



Framing the value and valuing the frame? Algorithms for child safety seat use[☆]



Anjala S. Krishen^{*}, Shaurya Agarwal, Pushkin Kachroo, Robyn L. Raschke

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 4505 Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89154, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 1 January 2015

Received in revised form 1 August 2015

Accepted 1 September 2015

Available online 23 October 2015

Keywords:

Fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis

Safety

Value equation

Decision-making

Risky choice

Framing theory

ABSTRACT

This study uses both the consumption value and framing theories to examine consumers' choices when making risky decisions. This examination uses a framework of “gives” and “gets” to test the consumer's perception of value and then uses a sequential fsQCA to take the mental accounting of a risky decision. The findings indicate that the value equation provides a beneficial conceptualization of safety that can guide managers and policymakers on ways to connect consumers' perceptions of value with mechanisms that create value-based framing.

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

According to the Center for Disease Control (CDC), the leading cause of death for children is a motor vehicle accident National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC, 2014). Further, non-fatal motor vehicle accidents injure approximately 165,000 children every year (Romano & Kelley-Baker, 2015). Unfortunately, many of these injuries are preventable and are primarily due to a lack of or incorrect use of child safety seats (Greenspan, Dellinger, & Chen, 2010).

This study combines the consumption value and framing theories to examine consumers' choices when purchasing a safety seat. This examination uses a fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) because more than one causal antecedent is present. The research identifies this condition as a conjunctive cause (working together) that produces the outcome condition of the child safety seat's usage (Ragin, 2000). Further, the research shows that functional, conditional, social, emotional, and epistemic types of values influence the consumer's choice behavior in a give-versus-get framework.

The article proceeds as follows: Section 2 reviews the appropriate literature on the two theories. Section 3 introduces the fsQCA analysis of the child safety seat's usage and the variables of interest. This section also proposes the framework that combines the value equation with

framing and re-analyzes the data. Section 4 offers a discussion, conclusions, and implications.

2. Literature review

2.1. Consumption value theory.

This study adapts the theory of consumption value, which comes from economic theory and the concept of utility (Sheth, Newman, & Gross, 1991), to a context in which the use or lack of use of child safety seats exists. The original consumption value theory has three fundamental propositions to explain the choice or use of a product, namely: The use is a function of many consumption values. In any given use situation, the consumption values have differential contributions. And the consumption values are independent. Sheth et al. (1991) suggest that five types of values influence the consumer's choice behavior: functional, conditional, social, emotional, and epistemic. The functional value of a product or service revolves around the physical measurement of its features and their respective benefits. An assessment of the conditional value comes from understanding the situational factors that surround its consumption. Therefore, a scarce product might have an inappropriately high conditional value at a particular moment simply due to its scarcity. The social value centers on the normative environment of the consumer as well as the type of object or service. Thus, products with a high social value allow the consumer to appear as a high-class individual. The emotional value of a product or service involves feelings such as love, fear, and arousal. The epistemic value comes from a desire for knowledge, curiosity, or novelty-seeking (Sheth et al., 1991). From a

[☆] The authors acknowledge the support of the Office of Traffic Safety, Nevada. We also thank Arch Woodside, Boston College, and the *JBR* reviewers for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this article.

^{*} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: anjala.krishen@unlv.edu (A.S. Krishen), iitg.shaurya@gmail.com (S. Agarwal), pushkin@unlv.edu (P. Kachroo), robyn.raschke@unlv.edu (R.L. Raschke).

Table 1
Construct items.

