INVESTIGATING THE VIEWS OF PRESCHOOL TEACHERS REGARDING PHILOSOPHY WITH CHILDREN THROUGH PWC EXPERIENCE

EMİNE DENİZ KOYUNCU

JUNE 2020

INVESTIGATING THE VIEWS OF PRESCHOOL TEACHERS REGARDING PHILOSOPHY WITH CHILDREN THROUGH PWC EXPERIENCE

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

BY

EMİNE DENİZ KOYUNCU

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

JUNE 2020

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Director

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

_____

Prof. Dr. Feyza ERDEN
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. Hasibe Özlen DEMİRCAN
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Metehan BULDU (Kırıkkale Uni., OÖÖ) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Hasibe Özlen DEMİRCAN (METU, ECE) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Serap SEVİMLİ ÇELİK (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 material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Emine Deniz KOYUNCU

Signature :

ABSTRACT

INVESTIGATING THE VIEWS OF PRESCHOOL TEACHERS
REGARDING PHILOSOPHY WITH CHILDREN
THROUGH PWC EXPERIENCE

Koyuncu, Emine Deniz
M.S., Department of Early Childhood Education
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hasibe Özlen DEMİRCAN
June 2020, 184 pages

The purpose of this evaluative case study was to investigate preschool teachers' views about Philosophy with Children and the use of Philosophy with Children in early childhood education settings, through PwC experience. In this study, eleven preschool teachers participated in PwC implementations for ten weeks. After these implementations, they implemented PwC in their own classrooms at least twice. Data was mainly collected before and after the implementations of the researcher and also after implementations of participants, by means of interviews. Moreover, data was also collected during ten-week implementation program via audio-based observation and field notes.

This study indicated that preschool teachers thought that PwC can be easily used in early childhood education in terms of flexibility of ECE curriculum and should be used in ECE. Preschool teachers were found to think that PwC can positively affect both children with special needs and preschool children in general, in diverse areas. It was also found that PwC directs preschool teachers to critically thinking on the established hierarchy between teacher and students, on the understanding of guidance in their teaching and on classroom management in traditional education. Regarding

the use of PwC, they foresaw some problems related to teachers' confidence and motivation. On the other hand, the study revealed traditional education structure is the major obstacle in using PwC. As a result, it is recommended that future research and education programs which will be arranged with preschool teachers be organized with more comprehensive content, including the philosophical dimension of PwC.

Keywords: Early Childhood Education, Preschool Teachers, Philosophy with Children

ÖZ

OKUL ÖNCESİ ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN ÇOCUKLARLA FELSEFE HAKKINDAKİ GÖRÜŞLERİNİN ÇOCUKLARLA FELSEFE DENEYİMİ YOLUYLA İNCELENMESİ

Koyuncu, Emine Deniz
Yüksek Lisans, Okul Öncesi Öğretmenliği Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hasibe Özlen DEMİRCAN
Haziran 2020, 184 sayfa

Bu değerlendirici durum çalışmasının amacı, okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin Çocuklarla Felsefe yaklaşımı ve bu yaklaşımın erken çocukluk eğitiminde kullanılması hakkındaki görüşlerini, Çocuklarla Felsefe deneyimi aracılığıyla incelemektir. Çalışmada, okul öncesi öğretmenleri on hafta boyunca Çocuklarla Felsefe uygulamalarına katılmış ve bu uygulamalardan sonra, en az iki kez kendi eğitim ortamlarında Çocuklarla Felsefe uygulaması gerçekleştirmişlerdir. Çalışmanın katılımcıları, Antalya'da devlet okullarında çalışan 11 okul öncesi öğretmenidir. Araştırmanın verileri, temel olarak, 10 haftalık uygulamanın öncesinde, sonrasında ve ayrıca katılımcıların kendi eğitim ortamlarındaki uygulamalarından sonra, yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Ek olarak, on haftalık uygulama esnasında, ses kayıtları üzerinden gözlem ve saha notları da veri toplama aracı olarak kullanılmıştır.

Bu çalışma, özellikle erken çocukluk döneminin önemi ve okul öncesi eğitim müfredatının esnekliği açısından, Çocuklarla Felsefe yaklaşımının, erken çocukluk eğitiminde kullanılabileceğini göstermiştir. Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin, Çocuklarla Felsefe yaklaşımının, özel ihtiyaçları olan çocuklar da dâhil olmak üzere, genel olarak çocukları, çeşitli alanlarda olumlu yönde etkileyebileceğini düşündükleri

bulunmuştur. Ayrıca katılımcılar, Çocuklarla Felsefe yaklaşımının, okul öncesi öğretmenlerini, geleneksel eğitim anlayışındaki öğretmen-öğrenci arasında kurulan hiyerarşiye, öğretimdeki rehberlik anlayışlarına ve sınıf yönetimlerine eleştirel bakmaya yönlendirdiğini düşünmüşlerdir. Okul öncesi öğretmenleri, sınıflarında Çocuklarla Felsefe yaklaşımını kullanmalarıyla ilgili olarak, güven ve motivasyon ile ilgili bazı problemlerin de oluşabileceğini öngörmüşlerdir. Öte yandan, bu çalışma, geleneksel eğitim yapısının, Çocuklarla Felsefe yaklaşımının kullanılmasının önündeki en büyük engel olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Sonuç olarak, okul öncesi öğretmenleri ile düzenlenecek gelecekteki araştırma ve eğitim programlarının, Çocuklarla Felsefe yaklaşımının felsefi boyutu da dâhil olacak şekilde daha kapsamlı bir içerikle düzenlenmesi tavsiye edilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okul Öncesi Eğitimi, Okul Öncesi Öğretmeni, Çocuklarla Felsefe

To the Path Full of Philosophy and Children on which I am Walking

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people I would like to express my gratitude for their support during the thesis. I wish to express my deepest and most sincere gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Hasibe Özlen DEMİRCAN who supported me during this journey. She was always both ‘standing by me' and 'ahead of me' during conducting of my research project with her endless and invaluable sincerity, warmth, advices, critiques, comments, encouragements and patience. It was a great pleasure for me to work with her in my thesis. Moreover, I am so glad to become acquainted with her in this life. I would appreciate her presence particularly in my thesis and generally in my life.

I further wish to express my gratitude to the members of my thesis committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Metehan BULDU and Assist. Prof. Dr. Serap SEVİMLİ ÇELİK for their valuable contributions which enabled my study to improve. I would also like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Şerife SEVİNÇ for her suggestions to improve the interview questions in the study and Res. Assist. Filiz KARADAĞ for her contributions to the preparation of the implementation program. I am also grateful to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kurtul GÜLENÇ for his support related to the implementation process.

My sincere thanks to all the teachers who participated in this research. Each of you trusted me with your thoughts and gave me your time and interest to provide me with such valuable data. This research was conducted thanks to your help. I would also thank the school administrators who welcomed me and the participants from different schools, in their school throughout the implementation process of the pilot and the main study.

I would also like to extremely thank my friend Ferhan KABOĞLU for her heartfelt assistance during coding process of this study. Besides that, I should state that I was so pleased for my seeing her enthusiasm related to the emerged data in the study.

Dear Sevil MERAN, you were always standing by me and you shined with the flashlight in your hand and sun in your heart throughout this journey. I would like to say thank you for your invaluable support in this study and presence in my life.

I also would like to whole-heartedly thank to my other dears; Görkem ARAPİSAOĞLU who I am growing up together, Melda ERCAN, Bircan IŞIK DEMİRCİ, Birsen CİVELEK, Yosun Ezgi DEMİRCİ, Yiğit BATTAL, Muharrem YETGİN, Gonca KİSTİK who I am walking together. Thank you all for your presence in my life.

Last but not least, I wish to thank to my mother Şerife ARITÜRKELİSİ KOYUNCU and my father Mustafa KOYUNCU with all my heart. You not only supported and encouraged me to write this thesis but also lived this challenging yet attainable process with me. Above all, thank you for bringing me into this world. In this way, I can walk on this path where I set my heart on.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM iii
ABSTRACT iv
ÖZ vi
DEDICATION viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS xi
LIST OF TABLES xviii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ixx
CHAPTER
1. INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 Purpose of the Study 6
1.2 Significance of the Study 7
1.3 My Motivation for the Study 11
1.4 Operational Definitions of the Important Terms 12
2. LITERATURE REVIEW 14
2.1 Theoretical Background of the Study 14
2.2 Philosophy and Children 15
2.3 Historical Background of Philosophy with Children 18
2.4 Describing Philosophy with Children 20
2.4.1 Different Methods in Philosophy with Children 21
2.4.1.1 Philosophy for Children 21
2.4.1.2 Community of Philosophical Inquiry 22
2.4.1.3 Socratic Dialogue 23
2.5 Using Philosophy with Children in Education 24
2.5.1 Related Literature about the Impacts of Philosophy with Children on Children 26
2.5.2 Related Literature about Teacher in Philosophy with Children 29

2.5.3 Related Literature about Teacher-Student Relationship in Philosophy with Children 34
2.6 Related Literature about Philosophy with Children in Turkish Context 35
2.7 Summary 38
3. METHOD 39
3.1. Research Design 39
3.2 Purpose and Research Questions 40
3.3 PwC Experience 40
3.3.1 Structure of PwC Sessions 41
3.3.2 Stimuli of PwC Sessions 42
3.4 Participants 44
3.5 Data Collection Tools of the Study 46
3.5.1 Interviews 46
3.5.1.1 Interview Questions 48
3.5.1.1.1 Pre- and Post-Implementation Interview Questions 48
3.5.1.1.2 Interview Questions after Implementation of Participants 49
3.5.2 Audio-Based Observation 49
3.5.3 Field Notes 50
3.6 Data Collection Process of the Study 50
3.6.1 Pilot Study 51
3.7 Data Analysis 52
3.8 Ethical Procedures 56
3.9 Trustworthiness of the Study 57
3.9.1 Validity 57
3.9.2 Reliability 58
3.10 Limitations 58
3.11 Summary 59
4. FINDINGS 60
4.1 Demographic Information of the Participants 60

4.2 Philosophy with Children 61
4.2.1 Findings before PwC Experience 62
4.2.1.1 Category Teacher-Led Approach to Thinking 62
4.2.1.1.1 Presenting Questions by Teacher 63
4.2.1.1.2 Sharing Opinions of Children 63
4.2.1.1.3 Directing Children about What to Think 64
4.2.2 Findings after PwC Experience 64
4.2.2.1 Category Teacher-Facilitated Approach to Thinking 65
4.2.2.1.1 Critical and Creative Thinking of Children 65
4.2.2.1.2 Children's Asking Own Questions 65
4.2.2.1.3 Collaborative Thinking of Children 66
4.3 The Use of PwC in Early Childhood Education Settings 67
4.3.1 The Use of PwC in Early Childhood Education 67
4.3.1.1 Findings before PwC Experience 67
4.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Related Outcomes 68
4.3.1.1.1.1 Developmentally Appropriateness of Children 68
4.3.1.1.2 Category 2 Teacher Related Outcomes 69
4.3.1.1.2.1 Philosophical Knowledge 69
4.3.1.1.2.2 Confidence of Teacher 70
4.3.1.1.3 Category 3 ECE Related Outcomes 71
4.3.1.1.3.1 Appropriateness for ECE Curriculum 71
4.3.1.2 Findings after PwC Experience 71
4.3.1.2.1 Category 1 Child Related Outcomes 72
4.3.1.2.1.1 Developmental Appropriateness of Children 72
4.3.1.2.2 Category 2 Teacher Related Outcomes 74
4.3.1.2.2.1 Philosophical Knowledge 74
4.3.1.2.2.2 Confidence of Teacher 75
4.3.1.2.2.3 Motivation of Teacher 75
4.3.1.2.3 Category 3 ECE Related Outcomes 76

4.3.1.2.3.1 Importance of Early Childhood Period 76
4.3.1.2.3.2 Appropriateness for ECE Curriculum .. 77
4.3.2 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Children 78
4.3.2.1 Findings before PwC Experience 78
4.3.2.1.1 Category 1 Learning 79
4.3.2.1.1.1 Subcategory Transition 79
4.3.2.1.1.1.1 Transition to Primary School 79
4.3.2.1.2 Category 2 Development 80
4.3.2.1.2.1 Subcategory 1 Cognitive Development 80
4.3.2.1.2.1.1 Critical and Creative Thinking 80
4.3.2.1.2.1.2 Academic Outcomes 81
4.3.2.1.2.2 Subcategory 2 Language Development 81
4.3.2.1.2.2.1 Speaking and Listening .. 81
4.3.2.1.2.3 Subcategory 3 Social Emotional Development 82
4.3.2.1.2.3.1 Self-Esteem and Self-Confidence 82
4.3.2.1.2.3.2 Empathy and Interpersonal Relationship 83
4.3.2.2 Findings after PwC Experience 83
4.3.2.2.1 Category 1 Learning 84
4.3.2.2.1.1 Subcategory 1 Transition and Future Life 84
4.3.2.2.1.1.1 Transition to Further Periods 85
4.3.2.2.2 Category 2 Development 85
4.3.2.2.2.1 Subcategory 1 Cognitive Development 86
4.3.2.2.2.1.1 Critical Thinking 86

4.3.2.2.2.1.2 Forming Questions 86
4.3.2.2.2.1.2 Creative Thinking 87
4.3.2.2.2.1.3 Collaborative Thinking .. 87
4.3.2.2.2.1.3 Academic Outcomes 88
4.3.2.2.2.2 Subcategory 2 Language Development 88
4.3.2.2.2.2.1 Speaking and Listening .. 88
4.3.2.2.2.3 Subcategory 3 Social Emotional Development 89
4.3.2.2.2.3.1 Self-Confidence..... 89
4.3.2.2.2.3.2 Self-Esteem 90
4.3.2.2.2.3.3 Respect for Others, Empathy and Tolerance..... 91
4.3.2.2.2.3.4 Participation 91
4.3.3 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Teachers 92
4.3.3.1 Findings before PwC Experience 93
4.3.3.1.1 Category 1 Professional Effects 93
4.3.3.1.1.1 Guidance 93
4.3.3.1.1.2 Change in Perception of Child 94
4.3.3.2.2.3 Knowing Child 95
4.3.3.1.2 Category 2 Personal Effects 95
4.3.3.1.2.1 Creative Thinking..... 95
4.3.3.2 Findings after PwC Experience..... 96
4.3.3.2.1 Category 1 Professional Effects 96
4.3.3.2.1.1 Guidance 97
4.3.3.2.1.2 Change in Perception of Child 98
4.3.3.2.1.3 Knowing Child 98
4.3.3.2.2 Category 2 Personal Effects 99
4.3.3.2.2.1 Thinking and Listening 99
4.3.3.2.2.2 Self-Awareness 100
4.3.3.2.2.3 Interpersonal Relationships..... 100

4.3.4 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on the Relationship between Student and Teacher 101
4.3.4.1 Findings before PwC Experience 101
4.3.4.1.1 Category Classroom Environment 101
4.3.4.1.1.1 Dialogue-Based Relationship 101
4.3.4.1.1.2 Safe Relationship 102
4.3.4.2 Findings after PwC Experience 102
4.3.4.2.1 Category Classroom Environment 103
4.3.4.2.1.1 Dialogue-Based Relationship 103
4.3.4.2.1.2 Safe Relationship 104
4.3.4.2.1.3 Managing the Classroom Cooperatively 104
4.3.5 The Obstacles in Using PwC in Early Childhood Education 105
4.3.5.1 Findings before PwC Experience 105
4.3.5.1.1 Category 1 Institutional Obstacles 105
4.3.5.1.1.1 Traditional Education System 106
4.3.5.1.2 Category 2 Socio-Cultural Obstacles 106
4.3.5.1.2.1 Perception of Philosophy and Child .. 106
4.3.5.2 Findings after PwC Experience 107
4.3.5.2.1 Category 1 Institutional Obstacles 107
4.3.5.2.1.1 Traditional Education System 107
4.3.5.2.1.2 Inadequate Teacher Training 108
4.3.5.2.2 Category 2 Socio-Cultural Obstacles 108
4.3.5.2.2.1 Perception of Philosophy 108
4.3.5.2.2.2 Perception of Child 109
4.4 Summary 110
5. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 112
5.1 Summary of the Study 112
5.2 Discussion of the Findings 113
5.2.1 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding Philosophy with Children .. 113
5.2.2 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Use of PwC in Early

Childhood Education Settings 114
5.2.2.1 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Use of PwC in Early Childhood Education 114
5.2.2.2 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Children 117
5.2.2.3 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Teacher 120
5.2.2.4 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on the Relationship between Children and Teacher 122
5.2.2.5 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Obstacles in Using PwC in Early Childhood Education 124
5.3 Implications 125
5.4 Recommendations for Further Studies 127
REFERENCES 129
APPENDICES
A. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 150
B. ACTIVITIES 153
C. CONSENT FORM 165
D. APPROVAL OF HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE 167
E. TURKISH SUMMARY/ TÜRKÇE ÖZET 168
F. TEZ İZİN FORMU/ THESIS PERMISSION FORM 184

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Demographic Data of the Study Participants 45
Table 2 Pre- and Post-Implementation Interview Questions 48
Table 3 Interview Questions after Implementation of Participant 49
Table 4 The Steps and Timeline of the Data Collection Process 51
Table 5 Emerged Categories and Codes in the Study 54
Table 6 PwC before PwC Experience 62
Table 7 PwC after PwC Experience 64
Table 8 Using PwC in Early Childhood Education before PwC Experience..... 68
Table 9 Using PwC in Early Childhood Education after PwC Experience 72
Table 10 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Children before PwC Experience 78
Table 11 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Children after PwC Experience 84
Table 12 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Teacher before PwC Experience 93
Table 13 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Teacher after PwC Experience 96
Table 14 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on the Relationship between Student and Teacher before PwC Experience 101
Table 15 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on the Relationship between Student and Teacher after PwC Experience 103
Table 16 The Obstacles in Using PwC before PwC Experience..... 105
Table 17 The Obstacles in Using PwC after PwC Experience 107

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CPI	Community of Philosophical Inquiry
CoPI	Community of Philosophical Inquiry of McCall
P4C	Philosophy for Children
PwC	Philosophy with Children
ZPD	Zone of Proximal Development
ÇiF	Çocuklarla Felsefe
FST	Felsefi Soruşturma Topluluğu

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Are young children relevant to philosophy? Or is philosophy relevant to young children? Children are not mature enough for philosophy. How do children learn so much philosophical knowledge? Philosophy confuses even adults. Child and philosophy are two very distant concepts. These statements reveal established traditional thinking. In traditional thinking, philosophy can be seen as learning philosophy, more clearly learning the history of philosophical ideas (Duruhan, Gürbüztürk, Şan, & Pepeler, 2014). Accordingly, philosophy means a stack of philosophical knowledge which is filled with terminology. However, philosophy originally comes from ‘‘philosophia’’ word in Greek and means the love of wisdom. This love of wisdom is not the love of passively learning the ideas of philosophers who are in pursuit of knowledge, however, it is the love of actively being in pursuit of knowledge (Gruioniu, 2012). Philosophy is actually a practice, an act of doing philosophy. It is a mental activity based on thinking and questioning (Cevizci, 2010).

In relation to the philosophy’s relevance of children, Aristotle stated that ‘‘Owing to their wonder, men both now begin and at first began to philosophize’’ (1907/2008, p.5). This wonder manifests itself in human beings beginning from their early childhood (Carson, 1965). Wonder is the first moment of doing philosophy and this first moment corresponds to early childhood period. Moreover, encouragement of children in their sense of wonder is so essential in this early period of life (Fisher, 2005). This encouragement enables children’s wonder to actually convert into doing philosophy.

What can encourage children’s sense of wonder and provide wonder’s converting into philosophical inquiry is education (Opdal, 2001). Beginning from early childhood education, children’s thinking should be promoted and learning

environments that facilitate and nurture their capacity should be ensured (Anderson, 2017). Instead of doing this, from the perspective of traditional education, it may be said that education focuses and should focus that knowledge of the teacher is transferred to students. However, "it is not education to fill students' heads with information but to arouse their thirst for knowledge.''(Wakhlu, Wakhlu, & Aga, 2013, p 231). Thus, they can turn into students who are in pursuit of knowledge more. Moreover, in this pursuit of knowledge, education plays an essential role in making children's thinking and questioning more qualified and profound. Owing to that, children can ask philosophical questions beyond the factual, that is, 'what the time is' rather than 'what time it is (Opdal, 2001). In this way, children can think philosophically, that is by considering alternatives and deliberating creatively and imaginatively (Lipman & Sharp, 1975).

On the other hand, for some philosophers and psychologists, education should not endeavor for making children think (Piaget, 1974; Rousseau, 1762/2010; Siegler, 2004). Since they regarded children as incapable in terms of reasoning and being ready to philosophize. According to them, struggle for that is a 'sisyphean challenge'. For Rousseau, childhood period is the time when children's reason sleeps (1762/2010). For Rousseau, children should grow up to be able to use their reason. Consistent with Rousseau's view, Piaget (1974) advocated that young children do not have the intellectual maturity to philosophize. According to Piaget's stages of cognitive theory, children gain this maturity to philosophize only after the formal operational stage which begins at about eleven years of age.

Conversely, Dewey defended that ''with respect to sympathetic curiosity, unbiased responsiveness, and openness of mind, we may say that the adult should be growing in childlikeness'' and thus should turn to a child as the model for praxis, possibility, and philosophy itself (Dewey, 1916, p. 50; Gregory & Granger, 2012). Matthew Lipman (1985), inspired by Dewey, considered the views on children's being intellectually immature as questionable and rethought about philosophy and the child. Hence, Lipman, in 1970s, as a pioneer, developed 'Philosophy for Children' (P4C) method. Lipman (2003) defined P4C as the method which encourages critical

and creative thinking in children, without filling children with the intellectual knowledge of traditional philosophy, however developing and expressing their own ideas. In doing this, it is also essential that by means of which material is used to stimulate children to eagerly engage in the philosophical dialogue. For this reason, Lipman wrote novels to be specially used during P4C sessions by removing philosophical terminology (Brown, Corrigan, & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2012, p. 199). Furthermore, according to Lipman (1985), this kind of method can manifest themselves only through philosophical dialogue within a community of inquiry. Lipman (2003) describes a community of philosophical inquiry as a community where;

> Students listen to each other with respect, build on one another's ideas, challenge one another to supply reasons for otherwise unsupported opinions, assist each other in drawing inferences from what has been said, and seek to identify one another's assumptions. (p. 18)

A community of philosophical inquiry as a guided, open-structured, dialogical speech community is seen as the most appropriate way to philosophize with children (Kennedy, 1992). Education in itself should also aspire after creating community of philosophical inquiry instead of a traditional classroom environment where a teacher/adult transposes knowledge to children. In a community of philosophical inquiry, what children learn is how to think rather than what to think (Gregory, 2002). While practicing philosophy with children, any values or ideas are not imposed, but children are invited to think for themselves. Children's own opinions and questions are resources for each other's inquiries and give shape to an inquiry instead of learning what other philosophers have thought.

Although P4C may be the most commonly known method to philosophize with children, several researchers also worked to develop philosophizing with children. In time, 'Philosophy with Children' (PwC) becomes a general title of the kind of doing philosophy into practice with children (Cassidy, & Christie, 2013). Similarly, in the current study, 'PwC' was used in the meaning of all kinds of philosophizing with children. Following Lipman, one of the researchers who promoted philosophizing with children is also Catherine McCall. McCall introduced a new method to

philosophize with children and adults of the name of 'Community of Philosophical Inquiry' (CoPI). CoPI is regarded as the most notable method among PwC methods (Sutcliffe, 2017). McCall (2013) defines CoPI as the method in which children question, make meaning through communication- interactions in a community of inquiry, show reasons for their ideas and see that they may be fallible on the subject. CoPI was produced by Catherine McCall as a consequence of her experience as a philosophy student and her studies with Lipman in the 1980s (Cassidy, 2007). After Lipman, researchers who developed philosophizing with children including McCall extended the selection of materials to stimulate children in the philosophical dialogue beyond Lipman's novels. They also used other interesting stimuli such as a story, a picture, a short film or an object. Similar to Lipman's P4C, McCall puts being community of philosophical inquiry in the center. For,

> The exercise of philosophical enquiry is, like any educative practice, most effective when it is participatory, proactive, communal, collaborative and given over to constructing meanings rather than receiving them. (Fisher, as cited in Cassidy, & Christie, 2013)

What different and more important is in CoPI is the philosophical quality of dialogue without aiming at reaching a conclusion or consensus, and this characteristic of the method allows deep consideration of the issue (McCall, 2017). Children in CoPI talk and learn together and collaboratively construct their learning by agreeing or disagreeing with a previous statement and giving justification of their statements. It is such a kind of educative practice that McCall (2017) points out those five-year-old children who actively participate in the communities of philosophical inquiry can better do philosophy than university students who passively learn about the history of philosophy and philosophers. In the implementation processes of this study, CoPI method was used.

What kind of role does a teacher have in such a kind of classroom? Community of philosophical inquiry is almost like an orchestra who conducts oneself (Kennedy, 1992). Differently from the traditional education, a teacher is not a leader of the community of inquiry as a source of knowledge. Conversely, teacher is a facilitator to construct their own knowledge of children, without steering them. Teacher in

Philosophy with Children approach does not participate in an inquiry together with children, rather promotes children's active interaction between each other and evaluation and giving reasons for their ideas (Maxwell, 2005; O'Tuel & Bullard, 1995). On the other hand, teacher in PwC should allow herself/himself to be as perplexed as to the learner, and to be of a co-enquirer and co-researcher (Murris, 2008). Being a facilitator at PwC requires complex, practical judgment that balances critical, creative, caring and collaborative thinking; and when criticizing and being criticized, it requires social intellectual virtues such as courage, humility, honesty, respect, patience, awareness and constructiveness (Quinn, 1997). Moreover, teacher in the community of philosophical inquiry should critically approach common perception of child and of teacher-student relationship and acknowledge a different ontology of child which is able and resilient and should get rid of established hierarchy between teacher and student (Murris, 2008). Under these circumstances, in educational area, teacher-child relationship is also affected through the practice of Philosophy with Children (Lyle, 2018). Additionally and distinctly, a facilitator in CoPI method is also responsible for ensuring a philosophical dimension of a discussion; and thus, differently from philosophy with children practices, it is expected that a facilitator in CoPI has a background in philosophy and logic (McCall, 2017, p. 114). In the light of this information, it is seen that teachers as facilitators have a distinctive feature and role in PwC practices.

In the literature, previous work has mostly focused on the effects of PwC on children, relatively focusing less on children in early childhood education. Early childhood period has a vital importance in human life. Several studies corroborate the idea that most habits are associated with experiences in the early childhood period (UNICEF, 2013). These experiences are also associated with teachers' teaching in the classroom. Besides that, the implementation of PwC or the investigation of factors affecting this implementation process is still poorly understood (O'Riordan, 2013). A teacher is one of the significant factors which affect using PwC in the classroom. For, the teacher who has a distinctive role in PwC is the person who should provide an appropriate environment to do philosophy with

children beginning from early childhood period (Anderson, 2017). Furthermore, teachers' teaching in the classroom is influenced by their views (Knight & Collins, 2014). Considering all of these, in the current study, preschool teachers' views regarding PwC approach and the use of PwC in early childhood education was investigated through preschool teachers' active participation in PwC sessions and active implementations in their own classrooms.

1.1 Purpose of the Study

This study aims to investigate the views of preschool teachers regarding PwC approach and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings through PwC experience. In the current study, 'PwC experience' corresponded to the sum of the implementations which were conducted by the researcher and conducted by preschool teachers on their own in their classrooms after ending the implementation of the researcher. Therefore, the study's purpose is more clearly to obtain a detailed and extensive understanding of the views of preschool teachers on 'Philosophy with Children' approach and the use of Philosophy with Children in early childhood education settings, by means of providing them with direct PwC experience. At this point, the current study sought to answer the following research questions:

1) What are the views of preschool teachers about PwC before and after PwC experience?
2) What are the views of preschool teachers about the use of PwC in early childhood education settings before and after PwC experience?
    a) What are the views of preschool teachers about the use of PwC in early childhood education before and after PwC experience?
    b) What are the views of preschool teachers about the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on children before and after PwC experience?
    c) What are the views of preschool teachers about the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on teacher before and after PwC experience?

d) What are the views of preschool teachers about the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on the relationship between student and teacher before and after PwC experience?
e) What are the views of preschool teachers about obstacles in using PwC in their educational environment before and after PwC experience?

1.2 Significance of the Study

The current study aims to investigate the views of preschool teachers regarding PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings through PwC experience. This research is thought to be significant for various reasons.

In Turkey, the aim of philosophy course specified as raising individuals who can question, respect different ideas, acquire a culture of debate, have the ability to interpret with original, independent, critical and logical thinking, and are aware of the change and development in human thought, and create a society consisting of individuals with these qualities (MoNE, 2018). Although the program is organized in this way, applications can still be continued in accordance with traditional understanding (Duruhan et al., 2014). In this traditional understanding of education, in the philosophy course, predominantly thoughts of philosophers from the history of philosophy are transferred to the students. There is a teacher in the center and the course is taught in a traditionally, one-way direction from teacher to student (Duruhan et al., 2014; Yılmaz, & Altınkurt, 2011). Furthermore, children in the Turkish education system officially take a philosophy course in 10th grade in high school at the earliest.

At this point, using Philosophy with Children in the education system of Turkey will make it possible for another kind of philosophy lessons and pedagogy in education. Because Philosophy with Children (PwC) is the pedagogical approach of doing philosophy with children beginning from the early childhood period. PwC aims to encourage critical and creative thinking in children, without filling children with the intellectual knowledge of traditional philosophy, however developing and expressing their own ideas (Lipman, 2003). In PwC, children question, make meaning through

communication- interactions in a community of inquiry, show reasons for their ideas and see that they may be fallible on the subject (Cassidy & Christie, 2013; McCall, 2013).

In relation to introducing children to this kind of philosophy in early childhood education, in the meeting on teaching of philosophy in Europe and North America which was organized by UNESCO, it was offered that research, pilot experiences and practices in the field of philosophy with children in preschool should be promoted and when possible, this approach should be institutionalized in the education system (2011b). Besides that, the early childhood curriculum of Turkey draws attention to the importance of early life experiences so that children can realize their own potential. In the curriculum is stated that early childhood education should present an environment where qualified cognitive stimuli, rich language interactions, positive social and emotional experiences are offered to the child and the child's independence is supported (MoNE, 2013). Early childhood education should promote children's thinking and should ensure learning environments that facilitate and nurture their capacity (Anderson, 2017). Considering all of these, it can be seen that PwC approach conforms with the early childhood education program.

In the literature, there has been a growing body of research on demonstrating the effects of PwC on children (Kilby, 2019). However, little attention has been directed to the implementation of PwC or to the investigation of factors affecting this implementation process (O'Riordan, 2013). One of the significant factors which affect the use of PwC is a teacher. For, the person who provides environments to do philosophy with children is the teacher and this teacher has a distinctive role in PwC (Anderson, 2017). The views of teachers influence their teaching (Knight & Collins, 2014), so it becomes very important to examine the views of teachers on PwC.

In a limited number of studies, it is revealed that using PwC in education initiates a broadening of teaching knowledge, improvement in the teacher's thinking skills, a critical evaluation of their pedagogy and improved confidence and self-esteem of the teacher (Akkocaoğlu Çayır, 2016; Daniel, 1998; Demissie, 2015; Green & Condy,

2016; Mergler, Curtis & Spooner-Lane, 2009; O'Riordan, 2017; Roberts, 2006; Scholl, 2014; Scholl, Nichols, & Burgh, 2016; Siddiqui et al., 2015). However, all these studies were conducted with primary or secondary teachers or teacher candidates. The current study differently focused on the views of preschool teachers which is one of the factors affecting the implementation process of Philosophy with Children in early childhood education settings.

In the Turkish context, Karadağ and Demirtaş (2018) conducted a research with 28 6-year-old children through implementing PwC throughout 8 weeks. They reached the conclusion that PwC developed the level of questions and answers given by pre-school children in their philosophical inquiry. Similar to the current study, Karadağ and Demirtaş (2018) gave place to views of three preschool teachers on PwC Curriculum by means of semi-structured interviews. With respect to the views of preschool teachers on continuing PwC activity and its inclusion in the curriculum, they reached that preschool teachers found PwC highly suitable for preschool period and stated that they were eager to include similar activities in weekly plans and to use the approach permanently in their life. However, in the study of Karadağ and Demirtaş (2018), teachers were not active participants of implementations in the study but were observants of their students. The current study is significant because the researcher directly invited preschool teachers (n=11) to the study and implemented PwC directly with them. Moreover, in the scope of the current study, the researcher expected preschool teachers in the study to use PwC in their own classroom.

Regarding teacher in PwC, in Turkey, Akkocaoğlu Çayır (2016) conducted a qualitative study with thirty teacher candidates who were in the elementary education department and in the guidance and psychological counseling department. In the study, throughout fourteen-week, Akkocaoğlu Çayır (2016) taught theoretical and practical knowledge and sample activities and related analysis regarding PwC. Moreover, the pre-service teachers were required to choose an elementary school lesson and prepared a plan by linking it with the goals or values in the curriculum. Then they applied their plans to other peers in the classroom. According to the study,

teacher candidates struggled to ask questions, conduct debates, and associate philosophy with curricula. However, their perceptions of childhood and philosophy changed positively. Beyond the study of Akkocaoğlu Çayır, the current study provided a difference in terms of being conducted with in-service preschool teachers. This study is important because it allows preschool teachers to grasp what kind of approach PwC is by directly experiencing that. The study is also important in terms of that the implementation process in the study was a recursive, continual and interactive process, in order for the teacher to internalize the approach and reflect it to their teaching. Because in this study, teachers came together regularly for ten weeks and experienced a process where they were active and interactive from beginning to end of the study. In the current study, preschool teachers also experienced using the approach as a facilitator in their own classes after the ten-week implementation. Thus, this study is significant in regards to allow a deep understanding of the views and changes in the views of the preschool teachers regarding PwC.

To our knowledge, the literature review shows that there are no studies which focus on the views of preschool teachers about Philosophy with Children through their active participation in PwC sessions. Therefore, this study may be the first to address meeting Philosophy with Children with teachers in early childhood education. At this point, the study is significant with respect to enable a better understanding of the views of preschool teachers on Philosophy with Children and also to promote researchers' further investigation of Philosophy with Children and of teacher training in Philosophy with Children in early childhood education in Turkey. Moreover, in Turkey, the study can establish a footing for policymakers' organizing preschool curricula and teacher training in a way to pursue Philosophy with Children approach and thus to prevalently benefit preschool children from gains of the approach. Furthermore, the study will aspire to encourage educators and school managements in preschools in Turkey to use Philosophy with Children as a teaching method in their early childhood educational environment.

1.3 My Motivation for the Study

After the high school, I entered the Department of Maritime Transportation and Management Engineering at Istanbul Technical University in having desire to explore the World. Noticing that this is not I am looking for, I dropped out the department. Then, I entered the Department of Philosophy at Middle East Technical University, as another way of exploring the World.

After my graduation from the department of Philosophy, I started to the Master of Early Childhood Education at Middle East Technical University, as I am interested philosophy with children in early childhood period. I had not come to 'early childhood education' overnight. Even while studying in the maritime department, I was working voluntarily with children in various fields. What I realized through these experiences was that children are more open to other ideas and are not stuck in their current thoughts. There are no apparent gaps between their thoughts and actions. They have a high potential to live whatever they think.

While I was in the philosophy department, I started thinking about that university or high school is a late period to meet philosophy throughout the whole educational process. It was a late period as well as a different kind of philosophy was needed. Current philosophy courses in whole education invite people to mostly repeat and memorize. Instead of following others' thoughts and memorizing them, I thought that we needed a philosophy and a period that would enable us to look philosophically and put our lives in full. I thought that we need to philosophize more and as early as possible. We need to remember to inquire, to revive the love of wisdom, which I perceive as allowing children to maintain to live their childhood.

Following all these experiences and thoughts, when I met the 'Philosophy with Children' approach, I have felt to find my way. In order to improve my awareness and depth in the field of Philosophy with Children, I participated in Teacher Training Workshops in P4C and CoPI methods in PwC. After the trainings, I have also been conducting workshops on Philosophy with Children for two years in diverse institutions, schools and associations including preschools.

In the 'Philosophy with Children' approach, the role of the 'facilitator' which is the person applying the approach is very important. Because the PwC approach is different from the approaches in traditional education, so the teacher in PwC is also different from the teacher in traditional education. Moreover, during my postgraduate education at the faculty of education and after my readings in the field of early childhood education, I saw that not only touching the child is enough, but also the teacher should be supported. And if I will study PwC in the field of education, especially in early childhood education, it would be quite meaningful to examine the views of preschool teachers on this approach by providing them experiencing this approach. Therefore, on the basis of my educational background and interests, in my graduate study I directed to work on 'Philosophy with Children' with preschool teachers in early childhood education.

1.4 Operational Definitions of the Important Terms

Specifically, in the research, the variables involve early childhood education, preschool children, Philosophy with Children, Philosophy for Children, Community of Philosophical Inquiry and PwC experience. At this point, making their operational definitions is a significant point for the study, their definitions in terms of the study;

Early Childhood Education:

- Early childhood education is the education which provides educational services to children from birth to 8-year old (NAEYC, 2009)

Preschool Children:

- Preschool children correspond to children 36-72 months (MoNE, 2013). In this study, preschool children correspond to children 48-72 months.

Philosophy with Children (PwC):

- PwC is the general title of the kind of doing philosophy into practice with children (Cassidy, & Christie, 2013). Moreover, in the scope of this study, PwC was defined by handling the definitions of P4C and CoPI together.

Philosophy for Children (P4C):

- P4C is the method which encourages critical and creative thinking in children, without filling children with the intellectual knowledge of traditional philosophy, however developing and expressing their own ideas (Lipman, 2003).

Community of Philosophical Inquiry (CoPI):

- CoPI is the method in which children question, make meaning through communication- interactions in a community of inquiry, show reasons for their ideas and see that they may be fallible on the subject (McCall, 2013).

PwC Experience:

- In the current study, PwC experience corresponded to the sum of the implementations which were conducted by the researcher and conducted by preschool teachers on their own in their classrooms after ending the implementation of the researcher.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study focuses on preschool teachers' views on PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings through PwC experience. In this chapter, the researcher presents a review of literature in order to provide the foundations for this study. The review includes theoretical background of the study, philosophy and children, historical background of PwC, describing PwC, using PwC in education and related studies in Turkish context.

2.1 Theoretical Background of the Study

At the heart of the study, Vygotsky's social development theory lies. Vygotsky, with social development theory, declares that social interaction plays an essential role in learning. He acknowledged lecture method in formal education as the formation of and practising with narrow and specialized habits. Based upon social interaction, he offered a different kind of teaching in education and moreover its forming a basis for education. Meanwhile, the method offered by Vygotsky extensively includes various mental functions and stimulates many areas of thinking (Doolittle, 1995).

