Preschool Teachers' Evaluation of the Current Preschool Education Programme[1]

*

Mehmet Mart *

* Dr. Öğr. Gör., Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi, Meram/Konya
E-Mail: dr.mehmetmart@gmail.com   **ORCID:** 0000-0001-5055-9951

Abstract

This research aimed to identify teachers' knowledge on the preschool education programme as it is substantial for the programme development process (Göle and Temel, 2015). The checking teachers' practical approaches to programme regularly provide in depth information about the practicability of the programme. Therefore, this research focused on forty preschool teachers in a county of Osmaniye in order to determine teachers' knowledge on the programme. For this reason, two different methods were used to collect the data over a year gap so as to cross-check their responses, which are group interviews and survey as mixed method (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2011). As a result, the research shows that there are some conflicts to be solved in terms of practicability of the programme such as having a centralised programme, lack of information on programme and beliving in that they can achieve everything without reading the programme. Thereofore, an action list for future is suggested to be considered.

Keywords: *Preschool Education Programme, Teachers, Perceptions, Mixed Method, Teachers' Approaches*

---

[1] *Part of this paper was presented in ECER 2019, Hamburg, 2019*

Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Güncel Okul Öncesi Eğitim Programını Değerlendirmeleri

*

Öz

Bu araştırma program geliştirmenin önemli bir öğesi olarak (Göle and Temel, 2015) öğretmenlerin okul öncesi eğitim programı hakkındaki görüşlerini belirlemeyi hedeflemiştir. Öğretmenlerin uygulamaya yönelik yaklaşımlarının düzenli olarak kontrol edilmesi, programın kullanılılışlığı hakkında derinlemesine bilgi sağlar. Bundan dolayı, bu araştırma Osmaniye ilinin bir ilçesinde bulunan 40 okul öncesi öğretmeninin program hakkındaki bilgilerini belirlemeye odaklanmıştır. Bu sebepten, karma yöntemden grup görüşmesi ve anketten (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011) oluşan iki farklı yöntem bir yıllık ara ile öğretmen görüşlerini çapraz kontrol etmek için kullanılmıştır. Sonuç olarak, araştırma programın uygulanabilirliği açısından bazı çözülmesi gereken çelişkiler olduğunu göstermiştir. Örneğin, merkezi program olması, öğretmenlerin program hakkındaki yetersiz bilgisi ve kendilerin daha iyi uygulama yapacağına yönelik var olan inançları. Bunlardan dolayı, yapılacabilecekler birkaç madde ile öneri olarak sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Okulöncesi Eğitim Programı, Öğretmen, Algı, Karma Yöntem, Öğretmen Yaklaşımı*

Introduction

Programme development is an ongoing and an active process, so it needs to be revised regularly considering the needs in the field as well as checking how teachers respond the programme in order to understand the effectiveness of the developed programme. Therefore, programme developers state that research are the main focus for them during programme development process (Sarama and Clements, 2019). Field works provide a wide range of understanding on practice to criticise. Developing a new programme also cannot arise or be constituted as unsystematic (Şıvgın, 2005). There should be an evaluation and consideration of the contemporary theories and approaches, the needs of the society, the changing characteristic and needs of children and youth, the rapid change of science, and technology (Göle and Temel, 2015). Hence programme development process requires a systematic approach and a consideration of different variables like practical aspects and the conditions of education system. In relation to that, Uzun (2007) states that it is important to have sufficient information to address children's developmental conditions, needs, interest, environmental conditions and abilities as well as knowing about children's problem solving abilities, who are wherever they are in. This means that it is important to remember considering different aspects, which are directly related with the implementation of programmes. In particular, preschool education programmes provide a holistic approach to children's physical, cognitive, emotional, language and self-caring abilities as well as supporting and strengthen learning opportunities (Başaran and Ulubey, 2018). Teachers therefore are the main people considering the programme in order to achieve preschool education's aims with organising classroom properly and family attainment (Özsırkıntı, Akay, and Yılmaz Bolat, 2014). Özsırkıntı et al. (2014) also claim that the quality of programme is important to achieve these aims for teachers, as teachers follow a programme in their practice.

