

Analyzing the Factors that Affect Preschoolers' Parents' Choice of Toys

Abdülkadir Kabadayi

Preschool Department, Faculty of Education, Necmettin Erbakan University

Abstract

Teachers at schools and parents at home need toys to support children's psychomotor, cognitive, socioemotional and linguistic development during the period of play. In this respect, toys used in play are effective media for teaching children while at the same time entertaining them. The aim of this study is to analyze the factors that affect the preschoolers' parents' choice of toys in the Turkish context with respect to some variables, such as parents' education and their economic status. The sample of this study comprised 194 parents of preschoolers attending 5 different preschool institutions in Turkey and the toys they bought for their children. The instrument titled "Toy Selection Preference Questionnaire" (TSPQ) for preschoolers was developed by the researcher and used to analyze the data. In this survey ANOVA test in SPSS 15.0 was used to compare the dependent and independent variables of this research. The findings showed that there were significant differences between the parents' levels of education and the subdimensions of TSPQ including the cognitive, parents' and toy design perspectives, and there were also significant differences between the parents' economic status and the subdimensions of TSPQ comprising health, parents and toy design perspectives.

Key words: *Developmental domains; parents' view; preschoolers; toys; Toy Selection Preference Questionnaire; Turkish context.*

Introduction

The importance of toys and play in child development has been stressed by some psychologists (Erikson, 1977; Rogers & Sawyer, 1988). Toys are regarded as effective tools by which a set of activities are performed freely and spontaneously, which "give joy, source of happiness while enhancing various domains of children as well as

entertaining” them (Kabadayı, 2012). In line with this, toys are “learning instruments” that stimulate children’s imagination and help them develop socially and intellectually (Mann, 1996). Furthermore, Uluğ (1997) also defines the toy as any kind of tool used to attain children’s goals at the playground during play. These tools vary from everyday life objects to objects designed in a special way and may be used for certain purposes in play (Yalçınkaya, 1996). Play and playthings are effective training tools of the children; therefore, children should be supported by quality toys in comfortable play settings (Kandır, 2000). Kaya (2007) also defines toys as playthings which regulate the movements of children through developmental stages, which support the cognitive, physical, socioemotional development of children and which enhance their imagination and creative skills. Therefore, it is not surprising that many new children’s toys are a cause for concern among those who care for children. Oravec (2001) pointed out that children could gain some useful knowledge from the toys if the toys were carefully selected for children’s developmental levels, and if children received specific guidance from their parents and teachers. At a preschool stage, it is crucial for the parents to choose appropriate playthings for the age and developmental stage of their children (Tezel Şahin, 1993). In addition to these, playthings and toys are *sine qua non* for completing play. When parents choose playthings which are appropriate for the developmental stage of their children in order to prepare them for their future lives, they are under the strict responsibility of choosing the appropriate playthings for their future generation (Konuk Er et al., 2008). A young child’s growth and development can be supported and enhanced through play. Toys bring parents or caregivers and children together in play. Early brain development is enhanced through these relationships (Shonkoff et al., 2000). These discussions are also an opportunity for the preschool teachers to help parents understand the role of play in all areas of development, including the cognitive, linguistic, social, physical and emotional development. Toys are also said to provide a bridge for a child’s interactions with parents or other caregivers. When preschool teachers advise parents, it is important to stress that toys have a supportive role in enhancing a child’s development. It is quite important that play materials match the developmental and individual needs of each child.

The aim of this study is to analyze the factors that affect the preschoolers’ parents’ choice of toys in the Turkish context with respect to some variables, such as parents’ level of education and their economic status.

Research Questions

The present study explores the toy selection preferences of the parents whose children attend different preschool institutions, regarding some variables relevant to their level of education and economic status in the Turkish context. The following research questions were examined:

1. Is there any difference between the preschoolers’ parents’ toy selection preferences and their level of education?

2. Is there any difference between the preschoolers' parents' toy selection preferences and their economic status?

Method

This study is a descriptive study of the survey type to investigate the prediction of the criterion variables (Adodo, 2012), including the parents' level of education and economic status, regarding their preferences in selecting toys. Best and Kahn (1993), and Abagi (1997) explain the descriptive survey design as a form of design that presents the existing conditions, practices, beliefs, attitudes or opinions held, processes going on and trends for developing the interpretation of meaning.

