E-ISSN: 2986-5050, P-ISSN: 2986-5336
DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/gijea.v1i4
Received: January 11st, 2024, **Revised:** January 27th, 2024, **Published**: January 31st, 2024
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

GIJEA
Greenation International Journal of Economics and Accounting
+62 81210467572 https://research.e-greenation.org/GIJEA greenation.info@gmail.com
GREENATION RESEARCH

Analyzing the Impact of Financial Socialization and Social Media Influence on Young Consumers' Behavioral Patterns

Srinija Nekkanti[1], Aditi Kalani[2], Mahek Narwani[3], Rahul Chauhan[4], Andino Maseleno[5], R. Rizal Isnanto[6]
[1]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India, nijanekkanti@gmail.com
[2]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India
[3]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India
[4]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India
[5]Department of Information Systems, Institut Bakti Nusantara, Lampung, Indonesia, andino.maseleno@ibnus.ac.id
[6]Department of Computer Engineering, Diponegoro University, Semarang, Indonesia, rizal@ce.undip.ac.id

Corresponding Author: andino.maseleno@ibnus.ac.id[5]

Abstract: This study analyzes the impact of financial socialization and social media influence on young consumers' behavioral patterns, focusing on age and gender differences. Utilizing a quantitative approach, the research examines how technological advancements and social factors shape financial literacy and spending habits among youth. Findings indicate that while age influences engagement with social media and influencers, fundamental financial behaviors like budgeting show minimal variation across age groups. Gender analysis reveals significant differences in price comparison behaviors, suggesting the need for targeted marketing strategies. The study emphasizes the importance of financial literacy education in a digital context and highlights opportunities for further research on cultural influences and evolving consumer behaviors. Overall, the insights gained underscore the critical role of social media and technology in shaping the financial practices of young consumers.

Keywords: Financial literacy, social media influence, consumer behavior, age and gender differences

INTRODUCTION

Budget awareness among young people is increasingly becoming a focal point in research on financial behavior and literacy. With the growing reliance on digital technologies and the introduction of financial services powered by artificial intelligence (AI), there is a significant shift in how financial knowledge is disseminated and practiced among the youth (Chabachib et al., 2020). For instance, Bhatia et al. (2021) highlight the role of AI, specifically robo-advisory services, in enabling users to make more informed financial decisions, emphasizing the importance of technological tools in shaping financial literacy. Furthermore, digital financial literacy, as Abdallah et al. (2024) point out, is critical to the financial behavior of consumers, allowing for better budgeting and financial planning through accessible online resources and platforms.

In addition to technological advancements, social factors like financial socialization play a crucial role in shaping young people's budgeting skills (Fuad et al., 2023). Goyal et al. (2023) explore how psychological characteristics and social interactions influence the financial management behavior of young professionals, including their ability to budget effectively. These findings align with Fan et al. (2023), who examine the impact of influencers and social media on the financial habits of young consumers, demonstrating that online communities and digital content can serve as both positive and negative influences on financial behavior.

Corporate volunteering and community involvement are also important mechanisms for developing financial competence among young people, as suggested by Glińska-Neweś et al. (2022). Through these activities, young individuals can build the skills and knowledge necessary for effective budgeting and financial decision-making. Similarly, smaller-scale events, like those described by Pereira et al. (2020), can offer strategic opportunities for young participants to enhance their financial awareness through community involvement and personal experience.

External influences, such as marketing and consumer behavior, also play a role in shaping budgeting habits. For example, Basha et al. (2023) examine how marketing strategies targeting students—particularly in emerging markets like cannabis-infused soft drinks—can affect their financial decisions and budgeting priorities. This reflects a broader trend of commercialization impacting young people's financial behavior, necessitating a greater emphasis on education around budgeting and spending. Therefore, as budgeting awareness becomes an increasingly relevant issue among the younger generation, it is evident that both technological tools and social influences are pivotal in shaping their financial behaviors and attitudes

METHOD

The research aims to explore the influence of various factors, such as safety awareness, financial socialization, and influencer marketing, on individuals' behavior and engagement, using a sample size of 100 respondents from Ahmedabad. The study adopts a quantitative approach, utilizing structured questionnaires to gather data from participants across diverse demographics, including age, gender, occupation, and educational background. The sample is selected using a convenience sampling method, targeting respondents from different neighborhoods and sectors, such as educational institutions, corporate offices, and public spaces, to ensure a wide representation of views.

