

# Adolescent's Perception of His Influence on Purchase Decision of Mobile Phone for his Own Use: a Consumer Socialization Perspective

By João Paulo Baía

**Abstract:** Globalization has brought the need for companies to seek to better understand their consumers and, in particular, how they decide to buy. In this context, the family is the most relevant consumer unit for marketing managers. The study of the family require a continued and more deeply study, in particular the participation of adolescent and the extent of such influence in decisions to purchase products, such as mobile phone for his own use. So, the adolescent' role is not adequately explained, having often been devalued or relegated. The adolescent tend to have a higher knowledge than his parents for technological items, which can constitute an important resource for participating in those decisions. Furthermore, technological products for adolescent' use have not yet been adequately researched.

The main purpose of this research is to examine the adolescent's influence on family purchase decisions of mobile phone for adolescent' use, and according to the adolescent's perception, considering a consumer socialization perspective.

In the research empirical phase, several high schools were contacted in Lisbon district, Portugal. 1,000 questionnaires were delivered in classrooms during May 2018. Adolescents were instructed to respond to the questionnaires during classes, and 726 validated questionnaires were returned.

Logistic regression was used and its results point out to parental' socio-oriented communication style, internet influence, television influence, and family type as relevant explanatory variables of his/her influence on the purchase of personal mobile phone. Results also have shown that, when parents have a higher socio-oriented communication style, adolescent' will reveal higher influence on personal computer for family. Adolescents with higher levels of internet' and television' influence were also positively related to his/her influence on that family purchase. Finally, adolescents' living in single-parent families will exert higher levels of influence than their counterparts in traditional families. These results are innovative in family purchase decisions' field of knowledge.

One can find several contributions are made to this area of study. First, the relevance of including the adolescent in purchases for personal mobile phone is reinforced.

Second, when considering mobile phone for adolescent use, marketing managers should direct their efforts to those adolescents who live in socio-oriented communication parental style' environment, to adolescents who are more influenced by internet and television, and to those adolescents living in single-parent families. Those results are innovative in this field of knowledge.

This research contributes significantly to the companies by allowing to conclude that the adolescent has an active participation on family purchase decisions. Once concluding the adolescent has a relevant role on those decisions, it is important that marketing managers focus their efforts on his satisfaction. By considering adolescent' perceptions on their own influence on that decision, those contributions are reinforce.

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

## I. Introduction

The family has long been considered by marketers as the most important consumer unit in the consumer market (Sondhi&Basu 2014, Kaur &Medury 2013, 2011,Shoham&Dalakas 2005). The study of household consumption behavior has become increasingly important in the literature on consumer behavior, and mainly process by which family decisions are taken. Given the evolution that family structure and the market have undergone, academics and marketers recognize the importance of continuous and in-depth study of the family in all its forms (Kaur &Medury 2013,Shoham&Dalakas 2005,Commuri& Gentry 2000). Several researchers refer to the need to deepen the study of adolescent's influence on family buying decisions, given the limited research on this phenomenon (Kaur & Singh 2006, Commuri& Gentry 2000). Adolescent has considered, over time, as a less relevant actor in family buying decisions, and his influence efforts are more associated with products for his own use, or products for family use, but with a lower purchase value and lower family involvement (Commuri& Gentry 2000, Beatty &Talpade 1994). Actually, until twenty years ago, research rarely perceived adolescents as influencers on family decision making (Mau et al. 2016, John 1999). The efforts made by adolescents in family purchases have increased in the recent times, although they are not yet deep explained (Sondhi&Basu 2014, Singh &Nayak 2014, Chitakunye 2012, Kaur&Medury 2011).

We can define consumer socialization as a processes through which consumption related skills, knowledge, and attitudes are transferred between generations (Aleti et al. 2015, Yang et al. 2014, Watne et al. 2014, 2011, Ward 1974). Parental communication has been the main construct used in consumer socialization and considered a fundamental predicted of adolescent's socialization. However, the effect of parental communication style in adolescents' influence on buying decisions still needs deeper research (Sharma &Sonwaney 2013).

Nowadays, theorists have explored the socialization agents' effect on adolescents, including television (Kushwaha 2017, Barber 2013, Luczak&Younkin 2012). However, there's also a lack of research about the internet impact on adolescents' consumer socialization (Barber 2013, Sharma &Sonwaney 2013, Niu 2013, Luczak&Younkin 2012).

It is crucial to marketing managers understanding the adolescent purchase behavior and their participation on family decisions (Niemczyk 2015, Srivastava 2015; Shahrokh&Khosravi 2014, Yang et al. 2014). The adolescents' role on family purchase decisions has been shown to varying by product, decision stage, adolescent, parental, and family characteristics (Aleti et al. 2015, Ishaque&Tufail 2014, Shahrokh&Khosravi 2014, Ali et al. 2013, Shergill et al. 2013, Chaudhary & Gupta 2012). However, the effects of cultural variables remain unexplored on adolescents' participation on family decision making field (Neulinger&Zsoter 2014, Barber 2013, Akinyele 2010).

