

**It Is Possible to Start Everything Again ....  
Children At-Risk and Galosh Production Center:  
Case Study of Trabzon Public Education Center**

*Ş. Şule Erçetin and Seçil Dayıoğlu*

Department of Educational Administration, Supervision,  
Planning and Economy, Hacettepe University, Turkey

---

**Abstract:** Being children at-risk is one of the hottest issues in Turkey because of various reasons. This study aims at dealing with whether these children can have the chance of having a standard life through using educational methods and approaches. The participants are the trainees and educators of “Galosh Production Training Program” at Trabzon Public Education Centers in Turkey. To gather data, Kolb’s Learning Styles Inventory for the trainees and Teaching Styles Inventory for the educators were administered. Also, interview with three trainees and one educator was used. Statistical analysis and content analysis were conducted. According to the results, the trainees at “Galosh Production Training Program” had the chance of beginning a new life.

**Key words:** children at-risk · learning styles and teaching styles · Kolb’s Learning and Teaching Styles

---

### INTRODUCTION

Nowadays in most of the schools in Turkey the tendency among children towards violence has been on the agenda. The children at the school-age have been involved in the violent activities to some extent. For a better future, we expect our children to go to school by having stationery objects in their bags; unfortunately, they can have knives, sticks or the similar things in their bags. This condition signifies that love is replaced by hate and discussion is replaced by fighting and instead of making the ideas collide with each other they choose hitting and kicking [1]. The children are ready to learn everything and they can easily perceive and learn the environment around, but they tend to learn violence in this case. These children are defined as “children at-risk”. In other words, these children are the ones who have been living in danger or risks that are not proper for their age group and who, as a result, leave their homes and drifted into bad habits such as using heroin and stealing. They can also be categorized as “street children, children who are pushed to crime, children working, children who are exploited” [2].

According to Turkish Criminal Code, *crime* is “committing an action against the laws valid in the

society and, as a result, being a subject of the certain laws’ punishment”. Moreover, considering the same code, child crime is “the under- eighteen ones who are against the laws or committed an action against it”. The feature that differentiates child crime from other types is that the child is in the process of becoming an adolescent when the crime is committed. This period could make it quite difficult for him or her to get used to the environment and the social norms because of his or her lack of experience. In this condition, the child begins to challenge the rules and tries to implement his or her rules and if he or she is not accepted by a social group, he or she would have conflict with the group itself [3,4].

These children can only exist in the environment appropriate for their own cognitive, affective and moral development by being rehabilitated by educational methods. This educational process should involve the materials and methods in line with their learning styles changing in terms of their individual differences. The educators should be aware of this fact.

**Problem statement:** Since children have been in the progress of becoming adults, it is not valid to use “criminology” term for them. In other words, children perceive the environment they are involved and they

react according to this perception. If violence occurs in the environment where children have been into, they learn violence, of course. Children at adolescence take their friends as models rather than their family and they would like to be accepted by them. For this reason, any behavior modeled by a child is spreaded within the group quickly and accepted by everyone. If this behavior is related to any bad habits, it becomes difficult to solve that behavior [5].

According to the Research Center for Violence at Schools in the U.S. [6], violence risk factors can be classified into three categories as factors based on individuality, family and society. Factors based on individuality can be the impact level of the friends on the children, children's aggressive attitudes, addiction, low level of intelligence and some complications occurred during birth period. Family factors can be having violence and criminal actions at the family background, low expectation level in the family, not having a close relationship with their children, having addiction problem in the family and behaving the children violently and aggressively. Factors based on society can be the increase in accessing weapons and addictive substances, the increase in divorced parents, the increase in the immigrated families and economical problems in the society [6]. Moreover, Hunt [7] indicated that the age of 10 is very critical for children and there is an increase in the tendency towards crime since they are in the process of being against continuously, excessive responsibility, the low level of their socio-economical situation and trying to exist as individuals.

According to the studies conducted to rehabilitate the children at-risk, some suggestions are identified to modify all the possible situations to create them and all the suggestions are child-centered. Most significant ones are as follows

- Providing them adult assistance and care for them; e.g. teachers, psychological consultants at schools, administrators, parents and group members.
- Improving their sense of ownership
- Stressing the positive sides of the child rather than incapacabilities
- Respecting the child
- Giving responsibility and identifying aims
- Improving an educational program having clear, holistic and multi-dimensional perspectives.
- Pertaining the educational experience with their future
- Having the long-term and supportive process [6,9]

Regarding these, in U.S.A some alternative programs, school career academies, alternative vocational high schools for the children who could not attend the school and have never attended have been implemented. "Youthbuild USA" is an example for one of the school career academies. From 1988 to 1998 the children at-risk were provided opportunities for gaining some vocational abilities and qualifications [6].

