ACADEMIC JOURNALS
expand your knowledge

Educational Research and Reviews

Full Length Research Paper

Comparison of value acquisitions of children of divorced and non-divorced parents

Hakan Sahin

Department of Preschool Education, Hasan Ali Yucel Faculty of Education, University of Istanbul Unıversity, Cerrahpasa, Turkey.

This research is a descriptive study aimed at comparing the value acquisitions of children of divorced and non-divorced parents. The study consists of 57,296 children who attended pre-school education in Ankara, in 2018. Of this sample was 54 divorced families and 4-5 year-old children of the same class and of the same socio-economic level and gender, who agreed to work. In order to reveal the compatibility of the data for normal distribution in the statistical analysis, Shapiro Wilks's test was used due to the unit of numbers. The Spearman's correlation coefficient was used in the relationships between data that did not emanate from the normal distribution. When analyzing the differences between the groups, Mann-Whitney U Test was used in cases where the variables did not come from the normal distribution. As a result of the Spearman's correlation coefficient analysis, the relationship between total scores obtained in the forms which applied to families, teachers and children in order to determine the value levels of children in both divorced and non-divorced families, was completely positive. And the scores obtained from teacher-child forms in all children from divorced family, and non-divorced family was significant and positive. As a result of the research, according to the results from the family-child and teacher form, as regards friendship/sharing, honesty, co-operation, respect and responsibility value, the average scores of children from non-divorced families were higher than the average scores of children from divorced families.

Key words: Value, values education, divorced family.

INTRODUCTION

The family is the smallest part of the society; it is an institution based on the principle of equality for satisfaction of social needs and where common needs are met (Aral and Gürsoy, 2000). In Turkish society, family begins with marriage. They are connected and strengthened by kinship and social bonds. Family

members are defined as the basic unit of the society where sexual, psychological, social, cultural and economic needs are met, mostly living in the same house and adapt to the society in which they live (Bulut, 2018; Özgüven, 2001). Mother and father are very important in the early childhood period, which is called the magic years of the individual's life, period in which one"s life is shaped (Oktay, 2007). Parents' interest, care and love to children play a complementary and balancing role in the children"s development, (Aydın, 2009). In order for children to be cognitive, physically, socially and emotionally healthy and to be beneficial individuals for their community, they need a loving family environment where effective communication is at the forefront (Kalkınç, 2013).

As much as parents take care of their children, another important task is to inform them about the rules, values, roles and culture that covers them, that will help the child to adapt to the society and also help them to live in the society. In this context, it is the family's responsibility to raise the child and make it an individual of the society in which she or he lives. The quality of the parent relationship and most importantly, its continuity is very important in the child's development. Children learn the correct behavioural patterns by modeling their mother and father, as their first teacher (Şenol, 2004). However, in a family environment where one or both parents are missing, it is inevitable for the child to be negatively affected by this situation and behavioural problems to be observed in the child (Attepe, 2010). Even solid, harmonious and balanced families may encounter unexpected and undesirable situations that will take away this system (Şentürk, 2008). In this context, the discomfort in the family can deeply hurt children. Today, as a result of the discomfort in family, the divorce rates increase significantly. According to TÜIK (Turkey Statistical Institute, 2018), while the number of divorced couples in 2017 was 128,411, this number has increased by 10.9% in 2018 to become 448,142 (Türkiye Istatistik Kurumu, 2018). The child"s age during the divorce period, and how the child undergoes the divorce process is important. Divorces, which coincide with early childhood, deeply affect the development process of the child. According to Seven (2008), if parents are divorced before the child turns two, they may not experience significant problems in adolescence. However, if children are between the ages of three and five, in adolescence, aggression appears in boys and girls experience aggression as well as failure in school. In addition, the reactions of children to divorce and the divorce effects vary according to children"s age, gender, personality characteristics and family structure (Aydın, 2010).

The cognitive functions of children aged 5 and 6 years of non-divorced families were found to be significantly different from children in divorced families in researches. Additionally, it has also been found that children in divorced families felt unhappy and children whose parents are divorced had constant high anger levels, low self-esteem, and high anxiety levels compared to children of non-divorced parents. In non-divorced families, fathers are at least as efficient as the mothers on the child's psychological adjustment; however, it was concluded that in divorced families the effect of fathers on their children diminished considerably compared to non-divorced families and the role of the mother in the child's life was higher (Feyzioğlu and Kuşçuoğlu, 2011; Altuntaş, 2012; Öngider, 2013b). Children who grow up without a father have a tendency to get involved in more antisocial behaviors and crime as well as their psycho-social adjustment, their achievement and behaviour in school, educational achievements are low, and their abilities to interact with others and develop are reduced; meeting with their father, and maintaining their relationship is very important in terms of children's mental health and well-being (Lund, 1987).

Children who often witness the picture of unhappiness in divorced families are negatively affected by this situation. Children who grow up in an unhappy environment also encounter many social, emotional and mental problems (Turan et al. 2007).

