

“Culture and consumer socialization effects on adolescent’s influence on purchase decision of computer for family use: A comparison between mother’ and adolescent’ perceptions”

João Paulo Baía

Abstract: With the expansion of globalization, the search for new markets and the interest of companies in the knowledge of how, in specific cultures, families structure their purchase decisions, is of particular relevance nowadays. So, to seek a better understanding of their consumers and, in particular, how they decide to buy. In this context, the family is the most relevant consumer unit for marketing managers. Literature has evidenced the existence of diverse cultural dimensions, namely individualism-collectivism and power distance. In addition, the family buying decisions is one of the most difficult consumer behavior subjects. Thus, adolescents became an increasingly attractive segment for companies, because they are considered as an active element and have influence the most important consumption unit, the family. In these, the role of the adolescent is not properly explained, having often been devalued or relegated. The adolescent tend to have a higher knowledge than his parents, which can constitute an important resource in his participation in those purchases, when comparing with their parents. Furthermore, technological products for family use have not yet been adequately studied.

The main objective of this research 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 personal computer’ purchase decision.

A quantitative research method is utilized in high schools in Lisbon district, Portugal. Then, 3,600 questionnaires were delivered in classrooms during May 2018. Adolescents’ students, aged 12 to 19 years, were instructed to fill their questionnaires in the classroom (a total of 1,800 questionnaires) and to deliver the remaining 1,800 questionnaires to their mothers and to return them, fully completed, some days later. Finally, the questionnaires were collected from the high-schools. This resulted in a total of 726 questionnaires by mothers and 726 by adolescents. This meant a total of 1,452 validated questionnaires.

Results of logistic regression analysis point to socio-oriented communication, television influence, and family income, as explanatory variables for family personal computer’ purchase. It can also be found a significant similarity of perceptions between the mother and the adolescent with regard to the participation of adolescent on that purchase decision. However, it is also important to conclude that there some differences were also found between some variables, when considering different family members’ inquired. Here, when considering the mother’ perception, considering the mother’ perception, adolescents with greater product knowledge not being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions, reinforcing the relevance of adolescent’ product knowledge. Also from the mother’ point of view, female adolescents had more influence on family purchases than male adolescents, valuating the adolescent’ gender. More, adolescents do have more influence on family purchases if they live in single-parent families than if they live in traditional families, also valuating the family type as an explanatory variable.

From the adolescent’ perspective, the internet influence is a variable that contributes to explaining his/her influence on the purchase of personal computer for family. When adolescent has a higher exposure to parents have a higher internet influence, adolescent’ will show higher influence on the purchase of family personal computer’ purchase.

One can consider several of this research made to this knowledge field. First, the relevance of including the adolescent in purchases for his own use is reinforced.

Second, when considering personal computer for family use, marketing managers should direct their efforts to those adolescents who live in socio-oriented communication families, to those adolescents who are more influenced by television, and that live in families with higher income. Those results are innovative in this field of knowledge.

Also contributes significantly to companies pointing to consider adolescent has an active participation on family purchase decisions. Having the adolescent relevant role on family buying decisions, it is important that marketers focus their efforts on his/her satisfaction. Comparing the mother’ and adolescent’ perceptions on the adolescent’ influence on that decision allows us to reinforce those contributions

Keywords: *Consumer behaviour, Culture, Consumer socialization, Family decision making, Adolescent, Influence, Personal computer for family use*

I. Introduction

Past literature on consumer behavior has emphasized the importance of considering culture as an explanatory variable in consumer behaviour, the raising phenomena of globalization and its impact on families functioning. In this area of knowledge, power distance and individualism-collectivism can be considered the most relevant dimensions (Al-Zu’bi 2016, Yang et al. 2014, Marbell & Grolnick 2013, Feng et al. 2011). For marketers, is very important in the context of global market, and being the family the most fundamental unit of consumption, it is crucial to understand how families make their consumer decisions in different cultures (Ishaque & Tufail 2014, Kaur & Medury 2013, Leng & Botelho 2010). Furthermore, family consumer behaviour is considered to be one of the most difficult subjects in the area of consumer behavior, needing deeper research (Aleti et al. 1995, Akinyele 2010, Beatty & Talpade 1994). In that context, adolescents constitute an important segment for companies and brands, mainly because of their actual attempts to influence family purchases (Al-Zu’bi 2016, Mau et al. 2014, Medury, 2013, Luczak & Younkin 2012). Thus, it is important for marketers to understand the importance and extent of adolescent influence in the family context (Luczak & Younkin 2012). Considering products where they are primary users, like breakfast cereals, clothes, music, generally, adolescents have autonomy to decide (Ishaque & Tufail 2014, Kaur & Singh 2006, Beatty & Talpade 1994), or in certain products like groceries (Baía 2018, Ashraf & Khan 2016, Chikweche et al. 2012, Chitakunye 2012). Foxman and Tansuhaj (1988) were among the first researchers to consider adolescent’s influence on technological products on family purchase decisions. Results indicated some adolescent’s influence on that purchase decisions on their households.