Study Group

The sample of this study encompassed 194 (7= fathers and 187= mothers) parents of preschool children attending 5 different preschool institutions within Mevlana, Karma, Ayşe Tümer, Melikşah, Mehmet Şükriye Sert primary schools in the center of Konya under the auspices of the Ministry of National Education. It is generally inferred that mothers are mostly responsible for children's education and training in the Turkish family structure. This is also in line with the responses of the vast majority of the participants who are female (98.4%), which generally reflects the current trends within the field of preschool education (Saluja, Early, & Clifford, 2002).

Table 1. Participants' Education Level

Education	Frequency	Percent
Primary	43	22.6 %
Secondary	33	17.4 %
Lycee'	52	27.4 %
University	62	32.6 %
Total	190	100 %

Table 1 shows that 22.6 percent of the participants have primary level of education; 17.4 percent of them have the secondary level of education; 27.4 percent of them have lycee' school level of education and 32.6 percent of them are university graduates.

Table 2. Participants' Economic Status

Economic	Frequency	Percent
Very Low	25	13.2 %
Low	68	35.8 %
Middle	43	22.6 %
High	54	28.4 %
Total	190	100 %

In the study, economic status of the participants was determined based on their income using the scale such as *very low* (200-350 €), *low* (401-700 €), *middle* (701-1,050€), and *high* (1,051 € and over). In Table 2 it can be seen that 23.2% of the

participants have a very low economic status, 35.8% of them have a low economic status, 22.6% have a middle economic status, and 28.4% of them have a high economic status.

Instrument

Toy Selection Preference Questionnaire (TSPQ) developed by the researcher was used to gather the study data. TSPQ consists of 2 sections. TSPQ was reviewed by 3 experts in the field and some item changes were made in line with their suggestions. The first section of TSPQ includes the demographic characteristics of the preschool children's parents, such as their level of education and their monthly salary. Then, TSPQ was subjected to a pilot study to obtain the satisfactory feedback. The second section of the TSPQ consists of 33 items assessed on a 3 point Likert scale: 1=no, 2=some, 3=yes. TSPQ contains 6 subdimensions: "Health", "Cognitive", "Social", "Toy Design", "Parents' Appreciation, and Child Friendly". The reliability coefficient of TSPQ is .80 Cronbach Alpha, and it should also be noted that the result of .80 is a reasonable goal (Gliem & Gliem, 2003).

Results and Discussion

In the process of analyzing the data, descriptive statistics including the mean score and standard deviation were used to report on the data. Additionally, One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used to determine the difference among the participants regarding their level of education and their economic status. Tukey HSD test was used to clarify the difference for or against each group.

In Table 3 two out of eight *Health dimensions of TSPQ suggested* that there was a significant difference between the parents of primary and lycee' school level of education, and those who have a lycee' education level – university graduates. In item (4) "I prefer to buy an easy to clean toy" there was a significant difference both between the parents with primary (2.60) – lycee' school (2.11) and lycee' school (2.11) – university graduates (2.35) ($F= 4.73$). In addition to this, in the item (30) "I prefer to buy a recycled and environmentally friendly toy" there was a significant difference between the parents with primary (2.39) and lycee' (1.92) school level of education ($F=4.28$). Conversely, there was an insignificant difference between and/or among the primary, secondary, lycee' school and university level of education of the participants comprising the "Health" dimension of TSPQ in the items (5) "I prefer to buy the toys with quality assurance certificate" ($F=1.03$); (14) "I prefer to buy health and environmentally friendly toys" ($F= 0.74$); (21) "I prefer to buy the toys which do not have spiky or sharp ends and cutter head" ($F= 0.13$); (25) "I prefer to buy the toys produced according to the rules of ISO 9000" ($F= 0.62$); (26) "I prefer to buy durable toys so that my child could use them for a long time" ($F=0.09$); and (31) "I prefer to buy toys having the seal of the Turkish Standards Institute" ($F= 0.90$).