Early childhood is the period in which the child's mental and social-emotional development is at the fastest; it is also a critical period in which the core values are gained. The core values gained are transferred to the coming years (Bakan and Şahin, 2018). Values is an abstract concept, as it is not easy to make a universal definition of it. Some of the explanation made emphasizes the social aspect, the individual and some other economic aspects of the concept of "value" which has an effect on the individual's thinking, decision making and behavioural processes. According to Cooper (2014), it refers to things that are good and desirable, principles that are desired and considered as important rules or standards. According to Schaefer (2012), the beautiful things that are desired to be realized, and the invisible moral principles are defined as the criteria that motivate and direct the individual's behavior and affect the individual in the decision-making process.

Values are the principles that affect the individual"s thinking and behaviour. Values undertake practically a control mechanism over the individual"s behaviour. It inhibits behaviours that are not accepted by the society; thus, individuals provide their own internal control through their value (Maya, 2017; Sapsağlam and Ömeroğlu, 2016). Values have three dimensions: cognitive, affective and behavioural (Rokeach, 1973). Rokeach (1973) divided the values into two groups, viz: purpose and tool values. Purpose values are the desired, intended, core values, which include behaviours that will be used to reach the core values. Another scientist, Schwartz, has studied the literature of many cultures concerning values. As a result of the study, he divided the values into ten value groups taking into consideration the differences along with the basic motivational features. These values

are: Universalism, Achievement, Self-direction, Benevolence, Security, Power, Hedonism, Conformity, Stimulation and Traditionalism (Bardi and Schwartz, 2003). Spranger and others also examined and classified the values in six different groups, viz; scientific (theoretical), aesthetic, economic, political, social and religious values (Güngör, 1993). As can be seen, the classification of the values varies as well as their definitions.

Along with this, values are living elements (Davidov, 2010), children acquire knowledge of values throughout their lives and the first knowledge is gained in the early period. Although this process continues throughout life, families play a big role in the child"s values acquisition process. Family environment affects children's moral development and also prepares children for society as an equipped individual with positive value education (Balat and Dağal, 2009; Brownlee et al., 2016). This is more likely to happen in a healthy family environment.

When we look at researches on single-parent children, much focus has been on the following topics: Whether children of single-parent are at psychological risk (Blechman, 1982); the competence and self-esteem of children from single-parent (Pike, 2003); the ways of approaching parents of children from divorced in terms of different cultures (Bilge and Kaufman, 1983); What are the stress and/or protective factors in the adaptation levels of children after divorce (Amato and Keith, 1991; Amato, 1991; Barnes, 1999; Compas and Williams, 1990; Guttmann and Rosenberg, 2003; Kelly and Emery, 2003; Rodgers and Rose, 2002); the effects of divorce on the child (Öngider, 2013); self-esteem and anxiety levels (Bulut-Serin and Öztürk, 2007; Öngider, 2016); anger levels and anger expression styles (Fiyakalı, 2008); father deprivation and anxiety levels in children (Özdal and Aral, 2005); the relationship between self-esteem and anxiety levels in children (Öztürk, 2006); anger levels and anger expression styles (Çivitci et al., 2009); the relationship between cognitive distortions and self-value (Kuyucu, 2007); the relationship between resilience, coping, self-esteem and psychological symptoms (Kurt, 2013; Kuyucu, 2007), and no research is done on the value levels of children from divorced family.

In line with these researches, when the literature on divorced and non-divorced families and values is examined, it is clear that the value of education given in a healthy family environment improves the moral judgment of the individual, brings values such as truth, honesty, justice and teaches the individual to take social responsibility. The quality and continuity of the parents' relationships are important in the child"s development. Children are the most affected in broken families. It is inevitable for this situation to affect their level of value. Based on these opinions, this study aimed to compare the levels of responsibility, respect, co-operation, honesty, friendship and sharing value of children from divorced and non-divorced parents according to the teacher, family and child forms.

METHODS

Research model

This research is a descriptive study aimed at comparing the value acquisitions of children from divorced and non-divorced parents who attend preschool education institutions. The screening model describes a situation that exists in the past or present as it is, It is a research approach in which the characteristics of the participants" interests, skills, abilities, attitudes, values under focus are determined (Karasar, 1984).

Scope, sample and study group

The scope of the research consists of children aged 4 and 5 years of 54 divorced families who have agreed to participate among 57,296 children, who attend public and private preschool institutions educations, in the 2017-2018 academic year in Ankara Province and 54 non-divorced families of the same class, socio-economic level and gender. The study group consists of children of 54 divorced families and children of 54 non-divorced families who accept to participate in the research, which is in contradiction with the purposive sampling method selected by random sampling.

Data collection

The "Family Information Form" developed by the researcher and the teacher and Child Form of the Preschool Values Scale" developed by Neslitürk and Çeliköz (2015) were used in the research.

Family ınformation form: Developed by the researcher, and questions consisting of the age, gender, number of siblings, birth order, age of the father and mother, educational status of the father and mother, and socio-economic level of the family were included in the form.

