Analysis of Preschool Teachers' Views on Out of School Learning Activities

Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Okul Dışı Öğrenme Faaliyetlerine Yönelik Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Cumhur GÜNGÖR ID[1], Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Cennet GÖLOĞLU DEMİR ID[2]

Abstract

Phenomenology, one of the qualitative research designs, was used in this study, which aims to examine how preschool teachers perceive out-of-school learning activities. Participants in the study were determined using an easily accessible sampling method. In this context, research was carried out with 19 pre-school teachers in a city that the researcher can easily reach. Research data were collected using a semi-structured interview form. The data were analyzed using the content analysis technique, using Excel and Word programs. As a result, within the framework of the opinions of preschool teachers participating in the study; OSLA's (out-of-school learning activities) predominantly include learning (permanent learning, indoor and outdoor learning, learning reinforcement, and experience), child contribution (skill development and obtaining educational program outcomes) and environment (institutions/ organizations, garden-greenhouse, theater / cinema and nature). According to the teachers, the main problems in terms of the execution of OSLA and the problems encountered in the process; security and control of children, parents' anxiety and unwillingness, the cost of the activity, the incompatibility of the curriculum, bureaucratic procedures and communication difficulties with children. Teachers' opinions about the competence of OSLA; shows that they did not receive in-service training or insufficient in-service training. In addition, it is understood that teachers have a positive perception of competence in terms of good research, preparation, and planning, benefiting from relevant guides and coping with difficult conditions. On the other hand, it is seen that they have a negative perception of efficacy in ensuring child safety and having difficulty coping with children.

Keywords: Out-of-school learning, preschool, informal learning, preschool teachers, phenomenology

Paper Type: Research

Öz

Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin okul dışı öğrenme faaliyetlerini nasıl algıladıklarını incelemeyi amaçlayan bu araştırmada nitel araştırma desenlerinde biri olan olgubilim (fenomenoloji) kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada katılımcılar kolay ulaşılabilir örnekleme yöntemiyle belirlenmiştir. Bu kapsamda bir ilde araştırmacının kolay bir şekilde ulaşabildiği 19 okul öncesi öğretmeni ile araştırma gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma verileri yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme formu ile toplanmıştır. Veriler içerik analizi tekniğiyle, Excel ve Word programlarından yararlanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Sonuç olarak, araştırmaya katılan okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin görüşleri çerçevesinde; ODÖF'ün (okul dışı öğrenme faaliyetleri) öğretmenler için ağırlıklı olarak öğrenme (kalıcı öğrenme, kapalı ve açık alanlarda gerçekleştirilen öğrenme, öğrenmeyi pekiştirme ve deneyim), çocuğa katkı sağlama (beceri geliştirme ve öğretim program kazanımlarını elde etme) ve ortam (kurum/kuruluşlar, bahçe-sera, tiyatro/sinema ve doğa) anlamlarına geldiği görülmektedir. ODÖF'ün yürütülmesi ve süreçte karşılaşılan sorunlar anlamında öğretmenlere göre başlıca sorunların; çocukların güvenlik ve kontrolü, veli kaygısı ve isteksizliği, faaliyetin maliyeti, öğretim programının tam olarak uygun olmaması, bürokratik prosedürler ve çocuklarla yaşanan iletişim güçlüğü olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Öğretmenlerin ODÖF açısından yeterlilikleri hakkındaki görüşleri; konuyla ilgili

---
[1] Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sandıklı Uygulamalı Bilimler Yüksekokulu, cgungor@aku.edu.tr
[2] Bandırma Onyedi Eylül Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, cdemir@bandirma.edu.tr

hizmetiçi eğitim almadıklarını ya da yetersiz hizmet içi eğitim aldıklarını ortaya koymaktadır. Ayrıca öğretmenlerin, ODÖF ile ilgili iyi araştırma, ön hazırlık ve plan yapabilmeleri, ilgili kılavuzlardan yararlanabilme ve zor koşullarla baş edebilmeleri konusunda olumlu yeterlik algısına sahip oldukları anlaşılmaktadır. Diğer taraftan, çocuk güvenliğini sağlama ve çocuklarla baş etmekte zorlanma konusunda olumsuz yeterlik algısına sahip oldukları görülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okul dışı öğrenme, okul öncesi, informal öğrenme, okul öncesi öğretmenleri, fenomonoloji

Makale Türü: Araştırma

Introduction

Social, economic, technologic and cultural developments deeply affect the social structure, and education as a social institution has its share of this change. One of these changes is that education is no longer limited to the classroom and school environment. Recent research now confirms the economic, academic and social importance of high-quality early childhood education (Aysan & Özdoğru, 2015). At the same time, numerous studies show that an outdoor learning and play environment with various natural elements advances and enriches all areas related to the development, health and well-being of young children (Kuo, Barnes & Jordan, 2019; Andrachuk et al., 2014). In this context, the Ministry of Education in Turkey (MoNE) to two points in the 2023 Vision for Education in Primary Education Subject related with OSLA serves in the following ways: a. "Cooperation with schools, science centers, museums, art centers, technoparks and universities in their regions will be increased." b. "Natural, historical and cultural places and out-of-school learning environments such as science-art centers and museums will be used more effectively in line with the gains in education / training programs." (MEB, 2019) In addition, MoNE; states that places such as museums, science centers, art centers, historical and cultural sites, libraries, natural sites and archaeological sites, industrial establishments and universities that are open to visit should be associated with preschool, primary and secondary education / training programs for OSLA.

