

A COMPARISON OF SOCIAL SKILLS OF 6-YEAR OLD UNPROTECTED CHILDREN AND 6-YEAR OLD CHILDREN LIVING WITH THEIR FAMILY

Korunmaya Muhtaç ve Ailesiyle Yaşayan 6 Yaş Çocuklarının Sosyal Becerilerinin Karşılaştırılması

Berrin AKMAN*

Hülya GÜLAY**

BAÜ
SBED
11 (19)

ÖZ

23

Problem durumu: Sosyal gelişim, yaşamın ilk yıllarından itibaren başlayan, çocuk- ebeveyn ilişkileriyle şekillenen ve hayat boyu devam eden bir süreçtir. Ebeveyn- çocuk ilişkileri, çocuğun diğer kişilerle iletişimini önemli ölçüde etkilemektedir. Sosyal beceriler de kişilerarası ilişkilerin sağlıklı ve başarılı bir biçimde devamını sağlayabilmektedir. 2828 Sayılı Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu Kanunu' na göre, Korunmaya Muhtaç Çocuk, beden, ruh ve ahlak gelişimleri veya şahsi güvenlikleri tehlikede olup;

1. Ana veya babasız, ana ve babasız,
2. Ana veya babası veya her ikisi de belli olmayan,
3. Ana veya babası veya her ikisi tarafından terkedilen,
4. Ana veya babası tarafından ihmal edilip; fuhuş, dilencilik, alkolü içkileri veya uyuşturucu maddeleri kullanma gibi her türlü sosyal tehlikelere ve kötü alışkanlıklara savunmasız bırakılan ve başıboşluğa sürüklenen çocuğu ifade etmektedir.

Bu koşullarda çocuklar, ihtiyaç duydukları becerileri öğrenecekleri, olumlu yetişkin modellerine sahip olamamaktadırlar. Aile yoksunluğu sosyal becerilerin gelişimine olumsuz etkide bulunabilmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu çalışma, ailenin sosyal beceriler üzerindeki olumlu etkisini ortaya koymuş araştırmaların bulgularına dayanarak, aile ile yaşamının sosyal becerilerin kullanımına olumlu etkisi olduğu hipotezine dayanmaktadır.

Yöntem: Araştırmada, korunmaya muhtaç ve ailesi ile yaşayan 6 yaş çocuklarının sosyal becerileri karşılaştırılmıştır.

Çalışmanın örneklem grubunu Ankara ve İstanbul illerinde, ailesi ile yaşayan ve kurumda yaşayan çocuklar oluşturmuştur.

Araştırmada Kişisel Bilgi Formu ve Sosyal Beceri Formu kullanılmıştır. Çocukların sosyal becerilerini değerlendirmek için "6 Yaş Çocukları İçin Sosyal Beceri Formu", çocukların demografik bilgilerinin belirlenmesi için de "Kişisel Bilgi Formu" kullanılmıştır.

Veriler, Ki- Kare, Fisher Kesin Ki- Kare ve Likelihood Ratio Ki- Kare istatistik teknikleri ile analiz edilmiştir.

Sonuçlar: Sonuçlar, ailesi ile yaşayan çocukların sosyal becerileri daha sık kullandıklarını göstermektedir.

Öneriler: Bu sonuç doğrultusunda, korunmaya muhtaç çocuklar için sosyal beceri programları geliştirilmelidir. Ayrıca, kurumda çalışan personelin düzenli olarak hizmet içi eğitim almalıdır. Koşu tipi kurumlar yerine ev tipi kurumlar oluşturulmalıdır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Sosyal beceriler, korunmaya muhtaç çocuklar, okul öncesi.

Balikesir
Üniversitesi Sosyal
Bilimler Enstitüsü
Dergisi
Cilt 11 Sayı 19
Haziran 2008
ss.23-39

* Prof. Dr., Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Okul Öncesi Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı,
bakman@hacettepe.edu.tr

** Dr., Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, hulyagulay7@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Problem situation: Social development is a lifelong process; however, its foundations are laid by parent-child relations in the first years of childhood. Parent-child relations have a greater importance on child's communication experiences with other people. Social skills ensure that interpersonal relations continue in a successful and healthy way. According to the law of Social Services and Child Protection Institution with the number of 2828, the child who needs protection is a child whose personal safety, moral, physical and spiritual development is in danger. This child is described like these:

- 1-The child without mother or father,without mother and father.
- 2- His mother or/and his father is unknown.
- 3-His mother or/ and his father abandoned him.
- 4- His mother or father neglects him and can not protect the child against prostitution,alcohol,drugs and narcotics and begging.

The absence of a family has adverse effects on the development of children's social skills because, in such a circumstance, children suffer from the lack of individual affinity and positive adult models which are required for learning skills.

Purpose of research: This research, relying upon the research findings showing that the family has a positive effect on social skills, is based on the hypothesis that living with family has a positive effect on the use of social skills.

Method: This research is carried out to study the social skills of 6-year old children, who need protection and who live with their families.

The sample group of the research is composed of the children, who stay at the orphanages, and those, who live with their families in Ankara, and in Istanbul.

The research employs the Personal Inquiry Form and Social Skills Form, which include demographic data, for data collection purposes. The social skills of children were evaluated through the "Form of Social Skills for 6-year old Children". Moreover, a "Personal Inquiry Form" which includes demographic data about the children was used.

The data obtained through the research were assessed by the Chi – Squared, Fisher Definite Chi – Squared and Likelihood Ratio Chi – Squared statistical analysis.

Results: The findings of the research reveal that the variable of living with the family is effective on the frequency of using social skills among children.