Four out of six *Parents' Appreciation dimension of TSPQ* revealed that there were significant differences found between parents with secondary (1.91) and university (1.54) level of education ($F=2.61$) in the item (11) "I prefer to buy a toy which is Turkish

brand". There was also a significant difference between the parents with secondary (2.25) and university (1.54) level of education ($F= 3.13$) in the item (20) "I take care not to buy an ordinary toy which is sold on the street". Furthermore, it appeared there was a significant difference between the parents with primary (2.76) and lycee' school (2.22) level of education ($F= 6.27$) in the item (3) "I always read the warnings on the toy when buying it". Another significant difference was found between the parents with primary (2.11) and university (1.77) level of education ($F= 4.62$) in the item (7) "What influences my choice is the price of the toy while buying", while there were non-significant differences between/among the primary, secondary, lycee' and university level of education of the participants in "Parents' Appreciation" dimension of TSPQ in the items (22) "I make up my mind which toys to buy before going out shopping" ($F=1.78$), and (32) "I prefer to buy a few quality toys rather than many ordinary toys" ($F=0.20$).

There was a significant difference between the parents with secondary (2.02) and university (1.49) level of education and parents who were secondary (2.02) and lycee' (1.57) school graduates ($F= 4.50$) regarding the "Toy Design" dimension of TSPQ in the item (2) "What is important for me is the toy design", while there appeared non-significant differences between/among the primary, secondary, lycee' school and university level of education of the participants regarding the "Parents' Appreciation" dimension of TSPQ in the items (6) "I prefer to buy extraordinary toys" ($F=2.04$); (8) "I prefer to buy simple toys" ($F=1.18$); (17) "It is quite important for me to know what kind of materials are used in the production process of the toys" ($F=1.18$); (19) "I prefer to buy the toys with popular cartoon characters" ($F=9.86$).

There were other non-significant differences found between/among the primary, secondary, lycee' school and university level of education of the participants regarding the "Cognitive" dimensions of TSPQ in the items (12) "I prefer to buy the toy which is both entertaining and educational" ($F=0.11$); (13) "I prefer to buy the toy to improve their creativity" ($F=2.11$); (15) "I prefer to buy the toys to enhance their mental development" ($F=0.26$); (16) "I prefer to buy the toys to enhance their individual talents" ($F=1.04$); (23) "I prefer to buy the toys having multi-purpose use" ($F=0.65$); (27) "I prefer to buy the toys to increase their power of imagination" ($F=1.54$); (29) "I prefer to buy the toys providing a strong stimulus and supporting various developmental domains of my child" ($F=1.23$).

There were also insignificant differences between/among the primary, secondary, lycee' school and university level of education of the participants regarding the "Child Friendly" dimensions of TSPQ in the items (1) "I prefer to buy toys which never promote violence or negative social, racial or gender stereotypes." ($F=0.72$); (9) "I prefer to buy age and gender friendly toys" ($F=2.27$); (10) "I prefer to buy child friendly toys" ($F=0.71$); (24) "I prefer to buy colorful, interesting toys having different dimensions and structure" ($F=0.29$) and (28) "I prefer to buy ergonomic toys" ($F=0.17$).

There were also insignificant differences found between/among the primary, secondary, lycee' school and university level of education of the participants regarding the "Social" dimensions of TSPQ in the items (18) "I prefer to buy the toys my child can play both with his/her friends and individually" ($F=1.59$); (33) "I prefer to buy the toys I can play with when I play with my child" ($F=0.85$).

