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Abstract: The adolescent is considered an active element in family purchases, with an important participation in the decision phase, especially for those purchases in which he/she is the primary user or consumer. However, in purchases such as breakfast cereals, adolescent participation needs a more comprehensive study. The adolescent’ presents, in this category of products, generally, a higher involvement and knowledge than his parents, which is an important resource in his participation in those purchases. 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 have become an increasingly attractive segment for companies because they are considered an active element and have an influence on the family, and on the other, they constitute a very important future market. In these, the role of the adolescent is not properly explained, having often been devalued. Furthermore, products for adolescents’ use have not yet been adequately studied, particularly the breakfast cereals.

The main purpose 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 breakfast cereals purchase decision. A survey was used via two self-administered questionnaires: one aimed at adolescents and the other directed at mothers, in high schools in Lisbon district, Portugal. 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 and to deliver the remaining 1,800 questionnaires to their mothers’ and to return them, fully completed, some days later. This resulted in a total of 726 questionnaires by mothers and 726 by adolescents, with a total of 1,452 validated questionnaires.

Results on logistic regression analysis point to distance to power, concept-oriented communication, television influence, and internet influence as explanatory variables for breakfast cereals’ 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 point out some differences between mother’ and adolescent’ perceptions, which resulted on considering different variables as explanation ones for each member view of adolescent influence. The mother’s and adolescent’s perceptions of his influence on the purchase of cereals is very similar. From mother’ and adolescents’ perception, concept-oriented communication, television influence, and internet Influence as explanatory variables for that purchase influence. So, those adolescents living with consensual parents being perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with protective parents. More, adolescents having higher television influence and higher internet influence will be more influent on family purchases. Besides that, from the mother’ point of view, adolescents living in low distance to power culture will be positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions, also valuating the distance to power as an explanatory variable for breakfast cereals purchases. Academic contributions of this study to knowledge in this area field point out to the relevance of including the adolescent in purchases for his own use is reinforced.

Managerial implications are derived for the future for companies who want to understand that when considering breakfast cereals, marketing managers should direct their efforts to those adolescents who live in low distance to power cultures, to those adolescents who are more influenced by television and by internet, and to the ones living with consensual parents. Those results are innovative in this research domain. Finally, this research also contributes significantly to companies pointing to consider adolescent has an active participator 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 his/her influence on that decision allows us to reinforce those contributions.
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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&Grolnick 2013, Feng et al. 2011). For marketers, it 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&Youunkin 2012). They also start to develop
According to Dahl et al. (2018), we are currently witnessing unprecedented changes in the demographics and lifestyle of adolescents. Estimates indicated, for 2015, that adolescents would total 16% of the world population, or 1.2 billion. In the family context, adolescents are an important segment for companies and brands, mainly due to their real attempts to influence family purchases as well as the interest they present as a future target (Al-Za’bi 2016, Mau et al. 2014, Medury 2013, Luczak&Younkin 2012). Thus, it is very important for companies and marketing managers to understand the importance and extent of adolescent influence in the family context (Luczak&Younkin 2012).

Considering products where adolescents 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 (Baia 2018, Ashraf & Khan 2016, Chikweche et al. 2012, Chitakunye 2012). However, there’s a need to be deep in the research for those type of products, specially trying to know more about the effects of culture and consumer socialization of adolescents’ attempts to influence.

Culture can be defined as the “collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from those of another” (Hofstede, 1994, p. 4). Hofstede (2001) identified several dimensions of national culture including individualism vs collectivism and power distance, to determine its impact on individual consumer behaviour (Al-Za’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).

Consumer socialization is as a processes through which consumption related skills, knowledge, and attitudes are transferred between generations (Nelissen & Bulck 2017, Thaichon 2017, 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). Despite this, there’s still a lack of research about the impact of internet on adolescents’ consumer socialization (Thaichon 2017, Barber 2013, Sharma & Sonwaney 2013, Niu 2013, Luczak&Younkin 2012).

Marketing managers must make a higher effort on understanding the adolescent purchase behavior and their participation on family decisions (Thaichon 2017, Niemczyk 2015, Srivastava 2015, Shahrorkh&Khosravi 2014, Yang et al. 2014). The adolescents’ role on family decisions has been shown to varying by product, decision stage, adolescent, and family characteristics (Aleti et al. 2015, Ishaque&Tufail 2014, Shahrorkh&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 (Neuling & Zsoter 2014, Barber 2013, Akinyele 2010).

For Dahl et al. (2018: 2), “Adolescent development builds on considerable childhood learning, and allows adolescents to acquire a new level of knowledge, skills and cultural competence to successfully transition to an independent adult role.”