In addition to the measures suggested above, Research Center for Violence at Schools in the U.S has implemented an action plan. According to this plan, social service centers have been established and at those centers school staff, parents, teachers and students have been appointed. Training program for the participants has been considered to be launched by the experts. All of these programs have aimed at searching about the source of the change on children's behavior by contacting their families and even working collaboratively with them. The school administrators have also expected to implement different program to overcome this problem and work collaboratively with the families [8].

One of the mostly-stressed violence tendency is that the children with learning problems have been directed to violence to show their individuality and to compensate for their own deficiencies. These children can be the ones who are unsuccessful at schools. As a result of their failure, they can think that they have lost the acceptance and through violence they try to draw attention and be known by the society. This is because children desire to be valued and accepted as an individual.

Learning involves a child's being accepted by the society and getting adapted to the environment. The child with learning problems is excluded by the people around him or her. The child's learning problem is not only related to the child himself or herself but also to the adults -teachers at schools and parents at home- organizing the learning environment cannot sometimes implement the effective method appropriate for his or her learning style and type. Regarding Croninger and Lee [6], children at-risk have more difficulties to adapt their environment and these adaption problems can be identified as not having similar learning styles, learning difficulties and low level of success as a result of their life experience. As a result of not having harmony with the child's learning styles and the learning environment itself, it should be questioned whether "the schools lead the students to be at-risk" and whether "children need to be re-trained or schools need to be re-organized" [6].

Examining methods towards learning, the learning styles of a child is very significant. Therefore, learning

styles have been defined by different scientists [19]. According to Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligence Theory, there are 9 types of intelligences: *verbal-linguistic, logical-mathematical, bodily-kinesthetic, musical-rhythmical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, spatial, naturalistic and sexistentialistic* [10]. In this theory intelligence refers to ability to do something and it signifies that every child has an innate ability to do something. Also, this theory indicates that if a learner is educated according to his or her learning styles, he or she will be successful. For instance, if it is known that a child has musical ability, using songs while teaching a foreign language to that child would help him or her more. However, the same method would not work for the child who has logical-mathematical ability. Therefore, a child should be educated regarding their intelligence types [11]. This is also relevant to the children at-risk.

In addition to the learning styles, teaching styles are also important. To make children learn more effectively, the teachers are expected to set the learning environment accordingly. To do this, teachers need to be aware of the children's learning styles and their own teaching styles so that they can make their instructional materials and equipments relevant. To identify the teaching and learning styles, there are different scales. In this study, 'Kolb's Learning and Teaching Styles Inventory' was used since they have been piloted and proved that they are parallel to each other. According to this inventory, 4 types of learning styles are identified as the below [10,17,14]:

**a)concrete experience (CE):** This style involves the abilities of making observation and taking view through their senses, explaining their experience concretely and making justifications.

**b)reflective observation (RO):** This style has the abilities of reflecting their experience and observation in addition to evaluation and having a different perspectives to evaluate experience and observation.

**c)abstract conceptualization (AC):** This style involves "conceptualizing" the observation and solutions and theorizing.

**d) active experimentation (AE):** This style is related to applying the theories and approaches to practice.

All these abilities cannot be used effectively with all the learners but there are learners that can use some of them more effectively than others. Kolb identifies the four types learners according to these abilities as [12-14].

**a)Diverges:** These learners are best in situations of concrete experience and reflective observation. They use all their sense for observation. They are good at solving problems in different ways, comparing the solutions and relating them to their experience so that they form a whole. Moreover, they can view the rare situations. They are active listeners and controversialists and they make other see themselves better. Also they rely heavily upon brainstorming and generation of ideas.

The children who are diverges can read for a long time and work on an issue deliberately. Also they ask lots of questions so they make others tired of them. They can be called as "menace" especially for the teachers who use traditional methods since they can ask unexpected questions. Listening exercises, discussion, working on the case studies and producing scenario are some of the best methods for them since these give them the chance of expressing themselves openly. They also regard being in a setting in which they are not considered 'aliens'.

