

1 Between "a friend" and "like a friend": Differences in Viewpoint
2 between Children and Teacher about Teacher's Role in Play of
3 Child-Care Center

4 Ga-II Jeon¹

5 ¹ Jangan University

6 *Received: 9 December 2015 Accepted: 31 December 2015 Published: 15 January 2016*

7

8 **Abstract**

9 This study explored the viewpoints of teachers and children about teacher's role in free play
10 at a play-based child care center, and sought the implication of the differences. For this aim, I
11 used participant observation of free playtime at a child care center that advocated
12 play-centered curriculum, and interviewed teachers and children. Results indicated both
13 similarity and difference in their viewpoints. While teachers regarded their primary role as ?a
14 playmate? who played with children in free play time, children perceived their teachers as
15 someone ?like a friend? rather than ?a friend.? However, both teachers and children regarded
16 teacher's role in free play as the planner of play: ?leading children to the goal? through free
17 play and ?planning the play.? Also, children perceived various differences between teachers and
18 themselves, and placed meanings to play motive, suggesting that the difference in viewpoints
19 to the role of teachers at free play possibly comes from the discrepant interpretation of play.
20 This study provides practical implication for teachers' interaction with children in play by
21 helping us understand the viewpoints of children about teacher's role in play.

22

23 **Index terms**— teacher's role, free-play, playmate, day-care center, phenomenological study.

24 **1 Introduction**

25 have worked as a teacher for a while at a child care center that advocated play as a curriculum. At that time,
26 I tried to make educational activities become play, not class. As a constructivist teacher of a childcare center
27 advocating play-centered program, I wanted to be a friend to the children getting along well with them. However,
28 after an activity had been finished, children came to me and asked like this: "Teacher, can I go and play now?"
29 No matter how hard I prepared an activity as play, it did not seem that they regarded it as "play". To the
30 children I felt that I was just a teacher, not a playmate. Why? Why could not I be a playmate of children?
31 What is the role of a teacher in play? This question not only concerns the relationship between children and
32 teacher, but also is relevant to understanding children's play. Further, characteristics of play are deeply related
33 to the player's role, teacher's role constructs the characteristics of play. Thus, to understand play at childcare
34 center, we need to look into teacher's role in play.

35 Studies on teacher's role in play have mainly analyzed the relationship between teacher and children in free
36 play. Many of them focused on teacher's interaction with children to help them in play (Ashiabi, 2007; Fumoto,
37 2011; Lobman, 2006; Jones, 2013; Park, 2007; Stanton-Chapman & Hadden, 2011; Widger & Schofield, 2012).
38 For example, Lobman (2006) demonstrated that teachers' interaction encouraged the enjoyment of children and
39 extended their play, focusing on the improvisational characteristics of play. Also, Widger and Schofield (2012)
40 showed teachers' interaction in play through teacher's viewpoint from three approaches based on child-centered
41 philosophy. Moreover, Fumoto (2011) and Stanton-Chapman and Hadden (2011) considered how teachers extend
42 the play by interacting in children's play, and help them actively participate in play. Play participation and

5 B) PARTICIPANTS

43 interaction of teacher is one of the highly emphasized roles in play-based curriculum . These studies demonstrate
44 that play participation and interaction of teacher serves a positive and important role that help children. However,
45 according to some studies, frequent play interaction and participation of teacher could restrict freedom and
46 enjoyment of children's play (Farne, 2005; Holt, Lee, Millar, & Spence, 2013; Jeon, 2013). Jeon (2013) showed
47 that teacher's participation in play simplifies the play by leading it toward the way that the teacher wants. Also,
48 Farne (2005) mentioned that real play of children takes place where there is no attention of adults, like street.
49 Therefore, the positive aspect of teacher's interaction needs to be examined, comparing with the viewpoints in
50 these studies.

