EARLY CHILDHOOD IN-SERVICE TEACHERS' PLAYFULNESS TRAITS
AND VIEWS ON PLAYFULNESS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

BEGÜM CANASLAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

OCTOBER 2018

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

————————————————

Prof. Dr. Tülin GENÇÖZ
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

————————————————

Assist. Prof. Dr. Hasibe Özlen DEMİRCAN
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

————————————————

Assist. Prof. Dr. Serap Sevimli ÇELİK
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Çağla Öneren Şendil (TEDU, ECE) ————————————————
Assist. Prof. Dr. Serap Sevimli Çelik   (METU, ECE)————————————————
Assist. Prof. Dr. H. Özlen Demircan   (METU, ECE)————————————————

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all materials and results that are not original of this study.

Name, Last name :

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

EARLY CHILDHOOD IN-SERVICE TEACHERS' PLAYFULNESS TRAITS AND VIEWS ON PLAYFULNESS

Canaslan, Begüm

Master, Department of Early Childhood Education

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Serap Sevimli-Celik

October 2018, 151 pages

The purpose of the current study is to investigate in-service teachers' playfulness traits and their views about playfulness. In this frame, some variables which have a possible effect on teacher's playfulness were examined in the study. The study was designed as a mixed method design. The quantitative part of the mixed method consisted of 485 in-service teachers with 20 teachers in the qualitative part. The Adult Playfulness Trait Scale was used for the aim of collect data of the quantitative part. Afterwards, the qualitative part was conducted to take the teachers' views on playfulness in the qualitative part. The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the years of experience, age of the teacher, number of children in the classroom, attending play course, attending professional development activities about play and playfulness. However, there was a significant difference between educational background, attending volunteer activities, type of school and playfulness. In addition, most of the teachers defined playfulness as "liking play". The teachers explained their play habits in the

classroom. They are active in terms of play in the classroom and the teachers participated in children's play. Thus, co-player is the favorite role among these teachers in activity times. Finally, the teachers stated that personality and responsibility negatively affect playfulness. The study result could contribute to the field literature in terms of explaining some factors of playfulness and early childhood in-service teachers' views on playfulness. According to result of the study, play course and professional development activities about play might contain less theoretical content.

ÖZ

OKUL ÖNCESİ ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN OYUNSEVERLİK ÖZELLİKLERİ ve OYUNSEVERLİK İLE İLGİLİ GÖRÜŞLERİ

Canaslan, Begüm

Yüksek Lisans, Okul Öncesi Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Serap Sevimli Çelik

Ekim 2018, 151 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı, okul öncesi öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik özelliklerini ve oyunseverlikle ilgili görüşlerini açıklamaktır. Öğretmenlerin mesleki deneyim yılları, yaşları, cinsiyetleri, sınıftaki öğrenci sayısı, oyun dersine katılmış olmak, oyun ile ilgili profesyonel eğitimlere katılmış olmak ve gönüllü olarak etkinliklerde yer almak değişkenlerinin öğretmenlerin oyunseverlikleri üzerindeki etkisi araştırılmıştır. Karma desen yönteminin kullanıldığı bu çalışmanın nicel kısmına 485 okul öncesi öğretmeni katılırken, nitel kısmına 20 okul öncesi öğretmeni katılmıştır. Çalışmanın ilk kısmında; Eğlence Eğilimi Özelliği Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın ikinci kısmında ise öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik ile ilgili görüşleri ile sınıftaki oyun davranışlarını belirleyebilmek için 20 öğretmen ile yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Nicel veri sonuçlarına göre öğretmenin mesleki deneyimin, yaşının, oyun dersi almış olma durumunun ve sınıftaki çocuk sayısının oyunseverlik üzerinde etkisinin olmadığı saptanmıştır. Buna karşın;

eğitim altyapısının, gönüllü etkinliklere katılma durumunun, çalışılan okul türü gibi etkenlerin oyunseverliği etkilediği ortaya çıkmıştır. Çalışmanın ikinci kısmında yapılan görüşme sonuçlarında, öğretmenlerin oyunsever kişileri "oyun oynamayı seven kişiler" olarak düşündükleri yönünde görüş bildirdikleri belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca, öğretmenler sınıfta çocukların oyunlarına aktif bir biçimde katıldıklarından ve en çok tercih edilen oyun rolünün "oyun arkadaşı" olduğundan bahsetmişlerdir. Son olarak öğretmenler, kişilik özelliklerinin ve artan sorumlulukların oyunseverlik üzerinde azalmaya sebep olduğu yönünde görüşlerini bildirmişlerdir. Bu çalışma okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin oyunseverlik özelliğini etkileyen faktörleri ve öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik ile ilgili görüşlerini bildirmeleri açısından alan yazınına katkıda bulunacaktır. Bu çalışmanın sonucuna göre oyun derslerinin ve oyun ile ilgili profesyonel gelişim aktivitelerinin teorik içeriklerinin azaltılması önerilebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okul öncesi eğitim, okul öncesi öğretmeni, oyunseverlik, öğretmen görüşleri, karma yöntem.

To My Parents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

xv

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Play has been a subject of many social disciplines since the beginning of the human history. It is usually defined as intrinsically motivated, freely chosen, pleasure-seeking, and meaning-making activity for children (Johnson, Christie, & Wardle, 2005; Isabel & Raines, 2007). Play addresses the whole development of children from physical to intellectual and from personal to emotional (Göncü & Gaskins, 2012) and connects with all developmental areas (Sutton-Smith, 1979). It is one of the primary ways for children to manipulate objects, learn about people around themselves and control their environment, and develop positive social skills (Sutton-Smith, 2003). Besides its developmental effects, play has some psychological benefits as well. It helps children to cope with any types of pressure they encounter and enable them to escape the stressful situations (Johnson, Christie, & Wardle, 2005). Young children usually have poor verbal skills. Consequently, they cannot express their feelings, thoughts, and views easily (Hall, Healey, & Harrison, 2002). For this reason, play can be seen as a commonly used verbalizing tool and offer a safe way for children to manage their psychological problems such as trauma and stress (Porter, Hernandez, Reif, & Jessee, 2009).

Not all activity types of children are described as play. In order for an activity to be considered as play, it should have some characteristics (Skard & Bundy, 2008). The most necessary aspect while characterizing play is intrinsic motivation in which child's play is motivated by play itself, not by rewards because rewards are an external motivation of play (Rubin, Fein, & Vandenberg, 1983). Another criterion is having a free choice. Play should be chosen freely by the player and it should not be forced by adults (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1999). Enjoyment or pleasure seeking is related to the positive effect of play. In addition, while playing, fear and

anxiety sometimes occur. For this reason, a positive effect is not considered as one of the criteria of play (Clark & Miller, 1998; Sutton-Smith, 2003; Burghardt 2005). Another important factor in play is active engagement. This discriminates play and passive states from each other (Skard & Bundy, 2008). Additionally, in order for an activity to be called as play, child's playfulness is required since playfulness is described as the basis and spirit of play itself (Bundy, 1993; Chandler, 1997; Liebermann, 1966).

There is one more aspect of play which is called playfulness as mentioned above. Playfulness is described as an internal motivation of play. It includes three elements: intrinsic motivation, internal control, and freedom (Bundy, 1991, 1993; Kooij, 1989). Intrinsic motivation refers to cases where players play because they only want to play but not because of any extrinsically motivating factor. Process is more important than product (Rubin, Fein, & Vandenberg, 1983). Skard and Bundy (2008) claim that a player may have fun if they win a game but winning a game is not a main reason to play. Another, internal control refers to cases where players have a response from their actions. For example, children decide other players to play with, what they play, how they play. Sometimes a player can change or modify rules of play. Finally, freedom to suspend reality is that children decide how they use an object. The object can be fitted in different role from player. Children act out roles that are not in real life (Skard & Bundy, 2008). Scholars state that playfulness is important in the development of children's play and for productive results of play (Garvey, 1977; Sutton-Smith, 1979; Vygotsky, 1978a).

Playfulness has impacts on personality traits. Some characteristics of human beings are related to playfulness. As playfulness affects personality, playfulness is also affected by characteristics of individual. According to literature, children's playfulness related with personal characteristics, creativity, gender, age, and family characteristics such as birth order, family size and family environment (Barnett, 1991, 1998, Cooper, 2000; Sanderson, 2010; Zachopoulou, Trevlas, & Tsikriki, 2004). Individual features and variables have an effect on playfulness even differences in playfulness (Trevlas, Grammatikopoulos, Tsigilis, & Zachopoulou, 2003). In order to define differences between girls' and boys' playfulness score,

Barnett (1991) conducted a study and concluded that boys have a higher score in physical spontaneity and manifesting joy dimensions, while girls got high score from the cognitive spontaneity dimension. Another study revealed that young children's playfulness score form Test of Playfulness is higher than older children's playfulness scoring (Saunders, Sayer, & Goodale, 1999). Play's developmental effect is mentioned above, like play, playfulness has developmental effects on children. Accordingly, the capacity of full and free engagement in play or playfulness of children is crucial for supporting their healthy development (Sanderson, 2010). Jenkinson stated that playful children contact more often with other children and adults, communicate with them and develop the skills of becoming an individual (2001). Further, playfulness is related to creativity. World-renowned composers, artists, scientist became famous through their creativity they are also known for their striking playful features. For instance, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart was one of the most famous examples of describing a creative as well as a playful person (Bateson, 2015). In conjunction with creativity, playful children are good at finding new solutions and therefore they develop creative problem-solving skills. Without playful capacity, the creative problem-solving skills may not improve (Meador, 1992). Moreover, divergent thinking and playfulness are related to each other. Lieberman conducted a study on kindergarten children to reveal the playfulness and divergent thinking relation. Children's playfulness was measured with "The Playfulness Scale'' developed by Lieberman, and "Divergent Thinking Task'' was applied for divergent thinking data. According to result of this study, correlation was found between children's playfulness and their divergent thinking (Lieberman, 1995).

Adults, like children, also play in their daily life but the types and features of play may vary. Playfulness is one of the most critical components of the definition of play. For this reason, Lieberman suggests that playfulness is a quality of play and it would transform themselves into a trait of players in adulthood and adolescence period (Lieberman, 1967). Playfulness continues in the adulthood and it does not end with childhood (Shen, 2010). While adults grow, they give up lots of play activities. Nevertheless, they maintain their playfulness. They use playfulness while playing ideas and improve imaginative mind (Solnit, 1998). Another research has

3

demonstrated that adult playfulness can be described as what people like to do in their free time and this reflects on the individual's personality relation with playfulness (Barnett, 2012). For example, extravert people are more social, stimulating and risk-taking in their leisure and free time (Brandstatter, 1994; Diener, Sandvik, Pavat, & Fujita, 1992). Additionally, another research has investigated that neurotic people do not prefer playful activities because of their hesitance to engage in social activities (Kirkcaldy, 1989).

Barnett (2012) also designed a study to describe the relationship between adult playfulness and personal variables like affectivity, personality, and motivation orientation. Collected data indicates that affectivity, personality, and motivation orientation can be used to determine playfulness. According to the study, components of playfulness are being outgoing, uninhibited, humorous (e.g. telling jokes, funny stories, producing humor etc.) and dynamic (being active and energetic). For example, female participants show more positive affect and they arrange the environment to make it fun for themselves. Moreover, males and females have the same scores on humor dimension (Barnett, 2012).

As stated before, play is critical for child development. Children play, and play is their work. However, all kind of activities is not called play. Playfulness is a necessity to call an activity as play. Play and playfulness are differentiated also from each other. The observable characteristic is called play; otherwise, playfulness can be described as internalized quality which evolves with interaction and experience (Howard, Bellin, & Rees, 2002). Lack of playfulness in childhood does not complete in adulthood and their personal relations lack playfulness. Likewise, if children's early learning environment does not include playfulness, the child may show anxiety towards new tasks (Youell, 2008).

As children's playfulness, adult playfulness is also a critical component of children's play in early childhood settings. Investigating teachers' and parents' playfulness is important because they are in a relationship with children. However, studies are fairly limited in this field (Yurt & Keleş, 2016). Lieberman suggests that teacher playfulness links with children's play, playfulness and divergent thinking. If a teacher is playful, they can create an environment where children have fun,

creative, and flexible in their play (1977). Further, literature mentions that teacher playfulness also has an impact on teacher-child relationship and interaction (Graham, Sawyer, & Deboard, 1989; Tegona, Groves, & Catron, 1999; McMillian, 2017). A longitudinal study showed that teachers evaluate playful children as the clowns of classroom. This situation also affects other children's thoughts during process (Barnett, 2018). Teachers firstly form expected behavior for children, then they trait children according to their expectations (Rosential & Jacobson, 1968). Children who demonstrate playful behaviors like telling jokes, making gesture for amusing or entertaining their friends are labeled clown of the classroom by the teacher (Barnett, 2018). This kind of child is tagged as problematic children by the teacher (Platt, Wagner & Ruch, 2016). Conversely, other children see the playful child as desired classmate opposite to distractive to themselves. In the third grade, children change their mind and they say that playful children were not popular, they do not want to be friend with them anymore. They find playful children's behavior as interruptive especially boy's ones. Children are affected by their teacher's thought during the process and they develop negative thoughts (Barnett, 2018). If a teacher shows playful behavior in classroom setting, they enhance children's playfulness and play (Singer, 2013). Teacher's playfulness is related to professional experience, according to the literature, teachers in their twenties and early thirties, as well as closely five years experienced teachers, are more flexible and they have sympathy for playful behavior. Otherwise, teachers who have more teaching experience in kindergarten are more resistant to the idea of playfulness (Lieberman, 1977).

Playful teachers can also be defined as effective teachers. Effective teachers' characteristics mostly include meeting the educational outcomes (Brodie, 1998), and being charismatic, enthusiastic, and expressive (Young & Shaw, 1999). Moreover, supporting effective communicative environment, comfortable learning atmosphere, having concern about students' needs, and motivating students are some other characteristic of effective teachers (Young & Shaw, 1999). Furthermore, students describe effective teachers as being positive, creative and the ones who have a sense of humor (Walker, 2008).

1.1. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the current study is to investigate in-service early childhood teachers' playfulness traits and their views on playfulness. In this context, teachers' self-reported play behaviors were investigated. Additionally, effects of some variables such as professional development, age, attending play course, type of school, attending professional development and volunteer activities, number of children at classroom, educational background and gender on teachers' playfulness traits, were examined in the study.

1.2. Research Questions

The following research questions were investigated in the current study:
1- Do professional development, age, attending play course, type of school, attending professional development and volunteer activities, number of children at classroom, educational background, and gender have an influence on in-service early childhood teachers' playfulness?

   a) Do professional development, age, attending play course, type of school, attending professional development and volunteer activities, number of children at classroom, educational background, and gender have an influence on early childhood in-service teachers' fun-seeking motivation?

   b) Do professional development, age, attending play course, type of school, attending professional development and volunteer activities, number of children at classroom, educational background, and gender have an influence on early childhood in-service teachers' uninhibitedness?

   c) Do professional development, age, attending play course, type of school, attending professional development and volunteer activities, number of children at classroom, educational background, and gender have an influence on early childhood in-service teachers' spontaneity?

2- What are the views of in-service teachers about playfulness?

3- What are the self-reported play behaviors of in-service teachers?

1.3. Significance of the Study

Playfulness helps understanding a children's personality; however, it is one of the least examined topics both in early childhood and education in general (Rentzou, 2013). Current playfulness research studies mostly concentrate on the inner psychological qualities or attributes which are characteristics of a playful person (Shen, 2010). Accordingly, the construct of playfulness is not understood because there is not enough rigorous research to support the description of playfulness in the literature. Mainly studies about playfulness have focused on the definitions of it (Christian, 2012).

Besides educational arena, research on adult playfulness is also limited in the literature. Current adult playfulness studies mention that playful adult is funny, clowning, psychologically healthy, happy, and have a high self-estimate (Bateson, Bateson, & Martin, 2013; Proyer, 2013a, 2014; Proyer & Jehle, 2013). Further, playfulness is related to job satisfaction and performance (Yu, Wu, Chen, & Lin, 2007). However, educational environment has not been investigated enough (Pinchover, 2017).

Characteristics of playful adults are described in the literature. As mentioned above, being playful is an important disposition for being an early childhood educator. Lieberman states that teachers' personality and teaching strategy have an influence on children's playfulness (Lieberman, 1977). Because if a teacher is playful, their behavior may provide playful environment, teacher-child interaction and relationship will be central to playfulness. Not only free play time but also structured activities might be conducted in a playful atmosphere. Moreover, study emphasizes that children demonstrate more divergent thinking when they have playful teachers (Lieberman, 1977). Even playfulness is natural disposition, discussing how some aspect of playfulness can be taught or at least discussed in teacher education programs. Further, how playfulness might lessen or which factors

7

might be central for decreasing playful behaviors would contribute to the literature. Moreover, playfulness ,one of the significant components of play pedagogy, is closely related to children's learning in early years (Hakkarainen, 2009).

It is critically important to study the effects of professional experience on teacher's playfulness when considering both the literature on children's playfulness and its relation to teacher's playfulness. The present study will hopefully contribute to the literature for some reasons. Adult playfulness has not been investigated as a teacher criterion enough. Thus, early childhood teachers' playfulness components' studies are limited as well. Therefore, the topic is not common in the playfulness literature. As mentioned before playfulness literature is not enough in terms of explaining components of playfulness.

1.4. Motivation of Mixed Method Study

The whole mixed method research target to explain the results of a study powerfully by combining quantitative and qualitative research. Therefore, the conclusion of the study could be expanding thanks to mixed method design. There are different ways of conducting a mixed method study. A mixed method study could be qualitatively driven, quantitatively driven or an equal status study (Schoonenboom & Johnson, 2017). In the current study, the researcher designed the study appropriately equal status. In equal status studies, the research design and result are given equal value and weight to both qualitative and quantitative components (Greene, 2015).

In the current study, the teachers' playfulness traits were investigated by quantitative design and their views were explained by qualitative design. The other step of mixed method study is determining the research question. One of the ways of constructing research question is that a research question can be related to both qualitative and quantitative design or the researcher may separate research questions as qualitative and quantitative (Schoonenboom & Johnson, 2017). In the current study, qualitative and quantitative design questions were used. The quantitative part

was designed to investigate the teachers' playfulness trait scores. By this way, targetting possible components of playfulness are explained. In addition, the qualitative part of the study was conducted in order to gain a deeper understanding of teachers' playful characteristics, their self-reported play behavior in class and the teachers' views on playfulness.

1.5. Definition of Terms

Early Childhood: Early childhood is a period including the age of 0-6 years old (Gürkan, 2009).

Playfulness: Playfulness as a personality trait as being cheerful, joyous, humorous, and playful (Barnett, 1998).

Fun Seeking Motivation: It means that individuals have fun deriving from internal or/and external environment (Shen, Chick, & Zinn, 2014a).

Uninhibitedness: It's creating a free and uninhibited mind, and controlling constraining conditions (Shen, Chick, & Zinn, 2014a).

Spontaneity: It means preparing mind to respond impetuously without thinking deeply (Shen, Chick, & Zinn, 2014a).

Professional Experience: It's associating the practical field of study, translating academic knowledge in activities (Vaines, 1997).

Personality: It's linking the relations between other internal attributes of individual (Barnett, 2012).

Play Behavior: Play behavior is defined as sign of social and cognitive development of play (Kohlberg, 1968). In the current study, play behavior refers to teachers' play role and play preferences.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The main purpose of the study is investigating early childhood in-service teachers' playfulness traits and their views on playfulness. In order to provide the study with theoretical literature; play, playfulness, teacher's professional experience, and teacher's play in early childhood education were summarized in this section. Previous studies and theoretical background of playfulness, teacher's professional experience and teacher's play in early childhood education were examined in the following section.

2.1. Play

Play is a multi-dimensional concept. For this reason, play can be defined and categorized in various aspects. Because of its complexity, definition of play should be formed of "combination of features'' instead of "defining characteristic'' to determine whether it's play or not (Smith & Vollstedt, 1985). Rubin, Fein, and Vandenburg (1983) identified play in three dimensions; behavior, context, and disposition. Behavioral dimension of play depends on observable social and cognitive behaviors. Social play includes solitary play, parallel play, and group play. In addition, cognitive play consists of functional play, constructive play, dramatic play and games with rules (Rubin, 1989). Rubin et al. (1983) explain the criteria of context for play as well-known objects or toys, friendly atmosphere, practical schedule which responses to children's needs, an environment in which children and adults are in agreement and children can decide what to play and minimalize adult

disruption. Finally, play's dispositional tendency dimension promotes that act in certain ways even in different conditions. Rubin et. al (1983) also stated six aspects of play propensity. These are intrinsically motivated behavior, a focus on process rather than product, play over exploratory behaviors, non-literality, freedom from external rules and active engagement. Play studies in the behavioral aspects generally emphasize cognitive and social level by Piaget (1950, 1962) and Vygotky (1967). In order to understanding play and playfulness relation, their views on play is given briefly in the next section.

2.1.1 Piagetian Play Perspectives

In 1970s, the majority of the studies on play were based on Piaget's work (Nicolopoulou, 1993). Piaget clarified the development of play from the beginning of life to seven years old. Firstly, practice play has seemed. The practice play continues for around 18 months. In the practice play stage, the infants repeat some sequenced actions and manipulations. The actions are not for practical or instrumental target, yet the actions only give pleasure to the infant. Secondly, at the end of age one, the repetitive actions become more meaningful. Then, the child starts to put some rules into the game. The play becomes containing some symbolism and the child performs and actions turn to symbolic. The last play is playing with rules. The stage is shown around 4 to 7 years old (Piaget, 1950, 1962). Children play together and there are at least two children in the play and they set some rules. The rules can be set as handed down or spontaneously (Piaget, 1965).

Piaget (1950, 1962) describes six main criteria for play. According to him, these main criteria distinguish play from non-ludic activities which are not called as play. The first criterion is lacking in precision. Play has a sense profoundly interested; therefore, the player focuses on the result of activity. The second criterion is spontaneity which is opposite to enforcement. The third one is pleasure. Play is an activity which is for deriving pleasure. The fourth criterion is lack of organization which is not always applied. Play does not match idea of organized structure and

opposite to serious thought. The fifth criterion is freedom from conflicts. The concept of conflicts does not fit into the concept of play, although it is inevitable to face conflict during serious activities. The last criterion is over motivation. It refers to consisting of additional incentives. Piaget also stated that even play is not a behavior but a behavioral orientation (1950, 1962).

2.1.2 Vygotskian Play Perspective

Vygotsky is the other theoretician, contributes to psychological studies on play (Nicolopoulou, 1993). He argues that play is appeared at around three years old. Play is always a social activity so there should usually be more than one children. In addition, since children express their understanding of sociocultural knowledge, a theme, a story, or a role are an element of play. Besides social way of play, Vygotsky states that play contributes to cognitive development rather than only reflect level of cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1967).

Vygotsky argues that defining play based only on pleasure is not correct because there are many things which give pleasure. Vygotsky claims that play should be fulfilled of children's wishes. In order to analyze play, children's needs, inclinations, effective aspiration, and motives for action should be considered. Vygotsky points out criteria of play for distinguishing play activity from general activity. For an activity to be accepted as play, imaginary situation should be created by children. The imaginary situations are required not only for pretend play but also for structured play. For instance, chess is a highly structured play but the characters of the play reflect real world so it contains imaginary situations. In the imaginary situation, preschoolers realize their imaginary desires in a fantastic world. Moreover, behaving children as if they are in an imaginary situation is impossible without rules. For example, if a child behaves like a mother, the child acts with maternal behavior and this is the rule of the play. Therefore, rule is another criterion for calling an activity as play (1967).

2.2 Playfulness

Playfulness has been described in different aspects. In the literature "orientation" and "motivational" criteria are under the umbrella of player's dispositional approach to distinguish play from any general activities. These dispositional criteria are put into the definition of playfulness (Sanderson, 2010). Lieberman examines playfulness as an internal characteristic of children (1965). Lieberman explains components of playfulness as physical spontaneity, social spontaneity, cognitive spontaneity, manifest of joy, and sense of humor (Lieberman, 1965). Barnett contributes to Lieberman's definition. According to Barnett, playfulness is a characteristic of the individual so it is more than what children do (1990). Barnett describes playfulness as a personality trait like cheerful, joyous, humorous, and playful attitude (1991). Recently, Barnett (2007) adds also that playfulness is a capacity to frame or reframe a situation in such a way that it provides one (and possibly others) with amusement, humor, and/or entertainment. According to Aguilar, playfulness is a perception and attitude which permits spontaneous behavior in play (1985).

2.2.1 Lieberman Theory of Playfulness

Lieberman is the pioneer of playfulness (Shin, 2004), adding the word to the literature for the first time (1965, 1977). She assumed that playfulness is a trait which directs children to play in some various ways (Lieberman, 1967). Firstly, playfulness was described as a quality part of play in preschoolers (Lieberman, 1965). Later, playfulness was also hypothesized as a personality trait of the player (Lieberman, 1966, 1967).

Playfulness is described as behavior which connects with play, imagination, and creativity (Lieberman, 1977). In addition, Lieberman added new features to the definition of playfulness, physical, social and cognitive spontaneity, manifest joy,

14

and sense of humor creates playfulness concept, these frames were considered as a quality of play too (Lieberman, 1977).

Physical Spontaneity: Generally unstructured physical play is called as physical spontaneity such as jumping rope, running or more structured activity like hopscotch. Physical spontaneity predicts that the frequency of children's physical activity and the physical activity is signed with exuberance, rhythmic movement, and motor coordination (Lieberman, 1977).

Social Spontaneity: The term refers to a feeling of comfort and the behavior without restriction in and out of a social setting. These signs are part of social spontaneity. (Lieberman, 1965, 1967). Playing in a group and integrating them are also associated with social spontaneity.

Cognitive Spontaneity: This element of playfulness is related to imaginative play (Lieberman, 1977) which contains pretending and role-playing by fine motor manipulations and symbolic activities (Barnett 1998) in the childhood years. The characteristic can be observed in a combinatorial play of creative adulthood period (Lieberman, 1977).

Manifest Joy: The item was refers to children's being enjoyable and enthusiastic while playing. Smiling, laughter, chuckling, singing, dancing and facial expressions are observable signs of joy and these items make the concept more concrete (Lieberman, 1977).

Sense of Humor: Among the spontaneity and joy manifest, sense of humor has more concrete foundations (Goldstein & McGhee, 1972; Levine, 1969). Lieberman (1977) stated that incongruity, novelty, and surprise create humor. Other view is about both producing the humor and consuming it (Lieberman, 1977).

In the frame of these elements, (physical, cognitive and social spontaneity, sense of humor and manifest joy) Lieberman developed a scale for measuring playfulness, it constructed as 5- point Likert scale and 12 items (Lieberman, 1965).

Playfulness Scale: The scale was developed to test the relationship between playfulness and divergent thinking. The scale included five playfulness traits, it was 5- point Likert scale type, 10 items, and 2 additional question items. These 2 questions addressed to intelligence and physical attractiveness. Children were rated

on the five traits of playfulness earlier named. Descriptive labels and samples of the behavior to be rated were given. To avoid contaminating frequency with intensity, ratings were requested for quantity (Part A) and quality (Part B). Two questions not related to play required ratings on intelligence and physical attractiveness. In each kindergarten class, two teachers acted as raters. Twelve ratings, consisting of the 10 scores on Parts A and B of the five playfulness traits and the two scores on the additional questions were obtained. The child's score on each trait was the pooled rating from the teachers. Corrected reliability coefficients, obtained from correlating the ratings of the two teachers, range from .66 to .83 and have a mean of .70 (Lieberman, 1965).

2.2.2 Barnett Playfulness Model:

While defining play, researchers generally focus on children's behavior and overt interactions. Instead of focus on what children do in play, characteristics of the individual should be considered (Barnett, 1990). Lieberman was the first person to explain playfulness trait of children (1965, 1966). She claims that playfulness contains five components which are physical spontaneity, cognitive spontaneity, social spontaneity, manifest joy and sense of humor (Lieberman, 1977). Lieberman measured children's playfulness according to these five components (Lieberman, 1965, 1966). However, she was criticized because of her methodology (Barnett, 1990). Then, Barnett and Kleiber worked on the topic (1982, 1984). One of Barnett's major work on playfulness is the development of playfulness scale (Shin, 2004). Her scale lays out Lieberman's groundwork, Lieberman's studies were replicated and redesigned to form the scale. At the end of the study, 5-point Likert scale consisting of 23 items and split into 5 components of playfulness (Barnett, 1990). The scale's validity and reliability issues were supplied so accepted by scholars. The previous scale was based on children's activity, this scale concentrates on qualities of individual's and child's characteristics which they are coming from their environment (Barnet, 1990).