MEB encourages students to discover the out-of-school learning environment, in line with the subjects and acquisitions within the scope of education / training programs, the production, culture, art and geographical capacity of their regions; to recognize plant and animal species, their local characteristics, game and folklore; It has defined the places where education and training activities are carried out (MEB, 2019) in order to enable them to learn by doing and experiencing as integrated or extracurricular activities. According to Gerber, Marek, and Cavallo (2001), out-of-school learning and educational activities include all activities aimed at learning outside of the classroom / school, accompanied by a guide or teacher. Out-of-school education is defined as an instructional strategy or method that is used effectively for children to specialize in the acquisitions in the curriculum, which includes activities that are impossible or difficult to do in the classroom. Out-of-school education; covers learning processes that involve educational activities in nature and the living environment. It is a less structured education, more spontaneous, and where surprise elements can develop depending on the situation (Ocak & Korkmaz, 2018).

Today, education systems have to be shaped to respond to the rapidly changing information and human capital demands of society. Innovations in curricula, methods, materials and technologies require changes in regulation and planning in educational environments of educational institutions (Günkör, 2017). Along with the developments in the field of education, there are important developments in learning and teaching methods and techniques. These activities are no longer limited to the inside of the school and the classroom, but the idea that they can benefit from all kinds of out-of-school learning environments that may be beneficial has come to the fore. In this context, learning environments considered primarily as school and classroom were expanded to include out-of-school environments. Out-of-school learning environment concept; covers many areas from various living spaces outside the school

boundaries to virtual environments (Eshach, 2007; Saltürk & Güngör 2019). The basic foundation and development of out-of-school learning go back to ancient times. First age thinkers starting from Aristotle, enlightenment age thinkers, humanism age thinkers and come up to the present day. Names such as Pestalozzi (Landerziehungsheime, country boarding schools), John Dewey, and Ivan Illich (deschooling society), which we can call the name fathers of modern education, saw out-of-school learning as extremely convenient. Contemporary educational approaches such as progressivism, constructivism, pragmatism, existentialism, which are the basis of Dewey's views, also support out-of-school learning.

Learning is a concept that philosophers and scientists have defined and tried to explain in different ways since ancient times. Today, almost all of psychologists and educators define learning as "a life product, behavior change with permanent traces". According to many scientists, learning is a social process, change must be relatively continuous for learning to be an outcome. The most effective strategy in education; is thought to be an understanding of teaching where the child takes an active role in learning, learns by doing and experiences, associates the subjects he / she learns with his / her environment and establishes connections with his social life. One of the methods in which this understanding can be applied most effectively is the out-of-school learning methods, which have been brought to the agenda in recent years with definitions such as "Out-of-School Education, Out-of-Class Education, Nonformal Education, Informal Education" and advocating that the information should be received by contact with the outside world (Eshach, 2007).

Out-of-school learning is expressed with different definitions in the literature. In some sources, there are definitions such as out of class education, out of school education in English, out of class education, outdoor learning, out of school experiences, out of school opportunities (Göloğlu Demir & Yılmaz, 2018; Şimşek & Kaymakçı, 2015). It can be considered as a field that structures the learning process with the realities of the events and phenomena that take place in life by considering learning in a child-centered manner, and enables the individual to learn by living with primary resources. It is a learning adventure carried out with institutions and organizations on the axis of education and training process in other fields other than the school (Salmi, 1993). Out-of-school learning is a type of learning that enriches learning and teaching based on a planned, programmed curriculum, and provides a concrete permanent life for the learner and teacher.

There are many studies in the literature regarding out-of-school learning, educational activities, and places subject to out-of-school learning. First of all, about the places where OSLA takes place; museums, art and science centers and similar places (Sturm & Bogner, 2010; Aktekin, 2008), national parks (Güler, 2009), aquarium (Falk & Adelman, 2003), industrial and production facilities (Bozdoğan, Okur & Kasap, 2015), zoos (Yavuz, 2012), energy parks (Ertaş, Şen & Parmasızoğlu, 2011; Balkan Kıyıcı & Atabek Yiğit, 2010), botanical garden (Wiegand, Kubisch, & Heyne, 2013).

Out-of-school learning environments contribute to formal education (Gerber, Marek, & Cavallo, 2001), create ecological awareness (Berberoğlu & Uygun, 2013), gain experience in daily life and help to think in connection with real-life (Bozdoğan & Yalçın, 2006; Ertaş, Şen and Parmasızoğlu, 2011; Tatar & Bağrıyanık, 2012; Tortop & Özek, 2013), that it affects academic success at school (Bozdoğan, 2008; Şentürk & Özdemir, 2014; Yavuz, 2012; Sturm & Bogner, 2010), contributing to permanent learning by gaining observation skills. There are studies that show that it is found (Balkan Kıyıcı & Atabek Yiğit, 2010) and supports the cognitive and affective development of individuals (Berberoğlu & Uygun, 2013; Güler, 2011; Tatar & Bağrıyanık, 2012).

In addition, Öztürk (2019) evaluated the views of social science teachers, and January and Korkmaz (2018), science and pre-school teachers about learning out of school. Balkan Kicier and Atabek Yiğit (2010), Bozdoğan (2015), Güler (2009), Tatar and Bağrıyanık (2012)

included teachers and teacher candidates who participated in travel and nature activities in their studies, Davidson (2006), Güler (2011) and Hakverdi Can (2013) dealt with primary, secondary and high school students' perceptions of out-of-school learning environment. On the other hand, it is seen that there is no study examining how preschool teachers perceive the out-of-school learning activities and their actions on this issue. In this respect, it can be said that it would be beneficial to examine the opinions of teachers of pre-school students, which constitute the most important years of cognitive and social development, towards learning out of school.