Suggestions: Social skills programs should be developed for unprotected children. In addition, the staff in orphanages should receive regular in-service training in order to optimize the conditions of unprotected children. Unpopulated orphanages which resemble houses should be constructed rather than barrack-type orphanages.

Key words: Social skills, unprotected children, preschool.

1. INTRODUCTION

Socialization is a process which begins with birth and continues till the end of life, and includes social learning which occurs when we interact with other people. Early childhood years and family have significant roles in this process. Early childhood is a period which plays a decisive role in the development of identity and during which learning and development are very rapid. The family ensures that children acquire their first social experiences. Findings of researches reveal that the quality of parent-child relations is very important to lay the foundations of social competency (Hortaçsu, 2003; Terzi, 2003). Each child is in need to develop a relationship based on mutual interaction with the adult, who is responsible for his/her care. The presence of the adult is important in the aspect of ensuring the child's emotional and physical safety, helping him/her and to teach him/her how to deal with the changing living conditions. It is considered in many societies that the parents and particularly the mothers are the most competent persons for the care, the protection and the raising of the children (McCall, 1998). According to the outcomes of several researches, the origins of social competency depend on the quality of parent – child relationship during the babyhood. It is put

that the social support provided by the family during the childhood affects not only the social but also the mental and even the physical improvement of the child (Johnson, 2002; Santrook, 1998). Here, it is important to emphasize the importance of parents' communication manner with their children and parents' contribution to creating social environments and supporting the participation of their children to existent environments in early childhood (Black & Logan, 1995). Social development is a lifelong process; however, its foundations are laid by parent-child relations in the first years of childhood (Maccoby, 2000). Parent-child relations have a greater importance on child's communication experiences with other people. The responsibilities that parents assume in the development of children vary from one society to another; however, it is common to all societies that mother-father-child relations and parents' serving as a role model for children are very important for the development of children (Biller, 1993).

Social skills ensure that interpersonal relations continue in a successful and healthy way. This acquisition will be followed by lifelong healthy and fruitful social relations.

There are several definitions of social skills since the variables which affect social skills are numerous and complex (personality, intelligence, language, perception, values, attitudes, the environment where the skill is used, etc.), social skills fall into the field of interest of various disciplines (social work, education, psychology, psychiatry, special training and psychiatric nursing) and each discipline develops a different approach to the concept (Merrel & Gimpel, 1998 qtd. in Çiftçi, 2001). The researches conducted on the matter lay down findings, which support that the risk to experience numerous problems primarily including refusal by peers, failure at school, committing crimes, leaving school in the further years for the children, whose social competency is low, is much higher in comparison to the socially competent children (Rubin & Burgess, 2001; Sisto, Urquijo, & Souza, 1999).

Michelson, Sugai, Wood and Kazdin (1983) studied sixteen different definitions of social skills and revealed that there are six common points of these definitions. These common points are as follows:

1. Social skills are basically acquired through learning.
2. They include verbal and non-verbal behaviors.
3. They ensure that the individual starts effective and appropriate communication and responds to interaction.
4. Their efficacy increases thanks to social awards.
5. They emerge thanks to the interaction of the environment and the individual.
6. They are affected by age, gender, status of the individual and features of the environment.
7. The deficiencies in skills can be identified in evaluations and compensated through education (qtd. in Çiftçi, 2001; Çakıl, 1998; Atılğan, 2001).

The children, who do not live in a family environment for various reasons and lead their lives in orphanages supported by the State, are known as unprotected children. According to the law of Social Services and Child Protection Institution with the number of 2828, the child who needs protection is a child whose personal safety, moral, physical and spiritual development is in danger. This child is described like these:

1. The child without mother or father, without mother and father.

2. His mother or/and his father is unknown.
3. His mother or/ and his father abandoned him.
4. His mother or father neglects him and can not protect the child against prostitution, alcohol, drugs and narcotics and begging.

Orphanages have been used to provide social care and security for orphans after disasters, war situations and other causes of parentlessness, as individual adoption has not proved to be realistic hope these children. Although many orphanages provide better environment than the deplorable circumstances of biological families, they cannot provide the individualized nurturing that could be found in loving and responsible families (McKenzie, 1998). Unprotected children lack many advantages which are to be assured by a family. One of these deficiencies is the lack of adults who may ensure positive and warm relations and serve as models for children. The absence of a family has adverse effects on the development of children's social skills because, in such a circumstance, children suffer from the lack of individual affinity and positive adult models which are required for learning skills.

1. 1. Problem Situation

This research, relying upon the research findings showing that the family has a positive effect on social skills (Lamb & Baumrind, 1978; Craig & Kermis, 1995; Darwish, Esquivel, Hautz & Alfonzo, 2000; Stelmann, Assel, Swank, Smith & Landry, 2002; Connell & Prinz, 2002), is based on the hypothesis that living with family has a positive effect on the use of social skills.

The research is limited to the comparison of the frequency of use of social skills by the children, who live with their families, and those, who need protection.