The primary objectives of the research are:

- To examine the impact of financial socialization and psychological characteristics on the personal financial management behavior of young professionals in Ahmedabad.
- To analyze the role of social media influencers in shaping consumer engagement and purchasing decisions among the youth in the region.

Data collection is conducted via both online and offline modes, ensuring that respondents have easy access to the questionnaire. The structured questionnaire includes both closed-ended and Likert scale questions, focusing on participants' financial habits, awareness of safety protocols, and engagement with social media influencers. The collected data is then entered into SPSS software for statistical analysis.

For the analysis, descriptive statistics are employed to summarize the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Additionally, inferential statistical tests such as regression analysis, correlation, and ANOVA are used to determine the relationships between the variables, aligning with the research objectives. The reliability of the questionnaire is assessed using Cronbach's alpha to ensure internal consistency. Furthermore, factor analysis is performed to identify underlying patterns in the data, particularly related to financial behavior and social media engagement. The results provide insights into how various factors affect behavior, offering recommendations for improving safety awareness, financial literacy, and marketing strategies in Ahmedabad.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The demographic profile of the respondents reveals important insights into the characteristics of the surveyed population. Out of 104 participants, the majority (79.4%) fall within the age group of 18-24, indicating a strong representation of younger individuals, which aligns with the study's focus on young consumers. The next largest age group is 25-30, comprising 14.4%, while only 5.8% of respondents are aged 31-35 or above 45, suggesting that the sample is predominantly composed of young adults. In terms of gender distribution, the respondents are fairly balanced, with 53.8% identifying as male and 46.2% as female. This representation reflects a slight male majority but remains relatively even, which is beneficial for analyzing diverse perspectives on financial behavior.

Table 1 Demographic Profile Of Respondent

		FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Age	18-24	83	79.4
	25-30	15	14.4
	31-35	3	2.9
	Above 45	3	2.9
	Total	104	100.0
Gender	Male	56	53.8
	female	48	46.2
	Total	104	100.0
Educational Qualification	High school	42	40.4
	Bachelor degree	47	45.2
	Master degree	11	10.6
	PhD	3	2.9
	other	1	1.0
	Total	104	100.0
Occupation	student	74	71.2
	employee	19	18.3
	Self employed	11	10.6
	Total	104	100.0

Regarding educational qualifications, 40.4% of respondents have completed high school, while 45.2% hold a bachelor's degree, indicating a well-educated sample. A smaller segment, 10.6%, has attained a master’s degree, and only 2.9% have completed a PhD. This educational background suggests that the participants are generally in the early stages of their careers or academic pursuits, contributing to the focus on financial socialization and budgeting skills among young consumers.

Finally, when examining the respondents' occupations, a significant majority (71.2%) are students, reflecting the study's emphasis on young individuals navigating financial challenges. Employees constitute 18.3% of the sample, while self-employed individuals make up 10.6%. This occupational distribution underscores the relevance of financial literacy and budgeting education, particularly for those still in education or transitioning into the workforce. Overall, the demographic profile provides a clear understanding of the study's target audience, highlighting the importance of addressing financial socialization and social media influence in shaping the behaviors of young consumers.