The aim of this study is to examine how preschool teachers perceive out-of-school learning activities. In this context, the following questions will be answered;

- What are preschool teachers' perceptions of OSLA about its meaning?

- How are preschool teachers' perceptions about supporting OSLA and the problems encountered in the process?

- What are preschool teachers' perceptions of their competencies in OSLA?

- How are the preschool teachers' experiences for OSLA?

2. Materials, and Methods

In this study, which aims to examine how preschool teachers perceive out-of-school learning activities, phenomenology, one of the qualitative research designs, was used. Phenomenology is interpreted in terms of the experiences of individuals that we are always aware of but do not have an in-depth and detailed understanding and knowledge about (Şimşek & Yıldırım, 2018; Merriam, 2009, Creswell, 2013; Christensen, Johnson & Turner, 2015). Facts can appear in the form of experiences and perceptions in the world we live in (Şimşek & Yıldırım, 2018). Before the research, the authorization of the Sub-Committee of Ethics for Social Sciences in Afyon Kocatepe University was sought and granted (Decision: 18.12.2020/250).

2.1. Participants

Participants in the study were selected using an easily accessible sampling method. This method is based entirely on items that are available, fast and easy to access. It is the least requested but most frequently used sampling method in qualitative research (Patton, 2005). In this context, research was carried out with 19 pre-school teachers in a city that the researcher can easily reach. The characteristics of the participants are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of participants

Participant's Code	Gender	Age	Professional Experience	Number of Children
T1	F	32	10	26
T2	M	31	8	20
T3	F	32	10	20
T4	F	40	18	11
T5	F	48	30	13
T6	F	55	35	10
T7	F	43	23	23
T8	F	27	4	18
T9	F	39	12	15
T10	F	37	14	15
T11	F	48	15	18
T12	F	27	5	23
T13	F	41	13	21
T14	F	32	9	20
T15	F	31	9	16
T16	F	32	7	19
T17	F	48	19	20
T18	F	34	12	21
T19	F	34	9	24

According to Table 1, it is seen that only one of the participants is male and the others are female. 2018 - 2019 academic year is 5% of the men working teachers from pre-school educational institutions in Turkey, according to statistics. (http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/www/ icerik_goruntule.php?KNO=361). Two of the teachers are 27 years old, eight are in the 31-35 age range, three are in the age range of 36-40, two are in the age range of 41-45, and four are in the age range of 46 and above. 9 of the teachers have between 4-10 years of professional experience, seven of them between 10-20 years, and three of them have an education of 20 years or more.

2.2. Data Collection Tools

Research data were collected using a semi-structured interview form. The semi-structured interview is used when the questions are flexible, there is no predetermined word and order (Merriam, 2009). The opinions of two academicians and two teachers regarding the prepared questions were taken. One of the questions was removed because it was not completely suitable for the purpose of the research, and the other question was similar to another question. Necessary corrections were made in line with the comments received. Afterward, a pre-interview was made with two teachers. By including alternative and probe questions, the interviewer was helped to understand the questions when necessary (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2018). In this way, a total of five questions were included in the interview form. The responses of the participants to the questions were recorded for the teachers who gave permission, and the data were collected by the researchers in the interviews with the teachers who did not want to be recorded. On average, each teacher was interviewed for 10-15 minutes.

2.3. Data Analysis

In line with all the purposes of the research, the content analysis method, which consists of coding the data, finding categories, organizing and defining the data according to codes and categories, and interpreting the findings, and requiring "in-depth analysis of the collected data" (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2018) was used. While analyzing the data, all interviews and notes were written in detail first. Later, Microsoft Excel 2010 was created. While entering the codes, which interviewers belonged to and if the interviewer's words attracted attention, they were transferred to the program. Themes and sub-themes have been created in Excell. Finally, tables containing participant numbers and frequencies were created and the findings were transferred to the word document.

2.4. Credibility, Transferability and Consistency

Various strategies were followed to ensure the validity (credibility and transferability) and reliability (consistency) of the study (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2018). Participant confirmation has been used for credibility (internal validity). At the end of the interview, the data were summarized by the researcher and feedback was obtained from the interviewer about its accuracy. Detailed descriptions are included for transferability. For consistency, a meeting was held on raw data, codes and themes with two researchers who had previously used interview and content analysis methods. Codes and themes were examined until a consensus was reached.

3. Findings

In this section, the findings obtained as a result of the content analysis of the interviews conducted for the purpose of "Examining Preschool Teachers' Views on Learning Activities Out of School" are included.

Table 2. Meaning of OSLA for preschool teachers

Theme	Sub Theme	Codes	Participants	f
Meaning of OSLA	Learning	Permanent learning	T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T8, T12, T10, T13, T14, T17, T18, T19	14
		Indoor and outdoor learning	T1, T2, T3, T4, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10T12, T13, T16, T18	13
		Reinforcement of learning	T2, T6, T7, T8, T12, T13, T14, T16, T19	9
		Experience	T2, T6, T12, T13, T14, T15T17, T19	8
		It is life itself	T13, T17	2
		Active learning	T2, T15	2
		Social learning	T12	1
	Contributing to the children	Ability development	T1, T3, T5, T6, T7, T9, T10, T11, T12, T13, T14, T15, T17	13
		Getting the achievements in the curriculum	T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T12, T13, T14, T15, T16, T18, T19	12
		Increases the will to learn (curiosity stimulation)	T2, T17, T19	3
		It supports readiness.	T2, T12	2
		Increases physical activity.	T1, T12	2
	Environment	Institutions / Organizations	T2, T3, T4, T11, T12, T13, T14, T17, T19, T18	10
		Garden-Greenhouse	T1, T2, T3, T7, T9, T10, T12, T18, T19	9
		Theater / Cinema	T1, T2, T6, T8, T12, T13, T14, T17	9
		Nature	T6, T7, T9, T10, T12, T18, T19	7
		Vocational workshops	T2, T3, T6, T14, T19	5
		Park / Playgrounds	T1, T3, T7, T12, T16	5
		Museum and Historical Sites	T2, T3, T6, T7, T19	5
		Home	T1, T2, T15, T18	4
		Aquarium / Zoo / Animal Shelters	T8, T2, T17	3
		Science centers	T6, T7, T8	3
		Out of class	T10, T14, T16	3
		Art centers / galleries	T7, T13	2