**b)Assimilators:** Their dominant learning styles are abstract conceptualization and reflective observation. They like the precise and logical development of the theory and its application. They can be described as "applied scientists" by Kolb.

The children described as assimilators can deal with theories and abstraction easily. Rather than applying the theories and approaches, they try to enrich the theories. They like designing experiments, analyzing the data obtained and re-arranging them.

**c)Convergers:** These learners have active experimentation and abstract conceptualization. They use active experimentation to base their experimentation on a theory or an approach. Solving problems, decision-making and application of the practice are their strengths.

These children are good at technical training. They can properly apply the theories and practice. They are successful at finding solutions. Developing various thinking styles and action plans, applying them, choosing the best solution, identifying their goals and making decision and brainstorming are the methods they prefer.

**d)Accommodators:** They like taking risks and they are good at active experimentation and concrete experience. They can be called "entrepreneurs". They are active and focused on active observation. Their strength is gaining new experience rather than applying the plans. They take risks and they are action-based. They can easily adapt to new environment.

These children are very creative and can be called as practitioners in the classroom. They are ready for taking responsibilities under innovative, different and challenging circumstances. Identifying goals and following them, finding new opportunities, taking responsibilities and taking risks are the issues they look for in their learning environment.

According to the learning types above, two teaching styles are also defined as supportive teaching styles and leading teaching styles [12,13,14]:

• **Supportive Teaching Styles:** These educators or teachers try to empower and motivate the learners to achieve their goals through overcoming their deficiencies and correcting their mistakes. Concrete experience and active experimentation are the main learning types they implement in their classroom setting. So, it can be stated that they appeal to diverges, accommodators and converges.

• **Leading Education Style:** These educators or teachers try to map the way for the learners; in other words, they guide them to their own goals. The purpose of the educators and teachers are making them go on according to this map. In this style, the map is formed rather than taken from, which is the main difference from the supportive education style. Abstract conceptualization and reflective observation are the main learning types they implement in the classroom. So, it can be stated that they appeal to diverges, assimilators and accommodators.

All the learners and educators in this study were from one of the public education centers in Turkey, Trabzon Public Education Center. These centers are the continuing education centers aiming at providing educational opportunities for all the people, especially for people disadvantaged for socio-economic, geographic or other reasons, according to the regulations of Ministry of National Education in Turkey. Trabzon Public Education Center is one of them which provides training programs in 250 different field areas and about 5000 trainees have attended in these programs up to now. In this center, the training program called “Galosh Production Training” was initiated for the children at-risk. Trabzon Province Welfare Association, Welfare Association for Children and Trabzon Police Department of Child Criminology were the supporters of this project. This project aimed at not only training them to produce galosh technically but also give them a chance of having a standard life. For rehabilitation, experts from one of the hospitals at Trabzon

and Psychological Consultancy Center at Ministry of Education in Trabzon were involved. These children were taken to the cinema, theatre, match and activities such as swimming.

In this study, the learning styles and learner types for children at-risk were examined through Kolb’s Learning Inventory and their educators’ teaching styles were examined through Kolb’s Teaching Inventory. Therefore, 8 trainees and 3 educators from Trabzon Public Education Center were participants for this study. The research questions are

- Can the children at-risk have the chance of having a standard life through using educational methods and approaches?
- What are the characteristics of the children at-risk?
- What are their learning styles?
- What are the teaching styles of the educators of children at-risk?
- Are the teaching styles of the educators are in line with the learning styles of the children?
- Is “Galosh Production Training Program” implemented at Trabzon Public Education Center successful?

## METHOD

In this study eight trainees of the “Galosh Production Training Program” and their educators were the participants. Kolb’s Teaching and Learning Styles Inventory were administered to the participants accordingly. Moreover, three trainees and one educator were interviewed through a semi-structured form. The results of both of the inventories were analyzed statistically. The results of the interviews were analyzed by content analysis.

**Population and Sample:** All the trainees and educators of the program were involved in this study. All the trainees were males and their ages ranged from 14 to 18. Four of them were attending the second part of the primary school and one of them was attending the industrial vocational high school. One of them left the high school and one left the second part of the primary school. One of them was illiterate and never ever attended any formal education. Regarding their family background, all their mothers except one were housewives. Two of the fathers of the trainees were technicians of the central heating system; one of the fathers of the trainees was a chapman; one of them was a car driver; three of them were unemployed; and, unfortunately, one of them was dead.

