Original Article
ISSN (Online): 3049-2416

ShodhPrabandhan: Journal of Management Studies
July-December 2024 1(1), 122-129

A COMPREHENSIVE EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION INTO PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE, PERCEPTIONS, AND ADOPTION OF EDUCATIONAL TOYS FOR GENERATION ALPHA CHILDREN

Dr. Sudheesh Kumar K. [1]

[1] Assistant Professor, P.G. and Research Centre of Commerce, Maharajas College (Government Autonomous), Ernakulam, India

Received 25 October 2024
Accepted 23 November 2024
Published 31 December 2024

Corresponding Author

Dr. Sudheesh Kumar K.,
Sudheesh.Kumar@outlook.com

DOI
10.29121/ShodhPrabandhan.v1.i1.2024.126

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

Generation Alpha, born from 2010 onwards, stands out as the first cohort to grow up entirely in the digital age. As the children of Millennials and the younger siblings of Generation Z, they wield surprising influence over brands and family purchases, even in their early years. Their upbringing is marked by experiences unlike any before them. The toys parents choose and how they engage with their children's playtime play a powerful role in shaping young minds and perceptions of gender. Studies reveal that younger parents, those with less education, and fathers are more likely to hold traditional gender views, while older, more educated parents and mothers tend to be less conventional. Yet, when it comes to judging which toys are desirable, parents' age, education, or gender make little difference. This research adopts a quantitative approach to explore these dynamics. Interestingly, what parents buy often does not match what their children truly want. This paper aims to uncover what draws children to certain toys, what drives parents' purchasing decisions, and what expectations parents hold when shopping for toys. The goal is to pinpoint the main factors behind parents' toy choices, using both theory and real-world data.

Keywords: Adoption, Educational Toys, Generation Alpha, Parental Acceptance, Parental Perceptions, Parents and Toy Preferences

1. INTRODUCTION

The Census of India (2011) reveals that children aged 6 to 10 make up a remarkable 27% of the population. For these young minds, toys are more than just playthings; they are essential tools that spark creativity, sharpen observation, and fuel both physical and cognitive development. However, India's vast market is flooded with non-branded toys, many of which are imported from countries like China, raising pressing safety concerns because manufacturing standards are not

consistently followed. Education is a dynamic force, shaping and being shaped by every facet of life. Its evolution is tightly woven with the march of science and technology, each propelling the other forward. As education embraces new knowledge and technologies, it adapts, while breakthroughs in science and technology demand fresh approaches in the classroom.

Children quickly become savvy consumers, learning to influence family purchases from a young age. While Western research has delved deeply into how children learn these roles, studies focused on India remain scarce Kaur and Singh (2006). As cities expand and middle-income families enjoy greater spending power, and as children become more tech-savvy, high-tech toys are capturing the imaginations of the youngest generation. Yet, parents' buying patterns among ten diverge from what their children truly desire. This research aims to uncover which features make toys irresistible to children, which factors shape parents' purchasing decisions, and which expectations parents bring to the toy aisle.

The label 'Alpha Generation' was coined by McCrindle and his team in Australia. Tootell et al. (2014) recount that several names were considered before 'Alpha' emerged as the top choice, beating out contenders like Gen Tech, Digital Natives, and Net Gen. The Alpha Generation is already recognized as a force for change. Sterbenz (2015) observes that anyone born after 2010 is part of this cohort, with an astonishing 2.5 million babies joining their ranks each week. These children are immersed in a world of mobile phones, tablets, and digital devices that shape their daily routines. They adapt to technology with remarkable speed, displaying advanced skills, unique media habits, and a clear preference for innovation.

