



International Conference on Education and Educational Psychology (ICEEPSY 2010)

Philosophy in the early years

Cagla, Gur*

Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

This study explains the philosophy for children method (P4C) and its aims, recounts its history, offers P4C research results from around the world, examines philosophy practices and research concerning children in Turkey, and samples its implementation by sharing the experiences of the P4C-trained researcher from working with six-year-old pre-school children. The aim of this study is to introduce the philosophy for children approach and contribute to the implementation studies in Turkey and North Cyprus. The study is based on a literature survey and observations from activities with children.

© 2009 Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).
Selection and/or peer-review under responsibility of Dr. Zafer Bekirogullari of Y.B.

Keywords: philosophy for children, preschool

*Cagla Gur. Tel.: +00-90-5336241134; fax:+00-90-312-3970415.
E-mail address: gurcagla@yahoo.co.uk.

1. Introduction

Along with the changes in the theoretical foundations and nature of science, new approaches to recognize the educational process and objectives, have been offered. One of the most important approaches, focuses on thinking (Marashi, 2008). Professor Mathew Lipman argued that by engaging children in philosophical discussions, it could be possible to develop their thinking abilities (Safaeimoghadam, 1999). He believes that if children's natural curiosity and their desire to discover the world are integrated with philosophy, they can be more flexible and effective thoughtful individuals (Safaeimoghadam, 1999).

In the 1970's, Matthew Lipman developed a philosophy curriculum called Philosophy for Children, based on the belief that children should be encouraged to philosophize. He was influenced by the Socratic method of systematic questioning and dialogue: starting from the point of assuming that one knows nothing, an argument is built up through step by step reasoning and agreement, with any inconsistency being challenged (Stanley & Bowkett, 2004). Through the Lipman's programme, children were encouraged to talk and listen to each other within a "community of enquiry" that was facilitated, not controlled, by the teacher (Vansieleghem, 2005).

In the 1990's Lipman's programme was beginning to attract a great deal of interest (Stanley & Bowkett, 2004). P4C has developed as a powerful pedagogical approach and met with ever-increasing popularity (Marashi, 2008). Now, in more than fifty countries methods of P4C is applied to the children (Marashi, 2008).

2. Purpose of the Study

This study explains the philosophy for children method (P4C) and its aims, recounts its history, offers P4C research results from all over the world, examines philosophy practices and research concerning children in Turkey, and samples its implementation by sharing the experiences of the P4C-trained researcher from working with 6-year-old pre-school children. The aim of this study is to introduce the philosophy for children approach and contribute to the implementation studies in Turkey and in North Cyprus. The study is based on a literature survey and observations from activities with children.

3. Aims of Philosophy For Children

Philosophy for Children should not be seen as a domain of knowledge, but rather as a package of practices and techniques designed to facilitate the attainment of knowledge and to enable participants to take decisions autonomously (Vansieleghem, 2005).

The basic premise of P4C is that through exploring, interesting, enjoyable and imaginative concrete stimuli, such as stories, children learn the skills necessary to develop their thinking towards the big issues that relate directly to their past, their present and their future. The discovery of new thoughts and questions about things that really matter will inevitably have a significant impact on their lives (Stanley & Bowkett, 2004). Here, it is important to teach children how to think instead of teaching what to think (Gregory, 2008).

P4C is designed to build thinking and reasoning skills and develop self-esteem. It emphasizes on cooperative yet rigorous inquiry and serves as a powerful educational model for teachers and students. Asking questions on the basic problems encountered and thinking about towards these questions are important in here (Estarellas, 2007). The purposes of the programme are; improving reasoning ability, developing creativity, bracing ethical values, enhancing self-awareness, raising critical thinking and supporting their judgement ability by providing children to think about the concepts that are important to themselves (Lipman, 1981; Marashi, 2008).

4. Researches on P4C

The researchers conducted several studies on P4C. These studies are examined under two different topics as researches conducted world-wide and as the situation in Turkey and in North Cyprus.

