = .048$, $p = .002$). Namun, uji r -to- z Fisher menunjukkan tidak ada perbedaan signifikan antara kedua efek tersebut ($z = 0,59$, $p = 0,553$). Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa pola asuh otoriter dapat melindungi remaja dari kecenderungan pembelian problematik dan mendorong intervensi dini untuk menumbuhkan kebiasaan keuangan yang sehat.

Introduction

Problematic buying behaviors are increasingly observed among junior high school students, not just older adolescents or adults. At this developmental stage, adolescents are still developing emotional regulation and decision-making skills, which makes them more susceptible to marketing

stimuli, digital advertisements, and peer influence. These vulnerabilities often result in unplanned or emotionally driven purchases (Huang, 2024a; Roberts, 2019a). Problematic buying, in this study, includes two distinct yet often conflated behaviors, namely impulsive and compulsive buying. Impulsive buying refers to spontaneous, unplanned purchases triggered by situational cues and immediate gratification (Badgaiyan, 2017; Sehra, 2024). In contrast, compulsive buying is a repetitive behavior used to regulate internal emotional distress that often leads to financial or social consequences (Mestre-Bach, 2023; Müller, 2021). Previous studies have indicated that adolescents, particularly in early adolescence, often lack the cognitive maturity to assess the long-term impact of their financial decisions, especially when emotions dominate rational control (David, 2024; Sun, 2023).

To deal with vulnerability of problematic purchase behavior among adolescents, psychological and parenting factors that affect purchase behaviour needs to be identified. One of the factors is parenting style. Adolescence, especially the early teen years, is a crucial period where parenting practices can shape emotional and behavioral outcomes. Studies in developmental psychology have showed that authoritative parenting, which is indicated by warmth, responsiveness, and consistent structure is associated with greater capacity for self-regulation, lower aggression, and better school adjustment (Kwan, 2023; Palacios, 2022; Wang & Guo, 2024). Nevertheless, the influence of parenting style on purchase behavior among adolescents has received limited empirical attention. Most prior research has focused on delinquency or substance use, while purchase behaviors such as impulsive or compulsive buying remain underexplored. This gap is significant, given that financial habits and consumption values begin forming during early adolescence and are likely shaped by the family environment.

Moreover, psychological literature often treats impulsive and compulsive buying as a single construct, despite their distinct emotional and behavioral mechanisms. Impulsive buying is linked to cognitive overload and external cues, whereas compulsive buying is rooted in emotional dysregulation and internal distress (Gogoi, 2020; Grant, 2024; Nyrhinen et al., 2023). Distinguishing these constructs become crucial for identifying specific intervention strategies, particularly for early adolescents who may lack adequate self-control and emotional awareness. This study draws upon two complementary frameworks. First, the Consumer socialization theory that posits a central role of parents in shaping their children's consumption behaviors and attitudes through both direct communication and modelling (Kim et al., 2015; Kim & Kim, 2016). Second, consumer behavior theory, which emphasizes that purchases are shaped by psychological states and situational triggers. Impulsive buying is typically driven by external stimuli or high cognitive load, while compulsive buying functions as a coping strategy for internal distress (Faber, 2010; Khadijah, 2023; Shrestha, 2024). The dual-systems model further explains adolescents' vulnerability to emotionally charged decisions due to an imbalance between the reward system and immature executive control, making early adolescence a critical period for examining such behaviors.

In parallel, this study is grounded in self-regulation theory, which argues that the ability to manage impulses and emotions is shaped by early social environments, especially parenting (Jin, 2024; Nabavi, 2012). Authoritative parenting is believed to promote better cognitive control and emotional regulation. From a psychological perspective, this parenting style may offer protection against compulsive tendencies by addressing emotional vulnerabilities and enhancing self-regulation, while also reducing impulsivity through clear behavioral expectations. Accordingly, this study proposes that authoritative parenting negatively predicts both impulsive and compulsive buying behavior in junior high school students. These assumptions guide the formulation of the study's hypotheses and theoretical expectations.

Based on the above theoretical framework and the previous studies, the present study examined the following hypotheses, H₁: Authoritative parenting negatively affects compulsive buying behavior among junior high school students, H₂: Authoritative parenting negatively affects impulsive buying behavior among junior high school students, and H₃: The influence of authoritative parenting is more substantial on compulsive buying than on impulsive buying in junior high school

students. This present study contributes to developmental and consumer psychology by providing evidence on how family practice, particularly parenting style, influence distinct types of buying behavior during a critical stage of adolescent development. The findings aim to inform parenting interventions and youth-focused consumer education programs designed to build healthier financial habits from an early age.

