

One of the advantages of being disorganized is that one is always having surprising discoveries - **A.A. Milne**

CHAPTER VI

Chapter VI

ANALYSIS OF COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS AND CHILDREN OF CHENNAI AND HYDERABAD

This chapter tries to clarify the differences between the perception of the Chennai parents and the Hyderabad parents. It also throws light on the distinction between the consumption patterns of Hyderabad children and the Chennai children.

Chapter objectives

- 1) To find out the underlying dimensions of the motivational perception children of Chennai and Hyderabad to demand a particular brand or product.
- 2) To examine the various variables affecting the parents and children of Chennai and Hyderabad and the inter relatedness among those factors.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION GROUPS AND LOCATIONS

The Chi-Square test has been applied to examine the significance of association between Parental Pressurizing perception Groups and locations and the results are shown in tables 6.1 and 6.2.

Table 6.1

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION GROUPS AND LOCATIONS

Parent groups	Locations		Total
	Chennai	Hyderabad	
Highest PPG	90	143	233
Higher PPG	52	30	82
High PPG	58	27	85
Total	200	200	400

Table 6.2

SIGNIFICANCE OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION GROUPS AND LOCATIONS

	Value	Df	Asymp P value (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.264 ^a	2	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	29.708	2	0.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.737	1	0.000
N of Valid Cases	400		

The tables 6.1 and 6.2 reveal that there is significant association between the two variables of Parental Pressurizing Groups and locations.

While Hyderabad has significantly more number of parents in the highest Parental Pressurizing Perception Group than Chennai, Chennai is significantly associated with more number of parents in higher and high Parental Pressurizing Perception Groups.

Table 6.3

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE CHILDREN'S MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION GROUPS AND LOCATIONS

Children Groups	Locations		Total
	Chennai	Hyderabad	
High Children's Motivational Perception Group	69	139	208
Moderate Children's Motivational Perception Group	47	26	73
Low Children's Motivational Perception Group	84	35	119
Total	200	200	400

Table 6.4

**SIGNIFICANCE OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE CHILDREN'S
MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION GROUPS AND LOCATIONS**

	Value	Df	Asymp P.Value
Pearson Chi-Square	49.775	2	0.000
Likelihood ratio	50.940	2	0.000
Linear-by-linear association	45.982	1	0.000
N of valid cases	400		

The tables 6.3 and 6.4 reveal that there is a significant association between the two variables of Children's Motivational Perception groups and locations.

While Hyderabad has significantly more number of children in the High Children's Motivational Perception group than Chennai, Chennai is significantly associated with more number of children in Moderate and Low Children's Motivational Perception groups.

COMPARISON OF FACTOR SCORES BETWEEN THE LOCATIONS

The T-test is used to compare the means of Children factors and Parent factors between the locations Chennai and Hyderabad and the results are shown in tables 6.3 to 6.6.

Hyp1- H_0 : There is no difference in the factor mean 1 scores for children between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp2- H_0 : There is no difference in the factor mean 2 scores for children between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp3- H_0 : There is no difference in the factor mean 3 scores for children between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp4- H_0 : There is no difference in the factor mean 4 scores for children between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp5- H_0 : There is no difference in the factor mean 5 scores for children between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp6- H_0 : There is no difference in the factor mean 1 scores for parent between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp7- H_0 : There is no difference in the factor mean 2 scores for parent between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp8- H_0 : There is no difference in the factor mean 3 scores for parent between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp9- H_0 : There is no difference in the factor mean 4 scores for parent between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp10- H_0 : There is no difference in the factor mean 5 scores for parent between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Table 6.5

GROUP STATISTICS OF THE CHENNAI AND HYDERABAD CHILDREN'S MOTIVATIONAL PECEPTION

Factors	Location	Mean	Std. Deviation
Internet advertising	Chennai	13.7200	6.66662
	Hyderabad	17.6650	4.44766
Multiple influences	Chennai	29.0950	7.32902
	Hyderabad	32.5950	5.88166
Celebrity endorsement	Chennai	9.9600	3.86953
	Hyderabad	11.9200	3.52929
Residual media influence	Chennai	4.8250	1.89535
	Hyderabad	5.3250	1.43516
Advertisement acceptance	Chennai	5.2850	2.18808
	Hyderabad	5.9850	1.70272
Total children motivational perception	Chennai	62.8850	16.26637
	Hyderabad	73.4900	12.01213