In Table 2, there is the theme of *"The Meaning of OSLA",* which includes the opinions of preschool teachers about what OSLA means for them. Teachers' opinions are grouped under three sub-themes. These are respectively;

The first sub-theme is **"Learning"**. Teachers stated that OSLA is permanent learning (f = 14), as it provides rich educational stimuli, the realization of learning by doing, and enables children to learn by having fun. The views of the T14 coded teacher on this subject are as follows: "*Learning becomes more permanent when children see many things in nature or outside. This kind of learning is not forgotten ".* Teachers define OSLA as learning carried out in closed and open spaces (f = 13). In this regard, teacher numbered T10 states his views as "*It*

is done in open or closed places outside of school ... It is a much more effective learning environment". Nine of the teachers interpreted it as reinforcing what learned from a school outside of school. Eight of the teachers place emphasis on experience as they provide a rich and diverse environment experience. I can say that it is one of the most enjoyable activities for children. The views of teachers numbered T19 are as follows: *"... enables them to acquire experiences and memories as well as learning by having fun"* (T19). Teachers define OSLA as life itself (f = 2), Active Learning (f = 2) and Social learning (f = 1).

The second sub-theme is **"Contributing to the Child".** 13 of the teachers stated that OSLA developed children' skills by emphasizing the issues such as expressing themselves, gaining manual skills, developing social skills, observation and research skills. In this regard, teacher number T12 said, *"Visits to such areas increase children's observation skills and awareness. ... Children gain skills in daily life"* emphasizes skill development.

While 12 of the teachers stated that the achievements in the curriculum can be achieved with OSLA, three of the teachers stated that it increased the desire to learn by making children curious. In this regard, teacher number T12 said, *"I think it is also efficient in terms of arousing curiosity about new subjects.* "Finally, two of the teachers stated that they support readiness and increase physical activity.

In the third sub-theme, teachers took the OSLA **"Environment".** 10 of the teachers treated them as trips and visits to "institutions and organizations" such as hospitals, social service institutions, places of worship and libraries. Nine of the teachers consider garden-greenhouse activities as "theater / cinema". Teachers consider historical sites (f = 4) such as nature (f = 7), professional workshops (f = 5), parks / playgrounds (f = 4), museums and archaeological sites as OSLA environments. Emphasizing both the environment and the reinforcement of learning in OSLA, teacher number T7 said, *"Out-of-school areas; these are areas that will reinforce learning such as museums, parks, historical places, science-art centers."*

Table 3. Supporting OSLA and problems encountered

Theme	Sub Theme	Codes	Participants	f
Supporting OSLA and Problems Encountered	Problems	Security and control	T1, T2, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T12, T16, T17, T18, T19	12
		Parent anxiety and reluctance	T3, T4, T5, T8, T9, T10, T13, T17, T18	9
		Cost	T2, T3, T5, T6, T9, T11, T13, T19	8
		The curriculum is not fully appropriate	T7, T13, T14, T16, T18	5
		Bureaucratic procedures	T7, T13, T15, T17, T19	5
		Communication difficulties with children	T2, T12, T16, T17, T18	5
		Personnel shortage	T3, T13, T14, T18	4
		Environmental conditions	T9, T10, T16, T18	4
		The negative perspective and indifference of the school administration	T2, T4, T11, T13	4
		Child responsibility	T15, T17, T18	3
		Distraction of children	T2, T12	2
		Negative attitudes of staff at the place visited	T11	1
	Support	Support of the school administration	T1, T3, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T12, T14 T15, T16, T17, T18, T19	15
		Collegiality	T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T13 T14, T15, T16, T18	14
		Appropriateness of the curriculum	T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T15 T17, T19	14
		Helping staff in the environment visited	T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T13, T15	11
		Assistant staff and / or Trainee child	T5, T6, T12, T13, T15, T17, T19	7
		Child's parents	T3, T5, T6, T17, T19	5

Table 3 contains the theme of *"Supporting OSLA and the Problems Encountered".* There are two sub-themes under this theme: "Problems" and "Support".

Under the sub-theme of **"Problems",** it is seen that the most anxious issue for teachers is the safety and control of children (f = 12). The teacher with the coded T12 expresses the problem of control with the words *"Crowded classrooms make control difficult in such activities".* Financial problems such as parents' anxiety and unwillingness (f = 9) and expensive activity (f = 8) were frequently mentioned by teachers. Teacher number T4 expresses his parents' reluctance with the following words: *"... Parents are generally not willing due to situations that may cause danger".* Teacher number T5 expresses the financial problem with the words *"financially expensive for parents".* Six of the teachers see it as a problem that the curriculum is not fully appropriate (F = 5). Teacher number T16: *"It can become more suitable with a more flexible curriculum."* In his words, he emphasized that the curriculum should be stretched in order to carry out OSLA. Another problem that teachers emphasize is that bureaucratic procedures (f = 5) such as leave and approval procedures are compelling.

