DOI:10.34056/aujef.1298427

Öğretmenlerin Benimsedikleri Eğitim Felsefeleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma: Eskişehir İli Örneği

A Study on Educational Philosophies Adopted by Teachers: The Case of Eskişehir

İnci Zeynep ÖZONAY BÖCÜK[1] / Turan Akman ERKILIÇ[2]

Article Type[3]**:** Research Article

Application Date: 18.05.2023 **Accepted Date:** 24.07.2023

To Cite This Article: Özonay Böcük, İ. Z. & Erkılıç, T. A. (2023). A study on educational philosophies adopted by teachers: the case of Eskişehir. *Anadolu University Journal of Education Faculty (AUJEF), 7*(3), 657-678.

ÖZ: Bu çalışmada, Eskişehir il sınırları içerisinde görev yapan öğretmenlerin benimsedikleri eğitim felsefelerinin cinsiyet, branş, okul türü ve hizmet süresi değişkenleri temelinde belirlenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Bu araştırma nicel bir araştırma olup tarama modeli kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma verileri 2020-2021 eğitim öğretim yılında toplam 492 öğretmene ulaşılarak elde edilmiştir. Veri toplama aracı olarak Kumral (2014) tarafından geliştirilen Eğitsel Düşünce ve Uygulamalar ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Veriler; betimleyici istatistikler, bağımsız örneklem için t testi, bağımlı örneklemler için t testi ve tek yönlü varyans analizi (ANOVA) ile çözümlenmiştir. Araştırmada öğretmenlerin çağdaş eğitim felsefesine daha yakın oldukları tespit edilmiştir. Cinsiyet değişkenine göre yapılan değerlendirmelerde, öğretmenlerin geleneksel eğitim felsefesi puanlarının anlamlı olarak farklılaştığı (p=.008), çağdaş eğitim felsefesi puanlarının ise farklılaşmadığı görülmektedir (p=1.151). Branş değişkenine göre, öğretmenlerin hem geleneksel (p=.070) hem de çağdaş eğitim felsefesinden (p=.436) aldıkları puanların istatistiksel olarak farklılaşmadığı görülmektedir. Okul türü değişkenine göre ise öğretmenlerin geleneksel eğitim felsefesi puanlarında anlamlı bir farkın olduğu (p=.030), çağdaş eğitim felsefesi puanlarında ise anlamlı bir farkın olmadığı belirlenmiştir (p=.424). Hizmet süresi değişkenine göre değerlendirildiğinde ise, öğretmenlerin geleneksel eğitim felsefesi puanlarında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farkın olduğu (p=.014), çağdaş eğitim felsefesi puanlarında ise anlamlı bir farkın olmadığı tespit edilmiştir (p=.061).

Anahtar sözcükler: Geleneksel eğitim felsefesi, çağdaş eğitim felsefesi, öğretmenler, öğretmen görüşleri

[1] Asst. Prof., Anadolu University Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, incizo@anadolu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5312-3130 (Corresponding author)

[2] Prof. Dr., Anadolu University Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, terkilic@anadolu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-2507-2663

[3] Ethics committee approval: 26513, 03.03.2021

ABSTRACT: In this study, it is aimed to determine the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers working within the borders of Eskişehir on the basis of gender, branch, school type, and teaching experience. This study was carried out using the survey model, one of the quantitative research methods. Research data were obtained by reaching a total of 492 teachers in the 2020-2021 academic year. Scale of Educational Thought and Applications (ETA) developed by Kumral (2014) was used as the data collection tool. Data were analyzed through descriptive statistics, independent samples t test, paired samples t test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Results revealed that the teachers were closer to the contemporary educational philosophy. In the evaluations made according to the gender variable, it is seen that the traditional educational philosophy scores of the teachers differed significantly (p=.008), while the contemporary educational philosophy scores did not differ (p=1.151). According to the branch variable, it is seen that the scores of the teachers from both traditional (p=.070) and contemporary educational philosophy (p=.436) do not differ statistically. According to the school type variable, it was determined that there was a significant difference in teachers' traditional educational philosophy scores (p=.030), while there was no significant difference in contemporary educational philosophy scores (p=.424). When evaluated according to the teaching experience variable, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference in the traditional educational philosophy scores of the teachers (p=.014), while there was no significant difference in the contemporary educational philosophy scores (p=.061).

Keywords: Traditional educational philosophy, contemporary educational philosophy, teachers, teacher views

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most important variables that determine the quality of education is the quality of teachers. In addition to teachers' field knowledge, professional knowledge and skills, their perspectives on education, their beliefs, that is, all their behaviors in the classroom directly affect the quality of education. All those teacher behaviors are shaped by the educational philosophy they adopt as they are the implementers of the curriculum (Bingöl & Kinay, 2018).

Educational philosophy is defined as a discipline that directs education, shapes teaching objectives, and guides teaching practices (Fidan & Erden, 1998). Educational philosophy plays an active role in many aspects including determining the objectives, arranging the content, choosing and employing teaching methods and techniques, conducting the measurement and evaluation process, and classroom management models used by teachers. In fact, every teacher has adopted an educational philosophy either consciously or unconsciously. Therefore, the proximity or distance of teachers to an educational philosophy affects the way they educate their students as well. Teachers manage their classrooms regarding their perspectives on knowledge, acquiring knowledge, and their own views about the role of a teacher (Livingston et al., 1995). Within this framework, considering its effect on the quality of education, it is vital to be aware of the eductaional philosophy adopted by teachers.

Wiles & Bondi (2002) stated that all philosophical understandings, from idealism to pragmatic philosophy, have an impact on education. On the other hand, it is acknowledged that teachers tend to reflect the philosophies they are more accustomed to in their teaching practices is also common. According to Sönmez (2020) teachers and teacher candidates from different fields adopted different philosophies. Philosophy movements that have an impact on educational processes are idealism, realism, pragmatism and existentialism. Educational philosophies resulting from influences of these movements are perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, and reconstructionism. Perennialism and essentialism are considered more as "traditional educational philosophies", while progressivism and reconstructionism are referred to as "contemporary educational philosophies".

Perennialism as an educational philosophy is based on the philosophical movements of idealism and realism. According to this movement, education should be shaped considering universal qualities, and people should be educated based on these unchanging moral principles since human nature and moral principles will not change. First of all, the teacher should be a field expert, be friendly towards the students and make them desireful to learn. Based on the assumption that students are not mature enough to make decisions on what is good for them, they are not expected to make decisions of their own learning. The task of a student is to try to develop his or her own intuition and thinking ability. Memorization, reasoning and deduction are used in teaching, and teachers participate in the teaching process as active contributors while students remain relatively passive. Basically, the school functions as a medium to transfer unchangeable values to the next generations (Erkılıç, 2019; Sönmez, 2020).

Essentialism, as an educational philosophy, is also based on the philosophical movements of idealism and realism. According to this movement, people are born with empty minds, and knowledge is acquired later on. Education is teacher-centered, and since the teacher is the sole authority in the classroom, he or she can resort to punishment when necessary. The essence of education is discipline and memorization of the subjects. Futuristic, unsolved and unproven information is not considered as content. According to the essentialists, the most important purpose of education is to create a better and superior society for the future by transferring the knowledge created by the society to the new generations (Demirel, 2012; Erkılıç, 2019; Ornstein ve Hunkins, 2016).

