

Research is creating new knowledge. **Neil Armstrong**

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION OF CHENNAI AND HYDERABAD

This chapter deals with the details of the parents of both the cities and their perception. Due consideration has been given to many aspects like their perceptions with regard to the T.V. watching habits of their children, the impact of celebrity endorsement on their children, the influence of the video games under which the children are caught etc.

Chapter objectives

- 1) To find out the underlying dominant dimensions of the 13 pressurizing perception variables of the parents of Chennai and Hyderabad.
- 2) To segregate the parents into dominant heterogenous groups significantly differentiated by their pressurizing perception factors.

DIMENSIONS OF PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION VARIABLES

The factor analysis has been applied to understand the underlying dimensions of the 13 parental pressurizing perception variables and reduce them into a limited number of manageable and independent factors. The Principal Component analysis of Extraction method and Rotation method of Varimax with Kaiser Normalization have been used in the Factor analysis and the results are shown in the tables 4.1 to 4.6.

Table 4.1

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION VARIABLES

variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Shopping with children	3.90	0.955
packaging	3.87	0.921
TV influence	4.17	0.830
Nagging of children	3.35	1.186
Unhealthy food	3.24	1.242
Celebrity endorsement	3.49	1.180
Video gaming habit	3.05	1.301
Unwilling to stop video game	3.04	1.219
More family income	3.33	1.366
Work pressure	3.32	1.383
Guilty feeling	3.17	1.344
Pocket money	2.70	1.236
Peer pressure	3.62	1.202

Table 4.1 shows the descriptive statistics of the parental pressurizing perception variables which have thirteen variables in all of which T.V. influence has the highest means and the least standard deviation indicating the maximum consistency among the parental responses.

Table 4.2

**COMMUNALITIES OF THE PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION
VARIABLES**

variables	Initial	Extraction
Shopping with children	1.000	0.770
Packaging	1.000	0.694
T.V. influence	1.000	0.614
Buying for nagging	1.000	0.488
unhealthy products	1.000	0.660
Celebrity endorsement	1.000	0.625
Video gaming	1.000	0.739
Unwilling to stop video games	1.000	0.705
More family income	1.000	0.521
Work pressure	1.000	0.803
Guilty feeling	1.000	0.798
Pocket money	1.000	0.697
Peer pressure	1.000	0.502

Table 4.3

**KMO AND BARTLETT'S TEST FOR FACTORIZATION OF PARENTAL
PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION ON CHILDREN'S BUYING BEHAVIOUR**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.708
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1309.109
	Df	78
	P value	0.000

Table 4.4

TOTAL VARIANCE EXPLAINED BY THE PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS

component	Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.171	16.698	16.698
2	1.926	14.819	31.517
3	1.717	13.206	44.723
4	1.686	12.972	57.695
5	1.115	8.579	66.274

Table 4.5

PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS

Factors	Variables	Factor loading
Factor 1 Work life imbalance	Work pressure	0.889
	Guilty feeling	0.875
	More family income	0.571
Factor 2 T.V. influence	T.V. influence	0.762
	Packaging	0.754
	Celebrity endorsement	0.706
	Nagging of children	0.468
Factor 3 Video gaming	Video gaming	0.753
	Pocket money	0.749
	Unwilling to stop video gaming	0.678
Factor 4 Pocket money	Unhealthy products	0.802
	Peer pressure	0.677
Factor 5 Shopping with children	Shopping with children	0.840

Tables 4.1 to 4.5 show that with the range of communalities of the **THIRTEEN** parental pressurizing perception variables, from 0.468 to 0.889, KMO Measure of Sampling adequacy

Value of 0.708 and Chi- square value of 1309.109 at d.f of 78with P – Value of 0.000 in Barlett’s Test of Sphericity, the Factor analysis is applicable for factorization of parental pressurizing perception variables.

Five factors have been extracted and they explain 66.274% of the variance in the thirteen parental pressurizing perception variables.

The most dominant Factor is Factor 1 with the explained variance of 16.698% and it has three parental pressurizing variables of Work pressure, guilty feeling of the parents and more family income. Therefore the factor has been labelled as ‘**WORK LIFE IMBALANCE**’.

The second most dominant Factor with the explained variance of 14.819% and with four variables of T.V. influence, packaging, celebrity endorsement and nagging of children is therefore labelled as ‘**T.V. INFLUENCE**’.