2. METHOD

2.1. Participants

The sample group of this study, which is carried out to compare the social skills of 6-year old children who live with their family and who need protection, is composed of 57 (36 boys, 21 girls) unprotected children living in Istanbul Bahçelievler Orphanage, Ankara Keçiören Atatürk Orphanage and Ankara İhsan Yazman Orphanage, and 57 (30 boys, 27 girls) children living with their families and attending nursery schools affiliated with State Railways (Ankara), Development Bank (Ankara) and Küçükçekmece Municipality (Istanbul). Examining the distribution of the children, who live in the orphanage, with respect to their period of stay at the orphanages; out of 57 children, 1 has been staying for 6 months, 13 have been staying for 1 year, 14 have been staying for 2 years, 15 have been staying for 3 years, 6 have been staying for 4 years, 4 have been staying for 5 years and 4 have been staying for 6 years. Looking at the reasons of the children in need for protection for being left to the orphanages, it is seen that they are at the orphanage for the following reasons; 13 since one of the parents left home, 12 due to socio – economic reasons, 12 due to divorce, 7 for being abandoned, 4 due to the imprisonment of father, 4 due to the lack of care by one parent since the other parent has a bad medical condition, 3 due to the passing of one of the parents and the lack of ability to care by the other, 1 due to physical abuse, 1 due to extra matrimonial intercourse. The children living at the orphanage attend to the nursery schools of the state elementary schools and benefit half – day pre – school education, and spend the rest of their times with their peers at the orphanages. A systematic education program is not applied for the children during the time they are at the orphanage. The services are predominantly oriented at the care of the children. The group attendants assigned at the orphanages are occupied

with the care and the needs of the children. The children, whose parents are alive, visit their parents from time to time. 28 of such children visit their mother while 20 of them do not. 26 of such children visit their fathers while 22 of them do not. In respect of the frequency of the visits paid to parents; the most frequent period of time for the visit of both parents is 0 – 3 months. The least frequent period of time for the visit of both parents, on the other hand, is 7 – 12 months.

All of the children living with their families continue living with their parents and brothers and/or sisters (if any). 16 of the children living with their families have no sisters or brothers. 22 of them have 1 sister and/or brother, 13 have 2 sisters and/or brothers, 6 have 3 sisters and/or brothers.

The nursery schools attended by the children constituting the sample group, who live at the orphanages under Social Services Society for the Protection of the Children, and live with their families, were selected by random sampling method. A letter of permission was obtained from the Directorate General of Social Services Society for the Protection of the Children in order to carry out the study with the children living at the Society for the Protection of the Children. In respect of the children living with their families, the required permissions were obtained from their nursery schools and families.

The Denver Developmental Scanning Test was applied to all children within the sample group and consequently, the children, who exhibit normal development characteristics, were included in the research.

2.2. Measures

“Personal Inquiry Forms” and “Social Skills Forms” were used to collect data for the research.

Personal Inquiry Forms: Two separate Personal Inquiry Forms were developed for children who live with their families and for children who need protection. The Personal Inquiry Forms for the children in need for protection include enquiries on the name – surname, the sex, the age, the place of birth, the name of the orphanage, the period of stay at the orphanage, other orphanage/s (if any), whether or not the mother and the father are alive, whether or not they visit the child if they are alive, the frequency of such visits if they do. The Personal Inquiry Forms for the children living with their families include enquiries on the name – surname, the sex, the age, the place of birth, the name of nursery school attended and the number of brothers and/or sisters.

Social Skills Form: Social Skills Form was developed by Gülay (2004). There are 32 items in the form. Each skill is evaluated in one of the following categories: “Always”, “Sometimes” and “Never”. The social skills form was constituted by Calderalla and Merrell (1997) by taking advantage of the five sub – dimensions formed for social skills. The sub – dimensions and the sample social skills mentioned therein are as follows (Calderalla and Merrell (1997):

1. Skills associated with peers: Appreciating the friends, being sensitive to their feelings, to ask for help when necessary, etc.
2. Self – control skills: Anger – management, obedience to rules, conciliation with others, etc.
3. Academic skills: Independent working capability, asking for help in an appropriate manner when necessary, paying attention to directives, etc.
4. Accommodation skills: Sharing materials, fulfilling the responsibilities, etc.

5. Audacity skills: Attempt to talk to others, expression of feelings, inviting friends to play together, etc.

The cronbah alfa reliability coefficient for the Social Skills Form was yielded as .95. The expert's opinions of 7 lecturers from various universities were referred to for the validity and the applicability of the form.

2. 3. Procedures

The Social Skills Form, one of the data gathering instruments, was filled in by the group attendants for the unprotected children, and by the nursery school instructors for the children, who live with their families. The "Personal Inquiry Form" was filled in by the researcher for the unprotected children on the basis of the files at the Social Services, and by the nursery school instructors for the children, who live with their families. Pains were taken to ensure that the group attendants and the nursery school instructors have been familiar with the children for at least 1 year. The instructors and the group attendants assessed the children's skills on the basis of their general observations taking the entire period of their familiarity into consideration. During the interviews, the skills within the form were individually introduced to each instructor, their questions were responded and their opinions were obtained.

2. 4. Data Analysis

The data obtained throughout the research were evaluated making use of the statistical analyses Chi-Square and Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square in SPSS 10.0 program.

3. FINDINGS

The Frequency Distribution of Using Each Social Skill among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Table 3. 1. The Frequency Distribution of Using "Greeting, Introducing Oneself Saying One's Name," Skills among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Frequency of Using Skills	CHILDREN WHO NEED PROTECTION								CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH FAMILY								GENERAL TOTAL	
	Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL		Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	s	%
Greeting	34	59.6	23	40.4	0	0.0	57	100.0	41	71.9	16	28.1	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: χ^2 (LHR) = 2.249 p= 0.325																		
Introducing Oneself Saying One's Name	36	63.2	16	28.0	5	8.8	57	100.0	47	82.4	5	8.8	5	8.8	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi-Square $\chi^2 = 7.220$, p= 0.027																		

Table 3. 1. illustrates that there is a significant difference between children living with their family and unprotected children in "Introducing Oneself Saying One's Name" skill ($\chi^2 = 7.220$). Children living with their family make use of this skill more frequently compared to their unprotected peers. The difference between two groups is no significant in "Greeting" skill which take place in the same table (χ^2 (LHR) = 2.249).