Over time, Turkey had different versions of preschool education programme, but the latest one was piloted in education term 2012-2013 with ten different cities as a revision of the previous programme (Özsırkıntı et al., 2014). Then, it has been launched in 2013 (Ministry of National Education, 2013). This programme is for children from 36 to 72 months, and which is evolved considering children's developmental conditions (Atlı, 2013).

The latest preschool education programme explains its aims as "this programme is developed to support children attending formal preschools, for their best level of healthy development, motor, social, emotional, language and cognitive development as well as self-caring abilities and increasing the readiness of primary school education via enriched learning opportunities" (Ministry of National Education, 2013, p.14). In light of these aims, the preschool education programme is based on children's developmental progress and basic needs (Atlı, 2013). In other respects, Şıvgın (2005) explains the current programme as embracing all range of activities that have been identified by Ministry of National Education (MoNE) and that are delivered by educational corporations as considering young children and their environments. "As it has aims to support children's developmental aspects fully, it is a balanced programme; and as it has primary aims to provide permanent learning and has based on scientific research, it is eclectic" (Başaran and Ulubey, 2018, p.4).

Although the programme is well-prepared, the implementation part plays a substantial role. This is because disqualified and lack of implementation of the programme is highly likely to endanger the aims of programme (Can Gül, 2009). As an example of this, Cömert had a study on the understanding of programme in 2003 about 2002's programme, and the research reveals that teachers had lack of information on the programme when it was done (Cömert, 2003). Therefore, it is always important to controlling teachers' awareness of programme and their practice regularly in order to remain the developing programme regarding the current situations. In this case, a research about the recent programme indicates that although teachers felt themselves as qualified enough to consider the programme, they were unable to implement because of inadequate size of classroom, high number of children, insufficient number of materials, outdoor areas as well as unfavourable parent approaches to activities and school managers' negative perspectives into preschool education (Pişgin Çivik, Ünüvar, and Soylu, 2015).

As previous research shows, teachers could have insufficient information on the programme and checking conditions regularly can reflect upcoming issues with the programme for the authorities as well as the programme development process. Therefore, this research has been designed to identify teachers' perspectives over a period. The following research questions were explained:

1. What does teachers think about the current Preschool Education Programme?
2. Do all teachers aware of the requirement of programme?
3. What are influencing aspects the practice of teachers?

Methodology

The aim of this study is to investigate the perceptions of the currently working teachers with a year gap follow up methods in order to identify whether there is a change in the participating teachers' perception to preschool education programme. Therefore, this is designed as a longitudinal and mixed method research.

Research Model

This research is based on descriptive research model that consisted of group interviews and a survey as a combination of qualitative and quantitative research, mixed model (Creswell, 2007). "Such studies look at individuals, groups, institutions, methods and materials in order to describe, compare, contrast, classify, analyse and interpret the entities and the events that constitute their various fields of inquiry" (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2007, p.205). In this model, researchers consider various viewpoints to gather data and analyse instead of focusing on only one aspect (Creswell, 2007). Therefore, the focus of this research is a group of preschool teachers and their perceptions of the current preschool education programme.

Study Group

As a strategy to choose sample group, the convenient sampling method was used to collect data because of working in a local district of MoNE. Convenient sampling is important for some research to organise groups or participants of research (Creswell, 2003) in terms of including all participants at the same time for the research purposes. As the researcher had a job in the local district of MoNE and had access to all teachers to invite for the research, convenient sampling was the only option to conduct with research. In this case, 92 currently working preschool teachers were invited to take

part in discussion groups and the survey, but only 40 of them attended the study voluntarily. All teachers in the town were invited to participate in the research by the support of the local district of MNE formally, and only 40 teachers responded invitation with a positive response in the first case to take part in the research. In the follow up survey, those 40 teachers were accessed, and they have completed the surveys voluntarily.

Data Collection Tools

As this research is based on mixed method, two different tools were used to collect data, which are group interviews and a survey. Group interview is "…interviewing different individuals at different times, the elements of group dynamics and of discussion among the participants are highlighted when a group discussion is conducted" (Flick, 2009, p.196). As using this data collection method, researcher can gather a depth information on the participating group' perspectives for the particular theme (Gall, Gall, and Borg, 2003). Considering the research topic (preschool education programme), participating individuals find a chance to analyse the designated topic in depth to enhance it (Flick, 2009). "It is also possible to detect how the participants support, influence, complement, agree and disagree with each other, and the relationships between them" (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 373). The key aspect of group interview is that the role of researcher is being a moderator or a facilitator instead of being a traditional interviewer role (Bell, 2005).