Additionally, three educators were administered Kolb's Teaching Styles Inventory. One of them was male and the others were females.

**Data Gathering Tools:** The data gathering tools were Kolb's Learning and Teaching Styles Inventory and interviewing with the three trainees and their educators.

**a.Kolb's Learning Styles Inventory:** Kolb's Learning Styles Inventory includes four sets involving nine descriptors for each one. The learners are to fill in the blanks by giving scores from 4 –the most appropriate- to 1 – the least appropriate- to describe themselves. The scores attached to them are grouped according to the learning styles in a table. All the points obtained are placed on the X-Y lines and a cycle to get the learner type.

**b.Kolb's Teaching Styles Inventory:** In Kolb's Teaching Styles Inventory, twelve sets involving two statements on the teachers' tendency for each one. The score scale "3-0, 2-1, 1-2, 0-3" are to be used to decide their own views. The parts "A, B, C, D" next to the box corresponding to the score are used for identifying the teaching styles.

**c.Interview:** Three trainees and their educators in the training program were interviewed through a semi-structured interview form in addition to the inventories. All the interviews were recorded and then transcribed. All of them were analyzed through content analysis since the study involved concepts related to children at-risk and these concepts were tried to be identified [15,16].

**Findings:** The findings obtained from Kolb's Learning and Teaching Styles Inventory were examined according to the research questions below:

- Can the children at-risk have the chance of having a standard life through using educational methods and approaches?
- What are the characteristics of the children at-risk?
- What are their learning styles?
- What are the teaching styles of the educators of children at-risk?
- Are the teaching styles of the educators are in line with the learning styles of the children?
- Is "Galosh Production Training Program" implemented at Trabzon Public Education Center successful?

What are the characteristics of the children at-risk?

The children attending "Galosh Production Training Program" implemented at Trabzon Public Education Center were given as below:

Soner was born in Trabzon in 1990. His mother works at a hospital and his father works as a driver. He has three siblings. His family's socio-economic condition is low. He has had to leave the high school. He was arrested because of theft. He has recently been attending "Galosh Production Training Program".

Mahmut was born in Trabzon in 1991. His mother is a housewife and his father is dead. He has 5 siblings. His family's socio-economic condition is low. He has still been attending the open high school program. He was arrested as a result of theft. He has recently been attending "Galosh Production Training Program".

Serdar was born in Trabzon in 1988. His mother is a housewife and his father is a technician dealing with the central heating. He has four siblings. His family's socio-economic situation is low. He has left the high school. He was arrested because of theft. He has recently been attending "Galosh Production Training Program".

Deniz was born in Trabzon in 1990. His mother is a housewife and his father is a technician dealing with the central heating. His family's socio-economic situation is low. He has been attending the open high school program. He was arrested because of theft. He has recently been attending "Galosh Production Training Program".

Zülfikar was born in Trabzon in 1992. His mother is a housewife and his father is a chapman. He has three siblings. His family's socio-economic situation is low. He is a graduate of the primary school. He was arrested because of theft. He has recently been attending "Galosh Production Training Program".

Doğan was born in Trabzon in 1990. His mother is a housewife and his father is unemployed. He has three siblings. His family's socio-economic condition is low. He has left Grade VI at the primary-school level. He was arrested because of theft. He has recently been attending "Galosh Production Training Program".

Necati was born in Trabzon in 1990. His mother is a housewife and his father is unemployed. He has three siblings. His family's socio-economic condition is low. He has been attending the industrial vocational high school. He was arrested because of theft. He has recently been attending "Galosh Production Training Program".

Metin was born in Trabzon in 1990. His mother is a housewife and his father is unemployed. He has five siblings. His family's socio-economic condition is low.