51 On the other hand, some studies focused on control and supervision of teacher during play (Jones, 2013;Leavitt,
52 1994;Wing, 1995). These studies showed how teachers restrict freedom of children, and make adult-centered order
53 and time rules internalized in the children in play scenes. In addition, these studies show how use of items is
54 formalized, and how the body system of children is adapted to school by teacher's control of time and space
55 (Leavitt, 1994). Such control and training also occurs in play. Teachers control formalization of space and time
56 of play as well as the use of toys (Leavitt, 1994;Jones, 2013). These studies give a new angle on the teacher's
57 participation in play that has been emphasized as a positive aspect in playbased curriculum so far. At the
58 same time, they emphasize children's objectivity as a being under control, by focusing on teacher's doing to the
59 children. However, children are not only the being in the world reacting to teacher's doing, but also interactive
60 subject making another possibility in limits of the world ??Heidegger, 1927;Jeon, 2013;Yin, 2013;van Manen,
61 2012). Therefore, when we consider the role of a teacher in play, we should explore children's viewpoints about
62 teacher's role as a subject of relation. Thus, we need to understand viewpoints of children, putting down our
63 pre-understanding and viewpoints as a teacher and an adult.

64 In this context, Samuelsson and Johansson (2009)'s study helps us to understand children's viewpoint by
65 demonstrating why children invite teachers to their play. Children wanted to invite teacher when they needed
66 help from teacher, broke the rules, or needed information. However, children did not ask teachers for help,
67 nor they invited them to play if possible, because playfulness of teachers did not come up to the children's,
68 and sometimes they even interrupted children's play (Samuelsson & Johansson, 2009). Also, teachers did not
69 want to jump into interaction in children's play. These researchers thought that it is because teachers have
70 different playfulness with children's and because teachers themselves are afraid of interrupting children's play.
71 These findings cast doubt upon the importance of teacher's play intervention and participation, which has been
72 supposed by most theories of play from a developmental perspective . Also, the researchers conjectured that
73 children in their study regarded teacher's main role as an assistant who helps their play. However, do Korean
74 children have the same conceptions as children in the European culture? How do children think about teacher's
75 role in play at childcare centers? What do teachers think their main role is? What viewpoints do teachers and
76 children have about teacher's role in play? If their thoughts are discrepant, how should we understand it? What
77 meaning is hidden in that difference?

78 To answer the questions above, the present study explored the viewpoints of the teacher and the child regarding
79 teacher's role in play by using participant observation and interview at a child care center in Korea. Especially,
80 to understand play in child care center and children's viewpoint to teacher's role, I tried to deconstruct my
81 pre-understanding and see the phenomenon as it is as I could.

82 2 II.

83 3 Methods

84 4 a) Design

85 This study used phenomenological qualitative inquiry to understand the viewpoints of the children and the
86 teachers about teacher's role in play. Phenomenological qualitative inquiry does not find the truth as fixed
87 substance, but seeks truthfulness ??Gadamer, 2000;Jeon, 2013). This study also tried to understand the teacher's
88 role at play in eyes of children and teachers, that is, in emic viewpoint of participant, rather than paid attention
89 to previous discussion on teacher's role in play.

90 5 b) Participants

91 The field in this study was five-year-old children's class, Pooreun, in Cday care center that had play-centered
92 curriculum, located in Seoul downtown. I visited the center once or twice a week, and did participant observation
93 in free playtime for about 10 months. Cday care center is a workplace child care facility, placed in the company
94 building, and can accommodate 100 children. It has a one-year curriculum, consisting of a series of play themes.
95 In a year, there are 12 broad themes, each of which has four sub-themes. Teachers plan play on a weekly and
96 monthly basis according to 'play-centered curriculum' theme of the day care center. Every week, two teachers
97 alternate their roles, one as a "head teacher"(main teacher), leading their planned activities, and the other as an
98 assistant. While the main teacher constructs main play of the week and leads it, the other teacher assists the
99 main teacher.

100 The participants were children and two teachers (Teacher, Han and Teacher, Jung) of class Pooreun. Prior to
101 the study, I visited the classroom to explain the study to teachers and ask for agreement to participate in the

102 study. Also, written, informed consent was obtained from parents of 14 children, which were all children in class
103 Pooreun.

