

Investigation of the Problematic Behaviors of Preschool Students Studying in Public and Private Schools

Kamil Arif Kırkıcıⁱ
İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University

Merve Aydınⁱⁱ
Ministry of National Education

Abstract

This study was conducted to investigate the problematic behaviors of preschool students studying in public and private schools according to certain variables. The research was carried out with 300 students and their parents in private and public kindergartens. A demographic information form prepared by the researcher was used to collect the data. The Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scale was used. Pearson Correlation Analysis was used to analyze the data obtained for behavioral problems and social skills, univariate t-test for the significance of the difference between the scale scores of the groups by one-way analysis of variance, and the result was a significant negative relationship between problem behaviors and social skills. Significant differences were observed between students' age, number of siblings, birth order, media usage, private or state education, their parent's marital status, their family's level of education and economic status, size of family, and students' behavior problems and social skills sub-dimensions. However, no significant difference was observed regarding the gender of the children.

Keywords: Preschool Students, Behavior Problems, Social Skills

DOI: 10.29329/ijpe.2020.332.1

ⁱ **Kamil Arif Kırkıcı**, Assist. Prof., Educational Sciences, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, ORCID: 0000-0002-8902-437X

Correspondence: kamil.kirkic@izu.edu.tr

ⁱⁱ **Merve Aydın**, Early Childhood Education, Ministry of National Education

INTRODUCTION

The self-acceptance of an individual in society depends on the healthy communication they establish. Social skills are the bridge in establishing this communication. The ability of an individual to adapt and be social and interact with friends and environment are indicators of social skills and social development (Çubukçu & Gültekin, 2006: 155-156). Full social development means a conscious adult. For conscious adulthood, preschool education, socialization, help, and communication skills throughout the life of the individual will be carried to his or her life (Yalçın, 2010). It is also useful if the family is supported in the school, and if this harmony is not achieved, there may be difficulties in internalizing appropriate behaviors (Temizdemir, 2018).

Problematic behavior is when difficulties experienced by children begin to attract attention. What is crucial here is whether the child undergoes a normal developmental process in the family environment. The first environment within which children to gain social skills is the family. Experiences in the early years are the basis of gains in the following years. Children learn by doing, through experiences in life, and healthy communication with the family; the education they receive will shape their future lives and social interaction in a significant way. As the second social environment, schools contribute to the development of children in addition to aiding the formation of a safe and peaceful environment and values within the family (Çağdaş & Seçer, 2002; Özbey, 2010).

It is the school and teachers of the school, which are the second environment within which active learning takes place. Fully equipped and trained teachers are needed to make a positive impact on the child in the classroom. Because of teachers who shape and direct children, teachers must be prepared for the problem behaviors they may face and form a strategy. Childhood is essential for children, and the aim of the family and the teacher is to help them develop conscious behaviors to learn and to build self-esteem, compassion, respect, and tolerance in their relationships with others (Νικολάος & Κόνζολαο, 2009; cited in Secher, 2014). The school, which is the systematic process of education, is one of the most important social institutions that individuals encounter after family (Özkan, 2008: 1). Schools aim to ensure that students develop in every way and to train successful and happy individuals. The first step taken by children in school life is preschool education. Preschool education is a process of learning that provides rich stimuli appropriate to children's cognitive, mental, social, and self-care characteristics and directs all their development. Considering that teachers can inspire children in preschool education institutions and are their role models, teachers have an essential duty and responsibility in this critical period (Aral, Kandır & Yazar, 2000).

In preschool years, children need to gain acceptance in society, as are adults, exhibit positive behaviors while communicating, obey the rules in the classroom, be sensitive to their friends, express their feelings with ease, and control themselves. Individuals with successful social behaviors do not have difficulty communicating and can work cooperatively; they tend to be happy and calm. At the same time, they can protect themselves from negativity, are sensitive to the rights of others, and are easily accepted in society. Having social skills enables this (Ceylan & Özyürek, 2014). When children first enter the school environment, they realize that this new environment is different and that it has rules to be followed. In this period, children learn to protect themselves, to share, to protect their rights, and not to harm others physically and emotionally while building their knowledge.” (Yavuzer, 2006).

From infancy, children develop their social skills when communicating with parents. Their social skills continue to develop as they interact within their social environment. As soon as a child steps into school life, social development accelerates. As a contribution to social development, school life enables the child to learn the required social rules, such as love, respect, benevolence, and sensitivity. The family must meet the essential needs (love, respect, support) in raising a healthy individual, and the healthy relationship between the child and the family is necessary for the child to develop his/her communication skills (Tarkoçin & Tuzcuoğlu, 2014). The second environment,

namely the school, provides essential values to the child, socializes, demonstrates cooperation with the family and the environment, and therefore is of great importance (Olcay, 2008).

The efforts of the family during cooperation with the school is to accept being a parent. This acknowledgment enables parents to carry out this duty. All caregivers who are willing to become parents are more conscious and sensitive to all problems (Özdemir, 2012). Children who have developed social skills are individuals compatible with their parents, avoid quarrels, are excellent communicators, can act individually, are accepted by their friends, and do not rely on others to make decisions (Özyürek, Begde, & Yavuz, 2014). Children who fail to develop social skills have difficulty in peer communication, can be aggressive, reluctant, unable to adapt, confrontational toward elders, often look sad and restless and introverted, and have a timid attitude (Birch & Ladd, 1977). Any behavior that hinders or prevents the education of the child or others around the child is defined as unwanted behavior. It includes any unwanted behavior that harms the child and his environment (Armağan, 2010).