Table 3. Parents' toy selection preferences regarding their level of education

DOMAINS	G R O U P S													
	Primary (a) (N=43)			Secondary (b) (N=33)			Lycee' School (c) (N=52)			University (d) (N=62)				
	\bar{X}	SD		\bar{X}	SD		\bar{X}	SD		\bar{X}	SD			
(From Health Perspective)	2.60	.62	2.36	.72	2.11	.74	2.35	.69	6.739	3	2.24	4.73	0.003	a-c, c-d
4. I prefer to buy an easy to clean toy									88.214	186	.474			
									94.953	189				
30. I prefer to buy a recycled and environmentally friendly toy	2.39	.69	2.30	.66	1.92	.74	2.28	.69	6.320	3	2.10	4.28	.006	a-c
									91.553	186	.492			
									97.874	189				
(From Parents Perspective)	1.53	.82	1.91	.90	1.51	.72	1.54	.68	4.341	3	1.44	2.61	.053	b-d
11. I prefer to buy a toy which is Turkish brand									103.075	186	.554			
									107.416	189				
20. I take care not to buy an ordinary toy which is sold on the street.	2.48	.73	2.25	.76	2.38	.76	2.56	.58	4.482	3	1.49	3.13	.027	b-d
									88.761	186	.477			
									93.242	189				
3. I always read the warnings on the toy when buying it	2.76	.47	2.63	.63	2.22	.81	2.43	.67	7.822	3	2.60	6.27	.000	a-c
									77.252	186	.415			
									85.074	189				
7. What influences my choice is the price of the toy while buying	2.11	.73	2.00	.75	1.94	.71	1.77	.61	6.679	3	2.22	4.62	.004	a-d
									89.537	186	.481			
									96.216	189				
(From Toy Design Perspective)	1.72	.88	2.02	.87	1.57	.71	1.49	.63	7.894	3	2.63	4.50	.004	b-c, b-d
2. What is important for me is the toy design									108.575	186	.584			
									116.468	189				

N = Participants \bar{X} = Mean Score Sd = Standard Deviation 0.000* = P < 0.05 TUKEY= Multiple Comparison

In Table 4 it can be seen that there were significant differences in some items between/among the parents' economic status regarding the "Cognitive", "Toy Design", "Parents' Appreciation" dimensions of TSPQ. In item (14) "I prefer to buy the toys providing a strong stimulus and supporting various developmental domains of my child" there was a significant difference between *very low* (2.08) and *high* (2.57) economic status of the parents ($F= 3.71$), while there were non-significant differences found between/among the *very low*, *low*, *middle* and *high* economic status of the parents regarding the "Cognitive" dimensions of TSPQ in the items (12) "I prefer to buy the toy which is both entertaining and educational" ($F=0.59$); (13) "I prefer to buy the toy which improves their creativity" ($F=0.50$); (15) "I prefer to buy the toys to enhance their mental development" ($F=0.49$); (16) "I prefer to buy the toys which enhance their individual talents" ($F=0.14$); (23) "I prefer to buy the toys having multi-purpose use" ($F=0.19$); (27) "I prefer to buy the toys which improve their power of imagination" ($F=1.58$).

Parents' Appreciation dimension of TSPQ showed that there was a significant difference between both *low* (1.80) and *high* (1.61), and *middle* (2.06) and *high* (1.61) economic status of the parents ($F=4.56$) in the item (7) "What influences my choice is the price of the toy while buying", while there were non-significant differences between/among the *very low*, *low*, *middle* and *high* economic status of the parents regarding the "Parents' Appreciation" dimension of TSPQ in the items (3) "I always read the warnings on the toy when buying it" ($F=0.86$); (11) "I prefer to buy a toy which is Turkish brand" ($F=1.24$); (20) "I take care not to buy an ordinary toy which is sold on the street" ($F=1.98$); (22) "I make up my mind which toys to buy before going out shopping" ($F=0.80$) and (32) "I prefer to buy a few quality toys rather than many ordinary toys" ($F=0.02$).

There was a significant difference between the *middle* (1.88) and *high* (1.38) economic status of the parents ($F= 3.32$) regarding the "Toy Design" dimension of TSPQ in the item (2) "What is important for me is the toy design" while there were non-significant differences between/among the *very low*, *low*, *middle* and *high* economic status of the parents regarding the "Parents' Appreciation" dimension of TSPQ in the items (6) "I prefer to buy extraordinary toys" ($F=0.63$); (8) "I prefer to buy simple toys" ($F=0.34$); (17) "It is quite important for me to know what kind of materials are used in the production process of the toys" ($F=0.77$); (19) "I prefer to buy the toys with popular cartoon characters" ($F=0.94$).

