

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Who decides? Intergenerational perception of adolescents' personal care products purchase and consumption

José Irrarázaval^{1,2}  | Beatriz Feijoo³  | Samuel Negrodo¹ 

¹Department of Journalism, School of Communication, University of Navarra, Campus Universitario, Pamplona, Navarra, Spain

²Facultad de Comunicación, Universidad de los Andes, Santiago, Chile

³Department of Communication, Villanueva University, Madrid, Spain

Correspondence

José Irrarázaval, Department of Journalism, School of Communication, University of Navarra, Campus Universitario, Pamplona, Navarra 31009, España.
Email: jirrazava.l@alumni.unav.es

Funding information

Fundación BBVA

Abstract

This study explores intergenerational differences in the perception of adolescents' (ages 12–17) use of personal care products and related purchasing decisions. An online survey of 1088 parent–child dyads ($n=2176$) was conducted, and paired samples t-tests were used. Results show minors report higher usage—especially of gym and fitness items—than parents acknowledge. Adolescents also perceive more parental supervision than parents report. Parents set stricter age limits for purchasing items like makeup and supplements and express greater concern over risks. These findings reveal perception gaps that may inform educational and regulatory approaches to adolescent consumption.

KEYWORDS

adolescent consumption, body care, dyads, parental supervision, spending

The fashion, cosmetics, aesthetic, and food product industries have gained prominence in contemporary society, driven by consumption associated with the value placed on physical appearance and the search for adolescent identity construction (Chaplin & John, 2007; Feijoo et al., 2024). In addition to the pursuit of identity, other factors that motivate consumption include well-being, better health, technology use, social pressure, and adaptation to new trends (Garcillán, 2025). This phenomenon has intensified with the expansion of social media and influencers, who act as role models and symbols of well-being for youth (Montúfar-Calle & Palomino-Moreno, 2024; Zozaya-Durazos et al., 2023).

Likewise, advertising and children's fashion increasingly reflect adult-world trends, showcasing models, sophisticated expressions, and makeup on children's faces that emulate adult aesthetics (Jiménez-Marín et al., 2017). This scenario becomes even more complex considering

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2026 The Author(s). Family & Consumer Sciences Research Journal published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences.

that today's adolescents have more purchasing power than ever before and dedicate a significant portion of their time to internet use to meet their needs and aspirations while informally acquiring digital skills within that ecosystem (Feijoo et al., 2021; Márquez et al., 2020; Mintz, 2006).

Faced with this reality, parental control becomes essential—not limited to rigid supervision, but encouraging dialogue based on mutual understanding and negotiation between parents and children (Kerrane & Hogg, 2013; Sadaba, 2018). This communication process must consider both parenting styles (Baumrind, 1991; Carlson & Grossbart, 1988) and family dynamics, as well as the restrictions parents impose when they perceive conflicts triggered by advertising or consumption decisions influenced by it (Carlson, Laczniak, & Muehling, 1994; Carlson, Walsh, et al., 1994; Dens et al., 2007).

In this context, the growing autonomy of adolescents in making purchasing decisions—especially for products related to body care (Barnig, 2017)—raises relevant questions about how they negotiate that autonomy with their parents or guardians. In this study, we use the term “personal care products or body care” to refer to three specific categories that are particularly relevant in adolescent consumption. These include: (a) makeup and cosmetics, such as facial creams, basic skincare products, and other beauty items; (b) fitness-related goods and services, including sports equipment, gym memberships, and digital fitness applications; and (c) nutritional supplements, such as proteins and vitamins. This operational definition provides conceptual clarity and ensures consistency across all sections of the study, including the measurement of variables and the interpretation of results.

The present research aims to explore intergenerational discrepancies through a comparative analysis of the perceptions of adolescents (ages 12–17) and their parents. This approach allows for the identification of divergences and points of consensus regarding parental supervision, the minimum age for accessing products, and the perceived risks associated with them. This study aims to inform educational and regulatory strategies that address adolescent consumption, considering their growing autonomy and the challenges it presents for families.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The theory of consumer socialization of adolescents describes how young people acquire knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to purchasing decisions. Ward (1974) defined this process as the way in which youth learn to interact with the marketplace through personal experiences and the observation of those around them. The family, especially parents, plays a key role in the early stages, acting as consumption role models (Moschis & Churchill, 1978).

John (1999) identified three stages in young consumers: perceptual, analytical, and reflective. The reflective stage (ages 11–17) is especially relevant because adolescents develop critical thinking about their consumption decisions, questioning advertising, parental guidance, and peer influence. According to McNeal (1987), this higher level of reflection and autonomy increases their influence on household purchases. At this stage, with more advanced cognitive skills and reduced parental control, adolescents actively participate in family consumption decisions (Gentina et al., 2018; Peña Meneses et al., 2023). This active participation intensifies when minors believe that having a good physical appearance contributes to greater social acceptance, a key aspect in the socialization process (Feijoo et al., 2023; Han & Kim, 2020).

In contemporary digital environments, adolescents' concerns about physical appearance are increasingly shaped by the content they encounter online. Tiggemann and Slater (2013) show that engagement with visually oriented platforms heightens body-image concerns, while, Perloff (2014) argues that social media intensify social comparison processes. Fardouly and Vartanian (2016) add that such appearance-based comparisons can occur rapidly and with limited reflection, influencing both self-esteem and consumption choices.

Recent studies indicate that this digital ecosystem reinforces the pursuit of an idealized appearance and, consequently, stimulates demand for body-care products (Feijoo, 2025; López-Martínez et al., 2024; Montúfar-Calle & Palomino-Moreno, 2024; Zozaya-Durazo & Yáñez-Galdames, 2024), making these categories a particularly relevant context for examining intergenerational perceptions and adolescents' participation in household purchase decisions.

