

Adolescent's Perception of his Influence on Family Vacations Purchase Decisions: A consumer socialization perspective

João Paulo Baía*

ABSTRACT

The adolescent is undoubtedly a relevant element in family purchases. However, he has been considered less participatory in the purchasing decision phase. In this context, services for family use have been less studied. Thus, the main purpose of this research is to study adolescent's influence on family vacations purchase decisions. In the 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 the class, and 726 validated questionnaires were returned. The analysis of logistic regression results point to parental communication style, television influence, adolescent's service knowledge, and adolescent's age as purchase relevant explanatory variables. These results are innovative in the study of family purchase decisions. The present research provides several contributions to this area of knowledge. First, it reinforces the importance of considering the adolescent participation on the final decision of family purchases for family use, which is innovative compared to past literature. Second, the results point to the relevance of including parental communication style, television influence, adolescent's service knowledge, and adolescent's age as explanatory variables of adolescent's influence on family vacations purchases. The present research also offers a contribution to marketers by providing evidence of the adolescent's influence on family vacations purchase decisions. Given the adolescents relevance on family decisions, it is important that marketers adopt strategies adjusted to family profiles, and that companies focus their efforts on adolescent satisfaction.

Keywords: Consumer socialization, Adolescent, Decision Making, Family Vacations.

^{*} Polythecnic Institute of Setúbal, Business and Administration School, Portugal. E-Mail: joao.baia@esce.ips.pt

Adolescent's Perception of his Influence on Family Vacations Purchase Decisions: A consumer socialization perspective

Received on: 2019.01.31

Approved on: 2019.04.03

Evaluated by a double blind review system

1. INTRODUCTION

The family has long been considered by marketeers as the most important consumer unit in the consumer market (Sondhi & Basu, 2014; Kaur & Medury, 2013, 2011; Shoham & Dalakas, 2005). The family is the dominant social group within which people spend their leisure time and consequently with whom they primarily plan, decide and spend their vacations (Ashraf & Khan, 2016; Khoo-Lattimore et al., 2016; Carr 2006). 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 indepth study of the family in all its forms (Kaur & Medury, 2013; Shoham & Dalakas, 2005; Commuri & Gentry, 2000). Several authors 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). Past research has considered adolescent is to be 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 (Commuri & Gentry, 2000; Beatty & Talpade, 1994). In fact, until the late nineties, research rarely perceived adolescents as family decision making influencers (Mau et al., 2016; John, 1999). The efforts made by adolescents in family purchases have increased in the present times, although they are not yet adequately explained (Sondhi & Basu, 2014; Singh & Nayak, 2014; Chitakunye, 2012; Kaur & Medury, 2011).

The adolescent market is substantial and growing which needs marketers to understand the adolescent purchase behavior for current sales and future brand loyalty (Niemczyk, 2015; Srivastava, 2015; Shahrokh & Khosravi, 2014; Yang et al., 2014). There is a good stream of research which has shown that adolescents play an important role in family varying by product, decision stage, adolescent, parental, and family characteristics (Ishaque & Tufail, 2014; Shergill et al., 2013; Ali et al., 2013; Akinyele, 2010). Researchers have been continuously analyzing the family decision making process.

This study examines the adolescent's influence in family purchase decision on vacations, considering a consumer socialization perspective, whose interest is based in the literature (Khoo-Lattimore et al., 2016; Watne & Winchester, 2011; Kaur & Singh, 2006). Although there are several studies that point the adolescent's influence on purchase decisions of family vacations (Khoo-Lattimore et al., 2016; Niemczyk, 2015; Kaur & Medury, 2011; Mangleburg, 1990; Foxman et al., 1989a, b), the adolescents influence on parent's vacations final decision remain sparsely researched (Khoo-Lattimore et al., 2016; Niemczyk, 2015; Kaur & Medury, 2011; Akinyele, 2010; Kaur & Singh, 2006). The present investigation subject is family consumption behavior on vacations purchase. This domain presents some gaps, among which, the adolescent's influence is often underestimated, and even omitted, with regard to the late phase of purchasing process, the decision.

The research problem essentially involves a theoretical dimension which relates to the answer to the following questions: Considering the consumer socialization perspective, what are the dimensions of the adolescent's influence on the decisions to buy family vacations? What is the adolescent's perception about his influence?

The article begins by reviewing the literature and defining the research hypotheses. Then the methodology used in the present investigation will be characterized. The main results of the study will be presented and the research results will be discussed, as well as the main conclusions, limitations and indications for future research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Family has been considered as the most relevant consumer and decision-making unit on consumer behavior (Aleti et al., 2015; Sondhi & Basu, 2014; Shergill et al., 2013; Shoham & Dalakas, 2005). The study of family consumption behavior has become increasingly important, in particular the process through which the family structures its decisions. Taking this into account, academics and marketers consider the continuing study the adolescent's influence on family buying decisions (Aleti et al., 2015; Shahrokh & Khosravi, 2014; Chaudhary & Gupta, 2012; Watne & Winchester, 2011).

One important service for families is vacations (Watne & Winchester, 2011). One theoretical approach has played leading role in studying. The consumer behavior theory regards parents as adolescent's socialization agents. Other agents like friends, television, and internet must also be considered as relevant in his socialization process (Kaur & Medury, 2011; Yang & Laroche, 2011; Chan & McNeal, 2003; Beatty & Talpade, 1994). Adolescents are considered has possessing relatively small degree of power over their parents (Shahrokh & Khosravi, 2014).

2.1. Family purchase decisions

Ashraf and Khan (2016), Kaur and Singh (2006) and Shoham & Dalakas (2003) pointed to higher levels of adolescent influence in the products purchase for own use or on those purchases that they consider most important (Kim & Lee, 1997). However, several researchers have pointed out that the adolescent's influence in family buying decisions is not adequately explained (Aleti et al., 2015; Shergill et al., 2013; Chaudhary & Gupta, 2012; Kaur & Singh, 2006).