This research 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 product for adolescent’ use; clothes’ purchase decision, whose interest is confirmed (Commuri & Gentry 2000, Beatty & Talpade 1994, Foxman et al. 1989a, b, Foxman & Tansuhaj 1988). The knowledge produced about purchasing behavior or the patterns of consumption of products for adolescents’ use in current family structures it not enough (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 (Baia 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 clothes for his/her own use.

The divergence 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 reinforced the relevance on inquiring both adolescent and one parent (Al-Za’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 breakfast cereals’ purchase decision? What are the family demographic characteristics that impact the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decision of buying adolescent clothes’ purchase? 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?

Past literature has considered adolescent as a relevant member on family purchases (Thaichon 2017, Khoor-Lattimore et al. 2016, Niemczyk 2015, Kaur & Medury 2011).
However, a holistic approach to the adolescents’ influence on breakfast cereals for family on final decision stage remain scarce researched (Barber, 2013; Akinsele, 2010; Neuling&Zsoter, 2014; Kaur &Medury 2011;Kaur & Singh 2006). The subject of the present investigation is the consumption behavior of family purchases for breakfast cereals.

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.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

The family consumer behavior has been stalling several gaps, namely the amount and extent of adolescent influence on family purchases, which has been consecutively neglected as an active member(Thaichon 2017, 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, that is direct influence and with more intensity on those purchases in which they are the primary users (Thaichon 2017, Kaur & Singh 2006, Beatty &Talpade, 1994). Despite that, adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions is still not adequately and completely explained (Aleti et al. 2015,Shergill et al. 2013, Chaudhary &Gupta 2012, Kaur& Singh 2006).

Cultural dimensions (Individualism vs collectivism):

Individualism vs collectivism refers to a society's cultural position relative to major individual cultural 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 Mooijand 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.

Cultural dimensions (Power distance):

Power distance refers to "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 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 parents, conditioning their behavior through parental communication style, internet influence, and television influence (Dahl 2017, Nelissen&Bulck 2017, Aleti et al. 2015, Watne et al. 2015, 2011, Haq& Rahman 2015, Barber 2013). 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 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). For concept-oriented and socio-oriented styles, four types of parental communication patterns can be considered: (i) Laissez-faire (low COS, low SOS); (ii) Protective (low COS, high SOS); (iii) Pluralistic (high COS, low SOS); and (iv) Consensual (high COS, high SOS) (Sharma & Sonwaney 2013, Rose et al. 1998, Moschis& Moore 1979). The laissez-faire style family believed to have week correspondence between parent and adolescent, the protective family demonstrates social amicability where adolescent could gain knowledge alone to some limited extent; the pluralistic family fosters adolescent practice of open communication, while the consensual family allows adolescent to develop his/her own perspective on family cohesiveness (Carlson & Grossbart 1990). Past research pointed that parents with concept-oriented style value adolescents’ opinion on purchase decisions and tend to consult them (Sharma & Sonwaney 2013, Rose et al. 1998, Moschis& Moore 1979).

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 been a contributing factor in influencing adolescents’ consumer socialization (Nelissen & Bulck 2017, Kaur & Medury 2011). For Thaichon (2017), online virtual communities, including social networking sites, play an important role in adolescent’s e-commerce purchases and is the online social media presence that shapes adolescent’s behavior in the online shopping environment. 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 effects of the socialization agents such as the internet and television in adolescents influence attempts is an area of great interest nowadays. 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 has been 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 is the most influential mass media channel, influencing consumers through the brands’ advertising that are supported by celebrities or acceptable by society (Churchill & Moschis 1979). For Nelissen and Bulck (2017), media and communication scholars have devoted considerable attention to how parents influence, teach, and guide the media use of their adolescents and on how they mediate the impact of media on their adolescents. That media channel 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). Thus:

**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 very relevant social power source, and can be defined as 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). For Dahl (2018: 3), “some specific brain connections are formed primarily in early to mid-adolescence, which may potentiate new forms of motivation and and/or new learning.” 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 behavior. 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 adolescents’ gender is considered of the main explanatory factors for their influence on family buying decisions (Ali et al. 2013, Watne & Winchester 2011, Shergill et al. 2013, Gentina et al. 2013, Kaur and Singh 2006, Shoham & Dalakas 2005). Moschis and Mitchell (1986) concluded that female adolescents appear to be more likely than male adolescents to participate in all phases of the purchasing decision process in general and to decide to purchase products in particular. Lee and Collins (2000) also concluded that female adolescents exert higher levels of influence than male adolescents in family buying decisions. Watne and Winchester (2011) concluded that female adolescents produce higher levels of influence specifically on family vacation purchases. Thus:

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

**Adolescent’s age:**
Past research have considered age as one of the main explanatory factors for adolescent’s influence on family purchases (Ali et al. 2013, Shergill et al. 2013, Gentina et al. 2013, Kaur & Singh 2006, Shoham&Dalakas 2005, Kim &Lee 1997). Kim and Lee (1997) and Beatty and Talpade (1994) found that older adolescents exert greater influence on family buying decisions. However, the conclusions regarding the importance of establishing differences between these two adolescent age groups as an explanatory factor for their influence on family buying decisions is not generalized, with several authors considering only one adolescent age group (Shoham&Dalakas 2005, Lee & Beatty 2002, Lee & Collins 2000). Thus, the hypothesis is:

H8: There is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with concerning older adolescents as having more influence on family purchases than if they are younger.