Method

This study employed a quantitative correlational design, as it seeks to examine the relationship between authoritative parenting and two types of problematic buying behavior—compulsive and impulsive—among junior high school students. A quantitative approach was selected because it allows for the measurement of variable relationships systematically and statistically, increasing the generalizability and objectivity of the findings. The theoretical framework was based on Baumrind's parenting and self-regulation theories, which provide the conceptual basis for understanding how parenting influences adolescent self-control and consumption habits. The main steps of the research included instrument development, sampling, data collection via questionnaires, statistical analysis, and interpretation of the results based on tested hypotheses.

The target population in this study consisted of junior high school students aged 12 to 15, enrolled in public and private schools in an urban district. Inclusion criteria included active enrollment in grades 7 to 9 and parental consent to participate. A proportionate stratified random sampling technique was employed to ensure adequate representation across school levels and demographics. The total sample size was 408 students, calculated using power analysis for small-to-medium effect sizes. Stratification based on gender and school type was applied to enhance representativeness and reduce sampling bias.

Table 1. Distribution of participants by gender and age across studies

	Study 1 (N=205)		Study2 (N=203)		Total (N=408)	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Gender						
Male	98	24.02	98	24.02	196	48.04
Female	107	26.23	105	25.74	212	51.96
Age						
12 Years-old	46	11.27	51	12.50	97	23.77
13 Years-old	119	29.17	75	18.38	194	47.55
14 Years-old	25	6.13	60	14.71	85	20.83
15 Years-old	15	3.68	17	4.17	32	7.84

Note: Study 1 = Impulsive buying; Study 2 = Compulsive buying

Table 1 illustrates the sample distribution in a study of 408 junior high school students, divided into two groups based on gender and age. 48.04% of the sample are males, while 51.96% are females. In terms of age, the majority of students are 13 years old (47.55%), followed by 12 years old (23.77%), 14 years old (20.83%), and 15 years old (7.84%). This distribution was achieved using a proportionate stratified random sampling technique, ensuring balanced representation across gender and age groups in both studies, offering a comprehensive view of the studied population.

This research consists of two separate studies each designed to explore the influence of authoritative parenting on two different forms of consumptive behaviour: impulsive buying (Study 1) and compulsive buying (Study 2). These two studies used different instruments and involved different samples and focused on specific aspects of behaviour. Therefore, demographic data and analytical results are presented separately for each study to reflect the differences in focus and analytical objectives. To compare the strength of the relationship between authoritative parenting and compulsive and impulsive buying, Fisher's r-to-z transformation was used on dependent correlations

with overlapping samples. Data were collected in one data collection set, then analyzed based on the type of buying behavior (compulsive and impulsive) that was the focus of separate sub-analyses.

The authoritative parenting scale measures parenting behaviors that balance high responsiveness and demands. This parenting style emphasizes open communication, emotional warmth, and consistent discipline. In the Indonesian context, the scale demonstrated strong internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.86, indicating that the items within the Authoritative subscale reliably measure the construct (Riany et al., 2018). The high reliability suggests that the scale is an effective tool for assessing Authoritative parenting behaviors in Indonesia, and it aligns well with the intended focus of fostering healthy parent-child relationships. These findings validate the scale's use in Indonesian parenting styles and child development research.

The Compulsive Buying Scale (CBS), first introduced by d'Astous (1990), is designed to measure compulsive buying behavior, which is characterized by an overwhelming and often emotionally-driven urge to shop. While later versions – such as the expanded model by Ridgway et al. (2008) provide broader dimensions, this study employs the original scale due to its prior validation among Indonesian adolescents (Mangestuti, 2014), showing strong reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.848. The CBS captures three primary components: reactivity, or the tendency to make emotionally spontaneous purchases; post-purchase regret, which reflects feelings of guilt or dissatisfaction; and financial difficulties, such as poor budgeting or debt accumulation. Comprising 12 items, the scale has demonstrated robust psychometric properties in the Indonesian context, making it a suitable tool for assessing compulsive consumer behavior in this population.

