

Culture and Consumer Socialization Effects on Adolescent's Influence on Family Purchase Decisions of Mobile Phone

João Paulo Baía

Adjunct Professor, Polytechnic Institute of Setubal, Portugal

Abstract: *Expansion into new markets places the challenge for companies to seek to better understand their consumers and, in particular, how they decide to buy. In this context, the family is the most relevant unit of consumption for marketing managers. Past literature has evidenced the existence of important cultural dimensions, such as the distance of power and individualism-collectivism that need further investigation in its application to the study of consumer behavior. Furthermore, the study of the family merits continued and more in-depth attention, in particular as regards the participation of its members and the extent of such participation in decisions to purchase products which currently have a high demand, such as mobile phone for his own use. In these, the role of the adolescent is not properly explained, having often been devalued or relegated to the background. The adolescent presents, in this category of products, generally, a higher knowledge than his parents, which can constitute an important resource in his participation in those purchases. Nonetheless, technological products for family use and for adolescents' use have not yet been adequately researched. This research main goal is to examine the influences of the national cultural constructs of individualism-collectivism and power distance, and consumer socialization effects on adolescent's influence on family purchase decision of mobile phone for his own use. A quantitative research method is utilized in high schools in Lisbon district, Portugal. 1,800 questionnaires were delivered in classrooms during May 2018. Adolescents' students were instructed to deliver questionnaires to their mothers for response, and 726 validated questionnaires were returned. Results of logistic regression analysis point to power distance, internet influence, and television influence, as purchase relevant explanatory variables. Several contributions are made to this knowledge area. Firstly, the relevance of including the adolescent in purchases for his own use is reinforced. Second, when considering mobile phone, marketing managers should direct their efforts to those adolescents who live in small power distance cultures, with parents with a higher socio-oriented communication style, to those adolescents who are more influenced by internet and television, who have greater knowledge about technological products, and who live in lower income families. These results are innovative in this area of knowledge. The present research contributes significantly to the companies by allowing concluding that the adolescent has an active participation on family purchase decisions. Having the adolescent relevant role on those decisions, it is important that marketers focus their efforts on his satisfaction.*

Keywords: Consumer behaviour, Culture, Consumer socialization, Family decision making, Adolescent, Influence, Mobile phone

1. Introduction

The literature on culture in the area of consumer behavior has emphasized the importance of considering the most relevant dimensions of that construct. More concretely, power distance and individualism-collectivism when considering the family purchase decision making (Al-Zu'bi, 2016; Yang et al., 2014; Marbell & Grolnick, 2013; Feng et al., 2011). For marketers, the search for new markets is very important in the context of globalization, and as the family is the most important unit of consumption, it is crucial to understand how families in different cultures decide their purchases (Ishaque & Tufail, 2014; Kaur & Medury, 2013; Leng & Botelho, 2010). In addition, the family buying decision process is considered to be one of the least researched and difficult subjects in the area of consumer behavior (Aleti et al., 1995, Akinyele, 2010; Beatty & Talpade, 1994, Belch et al. In this context, adolescents constitute an important segment for companies, mainly because of their attempts to influence family purchases, and because of the interest they have as active consumers in the future (Al-Zu'bi 2016; Mau et al., 2014; Medury, 2013, Luczak & Younkin, 2012). For these reasons, it is important for marketers to understand the patterns of adolescent consumption (Luczak & Younkin, 2012).

For some purchases, adolescents have autonomy to decide, especially for those products where they are primary users, like breakfast cereals, clothes, music (Ishaque & Tufail, 2014; Kaur & Singh, 2006; Beatty & Talpade, 1994), or in certain services for family consumption, like eating out, traveling, or even grocery products (Ashraf & Khan, 2016; Chikweche et al., 2012; Chitakunye, 2012).

The first researchers to consider adolescent's influence on technological products on family purchase decisions were Foxman and Tansuhaj (1988). Results indicated some adolescent's influence on that purchase decision.

Consumer socialization is defined as the processes through which consumption related skills, knowledge, and attitudes are transferred between generations (Aleti et al., 2015; Yang et al., 2014; Watne et al., 2014, 2011; Ward, 1974). Parental communication has been considered a reliable and successful predictor of adolescent's socialization. However, the effect of parental communication style in adolescents' influence on buying decisions is still under-exploited and needs further investigation (Sharma & Sonwaney, 2013).

Nowadays, consumer socialization theorists have explored the socialization agents' effect on adolescents, including television (Kushwaha, 2017; Barber, 2013; Luczak &

Younkin, 2012). However, there's also a lack of research about the internet impact on adolescents' consumer socialization (Barber, 2013; Sharma and Sonwaney, 2013; Niu, 2013; Luczak & Younkin, 2012).

The growing adolescent market needs marketing managers to understand the adolescent purchase behavior for current sales and their participation on family decisions (Niemczyk 2015, Srivastava, 2015; Shahrokh & Khosravi, 2014; Yang et al., 2014). There is a good stream of research which has shown that adolescents' role on family purchase decisions varying by product, decision stage, adolescent, parental, and family characteristics (Aleti et al. 2015, Ishaque & Tufail, 2014; Shahrokh & Khosravi, 2014; Ali et al., 2013; Shergill et al., 2013; Chaudhary & Gupta, 2012). However, the effects of cultural variables remain unexplored on adolescents' participation on family decision making (Neulinger & Zsoter, 2014; Barber, 2013; Akinyele, 2010).

This study examines influence of the national cultural individualism-collectivism and power distance constructs, and consumer socialization effects on adolescent's influence on family purchase decision, considering one technological product: mobile phone for adolescent use, whose interest is based in the literature (Barber, 2013; Akinyele, 2010; Neulinger & Zsoter, 2014; Kaur & Singh, 2006; Commuri & Gentry, 2000). Little is known about purchasing behavior or the patterns of consumption of technological products in households (Kaur & Singh, 2006; Chavda et al, 2005; Neely, 2005). The present research presents a holistic approach to adolescent influence, also considering the role of product knowledge on his/her influence, and the influence of demographic variables such as household income and adolescent's gender (Baía 2018, Ali et al. 2015). This paper also explores the role of television and internet as antecedents of adolescent's consumer socialization and its effects on his purchase influence.

The research problem essentially involves a theoretical dimension which relates to the answer to the following questions: What is the impact of the national cultural constructs and consumer socialization on adolescent's influence on mobile phone for adolescent's own use decision? What are the family demographic characteristics that impact the adolescent's influence on family purchase decision of buying a mobile phone for him/her? What is the mother's perception about the adolescent's influence?

Although past literature pointed adolescent as an influential member on family purchases (Khoo-Lattimore et al. 2016, Niemczyk 2015, Kaur and Medury 2011; Mangleburg 1990, Foxman et al. 1989a, b), a holistic approach to the adolescents' influence on mobile phone for adolescent's own use on final decision stage remain unexplained (Barber, 2013; Akinyele, 2010; Neulinger & Zsoter, 2014; Kaur and Medury 2011; Kaur and Singh 2006). The subject of the present investigation is the consumption behavior of family purchases for mobile phone.