However, this participation is not perceived in the same way by all family members. The literature shows that adolescents do influence household purchasing decisions, yet parents tend to underestimate this influence (Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Carlson et al., 1990). From attitudes toward ads, brands, and prices, to minors' ability to identify advertising—which is frequently underestimated by parents—external factors directly influence preferences and can even motivate household purchase decisions (Feijoo-Fernández et al., 2021; Mikeska et al., 2017; Mishra & Maity, 2021). The literature emphasizes that this tension between adolescents' self-perception and parents' views is influenced not only by family dynamics but also by the contemporary digital ecosystem, where advertising, social media, and especially influencers—many of whom are minors themselves—act as relatable, attractive, trustworthy, and highly persuasive role models (Hudders et al., 2021; Jean Lim et al., 2017; Zozaya-Durazo et al., 2023). In this environment, where minors navigate autonomously, actively choose the content they consume, and are exposed to a high volume of body and diet-related advertising, digital advertising becomes a personalized experience, often processed unconsciously or with low attention by minors (Feijoo et al., 2025; Hudders et al., 2019; Montúfar-Calle et al., 2024). This setting reinforces the sense of independence in their consumption decisions, especially in areas related to body care and physical appearance, which contrasts with the varying degrees of control and supervision exercised by parents, paving the way for an analysis of parenting styles and their effects on perceived purchasing autonomy.

Baumrind (1991) distinguishes between parenting styles based on levels of control and warmth, which affect the degree of autonomy minors exercise in their decisions, including consumption. While permissive styles favor greater independence, authoritarian styles tend to limit it, and the democratic style balances both aspects, promoting guided yet autonomous decisions. Along those lines, Stattin and Kerr (2000) argue that parental supervision can take active or passive forms. Active supervision involves direct parental involvement through questions, conversations, or setting rules, while passive supervision relies on children and adolescents voluntarily informing their parents about the consumption of certain goods or services. The Parental Monitoring Scale, developed by Stattin and Kerr (2000), measures how these forms of supervision influence youth behavior. Studies show that greater supervision can result in restrictions or guidance depending on context and product type (Borawski et al., 2003; Osman et al., 2024). There are discrepancies in the perception of parental supervision: adolescents report more supervision than their parents believe they exercise (Laird et al., 2003).

John (1999) argues that more authoritarian parenting styles tend to restrict children's active participation in purchasing decisions. Buijzen and Valkenburg (2005) show that restrictive mediation regarding advertising limits minors' autonomous decision-making ability when it comes to advertised products, while Lwin et al. (2008) conclude that strict parental supervision significantly reduces children's opportunities to make independent decisions, which also affects their online shopping habits.

In the case of products related to fitness and nutritional supplements, the literature indicates that the pressure to achieve certain body ideals can intensify consumption among adolescents and young people. Cafri et al. (2005) show that the pursuit of the “muscular ideal” is associated with greater use of supplements and with risk behaviors involving exercise and diet. Complementing this perspective, Moradi et al. (2024) document a high prevalence of supplement use among gym users and explain how the pressure of the sports environment, together with favorable attitudes toward these products, contributes to normalizing their consumption.

These findings highlight the importance of examining how parents and adolescents perceive access to these product categories and the risks they associate with them within the household.

From the perspective of fuzzy-trace theory (FTT), Reyna and Farley (2006) suggest that adolescents prioritize immediate rewards over long-term consequences. This pattern helps explain the underestimation of risks by adolescents exposed to social media advertising, which influences their consumption. Montúfar-Calle and Palomino-Moreno (2024) warn that this exposure—especially to influencers—impacts self-perception, well-being, and body dissatisfaction. Although adolescents identify certain risks, they tend to downplay their long-term consequences, unlike adults, who weigh them more heavily (Quadrel et al., 1993). Studies warn about potential negative effects on physical and mental health resulting from the use of personal care products (Alnuqaydan, 2024; Khalid & Abdollahi, 2021; Parikh & Lipner, 2024), a concern that may justify parental decisions to limit minors' use of certain products. Restrictions imposed by parents and grandparents are often stricter than what minors themselves consider necessary (Gram et al., 2017), a phenomenon also observed in studies on consumer socialization and parenting styles (Carlson, Lacznik, & Muehling, 1994; Carlson, Walsh, et al., 1994; John & Chaplin, 2022; Mikeska et al., 2017; Sigirci et al., 2022).

The consumption of personal care products among adolescents has grown significantly (Feijoo et al., 2024), generating differences in how parents and children interpret and manage these practices. While adolescents tend to underestimate risks and prioritize immediate rewards (Reyna & Farley, 2006), parents typically impose restrictions based on concerns about potential negative consequences that may affect the minor (Nagata et al., 2024). Taken together, this body of literature indicates that adolescents act as active agents in their consumer socialization process, particularly in product categories related to body care and strongly shaped by the digital ecosystem, while parents retain a supervisory and boundary-setting role grounded in risk perception (Baumrind, 1991; John, 1999). However, most previous studies have focused on a single product category or have not simultaneously compared how parents and adolescents perceive supervision, minimum age for access, and associated risks. This study addresses that gap through an intergenerational dyadic approach that examines how parents and adolescents differ in their perceptions of purchasing, spending, supervision, and access criteria for body-care products.

H1. *Adolescents report higher levels of purchase and spending on personal care products than those recognized by their parents.*

H2. *Adolescents perceive a higher level of parental supervision in the purchase of personal care products than parents report exercising.*

H3. *Adolescents and parents differ significantly regarding the minimum appropriate age for purchasing personal care products and the reasons for restricting access.*

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted through the application of an online questionnaire directed at dyads consisting of minors aged 12–17 and one of their parents, guardians, or responsible adults. Data collection was carried out via a panel supervised by a social research company, ensuring methodological rigor and sample representativeness. A total of 2176 individuals participated, distributed across 1088 households. For the total sample, a margin of error of $\pm 3\%$ was estimated, based on the assumption of simple random sampling (SRS), with a 95% confidence level ($p = q = 0.5$), in line with previous studies involving minors as the subject of analysis (Feijoo et al., 2023; Márquez et al., 2020). For measurement purposes, personal care

products (body-care) were assessed following the same operational definition introduced in the Introduction. The questionnaire therefore evaluated adolescents' and parents' perceptions across three product categories: (a) makeup and cosmetics, (b) fitness-related goods and services, and (c) nutritional supplements. These categories guided the construction of the survey items related to purchase, spending, parental supervision, recommended minimum age, and perceived risks.