2.2. Consumer socialization theory

Consumer socialization

Adolescents' participation or influence on family consumer decisions has been strongly related with socialization factors such as the parental communication style, friends or peers influence, internet and television influence (Aleti et al., 2015; Watne et al., 2015, 2011; Haq & Rahman, 2015; Barber, 2013; Kaur & Medury, 2011; Yang & Laroche, 2011). Among the identified factors, parents, peers and media have received the greatest research attention (Aleti et al., 2015; Yang & Laroche, 2011; Dotson & Hyatt, 2005; Moschis & Churchill, 1978).

Parental communication style

The parental communication style, ranging from more restrictive to or more permissive, has been the main focus of the parents' orientation regarding the education of adolescents for consumption (Kushwaha, 2017; Al-Zu'bi, 2016; Kim et al., 2015; Yang & Laroche, 2011). Several authors pointed, on the basis of concept-oriented style and socio-oriented style, four types of parental communication patterns were identified: (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 family lies on week correspondence between parent and adolescent, the protective family

demonstrates social amicability where adolescent could gain knowledge all alone to a limited extent; the pluralistic family fosters the adolescent to practice open communication, while the consensual family allows the adolescent to develop his own perspective on family cohesiveness (Carlson & Grossbart, 1990). Parents with conceptoriented style consult adolescents and value their opinion in buying decisions (Sharma & Sonwaney, 2013; Rose et al., 1998; Moschis & Moore, 1979). Past research has identified three roles of adolescents related to consumption: (1) buyers who have their own money to spend, (2) direct or indirect purchase influencers of a large amount of household items, and (3) a future market of a larger variety of products and services (Aleti et al., 2015; Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Srivastava, 2015; Shahrokh & Khosravi, 2014).

The adolescent is an influencing agent in the purchasing decisions within family consumption unit, and this influence is manifested directly, that is, by actively acting in the direction of making a decision, or when accompanying his/her parent and contributes to a choice. By contrast, indirectly, that is, only by their presence in this unit of consumption or because the parent is affected by the knowledge of their tastes or preferences when making a decision (Kaur and Singh, 2006, Mangleburg, 1990).

However, in the purchasing decision phase, it is less frequent to find the adolescent's influence. When specifically considering the family vacations purchase, Jenkins (1979), Ritchie and Filiatrault (1980), and Belch et al. (1985) were among the first researchers to study of the adolescent's influence in that purchase decision and concluded that adolescent participation is minor or null in the final purchase decision (Khoo-Lattimore et al., 2016; Watne & Winchester, 2011; Kaur & Medury, 2011; Carr, 2006). Niemczyk (2015), concluded that adolescents have some say in the final decision in the case of domestic holidays, but they do not participate in that phase when it is concerned holidays more planned and abroad. Those results emphasize the existence of a gap in the study of the adolescent's participation on decision on family vacations purchases. Thus, the study of that purchase lacks more deeply research.

His/her influence of that family member has been pointed greater in purchases of certain products categories. Shoham and Dalakas (2003) and Belch et al. (1985), pointed to higher levels of adolescent's influence when deciding a product for their own use. Other researchers reached the same conclusions (Kim & Lee, 1997). For some purchases, adolescents have the independence to make a decision, such as breakfast cereals, clothes,

music (Ishaque & Tufail, 2014; Kaur & Singh, 2006; Beatty & Talpade, 1994), or in certain products/services for family consumption, such as the decision to eat out, travel, or grocery products (Ashraf & Khan, 2016; Chikweche et al., 2012; Chitakunye, 2012). Lee and Beatty (2002) also concluded for a shared decision between parents and adolescents when choosing restaurant for dinner.

Mostly, past research has as also included the following factors as explanatory of the adolescent's influence in the family purchase decisions: the adolescent's personal characteristics, the family characteristics (Kushwaha, 2017; Watne et al., 2014; Neulinger & Zsoter, 2014; Kaur & Medury, 2013; Shergill et al., 2013), and the mother's occupational characteristics (Sharma & Sonwaney, 2014, 2013; Lee & Beatty, 2002). The adolescent's personal characteristics include: adolescent's gender and product's/service's knowledge. The family characteristics where the income is considered. Finally, the mother's occupational characteristics include her occupational status.

Parental communication style

According to Watabe and Hibbard (2014), parents with socio-oriented communication style seek to promote obedience by monitoring and controlling adolescents' consumer learning and behavior. Those researchers found that in permissive parenting style, adolescents testify that "mother did not view herself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up" (idem, p. 364).

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

H1: Adolescents with protective and consensual parents will perceive themselves as having more influence on family purchases than those with laissez-faire and pluralistic parents.

Friends influence

The sharp and global growth in the use of the internet has been a major influence on the way adolescents socialize and interact with each other (Kaur & Medury, 2011). According to Yang and Laroche (2012), "although high self-esteem adolescents do see their own decisions better than their peers, the tendency to maintain harmony may drive them to integrate the opinions of their peers into their purchasing decisions" (p. 15).

H2: Friends influence will be positively related to the adolescent's influence on family

purchase decisions.

Internet influence

According to Kaur and Medury (2011), worldwide there has been a huge explosion in internet use, and has been a major influence on adolescent's socialization. According to Luczak and Younkin (2012), considering the internet use as a vehicle and through its contents, it should influence adolescents' knowledge through direct experience. More, the "internet use as a vehicle and through its content, aides the formation of adolescents' attitudes towards consumption through the development of their consumption knowledge and skills" (idem, 2012, 49). Further, adolescents are also known to be more skilled in engaging with internet than parents. For these reasons, adolescents' internet use is also a matter of interest to academicians and marketeers (Kaur & Medury, 2011; Belch et al., 2005). Thus, the perception of the effects of the socialization of adolescent consumption by agents such as the internet and television are an area of great interest in our days. The increasing use of the internet as a communication tool makes this a potentially strong socialization agent (Lee et al., 2003).