The behavioral management dimension of classroom management makes the teacher responsible for paying close attention to the student to replace problem behaviors with positive behaviors. The type of student behavior needs to be continually addressed in the context of classroom management. Correct identification of unwanted practices in the classroom and the elimination of behaviors with appropriate methods and techniques are essential in terms of education and training (Kılıçoğlu, 2015). To identify negative student behaviors encountered in the classroom and to determine the causes of them and find solutions requires first contacting the family and determining the real causes of the problems. Teachers' classroom management differs as while some adopt class management by intervening when problems arise, others utilize approaches to prevent problems. Also, the philosophy adopted by the teacher and students' perceptions indicate the effectiveness of the teacher in classroom management (Gündoğdu, 2013). As preschool education is the first stage of a child's school life in terms of children and the basis for future school levels, it is crucial to determine the variables that affect problematic behaviors that preschool students can display and the social skills they are expected to have.

This study investigates several variables that affect the problematic behaviors of preschool students in public and private schools.

This research seeks answers to the following questions for this fundamental purpose:

1. Is there a significant difference in the problematic behaviors of preschool students according to variables such as type of institution, gender, living with the elders, togetherness of parents, age, number of siblings, and economic status of the family?
2. Are there any significant differences in the social skill levels of preschool students according to variables such as type of institution, gender, living with the elders, togetherness of parents, age, number of siblings, and economic status of the family?
3. Is there a relationship between problem behavior and social skill levels of preschool students?

METHOD

This study uses a relational survey model, a method of quantitative research methods, to examine the problematic behaviors of preschool students in public and private schools according to several variables. Survey models aim to describe a situation that has existed in the past or present. The general survey model is a survey arrangement looking at the whole or a group, a sample, or a sample taken from the universe to make a general judgment on multiple elements. The relational survey model

is a research model for determining the existence and degree of change between two and more variables together (Karasar, 2010, p.77-81).

Study sample

The population of this study, conducted as a quantitative research design, is composed of 300 children aged between 4-6 years in kindergarten and private kindergartens affiliated to primary schools in the district of Çekmeköy in Istanbul and Çekmeköy and their parents in the 2018-2019 academic year. The study uses a simple random sampling method. Participation in the study was voluntary.

Table 1. Demographic information about the participants

Variables		f	%
Institutions	Public	138	46,2
	Private	161	53,8
Age	3 years	21	7,0
	4 years	84	28,1
	5 years	92	30,8
	6 years	102	34,1
Gender	Girl	150	50,2
	Boy	149	49,8
Number of Siblings	1 sibling	86	28,8
	2 siblings	142	47,5
	3 siblings	71	23,7
Are there family elders at home?	Yes	107	35,8
	No	188	62,9
Economic Level of the Family	Low	29	9,7
	Medium	179	59,9
	High	91	30,4
Are the parents together?	Yes	239	79,9
	No	60	20,1
	Total	299	100,0

Three hundred children between 3-6 years participated in this study. 46.2 percent of these children are educated in state and 53.8 percent in private institutions. Also, 50.2 percent are girls, and 49.8 percent are boys. 28.8 percent are single children, 47.5 percent are one of two siblings, and 23.7 percent are one of three siblings. The mother of 11.7 percent of children is educated to primary school level, 11.4 percent to secondary school level, 40.5 percent to high school level, and 36.5 percent received a university education. 35.8 percent of the children have a family older than their parents. 9.7 percent of the families of children receive a low income, 59.9 percent middle, and 30.4 percent receive a high income.

Data Collection Tools

The Kindergarten and Preschool Behavior Scale (PKBS-2) developed by Merrel and adapted to Turkish by Fazlıoğlu et al. (2011) and the demographic information questionnaire prepared by the researcher were used.

Personal Information Form

After the academic advisor examined the questionnaire, it was prepared and used by the researcher. In the survey, questions were asked about the child's age group, gender, number of

siblings, the number of children in the family and child's birth order, the education level of the family, whether family elders live with the child, the frequency of using tablets and watching television, the economic status of the parents, and the living status of the parents.

Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scale

Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scale consists of two scales: Social Skills and Problematic Behavior. The social skills scale (34 items) consists of three factors: Social Cooperation, Social Interaction, and Social Independence. The problematic behavior scale (42 items) consists of two elements: Outward Orientation Problem and Inward Orientation Problem. The scale was developed by Merrell. The validity and reliability study of the Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scale (PKBS-2) used in this study was conducted by Fazlıoğlu et al. (2011). The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients were calculated whole scale, and its sub-dimensions were higher than .70.

Social Skills Scale (SSS)

The scale includes 34 questions that assess the social skills of children aged between 3-6 years. It consists of three dimensions: social cooperation, social interaction, and social independence.

1. Social cooperation dimension (SC): Collaboration with the child's friends and environment consists of 12 items, including adaptation, self-control, and the ability to follow instructions given by adults.

2. Social interaction dimension (SI): This includes items that involve interaction with friends, making friends, and acquiring friendship, and some items aimed at the child's interaction with adults. It consists of 11 questions.