Under the **"Support"** sub-theme, teachers (f = 15), colleagues (f = 14), staff in the environment visited (f = 11) Assistant staff / Trainee child (f = 5)) and parents (f = 5) Setting the environment, supplying necessary materials and tools, safety and control of children, etc. states that it is supportive in matters. Teachers' views on this issue are as follows:

"… We get support from parents and intern students on trips. Our school counselor and school administration also support us." (T5)

"Our helpers and friends - colleagues - help us on the way and in the environment, we are in. Sometimes we get support from our parents" (T6)

While some of the teachers see the curriculum as restrictive under the theme of "problems", on the contrary, most of the teachers state that the curriculum (f = 13) is suitable for doing such activities. The opinions of the teachers numbered T3 and t15 on this subject are as follows:

"We can blend our own original plans with out-of-school learning activities and prepare integrated activities. Pre-school program is a very wide field in this regard." (T3)

"Our curriculum allows this –OSLA-. I think the job depends on the teacher's wishes and the parents' attitude towards leave." (T15)

Table 4. Teacher competence for OSLA

Theme	Sub Theme	Codes	Participants	f
Teacher Competence for OSLA	Getting training on OSLA	Not receiving in-service training	T2, T3, T4, T6, T7, T8, T9, T13, T14, T15, T16, T17, T18, T19	15
		Insufficient training in pre-service period	T7, T9, T10, T15, T18, T19	6
		Lack of training in pre-service period	T5, T6, T8, T16, T17	5
		Getting adequate training in pre-service period	T2, T3, T4, T13, T14	5
		Receiving in-service training	T1, T10, T11, T12	4
	Positive Perceptions of Competence	Research and use of OSLA environments guidelines	T1, T2, T3, T10, T5, T12, T14, T15, T16, T17, T18 , T19	12
		Good preparation / planning	T3, T10, T13, T14, T17	5
		Coping with difficult conditions	T1, T6, T11, T18	4
		Communication and guidance with children	T7, T8, T19	3
		Having a lot of experience	T18	1
		Taking initiative	T18	1
	Negative Competence Perception	Worrying about keeping children safe	T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T14, T15, T17, T18, T19	11
		Difficulty finding suitable environment	T1, T2, T5, T9, T10, T15, T16, T17, T18	9
		Difficulty coping with children	T14, T16, T18	3
		Inability to cope with unexpected situations	T19	1

In Table 4, the teachers' theme of ***"Teacher Competence for OSLA"*** is included. There are three sub-themes under this theme: "Getting training on OSLA", "Positive Competence Perceptions" and "Negative Competence Perception".

In the sub-theme of **"Getting Training on OSLA",** 15 of the teachers stated that they received in-service training, and 4 of them did not receive in-service training. While five of the teachers stated that they did not receive training in the pre-service period, six of them stated that they received insufficient education. Five of the teachers, who stated that they received adequate training in the pre-service period, stated that thanks to these training, education can be provided in all conditions, they understood the importance of social projects and activities and the importance of nature education. Teachers' views on the sub-theme of "getting training on OSLA" are as follows:

"… I was not trained. I gained experience over the years. " (T6)

"I received a seminar on museum education. It was a very efficient and instructive education." (T11)

"… It was very inadequate. Definitely, importance should be given to undergraduate education" (T10)

"Internship / practice lessons gained competence in learning out of school". (T13)

In the sub-theme of ***"Positive Perceptions of Competence"***, 12 of the teachers stated that it is an advantage to do research on OSLA and that the guides for OSLA environments prepared by the Directorates of National Education are guiding and helpful, so they benefit from these guides. Five of the teachers stated that they can make good preparation / planning. In this regard, teacher number T13 said, *"I do not have any difficulties in controlling the situation in out-of-school activities. There is no problem after making a plan before going, informing the children and preparing them for the event. I have not faced any trouble until now."* His words stated that he had no problems. Three of the teachers see communication with children as their strength. In this regard, teacher number T19 said, *"I can communicate well with children, my soft face helps me affect them more quickly ..."*. One of the teachers emphasizes that having a lot of experience and being able to take initiative is an important point in performing OSLA.

In the sub-theme of ***"Negative Competence Perceptions"*** 11 of the teachers stated that they were worried about ensuring the children' safety and they did not consider themselves fully competent in this regard. Teacher numbered T8, T9 and T10 express their concern about this issue with the following words:

"… I'm concerned about not making sure the children come and go safely." (T8)

"Preschool children are concerned about the risk of getting lost outside of school" (T10)

"I'm afraid of the disappearance of children" (T9)

Nine of the teachers stated that they had difficulty in finding a suitable environment. Three of the teachers stated that they had difficulty coping with children outside of school.

