



Comparative Review the Development of Ownership Concept in Preschool and Elementary School Children

Saeed Mahmoodpour¹, Hadi Bahrami^{2*}, Noorali Farrokhi³, Fariborz Dortaj⁴

1. PhD Student of Curriculum Planning, Department of Educational Science, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
2. Professor, Department of Educational Science, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
3. Associate Professor, Department of Educational Science, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
4. Professor, Department of Educational Science, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Article history:

Received date: 10 August 2019

Review date: 25 September 2019

Accepted date: 28 September 2019

Keywords:

Ownership, children, preschool, elementary school

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of this research was comparison the development of ownership concept in preschool and elementary school children.

Methodology: Present study in terms of purpose was applied and in terms of implementation was causal comparative. Research statistical population was all male and female children of preschool and first, third and fifth grades of elementary school of Pakdasht township in 2017-18 academic years. The research sample was 100 people (25 people in each grade) who were selected by random cluster sampling method. To collect data used from individually structured interview (31 questions) that the face and content validity of interview questions was confirmed by the educational sciences and psychology experts and its reliability was reported desirable by method of examiners. Data were analyzed by methods of multivariate analysis of variance and bonferroni post hoc test in SPSS software version 19.

Findings: The findings showed that there was a significant difference between the scores of children in both part of objective and descriptive questions of ownership concept. In the other words, children of third and fifth grades of elementary school in compared to children of preschool and first grade of elementary school significantly have a higher score in both part of objective and descriptive questions of ownership concept ($P < 0.05$).

Conclusion: The results showed that preschool and first grad elementary school children in compared to third and fifth grads elementary school children have a more flawed understanding of ownership concept. Therefore, it is necessary for parents, educators and teachers to consider children's perception of the ownership concept and to be careful in taking and giving children objects and property so that their self-esteem is not damaged.

Please cite this article as: Mahmoodpour S, Bahrami H, Farrokhi N, Dortaj F. (2020). Comparative Review the Development of Ownership Concept in Preschool and Elementary School Children, *Iranian journal of educational Sociology*. 3(1): 150-156.

* Corresponding Author Email: prof.bahrami114@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Property is one of the fundamental human rights that has been considered in constitutions in the last two centuries (Amini & Kashani, 2017). Ownership is a right that a person has over his property and can take possession of it, except in cases where the law makes exceptions, and property means objects, actions, and persons demanded and desired by individuals, which makes a person seek possession. And acquire or use and benefit from it (Pirkkalainen, Pawlowski, Bick & Tannhauser, 2018). The study of child ownership development is a relatively new phenomenon in developmental psychology studies, and children from an early age argue over ownership or possession of objects and toys (Ross, Conant & Vickar, 2011). In addition to being related to basic needs, ownership is important in other ways, which can be associated with ownership with a sense of control or personal ability and experience of experience, the positive impact of ownership on self-concept, and its impact on showing power and individuality and the role of ownership in increasing security. Kurdish (Rochat, 2010). The origins of the growth of the concept of ownership in children can be traced back to one month and even earlier. That is, when the child searches for the mother's breast and sucks after finding it, but ownership can be discussed more confidently when the child can associate a person and an object with it (Blaks & Harris, 2011) and This association requires three abilities, including the ability to recognize persons from each other, the ability to distinguish objects from each other, and the ability to associate a person or object belonging to a person. These associations are initially limited to persons and objects that are within the scope of the child's perceptual field, but around the age of two the child can also use this association for absent persons and objects. When a person associates with objects belonging to him, the child first creates a schema of the person and then absorbs the objects belonging to that person in that schema, or in other words, expands that schema (Neary & Friedman, 2013).