Another tool used for data collection is a survey. Survey "…is essentially fact-finding and descriptive – although the data collected are also often used to make *predictions*, for instance by comparing the results of similar surveys at different times…" (Oppenheim, 1992, p.12). The aim of surveys is to collect data on the conditions at the specific time with considering the natural aspects, or determining the regular situations that can be analysed in view of the fact that continuing circumstances to be affected by, or to be compared (Cohen et al., 2011). After one year of group interviews, there was a follow up survey for the participating teachers, which was adopted from Başaran and Ulubey's (2018) survey that is named as "*A Questionnaire to Evaluate the Preschool Education Programme*". This has five different catego-

ries from lowest to highest as "totally not covering, not covering, partly covering, mostly covering and totally covering" in terms of programme covering some aspects of preschool education. From this survey, only related items with group interview has been chosen for the research.

Above group interview and survey methods have been used to collect data from the participating teachers in order to describe what they think about the preschool education programme over a period as well as having a triangulation on the findings of each method.

Data Collection

One of the used mixed methods for the first part of the research, group interviews were conducted in 2018-2019 fall term while research being in the town personally. As the first part of the research, the conveniently sampled volunteered teachers were allocated to four groups as each group had ten teachers. During the organization of these groups, the participating teachers' working time, types of schools they work and distance to town centres were considered in order not to interrupt their teaching as well as arranging the most convenient time for them.

For the second part of the research and to evaluate the participating teachers perception over a period, Başaran and Ulubey's (2018) questionnaire converted into online questionnaire to collect data because of the researcher being in a different city. This questionnaire were sent to some key people in the town such as a person working in local district of Ministry of National Education and a leading teacher of whatsapp group for the all teachers in the town. Thus, all volunteered teachers have been accessed and they have completed the online survey on October 2019.

Data Analysis

Two different analysis programme and methods have been used to examine the mixed method research. The first part of collected data have been analysed via using Nvivo 11 software programme, which is used to transcribe the data and organize them as thematically. The qualitative data have been categorised as considering the key questions asked during the group inter-

views, and thematic analysis were met to interpret the data at large. "Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data" (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.79).

For the second part of the research, SPSS 21 software programme were used to analyse the questionnaire as a part of quantitative aspect of the research. The collected data via online tool imported into SPSS and analysed as arithmetic mean and standard deviation. Each question is explicated to percentage and frequency. However, as it is difficult to represent the whole data, the related data with qualitative part of research is represented under the findings section.

During the representation of the data, teachers have been named regarding the group discussion number. In other words, teachers from the first group discussion have been numbered from 1-10 like teacher 1, teacher 2 and so on. Teachers from the second group have been number from 11-20 like teacher 11, teacher 12 and so on. In this case, first group's teachers started with 1, second group's teachers started with 11, third group started with 21, and the fourth group started with 31. This numbering style for teachers makes the data understandable and meaningful to remember which teacher is from which group.

Ethics

The research has been granted by local Directorate of Ministry of National Education in southern Turkey, and all teachers were invited with formal invitation. Therefore, the attending teachers knew the situation and accepted the conditions as taking part in the research. The participating teachers were aware of the anonymity of information, and they have accepted the invitation willingly, so there is no ethical conflict.

Findings and Discussions

In this section of the paper, both qualitative and quantitative data are presented together because all data feed to and are related to each other. The representation of data starts with considering the data collection process. During the representation of the data, the main focus of each group is dis-

cussed, and the related data from survey is represented. In terms of findings, the overall approach to preschool education programme started with discussing the condition of the preschool education in Turkey in the first group interview and their responses to related survey question. The participating teachers emphasised the lack of information on consideration of various situations of the schools. Hence they implicated the inadequacy of information on preschool education's condition and it is difficult to consider the programme in depth. Teacher 3 in the first group said that

"The authorities try to make it compulsory and to move forward, but most of the time we are going one step back".

She briefly explains the approach of teachers to programme and preschool education. Another teacher, Teacher-4 in the first group claimed that

"The programme is pretty good because it gives us some flexibility. However, the conditions are so bad for us as being part of primary school or secondary school. If we were in an independent preschool, it would be much better for us [to consider programme]. In the current condition, no one checks what we are doing. The most important thing is to have an academic achievement [of children when they start the 1st grade]."