Table 3. 2. The Frequency Distribution of Using “Independent Study, Working in Small Groups (2-5 children), , Starting and Continuing a Conversation” Skills among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Frequency of Using Skills	CHILDREN WHO NEED PROTECTION								CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH FAMILY								GENERAL TOTAL	
	Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL		Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Social Skills																		
Independent Study	19	33.3	38	66.7	0	0.0	57	100.0	40	70.2	17	29.8	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: χ^2 (LHR) = 16.939 p= 0.0001																		
Working in Small Groups (2-5 children)	24	42.1	27	47.4	6	10.5	57	100.0	47	82.5	10	17.5	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: χ^2 (LHR) = 24.016 p= 0.001																		
Starting and Continuing a Conversation	30	52.6	19	33.4	8	14.0	57	100.0	31	54.4	20	35.1	6	10.5	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi-Square $\chi^2 = 0.328$ p= 0.849																		

Table 3. 2 shows that the difference between two groups is important in the frequency of “Independent Study and Working in Small Groups (2-3 children)” skills (χ^2 (LHR) = 16.939, χ^2 (LHR) = 24.016). Children living with their family use these skills more frequently than children who need protection. However, no difference is found between two groups in the frequency of “Starting and Continuing a Conversation” skill ($\chi^2 = 0.328$).

Table 3. 3. The Frequency Distribution of Using “Listening, Asking Questions, Answering Questions ” Skills among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Frequency of Using Skills	CHILDREN WHO NEED PROTECTION								CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH FAMILY								GENERAL TOTAL	
	Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL		Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Social Skills																		
Listening	30	52.6	27	47.4	0	0.0	57	100.0	44	77.2	13	22.8	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: χ^2 (LHR) = 7.982 p= 0.018																		
Asking Questions	33	57.9	24	42.1	0	0.0	57	100.0	34	59.6	23	40.4	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: χ^2 (LHR) = 0.216 p= 0.898																		
Answering Questions	27	47.4	30	52.6	0	0.0	57	100.0	49	86.0	8	14.0	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: χ^2 (LHR) = 22.039 p= 0.0001																		

In Table 3.3 it is seen that children living with their family make use of “Listening, Asking Questions” skills more frequently than their peers who need protection (χ^2 (LHR) = 7.982, χ^2 (LHR) = 0.216). No difference is found between two groups in the frequency of “Asking Questions” skill (χ^2 (LHR) = 22.039).

Table 3. 4. The Frequency Distribution of Using “Asking permission, Following classroom rules, Participation in a group” Skills among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Frequency of Using Skills	CHILDREN WHO NEED PROTECTION								CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH FAMILY								GENERAL TOTAL	
	Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL		Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	s	%
Social Skills																		
Asking permission	9	15.8	39	68.4	9	15.8	57	100.0	47	85.5	10	17.6	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi- Square:	$\chi^2 = 31.898$								$p = 0.0001$									
Following classroom rules	25	43.8	32	56.2	0	0.0	57	100.0	47	82.5	10	17.5	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi- Square:	$\chi^2 (LHR) = 20.652$								$p = 0.0001$									
Participation in a group	32	56.2	25	43.8	0	0.0	57	100.0	47	82.5	10	17.5	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi- Square:	$\chi^2 (LHR) = 11.636$								$p = 0.003$									

Korunmaya
Muhtaç ve
Ailesiyle

30

Table 3. 4 illustrates that there is a significant difference between children living with their family and unprotected children in “Asking permission, Following classroom rules, Participation in a group” skills ($\chi^2 = 31.898$, $\chi^2 (LHR) = 20.652$, $\chi^2 (LHR) = 11.636$). Children living with their family make use of this skill more frequently compared to their unprotected peers.

Table 3. 5. The Frequency Distribution of Using “Defining feelings, Expressing feelings easily, Expressing wishes and needs easily” Skills among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Frequency of Using Skills	CHILDREN WHO NEED PROTECTION								CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH FAMILY								GENERAL TOTAL	
	Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL		Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	s	%
Social Skills																		
Defining feelings	21	36.8	28	49.2	8	14.0	57	100.0	29	50.8	28	49.2	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi- Square:	$\chi^2 = 3.723$								$p = 0.155$									
Expressing feelings easily	24	42.1	25	43.9	8	14.0	57	100.0	29	50.9	20	35.1	8	14.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi- Square :	$\chi^2 = 1.027$								$p = 0.598$									
Expressing wishes and needs easily	29	50.9	20	35.1	8	14.0	57	100.0	34	59.6	18	31.6	5	8.8	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi- Square :	$\chi^2 = 1.194$								$p = 0.550$									

Table 3. 5 shows that the no difference between two groups is important in the frequency of “Defining feelings, Expressing feelings easily, Expressing wishes and needs easily” skills ($\chi^2 = 3.723$, $\chi^2 = 1.027$, $\chi^2 = 1.194$).