Preschool values scale: The Family and Teacher Form is a Likert-style scale consisting of a total of 30 items and including positive and negative items. There are three options in accordance with frequency of showing behaviour in the created items, viz: yes, sometimes, and no. The options and scoring of the scale are as follows: 1 - Yes; 2 - Sometimes; and 3 - No. Reverse scoring was made for the negative items. The scale was prepared in a way to measure the values of respect, responsibility, honesty, co-operation, sharing, and friendship. The reliability of the Family Form of the preschool value scale was examined according to the internal consistency coefficient. The reliability coefficient was calculated as 0.89 according to the 0.84 Cronbach„s alpha reliability results of the family form based on the splitting test method. The reliability coefficient of the teacher on the Preschool Values Scale according to the splitting test method was 0.86, and according to the result of the Cronbach"s alpha reliability, it was found to be 0.91. The form"" Child Form of the Preschool Value Scale"" which was visually prepared for children consists of 18 different pictures. There is a coding list in the prepared form, and 18 different short stories occur in the coding table. Children were asked short questions by showing the pictures and telling these short stories. 0-1-2 scores were given in the scoring section in accordance with the answers given by the children.

Table 1. Spearman correlation coefficient analysis from the teacher, family and child forms, conducted to determine the relationship between the scores of the children of non-divorced family.

Variable	1	2	3
Total score of the family form	1		
Total score of the teacher form	0.239	1	
Total score of the child form	0.236	0.932**	1

Table 2. Spearman correlation coefficient analysis conducted to determine the relationship between the scores of children of the divorced family from teacher, family and child forms.

Variable	1	2	3
Total score of the family form	1		
Total score of the teacher form	0.321*	1	
Total score of the child form	0.385*	0.939**	1

Data processing and analysis

Firstly, descriptive statistics related to the demographic characteristics as to the sample of the research were calculated. In order to reveal the compatibility of the data for the normal distribution in the statistical analysis, Shapiro Wilks"s test was used due to the unit of numbers. The Spearman's correlation coefficient was used in the relationships between the data that did not come from the normal distribution. When analyzing the differences between the groups, Mann-Whitney U Test was used in case where the variables did not come from the normal distribution. When interpreting the results of the data, 0.05 was used as the level of significance, and it was stated that there is a significant relationship when p<0.05, but no significant relationship exists when p>0.05. The data obtained in the study were analyzed with SPSS 20" package" program.

RESULTS

The results here were obtained based on the demographic characteristics of the research sample, which comprises the distribution of children by gender (45.37% girls and 54.63% boys). When looking at the distribution of the number of siblings, 53.7% of the children do not have siblings, whereas 46.3% of them have siblings. Looking at the birth order, 70.37% were first child, 7.41% were the middle child, while 22.22% were the last child. Considering educational status of their mothers, 16.67% had primary education, 48.15% had high school education, 8.33% had associate graduate degrees, 23.15% had undergraduate degrees, while 3.7% had graduate degrees. As for their fathers, it was observed that 20.37% had primary school education, 48.15% had high school education, 11.11% had associate degrees, and 16.67% had undergraduate degrees. As regards socio-economic level, 50% of the families were in the low income group, 49.07% were in the middle income group, and 0.93% were in the high income group. With regard to family structure, 50% of

families are nuclear families, 2.78% are extended families, while 47.22% are single-parent families. It was observed that in the divorced families, 88.89% of children live with the mother while 11.11% live with the father. Concerning distribution of ages, it was seen that the children aged between 4 and 5 years; the fathers of children of the non-divorced families included in the study were between the ages of 26 to 52 years, and average age of fathers is 35.93 years; whereas the fathers of the children of the divorced families was between the ages 23 to 51 years, and their average age was 35.46 years. As for the mothers, it was determined that, the mothers of the children of the non-divorced families included in the study were between 25-47 years, and their average was 32.96 years; whereas the mothers of children of the divorced families were between the ages of 20 - 43 years and their average age was 32.46 years.

Table 1 shows the results of the Spearman"s correlation coefficient analysis from the teacher, family and child forms, conducted to determine the relationship between scores of the children of non-divorced family.

As can be seen in the table, the forms of children of non-divorced family showed a significant positive relationship from a statistical perspective between the teacher form and the child form scores at the level of p<0.05. Although it was not significant in all other scales, a positive" correlation was found among themselves in a low level.

Table 2 shows the results of the Spearman"s correlation coefficient analysis conducted to determine the relationship between the scores acquired from the children of the divorced Family, Teacher, Family and Child Forms. Here in this table, a statistically positive meaningful relationship was found between the family, teacher form and the child forms at the level of p<0.05.

Table 3 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U Test regarding the difference between the children of the non-

Table 3. Mann-Whitney U test results regarding the difference between the children of the divorced and non-divorced families according to the children's form.

Child form			Statistical parameters						Mann Whitney U Test		
		N	$\overline{x}$	Median	Min	Max	ss	Rank O.	z	P
Responsibility	Non-divorced	54	5.43	6	2	6	0.92	60.64		
	Divorced	54	4.93	5	0	6	1.29	48.36	-2.231	0.026
	Total	108	5.18	6	0	6	1.14			
Respect	Non-divorced	54	4.7	5	2	6	1.16	60.5		
	Divorced	54	4.15	4	1	6	1.39	48.5	-2.049	0.04
	Total	108	4.43	5	1	6	1.31			
Cooperation	Non -divorced	54	5.22	6	3	6	0.96	59.6		
	Divorced	54	4.89	5	2	6	1.04	49.4	-1.797	0.072
	Total	108	5.06	5	2	6	1.01			
Honesty	Non-divorced	54	5.11	5	2	6	1.09	62.94		
	Divorced	54	4.5	5	1	6	1.21	46.06	-2.923	0.003
	Total	108	4.81	5	1	6	1.19			
Friendship	Non-divorced	54	5.2	6	1	6	1.09	60.38		
	Divorced	54	4.7	5	2	6	1.3	48.62	-2.071	0.038
	Total	108	4.95	5	1	6	1.22			
Sharing	Non-divorced	54	4.5	4	1	6	1.18	59.44		
	Divorced	54	4.11	4	1	6	1.14	49.56	-1.698	0.089
	Total	108	4.31	4	1	6	1.17			
Total score	Non-divorced	54	30.17	31	18	36	4.06	64.75		
	Divorced	54	27.28	28.5	18	35	4.6	44.25	-3.415	0.001
	Total	108	28.72	30	18	36	4.56			