4.1. *Researches on P4C from All over the World*

The studies below are studies using controlled experimental designs and reporting adequate data. Such studies examined the following outcomes from P4C (Trickey and Topping, 2004):

- Logical reasoning (Williams, 1993; Sasseville, 1994; Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children, 2002);
- Reading comprehension (Lipman & Bierman, 1970; Haas, 1975; Williams, 1993; Dyfed County Council, 1994; Fields, 1995);
- Mathematics skills (Fields, 1995);
- Self-esteem (Dyfed County Council, 1994; Sasseville, 1994);
- Listening skills (Dyfed County Council, 1994);
- Expressive language (Dyfed County Council, 1994);
- Creative thinking (Education Testing Service, 1978);

These studies cover a 30-year time span. Some of the earlier studies were influential in the formation of what subsequently became the International Council for Philosophical Inquiry with Children (ICPIC), promoting philosophical enquiry in children in over 100 countries (Trickey and Topping, 2004; Lipman et al., 1980).

The Lipman and Bierman study.

It is the first known evaluation of P4C. It was conducted in 1970. The aim of the study was to determine the feasibility of teaching reasoning to fifth grade children. The study involved a pre–post test experimental design in which experimental and control groups were randomly selected. The groups were small in size ($n= 2 \times 20$). Significantly different gains in logical reasoning skills and reading scores on standardized tests were reported.

The Haas study.

The Haas evaluation was conducted in 1975 and reported in 1980. The Haas used a similar research design with a larger population of children ($n= 2 \times 200$). Sessions were applied by teachers to fifth and sixth grade children. Significant improvements in reading, critical thinking, and inter-personal relationships were gained.

The ETS study.

The study was conducted by The Education Testing Service of Princeton in 1978 and reported in 1980 with children utilised a similar research design ($n= 2 \times 200$) aged 10-to-13 in a 2-year project. Teachers received 2 hours training per week for the first year. Students received the programme 2 hours per week for 2 years. Significant differences were found between experimental and control groups in reading, mathematics, creative thinking, and formal reasoning.

The Williams's study.

William's (1993) study was conducted in Derbyshire, England, evaluated the effects of 27 1-hour sessions of P4C on 15 students aged between 11-to-12 years. The control group was consisted of 17 students. The control group received extra English. The teachers received 2 days initial training and met to discuss progress throughout the year. Pre–post questionnaires for students and standardized tests were used and coupled with analysis of video recording

of interaction. Gains in reading ability on the London Reading Test were statistically significant for P4C students, but there were no gains made by control group. Video recording of interaction indicated that there were significant gains in reasoning skills and the examination of assumptions and alternative ideas in more depth for P4C students, none for controls. The questionnaires suggested statistically significant gains in confidence, persistence, and in critical reasoning skills for P4C students. Teacher observations suggested that, there were improvements in inter-personal relations, particularly in listening to other points of view, reduction in angry and belittling responses, and more supportive group interaction.

The Sasseville's study.

Sasseville's (1994) study that was conducted in Canada focused on the impact on self-esteem. There were four experiment and four control groups. The experimental group consisted of 124 3rd to 6th grades children and the control group was 96 children. The teachers received 12 hours pre-project training and 4 days during the 5-month period of the research. The size of the classes involved was not stated. On the Pierce-Harris self-esteem test, P4C students showed an overall statistically significant gain compared to controls. The largest gains in self-esteem were with students with the lowest pre-test self-esteem, while those with high self-esteem actually showed a relative loss compared with the controls. To what extent this might be attributable to regression to the mean is a debatable point. Sasseville also applied a standardized test of logical reasoning skills to children. There was a significant gain in experimental group compared to control group.

The Dyfed study.

