



International Journal of Psychology and Counselling

Volume 6 Number 3 March 2014

ISSN 2141-2499



*Academic
Journals*

ABOUT IJPC

International Journal of Psychology and Counselling (IJPC) will be published monthly (one volume per year) by Academic Journals.

International Journal of Psychology and Counselling (IJPC) is an open access journal that provides rapid publication (monthly) of articles in all areas of the subject counter transference, Clinical psychology, Professional practice of behaviour analysis, Behavioural model etc.

The Journal welcomes the submission of manuscripts that meet the general criteria of significance and scientific excellence. Papers will be published shortly after acceptance. All articles published in IJPC are peer-reviewed.

Contact Us

Editorial Office: ijpc@academicjournals.org

Help Desk: helpdesk@academicjournals.org

Website: <http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/IJPC>

Submit manuscript online <http://ms.academicjournals.me/>.

Editors

Prof. Ahmed Awad Amin Mahmoud
*Faculty of Education and Higher Education
An-Najah National University,
Nablus.
Palestine.*

Dr. R. Joseph Ponniah
*Department of Humanities (English)
National Institute of Technology
Trichirappalli, Tamil Nadu
India.*

Dr. Kanwar Dinesh Singh
*# 3, Cecil Quarters,
Chaura Maidan, Shimla:171004 HP
India.*

Dr. S. D. Sindkhedkar
*Head, Department of English,
PSGVP Mandal's Arts, Science & Commerce College,
Shahada: 425409, (Dist. Nandurbar), (M.S.),
India.*

Dr. Marta Manrique Gómez
*Middlebury College
Department of Spanish and Portuguese
Warner Hall, H-15
Middlebury, VT 05753
USA.*

Dr. Yanjiang Teng
*801 Cherry Lane, APT201
East Lansing
Michigan State University
MI 48824
USA.*

Prof. Radhakrishnan Nair
*SCMS-COCHIN
Address Prathap Nagar, Muttom, Aluva-1
India.*

Prof. Lianrui Yang
*School of Foreign Languages, Ocean University of China
Address 23 Hongkong East Road, Qingdao,
Shandong Province, 266071 P
China.*

Editorial Board

Dr. Angeliki Koukoutsaki-Monnier

*University of Haute Alsace
IUT de Mulhouse
dep. SRC
61 rue Albert Camus
F-68093 Mulhouse
France.*

Dr. Martha Christopoulou

*Greek Ministry of National
Education & Religious Affairs
Xanthoudidou 2-4
Athens,
Greece.*

Dr. Zeynep Orhan

*Fatih University Hadımköy 34500 Istanbul
Fatih University Computer Engineering Department
Turkey.*

Dr. Tahar Labassi

*University of Tunis
94 Avenue 9 Avril, Tunis 1007
Tunisia.*

Dr. Ahmad M. Atawneh

*Hebron University
P.O.Box 40, Hebron
Palestine.*

Benson Oduor Ojwang

*Maseno University
P.O. BOX 333, MASENO 40105
Kenya.*

Lydia Criss Mays

*Georgia State University
30 Pryor Street, Suite 550
USA.*

Dr. Daniel Huber

*Université de Rennes 2
63, rue des Vinaigriers, 75010 Paris
France.*

Naomi Nkealah

*University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
English Academy of Southern Africa, P O Box 124, Wits
2050
South Africa.*

Yah Awg Nik

*Centre for Language Studies and Generic Development,
Universiti Malaysia Kelantan,
Locked Bag 36, Taman Bendahara,
Pengkalan Chepa, 16100 Kota Bharu, Kelantan
Malaysia.*

ARTICLES

Research Articles

Parental practices of disciplining children: Implications for intervention 22
Missaye Mulatie

**Risks, protection factors and resilience among orphan and vulnerable
Children (OVC) in Ethiopia: Implications for intervention 27**
Belay Tefera and Missaye Mulatie

Full Length Research Paper

Parental practices of disciplining children: Implications for intervention

Missaye Mulatie

Gondar University, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Department of Psychology, Ethiopia.

Downloaded 26 November, 2014

Accepted 23 December, 2013

The main purpose of this work is to assess parental practice of disciplining children. Of the total 350 students, 95 students were selected through simple random sampling technique. Data were collected using questionnaire having eighteen items that are intended to measure parents' disciplining methods. The result showed that parents used non-aggressive child disciplining technique more than psychologically aggressive disciplining and physical punishment to discipline their children. There was no significant mean difference in the use of non-aggressive techniques, psychologically aggressive method and physical punishment to discipline male and female children. Similarly, there was no significant mean difference in the use of non-aggressive techniques, psychologically aggressive method and physical punishment between educated and illiterate parents. Finally, there was no significant mean difference in using the three child disciplining techniques (non-aggressive, physical punishment and psychologically aggressive) among the different caregivers (both parents, mother only, father only and grandparents).