What are the main (but not always) property consequences with three property questions? Who is the owner? And what are the rules for transferring property? Were created, A study of children of three different age groups concluded that children aged 5-6 years and children aged 8-9 years attributed ownership to the nearest user of the object. For example, someone who was closer to the bus; Regardless of transient use (passenger) or fixed (driver) is known as the owner of the bus. In contrast, children aged 11-12 could relate ownership to relevant political institutions. In general, property owners have three rights, including the use of their own property, the denial of access to property, and the owner's right to transfer his property to others (Noles & Keil, 2011). To determine the ownership of an object, children have a bias towards the first person who owns the object from an early age, and many studies have shown that children aged 2-4 years have a bias towards the first user (Friedman, 2008; Friedman, Vande Vondervoort, Defeyter & Neary, 2013). Children are biased towards the first user to determine the owner, and in addition, they consider another determining factor to determine the ownership of the invention; In the case of 3-4 year old children in creative working conditions on clay, the creator of creative work is considered the owner, but adults retain the right of ownership over the original owner (Kanngiesser & Hood, 2014). Young children can also identify the owner correctly. Sometimes it is possible for children to not transfer all of these rights and responsibilities to the new owner at once in the process of growing ownership and accepting the transferee, and to gradually vote on the transfer in each of these cases, but only if the owner is or When this property is questioned, children are likely to give the right answer, but may need more time to give the right answer about other aspects of ownership (Mahmoodpour, Bahrani, Farrokhi & Dortaj, 2018).

Research has shown that two- to five-year-olds are more aggressive in defending their own toys than others (Liu, Linn, Qin & Yang, 2018). Another study found that 3- and 7-year-olds emphasized the owner's exclusive right to use objects even more than adults (Ross & et all, 2011). Children aged 5–6 years gave more immature responses to objective documents related to ownership concepts, such as buying, giving, receiving through work, or inheritance, compared to older children aged 8-9 and 11-12. Also, when children under the age of six were told that the toys belonged to them, compared to when they were told that the toys belonged to the class, the children retained more control over the toys, verbally declaring that the toys

belonged to them. They are more resilient to peer attempts to catch them and give less toys to others (Rochat, Robbins, Passos-Ferreira, Olivia, Dias & Guo, 2014). Research on children aged 24 and 30 months also showed that they respect and support property (Ross, Friedman & Field, 2015). Object-sharing behavior in children improves with age, and the results of a study showed that children aged 3-5 years keep about ten portions of food for themselves and give only one portion to peers (Wu & Su, 2013). Work and manipulation lead to ownership, and a study found that 2-3 year olds protested more when they built something and if someone destroyed it, than when he destroyed a third person (Kanngiesser & Hood, 2014).). Another study found that 9-12 year olds considered someone who used to enter and play on the field to be the owner, but some of them did not consider the mere priority of entering the field to be the cause of ownership (Verkuyten, Sierksma & Thijs, 2015). Children after the age of five have a good understanding of property transfers and can distinguish between gifts and theft; So that in the case of gifts the transfer of permanent ownership is accepted (Blaks & Harris, 2009). The results of another study showed that 4-8 year old children cannot distinguish between the destruction of their property and others and consider each one equally disgusting, 4-6 year old children find the return of stolen property and gifts equally disgusting and even these children It is believed that the seller retains some of his property rights even after the sale (Kim & Kalish, 2009).

Studies show that young children are more likely to use their property and have less flexibility than older children and adults. Some argue that the concept of ownership is dependent on growth and learning (Neary & Friedman, 2013), but others argue that children's perceptions of ownership are influenced by children's interactions with peers. In other words, children's beliefs about property come from the children's community, not the adult community. Thus, children learn morality from interaction with peers (Ross & et all, 2011). In order to know and understand children, it is necessary to know the level of their awareness of the concept of ownership and based on their understanding of the concept of ownership, one should take toys and share them in group parties. Therefore, in order to prevent the decline in self-esteem of children of different ages and not to reduce it through the unnecessary interference of adults in seizing the objects they own, the concept of ownership should be identified in children of different ages and since no such research has been done so far, This research is unique and can be a good guide for future researchers and help parents, educators and preschool and primary school teachers. Therefore, since the perception of children of different ages of ownership is different and research is needed to know their understanding, the most important issue of the present study is to understand the perception of children of different ages of the concept of ownership and parents, educators and teachers Is the content. As a result, the present study aimed to compare the growth of the concept of ownership in preschool and elementary school children.