He argues for importance of collaborative learning and active participation of children in learning process (Glassman, 2001). Learning occurs where children actively and collaboratively participate in their own learning rather than observing passive, lecture-based teaching. From this point of view, Vygotsky prioritizes interaction between people in development of children. Children can construct their own knowledge through this interaction. Thus, development firstly appears between people, then in the child (Vygotsky, 1978). To be able to develop individually, children require to be in community and to interact with other members in the community. Therefore, in educational area, learning environment should be created

in accordance with that the high level of social interaction both among children and children and teacher is provided (Glassman, 2001). This corresponds to the creation of the Zone of Proximal Development of Vygotsky. ZPD is the gap where learners can actively actualize their potentialities only in cooperation with adults or with more able peers (Vygotsky, 1978). Learning environment should be prepared considering the Zone of Proximal Development. Thus, learning and development for children make possible owing to this zone. Regarding the role of teacher, teacher in the social development theory, as a mentor, is the person who establishes the learning environment which is indeterminate for children and guides them in corporation with other children. At that point, teacher and other students attach scaffolding to the level of potential development from the level of actual development of a child. Thus, the zone of the proximal development is a zone where learners develop mastery of a practice (Wells, as cited in Chaiklin, 2003), a mastery here which is gained through interacting with the 'other'.

Considering all of these, the social development theory of Vygotsky manifests itself in a community of philosophical inquiry corresponding to the cognitive cooperation of peers and facilitators in PwC (Dewey, 1996). As in PwC, in social development theory, the activity is internalized and thinking between (inter) members in the group comes before thinking by an individual member. ''Social behaviour is the model which thinking behaviour replicates – not identically, necessarily, but similarly (Lipman & Pizzurro, 2001). For these reasons, social development theory of Vygotsky constituted theoretical framework of this study that investigated preschool teachers' views on PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings through PwC experience.

2.2 Philosophy and Children

Philosophy can be mostly seen 'as a body of prefabricated ideas', however, it is actually a practice, 'an act of philosophizing' (Gruioniu, 2012). People may consider philosophy as passively learning history of ideas, but philosophy means actively doing philosophy. Similarly, in *The Letters of William James*, James (1876) saw

philosophical study as ‘‘habit of always seeing an alternative, of not taking the usual for grante’’. According to Cevizci (2010), philosophy is a mental activity based on thinking and questioning. For Nagel (1987), philosophy endeavored to understand and question common ideas which are used without overthinking. Philosophy is also regarded as representing mind, criticism and sophisticatedly and scrutinizing thinking (Çotuksöken, 2001). From these points of view, philosophy is regarded as a practice. It is such a practice that seeks for more questions and alternative answers and also disapproves of ideas which are habitual and not examined in detail while approving of looking from other and in-depth points of view.

In relation to do philosophy, some philosophers and psychologists draw the line between young children and philosophy, and claim that young children cannot do philosophy (Piaget, 1974; Rousseau, 1762/2010). They regarded children as ‘developing’ and childhood as ‘becoming’ (Lyle, 2017). According to them, young children need time to be seen as ‘developed’ and ‘being’ and thus to be able to philosophy. Rousseau adopted an idea that childhood period is the time when children’s reason sleeps (1762/2010). For Rousseau, children should grow up to be able to use their reason. Consistent with Rousseau’s view, Piaget (1974) advocated that expecting to do philosophy of young children means waiting in vain. Piaget builds his relevant ideas on his theory of cognitive development. According to Piaget’s theory, cognitive development of human being consists of certain four stages as respectively sensorimotor (birth to age 2), preoperational (from age 2 to age 7), concrete operational (from age 7 to age 11) and formal operational (age 11 and up).In sensorimotor stage, sensory experience, in preoperational stage, use of language and symbolic thought, in preoperational stage, concrete thinking and in formal operational stage, abstract thinking occur. According to Piaget (1974), young children until 11 years old are incapable of doing philosophy, for their reasoning has not developed enough to philosophically think. Only after passing the formal operational stage (age 11 and up), children can reach intellectual maturity to do philosophy. Siegler (2004), one of the proponents of Piaget, remarks that the formal operational stage (age 11 and up) ‘‘leads at least some of them to think about

alternative organizations of the world and about deep questions concerning the nature of existence, truth, justice, and morality''. For them, doors of doing philosophy are opened after age 11.

On the other hand, some philosophers and educators espouse that young children can also do philosophy. Kennedy (1994) enunciated that young children participate in ordinary language communities in their classrooms and already practice complex cognitive operations in these communities such as making abstract conceptualization, expressing their agreeing and disagreeing, requesting reasons and also providing them, explaining, giving examples and counterexamples and presenting different ideas. Additionally, Kieran Egan (1988) asserted that very young children are engaged in using abstract concepts by means of their imagination. Thus, fantasy world of young children meets them with philosophy.

Associating doing philosophy and being creative, Matthew (1994) expresses that creativity is important to be able to do philosophy. Based on this, he disagrees with those who set an age criteria for philososophizing. Since people lose their creativity with age and become philosophically exhausted. Children, on the other hand, are those who have creativity. For Matthew, children's being creative enables them to do philosophy regardless of their age.Furthermore, according to Van der Leeuw, ''children's thinking shows us another side of the world, that is, how the world could have been'' (as cited in Murris, 2000, p.272). This indicates that children begin to consider different dimensions of life and thus, that they are oriented towards building new dimensions of life via their new thoughts. Moreover, children reveal that they reach these dimensions of life during discussing in the classroom environment, not as a result of tests which are conducted in laboratory environment as Piaget did (Goucha, 2007). Furthermore, believing and supporting children in that they can philosophize is very important. For as long as that children cannot do philosophy is believed, children cannot reveal their capability to do philosophy (Goucha, 2007). Similarly, Lipman (1973) points out that in the case that children are treated as if they cannot philosophically deliberate, children act as if they cannot philosophically deliberate. What makes doing philosophy possible is training in philosophical inquiry

rather than age (Murris, 2000). Based upon the understanding of philosophy as a practice, Lipman introduced philosophy in the world of children and encouraged them to go on the stage of doing philosophy.

2.3 Historical Background of Philosophy with Children

The historical roots of PwC date back to the ancient Greeks and Socrates. He was pleased to include the young people in the dialogues with two or three people in which they discovered knowledge as yet unrevealed to them. Dewey, in 1900s, thought that these dialogues should enlarge and take a central place in education by converting into communities of philosophical inquiry (CPI).

> Socratic dialectic represents only one set of speech acts among the larger set that CPI encompasses, which is broadly oriented to clarifying, coordinating, instantiating, and evaluating the ideas that emerge from each participant in the group. (Kennedy, 2012)

In 1922, philosopher Leonard Nelson introduced the Socratic Dialogue by convincing the force of dialogue in philosophy and rejecting teaching philosophy as a body of knowledge (Pihlgren, 2008).

At the end of 1960s an American philosopher, Matthew Lipman with great support of his collaborator Ann-Margaret Sharp, inspired by Dewey, firstly introduced the practice of philosophical dialogue in the name of Philosophy for Children (P4C) into the world of education. Lipman made this practice of philosophical dialogue a teaching tool to help children develop their critical and creative thinking in Montclair University, New Jersey. Lipman thought that materials that would be used during the discussion was so essential in terms of raising to trigger the philosophical discussion for young readers. For this reason, he directed to children's literature and wrote specific novels to be used during discussions. At the same time, Lipman and his colleagues provided training for teachers. In their training, they observed that teachers were untrained in philosophizing. At that point, Lipman and Sharp required people who had a strong philosophy background as 'teacher educators'. Thus, in 1983 master, in 1995 doctoral programs in P4C were established under the Institute

for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children (IAPC) to prepare future teacher-educators (Gregory, 2018). These teacher educators took a course at the IAPC to be prepared to work with both children and teachers and became familiar with the course materials which were specifically produced by Lipman. Then, teachers implemented P4C in their classrooms by means of these materials and received feedback from teacher educators.

Thus, Philosophy for Children lied beyond America. United Kingdom met P4C in 1990 by means of the screening BBC documentary 'Socrates for Six Year-Olds' which provided the historical background of P4C. The documentaryincluded an interview with Matthew Lipman and moreover the practices of his collegues – most notably, Catherine McCall, in schools. In 1991, to develop P4C in United Kingdom, SAPERE (Society for the Advancement of Philosophical Enquiry and Reflection in Education) was set up. In time, SAPERE organized courses which were led by trainers from United Kingdom and prepared its own course material.

After working with Lipman at Montclair University in 1980s, Catherine McCall, a Scottish philosopher, introduced her own approach- Community of Philosophical Inquiry (CoPI) to philosophize with children. By using CoPI, McCall works with both children and adults. In 1990, she set up EPIC (the European Philosophical Enquiry Centre) to use CoPI in schools and in other communities and Postgraduate Centre for Philosophical Inquiry at Glasgow University to teach and supervise researches in CoPI. Now postgraduate education in CoPI is provided at Strathclyde University at Glasgow under the leadership of Claire Cassidy.

With the increase of European practitioners in PwC, In 1993, SOPHIA (The European Foundation for the Advancement of Doing PwC) was set up in order to support doing PwC in all European cultures and languages.

In 2007, Emma and Peter Worley founded Philosophy Foundation which is a charity to conduct PwC in schools, communities and workplaces. They produce their own material to use in the practice. PwC has been currently implementing in more than 60 countries (Ventista, 2019). Turkey is also included in these countries.

PwC firstly entered Turkey in the early 1990s. Ionna Kucuradi is the person who launched PwC project under Philosophical Society of Turkey. Nuran Direk was also the coordinator of the project. In 1992, Direk began to conduct PwC programmes for primary and secondary school students. Later, in 2016, Özge Özdemir founded Little Thinkers Society in Bogazici University to announce in Turkey, to promote the research and implementations on P4C, moreover to arrange Philosophy for Children Educator Trainings for several communities. In 2018, P4C Turkey was founded to use P4C starting from early childhood education and also to train communities in P4C. Moreover, in 2019, research assistant Filiz Karadağ who got training from EPIC organized PwC Educator Training Programme which centred on CoPI method, together with associate professor Kurtul Gülenç in philosophy department.

2.4 Describing Philosophy with Children

Philosophy with Children (PwC) is the pedagogical approach of doing philosophy with children. PwC aims to encourage critical and creative thinking in children, without filling children with the intellectual knowledge of traditional philosophy, however developing and expressing their own ideas (Lipman, 2003). Moreover, PwC is the general title of the kind of doing philosophy into practice with children where children question, make meaning through communication- interactions in a community of inquiry, show reasons for their ideas and see that they may be fallible on the subject (Cassidy & Christie, 2013; McCall, 2013). According to Cam (2006), Fisher (2013), Haynes (2014) and Stanley (2004), PwC means a collaborative inquiry-based pedagogy which is focused on improving thinking skills through the deliberation within a community. By these definitions, PwC is the approach which rises against the traditional education where the teacher as a source of knowledge asks questions and expects a single right answer from children (Kennedy, 2012; Topping & Trickey, 2014). Additionally, PwC is the approach which does not deal with transmitting any knowledge about what children should think of a certain issue, rather deals with directing them in how to think (Scholl, Nichols, & Burgh, 2009). According to Wegerif (2010), PwC ‘‘is possibly the most positively evaluated thinking skills programme’’.

Matthew Lipman released ‘Philosophy for Children’ (P4C) method in 1970s as a way to do philosophy with young children in the educational environment. P4C is accepted as the first and most widely known method to make philosophy with children. After Lipman, several researchers also continued to develop philosophising with children. CoPI of McCall is one of the methods which was developed after P4C and might be the most notable among methods in philosophizing with children (Sutcliffe, 2017). Socratic Dialogue of Nelson is another method to philosophize with children and corresponds to earlier period than P4C and CoPI.

After some researchers begin to study on Philosophy for Children, they firstly introduced ‘PwC’ term instead of ‘Philosophy for Children’ to do PwC (Sutcliffe, 2017). Since according to Vansieleghem and Kennedy, while ‘for’ emphasized creating the dialogue for the children and also the superiority of the teacher in the dialogue; ‘with’ drawed the attention to building the dialogue together with children and equality in the dialogue (2011). Afterwards, PwC has become the general title of the kind of doing philosophy into practice with children, even if there are different methods which have specific name in doing PwC.

2.4.1 Different Methods in Philosophy with Children

2.4.1.1 Philosophy for Children (P4C)

Matthew Lipman, with the great support of his collaborator Sharp, suggested the way of philosophizing with children under the name of ‘Philosophy for Children’ (P4C) in 1970s. Lipman argued, inspired by Dewey, that education should meet the need for democracy in society through preparing for and itself practicing democracy (Kennedy, & Kennedy, 2011). In the practice of democracy in educational environment, children actively participate in their learning through converting classrooms into communities of inquiry (Gillen, 2015). P4C presents the opportunity of directly practicing democracy in education, for children. With this aim, Lipman puts **4C** in the center of P4C as **c**ritical, **c**reative, **c**ollaborative and **c**aring thinking. According to Lipman (2003), critical thinking is to justify and evaluate ideas, creative thinking is to introduce new ideas and to build on ideas of others,

collaborative thinking is to work constructively together with the group and caring thinking is to involve consideration of and respect for others and their interests.

By P4C, Lipman aims to support children in their becoming individuals who think more, make a judgment, advocate, justify, and question this judgment in the community of inquiry (Vansieleghem & Kennedy 2011). With regard to define community of philosophical inquiry, Lipman (2003) describes a community of philosophical inquiry as a community where:

> Students listen to each other with respect, build on one another's ideas, challenge one another to supply reasons for otherwise unsupported opinions, assist each other in drawing inferences from what has been said, and seek to identify one another's assumptions. (p. 18)

P4C introduced philosophy into K-12 classroom by removing philosophical terminology and benefiting from children's literature (Brown et al., 2012). This children's literature would be such a kind of literature that had accessible language and could raise to trigger the philosophical discussion for young readers. For this reason, Lipman wrote novels to be especially used during P4C sessions. In P4C, the teacher facilitates the dialogue with the focus on democracy among the community of inquiry (Cassidy & Christie, 2013). In conformity with its democratic nature, the question which children would like to discuss is selected by their voting.

2.4.1.2 Community of Philosophical Inquiry (CoPI)

Community of Philosophical Inquiry (CoPI) was produced by Catherine McCall as a consequence of her experience as a philosophy student and her studies with Lipman in the 1980s in order to philosophize with both children and adults (Cassidy, 2007). McCall builds CoPI Method by benefiting from realist philosophy. In realist philosophy, reality might be different than we know; that is, truth which is constructed by human beings can be wrong (Matthews, 2017). To reveal this contradiction, CoPI focuses on differences and disagreements in thoughts during the dialogue.

Similar to Lipman's P4C, community of philosophical inquiry is at the center of McCall's CoPI. In the community, children question, make meaning through communication-interactions, show reasons for their ideas and see that they may be fallible on the subject (Cassidy & Christie, 2013; McCall, 2013). Moreover this community ''does not come into being immediately or by itself, but is created through sustained practice over time'' (McCall, 2017, p. 80). In this way, being in a CoPI means more than physically and instantly gathering. CoPI focuses on the dialogue of the community. This feature distinguishes CoPI from P4C, for P4C of Lipman focuses on children and their democratic participation in the dialogue more (McCall, 2017). What important is in CoPI is the quality of a dialogue and this characteristics of the method allows deep consideration of the issue. In CoPI, the participation of children is also important, however, being philosophical of this participation as much as possible is desired much more. Similarly, in the selection of the question which would be discussed on, the facilitator determines the most philosophical one among the questions of children.

To be able to select the most philosophical question and to keep the philosophical quality of the dialogue, teacher in CoPI needs to learn philosophical knowledge and logical argumentation unlike P4C where teacher does not have to know philosophy and logic (McCall, 2017). Throughout the philosophical dialogue, children in CoPI talk and learn together and collaboratively construct their learning by agreeing or disagreeing with a previous statement and giving justification of their statements. It is such a kind of educative practice that McCall (2017) points out those five-year old children who actively participate in the communities of philosophical inquiry can better do philosophy than university students who passively learn about the history of philosophy and philosophers.

2.4.1.3 Socratic Dialogue

Socratic Dialogue is one of the first methods in which students actively do philosophy rather than passively learn knowledge of history of philosophy. The method was developed by Leonard Nelson by benefiting from Socrates and Kant's

ways of doing philosophy. For Nelson (1965), philosophizing with children is ‘‘the art not of teaching about philosophers but of making philosophers of the students’’. Similar to other methods in PwC, Nelson also regarded philosophy as a practice while rejecting acknowledging philosophy as teaching ideas of philosophers (Pihlgren, 2008). The basic purpose of the Socratic Dialogue is to encourage children to think for themselves. In this encouragement, teacher does never lecture or directly ask questions to children. Instead of them, teachers make children call their own ideas into question by raising difficulties and causing them to suspect their ideas in the dialogue, similar to maieutic process in the dialogues of Socrates (Roy, 2005). It is like an intellectual midwifery, who supports the birth of ideas of others. This similars a discovery. Knowledge is inside people and is tried to be revealed during the dialogue. For this reason, a teacher in the Socratic Dialogue is required to know philosophy like in CoPI.

Moreover, in Socratic Dialogue, participants are expected to share their opinions only based on the real experiences. Moreover, participants make an effort to come to agreement unlike the other two method in philosophizing with children (McCall, 2017, p. 100). According to Socratic Dialogue, if someone disagrees with one idea, the dialogue is probably going wrong. The facilitator often controls whether everyone understands and agrees about the idea at issue and philosophical anaylsis continues until noone disagrees. On the other hand, if there is a consensus, the facilitator should confirm that consensus is a true consensus where noone abstains from expressing disagreement because they are polite or do not want to interrupt the deepening discussion (Boyacı, Karadağ, & Gülenç, 2018). Considering all of these dialogue in Socratic Dialogue is a very slow and demanding process. Comparing Socratic Dialogue with P4C and CoPI, Socratic Dialogue may be said to have a more rigid structure than the other two methods for philosophizing with children.

2.5 Using Philosophy with Children in Education

PwC was particularly introduced as a way of applying philosopy in the educational area (Gruioniu, 2012). This innovation in an educational world can cause to make

analogies between PwC and already used approaches and practices in the area. For example, PwC can be seen as similar to inquiry-based approach in education (Dougherty, 2017). In his interview with Naji (2013), Cam, who is an international authority in PwC, explains the relationship between PwC and inquiry-based approach by stating that the heart of PwC pedagogy is full of a collaborative inquiry-based approach. On the other hand, PwC might be perceived as disconnected thinking games and merely sharing of ideas (Haynes, 2011). Similarly, PwC may be considered equal to activities in circle time where certain issues are discussed (O'Riordan, 2013). In this way, they revealed the wrong and incomplete assumptions related to PwC Approach.

Regarding PwC's becoming part of the school curriculum, there are different views. Newell-Jones (2012) drew attention to that PwC takes effect when it is used as a teaching tool within the curriculum. Conversely, the study of O'Riordan (2013) revealed that teachers raise concerns about crowded curriculum and also so time constraints to integrated PwC in the school curriculum. Millet and Kay (2011) pointed out importance of the content and form of lessons and found that PwC was an effective tool to teach values in the scope of the curriculum. Differently, Ventista (2019) held that in order to properly use PwC in the educational area, PwC needs specifically dedicated time without being imbedded in different subjects.

Farahani (2014) focused on the time of date with PwC in education and asserted that philosophy should not be limited with a certain period of time and should be initiated since the beginning of the education. With respect to use of PwC in early childhood education, Maxwell (2005) agreed with Farahani and argued that philosophy can centrally take a place in early childhood curriculum. About PwC's becoming part of the school curriculum, another issue is the efficiency of the person who implements PwC in the classrooms (Haynes, 2011). To be able to PwC integrate with their curriculum, teachers must primarily be equipped with awareness and knowledge about PwC and thoroughly learn how to properly use PwC in their classrooms. Classroom size may also affect the quality of PwC sessions. In respect to this, Fisher

(2013) mentioned that a group size of around 14 is ideal for properly using PwC, and over that size might lead to share ideas of fewer children and in a shorter time.

When PwC will be used in education, it is also possible to encounter some obstacles. Maxwell (2005) considered that the possible primary obstacle to integrate PwC into the curriculum is the prejudice against both children and philosophy. Another obstacle to use PwC in educational area may be traditional schooling structure (Kizel, 2016). Since, pedagogy of searching dominates in PwC while traditional education corresponds to pedagogy of fear. Furthermore, lack of appropriate teacher training might impede proper use of PwC (Haynes, 2011; Millet &Tapper, 2011). Besides that, Farahani (2014) also presents the significance of the family awareness and the structure of the society about using PwC in education. Considering educational context, family is one of the most important components. According to Farahani, in the issue of using PwC in education, if family is not aware of what PwC is and of its effects on their children, they may disapprove of the use of PwC in the classrooms of their children. Members of the society might also pose an obstacle against the use of PwC in education in the case that society dislikes for its authenticity and values being criticized (Farahani, 2014; Haynes, 2011).

2.5.1 Related Literature about the Impacts of Philosophy with Children on Children

There has been a growing body of research on demonstrating effects of PwC on children when PwC is used in educational area (Kilby, B, 2019). However, studies have been mostly conducted with primary and secondary school children. On the other hand, in these studies, although several benefits of PwC in diverse areas for children have been revealed, the most prominent effect of PwC is in the area of cognitive development (Yan, et al., 2018).

The literature indicated that using PwC programs in educational area contribute to children's reasoning skills (Daniel & Auriac, 2011; Lam, 2012; Marashi, 2009; Topping & Trickey, 2007; Yusoff, 2018), critical and creative thinking (Dyfed County Council,1994; Ghaedi et al., 2015; Haas, 1980; Jenkins & Lyle, 2010;

Lipman & Bierman, 1970; Marashi, 2008; Siddiqui et al., 2015) and collaborative thinking (Phillips, n.d.). Coherently with these studies, the meta-analysis report which was written by García-Moriyón, Rebollo and Colom (2005) reveals that Philosophy for Children approach has a positive impact on critical thinking skills of children. Additionally, the studies of Jenkins and Lyle, (2010) and Yusoff (2018) indicated that the use of PwC improved questioning skills of children. There are also studies which indicated positive effects of using PwC in educational area on academic achievement in maths, reading and writing (Dyfed County Council, 1994; ETS study, 1980; Fields, 1995; Haas, 1980; Imani et al., 2016; Lipman & Bierman, 1970; Siddiqui et al., 2015; Williams, 1993). Furthermore, regarding the relationship between academic achievement and socio-economic backgrounds of children, Siddiqui, Gorard and See (2015) revealed that the use of PwC in educational area more significantly affected the academic achievement of economically disadvantaged students. In agreement with the findings of Siddiqui, Gorard and See (2015), Ventista (2019) also reported greater impact on academic achievement in reading and writing of economically disadvantaged students.

Related to language area, studies show that PwC promotes active listening(Campbell, 2002; Commonwealth of Australia, 2008; Dyfed County Council, 1994) and expressive language (Campbell, 2002; Dyfed County Council, 1994; Jenkins & Lyle, 2010; Trickey, 2007). Furthermore, Jenkins and Lyle (2010) and Newell-Jones (2012) found that children who had been labeled as low achievers made surprisingly oral contributions during the use of PwC. Additionally, the study of Newell-Jones (2012) revealed that the use of PwC in education gave an opportunity to increase vocabulary and self-expression in bilingual linguistic development.

Besides the effects of PwC on cognitive and language areas, there are also studies which demonstrated the effects of using PwC in educational area on social emotional development of children. Several studies indicated that the use of PwC positively affects children's self-confidence (Campbell, 2002; Siddiqui, et al., 2015; Topping & Trickey, 2007), self-esteem (Cassidy et al., 2017; Palsson et al., 1998; Topping & Trickey, 2007), respect for other ideas (Cassidy & Christie, 2013), open-mindedness

(Fair et al., 2015), collaboration (Siddiqui, et al., 2015), socialization and self-direction (Naraghi et al., 2013), social behaviour, empathy and self-regulation of emotions (Cassidy et al., 2017; Topping & Trickey, 2007), intercultural understanding and awareness (Camhy, 2007), engagement with learning and peer relationships (Commonwealth of Australia, 2008; Topping &Trickey, 2007; Yusoff, 2018) and intentionally and intensely participation (Campbell, 2002; Cassidy & Christie, 2013; Marashi, 2008; Topping & Trickey, 2007). By specifically focusing on the effects of PwC approach on children with autism, Cassidy et al. (2017) revealed the usefulness of using PwC on these children in terms of their engagement and self-regulation.

With respect to early childhood education, studies on PwC which were conducted with preschool children are in a more limited number compared with the other periods in education. Nevertheless, the studies in the field were seen to be mostly carried out in the cognitive area. In the area of cognitive development, Gasparatou and Kampeza (2012) performed an exploratory qualitative research in two kindergartens in Greece to explore the possibility of P4C in kindergarten and the effect of P4C on critical thinking skills of children. One of the kindergartens was the experiment and the other was the control group in the P4C-pilot-program. In the study, Gasparatou and Kampeza provided training program of P4C including the history, aim, methods and expected outcomes of P4C by meeting with teachers in the experimental group twice before the implementation. Then the classroom teachers themselves implemented P4C in their classrooms and they evaluated the effects of the implementation via some marker-words which children used, such as ‘why’, ‘because’ and ‘hence’. Results of the study showed that children in experimental group began to philosophize and that their critical thinking skills were developed.

Similar to the study of Gasparatou and Kampeza, McCall’s study (2017) was conducted to examine on PwC’s effect on critical thinking skills in early childhood period. However, differently from them, McCall used CoPI method during implementations. She conducted her qualitative study with 5-year old children for 56 hours. McCall, on the other hand, was giving college students philosophy lessons

where students passively listened and learned others' philosophies for sixty hours. As a result, McCall indicated that critical thinking skills of 5-year old children were improved through PwC and they can philosophize better than college students.

In the cognitive area, differently, Ghaedi et al. (2015) carried out a study to examine PwC's effect on creative thinking skills on preschool children. In the study, PwC program was implemented with preschool children for 16 sessions and it was reached the conclusion that PwC program fosters the development of creative thinking in preschool children.

In addition to studies in the cognitive domain, the effects of PwC on language and social-emotional development of children in early childhood have been investigated but these studies have been yet very limited. By focusing on language development related to cognitive area, Säre, Luik,and Tulviste (2016) performed a study to investigate the effect of P4C on verbal reasoning skills of children aged 5 to 6 years. In the study, they compared the verbal reasoning skills of the intervention and control groups after an eight-month experiment. At the end of the study, they found that P4C improved the verbal reasoning skills of children aged 5 to 6 years.

In early childhood education, Dyfed study (1994) focused on cognitive development of children as well as language and social-emotional developmental areas. In this experimental study, total of 229 5-year-old children were studied and throughout about an academic year, one of the groups was implemented 'P4C and a reading activity', another group was implemented a reading activity and the other had no intervention. As a result of the study, it is found that PwC approach fostered preschool children in thinking, listening and speaking skills, and self-confidence.

2.5.2 Related Literature about Teacher in Philosophy with Children

In PwC, the role of teacher has a great importance. Teacher is not a leader of the community of inquiry as a source of knowledge. Conversely, teacher is a facilitator to construct their own knowledge of children, without steering them. Teacher in PwC approach does not participate in an inquiry together with children, rather

promotes children's active interaction between each other and evaluation and giving reasons for their ideas (Maxwell, 2005; O'Tuel& Bullard, 1995). Moreover, the teacher in PwC encourages children to freely express and discuss different ideas (Fisher 1998; Lipman, Sharp & Oscanyan 1980). In this self-governing community of inquiry, teacher is not the only person who is responsible for the content, direction, procedures and rules of an inquiry. Responsibility is shared by the community. On the other hand, although PwC does not mean the transfer of philosophers' views and the dominance of the facilitator/ teachers, it requires teachers to have philosophical sensitivity. This is important for children to gain awareness of various perspectives, and to activate their reasoning and analytical thinking skills (Daniel & Auriac, 2011; Lone, 2012b). Furthermore, in some methods in PwC, the teacher is expected to have a background in philosophy and logic in order to ensure a philosophical dimension of a discussion (McCall, 2017).

Taking into account all of these, PwC studies focused on teacher. Haynes and Murris (2011) presented that PwC has a transformative power in professional development of teachers. According to them, the use of PwC deconstructs prevalent thinking patterns of teachers in education and leads them to acknowledge a different ontology of child which is able and resilient and to get rid of established hierarchy between teacher and student. On the other hand, by reason of possibility of having 'controversial and sensitive content' of inquiries during using PwC, some teachers might be anxious about their possible strong feelings and sending wrong message to children (Haynes & Murris, 2008). Moreover, they might have a fear of parental complaints and misconceptions about the use of PwC (Haynes, 2008). The literature also shows that to be able to obtain the optimal success of PwC, teachers should be philosophically trained and should possess these skills in using PwC (Sofo & Imbriosciano, 1991). Furthermore, in the interview of Shaughnessy with Gregory (2005), Gregory emphasized teacher training in PwC with that "The only way to prepare teachers to facilitate this kind of thinking and inquiry with children is to facilitate the same kind of thinking and inquiry with the teachers"

(p. 7). Considering all of these, PwC studies have turned to implement PwC with teachers.

As it is shown in the literature, there have been some experimental studies were conducted with teachers and teacher candidates and moreover the use of PwC has also been diverse impacts on them. The experimental study of Roberts (2006) is one of them. In the study, Roberts studied with 11 primary school teachers and investigated the effects of teacher development program on Philosophy for Children and explored the perceptions of teachers about both themselves and their students. Teachers attended ten 'Philosophy for Children' sessions which are conducted by the thesis supervisor and at the end of sessions were encouraged to implement the program in their educational area. As a result, teachers expressed that they gained more insights about their students, their ability, capability and thoughts, and P4C experience affected their personal relationships in terms of listening more and being able to say 'I don't agree because' and supported the use of PwC in education throughout the curriculum.

Similarly, Scholl, Nichols and Burgh (2016) carried out a research with primary teachers. In the quasi-experimental study, they studied with fifty-nine primary teachers in two groups as the experimental and comparison group. The experimental group was trained in PwC for two days by two trainers including the researcher. The content of the training was the process of facilitating PwC, actively facilitating PwC in their own classrooms and the planning a philosophy lesson. Researchers had three semi-structured interviews (pre-intervention, 3 months post intervention and 7 months post-intervention). Participants in the experimental group were observed teaching a lesson incorporating PwC for 3 month post-intervention interview. The researchers found that teachers' pedagogical repertoires significantly broadened in ways that included drawing on students' background knowledge and preparing a problem-based curriculum.

Differently, the dissertation study of O'Riordan (2017) was conducted with 8 primary teachers who had been trained in P4C before the study. In the study,

teacher's perception of the factors determining the implementation of P4C in the primary classroom was examined. In this longitudinal 7-month study, participants implemented P4C in their classrooms and the researcher had interview with teachers. O'Riordan found that teachers gave more importance to children's questioning and discussion, had increased confidence in the field and moved towards a more dialogic pedagogy. However, while some participants preferred implementing P4C through the literacy curriculum, some preferred as a stand-alone lesson. On the other hand, in the end of the study, all participants confirmed that P4C could be associated with the content of other subjects in the curriculum. Some participants ceased their implementations in the classrooms due to time and performance pressures. Participants implemented P4C in a different number. Related to the issue, the researcher deduced that the difference might be caused by differing levels of motivation or confidence in the efficacy of P4C. Related motivation of teachers, O'Riordan propounded that its uncertain nature might make teachers feel as if loosing the control on classroom management. Additionally, according to the researcher, high expectations from teachers could affect teachers' continuing to use PwC (Williams, 2018). Teachers are often expected to use new applications in education and this may cause them not to be able to maintain to use PwC.

Siddiqui, Gorard, and See (2015) performed an intervention and evaluated its results in *Philosophy for Children: Evaluation Report and Executive Summary*. In the study, teachers were trained in PwC and teachers themselves implemented PwC with their fourth and fifth-grade students. In the scope of the study, the researchers also observed and had interview with teachers besides students. Coherently with the findings of O'Riordan, they found that teachers encouraged and demonstrated questioning and reasoning to their students and established less dominance in discussions. Additionally, teachers reported that the overall success of PwC depends on the regular using of PwC in education.

Another longitudinal study was by Newell-Jones (2012). The study was conducted with primary and secondary school teachers in the scope of about one-year Wiser Wales Project. In the study, P4C trainers trained primary and secondary school

teachers in PwC as well as directly worked with students. As a result, it was reported that teachers who used PwC with children over a period of time adopted less teacher-led approach, focused more on children and allowed children to contribute to the ideas of each other. Additionally, the result showed that some teachers felt uncomfortable with using PwC when they were not supported adequately by the school and they exposed to many other pressures.

Similar to the study of O'Riordan, Scholl (2014) studied with primary teachers who received training in PwC before. In the study, Scholl had interviews with thirteen primary school teachers who received training in PwC by The Federation of Australasian Philosophy in Schools Associations (FAPSA). At the end of the study, the researcher found that PwC supports the thinking skills of teachers and the critical evolution of their pedagogy.

In relation to the studies with teacher candidates, Daniel (1998) carried out two researches with pre-service teachers in physical education. The first study was conducted with four pre-service teachers by implementing two-hour PwC per week for nine weeks. In the second one, the study was conducted with thirteen trainees in physical education by implementing one-hour exchange of pedagogical experiences and one-hour PwC per week for fifteen weeks. Differently from first study, Daniel had individual interview with each trainee at the end of the training period about the awareness of their cognitive evolution. At the end of two researches, Daniel found that in the long run, PwC is a significant mean to develop critical thinking of participants and to increase quality of their teaching.

Another study which was conducted with teacher candidates was by Mergler, Curtis and Spooner-Lane (2009). They reported reflections of three pre-service teachers who participated in the twelve-week theoretical PwC program. As a result, they revealed that PwC increased self-awareness, attentive listening, the opportunity and ability to consider differing viewpoints and to express ideas with supporting reasons. Moreover, they added that pre-service teachers should have also actively experienced PwC to be able to actively engage their students in PwC.

Similarly, Demissie (2015) studied with eleven second-year student teachers. Firstly, researcher gave them a large piece of paper to record their views about the nature of knowledge and then discussed about the theoretical aspect of PwC and the structure of a PwC inquiry. Lastly, participants revisited their original drawings about knowledge, and completed a questionnaire about their perceptions of the module on their thinking about pedagogy. The study of Demissie showed that participants reflected on PwC that extended their pedagogical expertise and reconsidered their views about children's potential.

Differently from other studies which were performed with teacher candidates, in the study of Green and Condy (2016), teacher candidates received experiential training in PwC and implemented PwC during their teaching practice. The study was conducted with seventy-four final year education students. All students had received sixteen hours of experiential training in PwC consisting the principles of PwC, given selected readings, experienced community of inquiry dialogues and a variety of materials. After the training, they experimented with PwC during their teaching practice and submitted an assignment. 30 volunteered of seventy-four participants participated in focus group discussions at the end of the year. At the end of the study, researchers found that pre-service teachers believed that PwC could foster active and critical learning, create a context for collaboration and mutual respect, enhance thinking and reasoning, prepare learners for democratic citizenship, enhance awareness of different perspectives and develop language skills.

2.5.3 Related Literature about Teacher-Child Relationship in Philosophy with Children

Apart from the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on children and teacher, in the literature, although it is limited, it has been also revealed that the use of PwC in education affects the relationship between student and teacher. The study of Topping and Trickey (2007) indicated that children had more sophisticated capacity to think than teachers expected them to be and this expectation gave shape their relationship. The use of PwC in their classroom provided them to see real

capacity of their students and increased the quantity and the quality of teacher-child dialogue in the classroom.

Some other studies also presented that as a result of using PwC in the classroom, teacher-child relationship is based on dialogue, and issues are negotiated and evaluated not by a teacher as one authority, but by all members in the classroom community (Fisher, 2007; Haynes, 2014; Jenkins & Lyle, 2010). In this dialogue, both teacher and child listen and talk respectfully (Lyle, 2018). Furthermore, with the increase of the dialogue in the classroom, PwC contributes everyone in the classroom to feel themselves in a safe place where mutual trust (Kovalainen, et. al, 2001; Splitter, 2014). Kovalainen et al. (2001) and Dougherty (2017) also stated that the use of PwC affects on the classroom management and the classroom begins to be managed in a more communal manner.

2.6 Related Literature about Philosophy with Children in Turkish Context

In Turkey, Gür (2011) in the descriptive paper '*Çocuklar için Felsefe'*, addressed the history, aim and implementation of PwC. Boyacı, Karadağ and Gülenç (2018) in '*Çocuklar İçin Felsefe / Çocuklarla Felsefe: Felsefi Metotlar, Uygulamalar ve Amaçlar'* examined different perspectives in PwC with their philosophical and historical roots and different effects on children. Similar to these studies, Sormaz Öğüt (2019) in the doctoral thesis, identified philosophical thinking and presented activities which enable that and the history, aims, methods, benefits of Philosophy for Children and the role of educator as a facilitator in PwC. By approaching PwC more specifically, Günhan Altıparmak (2016),in the paper '*The Concept of Curiosity in the Practice of Philosophy for Children*', stressed that the importance of curiosity in PwC. On the other hand, Dirican (2017) in the paper '*Çocuklarla Felsefeye Varoluşsal Bir Bakış*', presented some mistakes in education system and the effects of PwC on overcoming these mistakes.

Related to the studies which were conducted with children in educational area in Turkey, Akkocaoğlu Çayır (2015), in the doctoral thesis, examined how 'Philosophy for Children' program affects 3rd grade students in the cognitive, affective and social

areas domains. At the end of the research, it was observed that students established relations between concepts and associated the concepts with everyday life regarding cognitive area, enjoyed the philosophy and awareness of the concepts regarding affective area and made progress in communication and problem solving skills regarding social area. Moreover, in the study, the gains of the sessions prepared for PwC were consistent with the gains in the current 3rd grade curriculum, so the researcher deduced that PwC could be integrated with the school curriculum.

In relation to studies which were performed with preschool children in Turkey, Okur (2008) in the master's thesis, studied with 24 six-year-old children for ten P4C sessions. Okur analyzed Philosophy for Children in terms of the improvement of children's specific social skills that are assertiveness, self-control, and cooperation. At the end of the study, Okur found that the use of Philosophy for Children significantly affected children's assertiveness, self-control, and cooperation.

Furthermore, Karadağ, Demirtaş and Yıldız (2017) developed the 'Critical Thinking Scale through Philosophical Inquiry for the children at five- and six-year old in pre-school period' to evaluate their critical thinking skills through PwC. After that, Karadağ and Demirtaş (2018) conducted a research with 30 five- and six-year old children to understand the effectiveness of PwC curriculum on critical thinking. They measured the effect by using Critical Thinking Scale through Philosophical Inquiry and found that PwC was effective on critical thinking skills of children.