104 **6 c) Data i**

105 The present study gathered various kinds of data in order to avoid unbalanced understanding of the phenomenon
106 due to one kind of data collection in qualitative research (Jo, 2011; ??olcott, 1994). The data collected for this
107 study were three types: Participant observation data on free play time, data from interview with children and
108 teachers, and journal offered by teachers. The contents of concrete data for each method of data collection are
109 shown in Table 1. First, basic coding was performed for all collected data, mainly with things related to the
110 subject of this study, using emic coding. Emic coding refers to sorting the data through the viewpoint of a
111 participant in it, in his or her own words, to make data tell the story by itself as much as it can. Emic coding
112 was followed by structural coding, which is to find the possible answer to research problems and structuralize
113 data (Saldana, 2009). Based on this structural coding, I categorized similar concept and mean shown on data,
114 and relation of subjects inductively by logical relation.

115 **7 III.**

116 **8 Results**

117 **9 a) Different viewpoints: "a friend" vs. "like a friend" Teacher: 118 "I believe I am a playmate to my children"**

119 Every time I went into the class, Pooreun, for observation, I had to look for teachers many times because they
120 were mingled with children playing. For example, teacher Han often made scripts and items with children for
121 pretend play, or watched pretend play. Teacher Jung often played a role herself in pretend play. Especially,
122 because there were many pretend plays, the teachers often used to play a role in the play, and toss around with
123 the children. When they invited other class children as an audience to their pretend play, teacher's role seemed
124 to become more obvious. After pretend play, teachers were excited and proud of it, talking about their feelings
125 with the children, as often seen among friends. Sometimes, opinions between children and teachers on making
126 pretend plays were divided. In those cases, children did not seem to care about teachers' opinions but rather
127 often insisted their own opinions strongly. They also pointed out teachers' mistakes. These observations together
128 made me think as if they treated their teacher as their friends. In the earlier semester, when the play theme was
129 <Day care center>, one child and Teacher Han almost fought while they were discussing how to decorate the
130 toddler class due to their different opinions. The happening ended after they went to the toddler class together
131 and checked the real interior of the classroom. In this context, teachers appeared to think that their relationship
132 with children was "a playmate" in free play. They thought them selves as friends of children during play, whom
133 served a part in the play at the same level as children, rather than instructed or controlled them. Teachers'
134 perception about teacher's role in free play is shown in the following interview.

135 Teacher As can be seen above, the teachers perceived their main role as "a playmate" in free playtime, and
136 they said, they want to believe it like that." They were proud of the fact that they work at a play-based day care
137 center, and gave it an important meaning. Teachers Han and Jung thought that playing with children in free
138 playtime was the most important than any other work. They thought that a teacher should be a "playmate" who
139 could accept and extend "free" play of children in a play-based day care center. They did not do any instruction
140 to children or control them, but rather they were just play-participants continuously interacting with children.
141 This pattern of teacher participation is highly distinct from that of teachers in ordinary day care centers in Korea,
142 who participate in children's play only when children ask for it or when there is a conflict or a problem among
143 children. Therefore, watching these teachers perceiving themselves as "a playmate" of children, I also thought
144 that the teachers were friends of children. It seemed that the ideal role of teachers in play that a play-based
145 curriculum seeks for was perfectly fulfilled in this class. While the teachers aimed to serve as a playmate in free
146 play of classroom as above, however, children had different thoughts.

147 Children While interviewing children and analyzing it later, I found a new viewpoint. Won-Ji said that teacher
148 liked "treating" her "like a friend". According to Won-Ji's expression, teacher is a person, "not play together
149 with, but just play with" her. They are sometimes a friend and sometimes are not, "half to half". It means that
150 teachers are "like a friend", but eventually they are not a friend! At the first of this interview, I did not think the
151 meaning of her saying deeply and I thought children regard teacher as their playmate. I ignored subtle difference
152 of "like~" in her saying. And then, throughout analyzing data again, I found that she was obviously saying "not
153 a friend", though "like a friend". After being aware of children's viewpoints through that subtle difference, I
154 could see the children's viewpoint like these in others interview. The children telling that their teachers were like
155 a friend, but not a friend, although each had a different reason.

156 "I like that the teacher treat us like friends" "Play with me (not continuously but when I need her) sometimes"
157 "Because she doesn't talk kindly (she is not a friend), although she played with me" "Teacher is not a friend,
158 although she plays with me" "Because teacher is older than me, she is not a friend." "Can talk with her, but
159 cannot play with her" "Not a friend, but like mom and dad, taking care of me?"

