

**Social Inclusion Project in Bulgaria**  
**Baseline Study**  
*Field survey - Social Skills at School*

February - May 2012

Prepared for:



Prepared by:





- **Contents** ..... 2
- **Research background and objectives**..... 3
- **Methodological framework**..... 4
- **Summary of results** ..... 5
- **Research results in graphs** ..... 9

- ❑ Although not designed by TOR, additional small survey was conducted for the purposes of obtaining information on the Project Outcome Indicator "Social skills".
  - ❑ The research obtained information on the following indicators:
    1. Propensity to self-segregation – whether the child tends to form a separate group by gender, ethnic origin or ties of relationship
    2. Interaction with children of different background during school
    3. Interaction with children of different background after-school hours
    4. Aggression – whether the child is tolerant and easy going with other children or tends to make conflicts and fights
    5. Respect to the teacher
    6. Responsible approach to learning:
      - the child shows serious and diligent attitude towards given tasks
      - the child is doing well with learning material
    7. Pro-social and helping behavior: the child is open to help – to the teacher and to the other children
- Another two indicators were added to the questionnaire with teachers, so as to give researchers and experts a deeper information on the roots of segregation at school
- propensity of other children to isolate the child
  - what are the reasons for that.

- The research was conducted as a telephone survey with 100 teachers, who described 300 cases of children of vulnerable groups in the first and second grade (about 3 cases per teacher) with the following parameters:
  - Method of collecting information: telephone CATI interview conducted in the CATI center of Market LINKS.
  - Interview duration: up to 10 minutes
  - Sample size: 100 teachers who described 3 cases of vulnerable children from their class. In each group of municipalities were conducted 34 interviews.
  - Sampling approach: typological quota sampling was applied with maximum spread of the cases across the three groups of municipalities
  - The selection criteria of the respondents were:
    - Teachers to work with first or second grade at primary schools
    - The schools to be of non-segregated type
    - The chosen cases had to cover all categories of vulnerable groups

- The index presented in the Monitoring Table shows that children with overall positive social predisposition are about three times more than those who do not have such. It can be stated that two-thirds of the children from vulnerable groups (73,6%) have good social skills and successful socialization at first and second class at primary schools in the target municipalities without significant difference across the three groups .
  - This trend could be noticed in the scores generated by the first sub-indicator - Propensity to self-segregation. The children who tend to form a separate group by gender, ethnic origin or ties of relationship are 26,7% of all pupils in the sample. It is rather low share when considering the fact that the sample consisted primarily of children of ethnic minorities, half of the sample were Roma children.
- 10% more of the children in Treatment group B tend to form such groups (31%) compared to the children from Control group (21%). Children from the Treatment group A generate almost the same score as the averaged one (27,5%).

- It appears that self-segregation is correlated with the propensity of the class to segregate the children of different ethnic origin in about 17% of the cases. Four main reasons for segregation, were identified:
  - The segregated child behaves badly with other children
  - Other children treat him/her badly without any visible reason
  - The child looks repelling – with dirty clothes, smells unpleasantly
  - Roma ethnic origin
  - The child doesn't know well Bulgarian and cannot communicate with the children.
- The trend is also consolidated by the scores of second sub-indicator - 86,7% of pupils interact with children of different background during school. Their share is highest in Treatment group B - 89,9%, and lowest in the Control group - 82,8%. In Treatment group A it is the same as averaged one - 87,2%
- The trend could be noticed further in the scores by sub-indicator “Interaction with children of different background after-school hours”. 67,3% of all pupils interact with such children. Their share is highest in Treatment group B - 73,7%, and lowest in the Treatment group A. In the Control group it is the same as averaged one - 66,7%