Related with the effect of PwC on preschool children's questioning, another study was by Demirtaş, Karadağ and Gülenç (2018). They studied with 14 six-year old children to determine the level of questions and the differences in the quality of their answers during PwC implementations. They observed that 'Philosophy for Children' program enhanced the levels of asking questions and giving answers of preschool children during their philosophical inquiry.

With more participants, Karadağ and Demirtaş (2018) conducted another research with 28 six-year-old children through implementing CoPI in PwC approaches by the researcher throughout eight weeks. They reached the conclusion that PwC developed

the level of questions and answers given by pre-school children in their philosophical inquiry. Karadağ and Demirtaş (2018) also gave place to views of 3 preschool teachers on the Philosophy with Curriculum by means of semi-structured interviews. Teachers were not active participants of implementations in the study, but were observants of their students. The researchers reached that preschool teachers thought that PwC has several benefits on children in terms of expressing thoughts better, presenting opinions and defending them, style of responding, developing different points of view, asking different questions, improvement in inquiry skills, multi-dimensional thinking, improvement in communication, justifying thoughts, making comparison among thoughts, empathy, thinking about someone else's thoughts and language skills. Furthermore, with respect to the views of preschool teachers on continuing the PwC activity and its inclusion in the curriculum, preschool teachers found PwC highly suitable for preschool period and stated that they were eager to include similar activities in weekly plans and to use the approach permanently in their life.

Regarding studies which were conducted with teacher, in Turkey, Akkocaoğlu Çayır (2016) carried out a qualitative study with thirty teacher candidates who were in the elementary education department and in the guidance and psychological counseling department. In the study, throughout fourteen week, Akkocaoğlu Çayır (2016) taught theoretical and practical knowledge and sample activities and related analysis regarding PwC. Moreover, the pre-service teachers were required to choose an elementary school lesson and prepared a plan by linking it with the goals or values in the curriculum. Then they applied their plans to other peers in the classroom. According to the study, teacher candidates struggled to ask questions, conduct debates, and associate philosophy with curricula. However, their perceptions of childhood and philosophy changed positively.

2.7 Summary

This chapter concentrated on six main topics: theoretical background of the study, philosophy and children, historical background of PwC, describing PwC, using PwC in education and related studies in Turkish context.

Philosophy with Children (PwC) is the approach which aims to encourage critical and creative thinking in children, without filling children with the intellectual knowledge of traditional philosophy, however developing and expressing their own ideas (Lipman, 2003). Moreover, PwC is the general title of the kind of doing philosophy into practice with children where children question, make meaning through communication- interactions in a community of inquiry, show reasons for their ideas and see that they may be fallible on the subject (Cassidy & Christie, 2013; McCall, 2013).

The social development theory of Vygotsky is the theoretical key of a community of philosophical inquiry corresponding to the cognitive cooperation of peers and facilitators in PwC (Dewey, 1996). Literature showed that when PwC is used in education, it has several positive effects on children, teacher and the relationship between them. However, most of the previous studies concentrated on primary and secondary school children and teachers. For this reason, there have been limited studies associated with PwC in early childhood education. Especially, studies associated with preschool teachers are very limited. Based on mentioned literature, in the current study, it was aimed to preschool teachers' views on PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings through PwC experience.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The general aim of the study is to investigate preschool teachers' views on PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings through PwC experience. To this aim, the focus of this chapter is the methodology of the study covering the design of the study, purpose and the research questions, PwC experience, participants, tools which are used for collecting data and the process and data analysis. Finally, ethical procedures, trustworthiness and limitations of the study were addressed.

3.1 Research Design

This study aims at investigating PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings on preschool teachers through the implementations by the researcher and the uses of the approach by the participants themselves. With this aim, the researcher conducted a qualitative research in this study because the qualitative research design allowed the participants to have a deep understanding of their views (Creswell, 2007) and thus it made the results of the study more meaningful and extensive. Considering the aims and the structure of the study, an evaluative case study design was used specifically in this study. Since ‘‘A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenology and context are not clearly evident’’ (Yin, 2009, p. 18). Moreover, “A case study is particularly useful for evaluating programs when programs are unique, when an established program is implemented in a new setting.” (Balbach, 2015, p. 17). Furthermore, an evaluative case study focuses on evaluating the merit of some practice or program beyond describing them (Thomas et al., 2015; Yin, 2003). Therefore, an evaluative case

study was appropriate for this study which aimed at investigating preschool teachers' views on PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings.

3.2 Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of the current study was to examine the views of preschool teachers about PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings, through PwC experience. In line with this aim, the current study focused on the following research questions:

1) What are the views of preschool teachers about PwC before and after PwC experience?
2) What are the views of preschool teachers about the use of PwC in early childhood education settings before and after PwC experience?
    a) What are the views of preschool teachers about the use of PwC in early childhood education before and after PwC experience?
    b) What are the views of preschool teachers about the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on children before and after PwC experience?
    c) What are the views of preschool teachers about the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on teacher before and after PwC experience?
    d) What are the views of preschool teachers about the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on the relationship between student and teacher before and after PwC experience?
    e) What are the views of preschool teachers about obstacles in using PwC in their educational environment before and after PwC experience?

3.3 PwC Experience

In the scope of the current study, the researcher conducted a ten-week PwC implementation with preschool teachers and moreover preschool teachers used PwC at least two times in their own classrooms after ending the implementation of the researcher. Thus, 'PwC experience' in the study corresponded to the sum of the

implementations of both the researcher and the preschool teachers. The researcher who is a certified trainer about PwC and a bachelor of philosophy prepared the implementation program in accordance with the structure of PwC sessions and also by benefiting from thought experiments in philosophy, stories for philosophy for kids and children's literature which raised philosophical questions (see Appendix B).

3.3.1 Structure of PwC Sessions

Each PwC session has a specific structure for the community to be eagerly provoked in the philosophical inquiry, focused on the inquiry and gone into more depth in their thinking journey. Siddiqui, Gorard and See (2015) explains the specific ten stages of PwC sessions as follows:

1- Getting set in a circle; for everyone to be able to see and hear each other. In this stage, warm-up activities may be conducted to assist children in effectively moving into philosophical discussion. These activities consist of questions such as 'If it were a friendship cake, what would be this cake's recipe?' before 'A Picture of a Friend' story which is on what a friend is.
2- Presentation of stimulus which will provoke children's interest and excite a philosophical dialogue. The stimulus might be a story, a picture, a short film or an object.
3- Thinking time in pairs when children think about what is strange, interesting and unusual about the stimulus and share their thoughts with a partner
4- Question making where children collaboratively form a question as philosophically as possible in pairs
5- Question airing where children in pairs share questions with the community. All questions are collected and recorded.
6- Question choosing where one of the questions is selected through children's voting or by the facilitator/ teacher in a way to choose the most philosophical
7- First thoughts where children individually share their first thoughts on the selected question with the community

8- Building where the dialogue is opened to the community, children state their ideas through ‘I agree with …, because…’ an ‘I don’t agree with .., because…’. By this way, they build their ideas on ideas of others in the community. The role of the teacher at this stage is to support students' reasoning, motivate them to question and encourage them to participate in a dialogue. Teachers often lead students to imagine alternatives and results, to seek evidence, and to provide examples and counter examples.
9- Last thoughts in which children share the last words on the discussion and summarize their views. Compared to the beginning of the discussion, if there were changes in their ideas, they are encouraged to state them.
10- Review in which children evaluate their own progress in the dialogue. The teacher asks ‘What went well?' and 'What did we need to improve?' and can point out the behavior of the children during the discussion. (Siddiqui, Gorard, & See, 2015).

3.3.2 Stimuli in PwC Sessions

In PwC sessions, what triggers children’s wonder and interest in philosophical inquiry and enables them to easily focus on the inquiry is the stimulus to be used. A short text, a short movie, a picture, or an object can be used as a stimulus in PwC sessions. What important is in a stimulus is its being a stimulus which is clear of philosophical terminology, but raises philosophical questions.

In the current study, short stories, a short tale and a picture were used as stimuli throughout PwC implementations. Before implementing, to validate the stimuli of implementation program, the researcher consulted the experts’ opinion. This expert was graduated from early childhood education and the member of Special Education and specialized in the field of PwC. After this consultation, one stimulus was removed. This stimulus was that:

> Sam is a boy who really wants to ride a bike. But he says he can't ride at that moment. Because the only suitable bike it can ride is pink. So she is a girl's bike.

According to the expert, this stimulus was so short to trigger the philosophical discussion. For this reason, instead of that, another stimulus was added to the implementation program. This stimulus was ‘‘Ballerino Nate’ Story of Kimberley Brubaker Bradley.

Thus, 10 stimuli to be used in this study took their final form. 10 stimuli which were used during PwC experience were as follows:

For Week 1:‘Keşiş Yengeci’ from originally ‘The Hermit Crab’ story of Carter Goodrich (2009)

For Week 2: ‘Arkadaşımın Resmi’ story from originally ‘Picture of a Friend’ story of Lipman, Ogden and Matkowski (2003)

For Week 3: ‘Mutsuz Prens’ story from originally ‘The Unhappy Prince’ story from The Philosophy Foundation (n.d.)

For Week 4: ‘Köprüyü Geçerken’ story from originally ‘The Bridge’ story of Heinz Janisch (2014)

For Week 5: ‘İyi Yer ve Kötü Yer’ story from originally ‘Goodland and Badland’ story from The Philosophy Foundation (n.d.)

For Week 6: ‘Kendinin Rengi’ story from originally ‘A Color of His Own’ story Leo Lionni (1975)

For Week 7: ‘Ağustos Böceği ile Karınca’ tale of Ezop (2018)

For Week 8: ‘Dansçı Nate’ story from originally ‘Ballerino Nate’ Story of Kimberley Brubaker Bradley (2006)

For Week 9: ‘Keşfedilmemiş Adadaki Yaratık’ story of Kurtul Gülenç and Filiz Karadağ (2019)

For Week 10: ‘A picture of a child behind a tree’ which was non-verbal visual stimulus

Thus, the ten-week implementation of the researcher lasted one hour per week per session. The researcher shared the plans of ten PwC sessions with the participants after ending the ten-week implementation. Following that, preschool teachers optionally selected at least two of the ten contents and used PwC approach in their own classroom based on their ten-week PwC implementation. Their implementations in their own classroom lasted approximately 40 minutes per implementation for two weeks.

3.4 Participants

This study was conducted with 11 preschool teachers from 6 different public preschools in Antalya. In this research, the selection of participants would depend on their availability and willingness to take part in the study, following a process that is also called convenience sampling. Since this study included ten meetings which were made one hour and once a week for ten weeks with all participants in a common place and time. The location of the implementations was the teachers’ room of S1 Public Preschool which had most teacher participation in the study. This place unanimously was determined by all participants in the study. Regarding the time of the implementations, the participants were met on tuesdays between 1 pm and 2 pm. Moreover, in the scope of the study, it was expected that participants experimented PwC in their own classrooms for at least two times. Besides them, the researcher individually had three interviews with participants in the study. Therefore, availability and willingness of participants were crucial to meet the requirements of this current study. As a result of using convenience sampling in the study, all participants who accepted to participate in the study were from public preschools. That is to say that, in the study, public preschool were not specifically selected. In relation to convenience sampling, Fraenkel and Wallen (2006) stated that convenience sampling satisfies in the case that the participants in the study shares

specific characteristics like demographics. The demographic data of the participants were presented with Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Data of the Study Participants

Participants	Gender	Age	Age Group Being Worked with	Teaching Experience	School	Course, Seminar or Training about PwC
P1	Female	42	5	16	S1 (Public Preschool)	X
P2	Female	32	5	11	S1 (Public Preschool)	X
P3	Female	41	5-6	21	S2 (Public Preschool)	X
P4	Female	34	5	12	S3 (Public Preschool)	X
P5	Female	38	4	16	S4 (Public Preschool)	X
P6	Female	44	4	19	S1 (Public Preschool)	X
P7	Female	55	5	32	S5 (Public Preschool)	X
P8	Female	42	4	19	S1 (Public Preschool)	X
P9	Female	34	5	10	S1 (Public Preschool)	X
P10	Female	53	5-6	31	S6 (Public Preschool)	X
P11	Female	33	5	10	S3 (Public Preschool)	X

3.5 Data Collection Tools of the Study

The study aims to investigate the views of preschool teachers about PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings through PwC experience. In line with this aim, ten-week PwC implementation program was performed with preschool teachers in the study by the researcher and also preschool teachers used PwC in their own educational settings at least two times after the implementation program. Data for the study was collected before, after and during ten-week implementation program and after implementation sessions of participants in their own classrooms. In this study, the researcher used a semi- structured interview, audio-based observation and field notes as the data collection tools.

3.5.1 Interviews

A semi-structured interview was the main instrument to collect data in the study. Fetterman (1988) expresses that interviews are the most significant method of data collection. The researcher collected data with the help of a semi-structured interview because this type of interview enables participants to participate more and offers a flexible way of learning their feelings (Frankel &Wallen, 2006). Patton (2002) also pointed out that interview helped participants with revealing participants' thoughts, emotions and intentions that are hard to observe. Semi-structured interviews encouraged participants to sufficiently answer with the help of more open ended questions. They also provide wider scope for participants in their replying to questions (Edwards & Holland, 2013).

In relation to generation of the interview questions, the interview questions were developed by the researcher following the literature review. To validate the questions, the researcher consulted with three experts who are the members of Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education departments in a public university. In total; three semi-structured interviews were conducted with preschool teachers before and after ten-week implementation and after their use PwC in their own classroom. Pre-interview was conducted in order to reveal the participant teachers' up-to-date views of preschool teachers regarding PwC and the use of PwC in early

childhood education settings. Pre- and post-implementation interviews were two of a kind in order to investigate whether there were any differences in participants' views after ten-week implementation. Additionally, the interview after participants used PwC in their own classroom investigated whether there were any differences in participants' views after their use of PwC in their own classroom. Furthermore, the findings of post-implementation interview and of the interview after participants used PwC in their own classroom were handled together and presented under the name of 'after PwC experience'.

With respect to the procedure of the interviews which were immediately before and after ten-week implementation, the interview which consisted of three sets of questions took approximately 20- 30 minutes. The first set was designed to obtain the personal information of the participants. The second set of questions was developed to collect data about the views of the participants about PwC. The last set of questions was arranged in order to reveal the views of the participants about general use of PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education.

In relation to the procedure of the interview which was had after participants used PwC in their own classroom, this interview which also included two sets of questions lasted approximately 10-15 minutes. The first set of questions was designed to collect their views about PwC after personal PwC implementations in their own classroom. The second was arranged in order to reveal data about the use of PwC in early childhood education.

At the beginning of the study, regarding the validation of the interview questions, the researcher consulted the experts' opinion before conducting the pilot and the main study in order to validate the interview questions and identify required changes. Three experts who are the members of Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education departments in a public university shared their opinions about the appropriateness of the interview questions. After the expert opinions, one question was added as a warm-up question and one of the questions was also removed from

the interview by reason of similarity to another question in the interview. Sentence structures were reconstructed to be more open ended and comprehensible.

3.5.1.1 Interview Questions

3.5.1.1.1 Pre- and Post-Implementation Interview Questions

Table 2

Pre- and Post-Implementation Interview Questions

Main Issues	Example Questions
Demographic Information	• How old are you? • What is your school? Public or Private? • What is your age group in your classroom? • How many terms did you have teaching experience? • Have you ever attended any course, seminar or training about PwC? If yes, what was the content?
Views about PwC	• What does philosophy evoke for you? • What does PwC evoke for you? • What can you relate to PwC after reading the definition of PwC?
Views about the use of PwC	• What do you think about the relationship between child and philosophy? • What do you think about whether you need philosophical knowledge when doing PwC? • What do you think about the use of PwC in early childhood education? • What do you think about using PwC in your teaching practice? • What do you think that PwC is a teaching method for school curriculum or an extracurricular activity such as philosophy workshop at school? Why? • What can be the effects of the use of PwC in early childhood education on children? • What can be the effects of the use of PwC in early childhood education on teachers? • What can be the effects of the use of PwC in early childhood education on teacher-child relationship? • What obstacles can you face with using PwC?

In relation to the definition of PwC which was given during the interview, the researcher defined 'PwC' based upon the literature review as follows:

> PwC (PwC) is the approach which aims to encourage critical and creative thinking in children, without filling children with the intellectual knowledge of traditional philosophy, however developing and expressing their own ideas (Lipman, 2003). Moreover, PwC is the general title of the kind of doing philosophy into practice with children where children question, make meaning through communication-interactions in a community of inquiry, show reasons for their ideas and see that they may be fallible on the subject (McCall, 2013; Cassidy, & Christie, 2013).

3.5.1.1.2 Interview Questions after Implementation of Participants

Table 3

Interview Questions after the Implementation of Participants

Main Issues	Example Questions
Views about PwC after Their Own Classroom Experience	• How do you tell someone what PwC is?
Views about the Use of PwC in terms of Their Own Classroom Experience	• What was the most important experience you had in mind? • Has your PwC experience changed your ideas about the children you work with in particular or in general? How? • Has implementing PwC made a personal and professional change to you? (positive, negative) • What more do you want to learn about PwC?

3.5.2 Audio-Based Observation

Another data source to collect data in the study was audio-based observation. The researcher recorded sound throughout ten-week implementation. This enabled participants to directly present their reality since audio-based observation was more unobtrusive tool to gather data, compared to the other tools (Creswell, 2009, p. 192).

In this study, audio-based observation of the sessions was used to support in validating any changes in participants from beginning to end of the study.

3.5.3 Field Notes

In addition to semi-structured interviews and audio-based observation, the researcher took detailed, accurate and comprehensive field notes during ten-week implementation to contribute to more meaningful research findings (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Field notes included both descriptive notes as objective observation records, and reflective ones as personal interpretations of the researcher (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Descriptive field notes consisted the researcher's objective observation about behaviors and dialogues of the participants throughout ten-week implementation. Besides descriptive field notes, the reflective notes which the researcher kept included subjective thoughts of the researcher about behaviors and dialogues of the participants during ten-week implementation.

3.6 Data Collection Process of the Study

The study aims to investigate preschool teachers' views on PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings by means of PwC experience. To achieve this goal, ten-week PwC implementation program was performed with preschool teachers in the study by the researcher and also preschool teachers used PwC in their own educational settings at least two times after ten-week implementation program. Therefore, data for the study was collected before, after and during ten-week implementation program and after implementation sessions of participants in their own classrooms between February 2019 and June 2019. The steps and the timeline of the data collection process were as presented in Table 4.

Table 4

The Steps and Timeline of the Data Collection Process

	Research Process	Date	The Number of Participants	Data Collection Tools
1	Pilot Pre-Interviews	February 4-6, 2019	6	Interview
2	Pilot Implementation	February 7-25, 2019	6	Audio-Based Observation/ Field Notes
3	Pilot Post-Interviews	February 26-27, 2019	6	Interview
4	Pilot Implementation of Participant Teachers	February 28-March 7, 2019	6	
5	Pilot Interview after Implementation of Participant Teachers	March 8-11, 2019	6	Interview
6	Pre-Interviews	March 25-27, 2019	11	Interview
7	Implementation	March 28-May 30, 2019	11	Audio-Based Observation/ Field Notes
8	Post-Interview	May 31-June 4, 2019	11	Interview
9	Implementation of Participant Teachers	June 5-11, 2019	11	
10	Interview after Implementation of Participant Teachers	June 12-14, 2019	11	Interview

3.6.1 Pilot Study

In the current study, before conducting the main study, a pilot study was administered in an attempt to obtain initial opinions on the effectiveness of testing for the interview questions and implementation. Additionally, with the help of the pilot study, the researcher could improve the clarity of the interview questions and

also the performance of implementation. In this study, the pilot study was conducted with preschool teachers (n=6) who were in public preschools in Antalya. The pilot study included pre-implementation interview, four-week implementation, post-implementation interview, at least two practices in their own classrooms and the interview after their use. Participants attended to the pilot study depending on their availability and willingness. An appropriate time and place for interviews and for one hour and once a week for four weeks were determined. Four stimuli were also among ten stimuli which would be used in actual study. At the end of the pilot study, the one of the interview questions was reorganized. As a result, the pilot study assisted the researcher to produce clearer interview questions and to present more comprehensible stimulus, to gain experience in terms of how to interview, to implement and to analyze data.

After the pilot study was conducted, the pre-post interview questions took their final version of 10 open-ended questions and two sub-questions (see Appendix A). The pre-post interviews encompassed participants' personal information, views about PwC and views about the use of PwC in early childhood education. The first five questions were performed as warm- up questions and the interview continued with the following questions related to views of the participants about PwC and its usage. On the other hand, the interview questions after participants used PwC in their classroom did not differ after the pilot study.

3.7 Data Analysis

In this evaluative case study, data which were obtained from preschool teachers regarding PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education were analyzed through content analysis method. The researcher collected data by means of a semi-structured interview, audio-based observation and field notes.The process of data analysis in the study consisted of firstly depicting data with respect to participant teachers' views about PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education setting on the basis of pre-interview, post-interview and interview after the implementation of participant teacher. Secondly, the data analysis process included revealing whether

there was any difference before and after PwC experience in terms of their views regarding PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education setting. With respect to the data analysis of the findings after PwC experience, the researcher presented the findings of the post-interview and the interview after the implementation of participant teacher together in corresponding research question by merging them under the name of 'after PwC experience'. Meanwhile, in addition to interviews, to analyse the data, audio-based observation and field notes which were taken during ten-week implementation were examined based on the categories emerged from the data of the pre- and post-interview+interview after the implementation of participant teacher.

For content analysis of the data in the study, the researcher used five steps of Creswell (2012, p. 237). As the first step, the researcher collected data through semi-structured interviews, audio-based observation and field notes. Secondly, the researcher prepared data for analysis by transcribing voice recordings of three semi-structured interviews. Thirdly, the researcher read the transcripts couple of times and reviewed to obtain general sense of them. Then, the researcher identified the codes. As the last step, major categories were formed according to the codes. The researcher used tables to present the data. Moreover, in data analysis process, after preparing the data for analysis, one more coder also read the transcripts of interviews and identified the codes. The second coder was a primary school teacher and a trainer in PwC. Two coders separately carried out the coding process. After completing, they compared their codes.

Besides the data from semi-structured interviews, the researcher also transcribed audio-based observation of all implementation. Moreover, field notes which were taken by the researcher throughout ten-week implementation were stored. Two data collection tools were examined based on the categories emerged from the data of interviews. Thus, using these multiple data sources enabled triangulation of data. Furthermore, triangulation of data enabled the researcher to reach more trustworthy data (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). In this way, all data were evaluated from a holistic

perspective. Table 5 shows categories together with the codes that emerged from these different data sources as a result of data analysis in the study.

Table 5

Emerged Categories and Codes in the Study

		Categories	Codes
1.Views about PwC	Before	Teacher-Led Approach to Thinking	Presenting Questions by Teacher
			Sharing Opinions of Children
			Directing Children What to Think
	After	Teacher-Facilitated Approach to Thinking	Critical and Creative Thinking of Children
			Children's Asking Own Questions
			Collaborative Thinking of Children
2.1 Views about the Use of PwC	Before	Child Related Outcomes	Developmentally Appropriateness of Children
		Teacher Related Outcomes	Philosophical Knowledge
			Confidence of Teacher
		ECE Related Outcomes	Appropriateness for ECE Curriculum
	After	Child Related Outcomes	Developmentally Appropriateness of Children
		Teacher Related Outcomes	Philosophical Knowledge
			Confidence of Teacher
			Motivation of Teacher
		ECE Related Outcomes	Importance of Early Childhood Period
			Appropriateness for ECE Curriculum

Table 5 (Continued)

2.2 Views on the Effects of PwC on Children	Before		Subcategories	
		Learning	Transition	Transition to Primary School
		Development	Cognitive Development	Critical & Creative Thinking
				Academic Outcomes
			Language Development	Listening &Speaking
			Social Emotional Development	Self-Esteem & Self-Confidence
				Empathy & Interpersonal Relationship
	After		Subcategories	
		Learning	Transition and Future Life	Transition to Further Periods
		Development	Cognitive Development	Critical Thinking
				Forming Questions
				Creative Thinking
				Collaborative Thinking
				Academic Outcomes
			Language Development	Listening and Speaking
			Social-Emotional Development	Self-Confidence
				Self-Esteem
				Respect for Others & Empathy & Tolerance
				Participation
2.3 Views on the Effects of PwC on Teacher	Before	Professional Effects		Guidance
				Change in Perception of Child
				Knowing Child
		Personal Effects		Creative Thinking

Table 5 (Continued)

	After	Professional Effects	Guidance
			Change in Perception of Child
			Knowing Child
		Personal Effects	Thinking and Listening
			Self-Awareness
			Interpersonal Relationships
2.4 Views on the Effects of PwC on the Relationship between Student and Teacher	Before	Classroom Environment	Dialogue-Based Relationship
			Safe Relationship
	After	Classroom Environment	Dialogue-Based Relationship
			Safe Relationship
			Managing the Classroom Cooperatively
2.5 Views on the Obstacles in Using PwC	Before	Institutional Obstacles	Traditional Education System
		Socio-Cultural Obstacles	Perception of Philosophy and Child
	After	Institutional Obstacles	Traditional Education System
			Inadequate Teacher Training
		Socio-Cultural Obstacles	Perception of Philosophy
			Perception of Child

3.8 Ethical Procedures

Before conducting the study, required ethical measures were taken. To this end, the researcher obtained permissions firstly from the Research Center for Applied Ethics of a public university in Ankara (see Appendix D) then from the Minister of National Education. After that, the researcher approached potential participants, invited them to volunteer and to give their consent through discussing face to face with school administrators and teachers with the purpose of explaining all details about the study

(the consent form can be seen in Appendix E). In this way a total of 11 teachers volunteered to participate.

All participants were informed that their privacy would be maintained throughout the study. Before starting the study, the participants were informed about the aims of the study with a signed consent form. The researcher also informed the participants that they may withdraw from the study if they wish. The identity of the participants was kept confidential and aliases were used instead of their real names. Finally, the data collected from the participants during the interview was used for scientific purposes only. After a participant gave approval, the researcher and the participant identified a suitable time and place for the interviews and ten-week implementation. No distractions or interruptions disrupted the interview process. Interview times were determined according to participants' wishes. The interviews and ten-week implementation were audio taped with the participants' agreement.

3.9 Trustworthiness of the Study

Regarding the trustworthiness of the study, specific approaches were used in the current study in order to confirm and contribute to the validity and reliability of the instruments and data.

3.9.1 Validity

"Validity is an essential criterion for evaluating the quality and acceptability of research" (Burns, 1999, p. 160). To evaluate the quality and acceptability of the qualitative research, Creswell (2007) also suggested specific methods. These methods are "prolonged engagement and persistent observation in the field, triangulation, peer review, refining hypotheses as the inquiry advances, clarifying researcher bias from the outset of the study, member checking, rich and thick description, and external audits" (Creswell,2007, p.208). Accordingly, if the researcher uses at least two of these methods in the study, the validity of the study is sufficiently ensured (Creswell, 2007, p.208). In the current study, the researcher also applied some of these methods. In order to satisfy the internal validity of the

interview questions, expert opinion was gathered from three experts in the Early Childhood Education and the Elemantary Education departments and a pilot study was also conducted. These two steps enabled the researcher to reorganize and redevelop the interview questions. Member checking which is another method to provide the validity (Creswell &Plano Clark, 2011) was also used in the study, thus participants approved the accuracy of the transcripts of their interviews (Punch, 2014). The researcher sent the transcripts of their interviews to a randomly selected number of participants in order to check their accuracy. Moreover, the researcher kept a journal throughout the study. In the journal, the researcher noted the assessment of the day and the views on what this experience meant for the whole research. Moreover, the present study frequently indicated direct quotations which were taken from interviews of participants.

3.9.2 Reliability

Reliability of the results is one of the basic requirements for a research. To ensure the reliability of this study, the researcher used inter-coder agreement. Silverman (2005) defines inter- coder agreement as interview data's being analyzed by two coders (as cited in Creswell, 2007). The first coder was the researcher and the second coder was a primary school teacher and a trainer in PwC. First of all, the two researchers separately read the transcripts and independently identified their codes and categories. After identifying, they compared their categories and codes. In the comparison, achieving a consensus is very crucial for the reliability of the study. Moreover, the researcher kept field notes and journal and took audio-based observation throughout ten-week implementation process and transcribed them. Using other data sources contributed to the accuracy of the interview data.

3.10 Limitations

The current study has some limitations which are associated with its participants, content of the study and the period of the study. The first limitation is the homogeneity of the participants in terms of gender. No male preschool teachers could be included by the researcher for the study. If there were some male

participants, the views of both genders could be presented as findings. Moreover, theoretical and philosophical knowledge about PwC could be added to the content instead of completely focusing on practice. This could enable deeper understanding of participants on PwC. Thirdly, that period of the study was the spring semester limited the implementation of the participants in their own educational environments. If the study began in the fall semester, participants could use the approach more by also using the beginning of the spring semester.

3.11 Summary

This chapter described the detailed information about the methodology of this study. The main issues were the design of the study, purpose and research questions, PwC experience, participants, the tools which are used for collecting data and the process, data analysis, ethical procedures, trustworthiness of the study and limitations. The data were collected from the interviews and audio-based observation and field notes before, after and during ten-week implementation program and after implementation sessions of participants in their own classrooms. That audio-based observation and field notes used as data collection tools also provided a detailed record of the views of early childhood teachers about PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education setting.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter consists of the findings of the data analyses on the purpose of investigating the views of preschool teachers about PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings through PwC experience. At the beginning of the chapter, the demographic information of the participants is presented. Following presenting the demographic information, the findings of the data analyses are introduced.

4.1 Demographic Information of the Participants

The researcher used codes instead of the real names of schools and the participants with the aim of masking identification. The data were gathered from total 11 preschool teachers from 6 different public preschools in Antalya in Turkey. The participants were anonymously ascribed titles from P1 to P11 and the preschools were named from S1 to S6. The researcher gathered demographic data about the preschool teachers prior to the interview. The age range of the participants was between 32 and 55 years. The average age of the participants was approximately 41. The range of teaching experience of the participants was also between 10 and 32 years. On average, the participants had about 18 years of teaching experience. With regard to age group which the participants worked with in their own educational settings, the majority of the age groups were 5-year-old children. Besides these, when the participants were asked whether they had attended any course, seminar or training about PwC, it was seen that none of them had attended any course, seminar or training about PwC.

Following the demographic information of the participants in the study, the researcher questioned pre- and post-implementation interview questions which were

two of a kind. Since after ten-week implementation, the purpose of the pre- and post-implementation interview was to investigate whether there were any differences on preschool teachers' views regarding PwC and the use of PwC. In addition to this interview, the researcher had another interview with participant teachers after they used PwC in their own classroom. Similarly, this interview is in order to examine whether there were any differences in preschool teachers' views after their use of PwC in their own classroom in addition to a ten-week implementation. Therefore, the researcher endeavored revealing more clearly whether there were any differences in participants' views about the PwC and the use of PwC, in the scope of this study. With respect to the data analysis after PwC experience, the findings of the post-implementation interview and the interview after the implementation of participant teacher were presented together in corresponding research question by merging them under the name of 'after PwC experience'.

Furthermore, the findings of data analyses from three one-to-one semi-structured interviews, audio-based observation and field notes are presented in association with all research questions.

4.2 Philosophy with Children

In the scope of the first research question that investigated the views of preschool teachers about PwC before and after PwC experience, the researcher firstly asked what philosophy and PwC evokes for them. After the participants answered the questions, the researcher gave the definition of the PwC to the participants because none of the participants had attended any course, seminar or training about the Approach. The researcher defined PwC for preschool teachers based upon the literature review as follows:

> PwC (PwC) is the approach which aims to encourage critical and creative thinking in children, without filling children with the intellectual knowledge of traditional philosophy, however developing and expressing their own ideas (Lipman, 2003). Moreover, PwC is the general title of the kind of doing philosophy into practice with children where children question, make meaning through communication-interactions in a community of inquiry,

show reasons for their ideas and see that they may be fallible on the subject (McCall, 2013; Cassidy & Christie, 2013).

After the definition, the participants were asked what the words were they can relate to PwC after considering this definition. Additionally, after PwC experience, in presenting findings regarding the first research question, the researcher also presented the findings of the question related to how they would tell someone what the PwC is. This was among the interview questions after preschool teachers used PwC in their own classroom.

4.2.1 Findings before PwC Experience

Regarding preschool teachers' views on PwC before PwC experience, the findings were presented in accordance with the category arising from the codes. The codes were organized under the category 'teacher-led approach to thinking'. Under the category 'teacher-led approach to thinking', preschool teachers touched three points, as presented in Table 6.

Table 6

PwC before PwC Experience

Category	Codes
Teacher-Led Approach to Thinking	• Presenting Questions by Teacher (n=11) • Sharing Opinions of Children (n=11) • Directing Children What to Think (=5)

4.2.1.1 Category Teacher-Led Approach to Thinking

Preschool teachers stated that they associated PwC with the approach in which teachers determined thinking of children. They touched presenting questions by teacher, sharing opinions of children and directing children what they should think.

4.2.1.1.1 Presenting Questions by Teacher

Before PwC experience, all preschool teachers considered that in PwC, teacher asked questions and children answered them. Moreover, they expressed that PwC evoked certain methods which were acquainted with in early childhood education such as question-answer methods. P11 expressed ideas by associating question-answer method:

> With PwC, asking open-ended questions and waiting for the children to answer come to my mind. I care about asking questions, and I ask children on every occasion and give them time to think. This is a method I always apply in my classroom. PwC can be similar to the question-answer method.

P9 shared her opinions with saying that:

> We have certain values in our curriculum. For example, love is one of them. We give the issue to the children. We ask a question on the subject. Children say their ideas. This is something I often practice in class. PwC can also be something like this.

P1 reflected her opinion about the same issue by emphasizing the importance of asking questions in philosophy:

> I think the most important part of philosophy is questions. We often ask questions to children, even though we do not name it as doing philosophy. We expect children to answer our questions. Thus, children learn to approach life with questions by seeing the questions we ask them. I think that the PwC is a similar approach to what we practice in our classrooms.

4.2.1.1.2 Sharing Opinions of Children

Before PwC experience, all preschool teachers thought that in PwC, children share opinions on certain issue. They also stated that they already give an opportunity to share opinions of children during several activities in the classroom. By giving brainstorming and idea bank as examples, P8 asserted that:

> Sometimes we create idea bank or do brainstorming studies on certain issues or concepts in the classroom. All children say different things about the subject. We are examining a subject or a concept in detail with all of children in the class. Or we sometimes PwC also sounds like this.

P2 shared her ideas by giving an example from the activities in story and circle time in her classroom:

> The activities I carried out in the circle time seem to me in PwC. In the circle, I am presenting a subject. Or I am reading a story. Then I ask a question about the topic or I want them to complete the story. After that, they all say their opinion.

4.2.1.1.3 Directing Children about What to Think

Preschool teachers (n=5) declared that PwC meant that teachers directed children about what they should think. With regard to the issue, P5 said that:

> Children have an empty brain. I think there are brains that we shape that we direct. Therefore, I am guided during the activities. For example, I'm telling a story. Then I ask 'I told you this story, but don't you think there is anything wrong with this story? I think this is a PwC activity. I say them 'I say this is not a convenient ending, Let's write a new ending for the story. Afterwards, they can write endings about punishment. I intervene at that point. I say, but we also need music. Thus, I extend the issue. PwC can also be something like this.

4.2.2 Findings after PwC Experience

After PwC experience, regarding PwC, the findings were viewed in accordance with the categories arising from the codes. Under the category teacher-facilitated approach to thinking, findings were classified under three codes as critical and creative thinking of children, their asking own questions and collaborative thinking, as presented in Table 7.

Table 7

PwC after PwC Experience

Category	Codes
Teacher-Facilitated Approach to Thinking	• Critical and Creative Thinking of Children (n=10) • Children's Asking Own Questions(n=9) • Collaborative Thinking of Children(n=5)

4.2.2.1 Category Teacher-Facilitated Approach to Thinking

Preschool teachers stated that PwC was the approach in which children were encouraged by teacher to think critically and creatively, to ask their own questions, to think collaboratively.

4.2.2.1.1 Critical and Creative Thinking of Children

Preschool teachers (n=10) expressed that PwC was the approach which supports children in their critical and creative thinking. P4 asserted that:

> We expect children to remain within the limits we teach. I think that PwC is an approach that involves thinking outside of what is taught and presented. I think it leads children to look at a subject or concept from different perspectives and to be aware of reasons of what they think.

P10 shared her ideas by pointing the difference between PwC and 'brainstorming and activities in the story time':

> Before the implementation, I thought that the PwC approach was something like the activities in story time or brainstorming. I said we are already doing this. But I see that activities we made were not PwC activity. Children also listen to thoughts of other friends and think whether they agree with their idea. It also allows them to produce different and creative thoughts.

P3 emphasized that PwC is more than sharing ideas of children by saying that:

> I thought differently before the implementation. I supposed that it was like an approach where children shared their ideas. Now, I see that it is more. I can say that PwC is an approach that supports children to question more, to think differently, not to accept everything as they are, and to be able to say 'I disagree'.

4.2.2.1.2 Children's Asking Own Questions

Preschool teachers (n=9) considered that PwC is the approach in which children form their own questions. By underlining that asking their own questions makes children more active and willing in the discussion, P6 stated that:

> At the beginning of the study, the question-answer method came to my mind when I thought of PwC. Those who asked questions were us as teachers in

> question-answer method. During implementations, I saw that you were not the person who asked the question. We as participants asked our own questions to discuss. It was a different approach than what I had in mind. I saw how important it was for the participants to determine the question to be discussed. This can make children more active. Thus, they will do more than answering the questions which we ask them and they will more willingly participate in the discussion. I think that as long as children ask questions, they can start generating questions in different ways in time.

Related to the issue, P1 commented that:

> In the beginning, I already thought that the most important part of philosophy was asking questions. But I didn't think that the person who asked the question could be the children themselves. At that time to do PwC, I thought that it was enough to children look for their own answers to the questions we asked. I saw that PwC allows children to find their own questions.

4.2.2.1.3 Collaborative Thinking of Children

Preschool teachers (n=5) considered that PwC is the approach in which children think collaboratively without dominance of teacher. Related to the issue, P9 stated that:

> In PwC approach, children share their ideas and think together. They are in constant interaction. We were exactly so during the implementation. We thought together while creating a question. While discussing, in the group we interchanged our ideas. I saw that we were influenced by each other's thoughts and that we had created new thoughts on it. You did not direct us about what we should think. I think it is an approach that children will experience the same.

By relating to the inquiry-based approach, P2 reflected her ideas:

> Sometimes, even though we do not want it to be so, we can suppress children's curiosity and inquiries. We don’t give them a chance to think and talk enough in the classroom. After the implementations, I see that this approach is for that. Actually, it is for their thinking together and talking with each other. I am in the background while children are more in the foreground and more active. In my opinion, it is also similar to the inquiry-based approach because they both are based on inquiry.