As a result, they stated as a common idea of the first group interview that

- *"We feel invisible as being part of bigger age group schools, and parents and the other people consider us as a carer rather a teacher."*

Table 1. Teachers' Response to Question about What Type Schools They Work

	Independent Kindergartens	Kindergartens attached to Primary Schools	Kindergartens attached to Secondary Schools	Implementation Kindergartens	Total
f	10	28	2	-	40
%	25	70	5	-	100

From the survey, Table 1 shows the responses about the question: what the type of schools the participating teachers work. 70% of them are working in kindergartens, which are part of primary schools, and 5% of them are working in kindergartens as part of secondary schools. Therefore, it is highly likely to occur problems as Mart, Alisinanoglu and Kesicioglu (2015) remark that kindergartens attached to primary or secondary schools, so they face with lack of opportunities like using the school yards. On the one

hand, this restricts the implementation of the preschool education programme although there are some expressions to use school facilities (Ministry of National Education, 2013). Göle and Temel (2015) on the other hand claim that even if teachers indicate positive attitude to quality of the programme, they are unlikely to consider this approach into the practice.

In the second interview group, the participants mainly mentioned about the changes of the programme comparing to previous one. Teacher 11 stated that

- *"They have changed the programme, but only words have been changed, the content is the same as the previous one. They have moved the words to different places in the programme, so it stayed same."*

While this teacher criticises the programme as having no difference between the previous one and the current one, later she added that

- *"When it was changed, I have read once. However, I cannot say the whole, it was more like skimming in order to see if there is a change."*

This teacher openly explains that they have failed to read when the programme has changed, but another participating teacher, Teacher 14 claims different supporting point what Teacher 11 said that

- *"We look through the books, they have sent us as an example of daily activities."*

She thinks that the supporting documents of the programme is enough for them to know about what to do and what they should do as considering the programme. Therefore, they have adverse feelings on the importance of checking the programme. This is because the documents, which are sent by MoNE to make programme more effective, led teachers to think that reading programme in-depth is unnecessary. Apart from these teachers, and parallel to first group's idea, another teacher, Teacher 15 states that

- "They are not for us. Either we don't have those facilities, or the managers do not let us do the similar activities. For example, the manager do not let us to go field trip during our formal education, he said that we could organise field trip out-of-school-time."

This teacher mentioned about the restriction on them during implementation of the programme. Similar to this example, survey had a question about whether programme includes outdoor activities.

Table 2. Teachers' Responses to the Question about Whether Programme Includes Outdoor Activities

	Fully uncovers	Mostly uncovers	Partly covers	Mostly covers	Fully covers	Total
f	3	3	16	9	9	40
%	7.5	7.5	40	22.5	22.5	100

As it can be seen from table 2, 15% of participants considered the programme as 'totally not covering' (%7.5) and 'not covering' (%7.5) to question on emphasis on applying outdoor activities although the programme has statements on importance of outdoor activities, and teachers are recommended to have activities outside as much as possible (see Ministry of National Education, 2013). Most of the teachers consider same circumstances differently, so this could be occurring because of different reasons such as not reading the programme properly. However, standard deviation of this question is already so low comparing to other questions, which is 1.83. There is balance within teachers on this question, so this could be resulting from what Teacher 15 said. The circumstances for them may led them not to focus on this part of the programme. In other respects, the research of Pişgin Çivik et al. (2015) shows that teachers feel themselves qualified enough to implement the programme, but they are unable to do it properly resulting from number of students, insufficient materials, insufficient guidance of programme, insufficient school gardens, parental aspects, insufficient outdoor areas etc. Another research exhibits that nearly half of teachers had a problem with controlling over children during outdoor and active activities, and they have negative feelings on children can get hurt themselves (Arslan and İlkay, 2015). In light of previous research and this research, teachers have some concerns on the conditions in terms of practical side of outdoor activities.