Key terms: Non-aggressive child disciplining, physical punishment, child disciplining, psychologically aggressive disciplining.

INTRODUCTION

Disciplining children is one of the most important but hardest tasks of parents. Nevertheless, most parents are not aware of how to discipline our children effectively. Unfortunately, most parents use discipline methods that are familiar but not effective (Gershoff, 2008; Santrock, 1998).

Child rearing is a business which costs time and resources. It is imperative to support parents in their child rearing practices since effective child rearing requires knowledge and skills. So, endeavors towards non-violent parenting behaviors are essential for creating and implementing effective prevention efforts (UNICEF, 2010).

The most commonly indicated dimensions of parenting

in disciplining children include non-aggressive child disciplining technique, psychologically aggressive disciplining and physical punishment. The most common forms of physical punishment reported were slapping a child on the bottom or on the hands, legs or arms, and shaking, grabbing or pushing a child. Psychologically aggressive strategies were not used frequently with children. Psychologically aggressive strategies included threatening to smack or hit a child (reported by 25% of parents) and calling a child stupid or lazy (reported by approximately 20% of parents). Love-withdrawal strategies were the least common behaviours reported by parents within this category of psychologically aggressive responses

E-mail: mulate2002@yahoo.com.

Author(s) agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of respondents.

Variables		N	Percent
sex	Male	47	50
	Female	47	50
Type of care giver	Mother and Father	62	66
	mother only	18	19.1
	father only	8	8.5
	grandparent	6	6.4
	Relative	-	-
Care givers' educational level	Illiterate	38	40.4
	Literate	58	59.6
Students' grade	Grade 5	39	41.5
	Grade 6	55	58.5

(Halpenny et al., 2009; Lakshmi and Arora, 2006).

However, there is little available information in Ethiopia about the prevalence of different parental disciplines. Though the researcher does not have universal knowledge, it is hard to find sufficient local studies specifically related to disciplining methods. There are abundant researches on parenting styles. Nevertheless, none of the previous studies have shown the specific discipline methods employed by parents. This, undoubtedly, necessitates a study. Bearing this in mind, this study assessed parental practices of disciplining children in Makisegnit Primary Schools, Northern Gondar Zone of Ethiopia. To this end, the following questions were stated:

1. What types of parenting discipline strategies do parents use?
2. Is there significant difference in use of discipline strategies across gender?
3. Is there difference in use of discipline strategies across educational level of parents?
4. What intervention measures should be taken for an effective discipline?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research design

In assessing parental practices of disciplining children, quantitative survey design was employed. It uses descriptive survey research type for its purpose in describing parental practices of disciplining children.

Participants and sampling

Out of the total 350 students who were attending Makisegnit Primary school, 94 participants were selected using simple random sampling technique. The rationale to use this technique is that it is best suited for homogeneous and finite population. Simple random technique is also appropriate to give equal chance of being selected to all parents.

Instruments

Data were collected using questionnaire. It contains eighteen items that are intended to measure parents' disciplining methods that are broadly classified under the non-aggressive discipline strategies, psychologically aggressive discipline strategies and physical punishment. The main reason to collect data through questionnaire is to make participants free to give their responses without perceived fear of criticisms. Regarding construction of the tool, questions were adapted from Children's Research Centre, Trinity College. In order to check reliability and validity of the items, pilot study was conducted. The total number of the items was 30 using Likert format (always, often, sometimes, rarely, never). The content validity was found good by two psychology experts and the reliability index was found to be 0.76. This enables us to measure the construct with minor modifications in the wording of some items

Administration

First of all, orientation was given to assistant data collectors on how to handle and administer questionnaires. The participants were also assured of the anonymity of their responses as their names are not solicited. Finally, the questionnaires were distributed to respondents in their home.

Analysis

Data were computed using SPSS version 16. Percentages and mean were used for demographic variables. One way ANOVA was used to check whether significant difference in child disciplining techniques exists among both parents, only mother, only father, grandparent and relatives. Moreover, independent sample t-test was computed to check mean difference in child disciplining across sex, educational level of parents. Alpha value of 0.05 was determined for all significant tests.