Besides the five characteristics of play, there are some moderator variables detected like gender and the child's home environment (Barnet & Kleiber, 1982, 1984). Barnett (1992) focuses on which individual and personality characteristics are related to playfulness. In this study, she studied with pre-school and kindergarten children. Children's playfulness scale was used in this study. Early childhood teachers filled the form after one month of the new school year. She claims that playful children have differences and similarities features in terms of playfulness dimensions. Age, gender, size of family and birth order cause differences in children's playfulness since these factors affect their play properties.

2.2.3 Bundy Model of Playfulness:

Bundy (1997) focuses on transactional aspects of play between player and environment. Bundy defines playfulness as playfulness includes four basic elements. These are intrinsic motivation, internal control, freedom to suspend some constraints of reality, and framing (Bundy, 1991). Bundy develops a scale based on these four bases of playfulness which is called the "Test of Playfulness''. The scale measures both typically developing children (Bundy, Nelson, Metzger, Bingaman, 2001) and children with disabilities (Okimoto, Bundy & Hanzlik, 2009).

20 children who are 5 to 7 years old and attended suburban primary school participated in the study. Researchers introduce loose parts to the junior playground for 11 weeks of school time. The research showed that after the intervention program, children's playfulness score is significantly higher, and teachers stated that children are more social, creative and resilient (Bundy et al., 2007). Player wants to play because play is an intrinsic motivation activity. Intrinsic motivation is related to the process, the process is more important than the product. Freedom is about children's using an object as they desire. Framing is children's ability to read and give cues. Playful children can contact with others and they can tell what they want and how others can join them. Lastly, the internal control means that each player has a responsibility while playing (Fabrizi, 2014).

2.2.4 Cooper's Contextual Model of Play & Playfulness

Cooper's model of children's play is built on Bundy's (1997) theory of play and playfulness. Cooper's model includes play environment, play skills of children, children's familial milieu and children's playfulness which can be defined as play and play selection attitudes (Cooper, 2000). Cooper argues that children bring their developmental skills and play abilities and that they add to their play selection and playfulness to play transaction no matter if the children's interactive environment (physical setting, play materials, and social elements) encourage the children or constrain their play activities. The play transaction is influenced by parenting, cultural values and beliefs, and children's previous experience of care. In this figure, components of play can be easily identified. In addition, observable forms and context can be explored according to Cooper's model of play (Cooper, 2000).

Play opposes to rules and it intrinsically motivated. Social expectation and external encouragement do not fit the spirit of play. It is done for only their desire (Rubin et al., 1983). For this reason, play distinguishes from work or goal-oriented activities by giving the feeling of entertainment and playfulness (Cooper, 2000). In this model, playfulness is affected by socio-economic factors like economic background, ethnicity, community support as much as family structure and parent-child attachment (Cooper, 2000).

There are four models which are related to playfulness. The Lieberman's theory (1977) is the base of Barnett's model (1982). Lieberman explained playfulness as a personality trait (1977) and Barnett conducted studies about playfulness in terms of personality characteristic (1992). Cooper and Bundy worked on environmental effects on playfulness. Therefore, in the current study, instead of Coopers and Bundy's playfulness model, Lieberman and Barnet's playfulness models were utilized.

2.3 Children's Playfulness

Playfulness has been studied by many scholars and these studies focus on different aspects of playfulness. Gender, therapy, intelligence, culture, divergent thinking, and creativity is mostly studied topics which investigate their relationship with the playfulness of children (Casas, 2003).

Lieberman argues that play is directly related to cognitive development. In order to examine the playfulness, she tries to prove the relationship between divergent thinking and playfulness (Barnett & Kleiber, 1982). She designed a study in 1960, to test playfulness and divergent thinking relationship. 93 kindergarten children who are between 5 years 6 months and have middle economical background, involved the study from a private kindergarten's 5 different classrooms in the New York. The Playfulness Scale, Divergent Thinking Task and Peabody Picture Vocabulary Tests were used for the study. The Playfulness Scale evaluated children in terms of physical spontaneity, manifest joy, sense of humor, social spontaneity, and cognitive spontaneity, Divergent Thinking Test gave an idea about fluency, flexibility, and originality of children. In addition, with Peabody Picture Vocabulary Tests, children's mental age score was determined by using their language development level. According to the result of Lieberman's study, children who got a high point from the playfulness scale were more successful in divergent thinking task than children who got the low mark from the Playfulness Scale (Lieberman, 1965).

Playful children have the ability to control their psychological well-being. Barnett and Storm (1981) and Barnett (1984, 1988) stated that in their series of experiments, playful preschool children who have high playfulness can reduce their stress to baseline level when they face with anxiety-provoking events during a play. In addition, Athey, Barnett, Cattell, Singer, and Rummo stated that imagination, humor, emotional expressiveness, flexibility, persistence, a penchant for novelty seeking, curiosity, openness, and communicativeness requires maintaining children's physical and mental health (items which are necessary for protecting

children's health). Also, these kinds of characteristics are related to playing and playfulness (as cited in Boyers, 1999, p.90).

Playfulness enables welcoming changes, adapting to new situations and fitting easily into the society. Playfulness can be evaluated as a gift that enables opportunities for children in thinking, planning and enjoying life and these are predicted changes and challenges of the 21st century (Boyer, 1997). Playfulness enhances some traits like flexible thinking, persistence, commitment, and a love of fascination. These personal characteristics are the basis of working with others (Boyer, 1997). Moreover, Bundy asserts that playful children have control of their sense, motivation and they interact with others who are around them in their physical and social world (1997). Besides its social benefits, playfulness emphasizes children that they do not have to be perfect, and therefore, children improve self-esteem while increasing their interpersonal relationships (Boyer, 1997).

2.4. Adult Playfulness

Play and playfulness are a permanent human activity throughout their life cycle. They are the main activities of adaptation for a human being. In addition, play is a primary activity like love and speak (Plaut, 1979). There are some studies to extend playfulness from childhood to adolescence and adulthood. Lieberman conducted a study (1977) to define adult playfulness. She concluded that playfulness is differentiated in adolescence in terms of a unitary trait in childhood. For example, adult playfulness can be labeled 'social-emotional playfulness' and 'academic playfulness'. Academic playfulness includes physical alertness vs. apathy, enthusiasm vs. discouragement, and intellectual curiosity vs. stagnation. In addition, social-emotional playfulness consists of physical mobility vs. stability, spontaneous joy-tenseness, and humor vs. lack of humor, group orientation vs. self-orientation, friendliness vs. rejection and play vs. conscientiousness (1977). Kruger stated that the started point of adult playfulness studies should not base on children's playfulness factor content or structure (1995) because playfulness in the adulthood

period is the shape of play in the childhood period, play can be sprung of as playfulness in later life (Solnit, 1998). Barnett follows this advice and then makes a definition and measurement of the playfulness of college students by examining personality disposition to decided playfulness in themselves and others (2007). Their analysis shows that for both men and women' perception, playfulness can be identified with four constitutive dimensions; (a) gregarious, (b) humorous, (c) uninhibited, (d) dynamic (Barnett, 2007).

Adult playfulness studies are conducted in different contexts such as work (Glynn & Webster, 1992), personality (Meehl, Lykken, Schofield, & Tellegan, 1971), temperament (Rogers, Fox, Harrison, & Ross 2000), teacher behaviors (Lieberman, 1977), and therapy (Feiner, 1990). The relationship was also found between playfulness and psychological well-being. Playful people do not avoid new experiences, they are open to doing something in a different way, and a playful person does not feel uncomfortable in unexpected situations (Shen, 2010). This kind of open mindset makes it easier to adopt behaviors against a new situation and changeable environments (Shen, Chick, & Pitas, 2017). Besides psychological wellbeing, playfulness can be linked to physical well-being like physical fitness (Proyer, 2013b). Adult playfulness is linked with psychological and physical well-being like physical fitness, life satisfaction (Tegano, 1990). In addition, Barnett stated that highly playful people show outgoing, humorous and happy characteristics (2007).

The workplace studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between effects of playfulness in work life. Sinetar (1992) explains that the 21st century's global society should have the following features:

- Working with others as collaborative to regenerate, renew and review learning and thinking to improve issues which could not be coped with alone.
- Having the ability to see the whole picture of the project or process.
- Shaping context from content by looking ahead.
- Connecting life and work
- Having the motivation to work and being up to with love of the task.

Boyer also stated that playful people have the 21st century abilities (Boyer, 1997).

Glynn and Webster (1992) created a scale to measure adult's playfulness in the workplace. The scale includes five dimensions of playfulness which are spontaneity, expressiveness, fun, creativity, and silliness. According to Glynn and Webster's (1992) study, they found that more playful people perceive work as much more enjoyable, and exhibit more playful behavior in the workplace. Moreover, the result of the study showed a significant relationship between self-reported playfulness and creativity and cognitive spontaneity. Glynn and Webster (1993) also conducted a study using the same scale, and they found that there is a significant relationship between playfulness and intrinsic motivation as well as innovative attitudes.

2.4.1 Teacher's Playfulness

Although there are many researches about adult playfulness in literature there are limited studies about the playfulness of educational professions. Teacher's playfulness is a way of connecting the warm and close relationship between teachers and children. In this way, children can develop a sense of security (Bergen, Reid, & Torelli, 2009). Jung studied with two caregivers that caregivers use playfulness purposefully because they believe that playfulness is an effective way to give positive energy to infants (2011). The study also investigated that caregiver's way of changing infants' emotions through playfulness during transitional time by using changing their moods from compassion to cheerful spirit, adding playful components in daily routine, acting like making jokes, silliness and humorousness, integrating physical and sensory play, arranging physical location to placed playfulness (Jung, 2011).

Playfulness is a tool to form trusting relationship between a teacher and children. While constructing a warm relationship, a teacher and students establish intimate communications and become familiar in a playful context (Jung, 2011). A

22

trustful and familiar environment is important for children because the study shows that children lose their play ability under the stressful conditions, even children's play comes from naturally inner desire. Adults' support is required to arrange playful experiences under stressful conditions since young children do not have the capability of emotional self-regulation (Gariepy & Howe, 2003). For this reason, caregivers have an important role to figure out children's stressful conditions (Jung, 2011).

Teacher's playfulness and communication with children are associated with each other. In order to investigate the relationship between teachers' playfulness creative thinking and degree of sensitivity in their communication with preschoolers during play, Graham, Sawyers, and DeBoard (1989) designed a study with 46 pre-service and 37 in-service teachers. The results of their study showed that pre-service teachers are more playful, creative, and have elaborative interaction style with children. On the contrary, in-service teachers have more structured communication style and their creativity level is low. The results also demonstrated that experience with children would lead to change in interaction style and playfulness of teachers (Graham et al., 1989).

Teacher's playfulness may affect children's play behavior. A pilot study in order to investigate the relation between a teacher's and children's playfulness. Thirty-one teacher-child dyads were chosen as sample. Participant children were between 40 and 72 months and all teachers had a degree in education and a teaching certificate. Adults Playfulness Scale was used to evaluate adult's playfulness. The scale includes spontaneity, expressiveness, creativity and silliness categories which are related to playfulness. In addition, children's playfulness was evaluated by using the Test of Playfulness. In the study, positive relation was found between teachers' spontaneity and silliness with child playfulness. Further, the pilot study shows that teacher's playfulness and children's playfulness is close to significant. However, the results were suggested to be reexamined with a larger sample (Pinchover, 2017).

Teachers who are aware of the importance of play and playfulness in children's development use their own playfulness in order to improve children's playfulness (Pinchover, 2017). For example, spontaneity is one of the elements of

23

playfulness, Glynn and Webster state that spontaneity is the spirit of being free and less disciplined (1992). Therefore, being spontaneous makes teachers focus more on play and reduced disciplined issues in their classroom. In this way, teachers give more opportunities for children to be playful (Pinchover, 2017). Jung and Jin argue that teacher training program should be reviewed to increase teacher's knowledge about play and playfulness and develop teacher's own playfulness, unfortunately, current teacher training programs are not adequate to enable that kind of information (2015).

Teachers' views about playfulness have an impact on children's playfulness as well. Barnett conducted a study on preschool children's problems when they will soon go to a primary school. Playful children are physically active and spontaneous. This behavior would not be appropriate for structured and rule-based schools according to teachers. For this reason, playful children could have problems in transition to primary schools because of rules and obedience to teachers' rules. According to the result of the study, playful children are more desirable playmates and these children perceive themselves as popular among their peers in the first and second grades. On the other hand, these children, especially the boys, are perceived by their classmates as being disruptive for the classroom in the third grade. Teacher behavior leads to a change in children's perception of their playful classmate. In this grade, playful children become unpopular and undesired to play because of teacher's attitudes to them (Barnett, 2018).

2.5 Teachers' Professional Experience

Teacher's burnout and attrition are one of the important problems of the profession. According to the statistics, 50% of new teachers leave teaching profession in North America within the first five years (OECD, 2013). For example, in Canada, graduating from college, 50% of early childhood teachers work in childcare center and preschool, 40% leave their profession their profession five years later (Beach, Bertrand, Forer, Michal, & Tougas, 2004). Lack of working

opportunities, limited support and inadequate teacher training lead to leave job and attrition of teachers (Jalongo & Heider, 2006). In addition, idealism and optimism make pre-teachers to feel negative and hopeless when they become a teacher (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009). Teachers' enthusiasm and idealism are high in the first years of profession. However, their enthusiasm inclines during teaching life (Lehman, 2000).

Teachers face some difficulties at the beginning of their profession (Yost, 2016). In addition, the initial years of profession can be described as the most challenging and intensive years in a novice teacher's career (Zhukova, 2018) because novice teachers transform into "professional educators" from "students". In this stage, the novice teacher should decide about their professional belief, philosophy, practice, and attitudes for their future career (Solite, 2015). Moreover, in this stage of their career, teachers should blend their theoretical knowledge with practices in real educational settings (Vonk, 1989). According to Cooper's theoretical framework, new teachers have difficulties on teaching assignments and finding solutions individually. In addition, they have limited experience and too much anxiety. New teachers do not have the ability to determine what they need and what solution is required (Cooper, 1990). Knowles supported Coopers' theoretical framework in the self-directed learning theory. Knowles mentioned that all human-beings have lifelong learning potential skills, so they need an appropriate context (Knowles, 1980).

Teachers' fundamental skills like thinking ability, acting according to system, incorporating their teaching practices into system and developing ability for teaching and learning are improved during the professional process by increasing teachers' personal and professional practice, knowledge, personal growth and inner maturity (Ilisko, 2015; 2016). Especially, early childhood educators have different requirements compared to primary and secondary school teachers. Being in early childhood education, their profession requires knowledge about curriculum and childcare. Teachers should know about the physical, social, emotional and cognitive features of children. Moreover, young children's self-care, warmth and feeding necessities should be met by the teachers (Brostom, 2006).

25

In the first year of their career, teachers generally tend to explain simple patterns of their classroom and school such as students' behavior, motivation, and their possible reasons. In the second year, teachers perceive themselves as having the power of overcoming problems and deal with daily crises of the first year. At the middle or end of the second years, novice teachers realize importance of student-centered instruction. In addition, they emphasize importance of developing critical thinking, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation skills of students (Zhukova, 2018). Another reason is that career motivation draws way of professional selection and continue making a job for a long time. Career motivation has been grouped as intrinsic, extrinsic and altruistic. Intrinsic motivation includes "beliefs about being a teacher", financial and job security can be an example of extrinsic motivation and altruistic motivation is like contributing to society (Bastick, 2000). In Turkey, extrinsic and altruistic motivations are dominant in deciding to be a teacher (Yuce, Sahin, Kocer & Kana, 2013).

There is a relation between formal education and specific training, especially BA degree in early childhood education of teachers with supported high-quality learning environment for children (Howes, 1997). Teachers, who have early childhood education college degree, demonstrate more sensitivity and stimulating interactions (Clarke-Stewart, Vandell, Burchinal, O'Brien, & McCartney, 2002). There is association between process quality and teacher training (Clifford et al., 2003).

Teachers have a vital role in holistic development of young children. Self-efficacy, problem-solving ability and perception of completing an activity successfully are main factors of being an effective teacher (Senemoğlu, 2013). Teacher's characteristics, teaching strategy, academic knowledge, and self-efficacy have influence on being effective teachers in educational setting (Demirel, 2012). Teacher self-efficacy defined as performing to desired student participation and increasing the learning level of student (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy (2001). Self-efficacy depends on gender, professional experience, educational institution, and social-economical background of educational institution (Gömleksiz & Serhatlıoğlu, 2013).

2.6 Teachers' Play Behavior

Teachers' role is important in play in early childhood education. Even though play has a vital role in children's development and learning, it depends on teachers' attitude, beliefs, context and practices (McLane, 2003). Kagan mentioned three barriers to the implementation of play. The first one is attitudinal barriers. This means that teachers' caring about play. A study shows that teachers think that they interfere with children's play if they participate in (Korat, Bahar & Snapir, 2003). In addition, some teachers think that as a teacher, their role is providing children's learning and managing academic development (Hadley, 2002). The second one is structural barrier. Play is impacted by curricula, materials, time and physical opportunity. Expectation from teachers is growing in terms of academic instruction nowadays. This expectation is restricted play time in early childhood classroom (Kagan, 1990).The last one is functional barrier. The barrier is related to attitudinal barrier. Implementation of play is changing because of school context (Olsen & Sumsion, 2000).

Teachers can involve different roles in the play. Hadley defined types of teacher participation. The first type is outside of the flow. In this involvement, teachers modify and extend play by prompt reflection (2002). The second type is inside of the flow in which teachers are inside of the play and they communicate with children directly and in an unmediated way (Hadley, 2002). Teachers' roles are categorized according to their interactions with children (Roskos & Neuman, 1993). Onlooker, stage manager, coplayer, play leader and uninvolved roles were defined as facilitative roles of teachers in children's play (Johnson, Christie &Wardle, 2005).

Onlooker: Teachers are audiences in children's play. They sit near the children's play area, watch them and give nonverbal signs. However, they do not involve in children's play and interfere in their play (Johnson, Christie &Wardle, 2005).

Stage Manager: In this role, teachers do not join the children's play as well. Teacher help children organize the play, supply materials and assist them to prepare the play setting (Johnson, Christie &Wardle, 2005).

Coplayer: Teachers are participants of play in this type of role. Teachers become a play partner. Teachers have a minor role, leaving the prime role to children. They can initiate the play by calling children to play and then leave the flow of play to children (Johnson, Christie &Wardle, 2005).

Play Leader: In this role, teachers are actively involved in the children's play. The teachers influence on children's play and they have the role to extend and enrich their play. The teachers may suggest a theme idea, and change the role of children when they have difficulties (Johnson, Christie &Wardle, 2005).

Uninvolved: Teachers sometimes ignore the play in the classroom. The teachers prepare something for the next activities in this period. The teachers mostly spend their time by warning children verbally and as safety monitors (Enz & Christie, 1997).

A study explains the gender difference's effect on teachers on play attitudes. Female teachers are not willing to participate in children's play because of some reasons. For example, some female teachers believe that children are more open and uncontrolled if the teacher does not participate in their play. In addition, their participation is interrupted by some factors such as talking with parents or taking attendance. On the other hand, male teachers call to children to play and they join in children's play themselves. They state that a teacher can know children better in this way. Sometimes they participate in the play because they just want to play (Sandberg & Pramling-Samuelsson, 2005).

Play can be categorized according to their types such as motor play, object play, symbolic play, social play and educational play (Johnson, Christie &Wardle, 2005).

Motor Play: This type of play contains all type of physical and manipulative play. Exploring their own body and others' bodies, or objects around children are kinds of motor play. In addition, motor play includes locomotor, rough-and-tumble play (Johnson, Christie &Wardle, 2005).

Object Play: Children use materials and objects during play. They can construct something with blocks or other kinds of objects. The type of play includes object manipulation, exploratory and constructive play (Johnson, Christie &Wardle, 2005).

Symbolic Play: Symbolic play is a simulative and metaphorical behavior (Fein, 1981). Children act "as if" the case is real or not real (Leslie, 1987).

Social Play: One child's successive and non-literal behaviors are engaged with other child's who is the partner of the child's non-literal behaviors (Garvey, 1974).

Educational Play: This type of plays are carefully planned play activities which are developmentally appropriate for the support of children's academic learning and their skills (Johnson, Christie &Wardle, 2005).

The type of play selection is differentiated between male and female teachers as well. In the same study, the female teachers stated that they give priority to calm play and the female teachers believe social developmental factor of play. On the contrary, male teachers support troublemaker and physical play, while they focus on physical development role of play (Sandberg & Pramling-Samuelsson, 2005).

2.7 Turkish Studies on Playfulness

The concept of play and playfulness place is in the Turkish culture is described briefly in this part. According to the literature, adults do not enter children's play in Turkish culture (Rogoff, Mosier, Mistry & Goncu, 1989). Adults believe that play inhibits success of children in their lessons, therefore, parents do not support children's play in Turkish culture (Oksal, 2005). On the other hand, Ministry of National Education gives importance to play in early childhood education and mentioned about play as one of the qualities of early childhood education program (MEB, 2016).

Tugrul, Aslan, Erturk, and Altınkaynak (2014) were carried out a study to investigate preschool teachers and six years old children's opinions and prospects

from play. 89 children and 59 teachers were attended to the study. Semi-structured interview forms were used to gather information about definition of play, playmate preferences, play opportunities, and their non-play time activities of children. In addition, teachers' play definitions and their self-efficacy about implementation of play were asked to the teachers. As a result of the study, teachers, and children defined play as a learning tool. Moreover, the teachers focused on the developmental side of play in psychological, cognitive, and social area (Tugrul, Aslan, Erturk & Altınkaynak, 2014).

The person who has playful characteristic s/he can change environment in an enjoyable and joyful way. In addition, the kind of person is qualified as creative, dynamic, funny, weird and unsuppressed. Playfulness is associated with variety of structures. These are innovativeness, intrinsically motivated, performance in working life, positive psychological concepts such as happy, positive, cheerful, etc. Besides these areas, playfulness is related to personality dispositions of teachers and pre-service teachers' burnout level, student-teachers interactions, classroom management strategies, and teaching skills. Nevertheless, the studies are limited in the playfulness examination of adult, especially teachers and teacher candidates' interaction with children (Keleş, Yurt & Koğar, 2016).

One of the studies was conducted by Keleş, Yurt and Koğar, the study aimed to explain psychological properties of Adult Playfulness Trait Scale's Turkish version form in terms of pre-service teachers. 440 teacher candidates participated in the study. As the result of the study, the Turkish version of the form's validity and reliability issues fit with the original form (Yurt, Keleş & Koğar, 2016). Another study was carried out by Keleş and Yurt to examine Children Playfulness Scale's validity and reliability issues in the Turkish version. Moreover, explaining some variables effect on children's playfulness level. 196 children were participating in ensuring validity and reliability issue of scale and 600 children were selected for comparative analysis. The result of the studies shows that the Turkish version of the Children Playfulness Scale enables validity and reliability issues. In addition, there was not found a significant interaction effect between gender, birth order and number of siblings.

The other study, which was conducted in Turkey to examine behavioral characteristic relations with regarding the playfulness of students who are interested in folk dance. 332 students participated in the study and Adult Playfulness Trait Scale and Behavior Scale was used as an instrument. The result of the study showed that there is a significant positive relation between behavior characteristic and playfulness (Önal, Gerek, Bedir & Bedir, 2017).

Finally, a study was carried out to investigate the associations between preschoolers' playfulness, social skills, and classroom environment supports. 212 prescholars who are 5 years old participated in the study. In addition, 16 private and 10 public schools were categorized with regard to their environmental quality. As the result of the study, Turkish preschoolers' playfulness level is relatively high. Moreover, environment impacts children's playfulness, and there is a correlation between children's playfulness and social ability (Sicim, 2017).

2.8 Summary of Evidences

The previous sections have mentioned about the definitions of play and playfulness and theories regarding play. Furthermore, teachers' professional experience and their play behaviors have been touched on as well. The playfulness is defined in different fields like psychology and occupational therapy. Lieberman definition is the theoretical base of the current study. She described playfulness as a personality trait. Barnett follows her studies and he is conducting recent studies about playfulness regarding personality trait.

Play and playfulness relation can be best explained by Piagetian and Vygotskian play. The theorists'' play perspectives are fitted with playfulness basis.

In the other part of the literature review chapter of the study, children's and adult playfulness were explored. Playfulness has positive effect on children's physical and mental health (Barnett, 1984, 1988), social skills, divergent thinking ability (Barnett & Kleiber, 1982) and motivating themselves (Bundy, 1997). Besides children, playfulness was investigated in adulthood period. Lieberman

mentioned academic and social-emotional playfulness types of adults. Academic playfulness contains characteristics like physical alertness, enthusiasm, and curiosity. In addition, social-emotional playfulness characteristic includes characteristics of physical mobility, spontaneous, humor, group orientation, friendliness and play (Lieberman, 1977).

Finally, teachers' professional experience explained in the literature review part. According to OECD report, teachers face burnout and attrition threats at the beginning of the first five years of their profession (OECD, 2013). In addition, teachers' play behaviors were explained in the last part. Teachers have different role and type of play in the early childhood education classroom.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Methodological procedures of the study will be presented in the following part. The overall design of the study will be demonstrated in the first chapter. Participants and sample selection method will be mentioned in the second part. The other part will present the instruments used in data collection. In the fourth part, data collection procedure will be explained. Lastly, data analysis process will be explained in the fifth part.

3.1 Overall Design of the Study

The current study examines in-service teachers' playfulness in terms of their experiences in the profession. The study is a mixed method research. A mixed method research includes both qualitative and quantitative methods. The method enables widely understanding of research questions. In addition, in this study method, the researcher can easily explain and clarify relationship between variables (Frankel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). The study is designed as sequential explanatory design. The method of sequential explanatory design is that quantitative method is applied first and then qualitative method follows (Creswell, 2007). The current study's data collection procedure is planned to appropriate as sequential explanatory design. The quantitative part is a causal-comparative study. According to Frankel, Wallen, and Hyun, in causal-comparative studies, researchers try to examine the different causes or consequences among groups or individuals (2012). The groups

are already existing and researchers do not interfere in characteristics of groups. A researcher uses some scientific methods to determine the reason, result or the difference (Frankel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012).

3.2. Participants

The mixed method study's quantitative part is a causal-comparative study. According to Frankel, Wallen & Hyun, at least 30 samples are required to set up a relationship (2012). However, the number is not enough to make a generalization; therefore, 485 participants were chosen for this study. For the first phase, there are six different groups; these are categorized into their years of professional experiences: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, 21-25 years and 26+years. Convenience sampling method was used for sample selection. Convenience sampling method is choosing groups or individuals who are available and accessible for the study (Frankel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). The sample selection method is easy and simplicity of the research, data collection duration is shorter than the other type of sampling, and it supports the cheapest implementation (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2012). The survey was sent to the participants via internet. The link of the internet survey was shared with early childhood teachers who are accessible and on social media platforms. The teachers are from different regions of Turkey.

The mixed method study's qualitative part sample was selected by using a convenience sampling method as well. The participants were selected from the teachers who participated in the first phase of the study. The teachers who signed "I accept attending the second part of the study" wrote down their e-mail addresses. The sample of the qualitative part was chosen between them. 20 early childhood in-service teachers participated the interview. The researcher accessed the participants via telephoning because the teachers were at Kahramanmaraş, Ağrı, and İzmir. The rest of the teachers were at Tokat so the researcher conducted a face to face interview process with them.

3.2.1 Participants Demographics for Quantitative Part

In-service teachers who are working in both private and public schools participated in the study. 485 teachers participated in the study from different regions of Turkey. The teachers were categorized according to their years of professional experience. The teachers' age range is from 18 to 54. Their average age range is 33.34. 20 (4%) of the teachers are male and 465 (96%) of them are female (see Table 3.2.1).