divorced and divorced families according to the child's form. Here the analyses reveals that while the average score in relation to responsibility value of children of the non-divorced family was 5.43, the average score of children of the divorced family was found to be 4.93 (z = -2.2231; p = 0.026; p <0.05). It was revealed that the scores of children of the non-divorced family were higher enough to make a significant difference from the scores of the children of the divorced family (p<0.05). While the average score in relation to respect value of children of the non-divorced family was 4.7, the average score of children of the divorced family was found to be 4.15 (z = -2.049; p = 0.04; p<0.05). Also, the scores of children of the non-divorced family were high enough to make a significant difference from those of children of the divorced family (p <0.05). While the average score in relation to cooperation of children of the non-divorced family was 5.22, that of children of the divorced family was found to be 4.89 (z = -1.779; p = 0.072; p>0.05). The scores of children of the non-divorced family did not show any statistically significant difference from those of

children of the divorced family (p>0.05). While the average score of children of non-divorced family in relation to honesty value was 5.11, that of children of the divorced family was found to be 4.5 (z = -2.923; p = 0.003; p <0.05). Thus, no statistically significant difference was observed between the scores of children from non-divorced family and those of children from divorced family (p> 0.05). Whereas the average score of children from non-divorced family in relation to friendship/value was 5.2, that of children of the divorced family was found to be 4.7 (z = -2.071; p = 0.038; p<0.05). This therefore revealed that the scores of children of the non-divorced family were high enough to make a significant difference from those of children of the divorced family (p<0.05). While the average score of children of the non-divorced family in relation to sharing value was 4.5, that of children of the divorced family was 4.11 (z = -1.669; p = 0.089; p>0.05). There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of children from non-divorced family and those of children from divorced family (p> 0.05). Furthermore, whereas the

Table 4. The Mann-Whitney U test results related to the difference between children of the non-divorced and divorced families according to the family form.

Family form		N	$\bar{x}$	Median	Min	Max	ss	Rank O.	z	P
			Statistical parameters					**Mann Whitney U Test**		
Responsibility	Non-divorced	54	6.93	7	2	9	1.78	63.46		
	Divorced	54	6.07	6	3	10	1.61	45.54	-3.027	0.002
	Total	108	6.5	7	2	10	1.74			
Respect	Non-divorced	54	7.15	8	2	10	1.91	60.44		
	Divorced	54	6.48	7	2	9	1.67	48.56	-2.002	0.045
	Total	108	6.81	7	2	10	1.81			
Cooperation	Non-divorced	54	7.78	8	4	9	1.08	60.18		
	Divorced	54	7.22	7.5	4	10	1.49	48.82	-1.949	0.051
	Total	108	7.5	8	4	10	1.32			
Honesty	Non-divorced	54	8.43	8	4	10	1.38	59.57		
	Divorced	54	7.85	8	4	10	1.61	49.43	-1.728	0.084
	Total	108	8.14	8	4	10	1.52			
Friendship	Non-divorced	54	9.3	10	7	10	0.88	62.15		
	Divorced	54	8.61	9	4	10	1.42	46.85	-2.686	0.007
	Total	108	8.95	9	4	10	1.23			
Sharing	Non-divorced	54	8.3	9	1	10	1.86	63.86		
	Divorced	54	7.35	8	2	10	1.83	45.14	-3.162	0.002
	Total	108	7.82	8	1	10	1.9			
Total score	Non-divorced	54	47.87	49	32	56	5.47	65.51		
	Divorced	54	43.59	44.5	30	55	6.2	43.49	-3.663	0.001
	Total	108	45.73	46	30	56	6.2			

average score of children of non-divorced family in relation to the total score in the child,s form was 30.17, that of children from divorced family was found to be 27.28 (z = -3.415; p = 0.001; p<0.05). It was revealed that the total scores of children of the non-divorced family were significantly higher than the total scores of children of the divorced family (p <0.05).