RESULTS

Half (50%) of the participants were male children and the rest half were females. Besides, 41.5% of that respondent were attending grade 5 while 58.5% of the participants were grade 6. Regarding type of caregiver, most (66%) were reared by their mother and father. The rest 19.1, 8.55 and 6.4% of the participants were reared by mother only, father only, and grandparents, respectively. More than half (58.5%) of the respondents' caregivers/parents/ were literate, whereas 40.4% of the participants caregivers (parents) were not educated (Table 1).

As shown in Table 2, the score of non-aggressive child disciplining technique by discussing issue calmly, making child take time-out, giving chore, and distracting child in some way (mean=5.46, SD=3.05) was higher than that of psychologically aggressive disciplining technique by refusing to talk to child, calling child stupid or lazy, threatening to smack or hit child, shouting and yelling (mean=5.03, SD=3.67). But the use of physical punishment to discipline children include slapping on the bottom, the hands, arms, legs, face, head or ear, kicking or knocking children down; throwing something at child that could hurt and hitting child with something like a

Table 2. Descriptive statistics on parenting practices of disciplining children.

Disciplining techniques	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Non-aggressive	94	5.46	3.05
Psychologically aggressive	94	5.03	3.67
Physical punishment	94	4.84	4.16

Table 3. Disciplining techniques used by parents across gender of children.

Disciplining techniques	Gender	N	Mean	Standard deviation	df	t	p-value
Non-aggressive	Male	47	5.48	2.70	92	0.067	0.94
	Female	47	5.44	3.39			
Psychologically aggressive	Male	47	5.23	2.97	92	0.531	0.59
	Female	47	4.82	4.29			
Physical punishment	Male	47	4.46	3.50	92	0.866	0.38
	Female	47	5.21	4.74			

slipper, belt, instrument was the least (mean =4.84, SD= 4.26).

The table shows that there was no significant mean difference in using non-aggressive techniques ($t=0.067$, $p=0.94$), psychologically aggressive method ($t=0.531$, $p=0.59$), and physical punishment ($t=0.866$, $p=0.38$), to discipline male and female children. Though not significant, as compared to female children (mean = 5.44, SD= 3.39), parents used a non aggressive type of disciplining technique (discussing issue calmly, making child take time-out, giving chore, distracting child in some way) to correct behavior of male children (mean =5.48, SD=2.70). Similarly, parents used more psychologically aggressive disciplining technique (refusing to talk to child, calling child stupid or lazy, threatening to smack or hit child, shouting and yelling) on their male children (mean=5.23; SD= 2.97) than their female children (mean= 4.82, SD=4.29). However, parents applied physical punishment (slapping on the bottom, hands, arms, legs, face, head or ear, kicking or knocking child down, throwing something at child that could hurt and hitting child with something like a slipper, belt, instrument) to discipline their male children (mean= 5.21, SD= 4.74) as compared to female children (mean= 4.46, SD=3.50).

There was no significant mean difference in use of non-aggressive techniques ($t=0.49$, $p=0.62$), psychologically aggressive method ($t=0.38$, $p=0.70$), and physical punishment ($t=0.29$, $p=0.76$) between educated and illiterate parents or caregivers (Table 4).

As indicated in Table 6, there was no significant mean difference ($F(3, 90)=0.55$, $p=0.649$) in using non-aggressive disciplining technique among the different caregivers (both parents, mother only, father only and grandparents). Similarly, there was no significant mean

difference ($F(3,90)=0.24$, $p=0.866$) in the use of psychologically aggressive technique and physical punishment ($F(3,90)=1.18$, $p=0.320$) among these four caregivers. Though not significant, the mean score of using a non aggressive discipline technique by a mother only (mean= 6.16) was highest. In the case of using psychologically aggressive and physical punishment, the mean score of both mother and father type of parents was the highest (Table 5).

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study showed that most (66%) were reared by their mother and father. The rest 19.1, 8.55 and 6.4% of the participants were reared by mother only, father only, and grandparents respectively. Besides, more than half (58.5%) of the children's caregivers/ parents/ were educated; whereas 40.4% of the participants caregivers (parents) were not educated.

As compared to using psychologically aggressive disciplining technique (mean=5.03, SD=3.67) and physical punishment (mean =4.84, SD= 4.26), parents were using non-aggressive child disciplining technique (mean=5.46, SD=3.05) (Table 3). This is in line with the previous studies (Halpenny et al., 2009) which indicated that the use of physical punishment as a discipline strategy was low according to the self-report data collected from parents. This study further showed that the vast majority of these parents indicated that they had 'never' used any physical punishment as a discipline strategy in the past year. Less severe forms of physical punishment, such as smacking a child on the bottom, hand or leg, were highlighted slightly more frequently by parents.

