# **Chapter 4: External Influences** **Group Influences**

**Consumer behavior** is strongly influenced by the social environment, and the groups people belong to. A group is made up of two or more individuals who interact with each other, share relationships, and pursue common goals or interests. These groups act as reference points, shaping how individuals think, feel, and act especially when it comes to buying decisions. People often adopt the norms, values, and behaviors of the groups they identify with, which can significantly impact what they choose to consume. This chapter looks at how different types of groups influence consumer behavior, the ways in which this influence occurs, and how marketers use these insights to create effective strategies.

At the end of this chapter, you will be able to:

1. Differentiate between different types of groups and the roles they play in shaping consumer behavior.
2. Recognize the role of subcultures and consumption subcultures in consumer decision-making.
3. Recognize the role of consumer-generated content, word-of-mouth, and influencers in consumer behavior, and their implications for marketing.
4. Discuss the innovation adoption in the context of consumer behavior and its implications for marketing.

Key Concepts to Remember:

* Types of groups:

Reference groups; Primary vs. secondary groups; Dissociative reference groups vs. aspiration reference groups

* Subcultures, consumption subcultures
* Seeding
* Types of influence:  
  Informational vs. normative influence vs. identification (value-expressive) influence
* Factors influencing the degree of group influence
* Asch phenomenon
* Brand ambassadors
* Brand community
* Word-of-mouth
* Consumer-generated content
* Guerrilla marketing
* Viral marketing
* Astroturfing
* Opinion leaders
* Market mavens
* Innovation adoption model (innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, laggards)
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## **Types of Groups**

Diverse groups exert varying degrees and forms of influence depending on their structure, purpose, and context in which they operate. This section delves into various types of groups.

### *Reference Groups*[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Reference groups** are critical in shaping consumer attitudes and behaviors. They serve as benchmarks for individuals to compare themselves with and decide the appropriateness of certain behaviors, including consumption patterns. For instance, a person may aspire to wear luxury brands such as Gucci or Louis Vuitton because these brands are endorsed by celebrities like Kim Kardashian or Harry Styles. Likewise, fitness-conscious individuals might turn to fitness influencers who promote brands like Nike or Adidas.

Reference groups can shift depending on the situation or context. For instance, when planning a spring break trip, a college student might rely on their friend group to decide where to go, what activities to do, and even what clothes to pack. Their choices are shaped by the preferences and expectations of their peers. In contrast, when shopping for groceries to cook a meal at home with family, the same student may prioritize family traditions, dietary needs, or budget considerations. These examples show how consumer decisions are often guided by the norms and values of the group that’s most relevant at the time.

### *Primary vs. Secondary Groups*

**Primary groups**, such as family and close friends, directly impact consumer behavior. For example, if the main decision-maker in the house who does the grocery shopping and prepares the meals decides to give up ultra-processed foods and harmful seed oils, it will lead all family members to switch from margarine to pasture-raised butter, reshaping their consumption habits towards more natural and wholesome options.

**Secondary groups**, such as acquaintances, clubs, or online communities, can influence consumer behavior. These groups may not be as close as family or close friends, but they still shape decisions in meaningful ways. For example, a student who joins a photography club might be encouraged to buy a specific type of camera or editing software based on what other members recommend or use. Even though the group isn’t deeply personal, the shared passion for photography creates a sense of trust and influence that guides purchasing choices.

### **Dissociative Reference Groups vs. Aspiration Reference Groups[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**Dissociative reference groups** are those that individuals actively avoid being associated with, and this avoidance can strongly influence their buying decisions. For example, a college student who wants to be seen as environmentally conscious might avoid using single-use plastic water bottles, distancing themselves from groups perceived as careless about sustainability. Instead, they may choose reusable bottles from brands like Stanley to reflect their values.

**Aspiration reference groups**, on the other hand, are people we admire and want to imitate. For instance, a student interested in entrepreneurship might follow successful startup founders on LinkedIn or YouTube and be inspired to buy productivity tools, business books, or even attend networking events to align themselves with that ambitious, driven lifestyle.

### *Subcultures, Consumption Subcultures[[3]](#footnote-3)*

**Subcultures** are groups within a larger culture that share distinct values, beliefs, and practices**.** These subcultures often influence consumer behavior by turning consumption into a way to express identity and belonging. One example is the sneakerhead subculture, made up of people who are passionate about collecting and wearing limited-edition sneakers. Members of this community often follow release dates, engage in online forums, and purchase from brands like Nike, Adidas, or New Balance not just for fashion, but to signal their knowledge and status within the group.