Table 4 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U Test in relation to the difference between children from non-divorced and divorced families according to the family form. From the analyses made, while the average score of children of non-divorced family in relation to responsibility value was 6.93, that of the divorced family was 6.07 (z = -3.027; p = 0.002; p<0.05). It was also revealed that the scores of children of the non-divorced family were significantly higher enough compared to those of children of the divorced family (p <0.05). It was observed that while the average score of children from non-divorced family in relation to respect value was 7.15, that of the divorced family children was 6.48 (z = -2.002; p = 0.045; p<0.05). Also, the scores of the non-divorced

family children were significantly high enough to make a significant difference from those of the divorced family children (p <0.05). Whereas the average score of children of the non-divorced family in relation to cooperation value was 7.78, that of children of the divorced family was seen to be 7.22 (z = -1.949; p = 0.051; p>0.05). There was no significant difference from a statistical level between the scores of children of the non-divorced family and those of children of the divorced family (p>0.05). While the average score of children of the non-divorced family in relation to honesty value was 8.43, that of children of the divorced family was found to be 7.85 (z = -1.728; p = 0.084; p>0.05). There was no significant difference from a statistical level between the scores of children from non-divorced family and those of children from divorced family (p> 0.05). Also, while the average score of non-divorced family children in relation to friendship value was 9.3, those of children from divorced family was 8.61 (z = -2.668; p = 0.007; p<0.05). It was revealed that the scores of children from non-divorced family were high enough to make a significant difference from those of children from

Table 5. The Mann Whitney U test results related to the difference between children from non- divorced and divorced families according to the teacher form.

Teacher form		Statistical parameters						Mann Whitney U Test		
		N	$\overline{x}$	Median	Min	Max	Ss	Rank Order	z	P
Responsibility	Non-divorced	54	8.35	8	4	10	1.48	66.51		
	Divorced	54	7	7	3	10	1.78	42.49	-4.049	0.001
	Total	108	7.68	8	3	10	1.77			
Respect	Non-divorced	54	8.37	9	3	10	1.74	61.23		
	Divorced	54	7.65	8	3	10	1.84	47.77	-2.279	0.023
	Total	108	8.01	8.5	3	10	1.82			
Cooperation	Non-divorced	54	8.7	9	4	10	1.63	61.15		
	Divorced	54	7.98	8	4	10	1.9	47.85	-2.274	0.023
	Total	108	8.34	9	4	10	1.8			
Honesty	Non-divorced	54	7.15	7	4	10	1.66	60.23		
	Divorced	54	6.46	6.5	2	10	1.61	48.77	-1.934	0.053
	Total	108	6.81	7	2	10	1.67			
friendship	Non-divorced	54	9.07	10	6	10	1.2	61.47		
	Divorced	54	8.43	9	5	10	1.54	47.53	-2.421	0.015
	Total	108	8.75	9	5	10	1.41			
Sharing	Non-divorced	54	8.78	9	4	10	1.56	62.78		
	Non-divorced	54	7.72	8	3	10	2.06	46.22	-2.842	0.004
	Total	108	8.25	9	3	10	1.9			
Total score	Non-divorced	54	50.43	51.5	30	60	6.63	66.8		
	Divorced	54	45.24	47	29	57	7.09	42.2	-4.086	0.001
	Total	108	47.83	49	29	60	7.32			

divorced family (p <0.05). While the average score of children from non-divorced family in relation to sharing value was 8.3, that of children from divorced family was 7.35 (z = -2.668; p = 0.002; p>0.05). There is no level of statistically significant difference between the scores of children from non-divorced family and those of children from divorced family (p>0.05). While the average score of children of non-divorced family in relation to the total score of the family form was 47.87, that of children of the divorced family was found to be 43.59 (z = -3.666; p = 0.001; p<0.05). It was revealed that the total scores of children of the non-divorced family were significantly higher than that of children of the divorced family (p <0.05).

Table 5 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U Test in relation to the difference between children from non-divorced and divorced families according to the teacher form. From the analysis made, while the average score of children of the non-divorced family in relation to responsibility value was 8.35, that of children of the

divorced family children was 7 (z = -4.049; p = 0.001; p<0.05). It was revealed that the scores of children of the non-divorced family were high enough to make a significant difference from those of children from divorced family (p <0.05). While the average score of children of the non-divorced family in relation to respect value was 8.37, that of children of the divorced family was 7.65 (z = -2.279; p = 0.023; p<0.05). It was revealed that the scores of children of the non-divorced family were high enough to make a significant difference from those of children of the divorced family (p <0.05). While the average score of children of the non-divorced family in relation to cooperation value was 8.7, that of children of the divorced family was 7.98 (z = -2,274; p = 0,023; p <0.05). It was revealed that the scores of children of the non-divorced family were high enough to make a significant difference from those of children of the divorced family (p <0.05). While the average score of children of the non-divorced family in relation to honesty value was 7.15, that of children of the divorced family

was 6.46 (z = -1.934; p = 0.053; p>0.05). It was revealed that the scores of children of the non-divorced family were high enough to make a significant difference from those of children of the divorced family (p <0.05). While the average score of children of the non-divorced family in relation to friendship value was 9.07, that of children of the divorced family was found to be 8.43 (z = -2.421; p = 0.015; p<0.05). It was revealed that the scores of children of the non-divorced family were high enough to make a significant difference from the scores of children of the divorced family (p <0.05). While the average score of children of the non-divorced family in relation to sharing value was 8.78, that of children of the divorced family was found to be 7.72 (z = -2.842; p = 0.004; p>0.05). It was revealed that the scores of children of the non-divorced family were high enough to make a significant difference from those of children of the divorced family (p <0.05). While the average score of children of the non-divorced family in relation to the total score of the teacher form was 50.43, that of children of the divorced family was found to be 45.24 (z = -4.086; p = 0.001; p<0.05). Thus, the scores of children of the non-divorced family were found to be high enough to make significant difference from those of children of the divorced family (p <0.05).