The paper begins by reviewing the literature and defining the research hypotheses. Then the methodology used will be characterized. The main study results will be presented and

they will be discussed, as well as the main conclusions, limitations and directions for future research.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses

The domain of family consumption behavior presents some gaps, among which the amount and extent of adolescent influence on family purchases is often undervalued or even neglected (Khoo-Lattimore et al., 2016, Watne and Winchester 2011, Kaur and Medury 2011, Carr 2006; Commuri & Gentry, 2000). In previous research, the adolescent is considered a less important or secondary member when studying family consumption decisions.

The adolescent role

The consumer role of the adolescent has deserved three associations in literature in the past: (1) buyers who have purchasing power and make purchases, (2) direct or indirect influencers of purchases made in the family context, and (3) a future large market potential for the purchase of various products and services (Aleti et al., 2015; Srivastava, 2015; Shahrokh et al., 2014). Adolescents' are influencing members on family purchasing decisions, and that influence is manifested directly, that is, by actively acting on a certain decision direction (Kaur & Singh, 2006; Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Mangleburg, 1990). For several researchers, adolescent's influence on family purchase decisions is not properly explained (Aleti et al., 2015; Shergill et al., 2013; Chaudhary & Gupta, 2012; Kaur & Singh, 2006).

Cultural dimensions

Culture can be defined as the "collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from those of another" (Hofstede, 1994, p. 4). Hofstede (2001) has identified several dimensions of national culture including individualism vs collectivism and power distance, to determine the culture constructs' impact on individual consumer behaviour (Al-Zu'bi 2016). Individualism versus collectivism refers to the individual or group relevance, that is, to what extent is the individual or society more valued in a certain country's cultural position (Chan & McNeal, 2003; Hofstede 1983).

Individualism vs collectivism

Individualism versus collectivism refers to a society's cultural position relative to individual or group's relevance (Chan & McNeal, 2002a; Hofstede, 1998, 1983). Individuals from a collectivist culture devote more attention to their families and sacrifice their individual interests to the interests of the community and the groups by comparison with individuals from individualistic cultures (Al-Zu'bi, 2016). According to Mooij & Hofstede (2010), on individualist cultures, individuals use the term "I" in their statements, while the individuals from collectivist cultures frequently use the term "We" in their arguments. Some researchers have pointed that "in Western cultures, the development of self is more separate, distinct, and independent of others. Therefore, acceptance and support from parents are sufficient for adolescents to establish a strong positive attitude toward themselves" (Yang & Laroche, 2011, p. 9). So, the first hypothesis is:

H1: The adolescents will be perceived as having more influence on family purchases if they are in individualism culture than if they are in collectivism culture.

Power distance

Power distance can be defined as "the degree of inequality among people which the population a country considers as normal: from relatively equal (that is small power distance) to extremely unequal (large power distance)" (Hofstede, 1993, p. 89). So, the power distance concept is related to a society desire for hierarchy versus egalitarianism (Chan and McNeal 2003). In a certain society, that reflects members who hold less power accept that power is distributed with iniquity (Hofstede 1980). Western Europe countries traditionally hold a low power distance (Hofstede, 1993). This means that in those countries, parents value adolescents' obedience when compared to parents in cultures with a higher power distance (Baía, 2018). Therefore, those parents are more likely to encourage and be more open to adolescents' influence on family decisions (Shergill et al., 2013). Thus, the hypothesis is:

H2: The adolescents will be perceived as having more influence on family purchases if they are in small power distance culture than in large power distance culture.

Consumer socialization

Adolescents' influence on family consumption decisions largely depends on socialization agents influence such as parental communication style, internet influence, and television influence (Aleti et al., 2015; Watne et al., 2015, 2011; Haq & Rahman, 2015; Barber 2013; Kaur & Medury, 2011). Past research has focus mainly on parents, peers and media (Aleti et al., 2015; Dotson & Hyatt, 2005; Moschis & Churchill, 1978).

Parental communication style

Parental communication style effect on adolescent's socialization process depends, largely, on parental orientation, being more restrictive or more permissive (Kushwaha, 2017; Al-Zu'bi, 2016; Kim et al., 2015; Yang & Laroche, 2011). When considering concept-oriented and socio-oriented styles, four types of parental communication patterns can be considered: (i) Laissez-faire (low COS, low SOS); (ii) Protective (low COS, high SOS); (iii) Pluralistic (high COS, low SOS); and (iv) Consensual (high COS, high SOS) (Sharma & Sonwaney, 2013; Rose et al., 1998; Moschis & Moore, 1979). The laissez-faire style family believed to have week correspondence between parent and adolescent, the protective family demonstrates social amicability where adolescent could gain knowledge alone to some limited extent; the pluralistic family fosters adolescent practice of open communication, while the consensual family allows adolescent to develop his/her own perspective on family cohesiveness (Carlson & Grossbart, 1990). Past research pointed that parents with concept-oriented style value adolescents' opinion on purchase decisions and tend to consult them (Sharma & Sonwaney, 2013; Rose et al., 1998; Moschis & Moore, 1979).

Watabe and Hibbard (2014) pointed that parents with socio-oriented communication style foster adolescents' obedience by monitoring and controlling their' consumer learning and

behavior. In permissive parenting style, adolescents noted that "mother did not view herself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up" (idem, p. 364).

For Rose et al. (1998), "consensual and pluralistic mothers held more negative attitudes toward advertising than laissez-faire mothers" (p. 80). Therefore, the third hypothesis is:

H3: Adolescents with laissez-faire and pluralistic parents will be perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with protective and consensual parents.

Internet influence

The phenomenon of globalization through internet has contributed and influenced in a decisive way the way adolescents socialize (Kaur and Medury, 2011). According to Luczak and Younkin (2012, p. 49), "In addition, adolescents demonstrate greater internet skills compared to their parents. For the reasons given, the use of the Internet by adolescents is a subject of great interest and lacking the greatest depth for academics and marketers (Kaur and Medury, 2011; Belch et al., 2005). Therefore, the study of the effects of the socialization of consumption by agents such as the internet and television in adolescents is an area of great interest today. The increasing use of the Internet as a communication tool makes it a socializing agent with high potential (Lee et al., 2003).

Adolescents experience the Internet as a physical and social space, alternative to the traditional physical environment, allowing people to talk, form relationships, discuss issues, and perform many of the tasks (Kaur and Medury, 2011).

The internet should be considered as a potential socializing agent with a major impact on adolescents' behavior (Barber, 2013), particularly related to his/her role in decision making (Kaur & Medury, 2011). Thus, it is expected that:

H4: Internet influence will be positively related to the adolescent's influence on family purchase decisions.

Television influence

The media have, over time, played a relevant role in guiding consumers to products and brands, providing reliable evidence (Barber 2013) on the one hand, and using the power of persuasion by using credible informants. Television has been the most influential of the mass media, influencing the consumer through the advertising of brands that are acceptable to society or supported by celebrities (Churchill and Moschis, 1979). The influence of television is, to a large extent, significant, affecting attitudes and behaviors such as desire for products, preference of brand and willingness to buy (Barber 2013). Television has also helped adolescents to develop product-related knowledge, perception of the consumer's role, and influence their purchasing intentions (Haq and Rahman, 2015).