Table 6.6

INDEPENDENT SAMPLE TEST FOR THE CHENNAI AND HYDERABAD CHILDREN'S MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION FACTORS

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	t	df	P Value (2-tailed)
Internet advertising	-6.962	346.856	0.000
Multiple influences	-5.267	380.177	0.000
Celebrity endorsement	-5.293	394.676	0.000
Residual media influence	-2.974	370.738	0.003
Advertisement acceptance	-3.571	375.347	0.000
Total children's motivational perception	-7.417	366.291	0.000

Table 6.7

GROUP STATISTICS OF THE CHENNAI AND HYDERABAD PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION

Factors	Location	Mean	Std. Deviation
Work life imbalance	Chennai	8.9850	3.38705
	Hyderabad	10.6550	3.12004
T.V. influence	Chennai	14.5000	3.30828
	Hyderabad	15.2450	2.40915
Video gaming	Chennai	8.0200	3.14149
	Hyderabad	9.5500	2.36335
Pocket money	Chennai	6.5650	1.87439
	Hyderabad	7.3200	1.95877
Shopping with children	Chennai	3.6950	1.13508
	Hyderabad	4.0950	0.67695
Total parental pressurizing perception	Chennai	41.7650	8.41271
	Hyderabad	46.8650	7.41496

Table 6.8

INDEPENDENT SAMPLE TEST FOR THE PARENTAL PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	t	df	P Value (2-tailed)
Work life imbalance	-5.129	395.346	0.000
T.V. influence	-2.574	363.734	0.010
Video gaming	-5.504	369.605	0.000
Pocket money	-3.938	397.231	0.000
Taking the children for shopping	-4.280	324.664	0.000
Total parental pressurizing perception	-6.432	391.821	0.000

From Tables 6.5 to 6.8 we infer the following results:

Hyp1: Since the T Tests is significant (sig. value is less than 0.05) the null hypothesis is rejected and we conclude that there is a significant difference in child factor 1 (Internet advertising) between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp2: Since the T Tests is significant (sig. value is less than 0.05) the null hypothesis is rejected and we conclude that there is a significant difference in child factor 2 (packaging, shopping with parents, pestering parents, celebrity endorsement, employed parents, T.V. influence, brand recognition) between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp3: Since the T Tests is significant (sig. value is less than 0.05) the null hypothesis is rejected and we conclude that there is a significant difference in child factor 3 (celebrity endorsement leading to junk food consumption) between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp4 since the T Tests is significant (sig. value is less than 0.05) the null hypothesis is rejected and we conclude that there is a significant difference in child factor 4 (radio and magazine) between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp5: Since the T Tests is significant (sig. value is less than 0.05) the null hypothesis is rejected and we conclude that there is a significant difference in child factor 5 (Advertisement acceptance) between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp6: Since the T Tests is significant (sig. value is less than 0.05) the null hypothesis is rejected and we conclude that there is a significant difference in parent factor 1 (work life imbalance) between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp7: Since the T Tests is significant (sig. value is less than 0.05) the null hypothesis is rejected and we conclude that there is a significant difference in parent factor 2 (T.V. influence) between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp8: Since the T Tests is significant (sig. value is less than 0.05) the null hypothesis is rejected and we conclude that there is a significant difference in parent factor 3 (video gaming) between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp9 Since the T Tests is significant (sig. value is less than 0.05) the null hypothesis is rejected and we conclude that there is a significant difference in parent factor 4 (pocket money) between Hyderabad and Chennai.

Hyp10: Since the T Tests is significant (sig. value is less than 0.05) the null hypothesis is rejected and we conclude that there is a significant difference in parent factor 5 (Shopping with children) between Hyderabad and Chennai.

To conclude

There is significant difference between Chennai and Hyderabad in each of the Children's Motivational Perception factors and also in Total Perception. The Hyderabad children have significantly higher Motivational Perception than the Chennai children not only in the Total Perception but also in each of their Motivational Perception factors.

There is significant difference between Chennai and Hyderabad in each of the Parental Pressurizing Perception factors and also in Total Perception. The Hyderabad parents have significantly higher Pressurizing Perception than the Chennai parents not only in the Total Perception but also in each of their Pressurizing Perception factors.

INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION FACTORS ON JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION HABIT AMONG THE CHENNAI CHILDREN

The Multiple Regression Analysis has been applied to study the significance of the influence of characteristics and the Motivational Perception factors on junk food consumption habit among the Chennai children respondents and the results are shown in tables 6.9 to 6.12.

Table 6.9

MULTIPLE REGRESSION RESULTS OF INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION FACTORS OF CHENNAI CHILDREN ON THEIR JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.728 ^d	0.531	0.521	11.871

Table 6.10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION FACTORS OF CHENNAI CHILDREN ON THEIR JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P Value
Regression	30895.088	4	7723.772	54.809	0.000 ^d
Residual	27338.831	194	140.922		
Total	58233.920	198			

Table 6.11

CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION FACTORS OF THE CHENNAI CHILDREN SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCING THEIR JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION

Influencing Factors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	P value
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-11.644	3.547		-3.283	0.001
Internet marketing	0.650	0.172	0.253	3.781	0.000
Multiple influences	0.753	0.136	0.322	5.516	0.000
Network Friends no.	0.030	0.005	0.324	5.487	0.000
No. of hours watching T.V. per week	0.225	0.110	0.103	2.058	0.041

Table 6.12

CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION FACTORS OF THE CHENNAI CHILDREN NOT SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCING THEIR JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION

Non influencing variables	Beta In	t	P value
Age of child	-0.086 ^d	-1.524	0.129
Gender of the child	0.050 ^d	1.002	0.318
social networking membership	0.013 ^d	0.201	0.841
Social Network usage period	0.081 ^d	1.356	0.177
Opinion on Network usefulness	-0.093 ^d	-1.647	0.101
Celebrity endorsement	0.028 ^d	0.472	0.638
Radio and magazine	0.021 ^d	0.372	0.710
Advertisement acceptance	-0.048 ^d	-0.879	0.380
Internet surfing hours per day	-0.123 ^d	-1.948	0.053
social sites hours per day	-0.007 ^d	-0.104	0.918
Mobile ownership	-0.017 ^d	-0.318	0.751

The regression equation of characteristics and the Motivational perception factors of Chennai children on their junk food consumption habit

Equation 6.1

Junk food consumption = $-11.644 + 0.650$ (Internet marketing) $+ 0.753$ (multiple influence) $+ 0.030$ (NW friends number) $+ 0.225$ (number of hours of TV watching per week).

Internet marketing, multiple influences, network friendship and T.V. Watching of the Chennai children have positive significant influence on the junk food consumption. In the case of Chennai children, when the network friends are more, the consumption of junk food is also high. Also when the T.V. watching is more the junk food consumption is high. When the networking friendship and T.V. watching are less, the junk food is also less consumed.

The other variables have no significant influence on the junk food consumption habit of the Chennai children.

INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION FACTORS ON JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION AMONG HYDERABAD CHILDREN

The Multiple Regression Analysis has been applied to study the significance of influence of characteristics and Motivational perception factors on junk food consumptions habit among Hyderabad children respondents and the results are shown in tables 6.13 to 6.16.

Table 6.13

MULTIPLE REGRESSION RESULT OF INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION FACTORS OF THE HYDERABAD CHILDREN ON THEIR JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.237 ^a	0.056	0.051	12.464
0.290 ^b	0.084	0.075	12.309
0.327 ^c	0.107	0.094	12.183

Table 6.14

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION FACTORS OF THE HYDERABAD CHILDREN ON THEIR JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P Value
Regression	3492.814	3	1164.271	7.845	0.000 ^c
Residual	29089.541	196	148.416		
Total	32582.355	199			

Table 6.15

**CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION FACTORS OF THE
HYDERABAD CHILDREN SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCING THEIR JUNK FOOD
CONSUMPTION**

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	P value
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
NW Friends no.	0.013	0.005	0.185	2.421	0.016
Celebrity endorsement	0.687	0.250	0.189	2.748	0.007
Age of child	0.942	0.417	0.174	2.262	0.025

Table 6.16

**CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVATIONAL PERCEPTION FACTORS OF THE
HYDERABAD CHILDREN NOT SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCING THEIR JUNK
FOOD CONSUMPTION**