The third group had some considerable aspects to be indicated through all four groups. Firstly, they mentioned about what brought the new programme such as less workload for them, but the differences among schools

subject to this group interview as well. From this group, Teacher 21 remarked that

- *"The content has little bit changed, and some paperwork are no longer a problem. Besides this, the list of activities has declined. It gives us more flexibility now. Therefore, it is quite better for us now. However, there is a difference working in a kindergarten and independent preschool."*

This teacher mentioned about the changes in the programme, and he pointed out possible impacts of differences along the school types. This argument was supported by Teacher 23 that

- *"The biggest difference occurs regarding where you are working at. I am working at an independent preschool, and we have more options comparing to teachers working in kindergartens [attached to primary or secondary schools], so the consideration of programme may not be only reason for this [implementation problems]. We have opportunities to take children to field trip and use the benefits of the environment. We couldn't do this when we were working in kindergartens."*

Such examples from third group explains possible differences to do outdoor activities with regard to the type of worked schools. As this group is a combination of teachers working in independent kindergartens, there is a common idea that having opportunities to consider and to do outdoor activities comparing to teachers working in kindergartens attached to different types of schools. However, there is an ongoing debate on this issue and there are some approaches on this situation, which can be solved with a detailed course for teachers. Before the launch of the recent programme, Durmuşçelebi and Akkaya (2011) remarked in their research that it is valuable to provide in-sessional courses and seminar about the new programme in advance or at the very early days of its launch, and such in-sessional courses are needed to ensure some variables like considering teachers' concerns, desires, needs and expectations. Although this research published before the last programme, there is still some issues for teachers who are reluctant to access these opportunities themselves.

In light of the expressions of two teachers from group three, there are consensus on the considerable difference among the type of worked schools

for possessed opportunities to apply the programme. However, during the group interview, Teacher 25 unveiled that

- *"Honestly, I don't think that anybody considers the programme here. Everybody has their own way to conduct activities."*

Once he claimed this, he was supported by Teacher 21 that

- *"Sometimes, we don't check the programme for days because we do activities much richer than the programme."*

As considering these teachers statements, it is difficult to take into consideration what the participating teachers said about the programme. Parallel to this idea, Göle and Temel (2015) claimed in their research that there was no significant difference between teachers attended in-sessional courses and not attended in-sessional course for the programme, so this results from not having in-sessional courses in actual places and with practical examples. Another research on the current preschool education programme exhibits similar statements with the participating teachers that in-sessional courses are insufficient and there is no guidance support for teachers (Başaran & Ulubey, 2018). In the consideration of these two teachers and such research, there is requirement on in-sessional courses to support teachers regularly. To understand this issue, survey had a question as "have you attended any in-sessional course in the last three years?"

Table 3. Teachers' Responses to Question about Whether they Attended In-sessional Courses about the Programme in the Last Three Years

	Yes	No	Total
f	8	32	40
%	20	80	100

Table 3 shows that only 20% of the participating teachers attended in-sessional courses about the programme, but majority of teachers (80%) not. Regarding these cases, there is conflict between what they said in the group interview and survey. This reveals a question how the participating teachers believed in themselves that they can do richer activities without knowing it?

Köksal et al. (2016) state that there is a requirement for repetitive in-sessional courses, and then it can be understandable in depth. The problem with in-sessional courses could occur because of being for once, so it may fail to be effective on teachers' practices. However, the issues mentioned by the partic-

ipating teachers can be discussed whether in-sessional courses and supporting teachers can improve the practice and the attendance of teachers to courses. In this case, there are various issues as having limited in-sessional courses, and teachers may not be able attend the courses because of timing issues or workload. Although this situation, there were some quite different comments on the programme. During the discussion in group three, one of the participating teachers, Teacher 23 asserted that

- *"We look through the developmental process of children, then we decide ourselves the activities. We only use daily plan and programme to submit to the school manager and to the inspector. We are keen to support children's creativity, and we work more child centred. The programme is already open to do such things."*

This was supported by other teachers as mentioning about the flexibility of the programme. However, this means that their approaches are not related to the programme, they have self-confidence, which is beyond the importance of following a programme. Nevertheless, the points Teacher 23 mentioned is significant aspect to consider in the survey because of this idea being supported by other teachers in the group interview. Her point is to conduct more creative activities than programme required as focusing on flexibility.