The degree of television viewing improves the knowledge of the market and its products (Mangleburg and Bristol, 1998). In addition, parents who regularly watch television with adolescents feel the need for less intervention because they can control the content to be observed (Kushwaha, 2017).

For Sharma and Sonwaney (2013), “children who received more parental restriction regarding television viewing tended to be less conscious of brand names” (p. 34). So, one can expect that:

H5: Television influence will be positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions.

Product knowledge

Social power can be considered as a person’s ability to persuade or influence other based on some attribute such as knowledge or expertise (Aleti et al. 2015, Beatty and Talpade 1994). When considering the influence of adolescents, such power comes from expertise and knowledge about a certain product or service (Watne et al. 2011, Beatty and Talpade 1994). Chitakunye (2012) pointed that adolescents are encouraged by parents to use their cognitive skills in consumer decisions. Adolescents tend to be most knowledgeable and interested in technological products, which will lead them to more influence attempts (Foxman and Tansuhaj 1988). Baía (2018) found that adolescents actually revealed a relevant participation on decisions when their knowledge is higher. Thus, the service knowledge should lead to greater adolescents’ influence attempts and more parental receptiveness (Chitakunye 2012, Belch et al. 2005, Shah and Mittal 1997, Beatty and Talpade 1994). Thus, the sixth hypothesis is:

H6: The adolescents will be perceived as having more influence on family purchases if they have greater product knowledge than if they have minor.

Several authors have considered age as one of the main explanatory factors for adolescent influence on family buying decisions (Shergill et al, 2013; Gentina et al., 2013; Kaur & Singh, 2006; Shoham&Dalakas, 2005). Those researchers concluded that older adolescents produce higher levels of influence on family purchases than younger adolescents. Thus, the first hypothesis is:

H7: The adolescents influence on purchases of products for family use will be greater if they are older than if they are younger.

Household income often appears as an explanatory variable of adolescent’s influence on family purchasing decisions, with adolescents presenting higher levels of influence in families with higher income (Ali et al. 2013, Kaur and Medury 2011, Isin and Alkibay 2011, Lee and Beatty 2002, Lee and Collins 2000, Ahuja and Stinson 1993). In families with higher levels of income, adolescents tend to have more opportunities and may be allowed to participate in more decisions (Isin and Alkibay 2011, Lee and Collins 2000, Beatty and Talpade 1994). Therefore, adolescents are expected to have consistent influence in families with higher income:

H8: Adolescents living in higher income households will be perceived as having more influence on family purchases than adolescents in lower income households.

3. Methodology

The present research is exploratory, aiming to study the influences of national cultural constructs of individualism-collectivism and power distance, and consumer socialization effects on adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions of mobile phone, according to mother’s perception.

The study universe is formed Portuguese families, with at least one adolescent (between 12 and 19 years). There is no knowledge of research on impact of cultural constructs and socialization consumer on adolescent’s influence on family mobile phone purchases in Europe, so this study provides a contribution in this area.

In the present study, due to the lack of information provided by official organisms, it was necessary to use a non-probabilistic sample, which is common in this type of studies (Aleti et al. 2015, Srivastava 2015, Kim and Lee 1997). The collected sample was focused on households with at least one adolescent between the ages of 12 and 19, which is consistent with past research (Aleti et al. 2015, Srivastava 2015, Kim and Lee 1997, Beatty and Talpade 1994).

On this area, several authors pointed out the importance of study product or service categories for adolescent use (Belch et al. 2005, Beatty and Talpade 1994). In this study, the selection of the product category to be studied derives from the literature review, with the decision on the mobile phone (Foxman and Tansuhaj 1988). More, little is known about the adolescent’s influence in this product category in the family final purchase decision.

The questionnaire survey was the method of data collection chosen for this study, which is consistent with past research (Aleti et al. 2015, Srivastava 2015, Shoham and Dalakas 2005, 2003, Beatty and Talpade 1994).

The questionnaire structure aimed to pursue the research objectives outlined. A pre-test was carried out that led to small changes in the questionnaire final structure. The suggestions presented by the 18 respondents in that phase concerned some difficulty in certain expressions understanding used in the initial version.

The measurement scales for variables studied were adapted from past research on this field (see Table 1).

Table 1: Linking the Model to the Questionnaire

<i>Variables in study</i>	<i>Adapted from...</i>
Explained variable	
• Adolescent Influence on Family Purchase Decisions	Shoham e Dalakas (2003); Beatty e Talpade (1994)
Explanatory variables	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power distance, • Individualism vs collectivism, • Parental communication style, • Internet influence, • Television influence, • Product knowledge, • Adolescent's gender • Family income. 	Wu (2006), Hofstede (2001); Wu (2006), Hofstede (2001); Chan and McNeal (2003); Kaur and Medury (2011); Kaur and Medury (2011); Beatty e Talpade (1994); Lee and Beatty (2002); Ahuja and Stinson (1993).
---	--

Explained variable

Past authors have used likert scale to measure adolescent's influence on final decision considering parents and adolescents participation (Shahrokh & Khosravi, 2014; Mangleburget al., 1999; Kim & Lee, 1997; Beatty & Talpade, 1994).

The measurement scale used on the explained variable was based on past research (Shoham and Dalakas, 2003; Beatty & Talpade, 1994). The mother's perception about adolescent's influence may in a range from 1 to 7 points (where 1 = I had no influence, and 7 = I had all influence).

Explanatory variables

The "individualism vs collectivism" is measured using the Hofstede (2001) scale. For this variable, twelve items were used, each one in a seven-point Likert scale. For parental communication style was used the Chan and McNeal (2003) seven-point Likert scale, ranked completely disagree (1) to completely agree (7). The "internet influence" variable used Kaur and Medury (2011) nine items with seven-point Likert scale, ranked completely disagree (1) to completely agree (7). The "television influence" variable also used Kaur and Medury (2011) nine items adapted to television, with the same seven-point Likert scale, ranked completely disagree (1) to completely agree (7).

The adolescent's age and product knowledge served as explanatory variables. The variable "age" is an ordinal variable, so it can assume values between 12 and 19 years, according to the proposal of Lee and Beatty (2002). The "product knowledge" represents the subjective knowledge, and will be measured according to Beatty and Talpade (1994) scale. A seven-point Likert scale is used, ranked completely disagree (1) to completely agree (7). The item to be measured will be translated by the phrase: "before buying this product I would describe myself as being very familiar with this product category." Finally, the household income used a scale of measurement according to Ahuja and Walker (1994)' proposal and adapted to monthly values.