Dyfed County Council Project was conducted in 1994. It was focused on pupils aged 5 years and employed a whole class approach using 'Teaching Philosophy with Picture Books' as the stimulus for discussion. One group of six schools used two interventions (P4C and a reading activity), one group of six schools used the reading activity alone with a small group of children 'at risk' of reading difficulty, and a third group of six schools was the control group. Total sample was 229 children. The P4C group had two 1-hour sessions each week for most (83%) of an academic year. The teachers received three separate distributed days of training, between which school visits were made by the Project team to provide ongoing support. Measurements included teacher questionnaires, a measure of student attitude to reading based on pupil questions, a reading miscue analysis procedure, reading comprehension questions, and two tests from the British Abilities Scales—the Word Recognition Test (reading) and the Matrices test (nonverbal reasoning). The standardized tests concluded that there was no evidence of differences between the groups. However, from the other measures it appeared that children gained from both P4C and the reading activity, but gained more from both together. The P4C children were found to gain in thinking, listening, language skills, and self-confidence. No details were provided about statistical analyses used. Experimental groups obviously received more support and attention than the no-intervention group.

The Fields study.

This study was conducted in 1995. The study evaluated the outcomes of P4C with 123 children aged 7-to-8 years over one academic year. Experimental and control groups were randomly selected from two schools, matched for intelligence quotient, age, and sex, and assigned pair-wise to conditions. There were significant differences between experiment and control groups on measures of reasoning (Ravens Matrices, the New Jersey Reasoning Test, and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children), but on reading ability or fluency or mathematics, the difference was not significant. For the P4C group, a considerable decrease in negative verbal interactions between students and an increase in behavioural indicators of self-esteem were noted. Teacher observations showed that the P4C groups were perceived as displaying markedly more motivation, curiosity, commitment, and concentration.

The Campbell's study.

Campbell's study was conducted in 2002. It evaluated the impact of P4C in two primary (elementary) schools in Scotland, considering listening and speaking skills, student willingness to verbally participate, level of confidence, and verbal reasoning ability. Evaluation methods were pre–post questionnaires, focus groups, semi-structured interviews, and direct observation. Data indicated that P4C improved listening and engagement in group discussion. P4C children became more willing to speak out in front of the class and to accept others' ideas more readily. There was some evidence of children offering more reasons when expressing opinions. Teachers believed that some of the gains had transferred to other parts of the curriculum beyond the P4C sessions, and reported general gains in social skills.

The IAPC study.

The Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children (IAPC, 2002), based at Montclair State University, New Jersey, provided a report of research conducted in 1993-to-1994. This study had two experimental-control post-tests only comparisons and one pre-test/post-test comparison for a single group, in four selected experimental sites across the US that had used P4C for from 5-to-15 years. The test used was New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills. Students who had used P4C reported significant gains compared to control groups.

4.2. Philosophy and Children in Turkey and in North Cyprus

The philosophy education in Turkey and in North Cyprus is widely applied as courses to high school students. The developed programmes, projects and competitions aimed at more high school- age children.

Philosophical Society of Turkey does studies to improve the philosophy for children. The institution provides in-service training for teachers, organizes education congresses and philosophy Olympics for high school students for philosophy education to be gained at an early age. The institution also organizes summer philosophy camps for children. In those camps, different programmes are applied to 4th and 5th grades, and 6th, 7th and 8th grades (Philosophical Society of Turkey, 2010).

Although there are some activities for children in Turkey, the scientific studies that have been made are very few (Akdag, 2003). As a result of the literature review about the subject, the same conclusion with Akdag (2003) has been reached. In the wake of the literature review, no scientific study about the subject in North Cyprus has been encountered. The studies in Turkey are summarized as follow:

Oz and Ulcay(2004) developed Robert College Thinking and Concept Education Programme, one of the applied programmes in high schools. After having completed the primary school, the students who are accepted to Robert High school but who are believed to be successful only by inquiring, linking, not being productive about "reading and writing", accepting the teacher as the only authority, not asking questions, straining practice, having restraint intellectual accumulation, having inability of social sciences and philosophy, memorizing teacher's words were subjected to the Concept Knowledge Programme. The Concept Knowledge Programme aims to improve thinking, understanding, being enterpreneur and using language skills by presenting activities such as reading, listening, asking questions, interpreting, and telling. Thus, it also aims to train the independent and creative individuals of modern world. The programme was applied at 9th grades in a course hour weekly for a year. In the Concept Knowledge course especially the Socratic method, revealing the students' knowledge and thoughts without imposing information, was used. In this context, the main technique was seen as question and answer. At the end of the study, an improvement was seen in students' learning and thinking skills (Oz and Ulcay, 2004).

In his research on the effect of religious culture and ethics courses done by using the Socratic method on students' critical thinking tendencies and their attitudes towards the lesson, Sisman (2009) applied the Socratic Thought-Based Education Programme to the 22 16-year-old students for a period of one hour weekly for two months. Students' tendencies about the critical thinking ability were tested with the scale California Critical Thinking Tendency. After the application, the changes in students' attitudes toward the religious culture and ethics course, were tested with the attitude scale prepared by the Ministry of Education, Head Office of Religious Education. At the end of the research, it is observed that students' tendencies about the critical thinking ability have increased and their attitudes toward the religious culture and ethics course have changed in a positive direction.

Between the years 1994- 1995, Direk prosecuted the studies of adapting and applying the Pixie Programme in Turkish with three different groups (9- 12 yrs) for two years in Kucukyali and Kasimpasa Society for the Protection of Children (Direk, 2002).

As a result of the literature review, it is seen that the only study made for the preschool age group in Turkey is the study carried out by Okur(2008) on the subject "Effects of philosophy for children on social skills that are: assertiveness, self-control and cooperation at children of six years old" .

The aim of Okur's research was analysing P4C as a pedagogical programme, focused on the improvement of children's specific social skills that are: assertiveness, self-control, and cooperation. The research was carried out in Istanbul. The participants were 24 of 6 year-old children during 2007- 2008 academic year. Children were divided into two groups to form one experiment group, and one control group of equal number. The boys and girls were equal numbers in the groups too. The educational programme was developed to evaluate the effects of method of philosophy for children on children's assertiveness, self control and cooperation skills, based on Matthew

Lipman's. The educational process consisted of ten 40 minute sessions for 8 weeks. Both sessions for experiment and control groups included story-telling and drama; and for experiment group the programme also included discussions initiated by teacher's questions which aimed the inquiry of philosophical concepts. A Social Skill rating scale; Teacher Form (Kamaraj, 2004) was administered to experiment, control groups as a pre-test and post test. The findings indicated that, there was significant improvement in children's cooperative skills, self control and assertiveness. The results indicated that children at the age of 6, showed a meaningful difference statistically at their social skill level in Philosophy for Children education Programme performances. At the end of the research; it could be seen that Philosophy for Children affected 6 year old children's social skills that were assertiveness, self-control, and cooperation.

5. How is P4C Delivered?

P4C is delivered through a set of core materials with accompanying manuals. However, for the activities of Philosophy for Children, different stories or materials about the subject can also be used. The programme is introduced at five-to-six years of age, the assumption being that children are capable of critical and reflective thinking even at this stage. (Trickley Topping, 2004). The novels serve as springboards for debate. Their central characters learn to resolve their problems through their powers of reasoning. The class acts as a 'community of enquiry' (Gregory, 2008). The skills of the teacher in providing open-ended questions in a supportive emotional climate are crucial to the outcomes of the process (Trickley Topping, 2004).

The IAPC (Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children-Montclair University) publishes curriculum materials in P4C for use in grades P-12(Gregory, 2008). There are materials prepared for early childhood, primary school, middle school and for secondary school. The curriculum materials for early childhood are:

- Reasoning about Personhood: The Doll Hospital (novel) and Making Sense of my World (manual)
- Reasoning about Language: Geraldo (novel) and Discovering our Voice (manual)

Beside these, IAPC has developed TTLC Manual (Hardartottir et al., 2002) for preschool children.