Table 4. Disciplining techniques used by parents across educational status of parents or caregivers.

Disciplining techniques	Educational status of caregivers	N	Mean	Standard deviation	df	t	p-value
Non-aggressive	Illiterate	38	5.65	2.62	92	0.49	0.62
	Literate	56	5.33	2.33			
Psychologically aggressive	Illiterate	38	5.21	3.29	92	0.38	0.70
	Literate	56	4.91	3.92			
Physical punishment	Illiterate	38	4.68	2.88	92	0.29	0.76
	Literate	56	4.94	4.86			

Table 5. Descriptive statistics on parenting practices of disciplining children by type of caregiver/parent.

Disciplining techniques	Type of care giver	Mean	Standard Deviation
Non aggressive	Mother and Father	5.33	3.00
	mother only	6.16	3.65
	father only	3.55	2.55
	grandparent	2.34	2.34
Psychologically aggressive	Mother and Father	4.00	0.50
	mother only	2.94	0.69
	father only	3.49	1.23
	grandparent	2.63	1.07
Physical punishment	Mother and Father	5.14	4.65
	mother only	4.66	2.70
	father only	5.12	2.47
	grandparent	1.82	3.54

Table 6. One way ANOVA on parenting practices of disciplining children among various type of caregiver/ parent.

Disciplining techniques	Sources of variation	Sum of squares	Df	Mean squares	F	P-value
Non-aggressive	Between groups	15.642	3	5.214	0.551	0.649
	Within groups	851.762	90	9.464		
	Total	867.404	93			
Psychologically aggressive	Between groups	10.105	3	3.368	0.243	0.866
	Within groups	1276.779	90	13.856		
	Total	1256.904	93			
Physical punishment	Between groups	61.205	3	20.402	1.185	0.320
	Within groups	1549.402	90	17.216		
	Total	1610.606	93			

There was no significant mean difference in using non-aggressive techniques ($t=0.067$, $p > 0.05$), psychologically aggressive method ($t=0.531$, $p > 0.05$), and physical

punishment ($t=0.866$, $p > 0.05$) across children. This also agrees with a study of Halpenny et al. (2009) which showed that the use of psychologically aggressive

discipline strategies appears to be equally distributed across child gender, with no significant differences evident for using these strategies with boys or girls. But, as compared to female children (mean = 5.44, SD= 3.39), parents used a non aggressive type of disciplining technique (discussing issue calmly, making child take time-out, giving chore, distracting child in some way) to correct behavior of male children (mean =5.48, SD=2.70). Similarly, parents used more psychologically aggressive disciplining technique (refusing to talk to child, calling child stupid or lazy, threatening to smack or hit child, shouting and yelling) to their male children(mean=5.23, SD= 2.97) than on their male children (mean= 4.82, SD=4.29). However, parents applied physical punishment (slapping child on the bottom, hands, arms, legs, face, head or ear, kicking or knocking child down, throwing something at child that could hurt and hitting child with something like a slipper, belt, instrument) to discipline their male children (mean= 5.21, SD= 4.74) as compared to female children (mean= 4.46, SD=3.50).

There was no significant mean difference in use of non-aggressive techniques ($t=0.49$, $p > 0.05$), psychologically aggressive method ($t=0.38$, $p > 0.05$), and physical punishment ($t=0.29$, $p > 0.05$) between educated and illiterate parents or caregivers. Halpenny et al. (2009) further found no effect of social class or educational level was evident in the parental use of physical punishment. Neither were effects by gender of parent or child recorded. There was no significant mean difference ($F(3, 90) = 0.55$, $p > 0.05$) in using non-aggressive disciplining technique among the different caregivers (both parents, mother only, father only and grandparents). Similarly, there was no significant mean difference ($F(3,90)= 0.24$, $p > 0.05$) in use of psychologically aggressive technique and physical punishment ($F(3,90)= 1.18$, $p > 0.05$) among these four caregivers.

Conflict of Interests

The author(s) have not declared any conflict of interests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to appreciate University of Gondar for creating the opportunity to conduct this research. He also extends his gratitude to Mekicha Alamirew for his support during data collection phase of the study. Last but not least, he also thanks participants for their willingness to give response.