The sample was obtained using a multi-stage cluster sampling method. In the initial stage, the first-level Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS-1) area was established as the primary sampling unit, following the territorial classification used by Eurostat and the European Union, which in Spain involves the aggregation of several Autonomous Communities. In the second stage, proportional stratification was applied based on the socioeconomic level of the families, defined using criteria related to educational attainment, income, and other relevant socioeconomic variables. This level was structured into three major groups: low, medium, and high socioeconomic status. Finally, the selection of individuals within households was conducted using cross quotas for the gender and age of the minors, ensuring a balanced distribution.

The final sample consisted of minors with an average age of 14.5 years (ranging from 12 to 17), with a distribution of 52.2% boys and 47.8% girls. Regarding the surveyed adults, the average age was 48.36 years (ranging from 31 to 67, with a standard deviation of 5.7), of whom 36.3% were men and 63.7% women. The household composition showed that 29.2% of households had only one child, 57.2% had two children, and 13.6% had three or more children. In terms of socioeconomic level, household distribution was as follows: 1.4% reported a very low level, 14.1% low, 76.2% medium, 7.8% high, and 0.6% very high.

To measure the study variables, a structured questionnaire was used that addressed various dimensions of product consumption, including adolescent personal care products. First, product purchases were assessed by differentiating between makeup and cosmetics (including moisturizers and facial treatments), gym and fitness equipment (such as gym memberships, apps, and sports gear), and dietary supplements (proteins and vitamins). This variable was measured using a dichotomous question (Yes/No). Additionally, a section was included on monthly spending levels for the above product categories, categorized into six price ranges (less than €10, €11–25, €26–50, €51–100, €101–200, and more than €200).

Another section of the questionnaire addressed the level of parental supervision in the purchase of body care products. A scale was designed based on the Parental Monitoring Scale by Stattin and Kerr (2000), with a reliability coefficient $\alpha=0.897$. This scale measured the extent to which parents supervise the purchasing process through the following items: indicating where to buy the product, helping select a specific product or model, showing interest in the purchase process, knowing the product cost, asking about features and brand, accompanying the child or giving instructions during the purchase, and monitoring spending. Responses were recorded on a three-point scale (1 = Never/almost never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often/very often). Additionally, a variable was included regarding the recommended age to purchase body care products, with categories ranging from “from any age” to “from age 18.” Finally, the questionnaire explored the reasons for restricting the purchase of these products, based on whether they were perceived as potentially harmful to physical health, mental health, or if minors were considered to lack the judgment needed to use them responsibly. In this case, responses were recorded in a dichotomous format (Yes/No).

Since the study is based on the comparison of perceptions between minors and their parents, the paired samples *t*-test represents the most appropriate statistical technique to analyze these differences. Unlike other mean comparison tests, this approach allows for examination of whether significant discrepancies exist between two related measures—that is, within each dyad (parent–child)—controlling for intra-subject variability. This is particularly relevant in the context of this study, as it is not only important to understand general

differences in the perception of consumption, supervision, and recommended purchase age, but also to determine whether each parent's response significantly differs from that of their child. The use of this test allows for the identification of possible intergenerational gaps in the perception of personal care product consumption, providing a solid empirical basis to analyze how adolescents form their purchasing habits in contrast with parental expectations and control. By evaluating each pair of responses, the analysis becomes more precise and sensitive to individual discrepancies, strengthening the validity of the findings. Data analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics software, which enabled rigorous and accurate statistical calculations, ensuring correct interpretation of significance values and confidence intervals for each comparison.

This study was conducted following ethical principles for research involving minors and in compliance with the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the university affiliated with this research (Ref: CE_2024-24). In addition, informed consent was obtained from all participants and their legal guardians, ensuring voluntary participation and respecting privacy and confidentiality. The data collected were treated anonymously and used exclusively for research purposes.

RESULTS

Purchase and spending on personal care products

The results reveal differences in perception between minors and parents regarding the purchase and spending on makeup and cosmetics, gym and fitness equipment, and dietary supplements.

In terms of purchase frequency, minors report higher consumption than their parents recognize. Specifically, 39.2% of adolescents state that they buy makeup and cosmetic products, compared to only 26.4% of parents who acknowledge this practice. Regarding gym and fitness equipment, 18.0% of minors claim to purchase these products, while only 10.1% of parents believe their children do so. The largest discrepancy is found in dietary supplements: 7.4% of minors report purchasing them, compared to just 2.5% of parents, as shown in [Table 1](#).

Paired samples *t*-tests confirm these differences for the gym and fitness equipment category ($t = -3.651, p < 0.001$), indicating that parents significantly underestimate their children's purchases in this category. However, for makeup and cosmetics ($t = 1.069, p = 0.285$) and dietary supplements ($t = -1.829, p = 0.068$), the differences do not reach statistical significance and can be seen in more detail in [Table 2](#).

TABLE 1 Perception of purchase and spending on personal care products: statements by minors versus beliefs of parents.

Purchase level by product category	Minor		Parent	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Makeup and cosmetics (moisturizing creams, facial treatments)	427	39.2	287	26.4
Gym and fitness equipment (gyms, sports apps, sports equipment)	196	18.0	110	10.1
Nutritional supplements (proteins, vitamin supplements)	81	7.4	27	2.5

Source: Data compiled by the authors.