- Thinking Trees and Laughing Cats: A Thinking Curriculum for Preschool Education.

Alternative stimulus materials have evolved since Lipman's original materials (Trickley Topping, 2004). In the UK, Fisher (1996) has produced a series of books. In Scotland, Cleghorn (2002) has produced a set of materials.

In P4C, the children engage in the production and exploration of questions, and about what the answers of these questions might be. P4C sessions, begin with a stimulus. This stimulus is presented by the teacher. This stimulus may be a story a poem, a picture, a drawing etc. After this stimulus, the participants are given some time to reflect on this and, then they produce some philosophical questions. The questions like "What is fair?", "What is time?", "Are thoughts real?", "What makes someone a best friend?", "What does it mean to be good?" are philosophical questions. At first, younger children may have a difficulty in formulating questions. This is because in traditional classes, the teacher reads a story and asks questions about the story; the children are only expected to give answers, not to formulate questions and ideas. So they are not familiar with formulating questions.

The enquiry process should include teacher behaviours that help to foster a climate conducive to the development of thinking skills, including the setting of ground rules well in advance, showing respect for each pupil's view, providing non-threatening activities, accepting individual differences, modelling thinking skills, and allowing students to be active participants(Trickley Topping,2004).

Researcher applied seven activities with 20 six-year-old pre-school children in Ankara, Turkey, with a purpose to observe the participation and attitudes of Turkish children in pre-school regarding P4C applications and the applicability of P4C activities for children. For subject to be more understandable, two sample applications and experiences are described below as an example. For children's status before and after the application of activities, to be more understandable, one of these activities was chosen among the first applied activities and the other was chosen among the last applied activities. After the examples are shown, the experiences and observations about the activities on the whole are mentioned.

5.1. Activity 1

In this activity researcher read a story from TTLC Manual as a stimulus and then asked questions to make the children reflect on the topic.

Story: A Picture of A Friend (Hardartottir et al., 2002)

One day, the teacher asked the children to draw pictures of their friends.

Next day they were showing their pictures to the class. There were picture of boys and girls from the class. Some pictures were really nice. Now it was Elfie's turn to show her picture. Her picture was different from the others. It was a picture of a pine-tree. Some kids started laughing. Elfie said, "My father planted this pine-tree near our house when I was born. We are growing together. And we are good friends." Everyone was silent. The children were looking at the picture and thinking.

After reading the story ,the researcher asked the questions below:

1. Can children from the same class be friends? Why?
2. Can children from the same school be friends? Why?
3. Can children from different schools be friends? Why?
4. Can plants be friends? Why?
5. Why do we have friends? Why?

Then the researcher told: "And now, you ask me a question about the story".

5.2. Observations on Activity 1

They all enjoyed the activity and the questions. They all participated. The researcher had no problem applying the activity to children. In this activity every child began to tell his own answer, not repeat the other's answer (This was the third activity of the all seven activities- in the first two activities most of the children repeated their friends' answers instead of thinking and telling their own answers). There was a problem in formulating questions on the topic. On asking them to find a question about the story, they all did not tell any question. They could not formulate questions. On giving some examples for helping them, they just repeated the same questions of the researcher.

Children's Answers to the Questions Asked:

1. Can children from the same class be friends? Why?

Yes- Because they can see each other/ because they can play/ because they are together etc.

2. Can children from the same school be friends? Why?

Yes- Because they can see each other/ because they can play/ because they are together etc.

3. Can children from different schools be friends? Why?

Yes- Because they sometimes see each/ sometimes they can play

No- Because they cannot see each other- they are in different places- they cannot play, etc.

4. Can plants be friends? Why?

No- because they have no eyes to see each other/ they have no mouths / they cannot speak/ they have no ears to listen- they cannot play- they cannot walk, etc.