This study examines the adolescent's influence on purchase decision mobile phone for adolescent use, considering a consumer socialization perspective, whose interest is based in the literature, and according to the adolescents' perception (Khoo-Lattimore et al. 2016, Watne& Winchester 2011, Kaur & Singh 2006). Little is known about purchasing behavior or the patterns of consumption of technological products in households (Kaur & Singh 2006, Chavda et al 2005, Neely 2005). The present research presents a holistic approach to adolescent influence, also considering the role of product knowledge on his/her influence, and the influence of demographic variables such as family type and income and adolescent's gender (Baía 2018, Ali et al. 2015). This paper also explores the role of television and internet as antecedents of adolescent's consumer socialization and its effects on his purchase influence.

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

In this sense, the research problem deals with a theoretical dimension concerning the answer to the following questions: What is the impact of consumer socialization on adolescent's influence on mobile phone for adolescent use? What are the family demographic characteristics that impact the adolescent's influence on family purchase decision of buying a mobile phone for adolescent use? What is the adolescent's perception about his/her own influence?

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

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

## **II. Literature Review and Hypotheses**

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

### **The adolescent role**

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

### **Consumer socialization**

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

### **Parental communication style**

Parental communication style influence on adolescent's socialization process depends mainly on parental orientation, ranging from more restrictive to more permissive (Kushwaha 2017, Al-Zu'bi 2016, Kim et al. 2015; Yang &Laroche 2011). Parental communication involves two main dimensions: concept-oriented and socio-oriented styles, and considers 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. 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" (Watabe& Hibbard 2014: 364).

Rose et al. (1998), pointed that "consensual and pluralistic mothers held more negative attitudes toward advertising than laissez-faire mothers" (p. 80). Therefore, the first hypothesis ((a) and (b)) are:

H1a: Adolescents with pluralistic parents will perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchases than those with laissez-faire parents.

H1b: Adolescents with consensual parents will perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchases than those with protective parents.

### **Internet influence**

Internet has, more recently, been contributed and influenced decisively the adolescents' consumer socialization (Kaur &Medury 2011). Adolescents reveal higher internet skills when we compare them with their parents. So, the use of the internet by adolescents is a subject of great interest and lacking the greatest depth for academics and marketers (Kaur &Medury 2011, Belch et al. 2005). The study of the effects of the socialization of consumption by agents such as the internet and television in adolescents is an area of great interest today. The increasing use of the Internet as a

communication tool makes it a socializing agent with high potential (Lee et al., 2003). From adolescents point of view, 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 tasks (Kaur &Medury 2011).

The internet should constitutes 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:

H2: Adolescents with higher internet influence will perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchase decisions than those adolescents with lower internet influence.

### **Television influence**

The television, and particularly the media, has played a relevant role in guiding consumers to products and brands, providing reliable evidence (Barber 2013), and by using credible informants, having also persuasion power over decision makers. Television has been the most influential mass mediachannel, influencing consumers through the brands' advertising that are supported by celebrities or acceptable by society (Churchill &Moschis 1979). It has helped adolescents developing product-related knowledge, perception of the consumer's role, and influence their purchasing intentions (Haq& Rahman 2015). Thus, television influence must be considered a very important socialization agent, affecting 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:

H3: Adolescents with higher television influence will perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchase decisions than those adolescents with lower internet influence.

### **Product knowledge**

Product knowledge is a major social power source, meaning a person's ability, based on some attribute such as knowledge or expertise, to influence another person' behavior or to persuade him/her (Aleti et al. 2015, Beatty &Talpade 1994). When considering adolescents, such power comes from expertise and knowledge about a certain product or service (Watne et al. 2011, Beatty and Talpade 1994). Chitakunye (2012) pointed that adolescents are encouraged to use their cognitive skills in family consumer behaviour. Adolescents tend to be most knowledgeable and interested in technological products, 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 and also to more parental receptiveness (Chitakunye 2012, Belch et al. 2005, Shah & Mittal 1997, Beatty &Talpade 1994). So, the research hypothesis is:

H4: Adolescents with higher product knowledge will perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchase decisions than those adolescents with lower product knowledge.

### **Adolescent's gender**

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

H5: Male adolescents will perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchase decisions than female adolescents.

### **Family type**

The family type is an important aspect when explaining the adolescent' influence on family purchase decisions, with the adolescents in single-parent families presenting higher levels of influence comparatively to those from traditional households (Mangleburg et al. 1999, Ahuja et al. 1998, Ahuja 1993, Ahuja & Walker 1994, Ekstrom et al. 1987). The

change in adolescent' influence seems to emerge from the increasing divorce rates, among several factors (Caruana&Vassallo 2003, Lackman&Lanasa 1993, Ekstrom et al. 1987). Ahuja (1993) concluded that adolescents in single-parent households could also participate in decision-making process at a higher level than the ones in traditional families, in their role as junior partners performing management activities and in mother' emotional support. Ahuja and Walker (1994) considered that 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:

H6: Adolescents living in in single-parent families will perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchase decisions than those adolescents living in traditional families.

#### *Family income*

Adolescents tend to present higher levels of influence in those households with higher income, and family income has being considered an explanatory variable of adolescent's influence on family purchasing decisions, with (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:

H7: Adolescents living in higher income families will perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchase decisions than those adolescents living lower income households.