Data collection procedures and sample

Research was conducted in May 2018. In order to carry out the data collection, 15 high-schools were contacted, involving Lisbon district. Regarding the sampling process, the Lisbon district present an important demographic profile in Portugal, namely as regards the average size of family households. Consequently, letters were sent to the Executive Councils of several schools in Lisbon area, and all the schools contacted agreed to participate in the study. Then, for each school level the form teachers were contacted, and instructed the teachers in each class to provide a questionnaire and a letter to the mother of each student, requesting her participation. During this phase, 1,800

questionnaires were delivered by the teachers in the classrooms during May 2018. Students, aged 12 to 19 years, were instructed to deliver the questionnaires to their mothers and to return them, fully completed, some days later. Finally, the questionnaires were collected from the high-schools during May 2018. This resulted in a total of 726 questionnaires fully answered by mothers, which meant a response rate of 40.3%. That represents a higher rate than main previous studies (Kaur and Medury 2013, Shergill et al. 2013, Wu 2006).

Statistical techniques used

Research goals determine the data analysis' method to be used. In line with past research, we used linear regression to study the adolescent's influence on family purchase decisions (Mangleburg et al., 1999; Beatty & Talpade, 1994). Nonetheless, is scarce the use of logistic regression when studying this research area (Baía, 2018). There are two main reasons to use logistic regression: a binary explained variable and the variables level of measurement.

Variables measurement

The explanatory variables considered do not raise any issues regarding the use of logistic regression (Hutcheson and Sofroniou 1999). The explanatory variables considered in the present investigation involve three types of scales: categorical, ordinal and interval. Individualism-collectivism, parental communication style, internet influence, television influence, service knowledge are interval variables, with one or more items classified in Likert scales with seven points. The family size is an ordinal variable, ranging from 2 to 6 or more persons, and family type is a binary variable classified in single-parent family or traditional family.

The explained variable

The explained variable, measured through a seven-point range scale, was transformed into a dichotomous variable. Therefore, the values that are in the range of 5 to 7, will correspond to 0 = does not influence; and values from 1 to 4 will correspond to the value 1 = influence (Baía 2018).

Variables selecting method for the logistic regression model

The Forward LR method of inclusion of variables will be used in logistic regression model in study. For Hutcheson and Sofroniou (1999), the ordinal or interval data can be transformed into dichotomous data, allowing its analysis the use of logistic regression models.

4. Data Analysis and Findings

Internal consistency

Cronbach's α ranks high in most researcher preferences among the several available methods to estimate internal consistency. The reliability of a measure refers to its ability to be consistent (Maroco and Garcia-Marques 2006). The Cronbach's α , which must vary from 0 to 1 when the mean correlation between the items is positive (idem 2006). Regarding the internal consistency presented, mostly Cronbach's α coefficients indicated good reliability, presenting values above 0.8.

Respondents' profile

Table 2: Respondents' profile (percentage)

Demographics	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<i>Adolescent's age range</i>		
12 to 15	38.5	38.5
16 to 19	61.5	100
<i>Adolescent's gender</i>		
Male	46.6	46.6
Female	53.4	100
<i>Mother's age range</i>		
25 to 34	6.6	6.6
35 to 49	70.1	76.7
50 to 64	22.4	99.2
More than 64	0.8	100
<i>Mother's educational level</i>		
No Schooling	1	1
Basic Education	28	29
High School	36	65.6
Bachelor's degree	5.8	71.4
University graduation	23.3	94.8
Masters or PhD	5.2	100
<i>Mother's Professional category</i>		
Housewife	11.5	11.5
Low-qualified or unskilled workers	8.8	20.3
Plant and machine Operators and assembly workers	12.7	33.1
Workers, builders and similar workers	17.6	50.7
Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries	18.2	68.9
Service and Sales Personnel	1.7	70.6
Administrative and similar Personnel	6.4	77
Technicians and Professional of Intermediate Level	3.4	80.4
Senior Management and Directors	12.3	100
<i>Family Income</i>		
Less than 5,000 euros	4.5	4.5
From 500 to 1,000 euros	24.5	29
From 1,001 to 1,500 euros	30.7	59.7
From 1,501 to 2,000 euros	15.2	74.9
From 2,001 to 2,500 euros	13.2	88.2
From 2,501 to 3,000 euros	5.9	94.1
From 3,001 to 5,000 euros	4.5	98.6
More than 5,000 euros	1.4	100

Results also point to a distribution of 53.4% for female adolescents of the total number of adolescents under study, with the age group from 16 to 19 years old representing 61.5% of the total sample collected (see Table 2).

Regarding mother's age, the most frequent age group is from 35 to 49 years, with a rate of 70.1%. The second most

frequent age group is 50 to 64 years, with a rate of 22.4% of the total of respondents.

The most frequent category of mother's educational level corresponds to high school education, with a rate of 36% of the total of respondents. The second most frequent category corresponds to basic school, with 28% of the total. Only 23.3% had a university graduation level (see Table 2).

The farmers and skilled workers represent the most frequent category concerning mother's professional category, with a rate of 18.2% of respondents. The second most frequent category corresponds to workers, builders and similar workers, with 17.6% of the total.

The most frequent household monthly post-tax income interval is the 1,001 to 1,500 euros range, with 30.7%. The second most frequent monthly income range is 500 and 1,000 euros, with 24.5% (see Table 2).

Table 3: Family demographic characteristics (percentage)

Demographics	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<i>Family Size</i>		
2 Persons	4.7	4.7
3 Persons	18.9	23.8
4 Persons	35.5	59.6
5 Persons	27.5	87.4
6 Persons or more persons	12.5	100
<i>Family Type</i>		
Single-parent	29.9	29.9
Traditional	70.1	100

The most frequent category of family size, with a rate of 35.5% of the total of respondents, is four persons. The second most frequent category corresponds to five members households, with 27.5% of the total (see Table 3). The traditional family represent the most frequent category concerning family type, with a rate of 70.1% of respondents, which also means that for each ten adolescents, three of them lives in a single-parent household.

Explanatory variables

Next, the adolescent's influence on family vacations purchase explanatory variables will be analyzed.

Individualism-collectivism

The individualism-collectivism doesn't add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model on family vacations purchase decision. Thus, H1 is not verified, so adolescents are perceived as having more influence on family purchases when they are in individualism culture than when they are in collectivism culture (see Table 4).

Table 4: Logistic regression for mobile phone (variables in equation)

		B	S.E	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp (B)	95% C.I. for EXP (B)	
								Lower	Uper
Step 3	Power distance	-0.159	0.070	5.232	1	0.022	0.853	0.744	0.977
	Television influence	0.562	0.168	11.149	1	0.001	1.753	1.261	2.438
	Internet influence	1.543	0.192	64.565	1	0.000	4.678	3.211	6.816
	Constant	-2.838	0.519	29.858	1	0.000	0.059		

Power distance

Table 4 reveals that power distance adds explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model in the decision to buy mobile phone for his own use. Thus, H2 is verified, so that adolescents in high power distance culture are perceived as having more influence on mobile phone than those in low power distance culture.

Internet influence

The internet influence adds explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on decision to buy mobile phone. Therefore, H4 is verified, so internet influence is positively related to the adolescent's influence on family purchase decisions, with adolescents who receive more internet influence having also greater influence on family purchases (see Table 4).

Television influence

The television influence adds explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on mobile phone. Thus, H5 is verified, thus television influence is positively related to the adolescent's influence on family purchase decisions, so adolescents who receive more television influence having greater influence on family purchases (see Table 4).