Variables	Beta In	T	P value
Gender	-0.051 ^c	-0.751	0.453
social network membership	-0.054 ^c	-0.645	0.519
Social network usage period	0.087 ^c	1.027	0.306
Opinion on Network usefulness	0.041 ^c	0.545	0.586
Internet advertising	0.062 ^c	0.758	0.449
Multiple influences	0.084 ^c	1.002	0.317
Radio & magazine	0.089 ^c	1.318	0.189
Advertisement acceptance	0.064 ^c	0.794	0.428
T.V. watching hours per day	-0.106 ^c	-1.571	0.118
Internet surfing hours per day	0.044 ^c	0.634	0.527
Social networking hours per day	0.019 ^c	0.264	0.792
Mobile ownership	0.082 ^c	1.043	0.298

The regression equation of characteristics and motivational Perception factors of Hyderabad children on their junk food consumption

Equation 6.2

$$\text{Junk food consumption} = 10.953 + 0.013 (\text{NW friends' number}) + 0.687 (\text{Celebrity endorsement}) + 0.942 (\text{age of the child})$$

The network friends, celebrity endorsement and the age of the Hyderabad children positively influence their junk food consumption. More the network friends, more the attraction towards celebrity endorsed brands and higher the age of a child, more is his / her consumption of junk food in the case of Hyderabad children and vice versa.

The other variables do not exert significant influence on the junk food eating habits of the Hyderabad children.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION OF CHENNAI AND HYDERABAD CHILDREN

The t- test has been applied to examine the significance and difference between the Hyderabad and the Chennai children in their junk food consumption habits.

Table 6.17
GROUP STATISTICS OF THE CONSUMPTION OF JUNK FOOD BY THE CHILDREN OF CHENNAI AND HYDERABAD

Location	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Hyderabad	36.64	12.796	0.905
Chennai	24.94	17.118	1.210

Table 6.18

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION BETWEEN
THE CHILDREN OF CHENNAI AND HYDERABAD**

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	t	df	P Value (2-tailed)
Equal variances not assumed	7.742	368.471	0.000

From tables 6.17 and 6.18, it is evident that the Hyderabad children consume significantly more junk food than the Chennai children.

INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS OF HYDERABAD PARENTS ON JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION OF THEIR CHILDREN

The Multiple Regression analysis has been applied to study the significance of influence of characteristics and Pressurizing Perception factors of Hyderabad parents on junk food consumption of their children respondents and the results are shown in tables 6.19 and 6.22.

Table 6.19

MULTIPLE REGRESSION RESULT OF INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS OF HYDERABAD PARENTS ON JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION OF THEIR CHILDREN

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.207 ^a	0.043	0.038	12.551

Table 6.20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS OF HYDERABAD PARENTS ON JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION OF THEIR CHILDREN

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P value.
Regression	1390.973	1	1390.973	8.830	0.003 ^a
Residual	31191.382	198	157.532		
Total	32582.355	199			

Table 6.21

CHARACTERISTICS AND PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS OF THE HYDERABAD PARENTS SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCING JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION OF THEIR CHILDREN

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	P Value
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	32.746	1.581		20.708	0.000
Mobile ownership	5.677	1.911	0.207	2.971	0.003

Table 6.22

CHARACTERISTICS AND PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS OF THE HYDERABAD PARENTS NOT SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCING JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION OF THEIR CHILDREN

variables	Beta In	t	P Value
Age of parent	0.031 ^a	0.404	0.687
Gender of the parent	-0.045 ^a	-0.647	0.518
Opinion on Social network usefulness	-0.134 ^a	-1.895	0.060
Worklife imbalance	0.122 ^a	1.752	0.081
T.V.influence	-0.002 ^a	-0.030	0.976
Video gaming	0.092 ^a	1.325	0.187
Pocket money	0.121 ^a	1.747	0.082
Shopping with children	0.107 ^a	1.544	0.124

The regression equation of characteristics and Pressurizing Perception factors of Hyderabad parents on junk food consumption of their children

Equation 6.3

Junk food consumption = 32.746+5.677 (mobile ownership) -

Tables 6.19 to 6.22 clearly show that the Hyderabad parents have expressed that junk food consumption habit of the children is significantly influenced by the mobile ownership of the

children. Children who have own mobile phones significantly consume more junk food than those who do not own mobile phones.

INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS OF CHENNAI PARENTS ON JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION OF THEIR CHILDREN

The Multiple Regression analysis has been applied to study the significance of influence of characteristics and Pressurizing Perception factors of Chennai parents on junk food consumption of their children respondents and the results are shown in tables 6.23 to 6.26.