### **III. Methodology**

The present is exploratory, aiming to study the consumer socialization effects on adolescent's influence on family purchase decision of mobile phone for adolescent use, according to 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 mobile phone for adolescent use 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 in line with past studies (Aleti et al. 2015, Srivastava 2015, Kim & Lee 1997). The collected sample was focused on households with at least one adolescent between the ages of 12 and 19 (Aleti et al. 2015, Srivastava 2015, Kim & Lee 1997, Beatty &Talpade 1994).

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

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

The questionnaire structure aimed to pursue the research 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 (see Table 1).

**Table1. Linking the Model to the Questionnaire**

Variables in study	Adapted from...
<b>Explained variable</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adolescent Influence on Family Purchase Decisions</li></ul>	Shoham e Dalakas (2003); Beatty e Talpade (1994)
<b>Explanatory variables</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Parental communication style,</li><li>• Internet influence,</li><li>• Television influence,</li><li>• Product knowledge,</li><li>• Adolescent's gender</li></ul>	Chan and McNeal (2003); Kaur and Medury (2011); Kaur and Medury (2011); Beatty e Talpade (1994); Lee and Beatty (2002);

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Family type</li><li>• Family income.</li></ul>	Ahuja and Stinson (1993); Ahuja and Stinson (1993).
--	--

#### *Explained variable*

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

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

#### *Explanatory variables*

The 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) seven 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 gender and product knowledge served as explanatory variables. The variable "gender" is a dichotomous variable, according to the proposal of Lee and Beatty (2002). The "product knowledge" represents the subjective knowledge, and will be measured according to Beatty and Talpade (1994) scale. A seven-point Likert scale is used, ranked completely disagree (1) to completely agree (7). The item to be measured will be translated by the phrase: "before buying this product I would describe myself as being very familiar with this product category." Finally, the family type and family income variables used scales proposed by Ahuja and Walker (1994).

The research was conducted in May 2018. In order to carry out the data collection, 11 high-schools were contacted, involving Lisbon, Setúbal, Portimão and Beja districts. With regard to the sampling process, data were collected from the districts referred to above by those with demographic data similar to the average for Portugal, in particular as regards the average size of the household. Thus, letters were sent to the Executive Councils of several schools in those cities, and all the schools contacted agreed to participate in the study. Then, after the Executive Councils approval, each school level form teachers were contacted, and for each school year instructed the teachers in each class to provide the students with a questionnaire and a letter to the mother requesting her participation in the study. During this phase, 1,000 questionnaires were delivered by the teachers in the classrooms during May 2018. Students, aged 12 to 19 years, were instructed to answer the questionnaires in the classroom and to return them, fully completed, a few minutes later. This resulted in a total of 726 questionnaires fully answered by adolescents, which meant a response rate of 72.6%. That represents a higher number than those presented in the past (Kaur &Medury 2013, Shergill et al. 2013).

#### **Statistical techniques used**

The study objectives condition the method to be used in data analysis. Several researchers have used linear regression to study the adolescent's influence in family buying decisions (Mangleburg et al. 1999, Beatty &Talpade 1994). Thus, there is no knowledge of the use of logistic regression in the study of adolescent's influence on family purchasing decisions. The reasons for choosing the logistic regression analysis are: the variables level of measurement and the explained variable characteristics.

#### **Variables measurement**

The logistic regression is adequate to the nature of the explanatory variables considered (Hutcheson and Sofroniou 1999). The explanatory variables involve three types of scales: categorical, ordinal and interval. Parental communication style, internet influence, television influence, service knowledge are interval variables, with one or more items classified in Likert scales with seven points. 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*

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

#### **IV. Data Analysis and Findings**

##### **Internal consistency**

Cronbach's  $\alpha$  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  $\alpha$ , 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  $\alpha$  coefficients, presenting values above 0.8, indicating good reliability.

##### **Respondents' profile**

**Table2.Respondents'profile(percentage)**

Demographics	Valid percent	Cumulative percentage
<i>Adolescent's age range</i>		
12 to 15	38.5	38.5
16 to 19	61.5	100
<i>Adolescent's gender</i>		
Male	46.6	46.6
Female	53.4	100
<i>Mother's age range</i>		
25 to 34	6.6	6.6
35 to 49	70.1	76.7
50 to 64	22.4	99.2
More than 64	0.8	100
<i>Mother's educational level</i>		
No Schooling	1	1
Basic education	28	29
High school	36	65.6
Bachelor's Degree	5.8	71.4
University graduation	23.3	94.8
Masters or PhD	5.2	100
<i>Mother's professional category</i>		
Housewife	11.5	11.5
Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers	8.8	20.3
Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers	12.7	33.1
Workers, Builders and Similar Workers	17.6	50.7
Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries	18.2	68.9
Service and Sales Personnel	1.7	70.6
Administrative and Similar Personnel	6.4	77
Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level	3.4	80.4
Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions	7.3	87.7
Senior Management and Directors	12.3	100
<i>Family income</i>		
Less than 500 euros	4.5	4.5
From 500 to 1,000 euros	24.5	29
From 1,001 to 1,500 euros	30.7	59.7
From 1,501 to 2,000 euros	15.2	74.9
From 2,001 to 2,500 euros	13.2	88.2
From 2,501 to 3,000 euros	5.9	94.1
From 3,001 to 5,000 euros	4.5	98.6
More than 5,000 euros	1.4	100

There's 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).