There were insignificant differences found between and/or among the *very low*, *low*, *middle* and *high* economic status of the parents about the "Health" dimension of TSPQ in the items (4) "I prefer to buy an easy to clean toy" ($F=0.20$); (5) "I prefer to buy the toys with quality assurance certificate" ($F=1.03$), (14) "I prefer to buy health and environmentally friendly toys" ($F=0.27$), (21) "I prefer to buy the toys which do not have spiky, sharp ends and cutter head" ($F=0.47$), (25) "I prefer to buy the toys produced according to the rules of ISO 9000" ($F=0.17$); (26) "I prefer to buy durable toys so that my child could use them for a long time" ($F=1.27$), (30) "I prefer to buy a recycled and

environmentally friendly toy,” (F=1.00), and (31) “*I prefer to buy toys having the seal of the Turkish Standards Institute*” (F=1.91).

There were insignificant differences found between/among the *very low, low, middle and high* economic status of the parents regarding the “*Child Friendly*” dimension of TSPQ in the items (1) “*I prefer to buy toys which never promote violence or negative social, racial or gender stereotypes*” (F=2.63); (9) “*I prefer to buy age and gender friendly toys*” (F=2.01); (10) “*I prefer to buy child friendly toys*” (F=0.59); (24) “*I prefer to buy colorful, interesting toys having different dimensions and structures*” (F=0.52) and (28) “*I prefer to buy ergonomic toys*” (F=0.91).

It was shown that there were insignificant differences between/among the *very low, low, middle and high* economic status of the parents regarding the “*Social*” dimensions of TSPQ in the items (18) “*I prefer to buy the toys my child can play both with his/her friends and individually*” (F=0.41); (33) “*I prefer to buy the toys I can play with when playing with my child*” (F=0.03).

Conclusion

In this part, toy selection preference of the parents of preschool children attending preschool institutions was made to discover whether there was a significant difference between/among the parents’ economic status and education level with regard to the “*Health*”, “*Cognitive*”, “*Social*”, “*Toy Design*”, “*Parents’ Appreciation*” and “*Child Friendly*” dimensions of TSPQ.

194 parents of preschoolers attending 5 different preschool institutions in Turkey participated in the research. Taking into consideration their levels of education, it can be concluded from the findings that the educational levels of the participants tend to improve when compared to their educational levels two decades earlier. As for their economic status, it can be concluded from the findings that nearly half of the participants (40%) are in a financially difficult situation, which may cause them to select more economical toys.

Regarding the participants’ education levels, there was a significant difference found between the parents of primary and lycee’ school, and lycee’ school and university graduates regarding the “*Health*” dimension of TSPQ in items (4) and (30). Contrarily, there was a non-significant difference found between and/or among the primary, secondary, lycee’ school and university level of education of the participants in items (5), (21), (25), (26) and (31).

In the “*Parents’ Appreciation*” dimension of TSPQ there appeared significant differences between secondary and university level of education of parents in items (11) and (20), and between primary school and lycee’ school level of education of parents in item (3), and between primary school and university level of education of parents in item (7), while there was a non-significant difference between/among the primary, secondary, lycee’ and university level of education of the participants regarding the “*Parents’ Appreciation*” dimension of TSPQ in items (22) and (32).

The study revealed that there was a significant difference between the secondary and university and secondary and lycee' school level of education of parents regarding the "Toy Design" dimension of TSPQ in item (2) while there were non-significant differences between/among the primary, secondary, lycee' and university level of education of the participants contained in the "Parents' Appreciation" dimension of TSPQ in items (6), (17) and (19).

The study also identified non-significant differences between/among the primary, secondary, lycee' and university level of education of the participants regarding the "Cognitive" dimensions of TSPQ in items (12), (13), (15), (16), (23), (27) and (29).

The study also found that there were insignificant differences between/among the primary, secondary, lycee' and university level of education of the participants contained in the "Child Friendly" dimensions of TSPQ in items (1), (9), (10), (24) and (28).

There were also non-significant differences found between/among the primary, secondary, lycee' and university level of education of the participants regarding the "Social" dimensions of TSPQ in items (18) and (33).