5. Why do we have friends?

For playing together (other answers had same meanings)

In this activity the students began to develop the habit of giving reasons for their answers by answering why questions.

5.3. Activity 2

In this activity the researcher read an other story from TTLIC Manual as a stimulus and then asked questions to make them reflect on the topic.

Story: *It Moves so it's Alive* (Hardartottir et al., 2002)

After school, James and Heather were playing in Heather's garden. "Did you see that?" asked Heather.

"See what?" responded James.

"That rock just moved!" said Heather.

"Don't be silly. Rocks can't move. They're not alive," James said.

"If something moves it's alive?" asked Heather.

"Yep," replied James, "You and I are alive because we move and animals are alive because they move."

"Does that mean cars are alive?" asked Heather.

For this activity the researcher had chosen if so, then statement and gave reason questions (Why? What makes you think so, Do you agree and why?) for leading her students. The questions are below:

1. If alive things are moving then does everything that move alive? What makes you think so?
2. Do you think cars move? If so, are they alive? Why do you think so?
3. Are trees alive? Why?
4. Are the things that do not move non-living?
5. Do you agree that something is alive only if it moves? Is there anything else a living thing does?

Then the researcher told: "And now, you ask me a question about the story".

5.4. Observations on Activity 2

They all participated in the activity. The children tried to find their own answers to the questions and everyone wanted to tell her/his own idea. On formulating the question they had difficulty again. They began to formulate questions; but these questions were like the questions, which the researcher gave as an example. They were not original yet but they began to produce question, this was an improvement for them.

Children's Answers to the Questions Asked:

1. If alive things are moving then does everything that move alive? What makes you think so?

One of them said "No". And then, everyone agreed.

- It can be move because of the wind.-trees, flowers
- Washing machine moves but electric makes this movement.
- The rain makes the leaves moving, etc.

2. Do you think cars move? If so, are they alive? Why do you think so?

No. (Everybody agreed with this answer)

- They are not alive because it is made from iron.
- Because it is made from glass.
- Because it has plastic parts.
- It is not moving by itself. There is anybody that starts it.
- There is a machine inside that makes the movement, etc.

3. Are trees alive? Why?

Some of them said "no" and some of them "yes".

No. Because; -they can not do anything.

- They are just standing/ the wind makes them moving, etc.

Yes. Because; -they may not move but they can still alive.

-They have branches/ they have leaves/ when a leaf is falling down, it is moving, etc.

4. Are the things that do not move non-living?

Yes. Because they cannot do anything.

No. Because, they may not move but still alive/ they may be hands and arms/ they may be eyes/ they may be an animal, etc.

5. Do you agree that something is alive only if it moves? Is there anything else a living thing does?

It can see/ it can talk/ it can eat/ it can breathe, etc.

It is seen in the applied P4C activities that, the children participated in activities pleurably and at the end of each activity, they told researcher to come again. This situation shows that the activities are applicable for children in Turkey. The researcher thinks that these activities are also applicable for the children in North Cyprus because of the origin and the observation of pre- school children in North Cyprus, by basing on his observations.

During the seven activities process, it was observed that children had difficulty in creating original ideas at first and created ideas similar to each other's responses, and even in the first application, only a few children conveyed the group, the others participated rarely. However, as the number of applications increased, the children began to express their opinions more comfortable by seeing that their ideas were valued. Later on, they produced more original ideas and they took care of giving their own original responses, rather than giving similar evasive responses to their friends'.

The most problematic part in studies with children is, children's question production about the subject. In the first two applications, the children avoided producing questions about the subject. This situation is believed to be originated because as it is known in traditional studies, after having been read the story by the teacher, the teacher asks the questions and sometimes s/he just reads the story and the children are not expected to participate with questions. In the third application, the children copied the sample questions given by the researcher. In the following applications, the children needed to be asked sample questions in order to start to ask questions; and then, they started to reproduce similar questions which were neither original nor philosophical. The children who are new to philosophy need the help of an experienced facilitator (Gergory, 2008). When it comes to the procedures of inquiry, the facilitator both guides the children and models for them by asking open-ended questions and questioning reasons (Gregory, 2008).