Progressivism as an educational philosophy is based on pragmatism. According to this movement, education is student-centered, and school should not be a preparation for life but life itself. This movement opposes the traditional understanding by putting education into a core position. It aims at enabling students to be active in a democratic education process and to construct knowledge by living and learning. The problems students may encounter are presented to them and they are expected to produce solutions. The teacher serves as a guide in the teaching-learning environment (Demirel, 2012; Ornstein ve Hunkins, 2016; Sönmez, 2020).

Reconstructionism as an educational philosophy is a continuation of the progressive movement. The most important point that distinguishes this movement from other educational philosophies is its goal of creating a new society. The most important purpose of education from the perspectives of reconstructionism is to trigger the social reform movement by eliminating the problems in the society. Reconstructionists think that there should not be a dominant view in education and that all values should be included in the curriculum. The teacher should have democratic attitudes, should not demonstrate any political view or thought, and should not impose his or her own thoughts on students. The teacher should encourage critical thinking in teaching practices. All kinds of materials, methods and techniques should be benefitted from while arranging the teaching environment. Education should be practical and should not use punishment as a discipline tool. According to reconstructionists, since societies are constantly changing, education programs should also change constantly (Erkılıç, 2019; Ornstein ve Hunkins, 2016; Sönmez, 2020).

Many studies have been conducted on the educational philosophies adopted by teachers and teacher candidates in Türkiye. The terms "educational philosophy" and "educational beliefs" were observed to be used in these studies, and they referred to the same meaning. Therefore, the term "educational philosophy" was preferred in summarizing the literature in the current study.

The previous studies conducted on the educational philosophies adopted by teacher candidates in Türkiye aimed to find out the relationship between the educational philosophy adopted by teacher candidates and their critical pedagogy and critical thinking tendencies, epistemological beliefs, self-efficacy perceptions and lesson planning processes (Kozikoğlu & Erden, 2018; Hayırsever & Oğuz, 2017; Akgün, 2015; Alkın Şahin et al., 2014; Biçer et al., 2013; Çalışkan, 2013; Ilgaz et al., 2013). There are also studies examining the effects of pre-service teacher education, educational philosophy course, the learning strategies and styles used by teacher candidates, and their levels of using instructional technologies and the Internet on the educational philosophy they adopted (Çelik & Orçan, 2016; Doğanay, 2011; Duman, 2008; Duman & Ulubey, 2008). Moreover, some studies investigated whether the educational philosophies adopted by teacher candidates differed in terms of some variables such as gender, department (Çetin et al., 2012; Kumral, 2015a; Kumral, 2015b; Tekin & Üstün, 2008; Ekiz, 2005; Çoban, 2002).

Examining the studies on the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers in the literature, it has been observed that those studies were limited in number compared to the studies carried out with teacher candidates. These studies aimed at finding out the relationship between the educational philosophies that teachers adopt and their professional values, their behaviors to support learner autonomy, their epistemological beliefs, their understanding of teaching and learning, teacher perceptions towards teaching strategies, and their views on teacher-student relations (Kahramanoğlu & Özbakış, 2018; Baş, 2015; Tunca et al., 2015; Oğuz et al., 2014; Yılmaz & Tosun, 2013; Çoban, 2004). In addition, a limited number of studies aimed at finding out whether the educational philosophies

adopted by teachers differ in terms of various variables such as gender and professional seniority (Aslan, 2017; Altınkurt et al., 2012; Doğanay & Sarı, 2003).

As for the international literature, there are some studies aiming at finding out the educational philosophies adopted by teachers and teacher candidates (Northcote, 2009; Austin & Reinhardt, 1999; Kagan, 1992; Silvernail, 1992). Moreover, there are other studies examining the relationship between the educational philosophies adopted by teachers and educational goals, technology-enriched classroom practices, learning environment, and use of computer in the classroom (Tondeur et al., 2008; Levin & Wadmany, 2006; Rideout, 2006; Levin & Wadmany, 2005; Livingston et al., 1995).

An examination of these studies revealed a lack of comprehensive research that aims to find out the educational philosophies of teachers with various levels of teaching experience who teach at different education levels (preschool, primary education and secondary education), and different branches, and whether their educational philosophies differ in terms of these variables. The main philosophy accepted in a country's curricula should be in harmony with the prevailing philosophy in that society. Everyone dealing with education should clearly know the educational philosophy adopted in the society. It is important that especially the experts who develop the curriculum and the teachers who are the implementers of this curriculum adopt the educational philosophy followed by the nation (Doğanay & Sarı, 2003). The curricula applied in primary and secondary education in Türkiye are based on the constructivist education approach which is based on modern education philosophies. This study is considered significant in terms of seeing the harmony between the current situation and the philosophy adopted by the country.

This study is expected to be a significant reference in terms of identifying the educational philosophies adopted by teachers teaching at various levels of education with different levels of teaching experience in different subject areas. In addition, the study is considered to add to the literature in the development of pre-service teacher education programs in terms of describing the existing situation and in providing a critical contribution to the philosophical context. As emphasized by Demirel (2012), philosophy of education has a very important place in curriculum development activities. On the other hand, as Karakuş (2006) stated, views and beliefs of teachers on the philosophy of education affect the teaching activities pursued in the classroom. In addition, knowledge of teachers on various educational philosophies will help them understand the relationship between curricula and their philosophical fundamentals, and implement the curricula effectively. In this respect, it is important to know the current situation. Finally, this study is expected to contribute to other studies on teacher education as well.

The aim of this study was to find out the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers working at preschool, primary education and secondary education institutions affiliated to the Ministry of National Education and to reveal whether these philosophies differed in terms of the variables of gender, subject area, school type and teaching experience. With regards to this aim, the answers to the following questions were sought in the study:

1. What are the educational philosophies adopted by teachers in their teaching practices?
2. Do the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers differ in terms of gender?
3. Do the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers differ in terms of the subject area they teach?
4. Do the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers differ in terms of the type of school they teach at?

5. Do the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers differ in terms of their teaching experience?

2. METHOD

In this part of the study, the research model, population and sample, data collection tools and data analysis processes are provided.

2.1. Research Model

This study was carried out using a survey model, one of the quantitative research methods. Survey models are research approaches that aim to describe a past or present situation as it exists (Karasar, 2021). Within the scope of this model, the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers were determined by means of a valid and reliable scale developed by another researcher through an online implementation after obtaining the necessary permissions.

2.2. Population and Sample

The population of the study consisted of teachers working at pre-school, primary education and secondary education institutions in Eskişehir in the 2020-2021 academic year. Information about the population of the study is given in Table 1 below.

Table 1: *Numerical Data on Teachers Constituting the Population of the Study*

	Pre-school Education		**Primary Education**		**Secondary Education**						**TOTAL**	
	Kindergarten Nursery School		**Primary School**		**Secondary School**		**General High School**		**Vocational High School**			
Gender	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Female	1066	9.04	2140	18.14	2296	19.46	1328	11.26	1004	8.51	7834	66.41
Male	53	0.45	794	6.73	1172	9.94	937	7.95	1006	8.52	3962	33.59
Total	1119*	9.49	2934	24.87	3468	29.40	2265	19.21	2010	17.03		
GRAND TOTAL	**1119**		**6402**				**4275**				**11796**	

* Includes all preschool education institutions within the body of private, public and primary schools.