REFERENCES

- Blake B, Pope T (2008). Developmental Psychology: Incorporating Piaget's and Vygotsky's Theories in Classrooms. *J. Cross-Disciplinary Perspect. Educ.* 1(1).
- Gershoff ET (2008). Principles and Practices of Effective Discipline: Advice for Parents. Columbus, OH: Centerfor Effective Discipline.
- Halpenny AM, Nixon E, Watson D (2009). Parents' Perspectives on Parenting Styles and Disciplining Children. Ireland: Minister for Health and Children.
- Lakshmi A, Arora M (2006). Perceived Parental Behavior as Related to Student's Academic School Success and Competence. *J. Indian Acad. Appl. Psychol.* 32(1):47-52.
- Santrock J (1998). *Child Development* (8th ed). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Full Length Research Paper

Risks, protection factors and resilience among orphan and vulnerable Children (OVC) in Ethiopia: Implications for intervention

Belay Tefera¹ and Missaye Mulatie^{2*}

¹College of Education and Behavioral Studies, School of Psychology, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.

²Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Gondar University, Ethiopia.

Downloaded 27 November, 2013; Accepted 24 February, 2014; Published March 2014.

The purpose of this study was to investigate risk, protective factors and resilience among orphan and vulnerable children (OVC) in Ethiopia. One hundred eighty two orphan and vulnerable children were randomly selected from 14 kebeles through simple random sampling technique. Data were collected by using self report questionnaire. The results show that most orphans and vulnerable children faced family, school and community related risks factors. Sizeable number orphan and vulnerable children faced community related problems including negative discrimination rejection and social isolation, social or cultural. However most of them failed to use protective factors to buffer these risks. Consequently, most were found to be less resilient to these adversities. Since the concepts of resilience and risks are broad, a more detail study shall be conducted for this study tries to assess only the general nature of the constructs.

Key words: risks, protective factors, resilience, orphan and vulnerable children.

INTRODUCTION

In Ethiopia, there has been a strong culture of caring for orphans, the sick, and disabled and other needy members of the society by the nuclear and extended family members, communities and churches. However, in the perception of the community, orphan and vulnerable children are not often considered to have asset to cope up adversity. As a result, no attention has been given to resilience ability of orphan and vulnerable children and thereby resilience or protecting abilities of orphan and vulnerable children has been ignored.

According to Margaret et al. (2001), people are born with resilient attributes. Margaret et al. (2001) added that people acquire resilience abilities that could be improved

through effective training and development. Similarly, Killian (2007) stated that people are naturally endowed with the ability to cope with adversity provided that they get nurturing and supportive environment.

Globally, about 145 million orphan children live in sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. In sub-Saharan Africa, where HIV has hit hardest, 12 of children were orphan (UNICEF cited in YLPB, 2009). Moreover, UNICEF (2012) estimated that about 5.5 million children in Ethiopia were orphan. This constitutes around 15% of the total child population. Of these, 16% lost their parents due to HIV/AIDS (UNICEF, 2012).

Despite serious hardships, many children overcome

*Corresponding author E-mail: mulate2002@yahoo.com.

difficulties and grow up to lead productive lives and become resilient through protective factors. Some children have protective capacities that enable them to cope better with the ups and downs of life and become resilient (Killian, 2007).

The sources of resilience can be genetic, biological, psychological, and environmental factors (Margaret et al., 2001). Resilience is not static construct rather changes over time. Therefore, resilience needs to be viewed as positive adaptation over time, not at a single point (Margaret et al., 2001).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants and Sampling

One hundred eighty two orphan and vulnerable children (OVC) participated in the study. Participants were randomly drawn using simple random sampling technique. The rationale to use simple random sampling technique was that it is best suited for such homogeneous and finite population and it gives equal chance for all orphan and vulnerable children to be considered in the study.

Instruments

The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale was used to measure resilience of participants. The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale is a 25-item scale that measures the ability to cope with adversity that respondents rate items on a scale from 0 (not true at all) to 4 (true nearly all the time) higher scores reflecting greater resilience (Campbell-Sills and Stein, 2007). In addition, checklists were used to measure risk and protective factors.

Pilot study was conducted so as to check reliability the tools. Some questions were discarded for low inter-item. Finally, the reliability of the risk, protective factor and resilience sub-measures were found to be 0.697, 0.590 and 0.773 respectively. The content validity of the items was also assessed by two Psychologists from Department of Psychology, University of Gondar.