3. Social independence dimension (SI): In general, these items cover social independence among friends, while some items cover independence from adults. It consists of 11 questions.

The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for the whole Social Skills Scale was .95, .91 for the first factor (Sc), .87 for the second factor (SI), and .85 for the third factor (SI).

Problematic Behavior Scale (PBS):

There are 42 items in the problematic behavior scale. The scale, which consists of two sub-factors, is divided into Outward Orientation Problem and Inward Orientation Problem.

Outward Orientation Problem (OOP): There are 27 items in this dimension. It refers to the general expression of aggressive and inconsiderate over-acting behavior. Moreover, the individual harms other people.

Inward Orientation Problem (IOP): This consists of 15 items. It is made up of questions regarding inner feelings such as fear, anxiety, and shyness. Moreover, the individual harms himself.

The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the whole scale was .96, while it was found to be .96 for the first factor (OOP) and .89 for the (IOP).

Data Analysis

The study used a t-test, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson correlation coefficient analyses. Also, simple linear regression analysis was conducted between problem behaviors and social skill level.

RESULTS

Problem behavior and social skill levels of the child were analyzed in line with gender, age, number of siblings, number of siblings of the family, birth order, family education status, whether the child lived with family elders, the frequency of using tablets and watching television, and the living condition of the parents. The following findings were yielded.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the scores obtained from the problematic behavior scale

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Sd	Variance
Outward Orientation Problem	299	.26	2.63	1.2489	.60190	.362
Inward Orientation Problem	299	.33	2.60	1.3175	.55197	.305
Problem Behaviors Total	299	.31	2.62	1.2734	.56342	.317

The mean score of the scale of the problematic behavior of the children participating in the study from the externalizing dimension was 1.25, the average of the scores from the internalizing size was 1.32, and the mean score of the problem behaviors scale was 1.27.

The skewness and kurtosis values of the social skills scale were -.321 and -.167; the skewness and kurtosis values of the Problem Behaviors Scale were .224 and -1.064, respectively. Therefore, independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA were used.

Table 3. t-test results to compare students' problem behaviors by the type of institution

	Institution	N	Mean	Sd	t	p
Outward Orientation Problem	Public	138	.9461	.48328	-9.090	.001
	Private	161	1.5084	.57262		
Inward Orientation Problem	Public	138	.9758	.43114	-12.081	.001
	Private	161	1.6104	.47043		
Problematic Behaviors Total	Public	138	.9567	.43795	-10.526	.001
	Private	161	1.5448	.51611		

There is a significant difference between the children in private and public schools in terms of externalizing, internalizing, and subscale scores of the scale of problem behaviors ($p < .01$). In three dimensions, the scores of children in private schools were higher than those of public schools.

Table 4. t-test results to compare problem behaviors by gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	t	p
Outward Orientation Problem	Girls	150	1.2440	.66849	-.141	.888
	Boys	149	1.2538	.52869		
Inward Orientation Problem	Girls	150	1.3667	.55449	1.549	.122
	Boys	149	1.2680	.54682		
Problematic Behaviors Total	Girls	150	1.2878	.60626	.443	.658
	Boys	149	1.2589	.51838		

There was no significant difference between boys and girls in terms of the externalizing and internalizing sub-dimensions of the scale of problem behaviors and the scores obtained from the whole scale ($p > .05$).

Table 5. t-test results to compare problem behaviors according to family elders living together with the child

	A family elder living together with the child	N	Mean	sd	t	p
Outward Orientation Problem	Yes	109	1.3908	.60064	3.245	.001
	No	190	1.1582	.58687		
Inward Orientation Problem	Yes	109	1.5022	.48398	4.638	.000
	No	190	1.2028	.55875		
Problem Behaviors Total	Yes	109	1.4306	.54054	3.852	.000
	No	190	1.1741	.55487		

There is a significant difference between the children with and without family elders living at home in terms of outward-oriented, inward-directed sub-dimensions of the problem behavior scale and the scores obtained from the whole scale ($p < .01$). The average of those who say yes in all three dimensions is higher than those who say no.

Table 6.: t-test results to compare problem behaviors according to parents' association

	Are parents together?	N	Mean	df	t	p
Outward Orientation Problem	Yes	239	1,2027	,61511	-2,674	.008
	No	60	1,4327	,51045		
Inward Orientation Problem	Yes	239	1,2798	,57352	-2,377	.018
	No	60	1,4678	,42811		
Problematic Behaviors Total	Yes	239	1,2302	,57778	-2,670	.008
	No	60	1,4452	,46814		

There was a significant difference between children with and without parents regarding the outward-oriented and inward-directed sub-dimensions of the problematic behavior scale and the scale's scores ($p < .05$). In three dimensions, the scores of children whose parents did not live together were higher than those who lived together.