Regarding estimated monthly spending, the results show some divergence between minors and parents. For makeup and cosmetics, 41.8% of adolescents report spending between €11 and €25 per month, while 39.4% of parents place this spending in the lower bracket (less than €10). For gym and fitness equipment, 45.0% of minors estimate their spending between €26 and €50, compared to 38.2% of parents who estimate it between €11 and €25. Although the differences in dietary supplement spending are smaller, adolescents still report slightly higher spending than what parents estimate. *t*-tests did not detect significant differences in spending levels across any of the analyzed categories ($p > 0.05$ in all cases), suggesting that although there are discrepancies in the estimates, they are not consistent enough to be considered statistically significant in paired comparison, as shown in Table 3.

Parental supervision and recommended age for purchase

Parental supervision in the purchase of personal care products also reveals significant discrepancies between minors and parents. While 57.4% of minors state that their parents supervise

TABLE 2 Statistical comparison of purchase and spending perceptions between minors and parents: paired samples' *t*-test.

Comparison pair	Matched differences		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Significant
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Makeup purchase: minor vs. parent	0.012	0.290	1.069	667	0.285	No
Gym purchase: minor vs. parent	-0.036	0.254	-3.651	671	0.000	Yes
Supplement purchase: minor vs. parent	-0.015	0.213	-1.829	656	0.068	No
Makeup spending: minor vs. parent	0.014	0.869	0.236	213	0.814	No
Gym spending: minor vs. parent	0.161	0.861	1.743	86	0.085	No
Supplement spending: minor vs. parent	0.200	0.414	1.871	14	0.082	No

Source: Data compiled by the authors.

TABLE 3 Estimated monthly spending by product category.

	Makeup and cosmetics				Gym and fitness equipment				Dietary supplements			
	Minor		Parent		Minor		Parent		Minor		Parent	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Less than €10	126	33.8	99	39.4	28	16.4	18	17.6	14	20.0	8	36.4
€11–25	156	41.8	90	35.9	41	24.0	31	30.4	29	41.4	9	40.9
€26–50	63	16.9	39	15.5	77	45.0	39	38.2	16	22.9	5	22.7
€51–100	22	5.9	15	6.0	18	10.5	11	10.8	5	7.1	0	0
€101–200	4	1.1	7	2.8	7	4.1	2	2.0	2	2.9	0	0
More than €200	2	0.5	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	1.0	4	5.7	0	0
Total	373	100.0	251	100.0	171	100.0	102	100.0	70	100.0	22	100.0
Don't know how much I spend	54		36		25		8		11		5	

Source: Data compiled by the authors.

these purchases “often” or “very often,” only 36.0% of parents report exerting that level of control. Conversely, 14.2% of parents consider that they “never or almost never” supervise these purchases, compared to just 4.1% of minors who perceive such a lack of control.

The paired samples *t*-test confirms this difference ($t = 7.853, p < 0.001$), indicating that adolescents perceive significantly more supervision than parents believe they provide. This may reflect differing interpretations: parents see supervision as occasional intervention, while minors may view any comment or question about purchases as supervision. See [Tables 4 and 5](#).

Regarding the recommended age to purchase personal care products, the generational gap is striking. While 23.5% of minors believe these products should be available at any age, only 4.0% of parents agree. Similarly, 19.1% of adolescents think purchases should be allowed from age 12, while only 2.6% of parents support this. In contrast, most parents set stricter limits, recommending age 16 (42.5%) or 18 (41.2%) as the minimum. See [Table 6](#) for the full comparison.

The *t*-test shows a highly significant difference on this variable ($t = -34.462, p < 0.001$), confirming that minors favor earlier access to these products, while parents prefer more conservative restrictions.

Finally, regarding the arguments for restricting access to these products, substantial differences were found. While 86.5% of parents believe some of these products could be harmful to physical health, only 33.5% of minors share this concern ($t = -21.636, p < 0.001$). For mental health risks, 65.6% of parents express concern compared to only 10.7% of adolescents ($t = -26.002, p < 0.001$). Lastly, 77.0% of parents believe minors lack sufficient judgment to purchase these products responsibly, a view shared by only 42.6% of minors ($t = -10.211, p < 0.001$).

These findings reflect that parents tend to perceive greater risks associated with these products and, consequently, establish stricter age restrictions, while adolescents hold a more permissive stance and lower awareness of potential negative effects, as shown in [Table 7](#).

DISCUSSION

The results of this study reveal significant discrepancies in the perception of body care product consumption between children, adolescents, and their parents. These divergences span aspects related to purchasing, spending, parental supervision, and the appropriate age for accessing the following categories of products: makeup and cosmetics (moisturizers and facial treatments), gym and fitness equipment (gym memberships, apps, and sports gear), and dietary supplements (proteins and vitamins).

Adolescents report greater consumption of makeup, gym-related items, and supplements than parents recognize. This suggests they actively acquire these products, often without parental awareness. This aligns with existing literature showing that adolescents perceive more autonomy than their parents attribute to them (Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Carlson et al., 1990). This pattern directly supports H1, which proposed that adolescents would report higher levels of purchasing and spending on body-care products than those recognized by their parents.

TABLE 4 Level of parental supervision.

	Minor		Parent	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Never/almost never	19	4.1	49	14.2
Sometimes	179	38.5	171	49.7
Often/very often	267	57.4	124	36.0
Total	465	100	344	100

Source: Data compiled by the authors.

TABLE 5 Paired samples' *t*-test.

Comparison pair	Matched differences		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Significant
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Parental supervision: minor vs. parent	0.303	0.630	7.853	265	0.000	Yes
Recommended age for purchase: minor vs. parent	-1.438	1.376	-34.462	1087	0.000	Yes
Restriction due to physical health: minor vs. parent	-0.42548	0.56724	-21.636	831	0.000	Yes
Restriction due to mental health: minor vs. parent	-0.52644	0.58400	-26.002	831	0.000	Yes
Restriction due to lack of judgment: minor vs. parent	-0.22236	0.62813	-10.211	831	0.000	Yes

Source: Data compiled by the authors.

TABLE 6 Perception of the minimum recommended age to purchase personal care products: comparison between minors and parents.