Table 5: Logistic regression for mobile phone(variables not in equation)

Step 3	Variables	Score	df	Sig.
	Adolescent's gender	0.007	1	0.931
	Family income	1.225	1	0.268
	Individualism vs Collectivism	0.130	1	0.718
	Concept-Oriented	2.215	1	0.137
	Socio-Oriented	3.493	1	0.062
	Product Knowledge	1.349	1	0.246
	Overall Statistics	12..565	10	0.249

Product Knowledge

Table 5 point out that product knowledge doesn't add explanatory capacity to adolescent's influence model in the decision to buy a personal mobile phone for adolescent. Thus, H6 is not verified, so adolescents with greater product knowledge exert more influence on computer purchase for family use than those adolescents with less product knowledge.

Parental communication style

Parental communication style does not add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model in the decision to buy mobile phone for his own use. Thus, H3 is not verified, so adolescents with laissez-faire and pluralistic parents are not perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with protective and consensual parents (see Table 5).

Adolescent's age

Adolescent's age doesn't add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model in the decision to buy mobile phone for his own use. Thus, H7 is not verified, so older adolescents are not perceived as having more influence on family purchases than the younger ones (see Table 5).

Family income

The family income doesn't add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on buying mobile phone for his own use (see Table 5). Thereby, H8 is not verified, so adolescents are perceived as having more influence on family purchases if they live in lower income families than if they live in higher income families.

Explanatory variables interpretation

For the study of the adolescent's influence on decision to buy mobile phone for adolescent's use, the -2LL analysis allows us to conclude that the exogenous variables add explaining capacity to adolescent's influence on that service purchase. This is reinforced by the Chi-square value, when pointing out that there is a large part of the model explained variance when considering power distance, internet influence, and television influence, as purchase relevant explanatory variables.

5. Discussion

In this research, a total of 726 fully completed questionnaires was reached, which is a larger sample than most past studies (Al-Zu'bi 2016, Ashraf and Khan 2016, Ali et al. 2013, Chikweche et al. 2012, Chitakunye 2012, Mangleburg et al. 1999, Darley and Lim 1986). In line with most past studies on household purchases, the present research used a convenience sample (Al-Zu'bi 2016, Ashraf and Khan 2016, Ali et al. 2013, Chikweche et al. 2012, Chitakunye 2012).

Internal validity

Family members' divergence of opinions when questioned about adolescent's influence raised internal validation issues, in past research (Beatty and Talpade 1994, Foxman et al. 1989b, Belch et al. 1985).

Several researchers have collected data questioning one or both parents and the adolescent in past studies on adolescent influence on family purchase decisions (Watne and Winchester 2011, Ishaque and Tufail 2014, Shoham and Dalakas 2005, Beatty and Talpade 1994, Foxman et al. 1989a, b, Belch et al. 1985), which has raised the issue lack of model internal validity, due to perception differences between the members questioned. Several authors pointed out the mother has as the most reliable member of the family when measuring adolescents' influence (Neely 2005, Mangleburg et al. 1999, Kim et Lee 1997). Therefore, the mother's inquiry was chosen, preserving internal validation of the influence construct.

When comparing mother's influence with adolescent's influence, or what one can call relative influence, the scale used shall also provide external validation (Baía 2018).

Internal consistency

The internal consistency of the independent variables scales under study was measured, and the Cronbach's α coefficient was used for individualism-collectivism and power distance, parental communication style, internet influence, and television influence scales. The individualism-collectivism scale presents a value of 0.743, and being above 0.7, is taken as acceptable reliability (Gliem and Gliem 2003). The power

distance scale presented a value of 0.874, almost excellent accordingly to Gliem and Gliem (2003).

The parental communication style scale has a 0.812 value, which represents a good Cronbach's α coefficient. For the internet influence, a 0.823 coefficient, also good. As for the television influence scale, an even better Cronbach's α coefficient was found, with a 0.828 value (idem 2003).

These values are consistent with past research (Ahuja & Stinson, 1993). Generally, previous researchers omitted scales' internal consistency values on their studies (Al-Zu'bi, 2016; Ashraf & Khan, 2016; Ishaque & Tufail, 2014; Ali et al., 2013; Chikweche et al., 2012; Watne & Winchester, 2011).

6. Conclusions

The present research has found several results, which allow us to conclude that: There is a significant adolescent's influence on family technological purchases, particularly on mobile phone for his own use. Power distance, internet influence, and television influence, as purchase relevant explanatory variables are explanatory variables of the adolescent's influence for that purchase. The adolescent has more influence on mobile phone purchase in low distance of power cultures. He/she also has more influence on those purchases when he/she's exposed in higher degree to internet influence and to television influence.

7. Limitations and Recommendations

Although the present research adds some important contributions to the theoretical-conceptual framework in this field, providing a response to national cultural constructs and consumer socialization effects on adolescent's influence on family vacation decisions, the results don't entirely explain the phenomenon. Thereby, other variables must also be considered in order to provide a more complete explanation on the adolescent's influence for this product decision. Furthermore, in this study, the use of a convenience sample does not allow us to extrapolate the results, although this procedure is consistent with past research (Aleti et al 2015, Yang et al. 2014, Chaudhary and Gupta 2012, Feng et al. 2011).

More, collecting data solely from mothers, although being considered the most reliable information source within families (Isin and Alkibay 2011, Beatty e Talpade 1994), was insufficient by some authors which have chosen to inquire both adolescent and one parent (Al-Zu'bi 2016, Ashraf and Khan 2016, Mau et al. 2016, 2014, Goswami and Khan 2015, Sondhi and Basu 2014).

Finally, it is suggested that future research studies the effect of friends as agents of socialization in the influence of adolescents. This aspect has been little studied and needs the most attention from researchers. Many have seen the internet as a way of socializing through the conviviality of teens with their peers. However, this relationship does not run out on the internet.

8. Research Contributions

The present research provides several contributions to this area of knowledge. In the first place, the main contribution of the present research is the suggestion of a theoretical-conceptual framework that provides explanatory capacity of national cultural constructs and consumer socialization effects on adolescent's influence on mobile phone decisions for adolescents, according to the mother's perception. It also reinforces the importance of including the adolescent in the final decision for that product, which is an innovation in this area of research.

More, the research indicated the adolescent's influence in the purchase of mobile phone, which is also an innovative result in traditional families. The results of the logistic regression analysis point to power distance, internet influence, and television influence as purchase important explanatory variables on the considered purchase. These results are innovative in the study of family purchases.

Finally, the results point to the relevance of considering adolescent as an influencer on mobile phone final decision, indicating that he/she has an important role when considering relevant products for adolescent's own use.

9. Business implications

The study offers a contribution to the companies by providing evidence of the adolescent's influence on the purchases of mobile phone. Given the adolescents relevance within family decisions, it is important that marketers focus their efforts on adolescent satisfaction, adopting strategies adjusted to the families. Should those professionals direct the marketing messages to adolescents living in low distance to power' cultures. Marketers approach to family markets should also be more precise if they target adolescents with higher internet influence, and with higher television influence. These results are innovative in the study of family purchases when it comes to buying mobile phone.