The most frequent age group is from 35 to 49 years, with a rate of 70.1%, 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.

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

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

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

**Table 3. Family demographic characteristics (percentage)**

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

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

#### *Explanatory variables*

From now on, the adolescent's influence on mobile phone for adolescents use' purchase explanatory variables will be analyzed.

#### *Parental communication style*

Parental communication style, particularly socio-oriented communication does add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model on family decision to buy a mobile phone for his/her own use. The results show that adolescents with pluralistic parents will perceive themselves as having more influence on family purchases than those with laissez-faire parents. So, H1a is verified (see table 4).

#### **Internet influence**

Internet influence does add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model on family decision to buy a mobile phone. The results show that adolescents with higher internet influence will perceive themselves as having more influence on family purchase decisions than those adolescents with lower internet influence. So, H2 is verified (see table 4).

#### **Television influence**

Television influence does add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model on family decision to buy a mobile phone. Adolescents with higher television influence will perceive themselves as having more influence on family purchase decisions than those adolescents with lower internet influence. So, H3 is verified (see table 4).

**Table 4. Logistic regression for computer for family use (variables in equation)**

		S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 4d	Socio-oriented commun	0,269	0,069	15,43	1	0
	Internet Influence	1,973	0,222	79,12	1	0
	Television Influence	0,571	0,187	9,306	1	0,002
	Family type	-5,568	0,554	101	1	0
	Constant	0,843	11,22	1	0,001	0,059

#### **Parental communication style**

Parental communication style, particularly concept-oriented communication does not add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model on family decision to buy a mobile phone for his/her own use. The results show that adolescents with pluralistic parents will perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchases than those with laissez-faire parents. So, H1b is not verified (see table 5).

#### **Product knowledge**

The product knowledge does not add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on family decision to buy a mobile phone for his/her own use. Adolescents with higher product knowledge will not perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchase decisions than those adolescents with lower product knowledge. Thus, H4 is not verified (see table 5).

#### **Adolescent' gender**

The adolescent' gender does not add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on family decision to buy a mobile phone for his/her own use. Male adolescents will not perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchase decisions than female adolescents. Then, H5 is not verified (see table 5).

#### **Family income**

Family income does not add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on family decision to buy a mobile phone for his/her own use. Adolescents living in higher income families will not perceived themselves as having more influence on family purchase decisions than those adolescents living lower income households. Thus, H7 is not verified (see table 5).

**Table 5. Logistic regression for computer for family use (variables not in equation)**

Step 4	Variables	Score	df	Sig.
	Product Knowledge	0,003	1	0,955
	Adolescent's gender	2,565	1	0,109
	Family income	0,02	1	0,888
	Concept-oriented communication	1,91	1	0,167
Overall Statistics		5,248	7	0,63

#### **Explanatory variables interpretation**

In the present research for 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 socio-oriented communication, internet influence, television influence, and family income as purchase relevant explanatory variables.

## V. Discussion

In this study, a total of 726 fully completed questionnaires was reached, 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 most past studies on household purchases, 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

Several researchers have opted to include the adolescent and one or both parents as respondents in studies of adolescent influence on family purchase decisions (Watne& Winchester, 2011; Ishaque&Tufail, 2014; Shoham&Dalakas, 2005; Beatty &Talpade, 1994; Foxman et al., 1989a, b). This approach an issue on perception differences between the family members about the adolescent's influence, with consequences to model's internal validity. Other researchers have opted to measure the mother's perceptions, considering it as the family element with greater knowledge of the adolescent's influencing attempts (Swinyard& Sim, 1987; Filiault& Ritchie, 1980). The mother has been pointed out in several studies as the most reliable member of the family in that measurement (Neely, 2005; Mangleburg et al., 1999; Kim & Lee, 1997). However, this approach continues to consider that the mother rates the adolescent according to her perception that might not be accurate about his/her real influence level. Some authors have chosen to administer the questionnaires only to the adolescents, who will certainly have a different perception from their parents regarding the influence they exert (Ali et al., 2013).

### Internal consistency

Internal consistency of the independent variables scales under study was measured, and the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  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  $\alpha$  coefficient. For the internet influence, a 0.823 coefficient, also good. As for the television influence scale, an even better Cronbach's  $\alpha$  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).

## VI. Conclusions

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

We can also find in the results that the parents' socio-oriented communication style, internet' and television' influences and the type of family are variables that contributes to explaining his/her influence on the purchase of mobile phones for personal use. When parents have a higher socio-oriented communication style, adolescent' will show higher influence on the purchase of mobile phone. Adolescents' with high exposure to internet and television influences have higher influence on that product. On the other side, in single-parent families adolescent' will exert higher levels of influence than those in traditional families.