As seen in Table 1, according to the national education statistics published by the Ministry of National Education, a total of 11796 teachers were working at in all private and public schools in Eskişehir in the 2020-2021 academic year. 1119 of these teachers were working in pre-school education institutions, 6402 in primary education institutions and 4275 in secondary education institutions. 7834 of the teachers were female and 3962 were male (MEB, 2020). Due to the difficulty of reaching the entire research population, sampling method was used. The stratified sampling method was used in the study. The stratified sampling method is a sampling method in which the subgroups in the population are determined and represented in the sample with regards to their ratios within the population size (Büyüköztürk et al., 2019). In determining the sample size, the sample size determination formula that was suggested by Büyüköztürk et al. (2019), was used, and a total of 474 teachers were selected for the sampling with a reliability level of .05. Numerical data regarding the teachers selected for sampling are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: *Numerical Data on the Teachers Selected as the Sample of the Study*

	Pre-school Education		**Primary Education**				**Secondary Education**				**TOTAL**	
	Kindergarten Nursery School		**Primary School**		**Secondary School**		**General High School**		**Vocational High School**			
Gender	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Female	45	9.49	86	18.14	92	19.41	53	11.18	40	8.44	316	66,66
Male	2	0.42	32	6.75	47	9.92	37	7.81	40	8.44	158	33,34
Total	47*	9.91	118	24.89	139	29.33	90	18.99	80	16.88	**474**	
GRAND TOTAL	**47**		**257**				**170**					

* Includes all preschool education institutions within the body of private, public and primary schools.

As seen in Table 2, the sample of the study consisted of 474 teachers, 47 of whom were working in pre-school education institutions, 257 in primary education institutions, and 170 in secondary education institutions.

In order to reach the required number of participants for the sample, 500 data collection tools were sent to the teachers and 492 of them were completed. The data collection tool was applied to the teachers on a voluntary basis by sharing the ethics committee document. Numerical data regarding the characteristics of the sample of the study are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: *Numerical Data on the Characteristics of the Teachers Participating in the Study*

Field	**School Type**	**Gender**				**Teaching Experience (year)**												**TOTAL**	
		Female		**Male**		**1-5**		**6-10**		**11-15**		**16-20**		**21-25**		**≥26**			
		f	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Pre-school	**Nursery School**	44	8.93	5	1.02	16	3.25	12	2.44	6	1.22	7	1.42	5	1.02	3	0.61	49	9.95
	Total	44	8.93	5	1.02	16	3.25	12	2.44	6	1.22	7	1.42	5	1.02	3	0.61	49	9.95
Primary School	**Primary School**	88	17.89	45	9.15	15	3.05	15	3.05	20	4.07	21	4.27	47	9.54	15	3.05	133	27.32
	Total	88	17.89	45	9.15	15	3.05	15	3.05	20	4.07	21	4.27	47	9.54	15	3.05	133	27.32
Social Studies	**Secondary School**	3	0.61	16	3.25	7	1.42	6	1.22	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	0.81	2	0.41	19	3.86
	General High School	8	1.62	5	1.02	0	0.00	3	0.61	0	0.00	2	0.41	7	1.42	1	0.20	13	2.64
	Vocational High School	1	0.20	5	1.02	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	1	0.20	3	0.61	1	0.20	6	1.22
	Total	12	2.44	26	5.28	7	1.42	10	2.03	0	0.00	3	0.61	14	2.85	4	0.81	38	7.72
Science	**Secondary School**	11	2.24	4	0.81	4	0.81	3	0.61	3	0.61	0	0.00	2	0.41	3	0.61	15	3.05
	General High School	4	0.81	6	1.22	0	0.00	2	0.41	0	0.00	3	0.61	2	0.41	3	0.61	10	2.03
	Vocational High School	4	0.81	4	0.81	0	0.00	1	0.20	1	0.20	1	0.20	1	0.20	4	0.81	8	1.62
	Total	19	3.86	14	2.85	4	0.81	6	1.22	4	0.81	4	0.81	5	1.02	10	2.03	33	6.70
Fine Arts Education	**Secondary School**	3	0.61	0	0.00	2	0.41	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	3	0.61
	General High School	2	0.41	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	2	0.41	3	0.61
	Vocational High School	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	1	0.20
	Total	5	1.02	2	0.41	2	0.41	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.61	2	0.41	7	1.42

Table 3 (Continued): *Numerical Data on the Characteristics of the Teachers Participating in the Study*

Field	School Type	Gender				Teaching Experience (year)												TOTAL	
		Female		Male		1-5		6-10		11-15		16-20		21-25		≥26			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Maths	Secondary School	22	4.47	3	0.61	10	2.03	7	1.42	5	1.02	0	0.00	1	0.20	2	0.41	25	5.08
	General High School	5	1.02	3	0.61	0	0.00	1	0.20	1	0.20	2	0.41	3	0.61	1	0.20	8	1.63
	Vocational High School	2	0.41	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.41	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.41
	Total	29	5.89	6	1.22	10	2.03	8	1.63	6	1.22	4	0.81	4	0.81	3	0.61	35	7.12
Turkish	Secondary School	10	2.03	8	1.63	5	1.02	11	2.24	1	0.20	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	18	3.66
	General High School	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Vocational High School	1	0.20	1	0.20	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.41
	Total	11	2.24	9	1.83	5	1.02	12	2.44	1	0.20	1	0.20	1	0.20	0	0.00	20	4.07
Turkish language and literature	Secondary School	1	0.20	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20
	General High School	6	1.22	3	0.61	0	0.00	3	0.61	2	0.41	1	0.20	1	0.20	2	0.41	9	1.83
	Vocational High School	3	0.61	1	0.20	0	0.00	2	0.41	1	0.20	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	4	0.81
	Total	10	2.03	4	0.81	1	0.20	5	1.02	3	0.61	1	0.20	2	0.41	2	0.41	14	2.85
Physical education	Secondary School	2	0.41	4	0.81	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	2	0.41	3	0.61	0	0.00	6	1.22
	General High School	1	0.20	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.41
	Vocational High School	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	1	0.20
	Total	3	0.61	6	1.22	0	0.00	1	0.20	1	0.20	3	0.61	3	0.61	1	0.20	9	1.83
Information technologies	Primary School	1	0.20	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20
	Secondary School	6	1.22	11	2.24	5	1.02	4	0.81	5	1.02	3	0.61	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	3.46
	General High School	1	0.20	1	0.20	1	0.20	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.41
	Vocational High School	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20
	Total	9	1.83	12	2.44	7	1.42	5	1.02	6	1.22	3	0.61	0	0.00	0	0.00	21	4.27
Religious culture	Secondary School	10	2.03	1	0.20	2	0.41	4	0.81	2	0.41	0	0.00	1	0.20	2	0.41	11	2.24
	General High School	2	0.41	0	0.00	2	0.41	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.41
	Vocational High School	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20
	Total	13	2.64	1	0.20	4	0.81	5	1.02	2	0.41	0	0.00	1	0.20	2	0.41	14	2.85
Vocational Education	Vocational High School	17	3.45	16	3.25	4	0.81	6	1.22	0	0.00	1	0.20	8	1.63	14	2.85	33	6.70
	Total	17	3.45	16	3.25	4	0.81	6	1.22	0	0.00	1	0.20	8	1.63	14	2.85	33	6.70
Special education	Primary School	1	0.20	2	0.41	3	0.61	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.61
	Secondary School	3	0.61	0	0.00	2	0.41	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.61
	General High School	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20
	Total	4	0.81	3	0.61	5	1.02	0	0.00	1	0.20	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	1.42