**Family type:**
Family type is important 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). The adolescent’s influence attempts seems to emerge from the increasing divorce rates, among several factors (Caruana&Vassallo 2003, Lackman&Lanas 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). Thus:

H9: 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 being an important 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:

H10: 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 in lower income households.

**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 breakfast cereals, according to mother’ and adolescent’ 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 breakfast cereals purchases in Europe, so this study provides an important contribution to this area of knowledge.

Given the lack of official information about households in Portugal, 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).

It 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 breakfast cereals for family (Foxman andTansuhaj 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 is defined to reach research goals. 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 concerned were adapted from past research (see Table 1).
Table 1. Linking the Model to the Questionnaire

| Variables in study                      | Adapted from…                                      |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| **Explanatory variables**              |                                                    |
| Adolescent Influence on Family Purchase Decisions | Shoham & Dalakas (2003); Beatty & Talpade (1994) |
| Power distance,                        | Wu (2006), Hofstede (2001);                       |
| Individualism vs collectivism,         | Wu (2006), Hofstede (2001);                       |
| Parental communication style,          | Chan and McNeal (2003);                           |
| Internet influence,                    | Kaur and Medury (2011);                           |
| Television influence,                  | Kaur and Medury (2011);                           |
| Product knowledge,                     | Beatty & Talpade (1994);                          |
| Adolescent’s gender,                   | Lee and Beatty (2002);                            |
| Adolescent’s age,                      | Lee and Beatty (2002);                            |
| Family type                            | Ahuja & Stinson (1993);                           |
|                                        | Ahuja & Stinson (1993).                           |

**Explanatory variables:**

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 scale proposed by Hofstede (2001). Twelve items where used, each one in a seven-point Likert scale. For parental communication style, 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).

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” means a subjective knowledge, and will be measured according to Beatty & 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:**

Data collection was carried out in 15 high schools, in May 2018, on Lisbon district. This district presents an important demographic profile in Portugal, namely as regards the average size of family households. The 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 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 (Nelissen & Bulck 2017, Thaichon 2017, Kaur & 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. To perform the statistical analysis, the SPSS program, version 9.0, was used.

**Variables measurement:**

Logistic regression model is adequate to the type of explanatory variables considered (Hutcheson & 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:**

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.

**DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

**Internal consistency:**

The 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:**

Table 2 reveals 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 |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| **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                   |

Regarding 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 breakfast cereals for family use’ purchase explanatory variables will be analyzed.

**Power distance:**
Power distance does add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model on breakfast cereals’ purchase decision. The adolescents will be perceived as having more influence on family purchases if they are in low power distance culture than if they are in high power distance culture (see table 4).
So, H2 is verified, and socio-oriented communication adds explanatory capacity to adolescent influence on family purchases (see tables 4 and 5).

**Concept-oriented communication:**
With regarding to consumer socialization, when considering concept-oriented communication’ dimension, 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. Thus, H3b is verified (see tables 4 and 5).

**Internet influence:**
Result point to 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. Thus, H4 is verified, so adolescents with internet influence being positively related to the adolescent’s influence on family purchase decisions from both perceptions (see tables 4 and 5).

**Television influence:**
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).

Table 4. Logistic regression for breakfast cereals (variables in equation for mother’s perception)

| Step 4d         | B     | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) | 95% C.I. for EXP(B) |
|-----------------|-------|------|------|----|------|--------|---------------------|
| Distance to power | 0.386 | 0.126 | 9.327 | 1 | 0.002 | 1.471 | 1.148-1.884         |
| Concept-oriented commun | 0.909 | 0.314 | 8.38  | 1 | 0.004 | 2.482 | 1.341-4.593         |
| Television Influence | -0.79 | 0.281 | 7.897 | 1 | 0.005 | 0.454 | 0.261-0.787         |
| Internet Influence   | 2.074 | 0.295 | 49.43 | 1 | 0   | 7.957 | 4.463-14.185        |
| Constant             | -3.27 | 0.826 | 15.69 | 1 | 0 | 0.038 |                     |

Table 5. Logistic regression for breakfast cereals (variables in equation for adolescent’s perception)
**Cultural dimensions (Individualism vs collectivism):**

In what concerns to individualism vs collectivism, there is no difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with respect to adolescents in individualistic culture not being perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with collectivistic culture. So, H1 is not verified (see tables 6 and 7).