	Minor		Parent	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
From any age	256	23.5	43	4.0
From age 12	208	19.1	28	2.6
From age 14	306	28.1	107	9.8
From age 16	236	21.7	462	42.5
From age 18	82	7.5	448	41.2
Total	1088	100.0	1088	100.0

Source: Data compiled by the authors.

TABLE 7 Arguments for restricting the age of purchase of body care products.

	Minor		Parent	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Some of these products may be harmful to physical health	364	33.5	941	86.5
Some of these products may be harmful to mental health	116	10.7	714	65.6
Minors do not have sufficient judgment to purchase or consume responsibly	463	42.6	838	77.0

Source: Data compiled by the authors.

Furthermore, the relationship between these findings and the theory of consumer socialization—particularly the reflective stage described by John (1999) is highly relevant. During this stage (ages 11–17), adolescents develop critical thinking about consumption, reflect on their preferences, and begin forming their own decision-making criteria. The greater autonomy they report may be reflected in this learning process and in their growing independence in decision-making. Social media and influencers reinforce adolescents' perceived independence and confidence in purchasing decisions (Hudders et al., 2021; Lajnef, 2023; Zozaya-Durazo et al., 2023).

Regarding differences in the perception of parental supervision, the findings confirm that minors feel more controlled than parents claim to exert. This discovery aligns with previous

studies showing that the perception of parental supervision is often influenced by parenting styles that seek to balance autonomy and control (Baumrind, 1991; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Stattin & Kerr, 2000). Adolescents may interpret any parental comment as control, while parents often view supervision only as explicit restrictions. These findings also support H2, which proposed that adolescents would perceive higher levels of parental supervision than parents themselves report. In our data, 57.4% of adolescents stated that their parents supervise them “often or very often,” compared with only 36.0% of parents who reported providing that level of oversight. Such divergences underscore the importance of understanding supervision not simply as control, but as part of the family decision-making process based on household norms and internal negotiations (Bao et al., 2007; John, 1999; Kerrane & Hogg, 2013). It is also worth noting that the presence of social media and influencers strengthens minors' perception of autonomy by offering platforms where they can access information, recommendations, and consumer models without the intervention of parents or guardians. This contributes to adolescents' perception of reduced parental supervision—even when parents believe otherwise.

In terms of the recommended age to purchase body care products, the generational divide is especially pronounced. While adolescents tend to favor earlier access, parents impose much stricter restrictions—particularly in categories such as makeup, cosmetics, and dietary supplements. For example, 23.5% of minors believe that the products analyzed in this study should be available at any age, compared to only 4.0% of parents. This aligns with research showing minors poorly assess long-term risks (Quadrel et al., 1993; Reyna & Farley, 2006; Steinberg, 2008), highlighting the need for appropriate guidance from parents or guardians.

These findings directly support H3, which proposed that adolescents and parents would differ significantly in their perceptions of the minimum appropriate age for purchasing body-care products and the reasons for restricting access. Consistent with this expectation, adolescents favored substantially earlier access, with 23.5% stating that these products should be available at any age and 19.1% from age 12, whereas parents endorsed far stricter limits, with 42.5% setting the minimum age at 16 and 41.2% at 18. Likewise, parents' justifications focused primarily on perceived risks to physical health (86.5%), mental health (65.6%), and on the concern that minors lack sufficient judgment to use these products responsibly (77.0%), a pattern clearly reflected in the paired comparisons.

Additionally, parents perceive greater risks related to physical health, mental health, and a lack of sufficient judgment on the part of minors to make responsible decisions. This finding is aligned with studies that show parental concerns about the use of body care products are not limited to economic issues, but also include concerns about the physical and emotional well-being of their children (Bai, 2024; Chang & Suttikun, 2017; Khalid & Abdollahi, 2021; Medley et al., 2023; Nagata et al., 2024).

IMPLICATIONS

This study provides nationally representative dyadic evidence showing that adolescents exert greater influence on household purchasing decisions (particularly in body-care categories) than parents recognize. This finding extends both classical work (Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Carlson et al., 1990) and more recent contributions (Feijoo-Fernández et al., 2021; Sádaba & Bringué, 2011; Shoham & Dalakas, 2005), illustrating that perception gaps persist in the current digital ecosystem.

The contrast between adolescents' reported supervision and parents' self-reported oversight reveals a meaningful mismatch in how both understand their role in the purchasing process. While traditional models of parental supervision (Stattin & Kerr, 2000) remain a solid theoretical reference, the divergences observed suggest that, in today's digital environment, additional dynamics associated with continuous exposure to influencers, aspirational content,

and personalized advertising may be at play. These intergenerational discrepancies are also not homogeneous: they vary clearly across cosmetics, fitness products, and nutritional supplements. This pattern underscores the need to examine adolescent consumption in a segmented manner that considers product category, gender, age, and maturity level, rather than treating youth consumption as a uniform phenomenon. The joint analysis of adolescents' and parents' perceptions offers an intergenerational perspective rarely explored in research on products whose use is increasing steadily among young people.

The results also translate into several practical implications. The discrepancies between adolescents' self-reported consumption and parents' perceptions, particularly in fitness and supplements, suggest that many families operate with partial information. Encouraging explicit discussions about specific product categories, spending levels, and responsible use criteria may help reduce misunderstandings and strengthen negotiation and guidance within the household. Moreover, the fact that adolescents perceive higher levels of supervision than parents believe they provide highlights the importance of establishing clear, shared expectations regarding the purchase and use of body-care products.

In educational settings, the finding that parents tend to set stricter minimum ages based on concerns about physical and mental health reinforces the need to include media-literacy and health-education content in school curricula. Providing adolescents with tools to evaluate risks, interpret body-image-related messages, and understand influence mechanisms present in digital environments can contribute to more informed and critical consumption.