If a decision is considered to be largely influenced by adolescents, then the messages should be addressed to him/her. In the present investigation it was concluded that adolescents represent an active influential market in the mobile phone within family, and so marketers should adopt strategies that reflect the adolescent's relative importance in those decisions. On the other hand, marketers should focus more their efforts on adolescent satisfaction in products/services for their personal use.

10. Suggestions for Future Research

In addition to the products/services that may be more associated with certain patterns of consumption characteristic of families, it is important to point out as research opportunity the study on the adolescent's influence in the purchasing decisions in those households for several other products/services. Application to other technological products for family consumption, like computers, tablets, ipads, and technological services, like Uber, internet purchases, vacation' sites. It's important to explore the

behavior nature of adolescents living on single-parent contexts, and to consider specific product and service categories that those family structures demand for.

On the other hand, the services/products of perceived adolescent's influence are not properly exhausted. Research in this area should focus on the influence of adolescents in the choice of services/products that are shared by the family versus those used by the parents; explore the mechanisms of decision making between male and female across this age range; explore differences between income ranges; and to go deeper in the study of the impact of mothers' occupational status on adolescents' influence.

References

- [1] Ahuja, R. D., and Stinson, K. M. 1993, Female-Headed Single Parent Families: an Exploratory Study of Children's Influence in Family Decision Making, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20, 1993, 469-474.
- [2] Ahuja, R. D., and Walker, M. 1994, Female-headed Single Parent Families: Comparisons with Dual Parent Households on Restaurant and Convenience Food Usage, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 11, 4, 41-54, DOI=<https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000003990>.
- [3] Ahuja, R.D., Capella, L.M., and Taylor, R.D. 1998, Child influences, attitudinal and behavioral comparisons between single parent and dual parent households in grocery shopping decisions, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 48-62.
- [4] Akinyele, S. T. 2010, The influence of children on family purchasing decisions in Ota, Nigeria, *Journal of Contemporary Management Research*; Tiruchirappalli, 4, 2 (Sep 2010), 1-11.
- [5] Al-Zu'bi, A. 2016, The direct and indirect influences of locus of control on Jordanian parents' communication patterns: Consumer socialization and cultural perspectives, *Journal of Islamic Marketing* 7, 2, 167-186, DOI=<https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/JIM-A-05-2014-0038>.
- [6] Aleti, T., Brennan, L., and Parker, L. 2015, Family communication for the modern era: a typology, *Young Consumers*; Bradford16, 4 (May 2015), pp. 367-384, DOI=<http://doi.10.1108/YC-08-2014-00471>.
- [7] Ali, A., Ravichandran, N., and Batra, D. K. 2013, Children's choice of influence strategies in family purchase decisions and the impact of demographics, *Vision* 17, 1 (March 6, 2013), 27-40, Sage Publications, DOI=<http://doi.10.1177/0972262912469561>.
- [8] Ashraf, M., and Khan, K. M. 2016, Adolescents' role in family decision-making for services in India, *Young Consumers* 17, 4 (June 2016), 388-403, DOI=<https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/YC-06-2016-00608>.
- [9] Baía, J. 2018, Mothers' Perceptions of Adolescents' Influence on the Purchase Decisions of Family Vacations, *Athens Journal of Tourism*5, 2, 111-132, Doi=10.30958/ajt.5-2-3
- [10] Barber, N. 2013, Investigating the potential influence of the internet as a new socialization agent in context with other traditional socialization agents, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*; Abingdon 21.2 (Spring 2013), 179-193, Doi=<http://adage.com/article/american-demographics/generational-divide/42724>
- [11] Beatty, S.E., and Talpade, S. 1994, Adolescent influence in family decision making: a replication with extension, *Journal of Consumer Research* 21, 9 (1 September 1994), 332-341, DOI=<http://doi.org/10.1086/209401>.
- [12] Belch, G.E., Belch, M. A., and Ceresino, G. 1985, Parental and teenage child influences in family decision making, *Journal of Business Research* 13, 163-176, DOI=[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(85\)90038-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(85)90038-4).
- [13] Belch, M.A., Krentler, K. A., and Willis-Flurry, L.A. 2005, Teen internet mavens: influence in family decision making, *Journal of Business Research* 58 (May 2005), 569-575, DOI=<http://doi.10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.08.005>.
- [14] Carlson, L., and Grossbart, S. 1990, An Investigation of Mothers' Communication Orientations and Patterns, *Advances in Consumer Research* 17, 804-812, Doi=<http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/7107/volumes/v17/NA-17>
- [15] Carr, N. 2006, A comparison of adolescents' and parents' holiday motivations and desires, *Tourism and Hospitality Research*; Feb 2006; 6, 2;129-142, DOI=<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1057/palgrave.t hr.6040051>.
- [16] Chan, K., and McNeal, J. 2002a, Parent-child communications about consumption and advertising in China, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 20, 4, 317-334, Doi=<https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760310483685>
- [17] Chan, K., and McNeal, J. 2002b, Parental concern about television viewing and children's advertising in China. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 15, 2, 151-166, Doi=<https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/15.2.151>
- [18] Chaudhary, M., and Gupta, A. 2012, Children's influence in family buying process in India, *Young Consumers*; Bradford13, 2, pp. 161-175, DOI=<https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/17473611211233512>.
- [19] Chikweche, T., Stanton, J., and Fletcher, R. 2012, Family purchase decision making at the bottom of the pyramid, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 29, 3, 202-213, DOI=<http://doi.10.1108/07363761211221738>.
- [20] Chitakunye, P. 2012, Recovering children's voices in consumer research, *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* 15, 2, 206-224, DOI=<http://doi.10.1108/13522751211215903>.
- [21] Churchill, G. A., and Moschis, G. P. 1979, Television and Interpersonal Influences on Adolescent Consumer Learning, *Journal of Consumer Research* 6 (1), 23-35.
- [22] Commuri, S. and Gentry, J. 2000, Opportunities for family research in marketing, *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, ABI/INFORM Global, 1-34, DOI=<https://search.proquest.com/openview/45ffdc1e7d6c05902ec3e24f441b320/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=25818>.
- [23] Darley, W.K., and Lim, J.S. 1986, Family decision making in leisure-time activities: an exploratory investigation of the impact of locus of control, child