DISCUSSION

From the results of the reseach aimed at comparing the value acquisitions of children of the divorced and non-divorced parents who attend preschool education institutions, it was found that the gender distribution is balanced and half of the children are siblings. The children are mostly first child, and their mothers and fathers are mostly high school graduates. The socio-economic levels of the families are low and medium. The majority of the divorced families live with one parent and mother. And the children"s father average age was 35.93 years while that of the mother was 35.46 years. From the Spearman correlation coefficient analysis, the relationship between total scores obtained in the forms which applied to families, teachers and children in order to determine the value levels of children from both divorced and non-divorced family was completely positive and in all divorced family children. And in children of the non-divorced family, the scores obtained from the teacher-child forms were significant. From this aspect, it was concluded that the data obtained in different sources concerning children were consistent with the value scores of the Child Form: responsibility, respect, cooperation, honesty and friendship; the Family Form: responsibility, respect, friendship/sharing; and the Teachers" Form: responsibility, respect, co-operation, friendship, sharing used in the research; and the value levels of children of the divorced family in the total scores of all scales were lower than the value levels of children from the non-

divorced family. According to Freud, the personality of individuals develops witihin the first years of their lives (Aydoğan et al., 2015). The effects of the individual"s experiences in early childhood period last a lifetime. The basic values gained during this period will directly affect their future lives. When we look at the values that can be gained, according to Sapsağlam (2017), children aged 3, 4 and 5 years can perceive the "responsibility" value positively; and according to Alpöge (2011) and Dinç (2011), values such as self-respect, self-control, responsibility, co-operation, love, respect, honesty and patience can be gained for children in preschool period. Also, values that can be given in the pre-school period includes: respect, responsibility, happiness, co-operation, patience and honesty values (Balat and Balaban Dağal, 2009). According to Uyanık Balat vd. (2011), parents listed the universal values they want their children to have as honesty, responsibility, respect, happiness, justice, compassion and reliability, being a good citizen and peace. As can be seen in the researches, the value acquisition is easily realized in this period. The value acquisition of individuals first begins by modeling in their family and develops with the experience gained from the environment (Yeşil and Aydın, 2007). It is not impossible to change the habits acquired in the family environment in the following years, but it is very difficult. For this reason, parents are very important because they leave traces that are difficult to remove in the child"s personality. It is revealed that the value acquisitions, which is also an indicator of social emotional development, are negatively affected in children from the divorced family. In line with the research findings, Özdemir et al. (2006b) and Sağlam (2011), children from divorced families were more adversely affected than parents and they feel the negative effects of the divorce in their later lives. In the study conducted by Er and Bartan (2019), problems such as turning away from social environment, inability to express themselves, fear, anxiety, aggressive behaviours, aggressivity, irritability, introversion and shyness and distraction were observed in children from single-parent family. Lengua et al. (2000) found that children from divorced parents have more social adjustment problems than children from non-divorced parents, and are also more prone to violence and depression. In a research conducted by Wallerstein and Kelly, it was found that children under the age of five had visible fear, behavioral regression, sleep disorder, aggression and fear of being abandoned shortly after the divorce. They stated that one of three of the same children were unsuccessful and unhappy after 5 years (Moore and Hotch, 1982; Sağlam, 2011). According to Şentürk (2006), the child who moves away from the father and mother due to breakup of the parents, feels helpless, lonely and unprotected. Depending on the intensity of the problems experienced after the divorce, children lose the possibility of obtaining psycho-social support, which will ensure the positive development of

their life. According to researches, it is stated that children from divorced families have problems in terms of socio-emotional characteristics, social adjustment, anxiety, aggression, and peer communication. The value acquisition begins in a happy family atmosphere. The child firstly learns the values such as respect, friendship, honesty, love/being loved, kindness, co-operation, and responsibility from their family. If the child's family environment and life is problematic, the acquisition of values will be negatively affected. A child who grows up in a loveless and unhappy family environment should not be expected to gain this value. In the multiple evaluation done in this research, results of the child, family and teacher form supports both the research and the body of literrature.

Suggestıons

In accordance with these results, an experimental research can be conducted to increase the value levels of children by preparing educational programs relating to value education in schools for children from divorced family. Educational programs relating to divorced parents can be prepared to look at changes in children's value levels. It can also be appropriate to examine how the child's living with the mother or father affects the value acquisition. With a wider group, the factors affecting value levels and value acquisition levels can be identified. It might also be necessary to investigate whether divorce affects children's gender and whether other variables also affect children"s value acquisitions. Finally, researches can be conducted to determine if there is any difference in the academic skills of children from divorced and non-divorced families.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Alpöge G (2011). Okulöncesinde Değerler Eğitimi. Istanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Altuntaş G (2012). Boşanmış ebeveyneler ile boşanmamış ebeveynlerin lise birinci, ikinci, üçüncü sınıflarında okuyan çocuklarının sürekli öfke ve öfke ifade tarzı, benlik saygısı ve anksiyete düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması. Yüksek lisans tezi, Maltepe Üniversitesi\ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Istanbul.