Table 7. One-Way ANOVA test results to compare problematic behaviors by age

	Age	N	Mean	sd	F	p	Post-Hoc Test
Outward Orientation Problem	A-3 years-old	21	1.6896	.51219	5.224	.002	A>B A>C A>D
	B-4 years-old	84	1.2222	.53666			
	C-5 years-old	92	1.2903	.58559			
	D-6 years-old	102	1.1427	.64607			
	Total	299	1.2489	.60190			
Inward Orientation Problem	A-3 years-old	21	1.6921	.36300	5.848	.001	A>B A>C A>D B>D
	B-4 years-old	84	1.3968	.46164			
	C-5 years-old	92	1.2978	.56805			
	D-6 years-old	102	1.1928	.59709			
	Total	299	1.3175	.55197			
Problematic Behaviors Total	A-3 years-old	21	1.6905	.44588	5.484	.001	A>B A>C A>D
	B-4 years-old	84	1.2846	.47716			
	C-5 years-old	92	1.2930	.56249			
	D-6 years-old	102	1.1606	.61286			
	Total	299	1.2734	.56342			

There was a significant difference between the three, four, five, and six-year-old children in terms of scores obtained from the outward orientation subscale of the problem behavior scale ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the causes of the difference, the average score of three-year-old children was higher than the average score of four, five, and lower-aged children ($p < .01$). There was a significant difference between the three, four, five, and six-year-old children in terms of scores taken from the internalizing subscale of the problem behavior scale ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the causes of the difference, the average score of three-year-old children was higher than the average score of four, five, and lower-aged children ($p < .01$). In addition, the average score of four-year-old children was higher than the average score of lower-age children ($p < .01$). There was a significant difference between the three, four, five, and six-year-old children regarding the problem behavior scale ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the causes of the difference, the average score of three-year-old children was higher than the average score of four, five, and lower-aged children ($p < .01$).

Table 8. One-Way ANOVA test results to compare problem behaviors by the number of siblings

	Number of Siblings	N	Mean	Sd	F	p	Post-Hoc Test
Outward Orientation Problem	A-1 sibling	86	1.3820	.61806	5.909	.003	A>B
	B-2 siblings	142	1.1265	.55070			C>B
	C-3 siblings	71	1.3323	.63902			
	Total	299	1.2489	.60190			
Inward Orientation Problem	A-1 sibling	86	1.4488	.55169	8.101	.001	A>B
	B-2 siblings	142	1.1859	.53066			C>B
	C-3 siblings	71	1.4216	.54122			
	Total	299	1.3175	.55197			
Problematic Behaviors Total	A-1 sibling	86	1.4059	.57052	7.112	.001	A>B
	B-2 siblings	142	1.1477	.51753			C>B
	C-3 siblings	71	1.3642	.59557			
	Total	299	1.2734	.56342			

There was a significant difference between single children, those of two siblings, and those of three siblings in terms of the scores obtained from the outward orientation subscale of the problem behavior scale ($p < .05$). According to the post hoc test to determine the causes of the difference, the mean scores of the children of two siblings were lower than those of one and three siblings ($p < .05$).

There was a significant difference between single children, those of two siblings, and those of three siblings in terms of scores taken from the internalizing subscale of the problem behavior scale ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the causes of the difference, the mean scores of the children of two siblings were lower than those of one and three siblings ($p < .01$).

There was a significant difference between the children of one child, two siblings, and three siblings in terms of the scores obtained from the scale of problem behaviors ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the causes of the difference, the mean scores of the children of two siblings were lower than those of one and those of three siblings ($p < .01$).

Table 9. One-Way ANOVA test results to compare problem behaviors by economic status

	Economic Status	N	Mean	Sd	F	p	Post-Hoc Test
Outward Orientation Problem	A-Low	29	.9400	.47938	85.623	.000	A>B A>C
	B-Moderate	179	1.0199	.49931			
	C-High	91	1.7977	.44198			
	Total	299	1.2489	.60190			
Inward Orientation Problem	A-Low	29	1.0184	.45036	112.213	.000	A>B A>C
	B-Moderate	179	1.0883	.44405			
	C-High	91	1.8637	.34739			
	Total	299	1.3175	.55197			
Problematic Behaviors Total	A-Low	29	.9680	.44799	105.726	.000	A>B A>C
	B-Moderate	179	1.0443	.44665			
	C-High	91	1.8213	.39511			
	Total	299	1.2734	.56342			

There is a significant difference between children with low, medium, and high economic status in terms of scores taken from the outward orientation subscale of the problem behavior scale ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the reasons for the difference, the mean scores of children with low economic status were lower than those with moderate and high scores ($p < .01$).

There is a significant difference between children with low, medium, and high economic status in terms of scores taken from the internalizing subscale of the problem behavior scale ($p < .01$).

According to the post hoc test to determine the reasons for the difference, the mean scores of children with low economic status were lower than those with moderate and high scores ($p < .01$).

There is a significant difference between children with low, medium, and high economic status in terms of the scores obtained from the scale of problem behaviors ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the reasons for the difference, the mean scores of children with low economic status were lower than those with moderate and high scores ($p < .01$).

FINDINGS ON SOCIAL SKILL LEVELS

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics Related to the Scores Obtained from Social Skills Scale

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Sd	Variance
Social Cooperation	299	.75	3.00	2.1062	.45943	.211
Social Interaction	299	.64	3.00	2.1417	.51983	.270
Social Independence	299	.45	3.00	2.1104	.46104	.213
Social Skill Total	299	.62	3.00	2.1190	.43996	.194

The average score of the social skills scale of the children participating in the study from the social cooperation dimension was 2.11, the average score of the social interaction dimension was 2.14, the average score of the social independence scale was 2.11, and the mean score of the social skills scale was 2.12.