**Socio-oriented communication:**

In what concerns 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 not being perceived as having more influence on family purchases than those with laissez-faire parents. Thus, H3a is not verified (see tables 6 and 7).

**Product knowledge:**

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

---

**Table 6. Logistic regression for breakfast cereals (variables not in equation for mother’s perception)**

| Step 4 | Variables                      | Score | df | Sig. |
|--------|--------------------------------|-------|----|------|
| Family size | 2.687                         | 1     | 0.101|
| Adolescent’s age | 0.003                         | 1     | 0.953|
| Adolescent’s gender | 0.603                         | 1     | 0.437|
| Individualism or Collectivism | 0.74                         | 1     | 0.39 |
| Socio-oriented communication | 1.191                         | 1     | 0.275|
| Product Knowledge | 0.023                         | 1     | 0.879|
| Family type | 0.285                         | 1     | 0.593|
| Overall Statistics | 6.735                         | 9     | 0.665|

**Table 7. Logistic regression for breakfast cereals (variables not in equation for adolescent’s perception)**

| Step 4 | Variables                      | Score | df | Sig. |
|--------|--------------------------------|-------|----|------|
| Adolescent’s age | 0.05                         | 1     | 0.823|
| Socio-oriented communication | 2.009                         | 1     | 0.156|
| Adolescent’s gender | 0.368                         | 1     | 0.544|
| Family size | 0.019                         | 1     | 0.891|
| Family type | 0.68                         | 1     | 0.408|
| Product Knowledge | 0.705                         | 1     | 0.401|
| Overall Statistics | 7.017                         | 9     | 0.635|

**Adolescent’s gender:**

Regarding adolescent’s gender, 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. Thereby, H7 is not verified (see tables 6 and 7).

**Adolescent’s age:**

There is difference in the perception of mother and adolescent with concerning older adolescents as having more influence on family purchases than if they are younger. Thereby, H8 is not verified (see tables 6 and 7). However, when considering the mother’s perception, older adolescents are perceived as having more influence on family purchases than younger adolescents.

**Family type:**

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. Thus, H9 is not verified (see tables 6 and 7). However, when considering adolescent perception, he/she perceives’ themselves as having more influence on family purchases if they live in single-parent families than if they live in traditional families.

**Family income:**

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. Then, H10 is not verified (see tables 6 and 7).
Explanatory variables interpretation:
The -2LL analysis, for adolescent’s influence on decision to buy clothes for adolescent’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 individualistic culture and television influence as relevant explanatory variables for that purchase.

DISCUSSION
A total of 1,452 fully completed questionnaires was reached in this research, which is a larger sample than most 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 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. Previous 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:
Cronbach’s α coefficient was used measuring independent variables scales’ internal consistency, 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 scored 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, uneven 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).

CONCLUSIONS
The present research has found several results, which allow us to conclude that: There is a significant adolescent’s influence on breakfast cereals for family. Distance to power, concept-oriented communication, television influence, and internet influence outcome as purchase relevant explanatory variables of the adolescent’s influence for that purchase. When living in a low power distance culture, adolescent will show higher influence on the purchase of breakfast cereals for family.

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, regarding concept-oriented communication, internet influence and television influence.

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 breakfast cereals for family consumption, according to the mother’s and adolescent’s 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.

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 breakfast cereals, it is crucial for companies’ success that marketing managers focus their efforts on his satisfaction. Comparing the mother’s and adolescent’s perceptions on the adolescent’s influence on that decision allows us to reinforce those contributions.
More, collecting data from mothers and adolescents is a very important 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 results of the logistic regression analysis point to individualism and television influences as the most relevant purchase’ explanatory variables on breakfast cereals. These results are innovative in the study of family purchases.

Finally, the results point to the relevance of considering adolescent as an influence on breakfast cereals’ decision, indicating that he/she has an fundamental role when considering relevant products for his/her own use and family 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 adolescents’ influence on breakfast cereals for family’ consumption, 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 adolescents’ influence on the purchases of breakfast cereals for family consumption. 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 lower distance to power cultures and being highly exposed to internet and television influences. They should also consider adolescents with consensual parents.

If a decision is considered to be largely influenced by adolescents, then the messages should be addressed to him/her. In the present investigation it was concluded that adolescents represent a decisive role in the market for that product, and so marketers should adopt strategies that reflect the adolescent’s role as main decision.

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 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 adolescent’s influence are not properly exhausted. Research in this area should focus on the influence of adolescents on 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.
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