Finally, the differences identified in perceived risks and minimum age criteria reveal the lack of common reference points for families. The results support the development of clear age-appropriate guidelines for the use of cosmetics, fitness products, and supplements, as well as informational campaigns addressing the risks associated with early use, particularly in nutritional supplements, where the discrepancies were most pronounced. Such initiatives may help families make more informed and coherent decisions at home.

Taken together, these results link the empirical evidence to the key theoretical frameworks—consumer socialization, parenting styles, and fuzzy-trace theory—showing that intergenerational perceptions of adolescent consumption emerge at the intersection of autonomy, supervision, and risk appraisal. In doing so, this study addresses the gap identified in previous literature by simultaneously comparing how parents and adolescents interpret these processes within product categories that are increasingly shaped by the digital ecosystem.

LIMITATIONS

This study presents several limitations. First, it relies on self-reported data, which may be subject to memory or social desirability biases, especially regarding body-image-related practices and consumption. Second, although the sample is nationally representative, the cross-sectional design prevents establishing causal relationships among the variables analyzed. Finally, the study focuses on three specific body-care categories; future research could incorporate additional consumption domains relevant to adolescents—such as fashion or technology—as well as longitudinal designs that capture how these intergenerational gaps evolve over time.

CONCLUSIONS

The results show that minors perceive greater autonomy in the purchase of personal care products than their parents acknowledge, with significant differences particularly in the gym and fitness equipment category. In terms of spending, although descriptive discrepancies were observed, these differences were not statistically significant.

Regarding parental supervision, minors report a higher level of control than what parents claim to exercise. Likewise, adolescents believe that these products should be available at younger ages, while parents establish more restrictive limits and perceive greater risks associated with their use.

The generational divergence in acceptable purchase ages is significant because it marks the boundary where adolescents' pursuit of autonomy meets parental caution. Recognizing this boundary helps explain how families negotiate consumption limits and how adolescents gradually gain independence in body-care decisions. This insight is valuable for policymakers, educators, and brands seeking to understand how consumption norms are constructed within households.

This study reveals intergenerational gaps in adolescent body care consumption. While adolescents seek greater autonomy and generally minimize the risks associated with these products, parents take a more restrictive approach, primarily based on concerns related to health and minors' lack of judgment. These findings highlight the need for educational strategies that foster parent–child dialogue, as well as the need to launch awareness campaigns on the main risks associated with the consumption of certain products. Future research should explore how these generational gaps vary by gender, socioeconomic status, and digital media exposure.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

José Irrázaval, Samuel Negrodo, Beatriz Feijoo: Conceptualization; project administration; resources; visualization; writing—review and editing. **José Irrázaval, Samuel Negrodo:** Data curation; formal analysis. **Beatriz Feijoo:** Funding acquisition, methodology, software. **José Irrázaval:** Investigation; writing—original draft. **Samuel Negrodo, Beatriz Feijoo:** Supervision; validation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank the families and adolescents who participated in this study for their time and valuable input. The authors are also grateful to the BBVA Foundation for supporting this research through a Leonardo Grant for Scientific Research and Cultural Creation, awarded to Beatriz Feijoo, which made this project possible.

FUNDING INFORMATION

This work was supported by a Leonardo 2024 Grant for Scientific Research and Cultural Creation from the BBVA Foundation.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

ORCID

José Irrázaval  <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-5786-6358>

Beatriz Feijoo  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5287-3813>

Samuel Negrodo  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8441-1231>

REFERENCES

Alnuqaydan, A. M. (2024). The dark side of beauty: An in-depth analysis of the health hazards and toxicological impact of synthetic cosmetics and personal care products. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12, 1439027. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1439027>

- Bai, Y. (2024). Adolescent cosmetic consumption: Exploring societal influences, safety concerns, and post-pandemic market shifts. *Advances in Economics, Management and Political Sciences*, 108(1), 140–145. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/108/20242028>
- Bao, Y., Fern, E. F., & Sheng, S. (2007). Parental style and adolescent influence in family consumption decisions: An integrative approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(7), 672–680. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2007.01.027>
- Barnig, K. (2017). Elementary schools students' use of beauty products and makeup behavior. *International Information Institute (Tokyo)*. *Information*, 20(4B), 2861–2868.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1), 56–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431691111004>
- Beatty, S. E., & Talpade, S. (1994). Adolescent influence in family decision making: A replication with extension. *Source: Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(2), 332–341. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209401>
- Borawski, E. A., Ievers-Landis, C. E., Lovegreen, L. D., & Trapl, E. S. (2003). Parental monitoring, negotiated unsupervised time, and parental trust: The role of perceived parenting practices in adolescent health risk behaviors. *The Journal of Adolescent Health: Official Publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*, 33(2), 60–70. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1054-139X\(03\)00100-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1054-139X(03)00100-9)
- Buijzen, M., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2005). Parental mediation of undesired advertising effects. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 49(2), 153–165. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4902_1
- Cafri, G., Thompson, J. K., Ricciardelli, L., McCabe, M., Smolak, L., & Yesalis, C. (2005). Pursuit of the muscular ideal: Physical and psychological consequences and putative risk factors. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 25(2), 215–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2004.09.003>
- Carlson, L., & Grossbart, S. (1988). Parental style and consumer socialization of children. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(1), 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209147>
- Carlson, L., Grossbart, S., & Walsh, A. (1990). Mothers' communication orientation and consumer-socialization tendencies. *Journal of Advertising*, 19(3), 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1990.10673190>
- Carlson, L., Laczniak, R. N., & Muehling, D. D. (1994). Understanding parental concern about toy-based programming: New insights from socialization theory. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 16(2), 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10641734.1994.10505019>
- Carlson, L., Walsh, A., Laczniak, R. N., & Grossbart, S. (1994). Family communication patterns and marketplace motivations, attitudes, and behaviors of children and mothers. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 28(1), 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.1994.tb00813.x>
- Chang, H. J., & Suttikun, C. (2017). The examination of psychological factors and social norms affecting body satisfaction and self-esteem for college students. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 45, 422–437. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fcsr.12220>
- Chaplin, L. N., & John, D. R. (2007). Growing up in a material world: Age differences in materialism in children and adolescents. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34, 480–493. <https://doi.org/10.1086/518546>
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model [article]. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3), 487–496. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487>
- Dens, N., Pelsmacker, P., & Eagle, L. (2007). Parental attitudes towards advertising to children and restrictive mediation of children's television viewing in Belgium. *Young Consumers*, 8(1), 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17473610710733730>
- Fardouly, J., & Vartanian, L. R. (2016). Social media and body image concerns: Current research and future directions. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 9, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.09.005>
- Feijoo, B., Bugueño, S., Sádaba, C., & García-González, A. (2021). Parents' and children's perception on social media advertising [La percepción de padres e hijos chilenos sobre la publicidad en redes sociales]. *Comunicar*, 67, 93–103. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C67-2021-08>
- Feijoo, B. (2025). Menores y consumo. Lo que dicen ellos, lo que perciben sus padres, pp. 3–58. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15616420>
- Feijoo, B., Durazo, Z., Saiz, C., & Sádaba, C. (2023). *Digital fit: Influencia de las redes sociales*. <https://www.fundacionmapfre.org/publicaciones/todas/digital-fit-influencia-redes-sociales/>
- Feijoo, B., Fernández-Gómez, E., Neira-Placer, P., Segarra, J., & Castelló-Martínez, A. (2025). *La exposición de los menores a la publicidad que recibe por su teléfono móvil*. Informe de resultados. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13960496>
- Feijoo, B., Vizcaíno-Verdú, A., & Núñez-Gómez, P. (2024). Cuerpo, imagen y redes sociales: El impacto y atractivo promocional de los influencers. *ZER - Revista de Estudios de Comunicación*, 29(57), 13–16. <https://doi.org/10.1387/zer.27123>
- Feijoo-Fernández, B., Bugueño, S., Sádaba-Chalezquer, C., & García-González, A. (2021). *La percepción de padres e hijos sobre la publicidad en redes sociales*. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C67-2021-08>
- Garcillán, M. d. (2025). *Marketing y cosmética: estrategias persuasivas e influencers creativos para el nuevo consumidor*. ESIC Editorial.