1.1. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

In this present scenario, Educational toys are very important for the kids. Due to Covid-19 situations, there are no schools or any other educational curriculum activities to serve the purpose of education. Alpha Gen kids belong to 3-10 years old kids. This age range is the milestone of each child in their brain growth and development stage. Their 90% of brain growth and development will happen in this time. So that now a days most of the Alpha gen parents choosing educational toys for their children. So this study deals with the influential factors of alpha gen parents to choose the educational toys and the effect of toy selection to determine the main toy-choice determinants.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Srinivasan et al. (2006) explained that children, especially tweens, are the largest consumers of media and entertainment products. While adults spend just around two hours a day watching television, kids are glued to the tube for over four hours a day. Datta (2008) explained that time has gone when Indian parents controlled children with an iron rod. Obedience was expected and no was a household word. But in a world where families spend "Quality Time" at the mall, those norms are going the way of the dodo. By every measure, parents are bending over backwards to please their children, over 50 percent want their children to move ahead in life. The study found that among the various toy types, children played most frequently with yank toys, fantasy play-type toys, and toys that had parts for handling. Another study revealed some factors which affect the purchase decision of mothers. Children's age is one of the factors; older children make fewer direct attempts to influence the decision of their parents, but they are also more successful with these attempts than the younger children McNeal (1969),Ward

(1972), Ward and Wackman (1972), Wells (1965). Further, parents tend to seek opinions from their older children towards the purchases; it was also discovered that with an increase in age, girls begin to make decisions towards products that are both family oriented and for personal use, while boys tend to only purchase products for their own personal agenda Mehrotra and Torges (1977). These results contribute to the overall influence mothers have on their daughters in a traditional female role as mothers are the ones who do most of the shopping McNeal (1969). Clifton et al. (1991) presented small (which elicited a one handed grasp) and large (which elicited twohanded grasps) objects in the dark and found that 6-month-olds chose the appropriate grip configuration for the object's size. Prior to trials in the dark, the large and small objects were presented in the light, and each object had a unique sound that could identify the object when heard in the dark. We concluded that infants were responding to size of the unseen objects on the basis of mental representation, a radical claim for 6-month-olds. McCarty et al. (2001) presented rods oriented vertically or horizontally out of the infant's reach, then turned out the room lights before bringing the rods within reach of 9-month-olds. A sound was emitted from the canter of the rod to specify its movement for to within reach, but the sound was the same for both positions, so offered no clue to the rod's orientation.

2.1. OBJECTIVES

- To analyse the effect of toy selection to determine the main toy-choice determinants.
- To analyses the influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design refers to the overall strategy that you choose to integrate the different components of the study in a coherent and logical way, thereby, ensuring you will effectively address the research problem; it constitutes the blueprint for the collection, measurement, and analysis of data. Structured questionnaire is used to collect primary data.

In the present study a structured presented questionnaire was used as the tool to collect data from the selected respondents. The first part of the questionnaire contains questions on personal profile which includes age, gender, marital status, income and occupation. The second section contains question related to the effect of toy selection to determine the main toy-choice determinants and the influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

3.1. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

OBJECTIVE 1: To analyse the effect of toy selection to determine the main toy-choice determinants.

- **H1:** Toy selection decisions differed according to purposes of using-related factors
- **H2:** Toy selection decisions differed according to emotional-related factors
- **H3:** Toy selection decisions differed according to informational-related factors

- **H4:** Toy selection decisions differed according to cost-related factors
- **H5:** Toy selection decisions differed according to children demographical-related factors
- **H6:** Toy selection decisions differed according to parent demographical-related factors

Table 1

Table 1 Regression Coefficient

Path	Estimate	CR	P	Variance explained
Purposes of Using-Related Factors -> Toy Selection Decisions	0.953	26.155	<0.001	90.8
Emotional-Related Factors ->Toy Selection Decisions	0.859	18.099	<0.001	86.2
Informational-Related Factors -> Toy Selection Decisions	0.886	19.692	<0.001	97.3
Cost-Related Factors -> Toy Selection Decisions	0.973	30.117	<0.001	94.7
Children Demographical-Related Factors -> Toy Selection Decisions	0.987	35.296	<0.001	78.5
Parent Demographical-Related Factors -> Toy Selection Decisions	0.929	23.173	<0.001	73.8

Source: survey data

H_1: Purposes of using-related factor is A Toy Selection Decision.