We can define consumer socialization as a 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 the main construct used in consumer socialization and considered a fundamental predicted of adolescent’s socialization. However, the effect of parental communication style in adolescents’ influence on buying decisions still needs deeper research (Sharma & Sonwaney 2013).

Nowadays, 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 & Sonwaney 2013, Niu 2013, Luczak & Younkin 2012).

It is crucial to marketing managers understanding the adolescent purchase behavior and their participation on family decisions (Niemczyk 2015, Srivastava 2015, Shahrokh & Khosravi 2014, Yang et al. 2014). The adolescents’ role on family purchase decisions has been shown to 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 field (Neulinger & Zsoter 2014, Barber 2013, Akinyele 2010).

The present study examines the 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: family personal computer’ purchase decision, whose interest is confirmed (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 current family structures (Kaur & Singh, 2006; Chavda et al. 2005, Neely 2005). A holistic approach to adolescent influence is presented, also considering the role of product knowledge on his/her influence, and the influence of demographic variables such as family type and 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 participation on personal computer for family use.

The absence of homogeneity among respondents has been dominant in studies on the influence of adolescents (Shoham & Dalakas 2005, 2003, Beatty & Talpade 1994, Foxman et al., 1989a, b, Foxman & Tansuhaj 1988). These cause a problem of internal consistency of the scale (Kim and Lee, 1997; Corfman, 1990b), so the perception of a particular family member who can issue an impartial and rigorous opinion, it will be a way to contribute to its resolution (Mangleburg, 1990). Also, many researchers pointed out the relevance and interest on inquiring both adolescent and one parent (Al-Zu’bi 2016, Ashraf & Khan 2016, Mau et al. 2016, 2014, Goswami & Khan 2015, Sondhi & Basu 2014).

The research problem deals with a theoretical dimension concerning the answer to the following questions: What is the impact of the national cultural constructs and consumer socialization on adolescent’s influence on personal computer for family use decision? What are the family demographic characteristics that impact the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decision of buying a personal computer for family use? What is the mother’s perception about the adolescent’s influence? What is the adolescent’s perception about

his/her own influence? Are mother’s perception and adolescent’s perception about his/her own influence different?

Despite past literature considered adolescent as a relevant member on family purchases (Khoo-Lattimore et al. 2016, Niemczyk 2015, Kaur & Medury 2011, Mangleburg 1990, Foxman et al. 1989a, b), a holistic approach to the adolescents’ influence on personal computer for family use on final decision stage remain scarce researched (Barber 2013, Akinyele 2010, Neulinger & Zsoter 2014, Kaur & Medury 2011; Kaur & Singh 2006). The subject of the present investigation is the consumption behavior of family purchases for personal computer for family use.

The paper begins by reviewing the literature and the definition of the research hypotheses. The methodology used will be characterized also. The main study results will be presented and discussed, as well as the main conclusions, limitations and directions for future research.

II. Literature Review and Hypotheses

The family consumer behavior presents several gaps, namely the amount and extent of adolescent influence on family purchases, which has been consecutively neglected as an active member (Khoo-Lattimore et al., 2016, Watne & Winchester 2011, Kaur & Medury 2011, Carr 2006, Commuri & Gentry 2000). The adolescent has been considered a less important or secondary member when studying family consumption decisions.

