A Study on Challenges Faced by Parents during Buying Decision of Toys for their Children

Ms Pooja Rani[1], Dr. Ashish Kumar[2] and Dr.Pushp Deep Dagar[3]
[1]Assistant Professor of Commerce, Govt. PG College for Women, Rohtak and Research Scholar of Commerce, Starex University, Gurugram, Haryana
[2]Assistant Professor of Commerce, Starex University, Gurugram, Haryana
[3]Assistant Professor of Commerce, Govt. PG College for Women, Rohtak

Abstract:
Wood or porcelain dolls were used for playing by the middle class girls in the 19th century. They had skipping ropes; model shops and dolls houses were also available. Toy trains, marbles and toy soldiers were available for boys.Toy boats were also used for playing. As per Cambridge English Corpus"It is a rather elegant tool one can use to engage in social activities and share ideas or perhaps coerce others to share their toys."
Research object of thestudy is the challenges faced by parents during buying decision related to toys for their children.Scope of the Study is basically limited up to only challenges related to deceptive trade practice in the area Gurugram district. Hypothesis testing will be find out significant difference between demographic factors (gender wise, age wise and education level) and challenges related to deceptive trade practice.

Keywords: Challenges, parents, buying, decision, toys, children and Gurugram

DOI Number: 10.48047/NQ.2022.20.13.NQ88497 **Neuroquantology 2022; 20(13): 4093-4101**

Introduction: As per Cambridge English Corpus"Furthermore, children manifested a marked increase in pretend-play with toy objects that were replicas of real objects specifically designed to stand for other objects."Earlier than the twentieth century youngsters had few toys and those they did have were precious. Furthermore kids did now not have plenty time to play. Most of the children went to school they wanted their parents to help them in doing simple job across the residence the field.Comparable video games had been played by children with other children. They also played with toyse.gspinning tops, marbles, dolls, ball, and timber animals etc.

There are various challenges faced by parents during buying decisions of toys for their children.

1. Toys quality is important issue for parents while taking buying decision of a toy.
2. Parents face difficulties in taking warranty and guarantee of toys.
3. They face challenges to know the return procedure of the toy.
4. They have many issues to know about organisation polices related to toy.

5. They have problem to know the refund procedure of the toy.
6. Theyhave difficulties due supply of inferior goods.
7. They face many problems due adulteration of good.
8. They face difficulties due lost or damaged risk.
9. They face problems due misleading advertising.
10. They can face card data security risk.
11. They face server error problem at payment time.
12. They face liquidity risk due to server error.
13. They face problem when payment cannot be verified until the internet connection is restored.

Review of Literature

Vaishnavi at el (2020)analysed the repurchase behaviour of parents based on retailer records of five majorof the toy segment in Chennaiand identified their behaviour by this study. The study identified the existing research gap through extensive literature review.The study analysed the data through path analysis. The results were found that direct influencing factors for repurchase behaviour wereemotional buying, hedonic shopping and behaviour.Indirect influencing factorwas onlya pester power. **Chawla at el (2020)**defined the children adopted factors those influence the buying decision of parents.Research object of this study to find out children adopted factors. For hypothesis testing, the factors on demographics profile (age and gender) were used. Descriptive and exploratory methods were used to find the results. The results were found the homogenous decision in case of selection decision of toys as per gender feature and the heterogeneous decision in case of girls and boys favourite cartoon characters.**Laukinnen et al (2016)**defined thebrand image is significantly predicted by performance of brand which findstheloyalty of a brandand also check the acquisition of consumers. With their children stratification, the parents obviously tend to get the overpowering feel so they wouldplan in future to buy a same brand product.

Research Methodology

Research Object: To study the challenges faced by parents during buying decision related to toys for their children.

Scope of this Study: The study basically limited up to onlychallenges related to deceptive trade practicein the area Gurugramdistrict.

Research Design: Exploratory cum Descriptive Research Design

Collection of Data: Both (primary source and secondary source)

Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between demographic factors (gender wise, age wise and education level)and challenges related to deceptive trade practice.

Software use: SPSS and Ms-Excel

Sample testing method: Percentage, mean, standard deviation, Cronbach's alpha, t- test, ANOVA test and Post Hoc Tests

Sampling Method: Convenience Sampling

Analysis and Interpretation

A. Demographic Profile

1. Toys buy or not by parents for their children

	Frequency	**Percent**
Yes	104	94.55
No	6	5.45
Total	110	100

Source: Primary Data

The table represents the frequency and percentage of toys buy or not by parents for their children. 104 parents (94.55percent) said that they buy the toys for their children. Only 6 parents (5.45percent) said that they don't buy the toys.The study is related to those parents whose buy the toys. Next part of questionnaire only filled them.

2. Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	46	44.23
Female	58	55.77
Total	104	100

Source: Primary Data

The table shows that 47 parents were male category and 62 parents from female category.

3. Age

Age	Frequency	Percent
20-25	14	13.46
25-30	28	26.92
30-35	26	25.00
35-40	20	19.23
40-45	13	12.50
Above 45	3	2.89
Total	104	100

Source: Primary Data

Above table shows that the majority of parents belong to 25–30 age groups i.e 28 parents (26.92 percent) followed by 30-35, 35-40, 20-25, 40-45 and above 45 i.e26 parents (25%), 20 parents (19.23%), 14 parents (13.46%), 13 parents (12.50%) and 3 parents (2.89%).

Educational level

Educational level	Frequency	Percent
Up to 12^{th}	5	4.81
Under Graduate	49	47.12
Post Graduate	36	34.61
Doctorate	14	13.46
Total	104	100.0

Source: Primary Data

This table represents that 49 parents (47.12%)are under graduate 36 parent followed by (34.61 %), 14 parents (13.46%) and 5 parents (4.81%) are post graduate, doctorate and up to 12^{th} respectively.

5. **Employment status**

Employment status	Frequency	Percent
Businessmen/ Self employed	21	20.19
Contractual employee	13	12.50
Govt. employee	25	24.04
Private employee	31	29.81
Unemployment	14	13.46

Total	104	100.0

Source: Primary Data

Above table shows that the majority of the parents i.e 31 (29.81%) belong to private employees. 25 (24.04%), 21 (20.19 percent), 14 (13.46 percent) parents are govt. employees, businessmen/ self employed and unemployed. The rest only 13 (12.50 percent) parents are contractual employees.

6. **Annual family income (Rs. in lakh)**

Annual Income	Frequency	Percent
Up to 3	17	16.35
3 to 6	29	27.88
6 to 9	31	29.81
Above 9	27	25.96
Total	104	100.0

Source: Primary Data

This table reveals the annual family income of parents, the most of the parents lies in 6 to 9 groups of income i.e 31 (29.81%) parents. 29 (27.88%), 27 (25.96) and 17 (16.35) parents have annual income in the range of 3 to 6, above 9 and up to3 lakhs respectively.

B. Research object: To study challenges related to deceptive trade practice in the area Gurugram district.

Descriptive Statistics N=104

Challenges	Mean	Std. Deviation
I face difficulties due supply of inferior goods.	3.66	0.867
I face difficulties due adulteration of product.	3.95	0.792
I face difficulties due lost or damaged risk.	3.70	0.824
I face difficulties due misleading advertising.	3.72	0.688

Source: Primary Data

Above table represents the mean and standard deviation value of 4 statements ofchallenges related to deceptive trade practice faced by parents during buying decision. The maximum mean score by adulteration of product with 3.95, followed by misleading advertising, lost or damaged risk and inferior goods with 3.72, 3.70 and 3.66 respectively. Mean score of all statements was greater than 3 so the results were accepted. The highest standard deviation value was observed by inferior goods (0.867) and lowest value was observed bymisleading advertising (0.688). All statements values of SD lie between 0 to1. So results were also accepted.

Reliability ofchallenges related to deceptive trade practiceis 0.863 of four items which is greater than 0.7 as per Nunnally, 1978.It was found fit and reliable as per calculated Cronbach's alpha value.

Ho1: There is insignificant difference between gender wise challenges related to deceptive trade practice

T-test

Hypothesis	Sig.
Between issues related to supply of inferior goods and gender	0.380
Between issues relating to adulteration of goods and gender	0.109
Between delivery and logistics issues like lost or damaged while in transit and gender	0.086

Between misleading advertising and gender	0.321

Source: Primary Data

Above table reveals that the p-value of all caseswerefound greater than 0.05 so null hypotheses is accepted in all above cases.

H02: There is insignificant difference between age wise challenges related to deceptive trade practice

Hypothesis	**Levene Test**	**ANOVA Test**	**Welch Test**
	Sig.	Sig.	|Sig.
Between age wise issues related to supply of inferior goods	.334	.070	
Between age wise issues relating to adulteration of goods	.097	.067	
Between age wise delivery and logistics issues like lost or damaged while in transit	.119	.223	
Between age wise issue related to misleading advertising	.024		**.014***

Source: Primary Data

***shows the mean difference is significant at 0.05 level**

Above table shows that the p-value of all cases were found greater than 0.05 except one case i.e significant difference between age wise issue related to misleading advertising (p value is .024<.050)through levene test. So Welch test will be applied in this case otherwise ANOVA test will be applicable. Ifound the p-values throughAnova test in first three cases. P –value of first three cases was greater than 0.05so null hypotheses will be accepted.I found the p-value of theage wise issue related to misleading advertising through Welch test was 0.014 which is less than 0.05 so the study supports the alternative hypothesis. Now I will check the significance difference of individual by post hoc method (Games-Howell).