Table 3.2.1

Gender distribution of teachers

Gender	Number of Teachers	*%*
Female	465	96
Male	20	4

Among them, 224 (46,2%) teachers have 0-5 years' experience, 156 (32,2%) teachers have 6-10 years' experience, 60 (12,4%) of them have 11-15 years of professional experience, 26 (5,4%) teachers have 16-20, 9 teachers(1,9%) have 21-25, and 10 (2,1%) teachers have 26+ years of professional experience (see table 3.2.2).

Table 3.2.2

Year of experience

Years	Number of teachers	*%*
0-5	224	46,2
6-10	156	32,2
11-15	60	12,4
16-20	26	5,4
21-25	9	1,9
26+	10	2,1

Type of school is categorized as private and public school. Public school refers to the schools directly connected to the Turkish National Ministry of Education. The private school refers to the partly-autonomous private corporations in connection with the Turkish National Ministry of Education. The teachers of 366 (75,5 %) are working in public school and 119 (24,5 %) teachers are working in private school (see Table 3.2.3).

Table 3.2.3

Type of working schools

School Type	Number of Teachers	%
Public	366	75.5
Private	119	24.5

Teachers' age range is from 18 to 54. The 60 of teachers (12,4%) is between the age range of 18-23; 178 teachers (36,7%) are between 24-29 years old; 141 teachers (29,1%) are between 30-35 years old; 66 teachers (13,6%) are between 36-

to 41 years old; and 40 of teachers (8,2%) is 42+ years old. The summary of age distribution of the teachers is given in the Table 3.2.4.

Table 3.2.4

Age distribution of teachers

Age	Number of teachers	%
18-23	60	12,4
24-29	178	36,7
30-35	141	29,1
36-41	66	13,6
42+	40	8,2

Additionally, the teachers' educational background is grouped as Open University undergraduate program, Open University associated degree program, undergraduate program, high school graduated, associated degree program, and master's degree. Open University education is defined as education via television, radio and education material (ÖSYM, n.d.). Undergraduate program is a higher education based on high school education and it covers eight semesters (ÖSYM, n.d.). Associate program is a higher education which takes four semesters and the program targets cultivating intermediary man power. High school includes institutions which are vocational, science, social, Anatolian, fine arts, gymnasiums, and religious type of schools. The schools take four education years (MEB, 2016). Master program is based on a higher education and covers at least two semesters. Master degree programs need a thesis with a profession (ÖSYM, n.d.). The Open University graduated teachers' frequency is 60 (12, 4%), Open University associated program graduated teachers' frequency is 22 (4,5%), undergraduate program frequency of teachers is 299 (61,6%), high school graduated teachers' frequency is 17 (3,5%), association degree's frequency is 60 (12,4%), and master degree teachers' frequency is 27 (5,65). The table 4 indicates the distribution of teachers' educational background (Table 3.2.5).

Table 3.2.5

Educational background

Type of degree	Number of teachers	*%*
Und. Grad.	299	61,6
Open Uni. Und. Gra.	60	12,4
Ass. Degr.	60	12,4
Master	27	5,6
Open Uni. Ass. Deg.	22	4,5
High Sch.	17	3,5

3.2.2 Participant Demographics for the Qualitative Part

The sample of the second phase of the study was selected according to the survey. The teachers who were accessible by telephoning or face to face were selected, while selecting these teachers' playfulness scores, professional experience and age were considered. Twenty teachers participated in the interview part. All the teachers are working at public school. The teachers' gender distribution is that 1 (5%) of them was male and 19 (95%) of them was female (see Table 3.2.6).

Table 3.2.6

Gender distribution of interview with the teachers

Gender	Number of teachers	*%*
Female	19	95
Male	1	5

The teachers' year of experience in the teaching profession is that 3 (15%) teachers have 0-5 years of experience, 11 (55%) teachers have 6-10 years of experience, 5 (20%) teachers have 16-20 years of experience, and 1 (5%) teacher has

26+ years of experience in the profession. The Table 3.2.7 summarized the distribution of the teachers' experience in the profession.

Table 3.2.7

Experience in the teaching profession

Years	Number of teachers	*%*
6-10	11	55
0-5	3	20
16-20	5	20
26+	1	5

The teachers' age ranges between 25 and 50. There are 4 (20%) teachers who are 24-29 years old, 9 (45%) teachers who are 30-35 years old, 5 (25%) teachers who are 36-41 years old, 2 (10%) teachers who are 42+ years old. Age distribution of the teachers is given at Table 3.2.8.

Table 3.2.8

Age distribution of teachers who participated interview

Age	Number of Teachers	*%*
30-35	9	45
36-41	5	25
24-29	4	20
42+	2	10

Five (25 %) of the teachers who joined the interview part were graduated from Open University undergraduate program and 15 (75%) of them have master degree (see the Table 3.2.9).

Table 3.2.9

Educational background of teachers

Type of degree	Number of Teachers	%
Undergraduate	15	75
Open University undergraduate program	5	15

3.3. Instruments

In order to collect the data, Adult Playfulness Trait Scale (APTS) and semi-structured interviews were used.

3.3.1 Adult Playfulness Trait Scale

With the demographic part of the survey, participants' age, gender, types of high-school, education level; attended play courses, professional development activities, additional trainings, type of school, and number of student asked to in-service teachers.

Adult Playfulness Trait Scale (see Appendix A) was developed by Shen, Chick and Zinn (2014a) and it was adapted into Turkish by Yurt, Keleş and Koğar (2016). APTS contains 19 items in a 7 Likert scale (1=strongly disagree and 7=strongly agree) and three subscales (fun seeking motivation, uninhibitedness, and spontaneity). The fun seeking subscales also contains fun belief, initiative, and reactivity sub-dimensions. Fun seeking motivation includes "I believe having a good time", "I try to have fun no matter what I am doing", I can find fun in most situations", uninhibitedness includes "I do not always have follow rules", Sometimes I can do things without worrying about consequences", "I do not fear losing anything

by being silly", and for spontaneity example of questions are "I often do unplanned things", "I often act upon my impulses".

The APTS is analyzing playfulness in relation to personality, behavior, perception, and attitude (Shen, Chick, & Zinn, 2014b). In the current study, the scale was used because the APTS examines the relationship between trait, behavior, and situation as well. The APTS includes three cognitive qualities: motivation to fun seeking, uninhibitedness, and spontaneity (Shen, Chick, & Zinn, 2014b). Fun seeking motivation is defined as a power behind all playful behavior. Uninhibitedness is a mental stage which provoke pursuing fun. In addition, quick response and unique traits of playfulness is called as spontaneity. Having one or more of these qualities do not always relate to being a playful person. However, having these three qualities increase chance of an individual being identified as a playful person (Shen, Chick, & Zinn, 2014a). According to Shen, Chick, and Zinn, face validity, structural validity, content validity, and internal consistency is adequate by the APTS. The Cronbach Alpha value is calculated .87 for whole scale (Shen, Chick, & Zinn, 2014b). The fun-seeking motivation of the Turkish version's Cronbach's α= .84, uninhibitedness Cronbach's α=.58 and spontaneity Cronbach's α=0.73 were calculated. In the current study, fun-seeking motivation Cronbach's α was found .82, uninhibitedness Cronbach's α=.58 and spontaneity Cronbach's α=.74.

3.3.2 Semi-structured Interviews

The second phase of the study was conducted to gather information about how in-service teachers define playfulness and the possible reasons leading to the increase or decrease of playfulness in adults. After preparing the interview questions, the researcher sent a draft to an early childhood expert whose specialty is playfulness. Based on her suggestion, the interview questions were modified. The second draft was created at the light of the comments and was sent back to her. She had some changes at the form and added questions parallel with her previous comments.

Finally, one more early childhood specialist whose expertise is on play checked and made some modifications to the grammatical structure of the questions.

The final version of the semi-structured interview form contains 12 questions. By using the form, researchers aim for understanding teachers' personality characteristics, their views on playfulness and their play behaviors. In-service teachers were asked; "why did you choose this profession", "do you like playing", "what kind of play you mostly engage with", "what do you do in your free time", "do you think you are a playful person, why" (see Appendix B for the details).

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

In the study, in-service teacher's playfulness level was investigated according to their professional experience. Before conducting the study, the researcher got the necessary permissions from the University's (METU) Ethical Board. After their permission, the researcher sent Adult Playfulness Trait Scale and Demographic forms via internet. For the second phase, volunteer participants were invited to the semi-structured interviews at their convenient time and location. The interviews conducted also by telephoning because some participants are residing in different city.

Gathering quantitative data took approximately 2 months. During the data collection process, both face to face communication with teachers and the internet were used for accessing teachers. According to their responses to a question in the survey regarding the voluntary participation to the second phase, the researcher contacted 20 volunteer participants via e-mail to decide an appropriate day for an interview. Interviews took approximately 20 minutes.

3.5. Data Analysis Procedure

Firstly, gathered data was written down SPSS V21 data files, and then missing data was checked. At the beginning of the study, there were 532 participants

but after the elimination of some outliers, missing scores, participants having doctorate degree, and participants working in different schools, 485 participants are remained. Moreover, 477 participants' data could be used because there were some missing values in this part. In order to define differences between variables (in-service teacher's age, graduated program type, duration of work experience, grade level, number of students, type of schools, attended play course, volunteer and professional development events) and teacher's playfulness level was analyzed. For this analysis one-way ANOVA was conducted. Secondly, in order to compare the teaching experience in the profession groups' playfulness level independent T-test analysis was run.

For the second phase, firstly, interview audio records were transcribed for the analysis of content. Phenomenological research design enables researchers to study human behaviors indirectly through an analysis of their communications (Frankel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). Descriptive analysis method was used to summarize and interpret the collecting data. In this analysis method, a researcher frequently gives quotations from the interview or observation. The purpose of the analysis summarizes and interprets the information which was gathered from participants (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2003). In the descriptive analysis, a researcher firstly determines a framework based on the study's research questions, conceptual framework, or interview and observation findings. Then, the researcher read the data based on the frameworks. Finally, the researcher makes meaningful connections between findings (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2003). To improve trustworthiness and confirmability of the qualitative results of the current study, intercoder reliability techniques was used. The codes were compared with two other experts in the early childhood education area to ensure the validity of the study. Milles and Hubermann's formula were used to calculate the inter-rater reliability. According to the formula all agreements were divided to sum of all disagreements and agreements (Milles & Hubermanss, 1994). The coders provide 94% agreement on two categories of codes. To provide reliability of an instrument, internal consistency, stability and equivalence should be tested. Internal consistency can be analyzed by split half, Kuder-Richardson coefficient and Cronbach's α (Heale & Twycross, 2015). The

calculated result of the instrument is found the researchers assumed that the instrument enables good internal consistency the Cronbach's α = .87 and the subscales ranges from Cronbach's α = .68 - .87 (Shen, Chick, & Zinn, 2014a). The Turkish version of the scale's construct validity and reliability level were found high. The whole scale reliability score was calculated .85 (Keleş, Yurt & Koğar, 2016).

3.6 Ethical Consideration

Before collecting the data, the university's ethical board permission was granted. The participation in second phase is totally based on voluntarily. In order to access to the teachers to invite second phase, the teachers' e-mail addresses were asked to them. Some of them filled the contact information while some of them did not fill the question. In the internet survey, the teachers signed "yes" if they want to participate to the second part of the study. For that reason, there is no other volunteer participation form.

The teachers who were volunteers for participating in the interview were informed at least one day before to make an appointment. The teachers were informed about their right to withdraw from the study if they don't feel comfortable responding to the questions.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In this part, the results of the current study are demonstrated. Firstly, descriptive statistics depend on participants' basic characteristic such as gender, age, educational background, profession experience's mean, and standard deviations are presented. In the second part, quantitative data result is presented. In this section, teachers' total playfulness scores, fun seeking motivation scores, uninhibitedness scores, and spontaneity scores were analyzed regarding the age, educational background, type of school, number of students in the classroom, attending play course, attending professional development, and volunteered activities. In the third part of the study, qualitative results are presented. The results are organized under the heading of the teachers' self-reported practices and views on play and playfulness.

4.1. Descriptive Statistic

In this part, descriptive statistic results of total playfulness scores of teachers regarding their age, gender, educational background, year of experience, number of children, type of school, and attending play course are shown. There were 536 participants of the study at the beginning, but some participants were eliminated from the study. Since only one participant has a doctorate degree and some participants are working in a special education institution, the kind of school is not included the current study. In addition, there is one missing value and one same response. After the cleaning process, z score checking was conducted for each item in the scale, to clean the data from outliers. The scores which are under -3 and above +3 points was

eliminated (Pallant, 2011). Finally, 485 participants remind to conduct the current study.

The result of the descriptive statistic, the total playfulness score is ranged between 46 and 94, the mean of the total playfulness score is $M = 74.2$ with a $SD = 8.6$ $(N = 485)$. In terms of gender, man's mean of score is $M = 73.5$ with a $SD = 8.9$ $(N = 20)$, female's mean of score is $M=74.3$ with $SD = 8.6$ $(N = 465)$ (See Table 4.1.1).

Table 4.1.1

Descriptive statistic result of gender and teachers' total playfulness

Gender	*N*	*Mean*	*SD*
Female	485	74.3	8.6
Male	20	73.5	8.9

The total playfulness score was analyzed regarding the teachers' educational background. There are six groups about these educational backgrounds: Teachers' total playfulness score of open university undergraduate program $(N = 60)$ is 75.6 with $SD = 8.1$; open university associated degree program $(N = 25)$ is 78.1 with $SD = 8.1$; undergraduate program $(N = 299)$ is 73.2 with $SD = 8.6$; high school graduated $(N= 17)$ is 78.5 with 8.1; associated degree program $(N = 60)$ is 75.9 with $SD = 8.2$; and master's degree $(N = 27)$ is 73.3 with $SD = 8.8$. The descriptive results of educational background are presented in Table 4.1.3.

Table 4.1.2

Descriptive statistic result of age and teachers' total playfulness

Age group	N	Mean	SD
18-23	60	77.5	7.7
24-29	178	73.5	8.5
30-35	141	74.2	8.3
36-40	66	73.7	10.5
41+	40	73.6	7.3

The total playfulness score was analyzed regarding to educational background. There are six groups regarding to these educational background, teachers' total playfulness score of open university undergraduate program ($N = 60$) is 75.6 with $SD = 8.1$; open university associated degree program ($N = 25$) is 78.1 with $SD = 8.1$; undergraduate program ($N = 299$) is 73.2 with $SD = 8.6$; high school graduated ($N = 17$) is 78.5 with 8.1; associated degree program ($N = 60$) is 75.9 with $SD = 8.2$; and master's degree ($N = 27$) is 73.3 with $SD = 8.8$. The descriptive results of educational background is presented in Table 4.1.3.

Table 4.1.3

Descriptive statistic result of educational background and teachers' total playfulness

Degree	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Undergraduate	299	73.2	8.6
Open University Under Graduate	60	75.6	8.1
Association Degree	60	75.9	8.2
Master	27	73.3	8.8
Open University Association Degree	25	78.1	8.1
High School	17	78.5	8.1

Teachers' professional experience is used as a variable. Total playfulness score is analyzed regarding their professional experience, there are six groups: 0-5; 6-10; 11-15; 16-20; 21-25 and 26+ years old experience. The total playfulness of teachers regarding professional experience 0-5 years ($N=224$) is 74.82 with $SD = 8.26$; 6-10 years ($N=156$) is 73.52 with $SD = 8.61$; 11-15 years ($N=60$) is 75.12 with $SD = 9.44$; 16-20 years ($N=26$) is 72.58 with $SD = 10.88$; 21-25 years ($N=9$) is 70.22 with $SD = 4.76$; 26+ years' experience ($N=10$) is 74.80 with $SD = 5.22$. The descriptive results of the years of experience is shown in Table 4.1.4.

Table 4.1.4

Descriptive statistic result of the years of experience and teachers' total playfulness

Years of Experience	N	M	SD
0-5	224	74.82	8.26
6-10	156	73.52	8.61
11-15	60	75.12	9.44
16-20	26	72.58	10.88
21-25	9	70.22	4.76
26+	10	74.80	5.22

The total playfulness score of teachers' is analyzed regarding number of children in a classroom as well. There are five groups with regards to the number of children in a classroom. The total playfulness score is about 10-15 number of children in a classroom ($N=160$) is that $M=75.2$ with $SD = 8.1$; 16-20 number of children in a classroom ($N=195$) is $M=74.5$ with $SD = 8.9$; 21-25 number of children in a classroom ($N=109$) is $M=73.5$ with $SD= 8.8$; 26-30 number of students in a class ($N=15$) is $M=72.4$ with $SD = 8.2$; and 30+ number of students in a classroom ($N=6$) is 74.0 with $SD = 10.4$. (See Table 4.1.5)

Table 4.1.5

Descriptive statistic result of the number of children and teachers' total playfulness

Number of children in the class	*N*	*M*	*SD*
10-15	160	75.2	8.1
16-20	195	74.5	8.9
21-25	109	73.5	8.8
26-30	15	72.4	8.2
30+	6	74.0	10.4

In the analysis, total playfulness score is describing the type of school. Total playfulness score of teachers who are working in public school (*N=366*) is *M=73.5* with *SD =8.6;* and private school (*N=119*) is *M=76.5* with *SD =8.1*.

Teachers' attending play course was analyzed by using descriptive statistics. The researcher presented total playfulness score regarding attending the play course, there are two groups. Total playfulness score of teachers in terms of attending play course (*N=366*) is *M=73.8* with *SD = 8.7;* and not attending play course (*N=119*) is *M=75.1* with *SD = 8.1*.

4.2 Results of Quantitative Study

In order to investigate the correlation between age and playfulness, Pearson correlation test was conducted. Then, the results of T-Test to show the difference of variables which are type of school, attending play course, professional development activities, volunteer activities with playfulness. In addition, ANOVA results are presented to analyses the difference between the years of experience in the teaching

profession, educational background, and number of children in classroom and playfulness.

4.2.1 Age and Playfulness

The Pearson correlation test was conducted to analyze the relation between age and playfulness. Moreover, the fun-seeking motivation, uninhibitedness and spontaneity results are shown below.

Table 4.2.1.1

Pearson Correlation results for age and total playfulness

		AGE	TOTALPLAYFU LNESS
AGE	Pearson Correlation	1	-,076
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,093
	N	485	485
TOTALPLAYFULNESS	Pearson Correlation	-,076	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,093	
	N	485	485

As seen in Table 4.2.1.1, the relationship between age and total playfulness scores of teachers (which is shown as totalplayfulness) was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses supply to normality, linearity and homoscedasticity assumptions. For checking the normality, test of normality analysis was used and Shapiro Wilk result shows that the data set is normally distributed. For linearity and homoscedasticity, scatterplot was used. According to result of the scatterplot has straight line relation and the shape is like cigar so the assumptions were violated too. There is no significant correlation between two variables, r = -.76, n =485, p>.05, with total playfulness score of teachers and their

age. To conclude, there is no relationship between age and total playfulness score of teachers.

Table 4.2.1.2

Pearson Correlation results for age and fun-seeking motivation

		AGE	FUNSEEKING
AGE	Pearson Correlation	1	-,091[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,045
	N	485	485
FUNSEEKING	Pearson Correlation	-,091[*]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,045	
	N	485	485

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

As seen in Table 4.2.1.2, the relationship between age and fun-seeking motivation subcategory of playfulness was analyzed by using Pearson correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses provide normality, linearity and homoscedasticity assumptions. According to result of the Pearson correlation coefficient, there is a weak, negative correlation between age and fun-seeking motivation, $r = -.09$, $n = 485$, $p<.05$. To sum up, if a teacher's age is lower, the fun-seeking motivation score is higher.

Table 4.2.1.3

Pearson Correlation results for age and uninhibitedness

		AGE	UNINHIBITEDNESS
AGE	Pearson Correlation	1	,011
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,815
	N	485	485
UNINHIBITEDNESS	Pearson Correlation	,011	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,815	
	N	485	485

Table 4.2.1.3 presents that According to result of Pearson correlation coefficient, there is no correlation between age and uninhibitedness, $r = .01$, $n = 485$, $p > .05$. There is not any relationship between age and uninhibitedness quality.

Table 4.2.1.4

Pearson correlation result for age and spontaneity

		AGE	SPON.
AGE	Pearson Correlation	1	-,085
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,061
	N	485	485
SPON.	Pearson Correlation	-,085	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,061	
	N	485	485

Table 4.2.1.4 shows that there is nonsignificant correlation between age and spontaneity. Increases or decreases of age does not include spontaneity behavior, $r = -.08$, $n = 485$, and $p > .05$

4.2.2 Educational Background and Total Playfulness

A one ANOVA test was conducted to investigate differences between educational background and playfulness. In addition, the fun-seeking motivation, uninhibitedness and spontaneity results are presented as follows.

Table 4.2.2.1

ANOVA results of educational background on total playfulness

	Sum of Squares	*Df*	Mean square	*F*	Sig.
Between Groups	1278,659	5	255,732	3,548	,004
Within Groups	34523,477	479	72,074		
Total	35802,136	484			

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to analyze the impact of educational background on total playfulness score as measured by The Adult Playfulness Trait scale. Participants were divided 6 categories according to their educational background (Group 1: Open University undergraduate program; Group 2: Open University associate degree program; Group 3: Undergraduate program; Group 4: High school graduate; Group 5: Associate degree program; Group 6: Master's Degree). It is significantly difference at the p<.05 level in total playfulness scores for the six educational groups: F (5, 479) = 3.5, p = .00. The effect size was calculated by using eta squared was .03. According to Cohen, .01 has small size effect, .06 means that there is medium size effect, and 1.4 has large effect (Pallant, 2011). Instead of there is a significant difference between groups, the actual mean score's difference is quite small. Post-hoc comparisons using the Gabriel test which is more appropriate if the cell size is not equal (Lee, Dinis, Lowe, & Anders, 2016) demonstrates that the mean score for Group 2 (M = 78.09, SD = 8.13) is significantly different from Group 3 (M = 73.17, SD = 8.61). Group 3 (M = 73.17, SD = 8.61) is statistically different from Group 4 (M = 78.52, SD = 8.15). Except Group 2, 3, and 4, there is non-significant difference between other groups. To sum up, teachers' who are graduated from Open University associate degree program, undergraduate program, high school total playfulness score is impacted from their educational background (see the Table 4.2.2.1).

Table 4.2.2.2

ANOVA results of educational background on fun seeking motivation

	Sum of Squares	*Df*	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Between Groups	250,444	5	50,089	2,860	,015
Within Groups	8389,647	479	17,515		
Total	8640,091	484			

A one-way between groups ANOVA was run for analysis the effect of educational background on fun-seeking which subcategory of playfulness is. There is statistically significant difference at p<.05 level in fun-seeking motivation category for the six type of educational background: F (5, 479) = 2.86, p = .01. Eta square is calculated to find effect size, it is .03. Instead of there is a statistical difference, the actual difference between mean scores is found quite small. Pairwise comparison Gabriel test result shows that there is no difference between any groups, however, mean score for Group 2 (M = 38.7, SD = 3.4) is slightly different from Group 3 (M = 36.4, SD = 3.4). The small size difference can be explained with the result (see the Table 4.2.2.2).

Table 4.2.2.3

ANOVA results of educational background on uninhibitedness

	Sum of Squares	*Df*	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Between Groups	34,415	5	6,883	1,048	,389
Within Groups	3146,966	479	6,570		
Total	3181,381	484			

A one-way between groups ANOVA was run for analysis the effect of educational background on uninhibitedness which subcategory of playfulness is. There is no significant difference at *p*<.05 level in uninhibitedness category for the six type of educational background: *F* (5, 479) = 1.05, *p* = .39. Eta square is

calculated to find effect size, it is .01. As conclusion, we can say that uninhibitedness is not affected from educational background (see the Table 4.2.2.3).

Table 4.2.2.4

ANOVA results of educational background on spontaneity

	Sum of Squares	*Df*	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Between Groups	258,454	5	51,691	4,315	,001
Within Groups	5738,610	479	11,980		
Total	5997,064	484			

The table 4.2.2.4 shows that the result of the one-way between groups ANOVA. The test was run for analysis the effect of educational background on spontaneity which subcategory of playfulness is. There is significantly difference at $p<.05$ level in spontaneity for the six type of educational background: $F (5, 479) = 4.3, p = .00$. Eta square is calculated to find effect size, it is .04. Even though there is a significant difference, the mean score between the groups is quite small. Pairwise comparison Gabriel test result shows that the mean score for Group 2 ($M = 20.4, SD = 3.3$) different from Group 3 ($M = 18.1, SD = 3.4$). Group 3 ($M = 18.1, SD = 3.4$) different from Group 4 ($M = 20.3, SD = 2.5$). In conclusion, graduated from Open University associate degree program, undergraduate program, high school spontaneity has an effect on spontaneity.

4.2.3 The Years of Experience in the Teaching Profession

The main purpose of the study is investigating the years of experience in the teaching profession influence on playfulness. In this section, one-way ANOVA results are shown and analyzing the difference between the years of experience and playfulness, fun-seeking motivation, uninhibitedness and spontaneity.

Table 4.2.3.1

Kruskal Wallis results of professional experience on playfulness

	TOTAL PLAYFULNESS
Chi-Square	8.034
df	5
Asymp. Sig.	.154

In order to compare difference between professional experience and total playfulness score, one-way ANOVA test was conducted. One prerequisite is homogeneity variance of one-way ANOVA. According to the result of Levene's test, this assumption is violated. Therefore, Kruskal Wallis test which is non-parametric test of one-way ANOVA, was used to continue analyzing. There is not significantly difference between professional experience and total playfulness scores: *H (5,479)* = 1.1, *p*= .154. To sum up, professional experience do not have effect on total playfulness of teachers (Table 4.2.3.1).

Table 4.2.3.2

ANOVA results of professional experience and fun seeking motivation

	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Between Groups	229,295	5	45,859	2,612	,024
Within Groups	8410,796	479	17,559		
Total	8640,091	484			

The impact of professional experience on fun-seeking motivation is analyzed by using one-way ANOVA. In the professional experience category participants were divided into six categories (Group 1: 0-5; Group 2: 6-10; Group 3: 11-15; Group 4: 16-20; Group 5: 21-25; Group 6: 26+). There is significant difference between professional experience and fun-seeking motivation at p<.05 level for six groups: *F (5,473)* = 2.6, *p* = .02. Although there is a significant difference, the mean scores between groups difference are quite small. The effect size was calculated by

using eta square .03. Post-hoc comparisons by Gabriel test, the result of the test indicates that the mean score for Group 1 ($M = 37.44$, $SD = 3.97$) is significantly different from Group 5 ($M = 33.66$, $SD = 2.5$). Shortly, it can be said that 0-5 years old experience and 21-25 years old experience has an impact on fun-seeking motivation (see the Table 4.2.3.2).

Table 4.2.3.3

ANOVA results of professional experience and uninhibitedness

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	8,039	5	1,608	,243	,943
Within Groups	3173,342	479	6,625		
Total	3181,381	484			

The Table 4.2.3.3 presented the analysis of ANOVA. The analysis of ANOVA result shows that the effect of professional experience is not significant, $F (5, 479) = .24$, $p = .94$. To sum up, professional experience does not have an effect on uninhibitedness features of teachers.

Table 4.2.3.4

ANOVA results of professional experience and spontaneity

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	41,540	5	8,308	,668	,648
Within Groups	5955,524	479	12,433		
Total	5997,064	484			

An analysis of variance demonstrates that the effect of professional experience on total spontaneity score is not significant, $F (5, 479) = .69$, $p = .64$ (see the Table 4.2.3.4).

4.2.4 The Type of School and Playfulness

The teachers are working in private and public schools. For the purpose of investigating the difference between type of school and playfulness, independent sample T-test was conducted. In addition, fun-seeking motivation, uninhibitedness and spontaneity was searched.