### Research contributions

Logistic regression results point to parental' socio-oriented communication style, internet influence, television influence, and family type as relevant explanatory variables of his/her influence on the purchase of mobile phones for personal use. When parents have a higher socio-oriented communication style, adolescent' will show higher influence on this purchase. Besides that, adolescents with higher levels of internet' and television' influence were positively related to his/her influence on family purchase of mobile phones for personal use. On the other side, in single-parent families

adolescent' will exert higher levels of influence than those in traditional families. These results are innovative in the study of family purchase decisions.

Several contributions are made to this knowledge area. Firstly, the relevance of including the adolescent in purchases for his own use is reinforced.

Second, when considering mobile phone, marketing managers should direct their efforts to those adolescents who live in parental' socio-oriented communication style environment, to those adolescents who are more influenced by internet and television, and to adolescents living in single-parent families. Those results are innovative in this field of knowledge.

The present research contributes significantly to the companies by allowing to conclude that the adolescent has an active participation on family purchase decisions. Having the adolescent relevant role on those decisions, it is important that marketers focus their efforts on his satisfaction. Having adolescent' perceptions on their own influence on that decision allows us to reinforce those contributions.

The results of the logistic regression analysis point to parental' socio-oriented communication style, internet influence, television influence, and family type as purchase important explanatory variables on the considered purchase. These results are innovative in the study of family purchases.

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

### **Limitations and recommendations**

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

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

### **Business implications**

The study offers a contribution to the companies by providing evidence of the adolescent's influence on the purchases of mobile phone. Given the adolescents relevance within family decisions, it is important that marketers focus their efforts on adolescent satisfaction, adopting strategies adjusted to the families. Should those professionals direct the marketing messages to adolescents living in socio-orient communication parents' structures Marketers approach to family markets should also be more precise if they target adolescents with higher internet influence, and with higher television influence. Finally, they must also consider that adolescents have higher saying in single-parent family type. These results are innovative in the study of family purchases when it comes to buying this product.

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

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

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

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

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

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

## References

- [1.] Ahuja, R. D., and Stinson, K. M. 1993, Female-Headed Single Parent Families: an Exploratory Study of Children's Influence in Family Decision Making, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20, 1993, 469-474.
- [2.] Ahuja, R. D., and Walker, M. 1994, Female-headed Single Parent Families: Comparisons with Dual Parent Households on Restaurant and Convenience Food Usage, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 11, 4, 41-54, DOI=<https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000003990>.
- [3.] Ahuja, R.D., Capella, L.M., and Taylor, R.D. 1998, Child influences, attitudinal and behavioral comparisons between single parent and dual parent households in grocery shopping decisions, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 48-62.
- [4.] Akinyele, S. T. 2010, The influence of children on family purchasing decisions in Ota, Nigeria, *Journal of Contemporary Management Research; Tiruchirappalli*, 4, 2 (Sep 2010), 1-11.
- [5.] Al-Zu'bi, A. 2016, The direct and indirect influences of locus of control on Jordanian parents' communication patterns: Consumer socialization and cultural perspectives, *Journal of Islamic Marketing* 7, 2, 167-186, DOI=<https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/JIMA-05-2014-0038>.
- [6.] Aleti, T., Brennan, L., and Parker, L. 2015, Family communication for the modern era: a typology, *Young Consumers; Bradford* 16, 4 (May 2015), pp. 367-384, DOI= <http://doi.10.1108/YC-08-2014-00471>.
- [7.] Ali, A., Ravichandran, N., and Batra, D. K. 2013, Children's choice of influence strategies in family purchase decisions and the impact of demographics, *Vision* 17, 1 (March 6, 2013), 27-40, Sage Publications, DOI=<http://doi.10.1177/0972262912469561>.
- [8.] Ashraf, M., and Khan, K. M. 2016, Adolescents' role in family decision-making for services in India, *Young Consumers* 17, 4 (June 2016), 388-403, DOI= <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/YC-06-2016-00608>.
- [9.] Baía, J. 2018, Mothers' Perceptions of Adolescents' Influence on the Purchase Decisions of Family Vacations, *Athens Journal of Tourism* 5, 2, 111-132, Doi=10.30958/ajt.5-2-3
- [10.] Barber, N. 2013, Investigating the potential influence of the internet as a new socialization agent in context with other traditional socialization agents, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice; Abingdon* 21.2 (Spring 2013), 179-193, Doi= <http://adage.com/article/american-demographics/generational-divide/42724>
- [11.] Beatty, S. E., and Talpade, S. 1994, Adolescent influence in family decision making: a replication with extension, *Journal of Consumer Research* 21, 9 (1 September 1994), 332-341, DOI= <http://doi.org/10.1086/209401>.

[12.] Belch, G. E., Belch, M. A., and Ceresino, G. 1985, Parental and teenage child influences in family decision making, *Journal of Business Research* 13, 163-176, DOI= [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(85\)90038-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(85)90038-4).

[13.] Belch, M. A., Krentlera, K. A., and Willis-Flurry, L.A. 2005, Teen internet mavens: influence in family decision making, *Journal of Business Research* 58 (May 2005), 569- 575, DOI= <http://doi.10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.08.005>.