Post Hoc Tests(Games-Howell)

Dependent Variable	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Issue related to misleading advertising	20-25	25-30	-.061	.139	.998
		30-35	-.148	.142	.903
		35-40	-.063	.157	.999
		40-45	.385	.223	.522
		Above 45	-.583	.211	.083
	25-30	20-25	.061	.139	.998
		30-35	-.086	.120	.979
		35-40	-.002	.137	1.000
		40-45	.446	.210	.288
		Above 45	-.522	.197	.112
	30-35	20-25	.148	.142	.903
		25-30	.086	.120	.979
		35-40	.085	.140	.991
		40-45	.532	.212	.134
		Above 45	-.435	.199	.268
	35-40	20-25	.063	.157	.999
		25-30	.002	.137	1.000

		30-35	-.085	.140	.991
		40-45	.448	.222	.343
		Above 45	-.520	.210	.153
	40-45	20-25	-.385	.223	.522
		25-30	-.446	.210	.288
		30-35	-.532	.212	.134
		35-40	-.448	.222	.343
		Above 45	-.968*	.263	**.006***
	Above 45	20-25	.583	.211	.083
		25-30	.522	.197	.112
		30-35	.435	.199	.268
		35-40	.520	.210	.153
		40-45	.968*	.263	**.006***

Source: Primary Data

***shows the mean difference is significant at 0.05 level**

This table revealsthe significance difference between at least one variable with other variables from age categories. Challenges related to deceptive trade practicewasdependent variable. I found the significant difference between issue related to misleading advertising of select individuals and age category namely, 40-45 and above 45 was0.006. I found other groups were insignificant with issue related to misleading advertising and individual variable with rest variables of age groups.

H03: There is insignificant difference between education wise challenges related to deceptive trade practice

Hypothesis	Levene Test	ANOVA Test	Welch Test
	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.
Between education wise issues related to supply of inferior goods	.172	**.000***	
Between education wise issues relating to adulteration of goods	.392	**.000***	
Between education wise issue related to delivery and logistics issues like lost or damaged while in transit	.045		.124
Between education wise issue related to misleading advertising	.242	**.006***	

Source: Primary Data

***shows the mean difference is significant at 0.05 level**

Above table reveals that the p-value of all cases were found greater than 0.05 except one case i.e significant difference between education wise issue related to delivery and logistics issues like lost or damaged while in transit (p value is .045<.050) through levene test. So Welch test will be applied in this case otherwise ANOVA test will be applicable. In case of Anova test, I found all p-values were less than 0.05. Now I will apply post hoc test (Tukey HSD) to find out the individual significance difference. I found the p-value of the education wise issue related to delivery and logistics issues like lost or damaged while in transit through Welch test was 0.124 which is greater than 0.05 so the study supports the null hypothesis.

Post Hoc Tests(Tukey HSD)

Dependent Variable	(I) Educational level	(J) Educational level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Issues related to supply of inferior goods	Up to 12th	Under Graduate	-.101	.151	.907
		Post Graduate	.235	.156	.439
		Doctorate	.225	.182	.606
	Under Graduate	Up to 12th	.101	.151	.907
		Post Graduate	.336*	.086	**.001***
		Doctorate	.326	.127	.056
	Post Graduate	Up to 12th	-.235	.156	.439
		Under Graduate	-.336*	.086	**.001***
		Doctorate	-.010	.134	1.000
	Doctorate	Up to 12th	-.225	.182	.606
		Under Graduate	-.326	.127	.056
		Post Graduate	.010	.134	1.000
Issues relating to adulteration of goods	Up to 12th	Under Graduate	-.560*	.179	**.015***
		Post Graduate	-.564*	.183	**.016***
		Doctorate	-.136	.201	.906
	Under Graduate	Up to 12th	.560*	.179	**.015***
		Post Graduate	-.004	.090	1.000
		Doctorate	.424*	.123	**.004***
	Post Graduate	Up to 12th	.564*	.183	**.016***
		Under Graduate	.004	.090	1.000
		Doctorate	.428*	.128	**.005***
	Doctorate	Up to 12th	.136	.201	.906
		Under Graduate	-.424*	.123	**.004***
		Post Graduate	-.428*	.128	**.005***
Issue related to misleading advertising	Up to 12th	Under Graduate	-.645*	.234	**.040***
		Post Graduate	-.603	.237	.065
		Doctorate	-.554	.252	.135
	Under Graduate	Up to 12th	.645*	.234	**.040***
		Post Graduate	.042	.098	.974
		Doctorate	.091	.130	.896
	Post Graduate	Up to 12th	.603	.237	.065
		Under Graduate	-.042	.098	.974
		Doctorate	.049	.136	.984
	Doctorate	Up to 12th	.554	.252	.135
		Under Graduate	-.091	.130	.896
		Post Graduate	-.049	.136	.984