Similarly, a sustainability-focused subculture might prioritize eco-friendly products, choosing reusable items, thrifted clothing, or brands that emphasize ethical sourcing. These choices reflect deeper values and help individuals align with the identity and lifestyle of their chosen community.

The concept of **seeding** comes into play with subcultures, as brands strategically introduce products to influential members of a subculture to gain credibility and encourage organic word-of-mouth. For instance, a clothing brand may send a trendy apparel item to a popular college influencer with a strong following among health-oriented students. As the influencer highlights the clothing in their social media posts, it creates buzz and association with a lifestyle centered around sustainability and natural fibers.

***Reflect***

1. How do diverse types of groups influence your purchasing decisions?
2. Can you think of a time when you conformed to a reference group’s expectations despite your own preferences?

## **Influence[[4]](#footnote-4)**

There are three main types of influence: informational, normative, and identification (value-expressive) influence.

### *Informational Influence*

**Informational influence** occurs when individuals seek information from a group to make informed decisions. This can be seen on online platforms, where consumers look for product reviews from peers before purchasing. For example, individuals might consult sites like TripAdvisor for restaurant reviews or Amazon for product ratings, relying on the experiences of others to guide their choices.

### *Normative Influence*

**Normative influence** arises from the desire to conform to the expectations of a group. A classic example can be found in fashion; if a peer group adopts a specific style, individuals may feel pressured to wear similar clothing brands to fit in, such as adopting sustainable and health-promoting fashion brands because of their growing popularity in their social circles.

Normative influence also plays a significant role in shaping college students' drinking behaviors, often driven by the desire to fit in. For example, during the first few weeks of the semester, it's common for students to attend social events, like parties or gatherings, where alcohol is prominently featured. If the majority of their social group is engaged in drinking and celebrating, a student may feel pressured to participate, even if they might not typically consume alcohol. Research indicates that college students are more likely to drink when their friends are drinking. The normalization of binge drinking on college campuses can have lasting effects, as students who perceive high levels of alcohol consumption among their peers may adopt similar behaviors. This social influence can lead to a pattern where drinking is not only accepted but expected, shaping the way students view alcohol consumption as a fundamental part of the college experience.[[5]](#footnote-5)

### *Identification (Value-Expressive) Influence*

**Identification influence** occurs when individuals align their beliefs and behaviors with those of a group because they have internalized this group’s values as their own. For instance, environmentally conscious consumers may choose to purchase electric vehicles (EVs) from Tesla to align with a community that portrays itself as a champion for sustainability, impacting their personal identity and social status.

*Example – Informational, Normative, and Identification Influence[[6]](#footnote-6)*

To illustrate the progression through these three types of influence, consider a hypothetical customer, Alex, who is looking to purchase a new smartphone. Initially, Alex seeks out information (informational influence) by reading reviews on tech forums and watching YouTube reviews from influencers about the latest models from brands like Apple and Samsung. Based on this information, Alex narrows down the options.

Next, as Alex discusses the potential choice with friends, the desire to fit in with their preferences becomes evident (normative influence). If most of Alex's friends have iPhones, Alex may feel pressured to conform to that standard despite having initially considered other brands.

Finally, once Alex decides to purchase an iPhone, the identification influence might play a role in making him a loyal customer and buying a newer version in the future. This choice is not merely about the product; it signifies belonging to a community that identifies with Apple’s brand image, style, innovation, and lifestyle choice.

*Reflect*

1. Does normative influence shape your consumer behavior in college or work settings?
2. Which of the three types of influence shapes your behavior the most?

### **Factors Influencing the Degree of Group Influence[[7]](#footnote-7)**

The Asch phenomenon, based on Solomon Asch's seminal studies on conformity, underscores the impact of group pressure on individual behavior and decision-making. In his experiments, Asch demonstrated that individuals would often conform to a group's incorrect answer on a simple perceptual task, even when they knew the correct answer. This tendency to yield to the opinions of others highlights several key factors influencing the degree of group influence on consumer behavior.[[8]](#footnote-8)

*Factors Influencing the Degree of Group Influence*

#### Visible Usage

Products used in public settings are often influenced by group dynamics because they are visible to others. When people know their choices will be seen and judged, they tend to follow social norms and choose items that reflect what is popular or accepted within their peer group. For example, a student might choose a branded laptop like a MacBook for use in class or at the library not just for its features, but because it is seen as stylish and professional among their peers. This decision may be less about personal preference and more about fitting in or projecting a certain image, showing how public visibility can drive conformity in consumer behavior.