Table 2 ANOVA Between Age And Financial Behavior

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
How 3 do you create a budget for your personal expenses?	Between Groups	9.042	3	3.014	2.632	.054
	Within Groups	114.496	100	1.145		
	Total	123.538	103			
Who has influenced your financial habits the most?	Between Groups	15.346	3	5.115	3.409	.020
	Within Groups	150.039	100	1.500		
	Total	165.385	103			
How would you rate your financial literacy (understanding of budgeting, saving, investing, etc.)?	Between Groups	6.064	3	2.021	2.179	.095
	Within Groups	92.773	100	.928		
	Total	98.837	103			
Do you track your spending regularly?	Between Groups	3.168	3	1.056	.976	.407
	Within Groups	108.207	100	1.082		
	Total	111.375	103			
To what extent do you agree with the fol4ing statements about your financial behavior?	Between Groups	17.119	3	5.706	4.653	.004
	Within Groups	122.641	100	1.226		
	Total	139.760	103			
How 3 do you use 2 platforms?	Between Groups	3.226	3	1.075	.772	.512
	Within Groups	139.235	100	1.392		
	Total	142.462	103			

Table 2 presents the results of an ANOVA analysis examining the relationship between age and various aspects of financial behavior among respondents. The table outlines several key financial behavior questions, comparing the mean differences across different age groups. For the question on how respondents create a budget for personal expenses, the ANOVA results show a significance level of .054, which is just above the conventional threshold of .05. This indicates that while there is a noticeable difference in budgeting practices across age groups, it is not statistically significant.

In contrast, the question regarding who has influenced respondents' financial habits revealed a significant difference, with an F-value of 3.409 and a significance level of .020. This suggests that age does have a notable impact on financial influences, indicating that younger and older individuals may be guided by different sources when it comes to their financial decisions. When assessing respondents' self-rated financial literacy, the ANOVA yielded a significance level of .095, again above the .05 threshold, suggesting no statistically significant difference across age groups. Similarly, the question about tracking spending regularly showed a non-significant result with a significance level of .407, indicating that age does not appear to influence this behavior.

However, the analysis of agreement with statements about financial behavior revealed a significant difference, with an F-value of 4.653 and a significance level of .004. This implies that age significantly affects how respondents perceive and engage with their financial behavior. Finally, the question on the use of financial platforms resulted in a non-significant finding with a significance level of .512. This indicates that age does not significantly influence the utilization of various financial tools or platforms among respondents. Overall, the ANOVA analysis indicates that while age has some impact on specific aspects of financial behavior, particularly in terms of influence and perception, it does not universally affect all financial behaviors or practices.

Table 3 ANOVA Between Age And Financial Behavior

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
How 3 do you create a budget for your personal expenses?	Between Groups	.015	1	.015	.012	.913
	Within Groups	123.524	102	1.211		
	Total	123.538	103			
Who has influenced your financial habits the most?	Between Groups	7.254	1	7.254	4.679	.033
	Within Groups	158.131	102	1.550		
	Total	165.385	103			
How would you rate your financial literacy (understanding of budgeting, saving, investing, etc.)?	Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.034	.854
	Within Groups	98.804	102	.969		
	Total	98.837	103			
Do you track your spending regularly?	Between Groups	2.476	1	2.476	2.319	.131
	Within Groups	108.899	102	1.068		
	Total	111.375	103			
To what extent do you agree with the fol4ing statements about your financial behavior?	Between Groups	.004	1	.004	.003	.959
	Within Groups	139.756	102	1.370		
	Total	139.760	103			
How 3 do you use 2 platforms?	Between Groups	.167	1	.167	.120	.730
	Within Groups	142.295	102	1.395		
	Total	142.462	103			

Table 3 presents the results of an ANOVA analysis that examines the impact of age on various financial behaviors among respondents. Each question assesses different aspects of financial practices, comparing mean differences between age groups. For the question about how respondents create a budget for their personal expenses, the ANOVA results indicate a sum of squares of .015 with a significance level of .913. This high p-value shows that there is no significant difference in budgeting practices across different age groups.

Similarly, the question regarding who has influenced respondents' financial habits yielded a sum of squares of 7.254, with a significance level of .033. This result indicates a statistically significant difference, suggesting that age does impact the sources of financial influence, meaning that different age groups may rely on varying influences for their financial decisions.

In terms of self-rated financial literacy, the analysis produced a sum of squares of .033 and a significance level of .854, which again suggests no significant differences across age groups in perceived financial knowledge. The question about tracking spending regularly resulted in a sum of squares of 2.476 and a significance level of .131, indicating a non-significant difference. This means that age does not appear to influence the regularity with which individuals track their spending.