Table 3. 6. The Frequency Distribution of Using “Asking information, Sharing, Skills to defend their rights whenever they are right among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Frequency of Using Skills	CHILDREN WHO NEED PROTECTION								CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH FAMILY								GENERAL TOTAL	
	Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL		Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	s	%
Social Skills																		
Asking information	14	24.6	27	47.4	16	28.0	57	100.0	31	54.4	17	29.8	9	15.8	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi- Square :	$\chi^2 = 10.655$								$p = 0.005$									
Sharing	14	24.6	43	75.4	0	0.0	57	100.0	43	75.4	14	24.6	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi- Square:	$\chi^2 (LHR) = 31.000$								$p = 0.0001$									
Defending Their Rights When They are Right	27	47.4	21	36.8	9	15.8	57	100.0	38	66.7	19	33.3	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi- Square:	$\chi^2 = 4.785$								$p = 0.091$									

In Table 3. 6 it is seen that children living with their family make use of “Asking information, Sharing” skills more frequently than their peers who need protection ($\chi^2 = 10.655$, χ^2 (LHR) = 31.000). No difference is found between two groups in the frequency of “Defending Their Rights When They are Right” skill ($\chi^2 = 4.785$).

Table 3. 7. The Frequency Distribution of Using “Preferring to Talk rather than Using Physical Force When Frustrated, Compromising, Bearing the Consequences of One’s Own Behavior” Skills among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Frequency of Using Skills	CHILDREN WHO NEED PROTECTION								CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH FAMILY								GENERAL TOTAL	
	Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL		Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Social Skills																		
Preferring to Talk rather than Using Physical Force When Frustrated	5	8.8	23	40.4	29	50.8	57	100.0	42	73.7	15	26.3	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi-Square: $\chi^2 = 55.422$ p= 0.0001																		
Compromising	6	10.5	24	42.1	27	47.4	57	100.0	33	57.9	17	29.8	7	12.3	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi-Square: $\chi^2 = 31.652$ p= 0.0001																		
Bearing the Consequences of One’s Own Behavior	14	24.6	35	61.4	8	14.0	57	100.0	48	84.2	9	15.8	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: χ^2 (LHR) = 44.205 p= 0.0001																		

An evaluation of Table 3. 7 reveals that children living with their family use “Preferring to Talk rather than Using Physical Force When Frustrated, Compromising, Bearing the Consequences of One’s Own Behavior” skills more frequently than unprotected children ($\chi^2 = 55.422$, $\chi^2 = 31.652$, χ^2 (LHR) = 44.205).

Table 3. 8. The Frequency Distribution of Using “Working in Large Groups (more than 5 children), Persuading, Complimenting” Skills among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Frequency of Using Skills	CHILDREN WHO NEED PROTECTION								CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH FAMILY								GENERAL TOTAL	
	Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL		Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Social Skills																		
Working in Large Groups (more than 5 children)	31	54.4	20	35.1	6	10.5	57	100.0	40	70.2	17	29.9	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square: χ^2 (LHR) = 3.228 p= 0.199																		
Persuading	18	31.6	24	42.1	15	26.3	57	100.0	27	47.4	19	33.3	11	19.3	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi-Square: $\chi^2 = 2.997$ p= 0.223																		
Complimenting	20	35.1	16	28.1	21	36.8	57	100.0	22	38.6	20	35.1	15	26.3	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi-Square: $\chi^2 = 1.540$ p= 0.463																		

Table 3. 8 shows that the no difference between two groups is important in the frequency of “Working in Large Groups (more than 5 children), Persuading, Complimenting” skills (χ^2 (LHR) = 3.228, $\chi^2 = 2.997$, $\chi^2 = 1.540$).

Table 3. 9. The Frequency Distribution of Using “Thanking, Apologizing, Asking help” Skills among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Frequency of Using Skills	CHILDREN WHO NEED PROTECTION								CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH FAMILY								GENERAL TOTAL	
	Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL		Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Thanking	21	36.8	28	49.2	8	14.0	57	100.0	42	73.7	8	14.0	7	12.3	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi-Square:	$\chi^2 = 18.178$								$p = 0.0001$									
Apologizing	7	12.3	31	54.4	19	33.3	57	100.0	35	61.4	22	38.6	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi-Square:	$\chi^2 = 31.898$								$p = 0.0001$									
Asking help	15	26.4	34	59.6	8	14.0	57	100.0	39	68.4	18	31.6	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi-Square:	$\chi^2 = 20.307$								$p = 0.0001$									

Table 3. 9 illustrates that there is a significant difference between children living with their family and unprotected children in “Thanking, Apologizing, Asking help” skills. Children living with their family make use of this skill more frequently compared to their unprotected peers ($\chi^2 = 18.178$, $\chi^2 = 31.898$, $\chi^2 = 20.307$).

Table 3. 10. The Frequency Distribution of Using “Labor division, Working cooperatively, Following verbal directions, Helping others” Skills among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Frequency of Using Skills	CHILDREN WHO NEED PROTECTION								CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH FAMILY								GENERAL TOTAL	
	Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL		Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Labor division, Working cooperatively	19	33.3	38	66.7	0	0.0	57	100.0	32	56.1	25	43.9	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square:	χ^2 (LHR) = 6.46								$p = 0.004$									
Following verbal directions	30	52.7	27	47.3	0	0.0	57	100.0	47	82.5	10	17.5	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square:	χ^2 (LHR) = 12.537								$p = 0.002$									
Helping others	27	47.4	30	52.6	0	0.0	57	100.0	41	71.9	16	28.1	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square:	χ^2 (LHR) = 7.464								$p = 0.024$									

An evaluation of Table 3. 10 reveals that children living with their family use “Labor division, Working cooperatively, Following verbal directions, Helping others” skills more frequently than unprotected children (χ^2 (LHR) = 6.46, χ^2 (LHR) = 12.537, χ^2 (LHR) = 7.464).