Table 1: Trainees at Galosh Production Training Program, Trabzon Public Education Center –Scores of them according to Kolb’s Learning Styles Inventory

Name of the Trainee	Score of Concrete Experience (SCE)	Score of Reflective Observation (SRO)	Score of Abstract Conceptualization (SAC)	Score of Active Experimentation (SAE)	Percentage of SCE	Percentage of SRO	Percentage of SAC	Percentage of SAE	Score of SAC-SCE	Score of SAE-SRO	Learner Type
Necati	15	12	12	17	% 55	% 35	% 10	% 65	-3	5	Accommodators
Metin	17	12	16	17	% 75	% 35	% 10	% 65	-1	5	Accommodators
Serdar	12	15	13	15	% 25	% 65	% 15	% 40	1	0	Divergers
Deniz	14	8	17	17	% 45	% 15	% 55	% 65	3	9	Convergers
Doğan	12	13	16	18	% 25	% 45	% 35	% 75	4	5	Convergers
Zülfikar	14	14	14	14	% 45	% 50	% 20	% 30	0	0	Divergers
Soner	16	15	14	15	% 65	% 70	% 20	% 40	-2	0	Divergers
Mahmut	18	17	11	14	% 85	% 85	% 30	% 85	-7	-3	Divergers

He has been attending the second part of the primary school. He was arrested because of theft. He has recently been attending “Galosh Production Training Program”.

Considering the characteristics of the students, it is obvious that these children have not been into the situation that is proper to their age and their developmental process. Additionally, these children have been away from their families and this drives them into the crime as a result of some reasons. Moreover, in terms of gender, all our trainees are males.

These findings are completely parallel to the study conducted by Burnett and Walz in 1994. In that study it was also found that ninety percent of the learners were males and they all come from the socially disadvantaged families.

**What are their learning styles?:** Learning styles and learner’s types of the children attending “Galosh Production Training Program” were examined through Kolb’s Learning Styles Inventory and Table 1 was designed according to these findings. Regarding each student, the findings below were obtained:

- The dominant learning type of Necati is ‘*accommodator*’. His score for active experimentation is 17 and the corresponding percentage is 65 %. His score for concrete experience is 15 and the corresponding percentage is 55 %. His other learning styles’ score for reflective observation is 12 and the corresponding percentage is 35 %. Also, his score for abstract conceptualization is 12 and the corresponding percentage is 10 %.
- The dominant learner type of Metin is ‘*accommodator*’. His score for active experimentation is 17 and the corresponding percentage is 65 %. His score for concrete experience is 17 and the

corresponding percentage is 75 %. His other learning styles’ score for reflective observation is 12 and the corresponding percentage is 35 %. Also, his score for abstract conceptualization is 12 and the corresponding percentage is 10 %.

- The dominant learner type of Deniz is ‘*converger*’. His score for abstract conceptualization is 17 and the corresponding percentage is 55 %. His score for active experimentation is 17 and the corresponding percentage is 65 %. His other learning styles’ score for reflective observation is 8 and the corresponding percentage is 15 %. Also, his score for concrete experience is 14 and the corresponding percentage is 45 %.
- The dominant learner type of Doğan is ‘*converger*’, like Deniz. His score for abstract conceptualization is 16 and the corresponding percentage is 25 %. His score for active experimentation is 18 and the corresponding percentage is 75 %. His other learning styles’ score for reflective observation is 13 and the corresponding percentage is 45 %. Also, his score for concrete experience is 16 and the corresponding percentage is 25 %.
- The dominant learner type of Serdar is ‘*diverger*’, which is different from Necati and Metin. His score for reflective observation is 15 and the corresponding percentage is 65 %. His score for concrete experience is 17 and the corresponding percentage is 25 %. His other learning styles’ scores are 15 for active experimentation (the corresponding percentage is 40%) and 13 for abstract conceptualization (the corresponding percentage is 15 %).
- The dominant learner type of Zülfikar is ‘*diverger*’ like Serdar. The scores for the learning styles of this learner type are composed of the score for reflective observation (14, 50%) and the score for concrete

experience (14, 45 %). His other learning styles' scores are 14 for active experimentation (the corresponding percentage is 30 %) and 14 for abstract conceptualization (the corresponding percentage is 20 %).

- The dominant learner type of Soner is 'diverger', which is similar to Serdar and Zülfikar. The score for reflective observation (15, 70 %) and the score for concrete experience (16, 65 %) forms the scores of this learning type. His other learning styles' scores are 15 for active experimentation (the corresponding percentage is 40%) and 14 for abstract conceptualization (the corresponding percentage is 20 %).
- The dominant learner type of Mahmut is 'diverger' like Serdar, Zülfikar and Soner. His score for reflective observation is 17 - the corresponding percentage is 85 % - and his score for concrete experience is 18 - the corresponding percentage is 85 %. His scores for other learning types are 18 for active experimentation - the corresponding percentage is 85 % - and 11 for abstract conceptualization - the corresponding percentage is 30 %.