Table 3 (Continued): *Numerical Data on the Characteristics of the Teachers Participating in the Study*

Field	School Type	Gender				Teaching Experience (year)												TOTAL	
		Female		Male		1-5		6-10		11-15		16-20		21-25		≥26			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Guidance	Primary School	5	1.02	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	1	0.20	3	0.61	1	0.20	6	1.22
	Secondary School	4	0.81	2	0.41	2	0.41	1	0.20	0	0.00	1	0.20	1	0.20	0	0.00	5	1.02
	General High School	4	0.81	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	4	0.81	0	0.00	5	1.02
	Total	13	2.64	3	0.61	2	0.41	1	0.20	1	0.20	3	0.61	8	1.63	1	0.20	16	3.25
Foreign Language	Primary School	8	1.63	1	0.20	1	0.20	1	0.20	2	0.41	4	0.81	1	0.20	0	0.00	9	1.83
	Secondary School	13	2.64	14	2.85	8	1.63	8	1.63	2	0.41	3	0.61	3	0.61	3	0.61	27	5.49
	General High School	10	2.03	10	2.03	2	0.41	5	1.02	5	1.02	4	0.81	3	0.61	1	0.20	20	4.07
	Vocational High School	7	1.42	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.41	2	0.41	1	0.20	1	0.20	1	0.20	7	1.42
	Total	38	7.72	25	5.08	11	2.24	16	3.25	11	2.24	12	2.44	8	1.63	5	1.02	63	12.80
TOTAL		**315**	**64.02**	**177**	**35.98**	**93**	**18.9**	**102**	**20.74**	**62**	**12.60**	**64**	**13.01**	**109**	**22.15**	**62**	**12.60**	**492**	**100**

As seen in Table 3, 315 (64.02%) of the teachers participating in the study were female and 77 (35.98) were male. 49 (9.95%) of participants were working at pre-school education institutions, 302 (61.39%) at primary education and 141 (28.66%) were working at secondary education institutions. As for the fields of educational background, 49 (9.95%) of the participants were working as pre-school teachers, 133 participants were working (27.32%) as primary school teachers, 38 (7.72%) participants were working as social studies teachers, 33 (6.70%) participants were working as science teachers, 7 (1.42%) participants were working as fine arts education teachers, 35 (7.12%) participants were working as mathematics teachers, 20 (4.07%) participants were working as Turkish teachers, 14 (2.85%) participants were working as Turkish language and literature teachers, 9 (1.83%) as physical education teachers, 21 (4.27%) participants were working as information technology teachers, 14 (2.85%) participants were working as religious culture and ethics teachers, 33 (6.70%) participants were working as vocational education teachers, 7 (1.42%) participants were working as special education teachers, 16 (3.25%) participants were working as guidance and counseling teachers, and 63 (12.80%) of them were working as foreign language teachers. As to the teaching experience, 93 (18.9%) of the teachers participating in the study had experience of 1-5 years, 102 (20.74%) participants had experience of 6-10 years, 62 (12.60%) participants had experience of 11-15 years, 64 (13.01%) participants had experience of 16-20 years, 109 (22.15%) participants had experience of 21-25 years, and 62 (12.60%) participants had experience of 26 years or more.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

The data of the study were collected with the "Scale of Educational Thought and Applications (ETA)" developed by Kumral (2014). Necessary written permission was obtained from the researcher to use it in the current study. The scale is in five-point Likert type consisting of two sub-dimensions as the traditional dimension (Perennialism-Essentialism) and the contemporary dimension (Progressivism-Reconstructionism). The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the sub-dimensions of the scale was calculated by Kumral (2014) as .98 for the "traditional" dimension and .95 for the

"contemporary" dimension. As for the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient for the overall scale was found to be .94.

The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was recalculated on the data obtained at the end of the application in this study. Accordingly, the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the sub-dimensions of the scale was determined as .89 for the "traditional" dimension and .92 for the "contemporary" dimension. In addition, the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient obtained for the overall scale was found to be .90. The literature reveals that if the Cronbach Alpha coefficient is .70 and above, the measurements are considered reliable (Fraenkel et al, 2012). Based on this reference, the findings obtained from the scale can be said to be quite reliable.

With regards to the purpose of the study, in the first part of the data collection tool, there were demographic questions addressing the gender, teaching field, the school type the teacher worked at, and their teaching experience. The second part included items of the scale to determine the philosophy of education of the participating teachers.

2.4. Data Analysis

First of all, the distribution of the data collected from the teachers was examined. For this purpose, skewness and kurtosis values for the sub-dimensions of the scale and the for whole scale were calculated using the SPSS 21.0 program. The results are given in Table 4.

Table 4: *Skewness and Kurtosis Values Regarding the Normality of the Scores of the Teachers*

Dimensions of the Scale	Skewness	Kurtosis
Traditional	.555	1.010
Contemporary	-1.265	2.615
The whole Scale	-0.534	3.789

Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), stated the skewness and kurtosis values of the data set needs to be between -1.5 and +1.5, in order to be accepted as having normal distribution. As seen in Table 4, the obtained values showed that the data were not normally distributed. Therefore, in order to draw the data to the normal distribution range, Log10 (values in base 10 of the logarithm of the data belonging to the traditional educational philosophy) for the values of traditional educational philosophy and square transformation (sq, squaring process (contemporary score x contemporary score)) calculations for contemporary educational philosophy were performed. Then, parametric analyses were conducted on these transformed data. Table 5 shows the skewness and kurtosis, and Levene Homogeneity Test results of sub-dimensions and the whole scale.

Table 5: *Skewness, Kurtosis and Levene Homogeneity Test Results Regarding the Normality of Teachers' Scores from the Scale*

Dimensions of the Scale	Skewness	Kurtosis	Levene Test	
			F	p
Traditional	-0.381	0.616	0.034	0.854
Contemporary	-0.371	0.528	0.05	0.945
The whole Scale	-0.383	0.597	0.118	0.731

When Table 5 is examined, it can be said that the skewness and kurtosis values of transformed data were in the range of -1.5 to +1.5, and the data set had a normal distribution. In addition, Levene's test was used to determine the homogeneity of variances. As seen in Table 5, the variances were homogeneously distributed regarding Levene Statistics p>.05, thus, the homogeneity was provided. Based on these findings, parametric analyses were conducted on these transformed data. SPSS 21.0 program was used in the analysis of the data. Data were analyzed through descriptive statistics, independent samples t test, paired samples t test for independent samples, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Provided that there was a significant difference in one-way analysis of variance, Tukey HSD test, one of the multiple comparisons (Post Hoc) tests, was used to compare the groups.

2.5. Research Ethics

After the research was planned, the data collection tool suitable for the study was determined. Written permission was obtained from the researcher who had developed the scale that was planned to be implemented in the study. Then, the study was submitted to the approval of the Anadolu University Social and Human Sciences Research and Ethics Committee, and the ethics committee approval was obtained on 03.03.2021 with the approval number of 26513. The scale was applied online with the pre-informed consent form, in which the participants stated that they voluntarily participated in the research, and the ethics committee approval form was also presented to the participants. In addition, participants were informed about the research in detail. The study was conducted within the framework of the Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive.