Adolescents experience the internet as a major social space, allowing people to talk, form relationships, discuss issues and perform many social tasks normally performed in physical environment (Kaur & Medury, 2011).

Nowadays, internet should be considered as a potential socializing agent with a major influence on adolescents (Barber 2013). For Kaur and Medury (2011), the internet impact on the adolescent would significantly relate to his/her role in decision making process. So, one can expect that:

H3: Internet influence will be positively related to the adolescent's influence on family purchase decisions.

Television influence

Informative influences of traditional mass media help guide consumers to products and brands through providing credible evidence (Barber 2013), often using the persuasive power of reputable informants such media sources. The most influential of the mass media has been the television through advertising what brands are acceptable by society or supported by celebrities (Churchill and Moschis, 1979). Television's influence is mostly expressive, affecting attitudes such as desire for products and brand preference (Barber, 2013). For Mangleburg and Bristol (1998), the adolescent's marketplace knowledge can be improved the degree of television viewing. Kushwaha (2017) found

that parents who regularly watch television with adolescents feel need of less intervention because they could control the content to be watched.

Sharma and Sonwaney (2013) also pointed that adolescents tended to be less conscious of brand names when receiving more parental restriction regarding television viewing. Haq and Rahman (2015) also concluded that television helps adolescents to develop product-related knowledge, consumer-role perception and influences their purchasing intentions. Thereby, it is expected that:

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

Adolescent's gender

The adolescent's gender often appears as one explanatory variable for their influence on family buying decisions (Ali et al., 2013; Watne & Winchester, 2011; Shergill et al., 2013; Gentina et al. 2013). 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 particularly to decide to purchase products. Lee and Collins (2000) also concluded that female adolescents have higher levels of influence than male adolescents in family buying decisions. Watne and Winchester (2011) concluded that female adolescents maintain higher levels of influence on family vacations purchases than male adolescents. Thus, the second hypothesis is:

H5: The adolescents will perceive themselves as having more influence on family purchases if they are older than if they are younger.

Service knowledge

Adolescents influence their parents through the social power they possess, more specifically knowledge and expertise (Aleti et al., 2015; Watne & Winchester, 2011). Thus, a higher service knowledge should lead to greater influence attempts, once the other members recognize that know-how (Chitakunye, 2012; Belch et al., 2005; Shah & Mittal, 1997; Beatty & Talpade, 1994). Chitakunye (2012) argued that parents are motivating the adolescent "to use its cognitive abilities in consumer situations". Belch et al. (2005) pointed that adolescents "would be expected to exhibit greater knowledge", and "have acquired more information on products/services." Aleti et al. (2015) and Watne and Winchester (2011) suggested that adolescents exercise greater levels of influence in purchase when they have more knowledge about the service, more

specifically in vacations decisions. Thus, it is expected that:

H6: The adolescents will perceive themselves as having more influence on family purchases if they have greater service knowledge than if they have minor.

3. METHODOLOGY

The present research aims to examine the consumer socialization effects on adolescent's influence on family vacation decisions, according to his perception. The study universe is formed Portuguese families, with at least one adolescent (between 12 and 19 years). There is no knowledge of studies about the impact of socialization consumer on adolescent's influence on family vacations purchase in Europe, so this study offers a contribution in this field.

Mostly researchers have shown great difficulty in selecting probabilistic samples to studying the households, using data collection from convenience samples (Aleti et al., 2015; Srivastava, 2015, Kim & Lee, 1997). In the present study, due to the lack of information provided by official organisms, it was also necessary to use a non-probabilistic sample. The sample was collected from households with at least one adolescent between 12 and 19 years old (Aleti et al., 2015; Srivastava, 2015; Kim & Lee, 1997; Beatty & Talpade, 1994). Furthermore, there was a concern to collect a sample consistent with the studies carried out in this area in order to reduce the risks inherent in collecting data from a reduced sample.

Several authors pointed out the importance of study product or service categories for family use, instead of studying only those product or service categories for adolescent's use (Belch et al., 2005; Kim & Lee, 1997; Beatty & Talpade, 1994). Based on this classification, in the present investigation one service category will be studied. The selection of the service category to be studied derives from the literature review, with the decision on the family vacations. Vacations have great importance to consumers (Kim & Lee, 1997; Foxman et al., 1989a, b; Foxman & Tansuhaj, 1988). Furthermore, with the literature scarce and absent in relation to the that specific purchase, little is known about the adolescent's influence on final purchase decision. Ekstrom et al. (1987) argue that adolescents transfer knowledge to parents, and that in certain purchase situations adolescents have greater service knowledge, namely in vacations (Belch et al. 2005).

The questionnaire survey was the method of data collection chosen for this study (Aleti et al., 2015; Srivastava, 2015). In general, studies on the adolescent's influence on family buying decisions used the questionnaire survey as the main method for collecting empirical data (Aleti et al., 2015; Srivastava, 2015; Shoham & Dalakas, 2005, 2003). Thus, the same approach will be applied, using self-completed questionnaire survey in the quantitative phase of the present study.

The choice of a suitable structure for the questionnaire sought to articulate two essential aspects, namely the objectives of the present research and the past research on the adolescent's influence on family decisions. The main objective of the data collection instrument is to pursue the research objectives outlined. A pre-test was carried out that led to small changes in what would come to be the final structure of the questionnaire. The suggestions presented by the 25 respondents in the pre-test phase of the questionnaire were in the sense of some difficulty in the perception of certain expressions used in the initial version, as well as to a more appealing layout.