2. Methodology

The present study was comparative in terms of practical purpose and causal method. The statistical population of the study was all preschool girls and boys in the first, third and fifth grades of Pakdasht city in the 2017-18 academic year. The research sample was 100 people (25 people in each base) who were selected by cluster random sampling. The research was conducted in such a way that after approving the proposal and coordinating with the officials of Pakdasht Education Department, the list of primary schools with preschools and their classes was prepared and then a number of classes were randomly selected. After identifying the samples, one of their parents was asked to go to the school and after stating the importance and necessity of the research and receiving the signed consent form of the informed participation in the research, their consent was obtained to conduct an interview with the children.

Structured individual interviews (31 questions) were used to collect data. Interview questions related to the concept of ownership and include concepts such as buying and selling, borrowing, giving and receiving gifts, lending and borrowing, theft, owning property without property, damaging the property of others, public places, property that is used It requires permission from them, the ownership of things that can not

be owned and there are no rules of ownership in them, was to find and exchange. The interview was conducted by a trained woman who was unaware of the purpose of the study, with the interviewer interviewing each of the subjects sitting at a desk individually at school. For preschool and elementary school children, the questions were read by the interviewer and the relevant picture was provided with the question. The text of the questions was read to them several times as needed to remove the role of memory from the effect on the interview and answers. Initially the questions were not read, but the questions were on the front page and they read the questions themselves. The interviewer was responsible for recording the responses; In this way, first the subjects answered the question correctly and incorrectly and the subject recorded the score related to their objective part and then explained their reasons and the interviewer wrote down the reasons and based on that the score related to the description part was recorded and for each The subject was provided with a response sheet. An example of the related questions and image is as follows. The saleswoman sold the derivative office to the boy and took the money: Who do you think owns the office now?



Who do you think owns this office now?

That lady? ☐ Why?
 this boy? ☐ Why?

Each question is scored in two ways. One, giving a score to an objective answers means giving a correct or incorrect answer. In other words, if the subject gives the correct question, the interviewer gives him a score of one and if he gives a wrong answer, he gives him a score of zero. Another is to rate the explanations for the same questions. In other words, the subject is asked to explain his / her reason and the more correct and complete the respondent's answer, the higher the score. Therefore, each subject has two scores, one related to the objective part and the other related to the descriptive part, the range of objective part scores is between 0 to 31 and the descriptive part scores range from 0 to 62, and higher scores in both objective and descriptive parts indicate the answer. It is more accurate and complete. The face and content validity of the interview questions were confirmed by experts in educational sciences and psychology and its reliability was reported by the method of favorable correctors.

Data were analyzed by individual interviews at both descriptive and inferential levels in SPSS software version 19. At the descriptive level, central tendency and dispersion indices were used to describe the variables, and at the inferential level, multivariate analysis of variance and Bonferroni post hoc test were used to test statistical hypotheses.

3. Findings

There were a total of 100 subjects; There were 25 people (10 girls and 5 boys) in each of the four groups (preschool, first grade, third grade and fifth grade). Table 1 reported the mean and standard deviation of the scores of the objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership in the groups.

Table1. Mean and standard deviation of the score of objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership in groups

Groups / scores	The objective part		Descriptive section	
	Average	Standard deviation	Average	Standard deviation
Preschool children	25/12	1/74	37/96	4/44
First grade children	25/60	2/20	37/36	4/32
Third grade children	28/68	1/14	42/24	4/19
Fifth grade children	29/20	0/71	43/40	4/68

Table 1 shows the mean and standard deviation of the scores of the objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership in preschool children and the first, third and fifth grades of elementary school. The assumptions of the analysis of variance method were to assume that the score of the concept of ownership was normal in both objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership based on Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices based on M. Box test and the assumption of homogeneity of variances based on Levin test. Therefore, there were conditions for using multivariate analysis of variance. The results of Pillay effect test from a set of multivariate tests showed that there was a significant difference between the groups in at least one of the objective or descriptive sections ($F = 15.05$, $P < 0.05$). Table 2 reported the results of multivariate analysis of variance to examine the differences between groups in each of the objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership.