3. FINDINGS

In this section, findings are presented under five titles regarding the order in accordance with the aim of the study.

3.1. The Educational Philosophy Adopted by Teachers

Within the scope of the first sub-aim of the research, the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers in their teaching processes were examined. Findings on the descriptive statistics calculated from the transformed data about the educational philosophies adopted by the participants (Log10 was used for the traditional educational philosophy; square was used for the contemporary educational philosophy) are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: *Descriptive Statistics on Educational Philosophies Adopted by Teachers (n=492)*

Dimensions	n	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$ (log10)	Ss	Minimum	Maximum	Range
Traditional	492	53.520	1.714	0.110	1.38	2.02	0.64
	n	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$ **(sq)**	**Ss**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**	**Range**
Contemporary	492	76.433	6053.022	1990.258	441.00	11025.00	10584.00

Table 6 shows the arithmetic means of both the transformed and the untransformed data. The reason for presenting both data together was to display the difference between them more clearly. Except for this extra information in this table, statistical calculations in all other tables were performed only on the transformed data. As seen in Table 6, the scores of the teachers regarding contemporary educational philosophy items had higher arithmetic averages.

In order to test whether the scores of the teachers from the educational philosophy were statistically different, the Dependent Samples t-test (Paired Sample t-test) was applied, and the results are given in Table 7.

Table 7: *Comparison of Educational Philosophies Adopted by Teachers; Paired Sample t-test Results*

Group	n	x̄	Ss	Sd	t	p
Traditional-Contemporary	492	-6051.307	1990.255	491	-67.441	.000*

p<.05*

As is seen in Table 7, the difference between the scores of the teachers from the traditional and contemporary educational philosophies was statistically significant (p=.000). Considering the averages of the scores (Table 6), as this difference was in favor of the contemporary educational philosophy, it can be said that teachers were closer to the contemporary educational philosophy.

3.2. Educational Philosophy Adopted by Teachers in terms of Gender Variable

Within the scope of the second sub-aim of the study, the Independent Samples t-test was conducted on the transformed data (Log10 was used for the traditional educational philosophy; square was used for the Contemporary educational philosophy) in order to find out the relationship between the education philosophies of the teachers and the gender variable. The findings are shown in Table 8.

Table 8: *Independent Samples t-test Results of Educational Philosophies Adopted by Teachers by Gender Variable*

Dimensions	Gender	n	x̄	Ss	Sd	t	p
Traditional	**Female**	315	1.705	0.111	490	-2.650	.008*
	Male	177	1.732	0.107			
Contemporary	**Female**	315	6130.393	2019.773	490	1.151	1.151
	Male	177	5915.327	1934.603			

p<.05*

Table 8 shows that the traditional educational philosophy scores of teachers differed significantly in terms of gender (p=.008). The averages revealed that male teachers had a higher average in terms of traditional educational philosophy. Accordingly, it can be said that male teachers have a more traditional view on teaching processes. When the scores of contemporary educational philosophy of teachers are examined, it can be seen that there was no significant difference regarding the gender variable (p=1.151).

3.3. Educational Philosophy Adopted by Teachers in terms of Field/Branch Variable

Within the scope of the third sub-aim of the research, in order to find out whether the educational philosophies of the teachers showed any difference in terms of the field/branch variable, One-Way ANOVA for Independent Groups was performed on the transformed data (Log10 for the traditional educational philosophy; square was used for the Contemporary educational philosophy). The findings are given in Table 9.

Table 9: *One-Way ANOVA Results of Educational Philosophies Adopted by Teachers by Field/Branch Variable*

Dimensions	Field / Branch	n	x̄	Ss	F	p
Traditional	**Pre-school**	49	1.67	0.12	1.619	.070
	Primary school	133	1.73	0.11		
	Social studies	38	1.70	0.12		
	Science	33	1.71	0.11		
	Fine Arts	7	1.72	0.04		
	Mathematics	35	1.72	0.08		
	Turkish language and literature	14	1.66	0.11		
	Turkish	20	1.68	0.13		
	Physical education	9	1.70	0.10		
	Information technologies	21	1.73	0.11		
	Religion culture	14	1.77	0.13		
	Vocational Education	33	1.73	0.10		
	Special education	7	1.73	0.10		
	Guidance and counseling	16	1.72	0.08		
	Foreign language	63	1.73	0.10		
Contemporary	**Pre-school**	49	6328.76	2156.38	1.016	.436
	Primary school	133	5855.91	1975.02		
	Social studies	38	6842.89	1510.75		
	Science	33	5742.73	2448.12		
	Fine Arts	7	6729.00	934.88		
	Mathematics	35	5506.51	1664.73		
	Turkish language and literature	14	6475.07	2038.76		
	Turkish	20	6023.60	1635.91		
	Physical education	9	5740.56	2723.56		
	Information technologies	21	5988.86	1863.44		
	Religion culture	14	6279.50	2741.98		
	Vocational Education	33	6290.67	1801.57		
	Special education	7	5864.43	2302.96		
	Guidance and counseling	16	5864.56	1607.66		
	Foreign language	63	6044.89	2082.74		

As seen in Table 9, the scores of teachers from both traditional (p=.070) and contemporary educational philosophy (p=.436) did not differ statistically in terms of the branch variable (p>0.05). In

addition, the scores the teachers received from the traditional educational philosophy dimension revealed that the Turkish Language and Literature, preschool and Turkish teachers received the lowest three points respectively, and the Religious Culture and Ethics teachers received the highest points. In this sense, it can be said that Turkish Language and Literature, preschool and Turkish teachers mostly adopted contemporary educational philosophy, while Religious Culture and Ethics Knowledge teachers were more inclined to traditional educational philosophy. As for the scores they received from the contemporary educational philosophy, the lowest three points belonged to the physical education, mathematics and science fields, and the highest three points belonged to the fine arts education, vocational education and social studies. Deriving from these findings, physical education, mathematics and science teachers can be said to adopt traditional educational philosophy while social studies, fine arts education, and vocational education teachers can be said to be more inclined to contemporary educational philosophy.

3.4. Educational Philosophy Adopted by Teachers in terms of School Type Variable

Within the scope of the fourth sub-aim of the study, One-Way ANOVA was done on the transformed data (Log10 was used for the traditional educational philosophy; square was used for the contemporary educational philosophy) in order to determine whether the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers differed in terms of the type of school they worked in. The findings are shown in Table 10.