The measurement scales used were adapted from reference studies in the research on this field (see Table 1), which is in line with most previous studies (Isin & Alkibay, 2011; Shoham & Dalakas, 2005).

Table 1. Linking the Model to the Questionnaire

Variables in study	Adapted from					
Explained variable						
Adolescent Influence on Family	Shoham e Dalakas (2003); Beatty e					
Purchase Decisions	Talpade (1994)					
Explanatory variables						
Parental communication style,	Chan and McNeal (2003);					
• Friends influence,	Yang and Laroche (2011);					
• Internet influence,	Kaur and Medury (2011):					
• Television influence,	Kaur and Medury (2011):					
 Service knowledge; 	Beatty e Talpade (1994);					
Adolescent's gender.	Belch et al. (2005).					

Source: author

3.1 Explained variable

Many authors have used a likert scale to measure the adolescent's relative influence in decision making process in which parents and adolescents are considered in the final decision (Shahrokh, 2014; Mangleburg, 1999; Kim & Lee, 1997; Foxman et al., 1989a, b).

The explained variable measurement scale was used according to past proposals (Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Shoham & Dalakas, 2003). The mother's perception may vary between 1 and 7 (where 1 = I had no influence, and 7 = I had all influence).

3.2 Explanatory variables

The parental communication style was used the Chan and McNeal (2003) seven-point Likert scale, ranked completely disagree (1) to completely agree (7). The "friends influence" variable used Yang and Laroche (2011) items with seven-point Likert scale, ranked completely disagree (1) to completely agree (7). The "internet influence" variable used Kaur and Medury (2011) nine items with seven-point Likert scale, ranked completely disagree (1) to completely agree (7). The "television influence" variable also used Kaur and Medury (2011) nine items adapted to television, with the same seven-point Likert scale, ranked completely disagree (1) to completely agree (7).

The variable "service knowledge" 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 service I would describe myself as being very familiar with this service category."

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 variable "service knowledge" will be measured according to the proposal presented by Beatty and Talpade (1994), representing the subjective knowledge. A seven-point Likert scale is used, ranked completely disagree (1) to fully agree (7). The item to be measured will be translated by the phrase: "before buying this service I would describe myself as being very familiar with this service category."

3.3 Data collection procedures and sample

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).

3.4 Statistical techniques used

The research objectives determine the method to be used in data analysis. In the past, mostly research 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.

3.5 Variables measurement

Logistic regression does not impose any restrictions on the types of explanatory variables considered (Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999). The explanatory variables considered in the present investigation involve two types of scales: categorical and ordinal and interval. The parental communication style, friends influence, internet influence, television influence, and service knowledge are ordinal variables, classified in the present investigation in a Likert scales. Adolescent's gender represents a categorical dichotomic scale.

3.6 The explained variable

The explained variable, measured through a seven-point range scale, was transformed into a dichotomous variable. Thus, this scale allows us to consider, by default, for values from 1 to 4, that the adolescent considered as having influence in that purchase decision. On the other hand, adolescent ratings in the range of 5 to 7 means that the

adolescent perceives no influence from the himself in that purchase. According to several authors, the intermediate point of the scale, which corresponds to the value 4, classifies both the members with a shared influence in the decision (Shahrokh and Khosravi 2014, Beatty and Talpade 1994). 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.

3.7 Variables selecting method for the logistic regression model

In the present investigation, being the adolescent's influence in purchasing decisions, a binary choice model, the main concern was the parameters' estimation. From the proposed conceptual theoretical model, one logistic regression model was proposed, according to the service category studied. According to Hutcheson and Sofroniou (1999), the ordinal data can be transformed into dichotomous data, allowing its analysis in logistic regression models. The Forward LR method of inclusion of variables will be used.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Internal consistency

Most researchers have preferred Cronbach's α among the several available methods to estimate internal consistency. The reliability of a measure refers to its ability to be consistent. The α , which must vary from 0 to 1, can be less than 0, which happens when the mean correlation between the items is negative (Maroco & Garcia-Marques, 2006). The independent variables scales' internal consistency was measured, and the Cronbach's α coefficient was used for individualism-collectivism and power distance, parental communication style, internet influence, and television influence scales. 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).

Parental communication style scale has a 0.812 value, that represents a good Cronbach's α coefficient value. For the internet influence, a 0.823 coefficient, also good. As for the television influence scale, 0.828 was found, which is a good Cronbach's α coefficient (idem, 2003).

These values are consistent with previous research (Ahuja and Stinson 1993). Mostly, past researchers did not refer to the internal consistency of scales used in their studies

(Al-Zu'bi, 2016; Ashraf & Khan, 2016; Ishaque & Tufail, 2014; Ali et al., 2013; Chikweche et al., 2012; Watne & Winchester, 2011).

4.2 Internal validity

Belch et al. (1985) were among the first authors to report divergence of opinions among family members when interviewed about the adolescent's influence without, however, making a contribution to its resolution (Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Foxman et al., 1989b). 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; Filiatrault & 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).

In the present research, the adolescent's inquiry was chosen, so with regard to internal validation, there is no problem in the past literature about the divergence of opinions among family members, so the scale offers guarantees of internal validation of influence construct. In addition, the application of this scale allows the respondent to perceive the influence dimension to be measured. Thus, it was clarified in the question itself, for the respondent, that what one intends to measure is the active influence on the purchase decision, in order to allow a more objective testimony (Commuri & Gentry, 2000; Mangleburg et al., 1999).

The scale used should also provide some external validation, since it will measure the relative influence by comparing the adolescent's influence with mother's influence, which considers the direct comparison between the mother and the older adolescent child.