Table2. Results of multivariate analysis of variance to examine the differences between groups in each of the objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership

Variables	Source of effect	Total squares	Degrees of freedom	Average squares	The value of F	meaningful	Effect size
The objective part of ownership	group	114/92	3	38/31	17/03	<0/05	0/64
	Error	207/13	96	2/25			
Descriptive section of ownership	group	863/71	3	287/90	15/17	<0/05	0/53
	Error	1822/08	96	18/98			

As can be seen in Table 2, there is a significant difference between the four groups, ie preschool children and children in the first, third and fifth grades of primary school, in both the objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership ($P < 0.05$). Table 3 reported the results of the Bonferroni post hoc test to examine the differences between groups in the objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership.

Table3. Results of Bonferroni post hoc test to examine the differences between groups in the objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership

Variables	Groups		Mean differences	standard error	meaningful
The objective part of ownership	Preschool children	First grade children	-0/48	0/386	>0/05
	Preschool children	Third grade children	-3/56	0/535	<0/05
	Preschool children	Fifth grade children	-4/08	0/608	<0/05
	First grade children	Third grade children	-3/08	0/517	<0/05
	First grade children	Fifth grade children	-3/60	0/541	<0/05
	Third grade children	Fifth grade children	-0/52	0/393	>0/05

Descriptive section of ownership	Preschool children	First grade children	0/60	0/399	>0/05
	Preschool children	Third grade children	-4/28	0/524	<0/05
	Preschool children	Fifth grade children	-5/44	0/639	<0/05
	First grade children	Third grade children	-4/88	0/576	<0/05
	First grade children	Fifth grade children	-6/04	0/660	<0/05
	Third grade children	Fifth grade children	1/16	0/412	>0/05

As can be seen in Table 3, there is no significant difference between preschool and first grade children and between third and fifth grade children in both the objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership ($P > 0.05$), but between preschool and first grade children with There is a significant difference between the third and fifth grade children in both the objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership ($P < 0.05$). Considering the differences in the means, it can be said that the average of preschool and first grade children is significantly lower than the third and fifth grade children in both the objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership.

4. Discussion

From this concept, the present study aimed to compare the growth of the concept of ownership in preschool and primary school children.

The results of this study showed that the understanding of the concept of ownership of preschool and primary school children and the understanding of this concept in third and fifth grade children were not significantly different, but the understanding of the concept of ownership of preschool and first grade children compared to third grade children and the fifth grade was weaker and more incomplete. These results are in the field of less understanding of children younger than the concept of ownership of older children with the results of research by Mahmoodpour et al. (2018), Liu et al. (2018), Rochat et al. (2014), Wu & Su (2013), Blaks & Harris (2009) and Kim & Kalish (2009) were consistent. For example, Mahmoodpour et al. (2018) found in a study that young children can also understand the concept of ownership, but need more time to accept the right to transfer ownership from seller to buyer. The results of Liu et al. (2018) showed that children aged 2-5 years showed more aggression than self-defense to defend their toys compared to other people's toys. In another study, Rochat et al. (2014) reported that children aged 5–6 years gave more immature responses to documents related to ownership concepts than older children aged 8–9 and 11–12 years.

Explaining the lack of difference in understanding the concept of ownership in preschool children with primary school children and the lack of difference in understanding this concept in third and fifth grade children and in explaining the weaker and weaker understanding of the concept of ownership in preschool and primary school children compared to children Third and fifth graders It can be said that preschool children are not significantly different from first graders and third graders from fifth graders cognitively, but between preschool children and first graders with third and fifth graders cognitively There is no big difference; As Piaget's theory of cognitive development confirms this claim. According to Piaget, preschool children and some first graders are in the pre-operational stage due to the poor social environment, but third and fifth graders are in the objective operation stage even with a poor social environment if they attend a school with a medium level of education. Are located, As a result, children in the third and fifth grades of elementary school, unlike preschool and first grade children, are at a higher level cognitively and solve various problems such as buying and selling, bartering, borrowing, gifts, etc. in the sense of ownership in each Both objective and descriptive sections are more successful, so they get better and higher scores in the

objective and descriptive sections of issues related to the concept of ownership. Therefore, it can be expected that preschool and elementary school children have a weaker understanding of some concepts related to ownership, such as buying and selling, barter, loans and gifts, and the concept of transfer of ownership, compared to third and fifth grade children. They make more mistakes, which reduces their score in the objective and descriptive parts of the concept of ownership.