#### High Relevance of Product to Group

Products that carry high relevance to a group’s identity or values, such as eco-friendly products or health and well-being products, are more likely to be influenced by group norms. When an individual's self-concept is intertwined with a group, they are more likely to conform to the group's preferences. This solidifies the group membership and makes choosing products consistent with these values an automatic response driven by the desire for acceptance and belonging to that group.

#### Low Individual Purchase Confidence

Individuals lacking confidence in their knowledge or choices may rely more heavily on the advice of groups. When facing uncertainty, consumers may feel compelled to conform to the opinions of those around them to avoid standing out or making “incorrect” choices. For instance, if a group of friends recommends a specific phone based on popular opinion, an individual unsure about their preferences is likely to adopt the group’s choice, thus showing conformity to reduce anxiety about decision-making.

#### Strong Individual Commitment to Group

How strongly someone identifies with a group can influence their buying decisions. The more committed a person is to a community or lifestyle, the more likely they are to follow that group’s preferences, even if it means setting aside their own preferences. For example, a person who is deeply involved in a fitness club might feel pressure to buy specific workout gear, supplements, or even follow certain diets that are popular within the group. Their strong connection to the club makes them more receptive to its norms and trends, reinforcing their sense of belonging and shared identity.

#### Non-Necessary Items

Consumers are more likely to rely on group influence for discretionary purchases than for essential items. For luxury items or the latest gadgets, individuals often conform to the standards set by their peers. The desire to appear coordinated with current trends or social norms prompts consumers to adhere to group influences, often leading them to make purchasing decisions that reflect collective tastes rather than their own individual preferences.

## **Brand Ambassadors and Brand Communities[[9]](#footnote-9)**

**Brand ambassadors** are individuals who promote products or services through their personal networks, often influencing others through social media or word-of-mouth. For example, tech companies like Apple may partner with student influencers on platforms like Instagram or TikTok to highlight their devices (iPads, MacBook, etc.) and how they enhance productivity, creativity, or student life. These ambassadors share real-life experiences, such as using an iPad for digital note taking or video editing, which can inspire their followers to consider purchasing the same products to align with that lifestyle or image.

**Brand communities** are social groups formed around a shared interest in a brand. An example of such group is The Harley-Davidson Owners Group, where members create bonds through shared experiences with the brand. This connection fosters loyalty that translates into repeat purchases and brand advocacy. Members are not just customers. They are part of a lifestyle that reinforces their identity through the brand. Online communities on platforms like Reddit or Facebook amplify these dynamics, enhancing discussions and sharing experiences among enthusiastic consumers.

### **Word-of-Mouth and Consumer-Generated Content[[10]](#footnote-10)**

**Word-of-mouth (WOM)** is one of the most powerful forms of influence, as consumers often trust peer recommendations over traditional advertising. Factors influencing the likelihood of seeking opinions from opinion leaders include whether the purchase is a high- or low-involvement decision. For instance, a consumer may seek advice on a high-involvement purchase, like a car, from someone they perceive as knowledgeable, while they might not consult anyone for low-involvement purchases like household items, such as toothpaste or dish soap. Similarly, when purchasing electronics, a consumer may turn to expert reviews or friends for guidance on a significant investment like a laptop, while they might simply grab a snack from the grocery store without seeking opinions.

**Consumer-generated content** on social media has amplified the impact of WOM**.** Brands like Chipotle encourage customers to share their customized orders online, which not only promotes the brand but also builds trust through real user experiences. Similarly, companies like Red Bull feature videos of extreme sports created by users, helping to build a community around the brand and influence others through authentic, relatable content.