Table 5. Implementation stages of OSLA

Theme	Sub Theme	Codes	Participants	f
Implementation Stages of OSLA	Preparation	Researching the learning environment	T4, T5, T6, T7, T9, T10, T11, T13, T15, T16 T18, T19	12
		Informing children and parents	T7, T8, T9, T10, T12, T13, T14, T16, T17, T18 T19	11
		Permission procedures	T1, T2, T3, T5, T8, T12, T14, T16, T17, T18	10
		Providing the necessary tools	T2, T6, T7, T8, T9, T14, T17	7
		Making an event plan.	T3, T6, T13, T14, T15, T17	6
		Giving research assignments to children about the activity and environment.	T19	1
	Implementation	Museum visit	T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12 T18	11
		Institutions and organizations	T2, T3 T4, T11, T12, T13, T14, T17 T19, T18	10
		Nature and Garden	T1, T3, T5, T7, T9, T10, T11, T12, T15, T19	10
		Ensuring active participation of children	T3, T4, T5, T8, T12, T14, T15, T17, T19	9
		Ensuring group control	T1, T3, T5, T8, T11, T12, T13, T14, T15, T19	9
		Observing children	T3, T11, T12, T15, T18, T19	6
		Zoo / animal shelter was visited.	T9, T17 T17	3
		Historical places / ruins were visited.	T5, T9, T12	3
	Evaluation	Talking about the activity	T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T9, T11, T12, T14, T15, T17, T18, T19	13
		Drawing and displaying pictures	T1, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T15, T17, T18, T19	13
		Drama	T15, T17	2
		Photograph and video recording.	T12	1

The theme of ***"Implementation Stages of OSLA"*** is included in Table 5. There are three sub-themes under this theme: "preparation", "implementation" and "evaluation".

In the **"Preparation"** sub-theme, 12 of the teachers stated that they did research about the learning environment. Teacher number T5 said, *"I pre-examine the destination, in terms of suitability for children."* While expressing his words, teacher number T7 stated that they did learning environment research with the words "*I try to choose a learning area related to the subject*". 11 of the teachers stated that they informed the children and their parents, 10 of them

stated that they are continuing their leave procedures. Teacher numbered T8 explained the preparation process for ODÖF as "*I will inform the parents, I will get their permission petitions*". Teachers stated their views in the form of supplying necessary equipment (f = 7) and making an activity plan (f = 6) in the preparation process of CAF.

In the **"Implementation"** sub-theme, it is seen that the most preferred environments by teachers are institutions and organizations such as museums (f = 11), dental hospitals, libraries, police, recycling facility (f = 10) and nature and garden activities (f = 10). Teachers talked about this in their experiences as follows:

"*We went to visit the fire station in our city with my group of 24 children on the shuttle. The staff on duty put all the children in helmets and aprons, lit a small fire and tried to extinguish it with a hose. Children were also included in this. We got on the fire truck in groups and toured... I would like to do it over and over again*" (T14)

"*We did organic farming in the garden. The children prepared the garden for planting. He planted the fruits and vegetables they wanted. They observed the growth phase. They learned what plants need by experiencing. Later, when they ate, they understood better how important organic farming is.*" (T6)

Nine of the teachers state that they try to ensure the active participation of children and group control during the application. In this regard, teacher number T9 said, "*I give the children the papers with images of the place we will go. If we go to the museum, the papers with the images in the museum. Children mark what they see,*" and expresses how they ensure active participation of children. Teacher number T13 emphasizes group control with his words, "*The most obvious thing to pay attention to is the control of the number of children that will participate in the trip on the way to and from ... If you are going to go by car, it is important to get on the vehicle and safety, likewise to support the children on the landing*" (T13). Six of the teachers stated that they observed the children in terms of behavior and focusing on the activity during the application phase.

In the "**Evaluation**" phase, the method frequently used by teachers is to post (f = 13) and painting (f = 13) about the activity with children. In this regard, teacher number T6 stated how he evaluated the process with the words "*I want them to paint what they see... I have a conversation and explain what they see*" after the activity.

4. Conclusion and Discussion

Within the framework of the opinions of the preschool teachers participating in the research; The emphasis of OSLA is on learning (permanent learning, indoor and outdoor learning, reinforcement of learning and experience), contributing to children (skill development and obtaining educational program gains) and environment (institutions / organizations, garden-greenhouse, theater) / cinema and nature). Yeşilbursa (2008) stated there are learning that provides concrete life in a similar study, and Adıgüzel (2011) stated that learning by doing out-of-school learning is learning by living, and Akın (2012) in similar research emphasized that out-of-school learning activities provide active participation. In his similar research Karademir (2013) said that out-of-school learning is effective and permanent learning, and Zayimoğlu Öztürk (2014) stated that OSLA is learning by doing and experiencing. In addition, Martin (2004) stated that the activities carried out in museums are effective on children' learning and support classroom learning. In his oral history study, Avcı Akçalı (2012) concluded that the lesson taught in the classroom was free from boredom and provided richness in the learning environment, thus students were willing and actively participating in the learning process. In another similar study, Karademir reached the conclusion (2013) that as an alternative to classroom learning, out-of-school learning provides endless experiences in terms of socialization by contributing to the multidimensional development of students. In their study, Malkoç and Kaya (2015) also stated that the out-of-class school environments embody

knowledge, increase permanence, provide students with visualization opportunities, support the socialization of students who learn by doing and experience, and this is a contribution that cannot be ignored for social studies, a course that aims to socialize itself. They stated that it can be evaluated. In addition, Eshach (2007) stated that out-of-school learning environments are effective in increasing students' interest and motivation and becoming more willing to learn. Kelly (2000) stated in his study that teacher candidates thought that teaching in out-of-school learning environments attracted students' attention and increased motivation. In the study conducted by Ramey-Gassert (1997), it was stated that the characteristics of informal learning environments include increasing motivation, arousing curiosity and being fun.

According to the teachers, the main problems in terms of conducting OSLA and the problems encountered in the process; security and control of the children, parents' anxiety and unwillingness, the cost of the activity, the incompatibility of the curriculum, bureaucratic procedures and communication difficulties with the children. In their studies Egüz and Kesten (2012) stated that teachers could not give place to museum education, which is one of out-of-school learning, due to the length of bureaucratic procedures. In addition, the teachers stated the appropriateness of the school administration, their colleagues, the staff in the out-of-school environment visited and the curriculum as supporting factors during the OSLA process.