Table 4.2.4.1

T-test comparison of total playfulness in terms of type of school

Type of Inst.	n	M	SD	t	P
Public	366	73.49	8,61	-3,32	,001
Private	119	76.48	8,18		

An independent sample t-test was run to comparing mean scores of type of working institutions and total playfulness score. There is a significant difference in total score for public school ($M = 73.49$, $SD = 8.61$) and private school ($M = 76.48$, $SD = 8.18$; $t (483) = -3.32$, $p= .001$, two-tailed). The difference of .02 scale unites showed small effect (mean difference = -2.99, 95% Cl: -4.75 to -1.22). To sum up, there is a difference of teachers' who are working in public and private school total playfulness score but the variable can explain only small size effect on total playfulness score (Table 4.2.4.1).

Table 4.2.4.2

T-test comparison of fun seeking motivation in terms of type of school

Type of Inst.	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Public	366	18.73	2.52	-3.36	.001
Private	119	18.98	2.67		

The Table 4.2.4.2 shows that an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare means of type of school and fun-seeking motivation score. Teachers' who are working at public (*M* = 18.73, *SD* = 2.52) and private school (*M* = 18.98, *SD* = 2.67); *t* (483) = -3.36, *p* = .001, two-tailed, mean score is statistically difference.

Table 4.2.4.3

T-test comparison of uninhibitedness in terms of type of school

Type of Inst.	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Public	366	18.73	2.52	-3.54	.001
Private	119	18.98	2.67		

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare means of type of type of school and uninhibitedness score. Teachers' who are working at public (*M* = 18.73, *SD* = 2.52) and private school (*M* = 18.98, *SD* = 2.67); *t* (483) = -3.54, *p* = .001, two-tailed, mean score is statistically difference (see the Table 4.2.4.3).

Table 4.2.4.4

T-test comparison of spontaneity in terms of type of school

Type of Inst.	N	M	SD	t	p
Public	366	18.17	3.50	-3.42	.001
Private	119	19.42	3.40		

To compare type of school, mean score, an independent sample t-test was conducted. According to result of the statistical analysis, there is statistically difference between public school mean score ($M = 18.17$, $SD = 3.5$), and private school mean score ($M = 19.42$, $SD = 3.4$; $t (483) = -3.42$, $p= .001$, two-tailed). Despite there is difference between public and private school scores, eta square is calculated to find effect size, it found .02, there is very small difference (mean difference = -1.25, 95% *Cl:*-1.97 to -.53). Teachers' working institutions types which are private and public, can be effect teachers' spontaneity quality (Table 4.2.4.4).

4.2.5 Attending Play Course and Playfulness

Attending play course and not attending it were analyzed in the frame of the study. In order to investigate the difference between attending or not attending play course and playfulness. Moreover, fun-seeking motivation, uninhibitedness and spontaneity was searched

Table 4.2.5.1

T-test comparison of total playfulness in terms of type of play course

Attending Play Course	n	M	SD	t	p
Yes	366	73.78	8.70	-1.98	.047
No	119	75.58	8.14		

To compare attending play course mean score, an independent sample t-test was conducted. According to result of the statistical analysis, there is statistically difference between attending play course mean score (M = 73.78, SD = 8.70), and not attending mean score (M = 75.58, SD = 8.14; t (483) = -1.98, p= .047, two-tailed). Despite there is difference between attending and not attending play course, eta square is calculated to find effect size, it found .02, there is very small difference (mean difference = -1.25, 95% *Cl:*-1.97 to -.53). Although there is difference between attending play course and not attending play course, the value of the difference in the means (mean difference = -1.79, 95% *Cl:*-3.57 to -.02) is very small (eta squared = .008). Briefly, attending and not attending play course can be effect of teachers' total playfulness score (see the Table 4.2.5.1).

Table 4.2.5.2

T-test comparison of fun-seeking motivation in terms of type of play course

Attending Play Course	n	M	SD	t	p
Yes	366	36.74	4.21	-1.93	.54
No	119	37.60	4.20		

As seen in the Table 4.2.5.2, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare means of attending play course and fun-seeking motivation score. Teachers' who participated play course (M = 36.74, SD = 4.21) and not participated

play course ($M = 37.60$, $SD = 4.20$); t (483) = -1.93, p = .54, two-tailed, mean score is not statistically difference. The value of the difference in the means (mean difference = -.86, 95% $Cl:$-1.73 to .01) is very small (eta squared = .007).

Table 4.2.5.3

T-test comparison of uninhibitedness in terms of type of play course

Attending Play Course	N	M	SD	t	p
Yes	366	18.73	2.50	-.927	.357
No	119	18.98	2.73		

The Table 4.2.5.3 presents that an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare means of attending play course and uninhibitedness score. Teachers' who participated play course ($M = 18.73$, $SD = 2.50$) and not participated play course ($M = 18.98$, $SD = 2.73$); t (483) = -.92, p = .357, two-tailed, mean score is not statistically difference. The value of the difference in the means (mean difference = -.69, 95% $Cl:$-1.41 to .04) is very small (eta squared = .001).

Table 4.2.5.4

T-test comparison of spontaneity in terms of type of play course

Attending Play Course	N	M	SD	t	p
Yes	366	18.31	3.57	-1.85	.64
No	119	19.00	3.30		

As the Table 4.2.5.4 indicates that an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare means of attending play course and spontaneity score. Teachers' who participated play course ($M = 18.31$, $SD = 3.57$) and not participated

play course (M = 19.00, SD = 3,30); t (483) = -1.85, p = .64, two-tailed, mean score is non-significantly difference. The value of the difference in the means (mean difference = -.69, 95% Cl:-1.41 to .04) is very small (eta squared = .001).

4.2.6 Number of Children and Playfulness

The number of children in classroom was investigated as a variable possible variable of playfulness. In order to find differences between number of children and playfulness, fun-seeking motivation, uninhibitedness and spontaneity one-way ANOVA tests were conducted.

Table 4.2.6.1

ANOVA results of number of children effect on total playfulness

	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Between Groups	130,974	4	32,743	,441	,779
Within Groups	35671,162	480	74,315		
Total	35802,136	484			

The impact of number of children on total playfulness score is analyzed by using one-way ANOVA. In the number of children category participants were divided into 5 categories (Group 1: 10-15; Group 2: 16-20; Group 3: 21-25; Group 4: 26-30; Group 5: 30+). There is not significantly difference between number of children and total playfulness score at $p<.05$ level for five groups: F (4,480) = .44, p = .78. In sum, number of children in the class does not impact on teachers' total playfulness score (see the Table 4.2.6.1).

64

Table 4.2.6.2

ANOVA results of number of children effect on fun-seeking motivation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	51,926	4	12,982	,726	,575
Within Groups	8588,164	480	17,892		
Total	8640,091	484			

As seen in the Table 4.2.6.2, an analysis of variance test result shows that the effect of number of children is not significant, $F (4, 480) = .73$, $p = .57$. To sum up, number of children does not influence fun-seeking motivation features of teachers.

Table 4.2.6.3

ANOVA results of number of children effect on uninhibitedness

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12,513	4	3,128	,474	,755
Within Groups	3168,868	480	6,602		
Total	3181,381	484			

An analysis of variance test result shows that the effect of number of children is not significant, $F (4, 480) = .73$, $p = .57$. To sum up, number of children does not influence uninhibitedness features of teachers (see the Table 4.2.6.3).

Table 4.2.6.4

ANOVA results of number of children effect on spontaneity

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	18,713	4	4,678	,376	,826
Within Groups	5978,351	480	12,455		
Total	5997,064	484			

A one-way between groups ANOVA was run for analysis the effect of number of children on spontaneity which is subcategory of playfulness. There is non-significantly difference at $p<.05$ level in spontaneity for the five number of student categories: $F(4, 479) =, 38, p = .826$. Briefly, the number of children in a class does not impact on teacher's spontaneity (see the Table 4.2.6.4).

4.2.7 Attending Professional Development and Playfulness

The teachers' attending professional development about play was analyzed as a possible factor of playfulness. T-test analyses were chosen to investigate the difference between attending play course attending professional development about play or not and playfulness, fun-seeking motivation, uninhibitedness and spontaneity.

Table 4.2.7.1

T-test comparison of total playfulness in terms of play professional development

Attending Prof. Dev.	n	M	SD	t	p
Yes	324	74.40	8.68	-.618	.537
No	161	73.88	8.44		

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare means of attending professional development activities about play and total playfulness score. Teachers' who participated professional development activities about play ($M = 74.40$, $SD = 8.68$) and not participated professional development activities about play ($M = 73.88$, $SD = 8.44$); $t(483) = -618$, $p = .54$, two-tailed, mean score is non-significantly difference. The value of the difference in the means (mean difference = -.51, 95% *Cl:* -2.14 to 1.11) is very small (eta squared = .000). In conclusion, the attending

professional activities about play does not affect teachers' total playfulness score (see the Table 4.2.7.1).

Table 4.2.7.2

T-test comparison of fun-seeking motivation in terms of play professional development

Attending Prof. Dev. Activities	n	M	SD	t	p
Yes	324	37.04	4.32	-639	.523
No	161	36.78	4.02		

As seen in the Table 4.2.7.2, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare means of attending professional development activities about play and fun-seeking score. Teachers' who participated professional development activities about play ($M = 37.04$, $SD = 4.32$) and not participated professional development activities about play ($M = 36.78$, $SD = 4.02$); t (483) = -639, $p = .52$, two-tailed, mean score is non-significantly difference. The value of the difference in the means (mean difference = -.26, 95% *Cl:* -1.06 to .54) is very small (eta squared = .000).

Table 4.2.7.3

T-test comparison of uninhibitedness in terms of play professional development

Attending Prof. Dev. Activities	n	M	SD	t	p
Yes	324	18.86	2.55	-82	.413
No	161	18.65	2.59		

As presented in the Table 4.2.7.3, to compare attending professional development activities about play score, an independent sample t-test was conducted. According to result of the statistical analysis, there is no statistically difference between attending professional development activities about play mean score ($M = 18.86$, $SD = 2.55$), and not attending professional development activities about play mean score ($M = 18.65$, $SD = 2.59$; $t (483) = -.82$, $p= .413$, two-tailed).

Table 4.2.7.4

T-test comparison of spontaneity in terms of play professional development

Attending Prof. Dev. Activities	n	M	SD	t	p
Yes	324	18.49	3.56	-146	.884
No	161	18.44	3.50		

As seen at Table 4.2.7.4, to compare attending professional development activities about play score, an independent sample t-test was conducted. According to result of the statistical analysis, there is no statistically difference between attending professional development activities about play mean score ($M = 18.49$, $SD = 3.56$), and not attending professional development activities about play mean score ($M = 18.44$, $SD = 3.50$; $t (483) = -.146$, $p= .884$, two-tailed).

4.2.8 Participating Volunteer Activities and Playfulness

Participating volunteer activities were investigated as a variable of playfulness. In order to analyses the difference between participating volunteer activities or not participating and playfulness, fun-seeking motivation, uninhibitedness and spontaneity.

Table 4.2.8.1

T-test comparison of total playfulness in terms of attending activities as volunteer

Attending Volunteer. Activities	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Yes	276	75.22	8.08	2.75	.006
No	201	73.03	9.18		

Although 485 participants' data were analyzed so far, in this analysis 477 participants' data could be used, because there were missing values. An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare means of attending volunteer activities and total playfulness score. Teachers' who participated activities as volunteer (*M* = 75.22, *SD* = 8.08) and not participated activities as volunteer (*M* = 73.03, *SD* = 9.18); *t* (475) = 2.75, *p* = .006, two-tailed, mean score is significantly difference. The value of the difference in the means (mean difference = 2.18, 95% *Cl:* .63 to 3.75) is very small (eta squared = .01). To conclude, attending activities as volunteer has an impact on teachers' total playfulness score (see the Table 4.2.8.1).

Table 4.2.8.2

Mann-Whitney U comparison of fun-seeking motivation in terms of attending activities as volunteer

Attending Volunteer. Activities	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*T*	*p*
Yes	276	38.00	3.89	23.73	.007
No	201	36.00	4.58		

As seen in the Table 4.2.8.2, to compare attending activities as volunteer, independent sample t-test was conducted. However, the data set could not be provided violation, for this reason, A Man Whitney test which is non-parametric test of independent sample t-test, was used. A Man-Whitney U test demonstrates that attending activities as volunteer (*Mdn*=38) is significantly greater than not participated activities as volunteer (*Mdn*= 36), $U = 23.73$, $p = .007$.

Table 4.2.8.3

T-test comparison of uninhibitedness in terms of attending activities as volunteer

Attending Volunteer. Activities	n	M	SD	t	p
Yes	276	19.10	2.49	2.99	.003
No	201	18.39	2.61		

As presented in the Table 4.2.8.3, to compare attending activities as volunteer score, an independent sample t-test was conducted. According to result of the statistical analysis, there is statistically difference between attending activities as volunteer mean score ($M = 19.10$, $SD = 2.49$), and not attending activities as volunteer mean score ($M = 18.39$, $SD = 2.61$; $t (477) = 2.99$, $p= .003$, two-tailed).

Table 4.2.8.4

T-test comparison of spontaneity in terms of attending activities as volunteer

Attending Volunteer. Activities	n	M	SD	t	p
Yes	276	18.68	3.31	1.13	.257
No	201	18.31	3.77		

The Table 4.2.8.4 shows an independent sample t-test result. The test was conducted to compare means of attending activities as volunteer and spontaneity score. Teachers' who participated activities voluntarily (M = 18.68, SD = 3.31) and not participated activities voluntarily (M = 18.31, SD = 3.77); t (475) = 1.13, p = .26, two-tailed, mean score is non-significantly difference. The value of the difference in the means (mean difference = .37, 95% Cl: -.27 to 1.01) is very small (eta squared = .000).

4.3 Results of Qualitative Study

In this part, the findings from the interviews with the teachers (n=20) will be presented. The qualitative part of the study aimed to take a deep understanding about teacher's playfulness views and their self-reported play behaviors in classroom. Their responses were summarized and interpreted according to interview questions. The results are demonstrated based on the teachers' self-reported practices and their views on play and playfulness as well. Moreover, the years of experience and total playfulness scores of teachers along with their leisure time activities will be presented to give a clear view on the characteristics of teachers regarding playfulness.

Investigating early childhood in-service teachers' playfulness traits and views on playfulness is the main purpose of the study. One of the variables which was investigated in the current study is professional experience. For this reason, teachers' who participated to interview part year of experience and total playfulness score was given in Table 9. In this way, the mixed method study's result that is gathered through qualitative and quantitative studies' findings could be discussed with comments. The teachers' who participated in the qualitative part mean score was found 71.2. The mean score of the population was found 74.2. The lowest score of the population is 46 and the highest score is 94. The lowest score is 51 and the highest score is 93 of the sample of the qualitative study. The sample of the qualitative part reflect the population's characteristics of the study.

The results show that teachers' playfulness does not depend on years of experience because the total playfulness score does not show consistently increasing or decreasing regarding the years of experience. The table demonstrates that the highest playfulness score belongs to the teacher (T14) who had 6- 10 years of experience in the profession. On the contrary, the lowest score owns to the teacher (T7) with 6-10 years of experience as well (see Table 4.3.1).

Table 4.3.1
The Year of Experience and Total Playfulness Scores

Participants	Year of Experience	Total Playfulness Score
T7	6-10	51
T9	16-20	63
T4	6-10	67
T13	6-10	69
T1	16-20	70
T8	0-5	70
T5	6-10	73
T10	0-5	73
T20	6-10	73
T2	6-10	75
T12	16-20	75
T19	6-10	76
T18	26+	77
T3	6-10	78
T16	0-5	78
T11	16-20	80
T6	16-20	81
T15	6-10	90
T17	6-10	90
T14	6-10	93

Teachers' most liked characteristic was asked for them. The characteristic is determined according to literature. The codings were arranged under eight categories. Most of the teachers reported that they are *easy-going* (n=6), *positive* (n=5), *calm* (n=5), and some of them stated that they are *curious* (n=4), *responsible* (n=3), *active* (n=1), *mature* (n=1), and *funny* (n=1). Most of the teachers show easy-going, positive and calm characteristic. The findings show that the teachers' characteristics are parallel with playfulness qualities (see Table 4.3.2).

Table 4.3.2

Most likely qualities of teachers

Categories	Codes
Easy-going	• Thoughtful (n=2)
	• Friendly (n=2)
	• Adoptable (n=2)
Positive	• Positive (n= 4)
	• Optimist (n=1)
Calm	• Patient (n=3)
	• Relaxed (n=2)
Curious	• Like searching (n=2)
	• Open-minded (n=2)
Responsible	• Mature (n=1)
	• On time (n=1)
	• Responsbile (n=1)
Active	• Active (n=1)
Mature	• Mature (n=1)
Funny	• Funny and cheerful (n=1)

*Each participant gives more than one answer.

Some of the exemplary quotes are shown below:

Most of the teachers (n=5) stated that they are easy-going person. Some exemplary quotes are given below:

I can easily adaptable in situation. (T10).

I am compassionate, I like my compassionate personality. (T13)

The teachers (n=5) defined themselves as positive, the comments of the teachers are given below:

I am positive, and I can easily adoptable. (T6)

I am positive, I try to keep continue a day well if I experienced something bad (T2).

Some of the teachers said that they are calm (n=5). The exemplary quote is as follows:

I am patient and I like my characteristic. (T7)

A few teachers stated that they are responsible. One of the comments is shown at below:

Firstly, I am responsible person, I can never tolerate disrespect. I hate to wait and I am generally on-time person. Moreover, I am a cautious person, I do not leave anything to chance, I have always another plan. (T5).

In order to support findings regarding the teachers' playfulness characteristics and make the connection between quantitative and qualitative results, questions include their leisure time activities were asked to the participant teachers. Their responds were categorized based on codings. The teachers expressed that they generally have fun from their life and most of them (n=15) have spare time for themselves. The teachers respond to the question as doing things they enjoyed (n = 15). Moreover, their leisure time activities seem to impact from their lifestyle because they expressed that they spend their leisure time with their family (n = 13). The other leisure time activities of the teachers are like searching about their profession (n = 9), being with their friends (n = 6), doing something active (n = 4), going to new places (n = 3), being in their house (n = 3), feeling good about themselves (n = 2), doing new things (n = 1), and they do not have leisure time (n = 3) (As seen Table 4.3.3).

74

Table 4.3.3

Leisure time activities

Leisure Time Act.	*N*
Do things I enjoyed	• Reading a book (n=9) • Watching a movie (n=3) • Shopping (n=2) • Listening to music (n=2) •
Be with my family	• Spent time with own child (n=11) • Spent time with child and husband (n=1) • Spent time with relative (n=1)
Do something about professional things	• Search about profession on internet(n=5) • Attending course (n=2) • Search about educational approaches (n=1) • Do something with children (n=1)
Be with my friends	• Spending time with friends (n=4) • Chatting with friends (n=1) • Meeting with friends (n=1)
Do something active	• Do sport (n=4) • Walking (n=1)
Go new places	• Visit new places (n=3) • Take a walk (n=1)
Be in my house	• Do smth.at home by myself (n=1) • Play at home (n=1) • Sleep at home (n=1)
No leisure time	• Not have lesisure time (n=3)
Feel good about myself	• Do smth.to reward myself (n=1) • Separate yourself time (n=1)

*Each participant gives more than one answer.

Most of the teachers responded the question as doing things they enjoyed (n = 15), they do activities which are entertaining for them. Some of the exemplary quotes are illustrated below:

> I watch a movie with my husband, and I play with my sons. (T6)

> I am watching movie, listening to music, reading book, walking in nature, and go shopping. (T2)

The teachers pointed out that they spend their leisure time with their family (n=13). Exemplary quotes are like that:

> I clean house in leisure time, and I spend time with my children, I have two children. (T13)

> I have a child, 11 years old, we do something with her mostly we are chatting. I watch a movie with my husband. (T6)

The teachers responded the question as search about their professional (n = 9), they are searching from the internet at their leisure time about their profession.

> I like search about my profession, I like to find different activities for class, think and make changes on current activities. (T4)

> I like reading book, especially about personality growth topic. I like activities which improve my personal development, for example, I was participating in training when I was a teacher at the center of city. (T7)

In addition, some of the teachers stated that they spend time with their friends (n=6) at their leisure time. The teachers' comments are given below:

> I visit my cousin, she has a little girl, and I spend time with her daughter. I watch movie, read a book, and spend time with my friend. (T5)

> I spent most of time with my friends. (T19)

Some of the teachers reported that they are active and do not like being stable. For this reason, they like doing something active (n = 4) in their leisure time. Some exemplary quotes are given below:

> I do sport and travel at my leisure time. (T3)

> I do Pilates in my leisure time. Doing Pilates is a lifestyle for me anymore. (T18).

Other teachers stated that they like going new places at their leisure time (n = 3), their comments are like that:

> I like travel and visit new places, in recent years I try to travel more. (T8)

> I like travel and go new places. For this reason, when I have leisure time, I try to go different place. (T16)

Some of the teachers expressed that they do not like going outside and they are in their house (n = 3) at leisure time because they do more stable activities. The comments of the teachers are below:

> If I am tired, I like resting at home, I like staying at home alone. (T2)

> I like sleep very much at my leisure time, listening music and reading book are another activities. (T8)

Some of the teachers stated that no leisure time (n=3). They do not evaluate spending time with children as leisure time. Being with families is not perceived as leisure time activities from the teachers. Exemplary quotes are shown below:

> In my leisure time I interested with my children, I do not have leisure time much. (T9)

> I do not have leisure time, my time is spent around, child-husband and house (T14)

The other teachers report that has something felt good about themselves (n=2), one of them stated that

> I eat chips to reward myself. (T6)

4.3.1 Teachers' Self-Reported Practices and Views on Play

In this part, the teachers' self-reported practices and views on the play were explained regarding the teachers' play preferences and their role in class, the teachers' play preferences and role at free play time. Finally, positive effects of play were mentioned, according to the teachers' report.

The researcher asked to the teachers if they like to play or not. Some of the teachers responded as "no" (*n = 4)* and some of them responded as "yes" (*n = 16*). Then, the teachers' play preferences were investigated. Their play selection in class time and also their play role asked for them to understand their play habits.

4.3.1.1 Play preferences and role of teachers in class

The teachers play preferences and their role to play at class time results will be given in this part. They allow time play activities within a day besides free play time. The teachers' type of play selection at class time is very close to each other. The teachers prefer motor play (*n = 11*), social play (*n = 7*), educational play (*n = 6*), object play (*n = 4*), symbolic play (*n = 2*). The results show that teachers want that all children participate to play; in addition, they also participate to play with children. Competitive game is generally chosen as motor play, because this kind of plays are both active and a whole group activity. In addition, the type of play is decided according to children's interests (see Table 4.3.4).

Table 4.3.4

Teachers' play preferences during activity time

Type of Play	*n=20*
Motor play	• Active game (n=3) • Competitive game (n=3) • Traditional game (n=2) • Garden game (n=2) • Physical game (n=1)
Social play	• Group plays (n=6) • Circle games (n=1)
Educational play	• Brain teaser (n=3) • School readiness games (n=2) • Chess (n=1)
Object play	• Play with materials (n=2) • Play with table games (n=2)
Symbolic play	• Dramatic play (n=2)

*Each participant gives more than one answer.

More than half of the teachers prefer motor play *(n=11)* play at classroom, because they reported that children like this kind of plays. The teachers' exemplary quotes were given below:

> We play all kinds of games at classroom. Sometimes competitive games are played. For example, for school readiness, addition and subtraction activities have been transformed a game for children like them. We have a good time at classroom by this way (T11).

> In order to enjoy, we play motor play, the atmosphere of the class is directing you (T19).

The number of teachers (*n* = 7) pointed out that they choose social play in class, because they argue that this type of play allows them to play together as a whole group. The teacher comments are like that:

> Depending on my observation, I can say that children like games which teachers participate, therefore I prefer group play and we play all together (T13).

> We play all kinds of play, it is up to children's interest. For example, we go outside and play 'kutu kutu pense' or warm up to each other, and developmental games (T3).

One of the popular types of play is educational play (*n* = 6) among the teachers. The comments of the teachers are given below:

> I give priority brain-boosting games, such as domino, puzzle, matching shapes, colors, and numbers (T18).

> Improving children's attention, brain-boosting, and table games are played in our class (T6).

> The teachers stated that they choose object play (*n* = 4), because children like play with materials. The exemplary quotas are given below:

> I like game with material and children also like these games, instead of without material, they prefer playing with material (T7).

> We play with materials such as Jenga materials, but we do not Jenga, I change it. In addition, I prefer playing without materials to improve children's creativity (T8).

The teachers reported that they select symbolic play ($n = 2$) as well and they participate in the children's play. The exemplary quotas like that:

If they play with blocks I also participate their play or while symbolic play I am included their play and I put some educational values on their play. (T16)

We play dramatic game, children like this kind of play, they love being hospitable (T13).

A teacher (T20) stated that;

I play all kinds of play at class both structured and unstructured.

Besides the type of play at activity time, teachers' roles during play time was asked. The teachers reported that they generally play at activity time with children. The teachers are playing with children as a child. According to responds of the teachers the most selected roles are in activity time is *co-player* ($n = 18$). Besides co-player, teachers are *stage manager* ($n = 14$), and the teachers are *onlooker role* ($n = 3$) while children play in the classroom at activity time. The teachers are usually co-player role ($n=18$) at activity time in the classroom. On the other hand, they rarely choose an onlooker role ($n=3$) at the activity time. Table 4.3.5 examines that the teachers play roles at activity time.

Table 4.3.5
Play roles of teachers at activity time

Play Role	*N*
Co- player	• Playmate (n=18)
Stage manager	• Play maker (n=13) • Guide (n=3) • Prepare materials (n=2)
Onlooker	• Observing children (n=3)

*Each participant gives more than one answer.

Most of the teachers (*n*=18) responded that they participate as co-player. Teachers mentioned that they are interested with children's play, they do not spare time to another thing in activity time play. The exemplary quotes were given below:

> I guide children to solve their problems about play. I choose a leader for a play. The leader is always changing, I would like for every child be the leader. I have a generally fun from a play that I am my unique role. (T6)

> If I have an intern, we participate in the game, but if I have not an intern, generally I direct play, open-close music etc. Mostly, I participate in play, in a different way. If I do not participate in their play, time is not running. (T15)

The teachers believe that they participate children's play as a stage manager (*n*=14). The teachers added that they mostly teach the rules of play and they start it. In addition, they observe children and interfere children if they need. The teachers' comments were like that:

> Firstly, I explain the game and then I play with them, if there is a child who do not have a partner, I match with his/her. (T10)

> Until children learn the rules of the game, I play with them, then I leave the play and I observe them, if they need help, I interfere their play. (T18)

Some of the teachers stated that they have onlooker role (*n*=3), they observe children and they do not interfere with their play. They illustrate their ideas like that:

> I observe children while they are playing, sometimes I participate their play (T2)

> I do not participate their play, I generally observe them. (T8)

4.3.1.2 Play preferences and role of teachers at free play time

The teachers' play preferences and their role to play at the free play time is another part of qualitative results. Teachers' free play time roles and selecting an activity type will be presented in this section. The results imply that the teachers tend to play. Teachers may play at activity time for the aim of teaching something to

children, but they do not target teaching something at free play time, so how they spend their time at this part of the day is important to study.

Free play time play preferences show differences when compared with activity time play preferences. The teachers prefer is *educational play type* (n = 7), *free play* (*n = 7*), and *symbolic play* (n = 7), *object play* (n=4)*, and motor play* (*n = 3*). According to the responds of the teachers, they enhance educational play (n=7) at free play time. Symbolic play is chosen by the teachers as well based on their responses, since they reported that the teachers observe children at that time to deeply understand their inner world. In addition, they choose free play (n=7) at free play time because the teachers believe that free play is more pleasurable for children (see Table 4.3.6).

Table 4.3.6

Teachers' play preferences in free play time

Type of Play	*N*
Educational play	• Educational toys (n=4) • Brain teaser games (n=3)
Free play	• Let play in different centers (n=4) • Play fulfill their wishes (n=3)
Symbolic play	• Dramatic play (n=7)
Object play	• Play with blocks (n=2) • Play with different materials (n=2)
Motor play	• Active play (n=2) • Doing sport (n=1)

*Each participant gives more than one answer.