4.3 Respondents demographic profile

As can be seen in table 2, the age group from 16 to 19 years old represents 61.5% of the total sample collected. Results also point to 53.4% for female adolescents of the total adolescents under study.

 Table 2. Demographic profile of participants (percentage)

16 to 19 61.5 10 Adolescent's gender 46.6 46 Male 46.6 46 Female 53.4 10 Mother's age range 25 to 34 6.6 6 35 to 49 70.1 76 50 to 64 22.4 99 More than 64 0.8 10 Mother's educational level 0.8 10 No Schooling 1 1 Basic education 28 2 High school 36 65 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 71 Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Housewife 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 <	Demographics	Valid percent Cumulative percentage		
12 to 15	Adolescent's age range			
16 to 19 61.5 10 Adolescent's gender 46.6 46 Male 46.6 46 Female 53.4 10 Mother's age range 25 to 34 6.6 6 35 to 49 70.1 76 50 to 64 22.4 99 More than 64 0.8 10 Mother's educational level 0.8 10 No Schooling 1 1 Basic education 28 2 High school 36 65 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 71 Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Housewife 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 <		38.5	38.5	
Male 46.6 46 Female 53.4 10 Mother's age range 25 to 34 6.6 6 35 to 49 70.1 76 50 to 64 22.4 99 More than 64 0.8 10 Mother's educational level 1 No Schooling 1 28 Basic education 28 2 High school 36 65 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 71 Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and			100	
Male 46.6 46 Female 53.4 10 Mother's age range 25 to 34 6.6 6 35 to 49 70.1 76 50 to 64 22.4 99 More than 64 0.8 10 Mother's educational level 1 No Schooling 1 28 Basic education 28 2 High school 36 65 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 71 Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and	Adolescent's gender			
Female 53.4 10 Mother's age range 25 to 34 6.6 6 35 to 49 70.1 76 50 to 64 22.4 99 More than 64 0.8 10 Mother's educational level 1 No Schooling 1 28 Basic education 28 2 High school 36 65 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 71 Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 1 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions		16.6	46.6	
Mother's age range 6.6 6 6 25 to 34 6.6 6 6 35 to 49 70.1 76 50 to 64 22.4 99 More than 64 0.8 10 Mother's educational level 1 No Schooling 1 1 Basic education 28 2 High school 36 65 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 71 Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Housewife 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>100</td></td<>			100	
25 to 34 6.6 6 35 to 49 70.1 76 50 to 64 22.4 99 More than 64 0.8 10 Mother's educational level 1 No Schooling 1 1 Basic education 28 2 High school 36 65 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 71 Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 <t< td=""><td></td><td>33.4</td><td>100</td></t<>		33.4	100	
35 to 49		6.6	6.6	
50 to 64 22.4 99 More than 64 0.8 10 Mother's educational level 1 No Schooling 1 Basic education 28 High school 36 65 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 71 Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 From 500 to 1,000 euros 4.5 4 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7			6.6	
More than 64 0.8 10 Mother's educational level 1 No Schooling 1 Basic education 28 2 High school 36 65 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 71 Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 From 500 to 1,000 euros 4.5 4 From 1,001 to 1,500 eur				
Mother's educational level 1 No Schooling 1 Basic education 28 High school 36 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 Universitary graduation 23.3 Masters or PhD 5.2 Mother's professional category Housewife 11.5 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 From 500 to 1,000 euros 4.5 From 500 to 1,000 euros 24.5 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74			99.2	
No Schooling	More than 64	0.8	100	
Basic education 28 High school 36 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 Universitary graduation 23.3 Masters or PhD 5.2 Mother's professional category Housewife 11.5 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 From 500 to 1,000 euros 4.5 From 500 to 1,000 euros 24.5 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2	Mother's educational level			
High school 36 65 Bachelor's Degree 5.8 71 Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category Housewife 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 From 500 to 1,000 euros 4.5 4 From 500 to 1,000 euros 24.5 5 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	No Schooling	1	1	
Bachelor's Degree 5.8 71 Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Housewife 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 From 500 to 1,000 euros 4.5 4 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	Basic education	28	29	
Universitary graduation 23.3 94 Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Housewife 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 From 500 to 1,000 euros 4.5 4 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	High school	36	65.6	
Masters or PhD 5.2 10 Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 From 500 to 1,000 euros 4.5 4 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 24.5 5 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	Bachelor's Degree	5.8	71.4	
Mother's professional category 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 Family income 4.5 4 Less than 500 euros 4.5 4 From 500 to 1,000 euros 24.5 5 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	Universitary graduation	23.3	94.8	
Housewife 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 70 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 Family income 4.5 4 Less than 500 euros 4.5 4 From 1,001 to 1,000 euros 24.5 5 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	Masters or PhD	5.2	100	
Housewife 11.5 11 Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers 8.8 20 Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers 12.7 33 Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 70 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 Family income 4.5 4 Less than 500 euros 4.5 4 From 1,001 to 1,000 euros 24.5 5 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	Mother's professional category			
Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers Workers, Builders and Similar Workers Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries Service and Sales Personnel Administrative and Similar Personnel Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions Senior Management and Directors Family income Less than 500 euros From 500 to 1,000 euros From 1,001 to 1,500 euros From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 12.3 20 33 4.5 4.5 4.5 4.5 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2		11.5	11.5	
Plant and Machine Operators and Assembly Workers Workers, Builders and Similar Workers Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries Service and Sales Personnel Administrative and Similar Personnel Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 Senior Management and Directors Family income Less than 500 euros From 500 to 1,000 euros From 1,001 to 1,500 euros From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 12.7 33 33 34 36 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	Low-qualified or Unskilled Workers		20.3	
Workers, Builders and Similar Workers 17.6 50 Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 3.4 80 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 Family income 4.5 4.5 Less than 500 euros 4.5 4.5 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	*		33.1	
Farmers and Skilled Workers in Agriculture and Fisheries 18.2 68 Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 7 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 Family income 4.5 4 Less than 500 euros 4.5 4 From 500 to 1,000 euros 24.5 5 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74		17.6	50.7	
Service and Sales Personnel 1.7 70 Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 6.4 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 Family income 4.5 4 Less than 500 euros 4.5 4 From 500 to 1,000 euros 24.5 4 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	,		68.9	
Administrative and Similar Personnel 6.4 Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level 3.4 80 Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 Family income 4.5 4 Less than 500 euros 4.5 4 From 500 to 1,000 euros 24.5 5 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74			70.6	
Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 Family income 4.5 4 Less than 500 euros 24.5 5 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	Administrative and Similar Personnel	6.4	77	
Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions 7.3 87 Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 Family income 4.5 4 Less than 500 euros 24.5 5 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	Technicians and Professionals of Intermediate Level	3.4	80.4	
Senior Management and Directors 12.3 10 Family income 2 10 Less than 500 euros 4.5 4.5 From 500 to 1,000 euros 24.5 24.5 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	Specialists of the Intellectual and Scientific Professions	7.3	87.7	
Less than 500 euros 4.5 4 From 500 to 1,000 euros 24.5 5 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	*	12.3	100	
Less than 500 euros 4.5 4 From 500 to 1,000 euros 24.5 5 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	Family income			
From 500 to 1,000 euros 24.5 From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74	•	4.5	4.5	
From 1,001 to 1,500 euros 30.7 59 From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74		24.5	29	
From 1,501 to 2,000 euros 15.2 74			59.7	
			74.9	
11 10 111 2,00 1 to 2,000 Cutob			88.2	
			94.1	
			98.6	
			100	