Table 13. t-test results to compare the level of social skills according to institution studied

	Institution	N	Mean	sd	t	p
Social Cooperation	Public	138	2.2579	.50803	5.542	.001
	Private	161	1.9762	.36780		
Social Interaction	Public	138	2.3307	.50812	6.173	.001
	Private	161	1.9797	.47434		
Social Independence	Public	138	2.1957	.45804	3.001	.003
	Private	161	2.0373	.45232		
Social Skill Total	Public	138	2.2613	.45063	5.418	.001
	Private	161	1.9971	.39269		

There is a significant difference between the children in the private and public preschool education institutions in terms of social cooperation, social interaction, social independence subscales, and scores obtained from the whole scale ($p < .01$). In all four dimensions, the average of public school students is higher than that of private schools.

Table 14. t-test results to compare the level of social skills by gender

	Gender	N	Mean	sd	t	p
Social Cooperation	Girl	150	2.1333	.44726	1.025	.306
	Boy	149	2.0789	.47128		
Social Interaction	Girl	150	2.1612	.48394	.651	.515
	Boy	149	2.1220	.55457		
Social Independence	Girl	150	2.1085	.43563	-.071	.944
	Boy	149	2.1123	.48675		
Social Skill Total	Girl	150	2.1343	.41159	.602	.547
	Boy	149	2.1036	.46767		

There was no significant difference between girls and boys in terms of social cooperation, social interaction, social independence sub-dimensions of the social skill behaviors scale, and the whole scale ($p > .05$).

Table 15. t-test results to compare the level of social skills according to family elders

	Is there a family elder living?	N	Mean	Sd	t	p
Social Cooperation	Yes	107	2.0078	.45262	-2.757	.006
	No	188	2.1605	.45996		
Social Interaction	Yes	107	1.9941	.53027	-3.653	.001
	No	188	2.2205	.50120		
Social Independence	Yes	107	2.0263	.45831	-2.382	.018
	No	188	2.1591	.46141		
Social Skills Total	Yes	107	2.0093	.44405	-3.223	.001
	No	188	2.1794	.43111		

There is a significant difference between children with and without family elders in terms of social cooperation, social interaction, social independence sub-dimensions of the social skill behaviors scale, and the scores obtained from the whole scale ($p < .05$). The average of those who say no in all four dimensions is higher than those who say yes.

Table 15. t-test results to compare social skill level according to parents' association

	Do parents live together?	N	Mean	sd	t	p
Social Cooperation	Yes	239	2.1468	.47089	3.094	.002
	No	60	1.9444	.37194		
Social Interaction	Yes	239	2.1997	.51391	3.944	.001
	No	60	1.9106	.48119		
Social Independence	Yes	239	2.1411	.45892	2.319	.021
	No	60	1.9879	.45268		
Social Skills Total	Yes	239	2.1621	.44259	3.438	.001
	No	60	1.9475	.38737		

There was a significant difference between children with and without parents regarding social cooperation, social interaction, social independence subscales, and scores obtained from the whole scale ($p < .05$). The average of those who say yes in all four dimensions is higher than those who say no.

Table 16. One-Way ANOVA test results to compare social skill level by age

	Age	N	Mean	sd	F	p	Post-Hoc Test
Social Cooperation	A-3 age	21	1.7500	.39176	9.979	.001	A<B
	B-4 age	84	2.0218	.36246			A<C
	C-5 age	92	2.0906	.48350			A<D
	D-6 age	102	2.2631	.46520			B<D
	Total	299	2.1062	.45943			C<D
Social Interaction	A-3 age	21	1.6364	.43693	13.336	.001	A<B
	B-4 age	84	2.0249	.45077			A<C
	C-5 age	92	2.1729	.56509			A<D
	D-6 age	102	2.3137	.45780			B<D
	Total	299	2.1417	.51983			C<D
Social Independence	A-3 age	21	1.9957	.41309	7.666	.001	A<B
	B-4 age	84	1.9545	.44008			A<C
	C-5 age	92	2.1136	.51894			A<D
	D-6 age	102	2.2594	.38237			B<D
	Total	299	2.1104	.46104			C<D
							B<C

Social Skill Total	A-3 age	21	1.7927	.36552	11.404	.001	A<B
	B-4 age	84	2.0011	.37934			A<C
	C-5 age	92	2.1247	.48021			A<D
	D-6 age	102	2.2783	.39908			B<D
	Total	299	2.1190	.43996			C<D

There was a significant difference between the three, four, five, and six-year-old children in terms of the scores obtained from the social cooperation subscale of the social skill scale ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the causes of the difference, the mean scores of the six-year-olds were higher than those of the three, four, and five-year-olds ($p < .01$). The mean scores of the five-year-olds were also higher than those of the three, and four-year-olds ($p < .01$).

There was a significant difference between the three, four, five, and six-year-old children in terms of the scores obtained from the social interaction subscale of the social skill scale ($p < .05$). According to the post hoc test to determine the causes of the difference, the mean scores of the six-year-olds were higher than those of the three, four, and five-year-olds ($p < .01$). The mean scores of the four and five-year-olds were also higher than those of the three-year-olds were ($p < .01$). Finally, the mean score of the four-year-olds was higher than the three-year-olds ($p < .01$).