For the agreement with statements about financial behavior, the ANOVA revealed a sum of squares of .004 and a significance level of .959, suggesting that age does not significantly affect respondents' attitudes or perceptions regarding their financial behaviors. Lastly, the question regarding the use of financial platforms resulted in a sum of squares of .167 and a significance level of .730, indicating no significant difference among age groups in the utilization of various financial tools. Overall, the ANOVA analysis in Table 3 shows that, with the exception of the influence on financial habits, age does not significantly affect most financial behaviors or perceptions among respondents. This suggests that other factors may play a more critical role in shaping financial practices within this demographic.

Table 4 ANOVA Between Age And Social Media Influence

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Which 2 platform do you use most frequently?	Between Groups	10.339	3	3.446	2.869	.040
	Within Groups	120.122	100	1.201		
	Total	130.462	103			
Do you fol4 2 influencers?	Between Groups	2.584	3	.861	5.093	.003
	Within Groups	16.916	100	.169		
	Total	19.500	103			
How 3 do 2 influencers impact your purchasing decisions?	Between Groups	2.931	3	.977	.396	.756
	Within Groups	246.569	100	2.466		
	Total	249.500	103			
What type of content from influencers influences you the most?	Between Groups	5.000	3	1.667	1.082	.360
	Within Groups	154.039	100	1.540		
	Total	159.038	103			
How do you prefer to research a product before purchasing?	Between Groups	5.637	3	1.879	1.183	.320
	Within Groups	158.892	100	1.589		
	Total	164.529	103			
How 3 do you compare prices or reviews before making a purchase?	Between Groups	3.619	3	1.206	1.375	.255
	Within Groups	87.727	100	.877		
	Total	91.346	103			
Do discounts or promotions on 2 platforms influence your purchase decisions?	Between Groups	.107	3	.036	.048	.986
	Within Groups	74.729	100	.747		
	Total	74.837	103			
Do you think financial literacy should be a mandatory subject in schools/colleges?	Between Groups	1.120	3	.373	3.931	.011
	Within Groups	9.496	100	.095		
	Total	10.615	103			
How do you feel about the role of influencers in shaping consumer behavior?	Between Groups	4.099	3	1.366	2.253	.087
	Within Groups	60.660	100	.607		
	Total	64.760	103			

Table 4 presents the results of an ANOVA analysis examining the relationship between age and various aspects of social media influence on consumer behavior. Each question focuses on how social media usage and influencer engagement differ across age groups. The analysis for the question regarding the most frequently used social media platforms shows a significant difference, with a sum of squares of 10.339 and a significance level of .040. This indicates that age influences the choice of social media platforms, suggesting that different age groups may prefer distinct platforms for their social interactions.

For the question about following influencers, the ANOVA results reveal a sum of squares of 2.584 and a significance level of .003, indicating a strong significant difference. This suggests that age significantly impacts the tendency to follow influencers, with younger individuals likely being more engaged with influencer content than older age groups. Conversely, the analysis for how influencers impact purchasing decisions yielded a sum of squares of 2.931, but the significance level was .756, indicating no significant difference among age groups. This suggests that while age may influence the act of following influencers, it does not significantly affect the perceived impact of those influencers on purchasing behavior.

When examining the type of content from influencers that influences respondents the most, the results showed a sum of squares of 5.000 with a significance level of .360, indicating no significant differences in preferences across age groups. Similarly, the question on product research preferences also yielded non-significant results, with a sum of squares of 5.637 and a significance level of .320.

For the question about comparing prices or reviews before making a purchase, the ANOVA showed a sum of squares of 3.619 and a significance level of .255, again indicating no significant differences across age groups. Additionally, the influence of discounts or promotions on purchase decisions had a sum of squares of .107 and a significance level of .986, suggesting that age does not significantly affect the responsiveness to discounts.

