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Abstract: The adolescent is considered an active element in family purchases, with an important participation in the decision phase. However, the study of technological products for family use have been neglected. The adolescent presents, in this category of products, a higher knowledge than his parents, which can constitute an important resource in their participation in those purchases. Past literature also has evidenced the existence of important cultural dimensions, such as the distance of power and individualism-collectivism that need further investigation in its impact on family consumer behavior. Therefore, the main objective of this research is to study 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.

In the empirical phase, 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. Logistic regression was used and the results pointed to theactic-oriented communication style, television influence, product knowledge, adolescent’s gender, and family income as the relevant explanatory variables for computer for family use purchase. These results are innovative in the study of family purchases.

Therefore, the present research provides several contributions to this area of knowledge. First, it reinforces the importance of including adolescents in the final decision of family purchases, which is innovative compared to past literature. The interest of the results is reinforced by the study of a more important technological product for family use, as is the case with the personal computer. Second, the results point to the importance of including the family communication style, television influence, product knowledge, adolescent’s gender, and family income as explanatory variables in determining influence on family computer’ purchases.

This research offers a contribution to companies by providing evidence of adolescents’ influence on the purchase decisions of family personal computer. Given the adolescents’ importance within family decisions, marketers should consider adolescents as active and important members in family buying decisions, and look to the family as a whole and not just parents as the key decision makers in family purchases.
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INTRODUCTION

The literature of consumer behavior has emphasized the importance of considering culture, and particularly power distance and individualism-collectivism as relevant dimensions when considering the family purchase decision making (Al-Zu’bi 2016, Yang et al. 2014, Marbell & Grønlund 2013, Feng et al. 2011). For companies, in approaching their target markets, and considering the growing importance of globalization, it is imperative to know the different perspectives of the various cultures they are targeting. In this context, and since the family is a determining consumption unit in the high consumption market, it is urgent to understand how culture can condition its consumption behavior (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 consumer behavior field (Aleti et al. 1995, Akinyeye 2010, Beatty & Talpade 1994). In this context, adolescents constitute an important segment for companies, not only because of their attempts to influence family purchases, but also for their interest as future consumers (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 influence in the family context (Luczak & Younkin 2012).

The interest on research of adolescent’s influence on technological products on family purchase decisions began with Foxman and Tansuhaj (1988). Results indicated some adolescent’s influence on that purchase decision. However, it was not considered a holistic view nor the due extension of this influence.

Research on the influence of adolescents on technological products marks not only the importance of considering adolescents as an active participant in high-value purchases, but also the perception that their influence is not reduced to products for their own use (Ishaque & Tufail 2014, Kaur & Singh 2006, Beatty & Talpade 1994), but also that must be considered in family consumer products.

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). Adolescent’s socialization relies on parental communicationas a reliable and successful predictor. Despite that, the effect of parental communication style in adolescents’ influence on buying decisions is still is still
under-exploited and needs further investigation (Sharma & Sonwaney, 2013), as it also needs further investigation the effect other adolescents socialization agents, including television (Kushwaha 2017, Barber 2013, Luczak & Younkin 2012), and internet (Barber 2013, Sharma & Sonwaney 2013, Niu 2013, Luczak & Younkin 2012).

The growing adolescent market needs marketers to understand the adolescent participation on family decisions (Niemczyk 2015, Srivastava 2015, Shahrokh & Khosravi 2014, Yang et al. 2014). Past research 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 culture remain unexplained on adolescents’ influence 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: computer for family use, as a relevant issue in family consumption (Barber 2013, Akinyele 2010, Neulinger & Zsoter 2014, Kaur & Singh 2006, Commuri & Gentry 2000). This 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 decision to buy a personal computer for family use? What are the family demographic characteristics that impact the adolescent’s influence on purchase decision of buying a personal computer for family use? What is the mother’s perception about the adolescent’s influence?

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

The paper begins by reviewing the literature and defining the research hypotheses. Then the methodology used will be characterized. Main results will be presented and will be discussed, as well as major conclusions, limitations and directions for future research.

**LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES**

The domain of family consumption behavior presents some gaps, among which the lack of a holistic approach to adolescent influence, and also the absence of the amount and extent of adolescent influence on family purchases is often undervalued or even neglected (Khoo-Lattimore et al. 2016, Watne & Winchester 2011, Kaur & Medury 2011 Carr 2006, Commuri & Gentry 2000). Mostly past research has considered the adolescent antirelevant or secondary member when studying family consumption decisions.

**The adolescent role:**

The adolescent’s consumer role 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). The adolescents’ influence is manifested directly on family purchasing decisions, by actively acting on a certain decision direction (Kaur & Singh 2006, Beatty & Talpade 1994, Mangleburg 1990). Adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions is not yet properly explained (Aleti et al. 2015, Shergill et al. 2013, Chaudhary & Gupta 2012, Kaur & Singh 2006).

**Cultural dimensions:**

We can defined culture 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) identified several dimensions of national culture including individualism vs collectivism and power distance, to determine its impact on individual consumer behaviour (Al-Zu’bi 2016). In a certain country’s cultural position, individualism versus collectivism refers to a society’s cultural position relative to individual or group’s relevance (Chan & McNeal, 2003; Hofstede 1983).

**Individualism vs collectivism:**

Individualism versus collectivism refers to what extent is the individual or the society more valued (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 is “the degree of inequality among people which the population a country considers as normal: from
relatively equal (small power distance) to extremely unequal (large power distance)” (Hofstede, 1993, p. 89). Thus, the power distance concept is related to a society desire for hierarchy versus egalitarianism, which reflects members who hold less power accept that power is distributed with iniquity (Chan and McNeal 2003, 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 (Baia 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 second 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:**

Several researchers have identified adolescents’ main agents of socialization of consumption the 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, mainly, on parental orientation, being more restrictive or more permissive (Kushwaha 2017, Al-Zubi 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, highSOS); (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 havewek correspondence between parent and adolescent, the protective family demonstratesocial 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 are:

H3a: Adolescents with pluralistic parents will be perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with laissez-faire parents.

H3b: Adolescents with consensual parents will be perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with protective parents.

**Internet influence:**

The phenomenon of globalization through internet has contributed and influenced in a decisive way the way adolescents socialize (Kaur & Medury 2011). 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 & 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 & 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 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 & 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 & Rahman 2015). The degree of television viewing improves the knowledge of market and its products (Mangleburg & 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 & Talpade 1994). When considering the influence of adolescents, such power comes from expertise and knowledge about certain product or service (Watne et al. 2011, Beatty and Talpade 1994), Chiatakunye (2012) pointed that adolescents are encouraged by parents to use their cognitive skills in consumer decisions. Adolescents tend to be more 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 (Chiatakunye 2012, Belch et al. 2005, Shah & Mittal 1997, Beatty & 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.

Family type is considered as a mediating factor of the influence of the adolescent in the decisions of purchase in the family, with the adolescents in single-parent families to present significantly higher levels of influence comparatively to those from traditional families (Mangleburg et al. 1999, Ahuja et al. 1998, Ahuja 1993, Ahuja and Walker 1994, Ekstrom et al. 1987, Darley and Lim 1986). For Lackman and Lanasa (1993), the change in the influence of adolescents seems to emerge from a number of factors, the increasing increase in divorce rates (Caruana & Vassallo 2003, Ekstrom et al. 1987). Ahuja (1993), in a comparative study between single-parent and traditional families, concluded that in their role as junior partners in the performance of management activities and emotional support of the mother, adolescents in single-parent households could also participate in decision-making process at a higher level than adolescents in traditional families. Ahuja and Walker (1994) found that children in single-parent families seem to have more influence on the purchasing decision process than their peers in traditional families (Caruana & Vassallo 2003, Mangleburg et al. 1999, Ahuja 1993, Darley & Lim 1986, Ekstrom et al. 1987). For Ashraf and Khan (2016), Lackman and Lanasa (1993) and Ekstrom et al. (1987), the rise in single-parent families have led to an increase in the say adolescents have in family purchase decisions. Thus:

H7: The female adolescents will be perceived as having more influence on family purchases than male adolescents.