There was a significant difference between the three, four, five, and six-year-old children in terms of the scores obtained from the social independence subscale of the social skill scale ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the causes of the difference, the mean scores of the six-year-olds were higher than those of the three, four, and five-year-olds ($p < .01$). The mean scores of the four and five-year-olds were also higher than those of the three-year-olds were ($p < .01$). Finally, the mean score of the four-year-olds was higher than the three-year-olds ($p < .01$).

There was a significant difference between the three, four, five, and six-year-old children in terms of the scores obtained from the total social skill scale ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the causes of the difference, the mean scores of the six-year-olds were higher than those of the three, four, and five-year-olds ($p < .01$). The mean scores of the five-year-olds were also higher than those of three, and four-year-olds ($p < .01$).

Table 17. One-Way ANOVA test results to compare social skill level by the number of siblings

	Number of siblings	N	Mean	sd	F	p
Social Cooperation	A-1 sibling	86	2.1153	.41895	.132	.877
	B-2 siblings	142	2.0921	.50194		
	C-3 siblings	71	2.1232	.42090		
	Total	299	2.1062	.45943		
Social Interaction	A-1 sibling	86	2.1279	.52314	.558	.573
	B-2 siblings	142	2.1216	.51901		
	C-3 siblings	71	2.1985	.52072		
	Total	299	2.1417	.51983		
Social Independence	A-1 sibling	86	2.0973	.46476	.727	.484
	B-2 siblings	142	2.0896	.47281		
	C-3 siblings	71	2.1677	.43344		
	Total	299	2.1104	.46104		
Social Skill Total	A-1 sibling	86	2.1135	.40607	.464	.629
	B-2 siblings	142	2.1009	.46865		
	C-3 siblings	71	2.1620	.42287		
	Total	299	2.1190	.43996		

There was no significant difference in the scores obtained from the social cooperation subscale of the social skill scale between children of one child, two siblings, and three siblings ($p > .05$). There was no significant difference in the scores obtained from the social interaction sub-dimension of the social skill scale between single children, those of two siblings, and those of three siblings ($p > .05$). There was no significant difference between the children of one child, two siblings, and three siblings in terms of the scores obtained from the social independence subscale of the social skill scale ($p > .05$). There was no significant difference between single children, those of two siblings, and those of three siblings in terms of scores obtained from the whole social skill scale ($p > .05$).

Table 18. One-Way ANOVA test results to compare social skills level by the economic status of families

	Economic Status	N	Mean	sd	F	p	Post-Hoc Test
Social Cooperation	A-Low	29	2.0230	.76987	14.124	.001	B>A B>C
	B-Medium	179	2.2146	.43935			
	C-High	91	1.9194	.26801			
	Total	299	2.1062	.45943			
Social Interaction	A- Low	29	1.9937	.75707	25.830	.001	B>A B>C
	B- Medium	179	2.3032	.48229			
	C- High	91	1.8711	.35132			
	Total	299	2.1417	.51983			
Social Independence	A- Low	29	1.8777	.58829	18.308	.001	B>A B>C
	B- Medium	179	2.2346	.45289			
	C- High	91	1.9401	.33614			
	Total	299	2.1104	.46104			
Social Skill Total	A- Low	29	1.9665	.68458	22.771	.001	B>A B>C
	B- Medium	179	2.2498	.41128			
	C- High	91	1.9105	.27402			
	Total	299	2.1190	.43996			

There is a significant difference between the children with low, medium, and high economic status in terms of social cooperation sub-dimension of social skill behaviors scale ($p < .01$) higher than the lower and higher ones ($p < .01$).

There is a significant difference between the children with low, medium, and high economic status in terms of the scores obtained from the social interaction sub-dimension of the social skill behaviors scale ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the reasons for the difference, the mean scores of those with moderate economic status were higher than those with low and high scores ($p < .01$).

There is a significant difference between the children with economic status low, medium, and high in terms of the scores obtained from the social independence subscale of the social skill behaviors scale ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the reasons for the difference, the mean scores of those with moderate economic status were higher than those with low and high scores ($p < .05$).

There is a significant difference between children with low, medium, and high economic status in terms of the social skill behaviors scale ($p < .01$). According to the post hoc test to determine the reasons for the difference, the mean scores of those with moderate economic status were higher than those with low and high scores ($p < .01$).

Relationship between Problematic Behavior and Social Skills

Table 19. Pearson correlation test to determine the relationship between problem behavior and social skills

		1	2	3	4	5	6
1-Outward Orientation Problem	r						
	p						
	N						
2-Inward Orientation Problem	r	.845**					
	p	.000					
	N	299					
3-Total of Problem Behaviors	r	.982**	.930**				
	p	.000	.000				
	N	299	299				
4-Social Cooperation	r	-.484**	-.425**	-.481**			
	p	.000	.000	.000			
	N	299	299	299			
5-Social Interaction	r	-.414**	-.449**	-.441**	.781**		
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000		
	N	299	299	299	299		
6- Social Independence	r	-.266**	-.355**	-.306**	.710**	.793**	
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	299	299	299	299	299	
7- Social Skills Total	r	-.426**	-.449**	-.450**	.908**	.939**	.904**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	299	299	299	299	299	299

** . Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

Negative scores among social cooperation ($r = -.481$), social interaction ($r = -.441$), social independence ($r = -.306$) and social skill total ($r = -.450$) were obtained from the whole scale of problem behaviors. There is a moderate significant relationship in the direction ($p < .01$). For social cooperation ($r = -.484$), social interaction ($r = -.414$), social independence ($r = -.266$), and social skill total ($r = -.426$), there is a negative relationship between the middle level ($p < .01$). For social cooperation ($r = -.425$), social interaction ($r = -.449$), social independence ($r = -.355$) and social skill total ($r = -.449$), there is a negative relationship between the middle level ($p < .01$).