Administration

Initially, orientation was given to assistant data collectors on how to handle and administer the questionnaires. In addition, participants were informed about the anonymity of their responses. Then, the questionnaires were distributed to those participants who can read and write in free rooms. For illiterate respondents, data collectors read the items to them and record their responses.

Analysis

In order to analyze data, different statistical techniques were computed using version 16. Percentages, mean, independent t-test and one way ANOVA were computed to analyze the data. Alpha value of 0.05 was determined for all significant tests.

RESULTS

Of the total 182 participants, 33.7% were orphan (lost both their mother and father). Others were vulnerable

children which consists 12.7%. Among the total 61 orphan participants, slightly above half (55%) participants were cared and supported by their grandparents. Even though small in number, the rest of the participants were cared by their relatives, brother, sister, uncle, aunt. Surprisingly, there were few children who were supporting themselves.

Out of the total 182 OVC respondents, 44.9% of them reported that they have ever experienced failure to promote to next grade level. Here, 48.6% participants witnessed that they had poor attachment with their schools and never obtained recognition for their achievements. Besides, in the social aspects, 39%, 22.5%, 31.8% and 25.8% participants faced negative pressure, social isolation from the society, social or cultural discrimination and rejection respectively. Moreover, 81.3% participants confirmed that they have lived with poor family. Finally, 23.6% participants reported that they had poor physical health.

Regarding protective factors, 69.2% respondents reported that they have social skills to communicate with others. The rest 30.8% did not have such skill. Besides, 65.4% participants reported that they have good attachment with their family or care givers whereas 34.6% did not have this close bond with their family or care givers. Moreover, 46.2% respondents were not successful in their academic performance. About 46.75% did not get care and support from their parents and care givers. Nearly half (46.75%) participants' parents were not employed. Surprisingly, 62.4% participants did not have access to social supports. Finally, 47.5% and 40.9% participants did not have community networks and participation respectively.

Among the total 182 OVC respondents, the mean resilience score was 40.13 with standard deviation of 9.87. The maximum and minimum scores were found to be 15 and 70 which shows a wide range. There was no statistically significant difference in average resilience scores between male and female OVC respondents ($t=0.112$, $p>0.05$). The mean resilience score of male and female participants were found to be 40.05 and 40.21 respectively. This is negligible difference. Besides, the mean resilience score of a respondent whose educational level ranges from grade one to grade four was 38.83 with standard deviation of 9.7. Finally, the mean resilience score of respondent whose educational level ranges from grade five to ten was 42.60 with standard deviation of 9.55. There was no significant difference in the resilience ability among illiterate OVC participants, participants whose educational level is between grade 1 to grade 4 and those whose grade is between grade 5 to grade 10 ($F=2.77$, $df=2$, $p>0.05$).

DISCUSSION

Some OVC in Chilga Wereda did not attend education

Table 1. Proportion of orphan and vulnerable participants.

S/N		Frequency	percent
1	Both parents alive	23	12.7
	Vulnerable Only mother alive	67	37
	Only father alive	30	16.6
2	Orphan Both parents died	61	33.7
	Total	181	100

Table 2. Types of Caregiver for orphans participants who lost both their parents.

S/N	Care givers	Frequency	percent
1	Grand parents	33	55
2	Relative	2	3.27
3	Brother	3	4.5
4	Sister	6	9.8
5	Uncle	5	8.2
6	Aunt	9	14.5
7	Self	3	4.5
	Total	61	100

Table 3. Proportion of respondents who faced risks.

S/N	Items	Yes		No	
		Frequency	percent	Frequency	percent
1	School failure	75	44.9	92	55.1
2	Negative peer group pressure	71	39	111	61
3	Poor attachment to school	86	48.6	91	51.4
4	Social isolation	41	22.5	144	77.5
5	Poverty	148	81.3	34	18.7
6	Social or cultural discrimination	57	31.8	122	68.2
7	Poor physical health	43	23.6	139	76.4
8	Peer rejection	47	25.8	135	74.2
9	Absence of positive parent- child interaction	60	33	122	67
10	Family conflict at home	63	34.6	119	65.4

which is basic right of each child. But, USAID (2008) report clearly states that a child who has access to education has a better chance to recover from the psychosocial impacts of their experiences and disrupted lives. Of the total 61 orphans, most of them (47.5%) were cared and supported by their grandparents. Since grandparents are likely to need supports of others, one may infer the amount and quality support given to orphans. The rest were living with their aunts, sisters, brothers, relatives, uncles. Though few in number, there were also orphan children who were living independently without the support of others. This shows that grandparents take the responsibility or burden to provide care and support to orphans.