*Reflect*

1. How do brand ambassadors and online influencers shape your feelings of products?

### **Guerilla Marketing and Viral Marketing[[11]](#footnote-11)**

Brands today are getting creative with how they grab attention. One popular strategy is **guerrilla marketing,** which uses unexpected and bold tactics to make people stop and take notice. Instead of traditional ads, it’s all about creating moments that feel fresh, shareable, and real. Creating buzz around a product can lead to organic word-of-mouth, while viral marketing aims are characterized by share-ability on social media platforms. For example, the “Ice Bucket Challenge” for ALS awareness represents a successful viral marketing campaign that involved mass participation and sharing, generating substantial donations and awareness.

**Astroturfing** is a sneaky marketing tactic where companies create fake grassroots support to influence public opinion. Instead of real people backing up a cause or product, brands might use paid actors or fake online profiles to make it look like there's widespread enthusiasm. This can trick others into thinking a product is super popular, or a controversial decision is widely accepted. For example, imagine a company raising the price of a life-saving medication and then flooding social media with fake accounts defending the move, pretending to be everyday people. Even though it’s unethical, astroturfing shows how powerful group influence can be, especially when people believe others genuinely support something.

*Reflect*

1. Do you think guerrilla marketing is ethical? Why or why not?
2. Can you think of a time when you questioned whether a product or movement was genuinely popular or just used the astroturfing tactic?

### **Opinion Leaders and Market Mavens[[12]](#footnote-12)**

**Opinion leaders** are people who have built trust and influence within a community, often shaping how others think, feel, and buy. They’re usually experts or creators who break down complex information into relatable content. Younger consumers often turn to influencers on platforms like YouTube, TikTok, or Instagram for advice before making purchases. For example, creators like Emma Chamberlain influence fashion and lifestyle choices through their authentic content and personal style. Similarly, tech influencers like Marques Brownlee (MKBHD) help people decide which phone or gadget to buy by giving honest, in-depth reviews. Because these creators feel relatable and trustworthy, their opinions carry weight and often guide consumer decisions more than traditional ads.

Another example are beauty opinion leaders, who specialize in cosmetics and skincare, and share their content through platforms like YouTube and Instagram. Their tutorials, product reviews, and makeup hauls showcase a variety of products and set off trends that can lead to explosive popularity for specific items. Using their platforms to communicate honest opinions and demonstrate product effectiveness, these beauty gurus impact consumer behavior and often determine which products become bestsellers. The ripple effect of their recommendations can be so strong that brands often collaborate with influencers to propel their products into the spotlight, leveraging the trust these opinion leaders have cultivated with their audiences.

On the other hand, market mavens are individuals who possess extensive knowledge about products and services across various categories. They are often recognized for their ability to provide insights and recommendations that others value. For instance, they might share a lot of details regarding their lifestyle and offer reviews and recommendations for a broad range of topics, from a wholesome protein-rich diet and active lifestyle to healthy natural fabric fashion choices, to sustainable and toxic-free home decor.

## **Innovation adoption model**

### Innovation adoption process and extended decision-making

The innovation adoption process is a model that describes how consumers and organizations adopt new products, services, or technologies over time. This process typically involves several stages:

1. **Awareness**: The consumer learns about the innovation’s existence, often through marketing efforts, word-of-mouth, or media coverage.
2. **Interest**: Following awareness, the consumer shows interest in the innovation, seeking additional information. This may involve researching features, benefits, and potential uses.
3. **Evaluation**: At this stage, the consumer assesses the innovation against their needs, preferences, and existing alternatives. They weigh the pros and cons, which can be influenced by factors such as social proof, expert reviews, and personal experiences.
4. **Trial**: The consumer engages in a trial of the product to test its efficacy and compatibility. This could involve sampling, using a demo version, or experimenting with a limited purchase.
5. **Adoption**: If the trial phase is positive, the consumer decides to fully adopt the innovation, integrating it into their regular life or business practices.
6. **Confirmation**: After adoption, the consumer seeks reinforcement for their decision, either by actively using the product and experiencing its benefits or encountering feedback from other users.

Extended decision-making refers to a consumer behavior model characterized by a high level of involvement and extensive information processing before making a purchase decision. This typically occurs in high-involvement situations where the stakes are high, such as purchasing a car, a house, or other major investments[[13]](#footnote-13). The steps involved in this process include:

1. **Problem Recognition**: The consumer identifies a need or problem that requires a solution, prompting the search for an innovative product.
2. **Information Search**: The consumer actively seeks information from various sources such as friends, family, online reviews, expert opinions, and advertisements to understand available options.
3. **Evaluation of Alternatives**: After gathering information, the consumer evaluates potential products based on criteria that matter to them, which can include features, price, quality, and brand reputation.
4. **Purchase Decision**: Based on the evaluations, the consumer decides which product to buy, often influenced by their perceptions and the findings from their research.
5. **Post-Purchase Evaluation**: Following the purchase, the consumer assesses their satisfaction with the product, which can lead to subsequent recommendations, repeat purchases, or regret.