The adolescent role

Adolescents’ are influencing family members on purchasing decisions by actively acting on a certain decision direction, or also considered direct influence, not only in those purchases in which they are the primary users, but also in family purchases of goods for use by the whole family. (Kaur & Singh 2006, Beatty & Talpade 1994, Mangleburg 1990). Adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions is still not properly explained (Aleti et al. 2015, Shergill et al. 2013, Chaudhary & Gupta 2012, Kaur & Singh 2006).

Cultural dimensions

Culture is considered 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 vs collectivism refers to a society’s cultural position relative to major individual relevance or that group’s interests must overlap individual 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 by comparison with individuals from individualistic cultures (Al-Zu’bi, 2016). For Mooij and 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 second 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 is “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). Thus, power distance concept is related to a society desire for hierarchy versus egalitarianism (Chan & McNeal 2003). 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 living in a higher power distance culture (Baía 2018). Thus, parents living in a higher power distance culture are more likely to encourage and be more open to adolescents’ influence on family decisions (Shergill et al., 2013). So, the first 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

This variable effect on adolescent’s socialization process varies, 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 weak 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).

Some researchers pointed that parents with socio-oriented communication style foster adolescents’ obedience by monitoring and controlling their’ consumer learning and behavior (Watabe & Hibbard 2014). When considering a 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 ((a) and (b)) are:

H3a: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with respect to adolescents with pluralistic parents being perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with laissez-faire parents.

H3b: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with respect to adolescents with consensual parents being perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with protective parents.

Internet influence

Internet has, more recently, been contributed and influenced decisively the adolescents’ consumer socialization (Kaur & Medury 2011). Adolescents reveal higher internet skills when we compare them with their parents. So, the use of the internet by adolescents is a subject of great interest and lacking the greatest depth for academics and marketers (Kaur & Medury 2011, Belch et al. 2005). 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).

Internet is considered 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 for adolescents (Kaur & Medury 2011).

The internet must be considered 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: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with respect to adolescents with internet influence being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions.

Television influence

The television, and particularly the media, has played a relevant role in guiding consumers to products and brands, providing reliable evidence (Barber 2013), and by using credible informants, having also persuasion power over decision makers. Television has been the most influential mass media channel, influencing consumers through the brands’ advertising that are supported by celebrities or acceptable by society (Churchill & Moschis 1979). Television has helped adolescents on developing product-related knowledge, perception of the consumer’s role, and influence their purchasing intentions (Haq & Rahman, 2015). Television influence has been a main socialization agent, influencing attitudes and behaviors such as desire for products, preference of brand and willingness to buy (Barber 2013).

The amount of television viewing improves the market’ knowledge and the products’ and brands’ awareness (Mangleburg & Bristol 1998). In addition, parents who regularly watch television with adolescents feel the need less intervention because they control the contents observed (Kushwaha 2017).

Sharma and Sonwaney (2013) pointed that “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: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with respect to adolescents with television influence being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions.

Product knowledge

Product knowledge is a major social power source, meaning a person’s ability, based on some attribute such as knowledge or expertise, to influence another person’s behavior or to persuade him/her (Aleti et al. 2015, Beatty & Talpade 1994). When considering 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 to use their cognitive skills in family consumer behaviour. Adolescents tend to be most knowledgeable and interested in technological products than their parents, which will lead them to more influence attempts (Foxman & Tansuhaj 1988). Baía (2018) found that adolescents actually revealed a relevant participation on decisions when their knowledge is higher.

Thus, the product knowledge should lead to greater adolescents’ influence attempts (Chitakunye 2012, Belch et al. 2005, Shah & Mittal 1997, Beatty & Talpade 1994). So, the sixth hypothesis is:

H6: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with respect to adolescents with greater product knowledge being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions.

Adolescent’s gender

The adolescent gender’s one of the main explanatory aspects for their influence on family consumer decisions (Ali et al. 2013, Watne & Winchester 2011, Shergill et al. 2013, Gentina et al. 2013, Kaur and Singh 2006). Foxman and Tansuhaj (1988) concluded that, for technological products male adolescents appear to be more likely than female adolescents to participate in all phases of the family purchasing decision process, in general, and to decide to particularly purchase products. Thus, the seventh hypothesis is:

H7: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with concerning to male adolescents as having more influence on family purchases than female adolescents.