Amato PR, Keith B (1991). Parental divorce and the well-being of children: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin 1(10):26-46.

Amato PR. (1991). The „child of divorce" as a person prototype: Bias in the recall of information about children in divorced families. Journal of Marriage and the Family 53:59-69.

Aral N, Gürsoy F (2000). Boşanmış ve Boşanmamış Ebeveynlerin Çocuklarının Depresyon Düzeyleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet.

Attepe S (2010). Anne Baba Kaybının Çocuklar Üzerindeki Etkileri". Aile ve Toplum Eğitim Kültür ve Araştırma Dergisi 6(23):23-28.

Aydın A (2009). Eğitim Sevgidir. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Aydın MZ (2010). Okulda Çalışan Herkesin Görevi Olarak Değerler Eğitimi. Değerler Eğitimi Buluşması Içinde. Ceceli Eğitim Kurumları, Ankara.

Aydoğan Y, Özyürek A, Gültekin AG (2015). Erken çocukluk döneminde gelişim (1. bs.). Ankara: Vize Yayıncılık.

Bakan T, Şahin H (2018). Değerler Eğitim Programının Anasınıfına Devam Eden Çocukların Değer Kazanımı Üzerine Etkisinin Çocuk Görüşlerine Göre Incelenmesi. FSM Ilmî Araştırmalar Insan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi. https://doi.org/10.16947/fsmia.502217

Balat GU, Dağal AB (2009). Okul öncesi dönemde değerler eğitimi etkinlikleri. Ankara: Kök Yayıncılık.

Barnes GG (1999). Divorce transitions: Identifying risk and promoting resilience or children and their parental relationships. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy 25(4):425-441.

Bilge B, Kaufman G (1983). "Children of divorce and one-parent families. Crosscultural perspectives". Family Relations 32(1):59-71.

Blechman EA (1982). Are children with one parent at psychological risk? A methodological review". Journal of Marriage and Family 441:179-195.

Brownlee JL, Scholes L, Walker S, Johansson E (2016). Critical values education in the early years: Alignment of teachers" personal epistemologies and practices for active citizenship. Teaching and Teacher Education 56:261-273.

Bulut- Bulut-Serin, Öztürk S (2007). "Anne-Babası Boşanmış 9-13 Yaşlarındaki Çocuklar Ile Aynı Yaş Grubundaki Anne-Babası Boşanmamış Çocukların Benlik Saygısı ve Kaygı Düzeyleri Ilişkisi". Gazi Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 8(2):117-128.

Bulut S (2018). "Boşanmış Babaların Çocuklarıyla Ilişkileri ve Buna Etki Eden Faktörler". Journal of Turkish Studies. https://doi.org/10.7827/turkishstudies.11558

Çivitci N, Çivitci A, Fiyakalı NC (2009). Anne Babası Boşanmış ve Boşanmamış Olan Ergenlerde Yalnızlık ve Yaşam Doyumu. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri 9(2):493-525.

Compas BE, Williams RA (1990). "Stress, coping, and adjustment in mothers and young adolescents in single and two parent families". American Journal of Community Psychology 18(4):525-545.

Cooper D (2014). Character education: a study of an elementary school leadership Academy. Wilmington University, Wilmington.

Davidov E (2010). Testing for comparability of human values a cross countries and time with the third round of the european social survey. International Journal of Comparative Sociology (51):171-191.

Dinç B (2011). Okulöncesi dönemde değerler eğitiminin yeri ve önemi (Editör: Arzu Arıkan). Okulöncesi Dönemde Değerler Eğitimi. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Web-Ofset Tesisi, pp. 149-164.

Er H, Bartan M (2019). Investigating the Opinions and the Implementations of Preschool Teachers Towards the Children of Single-Parent Families, Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education 20(2):364-383. DOI: 10.17679/inuefd.446087

Feyzioğlu S, Kuşçuoğlu C (2011). Tek Ebeveynli Aileler. Aile ve Toplum Eğitim Kültür ve Araştırma Dergisi 7(26):97-110.

Fiyakalı NC (2008). Anne-babası boşanmış ve boşanmamış lise öğrencilerinin sürekli öfke düzeyleri ve öfke ifade tarzlarının bazı değişkenler açısından karşılaştırılması. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Denizli.

Guttmann J, Rosenberg M (2003). Emotional intimacy and children"s adjustment: A comparison between single-parent divorced and intact families. Educational Psychology 23(4):457-472.

Güngör E (1993). Değerler psikolojisi. Amsterdam: Türk Akademisyenler Birliği.

Kalkınç F (2013). Hayat Arkadaşım 2. Izmir: Fer Kitap.

Karasar N (1984). Bilimsel Araştırma Metodu. Ankara: Hacetepe Taş Kitapçılık

Kelly JB, Emery RE (2003). Children"s adjustment following divorce: Risk and resilience perspectives. Family Relations 52:352-362.

Kurt T (2013). Ebeveynleri boşanmış ergenlerin yılmazlık, benlik saygısı, başa çıkma ve psikolojik belirtiler arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Yılmazlık aracı rolü. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Kuyucu Y (2007). Boşanmış ailede yetişen ergenlerin bilişsel çarpıtmalarıyla benlik değeri arasındaki ilişki. Yayınlanmamış Doktora

Tezi. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Izmir.