The Buying Impulsiveness Scale (BIS), originally developed by Rook and Fisher (Bessouch et al., 2015), is a unidimensional measurement tool to assess an individual's tendency to make spontaneous, unplanned, and emotion-driven purchases. It consists of 9 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale, capturing behaviors such as impulse buying without prior thought or planning. Example items include "I often buy things spontaneously" and "I often buy things without thinking." The scale demonstrated high internal reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87, indicating strong consistency among items. BIS has been widely validated across cultural contexts and is frequently used to explore relationships between impulsive buying and various psychological factors, such as personality traits, emotional states, self-control, and social influence.

A quantitative approach was employed, and two separate simple linear regressions were conducted to examine the effect of authoritative parenting on impulsive and compulsive buying behaviors. Prior to the regression analyses, descriptive statistics were generated to summarize participants' perceptions of authoritative parenting and their reported levels of buying tendencies. Each regression was applied to a distinct subsample, with one focusing on impulsive buying and the other on compulsive buying, and both groups consisted of comparable sample sizes. Additionally, to assess whether authoritative parenting exerted a significantly stronger influence on one type of buying behavior than the other, a Fisher r-to-z transformation was carried out to compare the two overlapping correlations. Through this analytic procedure, a more precise understanding was facilitated regarding how authoritative parenting may be associated with different patterns of consumer behavior among early adolescents.

Results

Descriptive statistics presented in Table 2 indicate that perceptions of authoritative parenting were relatively consistent across both groups, with a mean of 29.83 (SD = 4.87) in the impulsive buying group (Study 1) and 29.27 (SD = 4.84) in the compulsive buying group (Study 2). This suggests that participants across both studies viewed their parents' authoritative style similarly. The mean score for impulsive buying was notably higher (M = 40.20, SD = 5.83) than that for compulsive buying (M = 30.32, SD = 6.39), reflecting a stronger general tendency toward impulsive purchases among adolescents. These findings support the idea that, although parenting perceptions are stable,

impulsive and compulsive buying represent distinct consumer behaviours with different intensities among early adolescents.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for authoritative parenting and buying behaviors

Study	Variable	N	Min.	Max.	M	SD
Study 1	Authoritative	205	16	40	29.83	4.87
	Impulsive buying	205	22	53	40.20	5.83
Study 2	Authoritative	203	14	39	29.27	4.84
	Compulsive buying	203	13	47	30.32	6.39

A regression analysis was conducted to examine the effect of authoritative parenting on impulsive buying behavior in Study 1 (H_1). For impulsive buying behavior (Study 1), the regression analysis also showed a significant negative relationship, $R = -.162$, $R^2 = .026$, $F(1, 201) = 5.02$, $p = .026$, consistent with H_1 . The unstandardized coefficient ($B = -0.38$, $SE = 0.17$) suggested that authoritative parenting similarly predicted lower impulsive buying scores, though the effect size was smaller. The other regression analysis examined the effect of authoritative parenting on compulsive buying behavior (H_2). For compulsive buying behavior (Study 2), in line with H_2 the regression model revealed a statistically significant negative association between authoritative parenting and compulsive buying, $R = -.219$, $R^2 = .048$, $F(1, 203) = 10.15$, $p = .002$. The unstandardized coefficient ($B = -0.52$, $SE = 0.16$) indicated that higher levels of authoritative parenting predicted lower levels of compulsive buying.

Table 3. Regression analysis predicting compulsive and impulsive buying behavior

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	R ²	Adj. R ²
Study 1: Impulsive Buying						.026	.021
Authoritative Parenting	-0.38	0.17	-.162	-2.24	.026		
Study 2: Compulsive Buying						.048	.043
Authoritative Parenting	-0.52	0.16	-.219	-3.18	.002		

*Note: Both models are statistically significant. However, the strength of the relationships did not differ significantly ($z = 0.59$, $p = .553$).

To examine whether the predictive strength differed significantly between the two models (H_3), a Fisher r-to-z transformation was conducted (Table 4). Table 4 demonstrated that the test yielded a non-significant result, $z = 0.59$, $p = .553$. It means that the strength of the correlations between authoritative parenting and the two types of buying behavior did not differ significantly. Consequently, H_3 was not supported, as no statistical evidence was found to suggest that authoritative parenting is a stronger predictor of one buying behavior over the other.