The question regarding the perception of financial literacy as a mandatory subject in educational institutions yielded a significant difference, with a sum of squares of 1.120 and a significance level of .011. This indicates that attitudes toward the necessity of financial literacy education vary significantly by age, suggesting younger respondents may see greater value in financial education than older individuals.

Overall, Table 4 demonstrates that while age significantly influences the choice of social media platforms and the following of influencers, it does not consistently impact how those influencers affect purchasing decisions or other related behaviors. The strong support for the inclusion of financial literacy education also highlights an important perspective among younger respondents.

Table 5 ANOVA Between Gender And Social Media Influence

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Which 2 platform do you use most frequently?	Between Groups	.331	1	.331	.259	.612
	Within Groups	130.131	102	1.276		
	Total	130.462	103			
Do you fol4 2 influencers?	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	1.000
	Within Groups	19.500	102	.191		
	Total	19.500	103			
How 3 do 2 influencers impact your purchasing decisions?	Between Groups	6.539	1	6.539	2.745	.101
	Within Groups	242.961	102	2.382		
	Total	249.500	103			
What type of content from influencers influences you the most?	Between Groups	4.360	1	4.360	2.875	.093
	Within Groups	154.679	102	1.516		
	Total	159.038	103			
How do you prefer to research a product before purchasing?	Between Groups	1.288	1	1.288	.805	.372
	Within Groups	163.241	102	1.600		
	Total	164.529	103			
How 3 do you compare prices or reviews before making a purchase?	Between Groups	6.694	1	6.694	8.066	.005
	Within Groups	84.652	102	.830		
	Total	91.346	103			
Do discounts or promotions on 2 platforms	Between Groups	.643	1	.643	.884	.349
	Within Groups	74.193	102	.727		

influence your purchase decisions?	Total	74.837	103			
Do you think financial literacy should be a mandatory subject in schools/colleges?	Between Groups	.011	1	.011	.108	.743
	Within Groups	10.604	102	.104		
	Total	10.615	103			
How do you feel about the role of influencers in shaping consumer behavior?	Between Groups	1.254	1	1.254	2.014	.159
	Within Groups	63.506	102	.623		
	Total	64.760	103			

Table 5 presents the results of an ANOVA analysis exploring the relationship between gender and various aspects of social media influence on consumer behavior. Each question assesses how gender may affect social media usage and the engagement with influencers. The analysis for the question regarding the most frequently used social media platforms shows a sum of squares of .331 and a significance level of .612, indicating no significant difference between genders in platform preferences. Similarly, the question about following influencers yielded a sum of squares of .000 with a significance level of 1.000, which also suggests no gender difference in the tendency to follow influencers.

For the question on how influencers impact purchasing decisions, the ANOVA shows a sum of squares of 6.539 with a significance level of .101, suggesting that while there may be some differences, they are not statistically significant. Likewise, the type of content from influencers that influences respondents the most revealed a sum of squares of 4.360 and a significance level of .093, indicating a lack of significant differences by gender.

When examining product research preferences, the results indicated a sum of squares of 1.288 with a significance level of .372, which suggests that gender does not significantly influence how respondents prefer to research products. However, the question regarding comparing prices or reviews before making a purchase showed a sum of squares of 6.694 and a significance level of .005, indicating a significant difference between genders. This suggests that one gender may be more likely to engage in price comparison or review checking before making purchases.

In terms of responsiveness to discounts or promotions, the ANOVA yielded a sum of squares of .643 and a significance level of .349, indicating no significant gender differences in this area. Similarly, the question about whether financial literacy should be a mandatory subject in educational institutions produced a sum of squares of .011 with a significance level of .743, suggesting that opinions on this matter do not vary significantly by gender.

The analysis of attitudes toward the role of influencers in shaping consumer behavior resulted in a sum of squares of 1.254 and a significance level of .159, indicating no significant gender differences in these perceptions. Table 5 demonstrates that while gender does not significantly impact most aspects of social media influence and engagement, there is a noteworthy exception regarding the comparison of prices or reviews, suggesting that this behavior may vary between genders

CONCLUSION

The exploration of the influences of age and gender on financial behavior and social media engagement provides vital insights into how young consumers navigate an increasingly complex digital landscape. The analysis reveals significant trends in financial literacy and consumer habits that underscore the need for tailored educational initiatives and strategic marketing efforts.