Source: author

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

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

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

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

4.4. Explanatory variables

Then, the explanatory variables behavior will be analyzed, considering the adolescent's perception about his influence on the purchase of family vacations.

4.5 Parental communication style

Parental communication style does add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model on family decision to buy vacations. Thus, H1 is verified, so adolescents with protective and consensual parents do perceive themselves as having more influence on family purchases than those with laissez-faire and pluralistic parents (see Table 4).

4.6 Friends influence

The friends influence does not add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on family vacations. Therefore, H2 is not verified, so friends influence is not positively related to the adolescent's influence on family purchase decisions, with adolescents who receive more friends influence having not greater influence on family purchases for family vacations (see Table 3).

4.7 Internet influence

The internet influence does not add explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on family vacations. Therefore, H3 is not verified, so internet influence is not positively related to the adolescent's influence on family purchase decisions, with adolescents who receive more internet influence having not greater influence on family purchases (see Table 3).

4.8 Television influence

The television influence adds explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence on family vacations. Thus, H4 is verified, thus television influence is positively related to the adolescent's influence on family purchase decisions, so adolescents who receive more television influence have greater influence on family purchases (see Table 4).

4.9 Adolescent's age

As can be seen from Table 4, the adolescent's age adds explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model in the decision to buy family vacations. Thus, H5 is verified, so that older adolescents have greater influence than younger adolescents on the purchase of family vacations.

4.10 Service knowledge

Table 4 shows that service knowledge adds explanatory capacity to the adolescent influence model in the decision to buy family vacations. Thus, H6 is verified, so adolescents with greater service knowledge exert more influence on family vacations purchase than those adolescents with less service knowledge.

Table 3. Logistic regression for family vacations (variables in equation)

		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.fd	or EXP(B)
								Lower	Upper
Step 4	Adolescent's age	-0.209	0.046	20.403	1	0	0.812	0.741	0.889
	Service knowledge	0.196	0.047	17.666	1	0	1.217	1.11	1.333
	Parental communication style	0.204	0.069	8.759	1	0.003	1.226	1.071	1.403
	Television influence	1.642	0.224	53.979	1	0	5.166	3.334	8.007
	Constant	-3.917	0.519	57.006	1	0	0.02		

Source: author

Table 4. Logistic regression for family vacations (variables not in equation)

	variables	Score	df	Sig.
Step 4	Friends influence	1.789	1	0.181
	Internet influence	1.507	1	0.22
	Overall Statistics	2.81	2	0.245

Source: author

4. 11 Explanatory variables interpretation

Regarding the explanatory variables relevance, the -2LL analysis allows us to conclude that the exogenous variables contribute to explain the adolescent's influence in that

service purchase. This aspect is reinforced by the Chi-square value, considering there is a large part of the explained variance of the model when considering the variables parental communication style, television influence, adolescent's age and service knowledge.

5. DISCUSSION

In the present investigation, the sample surveyed allowed a total of 966 fully completed questionnaires, which represents a larger sample than common past research (Al-Zu'bi, 2016; Ashraf & Khan, 2016; Ali et al., 2013; Chikweche et al., 2012; Chitakunye, 2012). A convenience sample was used, which is consistent with main past studies (Al-Zu'bi, 2016; Ashraf & Khan, 2016; Ali et al., 2013; Chikweche et al., 2012; Chitakunye, 2012; Mangleburg et al., 1999).

5.1 Adolescent's age

Regarding the adolescent's age, the most frequent range is the 16 to 19 years, with a 61.5% of total rate, which is consistent with previous research (Beatty & Talpade, 1994). In the Shergill et al. (2013) and Darley and Lim (1986) studies, the most frequent adolescents 's age was 15 years old.

5.2 Adolescent's gender

The results of the present investigation point to a distribution of 53.4% for female adolescents. This distribution is consistent to that found in the study by Ali et al. (2013), with 46% of male and 56% of female adolescents.