10 C) THE MEANING OF BETWEEN "A FRIEND" AND "LIKE A FRIEND"

160 To the children, their teachers were "listening to what they said carefully", "playing with them" and "like a
161 friend". But they were not "a friend". I looked back that my understanding of teacher's role and meaning in play
162 was highly teacher-centered viewpoint, through finding the children's. Children's viewpoints like these, about
163 role of teacher in free play, show more clearly through teacher's role called "play planner" as follows.

164 b) Same viewpoints: "leading to the goal" and "planning the play" i. Teacher: "helping to approach the goal
165 by free play"

166 While doing participant observation over and over, the characteristic of play I found first in class Pooreun
167 was that children played as a group mostly. After snack time, even the children who had played alone or in
168 a small group, played the same things after 10 minutes. At the beginning of the observation, it seemed that
169 this phenomenon was natural. However, with observing over and over, I found that children repeated the same
170 pretend play form only with different theme. While in free playtime of five-year-old classroom in the other day
171 care center, observed during the same period, various play forms were observed, such as a game of slap-match,
172 dinosaur fighting, flicking go stone, car racing, fighting with guns, playing the restaurant, play like police, play a
173 comedy, making a flower garden, and making an airplane, etc. But the Pooreun's play almost ended in the same
174 form, group pretend play, whether any theme had been played. And this theme was fixed as a play theme of
175 this week, among the annual play theme, decided by the play-centered curriculum in A day care center. All the
176 annual theme of five-years class in A day care center are "Class and Friend", "Spring and Animals and Plants",
177 "Me and Family", "Machine and Life", "My country", and "The Earth and Environment", etc. That is setting
178 educational goal related to the themes, and helping to realize in play.

179 Teacher Jung: I think the role of teacher is? first, teacher does not insist their opinion, but there is a setting
180 goal through this play, mainly, so they should not forget that educational goal. That is, the role that helps to
181 approach to the goal closely by children's play is important to teacher. Maybe play fun with them, rather than
182 help. But it is important that teacher shouldn't forget the point, the point of the play.

183 Teachers said that, although there is a theme of play and a goal of the play, this goal does not apply to every
184 child alike, and because it is not something that children "have to know" or "have to study" but rather something
185 that children are "experiencing and feeling", it is different from learning. As teachers' said, if the play of Pooreun
186 is "the play as a experiencing and feeling", why should the theme of play be set? Could such play whose goal
187 is pre-determined, be free play? In fact, during the 10 months observation in Pooreun, I saw conflict between
188 theme play that teachers had prepared, and not-theme-related play by children.

189 Researcher As conflictive experience increased between play theme set by curriculum and play created by
190 children, teacher was concerned about the freedom of play. While teachers prepared a play according to the
191 pre-determined play theme and led children to goal, they wanted to be 'a playmate' at the same time. However,
192 do children consider a teacher as a friend, perceiving leading children to "the goal" as their important role while
193 playing? Eventually, teacher's role of "leading to goal" based on the play-centered curriculum made irony that
194 standardized and regularized play of them.

195 ii. Children: "After teacher planned, we played"

196 The participating children also had the same thoughts about teacher's role that the teachers told "leading to
197 the goal." There were two especially notable things while transcribing the content of interview and participant
198 observation about free play of the class,: First, most of the play occurred in the classroom was pretend play;
199 Second, children used the word "plan" very much about teacher's role. The play that could be seen frequently in
200 Pooreun was mostly 'making script', 'making items for pretend play', 'deciding a role in pretend play', 'decorating
201 the stage and making seats for audience', 'making invitation cards and tickets', 'play the pretend play', etc. And
202 in the center of directing and doing this pretend play, there was teacher Jung. What Jung said most frequently
203 during the free playtime, was "Please come here anyone who want to do pretend play~" and "Who want to
204 take this role?" and so on. Such pretend play is the play form that can show the play theme of play-centered
205 curriculum of A child care center most dramatically. In interview with children, they used the word "plan" most
206 frequently when they had a talk related to teacher's role in free play. To the question of the researcher 'How do
207 you play with teacher in free playtime?', participating children provided answers such as the followings.

208 "After teacher planned, we played" "After teacher told about planned play, (we played.)" "After teacher made
209 plan, we did it with our ideas" "Teacher sometimes planned and sometimes played with, many times they played
210 with us and helped us." "In play teacher planned she played with us."