The purpose of seven applied activities was to observe children's participations and attitudes towards activities rather than to make positive changes in children. It is believed that long-term applications are needed for serious progresses. In addition, as a result of long-term applications, the children are believed to gain the ability producing philosophical questions about the subject by relating the philosophical questions which they normally asked already in life to the subject (E.g. Why do people lie?) If it is considered that the age group is so young, children's start in producing questions as a result of a short process consisting of just seven activities applied one times a week, can be evaluated as a success.

P4C applications are thought to contribute to Turkish children and as a result of the observations; the children will give positive answers to these programmes and participate in them. It is believed that the development of P4C targeted behaviours will be supported.

6. Conclusion

P4C is developed by Lipman in 1970's. Today, this programme is applied in many countries, and it is accepted as a strong approach from an educational aspect. The main purpose of this programme is to make children gain different perspectives by teaching them how to think rather than teaching what to think.

The literature survey revealed that the philosophy for children (P4C) programme supports children's critical thinking skills, creativity, acquisition of ethical values, and social development. There is a limited number of studies in Turkey about this programme; and studies are needed about philosophy training approach in the pre-school period. No data could be reached concerning research or practice about philosophy training in the pre-school period in North Cyprus, and thus it was concluded that there is a need for such studies in North Cyprus as well.

In the philosophy activities conducted with 20 six-year-old children, the researcher observed that children were happy to participate in the activities, made an effort to create new ideas, but had difficulties in creating open-ended questions and in original thinking. It is thought that this is normal for children who are new to philosophy, and that the more experience they gain, the more quality questions they create and the more original and creative they become. The teacher should be patient, at first s/he should do question production exercises by reading stories. For example, after having asked sample questions about the question forms "Why" and "When", the teacher may demand children to produce questions with these forms. It should be accepted as normal that the children do not complete the first exercises enriching the subject. As the philosophical activities are applied, the children will start to ask a variety of reasonable questions about the subject over time.

Large number of questions may cause distraction and boredom in the applications with pre-school children; because the age group is so young. For this reason, in studies with young children, the teacher should ask limited number of questions in order children to retain the subject. (E.g. the discussion should be developed at about 4-5 questions for 6-year-old group.) Thus, the subject will be more clearly understood and the subject won't split. Again for the same reason, before starting the activity, meeting children's toilet and water needs will prevent the interruption of activity; because of these kind of needs and splitting children's attention to the exogenous factors.

P4C is a programme having properties that will affect an individual lifelong. Developing and applying the programmes basing on this approach, starting to apply P4C materials by completing the adaptation studies would have important benefits for children.

It is believed that integrating the P4C approach into pre-school education, offering in-service training about P4C to preschool educators, and educating future pre-school teachers who are knowledgeable about P4C by adding a new course to pre-school education programmes at universities would contribute to raising children to become sensitive individuals who are respectful of different perspectives and able to form their own rights, possess ethical values, notice and correct their own mistakes, and embrace new ideas.