Table 4. Teachers' Responses to Question about the Programme to support Children's Imagination, Creativity and Critical Thinking Abilities

	Fully uncovers	Mostly uncovers	Partly covers	Mostly covers	Fully covers	Total
f	-	5	17	17	1	40
%	-	12	42	42	3	100

However, from the survey, table 4 shows that most of the participating teachers (45%) thinks that programme provides opportunities for teachers to support children's imagination, creativity and critical thinking abilities. 42% of teachers also claims that the programme partially supports such activities, and 3% stated as 'fully covers'. On the one hand, the previous research mentions that while teachers believed in having sufficient knowledge on practicing the programme, they have failed to organise learning centres properly, and in addition to this, as they have attended the introductory education for the programme, they considered the context of the programme is insufficient

(Pişgin Çivik et al., 2015). On the other hand, although the programme has adequate information on activities as well as being flexible, teachers have some issues to address right activities (Köksal et al., 2016), but the child-centredness of the programme is used by teachers to support developmental abilities of children Dilek (2016). In the case of these contradictions, some problems for the programme can be mentioned by teachers, but there are chances to use flexibility and conduct various activities within their opportunities.

In the last of group interviews, the group four had different emphasis on the programme that they claimed the importance of in-sessional courses at the beginning of the group interview as being parallel to Table 3. In this case, as an example, Teacher 33 stated that

- *"I don't know if there is a huge difference with the previous one, but I feel myself insufficient in terms of the changes. We do have the programme on our desks, but we do only check the aims. That is all."*

This means that although they recognise the importance of the programme, they fail to appraise it properly. During this discussion, one of the participating teachers in fourth group interview, Teacher 31 asserted that "I have checked the programme 2 years ago." This situation needs to be discussed more, but later on the group interview; an answer occurred as Teacher 34 stated that

- *"I like the way the programme wants us to do, but we can't do them as we are working in kindergartens [attached to primary schools]. Besides this, we don't have enough information about the programme. No one trained us how to adapt this into our classrooms."*

Table 5. Teachers' Responses to Question about the Programme's Consideration of School and Environmental Facilities

	Fully uncovers	Mostly uncovers	Partly covers	Mostly covers	Fully covers	Total
f	1	5	17	15	2	40
%	2.5	12.5	42.5	37.5	5	100

This explanation is a key point in overall group interviews because of having limitation on the resources and lack of in-sessional courses with parallel to above discussion on in-sessional courses. Another teacher, Teacher 33 also stated that

- *"We can't put it into practice because of the limitation of classrooms as we are working in a village."*

The last quotation indicates the problems to conduct programme as requested, and the teacher implies teachers having facility issues in reference to where they work.

These examples and quotations from teachers exhibit the differences in school conditions, and as a result of these conditions, the problems with applying programme in schools. For example, teachers are unable to use school gardens as the programme requested because of having a common area with older age groups (Alisinanoglu, Kesicioglu, and Mart, 2013). There could rise such problems when programme is centrally developed and is required to be applied in every schools.

Table 5 represents a question from survey about programme's consideration of school and environmental facilities. Table 5 shows that 37.5% of participating teachers considers programme as 'mostly covering', but only 5% of them thinks as 'totally covering'. For this question, standard deviation is 5.35. As The standard deviation shows that there is a positive thinking about the programme in terms of consideration of both schools and environmental facilities. Although there are changes in the titles of activities (Dilek, 2016), teachers have problems with organising learning centres in the classroom because of limitation in the size of classroom and high number of students (Özsırkıntı et al., 2014).

The responses to this question are different than what teachers mentioned during group interviews as having lack of opportunities that is requirement by the programme. However, their responses had been changed through the time (from the group interviews to the survey).

Conclusions

This longitudinal research showed some apparent situations that authorities have to consider in near future because teachers have mixed feelings to programme and its implementation. The common idea is that the programme has insufficient information in terms of different conditions for teachers and school facilities. The participating teachers mentioned about issues with implementing the programme, but they have failed to read programme properly. In the group interviews, most of the participating teachers claimed

that they know the details of the programme, but later it was understood that they have not read the programme properly. As a result of these overall findings, it can be said that although the participating teachers have insufficient knowledge on programme, they can criticise it, but fail to implement it. Thus the working teachers are required to attend in-sessional courses (Durmuşçelebi and Akkaya, 2011) on the latest programme as well as informing them about the details of programme and its requirements. This is because the provided in-sessional courses could be seen as disqualified or unlikely to provide ongoing support for teacher (Başaran and Ulubey, 2018). As the programme is centralised, there is requirement to consider various circumstances for schools and teachers as well as providing courses for teachers.