Mangleburg et al. (1999), by contrast, have a more unbalanced distribution relative to the adolescent's gender. The authors present 74% for the female of the total adolescents under study.

5.3 Service knowledge

The service knowledge was pointed out by several authors as an adolescent resource should lead to higher levels of adolescent influence in certain purchases (Aleti et al., 2015; Watne & Winchester, 2011; Shah & Mittal, 1997; Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Ekstrom et al., 1987).

Shah and Mittal (1997) have pointed to product knowledge as a relevant variable that explains adolescent's influence in family purchases.

For Beatty and Talpade (1994), knowledge affected the perceived adolescent's influence on decision-making purchase phase.

Ekstrom et al. (1987) suggest that, in certain purchase situations, adolescents have a greater knowledge about the product when compared with their parents. For Watne and Winchester (2011), Beatty and Talpade (1994) and Foxman et al. (1989a), knowledge is seen as a resource adolescent uses in his/her buying participation attempts.

The results of the present investigation revealed that the explanatory variable product knowledge adds explanatory capacity to the adolescent's influence in the purchase of family vacations, which is consistent with previous research (Aleti et al., 2015; Watne & Winchester, 2011; Beatty & Talpade, 1994; Foxman et al., 1989a).

5.4 Mother's occupational status

The most frequent value is the low occupational status, with 49.5 %. The second most frequent category of among respondents, with a rate of 32.1%, is the high occupational status.

The demographic characteristics of the surveyed households are, as might be expected, distinctive compared to some of the household surveys conducted in the United States, where family incomes tend to be higher, and the higher mother's occupational status (Mangleburg et al., 1999; Darley & Lim, 1986).

The mother's occupational status was pointed out by several authors as an explanatory variable of the adolescent's influence in the decisions of family purchases (Watne & Winchester, 2011; Lee & Beatty, 2002; Ahuja & Stinson, 1993).

Lee and Beatty (2002) pointed that if mothers do not work outside the home, older adolescents generally exert more influence on the final decision than those children of households whose mothers work.

Regardless those results, in present study, the mother's occupational status adds explanatory capacity to the purchase of family vacations, having a positive effect on adolescent influence. So, adolescent's present greater influence when his mother has a high status, which is consistent with previous research (Watne & Winchester, 2011).

Internal validity

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

Several researchers have collected data questioning one or both parents and the adolescent in studies on adolescent influence on purchasing decisions (Watne & Winchester, 2011; Ishaque & Tufail, 2014; Shoham & Dalakas, 2005; Beatty & Talpade,

1994), which has raised the issue of perception differences between the members questioned, and subsequent lack of model internal validity. 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). Thus, in this study, the mother's inquiry was chosen, preserving internal validation of the influence construct.

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

6. CONCLUSIONS

Results found in present research allow us to conclude that: There is influence of the adolescent in the purchase of family vacations. Parental communication style, television influence, adolescent's service knowledge, and adolescent's age as purchase relevant explanatory variables. These results are innovative in the study of family purchase decisions. The adolescent influences on the purchase of vacations for family consumption is higher when parents have protective and consensual communication styles. His/her influence is also higher when the adolescent's older (15 to 19 years old). Also, adolescents who receive more television influence have greater influence on family purchases for vacations. Finally, adolescents with greater service knowledge exert more influence on family vacations purchase.

6.1 Research contributions

Present research provides several contributions to the knowledge of family consumption behavior, on a socialization perspective. Firstly, the main contribution of the present research is the suggestion of a theoretical-conceptual framework that provides explanatory capacity of the phenomenon of the adolescent's influence in the purchase decisions in the families, according to the adolescent's perception and it reinforces the importance of including the adolescent in the final decision, which is innovative in the literature. The interest of the results is reinforced by the fact that a category of service for family use has been studied, and the adolescent's influence is verified. More, the research indicated the adolescent's influence on purchase of family vacations, which is also an innovative result in traditional families. The results of the logistic regression analysis point to the parental communication style, television influence, adolescent's service knowledge, and adolescent's age as purchase relevant explanatory variables.

Secondly, results point to the relevance of considering the adolescent as an influencer in the final decision on purchasing family vacations, indicating that that family member has an important role when considering family services consumption. This is a relevant contribution since past research have studied mostly product or service categories for adolescent's use.

6.2 Business implications

The study offers a contribution to the companies by providing evidence of adolescent's influence on family vacations purchases. Given his/her 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 with protective and consensual parents. Marketeers should also focus their efforts for older adolescents, and for those adolescents who receive more television influence.

Finally, adolescents with greater service knowledge should deserve more attention from companies because they exert more influence on family vacations purchase.

If a decision is considered to be largely influenced by adolescent, then the messages should be addressed to him. This study has concluded that adolescents represent an active influential market in the family vacations, so that marketers should adopt strategies that reflect the adolescent's relative importance in those buying decisions. Thus, marketers should focus their efforts not only on adolescent satisfaction in products/services for their use, but also on those categories for family use.

6.3 Limitations and recommendations

As the main objective of the present research, in the theoretical-conceptual framework of defined research, to provide a response to the explanatory factors of the adolescent's perception of his/her influence on family vacations buying decisions, the results provided an important answer in terms of contribution, but does not entirely explain the phenomenon, and concluded that the adolescent's influence in purchasing decisions is a function of parental communication style, television influence, adolescent's service knowledge, and adolescent's age. Thus, other variables should have also been considered in the present investigation in order to provide a more complete explanation, providing a higher quality of adjustment of those models. Furthermore, it was necessary to collect data from a convenience sample, although this procedure is consistent with most studies on households (Aleti et al., 2015; Yang et al., 2014; Chaudhary & Gupta,

2012).