Table 3. 11. The Frequency Distribution of Using “Showing Respect When Their Friends are Right, Concentration on a task, Introducing Others Saying Their Name” Skills among Children Who Need Protection and among Children Who Live with Their Family

Frequency of Using Skills	CHILDREN WHO NEED PROTECTION								CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH FAMILY								GENERAL TOTAL	
	Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL		Always		Sometimes		Never		TOTAL			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Social Skills																		
Showing Respect When Their Friends are Right	6	10.5	31	54.4	20	35.1	57	100.0	33	57.9	24	42.1	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi-Square:	$\chi^2 = 33.181$				$p = 0.0001$													
Concentration on a task	23	40.4	29	50.9	5	8.7	57	100.0	44	77.2	13	22.8	0	0.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square:	$\chi^2 (LHR) = 16.871$				$p = 0.0001$													
Introducing Others Saying Their Name	30	52.6	20	35.1	7	12.3	57	100.0	36	63.2	13	22.8	8	14.0	57	100.0	114	100.0
Chi-Square	$\chi^2 = 2.097$				$p = 0.350$													

In Table 11 it is seen that children living with their family make use of “Showing Respect When Their Friends are Right, Concentration on a task” skills more frequently than their peers who need protection ($\chi^2 = 33.181$, $\chi^2 (LHR) = 16.871$). No difference is found between two groups in the frequency of “Introducing Others Saying Their Name” skill ($\chi^2 = 2.097$).

4. DISCUSSION

According to the outcomes of the research, the children living with their families, use 21 (introducing oneself saying one’s name, listening, answering questions, thanking, apologizing, asking permission, following classroom rules, independent study, working in small groups (2-5 children), participation in a group, asking information, sharing, preferring to talk rather than using physical force when frustrated, compromising, bearing the consequences of one’s own behavior, asking help, labor division, working cooperatively, following verbal directions, helping others, showing respect to friends when they are right, concentration on a task) of the 32 skills more frequently relatively to their peers. No difference was found in respect of the frequency of use for 11 skills (introducing others saying their name, working in large groups (more than 5 children), persuading, complimenting, defending their rights when they are right, defining feelings, expressing feelings easily, expressing wishes and needs easily, asking questions, starting and continuing a conversation, greeting).

Parenting is a rather complex process which entails great responsibilities, and is known as a whole of experiences which are required for the development of a child (Landau, 1999). Though many experiences presented to children by their surroundings are very important for their socialization, the first and fundamental experiences are lived thanks to their interaction with the parents (Maccoby, 2000). Children who live with their family in a home environment are able to learn many social behaviors and skills thanks to close and warm relations with their parents; however, unprotected children do not have adults models who provide interest and support for them and their access to individual affinity and guidance is limited in the institution where they live.

The attachment behavior, which develops between mother and baby in the first years and is supposed to shape all further relations, develops according to mother’s responses to child’s needs and signs and the interaction between mother and baby (Bowlby, 1982). To Bowlby, baby’s sucking, hugging, holding, crying and laughing behaviors shape the natural attachment and communication between mother and baby. Bowlby states that meeting the aforementioned needs is more

important than meeting physical needs so as to construct the attachment between baby and mother (Brazelton, & Cramer, 1991).

The children who do not gain confidence due to lack of parental support get stressed in complex emotions, ideas and conflicts. Children's curiosity and assertiveness decrease gradually due to lack of a mother (Özmen, 1989). Furthermore, the researches put evidence that lack of support - which compensates lack of a mother - eventuates that the child interrupts all his/her relations with people and the entire world, and embeds into psychological depression (Salk, 1982). Robertson (1981) emphasizes that children need interest and affection and that they will grow up like other children if these needs are met, otherwise they will become introvert and passive individuals who lack self-confidence (qtd. in Kahn, & Wright 1980). A father is as effective as a mother in the development of children. It is highlighted that the existence of a father ensures that children develop positive perception about their own body and contributes to the development of their social and mental capacity (Biller, 1993). The researches conducted show that the presence of father has huge influences on the children's academic success, conscious development, behavioral and emotional accommodation, and primarily their relationships with the peers (Tamis-LeMonda, Shannon, Cabrera, & Lamb, 2004). Unprotected children who lack parental affection and love display introvert and timid attitudes and lose their interest for their environment.

Moreover, children living in orphanages spend most of their time with their peer groups though they are with children, teens and adults from any age. They spend time with peer groups in the nursery school as well. Due to unfavorable physical conditions of the institutions and insufficiency of staff, children continuously interact in large groups rather than one-to-one relations. As a result, the staff working in these institutions is not able to deal with each child individually. Children are regarded as members of a group in the institution, not as individuals; hence, their individual needs, interests and expectations may be disregarded.

Stormshank & Stratton (1999) reveal that children display problematic behaviors in peer groups more frequently than in a home environment and that this situation results from family's interest and support and the strength of interaction among peers. Unprotected children spend most of their time with their peers though they lack parental support. Hence, they need more support and affinity to learn and reinforce positive behaviors. In addition, leaving the family in early ages and living in orphanages create a risky environment which may result in adaptation problems and mental disorders. Risky environments crumple children (Altuhul, 1991). Darwish et al. (2001) assert that abused children have difficulty in controlling themselves and are not good at social skills which require personal control compared to children who are not subject to abuse. In their study on the correlation between lack of a father and problem-solving capabilities, Fry & Grover (1980) made a comparison between fatherless children and children who have a father. The results show that lack of a father has adverse effects on children's social problem-solving skills, and that children who have a father think more analytically when solving problems. In the second part of the study some of fatherless children received an education program on problem solving. The overview of the results reveal that there is an improvement in the skills of social problem-solving and an increase in the capacity of the children who received training compared to who did not.