- Gentina, E., Shrum, L. J., Lowrey, T. M., Vitell, S. J., & Rose, G. M. (2018). An integrative model of the influence of parental and peer support on consumer ethical beliefs: The mediating role of self-esteem, power, and materialism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150(4), 1173–1186. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3137-3>
- Gram, M., O'Donohoe, S., Marchant, C., & Brembeck, H. (2017). Consumption and intergenerational relationships: Broadening interpretive research on family consumption by focusing on the grandparent-grandchild relationship. In *Interpretive Consumer Research Conference*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317256359>
- Han, T., & Kim, H. (2020). The ideal man and woman: South Korean Children's body image perceptions. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 49, 24–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fcsr.12370>
- Hudders, L., De Jans, S., & De Veirman, M. (2021). The commercialization of social media stars: A literature review and conceptual framework on the strategic use of social media influencers. *International Journal of Advertising*, 40(3), 327–375. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2020.1836925>
- Hudders, L., Van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Poels, K. (2019). Digital advertising and consumer empowerment. *Cyberpsychology*, 13(2), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.5817/CP2019-2-xx>
- Jean Lim, X., Rozaini bt Mohd Radzol, A., Cheah, J.-H., & Wai Wong, M. (2017). The impact of social media influencers on purchase intention and the mediation effect of customer attitude. *Asian Journal of Business Research*, 7(2), 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.14707/ajbr.170035>
- Jiménez-Marín, G., García Medina, I., & Bellido-Pérez, E. (2017). *La publicidad en el punto de venta: Influencia en la imagen corporal infantil*. <https://doi.org/10.4185/RLCS,72-2017-1202>
- John, D. R. (1999). Consumer socialization of children: A retrospective look at twenty-five years of research. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 26(3), 183–213. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209559>
- John, D. R., & Chaplin, L. N. (2022). Children as consumers: A review of 50 years of research in marketing. In *APA handbook of consumer psychology* (pp. 185–202). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000262-007>
- Kerrane, B., & Hogg, M. K. (2013). Shared or non-shared?: Children's different consumer socialisation experiences within the family environment. *European Journal of Marketing*, 47(3), 506–524. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090561311297436>
- Khalid, M., & Abdollahi, M. (2021). Environmental distribution of personal care products and their effects on human health. *Iranian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*, 20(1), 216–253. <https://doi.org/10.22037/ijpr.2021.114891.15088>
- Laird, R. D., Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. E., & Dodge, K. A. (2003). Parents' monitoring-relevant knowledge and adolescents' delinquent behavior: Evidence of correlated developmental changes and reciprocal influences. *Child Development*, 74(3), 752–768. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00566>
- Lajnef, K. (2023). The effect of social media influencers' on teenagers behavior: An empirical study using cognitive map technique. *Current Psychology*, 42(22), 19364–19377. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04273-1>
- López-Martínez, A., Sádaba, C., & Feijoo, B. (2024). Exposure of adolescents to food and body care influencer marketing. *Revista de Comunicación de la SEECI*, 57, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.15198/seeci.2024.57.e863>
- Lwin, M., Stanaland, A., & Miyazaki, A. (2008). Protecting children's privacy online: How parental mediation strategies affect website safeguard effectiveness. *Journal of Retailing*, 84(2), 205–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2008.04.004>
- Márquez, I., Masanet, M. J., Lanzeni, D., & Pires, F. (2020). Adolescentes que construyen su imagen digital en las redes sociales: aprendizajes informales, competencias transmedia y perfiles profesionales. *BiD (Barcelona)*, 45, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1344/BiD2020.45.9>
- McNeal, J. U. (1987). *Children as consumers: Insights and implications*. Lexington Books.
- Medley, E. A., Kruchten, K. E., Spratlen, M. J., Ureño, M., Cole, A., Joglekar, R., & Herbstman, J. B. (2023). Usage of Children's makeup and body products in the United States and implications for childhood environmental exposures. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(3), 2114. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20032114>
- Mikeska, J., Harrison, R. L., & Carlson, L. (2017). A meta-analysis of parental style and consumer socialization of children. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 27(2), 245–256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2016.09.004>
- Mintz, S. (2006). Born to buy: The commercialized child and the new consumer culture. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 28(5), 589–591. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2005.07.005>
- Mishra, A., & Maity, M. (2021). Influence of parents, peers, and media on adolescents' consumer knowledge, attitudes, and purchase behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 20(6), 1675–1689. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1946>
- Montúfar-Calle, Á., Feijoo, B., Díaz-Campo, J., & Palomino-Moreno, H. (2024). Actitud y comportamiento del adolescente frente al influencer advertising sobre cuerpo y dieta en Perú. *Revista de Comunicación Comunicación*, 23(2), 213–238. <https://doi.org/10.26441/RC23.2-2024-3605>
- Montúfar-Calle, Á., & Palomino-Moreno, H. (2024). Exposición y autopercepción física: el adolescente y la publicidad del influencer sobre cuerpo y dieta en Perú. *ZER—Revista de Estudios de Comunicación*, 29(57), 105–126. <https://doi.org/10.1387/zer.26933>