Most of the teachers stated that they enhance educational play (*n*=7) for free play time. The exemplary quotes were given below:

> They mostly play with Lego, I believe that Lego is beneficial toys. They sometimes play, pretend play, but I do not support pretend play, educational toys, and puzzles are most beneficial for children. (T5)

> I would like to play with educational toys, but this change according to children's interest. In the rural area children do not interested with educational toys. Boys play with cars and girls play with dolls. However, I wish children play with puzzle, educational toys because these kinds of toys improve children's creativity. (T10)

> I give chess to children to play or for girl I direct them to dramatic play center. (T9)

The teachers reported that they allow children to free play (*n*=7) at free playtime. Children play as their wishes. The comments of the teachers are like that:

> Sometimes I support motor play, sometimes brain-boosting games, puzzles, their own built play, I do not interfere with them, and they are free to choose their play. (T20)

> Sometimes I let them play whatever they play, they get more pleasure in this way. (T3)

Teachers stated that they support symbolic play (*n*=7) at free play time because they reported that the play gives clue about children's inner world. Some comments of the teachers are given below:

> I support pretend play at free play time because children learn life at pretend play. Pretend play is not waste of time for me, I think that it is important for children development. (T18)

> Children like to pretend play at free play time. Boys play with cars, and role as mother-father. 3 years old like also play with books they tell theirexperience, for example, the child said that 'Don't cry, we buy a chocolate for you. (T13)

The teachers support object play (*n=4*) as well, the teacher said that they supply objects for children to play at free play time. Exemplary quotas were demonstrated below:

I give materials to children at free play time, sometimes children play with materials which I prepared at home. I try to make Montessori materials by myself. Children play with them at free play time. (T4)

I prefer Lego, and children also like playing with Lego because it is beneficial for children's fine motor skills, also I support play pretend play. (T2).

Motor play (*n*=3) is preferred by the teachers for free play time, the exemplary quotas are shown below:

Firstly, I choose rather motor play because by this way children throw away their surplus energy and they can more easily adapt to educational activities. (T19)

I prefer children play with materials which about physical education, for example, we have badminton racket and I try t0 include different materials for children play. (T8)

The teachers' role to play at free play time was also asked for them. Their responds are different when comparing to play role at activity time. According to their responses the teachers prefer *onlooker role (*n = 17*)*. They prefer to observe children because children reflect themselves at the free play time. Some teachers stated that they participate children's play, so they have *co-player role* (n = 6). They generally join children's play if the children include the teachers. U*ninvolved play role* (n = 5) is also selected because they reported that in the free play time they busy with paper work or preparing their daily activity. D*irector role* (n = 4) is preferred since they direct children to different learning centers. In addition, a teacher prepares learning center based on current topics of the day for free play time, therefore, her role is *stage manager* (n = 1) at free play time. The teachers pointed out that they mostly prefer to observe children at free play time. The result of both their play preferences and the role of play is support the idea (see Table 4.3.7).

Table 4.3.7

Teachers' role at free play time

Play Role		*N*
Onlooker	•	Observe children (n=17)
Co- player	•	Play mates (n=6)
Uninvolved	•	Do paper work (n=3)
	•	Prepare environment (n=2)
Director	•	Direct children to center (n=3)
	•	Interfere children's play (n=1)
Stage manager	•	Prepare center (n=1)

*Each participant gives more than one answer.

The teachers stated that they prefer onlooker role (*n*=16), the exemplary quotes were shown at below:

> At free play time, I observe children, I ask questions to them about what they did in order to get deeply informed about their activities. For example, if a child drew a drawing, I ask for her/him tell the drawing. (T3)

> I do not interfere them at free play time, I just observe because they reflected everything at that time. I want that children forget me and behave naturally at free play time. (T7)

The teachers reflected that they select co-player role (*n*=6), their comments are like that:

> I observe them, firstly, and then I join a children's game who needs to improve play. I generally try to join with children who are special needs. (T16)

> I participate in them, in dramatic play they make a cake for me and I eat it. I pretend like them. (T17)

Some of the teachers stated that they choose an uninvolved role (*n*=5) at free play time. Their comments are as follows:

I observe them, and I prepare my activities such as choosing a story, look at daily plan, and prepare art activities. (T9)

There are 25 children in class, so I cannot get enough of myself. Therefore, I have prepared my activities at free play time. (T15)

Director role (*n*=4) is also selected by teachers, some exemplary quotes are shown below:

I observe them and sometimes I direct them to different play or different center. (T20)

We start free play time with sport, then I direct them to learning center, then I observe their play. (T18)

One of the teachers (T6) expressed that select stage manager role, she stated that *"I try to build temporary learning center and I make them play in this center."*

The researcher asked to teachers if they like playing or not. Some teachers responded as "no" (*n* = 4*)* and some of them responded as "yes" (*n* = 16). Then, they mentioned why they like playing. In addition, teachers believe that play is beneficial not only for children but also adults. Teachers emphasized that play has *fun* (n = 8*)*, *improves adult-child bond* (n = 2), has *self- healing effect* (n = 2), and is a *learning tool* (n = 1). The teachers pointed out that they have fun from play and they mentioned positive effects of the play as having fun. The finding is predicted that the play is a behavior that comes from within the teachers. The Table 4.3.8 examines the teachers' view on positive effect on play.

Table 4.3.8
Positive effect on play

Positive Effect	*N*
Have fun	• Give me pleasure (n=5) • Feel like children (n=1) • An entertainment way (n=1) • Take away surplus energy (n=1)
Improve adult-child bonds	• Earn memory with child (n=1) • Children like playing adult (n=1)
Learning tool	• Teach children by play (n=1)
Self-healing	• Feel and reflect different emotions (n=1)

*Each participant gives more than one answer.

The teachers responded that they play because the play has fun (*n*=8), their exemplary quotas are given below:

> I have fun while playing. Play is the first thing to entertain kids when there is monotony in class. Play changes the atmosphere of the classroom and me at those times. Play makes me excited (T14).

> Because play makes me happy, and I can throw away surplus energy. I love the tiredness that I feel while playing. I like the activity because I can use my whole body (T16).

The teachers believe that play impress in adult-child bond (*n*=2), their comments are as follows:

> We are playing at home with whole family members. I lost myself while play and we spend good time with my children. This is our special activity. We are collecting memories while playing (T11).

> I play not only my students; I also play with older children at my school. They wait end of my lesson to play with me. I play with them volleyball, football, dodgeball, etc. Play strengthens communication with children (T17).

One teacher stated that the play is a learning tool for children; *"I think that children learn best while playing"* (T13). For another participant play has self-healing effect. She stated that *"You are creating a different condition in play, you are different, and you can feel different emotions while playing"* (T2).

4.3.2 Teachers' Playfulness View

4.3.2.1 Teachers' view on characteristic of playful people

The teachers' view on the characteristic of playful people is presented in this part of the result. In order to learn how teachers define and evaluate playfulness, the researcher asked them if there is any playful adult around them and how they decide the person is playful. The teachers said that there is a *playful person around them* (n = 17), the playful adults are from their colleagues, their families, and social media phenomenon. Moreover, the teachers commented that there is *no playful person around them* (n = 3).

The responds of the teachers to the question which is why the people is playful. The teachers define a playful person as an individual who *likes playing* (n = 14), is *happy* (n = 5), *energetic* (n = 3), *friendly* (n = 1), and positive (n = 1). More than half of the teachers define playful people as a person like play, the main criteria to be playful is perceived as liking playing with kids. In sum, they mentioned personality characteristic like happy, and energetic which are already observed in the playfulness literature. But they barely mentioned happy and energetic personalities when compared with liking play responds' frequency (see Table 4.3.9).

Table 4.3.9

Playful people characteristic according to the teacher

Characteristic of playful people	*N*
Like play	• Play with children (n=10) • Like play (n=4)
Energetic	• Show high performance (n=2) • Active (n=1)
Positive	• Look at positive side (n=2) • Perceive life as play (n=1)
Happy	• Like being happy (n=1)
Friendly	• Love people and nature (n=1)

*Each participant gives more than one answer.

Most of the teachers said that liking play (*n*=14) show that a person is playful. The following quotes of the teachers about the question are that:

> My step father is a playful person because he plays with children and he really like it. When he was a child, he made his toys by himself and he played at outdoor. (T6)

> When I was a child, we played very well with my aunt. She liked to play with us. (T11)

Other characteristics that are collected from the teacher's answers is being positive (*n*=3), so playful people are likewise perceived as positive people by the participant and the quotation marks used by the teachers to explain this characteristic is that:

There are my colleagues, they are positive. (T2)

There are my friends. They love life and are happy, so they like to play. If they do not love life and are happy, they do not play anyway. (T7)

Being energetic (*n*=3) is seen another playful characteristic by some of the teachers. There are also some exemplary quotes provided below for clearer understanding:

We have a neighbor, she is a grandmother, my daughter loves her because they play, jumping rope, hiding play… They have over surplus energy. (T13)

I follow a teacher from Instagram. Even she is older, she is very active, and this performance at this age is amazing. (T1)

Another characteristic is happy (*n*=1) that is used to describe a playful person by the teachers. The teachers (T18) stated that *"she tries to tell everything by play and always act like drama in her daily life I said that she is playful person. She perceives life as a play..."*

One of the teachers defined being playful by being friendly (*n*=1). The quotes used by teachers to explain being friendly stated: *"They love the environment, children, and animals"* (T2).

The teachers' comments about other people's playfulness characteristic will be compared with comments on self-reflection about playfulness. For this purpose, the teachers asked firstly whether they are a playful person or not and then, why they think that they are a playful person. Teachers reported that they are playful (*n* = 11), participants considered that they are not playful (*n* = 9). The teachers pointed out why they are playful by saying that; they like play (*n* = 9); they are creating a play (*n* = 2), they enjoy in their life (*n* = 2); and positive (*n* = 2). Most of the teachers interpret them as a playful person. As mentioned before, teachers define a playful person as who like play. In this manner, it can be said that the teachers' playful

person definition is matching and the teachers related playfulness with play (see Table 4.3.10).

Table 4.3.10
Teachers' own playful characteristics

Personality Characteristic	*N=15*
Like play	• Like play with children (n=5) • Like play (n=3) • Like play as children (n=1)
Happy	• Enjoy with life (n=1) • Like being cheerful (n=1)
Creative	• Like create game (n=2)
Positive	• Look at positive side (n=2)

*Each participant gives more than one answer.

To explain their own playfulness characteristics, again, most of the teachers used like play (*n=9*) term, and the exemplary quotes include some of the ideas by teachers:

I enjoyed while playing in the classroom, so I like play. (T14)

I participate play at the seminar, if I cannot player, I get angry as a child. (T3)

Being happy (n=2) is another characteristic that the teachers used to define their playfulness. The exemplary quotes below:

I like fun and I get pleasure from my life. (T19)

I get pleasure from my life, my profession, and while playing with children and adults. (T2)

Creativity (*n=2*) is a characteristic which the teachers defined as a part of their playfulness. The quote is given below about the characteristic:

I like play, but I also add something to play and create new play. (T4)

Two of the teachers defined playfulness by being positive (n=2), and she explains likes that: *"I try to be positive and always look positive side of events"* (T7).

4.3.2.2 Factors of Decreasing Playfulness

The teachers who do not interpret themselves as playfulness were asked to why they are not playful anymore. Their comments give information about factors which impact playfulness negatively. The teachers reported that increasing *responsibility* (n = 4), *personality trait* (n = 2), *family attitude* (n = 2), *social roles* (n = 1), and *age* (n = 1), cause to decrease playfulness level in adulthood period. Growing is the main reason of decreasing playfulness according to teachers, because most of the teachers (n=4) report that increasing responsibility lead to decreasing playfulness. In addition, social roles and age are connected with growing as well. Furthermore, obviously the teachers again associate playfulness with play because they explain factors as cause to decrease their play time or play behavior (see Table 4.3.11).

Table 4.3.11
Factors of teachers' low playfulness

Factor	N
Responsibility	• Take the life seriously (n=1) • Exam stress (n=1) • Starting school (n=1) • Being adult (n=1)
Personality	• Personality traits (n=2)
Family attitude	• Family attitudes to play (n=2)
Social role	• Expecting be inactive (n=1)
Age	• Increasing age (n=1)

*Each participant gives more than one answer.

Most of the teachers stated that increasing responsibility (n=4) is an effect of decreasing playfulness. Their exemplar quotas are represented below:

> You see a more serious side of life in the exam year because you always study. Otherwise, I liked playing when I was a child. I always played with my baby doll. After beginning to school and lessons were intensifying, I caused to decrease play time. (T5)

> When you are a child, you just think about play, but when you have grown, responsibility is increasing and playfulness is decreasing. In addition, if you are a working mother, your job is more difficult. (T12)

The teachers emphasized that personality (*n*=2) is the cause of the low playfulness of adults, the following quotas providing the result:

> I think that it is about my personality characteristic. (T1)

The teachers commented that family attitude is reason of low playfulness. A teacher (T10) explained like that:

> I did not go to kindergarten, and my family did not play with me.

One of the teachers (T8) commented that social role (n=1) has an impact on playfulness. The teacher said that *"I believe that social role cause to decrease playfulness because people require different kind of matter instead of play."* Another teacher (T1) cited that age is affected negatively playfulness. Her assertion is like that *"Maybe age is another factor of decreasing playfulness."*

The teachers' opinion were asked about why children are not playing even they are children. In order to get answers from the teachers of the question, factors which caused to prevent children play in class were asked to the teachers. The teachers reported that children do not want to play because of their *personality* (*n = 9*), then *child rearing attitude* (n = 6) affect children's playfulness. If children are not happy at home, they do not want to play according to teachers comment so *stressful situation at home* (n = 5) is another reason. Furthermore, p*eer relation* (n = 4) impacts children's playfulness, *technological devices* (n = 3) is another factor. Children play with the tablet and computer and watch TV, therefore, they cannot set

play with their friends. P*hysical environment* (n = 3) as a factor of decreasing children's playfulness such as desirable play and accessing toys are impacted children's playful behavior in the classroom. The findings reveal that most of the teachers think that, personality is a factor of playfulness. Even so, the other factors are examined, it can be predicted that parental issues and environment can affect children's playfulness (see Table 4.3.12).

Table 4.3.12
Factors of children's low playfulness

Factor	N
Personality	• Personality trait (n=5) • Being shy (n=2) • Low-self esteem (n=2)
Childrearing attitudes	• Protective family (n=2) • Uninterested family attitudes (n=2) • Growing with adult (n=2)
Stressful situation at home	• Being unhappy because of family (n=5)
Peer relation	• Peer communication (n=3) • Social environment (n=1)
Technology	• Playing with tablet and telephone (n=3)
Physical environment	• Accesible of materials (n=2) • Rich environment (n=1)

*Each participant gives more than one answer.

Personality (*n*=9) is shown as a reason of low playfulness in childhood period. The teachers' exemplary quotes are like that:

The nature of the child, the temperament can be effective. While observing them at free play time, I can understand that they are happy from their facial expression. (T8)

They do not like or participate play because of their personality characteristics, there is no such matter as every child love play. (T19)

The teachers responded the question as child-rearing attitudes (*n*=6) of parents have role of children's playfulness, the exemplary quotes are as follows:

These kinds of children do not know how they play, because their parent has not been played so far. The parent has not created a play environment at home, the child's play behavior is affected negatively on such an occasion. (T15)

Family is a factor of children's love play or not. Until come school, children were with adults or because of child-rearing attitudes they did not allow children to play with other children at the apartment. Sometimes parents do not know how they behave with children, they are either too protector or too rule based. (T6)

Some children have not been in society before because of their parental structure, these kinds of children are shy. For this reason, they do not prefer play. (T4)

Children's stressful situations at home (*n*=5) are a possible factor of children's low playfulness or do not like the play, the exemplary quotes are given below:

Parental situation impacts on children's play behavior because if children are not happy at home, they do not desire to play when they come to school. (T5)

Absolutely, unhappy parent life prevents to children get pleasure from play. (T11)

The teachers signed to peer relation (n=4) factor on children's playfulness. The teachers' comments are like that:

Peer relation impacts their playfulness. Children do not participate play to get used to their peer. (T7)

Peer relation impacts children's playfulness. Play needs of socially active children. I observe that children are more successful while playing if they are social. (T16)

Technology (*n*=3) has shown reason of children's low playfulness or do not like the play, the teachers' comments are as follows:

> Technological devices prevent children's play, they cannot set play when they come together because of tablet and TV. (T1)

> Children who addicted to tablet, PC and TV at a very young age, thus, they do not get pleasure from play. (T18)

The teachers commented that the physical environment (*n*=3) has a role on children's playfulness; the exemplary quotes are given below:

> Firstly, knows children, then as teachers you should set attractive play for children. (T10)

> Environment, accessible and peer relation impact children's playfulness. For example, my children prefer toys instead of peer, on the other hand a child in the city, prefer peer. (T12)

4.4 Summary of the Qualitative Results

In this part, the result of the qualitative part is shown as summary by using key findings.

4.4.1 Summary of Self-Reported Practices on Play

In the self-reported practices on play, teachers mentioned their play types and role preferences regarding activity and free play time. In this part, their most important ideas are presented.

Table 4.4.1

Key findings of teachers' self-reported practices on play

Self- reported practices on play
• Teachers reported that children like active games and they are happy while playing active games. • Teachers think that children feel themselves worthier when teacher play with them. • Most of the teachers stated that observing children at free play time is important because children tell about themselves at that time. • Some of the teachers' belief that educational play is more beneficial than other type of play because the play improves children's cognitive skills. • Free play makes children happy because the children play fulfill their wishes. • Some teachers support symbolic play because they think that the type of play give clues about children's inner world.

4.4.2 Early Childhood In-Service Teachers' Playfulness Views

The teachers' description of playful people and decreasing factor of playfulness views are shown.

Table 4.4.2
Key findings of teachers' view on playfulness

Views on Playfulness
• Most of the teachers mentioned an individual as playfulness who like play and play with children. • A few of them use energetic and positive adjectives for describing playful person. • The teachers think that increasing responsibility lead to decreasing playfulness. • They pointed out that school is the first step of inclining playfulness. • Personality might be the reason of low playfulness. • If children are unhappy, that days they do not want to participate to play. • Playing with tablet and telephone always can be caused to kill playfulness of children. • Protective and uninvolved parenting style damage children's play skills.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results gathered from mixed method included quantitative and qualitative data were discussed accompanied by the field literature and based on these results suggestions and implications for the future research were presented. The main purpose of the current study was to investigate in-service teachers' playfulness traits in relation to their professional experience, age, educational background, attended play course, the type of school that they work, the number of children in their classroom, professional development activities they participated, and volunteered activities they engaged in and their views about playfulness. For this purpose, 485 early childhood teachers were filled the APTS scale which was developed by Shen, Chick and Zinn (2014), and the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with 20 teachers. The study results present that the teachers' playfulness score mean is average. Their playfulness score is not differentiated regarding to their years of experience in the teaching profession. On the other hand, educational background, type of school, attending play course, and participating volunteer activity influence on the teachers' playfulness score.

The study results present that the teachers' playfulness score mean is average. Their playfulness score is not differentiated regarding to their years of experience in the teaching profession. On the other hand, educational background, type of school, attending play course, and participating volunteer activity influence on the teachers' playfulness score.

Lieberman explained playfulness with personality characteristics. According to Lieberman, playfulness includes physical, social, cognitive spontaneity, manifest joy, and having a sense of humor (Lieberman, 1977).

97

Teacher stated that their mostly liked characteristic as being easy-going, calm, and positive dispositions when their mostly liked characteristics were asked to themselves in order to define the teachers' personality in terms of playfulness. Barnett who follows Lieberman's studies categorized that friendly, happy, cheerful, sociable, active, and energetic characteristics are elements of a playful person. There is a positive relationship between these characteristics and playfulness. On the contrary, there is a negative relationship between seriousness and playfulness (2007).

The result based on teachers' playfulness score is supported with their leisure time activity while it is asserted as personality in the literature. For instance, although a person who is impatient, and competitive choose different leisure activities, another person who has different personality characteristics like easy going select varied leisure time activity (Tang, 1986). However, Barnett suggests that individual leisure time perspectives and leisure time motivation are related to playfulness, but type of activities is not impacted from their playfulness (2011b). In the current study, most of the teachers (n=17) stated that they have leisure time and again most of them revealed that they do something enjoy at their leisure time. The result can be clue of the teachers' playful characteristic because they stated that they have leisure time and perceive the time for doing something good for them.

Age is thought to be an effective factor on playfulness. Generally, studies show that being young is related to highly playfulness (Proyer, 2012a, b). However, Proyer (2013b) claims that elderly people playfulness is not less than younger people. The results of the current study support the claim and according to the quantitative data of the study there is no relation between total playfulness score with teachers' age. In addition, except fun-seeking motivation, uninhibitedness and spontaneity sub-categories are not related with age. There is a negative correlation between age and fun-seeking motivation so young adults more tend to have fun with their activities. There is a study in the literature, early childhood teachers' emotional exhausting and depersonalization is related to age. 20-26 years old and 41+ years old teachers' emotional exhausting and depersonalization is higher than other age groups (Özçelik, & Deniz, 2008). The teacher (T1) of the qualitative part of the study

pointed out that age has negatively effect on playfulness. She stated that "*Maybe age is another factor of decreasing playfulness.*"

The analysis of the quantitative data findings, there is no relation between years of experience in the profession with a playfulness score except fun-seeking motivation sub categories of Adult Playfulness Trait Scale. 0-5 professional experience year fun-seeking motivation is higher than 21-25 years experiences. The teachers who have less years of experience in the teaching profession are more fun believer, initiative and re-active than more years of experienced teachers. Although literature is supporting that in the first years of teaching profession, teachers face with burnout syndrome because they have not improved coping method with problems and more experienced teachers can easily solve problems (Özçelik, & Deniz, 2008), the qualitative study of our research supports the quantitative result as well. The highest and lowest scores belong to the same year of experienced teachers at the qualitative part's teachers. For this reason, the findings predict that some different reasons can cause the playfulness score difference in the same year of experience.

Working at private or public school can be a possible factor effecting of playfulness. The variable was investigated by the researcher. According to the quantitative data analysis, type of school affects the teachers' playfulness score. There is a significant difference between public and private school teachers' total playfulness scores. The teachers who are working in private score have a higher total playfulness score than teachers who are working in public school. Furthermore, fun-seeking motivation, spontaneity and uninhibitedness score of the teachers who are working in private school is higher than the teachers who are working in public school. The result can be explained by teachers' who are working in public school job satisfaction and level is low and stress level is high while teachers' whose are working at private high school job satisfaction is high and stress level is low (Özdayı, 1990). As such, stress can be a factor of low playfulness for the teachers.

Play and playfulness cannot be separated from each other. Lieberman mentioned playfulness as a quintessence part of play (1977); Bundy defined playfulness as play attitude (1997); and Cooper (2000) described playfulness as

individual play style. For this reason, the teachers play behaviors were investigated in the current study. Teachers' previous experience of play has an effect on their play and playfulness. The quantitative result of the study shows that the teachers who were attending play course at their educational life, are less playful than teachers who did not attend play course in their educational life. According to undergraduate programs, pre-service teachers learn about the historical development of play, play theories, play in different and Turkish culture, etc. (YÖK, 2006). This situation can be caused by the fact that teachers perceive play more serious instead of having fun, they may focus on the educational benefits of play. The qualitative data support the findings as well. Most of the teachers (n=7) report that they choose educational type of play at free play time because they are focusing on children's intellectual development, as stated T6 *"To improve children's attention, brain-boosting, and table games are played in our class."*

Professional development activities are a way of improving teachers' necessary academic knowledge. Participating professional development activities about play seems directly related to teachers' interest to play but the result of the quantitative part of the study is presented that the teachers who attended professional development activities about the play have almost same playfulness score teachers who did not attend professional development about play. The finding supports theoretical approach to play affect playfulness negatively or not affect playfulness. The relation was found only between professional development and fun-seeking sub categorize of playfulness. The fun-seeking motivation score of teachers who participated in professional activities about play is lower than the score of those who did not participated in such activities. One can assume that the professional development activity does not include fun since the teachers who have higher fun-seeking score do not prefer attending professional activities. As Shulman (1987) mentioned, professional development focuses on improving teachers' knowledge in terms of content, pedagogical and pedagogical content knowledge. For this reason, these activities may be serious and playful individuals may not prefer attending this kind of activities. Therefore, educational part of play does not impact on teachers'

playfulness or we cannot say that teachers who tend to attend courses, or some professional development activities are more playful than others.

On the other hand, when analyzing participating volunteer activities, the SPSS results reveal that teachers who have participated volunteer activities, their total playfulness mean score is higher than teachers who have not participated volunteer activities. In addition, fun-seeking motivation and uninhibitedness qualities are higher of the teachers' who participated in volunteer activities. Similar to a previous study, playful people are intrinsically motivated, they concentrate on process of activities. Playful people are totally in activities and they cannot be limited from other people's rules (Barnett, 1992). In the light of these results, instead of intense theoretical play course and professional development, volunteer activities are more suitable spirit of playfulness.

Number of children in the classroom were investigated as a factor of effect teachers' playfulness. Regarding to results of quantitative part of the study, there is no relation between number of student and teachers' total playfulness score. Moreover, teachers' fun-seeking motivation, spontaneity and uninhibitedness are not affected from the number of students in the classroom. As in the study of early childhood teachers do not have a chance to interact with children in crowded groups, so they are mostly demonstrated uninvolved play roles (Howes, Guerrab, Fuligni, Zucker, Lee, Obregon, & Spivak, 2011). In addition, another study stated that crowded groups cause depersonalization, emotional exhausting, and burnout with time for teachers (Cemaoloğlu, & Şahin, 2007). One of the teachers (T15) stated that *"There are 25 children in class, so I cannot get enough time for myself. Therefore, I prepare my activities at free play time."* Although the teacher (T15) have 90 playfulness score, she does not participate in children's play at free play time. This finding makes us think about number of children effect on teachers play preferences but not playfulness.

The result of the current study shows that most of the teachers participate in children's play at activity time. The teachers generally prefer co-player role because children are happy if the teacher join in children's play. Besides children, the teachers are happy because of the participating children's play. The teachers revealed

101

that they play because play is fun for them. In addition, the teachers usually choose the type of motor play because children like these games. Shortly, children's desires shape teachers' play behaviors at activity time. The results are consistent with Sandberg and Pramling-Samuelson's (2005) study where they found that playful teachers mostly preferred motor play compared to less playful teachers whose preferences were the types of play that is calm and quite.

The teachers play role and type of play selection is different. The teachers prefer to observing children at free play time because they think that children reflect their emotional state at that play. Playful teachers produce an invitational play signal to connect children by play, after producing signal, the teacher waits for the responses of children in order to sustain play connection. At the final section, teachers build both children's and their own play actions (Pursi, &Lupponen, 2018). However, some of the teachers (n=5) are in uninvolved role at free play time.

The teachers' views on playfulness was analyzed in this study. The teachers defined a playful person as a person who likes playing with children. The teachers have some playful people around them or they follow some playful people from social media. The common trait of these playful people is that liking play with children. In addition, there is a surprising result, the teachers' example of playful people is not young. However, these people even older, they have energy and like play with children. As mentioned before in the current study, there is no correlation between age and playfulness. The teachers identified themselves as playful because they like playing as well. Therefore, it can be said that playful person is perceived as love play. The teachers mentioned positive effect of play on both children and adults. As Piaget's stated that one of the necessary components of play is being enjoyable (1950, 1962), the teachers believe that play has having fun positive effect on people too. Furthermore, the play is a tool of strong adult-child relation. Teachers use play when they require supposed to motivate children and themselves. They enjoy and throw away their surplus energy while playing, for this reason, the teachers prefer play.

Some factors cause decreased playfulness in adulthood period. Most of the teachers believe that responsibility cause to decreasing playfulness. Especially

school and lessons lead to a decrease in playfulness while increasing responsibility. When you are grown up, playfulness level goes down because the play is not accepted by society in adulthood. For this reason, adults avoid play so adults' play is observed limited, not seen (Lieberman, 1977). The result of high school graduated teachers' and Open University association program graduated teachers' mean scores are higher than undergraduate program can be related with the increasing responsibility as well. A study in the literature stated that under graduate program required more hours spend than association program per week (Sumral, Scott-Little, Paro, Pianta, Burchinal, Hamre, Dawner & Howes, 2016). In addition, fun-seeking motivation and spontaneity scores are impacted from educational background. Play activity is perceived as irresponsible, meaningless, and permissive and play is wasting time and not related productivity (Sutton-Smith, 2008). In addition, the teachers stated that they do not prefer play at their private life because of their personality. Moreover, family attitude to children's play impact on playfulness of their childhood. Parents negative responses to play, or if there is any playful adult around a child, the child loses his/her playfulness.