211 As seen in the above, most of the children talked teacher's role relating with play plan. Children of Pooreun
212 perceived obviously of that, the role of teacher in free play was play planner. Even to the question "In free
213 playtime do you play in the way you want?", most of the children answered "After teacher planned, we played."
214 And this plan is given already according to 'the play theme' of A day care center advocating playcentered
215 curriculum. Given play theme of play-centered curriculum and "a goal" of the teachers made teachers of class
216 Pooreun, play planner and director, and made children, executor or consumer (Jeon, 2013).

217 10 c) The meaning of between "a friend" and "like a friend"

218 Children and teachers had similar thoughts about teacher's role as the play planner. However, while teachers
219 thought that their most important role was a playmate participating in children's play, children considered
220 teachers as someone "like a friend" but not "a friend." What forms this gap? What meaning is hidden between "a
221 friend" and "like a friend"? i. Perception about difference: "Because teacher is an adult and I'm a child" As the

222 reason why they didn't think the teacher as a friend, children frequently mentioned a "difference" between teachers
223 and children. Those differences can be divided largely into physical differences and nonphysical differences. As
224 for the physical differences, children referred to biological age ("Because age is different?"), and body ("Because
225 teacher is tall, I'm small"). For the non-physical differences, they mentioned differences in cognitive abilities
226 ("Because I don't do it well, but teacher thinks all of it."), roles ("Because teacher takes care of us."), and power
227 ("Because teacher doesn't do kindly"). The child who answered "because teacher doesn't do kindly" referred
228 that in conflictive situations with friends in free play, teacher often talked in the other friend's side. Such answer
229 shows that the child perceives difference in power between teacher and him in play. Teachers regarded themselves
230 as "a playmate" of children who "just has the title, teacher", but children perceived that there still exists not
231 only physical difference but also difference in power.

232 ii. Play, not as enjoyment but as taking care of: "doesn't play together, but offered us with play" One
233 remarkably repeated phrase in children's description of play with teacher was that teachers "offered us with
234 play." Children used the expression "Teacher offered us with play" rather than "we played together with teacher."
235 What is the difference between 'offer play' and 'play together'? At first, I overlooked this difference, but the
236 expression caught me as I reviewed the interview with children. I found that children's viewpoint was hidden
237 there. That was interpretation about play motivation of teachers. Children thought that teachers were not
238 "playing together with" them but "offering play" to them. "Playing together" is playing with one's own pleasure,
239 but "offering play to" is participating in play to fulfill a duty to the other. Children thought that teacher was
240 playing with them to take care of them, not for their own pleasure. This viewpoint is clearly shown in the
241 interview with Eun-Mi.

242 Researcher At the beginning of the interview, Eun-mi said "Because teacher is an adult and I'm a child" as the
243 reason why teachers were not friends. However, at the end of the interview, Eun-mi said, without any hesitation,
244 that the researcher could be her friend "because (she) keeps playing together" despite the fact that the researcher
245 was an adult. Thus, eventually, to Eun-Mi, the main criteria in determining whether or not one is a friend in
246 play, was beyond the differences between adult and child.

247 iii. School type play: "It doesn't seem like free play" Another reason why children did not view the teacher as
248 a playmate despite the effort from teacher to be a friend was the characteristics of free play. In most cases, play
249 in free playtime of class Pooreun occurred was not children's spontaneous play. Rather, it was based on teacher's
250 careful planning according to the pre-determined play theme. The play themes were set for week, month and
251 year, so they were like "curriculum of play." This seems close to school type play, rather than free play. Teachers
252 perceived this, too.

253 Researcher: Teachers prepare play carefully in this day care center. What do you think about that? Teacher
254 Han: ?In that sense, it may not be free play? (omitted)? But in our class, children can choose their play within
255 the theme that teacher prepares.

256 The most surprising finding in participant observation of class Pooreun was that in almost every free playtime,
257 10 or more out of 14 children did pretend play of the same theme together. At first glance, play of class Pooreun
258 seemed various, but the over all theme was pre-determined, and the process of progressing children's play was
259 mostly fixed as follows.

260 Teachers' planning of play based on the theme? Teacher's explanation about the theme and play items?
261 Children's exploratory play in each play corner (e.g., building blocks, reading books)? Finding pretend play
262 items? Making stage, background, script, and items, etc. ? Doing pretend play.