Table 10: *One-Way ANOVA Results of Educational Philosophies Adopted by Teachers by School Type Variable*

Dimensions	School Type	n	x̄	Ss	F	p	Significant Difference
Traditional	**Nursery School (1)**	49	1.6664	0.11862	2.692	.030*	1<2; 1<3
	Primary School (2)	152	1.7227	0.11423			
	Secondary School (3)	150	1.7198	0.10699			
	General High School (4)	75	1.7166	0.10209			
	Vocational High School (5)	66	1.7196	0.10729			
Contemporary	**Nursery School (1)**	49	6328.7551	2156.38448	.969	.424	
	Primary School (2)	152	5890.4934	2035.51978			
	Secondary School (3)	150	6212.9667	1944.08352			
	General High School (4)	75	6090.0667	1786.61709			
	Vocational High School (5)	66	5817.0152	2080.54942			

p<.05*

As seen in Table 10, there was a significant difference in the traditional educational philosophy scores of teachers in terms of the school they worked in (p=.030), however, no significant difference was obtained in the contemporary educational philosophy scores for the same variable (p=.424). Tukey HSD test, one of the post hoc tests, was used to find out the source of the significant difference just among the data on the traditional educational philosophy. As a result of this test, primary school teachers had higher traditional educational philosophy scores than nursery school teachers (p=.016); secondary school teachers had higher traditional educational philosophy scores than nursery school teachers (p=.027), and there was a statistically significant difference between them. Examining the averages, it was seen that

nursery school teachers had the lowest average score and primary school teachers had the highest in terms of traditional educational philosophy. Vocational high school teachers had the lowest average score and nursery school teachers had the highest scores in terms of contemporary educational philosophy.

3.5. Educational Philosophy Adopted by Teachers in terms of Teaching Experience Variable

Within the scope of the fifth sub-aim of the research, One-Way ANOVA was conducted on the transformed data (Log10 was used for the traditional educational philosophy; square was used for the contemporary educational philosophy) in order to reveal the change in the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers regarding their teaching experience. The findings are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: *One-Way ANOVA Results of Educational Philosophies Adopted by Teachers by Teaching Experience Variable*

Dimensions	Teaching Experience	n	x̄	Ss	F	p	Significant Difference
Traditional	**1-5 year (1)**	93	1.68	0.11	2.903	.014*	1<5
	6-10 year (2)	102	1.71	0.11			
	11-15 year (3)	62	1.72	0.11			
	16-20 year (4)	64	1.72	0.10			
	21-25 year (5)	109	1.74	0.12			
	26 year and above (6)	62	1.72	0.10			
Contemporary	**1-5 year (1)**	93	6103.53	1904.82	2.124	.061	
	6-10 year (2)	102	5923.63	1871.58			
	11-15 year (3)	62	6570.24	2098.45			
	16-20 year (4)	64	5538.91	1746.11			
	21-25 year (5)	109	6244.58	2017.40			
	26 year and above (6)	62	5866.85	2274.16			

p<.05*

Table 11 reveals that there was a significant difference in the traditional educational philosophy scores of the teachers in terms of the teaching experience variable (p=.014) whereas the contemporary educational philosophy scores of the same variable were not statistically significant (p=.061). Tukey HSD test, one of the post hoc tests, was used to find out the source of the significant difference just among the data on the traditional educational philosophy. As a result of this test, teachers with 21-25 years of teaching experience had higher traditional educational philosophy scores (p=.003) than teachers with 1-5 years of experience, and there was a statistically significant difference between them. Deriving from these findings, it can be said that the more teaching experience the teachers have the more they adopt traditional educational philosophies in their teaching processes. Examining the average scores, it was found that the teachers who had the highest average scores of traditional educational philosophy were the ones with a teaching experience of 21-25 years. They were followed by the teachers with a teaching experience of 26 years and more, 16-20 years and 11-15 years. It can be seen in Table 11 that teachers who had experience of 1-5 years had the lowest average, followed by the teachers with a teaching experience of 6-10 years. Considering the scores of the teachers who adopted the contemporary

educational philosophy the teachers with 11-15 years of experience had the highest average and the ones with 16-20 years of experience had the lowest average.

4. DISCUSSION and RESULT

Educational philosophy is a discipline or a systematic set of ideas and concepts that directs education, shapes educational goals and guides educational practices (Fidan & Erden, 1998), and is at the center of the development and evaluation of curricula. In this sense, studies focusing on educational philosophy are extremely important studies that try to construct what can be done in order to increase the quality of education and quality of the teacher as it is as important as the quality of the system.

Most of the studies carried out to determine the educational philosophies adopted by teachers or teacher candidates in Türkiye focused on one or a few different branches including primary school teaching (Geçici & Yapıcı, 2008; Üstüner, 2008; Aslan 2017; Kahramanoğlu & Özbakış, 2018), Turkish language teaching (Bingöl & Kinay, 2018), and Religious Culture and Ethics Teaching (Coşkun, 2019; Altınkurt et al., 2012; Taşkın, 2020). Eğmir's study (2019), which analyzed studies on educational philosophies in Türkiye, suggested that most of the studies in the dimension of educational philosophy were conducted with teacher candidates (64.1%), and that studies conducted with teachers were relatively less (35.8%). On the other hand, the studies conducted on pre-service teachers mostly involved primary school teacher candidates and were followed by studies with social studies teacher candidates. Finally, in the same study, it was strongly recommended to increase the number of studies focusing on teachers from different branches working at different levels of education.

A total of 492 teachers from 15 different fields/branches, working at pre-school, primary school and secondary education institutions, with varying teaching experience participated in this study, which was conducted in Eskişehir in the 2020-2021 academic year. This study is important as it focuses on teachers, investigates a very large sample, and it provides the opportunity to evaluate the opinions of teachers from different branches and teaching experiences.

The first of the sub-aims of this research was to determine the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers in their teaching processes. It was found out that 412 (83%) of the 492 teachers scored higher in the contemporary sub-dimension of the scale and 80 (17%) scored higher in the traditional sub-dimension. Previous studies revealed similar findings in favor of contemporary educational philosophy (Duman, 2008; Duman & Ulubey, 2008; Altınkurt et al., 2012; Kozikoğlu & Uygun; 2018; Taşkın, 2020). In some of the studies examined, philosophy of "experimentalism" stood out as the most preferred educational philosophy among teachers while existentialism stood out as the most preferred educational philosophy in some other studies. However, Görmez (2015) stated that the educational philosophies adopted by teachers and teacher candidates and the philosophies they followed during the planning and implementation phases of the lesson were not compatible with each other. Akpınar and Aydın (2007) reported that teachers were aware of the roles contemporary educational philosophy imposed on them, but that they felt inadequate for those roles.

The second sub-aim of the study was whether the educational philosophy adopted by the teachers had a significant difference in terms of gender. Findings of the study revealed that the traditional educational philosophy of the teachers differed significantly regarding gender variable (p=.008). However, the contemporary educational philosophy scores did not differ (p=1.151). In addition, the average of contemporary educational philosophy scores of women was higher than men's average scores. Based on these results, it can be said that male teachers think more traditional in terms of educational

philosophy while female teachers are more contemporary. This finding is similar to findings of the study conducted by Kumral (2015b). Moreover, these findings are compatible with studies reporting whether the gender variable made a difference in some philosophical approaches or not in others (Geçici & Yapıcı 2008; Aslan, 2017; Yaralı 2020). Similar results were reported in many other studies (Duman, 2008; Doğanay, 2011; Kumral, 2015a). Finally, in some studies, no significant difference was found between educational philosophies and gender (Doğanay & Sarı 2003; Yokuş, 2016; Aybek & Aslan 2017; Taşkın, 2020).