Family type

The family type is an important aspect when explaining the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions, with the adolescents in single-parent families presenting higher levels of influence comparatively to those from traditional households (Mangleburg et al. 1999, Ahuja et al. 1998, Ahuja 1993, Ahuja & Walker 1994, Ekstrom et al. 1987). The change in adolescent’s influence seems to emerge from the increasing divorce rates, among several factors (Caruana & Vassallo 2003, Lackman & Lanasa 1993, Ekstrom et al. 1987). Ahuja (1993) concluded that adolescents in single-parent households could also participate in decision-making process at a higher level than the ones in traditional families, in their role as junior partners performing management activities. Ahuja and Walker (1994) stated adolescents seem to have more influence on family purchasing behaviour in single-parent families (Caruana & Vassallo 2003, Mangleburg et al. 1999, Ahuja 1993, Darley & Lim 1986). Therise in single-parent families have led to an increase of adolescents’ participation on family purchase decisions (Ashraf & Khan 2016, Lackman & Lanasa 1993, Ekstrom et al. 1987). Thus:

H8: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with concerning to adolescents as having more influence on family purchases if they live in single-parent families than if they live in traditional families.

Family income

Family income has been considered an explanatory variable of adolescent’s influence on family purchasing decisions, with adolescents presenting higher levels of influence in those households with higher income (Ali et al. 2013, Kaur & Medury 2011, Isin & Alkibay 2011, Lee & Beatty 2002, Lee & Collins 2000). In families with higher levels of income, adolescents tend to have more opportunities and may be allowed to participate in more decisions (Isin & Alkibay 2011, Lee & Collins 2000, Beatty & Talpade 1994). Therefore:

H9: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with concerning to adolescents living in higher income families being perceived as having more influence on family purchases than adolescents in lower income households.

III. Methodology

The present 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 personal computer for family use, according to mother’s and adolescent’s perceptions.

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 personal computer for family use purchases in Europe, so this study provides a contribution in this area.

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

There has been pointed out the importance of study product categories for family use (Belch et al. 2005, Beatty & Talpade 1994). In this research, the product category selected derives from the literature review, with the decision on the personal computer for family use (Foxman & Tansuhaj 1988). Besides, little is known about the adolescent’s influence in this product category in the family final purchase decision.

The method of data collection was the questionnaire survey, which is also consistent with past studies (Aleti et al. 2015, Srivastava 2015, Shoham & Dalakas 2005, 2003, Beatty & Talpade 1994).

The questionnaire structure aimed to pursue the research goals outlined. A pre-test was carried out that led to small changes in the questionnaire final structure. The contributions given 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 (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Linking the Model to the Questionnaire*

Variables in study	Adapted from...
Explained variable	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 type • 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); Ahuja and Stinson (1993).

Explained variable

Past research have used a 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 referential authors (Shoham & Dalakas, 2003, Beatty & Talpade 1994). The mother’s perception about adolescent’s influence was defined 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 scale (2001). For this, 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 family type and family income variables used scales proposed by Ahuja and Walker (1994).

Data collection procedures and sample

Research was conducted in May 2018, and data collection was carried out in 15 high-schools, on Lisbon district. 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 directed to the mother of each student, requesting her participation. During this phase, 3,600 questionnaires were delivered by the teachers in the classrooms during May 2018. Students, aged 12 to 19 years, were instructed to fill their questionnaires in the classroom (a total of 1,800 questionnaires) and to deliver the remaining 1,800 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 726 questionnaires fully answered by mothers and 726 by adolescents, which meant a response rate of 40.3%. That represents a higher rate than previous studies (Kaur and Medury 2013, Shergill et al. 2013, Wu 2006). Only questionnaires answered by adolescents whose mothers also completed their questionnaires were considered, so that could be possible to carry out a correspondence between the questionnaires answered by both.

Statistical techniques used

Linear regression to study the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions as the data analysis’ method was used (Mangleburg et al., 1999; Beatty & Talpade 1994). In past literature, 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 logistic regression is adequate to the nature of the explanatory variables considered (Hutcheson and Sofroniou 1999). The explanatory variables 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 the use of logistic regression models.

IV. Data Analysis and Findings

Internal consistency

Cronbach’s α ranks high in most researcher preferences to estimate internal consistency. The reliability of a measure refers to its ability to be consistent (Maroco & 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, presenting values above 0.8, indicating good reliability.