- Aggression is reported in 16,0% of all children. The children are tolerant and easy going with other children in highest share in Treatment group A, when only 13,7% tend to make conflicts and fights. The share of aggressive children is slightly higher in the Control group - 18,2% In Treatment group B the level is the same as the averaged one - 16,1%.
- Respect to the teacher show over than 70% with no significant differences across the groups.
- The sub-indicator “Responsible approach to learning” in the Monitoring Table is also a compound one. It includes two second-level sub-indicators:
  - the child shows serious and diligent attitude towards given tasks
  - the child is doing well with learning material
- 44,0% of all children in the sample are defined to be responsible and diligent in completing of their tasks. There are statistically significant differences observed between the groups: Highest score by this indicator achieve pupils in the Treatment group B and lowest score have pupils in the Control group: 52,5% vs. 35,3% in the Control group. Children in Treatment group A generate the same level as the one of the average value - 44,2%.
- About one third 34,0% of all children in the sample are doing well with learning material – almost the same level as in the Treatment group A - 33,3%.. Their share is higher Treatment group B 40,5% and lower in the Control group -28,3%.
- Pro-social and helping behavior show 56,0% of all pupils in the sample with no significant differences across the groups.

## Assumptions, risks and suggestions

- On the whole, the results from this survey are in line with the ones from the Field survey – they prove the hypothesis that children who are living without sufficient parental care and in unfavorable social environment, which were found to be about 25%, tend to not be socially well included at a later stage.
- As well, the survey leads to the same assumptions, as those, stated by most of the specialists and experts dealing with problems of vulnerable groups – that active measures for social inclusion of vulnerable children and in particular of Roma ones, also have to be addressed to the rest of the social environment at school – at Bulgarian children and their parents, and at teachers.



**RESEARCH RESULTS IN GRAPHS**

























## Gender of children and parents profile

	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Boy	53,3%	49,0%	58,6%	52,5%
Girl	46,7%	51,0%	41,4%	47,5%

	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Parents from vulnerable ethnic group	23,3%	24,5%	26,3%	19,2%
Parents on welfare, unemployed parents	22,3%	24,5%	19,2%	23,2%
Parents with 3 or more children, single parents	22,0%	24,5%	17,2%	24,2%
Parents /mostly mothers/ in risk age	0,3%	0,0%	0,0%	1,0%
Parents without or with basic education	10,3%	11,8%	8,1%	11,1%
Parents in poor living conditions	8,3%	4,9%	12,1%	8,1%
Parents who don't take care of their children	3,7%	2,0%	6,1%	3,0%
Parents of children with disabilities or health issues	2,3%	2,0%	3,0%	2,0%
Parents of children with health issues	2,3%	1,0%	2,0%	4,0%
Uninsured parents	4,0%	3,9%	6,1%	2,0%
Parents of children in risk /Developmentally Delayed, etc./	1,0%	1,0%	0,0%	2,0%

Base: All respondents

Ethnic origin of children

	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Bulgarian	 27,3%	 34,3%	 21,2%	 26,3%
Roma	 53,0%	 52,9%	 56,6%	 49,5%
Pomak	 2,0%	 1,0%	 5,1%	 0,0%
Turkish	 11,0%	 9,8%	 13,1%	 10,1%
Turkish roma	 5,7%	 2,0%	 4,0%	 11,1%
Other	 1,0%	 0,0%	 0,0%	 3,0%





















Base: All respondents





















**Propensity to self-segregation. Interaction with children of different background**

Does the child tend to form an informal group with other children – of ethnic, social or other type - that separates itself from other children?	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Yes	26,7%	27,5%	31,3%	21,2%
No	73,3%	72,5%	68,7%	78,8%
<b>Does the child interact with children outside his/her ethnic or social group – talking, playing?</b>				
	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Doesn't interact with other children	3,0%	2,9%	2,0%	4,0%
Rarely interacts with other children	10,3%	9,8%	8,1%	13,1%
Sometimes interacts with other children	21,0%	23,5%	20,2%	19,2%
Actively interacts with other children	42,7%	33,3%	52,5%	42,4%
Very actively interacts with other children	23,0%	30,4%	17,2%	21,2%
<b>Does the child play with children of other ethnic or social groups after school?</b>				
	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Yes, almost every day	49,0%	47,1%	51,5%	48,5%
Yes, sometimes	18,3%	14,7%	22,2%	18,2%
Yes, but rarely (at least once a month)	11,7%	14,7%	8,1%	12,1%
Never	6,7%	4,9%	7,1%	8,1%
Don't know	14,3%	18,6%	11,1%	13,1%