- age influence factor and parental type on perceived child influence, *Advances in Consumer Research* 13, Richard J. Lutz (Eds.), Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 370-374, DOI=<http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/6521/volumes/v13/NA-13>.
- [24] Dotson, M.J., and Hyatt, E. M. 2005, Major influence factors in children's consumer socialization, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 22, 1, 35-42.
- [25] Ekstrom, K.M., Tansuhaj, P. S., and Foxman, E. R. 1987, Children's influence in family decisions and consumer socialization: a reciprocal view, *Advances in Consumer Research* 14, 283-287, DOI=<http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/6704/volumes/v14/NA-14>.
- [26] Filiatrault, P., and Ritchie, J. R. 1980, Joint Purchasing Decisions: A Comparison of Influence Structure in Family and Couple Decision-Making Units, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Volume 7, Issue 2, (1 September 1980), 131-140, <https://doi.org/10.1086/208802>
- [27] Feng, C., Collins, R., and Song, W. 2011, The influences of national cultural constructs on marketing studies, *African Journal of Business Management* 5, 26, 10893-10899, (28 October 2011), DOI: 10.5897/AJBM11.1404
- [28] Foxman, E.R., and Tansuhaj, P.S. 1988, Adolescents' and mothers perceptions of relative influence in family purchase decisions: patterns of agreement and disagreement, *Advances in Consumer Research* 15, 449-453, DOI=<http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/6845/volumes/v15/NA-15>.
- [29] Foxman, E.R., Tansuhaj, P. S., and Ekstrom, K. M. 1989a, Family members' perceptions of adolescents' influence in family decision making, *Journal of Consumer Research* 15, 3 (March 1989), 482-491, DOI=<https://doi.org/10.1086/209187>.
- [30] Foxman, E. R., Tansuhaj, P. S., and Ekstrom, K. M. 1989b, Adolescents' influence in family purchase decisions: a socialization perspective, *Journal of Business Research* 18, 3 (March), 159-172, DOI=[https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(89\)90033-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(89)90033-7).
- [31] Gentina, E., Butori, R., Rose, G., and Bakir, A. 2013, How national culture impacts teenage shopping behavior: Comparing French and American consumers, *Journal of Business Research*, 1-7, DOI=<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.03.033>.
- [32] Gliem, J.A., and Gliem, R.R. 2003, Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales, Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, October 8-10, 2003.
- [33] Goswami, S., and Khan, S. 2015, Impact of Consumer Decision-making Styles on Online Apparel Consumption in India, *Vision* 19, 4 (January 25, 2016), 303-311, DOI=<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0972262915610853>.
- [34] Haq, M. R. and Rahman, S. D. 2015, Role of reality TV as a consumer-socialization agent of teenagers in a developing country, *International Journal of Emerging Markets* 10, 3, 598-618, DOI= 10.1108/IJoEM-06-2013-0101.
- [35] Hofstede, G.H. 1993, Cultural constraints in management theories, *The Executive* 7, 1, (Feb 1993), ABI/INFORM Collection pg. 81-94.
- [36] Hofstede, G.H. 1994, Management scientists are humans, *Management Science* 40, 4-13.
- [37] Hofstede, G.H. 2001, *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- [38] Hutcheson, G., and Sofroniou, N. 1999, *The Multivariate Social Scientist*, Sage Publications.
- [39] Isin, F., and Alkibay, S. 2011, Influence of children on purchasing decisions of well-to-do families, *Young Consumers* 12, 1, 39-52, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/17473611111114777>.
- [40] Ishaque, A., and Tufail, M. 2014, Influence of Children on Family Purchase Decision: Empirical Evidence from Pakistan, *International Review of Management and Business Research* 3, 1 (March 2014), 162-173, DOI=<http://www.irnbrjournal.com/papers/1389635731.pdf>.
- [41] Jenkins, R. L. 1979, The Influence of Children in Family Decision-Making: Parents' Perceptions, in *NA - Advances in Consumer Research* Volume 06, eds. William L. Wilkie, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, Pages: 413-418, DOI=<http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/9587/volumes/v06/NA-06>.
- [42] John, D. 1999, Consumer socialization of children: a retrospective look at twenty-five years of research, *Journal of Consumer Research* 26, 12 (December 1999), 183-213, DOI=<https://doi.org/10.1086/209559>.
- [43] Kaur, P., and Medury, Y. 2013, SEM Approach to Teen Influence in Family Decision Making, *Contemporary Management Research* 9, 3, 323-342, DOI=<http://doi.10.7903/cmr.11080>.
- [44] Kaur, P., and Medury, Y. 2011, Impact of the internet on teenagers' influence on family purchases, *Young Consumers* 12, 1, 27-38, DOI=<http://doi.10.1108/17473611111114768>.
- [45] Kaur, P., and Singh, R. 2006, Children in family purchase decision making in India and the west: a review, *Academy Marketing Science Review* 8, 1-30, DOI=<http://www.amsreview.org/article/kaur08-2006.pdf>.
- [46] Khoo-Lattimore, C., Prayag, G., and Cheah, B. L. 2016, Kids on Board: Exploring the Choice Process and Vacation Needs of Asian Parents with Young Children in Resort Hotels, *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, (Mar 2015), 1-31, DOI=<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19368623.2014.914862>.
- [47] Kim, C., and Lee, H. 1997, Development of family triadic measures for children's purchase influence, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Chicago, (Aug., 1997), 307-321, DOI= 10.2307/3151894.
- [48] Kim, C., Yang, Z., and Lee, H. 2015, Parental style, parental practices, and socialization outcomes: An investigation of their linkages in the consumer socialization context, *Journal of Economic Psychology*