Respondents’ profile

Table2. Respondents’ profile (percentage)

Demographics	Valid percent	Cumulative percentage
<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
Universitary 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 Professionals of Intermediate Level	3.4	80.4
Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions	7.3	87.7
Senior Management and Directors	12.3	100
<i>Family income</i>		
Less than 500 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

Table 2 shows 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.

The most frequent age group, with a rate of 70.1%, is from 35 to 49 years with regard to mother’s age. The second most frequent age group is 50 to 64 years, with a rate of 22.4% of the total of respondents.

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

With 18.2% rate, farmers and skilled workers represent the most frequent category concerning mother’s professional category. 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 range 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 percentage
<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 or more persons	12.5	100
<i>Family type</i>		
Single-parent	29.9	29.9
Traditional	70.1	100

Regarding the family size, the most frequent category, is four persons, with a rate of 35.5% of the total of respondents. 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

From this point forward, the adolescent’s influence on personal computer for family use’ purchase explanatory variables will be analyzed.

Socio-oriented communication

With regarding to consumer socialization, when considering socio-oriented communication’ dimension, there is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with respect to adolescents with pluralistic parents being perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with laissez-faire parents. So, H3a is verified, and Socio-oriented communication adds explanatory capacity to adolescent influence on family purchases (see tables 4 and 5).

Television influence

H5: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with respect to adolescents with television influence being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions. Thus, H5 is verified, so adolescents with television influence being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions from both perceptions (see tables 4 and 5).

Family income

H9: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with concerning to adolescents living in higher income families being perceived as having more influence on family purchases than adolescents in lower income households. Thus, H9 is verified (see tables 4 and 5).

Table 4. Logistic regression for personal computer for family use (variables in equation for mother’s perception)

	Variables	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 5e	Adolescent's gender	-0,466	0,198	5,516	1	0,019	0,628	0,426	0,926
	Family income	-0,155	0,063	6,09	1	0,014	0,857	0,758	0,969
	Socio-oriented communication	0,592	0,203	8,508	1	0,004	1,808	1,214	2,691
	Television Influence	0,484	0,206	5,542	1	0,019	1,623	1,084	2,43
	Product Knowledge	0,626	0,296	4,459	1	0,035	1,87	1,134	1,409
	Constant	-0,166	0,577	0,083	1	0,774	0,847		

Table 5. Logistic regression for personal computer for family use (variables in equation for adolescent’s perception)

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.
	Variables					
Step 4d	Socio-oriented communication	0,312	0,11	8,001	1	0,005
	Internet influence	0,292	0,12	5,932	1	0,015
	Television influence	1,28	0,302	17,92	1	0
	Family income	0,626	0,296	4,459	1	0,035
	Constant	-2,824	0,843	11,22	1	0,001

Individualism vs collectivism

Regarding individualism vs collectivism, H1 is not verified, so the adolescents will not be perceived as having more influence on family purchases if they are in individualism culture than if they are in collectivism culture (see tables 6 and 7).

Power distance

The results show that adolescents will not be perceived as having more influence on family purchases if they are in small power distance culture than in large power distance culture. Thus, H2 is not verified (see tables 6 and 7).

Concept-oriented communication

With regarding to consumer socialization, when considering concept-oriented communication’ dimension, there is difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with respect to adolescents with consensual parents being perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with protective parents. However, when we consider the adolescent’ perception, they do have more influence on family purchases with consensual parents being perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with protective ones. Thus, H3b is not verified (see tables 6 and 7).

Internet influence

There is difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with respect to adolescents with internet influence being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions. However, when considering the adolescent’ perception, adolescents with internet influence being positively related to influence on family purchase decisions. We consider H4 is not verified, so that adolescents with internet influence being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions from both mother’ and adolescent’ perceptions (see tables 6 and 7).

Product knowledge

H6: There is difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with respect to adolescents with greater product knowledge not being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions for both responders. However, when considering the mother’ perception, adolescents with greater product knowledge not being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions. So, H6 is not verified (see tables 6 and 7).

Adolescent’s gender

H7: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with concerning to male adolescents as not having more influence on family purchases than female adolescents. However, when considering the mother’ perception, female adolescents as having more influence on family purchases than male adolescents. Thereby, H7 is not verified (see tables 6 and 7).