Table 20. The result of simple linear regression analysis to predict problem behaviors by social skills

	R	R ²	F	p	B	t	p
Social Skills	.450	.200	75.342	.000	-.450	-8.680	.001

Simple linear regression analysis was performed to predict problem behaviors according to social skills. Social skill level is a significant predictor of problem behavior ($F(1,297) = 75.342$, $p < .01$). Social skill predicts 20 percent of the variance in problem behavior.

According to the results of the internal reliability analysis conducted with Cronbach alpha, the reliability coefficient of the Social Skills Scale was found to be .955, and the reliability coefficient of the Problem Behavior Scale was .932.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The problem behavior levels of three-year-old children were significantly higher than that of the four and five-year-old children. Similar to this result. Akduman, Günindi, and Türkoğlu (2015)

show significant differences in the age factor between children's problematic behavior and their social skill levels. This result indicates that the age and development of practices are related.

The results of the study showed significant differences when the family members living with children at home were examined statistically. Children who live with family elders have higher mean scores in problem behavior and social skills. In his study, Secher (2014) found that children living in crowded families with more family members than children living in small families exhibited fewer problems and more social skills behaviors.

When the marital status of the children's parents was examined, there was a significant difference in the mean scores of social skills and problem behavior scale. The 'yes' answer given by the people living with their families was higher than the 'no' answer given by the children of divorced families. This finding was found to have a high level of problematic behavior and social skills. Examining the results, children living with their parents do not display problematic behavior with higher social skills levels. There may be two reasons for this conclusion. First, children living separately from parents may experience different emotional problems. A child may engage in unwanted behavior to communicate or draw attention. The second reason is that children can gain different experiences from two parents who can be taken as an example (Acun Kapıkıran, İvrendi, & Adak, 2006).

Significant differences were found when the social skills behavior levels of the children were examined in terms of the number of siblings. The mean score of having two siblings in problematic behavior levels was low among single children and those of three siblings. In support of the finding, Çetinkaya's (2004) research shows that the number of siblings may have an impact on children and frustration in children without siblings, perhaps because no one is important except for their own will, sharing, and unhelpfulness, and susceptibility can be observed.

When the preschool students were examined by the institutions they were educated at, there were significant differences in their social skills and problematic behavior levels. The results of the analysis of the problematic behavior scale show that the level of problematic behavior was higher among children attending private schools than children in public schools. According to the scores obtained from the social skills scale, big data were collected from children in public schools and private schools.

The most striking part of the study is the comparison of the scores obtained from problematic behavior and social skills scales. A significant relationship was found following the analysis. As children's social skills (social cooperation, social interaction, social commitment) increase, problematic behaviors (outward orientation, inward orientation) decrease. In line with this research, Secher (2014) found a negative relationship between social skills and problem behavior. As the social level of the children increases, the problematic behaviors will decrease. While there are no behavioral problems in children who have high social communication with their friends in social environments and playgrounds, more problematic behaviors are observed in children who are afraid to communicate and cannot socialize.

REFERENCES

- Acun Kapıkıran, N, İvrendi, A, & Adak, A . (2006). Okul öncesi çocuklarında sosyal beceri: durum saptaması, [Social skills in preschool children: situation determination] *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19 (19), 19-27. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/pauefd/issue/11124/133034>
- Akduman, G. G., Günindi, Y. & Türkoğlu, D. (2015). Okul öncesi dönemde çocukların sosyal beceri ile davranış problemleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [Social responsibility of preschool

children examining the relationship between skill and behavior problems]. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırma Dergisi*. 37. 673-682.

Aral. N., Kandır. A. & Yaşar. M. (2000). *Okulöncesi eğitim ve ana sınıfı programları [Preschool and kindergarten curriculum]*. İstanbul. Turkey: Yapa yayınları.

Armağan. R. (2010). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğrencilerin sınıf içi istenmeyen davranışlarıyla başa çıkma becerileri ve özel bir ilköğretim okulunda yapılan uygulama [Classroom teachers' ability to cope with the unwanted behavior of students in class and practice in a private primary school]*. Yüksek lisans Tezi. Beykent Üniversitesi. İstanbul. (Master's thesis. Beykent University. İstanbul. Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>

Birch. S. H. & Ladd. G. W. (1997). The teacher-child relationship and children's early school adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology*. 35(1). 61-79.