Teachers' opinions about the competence of OSLA It reveals that they either did not receive in-service training or insufficient in-service training. In addition, it is understood that teachers have a positive perception of competence in terms of good research, preparation and planning, benefiting from relevant guides and coping with difficult conditions. On the other hand, they state that they have a negative perception of efficacy in ensuring child safety and having difficulty coping with children. This situation is similar to the studies in the literature (Bozdoğan, 2015) that show that teachers do not have sufficient knowledge and equipment (Güler, 2009) and self-efficacy about the environments in which OSLA will be carried out and that they are concerned about this. In addition, it was stated that teachers' inability to guide before and during the trip to these environments (Thomas, 2010), and teachers saw the time, cost, responsibility and bureaucratic work as problems (Bozdoğan, 2008).

Regarding the application stages of OSLA, the teachers; During the preparation phase, it is understood that they mostly make researches about the environment, inform children and parents, take leave procedures, procure necessary equipment and make an activity plan. In the implementation phase of OSLA; It is observed that they mostly visit museums, social service institutions / organizations, nature and gardens, and observe children with active participation and group control. During the evaluation of OSLA, teachers; it is understood that they mostly talked with the children about the subject, had them drawn and exhibited. Türkmen (2016) stated that school gardens are ideal for outdoor learning starting at school. In their research, Malkoç and Kaya (2015) found that teachers mostly mentioned environments such as school gardens, libraries, sports halls, multi-purpose halls, corridors, laboratories and museums within the scope of outside school environments that can be used for education and training.

References

Adıgüzel, Ö. (2011). Okul dışında farklı bir öğrenme ortamı olarak çocuk müzeleri. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum*, *4*(14), 32-41.

Akın, F. (2012). *Okul içi ve okul dışı öğrenmelerin öğrenci başarısına etkisi.* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Burdur.

Aktekin, S. (2008). Müze uzmanlarının okulların eğitim amaçlı müze ziyaretlerine ilişkin görüşleri. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 9*(2), 103-111.

Andrachuk, H., Edgar, T., Eperjesi, P., Filler, C., Groves, J., Kaknevicius, J., Lahtinen, R., Mason, J., Molyneux, L., Morcom, L., Petrini, G., Piersol, L., Power, M., & Young, J.

(2014). *Forest and Nature School in Canada: A Head, Heart, Hands Approach to Outdoor Learning.* (R. Carruthers Den Hoed, Ed.).

Applications in EducationSaraç, H . (2017). Türkiye'de okul dışı öğrenme ortamlarına ilişkin yapılan araştırmalar: içerik analizi çalışması. *Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi, 3 (2), 60-81.* Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ekuad/issue/29425/337191

Avcı Akçalı, A. (2015). Kuram ve uygulamada sınıf dışı tarih öğretimi algısı: Öğretmen aday ve öğretmen görüşleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim 40*(181), 117-137.

Aysan, M.F. ve Özdoğru, A. A. (2015). Avrupa'da erken çocukluk bakımı ve eğitiminin mukayeseli analizi, *Sosyoloji Dergisi, 3. Dizi, 30. Sayı, 2015/1, 167-194.*

Balkan Kıyıcı, F., & Atabek Yiğit, E. (2010). Science education beyond the classroom: A field trip to wind power plant. *International Online Journal of Science Education, 28*(12), 1373-1388.

Berberoğlu, O. E., & Uygun S. (2013). "Sınıf dışı eğitimin dünyadaki ve Türkiye'deki gelişiminin incelenmesi". *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 9*(2), 32-42.

Bozdoğan, A.E. (2015). Okul Dışı Çevrelere Eğitim Amaçlı Gezi Düzenleyebilme Öz- yeterlik İnancı Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi. *Kuramsal Eğitim bilim Dergisi, 9*(1), 111-129.

Bozdoğan, A.E. (2015). Okul dışı çevrelere eğitim amaçlı gezi düzenleyebilme öz- yeterlik inancı ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Kuramsal Eğitim bilim Dergisi, 9*(1), 111-129.

Bozdoğan, A.E., Okur, A., & Kasap, G. (2015). Planlı bir alan gezisi için örnek uygulama: bir fabrika gezisi.

Carrier, S. J. (2009). The effects of outdoor science lessons with elementary school students on preservice teachers' self-efficacy. *Journal of Elementary Science Education, 21*(2),35-48.

Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B., ve Turner, L. A. (2015). Araştırma yöntemleri: desen ve analiz, (Çev. A. Alpay), Anı Yayıncılık, Ankara.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Araştırma deseni, (Çev. S.B. Demir), Eğiten Kitap. Ankara

Davidson, S. K. (2006). *Student perspectives on their school trips to zoos.* Unpublished dissertation. University of California, Davis, USA.

Egüz, Ş. & Kesten, A. (2012). Sosyal bilgiler dersinde müze ile eğitimin öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi: Samsun ili örneği. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,13*(1), 81-103

Ertaş, H., Şen, A. İ., & Parmaksızoğlu, A. (2011). Okul dışı bilimsel etkinliklerin 9. sınıf öğrencilerinin enerji konusunu günlük hayatla ilişkilendirme düzeyine etkisi. *Necatibey Eğitim Fakültesi Elektronik Fen ve Matematik Eğitimi Dergisi [EFMED], 5*(2), 178-198.

Eshach, H. (2007). Bridging in-school and out-of-school learning: formal, non-formal, and informal education. *Journal of Science Education and Technology,16, 171-190.*

Falk, J.H., & Adelman, L.M. (2003). Investigating the impact of prior knowledge and interest on aquarium visitor learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40*(2), 163-176.