[14.] Carlson, L., and Grossbart, S. 1990, An Investigation of Mothers' Communication Orientations and Patterns, *Advances in Consumer Research* 17, 804-812, Doi= <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/7107/volumes/v17/NA-17>

[15.] Carr, N. 2006, A comparison of adolescents' and parents' holiday motivations and desires, *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Feb 2006, 6, 2;129-142, DOI= <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1057/palgrave.thr.6040051>.

[16.] Chan, K., and McNeal, J. 2002a, Parent-child communications about consumption and advertising in China, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 20, 4, 317-334, Doi= <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760310483685>

[17.] Chan, K., and McNeal, J. 2002b, Parental concern about television viewing and children's advertising in China, *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 15, 2, 151-166, Doi= <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/15.2.151>

[18.] Chaudhary, M., and Gupta, A. 2012, Children's influence in family buying process in India, *Young Consumers; Bradford* 13, 2, pp. 161-175, DOI= <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/17473611211233512>.

[19.] Chikweche, T., Stanton, J., and Fletcher, R. 2012, Family purchase decision making at the bottom of the pyramid, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 29, 3, 202-213, DOI= <http://doi.10.1108/07363761211221738>.

[20.] Chitakunye, P. 2012, Recovering children's voices in consumer research, *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* 15, 2, 206-224, DOI= <http://doi.10.1108/13522751211215903>.

[21.] Churchill, G. A., and Moschis, G. P. 1979, Television and Interpersonal Influences on Adolescent Consumer Learning, *Journal of Consumer Research* 6 (1), 23-35.

[22.] Commuri, S. and Gentry, J. 2000, Opportunities for family research in marketing, *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, ABI/INFORM Global, 1-34, DOI= <https://search.proquest.com/openview/45fffdc1e7d6c05902ec3e24f441b320/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=25818>.

[23.] Darley, W. K., and Lim, J.S. 1986, Family decision making in leisure-time activities: an exploratory investigation of the impact of locus of control, child age influence factor and parental type on perceived child influence, *Advances in Consumer Research* 13, Richard J. Lutz (Eds.), Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 370-374, DOI= <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/6521/volumes/v13/NA-13>.

[24.] Dotson, M. J., and Hyatt, E. M. 2005, Major influence factors in children's consumer socialization, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 22, 1, 35-42.

[25.] Ekstrom, K. M., Tansuhaj, P. S., and Foxman, E. R. 1987, Children's influence in family decisions and consumer socialization: a reciprocal view, *Advances in Consumer Research* 14, 283-287, DOI= <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/6704/volumes/v14/NA-14>.

[26.] Filiatrault, P., and Ritchie, J. R. 1980, Joint Purchasing Decisions: A Comparison of Influence Structure in Family and Couple Decision-Making Units, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Volume 7, Issue 2, (1 September 1980), 131-140, <https://doi.org/10.1086/208802>

[27.] Foxman, E. R., and Tansuhaj, P.S. 1988, Adolescents' and mothers perceptions of relative influence in family purchase decisions: patterns of agreement and disagreement, *Advances in Consumer Research* 15, 449-453, DOI= <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/6845/volumes/v15/NA-15>.

[28.] Foxman, E. R., Tansuhaj, P. S., and Ekstrom, K. M. 1989a, Family members' perceptions of adolescents' influence in family decision making, *Journal of Consumer Research* 15, 3 (March 1989), 482-491, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1086/209187>.

[29.] Foxman, E. R., Tansuhaj, P. S., and Ekstrom, K. M. 1989b, Adolescents' influence in family purchase decisions: a socialization perspective, *Journal of Business Research* 18, 3 (March), 159-172, DOI= [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(89\)90033-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(89)90033-7).

[30.] Gliem, J. A., and Gliem, R. R. 2003, Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales, *Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education*, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, October 8-10, 2003.

[31.] Goswami, S., and Khan, S. 2015, Impact of Consumer Decision-making Styles on Online Apparel Consumption in India, *Vision* 19, 4 (January 25, 2016), 303-311, DOI= <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0972262915610853>.

[32.] Haq, M. R. and Rahman, S. D. 2015, Role of reality TV as a consumer-socialization agent of teenagers in a developing country, *International Journal of Emerging Markets* 10, 3, 598-618, DOI= <10.1108/IJoEM-06-2013-0101>.

[33.] Hutcheson, G., and Sofroniou, N. 1999, *The Multivariate Social Scientist*, Sage Publications.

[34.] Isin, F., and Alkibay, S. 2011, Influence of children on purchasing decisions of well-to-do families, *Young Consumers* 12, 1, 39-52, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/1747361111114777>.

[35.] Ishaque, A., and Tufail, M. 2014, Influence of Children on Family Purchase Decision: Empirical Evidence from Pakistan, *International Review of Management and Business Research* 3, 1 (March 2014), 162-173, DOI= <http://www.irmbrjournal.com/papers/1389635731.pdf>.

[36.] Jenkins, R. L. 1979, The Influence of Children in Family Decision-Making: Parents' Perceptions, in NA - Advances in Consumer Research Volume 06, eds. William L. Wilkie, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, Pages: 413-418, DOI= <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/9587/volumes/v06/NA-06>.

[37.] John, D. 1999, Consumer socialization of children: a retrospective look at twenty-five years of research, *Journal of Consumer Research* 26, 12 (December 1999), 183-213, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1086/209559>.