As regards to the playfulness of children, Lieberman pointed out that playfulness can direct children's play in different ways (Lieberman, 1967). Like adults, some children do not involve in play at play time according to teachers' observation. The teachers explain the possible reason of the situation. According to the teachers, personality is the main reason of non-playful children. Every child does not want to participate play, they can draw or do individual activities by themselves. As Barnett mentioned home environment has effect on children's playfulness (Barnett & Kleiber, 1982, 1984), besides personality, family issues like child rearing attitudes, stressful situations at home or technology usage at home factors impact on children's playfulness. The teachers in the current study stated that children do not play with other children because of parents' protective attitudes. In addition, parents are not interested in their children, they give technological devices and the children become technology addiction at a young age. All these kinds of children have difficulties about participating or built up play. These reasons impact children built to play and getting pleasure from play. That the study result is similar to Proyer's

study enhances the result, concluding that the children's mood is important for their playfulness, bad mood, such as sadness impacts playfulness negatively (Proyer, 2012a). If children are exposed to something negative at home, the children reflect it in their play behavior at school. Moreover, physical environment should encourage children to play, accessible toys, taking children's attention activities and peer relations impact children's playfulness according to teachers' report. In addition, one can assume that digital games could change children's play perception and habits, because it impacts on children's playfulness.

In the current study, in-service teachers' playfulness and their views about playfulness were investigated. Under the teaching profession, early childhood teachers' age, educational background, attending play course, type of school, number of children at class, professional development activities and volunteer activities were searched as a variable which effect on the playfulness of teachers. In addition, early childhood teachers view about playfulness and factors which might have impact on playfulness were gathered information during the study. The result of this research shows that the teachers' years of experience in the teaching profession does not impact on the teachers' total playfulness score. Only, fun-seeking motivation is influence of teaching experience in the profession. The factor of age impact on spontaneity and uninhibitedness sub categories of playfulness, but there is no relation between total playfulness and fun-seeking motivation. Educational background influences total playfulness score, fun-seeking motivation and spontaneity. Attending play course has a negative effect on the playfulness of the teachers.

Type of school has an impact on the teachers' playfulness. The result of the study reveals that the total playfulness score of private school teachers is higher than the score of public school teachers, and fun-seeking motivation and spontaneity qualities are affected from type of school. Being in crowded or uncrowded classroom group does not have any impact on teachers' playfulness and any sub categories. Attending professional development about play is not related to the teachers' total playfulness score or any sub categories of playfulness. On the contrary, volunteer activities are impacted by the total playfulness score positively, in addition, fun-

seeking motivation and uninhibitedness also is related to participating volunteer activities.

5.2 Implications

The current study are expected to be beneficial to give ideas to teachers who work with children and teacher educators about the importance of playfulness. The results of the study explain certain factors which may impact early childhood in-service teachers' playfulness negatively and positively. Furthermore, teachers' views about playfulness were described in the current study.

The results of the study contribute to the literature because early childhood educators have not been the subjects of playfulness studies adequately. In addition, some variables which have influence on preschool teachers' playfulness were investigated. Through the variables, some issues can be considered. For example, play course could be more enjoyable and less theoretical and by this way teachers do not only focus on the educational part of play and they do not usually choose educational play in their classroom. Undergraduate program might result in a decrease in playfulness because of educational intensity of the program, therefore, the content of the course could be revised. Instead, the course can focus on the increase of playfulness of student teachers. In addition, in-service trainings and various kinds of professional development activities could be designed to increase entertainment side. According to literature, public school has higher stress level than private school. Therefore, some precautions may be taken in public schools to increase teachers' playfulness and they may try to promote job satisfaction of the teachers.

Child rearing attitudes, stressful situations at home, and technology might negatively affect children's playfulness so children's using technological devices time could be limited, and children's play might be supported in a home environment. Parents might prepare environment for children-peer matching. Moreover, they can play together to improve children's play skills and playfulness.

In order to have more playful people in a society, the society might support play in adulthood period too. To maintain children's playfulness into adulthood period, play may be supported in all platforms both schools, home and social life. Playfulness can be influenced negatively because of parental attitudes toward play and their child rearing attitudes. For this reason, parents could be educated about the role of play in children's whole development, and playfulness is the most important component of play. The disposition should be maintained. Accordingly, the result of the study could be evaluated by teachers and other educational experts.

5.3 Limitations

Just as all research studies, there are some limitations of the current study. The number of participating teachers is adequate for the study, but the distribution of their teaching experience in the profession is not equal even when an online survey tool was used. Additionally, reaching teachers all around Turkey, the distribution age and experience years are not equal. Using internet survey may be causing the problem because it has some limitations, too. For example, subjects who are accessed via internet could be younger and highly educated in the internet survey (Vaske, 2011). The other limitation is that a pilot study was not conducted. In addition, the interview was also conducted with the teachers who are a teacher at public school, private school teachers should be added in the sample.

5.4. Recommendations

This study provided an explanation of one more component of playfulness. Early childhood teachers were participants of the study. Different scales can be used to investigate teachers' playfulness regarding to their teaching experience in the profession and the results might be compared. In addition, an interview was conducted with teachers and their play habits were analyzed according to their expression. Observation methods can be added, teachers can be observed in their

classroom. By this way further information about their play preferences and the role can be gathered. There is a gap in the playfulness of early childhood educators play preferences and playfulness relations, so these topics should be investigated by a quantitative study to make generalizations. The researcher found differences between teachers who work in public schools and teachers who work in private schools. The main reason of the result should be investigated more deeply. In addition, qualitative study is very limited in the literature so that playfulness topic has not been deeply understood. In Turkish studies, the word of playfulness could be used differently from "play lover" because the phrase may lead to teachers' definition of playfulness in the study. Additionally, teachers' playfulness could be investigated by longitudinal study.

REFERENCES

Aguilar, T. E. (1985). Social and environmental barriers to playfulness. In J. L. Frost, S. Sunderlin (Eds.), *When children play* (pp. 73-76). Wheaton, MD: Association for Childhood Education International Psychological Reports, 71-83.

Barnett, L. (1984). Research note: young children's resolution of distress through play. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 25*(3), 477-483.

Barnett, L. (1992). Characterizing playfulness: Correlates with individual attributes and personality traits. *Play & Culture*, *4*, 371–393.

Barnett, L. (2007). The nature of playfulness in young adults. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43(*4), 949-958.*

Barnett, L. (2011). How do playful people play? Gendered and racial leisure perspectives, motives, and preferences of college students. *Leisure Sciences, 33*(5), 382-401.

Barnett, L. (2012). Playful People: Fun is in the mind of the beholder. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, *31*(3), 169-197. doi: 10.2190/ic.31.3.c

Barnett, L. A. (1990). Playfulness: Definition, design and measurement. *Play & Culture, 31,* 319-336.*

Barnett, L. A., & Kleiber, D. A. (1982). Concomitants of playfulness in early childhood: Cognitive abilities and gender. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 141,* 115–127.

Barnett, L. A., & Kleiber, D. A. (1984). Playfulness and the early play environment. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 144,* 153–164.

Barnett, L., & Storm, B. (1981). Play, pleasure, and pain: The reduction of anxiety through play. *Leisure Sciences, 4*(2), 161-175.

Barnett, L.A. (1998). The adaptive powers of being playful. In M.C. Duncan, G. Chick, & A. Aycock (Eds.), *Play and culture studies*: *Diversions and divergences in fields of play* (pp. 97–119). Greenwich, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Barnett, L.A. (2018). The education of playful boys: Class clowns in the classroom. *Front. Psychol*. *9*(232). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00232

Bastick, T. (2000). Why teacher trainees choose the teaching profession: Comparing   trainees in metropolitan and developing countries. *International Review of Education, 46*(3/4), 343-349.

Bateson, P. (2015). Playfulness and creativity. *Current Biology*, *25*(1), 12-16. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2014.09.009

Bateson, P., Bateson, P. P. G., & Martin, P. (2013). *Play, playfulness, creativity and innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/ CBO9781139057

Beach, J., Bertrand, J., Forer, B., Michal, D., & Tougas, J. (2004). *Working for change: Canada's child care workforce*. Ottawa, ON: Child Care Human Resources Sector Council.

Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2009). Understanding teacher identity: an overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 39*(2), 175-189.

Bergen, D., Reid, R., & Torelli, L. (2009). *Educating and caring for very young children*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Boyer, W. A. R. (1997). Enhancing playfulness with sensorial stimulation. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 12*, 78-87.

Brandstätter, H. (1994). Pleasure of leisure-pleasure of work: Personality makes the difference. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *16*(6), 931-946.

Brodie, D. A. (1998). Do students report that easy professors are excellent teachers? *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 28*(1), 1–20.

Bundy A (1997). Play and playfulness. In D. Parham & L. Fazio (Eds.), *Play in occupational therapy for children* (pp. 77-92*).* St. Louis, MO: Mosby Year Book.

Bundy, A. (1993). Assessment of play and leisure: Delineation of the problem. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 47*(3), 217-222.

Bundy, A. C. (1991). Play theory and sensory integration. In A. G. Fisher, E. A. Murray, & A. C. Bundy (Eds.), *Sensory integration: Theory and practice*, (pp. 48-68). Philadelphia: F.A. Davis.

Bundy, A. C., Nelson, L., Metzger, M., & Bingaman, K. (2001). Reliability and validity of a test of playfulness. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research, 21*(4), 276-292.

Burchinal, M. R., Cryer, D., Clifford, R. M., & Howes, C. (2002). Caregiver training and classroom quality in child care centers. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*, 2–11.

Burghardt, G. M. (2005). *The genesis of animal play: Testing the limits*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Brostrom, S. (2006). Care and education: Towards a new paradigm in early childhood education. *Child Youth Care Forum, 35*, 391-409.

Casas, A. (2003). *Childhood playfulness as a predictor of adult playfulness and creativity: A longitudinal study*. (Master dissertation, The Blacksburg Virginia State University.). Retrieved from https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/bitstream/handle/10919/32797/AKCasasFinal Thesis05_28_03.pdf?sequence=1

Cemaoloğlu, N., & Şahin, E., D. (2007). Öğretmenlerin mesleki tükenmişlik düzeylerinin farklı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi 15*(2), 465-484.

Chandler, B. E. & Giles, G., M. (Ed.). (1997). *the essence of play: A child's occupation*. Bethesda, MD: American Occupational Therapy Association

Christian, K. (2012). *The construct of playfulness: Relationships with adaptive behaviors, humor, and early play ability.* (Doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University). Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/!etd.send_file?accession=case1310254723&disposition=inline

Clark, C. D., & Miller, P. J. (1998). Play. In H. Friedman (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of mental health, 3*, 189-197. San Diego: Academic Press.

Clarke-Stewart, K. A., Vandell, D. L., Burchinal, M., O'Brien, M.,& McCartney, K. (2002). Do regulable features of child-care homes affect children's development? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 17*(1), 52–86.

Cooper, R. J. (2000). The impact of child abuse on children's play: A conceptual model. *Occupational Therapy International*, *7*, 259–276.

Cooper, M. G. (1990). Conceptual frameworks and models of assistance to new teachers. In A. I. Morey & D. F. Murphy (Eds.), *Designing programs for new teachers:The California experience* (pp. 19-25). San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory Publications Department.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Demirel, Ö. (2012). *Öğretim ilke ve yöntemleri öğretme sanatı.* Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Diener, E., Sandvik, E., Pavot, W., &Fujita, F. (1992). Extro version and subjective well-being in a U.S. national probability sample. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *26*, 205-215.

Fabrizi, S. E. (2014). *Measuring the playfulness of children with special needs is occupational therapist led, caregiver-included community playgroups.* Fort Lauderdale, FL: Nova Southeastern University.

Fein, G. G. (1981). Pretend play in childhood: An integrative review. *Child Development, 52,* 1095-1118.

Feiner, A. H. (1990). Playfulness and the interpersonal ideology. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 26 (1),* 95-107.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Gariepy, N., & Howe, N. (2003). The therapeutic power of play: Examining the play of young children with leukaemia. *Child: Care, Health & Development, 29(6),* 523–537.

Garvey, C. (1974). Some properties of soci al play. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 20 (3),* 163-180.

Garvey, C. (1977). *Play*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.

Glynn, M. A., & Webster, J. (1992). The adult playfulness scale: An initial assessment. *Psychological Reports, 71*, 83–103.

Glynn, M. A., Webster, J. (1993). Refining the nomological net of the adult playfulness scale: Personality, motivational and attitudinal correlates for highly intelligent adults. *Psychological Reports, 72*, 1023-1026

Goldstein, J. H., & McGhee, P. E. (Ed.). (1972). *The psychology of humor*. New York: Academic Press.

Goncu, A., & Gaskins, S. (2012). *Play and development: evolutionary, sociocultural, and functional perspectives*. Greenwich, CT: Taylor and Francis.

Gömleksiz, M. N., & Serhatlıoğlu, B. (2013). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin öz-yeterlik inançlarına ilişkin görüşleri. *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 8*(7), 201-221.

Graham, B. C., Sawyers, J. K., & DeBord, K. B. (1989). Teachers' creativity, playfulness, and style of interaction with children. *Creat. Res. J. 2*, 41–50. doi: 10.1080/10400418909534299

Greene, J. (2015). Preserving distinctions within the multimethod and mixed methods research merger. In S. Hesse-Biber and R. B. Johnson, (Eds.), *Oxford Handbooks Online*. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199933624.013.37

Gürkan, T. (2009). Okul öncesi eğitimine giriş. In Şefik Yaşar (Ed.), *Erken çocukluk dönemi ve okul öncesi eğitim,* (pp. 114-126). Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları: Eskişehir.

Hadley, E (2002). Playful disruptions. *Early Years, 22*, 9–17.

Hakkarainen, P. (2009). Learning and development in play. In Einarsdottir, J. & Wagner, J.T (Eds.), *Nordic childhoods and early Education, Philosophy, research, policy and practice in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden* (pp.183-222) . Greenwch, CT: Information Age.

Hall, T., Healey, M. & Harrison, M. (2002). Fieldwork and disabled students: discourses of exclusion and inclusion. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 27*(2), 213 –231.

Heale, R., & Twycross, A. (2015). Validity and reliability in quantitative studies. *Evidence Based Nursing*, *18*(3), 66-67. doi:10.1136/eb-2015102129

Howard, J. (2010). Early year's practitioners' perceptions of play: an exploration of theoretical understanding, planning and involvement, confidence and barriers to practice. *Education & Child Psychology, 27*(4), 91–102.

Howard, J., W. Bellin & Rees, V. (2002, September, 12-14). *Eliciting children's perceptions of play   and exploiting playfulness to maximize learning in the early years classroom.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, University of Exeter, England. Retrieved from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00002574.htm.

Howes, C. (1997). Children's experiences in center-based child care as a function of teacher background and adult: Child ratio. *Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 43*(3), 404–425.

Howes, C., A. W. Guerrab, A. Fuligni, E. Zucker, L. Lee, N. B. Obregon, & A. L. Spivak. (2011). Classroom dimensions predict early peer interaction when children are diverse in ethnicity, race, and home language. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly 26* (4), 399–408.

Ilisko, Dz. (2015). Locating sustainability in the Baltic States: Insights from ecofeminism. In Peppard, C., & Vicini, A. (Ed.), *Just sustainability. Technology, ecology*, *and resource extraction*. USA: Orbis Books.

Ilisko, Dz. (2016). Inquiry-based educational course in higher education towards sustainable communities: A case study. In Filho, L. & Pace, P. (Ed.), *Teaching education for sustainable development at university level*. The Netherlands: Springer.

Institute of Medicine (IOM) and National Research Council (NRC). (2015*). Transforming the workforce for children birth through age 8: A unifying foundation*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Isbell, R. and Raines, S. (2007). *Creativity and the arts with young children* (2nd ed.) Belmont: Wadshworth.

Jalongo, M. R., & Heider, K. (2006). Teacher attrition: an issue of national concern. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 33*(6), 379-380.

Jenkinson, S (2001). *The Genius of Play: Celebrating the spirit of childhood*. UK: The Bath Press.

Johnson, J. E., Christie, J. F., & Yawkey, T. D. (1999). *Play and early childhood development*. New York: Longman.

Johnson, J.E., Christie, J.F., & Wardle, F. (2005). *Play, development, and early education.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Jung, E., and Jin, B. (2015). College coursework on children's play and future early childhood educators' intended practices: the mediating influence of perceptions of play. *Early Child. Educ. J. 43,* 299–306. doi:10.1007/s10643-014- 0658-1

Jung, J. (2011). Caregivers' playfulness and infants' emotional stress during transitional time. *Early Child Development and Care, 181(10), 1397-1407.* doi: 10.1080/03004430.2010.532873

Kagan, S. L. (1990). Children's play: The journey from theory to practice. In E. S. Klugman, & S. Smilansky, (Eds.), *Children's play and learning: Perspectives and policy implications* (pp. 173 - 187). New York: Teachers College Press.

Kendall, F. E. (1983). *Diversity in the classroom. A multicultural approach to the education of young children.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Kirkcaldy, B. D. (1989). Gender and personality determinants of recreational interests. *Studia Psychologica*, *30*, 115-127.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Cambridge Adult Education.

Kohlberg; L., (1968). Early education: A cognitive developmental view. *Child Development, 39,* 1013-1062.

Kooij, R. V. (1989). Research on children's play. *Play & Culture, 2*, 20-34.

Korat, O., Bahar, E., & Snapir, M (2003). Sociodramatic play as opportunity for literacy development: The teacher's role. *The Reading Teacher, 56*, 386–393.

Krieg, S., & Whitehead, K. (2015). Where are the early years of school in contemporary early childhood education reforms? An historical perspective. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 42(3*), 319-333. doi:10.1007/s13384-014-0161-0

Kruger, A. (1995). The adult playfulness scale: A review. *Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior, 32,* 36–38.

Lehman, M. B. (2000). *Expectations, social support, and job satisfaction among first-year Oregon teachers.*(Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon).

Leslie, A. M. (1987). Pretence and representation: The origins of 'theory of mind'. *Psychological Review, 94*, 412-426.

Levine, J. (Ed.). (1969). *Motivation in humor.* New York: Atherton Press.

Lieberman, A. (1995). Practices that support teacher development: Transforming conceptions of professional learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76,* 591-596.

Lieberman, J. (1965). Playfulness and divergent thinking: an investigation of their relationship at the kindergarten level. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 107*(2), 219-224.

Lieberman, J. (1966). Playfulness: An attempt to conceptualize a quality of play and of the player. *Psychological Reports*, *19*(3), 1278-1278. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1966.19.3f.1278

Lieberman, J. (1967). A Developmental Analysis of Playfulness as a Clue to Cognitive Style. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *1*(4), 391-397.

Lieberman, J. (1977). *Playfulness*. New York: Academic Press.

Magnuson C., D. & Barnett, L., A. (2013). The playful advantage: How playfulness enhances coping with stress, leisure sciences. *An Interdisciplinary Journal, 35*(2), 129-144.

McLane, J. B. (2003). *''Does not.'' ''Does too.'' Thinking about play in the early childhood classroom.* Erikson Institute Occasional Paper, *4*, 1-20.

Meador, K. (1992). Emerging rainbows: A review of the literature on creativity in preschoolers. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, *15*(2), 174. doi:10.1177/016235329201500205

MEB. (2016a). *Çocuk Gelişimi ve Eğitimi Okul Öncesi Eğitim Programı*. Ankara

MEB. (2016b). *Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Ortaöğretim Kurumları Yönetmeliği.* Ankara

Meehl, P., Lykken, D., Schofield, W., & Tellegen, A. (1971). Recapturing item technique (RIT): A method for reducing somewhat the subjective element in factornaming. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 5*, 171-190.

Melamed, S., Meir, E. I., & Samson, A. (1995). The benefits of personality-leisure congruence: Evidence and implications. *Journal of Leisure Research, 27,* 25–40.

Miles, M. & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks. CA; Sage Publications.

Nicolopoulou, A., Scales, B. & Wientraub, J. (1993). Gender differences and symbolic imagination in the stories of four-years-olds. In A.H. Dyson & C. Genishi (Eds.). *The need for story cultural diversity in classroom and community urban.* IL: NCTE.

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). (2013). *Teaching and learning international survey*: *TALIS 2013*. OECD Publishing. http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/TALIS%20Conceptual%20Framework_FINAL.pdf

Okimoto A.,M., Bundy A.& Hanzik, J. (2000). Playfulness in children with and without disabilities: Measurement and intervention. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 54,* 73–82

Oksal, A. (2005). Perception of play in Turkish culture. *Paidéia (Ribeirão Preto)*, *15*(30), 69-77. doi: 10.1590/s0103-863x2005000100009.

Önal, L , Gerek, Z , Bedir, F , & Bedir, D . (2017). Halk danslari ile ilgilenen üniversite öğrencilerinin davranış özellikleri ile eğlence eğilimleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 19*(4), 104-   114. Retrieved from http://dergipark.gov.tr/ataunibesyo/issue/33246/374520

ÖSYM. (n.d.). *Yükseköğretim ile İlgili Genel Bilgiler.* Retriewed from http://www.osym.gov.tr/TR,1371/tanimlar.html

Özdayı, N. (1990). *Resmi ve özel liselerde çalışan öğretmenlerin iş tatmini, iş streslerini karşılaştırmalı analizi.* (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi).
Retrieved from http://acikerisim.istanbul.edu.tr/handle/123456789/14758

Öztürk, A., & Deniz, M., E., (2008). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin duygusal zekâ yetenekleri iş   doyumları ve tükenmişlik düzeylerinin bazı değişkenleri. *İlköğretim Online, 7*(3), 578-599.

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (4th ed.). Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Piaget, J. (1950/1962). *Play, dreams and imitation in childhood.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral judgment of the child.* New York: Free Press.

Pinchover, S. (2017). The relation between teachers' and children's playfulness: A pilot study. *Front. Psychol.*, *8*, 2214. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02214

Platt, T., Wagner, L., & Ruch, W. (2016). The association between class clown dimensions, school experiences and accomplishment. *Learn. Individ. Differ. 51,* 327–332. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2016.08.036

Plaut, E. A. (1979). Play and adaptation. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 34(1), 217-232. doi: 10.1080/00797308.1979.11823006

Porter, M., Hernandez-Reif, M., &Jessee, P. (2009). Play therapy: A review. *Early Child Development and Care*, *179*(8), 1025-1040. doi: 10.1080/03004430701731613

Proyer RT (2012a) Development and initial assessment of a short measure for adult playfulness: the SMAP. *Pers Indiv Dif ,53*, 989–994.

Proyer RT (2012b) Examining playfulness in adults: testing its correlates with personality, positive psychological functioning, goal aspirations, and multi-methodically assessed ingenuity. *Psychol. Test Assess Modeling 54,* 103–127.

Proyer, R. (2013a). Playfulness over the lifespan and its relation to happiness. *Zeitschrift Für Gerontologie Und Geriatrie*, *47*(6), 508-512. doi: 10.1007/s00391-013-0539-z.

Proyer, Rene T (2013b). The well-being of playful adults: Adult playfulness, subjective well-being, physical well-being, and the pursuit of enjoyable activities. *European Journal of Humour Research, 1*(1), 84-98.

Proyer, R. T. (2014). To love and play: testing the association of adult playfulness with the relationship personality and relationship satisfaction. *Curr. Psychol. 33*, 501–514. doi: 10.1007/s12144-014-9225-6

Proyer, R., T. & Jehle, N., (2013). The basic components of adult playfulness and their relation with personality: The hierarchical factor structure of seventeen instruments. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *55* (7), 811–816. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2013.07.010

Pursi, A., & Lipponen, L. (2018), Constituting play connection with very young children: Adults' active participation in play. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 17*, 21-37. doi: 10.1016/j.lcsi.2017.12.001

Rentzou, K. (2013). Greek preschool children's playful behavior: Assessment and correlation with personal and family characteristics. *Early Child Development and Care*, *183*(11), 1733-1745. doi:10.1080/03004430.2012.752736

Rogers, C. S., Fox, G. E., Harrison, P. K., & Ross, J. D. (2000). *Playfulness and temperament among older adolescents and young adults.* Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Play, Baltimore, MD.

Rogoff, B., Mosier. C., Mistry, J. & Goncu, A. (1989). Toodlers guided participation in cultural activity. *Cultural Dynamics*, *2*, 209-237.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968*). Pygmalion in the classroom: teacher expectation and pupils' ıntellectual development*. New York, NY: Rinehart and Winston.

Rubin, K. H., Fein, G. G., & Vandenberg, B. (1983). Play. In E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Socialization, personality, and social development* (4ᵗʰ ed., pp. 693-774). NewYork: Wiley.

Rubin, K., Hymel, S. and Mills, R. (1989). Sociability and social withdrawal in childhood: stability and outcomes. *Journal of Personality*, *57*(2), 237-255.

Salite, I. (2015). Searching for sustainability in teacher education and educational research: experiences from the Baltic and Black Sea Circle Consortium for educational research. *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education, 6(1),* 21-29. doi:10.1515/dcse-2015-0002.

Sandberg, A., Pramling-Samuelsson, I., (2005). An interview study of gender differenceces in preschool teachers' attitudes toward children's play. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 32*(5), 297-305.

Sanderson, C. (2010). *Social Psychology*. (1ˢᵗ ed.). Canada: John Wiley & Sons Canada, Limited.

Saunders, I., Sayer, M., & Goodale, A. (1999). The relationship between playfulness and coping in preschool children: A pilot study. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *53*(2), 221–226.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research Methods For Business Students* (6ᵗʰ ed.). Pearson Education Limited

Senemoğlu, N. (2013). *Gelişim, öğrenme ve öğretim kavramdan uygulamaya.* Ankara: Yargı Yayıncılık.

Shen, X. (2010). *Adult playfulness as a personality trait: its conceptualization, measurement, and relationship to psychological well-being.* (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University).

Shen, X. S., Chick, G. & Zinn, H. (2014a). Playfulness in adulthood as a personality trait: reconceptualization and a new measurement. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *46*(1), 58-83.

Shen, X. S., Chick, G. & Zinn, H. (2014b). Validating the adult playfulness trait scale (apts): an examination of personality, nomological network of playfulness. *American of Play, 6*(3), 345-368.

Shen, X., Chick, G., & Pitas, N. A. (2017). From playful parents to adaptable children: A structural equation model of the relationships between playfulness and adaptability among young adults and their parents. *Int. J. Play 6*, 244– 254. doi: 10.1080/21594937.2017.1382983

Shin, N. (2004). *Predictors of visual media use and their effects on imaginative playfulness in preschool children.* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University).

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57(1),* 1-22.

Sicim, S. B. (2017). *Investigating the association between playfulness, environment and social skills of preschool children.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University).

Sinetar, M. (1992). *Developing a 21st Century Mind.* Ballantine Books.

Singer, E. (2013). Play and playfulness, basic features of early childhood education. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *21*(2), 172-184. doi:10.1080/1350293x.2013.789198

Skard, G.,& Bundy, A.C. (2008). Test of playfulness. In Parham, L. & Fazio, L. (Eds.), *Play in occupational therapy for children* (2nd ed., pp.71-93). Louis, MO: Mosby Elsevier.

Smith, P. & Vollstedt, R. (1985). On Defining Play: An Empirical Study of the Relationship between Play and Various Play Criteria. *Child Development*, 56(4), 1042.

Solnit, A.J. (1998). Beyond play and playfulness. *Psychoanal Study Child, 53*(1), 102-110. doi: 10.1080/00797308.1998.11822478

Sumrall, T., Scott-Little, C., La Paro, K., Pianta, R., Burchinal, M., & Hamre, B. et al. (2016). Student teaching within early childhood teacher preparation programs: An examination of key features across 2- and 4-year institutions. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *45*(6), 821-830. doi: 10.1007/s10643-016-0830-x.

Sutton-Smith, B (2003). Play as a parody of emotional vulnerability. In JL Roopnarine (Eds.), *Play and educational theory and practice*, *play and culture studies,* (5th ed., pp. 3- 17). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Sutton-Smith, B. (2008). Play theory: A personal journey and new thoughts. *American Journal of Play, 1*, 82–125.