The results revealed that the purposes of using-related factors had significance in Toy Selection Decision. Purposes of Using-Related Factor as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Toy Selection Decision was 0.953, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was significant). So accept the hypothesis H_1 and conclude that Purposes of Using-Related Factors is a Toy Selection Decisions.

H_2: Emotional-Related Factor is a Toy selection Decision.

The results revealed that the Emotional-Related Factor had significant influence on decision factors as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Decision factors was 0.859, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was significant). So we accept the hypothesis H_2 and conclude that Emotional-Related Factor is a Toy Selection Decision

H_3: Informational -related factor is a Toy Selection Decision

The results revealed that the Informational -related factorhad significant influence on Decision factors as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Decision factors was 0.886, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was significant). So we accept the hypothesis $H_3$and conclude that Informational -related factoris a Toy Selection Decision

H_4: Cost-related factor is an Toy Selection Decision

The results revealed that the Cost-related factorhad significant influence on Decision factors as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Decision factors was 0.973, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was significant). So we accept the hypothesis H_4 and conclude that Cost-related factoris a Toy Selection Decision

H_5: Children Demographical factors is a Toy Selection Decision

The results revealed that the Children Demographical factors had significant influence on Decision factors as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Decision factors was 0.987, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was significant). So we accept the hypothesis H_5 and conclude that Children Demographical factors is a Toy Selection Decision

H_6: Parent Demographic related Factors is a Toy Selection Decision

The results revealed that the Parent Demographic related Factorshad significant influence on Decision factors as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Decision factors was 0.929, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was significant). So we accept the hypothesis H_6 and conclude that Parent Demographic related Factorsis a Toy Selection Decision

OBJECTIVE 2: To analyses the influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

H_1: IQ Development aspect is the influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

H_2: Feasibility aspect is the influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

H_3: Attraction isthe influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

H_4: Problem solving skill aspect is the influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

H_5: Creative aspect is the influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

H_6: Emotional and social development aspect**is** the influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

H_7: Concentration aspect isthe influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

H_8: Thinking Power aspect isthe influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

Table 2

Table 2 Regression Coefficient

Path	Estimate	CR	P	Variance explained
IQ Development aspect-> influential factor	0.714	12.566	<0.001	51
Feasibility ->influential factor	-0.006	-0.084	0.933	0
Attraction ->influential factor	0.237	3.391	0.001	5.6
Problem Solving skill->influential factor	0.562	8.923	<0.001	31.6
Creativity->influential factor	-0.119	-1.678	0.095	1.4
Emotional and social development aspect->influential factor	0.445	6.715	<0.001	19.8
Concentration ->influential factor	0.521	8.109	<0.001	27.2
Thinking power aspect->influential factor	0.342	5.002	<0.001	11.7

H_1: IQ Development aspect is the influential factors of Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys

The results exhibited in Table 2 revealed that the IQ Development aspect had significant influence on Alpha Gen Parents as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys was 0.714, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was significant). So we accept the hypothesis H_1 and conclude that IQ Development aspectleads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys

H_2: Feasibility leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

The results exhibited in Table 2 revealed that the Feasibility had no significant influence on Alpha Gen Parents as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys was -0.006, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was not significant). So we reject the hypothesis H2 and conclude that Feasibility does not lead to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys

H_3: Attraction leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

The results exhibited in Table 2 revealed that the Attraction had no significant influence on Alpha Gen Parents as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys was 0.237, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was not significant). So we reject the hypothesis H3 and conclude that Attraction does not leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys

H4: Problem Solving Skill leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

The results exhibited in Table 2 revealed that the Problem Solving Skill had significant influence on Alpha Gen Parents as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys was 0.562, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was significant). So we accept the hypothesis H4and conclude that Problem Solving Skill leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys

H5: Creativity leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

The results exhibited in Table 2 revealed that the Creativity had no significant influence on Alpha Gen Parents as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys was -0.119, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was not significant). So we reject the hypothesis H5and conclude that Creativity does not leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys

H6: Emotional and social development aspectleads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