[38.] Kaur, P., and Medury, Y. 2013, SEM Approach to Teen Influence in Family Decision Making, *Contemporary Management Research* 9, 3, 323-342, DOI= <http://doi.10.7903/cmr.11080>.

[39.] Kaur, P., and Medury, Y. 2011, Impact of the internet on teenagers' influence on family purchases, *Young Consumers* 12, 1, 27-38, DOI= <http://doi.10.1108/1747361111114768>.

[40.] Kaur, P., and Singh, R. 2006, Children in family purchase decision making in India and the west: a review, *Academy Marketing Science Review* 8, 1-30, DOI= <http://www.amsreview.org/article/kaur08-2006.pdf>.

[41.] Khoo-Lattimore, C., Prayag, G., and Cheah, B. L. 2016, Kids on Board: Exploring the Choice Process and Vacation Needs of Asian Parents with Young Children in Resort Hotels, *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, (Mar 2015), 1-31, DOI= <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19368623.2014.914862>.

[42.] Kim, C., and Lee, H. 1997, Development of family triadic measures for children's purchase influence, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Chicago, (Aug., 1997), 307-321, DOI= <10.2307/3151894>.

[43.] Kim, C., Yang, Z., and Lee, H. 2015, Parental style, parental practices, and socialization outcomes: An investigation of their linkages in the consumer socialization context, *Journal of Economic Psychology* 49, (August 2015), 15-33, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeop.2015.03.006>

[44.] Kushwaha, T. 2017, Parental Style and Television Socialization of Children and Adolescents: A Perceptual Study in the Indian Context, *South Asian Journal of Management* 24, 3 (Jul-Sep 2017), 88-105, DOI= <https://search.proquest.com/openview/8334a75287aa49563a4ef22350a3b5ed/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=46967>.

[45.] Lackman, C., and Lanasa, J. 1993, Family decision-making theory: an overview and assessment, *Psychology & Marketing* 10, 2 (March/April 1993), 81-93, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.4220100203> |.

[46.] Lee, C. K. C., and Beatty, S. E. 2002, Family structure and influence in family decision making, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 19, 1, 24-41, DOI= <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/07363760210414934>.

[47.] Lee, C. K. C., and Collins, B. A. 2000, Family decision making and coalition patterns, *European Journal of Marketing*, Bradford, 1181-1198, DOI= <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/03090560010342584>.

[48.] Luczak, C., Younkin, N. 2012, Net generation: a conceptual framework of the consumer socialization process, *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, Arden 16, 2, 47-51.

[49.] Mangleburg, T. F. 1990, Children's influence in purchase decisions: a review and critique, *Advances in Consumer Research* 17, Marvin E. Goldberg, Gerald Gorn, and Richard W. Pollay (Eds.), Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 813-825, DOI= <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/7108/volumes/v17/NA-17>.

[50.] Mangleburg, T. F., Grewal, D., and Bristol, T. 1999, Family Type, Family Authority Relations, and Adolescents' Purchase Influence, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 26 (1999), 379-384, DOI= <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/8284/volumes/v26/NA-26>

[51.] Maroco, J., and Garcia-Marques, T. 2006, Qual a fiabilidade do alfa de Cronbach? Questões antigas e soluções modernas?, *Laboratório de Psicologia*, 4(1): 65-90, Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada, Portugal, DOI= <http://publicacoes.ispa.pt/index.php/lp/article/viewFile/763/706>.

[52.] Mau, G., Schuh, M., Steinmann, S., and Schramm-Klein, H. 2016, How children make purchase decisions: behaviour of the cued processors, *Young Consumers*, Bradford 17, 2 (March 2016), 111-126, DOI= <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/YC-10-2015-00563>.

[53.] Mau, G., Schramm-Klein, H., and Reisch, L. 2014, Consumer Socialization, Buying Decisions, and Consumer Behaviour in Children: Introduction to the Special Issue, *Journal of Consumer Policy* 37, 155-160, DOI= <http://doi.10.1108/YC-10-2015-00563>.

[54.] Marbell, K. N., and Grolnick, W. S. 2013, Correlates of parental control and autonomy support in an interdependent culture: A look at Ghana, *MotivEmot* (2013) 37:79-92, DOI= [10.1007/s11031-012-9289-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-012-9289-2)

[55.] Moschis, G., and Churchill, G. 1979, An analysis of the adolescent consumer, *Journal of Marketing* 15, 40-48.

[56.] Moschis, G., and Mitchell, L. 1986, Television advertising and interpersonal influences on teenagers' participation in family consumer decisions, *Advances in Consumer Research* 13, 181-186, DOI= <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/6487/volumes/v13/NA-13>.

[57.] Moschis, G. and Moore, R. 1979, Decision Making Among the Young: A Socialization Perspective, *Journal of Consumer Research* 6, 101-112.

[58.] Niu, H. J. 2013, Cyber peers' influence for adolescent consumer in decision-making styles and online purchasing behavior, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 43, 1228–1237, DOI= 10.1111/jasp.12085.