We will go into more detail on these steps in chapters 10-15.

*Innovation Adoption Process and Extended Decision-Making*

The innovation adoption process and extended decision-making often overlap, especially when the products purchase require high-involvement decision-making process. For example. Consumers follow the innovation adoption stages more rigorously when adopting newer technologies or solutions, especially if they are uncertain about their implications. In the case of a new smartphone model, consumers may go through the innovation adoption phases starting from awareness through confirmation. They might seek extensive reviews, compare specs, and analyze consumer feedback before purchasing. Understanding these processes helps marketers design effective strategies to encourage adoption and support decision-making, ultimately driving consumer engagement and product success.

### Innovation Diffusion Process[[14]](#footnote-14)

An innovation is any idea, practice, or product that is perceived as new by an individual or organization. Innovations can vary in terms of their characteristics, including compatibility, complexity, observability, and trialability, all of which influence how quickly they are adopted. The Diffusion of Innovation process is a sociological model that explains how new ideas, products, and technologies spread within a society or social system over time. This process was first introduced by Everett Rogers in his seminal work, "Diffusion of Innovations," published in 1962.

#### Stages of the Adoption Process

The diffusion process consists of several stages through which individuals move as they adopt an innovation. First, in the **knowledge** stage, individuals become aware of the innovation and gain some understanding of how it works. As interest grows, they enter the **persuasion** phase, where they seek more information and start forming opinions about the innovation. This leads to the **decision** stage, where individuals weigh the pros and cons, ultimately deciding whether to adopt or reject the innovation. Once the decision is made, they proceed to the **implementation** stage, applying the innovation into practice and observing its effectiveness. Finally, in the **confirmation** phase, users seek reinforcement for their decision; positive experiences might solidify their continued use of the innovation, while negative experiences could lead to its rejection. For example, when a new smartphone model is launched, consumers first learn about it through ads (knowledge), then research reviews online and discuss it with friends (persuasion). They consider whether its features meet their needs against its price (decision) and eventually buy the phone (implementation), after which they evaluate its performance and seek confirmation through user reviews and personal experience with the product.

Adoption Process – Stages

#### Innovation Adoption Curve

The adoption of innovations usually follows a bell-shaped curve, which categorizes adopters into five segments:

* **Innovators (2.5%)**: These are the first individuals to adopt the innovation. They are risk-takers and often have a high level of interest in new technologies.
* **Early Adopters (13.5%)**: This group follows innovators and is more socially connected. Early adopters are often seen as opinion leaders within their social networks.
* **Early Majority (34%)**: These individuals adopt the innovation after careful consideration and observing others’ experiences. They are influenced by early adopters and seek proven benefits.
* **Late Majority (34%)**: This group is more skeptical and will only adopt the innovation after it has become widely accepted and proven.
* **Laggards (16%)**: Laggards are the most resistant to change and adopt innovations only when it becomes necessary or when they are left with no other alternatives.

*Adopter Categories*

Understanding these segments can provide valuable insights for marketers and innovators aiming to influence the adoption process effectively.

##### Innovators

Innovators are the first individuals to adopt an innovation. They are characterized by their willingness to take risks and their strong interest in new technologies and ideas. This group consists of technology enthusiasts, researchers, or those who enjoy being at the forefront of trends. Innovators are crucial for the initial spread of innovation, as they provide early feedback and help refine the product or idea. Their willingness to experiment with new concepts makes them valuable allies for companies looking to launch innovative products.

##### Early Adopters

Following the innovators, early adopters are typically socially connected and influential within their networks. They often serve as opinion leaders, helping to shape the perceptions and behaviors of others. This group is characterized by its willingness to try new products but with a more cautious approach than innovators. Early adopters are likely to conduct thorough research and seek validation from peers before making their decision. Their endorsement of an innovation can significantly impact wider acceptance and play a pivotal role in influencing the early majority.