According to these findings, according to the learner type, half of the children participating into this study have 'divergers'; two of them have 'accommodators'; two of them have 'convergers'. There is no participant having the learner type of 'assimilator'.

In addition to the findings of the inventory in the interview, children described their family and school environment in terms of learning environment. Three children stated that their family environment was broken because of some reasons. Also, they mentioned that one of their parents was dead or left them or their parents were always arguing each other. Moreover, one of them told that his father had been teasing him without any real reason. It can be understood that their family environment is a model for them showing 'violence' as a means of solving problems. Moreover, this indicates that they were in the environment that did not appeal to their own learning styles.

In terms of their school environment, all three stressed that they had a negative attitude towards school. One of them described the school environment as

"non-disciplined environment", in which nobody cares for anything. Moreover, they think that they did not get enough attention and have enough guidance. Also, they expressed that they were sometimes treated violently by the school administrator and the teachers. As a result, they left the formal education system.

All three participants emphasized the importance of friendship at schools. One of them stated "if I did not come across those friends, everything would be better". This shows how he felt the pressure of his friends. As a result, besides family structure, friendship at school is also one of the most crucial points. The reason for this can be that friends are more effective on the teenagers' behavior rather than their family members, teachers and any adult.

All three children described the learning environment they would like to be as the place where they "are respected" and "given importance as an individual". This indicates that they would like to be into the environment which they are accepted and given a chance of showing themselves sincerely. If the children cannot find this in their families and schools, they would easily get into other places in which they are noticed and accepted. This can make them take part in criminal activities.

**What are the teaching styles of the educators of children at-risk?:**

Regarding the educators' teaching styles, the findings of Kolb's Teaching Styles Inventory fulfilled by three educators were given in Table 2. These are as follows

- Zekiye Teacher had the low scores in both *supportive* and *leading* teaching styles. Her scores were 6 from Part A, 10 from Part B, 9 from Part C and 11 from Part D.
- Burhan Teacher had high score in *supportive* teaching style whereas low score in *leading* teaching style. His scores were 3 from Part A, 11 from Part B, 15 from Part C and 7 from Part D.
- Selim Teacher had high score in *supportive* teaching style whereas low score in *leading* teaching style, like Burhan Teacher. His scores were 0 from Part A, 9 from Part B, 15 from Part C and 12 from Part D.

Tablo 2: Educators at Galosh Production Training Program, Trabzon Public Education Center – Scores of them according to Kolb's Teaching Styles Inventory

Name of the Educators	Score A	Score B	Score C	Score D	Teaching Style
Zekiye (Muazzez )	6	10	9	11	Supportive and Leading- low
Burhan (Vural Ali)	3	11	15	7	Supportive - high Leading – low
Selim (Engin )	0	9	15	12	Supportive – high Leading - low

Are the teaching styles of the educators are in line with the learning styles of the children?

Two of all the educators (n=3) had high scores in supportive teaching style whereas all of them had low scores in leading teaching style. Regarding the learner styles of the children, divergers, convergers and accommodators, the teaching styles of the educators are relevant to them.

Three children attending “Galosh Production Training Program” implemented at Trabzon Public Education Center expressed that they all had been cared and loved by their educators. They also added that they could share everything and were happy to be there. They emphasized that they started to enjoy learning and to gain their enthusiasm for learning in this center.

Is “Galosh Production Training Program” implemented at Trabzon Public Education Center successful?

“Galosh Production Training Program” was implemented in the academic year of 2003-2004 at Trabzon Public Education Center with the purpose of making the children at-risk equipped with some skills that they can go on their life. The program was 200-400 in total and lasted from 8.30-12.00 in the morning and from 1 to 5 in the afternoon. One of the hospitals at Trabzon and Psychological Consultancy Center at Ministry of Education in Trabzon gave supports to rehabilitate the children. Additionally, these children were also taken to the activities as cinema, theatre, match and swimming.

In the interview children at-risk stressed their benefits they gained from this program and added that they had a new chance for life. One of the children stated that he was really happy to be there. The educator interviewed expressed that this program was intended to be improved and a special center for these kinds of students were going to be established. The children at-risk were easily adapted to the life. Also, they contributed into the family budget through the income they earned and even they bought some furniture for their houses such as refrigerators and washing-machines. These findings indicated that this program was successful.