Furthermore, P1 shared her ideas by associating with active listening:

> PwC seems to me as an approach that participants should really listen to each other, because they think together. While forming and expressing their

thoughts, they must have listened very well to what others said. Because they form and express their own opinion by thinking on others' thoughts.

4.3 The Use of PwC in Early Childhood Education Settings

In current study, the second research question was to investigate the views of preschool teachers about the use of PwC in early childhood education setting before and after PwC experience. In order to reach the views of preschool teachers on the issue, their views related to the use of PwC in early childhood education, to the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on children, on teacher and on the relationship between student and teacher and related to the obstacles in using PwC in their educational environment were asked.

4.3.1 The Use of PwC in Early Childhood Education

The preschool teachers' views about the use of PwC in early childhood education before and after PwC experience were investigated, through the questions about the relationship between philosophy and child, whether they need philosophical knowledge when doing PwC, about the use of PwC in early childhood education in general and in their own teaching practice, and in the school curriculum. In addition, while presenting the findings after the PwC experience, the findings regarding the most important experience that they had in mind when using PwC in their classroom and that they wanted to learn more about PwC were also presented under 'findings after the PwC experience'. They were among the interview questions after preschool teachers used PwC in their own classroom.

4.3.1.1 Findings before PwC Experience

In relation to the use of PwC in early childhood education before PwC experience, the findings were viewed in accordance with the category arising from the codes. The codes were organized under three categories which were child, teacher and ECE related outcomes. Therefore, findings were classified under one code from child related, two codes from teacher related and one code from ECE related outcomes, as presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Using PwC in Early Childhood Education before PwC Experience

Categories	Codes
Child Related Outcomes	• Developmentally Appropriateness of Children (n=11)
Teacher Related Outcomes	• Philosophical Knowledge (n=7) • Confidence of Teacher (n=4)
ECE Related Outcomes	• Appropriateness for ECE Curriculum (n=7)

4.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Related Outcomes

Preschool teachers stated their ideas about using PwC in early childhood education by focusing on children. They were stated under developmentally appropriateness of children.

4.3.1.1.1.1 Developmentally Appropriateness of Children

All preschool teachers reflected their ideas in terms of that developmentally appropriateness of children. They mentioned whether children are developmentally appropriate may determine the use of PwC in early childhood education. Some preschool teachers (n=6) argued that children are developmentally appropriate for philosophizing and PwC can be easily used with them. In this context, they evaluated children as being highly curious, questioner, creative and open to new ideas. Related to the issue, P7 commented that:

> Children think a lot and question. Sometimes I see that they are asking questions that adults don't ask. We always hear the question 'Why?' by children. Moreover, they continue to ask until they are satisfied. I think that in preschool period, children experience their most curious periods in life. Because in that period their minds are empty. So they are very open to learning. Yet more, they always want to learn something. I also see that they are very creative and that they present different thoughts. I am amazed how they thought about this.

P8 shared her ideas by making distinction between adults and children:

> They can ask and think about things that never come to our mind. Since children have no limits. They do not silence each other, they do not humiliate each other due to their thoughts. They don't have any fear of saying something wrong. But adults are not like that. Because they can press each other, they can be more anxious and put a limit when expressing their thoughts. So I can say that preschool period is the best time to do PwC.

On the other hand, some preschool teachers (n=4) regarded the use of PwC with preschool children as inappropriate in terms of their low cognitive development. They could not associated preschool children to PwC due to their being concrete operational stage of cognitive development. P1 reflected that:

> While philosophy is about the abstract, the child is in the concrete stage in their development and thus we cannot discuss every issue with them. This approach may be used in early childhood education, but it seems to me more appropriate in terms of development level, in the period of primary education and after.

Moreover, a few preschool teachers thought that PwC might not be used with children with special needs such as bilingual and inclusive children. According to them, they may have difficulty in understanding others' ideas, expressing their ideas and focusing on the inquiry.

4.3.1.1.2 Category 2 Teacher Related Outcomes

Preschool teachers expressed their views on using PwC in early childhood education in relation to teacher. They approached the issue from teacher's having philosophical knowledge and confidence of teacher.

4.3.1.1.2.1 Philosophical Knowledge

Preschool teachers (n=7) stated that having philosophical knowledge is essential when using PwC in early childhood education. They asserted that philosophical knowledge will provide profound comprehension of using the approach and emphasized the importance of properly knowing what they use and how they use this. Thus they highlighted that having philosophical knowledge will positively

influence the teacher efficacy of PwC approach. On the other hand, some preschool teachers (n=4) expressed that although having philosophical knowledge will support the teacher efficacy during the use of the approach, this is not essential. P3 declared that:

> I sometimes attend various trainings and courses. But these courses are not comprehensive enough. But I always think that I need to have more comprehensive information about whatever I practice in my class. So I think that philosophical knowledge is needed to use PwC in the classroom. Because we have to apply it correctly. We can influence the child's thinking unintentionally. As a teacher, I want to teach children how to think, not to influence their thoughts.

P6 stated that:

> I do not think that having philosophical knowledge is a must to be able to use PwC. As you said in the definition, we will not tell children the history of philosophy. But it would not be bad to have philosophical knowledge. It will enrich our application.

4.3.1.1.2.2 Confidence of Teacher

Preschool teachers (n=4) shared their ideas about using PwC in early childhood education in relation to confidence of teacher about properly using the approach. They emphasized the importance of the competency of the teacher in PwC and if they were not competent, they stated not to be confident in using PwC and in this case they would not want to use it. In this regard, P8 stated by making a comparison between teachers and competent person in using PwC that:

> It would be much better if competent person came in the extracurricular workshop. This person can perform better. We can just simply do it in the classroom. We can only encourage children to express their ideas and show them that there are different ideas. The competent can do more. It is also important to be able to blend the approach into our activities. Are we able to do this rightly? Maybe we know it wrong or missing. It is important to perform the approach in the right way and literally.

Related to the issue, P5 commented that:

> It is important who will apply this approach in the class. As a teacher, it is not possible for us to properly apply all approaches. I think it should be in the

> form of a separate workshop outside the curriculum and should be implemented by a more equipped, expert person. Because the teacher may not be enough in this field. If the teacher is competent, it can also be included in the curriculum and can be used by the teacher.

4.3.1.1.3 ECE Related Outcomes

Preschool teachers stated their ideas about using PwC in early childhood education by drawing attention to early childhood education itself. They handled early childhood education in terms of its curriculum.

4.3.1.1.3.1 Appropriateness for ECE Curriculum

Preschool teachers (n=7) thought that early childhood curriculum has impact on using PwC in early childhood education. They considered that early childhood curriculum was so flexible and this flexibility enabled to blend diverse approaches into the school curriculum. They agreed that the approach could have been a teaching method for school curriculum. On this point, P7 stated that:

> We do not have sharp limits in early childhood education. We always teach our lessons integratedly. We can embed this approach in any activity in our school curriculum. I think that PwC could be especially integrated into the Turkish speech and language activities in the school curriculum.

P4 commented that:

> In my opinion, we can easily use PwC by integrating the curriculum. We have a suitable curriculum for this. We are already teaching everything as integrated. I think it becomes more feasible and effective in curriculum rather than an extra-curricular activity.

They highlighted that PwC was the approach which is applicable in their educational environment. Moreover, they expressed that they have already actively used very similar methods to the approach such as brainstorming in their classroom.

4.3.1.2 Findings after PwC Experience

After PwC experience, regarding the use of PwC in early childhood education, the findings were viewed in accordance with the category arising from the codes. The

codes were organized under the same categories with the categories before PwC Experience. Therefore, findings were classified under one code from child-related, three codes practitioner related and two codes from ECE related outcomes, as presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Using PwC in Early Childhood Education after PwC Experience

Categories	Codes
Child Related Outcomes	• Developmentally Appropriateness of Children (n=11)
Teacher Related Outcomes	• Philosophical Knowledge (n=11) • Confidence of Teacher (n=5) • Motivation of Teacher (n=4)
ECE Related Outcomes	• Importance of Early Childhood Period (n=11) • Appropriateness for ECE Curriculum (n=7)

4.3.1.2.1 Category 1 Child Related Outcomes

Similar to the views before PwC experience, preschool teachers stated their views about using PwC in early childhood education in relation to children. They approached to the issue in terms of developmentally appropriateness of preschool children.

4.3.1.2.1.1 Developmentally Appropriateness of Children

After PwC experience, all preschool teachers reported that PwC are developmentally appropriate for preschool children and can be easily used in early childhood education. They emphasized that children would start to actively do philosophy, as long as they meet with PwC.

P2, who had said that children could not associate the child and philosophy due to child's developmental stages in the pre-interview, commented that:

> Before the implementation, I thought very differently. I have never been able to relate philosophy to the child. But I see that in fact, PwC was for preschool children. Because children are very curious and ask many questions in the preschool period. As they practice PwC, they will get used to it even more, and they will develop in doing philosophy more.

Similarly, P10 stated that:

> As teachers, we do not give children the opportunity to improve their relationship with philosophy. Children get what we give them. At the beginning of the study, I thought that children could not do philosophy. But it wasn't like that. We are not giving them the opportunity to do so. If we prepare the environment for PwC, their relationship will improve and of course they can do philosophy and PwC can also be used in preschool.

P4 asserted that:

> I think that if we do not intervene with children, they are already philosophers. Children can do philosophy, even better than adults. Because they can think out of the box. They can think more broadly and creatively differently from adults. Children do not have a fear of being judged as adults have.

Furthermore, the views of preschool teachers who thought that PwC might not be used with children with special needs such as bilingual and inclusive children and children with autism showed a change before and after PwC experience. After PwC experience, differently from their views before PwC experience, preschool teachers stated that they would not have difficulty in using PwC with children with special needs in their educational environment.

Furthermore, a preschool teacher pointed out the importance of classroom size and stated that she had 22 students in her classroom and this crowdedness will make it difficult for teachers to use the approach.

4.3.1.2.2 Category 2 Teacher Related Outcomes

Similar to the views before PwC experience, preschool teachers stated their views about using PwC in early childhood education related to teacher. In the post-interview, they handled the issue in terms of knowledge, confidence and motivation.

4.3.1.2.2.1 Philosophical Knowledge

Similar to the views before PwC experience, some preschool teachers (n=6) stated that teachers' having philosophical knowledge when doing the approach is essential. According to them, they should properly know what they use and how they use this. Especially P7 underlined the importance of logical reasoning by stating that ''in order to do PwC, we need to know what logical thinking is. In this way we can improve logical thinking in children''.

On the other hand, after PwC experience, some preschool teachers (n=5) firstly expressed that philosophical knowledge is not necessary when using PwC in early childhood education. They said that it is not necessary because they don't use this knowledge during the use of PwC. Instead of the need of philosophical knowledge, they highlighted the requirement of the knowledge of how the approach is used. By this way, they exhibited their views by making distinction between philosophical knowledge and the knowledge of how the approach is used. For example, P11 expressed that:

> We don't express our opinion when using the approach. We don't comment on thoughts of children, we don't inform them. When will we use it? I didn't see you using that. So I don't think we need philosophical knowledge in the use of the approach. We just need knowledge on how to conduct the discussion.

Some preschool teachers expressed that they need to learn knowledge of practical skills to be able to conduct better PwC. For example P8 said that:

> I would like to improve further on leading the sessions. I would like to know exactly how to apply PwC. I feel incompetent. For instance, what should I do when children cannot raise questions? Or what to do when they produce the same question? Which stimulus should I choose?

Preschool teachers stated that they want to have practical knowledge through performing practical applications more. P9 expressed that ‘‘I want to do more practices. As I practice, I will develop both in application and I will see what knowledge I need and what I need during the practice’’.

Additionally, one preschool teacher also thought to need to learn theoretical basis and progress of PwC. The preschool teacher emphasized the need of theoretical knowledge about the approach in order to have deeper understanding on that and to perform meaningful applications.

4.3.1.2.2.2 Confidence of Teacher

Similar to the views before PwC experience, preschool teachers (n=5) focused on the confidence of the teacher about properly using the approach. Preschool teachers expressed their lack of confidence in using PwC and that it would be more efficient to PwC approach be implemented especially by competent person in this approach. P1 expressed her change of view about this issue as follows:

> In the beginning, I supported that this approach should have been a teaching method for school curriculum, but that would mean that the teacher will apply it. The teacher may fail at applying it. So now I think it is important to be an extracurricular activity which is conducted by a specialist in the field of PwC.

P10 stated that she could not use the approach properly by saying that:

> I doubt about applying the approach. Because, when looking at our practices for 10 weeks, I observed that the facilitator was neutral. You as the facilitator never interfered with our ideas. That is not what we are used to. We are interventionists. I may push the child who doesn't speak, interfere with their ideas.

4.3.1.2.2.3 Motivation of Teacher

After PwC experience, preschool teachers (n=4) expressed that motivation of teacher has importance in the use of PwC in early childhood education. They underlined that the use of the approach should not be made compulsory in the curriculum, and that enthusiastic teachers used the approach in their classroom.

P8 reflected that:

> If the teacher herself/himself will use this approach in early childhood education, it has to be asked to teacher. Whether s/he wants it or not? Because this is something that can change from one teacher to another. The educational approach and energy of the teacher determines whether this teacher will use the approach in the class.

Related to the issue, P9 commented:

> I want this approach to be included in the National Curriculum, but not necessarily. In the long run, it is not productive. The willing teacher should use this approach and the unwilling teacher should not. First of all, the teacher has to like this approach herself. If she does not like it, she cannot apply in it and thus she cannot use this approach as a teaching method for a school curriculum. For this reason, I think that an extracurricular activity such as philosophy workshop at school by a high motivated person in the field of PwC will be nicer.

4.3.1.2.3 Category 3 ECE Related Outcomes

Preschool teachers expressed their views about using PwC in early childhood education in relation to early childhood education. In the post-interview, they handled the issue in terms of importance of early childhood period and appropriateness of ECE curriculum.

4.3.1.2.3.1 Importance of Early Childhood Period

Preschool teachers (n=11) explained their views on the use of PwC in early childhood education in relation to the early childhood period itself. They all supported using PwC in early childhood education by virtue of the fact that the importance of early childhood period. According to them, early childhood is a pivotal period for emotional, social, cognitive, language, approaches towards learning domains in one's development. For example, P3 asserted that:

> I think it is very important that children meet with this approach in early childhood. Because in this period, it is easier to shape children. They are like dough. It is a very valuable period. What they have learned in this period affects their entire lives. Through this approach, they will learn thinking,

> empathizing with others, expressing themselves better. When children learn them in this period, their future lives will also shape accordingly.

Similarly, P11 declared that:

> Early childhood is a very important period. Children are like sponges in this period. They absorb everything. We may not see this clearly. But it is a period in which their characters are largely developed. The things they experience form their characters. So I believe that it would better for children to meet with PwC, especially in preschool period.

4.3.1.2.3.2 Appropriateness for ECE Curriculum

Similar to the statements before PwC experiene, preschool teachers (n=10) highlighted that PwC was the approach which can be easily integrated with the school curriculum by basing their ideas on the adaptability of early childhood curriculum. Moreover, they stated that they would like to use PwC in their own classroom. In regard to this issue, P3 said that:

> In preschool, it is easier to incorporate such different approaches into the school curriculum than other stages of education. This is so applicable for us. I think it is even more efficient. In this way, we can teach children certain things more easily. For instance, we can use it as a teaching method in teaching concepts, or in values education or even mathematics.

Moreover, P1 emphasized the accessibility to PwC by stating that:

> If there is a separate philosophy workshop, it may be perceived as something for the elite class. But if it is blended into the school curriculum, every child will be able to access to the approach. If it happens in the workshop, it is perceived as something that we discuss only certain issues, only at certain time and place. But if it is blended into the school curriculum, they will spread everywhere and all day, children always will do philosophy. Philosophy should be not at just an hour and a place, but always and everywhere.

On the other hand, as distinct from the views before PwC experience, preschool teachers reflected that they observed the approach did not resemble other methods which they already actively used in their classroom and mentioned PwC has more different structure than other approaches related thinking. They added that with this different structure, PwC can be used easily in early childhood education.

4.3.2 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Children

Preschool teachers shared their views about the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on children through PwC experience. After PwC experience, in presenting findings, the researcher also presented the findings of the question related to whether teachers' PwC experience changed ideas about the children they work with in particular or in general. This question was among the interview questions after preschool teachers used PwC in their own classroom.

4.3.2.1 Findings before PwC Experience

The researcher asked preschool teachers for the possible effects of the use of PwC in early childhood education on children. The findings were viewed in accordance with the category arising from the codes. Before PwC Experience, the findings were presented under two main categories which were learning and development, as presented in Table 10.

Table 10

The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Children before PwC Experience

Categories	Subcategories	Codes
Learning	Transition	• Transition to Primary School (n=5)
Development	Cognitive Development	• Critical & Creative Thinking (n=8) • Academic Outcomes (n=1)
	Language Development	• Listening &Speaking (n=6)
	Social-Emotional Development	• Self-Esteem & Self-Confidence (n=8) • Empathy & Interpersonal Relationship (n=2)

4.3.2.1.1 Category 1 Learning

Before PwC experience, preschool teachers thought that PwC may positively influence children's learning. Under the 'learning' category, they focused on the children's transition.

4.3.2.1.1.1 Subcategory Transition

Under the 'transition' subcategory, preschool teachers explained their ideas by focusing on the transition to primary school. They mentioned the use of PwC in early childhood education may provide children to transit more easily to primary school.

4.3.2.1.1.1.1 Transition to Primary School

Preschool teachers (n=3) considered early childhood period as a baseline of a character formation. They concentrated on a primary school age and expressed that meeting with PwC in early age and continuing by having learnt its gains may support children in transition to primary education. Related to the issue, P3 shared her thoughts by stating that:

> Early childhood is a very important period. I see this period like the foundation of a building. So it's so important to be strong. It will affect other floors. If the child meets PwC in preschool, what kind of a student they will be in the primary school will also be affected. This child may be better listener and less selfish and may positively communicate with peers. So I think that this approach can increase children's readiness for primary education.

In relation to transition to primary education, P5 shared ideas by associating with their gaining self-awareness:

> Owing to this approach, children may have a closer relationship with themselves. They may better understand their own competences and abilities. They may discover themselves and so they may know their needs and desires better. I think that these will affect their transition to primary school. This awareness of themselves will make them more prepared for primary school.

4.3.2.1.2 Category 2 Development

Before PwC experience, preschool teachers thought that PwC can positively influence children's development in three aspects as cognitive, language and social-emotional.

4.3.2.1.2.1 Subcategory 1 Cognitive Development

Regarding the effects of PwC on children, early childhood education underscored the cognitive development of children. They explained their ideas in terms of critical and creative thinking skills and academic outcomes.

4.3.2.1.2.1.1 Critical and Creative Thinking

Preschool teachers (n=8) expressed that PwC may improve critical and creative thinking skills of children. In relation to critical thinking, they expressed that children may produce their own ideas, interpret, and interrogate more. P11 shared her ideas by saying that:

> Children may immediately accept what they are told. With this approach, they can think and question more. Instead of embracing others' ideas without questioning, they can independently create their own ideas.

P4 commented that:

> Especially children around the age of three are asking questions intensely. However, as a society, we want more of children not to think or question. But asking questions is actually good. People can only develop by asking questions and looking for answers to the questions they ask. I think it might be good to use this approach to support children's cognitive development.

With respect to creative thinking, P6 expressed her ideas by associating with problem-solving:

> I think that they may focus on that problem better and think over more deeply when children face to a problem. In order to solve it, they may present more diverse suggestions by looking from different points of views. Thus, PwC supports children in solving their problems better.

4.3.2.1.2.1.2 Academic Outcomes

One preschool teacher also pointed out that PwC can enhance academic outcomes of children. P10 shared her ideas by saying that:

> I think that children who have developed thinking and listening skills can focus on their subjects and understand better. They do not memorize the words, but deeply learn. They can produce their own ideas and make interpretations on the issue. All of these will lead children to better school success.

4.3.2.1.2.2 Subcategory 2 Language Development

With respect to the effects of PwC on children, preschool teachers pointed out the language development of children. They based their ideas on the development in speaking and listening.

4.3.2.1.2.2.1 Speaking and Listening

Preschool teachers (n=6) thought that PwC may develop speaking skills of children in early childhood period. According to them, PwC would freely open an area to speak for children and this area would support children in their speaking skills. Moreover, some preschool teachers (n=4) expressed that PwC may improve listening skills in children. P6 commented that:

> I see listening as the beginning of everything. Some consider this skill as unimportant, however I do not agree with them. I believe that when people attentively listen to what the other says, they can understand. So I think that improving listening skills in early childhood period is essential for both academic and social areas in life. For me, PwC seems most likely to improve listening skills.

On the other hand, two preschool teachers reflected that the use of PwC might not have a strong influence on bilingual children and children with inadequate language development. In relation to the issue, P9 explained her ideas by exemplifying children from her classroom:

> I have bilingual children in my class. They cannot completely speak and understand Turkish. They are silent in general. There are also children who

> have undeveloped listening skills. They don't care about listening to others. I tried many ways, but nothing changed in them. I think this approach will hardly affect these children.

On the other hand, field notes taken by the researcher during the first implementation session indicated that the participants talked many times at the same time and the researcher warned them not to talk at the same time. Moreover, according to the field note during the first implementation sessions, two participants expressed that they could not hear anything in the discussion because the other participants were talking at the same time and between each other.

4.3.2.1.2.3 Subcategory 3 Social Emotional Development

Preschool teachers in the study expressed that PwC may support social emotional development of children. They approached this area in terms of improving the self-esteem, self-confidence, empathy and interpersonal relationships of children.

4.3.2.1.2.3.1 Self-Esteem & Self-Confidence

Preschool teachers thought (n=8) that the use of PwC in early childhood education may encourage self-esteem and self-confidence of children. With respect to self-esteem, preschool teachers asserted that the approach may develop strong sense of self-esteem in children when it is used in early childhood education. P7 asserted that:

> I have some students in my class. They are afraid to say something wrong, they believe that they think wrong. I think that when this approach is used in preschool children, children can be aware of what they think, and they can learn to accept their thoughts without saying right and wrong. This will increase their self-esteem.

Regarding self-confidence, preschool teachers agreed that the approach may encourage self-confidence in children in early childhood education. P5 declared the ideas by giving an example from her own class:

> Although some children in my class have a thought, they refrain from expressing themselves because of the possibility of making a mistake. Owing to the regular use of this approach, they can begin to share their ideas with us more confidently.

4.3.2.1.2.3.2 Empathy & Interpersonal Relationship

Preschool teachers (n=2) considered that using PwC in early childhood education may improve empathy and interpersonal relationship of children. Relating to empathy, preschool teachers thought that the approach may support in understanding each other of children and empathizing of them when it is used in early childhood education. In conjunction with the development in their understanding each other, participants added that their peer relationships may be also positively affected. In related to this, P2 pointed that:

> Children are very selfish in early childhood period. This approach may decrease egocentrism and increase the empathy in children. When children empathize with and understand each other better, they also build more positive relationship with their peers. Accordingly, they can change their behavior in their interactions.

On the other hand, one preschool teacher stated that the use of PwC might not have an effect on an inclusive student. Related to the issue, P5 said that:

> In my class, I have one inclusive student. It is difficult to focus for him. He is distracted very quickly. He resists attending events. Similarly, I think that this student would not be able to adapt to this activity and perhaps resist. For this reason, I doubt how much this approach could help him.

4.3.2.2 Findings after PwC Experience

After PwC experience, regarding possible effects of the use of PwC in early childhood settings on children, preschool teachers shared their ideas. The findings were viewed under similar two main categories which were learning and development, as presented in Table 11.

Table 11

The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Children after PwC Experience

Categories	Subcategories	Codes
Learning	Transition and Future Life	• Transition to Further Periods (n=4)
Development	Cognitive Development	• Critical Thinking (n=10) • Forming Questions (n=7) • Creative Thinking (n=4) • Collaborative Thinking (n=5) • Academic Outcomes (n=2)
	Language Development	• Listening and Speaking (n=7)
	Social-Emotional Development	• Self-Confidence (n=5) • Self-Esteem (n=7) • Respect for Others & Empathy & Tolerance (n=6) • Participation (n=2)

4.3.2.2.1 Category 1 Learning

After PwC experience, similarly the views before Pwc experience, preschool teachers thought that PwC can positively influence children's learning when the approach is used in early childhood education.

4.3.2.2.1.1 Subcategory Transition and Future Life

Preschool teachers stated that PwC may affect transition and future life of children. They approached the issue in terms of transition to further periods than primary school age.

4.3.2.2.1.1.1 Transition to Further Periods

After PwC experience, additionally and differently from their statements before PwC experience, preschool teachers (n=4) expressed that the use of PwC in early childhood education may also support children in transition to further periods than primary school age and may positively affect their future life in diverse areas. P9 expressed that:

> I think that the sooner they get the benefits of this approach, the more they will have a positive impact on their future lives. Learning starts where the question is asked. When something is learned by questioning, that knowledge will settle more permanently. Thus it will affect their future life. I think it can have a positive impact on their primary/elementary/high school and university education, private life and professional life. Because, everything we learn in the preschool period affects us throughout our lives and in every aspect of our lives.

Regarding the possible effect on the adolescence stage, P1 stated that:

> Children in adolescence stage can show verbal bullying towards their environments. However, an individual who meets this approach in early childhood period will behave differently and will not verbally bully towards the environment.

Moreover, one preschool teacher asserted that children who have met the approach in their early childhood could easily resolve the problems and conflicts they face in the future life. Additionally, another preschool teacher declared that children may be more willing for learning and thus their relationship with the school will change. According to this participant, children will more eagerly come to school owing to the use of PwC in early childhood education.

4.3.2.2.2 Category 2 Development

After PwC experience, similar to the views before PwC experience, preschool teachers thought that PwC can positively affect children's development in three aspects as cognitive, langage and social-emotional. They kept previous statements about the possible positive developmental effects of the use of the approach in early childhood education. Moreover, they added some other possible effects about it.

4.3.2.2.2.1 Subcategory 1 Cognitive Development

Concerning the possible effects of PwC on children, after PwC experience, preschool teachers again pointed similar effects on cognitive development like improvements in creative thinking and academic outcomes. Furthermore, they added new possible effects to their statements. They differently focused on the improvement in explaining ideas with reasons in critical thinking, forming questions and collaborative thinking in children.

4.3.2.2.2.1.1 Critical Thinking

Preschool teachers (n=10) emphasized that PwC may positively affect critical thinking skills. Differently from pre-interview, however, three of them added explaining ideas with reasons to critical thinking. Related to development of explaining ideas with reasons in children, P6 said that:

> In the pre-interview, I thought that children may produce their own thoughts, consider alternatives, but now, I have seen that in this approach, it is very important that we explain our thoughts with their reasons. When we did this during our implementations, I saw that we could defend our thoughts better. Therefore, I think that this approach will support children to explain their thoughts with reasons and to better defend their ideas through these reasons.

Moreover, field notes of the researcher showed that participants in the study were explaining their ideas with reasons more during the last implementation session compared to initial sessions.

4.3.2.2.2.1.2 Forming Questions

Preschool teachers (n=7) expressed that the use of PwC in early childhood education may positively affect forming questions of preschool children. Regarding to development of forming questions, P1 commented that:

> During these ten weeks, I think that one of the most important aspects of the approach was to produce our own questions. Until now, we have wanted children to answer the questions we asked them instead of requiring them ask their own questions. At first I think they will have difficulty in producing

> questions. But with the regular implementation of this approach, I believe they will develop over time in generate a question.

On the other hand, after preschool teachers used PwC in their own classrooms, they stated that they observed children had difficulty in forming questions in their practices in their own classrooms. P11 said that ‘‘I noticed that children could not form a question. They asked how they would ask the question, what the question meant. After that, I asked sample questions for them’’. Related to this issue, P3 shared her ideas by pointing out her that:

> Before implementing the approach, I was worried that they wouldn't be able to raise questions. So, I also worked on questioning with children in the class. However, I was not sure it was settled in them. During the practice, I found that they were not as hard to produce questions as I thought.

4.3.2.2.2.1.3. Creative Thinking

Similar to the statements before PwC experience, preschool teachers (n=4) thought that children’s creative thinking will improve when PwC is used in early childhood education. According to preschool teachers, children will begin to think from different viewspoints, produce new ideas and solve their problems through creative solutions. Related to the issue, P5 stated that:

> I think this approach will improve children's creativity very much. They will not get stuck in certain thoughts. They will start thinking in ways they didn't think. They will be able to look from many different windows. They will be able to solve problems by approaching from different angles. I believe that PwC will enable children to produce new ideas.

4.3.2.2.2.1.4 Collaborative Thinking

After PwC experience, preschool teachers (n=5) vigorously pointed that the use of PwC in early childhood education may influence children with respect to collaborative thinking. According to preschool teachers, children will think among themselves and to be able to think collaboratively by going beyond individual thinking. For example, P8 argued this by stating that:

> After the 10-week experience, I have seen that in this approach children think together. Until now, our perception was that there was a teacher and a lot of students in the classroom. We are the teaching side and children were also 'waiting for being taught' side. We don't even give them the opportunity to think individually.

P1 expressed their ideas by comparing with individual thinking:

> We have activities where children produced something together. But in these activities, they produce physical materials. I have not known an approach that they think and produce ideas together. I have never implemented it. If it is implemented, I think this kind of activity will create a very different environment in the classroom. They will gain a habit of asking their peers for their opinions. They can build a pyramid of thoughts all together rather than their single opinions.

4.3.2.2.2.1.5 Academic Outcomes

Similar to the statements before PwC experience, a few preschool teachers (n=2) stated that the approach can enhance academic outcomes of children. P6 stated by associating with achievement in the primary school:

> After the implementations, I see that with PwC, children will more listen, think and ask questions. I think these are the basis of learning. By asking questions, they learn better. By listening and thinking, their understanding will improve. I think these will affect the children very positively especially in reading and writing. They will also be more successful in these lessons in primary school.

4.3.2.2.2.2 Subcategory 2 Language Development

After PwC experience, all preschool teachers (n=11) thought that PwC can develop both speaking and listening skills of children in early childhood period.

4.3.2.2.2.2.1 Speaking and Listening

Preschool teachers maintained to think that speaking and listening skills of children may be positively influenced by PwC. P8 said that:

> We attach particular importance to language development of children in early childhood education and organize several activities to improve it. I think that this approach may positively affect language development in children,

> especially their speaking skills. There may be children who never or slightly talk in our classes. PwC seems to me as based on speaking. Listening is also important. So I think that the approach will enhance speaking and listening in children.

Related to the issue, the field notes which were taken by the researcher during ninth session showed that participants did not talk much at the same time and between each other. According to the field notes, there was a moment when there was more than one voice in the discussion and at that time one of the participants invited the others to silence.

Besides that, preschool teachers (n=3) emphasized the conformity of the possible effects in linguistic area of the approach with the gains in language developmental domain which are denoted in Turkish early childhood education curriculum. P4 expressed this conformity as follows:

> I think that the approach will make a great contribution to children in terms of listening and expressing oneself. After these 10 weeks, I see that the effects of the approach can be very compatible with the gains of our preschool curriculum. For example, we have gains such as 'waiting for the order to speak', 'listening to what is told', 'constructing a question sentence', 'using language for communication' or 'using grammatical structures while talking'. I think this approach will support all of them.

4.3.2.2.2.3 Subcategory 3 Social Emotional Development

After PwC experience, similar to the statements before PwC experience, preschool teachers thought that when PwC is used in early childhood education, children can develop socially and emotionally. They restated the possible development in self-confidence, self-esteem and empathy. Moreover, they added some other possible effects of the approach which were respect for others, tolerance and participation.

4.3.2.2.2.3.1 Self-Confidence

After PwC experience, preschool teachers (n=5) thought that the use of PwC in early childhood education will increase self-confidence of children. According to them, PwC greatly encourages children to express their ideas and this encouragement will affect their self-confidence. About the increase of children’s self-confidence owing

to using PwC, P2 expressed their ideas by associating with her PwC implementations in her own classroom:

> I saw that children express their thoughts as much as they think. This largely requires self-confidence. There are children with high self-confidence in my class. They always express without hesitation. But I have a few students, they don't seem to be in the classroom, and I was wondering how they would behave in this approach. In the implementations in my class, it made me very happy to hear that they spoke even a little and expressed their thoughts. I wonder what effect it would be if I applied this more.

Similarly, P4 also asserted that children more confidently expressed their ideas after the first practice in their own classrooms by saying that:

> I have a few students who are generally quiet in activities in the classroom, and even one of them never speaks. Actually, I didn't think it would be different again. After the second PwC implementation, I was very surprised when she raised her finger to say her opinion. I suppose she needed such an activity. I think she felt more comfortable and so could confidently express her ideas.

4.3.2.2.2.3.2 Self-Esteem

Preschool teachers (n=7) agreed that the use of PwC in early childhood education will boost children's self-esteem. P9 commented that:

> As far as I can see, PwC does not exclude anyone's thinking by saying that you think wrong, you think incomplete. For someone who does not think his thought is correct enough, PwC may lead oneself to say, "Yes, my thought is not wrong, I think this way too." When the approach is used in early childhood education, children can also think of their thoughts as a valuable thought.

Related to the issue, P7 stated that:

> I think that children will have difficulties at first. But then, as they get used to this approach where they can reveal themselves, their relationship with themselves will also change positively. They will be able to see what they can do and even to see more than what they can do. They will see and can accept themselves as they are.

4.3.2.2.2.3.3 Respect for Others, Empathy, Tolerance

In the study, at the first time, preschool teachers (n=6) mentioned about the possible effect of the approach on respect for others and tolerance of children. On the other hand, similar to the views before PwC experience, they also stated that children's empathy will improve owing to the use of PwC in early childhood education. They thought that when PwC was used in early childhood education, children could be individuals who were more tolerant, understanding, respectful for differences and more empathetic with others. Related to the tolerance, P3 shared her ideas associating with the respect for others:

> Based on our 10-week experience, I think that the tolerance of the person attending these sessions will improve considerably. If she continues to participate in applications, I think she continues to tolerate others. That is, it is much easier in children, in adults, it can be harder to accept, respect, and tolerate thoughts of others. But with this approach, I think that everyone, including children, will begin to respect others' thoughts and therefore become more tolerant.

About increasing respect for others and empathy owing to the use of PwC, P11 stated that:

> In PwC, anyone can express their thoughts freely. Nobody is on trial. Everyone respects each other. There may be different thoughts or even opposing thoughts. But I think that when someone uses this approach regularly, they will start accepting different views more easily. Children will already develop more easily. After a while, I think they can put themselves in the place of their friend and another person. They can start looking from where s/he stands, thinking the way s/he thinks. I think the use of PwC will very likely develop children's empathy.

4.3.2.2.2.3.4 Participation

After PwC experience, for the first time in the study, preschool teachers (n=2) mentioned that the use of PwC in early childhood education may affect children's participation. They thought that children may want to participate more intentionally and more intensely in activities in the classroom by virtue of using PwC in the classroom.

In relation to the issue, P1 asserted that:

> After this ten-week implementation, I have seen that if the approach is used regularly, children who do not participate gradually begin to participate in the classroom. I think they will feel more comfortable and participate more in discussions in time because their thoughts are not intervened and they are listened.

Additionally, regarding the effects of PwC on inclusive children, P5 showed a change before and after PwC experience. The participant commented that:

> As I said in the first interview, in my class, I have one inclusive student. After our implementations in my class, now I believe that if I continuously employ the approach, it would create great changes on these children over time. He was the student who surprised me the most in my class practices. In the second practice in my class, he was surprisingly focused. When I asked them to pose questions in groups, I thought it would resist. But he liked it very much. I have seen these changes in just 2-3 practices. I am curious about the effects of this child and the effects on children in general for longer applications.

Furthermore, after preschool teachers used PwC in their own classroom, P10 who had a student who was with autism expressed that the student started to adapt to the activity and unexpectedly participated in, after the second PwC practice.

On the other hand, after preschool teachers used PwC in their own classroom, a few preschool teachers (n=2) stated that they cannot observe any effect of PwC on children they work with. By associating with the limited number of practices, P7 shared her ideas that:

> I can’t say that I observed any changes in children. Because I applied the approach only twice. I do not think it is enough to observe a change in children. I need a little more practice both to make a change in children and to be able to observe this.

4.3.3 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Teachers

Preschool teachers shared their views about the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on teacher before and after PwC experience. In presenting findings after PwC experience, the researcher also handled the findings of whether

implementing PwC made a personal and professional change to preschool teacher. This was among the interview questions after preschool teachers used PwC in their own classroom.

4.3.3.1 Findings before PwC Experience

The researcher asked preschool teachers for the possible effects of the use of PwC in early childhood education on teacher. The findings were viewed in accordance with the category arising from the codes. Before PwC experience, the findings were presented under two categories which were professional and personal effects as presented in Table 12.

Table 12

The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Teachers before PwC Experience

Categories	Codes
Professional Effects	• Guidance (n=6) • Change in Perception of Child (n=3) • Knowing Child (n=2)
Personal Effects	• Creative Thinking (n=2)

4.3.3.1.1 Category 1 Professional Effects

Before PwC experience, all preschool teachers thought that PwC can positively influence the professional life of teachers in terms of guidance, change in perception of child and knowing children in their classroom.

4.3.3.1.1.1 Guidance

Preschool teachers (n=6) thought that the use of PwC in early childhood education can positively affect teachers about guiding children. They mentioned that they can

direct children better by presenting right questions and answers and converting into better problem-solver in the classroom. For example, P6 commented that:

> This approach can help my students ask the right questions and give more accurate answers. Sometimes they ask hard questions, maybe with this approach, I can answer them more easily. Or, let's say there is a problem among children in the classroom, I can solve this problem better. I also think that it can help me in classroom control. With PwC, I can provide it more easily.

Furthermore, in the field notes on the first implementation, the researcher recorded that participants frequently looked at the researcher to interfere in the discussion or to give the right answer at some points in first two implementation sessions.

Similarly, transcript of audio-based observation which belongs to second sessions revealed that participant demands for the interference of the researcher. Regarding the content of the session, the stimulus was 'Picture of a Friend' Story (see Appendix B) and the chosen question which was formed by participants themselves was ''Do our differences prevent us from being friends?''. At the 40th minute of the session, the conversation between P11 and the researcher was as follows:

> P11: Do you expect us to make a universal definition of friendship or a definition that varies from person to person? Which one is correct?
>
> Researcher: I do not expect a specific definition from you. I also do not expect you to define your definition according to a certain criterion that I set. There is no one correct definition/answer and I don't have that. The definition you will make and which criterion you will base upon while defining is up to you.

4.3.3.1.1.2 Change in Perception of Child

Preschool teachers (n=3) asserted the possibility of change in their perception of child owing to the use of PwC in early childhood education. According to them, some preschool teachers who underestimate children may encounter with the able side of child and begin to give children more value.