Regarding the participants' economic status, there were significant differences found in some items between/among the parents' economic status regarding the "Cognitive", "Toy Design", "Parents' Appreciation" dimensions of TSPQ. There was a significant difference found between *very low* and *high* economic status of the parents in item (14) while there were insignificant differences between/among the *very low*, *low*, *middle* and *high* economic status of the parents regarding the "Cognitive" dimensions of TSPQ in items (12), (13), (15), (16), (23) and (27).

Under the "Parents' Appreciation" dimension of TSPQ there was a significant difference found between both *low – high* and *middle – high* economic status of the parents in item (7), while there were non-significant differences found between/among the *very low*, *low*, *middle* and *high* economic status of the parents regarding the "Parents' Appreciation" dimension of TSPQ in items (3), (20), (22) and (32).

The study revealed a significant difference between the *middle* and *high* economic status of the parents regarding the "Toy Design" dimension of TSPQ in item (2) while there were insignificant differences between/among the *very low*, *low*, *middle* and *high* economic status of the parents regarding the "Parents' Appreciation" dimension of TSPQ in items (6), (8), (17) and (19).

There were also non-significant differences between and/or among the *very low*, *low*, *middle* and *high* economic status of the parents regarding the "Health" dimension of TSPQ in items (4), (5), (21), (25), (26), (30) and (31).

There appeared non-significant differences between/among the *very low*, *low*, *middle* and *high* economic levels of the parents regarding the "Child Friendly" dimension of TSPQ in items (1), (9), (24) and (28).

The study also put forward the fact that there were non-significant differences between/among the *very low*, *low*, *middle* and *high* economic status of the parents regarding the "Social" dimensions of TSPQ in items (18) and (33).

As a result, it is recommended for the parents to consider whether a toy promotes negative racial, ethnic, cultural or gender stereotypes and these toys are not recommended for children. It is also advised that parents should provide children with safe, affordable toys that are appropriate for their stage of development. They should also include toys that help promote learning and growth in all areas of development. Parents are also advised to avoid the toys that discourage children from using their own imagination. It should be kept in mind that the most educational toy is the one that fosters the interaction of an adult with a child in supportive, unconditional play. Therefore, parents' involvement is vital for children's development in the playing process. As Shonkoff et al. (2000) emphasized, toys are never the substitutes for the attention of devoted caregivers. It is also widely known that children discharge their extra energy via play and playthings. Therefore, social/emotional and cognitive skills are developed and enhanced as children play and use playthings to work out the real-life problems (Bronson, 1995; NAEYC, 1999; Thompson et al., 2001; Goodson et al., 2002).

Acknowledgment

This research is supported by the Scientific Research Projects of Konya N. E. University (BAP).

References

- Abagi, O. (1997). *Public and Private Investment in Primary Education in Kenya: Agenda for Action*. Discussion Paper, No. ED/001/97. Nairobi: IPAR.
- Adodo, S. O. (2012). A predictive study of pre-service teachers' gender self-concept, interest and attitude towards interactive computer technology (ICTS) in Nigeria Universities of Faculties of Education. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 2(3), 145-150.
- Best, J. W. & Kahn, J. V. (1989). *Research in Education* (Sixth ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bronson M.B. (1995). *The Right Stuff for Children Birth to 8: Selecting Play Materials to Support Development*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Danette Glassy, M.D & Judith Romano, M.D. (2003). Selecting Appropriate Toys for Young Children: The Pediatrician's Role. *Pediatrics*, 111 (4), 911-913.
- Erikson, E. (1977). *Toys and reasons: Stages in the reutilization of experience*. New York: Norton.
- Gliem, J. A. & Gliem, R. R. (2003). Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales, Paper Presented at the *Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education*, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, October 8-10, 82-88.