Suggestions

Considering the above findings on the programme, the following actions can be considered to increase the impact of programme for teachers:

- Before programme launch, all working teachers can have in-sessional courses.
- After programme launch, there could an ongoing support people for teachers, so they can easily access the required help to conduct the programme properly.
- For the current situation, the controlling mechanism can be enhanced whether teachers apply the programme as it should be.

The implication of the programme considering the local context can be criticised as it is a centralised programme.

References

Alisinanoglu, F., Kesicioglu, O. S., and Mart, M. (2013). Evaluation of preschool children's development of geometric thought in the UK and Turkey according to Van Hiele Model. *International Journal of Education and Research, 1*(10), 1-10.

Arslan, S., and İlkay, N. (2015). Okulöncesi öğretim programına yönelik öğretmen görüşleri. *Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1*(1), 22-32.

Atlı, S. (2013). The pre-school education programmes implemented in the European Union countries and Turkey. *Journal of Educational Policy Analysis, 2*(2), 56-76.

Başaran, S., and Ulubey, Ö. (2018). 2013 Okul öncesi eğitim programının değerlendirilmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, 51*, 1-38. doi:10.30964/auebfd.417643

Bell, J. (2005). *Doing your research project: A guide for first-time researchers in education, health and social science.* (4th ed.), Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Can Gül, Ş. (2009). *Investigation of ealy childhood teachers' and student teachers' perceptions and behaviours about evaluation aspects of 2006 early childhood education programme.* Unpublished Master Thesis, Pamukkale University, Denizli.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). London: Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). Oxon: Routledge.

Cömert, S. (2003). *2002 yılı okulöncesi eğitim programı hakkında öğretmen görüşleri ve uygulamaları: Sakarya ili örneği.* Unpublished Master Thesis, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya. (148204)

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing Among five approaches*. London: SAGE.

Dilek, H. (2016). TC MEB 2013 okul öncesi eğitim programı ile 2006 programının karşılaştırılması. *Pegem Atıf İndeksi*, 585-604.

Durmuşçelebi, M., and Akkaya, D. (2011). Evaluating teachers' opinion according to 2006 preschool education programme:Kayseri Sample *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 31*(2), 255-272.

Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research* (4th ed.). London: SAGE.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., and Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). London: Allyn and Bacon.

Göle, M., and Temel, F. (2015). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin nitelikli bir okul öncesi eğitim programında bulunması gereken özelliklere ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 11*(3), 663-684.

Köksal, O., Balaban Dağal, A., and Duman, A. (2016). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin okul öncesi eğitim programı hakkındaki görüşlerinin belirlenmesi. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies, 46*, 379-394.

Mart, M., Alisinanoğlu, F., and Kesicioğlu, O. S. (2015). An investigation of preschool teachers use of school gardens in Turkey. *The Journal of International Social Research, 8*(38), 721-727.

Ministry of National Education. (2013). *Preschool education programme.* Retrieved 23 April 2014 http://tegm.meb.gov.tr/dosya/okuloncesi/ooproram.pdf

Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.

Özsırkıntı, D., Akay, C., and Yılmaz Bolat, E. (2014). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin okul öncesi eğitim programı hakkındaki görüşleri: Adana ili örneği. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 15*(1), 313-331.

Pişgin Çivik, S., Ünüvar, P. and Soylu, B. (2015). Pre-school Education Teacher's Opinion about the Implementation of 2013 Pre-school Education Program. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences, 174*, 693-698.

Sarama, J., and Clements, D. H. (2019). From cognition to curriculum to scale. In D. C. Geary, D. B. Berch, and K. Mann Koepke (Eds.), *Cognitive Foundations for Improving Mathematical Learning* (Vol. 5, p. 143-173). Denver: Academic Press.

Şıvgın, N. (2005). *Teachers perceptions to educational programmes applied in early years settings: Denizli Sample.* Unpublished Master Thesis, Pamukkale University, Denizli.

Uzun, H. (2007). *The Evaluation of Teachers' Opinions About the Application of Preschool Education Curriculum in Malatya (a research on Kindergarten).* Unpublished Master Thesis, İnönü University, Malatya.