The third sub-aim of the study was to find out whether the educational philosophy adopted by the teachers created a significant difference considering the branch they taught. In the evaluation made between the educational philosophy adopted by the teachers and their branches, no statistical difference was found in terms of both traditional (p=.070) and contemporary educational philosophies (p=.436). However, the Turkish Language and Literature, preschool and Turkish teachers were observed to score the lowest three points in traditional educational philosophy, and the Religious Culture and Ethics teachers received the highest points. As for the contemporary educational philosophy, the teachers of physical education, mathematics and science had the lowest three points. The highest three points belonged to the social studies, fine arts education and vocational education teachers. In his study, Eğmir (2019) attributed traditional philosophy's being more effective in areas such as mathematics and science to the fact that the knowledge is more stable and the student contribution to its acquisition is low. In a similar situation regarding the department variable, Ekiz (2007), stated that pre-service teachers studying at areas such as primary school and pre-school teacher education were more open to contemporary philosophies compared to pre-service teachers studying in departments such as mathematics and science.

There are some other studies conducted in Türkiye focusing on the relationships between the branch and the educational philosophy. For example, Cetin et al. (2012) conducted a study on teacher candidates and reported significant differences among the branches of science, primary school mathematics, primary school teaching and social studies teaching in terms of educational philosophy. Kumral (2015a), established the relationship between the branch variable and the adopted educational philosophy in his study. Duman (2008), mentioned the relationship between the educational philosophy adopted by primary school, preschool, painting, social, furniture and science branch teachers, but did not evaluate it statistically. There are also studies showing that social studies teacher candidates (Ekiz, 2007) and preschool teacher candidates (Duman, 2008) are more inclined to contemporary educational philosophy, and religious culture and ethics teacher candidates are more inclined to traditional education philosophy (Coşkun, 2019). On the other hand, there are studies showing that there is no significant relationship between the branch variable and the educational philosophy teacher candidates adopted (Doğanay, 2011; Kumral, 2015b; Coşkun & Taneri, 2021). Findings of all these studies are similar to the ones of the present study.

The fourth sub-aim of this study was to find out whether there was a significant difference between the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers and the type of school they taught. It was found out that there was a significant difference in the traditional educational philosophy scores of the teachers in terms of the school they worked in (p=.030), and there was no significant difference in the contemporary educational philosophy scores (p=.424). The teachers working at nursery schools got the highest scores from the contemporary educational philosophy and the lowest from the traditional educational philosophy. Accordingly, teachers working at nursery schools can be said to have adopted the contemporary education philosophy. In Türkiye, preschool education has become more popular due to the increasing interest, and it is a developing area in terms of increasing the quality of education (Atlı,

2013). In this context, it can be said that preschool education institutions train teacher candidates using contemporary philosophical approaches (Coşkun, 2019). There are almost no studies focusing on school type and educational philosophies adopted by teachers in Türkiye (Altınkurt et al., 2012). Eğmir (2019), suggested to increase the diversity on the basis of education level especially in studies that focus on teachers. In this sense, this study is considered to be important as it both selected teachers as a sample and included different school types.

The last the sub-aim of the research was to find out whether there was a significant difference between the educational philosophies adopted by the teachers and their teaching experience. A statistically significant difference in the traditional educational philosophy scores of the teachers was found (p=.014) in terms of their teaching experiences but there was no significant difference in the contemporary philosophy of education scores (p=.061). The average traditional educational philosophy scores of teachers who worked for 1-5 years were low, in other words, they can be said to have adopted the contemporary educational philosophy. Based on these results, it can be argued that teachers who spent their novice years in the profession adopt contemporary educational philosophies by being due to the influence of the institutions in which they were educated, but in time, they adopt the approaches of more experienced teachers working at the same school. This situation can be changed by providing in-service training to all teachers to enable them to adopt and use contemporary education approaches.

Many studies stated that the more teaching experience the teachers had the more they adopted traditional philosophies (Eğmir, 2019). The first study that focused on the teaching experience variable in terms of educational philosophy was conducted in 2002, and there has been an increase in the number of such studies, especially after 2014 (Geçici & Yapıcı, 2008; Üstüner, 2008; Karadağ et al., 2009; Baş, 2015; Aslan, 2017); Kahramanoğlu & Özbakış, 2018; Demir & Aslan, 2021). The fact that such studies have increased considerably in recent years is associated with the low performance of our country, especially in 2012 and 2015 PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) exam scores. The scores obtained from PISA are considered to provide feedback for many researchers and have an effect on curricula. It is thought that the increasing number of such studies is due to the focus on increasing the quality of teachers and education in Türkiye (Eğmir, 2019).

This study focuses on educational philosophies on the basis of teachers investigating the variables of gender, school type, branch and teaching experience, and is expected to contribute to the studies in this field in Türkiye. Similar studies are recommended to be carried out in different cities, examining variables such as different branches, school types, and teaching experiences, with pre-service teachers as well as teachers who are actively teaching, in order to reveal Türkiye's profile on this subject.

Declaration of Contribution Rate of Authors

The authors contributed equally to the research.

Conflict of Interest Declaration

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

REFERENCES

Akgün, İ. (2015). *Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarında eleştirel düşünce yönelimleri ile eğitim inançları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Kütahya.

Akpınar, B., & Aydın, K. (2007). Eğitimde değişim ve öğretmenlerin değişim algıları. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 32*(144), 71-80.

Alkın-Şahin, S., Tunca, N., & Ulubey, Ö. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim inançları ile eleştirel düşünme eğilimleri arasındaki ilişki. *İlköğretim Online, 13*(4), 1473-1492.

Altınkurt, Y., Yılmaz, K., & Oğuz, A. (2012). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin eğitim inançları. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 31*(2), 1-19.

Aslan, S. (2017). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin eğitim inançlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 25*(4), 1453-1468.

Atlı, S. (2013). Türkiye'de ve Avrupa birliği ülkelerinde uygulanan okul öncesi eğitim programları. *Eğitimde Politika Analizi Dergisi, 2*(2), 56-76.

Austin, J. R. & Reinhardt, D. C. (1999). Philosophy and advocacy: An examination of preservice music teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*(1), 18-30.

Aybek, B. &. Aslan, S. (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının eleştirel düşünme eğilimleri ile benimsedikleri eğitim felsefelerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences, 16* (2), 373-385.

Baş, G. (2015). Öğretmenlerin eğitim felsefesi inançları ile öğretme-öğrenme anlayışları arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 40*(182), 111-126.

Biçer, B., Er, H., & Özel, A. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının epistemolojik inançları ve benimsedikleri eğitim felsefeleri arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama,* 9(3), 229-242.

Bingöl, U., & Kinay, İ. (2018). Türkçe öğretmen adaylarının benimsedikleri eğitim felsefelerinin çeşitli değişkenlere göre değerlendirilmesi: Ziya Gökalp eğitim fakültesi örneği. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 17*(68), 1636-1647.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2019). *Eğitimde bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* (27. baskı). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Coşkun, M. K. (2019). Din kültürü ve ahlak bilgisi öğretmen adaylarının benimsedikleri eğitim felsefeleri. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(1), 93-98.

Çalışkan, İ. (2013). Fen öğretmen adaylarının eğitim felsefesi yaklaşımları ile planlama süreçleri üzerine bir çalışma. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Özel Sayı* (1), 68-83.

Çelik, R., & Orçan, F. (2016). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim inançları üzerine bir çalışma. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama, 12*(1), 63-77.

Çetin, B., İlhan, M., & Arslan, S. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının benimsedikleri eğitim felsefelerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *International Journal of Social Science, 5*(5), 149-170.