Source: Primary Data

***shows the mean difference is significant at 0.05 level**

This table reveals the significance difference between at least one variable with other variables from education categories. Challenges related to deceptive trade practicewas dependent variable. I found the significant difference between issues related to supply of inferior goods of select individuals and education categories namely, under Graduate and post Graduate was 0.001.It was also found the significant difference between issues relating to adulteration of goods transit of select individuals and education category namely, up to 12th and under graduate, up to 12th and post graduate, under graduate and doctorate, post graduate and doctorate were .015, .016, 0.004 and 0.005 respectively. I found the significant difference between issue related to misleading advertising of select individuals and education categories namely, up to 12th and under graduate was0.040. Others groups were found insignificant with issues related to supply of inferior goods and individual variable, issue delivery and logistics issues like lost or damaged while in transitand individual variable, issue related to misleading advertising and individual variable with other variables of education level groups.

Finding and conclusion:

1. Reliability was found fit and reliable. Through Cronbach's alpha test, reliability was tested. It was found reliable and fit for challenges related to deceptive trade practice. It was 0.86 which is acceptable.
2. Mean scores of challenges related to deceptive trade practicefor parents were greater than 3 those were acceptable.Standard deviation of challenges related to deceptive trade practicewas less than 1 so data is more reliable.
3. I found the insignificant difference between gender wise challenges related to deceptive trade practice through t-test.
4. In case of insignificant difference between age wise challenges related to deceptive trade practice, through levene test all cases p values were greater than 0.05 except issue related to misleading advertising (p value is .024<.050). Then I applied Welch test and again find p-value was less than 0.05. Then I applied Post hoc test (Games-Howell).to find out the individual significant difference. It was found the significant difference between issue related to misleading advertising of select individuals and age category namely, 40-45 and above 45 was 0.006.
5. P-value of all cases through levene test were found insignificant except one case i.e significant difference between education wise issue related to delivery and logistics issues like lost or damaged while in transit. In case of Anova test, I found all p-values were significant. Then I found the significant difference between issues related to supply of inferior goods of select individuals and education categories. It was 0.001 in graduate and post graduate. Second, it was also found the significant difference between issues relating to adulteration of goodsof select individuals and education category namely, up to 12th and under graduate, up to 12th and post graduate; under graduate and doctorate, post graduate and doctorate were .015, .016, 0.004 and 0.005 respectively.Last, I found the significant difference between issue related to misleading advertising of select individuals and education categories namely, up to 12th and under graduate was 0.040.

References:

- Chawla, N., & Mehta, R. (2020). Children's Influence on Parent's Purchasing Decision in Toy Industry. Pacific Business Review International, 13(3), 127-137.
- Vaishnavi, B., & Justus, F. S. Toy Repurchase behaviour among parents.
- Hirvonen, S., Laukkanen, T., &Salo, J. (2016). Does brand orientation help B2B SMEs in gaining business growth?. Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing.
- Cook, G. (2014). Customer experience in the omni-channel world and the challenges and opportunities this presents. Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice, 15, 262-266.
- Kennedy, A. (2006). Electronic customer relationship management (eCRM):

Opportunities and challenges in a digital world.

- Pioch, E. A., & Schmidt, R. A. (2000). Consumption and the retail change process: a comparative analysis of toy retailing in Italy and France. The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research, 10(2), 183-203.
- Alajoutsijärvi, K., Mannermaa, K., &Tikkanen, H. (2000). Customer relationships and the small software firm: A framework for understanding challenges faced in marketing. Information & Management, 37(3), 153-159.
- https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/toy
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Standard_deviation
- https://www.iuj.ac.jp/faculty/kucc625/method/anova.html
- https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6813708/
- https://stats.oarc.ucla.edu/spss/faq/what-does-cronbachs-alpha-mean/
- https://kb.iu.edu/d/bctl
- https://statisticsbyjim.com/basics/cronbachs-alpha/
- https://www.cwauthors.com/article/significance-and-use-of-post-hoc-analysis-studies
- https://statisticsbyjim.com/anova/post-hoc-tests-anova/
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Welch%27s_t-test