The results exhibited in Table 2 revealed that the Emotional and social development aspect had significant influence on Alpha Gen Parents as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys was 0.445, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was significant). So we accept the hypothesis H6and conclude that Emotional and social development aspectleads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

H7: Concentration leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

The results exhibited in Table 2 revealed that the Concentration had significant influence on Alpha Gen Parents as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys was 0.521, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was significant). So we accept the hypothesis H7 and conclude that Concentration leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys

H8: Thinking power aspect leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

The results exhibited in Table 2 revealed that the Thinking power aspect had no significant influence on Alpha Gen Parents as the standardised direct effect of this construct on Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys was 0.342, which is more than 0.4 (also p value was not significant). So we reject the hypothesis H8and conclude that Thinking power aspect does not leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys

4. FINDINGS

Purposes of Using-Related Factors, Emotional-Related Factor, Informational - related factor, Cost-related factor, Children Demographical factors, Parent Demographic related Factors are the important factors considering while Toy Selection Decision process.

Thinking power aspect does not lead to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys. Concentration leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys. Emotional and social development aspect leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys. Creativity does not lead to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys. Problem Solving Skill leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys. Attraction does not lead to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys. Feasibility does not lead to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys. IQ Development aspect leads to Alpha Gen Parents to choose the educational toys.

5. CONCLUSION

Most of the previous research that investigated toy purchases concentrated mainly on the influence of child gender on toy selection. However, this study was broader and took into account more diversified factors and variable considerations such as emotional-related factors and purposes of using-related factors. One can assert that the Alpha generation is an innovative generation. Alphas use modern technology and gadgets and are digitally well equipped, both in terms of access and familiarity. However, while the impact of customized needs of this generation on the consumer market is slowly becoming clearer, there is not much clarity on how sectors like healthcare and service are going to be affected and what kind of arrangements will be made by the Alphas to adapt to the various changes that will take place around them. Alpha will be a dominant force in the use of technology and digital media.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Clifton, R. K., Perris, E. E., and Bullinger, A. (1991). Infants' Perception of Auditory Space. Developmental Psychology, 27(2), 187–197. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.27.2.187

Datta, D. (2008, January 21). Price of Indulgence. India Today, 80–88.

Kaur, P., and Singh, R. (2006). Children in Family Purchase Decision Making in India and the West: A Review. Academy of Marketing Science Review, 2006(8), 1–30.

McCarty, M. E., Clifton, R. K., and Collard, R. R. (2001). The Beginnings of Tool use by Infants and Toddlers. Infancy, 2(2), 233–256. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327078IN0202_8

McNeal, J. U. (1969). An Exploratory Study of the Consumer Behavior of Children. In J. U. McNeal (Ed.), Dimensions of consumer Behavior (255–275). Appleton-Century-Crofts.

McNeal, J. U. (Ed.). (1969). Dimensions of Consumer Behavior. Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Mehrotra, S., and Torges, S. (1977). Determinants of Children's Influence on Mothers' Buying Behavior. In W. D. Perreault, Jr. (Ed.), Advances in Consumer Research (Vol. 4). Association for Consumer Research.

Srinivasan, P., Sachitanand, R., and Shukla, A. (2006, January 1). The Tween Economy. Business Today, 53–56.

Sterbenz, C. (2015, July 2). Here's Who Comes After Generation Z—and they're Going to Change the World Forever. Business Insider.

Tootell, H., Freeman, M., and Freeman, A. (2014). Generation Alpha at the Intersection of Technology, Play and Motivation. In 2014 47th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (82–90). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2014.19

Ward, S. (1972). Effects of Television Advertising on Children and Adolescents. In G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (Eds.), Television and Social Behavior: Vol. 4. Television in Day-to-Day Life: Patterns of use (432–451). U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ward, S., and Wackman, D. B. (1972). Children's Purchase Influence Attempts and Parental Yielding. Journal of Marketing Research, 9(3), 316–319. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224377200900312

Wells, W. D. (1965). Communicating with Children. Journal of Advertising Research, 5, 2–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/00218499.1965.12519775