Sutton-Smith, B. (Ed.). (1979). *Play and learning*. The Johnson and Johnson Pediatric Round Table III. New York: Gardner.

Tang, T. L. (1986). Effects of Type-A personality and task labels (work vs. leisure) on task preference. *Journal of Leisure Research, 18*, 1–11.

Tegano, D. W., Groves, M. M., and Catron, C. E. (1999). Early childhood teachers' playfulness and ambiguity tolerance: essential elements of encouraging creative potential of children. *J. Early Child. Teach. Educ*. *20*, 291–300. doi: 10.1080/0163638990200307

Tuğrul, B., Metin A, Ö., Erturk, G., & Altinkaynak, Ö., Ş. (2014). Anaokuluna devam eden altı yaşındaki çocuklar ile okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin oyun hakkındaki görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 15*(1), 97-116. doi: 10.17679/iuefd.05509.

Trevlas, E., Grammatikopoulos, V., Tsigilis, N., & Zachopoulou, E. (2003). Evaluating playfulness: Construct validity of the children's playfulness scale. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 31*(3), 33–39.

Tschannen-Moran, M., ve Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805.

Vaines, E. (1997). Professional practice and families: Searching for maps to guide ethical action. In J. F. Laster & R. G. Thomas (Eds.), *Thinking for ethical action in families and communities* (pp. 203-215). Peoria, IL: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill.

Vonk, J. H. C. (1989). Beginning teachers' professional development and its implications for teacher education and training. *The Irish Journal of Education, 23(1),* 5-21.

Vygotsky, L. (1967). Play and its role in the mental development of the child. *Soviet Psychology, 5*(3), 6-18.

Vygotsky, L. (1978a). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L., (1978b). Interaction between learning and development. In Guavain & Cole (Eds.). *Readings on the development of children.* New York: Scientific American Books.

Walker, R. J. (2008). Twelve characteristics of an effective teacher: A longitudinal, qualitative, quasi-researchstudy of in-service and pre-service teachers' opinions. *Educational Horizons, 87*(1), 61-68.

Yıldırım, A., Şimşek, H., (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Seçkin yayıncılık

Youell, B. (2008). The importance of play and playfulness. *European Journal of Psychotherapy & Counselling, 10*(2), 121-129.

Young, S., & Shaw, D. G. (1999). Profiles of effective college and university teachers. *Journal of Higher Education, 70*(6), 670–686.

YÖK. (2006). *Eğitim Fakültesi Öğretmen Yetiştirme Lisans Programları.* Ankara.

Yu, P., Wu, J. J., Chen, I. H., and Lin, Y. T. (2007). Is playfulness a benefit to work? Empirical evidence of professionals in Taiwan. *Int. J. Technol. Manag. 39*, 412–429.doi: 10.1504/IJTM.2007.013503

Yuce, K., Sahin, E. Y., Kocer, O., & Kana, F. (2013). Motivations for choosing teaching as a career: A perspective of pre-service teachers from a Turkish context. *Asia Pacific Educational Review, 14*, 295-306.

Yurt, Ö., Keleş, S., & Koğar, H. (2016). Yetişkin eğlence eğilimi özeliği ölçeği Türkçe formunun psikometrik özelliklerinin incelenmesi. *Journal of Human Sciences,13*(1), 650-662. doi:10.14687/ijhs.v13i1.3539

Zachopoulou, E., Trevlas, E., & Tsikriki, G. (2004). Perceptions of gender differences in playful behavior among kindergarten children. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 12*(1), 43-53. doi:10.1080/13502930485209301

Zhukova, O. (2018). Novice teachers concerns, early professional experiences and development: Implications for theory and practice. *Discourse and for Sustainable Education, 9*(1), 100-114. doi: 10.2478/dcse-2018-0008.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE

Okul Öncesi Öğretmenleri Oyunseverlik Anketi

Merhaba ben Begüm Canaslan, Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi yüksek lisans öğrencisiyim. ''Okul Öncesi Öğretmen ve Öğretmen Adaylarının Oyunseverlik Özelliklerinin Mesleki Tecrübelerine göre Karşılaştırılması'' üzerine bir araştırma yapıyorum.

Amacım: Okul öncesi öğretmen adaylarının ve öğretmenlerinin mesleki deneyimlerine göre oyunseverlik özelliklerinin tespit edilmesidir.

Çalışmanın Önemi: Bu çalışma ile okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin oyunseverlik özelliklerinde mesleki deneyim yıllarına göre bir değişim olup olmadığının analiz edilmesi amaçlanmaktadır.

Bu anketin sonuçları yukarıda belirtilen amaçlar doğrultusunda yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında Begüm Canaslan tarafından kullanılacaktır. Toplanan veriler yalnızca araştırmalar kapsamında kullanılacak ve başka hiçbir kurum ve kuruluşa verilmeyecektir. Aşağıdaki sorulara sizi en iyi ifade ettiğini düşündüğünüz şıkları işaretleyerek cevap vermenizi rica eder, katkılarınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederim.

* Gerekli

1. **Yaşınız**: *

_____

2. **Cinsiyetiniz: ***Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

    ◯   Kadın

    ◯   Erkek

3. **Mezun olduğunuz lise türü: *** *Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

- ( ) Anadolu Lisesi
- ( ) Anadolu Öğretmen Lisesi
- ( ) Düz Lise
- ( ) Fen Lisesi
- ( ) Meslek Lisesi
- ( ) Diğer: _____

4. **Eğitim durumunuz: *** *Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

- ( ) Lise Mezunu
- ( ) Açık Öğretim Üniversitesi Önlisans Mezunu
- ( ) Önlisans Mezunu
- ( ) Açık Öğretim Üniversitesi Lisans Mezunu
- ( ) Lisans Mezunu
- ( ) YüksekLisans
- ( ) Doktora
- ( ) Diğer: _____

5. **Çalışmanın ilerleyen aşamalarında sizinle iletişime geçmemizi ister misiniz? *** *Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

○ Evet

○ Hayır

6. **Yukarıdaki soruya yanıtınız "Evet" ise lütfen e-mail adresini yazınız.**

_____

7. **Çalıştığınız kurum türü: *** *Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

○ Devlet Anaokulu

○ Devlet Anasınıfı

○ Özel Anaokulu

○ Özel Anasınıfı

○ Kurum Anaokulu

○ Diğer:

8. **Kaç yıllık mesleki deneyime sahipsiniz? *** *Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

- ◯ 0-5
- ◯ 6-10
- ◯ 11-15
- ◯ 16-20
- ◯ 21-25
- ◯ 26 ve üzeri

9. **Sınıfınızda kaç öğrenci var? *** *Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

- ◯ 10-15
- ◯ 16-20
- ◯ 21-25
- ◯ 26-30
- ◯ 31 ve üzeri

10. **Daha önce oyun dersi aldınız mı? *** *Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

○ Evet

○ Hayır

11. **Oyun konusunda profesyonel gelişiminize dair aşağıdaki etkinliklerden bir ya da birkaçına katıldınız mı? ****Uygun olanların tümünü işaretleyin.*

☐ Seminer

☐ Kongre

☐ Konferans

☐ Sertifika Programı

☐ Hiçbiri

☐ Diğer: _____

12. **Yukarıdaki seçenekler arasında katıldığınız etkinlikler toplamda kaç saat sürmüştür?** *Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

○ 0-3 saat

○ 4-7 saat

○ 8-10 saat

○ Diğer: _____

13. **Gönüllü olarak katıldığınız etkinlikler var mı?** *Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

○ Evet   *15. soruya geçin.*

○ Hayır   *25. soruya geçin.*

14. **Gönüllü olarak katıldığınız etkinlikler oyun ile ilgili miydi?** *Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

◯ Evet

◯ Hayır

15. **Yukarıdaki soruya cevabınız "evet" ise lütfen kaç saat katıldığınızı belirtiniz.** *Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyin.*

◯ 0-3 saat

◯ 4-7 saat

◯ 8-10 saat

Diğer:——————————————————

16. **Gönüllü olarak katıldığınız etkinlikler "oyun" ile ilgili değil ise hangi konuda olduğunu kısaca belirtiniz.**

——————————————————

YETİŞKİN EĞLENCE EĞİLİMİ ÖZELİĞİ ÖLÇEĞİ (YEEÖÖ)

		Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
1	Kurallara uymadığım zamanlar olur.					
2	Bir başkası eğlenceli bir şey başlattığında, ben de katılmaktan mutluluk duyarım.					
3	Bazen sonuçları hakkında endişeye düşmeden bir şeyler yapabilirim.					
4	Yaptığım ne olursa olsun, eğlenmeyi denerim.					
5	Sıklıkla planlanmamış şeyler yaparım.					
6	Birçok durumdan eğlence çıkarabilirim.					
7	Başka insanlar tarafından başlatılan eğlenceli şeyleri takdirle karşılarım.					
8	Sıklıkla bazı şeyleri anında, herhangi bir ön hazırlık yapmadan yaparım.					
9	Eğer bir şeyi yapmak istiyorsam, genellikle diğer insanların düşünebileceklerinin beni durdurmasına izin vermem.					
10	İyi vakit geçirilebileceğine inanırım.					
11	Sıklıkla dürtülerime göre hareket ederim.					
12	Sosyal kurallara anlayış gösteririm fakat çoğu zaman onlarla kısıtlanmam.					
13	Sıklıkla herhangi bir durumdaki eğlenceli şeyleri başlatan kişiyimdir.					
14	Başka insanların başlattığı eğlenceli şeylerden keyif alırım.					
15	Sıklıkla anlık DÜŞÜNCELERİMİN peşinden giderim.					
16	Sıklıkla anlık HİSLERİMİ takip ederim.					
17	Eğlencenin hayatın çok önemli bir parçası olduğunu düşünürüm.					
18	Aptallık ederek bir şeyleri kaybetmekten korkmam.					
19	Neredeyse her etkinliği benim için yapması eğlenceli hale getiririm.					

Merhaba ben Begüm Canaslan, Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi yüksek lisans öğrencisiyim. ''Okul Öncesi Öğretmen ve Öğretmen Adaylarının Oyunseverlik Özelliklerinin Mesleki Tecrübelerine göre Karşılaştırılması'' üzerine bir araştırma yapıyorum.

Amacım: Okul öncesi öğretmen adaylarının ve öğretmenlerinin mesleki deneyimlerine göre oyunseverlik özelliklerinin tespit edilmesidir.

Çalışmanın Önemi: Bu çalışma ile okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin oyunseverlik özelliklerinde mesleki deneyim yıllarına göre bir değişim olup olmadığının analiz edilmesi amaçlanmaktadır.

Bu anketin sonuçları yukarıda belirtilen amaçlar doğrultusunda yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında Begüm Canaslan tarafından kullanılacaktır. Toplanan veriler yalnızca araştırmalar kapsamında kullanılacak ve başka hiçbir kurum ve kuruluşa verilmeyecektir. Aşağıdaki sorulara sizi en iyi ifade ettiğini düşündüğünüz şıkları işaretleyerek cevap vermenizi rica eder, katkılarınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederim.

1- Biraz kendinizden bahseder misiniz? En sevdiğiniz yönleriniz nelerdir?

2- Mesleğinizi nasıl seçtiniz?

3- Mesleğinizin en çok sevdiğiniz yönü nedir?

4- Sizce bu mesleği yapan insanların sahip olması gereken nitelikler nelerdir?

5- Boş zamanlarınızda neler yaparsınız?

6- Oyun oynamayı sever misiniz? Neden? Sınıfta ne tarz oyunlar oynarsınız? Çocukların oyununa katılır mısınız? Bu oyunlarda rolünüz ne olur?

7- Çocukların serbest oyun zamanında siz neler yaparsınız? Serbest oyunlarda en çok hangi tip oyun oynamalarını destekliyorsunuz? Hangi materyalleri kullanıyorsunuz?

8- Sınıfta çocukların oyunsever olduklarını nasıl belirlersiniz, oyuncu olup olmamalarını ne gibi değişkenler etkiler? Veya destekler?

9- Çocukların oyuncu birey olmalarını destekliyor musunuz? Ne zamana kadar oyun oynamaları gerekir? Evet ise;

- Çocukların oyuncu bireyler olarak kalmaları için neler yapılmalıdır? Bu konuda öğretmenlere, ebeveynlere ve okula- topluma ne gibi görevler düşer?

10- Çevrenizde oyunsever olarak tanımlayabileceğiniz bir yetişkin var mı? Hangi davranışlarından dolayı oyunsever olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?

11- Peki siz kendinizi oyunsever olarak tanımlar mısınız? Biraz açıklar mısınız?

- Hayır ise; peki sizce çocukluğunuzdan sonra hangi etkenler oyuncu olma özelliğinizi kaybetmenize neden olmuştur?

12- Benim sorularım bu kadar sizin eklemek istediğin ya da keşke sunuda sorsaydınız dediğiniz başka bir soru var mı?

Katıldığınız için teşekkür ederim.

APPENDIX C: ETHICAL COMMITTEE APPROVAL OF METU

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSI

05 NİSAN 2018

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Serap SEVİMLİ ÇELİK

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız yüksek lisans öğrencisi Begüm CANASLAN'ın *"Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin ve Öğretmen Adaylarının Mesleki Tecrübe Yılları ile Oyunseverlik Özelliklerinin İlişkisinin İncelenmesi "* başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay **2018-EGT-015** protokol numarası ile **06.04.2018 - 30.09.2020** tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN

Başkan V

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL

Üye

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR

Üye

Doç. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI

Üye

Doç. Dr. Zana ÇITAK

Üye

Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

134

APPENDIX D: TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Oyun insanlık tarihinin başlangıcından beri pek çok sosyal disipline konu olmuştur. Oyun çocukların içten gelen bir motivasyon ile, özgür seçimlerinin sonunda zevk almak için yaptıkları anlamlı bir etkinliktir (Johnson, Christie, ve Wardle, 2005; Isabel ve Raines, 2007). Oyun çocukların fiziksel gelişimlerinden zihinsel gelişimlerine, kişilik gelişimlerinden duygusal gelişimlerine kadar pek çok alanlarına hitap etmektedir (Göncü ve Gaskins, 2012). Bütüncül gelişim alanlarına olan olumlu etkisinin yanında, oyunun çocukların psikolojik durumları üzerinde de olumlu etkilerinin olduğu saptanmıştır çünkü çocuklar stresli durumlarla başa çıkma yolu olarak oyunu kullanmaktadır (Johnson, Christie, ve Wardle, 2005). Oyun çocukların nesnelerle etkileşime geçerek diğer insanları ve kendilerini tanıdıkları, çevrelerini kontrol etmeyi öğrendikleri en birincil yoldur (Sutton-Smith, 2003).

Çocukların yaptıkları her etkinlik oyun olarak adlandırılmamaktadır. Bir etkinliğin oyun olarak adlandırılabilmesi için bazı özellikleri taşıması gerektiği belirtilmiştir (Skard ve Bundy, 2008). Bir etkinliğin oyun olması için öncelikle onun içsel bir motivasyonla yapılması gerekmektedir. Ödül karşılığında yapılan şeyler oyun olarak adlandırılmamaktadır çünkü ödül dışsal motivasyon kaynağıdır (Rubin, Fein, & Vandenberg, 1983). Diğer özelliğin serbest seçim ile yapılması olduğu belirtilmektedir. Oyunun özelliklerine oyuncunun kendi serbest seçimi ile karar verilmelidir, bir yetişkin tarafından zorlanarak yaptırılan etkinlikler oyun olarak değerlendirilmez (Johnson, Christie, ve Yawkey, 1999). Eğlence ya da zevk alma oyunun olumlu etkileri arasındadır fakat bazen oyunlar korku ve kaygı içerebilir bu yüzden her zaman olumlu bir etkisinin olması oyunun bir özelliği yapılan çalışmalarla ortaya koyulmuştur (Clark ve Miller, 1998; Sutton-Smith, 2003; Burghardt 2005).

Bütün bu sayılan özelliklerinin yanı sıra bir etkinliğin oyun olarak değerlendirilebilmesi için oynama eğiliminin de olması gerekmektedir. Oyunseverlik oyunun içsel motivasyonu olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Pek çok akademik çalışmada oyunseverliğin çocukların gelişimi ve oyunun faydalı sonuçlar sağlayabilmesi için mutlaka olması gereken bir özellik olduğuna değinmiştir (Garvey, 1977; Sutton-Smith, 1979; Vygotsky, 1978). Bir etkinliğin oyun olarak değerlendirebilmesi için oyunseverliğin olması gerekmektedir, çünkü bu oyunun temeli ve özüdür (Bundy, 1993; Chandler, 1997; Liebermann, 1966). Oyunseverlik üç önemli unsurdan oluşmaktadır. Bunlar içsel motivasyon, iç kontrol ve özgürlüktür (Bundy, 1991, 1993; Kooij, 1989). İçsel motivasyon, oyuncuların kendi istekleri ile oynaması anlamına gelmektedir. Oyuncular için süreç sonuçtan daha önemlidir (Rubin, Fein, & Vandenberg, 1983). Skard ve Bundy oyuncuların oyunda kazanmaktan zevk aldıklarını belirtmiştir ama kazanmak oyunun birincil amacı değildir (2008). Oyuncular oyunda kiminle oynayacaklarına, ne oynayacaklarına, nasıl oynayacaklarına ve hangi kuralları koyacaklarına kendileri karar verirler. Özgürlük ise oyuncuların gerçeği nasıl manipüle edip materyalleri nasıl kullanacaklarına karar vermeleri anlamına gelmektedir. Nesneler oyuncuların istekleri doğrultusunda farklı amaçlarda kullanılabilirler. Çocuklar oyunlarında gerçek hayatta olan şeyleri değiştirip kendi istekleri doğrultusunda oynayabilirler (Skard ve Bundy, 2008).

Oyunseverliğin kişilik özellikleri üzerine etkisi vardır. Kişilik özelliklerinin oyunseverlik özelliğinden etkilendiği gibi oynama eğilimi de kişilik özelliklerinden etkilenmektedir. Alan yazınındaki çalışmalar oyunseverliğin kişilik özellikleri, yaş, cinsiyet, yaratıcılık ve aile özellikleri ile ilişkili olduğunu göstermektedir (Barnett, 1991, 1998, Cooper, 2000; Sanderson, 2010; Zachopoulou, Trevlas, & Tsikriki, 2004). Kişisel özelliklerin ve değişkenlerin bireylerin oyunseverlik üzerinde etkili olduğu saptanmıştır (Trevlas, Grammatikopoulos, Tsigilis, & Zachopoulou, 2003). Barnett'ın yaptığı bir çalışma kız ve erkek çocukları arasında oyunseverlik bakımından farklılıklar olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Erkek çocukların fiziksel

kendiliğindenlik ve eğlencenin dışavurumu boyutlarında daha yüksek puan alırken, kız çocukların bilişsel kendiliğindenlik boyutunda daha yüksek puanlara sahip olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır (1991). Bir başka çalışmada ise yaşça küçük olan çocukların yaşça büyük olan çocuklara göre oyunseverlik ölçeğinden yüksek puan aldıkları görülmektedir (Saunders, Sayer, ve Goodale, 1999). Oyunun çocukların gelişimleri üzerindeki olumlu özellikleri olduğu gibi oyunseverlik özelliğinin de çocuklar üzerinde olumlu etkileri vardır. Bu yüzden çocukların oyun ve oyunseverlik özellikleri bakımından desteklenmeleri gerekmektedir (Sanderson, 2010). Jenkinson'a göre oynama eğilimi olan çocuklar olmayan çocuklara göre büyüklerle ve diğer çocuklarla iletişim kurabilme açısından daha başarılıdırlar (2001).

Oyunseverlik özellikleri yaratıcılıkla ilgisi vardır, dünyaca tanınan sanatçılar, artistler ve besteciler yaratıcı olmalarının yanında aynı zamanda oyunseverlik özellikleri ile de dikkat çekmektedirler. Örneğin dünyaca bilinen müzisyen Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart yaratıcılık ve oyunseverlik özellikleri ile en çok tanınan sanatçılardan birisidir (Bateson, 2015). Yaratıcılık ile bağlantılı olarak oyunsever olan çocuklar aynı zamanda yeni çözümler üretme konusunda da başarılı oldukları için probler karşısında kolaylıkla çözüm yolu bulmaktadırlar. oyunseverlik kapasitesi olmadan yaratıcı problem çözme becerilerinin de geliştirilmesi pek mümkün değildir (Meador, 1992).

Yetişkinler de çocuklar gibi oyun oynamaktadırlar. Ama yetişkinlerin oyun türleri ve oyunlarının özellikleri değişmektedir. Oyunseverlik özelliği oyunun özüdür bu yüzden oyunseverlik özelliği oyunun kalitesini belirleyen bir özelliktir. Oyunseverlik yetişkinlerde kişilik özelliği olarak değişim göstermektedir (Lieberman, 1967a). Oyunseverlik yetişkinlik döneminde de devam etmektedir ve erken çocukluk dönemi ile sınırlı kalmamaktadır (Shen, 2010). Yetişkinler büyürken pek çok davranışını bırakmaktadırlar ama Oyunseverlik özellikleri süregelmektedir. Yetişkinler düşünceleri ile oynarken ve yaratıcı fikirler geliştirirken oyunseverliliklerini kullanmaktadırlar (Solnit, 1998). Bazı çalışmalar oyunseverlik özelliklerinin insanların boş zamanlarında yaptıkları aktivitelerden

gözlemlenebileceğini ortaya koymaktadır (Barnett, 2012). Örneğin dışa dönük insanlar boş zamanlarında sosyal, harekete geçirici ve riskli etkinlikleri tercih etmektedirler (Brandstatter, 1994; Diener, Sandvik, Pavat, & Fujita, 1992). Öte yandan nörotik insanların sosyal etkinliklere katılma konusunda daha dirençli oldukları görülmüştür (Kirkcaldy, 1989).

Yetişkinlerin oyunseverlik özelliklerine karar vermek için dikkatli gözlemler yapılmalıdır. Barnett'ın yaptığı çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre oyunseverlik özellikleri yüksek olan yetişkinlerin sempatik, baskılanmamış, eğlenceli ve dinamik oldukları ortaya çıkmıştır. Örneğin, kadınların pozitif özellikleri ile çevrelerini kendileri için eğlenceli hale getirme konusunda erkeklere oranla daha başarılı oldukları görülmüştür (2012).

Çocukların oyunsever olmasının önemli olduğu kadar çevrelerindeki yetişkinlerin de oyunsever olmaları önem taşımaktadır. Bu yüzden öğretmenlerin ve ebeveynlerin oyunseverlik ile ilgili çalışmalar yapmak gereklidir. Fakat bu konuda ki çalışmalar sınırlıdır (Yurt & Keleş, 2016). Lieberman öğretmenlerin oyunseverlikleri çocukların oyunları, oyunseverlikleri ve yaratıcı düşünme özellikleri üzerinde etkili olduğunu savunmaktadır. Eğer bir öğretmen oyunseverlik özelliğine sahipse bu öğretmenler çocukların eğlenecekleri, yaratıcı olacakları ve esnek olan öğrenme ortamları yaratabilirler (1977). Öğretmenlerin oyunseverliliklerinin öğretmen-çocuk ilişkisi ve iletişimleri üzerinde olumlu etkilerinin olduğu alan yazınında yer alan çalışmalarla ortaya konulmuştur (Graham, Sawyer, & Deboard, 1989; Tegona, Groves, & Catron, 1999; McMillian, 2017). Boylamsal yürütülen bir çalışmanın sonucuna göre, oyunsever olan çocukların ilkokula başladıklarında öğretmenleri tarafından sınıfın şaklabanlık yapan çocuğu olarak değerlendirdikleri ortaya çıkarılmıştır. Öğretmenlerin bu tutumları sınıftaki diğer çocukların da algılarını değiştirerek bu çocuğa olan davranışlarını etkilediği görülmüştür (Barnett, 2018). Diğer yandan eğer bir öğretmenin, kendisi oyunseverlik davranışları gösteriyorsa çocukların da bu özellikleri desteklenmektedir (Singer, 2013).

138

Öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik özellikleri mesleki deneyimlerinden etkilenmektedir, Libermann yaptığı çalışmasında yirmili, otuzlu yaşların başında olan öğretmenlerin ve yaklaşık olarak beş yıl mesleki deneyime sahip olan öğretmenlerin daha esnek ve oynama eğilimi davranışları karşısında daha ılımlı olduklarını belirtmiştir. Öte yandan mesleki deneyimi fazla olan öğretmenlerin ise oynama eğilimi davranışları karşısında daha dirençli oldukları görülmüştür (1972).

Araştırma soruları

Bu çalışmanın amacı okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin oyunseverlik özellikleri ve oyunsverlik ile ilgili görüşlerinin analiz edilmesidir. Bunun yanı sıra mesleki deneyimlerinin oyunseverlik özellikleri üzerine bir etkisinin olup olmadığının araştırılması çalışmanın bir diğer amacıdır.

Yukarıda belirtilen amaçlar doğrultusunda, aşağıda verilen araştırma soruları bu çalışmanın özünü oluşturmaktadır :

1)Yaş, cinsiyet, mesleki deneyim, çalışılan okul türü, sınıftaki çocuk sayısı, eğitim geçmişi, oyun dersi alıp almamak, oyun ile ilgili eğitime katılıp katılmamış olmak, ve gönüllü etkinliklere katılıp katılmamış olmak değişkenlerinin öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik özellikleri üzerinde etkisi var mıdır?

a) Yaş, cinsiyet, mesleki deneyim, çalışılan okul türü, sınıftaki çocuk sayısı, eğitim geçmişi, oyun dersi alıp almamak, oyun ile ilgili eğitime katılıp katılmamış olmak, ve gönüllü etkinliklere katılıp katılmamış olmak değişkenlerinin öğretmenlerin eğlence motivasyonu arayışı üzerinde bir etkisi var mıdır?

b) Yaş, cinsiyet, mesleki deneyim, çalışılan okul türü, sınıftaki çocuk sayısı, eğitim geçmişi, oyun dersi alıp almamak, oyun ile ilgili eğitime katılıp katılmamış olmak, ve gönüllü etkinliklere katılıp katılmamış olmak değişkenlerinin öğretmenlerin baskılanmamışlık özellikleri üzerinde etkisi var mıdır?

c) Yaş, cinsiyet, mesleki deneyim, çalışılan okul türü, sınıftaki çocuk sayısı, eğitim geçmişi, oyun dersi alıp almamak, oyun ile ilgili eğitime

katılıp katılmamış olmak, ve gönüllü etkinliklere katılıp katılmamış olmak değişkenlerinin öğretmenlerin kendiliğindenlik özellikleri üzerinde bir etkisi var mıdır?

2)Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin oyunseverlik ile ilgili görüşleri nelerdir?

3)Oyunseverlik özelliğinin okul öncesi öğretmenlerin kendi aktardıkları oyun davranışları üzerinde etkisi var mıdır?

Ounseverlik çocukların kişilik özelliklerini anlama konusunda çok faydalı olduğu halde bu konuda yapılan çalışmalar çok kısıtlı kalmıştır (Rentzou, 2012). Yapılan güncel oyunseverlik ile ilgili olan çalışmalar daha çok oyunseverliğin psikolojik boyutları ya da oyunsever insanların kişilik özellikleri üzerinde yoğunlaşmıştır (Christian, 2012).

Eğitim alanındaki çalışmaların yetersiz olduğu gibi oyunsever yetişkinlerle ilgili yapılan çalışmalar da kısıtlıdır. Güncel oyunsever yetişkin çalışmaları, oyunsever yetişkinlerin eğlenceli, psikolojik yönden sağlıklı, mutlu ve yüksek özgüvene sahip bireyler oldukları ile ilgilidir (Proyer, 2013, 2014; Bateson, Bateson, & Martin, 2013, Proyer & Jehle, 2013). Ayrıca yetişkinlerde oyunseverlik özelliğinin iş memnuniyeti ve performansle ilişkili olduğu belirtilmektedir (Yu, Wu, Chen, & Lin, 2007). Fakat bu konu eğitim alanında yeteri kadar araştırılmamıştır (Pinchover, 2017).