Related to the issue, P7 expressed that:

> I think that this approach can enable the teacher to accept the child as an individual without saying 'Stop it, sit down!'. I observe that some teachers do not accept this and they underestimate children in their classroom. With the use of the approach in early childhood education, teacher can learn that children have an opinion and should respect them and listen.

4.3.3.1.1.3 Knowing Child

Preschool teachers (n=2) considered that PwC may enable that preschool teachers know their students better. Related to the issue, P10 shared her thoughts by stating that:

> I think that PwC may help us to know what students think about what because children can express all their thoughts while using this approach. We can also better observe the needs and interests of children. With all these, we can know our students better.

Furthermore, one preschool teacher expressed that these kinds of change in professional lives of teachers may increase their job satisfaction. P3 said that:

> In my opinion, as I learn new things, my influence on my students changes. Now this approach can help me get to know my students better. If I know better, my benefit to them also increases. As I see this, I am even more satisfied with my work. I like my job.

4.3.3.1.2 Category 2 Personal Effects

Before PwC experience, fewer preschool teachers compared to professional effects declared that PwC can positively influence the personal life of teachers. They stated their ideas in terms of creative thinking.

4.3.3.1.2.1 Creative Thinking

Preschool teachers (n=2) considered that teachers may look from more different and wide angles as the possible effect of the use of PwC in early childhood education on teachers.

P5 expressed that:

> I believe that teachers will be affected as much as children in a classroom where this approach is applied regularly. I think the teacher will inevitably begin to think and look from different angles. Maybe in this manner, s/he will find a new creative way, s/he will solve the problems s/he has not been able to solve until that day.

4.3.3.2 Findings after PwC Experience

After PwC experience, the researcher again asked preschool teachers for the possible effects of the use of PwC in early childhood education on teacher. The findings were viewed in accordance with the category arising from the codes. Preschool teachers again approached with similar headings in the pre-interview and also added further headings to them. The findings were presented under two main categories which were professional and personal effects, similar to them in the pre-interview, as presented in Table 13.

Table 13

The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Teachers after PwC Experience

Categories	Codes
Professional Effects	• Guidance (n=7) • Change in Perception of Child (n=6) • Knowing Child (n=5)
Personal Effects	• Thinking and Listening (n=6) • Self-Awareness (n=4) • Interpersonal Relationships (n=4)

4.3.3.2.1 Category 1 Professional Effects

After PwC experience, all preschool teachers maintained to think that PwC can influence their profession in terms of guidance, change in perception of child and

knowing child. However, they began to differently understand the guidance compared with the statements before PwC experience.

4.3.3.2.1.1 Guidance

Preschool teachers (n=7) maintained to think that the use of PwC in early childhood education will affect their guidance in their classroom. However, their understanding of guidance showed difference before and after PwC experience. They began to regard guidance not as the dominance of the teacher, but the facilitation of teacher. They mentioned that they might guide their students by inviting them to think, question, and respect for others more if they regularly use PwC. P1 said that:

> I think that all preschool teachers should be trained in PwC. Because we are very interventionist. We suppose that we embrace child-centered approach in our teaching. However, we make all planning regardless of children. Children just fulfill our plan. I observed that in this approach, teacher is rather listener and a collector of children's ideas. So, I think that the use of this approach may reduce the intervention of teachers to students.

Similarly, P2 shared her ideas associating with the implementations in her own classroom that:

> During practices in my class, I realized that I attempted to complete children's sentences and questions and that I interfered in their ideas. I didn't allow them to express themselves freely and talk with each other. With this approach, I show attention not to behave in this way in the classroom no longer.

P8 commented that:

> I think the use of PwC directly affects my teaching, my attitude in class. It's not an approach we're used to. I think I will try to direct the children by asking the right questions. I can give children a higher priority to express themselves. Now I am also giving it, but with PwC I can give it more. For example, when there is a problem in the classroom, I normally encourage them to solve the problem themselves. But with this approach, this attitude can be further settled.

Furthermore, compared to the initial implementation sessions, towards last sessions, in the field notes the researcher recorded that the participants did not any longer expect the researcher to intervene in the discussion or to give the right answer.

4.3.3.2.1.2 Change in Perception of Child

Similar to the statements before PwC experience, preschool teachers (n=6) expressed that they can perceive a child differently with the effect of using PwC. They also added that their PwC implementations in their own classrooms affected their perceptions of child. P11 shared ideas by emphasizing the importance of how a teacher perceives children that:

> Some teachers don't actually see the child as valuable. At least I think teachers shouldn't think like that. The child can feel this unworthiness everywhere. But, at least in school, we must give him the value they deserve. They seem incomplete. When we believe in them, when we give them an opportunity, they show us how skilled they are. We should see them, their potentiality. I think this approach may show real potentiality of children and affect the opinions of teachers about children.

P2 stated as her prominent experience during the implementation in her own classroom that:

> Initially, I wasn't even sure I could fully implement the approach in my classroom with my students. I thought we couldn't create a discussion. I never thought they could listen each other so much, offer different ideas. I'm shocked. I realized that I underestimated them. I see that I have not seen what they can do and think so far.

4.3.3.2.1.3 Knowing Child

Similar to the statements before PwC experience, preschool teachers (n=5) asserted that the use of PwC in early childhood education would affect teachers in terms of knowing students better. They also mentioned that during the implementations in their own classrooms, they became aware of that they do not have knowledge so much about the children in their classrooms. Related to the issue, P3 said that:

> I think this approach will provide us to be aware of the thoughts, feelings and dreams of the children more. While expressing themselves abundantly, they

> will actually tell us these. Since they can manifest themselves more freely, we will have more opportunities to observe what they can and can do. Thus, it will enable us to touch them more efficiently.

4.3.3.2.2 Category 2 Personal Effects

After PwC experience, very differently from their views before, all preschool teachers (n=11) declared that PwC may also have positive impacts on the personal lives of teachers besides professional life. Preschool teachers mentioned that the use of the approach may ensure developed thinking and listening skills, self-awareness and interpersonal relationship in their personal life.

4.3.3.2.2.1 Thinking and Listening

Preschool teachers (n=6) stated that the use of PwC may enable teachers to improve thinking and listening skills. They mentioned that they may begin to think more critically and creatively and to listen rather than speaking more.

P9 also stated that:

> It will also affect the way we think. I cannot say that I am a very questioning person in life. The experiences in this study confronted me with this too. I saw how I lived without thinking. If I apply this approach regularly in my class, I would probably question and think about what I encountered before I immediately accepted and rejected everything. Owing to the approach, I may begin to produce new and different ideas than I have ever thought.

P1 shared her ideas by focusing on creative thinking that:

> We have a lot of problems in life. I think it will affect our approach to them. For example, when we encounter a problem, we can analyze it better, look at it from different angles, rethink the problem and solve it more easily through PwC.

Related to the effect of PwC on listening skills of teachers, P11 said that:

> I believe that everyone speaks rather than listening. We also experienced this in the implementations here. We think we listen, but we don't. We think we understand each other, but we don't. If this approach is regularly used, teachers also will start to listen more and so understand better what is said.

4.3.3.2.2.2 Self-Awareness

Preschool teachers (n=4) asserted that they may be more aware of themselves owing to PwC. According to them, PwC will provide them to think about themselves. P8 commented that:

> I think that everyone who is involved in PwC activity will discover a lot of new things about oneself. They will be more aware of their ideas and emotions. This approach can allow us to see which we cannot see about ourselves until that day. Through the approach, my belief or idea on a certain subject I've never been aware of may reveal.

Some of them shared ideas by associating with self-improvement:

> With this approach, I think we will be more aware of what we are. What do we think, feel or do? PwC may also show us our deficiency in certain issues. Thus, we can be more aware of what we are not. This may lead us to improve and renew ourselves in our personal life.

4.3.3.2.2.3 Interpersonal Relationships

Preschool teachers (n=4) expressed that their interpersonal relationships will be affected by the use of PwC in early childhood education. They agreed that tolerance of teachers may increase owing to PwC. Related to the issur, P9 stated that:

> With this approach, we also begin to transform in our own lives. For example, I can become more tolerant in my relationship with my husband. He sometimes behaves in the way I do not like. Or I sometimes disagree with his thoughts. At those times I can feel uncomfortable. PwC can ensure that I accept them more comfortably.

One preschool teacher emphasized the possibility of being less dominant in personal life of teachers as the effect of the use of PwC in early childhood education.

P8 commented by exemplifying from her own life:

> I think teachers may also be less interventionist in other areas of their lives in addition to their classroom. For example, I started to intervene less. When I come across a situation that I can intervene in previous times, now I say that I shouldn't say this, I shouldn't be involved; this is not something I decide.

4.3.4 The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on the Relationship between Student and Teacher

In the scope of this study, preschool teachers shared their ideas about the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on the relationship between student and teacher before and after PwC experience

4.3.4.1 Findings before PwC Experience

The researcher asked preschool teachers for the possible effects of the use of PwC in early childhood education on the relationship between student and teacher before PwC experience. The findings were presented under the category 'Classroom Environment' as presented in Table 14.

Table 14

The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on the Relationship between Student and Teacher before PwC Experience

Category	Codes
Classroom Environment	• Dialogue-Based Relationship (n=8) • Safe Relationship (n=7)

4.3.4.1.1 Category Classroom Environment

Before PwC experience, all preschool teachers reported that PwC can positively affect the relationship between student and teacher. They expressed their ideas in terms of forming dialogue-based and safe relationships.

4.3.4.1.1.1 Dialogue-Based Relationship

Preschool teachers (n=8) stated that children and teacher may form high and positive verbal interaction between them through the use of the approach in early childhood education.

Related to this, P2 said that:

> Owing to PwC, I think we will have a relationship where everything can be discussed and solved. We will use a positive communication language in our relationship. I believe that conflicts that may arise between us can be resolved by speaking positively without establishing a negative destructive communication.

4.3.4.1.1.2 Safe Relationship

Preschool teachers (n=7) thought that PwC may support teacher and children in building safe relationship. P9 expressed that:

> If this approach provides that I talk more with children, let them in each other talk more and listen to them, I think that these will positively affect our relationship. It can make children express themselves more easily. This also will relieve the teacher-child relationship.

Some of them also asserted that PwC may enable teacher and children to know each other better in this safe relationship. Related to the issue, P3 commented that:

> When everyone in the classroom starts to express their thoughts without disrespecting to and refraining from each other, I think that they actually get to know each other better. They can be more aware of each other's feelings and thoughts because they can express them comfortably.

4.3.4.2 Findings after PwC Experience

After PwC experience, in relation to the effects of the use of PwC in early childhood education on the relationship between student and teacher, preschool teachers again approached from similar headings and also presented new ideas. The findings were presented under one main category which was classroom environment as presented in Table 15.

Table 15

The Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on the Relationship between Student and Teacher after PwC Experience

Category	Codes
Classroom Environment	• Dialogue-Based Relationship (n=11) • Safe Relationship (n=10) • Managing the Classroom Cooperatively (n=3)

4.3.4.2.1 Category Classroom Environment

After PwC experience, preschool teachers expressed their views under the category 'classroom environment'. They reflected that when PwC was used in early childhood education, the relationship between student and teacher may be affected in terms of improving dialogue-based and safe relationships and managing the classroom cooperatively.

4.3.4.2.1.1 Dialogue-Based Relationship

Preschool teachers all propounded that PwC may develop dialogue-based relationship between children and teacher when it is used in early childhood education. According to them, differently from the monologue of the teacher in traditional education, PwC may invite them to talk more with each other in general and to solve their problems through the dialogue of teacher and children. In this dialogue-based relationship, both children and teacher are equally included in the dialogue. P2 touched on the matter by stressing the change in mutual prevalent perceptions of both teacher and children that:

> I think that with PwC, traditional teacher-student relationship will change. In the traditional, the teacher talks more because s/he knows more. Children listen and accept what teacher says. As a matter of fact, what we mostly apply in our classes is that. But I think that PwC can bring a mutual interaction to our relationship. The use of PwC may change these perceptions. Children may not see teachers as the dominant character in the classroom. We may see children differently and establish a relationship in which we as teachers listen

> to them more. I think that this will positively affect our relationship in the classroom.

P9 expressed that:

> I think verbal communication between them will increase a lot. It will ensure that the child's voice is heard as much as the teacher. Our conversation with children is sometimes like a one-person conversation, a conversation where we hear our own voice. This approach can help us establish a mutual communication where everyone is listening and talking to each other.

4.3.4.2.1.2 Safe Relationship

Preschool teachers (n=10) thought that their relationship between children and teacher may convert into a more safe relationship when PwC is used in their educational environment. According to the participants, teacher and children will mutually respect their ideas and feelings. They will attach great importance to understanding each other. In the relationship with teacher, children will know that they are listened to and not be silenced and humiliated while expressing themselves.

P9 commented that:

> In the classroom, we may reject the ideas of children or might not listen to them. These may make them feel bad. This can cause the child to move away from us. And this may damage our relationship. With the use of PwC, everyone can express their opinions and see that they are not rejected there will be a trust bond between teacher and children. They will lead teacher and children to respect each other. This will make our relationship closer and stronger.

4.3.3.1.1.3 Managing the Classroom Cooperatively

Differently from their views before PwC experience, preschool teacher (n=3) reported that teacher and children can manage the classroom cooperatively through the use of PwC in early childhood education. Related to managing classroom cooperatively, P1 pointed that:

> In this approach, children seem very active to me. They can manage the activity with the teacher. They can share responsibilities in the classroom. And I believe that managing the class together positively affects the relationship between the teacher and the children.

P6 stated her ideas by attracting attention to her views before PwC experience that:

> At the beginning, I thought that I may have difficulty in retaining authority in the classroom when PwC is used in my classroom. When my students asked questions, I had to be able to answer the questions they ask and convince them. If I didn't, my authority in the class would be destroyed. But now, I start to think differently. I don't have to be able to answer their all questions and don't have to convince them. We can investigate the answer to a question altogether. When a decision is made, we can talk, discuss and make a decision together.

4.3.5 The Obstacles in Using PwC in Early Childhood Education

Preschool teachers shared their ideas about the obstacles which they could face with using PwC in early childhood educational environment before and after PwC experience.

4.3.5.1 Findings before PwC Experience

The researcher asked preschool teachers for the possible obstacles in the use of PwC in early childhood education. The findings were viewed in accordance with the category arising from the codes. Before PwC experience, the findings were presented under two categories which were institutional and socio-cultural obstacles, as presented in Table 16**.**

Table 16

The Obstacles in Using PwC before PwC Experience

Categories	Codes
Institutional Obstacles	• Traditional Education System (n=6)
Socio-Cultural Obstacles	• Perception of Philosophy and Child (n=5)

4.3.5.1.1 Category 1 Institutional Obstacles

Preschool teachers stated that they may meet with institutional obstacles in using PwC. They explained these obstacles in terms of traditional education system.

4.3.5.1.1.1 Traditional Education System

Before PwC experience, preschool teachers (n=6) asserted that traditional education system in Turkey may not open to use PwC. According to them, traditional education system is not open to be curious about and to criticize. P10 commented by associating it with the institutions of the education system that:

> It is so important that the school administration approves using the approach. My eagerness to use PwC alone is not enough. If the school administration does not approve, I cannot use it. School administrations don't allow every implementation. With PwC, children may be more curious and ask more questions. School administrators may see the content and outcomes of it as undesirable. In such a case, I don't suppose that they will approve using the approach.

4.3.5.1.2 Category 2 Socio-Cultural Obstacles

Preschool teachers reflected that they may also meet with socio-cultural obstacles in using PwC. They explained these obstacles in terms of perception of philosophy and child in the society.

4.3.5.1.2.1 Perception of Philosophy and Child

Preschool teachers (n=5) thought that perception of philosophy and child in the society may be an obstacle in using PwC. About the perception of philosophy in the society, P8 stated that:

> I think our society does not value philosophy very much. Even in TV series and movies, dealing with philosophy and making philosophy is shown as something useless and worthless. Or being interested in philosophy can be shown as perplexing. So people may not confirm to do philosophy and some things related to philosophy.

Related to the perception of child in the society as the possible obstacle in using PwC, P5 commented that:

> In my opinion, views on children in the society may prevent from using PwC. Those who see children too small may think that they cannot do philosophy. According to them, preschool children are too young to have their own

thoughts. Adults think instead of them. They may think what philosophy has to do with the child.

4.3.5.2 Findings after PwC Experience

After PwC experience, preschool teachers shared their ideas about the obstacles in the use of PwC in early childhood education. The findings were viewed in accordance with the category arising from the codes. After PwC experience, views of preschool teachers were categorized under the same two categories with the categories before PwC experience, which were institutional and socio-cultural obstacles, as presented in Table 17.

Table 17

The Obstacles in Using PwC after PwC Experience

Categories	Codes
Institutional Obstacles	• Traditional Education System(n=7) • Inadequate Teacher Training (n=1)
Socio-Cultural Obstacles	• Perception of Philosophy (n=5) • Perception of Child (n=5)

4.3.5.2.1 Category 1 Institutional Obstacles

Preschool teachers stated that they may meet with institutional obstacles in using PwC. They explained these obstacles in terms of traditional education system and inadequate teacher education.

4.3.5.2.1.1 Traditional Education System

After PwC experience, preschool teachers (n=7) asserted that the education system in Turkey may pose an obstacle in using PwC and for this reason its institutions may also oppose to use the approach. P1 emphasized that using the approach may not be sustained in the education system in Turkey by saying that:

> If children can learn to think and question through this approach, it is necessary to provide an environment for them to do so. I can say that preschool education opens up more space for children to express themselves, to think and to question themselves compared to other education levels. But we are still in a system that tries to mold ideas of children, wanting children to accept without question. Supposing that the children are introduced to this approach in preschool, and then they will go to primary school. There, 'Shut up, don't talk!' is called. It will seem them to speak a lot and unnecessary. They will also be subjected to multiple choice exams. I think that our close-ended education system may pose an obstacle for using the approach.

Related to the issue, P4 said that:

> This approach may be seen as a threat. Because children will criticize with PwC. There is no place for criticism in traditional education. So, I think that school administration or teachers having traditional view in education may be an obstacle to it.

4.3.5.2.1.2 Inadequate Teacher Education

After PwC experience, one preschool teacher pointed out inadequate teacher education as the possible obstacle in using PwC. P2 expressed that:

> We participate in many teacher education programs, but according to me, some of them are inadequate. If we, as teachers, do not receive adequate training, we don't apply that approach or method completely or correctly. We can say that we do philosophy with children without knowing and practicing it fully. So I think that teacher training is so important. If it is not adequate, it could be an obstacle in using PwC.

4.3.5.2.2 Category 2 Socio-Cultural Obstacles

After PwC experience, preschool teachers stated that they may also meet with socio-cultural obstacles in using PwC. Similar to their views before PwC experience, they explained these obstacles in terms of perceptions of philosophy and of child in the society.

4.3.5.2.2.1 Perception of Philosophy

Preschool teachers (n=5) thought that perception of philosophy in the society may be the obstacle in using PwC. They mentioned that philosophy may be regarded as

complicated or unnecessary or being against religion. P11 shared ideas by referring her high school years:

> I remember my high school years. I would enjoy philosophy very much. But some friends would find philosophy very complex. In philosophy lessons, they acted as if a foreign language was spoken. They would never even try to listen, to understand. I think it was a little thought of by everyone. Philosophy is a very heavy matter. Not everyone can care. Not everyone can understand. I think there is a perception that the child cannot understand at all.

P3 asserted that:

> I believe that there are people who have some prejudices against philosophy and they do not know actually what philosophy is. They may think that philosophy is something of being unnecessary or being irreligious. For this reason, they may humiliate philosophy or see as an enemy of religion. I think these kinds of prejudices may form obstacle in using PwC.

4.3.5.2.2.2 Perception of Child

Preschool teachers (n=5) thought that perception of child in the society may pose an obstacle in using PwC. Related to this possible obstacle, P7 said that:

> I think some people will not be able to make any connection between children and philosophy. They may think that PwC will not be effective in children because they see the child inadequate. They can say that 'no need', 'you are trying in vain'. They can see it as writing on water. Such thoughts can hinder the use of the approach.

Furthermore, after the implementations in their own classroom, preschool teachers mentioned general change in their ideas about children who they work with. They said that children in general are open to philosophize more than they thought. P3 declared her ideas that:

> I've been doing this profession for years, but I've seen some aspects which I haven't seen before of children. I was amazed that they were curiously and eagerly circled by asking ‘What are we going to discuss today?’. I didn't think children could not do philosophy, but at the same time, I didn't think they were so open. I have seen that children are much more open to philosophize than adults. Based on our ten-week practices, I can say that we have prejudice and stereotypes. We have difficulty in respecting other ideas or changing our

> ideas. These are obstacles to philosophize. But I have seen that children are without prejudice, more open to questioning and to accepting different ideas.

In relation to the change in her views on children, P6 expressed that:

> I had children that I didn't expect them to participate in the discussion, to express their opinion, to raise questions. I was mistaken about them. They changed my mind. I've obviously been prejudiced about them. They did what I said they couldn't. For example, I had a child who didn't speak for a whole period, I saw him express himself very well in the activity.

4.4 Summary

The purpose of the study was to investigate preschool teachers' views on PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings through PwC experience. In line with this purpose, participants were asked some questions such as "What does PwC evoke for you? What do you think about the use of PwC in early childhood education? Or What can be the effect of using PwC in early childhood education on teachers?." The findings of the study took shape in the consideration of these questions and the answers of the participants. This chapter introduced the findings of the study by starting with presenting demographic information of the participants. Following that, findings were presented in company with research questions. The findings were organized in accordance with the categories arising from the coding identified while analyzing interview transcripts.

This study presented several findings. One of the main findings was about that in the beginning, preschool teachers in the study did not have any knowledge about PwC and most of them confused PwC with certain thinking methods such as brainstorming. At the end of the study, all preschool teachers realized the difference between PwC and other methods related thinking. This showed that PwC was an untouched and also needs to be touched in their early childhood education. The second finding was that although participants cannot associate preschool children with philosophy at the beginning, they could associate them at the end of the study. This demonstrated that preschool teachers impressed by the study in terms of change in their perception of philosophy and child. Another finding was related to the effects of using PwC on teachers. While at the start of the study they considered guidance

from more dominance of teacher, they showed an approach to guidance as more facilitation of teacher at the end of the study. Another finding was that preschool teachers observed that they could be positively affected by PwC in terms of personal benefits besides professional benefits. Another finding was related to whether or not the preschool teachers were interested to use PwC in their own classrooms. All of the participants in the study would like to practice PwC. Moreover they practiced, too. However, regarding the use of PwC, they both foresaw some problems related to teachers' confidence and motivation. In summary, this study illuminates PwC and its use in early childhood education with its findings. The following chapter moves on to discussion of these findings.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the summary of the study is primarily presented. Then, its findings on preschool teachers' views on PwC and the use of PwC in early childhood education settings through PwC experience are discussed in detailed. Furthermore, educational implications and recommendations for further studies are given.

5.1 Summary of the Study

The purpose of this evaluative case study was to investigate preschool teachers' views on Philosophy with Children and the use of Philosophy with Children in early childhood education settings, through PwC experience. In accordance with this purpose, ten-week Philosophy with Children implementation program was performed with preschool teachers in the study by the researcher and also preschool teachers used Philosophy with Children in their own educational settings at least two times after the implementation program. Therefore, in this study, 'PwC experience' corresponded to the sum of implementations that were conducted by the researcher and also conducted by preschool teachers on their own in their classrooms after ending the implementation of the researcher. Participants shared their views in terms of what PwC is, its use and the effects of PwC on children, teachers and the relationship between them and also the obstacles in using PwC. Before the main study, pilot study was also conducted. The participants in the main study were all preschool teachers who were currently working at public preschools in Antalya, Turkey. A total of 11 female preschool teachers participated in the study. Data for the study was mainly collected before and after the implementations of the researcher and also after implementations of participants, by means of semi-structured interviews. Moreover, data was also collected during ten-week implementation program via audio-based observation and field notes. Once all the data had been

collected, the analysis process was undertaken by two coders. Finally, the findings were presented under categories derived from the codes determined during analyzing the data.

5.2 Discussion of the Findings

5.2.1 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding PwC

The findings of the current study revealed that preschool teachers accepted PwC as the approach which improves the critical and creative thinking of children, enables them to ask their own questions and fosters collaboratively thinking. Correspondingly, Cassidy and Christie (2013), Lipman (2003) and McCall (2013) described Philosophy with Children as the approach which encourages children in critical and creative thinking, in asking questions and collaborative thinking in a community of inquiry. Another view of few participants was that PwC is the inquiry-based approach in terms of children's being more active in producing their own questions and answers and of both two approaches being based on inquiry. On the other hand, although collaboration is not emphasized in the inquiry-based approach, preschool teachers pointed to the importance of collaboration in PwC approach. This finding is consistent with other studies that marked that PwC can be seen as similar to the inquiry-based approach in education and moreover which also emphasized that PwC is an inquiry-based approach that specifically focuses on collaborative dialogue in the community (Cam, 2006; Dougherty, 2017; Fisher, 2013; Haynes, 2014; Naji, 2013; Stanley, 2004).

Another findings showed that while at the beginning of the study, preschool teachers regarded PwC as the approach in which teachers ask questions to children and direct children about what they should think; after PwC experience they acknowledged PwC as the approach in which the teacher does not lead children's thinking, rather facilitates their thinking and they described PwC as dealing with directing children in how they should think without limiting them in what to think. This finding can be explained with that while at the beginning of the study, preschool teachers addressed PwC from the existing teacher-led approach in traditional education, after their PwC

experience, they addressed the approach from the teacher-facilitated point of view (Newell-Jones, 2012). Additionally, these findings coincide with the previous studies which reflected that PwC objects to traditional education in which the teacher as a source of knowledge asks questions and expects a single right answer from children, and also deals with transmitting any knowledge about what children should think of a certain issue (Kennedy, 2012; Scholl, Nichols, & Burgh, 2009; Topping & Trickey, 2014).

Besides that, while preschool teachers, before PwC experience, made an analogy between PwC and certain methods which were already used in early childhood education such as question-answer, brainstorming, idea bank or the activities in story and circle time, all preschool teachers, after PwC experience, stated that they changed their thoughts on the issue. They expressed that PwC approach is beyond and different from disconnected thinking games and merely sharing of ideas. Their initial views on PwC can be explained with the study of Haynes (2011) which revealed these kinds of misunderstanding about PwC is related to the lack of knowledge about the approach. Moreover, while before the PwC experience preschool teacher expressed that they were already doing philosophy with children in their classrooms on the basis of their initial views related to PwC, after the experience they stated to realize that they did not actually do philosophy with children. A possible explanation for this finding might have been that teachers corrected their misunderstanding about PwC by having more knowledge about the approach after their PwC experience (O'Riordan, 2013).

5.2.2 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Use of PwC in Early Childhood Education Settings

5.2.2.1 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Use of PwC in Early Childhood Education

The current study found that preschool teachers strongly supported that Philosophy with Children are developmentally appropriate for preschool children and can be easily used in early childhood education. While, before PwC experience, some

preschool teachers could not associate the child to philosophy due to child's cognitive incapability to do philosophy (Lyle, 2017; Piaget, 1974; Rousseau, 1762/2010; Siegler, 2004); after PwC experience, they changed their views about that young children can also do philosophy. In accordance with the present finding, previous studies have indicated that young children already practice complex cognitive operations in these communities such as making abstract conceptualization, expressing their agreeing and disagreeing, requesting reasons and also providing them, explaining, giving examples and counterexamples and presenting different ideas (Kennedy, 1994; Kieran Egan; 1988; Matthew, 1994; Murris, 2000). Moreover, a few preschool teachers stated that they do not give children the opportunity to do philosophy and in the case that teachers prepare the proper classroom environment for that, children can also do philosophy. This finding is consistent with the idea that if people believe in children's capability to do philosophy and support them to do this, children can reveal their capability to do philosophy (Goucha, 2007; Lipman, 1973).

According to some preschool teachers in the study, while using PwC in the educational area, philosophical knowledge is not necessary. They explained this with that a teacher in PwC does not express their own knowledge and inform children. On the other hand, in the related literature, it is argued for the importance of having philosophical sensitivity and knowledge in using PwC (Akkocaoğlu Çayır, 2018; Daniel & Auriac, 2011; Haynes, 2011; Lone, 2012b; McCall, 2017). The facilitator in PwC benefits from philosophical knowledge without exhibiting that. For this reason, this finding might be related to the structure of PwC which does not aim at transmitting philosophical knowledge to children but aims at facilitating the construction of their own knowledge (Lone, 2012b; Maxwell, 2005; Scholl et al., 2009). This finding might have also arisen from the participants' looking through the window of traditional education where the teachers as a source of knowledge transmit their all knowledge, thus also demonstrate their knowledge (Kennedy, 2012; Topping & Trickey, 2014). This finding might be also supported by the idea of

Murris (2015) which revealed that non-philosophically educated teachers are in need of being philosophical more through training in PwC approach.

Regarding PwC's becoming part of the school curriculum, preschool teachers in the study handled the subject in terms of teachers' confidence and motivation in using PwC in the school curriculum. Some preschool teachers expressed their lack of confidence in properly using Philosophy with Children. Thus, they preferred that PwC is used as the extracurricular activity which is conducted by a competent person in the field. Moreover, they highlighted the importance of teacher's motivation in PwC's being part of the school curriculum. According to the participants, unwilling teachers should not be forced to integrate PwC into the school curriculum. These findings agree with the findings of O'Riordan (2013) which showed differing levels of motivation and confidence might affect the use of PwC. Related to motivation, the reluctance of teachers about using PwC might be associated with high expectations about their always using new applications from teachers and with time constraints in relation to the crowded curriculum (O'Riordan, 2013; Williams, 2018).

Preschool teachers in the study thought that to be effective of PwC approach should be used continuously. This finding is consistent with the findings of Topping and Trickey (2007) and Siddiqui et al. (2015) which demonstrated that overall success of PwC depends on the regular using of PwC in education. Another finding of the study was that preschool teacher focused on the importance of classroom size related to the proper use of PwC in the educational area. Preschool teacher declared that if classroom was so crowded, the quality of PwC sessions would be negatively affected. Similar to the finding of this study, Fisher (1998) mentioned that crowded group size might stop the facilitator from properly using PwC and might cause to share ideas of fewer children and in a shorter time, so group size of around 14 is ideal. Moreover, in conformity with this finding, Toprak and Güneş (2019) found that crowded classrooms which consist of about 20 students pose a general problem in early childhood education in Turkey, they decrease the quality of the activities and lead to a teacher-centered pedagogy.

The finding of the study also revealed that preschool teachers emphasized that meeting PwC is importance in early childhood period. They mentioned that the early childhood period is a pivotal period in one's life in terms of its forming of character. Therefore, it is essential for children to meet PwC in early childhood period. These findings corroborate the ideas of Maxwell (2005) and Farahani (2014) which defended that PwC should be initiated since the early childhood period and centrally take a place in the early childhood curriculum. Preschool teachers also stated that early childhood curriculum is flexible enough to integrate PwC into it. According to the participants, there is no sharp limit in early childhood curriculum unlike further periods in the educational area. In harmony with this finding, in Turkish early childhood education program (MoNE, 2013), it is stated that a flexible framework is drawn for preschool teachers related to prepare and implement their plans. Preschool teachers can prepare their plans integrated or separately and can enrich learning processes by making use of different activities. Moreover, this finding supports the finding of Karadağ and Demirtaş (2018) who found that preschool teachers thought that PwC highly suitable for preschool period and they were enthusiastic about permanently using the approach in their plans. Moreover, the finding of the present study indicated that some preschool teachers thought that PwC can be easily integrated especially with the activities related literacy and teaching values or concepts. This finding also agrees with the idea of Millet and Kay (2011) which remarked the importance of the content and form of lessons in integration of PwC in the school curriculum.

5.2.2.2 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Children

There has been a growing body of research on demonstrating the effects of PwC on children (Kilby, 2019). Although several effects of PwC in diverse areas have been revealed, the most prominent effect of PwC is in the area of cognitive development (Yan, et al., 2018). The literature indicated that using PwC programs in the educational area contribute to children's reasoning skills (Akkocaoğlu Çayır, 2015; Daniel & Auriac, 2011; Lam, 2012; Marashi, 2009; Säre, Luik, & Tulviste, 2016;

Topping & Trickey, 2007; Yusoff, 2018), critical and creative thinking (Dyfed County Council,1994; Gasparatou & Kampeza, 2012; Ghaedi et al., 2015; Haas, 1980; Jenkins & Lyle, 2010; Karadag and Demirtas, 2018; Lipman & Bierman, 1970; Marashi, 2008; McCall, 2017; Siddiqui et al., 2015), collaborative thinking (Phillips, n.d.), questioning skills (Demirtaş et al., 2018; Jenkins & Lyle, 2010; Karadag & Demirtas, 2018; Yusoff, 2018) and academic achievement in maths, reading and writing (Dyfed County Council, 1994; Fields, 1995; Haas, 1980; Imani et al., 2016; Lipman & Bierman, 1970; Siddiqui et al., 2015; The ETS study, 1980; Williams, 1993).

Coherently with the literature, the findings of the current study revealed that preschool teachers thought that the use of PwC in education has a positive impact on the cognitive development of children in terms of critical, creative and collaborative thinking, questioning skills and academic outcomes. They expressed critical thinking by questioning a thought without immediately accepting it and explaining thoughts with their reasons; and expressed creative thinking by producing new thoughts and looking from different perspectives. Regarding collaborative thinking, they expressed that children will start thinking among themselves by going beyond individual thinking individually. Moreover, the finding of the study showed that preschool teachers in the study gradually paid more attention to explain their ideas with reasons throughout ten-week PwC implementation. These findings might be explained with that ten-week PwC implementation had an impact on the critical thinking skills of the participants who were the members of the community of philosophical inquiry.

The literature also showed that using PwC in education contributes to the language development of children. PwC promotes active listening (Campbell, 2002; Commonwealth of Australia, 2008; Dyfed County Council, 1994) and expressive language (Campbell, 2002; Dyfed County Council, 1994; Jenkins & Lyle, 2010; Trickey, 2007). Preschool teachers in the study thought that speaking and listening skills of children are positively influenced by using PwC. Furthermore, during ten-week PwC sessions, the researcher recorded that preschool teachers increasingly

began to listen to each other better towards the end of ten-week sessions while they lacked listening to each other and talked at the same time during early PwC sessions. This finding might be also explained as the effects of 10 ten-week PwC implementation on the language development of preschool teachers who were the members of the community.

Besides that, the findings of the study showed that preschool teachers thought that using PwC in the educational area has an impact on the social-emotional development of children in terms of self-confidence, self-esteem, respect for others, empathy, tolerance and participation. In accordance with these findings, many studies supported that the use of PwC positively affects children's self-confidence (Campbell, 2002; Okur, 2008; Siddiqui, et al., 2015; Topping & Trickey, 2007), self-esteem (Palsson et al., 1998; Topping& Trickey, 2007), respect for other ideas (Cassidy & Christie, 2013; Sigurborsdottir, 1998), open-mindedness (Fair et al., 2015), socialization and self-direction (Naraghi et al., 2013), social behavior, empathy and self-regulation (Cassidy et al., 2017; Okur, 2008; Topping & Trickey, 2007), collaboration (Okur, 2008; Siddiqui, et al., 2015), engagement with learning and peer relationships (Commonwealth of Australia, 2008; Sigurborsdottir, 1998; Topping & Trickey, 2007; Yusoff, 2018) and participation (Campbell, 2002; Cassidy & Christie, 2013; Cassidy et al., 2017; Marashi, 2008; Topping & Trickey, 2007).

Another finding of the study was that preschool teachers stated that PwC approach can also positively affect children with special needs. A few preschool teachers expressed that bilingual children who cannot completely speak and understand Turkish and be mostly silent can also participate and develop linguistically in PwC implementation. This finding accords with the study of Newell-Jones (2012) which found that using PwC has an impact on bilingual linguistic development through increasing vocabulary and self-expression of children. Moreover, one preschool teacher stated that a child with autism in her classroom started to adapt to PwC after the second PwC implementation. In accordance with this finding, Cassidy et al. (2017) revealed the usefulness of using PwC on children with autism in terms of their engagement and self-regulation.

5.2.2.3 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on Teacher

Regarding the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on teachers, preschool teachers in the study thought that the use of PwC in their educational environment affects teachers themselves in terms of both their professional and personal lives. They mentioned that the use of PwC improves teachers' guidance, changes their perception of child, helps teachers know children better. In relation to personal life, they thought that owing to the use of PwC, their thinking-listening skills, and interpersonal relationships are improved and self-awareness is increased.

Preschool teachers in the study showed a different approach to guidance before and after PwC experience. While at the start of the study they considered guidance from more dominance of teacher, they showed an approach to guidance as more facilitation of teacher at the end of the study. They mentioned that they might guide their students by inviting them to think, question, and respect for others. They highlighted that they noticed how dominant they are in the classroom environment although they supposed to embrace the child-centered approach. Moreover, they thought that the use of PwC in early childhood education can decrease their dominance in the classroom environment in general (see 4.3.3.2.1.1 for the views on guidance after PwC experience). Related to their understanding of guidance, while in the beginning, the participants expected the researcher who was the facilitator to give the right answer of the question and interfere during the discussions, they abandoned these expectations towards the last sessions of the ten-week implementations. These findings are consistent with the finding of previous studies which found that teachers established less dominance in their teaching in general and tented to encourage their students in questioning and reasoning more owing to PwC (Newell-Jones, 2012; O'Riordan, 2017; Scholl et. al., 2016; Siddiqui et. al.,2015).

Moreover, the finding of the study showed that preschool teachers thought that the use of PwC affects teachers' perception of child. They expressed that children could be seen as incompetent and immature, however, this perception turns into an 'able'

child through the use of PwC. In parallel with their views, before PwC experience preschool teachers in the study who could not associate the child and philosophy argued that children are strongly associated with philosophy after PwC experience. It can be said that PwC experience contributed to bringing them new perception of the child. In this new perception, children behaved and thought more competent and mature than preschool teachers expected. Similar to this finding of the study, many studies emphasized that the use of PwC leads teachers to acknowledge a different ontology of child who has high potentiality more than teachers expected and also supports teachers' critical evolution of their pedagogy by deconstructing their prevalent thinking patterns. (Akkocaoğlu Çayır, 2018; Demissie, 2015; Haynes & Murris, 2011; Scholl, 2014; Topping and Trickey, 2007)

Another finding was that preschool teachers mentioned that they know their students better owing to the use of PwC in the educational area. They stated that they can know what children think, have an interest and need, because the use of PwC provides more space for children to express themselves. Preschool teachers thought that they can observe all expressions of children and thus be better aware of their thoughts, needs, and interests. Moreover, they expressed to experience this effect of the approach during their own classroom implementations. In accordance with this finding, the studies of Roberts (2006) and Scholl et al. (2016) indicated that teachers gained more insights about their students, their ability, capability, thoughts and backgrounds after PwC sessions.