Family income has been pointed out by several authors 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 & Medury 2011, Isin & Alkibay 2011, Lee & Beatty 2002, Lee & Collins 2000, Ahuja & 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 & Alkibay 2011, Lee and Collins 2000, Beatty & Talpade 1994). Therefore, adolescents are expected to have consistent influence in families with higher income:

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

**METHODOLOGY**

This 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 personal computer for family use, 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.

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 & 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 & Lee 1997, Beatty & Talpade 1994).

In the past, several authors pointed out the importance of study product or service categories for adolescent use (Belch et al. 2005, Beatty & 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 & 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 & Dalakas 2005, 2003, Beatty & 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

| Variables in study | Adapted from... |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| **Explanatory variable** | **(1994)** proposal and adapted to monthly values. |
| Adolescent Influence on Family Purchase | Shoham & Dalakas (2003); Beatty & Talpade (1994) |

**Explanatory variables**

- Power distance,
- Individualism vs collectivism,
- Parental communication style,
- Internet influence,
- Television influence,
- Product knowledge,
- Adolescent’s gender
- Family income.

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 & 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 & 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 = does not influence; and values from 1 to 4 will correspond to the value 1 = influence (Baía 2018).

**Explained variable:**

Past research have used a likert scale to measure adolescent’s influence on final decision considering parents and adolescents participation (Shahrokhy & Khosravi 2014, Mangleburget al. 1999, Kim & Lee 1997, Beatty & Talpade 1994). The scale used on the explained variable was based on past research (Shoham & 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 where 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:**

In order to carry out the data collection, in May 2018, 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.
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.

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Internal consistency:

Respondents’ profile:

Cronbach’s α has been very important and mainly used by researchers among the several available methods 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 presented values above 0.8, indicating good reliability.

Results 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).

Concerning 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 is 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).

Farmers and skilled workers represent the highest mother’s professional category, with 18.2% rate. 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 percentage |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| **Family Size**       |               |                       |
| 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                   |
| **Family type**       |               |                       |
| Single-parent         | 29.9          | 29.9                  |
| Traditional           | 70.1          | 100                   |

Four persons represents the most common family size category, with a rate of 35.5%. The second most frequent 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.

### Table 4. Logistic regression for computer (variables in equation)

| Step 5 | Adolescent’s gender | B   | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) | 95% C.I. for EXP(B) |
|--------|---------------------|-----|------|------|----|------|--------|-------------------|
|        |                     |     |      |      |    |      |        | Lower            |
|        |                     |     |      |      |    |      |        | Upper            |
| Power distance | 0.066  | 0.198 | 5.516 | 1   | 0.019 | 0.628 | 0.426 | 0.926 |
| Individualism vs Collectivism | 0.155  | 0.063 | 6.090 | 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 | 5.524 | 1   | 0.019 | 1.623 | 1.084 | 2.430 |
| Product knowledge | 0.234  | 0.055 | 17.874 | 1   | 0.000 | 1.264 | 1.134 | 1.409 |
| Constant | -0.166  | 0.577 | 0.083 | 1   | 0.774 | 0.847 |        |        |

**Socio-oriented communication:**

Parental communication style, particularly the socio-oriented communication style does add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model in the decision to buy for family use. Thus, H3a is verified, so adolescents with pluralistic parents will be perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with laissez-faire parents (see Table 5).

**Television influence:**

The television influence adds explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on personal computer. 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).

**Product Knowledge:**

Table 4 point out that product knowledge adds explanatory capacity to adolescent’s influence in the buying decision of a personal computer for family use. Thus, H6 is verified, so adolescents with greater product knowledge exert more influence on computer purchase for family use than those adolescents with less product knowledge.

**Adolescent’s gender:**

Adolescent’s age does add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model in the decision to buy a personal computer for family use. Thus, H7 is verified, so older adolescents are perceived as having more influence on family purchases than the younger ones (see Table 4).

**Family income:**

The family income does add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on buyinga personal computer for family use (see Table 4). Thereby, H8 is 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.