Family type

H8: There is difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with concerning to adolescents as having more influence on family purchases if they live in single-parent families than if they live in traditional families. When considering the mother’ perception, they do have more influence on family purchases if they live in single-parent families than if they live in traditional families. Thereby, H8 is not verified (see tables 6 and 7).

Table 6. Logistic regression for personal computer for family use (variables not in equation for mother’s perception)

Step 5	Variables	Score	df	Sig.
	Power distance	0,031	1	0,861
	Individualism vs collectivism	0,015	1	0,903
	Concept-oriented communication	2,032	1	0,154
	Internet influence	0,564	1	0,453
	Family type	2,405	1	0,121
Overall Statistics		8,616	8	0,376

Table 7. Logistic regression for personal computer for family use (variables not in equation for adolescent’s perception)

Step 4	Variables	Score	df	Sig.
	Product knowledge	0,044	1	0,834
	Adolescent's age	4,972	1	0,026
	Concept-oriented communication	8,522	1	0,004
	Socio-oriented communication	12,96	1	0
	Influência Internet	9,475	1	0,002
	Family type	6,851	1	0,009
Overall Statistics		28,65	10	0,001

Explanatory variables interpretation

In the present study the -2LL analysis, for adolescent’s influence on decision to buy personal computer for family’s use, which allows us to conclude that the exogenous variables add explaining capacity to adolescent’s influence on that product purchase. This is reinforced by the Chi-square value, when pointing out that there is a large part of the model explained variance by socio-oriented communication, television influence, and family income as relevant explanatory variables for that purchase.

V. Discussion

In this research, a total of 1,452 fully completed questionnaires was reached, which is a larger sample than most studies known (Al-Zu'bi 2016, Ashraf & Khan 2016, Ali et al. 2013, Chikweche et al. 2012, Chitakunye 2012, Mangleburg et al. 1999, Darley & Lim 1986).

In line with most past research, the present study used a convenience sample (Al-Zu'bi 2016, Ashraf & Khan 2016, Ali et al. 2013, Chikweche et al. 2012, Chitakunye 2012).

Internal validity

Divergence between family members’ opinions when questioned about adolescent’s influence raised internal validation issues overtime (Beatty & Talpade 1994, Foxman et al. 1989b, Belch et al. 1985).

Researchers have collected data questioning one or both parents and the adolescent in past studies on adolescent influence on family purchase decisions (Watne & Winchester 2011, Ishaque & Tufail 2014, Shoham & Dalakas 2005, Beatty & Talpade 1994, Foxman et al. 1989a, b, Belch et al. 1985), which has raised the issue of lack of model internal validity, due to perception differences between members. Past 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). However, the mother's and adolescent’s inquiries were chosen, preserving internal validation of the influence construct. This is reinforced by several past researchers have chosen to inquire both adolescent and one parent (Al-Zu'bi 2016, Ashraf & Khan 2016, Mau et al. 2016, 2014, Goswami & Khan 2015, Sondhi & Basu 2014).

When comparing mother’s influence with adolescent’s influence, or relative influence, the scale used shall also provide external validation (Baía 2018).

Internal consistency

Independent variables scales’ internal consistency 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 values above 0.7, and being above 0.7, is taken as acceptable reliability (Gliem & Gliem 2003). The power distance scale presented values above 0.8, almost excellent accordingly to Gliem & Gliem (2003). Therefore, the mother's and adolescent’s inquiries were chosen, preserving internal validation of the influence construct, due to Cronbach’s α coefficients indicated good reliability, presenting values above 0.8.

Parental communication style scale has values above 0.8, which represents a good Cronbach’s α coefficient. For the internet influence, values above 0.8, also good. As for the television influence scale, an even better Cronbach’s α coefficient was found, with a 0.828 value (idem 2003).

Those 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).

VI. 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 personal computer for family use. Socio-oriented communication, television influence, and family income, as purchase relevant explanatory variables of the adolescent’s influence for that purchase.