[59.] Neely, S. 2005, Influences on consumer socialization, *Young Consumers*, World Advertising Research Center, Quarter 1, 63-69, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1108/17473610510701115>.

[60.] Neulinger, A., and Zsoter, B. 2014, Mother-child interactions in youth purchase decisions, *Society and Economy* 36, 3, 387–406, DOI= <https://akademiai.com/doi/abs/10.1556/SocEc.36.2014.3.4>.

[61.] Niemczyk, A. 2015, Family decisions on the tourism market, *Economics & Sociology*; Ternopil 8, 3, 272-283, DOI= <http://doi.10.14254/2071-789X.2015/8-3/19>.

[62.] Rose, G. M., Bush, V. D., and Kahle, L. 1998, The influence of family communication patterns on parental reactions toward advertising: A cross-cultural national examination, *Journal of Advertising* (Winter 1998) 27, 4, BI/INFORM Collection, 71-85.

[63.] Ritchie, J. R., and Filiatrault, P. 1980, Family vacation decision-making - A replication and extension, *Journal of Travel Research*, 16, 2-7, DOI= <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/004728758001800401>

[64.] Shah, R., and Mittal, B. 1997, Toward a theory of intergenerational influence in consumer behaviour: an exploratory essay, *Advances in Consumer Research* 24, 55-60, DOI= <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/8008/volumes/v24/NA-24>.

[65.] Shahrokh, Z. D., and Khosravi, M. E. 2014, Children's Influence in Family Consumption Decisions: An Integrative Approach, *International Review of Management and Business Research*; Peshawar 3, 2, 1275-1287.

[66.] Sharma, A., and Sonwaney, V. 2014, Theoretical modeling of influence of children on family purchase decision making, *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 133, 38 – 46, DOI= <http://doi.10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.167>.

[67.] Sharma, A., and Sonwaney, V. 2013, Influence of Children on Family Purchase Decisions in Urban India: An Exploratory Study, *International Journal of Marketing & Business Communication* 2, 2, 32-43.

[68.] Shergill, S., Sekhon, H., and Zhao, M. 2013, Parents' perception of teen's influence on family purchase decisions: A study of cultural assimilation, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics* 25, 1, 162-177, DOI= <http://doi.10.1108/13555851311290993>.

[69.] Shoham, A., and Dalakas, V. 2005, He said, she said ... they said: parent's and children's assessment of children's influence on family consumption decisions, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 3, 22, 152-160, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760510595977>.

[70.] Shoham, A., and Dalakas, V. 2003, Family consumer decision making in Israel: the role of teens and parents, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 3, 20, 238-251, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760310472263>.

[71.] Singh, R., and Nayak, J. K. 2014, Peer Interaction and Its Influence on Family Purchase Decision: A Study among Indian Teenagers, *Vision*, 18(2) 81-90, SAGE Publications, Los Angeles, DOI: 10.1177/0972262914527873.

[72.] Sondhi, N., and Basu, R. 2014 Role of children in family purchase across Indian parental clusters, *Young Consumers*, 15, 4, 365-379, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-10-2013-00402>.

[73.] Srivastava, A., 2015, Consumer Decision-Making Styles of Indian Adolescents, *Contemporary Management Research*; Sansia 11.4, 385-408, DOI= <http://doi.10.7903/cmr.14181>.

[74.] Swinyard, W. R., and Sim, C. P. 1987, Perception of children's influence on family decision processes, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 4, 1, 25-38, DOI= <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb008186>.

[75.] Tinson, J. S., Nancarrow, C., and Brace, I. 2008, Purchase decision making and the increasing significance of family types, *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 25, 1, 45-56, DOI= <http://doi.10.1108/07363760810845408>.

[76.] Yang, Z., Kim, C., Laroche, M., and Lee, H. 2014, Parental style and consumer socialization among adolescents: A cross-cultural investigation, *Journal of Business Research* 67, 228-236, DOI= <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.05.008>.

[77.] Ward, S. 1974, Consumer socialization, *Journal of Consumer Research* 1, 1-14.

[78.] Watabe, A., and Hibbard, D. R. 2014, The Influence of Authoritarian and Authoritative Parenting on Children's Academic Achievement Motivation: A Comparison between the United States and Japan, *North American Journal of Psychology* 16, 2, 359-382, Doi= <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1534958903?accountid=44038>.

[79.] Watne, T. A., Lobo, A., and Brennan, L. 2011, Children as Secondary Socialisation Agents for their Parents. *Young Consumers*, 12, 4, 285-294, Doi= <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/1747361111185841>

[80.] Watne, T. A., Brennan, L., and Parker, L. 2015, Consumer socialisation agency within three-generational Vietnamese families, *Young Consumers* 16, 2, 172-188, DOI= 10.1108/YC-08-2014-00471.

[81.] Watne, T. A., Brennan, L., and Winchester, T. 2014, Consumer Socialization Agency: Implications for family decision-making about holidays, *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 1-20.

[82.] Watne, T. A., and Winchester, T. 2011, Family holiday decision making: the knowledge and influence of adolescent children and parents, in ANZMAC 2011 conference proceedings: *Marketing in the Age of Consumerism: Jekyll or Hyde?*, ANZMAC, Perth W. A., 1-9.