Ceylan, Ş, & Özyürek, D. (2014). Okul öncesi çocuklarda sosyal becerilerin desteklenmesi konusunda öğretmen ve veli görüşlerinin belirlenmesi [Determining the views of teachers and parents on supporting social skills at preschoolers]. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35 (35), 99-114 . DOI: 10.9779/PUJE575

Çağdaş. A. & Seçer. Z. Ş. (2002). *Çocuk ve ergende sosyal ve ahlak gelişimi [Social and moral development in children and adolescents]*. Ankara. Turkey: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Çetinkaya. B. (2004). *Ruhsal açıdan aile çocuk [Family child in terms of spirituality]*. Ankara. Turkey: Empati Yayıncılık.

Çubukçu. Z. & Gültekin. M. (2006). İlköğretimde öğrencilere kazandırılması gereken sosyal beceriler [Social skills needed to be acquired to students in primary education]. *Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi Dergisi*. (37).155-156.

Fazlıoğlu. Y., Okyay. L. & Ilgaz. G. (2011). Okulöncesi ve anaokulu davranış ölçeğinin geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması [Preschool and kindergarten behavior scale validity and reliability study]. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 13(1). 253-266

Gündoğdu. S. (2013). *İlkokul ve ortaokul öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetiminde istenmeyen öğrenci davranışlarına ilişkin görüşleri ve bu davranışlara karşı uyguladıkları stratejiler [Opinions of primary and secondary school teachers about unwanted student behaviors in classroom management and strategies used against these behaviors]*. Yüksek Lisans tezi. Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi. Gaziantep. (Master's thesis. Hasan Kalyoncu University. Gaziantep. Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>

Karasar. N. (2010). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri [Research methods]*. Ankara. Turkey: Nobel Yayınları.

Kılıçoğlu. C. (2015). *Sınıf içerisinde istenmeyen davranışlara karşı öğretmenlerin baş edebilme yöntem ve teknikleri [Methods and techniques of coping teachers against unwanted behaviors in the classroom]*. Yüksek Lisans tezi. Toros Üniversitesi. Mersin. (Master's thesis. Toros University. Mersin. Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>

Olçay. O. (2008). *Bazı Kişisel ve Ailesel Değişkenlere Göre Okul Öncesi Dönemdeki Çocukların Sosyal Yetenekleri ve Problem Davranışlarının Analizi [Analysis of Social Abilities and Problem Behaviors of Preschool Children According to Some Personal and Family*

- Variables*]. Yüksek Lisans tezi. Selçuk Üniversitesi. Konya. (Master's thesis. Selçuk University. Konya. Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Özbey. S. (2010). Okul öncesi çocuklarda uyum ve davranış problemleriyle başa çıkmada ailenin rolü [The role of the family in coping with adaptation and behavior problems in preschool children]. *Aile ve Toplum Eğitim Kültür ve Araştırma Dergisi*, 11, 9-18.
- Özdemir. D. A. (2012). *Bazı Değişkenler Açısından Okul Öncesi Dönemdeki Çocukların Sosyal Becerilerinin ve Ailelerinin Ebeveynliğe Yönelik Tutumları [Social Variables of Preschool Children in Terms of Some Variables Attitudes of Parenting Skills and Families towards Parenting]*. Yüksek Lisans tezi. Selçuk Üniversitesi. Konya. (Master's thesis. Selçuk University. Konya. Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Özkan. V. (2008). *İlkokulda Görevli Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeyler (Sakarya İl Örneği) [Organizational Commitment Levels of Primary School Teachers According to Some Variables (Sakarya Province Case)]*. Yüksek Lisans tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi. Sakarya. (Master's thesis. Sakarya University. Sakarya. Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Özyürek. A., Begde. Z. & Yavuz. F. N. (2014). Okul öncesi çocukların sosyal becerileri ile yakın çevresindeki yetişkin etkileşimleri arasındaki ilişki [Social skills of preschool children relationship between adult interactions]. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 16. 115-134.
- Secher. M. A. (2014). *Batı Trakya Örneğinde Okul Öncesi ve Anaokulu Davranış Ölçeğinin Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlilik Çalışması [Validity and Reliability Study of Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scale in Western Thrace Sample]*. Yüksek Lisans tezi. Trakya Üniversitesi. Edirne. (Master's thesis. Trakya University. Edirne. Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Tarkoçin. S. & Tuzcuoğlu. N. (2014). Okul öncesi eğitim kurumuna devam eden 48-66 aylık çocukları olan ebeveynlerin çocuklarıyla iletişim kurma düzeyleri ve davranış sorunları arasındaki ilişkinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Investigation of the relationship between the communication levels and behavioral problems of parents of 48-66 months old children attending preschool education in terms of some variables]. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*. 2(8). 339-354.
- Temizdemir. H. A. (2018). *Ebeveyn- Çocuk İnternet Kullanımı. Aile İçi İletişim. Çocukların Uyku Kalitesi ve Sosyal Becerilerin Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. [Investigation of the Relationship between Parent-Child Internet Use. Family Communication. Children's Sleep and Social Quality and Social Skills]*. Yüksek Lisans tezi. Üsküdar Üniversitesi. İstanbul. (Master's thesis. Üsküdar University. İstanbul. Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Yalçın. H. (2010). *Çocuk Gelişimi [Child Development]*. İstanbul. Turkey: Morpa Yayınevi.
- Yavuzer. H. (2006). *Çocuk Psikolojisi [Child Psychology]*. 20. Baskı. İstanbul. Turkey: Remzi Kitabevi.