One last limitation relates to inquiring adolescents who, while appearing as a reliable family member in perceiving his/her influence (Isin & Alkibay, 2011), several authors have chosen to inquire one parent and the adolescent (Al-Zu'bi, 2016; Ashraf & Khan, 2016; Mau et al., 2016, 2014; Goswami & Khan, 2015; Sondhi & Basu, 2014).

6.4 Suggestions for Future Research

In addition to the products/services that may be more associated with certain patterns of family consumption characteristics, one can point out as research opportunity the study on the adolescent's influence on purchasing decisions for several other family products/services. Application to other services, like eating out, hotel services, sports and other leisure activities might let researchers reach important conclusions on this field.

Nevertheless, the services/products of perceived adolescent's influence are not properly exhausted. Research in this area should focus on the adolescent's influence on choice of services/products that are family shared versus those for parents; explore the differences of decision making between male and female across this age range will also be important. Another relevant research path should be the single-parent family study.

REFERENCES

Ahuja, R. D. & 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.

Ahuja, R. D. & 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.

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.

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.

Aleti, T., Brennan, L. & Parker, L. (2015). Family communication for the modern era: a typology, *Young Consumers*; Bradford 16, 4, 367-384, DOI= http://doi.10.1108/YC-08-2014-00471.

Ali, A., Ravichandran, N. & Batra, D. K. (2013). Children's choice of influence strategies in

family purchase decisions and the impact of demographics, *Vision*, 17, 1, 27-40, Sage Publications, DOI= http://doi.10.1177/0972262912469561.

Ashraf, M. & Khan, K. M. (2016), Adolescents' role in family decision-making for services in India, *Young Consumers*, 17, 4, 388-403, DOI= https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/YC-06-2016-00608.

Beatty, S. E. & Talpade, S. (1994). Adolescent influence in family decision making: a replication with extension, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21, 9, 332-341, DOI= http://doi.org/10.1086/209401.

Belch, G. E., Belch, M. A. & 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.

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

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.

Chaudhary, M. & Gupta, A. (2012). Children's influence in family buying process in India, *Young Consumers*; Bradford 13, 2, 161-175, DOI= https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/17473611211233512.

Chavda, H., Haley, M. & Dunn, C. (2005). Adolescent's influence on family decision-making, *Young Consumers*, World Advertising Research Center (2), 68-78, DOI= https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/17473610510701223.

Chikweche, T., Stanton, J. & 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.

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.

Commuri, S. & 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.

Darley, W. K. & 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.

Ekstrom, K. M., Tansuhaj, P. S. & 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.

Filiatrault, P. & 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

Foxman, E. R. & Tansuhaj, P. S. (1988). Adolescents' and mother's 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.

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

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

Gentina E., Butori, R., Rose, G. & Bakir, A. (2013). How national culture impacts teenage shopping behavior: Comparing French and American consumers, *Journal of Business Research*, 1-7, DOI= http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.03.033.

Goswami, S. & Khan, S. (2015). Impact of Consumer Decision-making Styles on Online Apparel Consumption in India, *Vision*, 19, 4, 303–311, DOI= http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0972262915610853.

Hutcheson, G. & Sofroniou, N. (1999). The Multivariate Social Scientist, Sage Publications.

Isin, F. & Alkibay, S. (2011). Influence of children on purchasing decisions of well-to-do families, *Young Consumers*, 12, 1, 39-52, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/174736111111114777.

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

Jenkins, R. L. (1979). The Influence of Children in Family Decision-Making: Parents' Perceptions, in NA - *Advances in Consumer Research*, 6, eds. William L. Wilkie, Ann Abor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 413-418, DOI= http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/9587/volumes/v06/NA-06.

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

Kaur, P. & 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.

Kaur, P. & Medury, Y. (2011). Impact of the internet on teenagers' influence on family purchases, *Young Consumers*, 12, 1, 27-38, DOI= http://doi.10.1108/174736111111114768.

Kaur, P. & 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.

Khoo-Lattimore, C., Prayag, G. & 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*, 4, 1-31, DOI= https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19368623.2014.914862.

Kim, C. & Lee, H. (1997). Development of family triadic measures for children's purchase influence, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Chicago, 8, 307-321, DOI= 10.2307/3151894.

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, 88-105, DOI= https://search.proquest.com/openview/8334a75287aa49563a4ef22350a3b5ed/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=46967.

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

Lee, C. K. C. & 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.

Lee, C. K. C. & 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.

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.

Maroco, J. & 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.

Mau, G., Schuhen, M. Steinmann, S. & 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.

Mau, G., Schramm-Klein, H. & 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.

Moschis, G. & 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.

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

Neulinger, A. & 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.

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.

Ritchie, J. R. & 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

Shah, R. & 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.

Shahrokh, Z. D. & 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.

Sharma, A. & 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.

Sharma, A. & 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.

Shergill, S., Sekhon, H. & 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.

Shoham, A. & 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.

Shoham, A. & 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.

Singh, R. & 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.

Sondhi, N. & Basu, R. (2015). Role of children in family purchase across Indian clusters, *Young Consumers*, 15, 4, 365-379, DOI= https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-10-2013-00402.

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.

Swinyard, W. R. & 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.

Tinson, J. S., Nancarrow, C. & 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.

Yang, Z. & Laroche, M. (2011). Parental Responsiveness and Adolescent Susceptibility to Peer

Influence: A Cross-Cultural Investigation, Journal of Business Research, 1-32.

Yang, Z., Kim, C., Laroche, M. & 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.

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

Watne, T. A. & 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.

How to cite this article:

Baía, J. P. (2019). Adolescent's Perception of his Influence on Family Vacations Purchase Decisions: A consumer socialization perspective. *International Journal of Marketing, Communication and New Media. Special Issue 5 – Tourism Marketing*, 26-53.