The third most dominant Factor is factor 3 with the explained variance of 13.206% and has three variables of video gaming, pocket money culture and unwillingness to stop video gaming has been named as ‘**VIDEO GAMING**’

The fourth most dominant factor is Factor 4with the explained variance of 12.972% and has two variables of unhealthy products and peer pressure. Therefore the factor has been labelled as ‘**POCKET MONEY**’ as pocket money leads pester power of children to buy unhealthy products and the brands mentioned by the peers

The fifth dominant is Factor 5 which explains 8.579% of the variance and has a single variable of taking the children for shopping and has been labelled as ‘**SHOPPING WITH CHILDREN**’.

Table 4.6

**DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION
FACTORS AND TOTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION SCORE**

Descriptive statistics	Work life imbalance	T.V. influence	Video gaming	Pocket money	Shopping with children	Parental pressurizing perception Total	
Mean	9.820	14.872	8.785	6.942	3.895	44.315	
Median	10.000	16.000	9.000	7.000	4.000	46.000	
Mode	12.00	16.00	10.00	9.00	4.00	51.00	
Std. Deviation	3.3579	2.914	2.880	1.951	0.954	8.320	
Variance	11.276	8.492	8.295	3.809	0.911	69.239	
Skewness	-0.402	-0.709	-0.339	-0.484	-1.144	-0.520	
Std. Error of Skewness	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	
Kurtosis	-0.832	0.856	-0.548	-0.516	1.420	-0.515	
Std. Error of Kurtosis	0.243	0.243	0.243	0.243	0.243	0.243	
Range	12.00	16.00	12.00	8.00	4.00	41.00	
Minimum	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	20.00	
Maximum	15.00	20.00	15.00	10.00	5.00	61.00	
Q 1	25	7.000	13.000	7.000	6.000	4.000	38.000
Q 3	75	12.750	16.000	11.000	9.000	4.000	51.000

The table 4.6 reveals that with the lower Standard Deviation values, the estimated mean values of the Parental Pressurizing factors and the total score are the robust measures of those distributions.

**PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS BASED CLUSTER
FORMATION**

An attempt has been made to classify all 400 parent respondents into distinctive clusters significantly differentiated by Parental Pressurizing Perception factors by applying Quick Cluster and discriminant Analyses. The results are shown in the tables 4.7 to 4.15.

Table 4.7

QUICK CLUSTER

**PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTOR BASED INITIAL
CLUSTER MEANS**

Factors	Cluster		
	1	2	3
Worklife imbalance	13.00	3.00	3.00
T.V.influence	18.00	4.00	20.00
Video gaming	14.00	9.00	3.00
Pocket money	10.00	4.00	5.00
Shopping with children	4.00	1.00	4.00

Table 4.8

**ITERATION HISTORY OF FORMATION OF PARENTAL PRESSURIZING
PERCEPTION FACTOR BASED CLUSTERS**

Iteration	Change in Cluster Centers		
	1	2	3
1	5.178	7.551	6.137
2	0.315	0.638	0.407
3	0.114	0.364	0.509
4	0.061	0.237	0.215
5	0.038	0.091	0.080
6	0.021	0.058	0.000
7	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 4.9

PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTOR WISE FINAL CLUSTER MEANS

Factors	Cluster		
	1	2	3
Work life imbalance	12.08	7.38	5.94
T.V.influence	15.93	10.78	16.11
Video gaming	10.01	7.61	6.51
Pocket money	8.12	5.46	5.15
Shopping with children	4.03	3.45	3.96

Table 4.10

PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION CLUSTER FREQUENCY TABLE

Cluster	No. of parents	Percentage
1	233	58.25%
2	85	21.25%
3	82	20.5%
Total	400	100%

Table 4.11

PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTOR WISE TESTS OF EQUALITY OF CLUSTER MEAN VALUES

Factors	Wilks' Lambda	F	df1	df2	P value
Worklife imbalance	0.349	370.597	2	397	0.000
T.V.influence	0.465	228.378	2	397	0.000
Video gaming	0.731	73.227	2	397	0.000
Pocket money	0.492	205.204	2	397	0.000
shopping with children	0.940	12.761	2	397	0.000

Table 4.12

EIGEN VALUES OF CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS IN PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION CLUSTERS

Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical Correlation
1	2.670 ^a	73.7	73.7	0.853
2	0.952 ^a	26.3	100.0	0.698

Table 4.13

WILK'S LAMBDA TEST OF DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS IN PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION CLUSTERS

Test of Function(s)	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-square	df	P Value	inference
1 through 2	0.140	777.800	10	0.000	significant
2	0.512	264.265	4	0.000	significant