Construct	Items
PRICEATT	1. The price of child safety seat is high.
	2. The price of child safety seat is low.
	3. Child safety seats are expensive. (Yoo, Donthu, & Lee, 2000)
RISKAVERCOMBINED	1. I would rather be safe than sorry.
	2. I want to be sure before I purchase anything.
	3. I avoid risky things. (Donthu & Garcia, 1999)
	4. I don't like to take risks.
	5. Compared to most people I know, I like to live life "on the edge."
	6. I have no desire to take unnecessary chances on anything.
	7. Compared to most people I know, I like to gamble on things. (Burton, Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, & Garretson, 1998)
ATT_SS	1. Child safety seats are too expensive to be used.
	2. To prevent injury during a crash it is always safer to use a child safety seat.
	3. It is more convenient for a passenger to hold a child.
	4. Safety seats must be changed as a child grows.
	5. It is important to use a child safety seat for a small duration trip.
	6. To prevent severe injury it is always better to use a safety seat.
PERCEIVEDKNOW	1. I have a lot of experience with child safety seats.
	2. As compared to the average person, I would say that I am highly knowledgeable about the child safety seat product category.
	3. I would describe myself as being very familiar with the child safety seat product category. (Beatty & Smith, 1987)
ATT_OBJECT	1. Child safety seats are a good idea.
	2. Child safety seats are a favorable idea.
	3. Child safety seats are a pleasant idea. (Lord, Lee, & Sauer, 1994)
PRODUCTEXPR	1. I have a great deal of skill in using child safety seats.
	2. I make use of child safety seats frequently.
	3. I have experience using child safety seats.
	4. I know how to operate child safety seats. (Griffin, Babin, & Attaway, 1996)
PRICECONSCIOUS	1. I buy as much as possible at sale prices.
	2. The lower price products are usually my choice.
	3. I look carefully to find the best value for the money. (Shim & Gehrt, 1996)
INTENTIONTOUSE	1. How often do you use a child safety seat while driving with children under the age of 14 years?
	2. How often do you use a child safety seat?
	3. How regularly do you use a child safety seat? (Sirgy et al., 1997)

value equation perspective, the perceived quality is a proxy for a get/benefit, whereas the perceived price is a give/cost. The research sees both as inputs in the perceived value that contributes to customer satisfaction and ultimately to loyalty (Gallarza, Gil-Saura, & Holbrook, 2011).

2.2. Framing theory

The concept of framing comes from the study of social movements that allows individuals to construct meaning and interpret occurrences. As such, framing allows events to become meaningful and to lead to experience and eventually to intention or action (Benford & Snow, 2000). In the realm of consumer choice, this theory forms the basis for mental accounting through a value function. This function suggests that individuals weigh pleasure and pain through the reference point of their perceptions and therefore adjust for framing effects. As such, the marketing research applies the framing theory to multiple contexts, for example, prosocial behaviors such as public transportation, recycling (Krishen, Raschke, Kachroo, LaTour, & Verma, 2014), and obesity prevention (Krishen & Bui, 2015). This study contends that when a consumer faces a decision regarding the usage of a child safety seat, he or

she will weigh the sacrifices versus the benefits to derive his or her perception of the value. In so doing, the consumer frames the information as a risk choice that comes from his or her individual predisposition and situational factors.

3. fsQCA study

3.1. Participants and measures

Using the quota convenience sampling technique of combinatorial optimization-based sample identification (Raschke, Krishen, Kachroo, & Maheshwari, 2013), graduate students collected a non-student sample of 217 respondents. The subjects had to meet the following criteria to participate: (1) be 18 or over; (2) have one or more children under the age of 14; (3) have a valid driver's license in the state of Nevada; and (4) not be enrolled as a student in a university. The study measures all of the constructs, except for the intention to use, with a 7-point Likert scale with a range of 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The intention to use construct has endpoints of 1 = not often at all to 7 = very often. Table 1 contains the scale details, and Table 2 provides the respondent demographics.

3.2. Procedure to apply fsQCA method

Since this survey uses a Likert scale, the fsQCA appropriately captures the degree of agreement of the qualitative statements (Emmenegger, Schraff, & Walter, 2014). The original values for all variables (conditions) are calibrated into membership scores ranging from zero to one. The calibrations are not the most common definition of a variable but instead are essentially represented by the degree of membership of a group of values in a category or specific condition, such as a loyal customer (Woodside & Zhang, 2013).

Table 2
Sample demographics.

Category	Frequency N = 186	Percentage
Gender		
Male	78	41.9%
Female	108	58.1%
Age		
<30	101	54.3%
31–40	85	45.7%
Education level		
High school	65	34.9%
Bachelors	71	38.2%
Graduate	14	7.5%
Other	36	19.4%
Household income		
<\$35,000	63	33.9%
\$35,000–\$65,000	57	30.6%
>\$65,000	29	15.6%
Not answered	37	19.9%
Marital status		
Married	113	60.8%
Widowed	2	1.1%
Divorced	25	13.4%
Single	46	24.7%
Number of children		
1	94	50.5%
2	65	34.9%
3	23	12.4%
4 or more	4	2.2%
Vehicles owned		
1	83	44.6%
2	88	47.3%
3	14	7.5%
4	1	.6%

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/1016896>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/1016896>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)