- Moradi, F., Yazdani, A., Nematollahi, F., Hosseini-Roknabadi, S. M., & Sharifi, N. (2024). Prevalence of supplement usage and related attitudes and reasons among fitness athletes in the gyms of Kashan and its relationship with feeding behavior: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Sports Science, Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 16(1), 150. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13102-024-00940-3>
- Moschis, G. P., & Churchill, G. A. (1978). Consumer socialization: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 15(4), 599–609. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224377801500409>
- Nagata, J. M., Paul, A., Yen, F., Smith-Russack, Z., Shao, I. Y., Al-shoaiibi, A. A. A., Ganson, K. T., Testa, A., Kiss, O., He, J., & Baker, F. C. (2024). Associations between media parenting practices and early adolescent screen use. *Pediatric Research*, 97, 403–410. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41390-024-03243-y>
- Osman, B., Champion, K. E., Thornton, L., Burrows, T., Smout, S., Hunter, E., Sunderland, M., Teesson, M., Newton, N. C., & Gardner, L. A. (2024). Exploring the association between adolescent-perceived parental monitoring on dietary intake. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, 20(3), e13650. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.13650>
- Parikh, A. K., & Lipner, S. R. (2024). Glow or No-go: Ethical considerations of adolescent and teen skincare trends in social media [article]. *Skin Research and Technology*, 30(8), e70029. <https://doi.org/10.1111/srt.70029>
- Peña Meneses, G. R., Martín Peña, G. M., Astudillo Valverde, D. F., & Larios Gómez, E. (2023). Revisión y análisis documental sobre la influencia familiar en comportamientos de compra en niños y adolescentes. *FACE: Revista de La Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Empresariales*, 22(3), 17–34. <https://doi.org/10.24054/face.v22i3.1443>
- Perloff, R. M. (2014). Social media effects on young women's body image concerns: Theoretical perspectives and an agenda for research. *Sex Roles*, 71(11–12), 363–377. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s1199-014-0384-6>
- Quadrel, M. J., Fischhoff, B., & Davis, W. (1993). Adolescent (in)vulnerability. *The American Psychologist*, 48(2), 102–116. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.48.2.102>
- Reyna, V. F., & Farley, F. (2006). Risk and rationality in adolescent decision making implications for theory, practice, and public policy. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 7(1), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2006.00026.x>
- Sadaba, C. (2018). Niños como consumidores digitales. In E. Jiménez, M. Garmendia Larrañaga, & M. Á. Casado (Eds.), *Entre selfies y whatsapps: Oportunidades y riesgos para la infancia y la adolescencia conectada* (pp. 247–257). Gedisa.
- Sádaba, C., & Bringué, X. (2011). *Redes sociales: Manual de supervivencia para padres*. Viceversa.
- Shoham, A., & Dalakas, V. (2005). He said, she said ... They said: Parents' and children's assessment of children's influence on family consumption decisions. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 22(3), 152–160. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760510595977>
- Sigirci, O., Gegez, A. E., Aytimur, H., & Gegez, E. E. (2022). Children in marketing: A review, synthesis and research agenda [article]. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 46(5), 1594–1639. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12819>
- Stattin, H., & Kerr, M. (2000). Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. *Child Development*, 71(4), 1072–1085. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00210>
- Steinberg, L. (2008). A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking. *Developmental Review*, 28(1), 78–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2007.08.002>
- Tiggemann, M., & Slater, A. (2013). NetGirls: The internet, facebook, and body image concern in adolescent girls. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 46(6), 630–633. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22141>
- Ward, S. (1974). Consumer socialization. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1086/208584>
- Zozaya-Durazo, L., Feijoo, B., & Sádaba-Chalezquer, C. (2023). Social media influencers defined by adolescents. *KOME*, 11(2), 68–90. <https://doi.org/10.17646/KOME.of.4>
- Zozaya-Durazo, L., & Yáñez-Galdames, M. J. (2024). Verse bien > sentirse bien. Impacto de las colaboraciones entre marcas e influencers sobre el culto al cuerpo para adolescentes. *ZER—Revista de Estudios de Comunicación*, 29(57), 171–187. <https://doi.org/10.1387/zer.26926>
- Zozaya-Durazos, L., Fernández, B. F., & Chalezquer, C. S. (2023). The role that influencers play in consumption decisions made by Spanish minors. *Doxa Comunicación*, 2023(36), 401–413. <https://doi.org/10.31921/doxacom.n36a1685>

How to cite this article: Irarrázaval, J., Feijoo, B., & Negro, S. (2026). Who decides? Intergenerational perception of adolescents' personal care products purchase and consumption. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 54, e70057. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fcsr.70057>