Lengua LJ, Wolchik SA, Sandler IN, West SG (2000). The additive and interactive effects of parenting and temperament in predicting adjustment problems of children of divorce. Journal of Clinical Psychology 29(2):232- 244.

Lund M (1987). The non-custodial father: Common challenges in parenting after divorce. In, Lewis, C. and O"Brien, M. (Eds.). Reassessing Fatherhood. London: Sage, pp. 212-224.

Maya I (2017). Self-values of pre-school teachers working in Turkish public schools. Educational Research and Reviews 12:595-603. 10.5897/ERR2017.3269. DOI: 10.5897/ERR2017.3269, https://academicjournals.org/journal/ERR/article-full-text-pdf/4E9498864680

Neslitürk S, Çeliköz N (2015). Okul öncesi değerler ölçeği aile ve öğretmen formunun geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 24:19-42

Oktay A. (2007). Yaşamın sihirli yılları: Okul öncesi dönem. İstanbul. Epsilon Yayıncılık.

Öngider N (2013). Boşanmanın çocuk üzerindeki etkileri. Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar 5(2):140-161.

Öngider N (2013b). Boşanmış ve evli ailelerden gelen çocukların algıladıkları ebeveyn kabul red düzeyleri ile psikolojik uyum düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması. Klinik Psikiyatri 16:164-174.

Öngider N (2016). Boşanma mı Yoksa Çocuk Için Evliliği Sürdürmek mi? Çocuğun Psikolojik Uyumu Açısından Önemli Bir Soru. Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar Dergisi 8(3):275-289.

Özdal F, Aral N (2005). Baba yoksunu olan ve anne-babası ile yaşayan çocukların kaygı düzeylerinin incelenmesi. Gazi Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 6(2):255-267.

Özdemir U, Laçin A, Yiğit T, Saruç S, Kılıç AK (2006b). Boşanmış aileden gelen çocuklar üzerine bir araştırma. Küreselleşen dünyada, sosyal hizmetlerin, konumu, hedefleri ve geleceği sempozyumu sunum kitabı, Başbakanlık Sosyal Hizmetler ve Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu Yayınları 524 Antalya.

Özgüven IE (2001). Ailede Iletişim ve Yaşam. PDREM YAYINLARI.

Öztürk S (2006). Anne Babası Boşanmış 9–13 Yaşlarındaki Çocuklar Ile Aynı Yaş Grubundaki Anne –Babası Boşanmamış Çocukların Benlik Saygısı ve Kaygı Düzeyleri Ilişkisi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Izmir.

Rodgers KB, Rose HA (2002). Risk and resiliency factors among adolescents who experience marital transitions. Journal of Marriage and Family 64(4):1024-1037.

Rokeach M (1973). The nature of human values. New York: Free Pres.

Sağlam M (2011). Boşanma Sürecinde Olan Ailelerdeki Çocukların Aile Algılarının ve Sorunlarının Resimler Aracılığı Ile incelenmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü Ev Ekonomisi(Çocuk Gelişimi) Ana Bilim Dalı, Ankara.

Pike LT (2003). The adjustment of Australian children growing up in single-parent families as measured by their competence and self-esteem. Childhood 10(2):181-200.

Turan Z, Doğan M, Uzuner K, Iftar G, Iftar E, Kapçı A, Uzuner Y, Tanrıdiler A, Karasu G, Karasu P, Kaya P (2007). Çocuk Ruh Sağlığı ve Kişilerarası Iletişim Becerileri. Çocuğun Ruhsal Gelişimini Etkileyen Ruhsal Yaşam Olayları, Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Sapsağlam Ö, Ömeroğlu E (2016). Examining the effect of social values education program being applied to nursery school students upon acquiring social skills. Educational Research and Review 11(13):1262-1271.

Sapsağlam Ö (2017). Okul öncesi dönem çocuklarının değer algılarının çizdikleri resimler ve sözlü anlatımlarına göre incelenmesi: Sorumluluk Değeri Örneği. Eğitim ve Bilim 42(189):287-303.

Schaefer MP (2012). Determining methods for teaching character education in elementary schools Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Northcentral University, Arizona.

Şenol S (2004). Evlat Edinme. Çoluk Çocuk Dergisi 37(7):12-15.

Şentürk Ü (2006). Parçalanmış Aile Çocuk Ilişkisinin Sebep Olduğu Sosyal Problemler (Malatya Uygulaması), Doktora Tezi, Inönü Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyoloji Ana Bilim Dalı, Malatya.

Şentürk Ü (2008). Aile Kurumuna Yönelik Güncel Riskler. Aile ve Toplum Eğitim Kültür ve Araştırma Dergisi 4(14):7-32.

Seven S (2008). Çocuk Ruh Sağlığı. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.

Uyanık Balat, G,Özdemir Beceren B, Adak Özdemir A (2011). The evaluation of parents" views related to helping pre-school children gain some universal values. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 15:908-912.

Yeşil R, Aydın D (2007). Demokratik değerlerin eğitiminde yöntem ve zamanlama. Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi 11(2):65-84.