- Goodson, B., Bronson, M. B. (2002). *Which Toy for Which Child: A Consumer's Guide for Selecting Suitable Toys, Ages Birth through Five?* Washington, DC: Consumer Product Safety Commission /online/. Retrieved on 6 June 2002 from [http:// www.cpsc.gov/cpsc/pub/pubs/285.pdf](http://www.cpsc.gov/cpsc/pub/pubs/285.pdf).
- Kabadayı, A. (2012). Analyzing “children-playground-play” metaphors based on pre-service teachers' views. *Energy Education Science and Technology Part B: Social and Educational Studies*, 4(1), 365-372.
- Kandır, A. (2000). Play and Toys in Preschool Period. *Gazi University Journal of Vocational Education*, 2 (2), 63-65.
- Kaya, D. (2007). *Analyzing the toys designed for 37-72 month children regarding their various domains*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University; Ankara.
- Konuk Er, R., Alakoç Pipir, D. & Yıldırım Doğru, S. (2008). Toy Choice Opinions of the Parents with Normally Developing or Handicapped Children in Early Childhood. In Özcan Demirel & Ali Murat Sünbül (Eds.), *Further Education in the Balkan Countries* (pp. 167-179). Educational Bookstore Press.
- Mann, D. (1996). Serious Play. *Teachers College Record*, 97(3), 446- 470.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children (1999). *Toys: Tools for Learning*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Oravec, J. A. (2000). Interactive Toys and Children's Education: Strategies for Educators and Parents. *Childhood Education*, 1, 81-85.
- Rogers, C. & Sawyer, J. (1988). *Play in the lives of children*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Saluja, G., Early, D.M. & Clifford, R.M. (2002). Demographic characteristics of early childhood teachers and structural elements of early care and education in the United States. *Early Childhood Research and Practice*, 4(1). Retrieved on 12 June 2011 from <http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v4n1/saluja.html>.
- Shonkoff J.P., Phillips D.A. (2000). Nurturing relationships. In Shonkoff J.P., Phillips D.A., (Eds.) *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development* (pp.225 -266). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Tezel Şahin, F. (1993). *Analyzing the 3-6 year-old children's parents' opinions about child, play and toys*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University : Ankara.
- Thompson, K. M., Haninger, K. (2001). Violence in E-rated video games. *JAMA Journal of the American Medical Association*, 286(5), 591-598.
- Yalçınkaya, T. (1996). *Eğitici Oyun ve Oyuncak Yapımı*. İstanbul: Esin Yayınevi.

Abdülkadir Kabadayı

Kılıçaslan Mah. Otlukbeli Sk. Parkvadi Evleri 44/17 Selçuklu
Konya, Turkey
akkabadayı@konya.edu.tr

Analiza čimbenika koji utječu na odabir igračaka među roditeljima predškolaca

Sažetak

Nastavnicima u školama i roditeljima kod kuće potrebne su igračke kao potpora djetetovu psihomotornom, kognitivnom, socioemocionalnom i jezičnom razvoju za vrijeme igre. Igračke koje se koriste za vrijeme igre učinkoviti su mediji s pomoću kojih djeca istodobno uče i zabavljaju se. Cilj je ovoga istraživanja analizirati čimbenike koji utječu na odabir igračaka među roditeljima predškolaca u turskom kontekstu s obzirom na određene varijable, kao što su obrazovanje roditelja i njihov ekonomski status. Uzorak ispitanika u ovom istraživanju sastoji se od 194 roditelja predškolske djece koja pohađaju 5 različitih predškolskih ustanova u Turskoj. Analiza je uključivala igračke koje su roditelji kupili za svoju djecu. Instrument pod nazivom "Upitnik o odabiru igračaka" za djecu predškolske dobi konstruirali su istraživači i upotrijebljen je za analizu podataka. U ovom je istraživanju korištena analiza varijance u programu SPSS 15.0 s ciljem usporedbe zavisnih i nezavisnih varijabli. Rezultati su pokazali da postoje značajne razlike između razine obrazovanja roditelja i poddimenzija "Upitnika o odabiru igračaka" koje se odnose na spoznajnu te perspektivu roditelja i izrade igračaka. Značajne su razlike također utvrđene između ekonomskog statusa roditelja i poddimenzija "Upitnika o odabiru igračaka" koje se odnose na zdravlje te perspektivu roditelja i izrade igračaka.

Ključne riječi: *igračke; predškolska djeca; razvojne domene; stav roditelja; turski kontekst; "Upitnik o odabiru igračaka".*