Table 4.14

STRUCTURE MATRIX OF DISCRIMINANT FACTORS IN DISCRIMINANT FACTORS IN DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS OF PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION CLUSTERS

Factors	Functions	
	1	2
Worklife imbalance	0.824*	-0.235
Pocket money	0.621*	-0.072
Video gaming	0.361*	-0.146
T.V. influence	0.384	0.892*
Shopping with children	0.109	.0186*

Table 4.15

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS IN FORMATION OF PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION CLUSTERS

Cluster number	Predicted group membership			Total
	1	2	3	
1	227	3	3	233
2	0	83	2	85
3	0	1	81	82
Total	227	87	86	400

The tables 4.6 to 4.15 show that three clusters have been formed significantly differentiated by all the parental pressurizing perception factors.

Of the two discriminant functions, the first most Discriminant function with Eigen value of 2.670 and Canonical Correlation of 0.853 and also with Wilk's Lambda of 0.140 and chi-square value of 777.800 at 10 d.f. and 0.000 level of significance explains 73.7% of variance in the differentiation. In it, the most dominant differentiating factor is Work life imbalance followed by pocket money and video gaming.

The second most discriminant function with the Eigen value of 0.952 and canonical correlation of 0.698 and also with Wilk's Lambda value of 0.512 and Chi-Square value of 264.265 at 4 d.f. and 0.000 level of significance, explains 26.3% variance in the differentiation. In that the most dominant differentiating factor is T.V. influence followed by shopping with children.

The 4.10 indicates that the first cluster formed has 233 parents constituting 58.25% of all the parents of Chennai and Hyderabad covered in the study. The second and the third clusters have 85 and 82 parents constituting 21.25% and 20.5% respectively. Table 4.15 reveals that 97.8% of the classification is correct.

Table 4.16

**DESCRIPTION OF PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS IN
DOMINANT CLUSTERS / GROUPS**

Parental pressurizing perception factors	Clusters	Mean	S.D	Rank	Description
Work life imbalance	1	12.077	1.818	1	Highest work life imbalance
	2	7.377	2.299	2	Higher work life imbalance
	3	5.939	2.104	3	High work life imbalance
T.V. influence	1	15.913	1.858	2	Higher T.V. influence
	2	10.777	2.123	3	High T.V. influence
	3	16.110	2.211	1	Highest T.V. influence
Video gaming	1	10.013	2.165	1	Highest video gaming habit
	2	7.612	2.726	2	Higher video gaming habit
	3	6.512	2.953	3	High video gaming habit
Pocket money	1	8.116	1.252	1	Highest pocket money culture
	2	5.459	1.585	2	Higher pocket money culture
	3	5.146	1.458	3	High pocket money culture
Shopping with children	1	4.034	0.765	1	Most shopping with children
	2	3.447	1.210	3	Moderate shopping with children
	3	3.963	1.012	2	More shopping with children
Total	1	50.153	4.428	1	Highest pressurizing perception
	2	34.672	2.728	3	High pressurizing perception
	3	37.670	4.889	2	Higher pressurizing perception

Table 4.16 shows that the description of the Parental pressurizing perception dominant groups is significantly differentiated by all five pressurizing perception factors.

The Highest dominant Parental Pressurizing perception Cluster is Cluster 1, in which Highest Work life imbalance prevails, Higher T.V. influence, Highest Video gaming habit, Highest pocket money culture and habit of most shopping taking the children along are seen. Therefore, this group is named as **Highest Pressurizing Perception Group**

The second dominant Parental Pressurizing Perception Cluster is Cluster 2, in which Higher Work life imbalance prevails, High T.V.influence, Higher video gaming habit, Higher pocket money culture and moderate shopping with children are seen. Therefore, this group is named as **High Pressurizing Perception Group**.

The third dominant Parental Pressurizing Perception Cluster is Cluster 3, in which High Work life imbalance prevails, Highest T.V.influence, High Video gaming habit, High pocket money culture and more shopping with children are seen. Therefore, this group is named as **Higher Pressurizing Perception Group**.

To conclude

The parental pressurizing perception variables numbering 13 were reduced to 5 independent factors of which the most dominant is Work life imbalance, followed by T.V. influence, video gaming, pocket money and shopping with children. Differentiated by 5 parental pressurizing perception factors, the parents were divided into 3 dominant groups of the Highest Parental Pressurizing Perception Group, the Higher Parental Pressurizing Perception Group and the High Parental Pressurizing Perception Group.