Table 6.23

MULTIPLE REGRESSION RESULT OF INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS OF CHENNAI PARENTS ON JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION OF THEIR CHILDREN

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.590 ^e	0.348	0.332	13.996

Table 6.24

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE INFLUENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AND PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS OF CHENNAI PARENTS ON JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION OF THEIR CHILDREN

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P value
Regression	20313.355	5	4062.671	20.741	0.000 ^e
Residual	38000.800	194	195.880		
Total	58314.155	199			

Table 6.25

CHARACTERISTICS AND PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS OF THE CHENNAI PARENTS SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCING JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION OF THEIR CHILDREN

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	P Value
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-18.209	5.187		-3.510	0.001
Worklife imbalance	0.805	0.344	0.159	2.342	0.020
TV influence	1.593	0.313	0.308	5.084	0.000
Mobile ownership	9.933	2.200	0.290	4.514	0.000
Video gaming	1.220	0.345	0.224	3.534	0.001
Social network useful	-6.916	2.360	-0.190	-2.931	0.004

Table 6.26

CHARACTERISTICS AND PRESSURIZING PERCEPTION FACTORS OF THE CHENNAI PARENTS NOT SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCING JUNK FOOD CONSUMPTION OF THEIR CHILDREN

	Beta In	T	P value
Age of parent	-0.002 ^e	-0.024	0.981
Gender	0.095 ^e	1.606	0.110
Pocket money	0.060 ^e	0.682	0.496
Taking children for shopping	0.049 ^e	0.787	0.432

The regression equation of characteristics and pressurizing perception factors of the Chennai parents on the junk food consumption habit of their children

Equation 6.4

Junk food consumption = -18.209+0.805(work life imbalance)+1.593(T.V.

Influence) + 9.933 (mobile ownership) +1.220 (video gaming)-6.916(Social network useful)

It is evident from the tables 6.25 and 6.26 that Work life imbalance, T.V. influence, Mobile ownership, video gaming and social networking usefulness have significant influence on the junk food consumption habit of the children of the Chennai parents.

Work life imbalance, T.V. influence and video gaming of the children have positive and significant influence on the junk food consumption habit. In other words, higher the work pressure, influence of T.V and the video gaming, perception factors of the parents of Chennai, higher is the junk food consumption of the children and vice versa.

The Mobile ownership of the children in Chennai is significantly influencing their junk food consumption. The parents of Chennai children also feel that those children who have mobile phones have significantly higher consumption of junk food than those who do not have.

The Chennai parents who consider Social networking is useful, have children with significantly lesser consumption of junk food than those who do not have such opinion.

To conclude

- Internet marketing happens to be the most dominant factor influencing the children's motivational perception followed by multiple influences like packaging, peer pressure, friend's opinion, pester power, celebrity endorsement, influence of T.V. and brand recognition. The third most dominant factor is celebrity endorsement which attracts the children to a great extent. Children tend to believe that the celebrity endorsed brands would be of good quality. They also prefer buying celebrity endorsed brands. The next dominant factor is residual media influence which includes radio and magazine advertisements and the final factor is advertisement acceptance which speaks as to how the children perceive

advertisements and trusts that the messages in the commercials are true. This makes the children accept the advertisements

- Even though the parents of Chennai and Hyderabad have high level of pressurizing perception, the Hyderabad parents have significantly higher pressurizing perception than Chennai parents. Even factor wise analysis between the Chennai and the Hyderabad parents reveals the Hyderabad parents have significantly more pressurizing perception than the Chennai parents.
- In the case of children as well, the motivational perception of the Hyderabad children is higher than that of the Chennai children. It is the case with every factor which affects the motivational perception of the children.
- While the highest Parental Pressurizing Perception is associated with Hyderabad, the higher Parental Pressurizing Perception and the high Parental Pressurizing Perception are associated with the Chennai. While the High Motivational Perception is associated with the Hyderabad children, the Moderate Motivational Perception and the Low Motivational Perception are associated with the children of Chennai.
- The parents of Hyderabad feel that the possession of mobile phones by the children significantly leads to higher consumption of junk food while the parents of Chennai feel that their work life imbalance, the influence exerted by T.V. and video gaming habit of their adolescent children lead to more number of visits to the junk food joints. They also opine that possession of mobile phones by their children also is one of the reasons to prefer junk food.