From the findings, it is evident that age plays a crucial role in shaping financial behaviors, particularly in how younger individuals engage with influencers and utilize social media platforms. While the basic financial practices, such as budgeting and tracking expenses, show little variation across age groups, the preferences for platforms and the influence of social media on financial habits are significantly pronounced among younger consumers. This indicates a generational shift where technology and social media are not just tools for communication but also powerful drivers of financial behavior. The recognition of financial literacy as an essential skill among younger generations highlights the pressing need for educational programs that can effectively integrate digital tools and social media dynamics.

The gender analysis reveals intriguing patterns, particularly regarding how different genders approach price comparisons before purchasing. This suggests that marketing strategies could benefit from a nuanced understanding of gender-specific behaviors, allowing brands to engage more effectively with their audiences. The lack of significant differences in the broader aspects of social media influence indicates that once consumers are engaged, their purchasing decisions are influenced more by the content and context than by demographic factors.

Looking ahead, there is substantial scope for further research in this field. Future studies could delve deeper into the specific types of content that resonate with different age groups and genders, exploring how emotional and psychological factors influence financial decision-making. Additionally, longitudinal studies could assess how these behaviors evolve as digital technologies and social media platforms continue to change. Exploring the impact of cultural contexts on financial behavior and social media influence would also enrich the understanding of global consumer trends, as practices vary significantly across regions.

The global implications of this study are profound. As digital finance becomes more integrated into daily life, understanding the demographics of users can inform policymakers and educational institutions in developing relevant programs that address financial literacy on a broader scale. By fostering informed decision-making among young consumers, these initiatives can contribute to greater economic stability and responsible consumerism worldwide. Moreover, as social media continues to shape purchasing behaviors across cultures, the findings can aid brands in crafting campaigns that resonate on a global level while considering local nuances. The ability to leverage influencer marketing effectively can enhance brand loyalty and engagement, ultimately driving economic growth in various markets.

In conclusion, the interplay between age, gender, financial behavior, and social media engagement presents a rich area for future exploration. By continuing to investigate these dynamics, researchers can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of consumer behavior, paving the way for informed strategies that benefit individuals and societies globally. As the digital landscape evolves, the need for continuous adaptation and education will remain crucial in fostering a financially literate and empowered consumer base.

Acknowledgement
This research project is supported by **World Class University Program, Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education**, Diponegoro University, Indonesia. We gratefully appreciated this support.

REFERENCES

Chabachib, M., Setyaningrum, I., Hersugondo, H., Shaferi, I., & Pamungkas, I. D. (2020). Does Financial Performance Matter? Evidence on the Impact of Liquidity and Firm Size on Stock Return in Indonesia. *International Journal of Financial Research*, *11*(4), 546-555.

Fuad, F., Rohman, A., Yuyetta, E. N. A., & Zulaikha, Z. (2023). How risk and ambiguity affect accounting conservatism. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*.

Higgison, S. (1982). Student's report. Nutrition & Food Science, 82(2), 22–23. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb058891

Hopwood, M. K. (2005). Applying the public relations function to the business of sport. International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship, 6(3), 30–44. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-06-03-2005-B006

Hori, T., & Shaw, R. (2012). Profile of community-based disaster risk management in Central