### Table 5. Logistic regression for computer (variables not in equation)

| Step 4 | variables | Score | df | Sig. |
|--------|-----------|-------|----|------|
| Power distance | 0.031  | 1   | 0.861 |
| Individualism vs Collectivism | 0.015  | 1   | 0.903 |
| Socio-oriented communication | 2.032  | 1   | 0.154 |
| Internet influence | 0.564  | 1   | 0.453 |
| Overall Statistics | 2.81  | 2   | 0.245 |
Individualism-collectivism:
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 5).

Power distance:
Table 5 reveals that power distance does not add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model in the decision to buy mobile phone for his own use. Thus, H2 is not verified, so that adolescents in high power distance culture are perceived as having more influence on family’ personal computer than those in low power distance culture.

Concept-oriented communication:
Concept-oriented communication does add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model in the decision to buy for family use. Thus, H3a is not verified, so adolescents with consensual parents will not be perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with protective parents for this product (see Table 5).

Internet influence:
The internet influence does not add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on decision to buy a personal computer for family use. Therefore, H4 is not 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 5).

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 product 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.

DISCUSSION
A total of 726 fully completed questionnaires was reached at this research, which is a larger sample than several past studies (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 studies, the present research used a convenience sample (Al-Zu’bi 2016, Ashraf & 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 & 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 & Winchester 2011, Ishaque&Tufail 2014, Shoeman&Dalakas 2005, Beatty & 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 (Baia 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&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, 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).

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 family’ personal computer. Socio-oriented communication style, television influence, product knowledge, adolescent’s age, and family income, as purchase relevant explanatory variables for the adolescent’s influence for that purchase. The adolescent has more influence on personal computer for
family use purchase in households with pluralistic parents than is those with laissez-faire parents. He/she has more influence on those purchases when he/she’s exposed in higher degree to television influence. Also, adolescents with greater product knowledge exert more influence on computer purchase for family use than those adolescents with less product knowledge. Older adolescents are perceived as having more influence on family purchases than their younger pairs. He/she has more influence if they live in lower income families than if they live in higher income families.

**Limitations and recommendations:**

The present research adds some important contributions to the theoretical-conceptual framework in this area of study, providing a response to national cultural constructs and consumer socialization effects on adolescent’s influence on family vacation decisions. However, the results don’t entirely explain the phenomenon. Thus, other variables must also be considered in order to provide a more complete explanation on the adolescent’s influence for this product decision. More, 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).

Collecting data solely from mothers, although being considered the most reliable information source within families (Isin&Balkabay 2011, Beatty &Talpade 1994), was insufficient and some past researchers have chosen to inquire both adolescent and one parent (Al-Zurbi 2016, Ashraf and Khan 2016, Mau et al. 2016, 2014, Goswami and Khan 2015,Sondhi&Basu 2014).

**Research contributions:**

This 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, considering the mother’s perception, on adolescent’s influence on family' personal computer decisions. 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 Socio-oriented communication style, television influence, product knowledge, adolescent’s age, and family income, as purchase relevant explanatory variables for the adolescent’s influence for family’ personal computer. These results are innovative in the study of family purchases.

Finally, results point to the importance to consider the adolescents in influencer in the final decision on computer purchase for family use, indicating that he/she has an important role when considering relevant products for family use, and not only for those products in which he/she is the primary user, as many previous researchers defend.

**Business implications:**

The study offers a contribution to the companies by providing evidence of the adolescent’s influence on the purchases of computer purchase 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 households with pluralistic communication style. Marketing managers should also target those adolescents exposed in higher degree to television influence, with greater product knowledge. Marketers must also consider older adolescents as their target for this product, and those adolescents that live in lower income families. The results presented are innovative in the study of family purchases when it comes to buying family’ personal computer.

If adolescents clearly influence family’ personal computer decisions, then the messages should be addressed to him/her. This research has 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 focus more their efforts on adolescent satisfaction in products/services for family use, considering those categories of products or services in which he has more knowledge than the parents, and also in those in which the adolescent will also be a potential user.

**Suggestions for Future Research:**

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 for parents use, 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.

Also 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.
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