- 49, (August 2015), 15-33, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2015.03.006>
- [49] Kushwaha, T. 2017, Parental Style and Television Socialization of Children and Adolescents: A Perceptual Study in the Indian Context, *South Asian Journal of Management* 24, 3 (Jul-Sep 2017), 88-105, DOI=
<https://search.proquest.com/openview/8334a75287aa49563a4ef22350a3b5ed/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=46967>.
- [50] Lackman, C., and Lanasa, J. 1993, Family decision-making theory: an overview and assessment, *Psychology & Marketing* 10, 2 (March/April 1993), 81-93, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.4220100203>.
- [51] Lee, C.K.C., and Beatty, S. E. 2002, Family structure and influence in family decision making, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 19, 1, 24-41, DOI=
<https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/07363760210414934>.
- [52] Lee, C.K.C., and Collins, B. A. 2000, Family decision making and coalition patterns, *European Journal of Marketing*, Bradford, 1181-1198, DOI=
<https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/03090560010342584>.
- [53] Luczak, C., Younkin, N. 2012, Net generation: a conceptual framework of the consumer socialization process, *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, Arden 16, 2, 47-51.
- [54] Mangleburg, T.F. 1990, Children's influence in purchase decisions: a review and critique, *Advances in Consumer Research* 17, Marvin E. Goldberg, Gerald Gorn, and Richard W. Pollay (Eds.), Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 813-825, DOI=
<http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/7108/volumes/v17/NA-17>.
- [55] Mangleburg, T.F., Grewal, D., and Bristol, T. 1999, Family Type, Family Authority Relations, and Adolescents' Purchase Influence, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 26 (1999), 379-384, DOI=
<http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/8284/volumes/v26/NA-26>
- [56] Maroco, J., and Garcia-Marques, T. 2006, Qual a fiabilidade do alfa de Cronbach? Questões antigas e soluções modernas?, *Laboratório de Psicologia*, 4(1): 65-90, Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada, Portugal, DOI=
<http://publicacoes.ispa.pt/index.php/lp/article/viewFile/763/706>.
- [57] Mau, G., Schuhen, M., Steinmann, S., and Schramm-Klein, H. 2016, How children make purchase decisions: behaviour of the cued processors, *Young Consumers; Bradford* 17, 2 (March 2016), 111-126, DOI=
<https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/YC-10-2015-00563>.
- [58] Mau, G., Schramm-Klein, H., and Reisch, L. 2014, Consumer Socialization, Buying Decisions, and Consumer Behaviour in Children: Introduction to the Special Issue, *Journal of Consumer Policy* 37, 155-160, DOI= <http://doi.10.1108/YC-10-2015-00563>.
- [59] Marbell, K. N., and Grolnick, W. S. 2013, Correlates of parental control and autonomy support in an interdependent culture: A look at Ghana, *MotivEmot* (2013) 37:79-92, DOI= 10.1007/s11031-012-9289-2
- [60] Mooij, M. 2015, Cross-cultural research in international marketing: clearing up some of the confusion, *International Marketing Review* 32, 6, 646-662, DOI= 10.1108/IMR-12-2014-0376.
- [61] Moschis, G., and Churchill, G. 1979, An analysis of the adolescent consumer, *Journal of Marketing* 15, 40-48.
- [62] Moschis, G., and Mitchell, L. 1986, Television advertising and interpersonal influences on teenagers' participation in family consumer decisions, *Advances in Consumer Research* 13, 181-186, DOI=
<http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/6487/volumes/v13/NA-13>.
- [63] Moschis, G. and Moore, R. 1979, Decision Making Among the Young: A Socialization Perspective, *Journal of Consumer Research* 6, 101-112.
- [64] Niu, H. J. 2013, Cyber peers' influence for adolescent consumer in decision-making styles and online purchasing behavior, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 43, 1228-1237, Doi= 10.1111/jasp.12085.
- [65] Neely, S. 2005, Influences on consumer socialization, *Young Consumers*, World Advertising Research Center, Quarter 1, 63-69, DOI=
<https://doi.org/10.1108/17473610510701115>.
- [66] Neulinger, A., and Zsoter, B. 2014, Mother-child interactions in youth purchase decisions, *Society and Economy* 36, 3, 387-406, DOI=
<https://akademai.com/doi/abs/10.1556/SocEc.36.2014.3.4>.
- [67] Niemczyk, A. 2015, Family decisions on the tourism market, *Economics & Sociology; Ternopil* 8, 3, 272-283, DOI= <http://doi.10.14254/2071-789X.2015/8-3/19>.
- [68] Rose, G.M., Bush, V. D., and Kahle, L. 1998, The influence of family communication patterns on parental reactions toward advertising: A cross-culturalnational examination, *Journal of Advertising* (Winter 1998) 27, 4, BI/INFORM Collection, 71-85.
- [69] Ritchie, J. R., and Filiatrault, P. 1980, Family vacation decision-making - A replication and extension, *Journal of Travel Research*, 16, 2-7, DOI=
<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/004728758001800401>
- [70] Shah, R., and Mittal, B. 1997, Toward a theory of intergenerational influence in consumer behaviour: an exploratory essay, *Advances in Consumer Research* 24, 55-60, DOI=
<http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/8008/volumes/v24/NA-24>.
- [71] Shahrokh, Z. D., and Khosravi, M. E. 2014, Children's Influence in Family Consumption Decisions: An Integrative Approach, *International Review of Management and Business Research; Peshawar* 3, 2, 1275-1287.
- [72] Sharma, A., and Sonwaney, V. 2014, Theoretical modeling of influence of children on family purchase decision making, *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 133, 38 - 46, DOI=
<http://doi.10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.167>.
- [73] Sharma, A., and Sonwaney, V. 2013, Influence of Children on Family Purchase Decisions in Urban

- India: An Exploratory Study, *International Journal of Marketing & Business Communication* 2, 2, 32-43.
- [74] Shergill, S., Sekhon, H., and Zhao, M. 2013, Parents' perception of teen's influence on family purchase decisions: A study of cultural assimilation, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics* 25, 1, 162-177, DOI= <http://doi.10.1108/13555851311290993>.
- [75] Shoham, A., and Dalakas, V. 2005, He said, she said ... they said: parent's and children's assessment of children's influence on family consumption decisions, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 3, 22, 152-160, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760510595977>.
- [76] Shoham, A., and Dalakas, V. 2003, Family consumer decision making in Israel: the role of teens and parents, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 3, 20, 238-251, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760310472263>.
- [77] Singh, R., and Nayak, J. K. 2014, Peer Interaction and Its Influence on Family Purchase Decision: A Study among Indian Teenagers, *Vision*, 18(2) 81-90, SAGE Publications, Los Angeles, DOI: 10.1177/0972262914527873.
- [78] Sondhi, N., and Basu, R. 2014 Role of children in family purchase across Indian parental clusters, *Young Consumers*, 15, 4, 365-379, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-10-2013-00402>.
- [79] Srivastava, A., 2015, Consumer Decision-Making Styles of Indian Adolescents, *Contemporary Management Research; Sansia* 11.4, 385-408, DOI= <http://doi.10.7903/cmr.14181>.
- [80] Swinyard, W. R., and Sim, C. P. 1987, Perception of children's influence on family decision processes, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 4, 1, 25-38, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb008186>.
- [81] Tinson, J.S., Nancarrow, C., and Brace, I. 2008, Purchase decision making and the increasing significance of family types, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 25, 1, 45-56, DOI= <http://doi.10.1108/07363760810845408>.
- [82] Yang, Z., Kim, C., Laroche, M., and Lee, H. 2014, Parental style and consumer socialization among adolescents: A cross-cultural investigation, *Journal of Business Research* 67, 228-236, DOI= <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.05.008>.
- [83] Ward, S. 1974, Consumer socialization, *Journal of Consumer Research* 1, 1-14.
- [84] Watabe, A., and Hibbard, D. R. 2014, The Influence of Authoritarian and Authoritative Parenting on Children's Academic Achievement Motivation: A Comparison between the United States and Japan, *North American Journal of Psychology* 16, 2, 359-382, Doi= <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1534958903?accountid=44038>.
- [85] Watne, T. A., Lobo, A., and Brennan, L. 2011, Children as Secondary Socialisation Agents for their Parents. *Young Consumers*, 12, 4, 285-294, Doi= <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17473611111185841>
- [86] Watne, T. A., Brennan, L., and Parker, L. 2015, Consumer socialisation agency within three-generational Vietnamese families, *Young Consumers* 16, 2, 172-188, DOI= 10.1108/YC-08-2014-00471.
- [87] Watne, T. A., Brennan, L., and Winchester, T. 2014, Consumer Socialization Agency: Implications for family decision-making about holidays, *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 1-20.
- [88] Watne, T. A., and Winchester, T. 2011, Family holiday decision making: the knowledge and influence of adolescent children and parents, in ANZMAC 2011 conference proceedings: Marketing in the Age of Consumerism: Jekyll or Hyde?, ANZMAC, Perth W. A., 1-9.
- [89] Wu, M.Y. 2006, Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions 30 Years Later: A Study of Taiwan and the United States, *Intercultural Communication Studies XV: 1* 2006, 33-42.