Çoban, A. (2002). Sınıf öğretmenliği öğretmen adaylarının, eğitim sürecine ilişkin felsefesi tercihlerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 26*(2), 311-318.

Çoban, A. (2004). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin eğitim sürecine ilişkin felsefi tercihlerini değerlendirme. *13. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı (CD)*, Malatya, Türkiye.

Çoşkun, S. & Taneri, P.O. (2021). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim yaklaşımlarının eğitim felsefeleri çerçevesinde değerlendirilmesi, *Dört Öge, 10*(19), 29-48.

Demir, O., & Aslan, S. A. (2021). Öğretmenlerin benimsedikleri eğitim felsefelerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *8*(1), 307-321.

Demirel, Ö. (2012). *Eğitimde program geliştirme: kuramdan uygulamaya*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Doğanay, A. (2011). Hizmet öncesi öğretmen eğitiminin öğretmen adaylarının felsefi bakış açılarına etkisi. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 36*(161), 332-348.

Doğanay, A. ve Sarı, M. (2003). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin sahip oldukları eğitim felsefelerine ilişkin algıların değerlendirilmesi: öğretmenlerin eğitim felsefeleri. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 1*(3), 321-337.

Duman, B. & Ulubey, Ö. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının benimsedikleri eğitim felsefelerinin öğretim teknolojilerini ve interneti kullanma düzeylerine etkisi ile ilgili görüşleri. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 20,* 95-114.

Duman, B. (2008). Öğrencilerin benimsedikleri eğitim felsefeleriyle kullanıldıkları öğrenme strateji ve öğrenme stillerinin karşılaştırılması. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *17*(1), 203-224.

Erkılıç, T. A. (2019). Eğitim felsefesi akımları. A. Boyacı (Ed.), *Eğitim Felsefesi* içinde (s. 49-69). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Açıköğretim Yayınları.

Eğmir, E. (2019). Eğitim inançlarına ilişkin Türkiye'de yapılmış çalışmaların analizi: Öğretmen ve öğretmen adaylarına ilişkin bir inceleme. *PESA Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, *5*(3), 264-278.

Ekiz, D. (2005). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının eğitim felsefesi akımlarına ilişkin eğilimlerinin karşılaştırılması. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *19*, 1-11.

Ekiz, D. (2007). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim felsefesi akımları hakkında görüşlerinin farklı programlar açısından incelenmesi. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *24*, 1-12.

Fidan, N., & Erden, M. (1998*). Eğitime giriş*. İstanbul: Alkım Yayınları.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. (2014). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Geçici, S., & Yapıcı, Ş. (2008). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin eğitim felsefesiyle ilgili görüşleri. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim, 1*(2), 57-64.

Görmez, S. (2015). *Öğretmen adaylarının ve öğretmenlerin eğitim felsefelerinin belirlenmesi ve eğitim ortamı açısından incelenmesi.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Hayırsever, F., & Oğuz, E. (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim inançlarının eleştirel düşünme eğilimlerine etkisi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *17*(2), 757-778.

Ilgaz G., Bülbül T., & Çuhadar, C. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim inançları ile öz-yeterlik algıları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *13*(1), 50-65.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist, 27,* 65-90.

Kahramanoğlu, R., & Özbakış, G. (2018). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin eğitim inançlarının ve epistemolojik inançlarının belirlenmesi ve aralarındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Disiplinlerarası Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *2*(3), 8-27.

Karadağ, E., Baloğlu, N., & Kaya, S. (2009). Okul yöneticilerinin eğitim felsefesi akımlarını benimseme düzeylerine ilişkin ampirik bir çalışma. *Kaygı, 12,* 181-200.

Karakuş, M. (2006). Öğretmen yetiştirmede felsefenin yeri ve önemi. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 1*(31), 79-85.

Karasar, N. (2021). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. (37. baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kozikoğlu, İ, & Uygun, N (2018). Investigation of the relationship between teachers' philosophies of education beliefs and curriculum design approaches. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *47*(2), 411-438.

Kozikoğlu, İ., & Erden, R. Z. (2018). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim felsefesi inançları ile eleştirel pedagojiye ilişkin görüşleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *İlköğretim Online*, *17*(3), 1566-1582.

Kumral, O. (2014). Eğitsel düşünce ve uygulamalar (EDU) ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi: geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, 4*(2), 131-144.

Kumral, O. (2015a). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim felsefeleri: Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi örneği. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *1*(2), 59-68.

Kumral, O. (2015b). Pedagojik formasyon eğitimi sertifika programına katılan öğretmen adaylarının eğitim felsefeleri. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *4*(2), 73-80.

Levin, T., & Wadmany, R. (2005). Changes in educational beliefs and classroom practices of teachers and students in rich technology-based classrooms. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, *14* (3), 281-308.

Levin, T., & Wadmany, R. (2006). Teachers' beliefs and practices in technology-based classrooms: A developmental view. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 39* (2), 157-181.

Livingston, M. J., Mcclain, B. R., & Despain, B. C. (1995). Assessing the consistency between teachers' philosophies and educational goals. *Education, 116*(1), 124-129.

MEB. (2020). *Milli eğitim istatistikleri: örgün eğitim 2019-20.* Ankara: MEB Yayınları.

Northcote, M. (2009). Educational beliefs of higher education teachers and students: Implications for teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *34*(3), 68-81.

Oğuz, A., Altınkurt, Y., Yılmaz, K. ve Hatipoğlu, S. (2014). Öğretmenlerin eğitim inançları ile öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies, 1*(1), 37-78.

Ornstein, C. A., & Hunkins, P. F. (2016). *Curriculum: foundations, principles and issues.* USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Rideout, G. W. (2006). Educational beliefs and the learning environment. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, *10* (2), 67-71.

Silvernail, D. L. (1992). The educational philosophies of secondary school teachers. *The High School Journal*, *75*(3), 162-167.

Sönmez, V. (2020). *Eğitim felsefesi*. (16. Basım). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Taşkın, T. (2020). Fizik, kimya ve biyoloji öğretmenlerinin eğitim felsefesi tercihlerinin ve bilimsel epistemolojik inançlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, *16*(1), 1-19.

Tekin, S., & Üstün, A. (2008). Amasya eğitim fakültesi öğretmen adaylarının eğitim süreci hakkındaki felsefi tercihlerinin tespiti. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *25*, 145-158.

Tondeur, J., Hermans, R., vanBraak, J. V., & Valcke, M. (2008). Exploring the link between teachers' educational belief profiles and different types of computer use in the classroom. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *24*, 2541–2553

Tunca, N., Alkın-Şahin, S., & Oğuz, A. (2015). Öğretmenlerin eğitim inançları ile mesleki değerleri arasındaki ilişki. *Kalem Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, *5*(1), 11-47.

Üstüner, M. (2008). The comparison of the educational philosophies of Turkish primary school superintendents and teachers. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *33*, 177-192.

Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (2002). *Curriculum development: A guide to practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Yaralı, D. (2020). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim inançlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: Kafkas üniversitesi örneği. *Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 15* (29), 160-185.

Yılmaz, T., & Tosun, M. F. (2013). Öğretmenlerin eğitim inançları ile öğretmen öğrenci ilişkilerine yönelik görüşleri arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *2*(4), 205-218.

Yokuş, T. (2016). Müzik öğretmeni adaylarının benimsedikleri eğitim felsefelerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi, *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *3*(1), 26-36.