Besides the professional effects of PwC on teachers, preschool teachers thought that using PwC also influences their personal life. In this regard, they mentioned that their thinking and listening skills would be improved through the use of PwC. Preschool teachers stated that using PwC would lead them to question and think more before accepting and rejecting ideas immediately. They also mentioned that the use of PwC promotes problem solving through looking at problems from different angles. This finding also supports the finding of Mergler et al. (2009) Scholl (2014) Green and Condy (2016) which found that PwC improved thinking skills of pre-service and in-service teachers.

The finding of the study indicated that preschool teachers thought that their self-awareness would be also affected owing to PwC. According to them, PwC invites preschool teachers to be aware of what they think, feel and do. By the approach, they reflected that they would be more aware of what they are and what they are not. This finding supports the result of Mergler, Curtis, and Spooner-Lane (2009) which revealed that PwC increased self-awareness of pre-service teachers. Furthermore, preschool teachers in the study shared that their interpersonal relationships would be influenced by using PwC in terms of increasing their tolerance and decreasing dominance. They mentioned that PwC ensures to accept different ideas more comfortably. Preschool teachers emphasized that the use of PwC in education also leads them to be less dominant in their personal life, besides in professional life. They mentioned that they sometimes found unnecessary intervention in conversation and that they stopped themselves at these moments. These findings are consistent with the study of Roberts (2006) which found that PwC experience affected the personal relationships of teachers in terms of listening more.

5.2.2.4 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Effects of Using PwC in Early Childhood Education on the Relationship between Student and Teacher

Apart from the effects of using PwC in early childhood education on children and teacher, the literature also showed that the use of PwC in the educational area has also effects on the relationship between student and teacher (Dougherty; 2017; Fisher, 2007; Green & Condy, 2016; Haynes, 2014; Jenkins & Lyle, 2010; Kovalainen, et. al, 2001; Lyle, 2018; Splitter, 2014; Topping & Trickey, 2007). In accordance with these previous studies, this study also revealed that preschool teachers agreed that using PwC in early childhood education affected the relationship between teacher and preschool children.

The finding of the study stated that preschool teachers thought that through the use of PwC in early childhood education, dialogue-based relationship is developed between children and teacher. In this dialogue-based relationship, they also emphasized that perceptions of child and teacher in traditional education in which the monologue of

the teacher is dominant would change. They stated that in the classroom environment where PwC is regularly used, the issues would be discussed and evaluated through the dialogue of teacher and children more, not through the monologue of the teacher. This finding is consistent with the other studies which indicated that the use of PwC increased the quantity and the quality of teacher-child dialogue where both teacher and child listen and talk respectfully in the classroom (Dougherty, 2017; Lyle, 2018; Topping & Trickey, 2007)

Another finding was that preschool teachers thought that their relationship would convert into a safe relationship as far as PwC is used in the classroom environment. They stated that PwC supports them in building trusting and respectful relationships in which everyone can express their opinions. According to them, through this kind of relationship, the relationship between student and teacher strengthens and turns into a relationship where they trust each other reciprocally. Similar to the present finding, the findings of Kovalainen, et al. (2001), Splitter (2014) and Green and Condy (2016) also revealed that PwC contributes everyone in the classroom to feel themselves in a safe place where mutual respect and trust.

Additionally, preschool teachers in the study thought that teacher and children can manage the classroom cooperatively through the use of PwC in early childhood education. While before PwC experience a few participants expressed that they had the anxiety to lose the authority in the classroom management in using PwC in consistent with the finding of O'Riordan (2013), they changed their views in line with managing the classroom in a more communal manner after PwC implementations. This finding agrees with the findings of previous studies which showed that issues in the classroom are negotiated and evaluated by all members in the classroom community, not by a teacher as an authority (Fisher, 2007; Freire & Ramos, 1970; Haynes, 2014; Jenkins & Lyle, 2010). Moreover, this change might be explained with that established hierarchy between teacher and student in traditional education is given up through the use of PwC in education (Haynes & Murris, 2011). In this established hierarchy while a teacher is an authoritative

source of knowledge, not a facilitator of learning for children; children accept what is taught and wait for the teacher to give the correct answer (Funston, 2017).

5.2.2.5 Views of Preschool Teachers regarding the Obstacles in Using PwC in Early Childhood Education

The findings of the study indicated that in using PwC in early childhood education, preschool teachers thought that institutional and socio-cultural obstacles are. Preschool teachers expressed that traditional education structure constitutes an impediment to use PwC in early childhood education. According to them, PwC is a challenge for traditional education structure. Preschool teachers thought that traditional education might undermine curiosity and criticism of children. This finding is consistent with the idea of Kizel (2016) that while the traditional education corresponds to the pedagogy of depending on an omniscient authority, what dominates in PwC is the pedagogy of searching. In the traditional, curiosity killed the cat and there is no place for criticism. Furthermore, knowledge is transmitted as one-way from teacher to child. According to preschool teachers, traditional education structure can also affect the attitude of school administrators and they may not approve using PwC in their educational environment. This finding can be supported by the finding of Newell-Jones (2012) who found that teachers felt uncomfortable with using PwC when they were not supported adequately by the school and they exposed to many other pressures. Additionally, in the scope of institutional obstacles, one preschool teacher mentioned inadequate teacher education in PwC. For this participant, in order to use PwC completely and correctly, teachers should receive adequate education about PwC. This finding is in accord with the ideas of Haynes (2011) and Millet and Tapper (2012) which the lack of appropriate teacher training might impede proper use of PwC.

In the socio-cultural obstacles, preschool teachers mentioned perceptions of both child and philosophy. In relation to the perception of philosophy, preschool teachers mentioned that philosophy asks disturbing questions which might be perplexing. This perplexity can be perceived as subversive activity for society.

Moreover, for this reason, according to the participants, people might trivialize philosophy as a waste of time or demonize it by presenting as an enemy of religion. In consistent with this finding of the study, the studies of Haynes (2011) and Farahani (2014) underline that in the case that the society dislikes for its authenticity and values being criticized, members of this society will also be against philosophizing and Philosophy with Children.

Another finding of the study was that preschool teachers thought that the perception of child as not capable of doing philosophy will pose an obstacle in using PwC in early childhood education. This finding supports the idea of Maxwell (2005) presented that the possible primary obstacle to use PwC in education is the perception of children who are acknowledged as ‘‘vulnerable members in the society who need care and guidance’’ (Andal, 2020).

5.3 Implications

Although there is a growing body of literature on Philosophy with Children, studies which focus on views of preschool teachers on Philosophy with Children and its use in early childhood education are in a very limited number. Therefore, the findings of the current study contribute to the field of early childhood education by revealing the views of a group of preschool teachers regarding Philosophy with Children and its use in early childhood education. Considering the findings of the study, it is possible to discuss both practical and research implications of the current study.

This current study revealed several cognitive, linguistic and social-emotional benefits of using PwC in early childhood education on children including children with special needs in many areas. Additionally, this study indicated that using PwC affects preschool teachers by bringing several professional benefits such as improving guidance, changing perception of child and personal benefits such as improving thinking-listening skills and interpersonal relationship. Moreover, current study showed the use of PwC has an impact on the relationship between student and teacher in terms of its converting into dialogue-based and safe relationships and cooperative management of the classroom. According to these findings, this study

might have encouraged preschool teachers in critical thinking on an established hierarchy between teacher and student and on classroom management in traditional education. On the other hand, although philosophical dimension has importance in PwC, preschool teachers thought that philosophical knowledge is not essential in using PwC. This study also indicated that traditional education structure and inadequate teacher training and perceptions of child and philosophy in the society could prevent from using of PwC in early childhood education.

In consideration of the obtained findings, regarding practical implications of the study, PwC could be regularly implemented one-hour per week beginning from 4-year-old children both as a teaching method within the school curriculum and/or as an extracurricular activity such as philosophy workshop at school. In classrooms with a class size above 20, PwC implementations could be made by dividing it into 2 groups. Besides that, continuous and comprehensive teacher training programs in PwC could be implemented for preschool teachers to be able to effectively use and to reap the benefits of the approach. This training could include substantial philosophical knowledge, theoretical and methodological dimensions of PwC and implementations within the training group. It could be carried out by specialists in PwC throughout one school term as two hours per week. Following this term, willing preschool teachers could implement PwC in their classrooms once a week and obtain feedback on their implementations from specialists. Furthermore, elective courses in early childhood education departments in universities could be designed about PwC approach for pre-service preschool teachers gain awareness of PwC. This course could be conducted by a specialist in PwC throughout one school term. Similar to the teacher training program, this course could also include substantial philosophical knowledge, theoretical and methodological dimensions of PwC and implementations within classroom community. Moreover, if pre-service preschool teachers take this course before the internship, they could implement the approach in their internship.

Related to the research implications of the study, future research could examine the specified effects of PwC on preschool children such as collaborative thinking, on teachers such as understanding of guidance or on student-teacher relationship such as

cooperative classroom management. They could focus on a certain age group or certain children such as children with autism. Future researches could be conducted with preschool children or teachers at least throughout a year and could be examined long-term effects of PwC on them. Moreover, teacher training in researches could include theoretical, methodological and philosophical dimensions of PwC. Researches could also observe teachers' implementations in their own classrooms.

5.4 Recommendations for Further Studies

This section offers recommendations for future studies on Philosophy with Children in early childhood period. These recommendations are detailed in the following paragraphs.

This current study was conducted as an evaluative case study research design with 11 participants which were preschool teachers in Antalya, Turkey. It is aimed to investigate the views of preschool teachers regarding Philosophy with Children and the use of PwC in early childhood education through PwC experience. In the scope of the study, the researcher applied PwC implementation for 10 weeks and also the participants applied PwC implementation at least two times after ending the implementations of the researcher. A semi- structured interview, audio-based observation and field notes was used in order to collect data. Future research with preschool teachers can be supported by quantitative experimental studies and thus can be conducted with more participants. PwC experiences in future researches can be lasted for a longer time and can comprehensively include theoretical, methodological and philosophical dimensions of PwC.

Future studies can be carried out with different levels of pre-service preschool teachers. Moreover, future research can be applied to examine the relationship between in-service and pre-service preschool teachers' views on Philosophy with Children and its use in early childhood education. Elective courses in early childhood education departments in universities can be designed about PwC approach to pre-service preschool teachers gain awareness of PwC.

This study revealed several effects of using PwC in early childhood education on children in many areas. Future studies can specifically focus on certain effect among them on preschool children. Moreover, this study reached a clue about the effect of the parental socio-economic status and environments of children on the use of PwC. Future studies can also particularly focus on this issue. Parents are one of the most important components of education system. Future studies can be applied with parents on their views or PwC's effects on them and their relationship with children. School administrators are another important component in education system. Future studies can explore the views of school administrators on PwC and its use in their educational environment.

From early childhood education to higher education, PwC approach can be integrated with other subjects or be included as an independent subject in the curriculum. However, about implementing PwC in the educational area, the adequate teacher training program is a significant issue. The government can comprehensively arrange continuous teacher training programs for preschool teachers specializing in PwC.

The last recommendation is related to the philosophy department in the universities. Philosophy department can include elective course about PwC. In universities, an interdisciplinary master program on PwC can be designed with the cooperation of the philosophy department and the faculty of education. Philosophy departments can work on resources for PwC sessions which are far from philosophical terminology but filled with philosophical issues.

REFERENCES

Akbaba, A. & Kaya, B. (2015). Okul öncesi öğrencilerinin düşünme becerilerinin gelişmesine yönelik öğretmen görüşleri (Teachers' views on the development of preschool students' thinking skills). *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi/ Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 14*(55), 148-160. Retrieved from http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/70672

Akkocaoğlu Çayır N. & Akkoyunlu B. (2016). Çocuklar için felsefe eğitimi üzerine nitel bir araştırma (A qualitative research on philosophy education for children). *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI),* 7(2), 97-133.

Akkocaoğlu Çayır, N. (2015). Çocuklar için Felsefe eğitimi üzerine nitel bir araştırma (A qualitative research on philosophy education for children) (Doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.

Akkocaoğlu Çayır, N. (2018). Philosophy for children in teacher education: Effects, difficulties, and recommendations. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *11*(2), 173–180.

Ancess, J. (2001). Teacher learning at the intersection of school learning and student outcomes. *Teachers caught in the action: professional development that matters*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Andal, A. G. (2020). Discourses of educational rights in Philosophy for Children: On the theoretical and practical merits of philosophical education for children. *AVANT. The Journal of the Philosophical- Interdisciplinary Vanguard*, *11*(2).

Anderson, B. (2017). *Philosophy for children theories and praxis in teacher education*. London; New York: Routledge.

Aristotle (2008). *The metaphysics* (J. H. McMahon, Trans.). New York, NY: Cosimo Publications, Inc. (Original work published in 1907)

Baker, S. & Smith, S. (1999). Starting off on the right foot: the influence of four principles of professional development in improving literacy instructionin two kindergarten programs. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 14(4), 239-253.

Bleazby, J. (2006). Autonomy, democratic community, and citizenship in philosophy for children: Dewey and philosophy for children's rejection of the individual/ community dualism. *Analytic Teaching*, 26(1), 30-52.

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Boston, MA: Allen and Bacon.

Boyacı, N., Karadağ, F. & Gülenç, K. (2018). Çocuklar İçin Felsefe / Çocuklarla Felsefe: Felsefi metotlar, uygulamalar ve amaçlar (Philosophy for Children / Philosophy with Children: Philosophical methods, applications and objectives. *Kaygı. Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Felsefe Dergisi*. 145-173.

Brown, P., Corrigan, M. W. & Higgins-DAlessandro, A. (2012). *Handbook of prosocial education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Brubaker Bradley, K. (2006). *Ballerino Nate*. New York: Dial Books for Young Readers

Burgh, G. & Yorshansky, M. (2011). Communities of inquiry: Politics, power and group dynamics. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43 (5). 436-452.

Cam, P. (2006) *20 thinking tools: Collaborative inquiry for the classroom*. Australian Council for Educational Research.

Camhy, D., G. (2007). Can we philosophise a strategy against xenophobia and racism? In E. Marshal, T. Dobashi, & B. Weber (Eds.), *Ethical Reflection Competence in the Basic School Age Concepts of Philosophising with Children*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Campbell, J. (2002) *An evaluation of a pilot intervention involving teaching philosophy to upper primary children in two primary schools, using the Philosophy for Children methodology* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Dundee, Dundee, Scotland.

Carson, R. & Pratt, C. (1965). *The sense of wonder*. New York: Harper& Row.

Cassidy, C. (2007). *Thinking children*. London: Continuum.

Cassidy, C. & Christie, D. (2013). Philosophy with children: Talking, thinking and learning together. *Early Child Development and Care, 183* (8), 1072-1083.

Cassidy, C., Marwick, H., Deeney, L. & McLean, G. (2017). Philosophy with Children, self-regulation and engaged participation for children with emotional-behavioural and social communication difficulties. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 23(1), 81-96.

Cevizci, A. (2010). *Felsefeye giriş (Introduction to philosophy)*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. Ageyev, & S. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context* (pp. 39 64). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,

Commonwealth of Australia (2008). *At the heart of what we do:Values education at the centre of schooling*—The Final report of the values education good practice schools project—Stage 2 , Carlton South: Curriculum Corporation.

Costello, P. J. (2017). *Thinking skills and early childhood education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

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

Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Çotuksöken, B. (2001). *Felsefeyi anlamak felsefe ile anlamak (To understand philosophy to understand through philosophy)*. İstanbul: İnkılap kitabevi.

Daniel, M. F. (1988). P4C in pre-service teacher education. *Analytic Teaching*, 19(1), 13-19.

Daniel, M. & Auriac, E. (2011). Philosophy, critical thinking and philosophy for children. *Educational Philosophy and Theory 43*(5), 415-435.

Demirtaş, V. Y., Karadağ, F., & Gülenç, K. (2018). Levels of the questions formulated by preschool children during the philosophical inquiry process and the qualities of their answers: Philosophy with children. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences,*10(2).

Demissie, F. (2015). Promoting student teachers' reflective thinking through a philosophical community of enquiry approach. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(12).

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan. Retrieved from https://www.gutenberg.org/files/852/852-h/852-h.htm

Dirican, R. (2018). Çocuklarla felsefeye varoluşsal bir bakış (An existential view of philosophy with children). *Çocuk ve Medeniyet Dergisi,* 2 (4), 167-177.

Doolittle, P. E. (1995).*Understanding cooperative learning through Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development*. (Speeches/ Conference Papers). Paper presented at the Lily National Conference on Excellence in College Teaching (Colombia, SC, June, 2-4, 1995).

Dougherty, R. (2017). *Rhapsode metaphor: Understanding the student-teacher relationship in Philosophy for Children* (Master's thesis). University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, United States of America.

Duruhan, K. , Gürbüztürk, O., Şan, İ. & Pepeler, E. (2014). Türk eğitim sistemi içinde eğitilmiş olmanın, ilerlemeci ve geleneksel anlayışlar ile uygulamalar yönünden değerlendirilmesi (Malatya ili örneği) (Assessment of being trained in the Turkish education system in terms of progressive and traditional understandings and practices (Case of Malatya). *Journal of Inonu University Faculty of Education/ İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* 14(3), 59-78. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/inuefd/issue/8710/108766

Dyfed County Council (1994).*Improving reading standards in primary schools project*. Dyfed County Council, Wales.

Edwards, R. & Holland, J. (2013). *What is qualitative interviewing?* Retrieved from http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/3276/

Egan, Kieran (1988) *Primary understanding: Education in early childhood.* London: Routledge.

Evans, R. & Jones, D. (2009). *Metacognitive Approaches to Developing Oracy: Developing Speaking and Listening with Young Children*. London: Routledge.

Ezop (2018). *Ezop masalları* (Aesop's tales). İstanbul: Pena Yayınları.

Fair, F., Haas, L. E., Gardosik, C., Johnson, D. D., Price, D. P. & Leipnik, O. (2015). Socrates in the schools from Scotland to Texas: Replicating a study on the effects of a Philosophy for Children program. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, *2*(1).

Farahani, M.F. (2014). The study on challenges of teaching philosophy for children. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2141-2145.

Fetterman, M. (1998). *Ethnography: Step by step*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fisher, R. (2005). *Teaching children to think* [Google Books version]. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=0az0JYM_pHMC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.

Fisher, R. (2007). Dialogic teaching: Developing thinking and metacognition through philosophical discussion. *Early Child Development and Care*, 177(6-7), 615 631.

Fisher, R. (2013) *Teaching thinking: philosophical enquiry in the classroom*. 4 th edn. London: Bloomsbury.

Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (6th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Freire, P. & Ramos, M. B. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Fullan, M. (1995). The limits and the potential of professional development. *In Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Funston, J. (2017). Toward a critical philosophy for children. *PSU McNair Scholars Online Journal*, 11(1).

Ganser, T. (2000). An ambitious vision of professional development for teachers. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(618), 6-12.

García-Moriyón, F., Rebollo, I. & Colom, R. (2005). Evaluating philosophy for children. *Thinking: The Journal of Philosophy for Children, 17*(4), 14-22.

Gasparatou, R. & Kampeza, M. (2012). Introducing P4C in kindergarten in Greece. *Analytic Teaching and Philosophical Praxis*, 33(1), 72-82.

Ghaedi, Y., Mahdian, M. & Fomani, F. K. (2015). Identfying dimensions of creative thinking in preschool during implementation of philosophy for children (P4C) program: A directed content analysis. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 3(5), 547-551.

Gillen, M. (2015). John Dewey's theories of enquiry as conceptual framework. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/13204684/John_Deweys_Theories_of_Enquiry_Conceptual_Framework

Glassman, M. (2001). Dewey and Vygotsky: Society, experience, and inquiry in educational practice. *Educational Researcher, 30*(4), 3-14.

Glatthorn, A. (1995). Teacher development. In *International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education*(2nd ed.). London: Pergamon Press

Glesne, C. & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers*. New York, NY: Longman.

Goodrich, C. (2009). *The hermit crab*. New York: Simon & Schuster Books for Young Readers

Goucha, M. (2007). *Philosophy: A school of freedom: teaching philosophy and learning to philosophize: status and prospects*. Paris: UNESCO.

Green, L. & Condy, J. (2016). Philosophical enquiry as a pedagogical tool to implement the CAPS curriculum: Final-year pre-service teachers' perceptions. *South African Journal of Education*, 36(1), 1140-1148.

Gregory, C. G. (2018). *Unearthing the tubers and shoots of thought, talk, and praxis: A historiography of classroom discourse in theory and practice* (Doctoral dissertation). Colombia University, New York, The United States of America.

Gregory, M. (2002). Are philosophy and children good for each other? *Thinking*, 16(2), 121- 124.

Gregory, M. & Granger, D. (2012). Introduction: John Dewey on philosophy and childhood. *Education and Culture*, 28(2). Retrieved April 05, 2018, from https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/eandc/vol28/iss2/art2

Gregory, M., Haynes, J. & Murris, K. (2017). *The Routledge international handbook of philosophy for children*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gruioniu, O. (2013). The Philosophy for Children, an Ideal Tool to Stimulate the Thinking Skills. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 76*, 378-382.

Günhan Altıparmak, İ. (2016). The concept of curiosity in the practice of Philosophy for Children. *Croatian Journal of Philosophy*, 16(48), 361-380.

Gür, C. (2011). International conference on education and educational psychology (ICEEPSY 2010) Philosophy in the early years. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,12*, 501-511.

Guskey, T.R. (1995). Professional development in education: In search of the optimal mix. In T. Guskey and M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices* (pp. 114-131) New York: Teachers College Press.

Haas, H. (1980). *Philosophy in the classroom.* Appendix B: experimental research in philosophy for children, in: M. Lipman, A. M. Sharp & F. Oscanyon (Eds). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Haynes, F. (2014). Teaching children to think for themselves: from questioning to dialogue. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 1(1), 131-146.

Haynes, J. (2008). *Children as Philosophers: Learning through enquiry and dialogue in the primary classroom.* London: Routledge

Haynes, J. (2011). *Feeling the Pea beneath the mattresses: philosophising with children as imaginative, engaged and critical practice*. Presented at ESRC Seminar at Birkbeck College, University of London, October 21.

Haynes, J. & Murris, K. (2008). The 'wrong message': Risk, censorship and the struggle for democracy in the primary school thinking. *Journal of Philosophy for Children*, 19(1), 2-12.

Haynes, J. & Murris, K. (2011). The Provocation of an epistemological shift in teacher education through Philosophy with Children. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *45*(2), 285–303.

James, W. (1876). *The letters of William James,* Vol. 1. Retrieved from http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/40307

Janish, H. (2017). *Köprüyü geçerken (The bridge).* İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları

Jenkins, P. & Lyle, S. (2010). Enacting dialogue: the impact of promoting Philosophy for Children on the literate thinking of identified poor readers, aged 10. *Language and Education*, 24(6), 459-472.

Karadağ, F., Demirtaş, V. Y. & Yıldız, T. (2017). Development of critical thinking scale through philosophical inquiry for children 5-6 years old. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(4), 1025-1037.

Karadağ, F. & Demirtaş, V. Y. (2018). The effectiveness of the philosophy with children curriculum on critical thinking skills of pre-school children. *Eğitim Ve Bilim/ Education and Science*, 43(195), 19-40.

Karadağ, F. & Gülenç, K. (2019). Keşfedilmemiş adadaki yaratık (Creature on unexplored island). *Çocuklar için felsefi öyküler-Eğitimciler için el kitabı (pp. 71-74)*. İstanbul: Dinozor Çocuk.

Kennedy, D. (1992). Why philosophy for children now?, *Thinking*, 10(3), 2–6.

Kennedy, D. (1994). Helping children develop the skills and dispositions of critical, creative and caring thinking. *Analytic Teaching, 15*(1), 3-16.

Kennedy, D. (2012). Lipman, Dewey, and the community of philosophical Iinquiry. *Education and Culture, 28*(2), 36–53.

Kennedy, N., & Kennedy, D. (2011). Community of philosophical inquiry as a discursive structure, and its role in school curriculum design. *Journal of Philosophy of Education,45* (2), 265-283.

Kilby, B. (2019). Why teachers' beliefs and values are important in p4c research: a victorian perspective. *Childhood & Philosophy, 15*, 01–19.

King, B. & Newmann, F. (2004). Key link: Successful professional development must consider school capacity. *Journal of Staff Development,* 25(1), 26-30.

Kizel, A. (2016). Philosophy with children as an educational platform for self determined learning. *Cogent Education* 3(1):1244026.

Knight, S. & Collins, C. (2014). Opening teachers' minds to philosophy: The crucial role of teacher education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 46(11), 1290 1299.

Koyuncu Şahin & M , Akman, B . (2018). Erken çocukluk döneminde düşünme becerilerinin gelişimi (Development of thinking skills in early childhood). *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 47 (218) , 5-20.

Kovalainen, M. & Kumpulainen, K. & Vasama, S. (2001). Orchestrating classroom interaction in a community of inquiry: Modes of teacher participation. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*. 36. 17-28.

Lieberman, A. & Pointer Mace, D. (2008). Teacher learning: the key to education reform. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(3), 226-234.

Lionni, L. (1975). A colur of his own. London: Abelard /North-South

Lipman, M. (1973). *Philosophy for children*. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED103296.pdf. (ED103296)

Lipman, M. (1985). Philosophy and the cultivation of reasoning. *Thinking: The Journal of Philosophy for Children, 5*(4), 33-41.

Lipman, M. (2003) *Thinking in education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lipman, M. & Bierman, J. (1970). Appendix B: Experimental research in philosophy for children. M. Lipman, A. M. Sharp, & F. Oscanyon (Eds.), *Philosophy in the classroom*. Temple University Press Philadelphia.

Lipman, M., Ogden, C., & Matkowski, J. (2003). A picture of a friend. *Thinking trees and laughing cats: A thinking curriculum for pre-school education*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children.

Lipman, M. &Sharp, A. M. (1975). *Teaching children philosophical thinking: An introduction to the teacher's manual for Harry Stottlemeier's discovery"*. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED103297.pdf. (ED103297)

Lipman, M., Sharp, A. M. & Oscanyan, F. S. (1980). *Philosophy in the classroom*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Lipman, M. & Pizzurro, S. (2001). The Vygotsky touch. critical and creative thinking. *The Australasian Journal of Philosophy in Education*, 9(1), 12-17.

Love, R. (2016). The case for Philosophy for Children in the English primary curriculum. *Analytic Teaching and Philosophical Praxis*. 36.

Lyle, Sue. (2017). The construct of the child: the 'C' in PwC. In B. Anderson (ed.) *Philosophy for Children: Theories and praxis in teacher education* (25-36). Oxon: Routledge

Lyle, Sue. (2018). Putting the Child into Philosophy for Children. *Creative Teaching and Learning*, 7, 28-36.

Marashi, S. M., (2009). Teaching philosophy to children: A new experience in Iran. *Analytic Teaching*, 27(1), 12-15.

Maxwell, N. (2005). Philosophy seminars for five-year-olds. *Learning for Democracy*, 1(2), 71-77

Matthews, M. R. (2014) Introduction: The History, Purpose and Content of the Springer *International Handbook of Research in History, Philosophy and Science Teaching*. In: Matthews M. (eds) International Handbook of Research in History, Philosophy and Science Teaching. Springer, Dordrecht.

McCall, C. C. (2013). *Transforming thinking: philosophical inquiry in the primary and secondary classroom*. Routledge.

McCall, C. C. (2017). *Düşünmeyi dönüştürmek (Transforming thinking)*. (K. Gülenç & N. P. Boyacı, Trans.) Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Mergler, A., Curtis E. & Spooner-Lane, R. (2009). Teacher educators embrace philosophy: Reflections on a new way of looking at preparing pre-service teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(5), 1-14.

Millett, S. & Kay, G. (2001). *A community of inquiry approach to values education in a Middle School for Boys*. Unicorn Online. Carlton, VIC: Australian College of Educators.

Millet, S. & Tapper, A. (2012). Benefits of collaborative philosophical inquiry in schools. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 44(5).

Ministry of National Education (2013). *Early childhood education programs*. Retrieved December 2017, from https://tegm.meb.gov.tr/dosya/okuloncesi/ooprogram.pdf

Mohr Lone, J. (2012b). *The philosophical child*. Lanham, MD: Rowman Littlefield.

Motlaq, T. K. & Noushadi, N. (2016). The content analysis of questioning level at P4C classroom. *Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences*, *8*(3), 803.

Mundry, S. (2005). Changing perspectives in professional development. *Science Educator*, 14(1), 9-15.

Murris, K. (2000). Can children do philosophy?. *Journal of the Philosophy of Education, 34*(2), 261-279.

Murris, K. S. (2008). Philosophy with Children, the stingray and the educative value of disequilibrium. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *42*(3-4), 667 685.

Murris, K. (2015). The philosophy for children curriculum: Resisting 'teacher proof' texts and the formation of the ideal philosopher child. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 35 (1), 63-78.

Nagel, T. (1987). *What does it all mean? A very short introduction to philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Naji, S. (2013). Recent interviews with Philosophy for Children (P4C) scholars and practitioners. *Childhood & Philosophy*, 9(17), 153-170.

Naraghi, M. S., Ghobadiyan, M., Naderi, E. A. & Shariatmadari, A. (2013). Philosophy for children (P4C) program and social growth. *Journal of Basic and Applied ScientificResearch*, 3(5), 398-406.

Naraghi, M. S., Okpala, A. O., & Smith, F. E. (2001). Parental involvement, instructional expenditures, family socioeconomic attributes, and student achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 95(2), 110-115.

National Staff Development Council (2009b). *NSDC standards: Learning communities.* Retrieved November 30, 2019 from http://www.nsdc.org/standards/learningcommunities.cfm

Nelson, L. (1965). *Socratic method and critical philosophy: Selected essays*. New York, USA: Dover Publications.

Newell-Jones, K. (2012). *Wiser Wales: Developing Philosophy for Children (P4C) in different school contexts in Wales 2009-2012*. Cardiff: Council for Education in World Citizenship.

Okur, M. (2008). *Çocuklar için Felsefe eğitim programının altı yaş grubu çocuklarının atılganlık, iş birliği ve kendini kontrol sosyal becerileri üzerindeki etkisi (Effects of Philosophy for Children on social skills that are: Assertiveness, self-control and cooperation at children of six years old)* (Master's thesis). Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Opdal, P. M. (2001). Curiosity, wonder and education seen as perspective development. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 20*(4), 331-344.

O'Riordan, N. (2013). *Swimming against the tide: the implementation of philosophy for children in the primary classroom* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Hull, Kingson upon Hull, England.

O'Tuel, F. S. & Bullard, R. K. (1995). *Developing higher order thinking in the content areas K-12*. Highett, Vic: Hawker Brownlow Education.

Palsson, H., Sigurdardottir, B. & Nelson, B. (1998). *Philosophy for children really works! Critical and Creative Thinking*, 6(1), 14-22.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research& evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Phillips, S. (n.d.). *Exploring the impact of philosophy for children lessons on the communication and thinking skills in a primary school*. Retrieved from https://www.ewc.wales/site/index.php/en/documents/research-and statistics/action-research-reports/1457-exploring-the-impact-of-philosophy for-children-lessons-on-the-communication-and-thinking-skills-in-a-primary school.html

Piaget, J. (1974). *The origins of intelligence in children*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press.

Pihlgren, A. S. (2008). *Socrates in the classroom*: *Rationales and effects of philosophizing with children* (Doctoral dissertation). Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweeden.

Poulton, J. (2014). Identifying a K-10 developmental framework for teaching philosophy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 46(11), 1238-1242.

Punch, K. F. (2014). *Introduction to social research quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Quinn, V. (2018).*Critical thinking in young minds.* Routledge.

Roberts, A. F. (2006). *The effects of a teacher development programme based on Philosophy for Children* (Master's thesis). University of Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa.

Rousseau, J. (2010). *The collected writings of Rousseau. Emile or on education: Includes Emile and Sophie, or the Solitaries*. A. Bloom, & C. Kelly, Eds. and Trans.) University Press of New England. (Original work published in 1762)

Roy, B. (2005). To imagine, to recollect, per chance to discover: The modern Socratic dialogue and the history of philosophy. *Philosophical Practice*, 1 (3), 159-170.

Säre, E., Luik, P. & Tulviste, T. (2016). Improving pre-schoolers' reasoning skills using the philosophy for children programme. *Trames: Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 20*(3), 273-295.

Scholl, R. (2014) Inside-out Pedagogy: Theorizing pedagogical transformation through teaching philosophy. *Australian Journal of teacher Education*, 39 (6).

Scholl, R., Nichols, K. & Burgh, G. (2009). *Philosophy for children: Towards pedagogical transformation*. Refereed paper presented at 'Teacher education crossing borders: Cultures, contexts, communities and curriculum' the annual conference of the Australian Teacher Education Association (ATEA), Albury, 28 June – 1 July

Scholl, R., Nichols, K. & Burgh, G. (2016). Connecting learning to the world beyond the classroom through collaborative philosophical inquiry. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(5), 436-454.

Shaughnessy, M. F. (2005). An interview with Maughn Gregory: About philosophy, critical thinking and higher-order thinking. *The Korean Journal of Thinking & Problem Solving, 15*(1), 115–125.

Siddiqui, N., Gorard, S. & See, B. (2015). *Philosophy for children: Evaluation report and executive summary*. Millbank: Education Endowment Foundation.

Siddiqui, N., Gorard, S. & See, B. (2017). *Non-cognitive impacts of philosophy for children*, Durham: Durham University.

Siegler, R. S. (2004). *Children's thinking*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Sigurborsdottir, I. (1998). Philosophy with children in Foldaborg: Development project in Foldaborg, a preschool in Reykjavik for children from 1-6 years. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 30 (1), 14.

Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Sofo, F. & Imbrosciano, A. (1991). Philosophy? For children. *Educational Review*, 43(3), 283-305.

Sormaz Öğüt, F. (2019). *Felsefi düşünmenin önemi ve çocuklar için felsefe (The importance of philosopical thinking and philosophy for children)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Maltepe University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Splitter, L. J. *(*2014*).* Preparing teachers to 'teach' Philosophy for Children. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 1 (1), 89-106.

Stanley, S. (2004) *But why? Developing philosophical thinking in the classroom*. Stafford: Network Educational Press.

Sutcliffe, R. (2017). The evolution of Philosophy for Children in the UK. In B. Anderson (ed.) *Philosophy for Children: Theories and praxis in teacher education* (pp.3-13). Oxon: Routledge

Tate, M. L. (2009). Workshops: Extend learning beyond your presentation with these brainfriendly strategies. *Journal of Staff Development*, 30(1), 44-46.

Thomas, J. R., Nelson, J. K. & Silverman, S. J. (2015). *Research methods in physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Topping, K. & Trickey, S. (2007). Impact of philosophical enquiry on school students' interactive behaviour. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *2*(2), 73–84.

Topping, K. J. & Trickey, S. (2014). The role of dialog in philosophy for children. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 63, 69-78.

Toprak, Z. & Güneş, C. (2019). Okul öncesi eğitimde sınıf mevcudunun etkinliklere etkisi üzerine nitel bir çalışma (A qualitative study of the effects of class size on classroom management and activities in pre-school education. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi/ Anadolu University Journal of Education Faculty*, 3(4), 274-286.

Trickey, S. (2007). *Promoting social and cognitive development in schools: An evaluation of 'thinking through philosophy'*. Paper presented at 13th International Conference of Thinking, June 17–21, in Norrkoping, Sweden.

United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF). (2013). *Protecting and realizing children's rights.*

The Philosophy Foundation. (n.d). *Good land and bad land*. Retrived from https://www.philosophy-foundation.org/enquiries/view/goodland-and badland

The Philosophy Foundation. (n.d). *The unhappy prince*. Retrived from https://www.philosophy-foundation.org/enquiries/view/the-unhappy-prince

Ventista, O. (2019). *An Evaluation of the 'Philosophy for Children' programme: The impact on Cognitive and Non-Cognitive Skills* (Doctoral dissertation). Durham University, Durham, England.

Vygotskiĭ, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. In Cole, M. (Ed.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wakhlu, O. N., Wakhlu, A. & Aga, N. (Eds.). (2013). *Creative teachers: a manual*. New Delhi: S Chand.

Wegerif, R. (2010). *Mind expanding: Teaching for thinking and creativity in primary education.* Open University Press.

Williams, S. (2018). *A brief history of P4C, especially in the UK*. Retrieved from www.p4c.com

Yan, S., Walters, L. M., Wang, Z. & Wang, C. –C. (2018). Meta-analysis of the effectiveness of philosophy for children programs on students' cognitive outcomes. *Analytic Teaching and Philosophical Praxis*, 39(1), 13-33.

Yılmaz, K. & Altınkurt, Y. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının Türk eğitim sisteminin sorunlarına ilişkin görüşleri (Prospective teachers' views about the problems of Turkish educational system). *İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi/ Journal of Human Sciences*, 8 (1), 942-973.

Yusoff, W. M. W. (2018). The impact of philosophical inquiry method on classroom engagement and reasoning skills of low achievers. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, *7*(1), 135-146.

APPENDICES

A. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. PRE- AND POST-IMPLEMENTATION INTERVIEW

A. Kişisel Bilgiler

1. Yaş:
2. Çalışılan Okul Türü: ( ) Özel ( ) Devlet
3. Çalışılan Yaş Grubu:
4. Öğretmenlik Deneyimi (Yıl):
5. Daha önce Çocuklarla Felsefe ile alakalı bir seminere/atölyeye ya da derse katıldınız mı? Evet ise, içeriğinden bahsedebilir misiniz?

B. Katılımcıların Çocuklarla Felsefe Yaklaşımı Hakkındaki Görüşleri

1. Felsefe deyince aklınıza ne/neler geliyor?

2. Çocuklarla Felsefe deyince aklınıza ne/neler geliyor?

Birazdan soracağım soruları daha rahat yanıtlayabilmeniz için, şimdi size Çocuklarla Felsefenin bir tanımını vermek istiyorum.

Çocuklarla Felsefe: Çocuklarla Felsefe, çocukların felsefe tarihinden filozofların düşüncelerini öğrenmedikleri, kendi fikirlerini geliştirip, ifade ettikleri, eleştirel ve yaratıcı düşünmelerini teşvik etmeyi amaçlayan bir yaklaşımdır (Lipman, 2003). Aynı zamanda, çocukların, bir soruşturma topluluğu içinde, sorguladıkları, iletişim-etkileşimden anlam çıkardıkları, düşüncelerini gerekçelendirdikleri, bir konu üzerinde hata yapabildiklerini de gördükleri, çocuklarla felsefe yapma yaklaşımlarının genel adıdır (McCall, 2013; Cassidy, & Christie, 2013).