##### Early Majority

The early majority constitutes a significant portion of the adoption curve and represents individuals who are more deliberate and risk-averse than the earlier groups. They typically adopt innovations after observing their success among early adopters. This group requires clear evidence of benefits and proven functionality before committing to a new product. Social influence plays a crucial role at this stage, as the early majority often looks to the experiences and testimonials from early adopters. This group helps to validate the innovation's place in the market.

##### Late Majority

The late majority represents individuals who are skeptical of innovations and tend to adopt them only after they have gained widespread acceptance. This group often requires significant social proof and reassurance, as they are typically more conservative in their approach to change. They might adopt new technologies or ideas due to peer pressure, societal trends, or a need to remain relevant. By the time the late majority adopts an innovation, it has often become mainstream, making them less likely to explore alternatives.

##### Laggards

Laggards are the final group on the innovation adoption curve and are characterized by their resistance to change. They are highly skeptical of innovations and often prefer traditional methods and products. Laggards typically adopt an innovation only when it becomes an absolute necessity or when they have no other options left. Factors such as economic constraints, aversion to risk, and a strong attachment to the status quo contribute to their cautious adoption process. Laggards are often the last to embrace technology with a strong preference for familiarity over newness.

*Reflect*

1. How quick are you to adopt innovations and why? Which of the innovation adoption groups do you identify with?

### **Implications for Marketing**

Understanding these five segments can help innovators and marketers tailor their strategies to effectively reach each group. By recognizing the motivations, concerns, and behaviors of each adopter category, organizations can create targeted messaging and approaches that resonate with their audience, facilitating smoother entry and acceptance of new products or ideas in the market.

Marketers can effectively target customers at each stage of the innovation adoption process by understanding the unique characteristics and needs of each adopter segment.

For **innovators**, marketers should focus on engagement strategies that create excitement through pre-launch initiatives that showcase the innovation in progress. This group values being the first to know and experience innovative ideas, so offering exclusive access to previews or beta testing opportunities can foster a sense of involvement. Additionally, building online communities or forums where innovators can share experiences and provide feedback can enhance their connection to the product.

When it comes to **early adopters**, collaborating with opinion leaders and influencers whom they trust can significantly sway their perceptions. Marketers should provide detailed educational content through webinars, videos, and articles that highlight the innovative features and benefits of the product, effectively addressing any potential concerns. Leveraging testimonials and case studies that showcase the successful experiences of other early adopters can also reinforce their interest and confidence in innovation.

The **early majority** represent a larger segment of the adoption curve and targeting them requires a different approach. Marketers can encourage adoption by offering free trials, demos, or money-back guarantees, which help reduce perceived risk and boost confidence in the product’s effectiveness. Focusing on practical benefits and ROI (return on investment) with relatable scenarios that resonate with their daily lives is important. Moreover, providing robust customer support and easily accessible resources ensures that this group feels guided and well-supported during their adoption phase.

For the **late majority**, marketers should emphasize social proof through mass-market advertising that proves widespread acceptance and success of the innovation. Highlighting how many people have adopted the product can alleviate skepticism. Targeted promotions, such as exclusive offers or discounts, can create incentives for this more price-sensitive segment. Additionally, education and reassurance are vital, and clear, easy-to-understand information about the innovation can address common misconceptions and enhance comfort levels.

Finally, when engaging with **laggards**, marketers need to appeal to traditional values and methods that this segment prefers. Marketing messages should acknowledge these preferences while gradually introducing the innovation as a necessary evolution. Encouraging adoption through family and community influences can also be effective, using their social networks to demonstrate the product’s utility. Marketers can highlight circumstances where the product becomes a necessity, showing how not adopting it may lead to disadvantages or missed opportunities.

In conclusion, by understanding the distinct motivations and characteristics of each adopter category in the innovation adoption process, marketers can create targeted strategies that enhance customer engagement, drive adoption, and lead to market success. Effective messaging, social proof, and robust support systems are key to easing smoother transitions through each stage of the adoption curve.

End-of-Chapter Self-Reflection

1. What are the ways in which groups have influenced your past buying decisions?

1. Have you ever been impacted by a viral marketing campaign? If so, how?
2. What type of consumer do you think you are in the innovation adoption model? Why?
3. How can understanding group influences help you become a more mindful consumer?
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