Table 4. Fisher r-to-z comparison between two correlations

Comparison	r_1	n_1	r_2	n_2	z	p
Compulsive vs Impulsive Buying	-.219	205	-.162	203	0.59	.553

Note: The Fisher r-to-z test revealed no significant difference between the two correlations.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that authoritative parenting has a negative and significant effect on compulsive buying behavior among junior high school students. The first regression model shows that authoritative parenting accounts for 4.8% of the variance in compulsive buying behavior. This means that the higher adolescents perceive their parents' parenting as authoritative, the lower their tendency to engage in compulsive purchases. This finding aligns with self-regulation theory, which posits that a supportive and structured family environment fosters better emotional control. It is also consistent with previous studies indicating that authoritative parenting reduces the risk of compulsive or addictive behaviors due to its emotional support and clear boundaries (Nur et al., 2021; Roberts, 2019b).

Meanwhile, the influence of authoritative parenting on impulsive buying behavior is also significant, but with a smaller effect size. The second regression analysis reveals that authoritative parenting explains only 2.5% of the variance in impulsive buying behavior. Although the direction of the relationship remains negative, this suggests that the protective effect of authoritative parenting on impulsive buying is weaker than that on compulsive buying. This difference may be explained by the psychological mechanisms underlying each behavior: compulsive buying tends to be driven by chronic emotional distress, which can be mitigated by a stable parenting environment, while immediate external stimuli, such as advertising or peer influence, more influence impulsive buying (Anita, 2023; Halim, 2022). Therefore, although authoritative parenting offers some protection, its impact on situational impulsivity is relatively limited.

Although the regression results indicated a slightly higher effect size of authoritative parenting on compulsive buying compared to impulsive buying, a Fisher's *r*-to-*z* transformation revealed that this difference was not statistically significant. This finding suggests that authoritative parenting plays a protective role in both types of problematic buying behavior, but the strength of its influence does not differ in a meaningful statistical sense. These results highlight the importance of recognizing that while compulsive and impulsive buying may differ in their psychological underpinnings, they are similarly shaped by early parenting experiences rooted in emotional warmth and behavioral structure (Grant, 2024; Khorrami et al., 2015). Thus, interventions aimed at reducing maladaptive buying behaviors may benefit from strengthening authoritative parenting practices, regardless of the specific type of consumption pathology involved.

This study makes a valuable contribution to developmental and consumer psychology, particularly in the context of adolescent behavior in early adolescence. Differentiating between compulsive and impulsive buying highlights the need for more nuanced approaches in understanding problematic consumption among youth. Moreover, this study addresses an empirical gap regarding the role of authoritative parenting in influencing both types of buying behavior – an area that has often been oversimplified in prior research (Japutra, 2022; Malafe, 2023; Somma, 2023). These findings extend theoretical discussions about family influence, offering new insights into how parenting styles interact with adolescents' psychosocial development in shaping either adaptive or maladaptive consumer habits.

These findings can support the design of parenting education programs and school-based interventions. Educational institutions and school counselors can incorporate elements of authoritative parenting into parent training modules to strengthen emotional support and consistent discipline at home (Kang, 2022; Tiwari, 2022). Additionally, schools can develop age-appropriate financial literacy programs that help students manage spending urges and recognize manipulative marketing (Huang, 2024; Tarka et al., 2022). The finding that authoritative parenting substantially affects compulsive buying suggests that interventions for this behavior may benefit more from family-based strategies (Kellett et al., 2021; Shanbhag, 2024). Meanwhile, addressing impulsive buying may require more external interventions, such as peer-group discussions or media literacy programs that teach students to evaluate advertisements and social pressure critically.

This study has several limitations that should be addressed in future research. First, the data were collected through self-report questionnaires, which are susceptible to social desirability bias and limitations in self-awareness. Future studies could incorporate multiple data sources, such as teacher evaluations or behavioral observations, to increase validity. Second, the cross-sectional design prevents the establishment of causal relationships. Longitudinal studies are recommended to examine how parenting style influences the development of buying behavior over time. Additionally, this study may be subject to common method bias due to its exclusive reliance on self-report questionnaires collected at a single point in time. Although steps were taken to ensure measurement reliability, future research should consider incorporating multi-informant data or longitudinal designs to mitigate such bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Future research could also explore potential mediating or moderating variables, such as emotional regulation, self-esteem, or social media use.

intensity, to better understand the psychological mechanisms involved in shaping consumer behavior during early adolescence.