It can also be found a significant similarity of perceptions between the mother and the adolescent with regard to the participation of adolescent on the purchase decision considered. However, it is also important to conclude that there some differences were also found in the behavior of some variables, when considering different family members’ inquired. Here, when considering the mother’ perception, considering the mother’ perception, adolescents with greater product knowledge not being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions, reinforcing the relevance of adolescent’ product knowledge. Also from the mother’ point of view, female adolescents as having more influence on family purchases than male adolescents, valuating the adolescent’ gender. More, adolescents do have more influence on family purchases if they live in single-parent families than if they live in traditional families, also valuating the family type as an explanatory variable. Several contributions are made to this knowledge area. First, the relevance of including the adolescent in purchases for his own use is reinforced.

Second, when considering personal computer for family use, marketing managers should direct their efforts to those adolescents who live in socio-oriented communication parental context, that revealed television influence, and who live in families with higher income. Those results are innovative in this field of knowledge.

The present research contributes significantly to the companies by allowing to conclude 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. Comparing the mother’ and adolescent’ perceptions on the adolescent’ influence on that decision allows us to reinforce those contributions

We can also find in the results a significant similarity of perceptions between the mother’ and adolescent’ with regard to his/her participation on that purchase. Despite this, it is also important concluding that there are differences in including variables depending on the family member inquired. From the mother’ perception, considering the mother’ perception, adolescents with greater product knowledge not being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions, reinforcing the relevance of adolescent’ product knowledge. Also from the mother’ point of view, female adolescents as having more influence on family purchases than male adolescents, valuating the adolescent’ gender. More, adolescents do have more influence on family purchases if they live in single-parent families than if they live in traditional families, also valuating the family type as an explanatory variable. Several contributions are made to this knowledge area. The parents’ socio-oriented communication style, and the type of family are variables that contributes to explaining his/her influence on the purchase of personal computer for family use. When parents have a higher socio-oriented communication style, adolescent’ will show higher influence on the purchase of personal computer for family use. On the other side, in single-parent families adolescent’ will exert higher levels of influence than those in traditional families.

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 personal computer for family use, according to the mother’ and adolescent’ perceptions. Those results are innovative in this field of study. It also reinforces the importance of including the adolescent in the final decision for family decision, which is an innovation in this area of research.

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 personal computer for family use, marketing managers should direct their efforts to those adolescents who live in to socio-oriented communication households, with major television influence, and in higher family income structures. Those results are innovative in this field of knowledge.

More, collecting data from mothers and adolescents is a very importance advance in this field, in line with some past research (Al-Zu’bi 2016, Ashraf & Khan 2016, Mau et al. 2016, 2014, Goswami & Khan 2015, Sondhi & Basu 2014), reaching convergent perceptions between mother and adolescent.

The present research contributes significantly to the companies by allowing to conclude that the adolescent has an active participation on family purchase decisions. Having the adolescent relevant role on personal computer for family use, it is crucial for companies’ success that marketers focus their efforts on his satisfaction. Comparing the mother’ and adolescent’ perceptions on the adolescent’ influence on that decision allows us to reinforce those contributions.

The results of the logistic regression analysis point to socio-oriented communication, television influence, and family income as purchase important explanatory variables on personal computer for family use. These results are innovative in the study of family purchases.

Finally, the results point to the relevance of considering adolescent as an influencer on personal computer for family use final decision, indicating that he/she has an important role when considering relevant products for family use and for his/her own use. These results are confirmed not only by himself, but also by his/her mother, which is an innovative result in traditional families.

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 personal computer for family use, 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).

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.

Business implications

The study offers a contribution to the companies by providing evidence of the adolescent’s influence on the purchases of personal computer for family use. 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 socio-oriented communication parents, with major television influence, and living in higher income’households. Marketers approach to family markets should also be more precise if they target adolescents with higher internet influence, and with higher television influence. They should also consider adolescents with greater product knowledge, female adolescents, single-parent’ families as relevant characteristics. Several contributions are made to this knowledge area. These results are innovative in the study of family purchaseswhen it comes to buying personal computer for family use.

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

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 mobile phones, tablets, ipads, and technological services, internet purchases, vacation’ sites.

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.

More studies are needed comparing the mother’ and adolescent’ perceptions on the adolescent’ influence on buying decision which allows us to advance with more reliable and consistent results and contributions to science.

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/JIMA-05-2014-0038>.
- [6]. Aleti, T., Brennan, L., and Parker, L. 2015, Family communication for the modern era: a typology, *Young Consumers; Bradford*16, 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., Krentlera, 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.thr.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; Bradford*13, 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_2.
- [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.