Each study faces limitations during implementation and one of the important limitations of the present study is the small sample size in each group, failure to review the results by gender and the limitation of the research community to preschool children and first, third and fifth grades of Pakdasht. The strength of the present study was the use of interview tools to collect data. In this study, individual interviews were used and this strength largely covers the weakness of the small sample size in each group. Based on the limitations, it is suggested that this study be reviewed on children of different ages, with different genders and in different cities and regions, and that the results be compared with the results of the present study. According to the results of the present study and the inadequate and weaker understanding of preschool and first grade children than third and fifth grade children, it is suggested that parents, educators and teachers consider this matter in taking and giving children objects and property to Do not damage the self-esteem of these children.

References

- Amini M, Kashani SS. (2017). Respect for Ownership rights in fundamental rights. *Legal Research Quarterly*. 20(79): 171-193.
- Blake PR, Harris PL. (2009). Children's understanding of ownership transfers. *Cognitive Development*. 24(2): 133-145.
- Blake PR, Harris PL. (2011). Early representations of ownership origins of ownership property. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*. 132: 39-51.
- Friedman O, Vande Vondervoort JW, Defeyter MA, Neary K. (2013). First possession, history, and young children's ownership judgments. *Child Development*. 84(5): 1519-1525.
- Friedman O. (2008). First possession: An assumption guiding inferences about who owns what. *Psychological Bulletin & Review*. 15: 290-295.
- Kanngiesser P, Hood BM. (2014). Young children's understanding of ownership rights for newly made objects. *Cognitive Development*. 29(1): 30-40.
- Kim S, Kalish CW. (2009). Children's ascriptions of property rights with changes of ownership. *Cognitive Development*. 24(3): 322-336.
- Liu AA, Linn J, Qin P, Yang J. (2018). Vehicle ownership restrictions and fertility in Beijing. *Journal of Development Economics*. 135: 85-96.
- Mahmoodpour S, Bahrami H, Farrokhi N, Dortaj F. (2018). The ability of preschool children to distinguish among use right and ownership right. *Scientific Journal of Education Research*. 14(57): 121-134.
- Neary KR, Friedman O. (2013). The origin of children's appreciation of ownership rights. *Navigating the social world: What infants, children, and other species can teach us*. New York: Oxford University Pres.
- Neary KR, Friedman O. (2014). Young children give priority to ownership when judging who should use an object. *Child Development*. 85(1): 326-337.
- Noles NS, Keil FC. (2011). Exploring ownership in a developmental context. origins of ownership property. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 132: 91-103.
- Pirkkalainen H, Pawlowski JM, Bick M, Tannhauser A. (2018). Engaging in knowledge exchange: The instrumental psychological ownership in open innovation communities. *International Journal of Information Management*. 38(1): 277-287.
- Rochat P, Robbins E, Passos-Ferreira C, Olivia AD, Dias MDG, Guo L. (2014). Ownership reasoning in children across cultures. *Journal of Cognition*. 132(3): 471-484.
- Ross H, Friedman O, Field A. (2015). Toddlers assert and acknowledge ownership rights. *Social Development*. 24(2): 341-356.
- Ross R, Conant C, Vickar M. (2011). Property rights and the resolution of social conflict. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*. 132: 53-64.
- Verkuyten M, Sierksma J, Thijs J. (2015). First arrival and owning the land: How children reason about ownership of territory. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 41: 58-64.
- Wu Z, Su Y. (2013). Development of sharing in preschoolers in relation to theory of mind understanding. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*. 35: 3811-3816.