To Biller (1993), the most favorable environment for the development of children is the environment where they live together with both their parents

because each parent has a different importance on children. Hence, it is not possible that one of the parents compensate the place of the other. The love and interest of parents for children living with their family increase their enthusiasm for life and behavior problems are less frequently encountered among these children. During the research, which lasted for 2 years, the impacts of adoption and orphanages on children in need for protection in Iraq were compared. The outcomes of the research put that both the adopted children and the children in need for protection living at the orphanages have more social – emotional problems, however the adopted children have higher social competency levels relatively to those living at the orphanage (Ahmad, Qahar, Siddiq, Majeed, Rasheed, Jabar and von Knorring 2005).

Examining the outcomes of the researches on the impacts of the orphanage experience on the children in need for protection (Bender, 1945; Bodman & McKinlay, 1950; Bowlby, 1944; Bowlby, et al., 1956; Goldfarb, 1949; Hodges & Tizard, 1989; Quinton, Rutter & Liddle, 1984; Rutter, Quinton & Hill, 1990; Provence, 1989); it is seen that the children living at the orphanages make lower score relatively to the children living with their families when in social skill measurements (Akt. McCall, 1998). Ford and Kroll (1995) also put that the common result of the researches, which have been carried out for fifty years, lay down the fact the children, who live at the orphanages for long periods of time experience problems in their social relationships, have personality problems and most of them also experience problems when they become parents in the further phases of their lives.

About the incapability of unprotected children it is generally believed that lack of parents who serve as a model, who deal with them closely and who act as a guide for them; the lack of sufficient affinity and tender; and physical insufficiency of orphanages have a great role in hindering the acquirement and reinforcement of skills.

One of the fundamental objectives of preschool education is to ensure the socialization of children. To Connell & Prinz (2002), McClelland & Morrison (2003), preschool education is effective on preservation of existent skills and acquirement of new social skills. The educational programs applied at the nursery school are supported by numerous social skill – improving events, during which the children are in interaction with each other, such as dramas, project works, trips, open air and indoor plays. Unprotected children receive preschool education like children who live with their family. Within the scope of Competent Children project in New Zealand, the 4 – year old children, who attend pre – school education, were followed up until they are 10 years old. The findings of the research show that the children, who attend pre – school education for 3 or more years, are more competent in the fields of social skills and communication relatively to those, who attend pre – school education for less than 3 years (Wylie, & Thompson, 2003). McClelland, Morrison, Holmes (2000), within the conclusion of their research, by which they examined the impact of the social skills related to learning on the early academic problems with children at 4 – 7 years, suggest that the social skills gained at nursery school affected the social skills at the nursery school and that there is a relationship between the social skill level and the academic skill level at the primary education age.

Moreover, unprotected children spend time with their peers in the environments out of the school.

It is possible to conclude that the time unprotected children spend with their peers and the preschool education may contribute to their acquirement of certain skills.

Lack of parents and lack of love, tender, models to develop close relations and one-to-one interest are significant disadvantages which hinder unprotected children from learning social skills and reinforcing the social skills they have learned. Children living with their family are in an environment where they receive support, love and interest. This environment assures that they learn many social skills which are appropriate for their developmental level.

Social skills programs should be developed. In addition, the staff in orphanages should receive regular in-service training in order to optimize the conditions of unprotected children. Unpopulated orphanages which resemble houses should be constructed rather than barrack-type orphanages. These orphanages provide the opportunity to develop warm relations between children and staff. Moreover, foster parenting should be encouraged; and various models which ensure that unprotected children live in a family environment should be developed.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, A., Qahar, J., Siidq, A., Majeed, A., Rasheed, J., Jabart, F., & Von Knorring, A. L. (2005). A 2 year follow-up orphans' competence, socio emotional problems and post-traumatic stress symptoms in traditional foster care and orphanages in Iraq. *Child: Care, Health & Development*, 31, 2, 203-215.
- Altuhul, S. (1991). Konya Çocuk Yuvasındaki 0-12 Yaş Çocuklarının Gelişim Özellikleri Ve Ana Yoksunluğunun Çocuk Gelişimine Etkileri Açısından Koruyucu Aile Bakımı İle Karşılaştırılmalı İncelenmesi. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Atılgan, G. (2001). Okul Öncesi Eğitim Kurumlarına Devam Eden ve Etmeyen İlköğretim I. Kademe I. Devre Öğrencilerinin Sosyal Beceri Özelliklerinin Karşılaştırılması. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Billar, H. B. (1993). *Fathers and families*. America: Auburn House.
- Black, B., & Logan, A. (1995). Links Between Communication Patterns In Mother-Child, Father-Child And Child-Peer Interactions And Children' S Social Status. *Child Development*, 66, 255-271.
- Bowlby, J.(1982). *Attachment and loss (2.Ed)*. New York: Vol. 1. Attachment Basic Books.
- Brazelton, T.B., & Cramer, B. (1991). *The Earliest relationship*. ABD: Addison -Wesley Publishing Company.
- Calderella, P. K., & Merrell W. (1997). Common Dimensions Of Social Skills Of Children And Adolescents: A Taxonomy Of Positive Behaviors. *School Psychology Review*, 26 (2), 264-278.