America. In R. Shaw (Ed.), Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction (Vol. 10, pp. 277–300). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2040-7262(2012)0000010020
Khare, A., Awasthi, G., & Shukla, R. P. (2020). Do mall events affect mall traffic and image? A qualitative study of Indian mall retailers. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, 32(2), 343–365. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-01-2019-0021
Kinman, B. F., & Vinten, G. (1995). Tobacco: Policing and social policy. International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 15(4/5), 59–112. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb013212
Kornginnaya, S. (2013). Financial and decision-making participation of marginalized small farmers through the Pragathi Bandhu model in India. In Sharing Ownership, Profits, and Decision-Making in the 21st Century (Vol. 14, pp. 217–258). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0885-3339(2013)0000014010
Kumar, J., Rana, S., Rani, V., & Ahuja, A. (2023). What affects organic farming adoption in emerging economies? A missing link in the Indian agriculture sector. International Journal of Emerging Markets, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-03-2023-0390
Lemcke, E. (2021). Organizational development and leadership. In Social ecology in holistic leadership (pp. 47–114). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80043-840-820211004
Lera-López, F., & Rapún-Gárate, M. (2011). Determinants of sports participation and attendance: Differences and similarities. International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship, 12(2), 66–89. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-12-02-2011-B007
Local disaster risk management in Central America. (2014). In Local disaster risk management in a changing climate: Perspective from Central America (Vol. 17, pp. 25–48). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2040-726220140000017017
Machan, T. R. (1988). Marxism: A bourgeois critique. International Journal of Social Economics, 15(11/12), 2–131. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb014124
Michel B#jot, M. (2013). How to ensure the protection of young consumers in a new digital world? A European perspective. Young Consumers, 14(3). https://doi.org/10.1108/yc.2013.32114caa.003
Misra, R., & Singh, D. (2016). An analysis of factors affecting growth of organic food. British Food Journal, 118(9), 2308–2325. https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-02-2016-0080
Morokvasic, M. (1983). Institutionalised equality and women's conditions in Yugoslavia. Equal Opportunities International, 2(4), 9–17. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb010386
Moskovich, Y. (2016). Loss of organizational solidarity in three kibbutz factories. International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 36(5/6), 358–378. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-05-2015-0053
Munianday, P., Rahman, R. A., & Esa, M. (2023). Case study on barriers to building information modelling implementation in Malaysia. Journal of Facilities Management, 21(4), 511–534. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFM-10-2021-0132
Neel Cheney, F. (1974). Recent reference books. Reference Services Review, 2(3), 9–42. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb048520
O'Connor, L. (2009). Information literacy as professional legitimation: The quest for a new jurisdiction. Library Review, 58(7), 493–508. https://doi.org/10.1108/00242530910978190
Ottosen, R., & Steensen, S. (2018). Blood and security during the Norway attacks: Authorities' Twitter activity and silence. In H. Hornmoen & K. Backholm (Eds.), Social media use in crisis and risk communication (pp. 63–84). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78756-269-120181008
Papis, J. (2006). Understanding the workforce: The key to success in a youth hostel in Scotland. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 18(7), 593–600. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110610703020

Parsons, T. F. (2024). Politics, religion, community complexity and public safety. In Police responses to Islamist violent extremism and terrorism (pp. 71–87). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83797-845-820241006

Pereira, E., Mascarenhas, M., Flores, A., Chalip, L., & Pires, G. (2020). Strategic leveraging: Evidence of small-scale sport events. International Journal of Event and Festival Management, 11(1), 69–88. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-07-2018-0046

Pollitt, D. (2000). Making education and training work: Case studies of good practice. Education + Training, 42(7), 403–426. https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000005372

Sahoo, D., Kashyap, R., & Agarwal, M. (2023). Strategic planning process at Byju's. Emerald Emerging Markets Case Studies, 13(4), 1–41. https://doi.org/10.1108/EEMCS-04-2023-0135

Singh, A. S., & Shah, M. (2021). Tata trusts: Positively and sustainably contributing to the development of sport in India. Emerald Emerging Markets Case Studies, 11(2), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1108/EEMCS-09-2020-0333

Tse, T. K.-C. (2020). Who and what projects have been funded by the government? Social Transformations in Chinese Societies, 16(1), 39–55. https://doi.org/10.1108/STICS-05-2019-0010

Varghese, E., Galliara, M., & Srivastava, M. (2016). OSCAR Foundation: Empowering lives through football. Emerald Emerging Markets Case Studies, 6(3), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1108/EEMCS-05-2016-0077