**Implications and suggestions:** In this study, which aims at identifying the learner style of the children at-risk and the teaching styles of the educators, the most striking result obtained is that the most crucial description for their learning environment is being respected and valued. For this reason, these educators should take this into consideration and try to organize the learning

environment accordingly. Some suggestions are as follows [14,17,18]:

- Children should be given equal rights to express themselves.
- They should be provided a chance of taking part in the decision-making process.
- They should be provided opportunities to defend themselves.
- They should be guided to construct their own ideas.
- Educators should empower the positive sides in children’s personalities rather than criticizing the negative ones.
- Children’s desires and suggestions should be taken into the consideration.
- They should be encouraged to interact with each other in collaborative and cooperative learning environment.
- Children should be provided social and cultural activities to join.
- In-service training should be provided for the educational administrators, educators and teachers.
- Violence and all the methods related to that should be removed from the learning environment.

Since the children at-risk mostly have problems related to their family, this can hinder their self-realization. For this reason, programs for training these children’s family should be conducted urgently. Parents’ education programs at public education centers can be the first step for this. For this program parents should be invited and encouraged to participate into them. Another important point is making all these kinds of families be informed about the other families in similar situations. This can help to follow all these children more systematically and reach them easily.

All the children are the future for us. Children at-risk are in that situation because of the adults’ misbehavior or attitude. Therefore, making them get rid of this problem is the responsibility of the adults. We should not forget if these children could not be rehabilitated, this would lead our future to be under-the-risk.

## REFERENCES

1. Eğitimsen, 2007. Ortaöğretimde biddet araştırması. <http://www.egitimsen.org.tr/index.php?yazi=830>
2. Sokak Çocukları. Güç Köpüllardaki Çocuklar ya da Risk Altındaki Çocuklar Kimlerdir? Sokak Çocukları. <http://www.sokakcocuklari.net/kimdir/02.htm>



3. Sarpdağ, M. Çocuk suçluluğunda suç ve sapma kavramları. <http://www.caginpolicisi.com.tr/35/33-34.htm>
4. Erçetin, Ş.Ş., (ed.), 2006. Eğitim ve Suç. Hegem Yayıncılık.
5. Millet Gazetesi, 2006. Okulda Şiddet.
6. Kerka, S., 2003. Alternatives for At-risk and Out-of-school Youth. ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Career and Vocational Education Columbus. (ED482327).
7. Johnson, E.B., 2004 The Root of School Violence: Causes and Recommendations for a Plan of Action. College Student Journal, 38 (2): 199-202.
8. Hunt, S., K.C. Land and P. Wilcox, 2003. Criminal Justice. Walter de Gruyter
9. Burnett, G. and G. Walz, 1994. Gangs in the Schools. ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education (ED372175)
10. Erçetin, Ş.Ş., 2004. Örgütsel Zekâ ve Örgütsel Aptallık. Asıl Yayın Dağıtım Ltd.
11. Brandit, R., 2002. If Only We Knew Enough. Leadership. EBSCHOT Publishing.
12. Healey, M. and A. Jenkins, 2000. Learning Cycles and Learning Styles: Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory and Its Application in Geography in Higher Education. <http://www2.glos.ac.uk/gdn/discuss/kolb1.htm>
13. Robertson, M. and R. Gerber, 2001. Children Ways of knowing: Learning Through Partnerships. Acer Press
14. Yunfei, D. and C. Simpson, 2002. Effects of Learning Styles and Class Participation on Students' Enjoyment Level in Distributed Learning Environment. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of Library and Information Science Education. New Orleans. (ED473755)
15. Yıldırım, A. and H. Şimşek, 2006. Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri. Seçkin Yayınevi: Ankara
16. Strauss, A. and J. Corbin, 1990. Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques. Newsbury Park, CA: Sage.
17. Tilestone, D.W., 2005. Ten Best Teaching Practices. Corwin Press
18. O'Neil, J., 1990. Making Sense of Style. Educational Leadership.
19. Definitions, Theories, Measurement of Learning and Teaching Styles. <http://leadersandmanagers.blogspot.com/>
20. Du, Y. and C. Simpson, 2002. Effects of Learning Styles and Class Participation on Students' Enjoyment Level in Distributed Learning Environment. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of Association for Library and Information Science Education, New Orleans, LA.