Conclusion

This study confirms that authoritative parenting serves as a protective factor against problematic buying behaviors in early adolescents. The findings demonstrate that higher levels of authoritative parenting are significantly associated with lower levels of both compulsive and impulsive buying. Although the effect on compulsive buying appeared slightly stronger than on impulsive buying, a formal statistical comparison using Fisher's r-to-z transformation indicated that this difference was not statistically significant. Thus, while authoritative parenting contributes to healthier consumer behaviour overall, its influence does not differ substantially across the two behavioral outcomes. These results underscore the value of fostering a parenting style characterized by warmth, consistency, and clear boundaries during early adolescence a formative period for developing self-regulation and decision-making. The study provides empirical support for designing targeted parenting programs and school-based interventions aimed at preventing maladaptive consumption patterns and promoting financial responsibility among youth.

References

- Anita, T. L. (2023). The Antecedents of Online Impulsive Buying. In *2023 8th International Conference on Business and Industrial Research, ICBIR 2023 - Proceedings* (pp. 322–326). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICBIR57571.2023.10147510>
- Badgaiyan, A. (2017). If brands are people, then people are impulsive-assessing the connection between brand personality and impulsive buying behaviour. *Journal of Brand Management*, 24(6), 622–638. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41262-017-0060-6>
- Bessouch, N., Mir, A., & Ali Iznasni. (2015). A test of the relationship between buying impulsiveness and impulse Purchases: adapting Rook and Fisher's scale to the Algerian cultural context. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 3(5), 73–81.
- David, J. (2024). Emotional difficulties mediate the impact of adverse childhood experiences on compulsive buying-shopping problems. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 13(4), 1064–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.2024.00056>
- d'Astous, A. (1990). An inquiry into the compulsive side of "normal" consumers. *Journal of consumer policy*, 13(1), 15–31.
- Faber, R. J. (2010). Impulsive and compulsive buying. *Wiley International Encyclopedia of Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444316568.wiem03007>
- Gogoi, B. J. (2020). Do impulsive buying influence compulsive buying? *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/fb1e856ee0a4feb54fa1b69b93661ee0/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=38744>
- Grant, J. E. (2024). Compulsive buying disorder: Conceptualization based on addictive, impulsive, and obsessive-compulsive features and comorbidity. *Psychiatry Research Communications*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psycom.2024.100199>

- Halim, E. (2022). Customer Impulsive Buying Behaviors in Indonesia E-Marketplace. In *Proceedings of 2022 International Conference on Information Management and Technology, ICIMTech 2022* (pp. 533–538). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICIMTech55957.2022.9915065>
- Huang, J. (2024a). Reasons For Impulsive Buying Behavior Among Adolescents in The Digital Age. *Highlights in Business, Economics and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.54097/aa169427>
- Huang, J. (2024b). Reasons For Impulsive Buying Behavior Among Adolescents in The Digital Age. *Highlights in Business, Economics and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.54097/aa169427>
- Japutra, A. (2022). Discovering the dark side of brand attachment: Impulsive buying, obsessive-compulsive buying and trash talking. *Journal of Business Research*, 145, 442–453. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.03.020>
- Jin, Y. (2024). Relationship between Authoritative Parenting Style and Preschool Children's Emotion Regulation: A Moderated Mediation Model. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 26(3), 189–198. <https://doi.org/10.32604/ijmh.2023.045331>
- Kang, J. (2022). The effects of authoritative parenting style on young adult children's prosocial behaviour: the mediating role of emotion-regulation. *China Journal of Social Work*, 15(2), 162–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17525098.2021.1956760>
- Kellett, S., Oxborough, P., & Gaskell, C. (2021). Treatment of compulsive buying disorder: Comparing the effectiveness of cognitive behavioural therapy with person-centred experiential counselling. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 49(3), 370–384. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1352465820000521>
- Khadijah, A. (2023). The Age of Indulgence: An Online Impulsive and Compulsive Buying Analysis. In *2023 8th International Conference on Informatics and Computing, ICIC 2023*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICIC60109.2023.10382051>
- Khorrami, M. S., Esfidani, M. R., & Delavari, S. (2015). The effect of situational factors on impulse buying and compulsive buying: Clothing. In *International Journal of Citeseer*. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=ccf75d83833ee18af6ee9e3f83bf38d5d7cf9506>
- Kim, C., Yang, Z., & Lee, H. (2015). Parental style, parental practices, and socialization outcomes: An investigation of their linkages in the consumer socialization context. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 49, 15–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2015.03.006>
- Kim, J. E., & Kim, J.-H. (2016). Consumer Socialization on Adolescent Impulsive Buying Behavior through School and Parents: A Random Effects Model. *Family and Environment Research*, 54(4), 385–395. <https://doi.org/10.6115/FER.2016.029>
- Kwan, Z. S. Y. (2023). Maladaptive emotion-focused coping and anxiety in children: The moderating role of authoritative parenting. *Current Psychology*, 42(26), 22781–22790. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03312-7>