Gerber, B.L., Marek, E.A., & Cavallo, A.M.L. (2001). Development of an informal learning opportunities assay. *International Journal of Science Education 23*(6), 569-583.

Göloğlu Demir, C. & Yılmaz, H. (2018). The effect of outdoor education activities on the attitudes of students toward science and technology and sentiment analysis. *Journal of the Human and Social Sciences Researches, 7* (5), 101-116. Retrieved from http://www.itobiad.com/issue/41845/483404.

Güler, T. (2009). Ekoloji temelli bir çevre eğitiminin öğretmenlerin çevre eğitimine karşı görüşlerine etkileri. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 34*, 146-151.

Günkör, C. (2017). Öğretim elemanlarının eğitim ortamına ilişkin algıları, *Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, Bahar, 2016; (13) ss.125-148.* ISSN:1308-5069.

Hakverdi Can, M. (2013). İlköğretim öğrencilerinin bilim merkezindeki deney setleri hakkındaki görüşleri ve öğrenme. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Özel Sayı* (1), 219-229.

Karademir, E. (2013). *Öğretmen ve öğretmen adaylarının fen ve teknoloji dersi kapsamında "okul dışı öğrenme etkinliklerini" gerçekleştirme amaçlarının planlanmış davranış teorisi yoluyla belirlenmesi.* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi), Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Kelly, J. (2000). Rethinking the elementary science methods course: a case for content, pedagogy, and informal science education. *International Journal of Science Education, 22 (7), 755-777.*

Kuo, M., Barnes, M. & Jordan, C. (2019). Do experiences with nature promote learning? converging evidence of a cause-and-effect relationship. Front. Psychol. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00305

Malkoç, S. & Kaya, E. (2015). Sosyal bilgiler öğretiminde sınıf dışı okul ortamlarının kullanılma durumları. *İlköğretim Online*, *14*(3), 1079-1095.

Martin, L. M. W. (2004). An emerging research framework for studying informal learning and schools. *Science Education, 88 (S1), 71-82.*

MEB (2019). Okul dışı öğrenme ortam kılavuzu.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research a guide to design and implementation revised and expanded from qualitative research and case study.* John Wiley & Sons

Ocak, İ. & Korkmaz, Ç. (2018). An examination of the views of science and pre-school teachers on non-formal learning environments. *International Journal of Field Education. 4 (1),18-38*

Öztürk, A. (2019). Okul dışı öğrenmeye ilişkin sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin görüşleri. Niğde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi. Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Türkçe Ve Sosyal Bilimler Anabilim Dalı. Sosyal Bilgiler Eğitimi Bilim Dalı. Yükse Lisans Tezi. Niğde.

Ramey-Gassert, L. (1997). Learning science beyond the classroom. *The Elementary School Journal, 97 (4), 433- 450.*

Salmi, H. (1993). Science centre education, motivation and learning in informal education. Helsinki: Faculty of Educationin the University of Helsinki.

Saltürk, A. & Güngör, C. (2019). Okul ikliminin sınıf ve okul büyüklüğü açısından incelenmesi, 2. Uluslararası İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı içinde (s.127-136) bildiri tam metin. ISBN 978-605-7828-10-1.

Şentürk, E., & Özdemir, Ö. F. (2014). The effect of science centres on students' attitudes towards science, *International Journal of Science Education, 4*(1), 1-24.

Şimşek, M. & Kaymakçı, S. (2015). *Okul dışı sosyal bilgiler öğretiminin amacı ve kapsamı.* A. Şimşek ve S. Kaymakçı (Ed.). Okul dışı sosyal bilgiler öğretimi içinde (s.1-14). Ankara: Pegem A yayıncılık.

Sturm, H., & Bogner, F. X. (2010). Learning at workstations in two different environments: A Museum and A Classroom. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 36*, 14-19.

Tatar, N., & Bağrıyanık, K. E. (2012). Fen ve teknoloji dersi öğretmenlerinin okul dışı eğitime yönelik görüşleri. *İlköğretim Online, 11(4), 883-896.*

Thomas, G. (2010) Facilitator, teacher, or leader? Managing conflicting roles in outdoor education. *Journal of Experiential Education, 32*(3), 239–254.

Tortop, H. S., & Özek, N. (2013). Proje tabanlı öğrenmede anlamlı alan gezisi; güneş enerjisi ve kullanım alanları konusu. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,44*, 300-307.

Türkmen, H. (2016). *Sınıf Dışında Öğrenme.* H. Türkmen, M., Sağlam, & E., Şahin Pekmez (Eds.) İlköğretimde eğlendiren ve anlamayı geliştiren fen öğretimi (ss. 95-126). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık

Wiegand, F., Kubisch, A., & Heyne, T. (2013). Out- of- school learning in the botanical garden: guided or self – determined learning at work stations? *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 39*, 161-168.

Yavuz, M. (2012). Fen eğitiminde hayvanat bahçelerinin kullanımının akademik başarı ve kaygıya etkisi ve öğretmen-öğrenci görüşleri. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Sakarya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.

Yeşilbursa, C.C. (2008). Sosyal bilgiler öğretiminde tarihi yerlerin kullanımı. *Türklük Bilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi, 23*(23), 209-222.

Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H.(2018). Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri, Seçkin Yayıncılık, Ankara.

Zayimoğlu Öztürk, F. (2014). Sosyal bilgiler dersinde arkeolojik kazı çalışması ve müze gezisi. *Araştırma Temelli Etkinlik Dergisi (ATED), 4*(1), 12-26.