Philosophy with Children (PwC): Philosophy with Children (PwC) is the approach which aims to encourage critical and creative thinking in children, without filling

children with the intellectual knowledge of traditional philosophy, however developing and expressing their own ideas (Lipman, 2003). Moreover, Philosophy with Children is the general title of the kind of doing philosophy into practice with children where children question, make meaning through communication-interactions in a community of inquiry, show reasons for their ideas and see that they may be fallible on the subject (McCall, 2013; Cassidy, & Christie, 2013).

3. Yukarıdaki tanımı da dikkate alarak Çocuklarla Felsefe ile neleri ilişkilendirebilirsiniz?

C. Çocuklarla Felsefe Yaklaşımının Okul Öncesi Eğitiminde Kullanılması

1. Çocuk ve felsefe arasındaki ilişki ile ilgili düşünceleriniz nelerdir?

2. Çocuklarla Felsefe yaparken felsefi bilgiye ihtiyacınız olup olmadığı konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz?
3. Çocuklarla Felsefenin okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanılması konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz?

> 3.1 Okul öncesi eğitimcisi olarak, kendi eğitim ortamınızda Çocuklarla Felsefe yapmanız konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz?
>
> 3.2 Çocuklarla Felsefe, tüm (ya da herhangi bir) okul derslerinin öğretimi için bir yöntem olabilir mi? Yoksa okulda ayrıca felsefe atölyesi-saati gibi ders dışı etkinlik olarak mı yer almalı? Neden?

4. Çocuklarla Felsefe, okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanıldığında bunun çocuklar üzerindeki etkileri neler olabilir?
5. Çocuklarla Felsefe, okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanıldığında bunun öğretmenler üzerindeki etkileri neler olabilir?

6. Çocuklarla Felsefe, okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanıldığında bunun öğretmen-öğrenci arasındaki ilişki üzerindeki etkileri neler olabilir?

7. Eğitim ortamınızda Çocuklarla Felsefe yapmanız konusunda karşılaşabileceğiniz engeller neler olabilir?

2. INTERVIEW AFTER IMPLEMENTATIONS OF PARTICIPANTS

A. ‘Çocuklarla Felsefe’ Yaklaşımı Hakkındaki Görüşleri

1. Birisine Çocuklarla Felsefe’nin ne olduğunu nasıl anlatırsınız?

B. ‘Çocuklarla Felsefe’ Yaklaşımının Okul Öncesi Eğitiminde Kullanılması ile İlgili Görüşleri

1. Aklınızda kalan en önemli deneyim neydi?

2. Çocuklarla Felsefe deneyiminiz, çalıştığınız çocuklar hakkında fikirlerinizi, izlenimlerinizi, özelde veya genelde bir değişikliğe uğrattı mı? Nasıl?

3. Çocuklarla Felsefe uygulaması yapmak, sizde kişisel ve mesleki açıdan bir değişim yarattı mı (olumlu, olumsuz)? Nasıl?

4. Çocuklarla Felsefe konusunda daha fazla ne öğrenmek istersiniz?

B. ACTIVITIES

ETKİNLİK 1

Araştırmacı, katılımcılara ‘Şimdi sizinle bir hikâye paylaşmak istiyorum.’ diyerek, hikâyeyi canlı bir şekilde anlatmaya başlar:

Hikâye: Keşiş Yengeci (Goodrich, 2009)

Bir gün utangaç bir keşiş yengeci aç karnını doyurmak için yemek arıyormuş. Bu sırada, büyüyen vücudunun içinde daha rahat edebileceği kendi sırtındakinden daha büyük bir kabukla karşılaşmış. Bu kabuğu görünce, eski kabuğundan ayrılıp, üstüne, daha büyük olan bu yeni kabuğu yerleştirmiş. O sıralarda da, bu yeni kabuğun arka tarafında, bir balık, balık kapanına kısılmasın mı? Keşiş yengeci yeni kabuğunu giydiği zaman, hemen arkasındaki bu kapanı görmüş. Onun bir kapan olduğunu anlamamış ve onu bir restoran zannetmiş. Aç keşiş yengeci, yemeğe ulaşmak için, kapanı sağa sola, aşağı yukarı sallamış, çalkalamış. Bunları yaparken de, farkında olmadan kapanı gevşetmiş! Böylece de, kapana kısılmış olan balık, kapandan kurtuluvermiş. Tam bu sırada, bu olayı uzaktan gören başka bir balık da, keşiş yengecinin bir kahraman olduğunu düşünmüş.

Araştırmacı, hikâyeyi anlattıktan sonra, hikâye hakkında düşünmeleri için, katılımcıları ikişerli gruplara ayırır. Ondan sonra da, onlardan, üzerlerine düşünecekleri kafa karıştırıcı sorular üretmelerini ister. Katılımcılar, soruları hazırladıktan sonra, toplulukla sorularını paylaşırlar. Katılımcıların oylamaları yoluyla, sorulardan biri seçilir. Seçilmiş soru hakkındaki ilk düşüncelerini, kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde birbirleriyle paylaşırlar. Kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde paylaştıktan sonra da, düşüncelerini topluluğa açarlar. Tüm düşünceler, onaylama-onaylamama ve düşüncelerin nedenleriyle açıklanması yoluyla ifade edilir. Böylece, katılımcılar kendi felsefi diyaloglarını inşa ederler. Diyaloglarını inşa ettikten sonra, son düşüncelerini ifade ederler ve bütün diyaloğu özetlerler. En sonunda da, katılımcılar, ‘’Birbirimizi dikkatlice dinledik mi? Herkes konuştu mu? Konuşmak

için sıramızı bekledik mi? Yoksa birbirimizin sözünü mü kestik? Bugün çok düşündük mü? Düşüncelerimizi nedenleriyle açıkladık mı? Bugün güzel sorular sorduk mu? Yeni bir fikre sahip olduk mu? Gibi sorular eşliğinde, diyalog içindeki kendi süreçlerini gözden geçirirler.

ETKİNLİK 2

Araştırmacı, çember şeklinde oturmuş katılımcılarla, ‘‘Biliyor musunuz, bugün, bir pastanede, daha önce hiç görmediğim bir pasta ile karşılaştım. Pastanın adı ‘Arkadaşlık Keki’ idi’’ diyerek, konuşmaya başlar. Araştırmacı, aynı zamanda, daha önce hazırlamış olduğu bu ‘Arkadaşlık Kekinin’ resmini gösterir. Araştırmacı, katılımcılara ‘‘Sizce bu kekin tarifi nasıldır?’’ diye sorar. Katılımcıların düşüncelerini dinledikten sonra, araştırmacı, ‘’Biliyor musunuz, ben arkadaşlık hakkında bir hikâye biliyorum. Haydi, önce size bu hikâyeyi anlatayım, sonra da beraber onun hakkında konuşalım!’’ der. Hikâye, arkadaşın ne demek olduğuna dair, felsefi bir diyalog açılmasına imkân verebilecek olan ‘Arkadaşımın Resmi’ hikâyesidir. Böylece, araştırmacı, canlı bir şekilde, hikâyeyi katılımcılara aktarır.

Hikâye: Arkadaşımın Resmi (Lipman vd., 2003)

Bir gün, öğretmen, çocuklardan, arkadaşlarının resimlerini çizmelerini istemiş.

Ertesi gün olmuş. Çocuklar çizdikleri resimleri, sınıftaki diğer çocuklara gösteriyorlarmış. Resimler, hep sınıftan kızların ve erkeklerin resimleriymiş. Bazı resimler gerçekten hoşmuş. Şimdi resmini gösterme sırası Elfie’deymiş. Onun resmi diğerlerininkinden farklıymış. O, bir çam ağacının resmiymiş. Sınıftan bazı çocuklar, resmi gördükleri zaman, gülmeye başlamışlar. Elfie, ‘’Babam bu çam ağacını, ben doğduğum zaman, evimizin yanına dikmiş. Biz onunla beraber büyüyoruz ve iyi arkadaşız’’ demiş. Ortam sessizleşmiş. Bütün çocuklar Elfie’nin elindeki çam ağacı resmine bakıyorlar ve düşünüyorlarmış.

Araştırmacı, hikâyeyi anlattıktan sonra, hikâye hakkında düşünmeleri için, katılımcıları ikişerli gruplara ayırır. Ondan sonra da, onlardan, üzerlerine düşünecekleri kafa karıştırıcı sorular üretmelerini ister. Katılımcılar soruları

hazırladıktan sonra, toplulukla sorularını paylaşırlar. Katılımcıların oylamaları yoluyla, sorulardan biri seçilir. Seçilmiş soru hakkındaki ilk düşüncelerini, kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde birbirleriyle paylaşırlar. Kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde paylaştıktan sonra da, düşüncelerini topluluğa açarlar. Tüm düşünceler, onaylama-onaylamama ve düşüncelerin nedenleriyle açıklanması yoluyla ifade edilir. Böylece, katılımcılar kendi felsefi diyaloglarını inşa ederler. Diyaloglarını inşa ettikten sonra, son düşüncelerini ifade ederler ve bütün diyaloğu özetlerler.

En sonunda da, çocuklar, ‘’Birbirimizi dikkatlice dinledik mi? Herkes konuştu mu? Konuşmak için sıramızı bekledik mi? Yoksa birbirimizin sözünü mü kestik? Bugün çok düşündük mü? Düşüncelerimizi nedenleriyle açıkladık mı? Bugün güzel sorular sorduk mu? Yeni bir fikre sahip olduk mu? Gibi sorular eşliğinde, diyalog içindeki kendi süreçlerini gözden geçirirler.

ETKİNLİK 3

Araştırmacı, katılımcılara ‘Şimdi sizinle bir hikâye paylaşmak istiyorum.’ diyerek, hikâyeyi canlı bir şekilde anlatmaya başlar:

Hikâye: Mutsuz Prens (The Philosophy Foundation, n.d.)

Yıllar önce, Kuzey İtalya’da bir kral yaşıyormuş. Oğlu ile bir birlikte bir sarayda hayatlarını geçiriyorlarmış. Her hafta kral ve oğlu, tepeden aşağı, ağaçların arasından bir göle doğru yürürlermiş. Saatlerce yüzdükten sonra; burunlarının ucundan damlayan sularla kaleye geri dönerlermiş. Yine bir hafta sonu, kral ve oğlu Prens, burunlarından damlayan sularla saraya geri yürüyorlarmış. Ama Kral bir fark etmiş ki, oğlu her zaman olduğu gibi yürümüyormuş. Omuzları düşük ve yüzü asıkmış. Kral, Neden böyle mutsuzsun oğlum? Diye sormuş. Prens, bilmediğini söylemiş. Sadece mutsuzum ve nedenini bilmiyorum. ” demiş. Kral devam etmiş, “Seni bu kadar mutsuz eden nedir? Prens, sadece omuzlarını kaldırıp indirmiş. Kral sormuş, Acıktın mı? Biraz yemek ister misin? En sevdiğin yiyecekleri getireyim! “Hayır, baba, aç değilim. Sadece mutsuzum. Nedenini bilmiyorum ” demiş prens. “O zaman sıkıldın mı? Arkadaşlarınla oynamak ister misin? Kasabadaki tüm çocukları

getireyim ve hepsiyle beraber bahçede oynayın!'' ''Hayır, baba, sıkılmadım. Sadece mutsuzum. Nedenini bilmiyorum '' demiş genç prens.

Araştırmacı, hikâyeyi anlattıktan sonra, hikâye hakkında düşünmeleri için, katılımcıları ikişerli gruplara ayırır. Ondan sonra da, onlardan, üzerlerine düşünecekleri kafa karıştırıcı sorular üretmelerini ister. Katılımcılar soruları hazırladıktan sonra, toplulukla sorularını paylaşırlar. Katılımcıların oylamaları yoluyla, sorulardan biri seçilir. Seçilmiş soru hakkındaki ilk düşüncelerini, kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde birbirleriyle paylaşırlar. Kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde paylaştıktan sonra da, düşüncelerini topluluğa açarlar. Tüm düşünceler, onaylama-onaylamama ve düşüncelerin nedenleriyle açıklanması yoluyla ifade edilir. Böylece, katılımcılar kendi felsefi diyaloglarını inşa ederler. Diyaloglarını inşa ettikten sonra, son düşüncelerini ifade ederler ve bütün diyaloğu özetlerler.

ETKİNLİK 4

Araştırmacı, katılımcıların çember oluşturduğu alanı, bir yerden bir yere bir ip sererek ikiye ayırır. Az sonra size söyleyeceklerimden her biri bu ipin bir tarafını temsil ediyor. Birini seçecek olsanız hangisini seçerdiniz? Neden? Diyerek,

Açık havada olmak mı, odanın içinde olmak mı?

Gece mi gündüz mü?

Bir masalda dev mi sihirbaz mı?

İkiliklerini sunar ve katılımcılardan bir seçimde bulunup, onu gerekçeleriyle açıklamalarını ister.

Ardından, 'Şimdi sizinle bir hikâye paylaşmak istiyorum, büyük köprünün hikâyesini' diyerek, hikâyeyi canlı bir şekilde anlatmaya başlar:

Hikâye: Köprüyü Geçerken (Janisch, 2014)

Bir sabah, ırmağın bir yakasından kocaman bir ayı köprüye geldi. Irmağın diğer yakasından da bir dev geldi köprüye. İkisi de, uzun ve dar köprüden geçmek istiyordu. Köprünün tam ortasında burun buruna geldiler. Ayı ayaklarının üzerine kalkıp, öfkeyle homurdanarak başını salladı. Hayır, deve yol vermeyecekti. Dev de olduğu yerde sessizce duruyordu. Hayır, o da ayıya yol vermeyecekti. Köprü, ikisinin aynı anda geçmesi için çok dardı. Sallanmaya başlamıştı bile. Dev, 'Bir çözüm bulmalıyız' dedi. Ayı da başını sallayarak onayladı. Benim aklımdan geçen bir yol var… diye homurdandı ayı. 'Sen suya atla, benim geçmeme izin ver:' Sen atlasana suya! Diye çıkıştı dev. Düşmanca birbirlerine baktılar. Dev düşünüyordu.'İstersen benim üstüme çık, ben de seni omzuma alayım, sonra…' 'Sonra, ikimiz de aşağı düşelim! Dedi ayı. 'Bu hiç iyi bir fikir değil!

Araştırmacı, hikâyeyi anlattıktan sonra, hikâye hakkında düşünmeleri için, katılımcıları ikişerli gruplara ayırır. Ondan sonra da, onlardan, üzerlerine düşünecekleri kafa karıştırıcı sorular üretmelerini ister. Katılımcılar soruları hazırladıktan sonra, toplulukla sorularını paylaşırlar. Katılımcıların oylamaları yoluyla, sorulardan biri seçilir. Seçilmiş soru hakkındaki ilk düşüncelerini, kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde birbirleriyle paylaşırlar. Kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde paylaştıktan sonra da, düşüncelerini topluluğa açarlar. Tüm düşünceler, onaylama-onaylamama ve düşüncelerin nedenleriyle açıklanması yoluyla ifade edilir. Böylece, katılımcılar kendi felsefi diyaloglarını inşa ederler. Diyaloglarını inşa ettikten sonra, son düşüncelerini ifade ederler ve bütün diyaloğu özetlerler.

ETKİNLİK 5

Araştırmacı, tahtaya bir insan resmi çizer ve onunla ilgili bildiğimiz tek şey, bu insanın iyi biri olduğu, der. Katılımcılara, 'Sizce bu insanı iyi yapan özellikler neler olabilir? Diye sorar. Katılımcıların düşüncelerini dinledikten sonra, araştırmacı, ''Biliyor musunuz, ben iyilik hakkında bir hikâye biliyorum. Haydi, önce size bu hikâyeyi anlatayım, sonra da beraber onun hakkında konuşalım!'' der. Hikâye, iyi ve kötü kavramlarına dair, felsefi bir diyalog açılmasına imkân verebilecek olan 'İyi

Yer ve Kötü Yer' hikâyesidir. Böylece, araştırmacı, canlı bir şekilde, hikâyeyi katılımcılara aktarır.

Hikâye: İyi Yer ve Kötü Yer (The Philosophy Foundation, n.d.)

Bay İyi, İyi Yer denilen bir yerde yaşıyormuş. Bu İyi Yer denilen yerde, pek çok iyi şey oluyormuş. Bay İyi de, İyi Yer'de etrafı temizlemek, dişlerini fırçalamak, kapılarını açık bırakmak ve başkalarına, onlara ağır gelen alışveriş torbalarında yardım etmek gibi pek çok iyi şey yapıyormuş. Bir gün, Bay İyi, uzun bir yürüyüşe çıkmış ve nereye gittiğini gerçekten fark etmeden çok uzun bir süre yürümüş. Sonra bir köşeye gelmiş ve alışveriş poşetlerini taşımakta güçlük çeken birine rastlamış. Ona yardım etmek için durmuş. Ama adam ona, ''Git, elimdeki poşetleri çalmaya çalışıyorsun'' diyerek bağırmasın mı? Bay İyi, bu kişinin neden bu kadar kaba olduğunu, bunun hiç hoş bir şey olmadığını düşünmüş ve aniden İyi Yer adındaki yerden çıkmış olduğunu ve kötü insanlarla dolu, kötü şeylerin olduğu Kötü Yer denilen yere geçmiş olduğunu fark etmiş.

Araştırmacı, hikâyeyi anlattıktan sonra, hikâye hakkında düşünmeleri için, katılımcıları ikişerli gruplara ayırır. Ondan sonra da, onlardan, üzerlerine düşünecekleri kafa karıştırıcı sorular üretmelerini ister. Katılımcılar soruları hazırladıktan sonra, toplulukla sorularını paylaşırlar. Katılımcıların oylamaları yoluyla, sorulardan biri seçilir. Seçilmiş soru hakkındaki ilk düşüncelerini, kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde birbirleriyle paylaşırlar. Kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde paylaştıktan sonra da, düşüncelerini topluluğa açarlar. Tüm düşünceler, onaylama-onaylamama ve düşüncelerin nedenleriyle açıklanması yoluyla ifade edilir. Böylece, katılımcılar kendi felsefi diyaloglarını inşa ederler. Diyaloglarını inşa ettikten sonra, son düşüncelerini ifade ederler ve bütün diyaloğu özetlerler.

ETKİNLİK 6

Araştırmacı, katılımcılarla, 'değişme' kelimesiyle başlattığı bir çağrışım oyunu oynar. Burada, sırayla, çemberdeki her katılımcıdan, bir önceki katılımcının

söylediği kelimenin ona çağrıştırdığı bir kelimeyi, nedeniyle birlikte söylemesi beklenir.

Ardından, ‘Şimdi sizinle bir hikâye paylaşmak istiyorum.’ diyerek, hikâyeyi canlı bir şekilde anlatmaya başlar:

Hikâye: Kendinin Rengi (Lionni, 1975)

Küçük bir bukalemun varmış. Diğer hayvanlar gibi kendi rengine sahip olmadığı için çok üzülüyormuş. Çünkü renk değiştirmeden hareket edemiyormuş. O kadar çok bir rengi olsun istiyormuş ki, ormandaki en yeşil yaprağı bulup, sonsuza dek orada kalmaya karar vermiş. Böylece, sabit bir renge sahip olabilecekmiş. Mevsimler değişmeye başlayana kadar, bukalemunun düşündüğü gibi de olmuş. Ama sonra, bir bakmış ki, yaprak sarıya ve sonra kırmızıya dönmeye başlamış. Sonunda, ona birlikte seyahat etmeyi öneren başka bir bukalemunla tanışmış ve birlikte yeni bir yolculuğa çıkmışlar.

Araştırmacı, hikâyeyi anlattıktan sonra, hikâye hakkında düşünmeleri için, katılımcıları ikişerli gruplara ayırır. Ondan sonra da, onlardan, üzerlerine düşünecekleri kafa karıştırıcı sorular üretmelerini ister. Katılımcılar soruları hazırladıktan sonra, toplulukla sorularını paylaşırlar. Katılımcıların oylamaları yoluyla, sorulardan biri seçilir. Seçilmiş soru hakkındaki ilk düşüncelerini, kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde birbirleriyle paylaşırlar. Kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde paylaştıktan sonra da, düşüncelerini topluluğa açarlar. Tüm düşünceler, onaylama-onaylamama ve düşüncelerin nedenleriyle açıklanması yoluyla ifade edilir. Böylece, katılımcılar kendi felsefi diyaloglarını inşa ederler. Diyaloglarını inşa ettikten sonra, son düşüncelerini ifade ederler ve bütün diyaloğu özetlerler.

ETKİNLİK 7

Araştırmacı, katılımcılara ‘Şimdi sizinle bir hikâye paylaşmak istiyorum.’ diyerek, hikâyeyi canlı bir şekilde anlatmaya başlar:

Hikâye: Ağustos Böceği ile Karınca (Ezop, 2018)

Eğlenceyi çok seven bir ağustos böceği varmış. Bu ağustos böceği devamlı saz çalar, şarkı söylermiş. Tüm gününü bu şekilde geçirirmiş. Derken güzel, sıcak günler bitmiş, kış gelmiş. Artık havalar çok soğuk ve yağışlıymış. Ağustos böceği şarkı söylemez hale gelmiş. Soğuktan çok üşüyormuş ve karnı da çok mu çok açmış. Tüm yazı saz çalarak ve şarkı söyleyerek geçirdiği için hiç yiyeceği yokmuş. Kış için hiç hazırlık yapmamış. Fakat o bu şekilde eğlenirken minik komşusu karınca tüm yazı kış hazırlığı yaparak geçirmiş. Ağustos böceği bunu hatırlamış ve aklına karınca komşusundan yiyecek istemek gelmiş;

— Karınca komşumdan ödünç yiyecek bir şeyler isteyeyim, hem ne var ağustosta yine öderim, demiş.

Ağustos böceği bu fikir içinde karınca komşusunun kapısına gitmiş. Kapıyı çalmış. Karınca açmış kapıyı. Karşısında açlık ve soğuktan perişan olmuş ağustos böceğini görmüş;

— Ne istiyorsun ağustos böceği, demiş.

— Karınca kardeş havalar oldukça soğudu çok üşüyorum, üstelik karnımda çok aç fakat yiyecek hiçbir şeyim yok. Bana ödünç yiyecek bir şeyler verir misin? Söz veriyorum ağustosta borcumu ödeyeceğim sana, demiş ağustos böceği. Karınca;

— Niçin yiyecek hiçbir şeyin yok, tüm yaz ne yaptın sen?

Ağustos böceği mahçup bir şekilde;

— Şey, ben tüm yaz saz çaldım, şarkı söyledim. Kış için hazırlık yapmadım. Karınca çok sinirlenmiş bu cevabı duyunca;

— Madem öyle tüm yaz saz çalıp, şarkı söyledin şimdi de oyna, demiş karınca ve tak diye kapıyı ağustos böceğinin yüzüne kapatmış.

Araştırmacı, hikâyeyi anlattıktan sonra, hikâye hakkında düşünmeleri için, katılımcıları ikişerli gruplara ayırır. Ondan sonra da, onlardan, üzerlerine düşünecekleri kafa karıştırıcı sorular üretmelerini ister. Katılımcılar soruları hazırladıktan sonra, toplulukla sorularını paylaşırlar. Katılımcıların oylamaları yoluyla, sorulardan biri seçilir. Seçilmiş soru hakkındaki ilk düşüncelerini, kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde birbirleriyle paylaşırlar. Kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde paylaştıktan sonra da, düşüncelerini topluluğa açarlar. Tüm düşünceler, onaylama-onaylamama ve düşüncelerin nedenleriyle açıklanması yoluyla ifade edilir. Böylece, katılımcılar kendi felsefi diyaloglarını inşa ederler. Diyaloglarını inşa ettikten sonra, son düşüncelerini ifade ederler ve bütün diyaloğu özetlerler.

ETKİNLİK 8

Araştırmacı, katılımcılara 'Şimdi sizinle bir hikâye paylaşmak istiyorum.' diyerek, hikâyeyi canlı bir şekilde anlatmaya başlar:

Hikâye: Dansçı Nate (Bradley, 2006)

Nate'in gittiği anaokulundaki öğretmenleri, bir gün onları, başka öğrencilerin gerçekleştireceği bir bale gösterisini izlemeye götürmüş. Nate, bu bale gösterisinden öyle etkilenmiş ki, izledikten sonra, bir balet olmak istediğine karar vermiş. Ama Nate'in abisi, Nate'in bu kararını hiç desteklememiş ve ona erkeklerin balerin olamayacağını, eğer olacaksa, pembe dans elbisesi ve pembe dans ayakkabıları giymek zorunda kalacağını söylemiş. Nate'in anne ve babası, Nate'in abisinden farklı olarak, Nate'i bu kararında desteklemişler. Ama tabii, abisinin sözleri Nate'i düşündürüyormuş. Ailesi, Nate'e bale dersleri aldırmaya başlamış. Nate, bale sınıfını çok seviyormuş ama bir taraftan da neden sınıftaki tek erkek çocuk olduğunu merak ediyormuş. Erkek kardeşi de onunla dalga geçmeye devam ediyorken, Nate'in annesi Nate'i büyük bir tiyatro salonundaki içinde erkek dansçıların da olduğu gerçek bir bale gösterisine götürmüş.

Araştırmacı, hikâyeyi anlattıktan sonra, hikâye hakkında düşünmeleri için, katılımcıları ikişerli gruplara ayırır. Ondan sonra da, onlardan, üzerlerine

düşünecekleri kafa karıştırıcı sorular üretmelerini ister. Katılımcılar soruları hazırladıktan sonra, toplulukla sorularını paylaşırlar. Katılımcıların oylamaları yoluyla, sorulardan biri seçilir. Seçilmiş soru hakkındaki ilk düşüncelerini, kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde birbirleriyle paylaşırlar. Kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde paylaştıktan sonra da, düşüncelerini topluluğa açarlar. Tüm düşünceler, onaylama-onaylamama ve düşüncelerin nedenleriyle açıklanması yoluyla ifade edilir. Böylece, katılımcılar kendi felsefi diyaloglarını inşa ederler. Diyaloglarını inşa ettikten sonra, son düşüncelerini ifade ederler ve bütün diyaloğu özetlerler.

ETKİNLİK 9

Araştırmacı, 'O gerçek değil'. Cümlesini kurar ve çemberde yanında oturan katılımcıdan 'O gerçek değil. İfadesinin nedenini açıkladığı bir cümle kurmasını ister. Sonra onun da yanındaki, onun kurduğu cümlenin nedenini açıklayacaktır. Çemberde herkesin, bir yanındakinin ifadesini gerekçelendirmesiyle, düşünmeye ısınma oyunu tamamlanır.

Ardından, araştırmacı 'Şimdi sizinle bir hikâye paylaşmak istiyorum.' diyerek, hikâyeyi canlı bir şekilde anlatmaya başlar:

Hikâye: Keşfedilmemiş Adadaki Yaratık (Karadağ ve Gülenç, 2018)

Bir gün Filiz, Mete ve Eda isminde üç bilim insanı kimseciklerin gitmediği bir adada araştırma yapmaya karar vermiş. Bu araştırma için gerekli hazırlıkları yaptıktan sonra yola koyulmuşlar. Yanlarına araştırmalarında kullanacakları ekipmanları almışlar. Uçağa atlayıp adaya gitmişler. Uzun bir yolculuğun ardından adaya ulaşmışlar. Ada tahmin ettiklerinden büyükmüş. Koskoca ağaçlar, göller, ovalar, büyük tepeler... Adada dolaştıkça yeni şeyler görmüşler. Adanın fotoğrafını çekmek istediklerinde ise ekipmanlarının bozulduğunu fark etmişler.

Günlerden bir gün adanın iç taraflarından korkutucu bir ses yükselmiş. Adanın kıyısında kalan bu üç kâşif sesi duyar duymaz büyük bir korkuya kapılmışlar. Aynı zamanda çok meraklanmışlar. Koşa koşa sesin geldiği yöne doğru gitmeye başlamışlar. Tepenin üstünde daha önce hiç karşılaşmadıkları bir yaratık görmüşler.

Yaratık onları görünce el sallayarak gülümsemiş. Ve hızla uzaklaşmış. Üç kâşif kendi aralarında konuşmaya başlamış:

“Neydi bu?” diye sormuş Eda. Filiz; “Evet, neydi bu?” diye tekrar etmiş.

“Gobbit” demiş Mete. “Bu gobbit’ti” “Gobbit de nedir?” diye sormuş Filiz. Daha önce böyle bir şey duymadım. “Ona bu ismi ben verdim” demiş Mete. “Gobbit ismi bu yaratığa çok yakıştı!”

Üç kâşif bir daha bu yaratıkla karşılaşmamış. Ve araştırmalarını tamamladıktan sonra ülkelerine geri dönmüşler. Ülkelerine geri döndüklerinde ise arkadaşlarına bu yaratığı anlatmışlar. Onlardan bu yaratığı tanımlamaları istendiğinde üçü de farklı tanım vermiş. Yaratığın benzer ancak farklı resimlerini çizmişler.

Araştırmacı, hikâyeyi anlattıktan sonra, hikâye hakkında düşünmeleri için, katılımcıları ikişerli gruplara ayırır. Ondan sonra da, onlardan, üzerlerine düşünecekleri kafa karıştırıcı sorular üretmelerini ister. Katılımcılar soruları hazırladıktan sonra, toplulukla sorularını paylaşırlar. Katılımcıların oylamaları yoluyla, sorulardan biri seçilir. Seçilmiş soru hakkındaki ilk düşüncelerini, kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde birbirleriyle paylaşırlar. Kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde paylaştıktan sonra da, düşüncelerini topluluğa açarlar. Tüm düşünceler, onaylama-onaylamama ve düşüncelerin nedenleriyle açıklanması yoluyla ifade edilir. Böylece, katılımcılar kendi felsefi diyaloglarını inşa ederler. Diyaloglarını inşa ettikten sonra, son düşüncelerini ifade ederler ve bütün diyaloğu özetlerler.

ETKİNLİK 10

Araştırmacı, katılımcılardan, aşağıdaki resme bakmalarını ister ve resim hakkında düşünmeleri için, katılımcıları ikişerli gruplara ayırır. Ondan sonra da, onlardan, üzerlerine düşünecekleri kafa karıştırıcı sorular üretmelerini ister. Katılımcılar soruları hazırladıktan sonra, toplulukla sorularını paylaşırlar. Katılımcıların oylamaları yoluyla, sorulardan biri seçilir. Seçilmiş soru hakkındaki ilk düşüncelerini, kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde birbirleriyle paylaşırlar. Kendi düşünme çiftleri içinde paylaştıktan sonra da, düşüncelerini topluluğa açarlar. Tüm düşünceler,

onaylama-onaylamama ve düşüncelerin nedenleriyle açıklanması yoluyla ifade edilir. Böylece, katılımcılar kendi felsefi diyaloglarını inşa ederler. Diyaloglarını inşa ettikten sonra, son düşüncelerini ifade ederler ve bütün diyaloğu özetlerler.

C. CONSENT FORM

GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU

Bu araştırma, ODTÜ Okul Öncesi Öğretmenliği Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Emine Deniz Koyuncu tarafından Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hasibe Özlen Demircan danışmanlığındaki yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında yürütülmektedir. Bu form, sizi araştırma koşulları hakkında bilgilendirmek için hazırlanmıştır.

Çalışmanın Amacı Nedir?

Araştırmanın amacı, okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin Çocuklarla Felsefe yaklaşımı hakkındaki görüşlerinin incelenmesidir.

Bize Nasıl Yardımcı Olmanızı İsteyeceğiz?

Araştırmaya katılmayı kabul etmeniz durumunda, öncelikle, sizinle, birebir olarak, Çocuklarla Felsefe yaklaşımına dair görüşlerinizi değerlendirebileceğimiz bir mülakat gerçekleştirilecektir. Daha sonra, sizden, 12 kişiden oluşan 'Çocuklarla Felsefe' uygulama grubuna 10 hafta boyunca ve haftada bir saat olmak üzere katılmanız beklenmektedir. Uygulamaların yapılacağı yer ve zaman, katılımcıların uygunluk durumuna göre belirlenecektir. Uygulamalar ve mülakatlar esnasında ses kaydı alınacaktır. 10 haftalık uygulama süreci tamamlandıktan sonra, yeniden sizinle, birebir olarak, bir mülakat yapılacak ve başlangıçtaki mülakatta sorulan sorular yinelenecektir. Uygulamaların sonrasındaki 2 hafta içinde de, kendi okul öncesi eğitim ortamınızda, en az 2 kez olmak üzere Çocuklarla Felsefe uygulaması gerçekleştirmeniz beklenmektedir. Bu uygulamalarınız sonunda da, yine birebir olarak, kendi eğitim ortamlarınızdaki Çocuklarla Felsefe uygulama deneyimlerinize ilişkin olarak bir mülakat daha gerçekleştirilecektir.

Sizden Topladığımız Bilgileri Nasıl Kullanacağız?

Araştırmaya katılımınız tamamen gönüllülük temelinde olmalıdır. Çalışmada sizden kimlik veya kurum belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplarınız tamamıyla gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacılar tarafından kodlama yoluyla değerlendirilecektir. Katılımcılardan elde edilecek bilgiler bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır.

Katılımınızla ilgili bilmeniz gerekenler:

Çalışma, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek sorular veya uygulamalar içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz çalıştayı yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta serbestsiniz. Böyle bir durumda çalışmayı uygulayan kişiye çalışmadan çıkmak istediğinizi söylemeniz yeterli olacaktır.

Araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isterseniz:

Çalışma sonunda, bu çalışmayla ilgili sorularınız cevaplanacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Okul Öncesi Öğretmenliği öğretim üyelerinden Dr. Hasibe Özlen Demircan (E-posta: dozlen@metu.edu.tr) ya da yüksek lisans öğrencisi Emine Deniz Koyuncu (E-posta: deniz.koyuncu@metu.edu.tr) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum.

(Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz).

İsim Soyad Tarih İmza

---/----/-----

D. APPROVAL OF HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816 / 16

08 OCAK 2019

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Dr.Öğretim Üyesi Hasibe Özlen DEMİRCAN

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız Emine Deniz KOYUNCU'nun **"Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Çocuklarla Felsefe Yaklaşımı Hakkındaki Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi"** başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay **006-ODTÜ-2019** protokol numarası ile araştırma yapması onaylanmıştır.

Saygılarımla bilgilerinize sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Tülin GENÇÖZ
Başkan

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL
Üye

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR (4.)
Üye

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Üye

Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK
Üye

Doç. Dr. Pınar KAYGAN
Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ali Emre TURGUT
Üye

E. TURKISH SUMMARY/ TÜRKÇE ÖZET

GİRİŞ

Çocukların felsefeyle ne alakası olabilir? Ya da felsefenin çocuklarla ne alakası olabilir? Çocuklar, felsefe için yeterince olgun değillerdir. Çocuklar, bu kadar felsefi bilgiyi nasıl öğrenebilir? Felsefe, yetişkinlerin kafasını bile bulandırır. Felsefe ve çocuk, birbirinden çok uzak olan iki kavramdır. Bu ifadeler yerleşik olan geleneksel düşünceyi ortaya koymaktadır. Geleneksel düşüncede felsefe, felsefeyi öğrenmek, daha açık bir ifadeyle, felsefi fikirlerin tarihini öğrenmek demektir. Buna göre felsefe, terimlerle dolu bir felsefi bilgi yığınına karşılık gelmektedir. Ancak, felsefe aslında Yunanca ‘‘philosophia’’ kelimesinden gelmektedir ve bilgelik sevgisi anlamındadır. Bu bilgelik sevgisi, bilginin peşinde olan filozofların fikirlerini pasif bir şekilde öğrenmenin sevgisi değil, ancak aktif bir şekilde bilginin peşinde bulunmanın sevgisidir (Gruioniu, 2012). Felsefe aslında bir pratiktir, felsefe yapma eylemidir. Düşünme ve sorgulamaya dayanan zihinsel bir faaliyettir (Cevizci, 2010).

İnsanın felsefe yapmaya başladığı ilk an da merak ettiği o andır (Aristotle, 1907/2008) ve bu ilk an, okul öncesi döneme karşılık gelmektedir (Carson, 1965). Fakat bazı filozoflar ve psikologlara göre çocuklar, akıl yürütme ve felsefe yapmaya hazır olma konusunda yetersizlerdir (Piaget, 1974; Rousseau, 1762/2010; Siegler, 2004). Dewey ise, çocukların sahip olduğu merak, taraf tutmaksızın yanıt verme ve yeni fikirlere açık olma özelliklerinden dolayı, çocukların, felsefeye, yetişkinlerden daha yakın olduğunu savunmaktadır (Dewey, 1916; Gregory ve Granger, 2012). Matthew Lipman da (1985), Dewey'den esinlenerek, felsefe ve çocuk kavramları üzerine yeniden düşünmüş ve 1970'lerde, çocuklarla felsefe yapmak için Çocuklar için Felsefe yöntemini geliştirmiştir. Lipman (2003), Çocuklar için Felsefe yöntemini, çocukları felsefe tarihi ve filozofların düşünceleriyle doldurmadan,

onların, kendi fikirlerini geliştirip ifade ettikleri, eleştirel ve yaratıcı düşünmelerini teşvik eden bir yöntem olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Lipman sonrasında da, birçok araştırmacı, çocuklarla felsefe alanında çalışmaya devam etmiştir. Zaman içinde, 'Çocuklarla Felsefe', çocuklarla felsefe yapmanın genel bir başlığı haline gelmiştir (Cassidy & Christie, 2013). Bu çalışmada da, Çocuklarla Felsefe (ÇiF), çocuklarla felsefe yapmanın genel başlığı olarak kullanılmıştır. Catherine McCall, Lipman'ın ardından çocuklarla felsefe üzerine çalışan araştırmacılardan biridir. McCall, hem çocuklarla hem de yetişkinlerle felsefe yapmak için Felsefi Soruşturma Topluluğu (FST) adında yeni bir yöntem geliştirmiştir. McCall (2013) FST'yi çocukların, bir soruşturma topluluğu içinde, sorguladıkları, iletişim-etkileşimden anlam çıkardıkları, düşüncelerini gerekçelendirdikleri, bir konu üzerinde hata yapabildiklerini de gördükleri, bir çocuklarla felsefe yapma yöntemi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Bu çalışmanın uygulama süreçlerinde FST yöntemi kullanılmıştır.

Çalışmanın Önemi

Türkiye'de felsefe dersinin amacı, farklı fikirlere saygı duyan, tartışma kültürü edinebilen, özgün, bağımsız, eleştirel ve mantıklı düşünerek yorum yapabilen, değişimin ve gelişmenin farkında olan bireyler yetiştirmek olmasına rağmen (MEB, 2018), dersler, geleneksel anlayışa yakın bir şekilde işlenebilmektedir (Duruhan, Gürbüztürk, Şan ve Pepeler, 2014). Bu anlayışta, ağırlıklı olarak felsefe tarihinden filozofların düşünceleri, bilgi kaynağı olan öğretmenden, tek yönlü bir şekilde öğrencilere aktarılmaktadır (Duruhan vd., 2014; Yılmaz ve Altınkurt, 2011). Ayrıca, Türkiye'de, bir öğrenci, eğitim sistemi içinde, resmi olarak en erken 10. sınıfta felsefe dersi alabilmektedir. Bu noktada, Türkiye'de eğitim sistemi içerisinde ÇiF'in kullanılması, eğitimde başka bir felsefe dersinin ve yaklaşımın mümkün olmasını sağlayacaktır.