Oyunsever yetişkinlerin karakteristik özellikleri literatürde yeterince belirtilmemiştir. Daha öncede bahsedildiği gibi okul öncesi öğretmenlerin bu özelliğe sahip olmaları çocuklar açısından önem taşımakadır. Lieberman çalışmasında öğretmenlerin kişilik özelliklerinin ve öğretim yöntemlerinin çocukların oyunseverlik özellikleri üzerinde etkisinin olduğunu belirtmektedir (1972). Çünkü eğer bir öğretmen oyunseverlik özelliğine sahip ise öğretmenler çocuklar için oyun dolu eğitim ortamları yaratabilirler, ve oyunseverliği öğretmen-çocuk ilişkisi ve iletişiminin merkezine koyabilirler. Öğretmenler sadece serbest oyun zamanında değil, etkinlik zamanlarını da oyun temellerini üzerine kurabilirler. Oyunsever öğretmenlerin yetiştirdikleri çocukların farklı düşünme özelliklerinin

140

gelişmiş olduğu yapılan çalışma ile ortaya konulmuştur (Lieberman, 1972). Oyunseverlik özelliğinin doğuştan gelen bir kişilik özelliği olduğu kabul edilse bile, bazı yönlerinin eğitim ile nasıl geliştirebileceği konusnda tartışma yapabilmek, oyunseverlik özelliğinin azalmasına neden olan faktörleri ortaya çıkarabilmek açısından bu çalışma literatüre katkıda bulunacaktır.

Öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik özelliklerinin çocukların oyunseverlik özellikleri üzerindeki etkisi düşünüldüğünde öğretmenlerin mesleki deneyimlerinin oyunseverlik özellikleri üzerindeki etkilerini araştırmak önem taşımaktadır. Bu çalışma literatüre okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin oyunseverlik özelliklerini konu alması ve mesleki deneyimleri ile olan ilişkisini incelemesi açısından katkıda bulunması beklenmektedir. Daha önce de belirtildiği gibi oyunseverlik özelliklerinin öğeleri ile ilgili henüz yeteri kadar çalışma bulunmamaktadır. Bu çalışmanın okul öncesi öğretmeni yetiştiren kurumlara oyunseverlik özelliğinin önemi ile ilgili fikir vermesi beklenmektedir. Bu çalışmanın sonucuna göre ise bu kurumlarda bazı değişikliklerin yapılması yönünde önerilere yer verilecektir.

Bu çalışma karma yöntem kullanılarak yürütülmüştür. İlk olarak nicel sonra nitel çalışma sırası takip edildiği için karma yöntemin açıklayıcı desenine uygun olarak dizayn edilmiştir (Yıldırım ve Şimşek, 2005). Nicel kısmı nedensel karşılaştırma modelinde bir çalışma iken nicel kısmı fenomenolojik modelde bir çalışmadır. Nitel çalışma kısmına farklı meslkei deneyim yıllarına sahip 485 okul öncesi öğretmeni katılmıştır. Nicel kısmı ise 20 okul öncesi öğretmeninin katılımı ile sürdürülmüştür. Bu öğretmenlerin mesleki deneyimleri 0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25 ve 26+ olarak gruplandırılmıştır. Anketler öğretmenlere online form şeklinde ulaştırılmıştır. Bu sayede Türkiye'nin tüm bölgelerinden katılımcıya ulaşılabilmiştir. Mülakat görüşmeleri de yine ulaşılabilir örneklem methodu kullanılarak, erişebilirliği kolay olan öğretmenler çalışmaya dahil edilerek yürütülmüştür. Nitel verileri toplayabilmek için Shen, Chick ve Zinn tarafından 2014 yılında geliştirilen ve 2016 yılında Keleş, Koğar ve Yurt tarafından Türkçeye uyarlanan "Yetişkin Eğlence Eğilimi Özelliği Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Bu ölçeğin başına

katılımcı öğretmenlerin yaş, cinsiyet, eğitim durumları, mezun oldukları lise türleri, oyun dersi alma durumları, oyun ile ilgili profesyonel eğitime katılma durumları, gönüllü etkinliklere katılma durumları, çalıştıkları okul türleri ve sınıflarındaki çocuk sayıları gibi bilgiler sorulmuştur.

Mülakat çalışması için yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşme formu hazırlanmıştır. Bu formun son haline ulaşması için iki uzmandan görüş alınmıştır. 12 sorudan oluşan form öğretmenlerin kişilik özellikleri, oyunseverlik ile ilgili görüşleri ve oyun davranışları ile ilgili soruları içermektedir.

BULGULAR

Nicel Veri Bulguları

Anketlerin sonuçlarına göre öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik puanlarının ortalaması 74.2 olarak bulunmuştur. Bu ölçekten alınabilecek en düşük puan 19 en yüksek puan ise 95 puandır. SPSS programı kullanılarak yapışan nicel veri bulguları okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin yaş, eğitim durumları, oyun dersi alma durumları, gönüllü etkinliklere katılmaları, çalıştıkları eğitim kurum türü, sınıflarındaki çocuk sayıları ve mesleki deneyim yıllarına göre analizleri yapılmıştır.

Bu analizler sonucunda öğretmenlerin yaşları ile oyunseverlik özellikleri arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır. Ayrıca baskılanmışlık ve kendiliğindenlik özellikleri de yaş faktöründen etkilenmemektedir. Sadece eğlence arayışı motivasyonunda 0-5 yıl mesleki tecrübeye sahip öğretmenler ile 21-25 yıl mesleki tecrübeye sahip öğretmenler arasında anlamlı bir farka ulaşılabilmiştir.

Öğretmenlerin eğitim durumları ve oyunseverlikleri arasındaki ilişkinin analiz sonuçlarına göre, meslek lisesi ve Açık Öğretim Fakültesi meslek yüksek okulundan mezun olan öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik puanlarının üniversitelerin dört yıllık okul öncesi öğretmenliği programından mezun olan öğretmenlerden daha yüksek olduğu bulunmuştur. Kendiliğindelik boyutu alt kategorisi analiz sonuçları da oyunseverlik analiz sonucu ile aynıdır. Eğlence arayışı motivasyonu alt kategorisinde Açık Öğretim Fakültesi meslek yüksek okulu ile dört yıllık program

arasında fark bulunmuştur. Açık Öğretim Fakültesi meslek yüksek okulundan mezun öğretmenlerin toplam puanlarının ortalaması daha yüksektir. Baskılanmamışlık alt boyutunda anlamlı farklılık bulunmamıştır.

Öğretmenlerin mesleki tecrübe yılları ile oyunseverlik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki analiz edildiğinde oyunseverlik, baskılanmamışlık ve kendiliğindenlik özelliklerinde anlamlı farklılık bulunmamıştır. Fakat eğlence arayışı motivasyonunda 0-5 yıl ve 21-25 yıl grupları arasında anlamlı farklılık bulunmuştur. 0-5 yıl mesleki tecrübeye sahip öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik puanlarının daha yüksek olduğu görülmüştür.

Öğretmenlerin çalıştıkları okul türleri özel ve devlet okulları olarak ikiye ayrılmıştır. Yapılan nicel analiz sonuçlarına göre özel okulda çalışan öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik ve kendiliğindenlik puanlarının devlet okullarında çalışan öğretmenlere göre daha yüksek olduğu ortaya konulmuştur. Bunun yanında eğlence arayışı motivasyonu ile baskılanmamışlık özellikleri arasında anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmamıştır.

Öğretmenlerin eğitim hayatlarında oyun dersi alıp almadıkları ile oyunseverlik özellikleri ilişkilendirildiğinde, yapılan SPSS sonuçlarına göre, oyun dersine katılmayan öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik puanlarının katılanlara göre daha yüksek olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Alt kategorilerin hiçbirinde anlamlı bir farklılığa rastlanmamıştır. Öğretmenlerin oyun ile ilgili eğitimlere katılmalarının oyunseverlik üzerinde bir etkisi olmadığı saptanmıştır. Yalnızca eğlence arayışı motivasyonu alt boyunda anlamlı bir farklılığa rastlanmıştır. Katılmayan öğretmenlerin katılan öğretmennlere göre eğlence arayışı motivasyonu puanlarının daha yüksek olduğu görülmüştür. Bunun yanında gönüllü etkinliklere katılan öğretmenlerin katılmayan öğretmenlere göre oyunseverlik özelliği puanları daha yüksek olduğu saptanmıştır. Ayrıca eğlence arayışı motivasyonu ile baskılanmamışlık alt boyutlarında da aynı şekilde anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur.

143

Öğretmenlerin sınıflarında bulunan çocuk sayıları oyunseverlik, eğlence arayışı motivasyonu, baskılanmamışlık ve kendiliğindenlik özellikleri arasında anlamlı farklılıklara rastlanmamıştır.

Nitel Veri Bulguları

Öğretmenlerle yapılan görüşmelerde öncelikli olarak öğretmenlere en sevdikleri yönleri sorulmuştur. Bu soru karşısında öğretmenlerin 6'sı kendilerini *geçimli* kişiler olarak tanımlamıştır. Bunun yanı sıra 5 öğretmen kendisini *pozitif ve sakin* olarak tanımlamışlardır. Öğretmenler arasında kendisini *sorumluluk sahibi* ve *meraklı* olarak tanımlayanlar da vardır. Öğretmenlere boş zamanlarında hangi etkinlikleri yaptıkları da sorulmuştur. Verdikleri cevaplar arasında en çok verilen cevap 15 öğretmen tarafından söylenen *eğlenceli şeyler yaparım* cevabı olmuştur. Öğretmenlerin en çok verdikleri diğer cevap ise 13 öğretmen tarafından tekrar edilen *ailemle vakit geçiririm* olmuştur. Öğretmenler boş zamanlarında alanları ile ilgili araştırma yapmaktan da hoşlanmaktadırlar. Nitekim 9 öğretmen *alanımla ilgili bir şeyler araştırırım* cevabını vermiştir. Altı öğretmen de boş zamanlarında *arkadaşları ile vakit geçirmeyi* tercih etmektedir.

Öğretmenlerin oyun davranışlarını analiz edebilmek için etkinlik zamanlarında hangi oyunları tercih ettikleri sorulmuştur. Öğretmenlerden 11 tanesi motor oyunları tercih ettiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Gerekçe olarak ise çocukların bu tarz oyunları daha çok sevdiklerini aktarmışlardır. Motor oyundan sonra 7 öğretmenin tercih ettiği sosyal oyunlar gelmektedir. Çünkü sosyal oyunlar tüm sınıfın dahil olduğu hep birlikte oynanan oyunlardır diye belirtmişlerdir. 6 öğretmen ise en çok eğitici oyunları oynadıklarını söylemişlerdir. Bu oyunlarda öğretmenlerin rolleri ise 18 öğretmenin yardımcı oyuncu rolünde oynadıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Öğretmenlerden 14'ü ise sahne yöneticisi olarak çocukların oyunlarında rol almaktadır. Öğretmenlerden 3 tanesi gözlemci rolünde olduklarını bildirmişlerdir.

Öğretmenlere serbest oyun zamanlarında hangi oyunları tercih ettikleri sorulduğunda ise öğretmenlerin tercihleri üç oyunda eşit sayıdadır. 7 öğretmen eğitici oyunları, 7 öğretmen serbest oyunları ve 7 öğretmen ise sembolik oyunun

oynanamasını desteklediklerini söylemişlerdir. Bunların dışında materyalli oyunlar ve motor oyunlarına da yer vermişlerdir. Öğretmenler serbest oyun zamanını genellikle gözlem yaparak geçirmektedirler. Öğretmenlerin 17'si serbest oyun zamanında gözlem yaptıklarını, 6 tanesi çocuklarla yardımcı oyuncu rolünde oynadıklarını 5 tanesi ise dahil olmamış rolde kendi işlerini yaptıklarını bildirmişlerdir. Öğretmenler oyun oynadıklarını çünkü oyunun olumlu etkileri olduğundan bahsetmişlerdir. Öğretmenlerin 10 tanesi oyunun zevk verdiği için oynadıklarını söylerken, 2 tanesi yetişkin ve çocuk arasındaki ilişkiyi güçlendirdiğini belirtmişlerdir.

Öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik denilince ne düşündüklerini anlayabilmek için çevrelerinde tanıdıkları oyunsever yetişkinler olup olmadığı sorulmuştur. Öğretmenlerin 17 tanesi etraflarında oyunsever yetişkinlerin olduğunu söylemiştir. Hangi özelliklerinden dolayı öyle olduğunu düşündüklerini sorunca 14 öğretmen *oyun oynamayı çok sevdikleri için* cevabını vermiştir. Bunun dışında 3 öğretmen *enerjilerinin yüksek olduğunu* 3 öğretmen de *hayata olumlu yönlerinden bakan* insanlar oldukları için böyle düşündüklerini yönünde görüş bildirmişlerdir.

Öğretmenlere kendilerini oyunsever olarak tanımlar mısınız diye sorduğumuzda 15 öğretmen oyunsever olduğunu 5 öğretmen ise oyunsever olmadığını söylemiştir. Kendilerinin hangi özelliklerinden dolayı böyle olduklarını sorduğumuzda ise yine aynı cevabı vermişlerdir. Öğretmenlerin 9 tanesi *oynamayı çok sevdikleri için* oyunsever olduklarını belirtirken, 2 öğretmen *mutlu olmayı sevdiğini*, 2 öğretmen *yaratıcı olduğunu* ve oyun yaratmayı sevdiğini, 2 öğretmen ise *hayata olumlu yönlerinden baktıkları için* oyunsever olduklarını belirtmişlerdir.

Oyunsever olmadığını söyleyen öğretmenlere de sizce neden oyunsever değilsiniz diye sorulduğunda 4 öğretmen *sorumlulukların artmasının* oyunseverlik özelliğini azalttığını söylemiştir. Özellikle okula başladıktan sonra oyunun daha geri planda kaldığını belirtmişlerdir. Ayrıca 2 öğretmen *kişilik özelliği* olduğunu bu yüzden oyun oynamaktan hoşlanmadıklarını, 2 öğretmen ise *aile tutumlarının* olumsuz etkisinin olduğunu söylemişlerdir. Ailelerinin küçükken onlarla

oynamaması ya da belirli bir yaşa geldikten sonra oyun oynamalarını eleştirmeleri bu öğretmenlerin yetişkin olduklarında oynama eğilimi özelliklerinin çocukluklarına kıyasla azaldığını aktarmışlardır. Çocukların oynama eğilimlerinin olmama nedenleri sorulduğunda ise 9 öğretmen *kişilik özelliklerinin* etken olduğunu, her çocuğun oyun oynamayı sevmek zorunda olmadığını aktarmışlardır. Öğretmenlerden 6 tanesi *ailelerin çocuk yetiştirme tutumlarının* etkili olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Çünkü bazı aileler aşırı korumacı tutumlarından dolayı çocuklar evde yalnız büyümektedir, diğer çocuklarla nasıl oyun oynayacağını bilmemektedir ya da çok ilgisiz olan aileler evde çocukla oyun oynamayıp tablet, telefon gibi teknolojik aletlerle vakit geçirmesine neden olmaktadır. Evde yaşanan olumsuz olayların okula yansımasından dolayı çocukların oynama eğilimlerinin bazı günler azaldığını belirten beş öğretmen vardır. Çocuk evde yaşadığı mutsuzluklardan dolayı okula geldiğinde oyun oynamak istememektedir. Arkadaş ilişkileri ve teknoloji kullanımı da çocukların oynama eğilimlerini düşüren faktörler arasındadır. Öğretmenlerden 4'ü arkadaşlarıyla sosyal ilişki kurmakta zorlanan çocukların oyun oynama isteklerinin daha az olduğunu, sınıfta oyun oynamaktansa resim yapma, hamurla oynama gibi daha bireysel aktiviteleri tercih ettiklerini söylemişlerdir. Ayrıca 3 öğretmen çok fazla tablet, telefon gibi araçlarla oynanan digital oyunlardan dolayı çocukların oyun kurmakta zorlandıkları ve oyundan zevk almadıklarını aktarmışlardır.

TARTIŞMA VE ÖNERİLER

Öğretmenlerin Yetişkin Eğlence Eğilimi Özelliği ölçeğinden aldıkları ortalama puan 74.2 olarak bulunmuştur. Bu puan ortalama bir puandır. Öğretmenlerin en çok sevdikleri özellikleri sorusuna verdikleri cevaplar ile nicel veri analizi sonucu örtüşmektedir. Barnett oyunsever yetişkinlerin özelliklerini arkadaş canlısı, mutlu, neşeli, sosyal, aktif ve enerjisi yüksek insanlar olarak tanımlamıştır (2007). Nitel çalışmaya katılan öğretmenler de kendilerini geçimli, pozitif, sakin, sorumluluk sahibi ve enerjileri yüksek insanlar olarak tanımlamışlardır. Ayrıca

öğretmenlerin boş zaman aktiviteleri de bu özellik ile örtüşmektedir. Öğretmenlerin büyük bir çoğunluğu kendilerine boş zaman ayırmakta ve bu zamanlarını verimli bir şekilde geçirmektedirler. Boş zaman aktivitelerinin kişilik özellikleri ile alakası olduğu literatürde yer almaktadır (Melamed, Meir, ve Samson, 1995). Çalışmanın kişilik özelliği ve boş zaman aktivitelerinin analiz edilmesi kısmı nitel ve nicel verilerin birbirleri ile paralellik gösterip göstermediğini analiz etmek için yapılmıştır. Sonuç olarak iki verinin birbirini desteklediği görülmektedir.

Çalışmadan elde edilen bulgulara göre yaş ile oyunseverlik özelliği arasında bir ilişki yoktur. Sadece eğlence arayışı motivasyonu ilerleyen yaşlarda azalma göstermektedir. Bu sonuç literatürde yer alan başka bir çalışma tarafından da desteklenmektedir. Proyer (2013) ileri yaştaki insanların genç yaştaki insanlardan daha az oyunsever olduğunu söyleyemeyiz demiştir. Çalışmanın asıl amacı mesleki deneyimin oyunseverlik özellikleri üzerine olan etkisi incelendiğinde mesleki deneyimin oyunseverlik özelliği üzerinde etkisinin olmadığı görülmüştür. Sadece yaş değişkeninde olduğu gibi ilerleyen mesleki yıllarda oyunseverlik özelliğinin azaldığı bulgular sonucunda elde edilmiştir. Nitel çalışmaya katılan öğretmenlerin mesleki deneyim yılları ile ölçekten aldıkları puanlara bakıldığında en yüksek ve en düşük puanın aynı mesleki deneyim yılında alındığı görülmüştür.

Öğretmenlerin çalıştıkları okul türlerinin oyunseverlik özellikleri üzerinde etkisinin olduğu çalışmanın buguları arasındadır. Özel okulda görev yapan öğretmenlerin devlet okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlere göre daha yüksek oyunseverlik puanına sahip oldukları görülmüştür. Bu durum daha önce yapılan bir çalışmanın sonuçlarından faydalanılarak şöyle açıklanabilir devlet okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin mesleki doyumları düşük ve stress seviyeleri yüksek iken özel eğitim kurumlarında çalışan öğretmenlerin iş doyumları yüksek ve stress seviyelerinin daha az olduğu ortaya koyulmuştur (Özdayı, 1990).

Öğretmenlerin oyun deneyimlerinin oyunseverlikleri üzerinde etkisi de analiz edilmiştir. Eğitim hayatlarında oyun dersi alan öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik özelliklerinin daha düşük olduğu görülmüştür. Bu durum öğretmenlerin aldıkları

oyun derslerinin oyunun daha çok teorik, tarihsel gelişimi, kültürel değişimleri gibi yönlerine odaklandığından dolayı oyunu daha ciddi bir iş olarak algılamalarına neden olmasından dolayı olduğu düşünülmektedir. Öğretmenlerin serbest oyun zamanlarında eğitici oyunlara daha çok yer vermek istemeleri de bu durumu desteklemektedir. Ayrıca oyun ile ilgili eğitimlere katılan öğretmenlerin katılmayanlar ile aralarında fark bulunamazken, eğlence eğilimi alt boyutunda katılanlların alehine bir fark bulunmuştur. Gönüllü olarak katıldıkları etkinliklerde ise katılan öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik puanlarının katılmayanlara göre daha yüksek olduğu saptanmıştır. Shulman'ın çalışmasında aktardığı gibi, profesyonel gelişim etkinlikleri daha çok konu ile ilgili bilgi seviyesini arttırmayı hedeflemektedir (1987). Bu durum ise öğretmenlerin oyunu ciddiyetle yapılması gereken bir iş olarak algılamalarına sebep olduğu düşünülmektedir.

Sınıftaki çocuk sayısının öğretmenlerin oyun rollerini etkilediği literaürde yer almaktadır. Sınıftaki çocuk sayısı arttıkça, öğretmenlerin çocuklarla olan iletişiminin azaldığını belirtmektedir (Howes, Guerrab, Fuligni, Zucker, Lee, Obregon, & Spivak, 2011). Çalışmaya katılan öğretmenlerin çoğunlukla çocukların oyunlarına katıldıkları sonucuna varılmıştır. Bu durumu çocukların hoşuna gittiği için ve kendilerinin de oyun oynamaktan zevk aldıkları gibi nedenlerle açıklamışlardır. Ayrıca öğretmenler sınıfta daha çok motor/hareketli oyunlar oynamaktadırlar. Bu durum yine çocukların bu oyunlardan daha çok zevk aldıkları için gerekçesi gösterilerek açıklanmıştır. Hareketli olmayan oyunları oynamayı tercih etmeyen öğretmenlerin oyunsever olmadıklarını söylemek zor olsa da, oyunsever özelliğe sahip olan öğretmenlerin hareketli oyunları tercih ettiğini söyleyebiliriz. Çünkü bu oyunları oynayan öğretmenlerin enerjisi yüksek ve aktif olmaları gerekmektedir.

Öğretmenler serbest oyun zamanlarında gözlem yapmayı tercih etmektedirler çünkü çocuklar bu oyunlarda kendi iç dünyalarını yansıtmaktadırlar. Oyunsever öğretmen lieteratürde çocuğu gözlemleyen ve çocuktan oyuna davet işaretini aldıktan sonra çocuğun oyununa onun oyununda değişiklikler yapmadan dahil

olabilen öğretmendir diye açıklanmıştır (Pursi, &Lupponen, 2017). Bazı öğretmenler de sınıftaki çocuk sayısının kalabalık olmasından dolayı serbest oyun zamanında hazırlık yaptığını belirtmiştir. Bu durumda daha önce bahsedilrn sınıftaki çocuk sayısının öğretmenin oyunseverlik özelliği üzerine değil ama oyun rolleri üzerinde bir etkisinin olduğu söylenebilir.

Öğretmenler oyunsever olma kavramını oyun oynamayı seven, oyun oynamaktan zevk alan kişi olarak tanımlamıştır. Öğretmenlerin oyunsever olarak tanımladıkları kişiler ileri yaştaki kişilerdir. Bu durum daha önce bahsedilen yaşın oyunseverlik üzerinde etkisi olmadığı görüşünü destekler niteliktedir. Öğretmenler oyun oynamaktan zevk aldıkları için oynadıklarını bildirmişlerdir. Yani içten gelen bir motivasyonla oynadıkları için çalışmaya katılan ve bu cevabı veren öğretmenler bu yönüyle oyunsever olarak değerlendirilebilir. Oyunseverlik üzerinde artan sorumlulukların olumsuz yönde etkilerinin olduğunu belirten öğretmenler, kişiliğin ve aile tutumunda etkili olduğunu söylemişlerdir. Kısacası büyümenin oyunseverlik özelliği üzerinde olumsuz yönde etkisi olduğu öğretmenlerin verdikleri cevaplardan çıkartılabilecek bir sonuçtur. Yapılan bir çalışma bu sonucu şu şekilde desteklemektedir; oyun yetişkinlikte toplum tarafından kabul edilmediği için yetişkinlik döneminde oyun çok kısıtlı olarak görülmekte ya da hiç görülmemektedir (Lieberman, 1977).

Çocukların oyunseverlik özellikeri üzerinde ise kişilik özelliklerinden dolayı oyunseverlik özelliklerinin diğer çocuklara göre daha az olduğu ve aile tutumları, arkadaş ilişkileri ve teknolojinin olumsuz yönde etki ettiği öğretmenler tarafından bildirilmiştir. Özellikle teknolojik aletlerin çocukların oyunu algılama ve oyundan zevk alma alışkanlıklarını değiştirdiği ve değiştireceği bu cevaplar sonucunda söylenebilir.

Bu çalışma ile literatürde eksikliği hissedilen oyunseverlik özelliğinin bazı ögeleri ele alınarak açıklanmıştır. Ayrıca okul öncesi öğretmenleri oyunseverlik çalışmalarında örneklem grubunda yer almamaktadırlar. Bu yöne ile de bu çalışma literature bir katkıda bulunmuştur. Oyunseverliğe etki ettiği düşünülen

değişkenlerden biri olan oyun dersine katılmış olmanın çalışma sonucunda oyunseverlik üzerinde bir etkisinin olmadığı görülmüştür. Bu durumda oyun dersinin içeriğinin değiştirilmesi ve teorik alt yapının yanında daha eğlenceli yönlerinin de vurgulanması bu çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre önerilebilir. Ayrıca profesyonel eğitimlerde öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik özelliklerine bir etkisi olmadığı yapılan bu çalışma ile ortaya çıkarılmıştır. Yine bu durumda bu eğitimlerinin içeriğinin de teoriğin yanında pratik ve uygulama yönüyle zenginleştirilmesi gerektiği söylenebilir.

Çocukların oyunseverlikleri üzerinde aile tutumlarının etkili olduğu görülmüştür. Ailelerin çocuklara oyun oynayacak alan yaratmalarının önemi konusunda bilinçlendirilmeli, çocukların diğer çocuklar ile bir arada olabilecekleri ortamlara izin verilmesi gerekmektedir. Aileler çocukları ile ilgilenmeli, teknolojik aletler ile geçirdikleri zaman kısıtlanmalıdır. Oyunsever toplumların oluşabilmesi için yetişkinlerin üzerindeki sorumluluk ve toplum baskısı azaltılmalıdır.

Gelecekteki çalışmalar için oyunseverlik özelliğini ölçen başka ölçekler kullanılarak okul öncesi öğretmenleri ile çalışmalar yaparak sonuçların karşılaştırılması okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin oyunsever özelliklerinin doğru saptanması açısından daha güvenilir sonuçlar verecektir. Bu çalışmanın görüşme kısmında sadece devlet okullarında görev yapan öğretmenler yer almaktadır. Bu yüzden özel okullarda görev yapan öğretmenler ile de görüşme yapılması gelecekteki çalışmalara ışık tutacaktır. Öğretmenlerin oyun davranışları ile oyunseverlikleri arasında bir ilişki kurulmaya çalışılmıştır bu çalışma öğretmenlerin sınıf içindeki oyun davranışlarının gözlemlenmesi ile daha doğru sonuçlara ulaştıracaktır. Ayrıca oyun tercihleri ve oyunseverlik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki nicel yöntemler kullanılarak çalışılması genelleme yapılması açısından önemlidir. Ayrıca, öğretmenlerin oyunseverlik özellikleri uzun süreli çalışma yöntemi kullanılarak da araştırılmalıdır.

APPENDIX E: TEZ İZİN FORMU/ THESIS PERMISSION FORM

<u>**ENSTİTÜ /**</u> <u>INSTITUTE</u>

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

<u>**YAZARIN /**</u> <u>AUTHOR</u>

Soyadı / Surname : Begüm
Adı / Name : Canaslan
Bölümü / Department : Temel Eğitim Bölümü/Elematary and Early Childhood Education

<u>**TEZİN ADI /**</u> <u>TITLE OF THE THESIS</u> (**İngilizce** / English) : Early Childhood In-Service Teachers' Playfulness Traits And Views On Playfulness

<u>**TEZİN TÜRÜ /**</u> <u>DEGREE:</u> **Yüksek Lisans** / Master ☒   **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☒

2. **Tez <u>iki yıl</u> süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **<u>two year</u>. *** ☐

3. **Tez <u>altı ay</u> süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **<u>six months</u>. *** ☐

* *Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.*
A copy of the Decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature ....   **Tarih** / Date ....