References

- Akdag, B.(2003). Philosophy teaching research. *Journal of the Philosopher*, no. 3, 55-59.
- Campbell, J. (2002). *An evaluation of a pilot intervention involving teaching philosophy to upper primary school children in two primary schools, using the Philosophy for Children methodology*. Unpublished MSc Educational Psychology thesis, University of Dundee.
- Cleghorn, P. (2002) *Thinking through philosophy*. Blackburn, England: Educational Printing Services.
- Direk, N. (2002). *Thinking of the Little Prince*.(3rd ed.). Istanbul: Pan Publishing.
- Dyfed County Council (1994). *Improving reading standards in primary schools project*. Wales: Dyfed County Council.
- Education Testing Service (1980). Appendix B: experimental research in philosophy for children. In: M. Lipman, A. M. Sharp & F. Oscanyon (Eds) *Philosophy in the classroom* (pp.217-224).Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Estarellas,P.C.(2007.) Teaching philosophy vs teaching to philosophize. *Philosophy Now*, 1(63):12-15.
- Fields, J. (1995). Empirical data research into the claims for using philosophy techniques with young children. *Early Child Development and Care*,107, 115–128.
- Fisher, R. (1996). *Stories for thinking*. Oxford, England: Nash Pollock.
- Haas, H. (1980). Appendix B: experimental research in philosophy for children. In: M. Lipman, A. M. Sharp & F. Oscanyon (Eds.) *Philosophy in the classroom* (pp.217-224).Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Gregory,M.(2008). *Philosophy for children: Practitioner handbook*. Montclair,USA: IAPC Publication.
- Hardartottir,G.A , Heuy-Ing,C., Jo,S.H., Koltko,N; Lipman,M., Ogden,C. & Suklomlinsky,V.(2002) *Thinking trees and laughing cats: A thinking curriculum for preschool education*. Montclair, USA: IAPC Publication.
- Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children (2002) *IAPC research: experimentation and qualitative information*. Available online at: www.montclair.edu/pages/iapc/experimentalinfo.html, accessed 1 December 2007.
- Lipman, M. (1981). Philosophy for children. In: A. L. Costa (Ed.), *Developing minds: Programs for teaching thinking*. Vol.2 (pp.35-38).Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curricular Development.
- Lipman, M. & Bierman, J. (1980). Appendix B: Experimental research in philosophy for children. In: M. Lipman, A. M. Sharp & F. Oscanyon (Eds.) *Philosophy in the classroom*.(pp.217-224). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

- Lipman, M., Sharp, A.M. & Oscanyan, F.S. (1980). *Philosophy in the classroom*. Philadelphia, USA: Temple University Press.
- Marashi, S.M. (2008). Teaching philosophy to children: A new experience in Iran. *Analytic Teaching*, 27(1):12-15
- Okur, M. (2008). *Effects of philosophy for children on social skills that are: assertiveness, self-control and cooperation at children of six years old*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Istanbul, Turkey: Marmara University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Department of Early Childhood Education.
- Oz, F.G. & Ulcay, S. (2004). *The application of concept information programme at Robert High School*. Istanbul, Turkey: Private American Robert High School.
- Safaeimoghadam, M. (1999). Philosophy for children program. *Journal of Human Science*, 8, 26-27.
- Sasseville, M. (1994). Self esteem, logical skills and philosophy for children. *Thinking*, 4(2), 30–32.
- Sharp, A.M. & Splitter, L.J. (2000). *The doll hospital and making sense of my world: Teacher manual for doll hospital*. Australia: The Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Sharp, A.M. & Splitter, L.J. (2000). *Geraldo and discovering our voice : Teacher manual for Geraldo*. Australia: The Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Sisman, S. (2009). *The effect of religious culture and ethics courses done by using the Socratic method on students' critical thinking tendencies and their attitudes towards the lesson*. Paper presented at XVIII. National Congress of Educational Sciences (1-3 October), Ege University Faculty of Education, Izmir, Turkey.
- Stanley, S. & Bowkett, S. (2004). *But why? Teacher's manual: Developing philosophical thinking in the classroom*. U.K.: Network Educational Press.
- Trickey, S. & Topping, K.J. (2004). Philosophy for children: A systematic review. *Research Papers in Education*, 19(3), 365-379.
- Vansielegem, N. (2005). Philosophy for children as the wind of thinking. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 29(1), 19-35
- Williams, S. (1993) *Evaluating the effects of Philosophical Enquiry in a secondary school*. Derbyshire, England: Derbyshire County Council.