- Connell, C. M., & Prinz R. J. (2002). The Impact Of Childcare And Parent-Child Interactions On School Readiness And Social Skills Development For Low-Income African American Children. *Journal of School Psychology*, 40 (20), 177-193.
- Craig, G., J., & Kermis, D., M. (1995). *Children today*. New Jersey: Perentice Hall.
- Çakıl, N. (1998). Grupla Sosyal Beceri Eğitiminin Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Yalnızlık Düzeyleri Üzerindeki Etkisi. *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi*, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Çiftçi, İ. (2001). Zihinsel Engelli Bireyler İçin Hazırlanan Bilişsel Süreç Yaklaşımına Dayalı Sosyal Beceri Programının Etkililiğinin İncelenmesi. *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi*, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Darwish, D., Esquivel G. B., Houtz, J. C., & Alfonse V. C. (2000). Play and social skills in maltreated and non-maltreated preschoolers during peer interactions. *Child Abuse And Neglect*, 15, (3), 307-329.
- Ford, M., & Kroll, J. (1995). There is a better way: Family- based alternatives to instutional care. North American Council on Adoptable Children, Research Brief, 3.
- Fry, P. S. & Grover, S. C. (1980). The relationship between father absence and children' s social problem solving competencies. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 3, 105- 120.
- Gülay, H. (2004). Korunmaya Muhtaç Çocuklarla Ailesi Ile Yaşayan 6 Yaş Çocuklarının Sosyal Becerilerinin Karşılaştırılması. *Yayımlanmamış Bilim Uzmanlığı Tezi*, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Hortaçsu, N. (2003). *Çocuklukta ilişkiler: ana baba, kardeş ve arkadaşlar*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Johnson, V. (2002). Parental views of the development of children in a rural south African community. *ABFN Journal*, Jan-Feb.
- < [http:// www. findarticles.com](http://www.findarticles.com) > (20.02.2003).
- Kahn, J. & Wright S. E. (1980). *Human Growth and The Development of Personality*. U. K.: Wheaton And Co. Ltd.
- Lamb, M. E., & Baumrind, D. (1978). *Socialization and Personality Development in the Preschool Years*. M. E. Lamb (Ed.), Social and Personality Development, America: Halt, Rinehart and Winsten, 50-67.
- Landau, R. (1999). Planned orphanhood. *Social Science & Medicine*, 49, 185-196.
- Maccoby, E. E. (2000). Parenting And Its Effects On Children: On Reading And Misreading Behavior Genetics. *Annual Review of Psychology*.
- < [http:// www. findarticles.com](http://www.findarticles.com) > (14.03.2005).

- McCall, J. (1998). Research On The Psychological Effects Of Orphanage Care: A Critical Review. R. Mckenzie (Ed.), *Rethinking Orphanages for the 21st Century*, USA: Sage Publications.
- Mc Clelland, M. M. & Morrison F. J. (2003). The Emergence Of Learning Related Social Skills In Preschool Children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 18, 206-224.
- Mc Clelland, M. M., Morrison F. J. & Holmes, D. C. (2000). Children At Risk For Early Academic Problems: The Role Of Learning-Related Social Skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 15, (3), 307-329.
- McKenzie, R. B. (1998). Neglected Solutions,, Orphanages May Be Preferable Over Foster Families. *National Review*, 18, 1-5.
- Özmen, B. (1989). *Annesiz Veya Babasız Büyüyen 5-8 Yaş Çocuklarının Kişilik Özelliklerinin İncelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Bilim Uzmanlığı Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Rubin, K. H., & Burgess, K. B. (2001). Social withdrawal and anxiety. In M. W. Vasey & M: R: Dadds (Eds.), *The developmental Psychopathology of Anxiety*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Salk, L. (1982). *Çocuğun duygusal sorunları*. (Çev. Onur E.) İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Santrock, J. W. (1998). *Child development*. America: Mc Graw-Hill Companies.
- Steelman, L., M., Assel, M. A., Swank, P. R., Smith, K. E. Landry, S. H. (2002). Early Maternal Warm Responsiveness As A Predictor Of Child Social Skills. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 23, (2), 135-156.
- Sisto, F. F., Urquijo, S., & Souza, M. T. C. C. (1999). Peer Acceptance And Cognitive Development. *Psychological Reports*, 84, 611-616.
- Stormshak, E. A. & Webster-Stratton C. (1999). The Qualitative Interactions Of Children With Conduct Problems And Their Peers. Differential Correlates With Self-Report Measures, Home Behavior And School Behavior Problems. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 20, (2), 295-317.
- Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Shannon, J. D., Cabrera, N. J., & Lamb, M. E. (2004). Fathers And Mothers Play With Their 2- And 3- Year Olds: Contributions To Language And Cognitive Development. *Child Development*, 75, (6), 1806-1820.
- Terzi, Ş. (2003). 6. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Kişiler Arası Problem Çözme Beceri Algıları. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*. 2, (1).
- Wylie, C., & Thompson, J. (2003). The Long-Term Contribution Of Early Childhood Education To Children' S Performance- Evidence From New Zealand. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 11, (1), 69-78.

Prof. Dr. Berrin AKMAN

Berrin Akman, 1992-1995 yılları arasında, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Ev Ekonomisi Yüksekokulu Çocuk Gelişimi ve Eğitimi Bölümü'nde Araştırma Görevlisi olarak görev yapmış, 1995-1997 yılları arasında aynı bölümde yardımcı doçent olarak çalışmıştır. 1997 yılında doçent olan Berrin Akman, 2004 yılından beri Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İlköğretim Bölümü Okulöncesi Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı'nda profesör olarak görev yapmaktadır. Berrin Akman'ın alanıyla ilgili ulusal ve uluslararası dergilerde yayımlanmış makaleleri, ulusal ve uluslararası sempozyumlarda sunulmuş bildirileri vardır.

BAÜ
SBED
11 (19)

39