When we come to school related risks, nearly half (44.9%) OVC in Chilga Wereda have ever failed to promote to the next grade at least once in their academic life. Besides, more than half (58%) had poor attachment with their schools and never obtained recognition for their achievements. This shows that considerable proportion of OVC in the Wereda were not successful in their academics which likely lead to susceptibility to adversity or bad life condition. Because, according to USAID (2008) report, accessibility to quality primary schooling helps children for better chance in life. In addition, there were some OVC who faced social problems like negative pressure, social isolation from the society, social or cultural discrimination and rejection. Moreover, the

Table 4. Protective factors that have been used by OVC.

S/N	Items	Yes		No	
		Frequency	percent	Frequency	percent
1	Social skills	127	69.2	55	30.8
2	Attachment to family/ caregiver/	119	65.4	63	34.6
3	Successful achievement in school	97	53.3	84	46.2
4	Parent/caregiver care and support	98	53.8	84	46.2
5	Parental job/employment/	97	53.3	85	46.7
6	Access to support services	68	37.6	113	62.4
7	Positive school climate	116	64.3	65	35.7
8	Sense of belongingness	119	65.7	61	33.7
9	Community networking	95	52.5	86	47.5
10	Participation in the community	107	59.1	74	40.9

Table 5. Independent t-test on gender difference in resilience.

Sex	Mean	t	Sig
Male	40.05	0.112	0.119
Female	40.21		

Table 6. Independent t-tests on resilience by age.

Age	Mean	t	Sig
4-12 years	38.8		0.02
13-17 years	42.2	2.3	

Table 7. Descriptive statistics on Resilience by Educational Level.

Educational level	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Illiterate	21	39.7143	10.77
Grade 1 -4	103	38.8350	9.7
Grade 5-10	58	42.6034	9.55

majority (81.3%) of children were conditions. All these show that, most orphans and vulnerable children in Chilga Wereda were suffering family, school and community related factors risks.

Regarding protective factors to buffer risks, more than half (69.2%) had social skills to communicate with others. Similarly, 65.4% had good relationship with their family or care givers whereas 34.6% did not have this close bond with their family or care givers. However, nearly half (46.2%) OVC were not successful in their academic performance. Besides, 46.75% did not get care and support

from their parents and care givers. Moreover, 46.75% OVCs' parents or care givers were not employed. Most OVC (62.4%) did not have access to social supports. Finally, nearly half (47.5%) and 40.9% OVC did not have social networks and participation in the community. This implies that substantial number of OVC in Chilga Wereda did not use protective factors to cope up with risks. This might be due to lose relationship between children and their parents or care givers. In addition, the society may not give equal opportunity to such children. The other possible explanation for failure to employ protective factors may be absence of educational opportunity for some OVC. Because, as to USAID (2008), a child who has access to education has a better chance to recover from the psychosocial impacts of their experiences and disrupted lives.

Coming to resilience, resilience score of OVC ranges from 10 to 17 with the mean score of 40.13. About 62 % OVC scored above half of the total score. But, 38 % OVC participants scored below half on Davidson's resilience measure. Though there is no clear cut point to determine resilience, the higher the score, the higher resilience ability of children. Based on the findings, we may at least infer that some OVC who scores below half were not resilient. This could be due to inability to use protective factors.

When we see resilience across sex and, was no statistically significant difference in resilience between male and female OVC respondents ($t=0.112$, $p>0.05$). The mean resilience score of male and female participants were almost equal (40.05 for males and 40.21 for females). However, there was statistically significant difference in resilience between OVC participants whose age ranges from 4 to 12 years and 13 to 17 years ($t=2.30$, $p<0.05$). The mean resilient score of young OVC (ranges from 4 to 12 years) was 38.8 and the mean resilience score for older OVC (13 to 17 years) was 42.2. This implies that young OVC are less resilient than older ones. Similarly, Luthar (2007) stated that resilience can also change over time based on the child's developmental

Table 8. One way ANOVA on resilience of OVC across educational level.

Source of Variation	Sum of Square	Mean Square	df	F	Sig
Between groups	531.207	265.603	2		
With in groups	17128.359	95.689	179	2.776	.065
Total	17659.566		181		

stage and subsequent experiences. Therefore, this difference could be due to effect development and as age of child increases, he or she become better in physical and mental maturity.