- Malafe, N. S. A. (2023). The Impact of Advertising Values on Impulsive and Compulsive Buying. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 22(3), 349–394. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332861.2022.2057122>
- Mangestuti, R. (2014). Model Pembelian Kompulsif Pada Remaja. [http://repository.uin-malang.ac.id/340/1/Ringkasan Disertasi](http://repository.uin-malang.ac.id/340/1/Ringkasan%20Disertasi)
- Mestre-Bach, G. (2023). Obsessive-compulsive, harm-avoidance and persistence tendencies in patients with gambling, gaming, compulsive sexual behavior and compulsive buying-shopping disorders/concerns. *Addictive Behaviors*, 139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2022.107591>
- Müller, A. (2021). Problematic Online Buying-Shopping: Is it Time to Considering the Concept of an Online Subtype of Compulsive Buying-Shopping Disorder or a Specific Internet-Use Disorder? In *Current Addiction Reports* (Vol. 8, Issue 4, pp. 494–499). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40429-021-00395-3>
- Nabavi, R. T. (2012). *Bandura's Social Learning Theory & Social Cognitive Learning Theory*. 1–23.
- Nur, H., Setyaningrum, P., & Novandita, A. (2021). Permissive, Authoritarian, and Authoritative Parenting Style and Smartphone Addiction on University Students. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology*, 10(3), 419. <https://doi.org/10.12928/jehcp.v10i3.20620>
- Nyrhinen, J., Sirola, A., Koskelainen, T., Munnukka, J., & Wilska, T. (2023). Online antecedents for young consumers' impulse buying behavior. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 153, 108129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.108129>
- Palacios, I. (2022). Positive parenting style and positive health beyond the authoritative: Self, universalism values, and protection against emotional vulnerability from Spanish adolescents and adult children. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1066282>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. In *Journal of Applied Psychology* (Vol. 88, Issue 5, pp. 879–903). American Psychological Association Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Riany, Y. E., Cuskelly, M., & Meredith, P. (2018). Psychometric Properties of Parenting Measures in Indonesia. *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, 22(2), 75. <https://doi.org/10.7454/hubs.asia.1160118>
- Ridgway, N. M., Kukar-Kinney, M., & Monroe, K. B. (2008). An expanded conceptualization and a new measure of compulsive buying. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(4), 622–639. <https://doi.org/10.1086/591108>
- Roberts, J. A. (2019a). Family conflict and adolescent compulsive buying behavior. *Young Consumers*, 20(3), 208–218. <https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-10-2018-0870>

- Roberts, J. A. (2019b). Family conflict and adolescent compulsive buying behavior. *Young Consumers*, 20(3), 208–218. <https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-10-2018-0870>
- Sehra, S. K. (2024). Are expensive decisions impulsive? Young adults' impulsive housing and real estate buying behavior in India. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 17(2), 266–286. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJHMA-06-2022-0090>
- Shanbhag, T. (2024). Solution-focused Brief Psychological Intervention in Alteration of Compulsive Buying Behavior in an Individual with Compulsive Buying Disorder: A Case Report. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02537176241259709>
- Shrestha, A. (2024). *Impulsive Buying Behavior in Retailing and Consumer Behavior: A Review*. 1(1), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.69476/sdpr.2024.v01i01.004>
- Somma, A. (2023). Are problem buying and problem gambling addictive, impulsive, or compulsive in nature? A network analysis and latent dimension analysis study in Italian community-dwelling adults. *Psychiatry Research*, 321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2023.115100>
- Sun, B. (2023). Relationship between time pressure and consumers' impulsive buying – Role of perceived value and emotions. *Heliyon*, 9(12). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e23185>
- Tarka, P., Kukar-kinney, M., & Harnish, R. J. (2022). Consumers' personality and compulsive buying behavior: The role of hedonistic shopping experiences and gender in mediating-moderating relationships. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 64, 102802. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102802>
- Tiwari, A. P. (2022). Authoritative Parenting: The Best Style in Children's Learning. *American Journal of Education and Technology*, 1(3), 18–21. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajet.v1i3.687>
- Wang, Y., & Guo, F. (2024). Parenting style profiling, parent-child relationships, and their impacts on adolescents' social-emotional skills in China. *Current Psychology*, 43(42), 33118–33139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-06761-4>