Alanyazında da, çocuklarla felsefe alanındaki araştırma, pilot deneyimler ve uygulamaların okul öncesi dönemde desteklenmesi ve bu yaklaşımın eğitim sisteminde kurumsallaşması önerilmektedir (UNESCO, 2011b). Bununla beraber,

Türkiye'nin okul öncesi eğitim programı, çocukların kendi potansiyellerini gerçekleştirebilmeleri için erken yaşam deneyimlerinin önemine dikkat çekmektedir. Programda, okul öncesi eğitiminin çocuğa nitelikli bilişsel uyaranların, zengin dil etkileşimlerinin, olumlu sosyal ve duygusal deneyimlerin sunulduğu ve çocuğun bağımsızlığının desteklendiği bir ortam sağlaması gerektiği belirtilmektedir (MEB, 2013). Tüm bunlar göz önüne alındığında, ÇiF'in okul öncesi eğitim programına uygun olduğu görülebilmektedir. Diğer taraftan, alanyazında, ÇiF'in çocuklar üzerindeki etkilerini gösteren araştırmalar gün gittikçe artmasına rağmen (Kilby, 2019), eğitimin diğer dönemlerine kıyasla, ÇiF'in okul öncesi dönemde kullanılmasıyla ilgili çalışmalar oldukça kısıtlıdır.

Öğretmen ise, sınıfta, ÇiF'i uygulamak için uygun ortamı hazırlayan ve yaklaşımın kullanılmasını etkileyen en önemli faktörlerden biridir (Anderson, 2017). Fakat ÇiF'in eğitim alanında kullanılmasıyla ilgili olarak, öğretmenlerle hem sınırlı sayıda çalışma yapılmıştır hem de şimdiye kadar bu alanda yapılan neredeyse tüm çalışmalar, ilköğretim veya ortaöğretim öğretmenleri veya öğretmen adayları ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Alanyazında, doğrudan okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin, ÇiF'e ilişkin görüşlerine odaklanan ve bunu da ÇiF'i doğrudan deneyimlemeleri yoluyla yapan bir çalışmaya rastlanmamıştır. Bu çalışmada okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin, ÇiF'e ve ÇiF'in okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanılmasına ilişkin görüşleri, okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin aktif olarak ÇiF uygulamalarına katılmaları ve kendi sınıflarında bu yaklaşımı uygulamaları yoluyla araştırılmıştır.

YÖNTEM

Bu çalışma, okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ÇiF yaklaşımı ve ÇiF yaklaşımının okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanılması ile ilgili görüşlerini ÇiF deneyimi aracılığıyla incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışmada 'ÇİF Deneyimi', araştırmacı tarafından yürütülen uygulamalar ile okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin, araştırmacının uygulaması sona erdikten sonra kendi sınıflarında yürüttükleri uygulamaların toplamına karşılık gelmektedir. Bu noktada, mevcut çalışma aşağıdaki araştırma sorularını cevaplamaya çalışmıştır:

1) Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ÇiF ile ilgili ÇiF deneyimi öncesi ve sonrasındaki görüşleri nelerdir?

2) Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ÇiF'in okul öncesi eğitimi ortamlarında kullanımı ile ilgili ÇiF deneyimi öncesi ve sonrasındaki görüşleri nelerdir?

a) Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ÇiF'in okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanılması ile ilgili ÇiF deneyimi öncesi ve sonrasındaki görüşleri nelerdir?

b) Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ÇiF'in okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanılmasının çocuklar üzerindeki etkisiyle ilgili ÇiF deneyimi öncesi ve sonrasındaki görüşleri nelerdir?

c) Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ÇiF'in okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanılmasının öğretmenler üzerindeki etkisiyle ilgili ÇiF deneyimi öncesi ve sonrasındaki görüşleri nelerdir?

d) Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ÇiF'in okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanılmasının öğrenci-öğretmen arasındaki ilişki üzerindeki etkisiyle ilgili ÇiF deneyimi öncesi ve sonrasındaki görüşleri nelerdir?

e) Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ÇiF'in okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanılmasının önündeki engellerle ilgili görüşleri nelerdir?

Araştırma Yöntemi

Bu çalışmada, değerlendirici durum çalışması deseni kullanılmıştır. Değerlendirici durum çalışması deseni, bu çalışmada da olduğu gibi, özellikle olgu ve bağlam arasındaki sınırlar açıkça belli olmadığında, bir olguyu gerçek yaşam bağlamında araştırmak için kullanılmaktadır (Yin, 2009).

Çocuklarla Felsefe Uygulamaları

Bu çalışma kapsamında, araştırmacı, okul öncesi öğretmenleri ile on haftalık bir ÇiF uygulaması gerçekleştirmiş ve ayrıca okul öncesi öğretmenleri, araştırmacının

gerçekleştirdiği uygulamalar bittikten sonra, kendi sınıflarında en az iki kez ÇiF uygulaması yapmışlardır. Araştırmacı, on haftalık uygulamayı bitirdikten sonra tüm Çocuklarla Felsefe oturumlarının planlarını katılımcılarla paylaşmıştır (bkz. EK B). Bunu takiben, okul öncesi öğretmenleri isteğe bağlı olarak on plandan en az ikisini seçmiş ve on haftalık ÇiF deneyimlerine dayanarak, kendi sınıflarında ÇiF yaklaşımını kullanmışlardır.

Katılımcılar

Bu değerlendirici durum çalışmasında, örneklem seçilim yöntemi olarak elverişlilik örneklemesi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın katılımcılarını, Antalya ilinden 6 farklı devlet anaokulundan 11 kadın okul öncesi öğretmeni oluşturmaktadır. Çalışmada, katılımcıların gerçek isimleri kullanılmamış ve katılımcılara P1- P11 arasında ve çalışıyor oldukları anaokullarına, S1-S6 arasında kodlar verilmiştir.

Veri Toplama Araçları ve Süreci

Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ÇiF ile ve onun okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanılmasıyla ilgili görüşlerinde, ÇiF deneyimi öncesi ve sonrasında bir farklılık olup olmadığını incelemek amacıyla, 10 haftalık uygulamanın öncesinde, sonrasında ve ayrıca katılımcıların kendi eğitim ortamlarındaki uygulamalarından sonra olmak üzere birebir olarak 3 yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme gerçekleştirilmiştir. Ek olarak, çalışmada, on haftalık uygulama esnasında, ses kayıtları üzerinden gözlem ve saha notları da veri toplamak için kullanılmıştır. Hazırlanan görüşme soruları, okul öncesi eğitimi ve ilköğretim alanında çalışmalar yapan 3 uzman tarafından incelenmiş ve uzman görüşleri alınmıştır. Ardından, 6 okul öncesi öğretmeni ile bir pilot çalışma yürütülmüştür. Uzman görüşleri ve pilot çalışma sonuçları doğrultusunda gerekli düzenlemeler yapılmış ve görüşme soruları son haline getirilmiştir. 10 haftalık uygulama öncesi ve sonrasında gerçekleştirilen görüşme toplam 17 sorudan oluşmuş ve 20-30 dakika sürmüştür. Öğretmenlerin kendi uygulamalarından sonra yapılan görüşme de toplam 5 sorudan oluşmuş ve 10-15 dakika sürmüştür. Görüşmeler, katılımcılara uygun olan yer ve zamanda gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmacı tarafından

10 hafta boyunca, haftada 1 kez ve 1 saat olmak üzere yürütülen ÇiF uygulamalarında, 11 katılımcı aynı anda aynı yerde buluşmuşlardır.

Çalışmayı gerçekleştirmeden önce, üniversitenin etik kurulundan ve Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'ndan gerekli izinler alınmıştır. Çalışma, 2018-2019 eğitim öğretim yılı bahar döneminde gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Veri Analizi

Bu çalışmada, okul öncesi öğretmenlerinden elde edilen veriler, içerik analizi yöntemiyle analiz edilmiştir. Çalışmada veri analizi sürecinde, öncelikle olarak katılımcılarla, 10 haftalık uygulama öncesi ve sonrası ve aynı zamanda kendi sınıflarındaki uygulamaları sonrası yapılan görüşmelerin ses kayıtları yazıya aktarılmıştır. Sonrasında, katılımcıların, ÇiF deneyiminden önce ve sonra, ÇiF ve ÇiF'in okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanılması ile ilgili görüşlerinde herhangi bir farklılık olup olmadığına bakılmıştır. ÇiF deneyimi sonrası veri analizinde, 10 haftalık uygulama sonunda yapılan görüşmenin ve katılımcıların kendi sınıflarında yaptıkları uygulamaların sonunda yapılan görüşmenin bulguları beraber ele alınmış ve 'ÇiF Deneyiminden Sonra' başlığı altında birlikte sunulmuştur.

BULGULAR VE TARTIŞMA

1. Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Çocuklarla Felsefe Yaklaşımına İlişkin Görüşleri

ÇiF deneyimi öncesinde, katılımcılar, ÇiF'i öğretmenin çocuklara sorular sorması, çocukların fikirlerini paylaşmaları ve onları ne düşünecekleri konusunda yönlendirme ile ilişkilendirmişlerdir. ÇiF deneyiminden sonra ise, ÇiF'i, öğretmenin çocuklar üzerinde hâkimiyet kurmadan, onların eleştirel ve yaratıcı düşünmesini, kendi sorularını üretmelerini ve hep birlikte düşünmelerini sağlayan bir yaklaşım olarak tarif etmişlerdir. Alanyazında diğer çalışmalar da, ÇiF'i bir soruşturma topluluğu içinde, çocukların eleştirel ve yaratıcı düşünmesini, soru sormasını ve iş birliği içinde düşünmelerini teşvik eden bir yaklaşım olarak tanımlamaktadır

(Cassidy ve Christie; 2013; Lipman, 2003; McCall, 2013). Bazı katılımcılar, çocukların kendi soru ve cevaplarını üretmesi, daha aktif olmaları ve her iki yaklaşımın da sorgulamaya dayalı olması açısından ÇiF'i sorgulama temelli yaklaşıma da benzetmişlerdir. Bu bulgu, ÇiF'in, özellikle topluluk içinde, iş birliğiyle kurulan bir diyaloğa odaklanmış sorgulamaya dayalı bir yaklaşım olduğunu gösteren daha başka çalışmalarla da tutarlıdır (Cam, 2006; Dougherty, 2017; Fisher, 2013; Haynes, 2014; Naji, 2013; Stanley, 2004).

Katılımcılar, ÇiF'i, çocukları ne düşünmeleri gerektiği konusunda sınırlandırmadan, onları daha çok düşünmeye, sorgulamaya ve beraber düşünmeye yönlendiren bir yaklaşım olarak tanımlamışlardır. Bu bulgu, katılımcıların, araştırmanın başında, ÇiF'e daha çok geleneksel eğitimdeki öğretmenin lider olduğu bir bakış açısıyla yaklaşırken, ÇiF deneyiminden sonra, öğretmenin, çocukları daha çok düşünmelerinde desteklediği bir bakış açısıyla ele aldıkları şeklinde açıklanabilir (Newell- Jones, 2012).

Bunun yanı sıra, katılımcılar, ÇiF deneyiminden önce, ÇiF ile soru-cevap, beyin fırtınası, fikir bankası veya hikâye ve çember zamanındaki etkinlikler gibi okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanılan belirli yöntemler arasında bir benzerlik kurarken, tüm katılımcılar, ÇiF deneyimi sonrasında, ÇiF'in, düşüncelerin aralarında bağlantı kurulmadan, çocukların yalnızca fikirlerini paylaştıkları diğer düşünme üzerine olan etkinliklerden farklı olduğunu söyleyerek, konuyla ilgili düşüncelerini değiştirdiklerini ifade etmişlerdir. ÇiF deneyiminden önce, ilk varsayımlarına da dayanarak, sınıflarında çocuklarla zaten felsefe yaptıklarını düşünürken, deneyim sonrasında, yaptıkları şeyin gerçekten felsefe olmadığını fark ettiklerini de dile getirmişlerdir. Bu bulgu, öğretmenlerin ÇiF deneyimlerinden sonra yaklaşım hakkında daha fazla bilgiye sahip olarak, yaklaşım hakkındaki yanlış anlamalarını düzeltmiş olabilecekleriyle açıklanabilir (O'Riordan, 2013).

2.Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Çocuklarla Felsefe Yaklaşımının Okul Öncesi Eğitim Ortamında Kullanılmasıyla İlgili Görüşleri

2.1 Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Çocuklarla Felsefe Yaklaşımının Okul Öncesi Eğitim Ortamında Kullanılmasıyla İlgili Görüşleri

Çalışmanın başlangıcında, bazı katılımcılar, çocuğu, bilişsel olarak yetersiz kabul ederek, çocuk ve felsefeyi birbiriyle ilişkilendirememiş olsa da (Lyle, 2017; Piaget, 1974; Rousseau, 1762/2010; Siegler, 2004), ÇiF deneyimi sonrasında, görüşlerini, okul öncesi dönemdeki çocukların da felsefe yapabileceği yönünde değiştirmişlerdir. Önceki çalışmalar da, küçük çocukların, soyut kavramsallaştırma yapma, fikirlere katılıp, katılmadıklarını ifade etme, neden talep etme ve neden sunma, örnek ve karşı örnekler verme ve farklı fikirler sunma gibi karmaşık bilişsel işlemleri yerine getirdiklerini göstermektedir (Kennedy, 1994; Kieran Egan; 1988; Matthew, 1994; Murris, 2000).

Ayrıca, katılımcılar, ÇiF deneyimi sonrasında, ÇiF yaklaşımının okul öncesi dönemdeki çocuklar için gelişimsel olarak uygun olduğunu ve okul öncesi eğitiminde kolaylıkla kullanılabileceğini düşünmüşlerdir. Bazı katılımcılar, sınıflarında çocuklara, felsefe yapma fırsatı vermediklerini ve öğretmenlerin bunun için uygun sınıf ortamını hazırlamaları durumunda çocukların da felsefe yapabileceklerini belirtmişlerdir. Bu bulgu, eğer çocukların felsefe yapabileceğine inanılır ve bunu yapmaları desteklenirse, çocukların da felsefe yapma yeteneklerini ortaya koyabileceğine dikkat çeken çalışmalarla tutarlıdır (Goucha, 2007; Lipman, 1973).

Diğer taraftan, bazı katılımcılar, ÇiF yaklaşımı uygulanırken, felsefi bilginin gerekli olmadığını düşünmüşlerdir. Bu görüşlerini de, ÇiF yaklaşımı içinde, öğretmenin kendi düşüncesini paylaşmaması ve çocuklara herhangi bir bilgi aktarmamasıyla açıklamışlardır. Öte yandan ilgili alanyazında ÇiF yaklaşımında kolaylaştırıcının, felsefi duyarlılık ve bilgi sahibi olmasının önemi vurgulanmaktadır (Akkocaoğlu Çayır, 2018; Daniel ve Auriac, 2011; Haynes, 2011; Lone, 2012b; McCall, 2017). ÇiF'te kolaylaştırıcı, sahip olduğu felsefi bilgiyi sergilemeden ondan

yararlanmaktadır. Bu sebeple, bu bulgunun, çocuklara felsefi bilgi aktarmayı değil de, onların kendi bilgilerini oluşturmalarını kolaylaştırmayı amaçlayan ÇiF'in yapısı ile ilgili olduğu düşünülebilir (Lone, 2012b; Maxwell, 2005; Scholl vd, 2009). Bu bulgu, aynı zamanda, katılımcıların, bilginin kaynağı olarak görülen öğretmenlerin, sahip oldukları bilgileri öğrencilere aktardıkları ve böylece bilgilerini gösterdikleri geleneksel eğitim penceresinden bakmalarından da kaynaklanmış olabilir (Kennedy, 2012; Topping ve Trickey, 2014).

Ek olarak, bazı katılımcılar, ÇiF'i uygulayan kişinin kendine güvenmesinin önemli olduğunu ve yaklaşımı doğru uygulama konusunda kendilerine güvenmediklerini ifade etmişlerdir. Böylece, ÇiF'in, bu alanda yetkin bir kişi tarafından müfredat dışında yürütülen bir uygulama olmasını desteklemişlerdir. ÇiF'in müfredatla bütünleştirilmesiyle ilgili olarak da, öğretmenin motivasyonunun önemini vurgulamışlardır. Katılımcılara göre, uygulamaya gönüllü olmayan bir öğretmen, ÇiF'i okul müfredatıyla bütünleştirmek zorunda bırakılmamalıdır. Bu bulgular, O'Riordan'ın (2013), öğretmenlerin, farklı motivasyon ve güven seviyelerinin, ÇiF'in eğitim ortamında kullanımını etkileyebileceğini gösteren çalışması ile uyumludur.

Ayrıca, katılımcılar, ÇiF yaklaşımının etkili olabilmesi için düzenli kullanılması gerektiğini düşünmüşlerdir. Bu bulgu, ÇiF'in genel başarısının, eğitimde düzenli kullanımına bağlı olduğunu gösteren çalışmalarla paralellik içindedir (Topping ve Trickey, 2007; Siddiqui vd., 2015). Bir katılımcı da, ÇiF'in uygulanabilmesinde sınıf mevcudunun önemine değinerek, kalabalık bir sınıfta, yaklaşımı uygulamanın kolay olmayabileceğini dile getirmiştir. Benzer şekilde Fisher'a (1998) göre, kalabalık grup sayısı kolaylaştırıcının ÇiF'i tam anlamıyla kullanmasını engelleyebilir ve az sayıda çocuğun, daha kısa süreyle fikirlerini paylaşmasına neden olabilir, bu nedenle bir soruşturma topluluğu için ideal sayı yaklaşık 14'tür.

Katılımcılar, okul öncesi dönemde, kişinin karakterinin büyük oranda oluştuğunu ve bu nedenle, çocukların bu erken dönemde ÇiF ile tanışmalarının çok önemli olduğunu düşündüklerini de ortaya koymuştur. Bu bulgu, ÇiF uygulamalarının okul

öncesi eğitiminden başlayarak, müfredatta merkezi bir yer almasını gerektiğini savunan görüşleri desteklemektedir (Farahani, 2014; Maxwell, 2005). Katılımcılar, ayrıca okul öncesi eğitim programının, ÇiF'i müfredatlarıyla rahatlıkla bütünleştirecek esneklikte olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Katılımcılara göre, eğitimin diğer dönemlerinin aksine, okul öncesi eğitim programının keskin sınırları yoktur. Türkiye'de okul öncesi eğitimi programında (MEB, 2013), öğretmenlere, planlarını hazırlama ve uygulama konusunda esnek bir çerçeve çizildiği de, bu bulgu ile uyumlu olarak ifade edilmektedir. Bu bulgu ayrıca, okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ÇiF'in, okul öncesi dönemde kullanmak için oldukça uygun bir yaklaşım olduğunu düşündüklerini ve planlarında onu kalıcı olarak kullanma konusunda istekli olduklarını gösteren Karadağ ve Demirtaş'ın (2018) çalışmasını da desteklemektedir.

2.2 Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Çocuklarla Felsefe Yaklaşımının Okul Öncesi Eğitim Ortamında Kullanılmasının Çocuklar Üzerindeki Etkileriyle İlgili Görüşleri

Katılımcılar, ÇiF deneyimi öncesinde, okul öncesi eğitiminde ÇiF kullanımının, yalnızca, ilköğretime geçişi kolaylaştıracağını düşünürken, ÇiF deneyimi sonrasında, ergenlik ve yetişkinlik dönemini de olumlu olarak etkileyebileceğini dile getirmişlerdir. Ayrıca, çocukların eleştirel, yaratıcı ve iş birliği içinde düşünmeleri, soru oluşturmaları ve akademik başarılarını desteklemesi bakımlarından, onların bilişsel gelişimlerini olumlu etkileyeceğini ifade etmişlerdir. Eleştirel düşünmeyi, bir düşünceyi hemen kabul etmeden, onu sorgulama, düşünceleri nedenleriyle açıklama; yaratıcı düşünmeyi ise, yeni düşünceler üretebilme ve farklı açılardan bakabilme şeklinde ifade etmişlerdir. İş birliği içinde düşünme ile ilgili olarak ise, çocukların bireysel olarak düşünmelerinin ötesine geçerek, kendi aralarında düşünmeye başlamalarından bahsetmişlerdir. Alanyazında da, eğitim alanında ÇiF yaklaşımının kullanılmasının çocukların akıl yürütme (Akkocaoğlu Çayır, 2015; Daniel ve Auriac, 2011; Lam, 2012; Marashi, 2009; Säre, Luik ve Tulviste, 2016; Topping ve Trickey, 2007; Yusoff, 2018), eleştirel ve yaratıcı düşünme (Dyfed County Council, 1994; Gasparatou ve Kampeza, 2012; Ghaedi vd., 2015; Haas, 1980; Jenkins ve Lyle, 2010; Karadağ ve Demirtaş, 2018; Lipman ve Bierman, 1970; Maraş, 2008; McCall,

2017; Siddiqui vd., 2015), işbirlikçi düşünme (Phillips, tarihsiz), soru oluşturma becerilerine (Demirtaş vd., 2018; Jenkins ve Lyle, 2010; Karadağ ve Demirtaş, 2018; Yusoff, 2018), akademik olarak da, matematik, okuma ve yazmada daha başarılı olmalarına katkıda bulunduğunu ortaya koyulmaktadır (Dyfed County Council, 1994; Fields, 1995; Haas, 1980; Imani vd., 2016; Lipman ve Bierman, 1970; Siddiqui vd., 2015; ETS Study, 1980; Williams, 1993). Ayrıca, çalışmanın bulguları, okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin on haftalık ÇiF uygulaması boyunca fikirlerini gerekçeleriyle açıklamaya, giderek daha fazla dikkat ettiklerini göstermiştir. Bu bulgular, katılımcıların, felsefi soruşturma topluluğunun üyesi olduğu on haftalık ÇiF uygulamasının eleştirel düşünme becerileri üzerinde bir etkisi olmuş olmasıyla açıklanabilir.

Ayrıca eğitimde ÇiF kullanımının, aktif dinlemeyi (Campbell, 2002; Commonwealth of Avustralia, 2008; Dyfed County Council, 1994) ve ifade dilini (Campbell, 2002; Dyfed County Council, 1994; Jenkins ve Lyle, 2010; Trickey, 2007) geliştirerek, çocuklarda dil gelişimini desteklediğini ortaya koyan alanyazınla uyumlu olarak, katılımcılar da, çocukların konuşma ve dinleme becerilerinin ÇiF sayesinde, olumlu yönde etkileneceğini düşünmüşlerdir.

Bunların yanında, katılımcılar, sosyal-duygusal gelişim alanında, herkesin fikrine değer verilmesi ve ifade etmesi için fırsat verilmesiyle, çocukların kendilerine ve başkalarına saygılarının, özgüvenlerinin, empatilerinin, hoşgörülerinin artacağını ve sınıf içi etkinliklere daha istekli ve yoğun katılmak isteyebileceklerini düşünmüşlerdir. Bu bulguları, alanyazın da, ÇiF'in çocuklarda özgüveni (Campbell, 2002; Okur, 2008; Siddiqui vd., 2015; Topping ve Trickey, 2007), özsaygıyı (Palsson vd.., 1998; Topping ve Trickey, 2007), diğer fikirlere saygıyı (Cassidy ve Christie, 2013; Sigurborsdottir, 1998), açık görüşlülüğü (Fair vd., 2015), empatiyi (Cassidy vd., 2017; Okur, 2008; Topping ve Trickey, 2007) sosyalleşmeyi ve akran ilişkilerini (Commonwealth of Australia, 2008; Naraghi vd., 2013; Sigurborsdottir, 1998; Topping ve Trickey, 2007; Yusoff, 2018) ve katılımı (Campbell, 2002; Cassidy ve Christie, 2013; Cassidy vd., 2017; Marashi, 2008; Topping ve Trickey, 2007) geliştirdiğini ortaya koyarak desteklemektedir.

Ayrıca, bazı katılımcılar, ÇiF'in özel gereksinimi olan çocukları da olumlu yönde etkileyebileceğini ifade etmişlerdir. Çalışmanın başında, sınıfındaki, Türkçe'yi tam konuşamayan ve anlayamayan, çoğunlukla sessiz olan iki dilli öğrencilerinin ÇiF uygulamalarına katılamayacağını düşünürlerken, ÇiF deneyimi sonrasında, onların da katılabileceklerini ve hatta ÇiF sayesinde dilsel olarak gelişebileceklerini ifade etmişlerdir. Alanyazın da, ÇiF kullanımının çocukların kelime dağarcığını arttırıp, kendini ifade etme becerisini geliştirmesi açılarından iki dilli dil gelişimini desteklediğini ortaya koymaktadır (Newell-Jones, 2012). Ayrıca, ÇiF yaklaşımını kullanmanın otizmli çocukların katılımlarını ve öz düzenlemelerini desteklediğini gösteren alanyazınla paralel olarak (Cassidy vd., 2017), bir katılımcı da, otizmli bir öğrencisinin, sınıfındaki ikinci ÇiF uygulamasından sonra yaklaşıma uyum sağlamaya başladığını dile getirmiştir.

2.3 Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Çocuklarla Felsefe Yaklaşımının Okul Öncesi Eğitim Ortamında Kullanılmasının Öğretmen Üzerindeki Etkileriyle İlgili Görüşleri

Katılımcılar, çalışmanın başında öğretmenin daha fazla egemen olduğu bir rehberlik anlayışına sahipken, ÇiF deneyimi sonrası, rehberlik anlayışlarında, çocukların daha aktif oldukları, öğretmenin onları düşünmeye, soru sormaya ve başkalarına saygı duymaya davet ettiği bir rehberlik anlayışını ortaya koymuşlardır. Bazı katılımcılar, çocuk merkezli yaklaşımı benimsiyor olduklarını düşünmelerine rağmen, sınıftaki ÇiF uygulamalarında, sınıf ortamında ne kadar baskın olduklarını, çocukların düşüncelerine müdahalede bulunduklarını fark ettiklerini dile getirmiştir. ÇİF'in okul öncesi eğitiminde kullanımının da, bu öğretmen egemen ortamı dönüştürebileceğini düşünmüşlerdir. Konuyla ilgili olarak, 10 haftalık ÇiF uygulamaları sırasında, katılımcılar, başlangıçta kolaylaştırıcı olan araştırmacının soruların doğru cevabını vermesini ve tartışmalara müdahale etmesini beklerken, on haftalık uygulamaların son oturumlarına doğru bu beklentileri terk etmişlerdir. Bu bulgular, öğretmenlerin, ÇiF ile birlikte, öğrenciler üzerinde daha az hakimiyet kurduklarını ve öğrencilerini daha fazla düşünmeye, soru sormaya teşvik ettiklerini tespit eden önceki çalışmaların

bulgularıyla tutarlıdır (Newell-Jones, 2012; O'Riordan, 2017; Scholl vd., 2016; Siddiqui vd., 2015).

Ayrıca, katılımcılar, ÇiF kullanımının, ‘çocuk’ algılarını etkileyeceğini düşünmüşlerdir. Çocukların yetersiz ve tam olgunlaşmamış olarak görülebileceklerini, ancak bu algının ÇiF ile, yapabilen, düşünebilen bir çocuğa dönüşebileceğini ifade etmişlerdir. Görüşlerine paralel olarak da, ÇiF deneyimi öncesi, çocuk ile felsefeyi ilişkilendiremeyen bazı okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin, ÇiF deneyiminden sonra, çocukların felsefe ile güçlü bir şekilde ilişkili olduğunu savunduğu görülmüştür. Buradan, ÇiF deneyiminin, onlara ‘yeni’ çocuk algıları kazanmalarında katkıda bulunduğu söylenebilir. Bu yeni algıda, çocuklar, davranış ve düşünme konusunda, öğretmenlerinin onları sandığından daha ‘olgun’ davranmışlardır. Alanyazındaki çalışmalar da, ÇiF’in, öğretmenleri, beklediklerinden daha yüksek potansiyele sahip, farklı bir 'çocuk' anlayışını kabul etmeye yönlendirdiğine ve ayrıca öğretmenlerin yerleşik düşünce kalıplarını yeniden yapılandırarak, mevcut pedagojilerinin eleştirel olarak evrimini desteklediğine dikkat çekmektedir (Akkocaoğlu Çayır, 2016; Demissie, 2015; Haynes ve Murris, 2011; Scholl, 2014; Topping ve Trickey, 2007).

Bir diğer bulgu da, katılımcıların ÇiF’in eğitim alanında kullanılmasıyla birlikte, öğrencilerini daha iyi tanıyacaklarını düşünmüş olmalarıdır. ÇiF, çocukların kendilerini ifade etmelerine daha fazla alan açtığı için, çocukların bir konuda ne düşündüğünü, hissettiğini, ilgilendiği şeyleri ve neye ihtiyaç duyduklarını bilmelerine yardımcı olabileceğini belirtmişlerdir. Bununla birlikte, alanyazındaki bazı çalışmalarla da uyumlu olarak (Roberts, 2006; Scholl vd., 2016), kendi sınıf uygulamaları sırasında da, yaklaşımın bu etkisini deneyimlediklerini ifade etmişlerdir.

Katılımcılar, ÇiF’in öğretmenler üzerindeki mesleki etkilerinin yanı sıra, yaşamlarını, kişisel olarak da etkileyeceğini düşünmüşlerdir. Bu bağlamda, ÇiF’le birlikte, kendi düşünme ve dinleme becerilerinin de gelişeceğini dile getirmişlerdir. Alanyazındaki diğer çalışmalarla uyumlu olarak (Green ve Condy, 2016; Mergler vd., 2009; Scholl, 2014), katılımcılar, ÇiF yaklaşımını eğitim ortamlarında

kullanmaları durumunda, fikirleri hemen kabul etmeden ve reddetmeden önce, üzerine daha çok düşünmeye ve problemlere farklı açılardan bakarak daha rahat çözmeye başlayabileceklerini söylemişlerdir. Ayrıca, ÇiF sayesinde öz farkındalıklarının da artacağını düşünmüşler ve ÇiF'in, öğretmenleri, düşündüklerinin, hissettiklerinin ve yaptıklarının farkında olmaya davet eden bir yaklaşım olduğunu belirtmişlerdir (Mergler vd., 2009). Bunun yanında, katılımcılar, Roberts'ın (2006), ÇiF'in öğretmenleri kişisel ilişkilerinde daha fazla dinlemeye yönelttiğini ortaya koyan çalışmasına uygun olarak, öğretmenlerin kişiler arasındaki ilişkilerinde de hoşgörülerinin artması ve karşılarındakini daha çok dinlemeye başlamaları açısından ÇiF'ten etkilenebileceklerini dile getirmişlerdir.

2.4 Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Çocuklarla Felsefe Yaklaşımının Okul Öncesi Eğitim Ortamında Kullanılmasının Öğrenci ve Öğretmen Arasındaki İlişki Üzerindeki Etkileriyle İlgili Görüşleri

Katılımcılar, ÇiF'in kullanıldığı sınıflarda, öğretmen ve öğrenciler arasında diyalog temelli bir ilişkinin geliştirileceğini düşündüklerini ifade etmişlerdir. Bu diyalog temelli ilişkide, konuşanın daha çok öğretmen olduğu geleneksel eğitimdeki 'çocuk' ve 'öğretmen' algılarının da farklılaşacağını vurgulamışlardır. Aralarındaki bir meselenin, yalnızca öğretmenin kendisiyle değil de, öğretmen ve öğrencinin karşılıklı diyaloğu yoluyla tartışılıp değerlendirileceğini ifade etmişlerdir. Bu bulgu, ÇiF'in hem öğretmenin hem de öğrencinin birbirini saygıyla dinleyip, konuştuğu öğretmen-öğrenci diyaloğunun miktarını ve niteliğini arttırdığını gösteren diğer çalışmalarla tutarlıdır (Dougherty, 2017; Lyle, 2018; Topping ve Trickey, 2007).

Katılımcılar, ayrıca, ÇiF'in sınıf ortamında kullanılmasıyla öğretmen öğrenci arasındaki ilişkinin güvenli bir ilişkiye dönüşeceğini düşünmüşlerdir. Alanyazınla uyumlu olarak (Kovalainen vd., 2001; Splitter, 2014; Green ve Condy, 2016), ÇiF'in, sınıfta, herkesin düşüncesini çekinmeden ifade edebildiği, karşılıklı olarak güven veren, saygılı bir ilişki kurmalarını destekleyeceğini belirtmişlerdir.

Bunların yanında, katılımcılar, okul öncesi eğitiminde ÇiF'in kullanılmasıyla, sınıfın, öğretmen ve çocukların iş birliği ile yönetilebileceğini düşünmüşlerdir. ÇiF deneyimi

öncesinde bazı katılımcılar, O'Riordan'ın (2013) bulgusuna uygun olarak ÇiF'te, sınıf hakimiyetini kaybetme endişesini yaşayabileceklerini ifade ederken, ÇiF deneyimi sonrasında, sınıfın beraberce yönetilmesi doğrultusunda görüşlerini değiştirmişlerdir. Bu bulgu, sınıftaki sorunların bir otorite olarak öğretmen tarafından değil, sınıf topluluğundaki tüm üyeler tarafından görüşülüp, değerlendirildiğini gösteren önceki çalışmalarla uyumludur (Fisher, 2007; Freire ve Ramos, 1970; Haynes, 2014; Jenkins ve Lyle, 2010). Ayrıca, katılımcıların görüşündeki bu değişiklik, geleneksel eğitimde öğretmen ve öğrenci arasında kurulan hiyerarşinin, eğitimde ÇiF yaklaşımının kullanılması sonucu terk edilmesiyle de açıklanabilir (Haynes ve Murris, 2011). Bu yerleşik hiyerarşide öğretmen, çocuklar için öğrenmeyi kolaylaştırıcı değil, otoriter bir bilgi kaynağı iken; çocuklar öğretilenleri kabul etmekte ve öğretmenin doğru cevabı vermesini beklemektedir (Funston, 2017).

2.5 Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Çocuklarla Felsefe Yaklaşımının Okul Öncesi Eğitim Ortamında Kullanılmasının Önündeki Engellerle İlgili Görüşleri

Katılımcılar, kurumsal bir engel olarak, geleneksel eğitim sisteminin okul öncesi eğitiminde ÇiF'i kullanmak için bir engel oluşturabileceğini ifade etmişlerdir. Katılımcılara göre, geleneksel eğitim, çocukların merakını ve eleştirelliğini bastırdığı için, ÇiF geleneksel eğitim yapısına bir meydan okumadır. Bu bulgu, geleneksel eğitimin her şeyi bilen bir otoriteye bağlılık pedagojisine karşılık gelirken, ÇiF'te baskın olanın araştırma pedagojisi olması fikriyle tutarlıdır (Kizel, 2016). Katılımcılara göre, geleneksel eğitim yapısı, okul yöneticilerinin tutumunu da etkileyebilir ve böylece okul yönetimi, eğitim ortamlarında ÇiF kullanımını onaylamayabilir. Bu bulgu, Newell-Jones'un (2012), öğretmenlerin okul tarafından yeterince desteklenmemelerinin ve başka baskılara maruz kalmalarının ÇiF'i kullanmalarını etkileyebileceğini ortaya koyduğu çalışmasıyla desteklenmektedir. Ek olarak, kurumsal engeller kapsamında, bir katılımcı, alanyazınla uyumlu olarak (Haynes; 2011; Millet ve Tapper, 2012), yetersiz öğretmen eğitiminde yaşanacak eksikliklerin ÇiF'in doğru kullanımını engelleyebileceğine işaret etmiştir.

Bunların yanı sıra, katılımcılar, sosyo-kültürel olarak, toplumdaki ‘çocuk’ ve ‘felsefe’ algılarının, ÇiF’in okul öncesi eğitim ortamında kullanımına engel oluşturabileceğini düşünmüşlerdir. Felsefenin kafa karıştırıcı olabilecek rahatsız edici sorular sorduğunu ve bu kafa karışıklığının toplum için yıkıcı bir faaliyet olarak algılanabileceğini ifade etmişlerdir. Bu nedenle, toplumda felsefenin zaman kaybı olarak önemsizleştirilebileceğini veya din düşmanı olarak sunularak şeytanlaştırılabileceğini dile getirmişlerdir. Bu bulguyla paralel olarak, Haynes (2011) ve Farahani (2014) de, toplumun güvenilirliğinin ve değerlerinin eleştirilmesinden hoşlanmadığı durumlarda, toplumun üyelerinin de felsefeye ve Çocuklarla Felsefeye karşı olacağına dikkat çekmektedir. Çalışmanın son bulgusu da, katılımcıların, toplumdaki, felsefe yapmaya aklı yetmeyen “çocuk” algısının okul öncesi eğitiminde ÇiF’in kullanılmasının önünde bir engel oluşturacağını düşünmüş olmasıdır. Bu bulgu ise, Maxwell'in (2005) ÇiF’in eğitimde kullanılmasının önündeki başlıca engel olduğunu ifade ettiği, ‘‘toplumda bakıma ve yönlendirilmeye ihtiyacı olan savunmasız üye’’ olarak kabul edilen çocuk algısıyla desteklenmektedir (Andal, 2020).

Böylelikle, bu çalışma, okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin Çocuklarla Felsefe hakkındaki görüşlerinin daha iyi anlaşılmasını ve araştırmacıların, Çocuklarla Felsefe, okul öncesi eğitimde Çocuklarla Felsefe ve öğretmen eğitimi üzerine daha fazla araştırma yapmalarını sağlayabilir. Bununla beraber, Türkiye’de, politika belirleyicilerin Çocuklarla Felsefe yaklaşımını takip edecek şekilde okul öncesi müfredatını ve yaklaşımın felsefi boyutunun da içeriğe dâhil edildiği kapsamlı bir öğretmen eğitimini düzenlemelerini, böylece okul öncesi dönemdeki çocukların ve öğretmenlerin ÇiF’in kazanımlarından yaygın olarak faydalanabilmelerini sağlamak için bir temel oluşturabilir. Her şeyden önce, bu çalışma, politika belirleyicileri, okul öncesi eğitim alanında çalışan öğretmen ve araştırmacıları ve genel olarak çocuk ve eğitim ile yolları kesişen tüm alanlarda çalışanları, çocuk, felsefe, öğretmen ve eğitim kavramları üzerine yeniden düşünmeye çağırabilir.

F. TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

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 ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı/ Surname : KOYUNCU

Adı / Name : Emine Deniz

Bölümü / Department : Okul Öncesi Öğretmenliği

TEZİN ADI/ TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English) : Investigating the Views of Preschool Teachers regarding Philosophy with Children through PwC Experience

TEZİN TÜRÜ/ DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans**/ Master ■ **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır.** /Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ■
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years. *** ☐
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. ***** ☐

*****_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……