Finally, there was no significant difference in the resilience ability of among OVC with different educational status (illiterate OVC participants, participants whose educational level is between grade 1-4 and those whose grade is between grade 5-10) ($F=2.77$, $df=2$, $p>0.05$). The mean resilient score of illiterate OVC and those whose education ranges from grade 1-4 is almost equal which were found to be 39.7 and 38.8 respectively. But OVC whose level of education is between grade five and ten score slightly higher than others. The difference may be due to the effect of education. Similarly, According to Margaret et al. (2001), stated that people acquire resilience abilities that could be improved through effective training and development.

Implications for intervention

OVC need psychosocial training so as to use protective mechanisms and for positive adaptation. Intervention should strive to reduce modifiable risks to promote protective factors and ultimately to develop resilience.

It is important to increase awareness of parents, care givers and the community about risks facing OVC.

Conflict of Interests

The author(s) have not declared any conflict of interests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First, we would like to thank Mr. Nega Gidey, OVC Project Coordinator in Chilga Woreda, for his support during data collection. Last but not least, we are indebted to all volunteer OVC workers in Chilga Woreda for their co-operation and assistance in collecting data.

REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association, (2008). Resilience in African American children and adolescents: A vision for optimal development. Washington, DC.
- Campbell-Sills L, Stein M (2007). Psychometric Analysis and Refinement of the Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). *J. Traumatic Stress* 20(6):1019-1028.
- Killian B (2007). Risk and Resilience: A Generation at Risk? HIV/AIDS, Vulnerable Children and Security in Southern Africa.
- Luthar SS (2007). The construct of resilience: Implications for interventions and social policies. New York Columbia University .
- Margaret B, Ted T, John D (2001). Resilience in Response to Life Stress: The Effects of Coping Style and Cognitive Hardiness 34:1.
- YLPB (2009). The Impact of Parental Death on Child Outcomes: Evidence from Ethiopia. Department of International Development UK: Young Lives Policy Brief.
- UNICEF (2012). Investing in people: caring for vulnerable children and their families.
- USAID (2008). Education Programming for Orphans and Vulnerable Children Affected by or Vulnerable to HIV: Moving Beyond School Fees and Uniforms.

UPCOMING CONFERENCES

26th Chinese Control and Decision Conference, Changsha, China. May 31-June 2, 2014 Changsha, China.



The banner features a scenic view of a city by the water on the left and a mountain landscape on the right. The text is centered and includes the year '2014' with a stylized 'CCD' logo, the conference name, dates, location, and website.

2014
May 31-June 2, 2014, Changsha, China
The 26th Chinese Control and Decision Conference
www.ccdc.neu.edu.cn

English | 中文

**IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence, Orlando, USA
14 in Orlando, Florida, December 9 to 12, 2014**



The banner features a cityscape with a 'WELCOME TO DOWNTOWN ORLANDO' sign in the foreground. It includes the IEEE logo, the IEEE Computational Intelligence Society logo, and a collage of images including a Universal Islands globe, a rocket launch, a castle, and Disney characters.

IEEE SSCI 2014
December 9 to 12, 2014 Orlando, Florida, U.S.A.

IEEE
IEEE Computational Intelligence Society

Important Dates

Special Session Proposal	April 15, 2014
Paper Submission	June 15, 2014
Notification to authors	September 5, 2014
Final Submission	October 5, 2014
Early Registration	October 5, 2014

2014 IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence

Conferences and Advert

April 2014

Canadian Anthropology Society (CASCA) Annual Conference, Toronto, Canada

2014 International Conference on Innovation, Service and Management- ICISM 2014

27th Conference on Software Engineering Education and Training, (CSEE&T 2014), Klagenfurt, Austria

18th International Research Society for Public Management Annual Conference, Ottawa, Canada

International Conference on Corporate Social Responsibility, Governance and Sustainable Development (ICCSR-GSD), Accra, Ghana

May 2013

5th World Conference on Psychology, Counseling and Guidance, (WCPCG-2014), Dubrovnik, Croatia


Peace Studies International Conference, Bradford, UK

7th Conference on Language, Discourse, and Cognition (CLDC 2014), Taiwan, Taiwan

13th International Public Communication of Science and Technology Conference, Salvador, Brazil

International Conference on Language, Literature and Culture in Education, Nitra, Slovakia

9th International Conference for Literary Journalism Studies (IALJS-9), Paris, France



International Journal of Psychology and Counselling

Related Journals Published by Academic Journals

- Journal of Media and Communication Studies
- International Journal of English and Literature
- Philosophical Papers and Reviews
- Educational Research and Reviews
- Journal of African Studies and Development
- Philosophical Papers and Reviews

academicJournals