*Base: All respondents*





















**Responsible approach to learning (attitude towards given tasks and doing well with the learning material)**





















How responsible is the child? How serious and diligent is his/her attitude towards given tasks?	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Very irresponsible	 11,7%	 9,8%	 9,1%	 16,2%
Rather irresponsible	 20,0%	 18,6%	 21,2%	 20,2%
Not irresponsible, but not responsible as well	 24,3%	 27,5%	 17,2%	 28,3%
Rather responsible	 32,0%	 32,4%	 39,4%	 24,2%
Very responsible	 12,0%	 11,8%	 13,1%	 11,1%

How would you evaluate his/her school performance?	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Very poorly	 12,7%	 9,8%	 12,1%	 16,2%
Rather poorly	 25,3%	 24,5%	 24,2%	 27,3%
Average	 28,0%	 32,4%	 23,2%	 28,3%
Rather good	 21,7%	 20,6%	 25,3%	 19,2%
Very good	 12,3%	 12,7%	 15,2%	 9,1%

*Base: All respondents*

**Aggression (whether the child tends to make conflicts and fights). Respect to the teacher**

Is the child friendly and tolerant with children outside his/her ethnic group or is it aggressive and prone to conflict?	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Very aggressive and prone to conflict	 2,7%	 2,9%	 2,0%	 3,0%
Aggressive and prone to conflict to some degree	 13,3%	 10,8%	 14,1%	 15,2%
Not aggressive, but not friendly as well	 25,0%	 30,4%	 16,2%	 28,3%
Rather friendly and positive	 38,0%	 31,4%	 49,5%	 33,3%
Very friendly and positive	 21,0%	 24,5%	 18,2%	 20,2%

Does the child show respect to the teacher?	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Very disrespectful	 0,7%	 1,0%	 0,0%	 1,0%
Rather disrespectful	 6,7%	 7,8%	 6,1%	 6,1%
Not disrespectful, but not respectful as well	 18,7%	 17,6%	 16,2%	 22,2%
Rather respectful	 38,0%	 34,3%	 36,4%	 43,4%
Very respectful	 36,0%	 39,2%	 41,4%	 27,3%

*Base: All respondents*

## Pro-social and helping behavior

How responsive and willing to help is the child – towards the teacher and other children?	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Very unresponsive and not willing to help	3,3%	2,9%	4,0%	3,0%
Rather unresponsive	13,0%	9,8%	16,2%	13,1%
Not unresponsive, but not responsive as well	27,7%	28,4%	27,3%	27,3%
Rather responsive	40,0%	40,2%	38,4%	41,4%
Very responsive and willing to help	16,0%	18,6%	14,1%	15,2%

Do other children exclude the child from conversations and games?	All N=300	Group A N=102	Group B N=99	Control group N=99
Never	50,7%	48,0%	59,6%	44,4%
Yes, but rarely (at least once a month)	19,3%	17,6%	16,2%	24,2%
Yes, sometimes	24,7%	27,5%	21,2%	25,3%
Yes, almost always	5,3%	6,9%	3,0%	6,1%

<i>Base: All respondents</i>	All N=148	Group A N=53	Group B N=40	Control group N=55
<b>What do you think the reason for that isolation?</b>				
Treats other children poorly	27,0%	30,2%	30,0%	21,8%
Other children treat him/her bad for no reason at all	28,4%	28,3%	25,0%	30,9%
Doesn't speak Bulgarian very well	11,5%	5,7%	10,0%	18,2%
Child looks repulsive (dirty and/or poorly dressed)	15,5%	20,8%	20,0%	7,3%
Prejudice toward his/her ethnic origin	17,6%	15,1%	15,0%	21,8%

*Base: respondents who have been isolated*