263 It revealed that children's play form was not various although the play themes varied according to the
264 annual theme. This was because free playtime of Pooreun is school type play according to a fixed curriculum.
265 Consequently, in such situation, children did not think their teachers, who plan and prepare school type play, as
266 "a friend."

267 IV.

268 11 Discussion and Conclusion

269 The present study was conducted to understand the viewpoints of teachers and children to the role of a teacher
270 in free play at a play-centered daycare center, and to understand the meaning of the difference. Below, I discuss
271 the current findings in relation to previous studies, and provide suggestions for follow-up research and the field
272 of early childhood education.

273 First, the teachers considered themselves as children's friends, where as children viewed the teachers as figures
274 who were not friends but "like friends", indicating a difference in viewpoints between teachers and children to
275 the teachers' role in free play. Such discrepancy in view points might be because children and teachers define
276 a "playmate" differently, which eventually relates to the interpretation of play. Perhaps, playing for something
277 (educational goal in teacher's side) was not play to children. Several previous studies (Farne, 2005; Holt, Lee,
278 Millar, & Spence, 2013; Jeon, 2013) showed that teacher's frequent participation at play could damage the
279 enjoyment of play of children. Such findings suggest that interaction in teacher's side could be interruption to
280 children in free play (Widger & Schofield, 2012). The difference of viewpoints between teacher and child reminds
281 of Thomson and Philo's (2004) point that we are still looking at children's play by value of adults and eyes of
282 the necessity.

283 Second, in play-centered childcare, teachers perceived their main role in free play as leading children to the

11 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

284 educational goal through play, and children also viewed that planning play was the main role of teacher. This
285 finding is consistent with traditional play-based curriculum seeing children's play as a key to the curriculum in
286 the field of early childhood education (Cannella, 1997;King, 1982;Wing, 1995). The majority of play-centered
287 childcare centers try to achieve educational goal and proceed children's educational activity by play (Hoorn,
288 Nourot, Scales, & Alward, 2011; ??eu, 2004). Such result is slightly different from those studies (Ashabi,
289 2007;Fumoto, 2011;Lobman, 2006;Park, 2007;Stanton-Chapman & Hadden, 2011) that view the role of a teacher
290 in play is to increase interaction and improve the relation between children. Follow-up research needs to further
291 explore these two different aspects of interaction.

292 Third, as a reason why teachers were not their friends, children perceived differences between teachers and
293 themselves in both physical aspects such as age and body size, and non-physical aspects such as cognitive abilities,
294 decision authority, and power. Possibly, such perception of differences made children consider teacher's interaction
295 in a play as an instruction, rather than a conversation or discussion that usually happens among friends to solve
296 conflicts or to compromise. Although teachers thought that they put down their power and had an equal status
297 as the children during play, children were still prone to remark the differences (Jeon, 2013, Yin, 2013). This
298 finding suggests that teacher's interaction in play may cause inequality, albeit unintentionally does so. Thus,
299 when teachers want to participate in play, they need to understand the viewpoints of children. However we,
300 adults and teachers, put it down, we still have more power than children.

301 Fourth, not only the playing behavior but also the motive of playing may be an important component of play
302 to children. Children expressed that teachers did not play together with them. Perhaps children recognized that
303 teachers participated in children's play as one of the child caring work rather than playing with children together
304 because of their own pleasure. To children, teachers who were playing as a caring duty were not "a friend"
305 of them, suggesting children's thoughts about inner motive of play. This finding helps us better understand
306 children's viewpoints about play and has an implication for how teachers could become a real friend of children.

307 Lastly, in "school" type play, a teacher cannot be a friend no matter how she or he is receptive. The teachers
308 in this study were kind, gentle and very receptive. At the same time, because teachers regarded play as their
309 most important curriculum, they prepared play carefully, suggested a "theme" of play to children, and were
310 always together in that play. Consequently, regardless of how much the teachers played together with the
311 children, children regarded the two teachers as teachers preparing educational activities according to the theme.
312 This shows children's insight into planned and instructed play, that is, school type play. Because school type
313 play lacks properties such as freedom and improvisation, it seems closer to educational activities than to a real
314 "play", from children's point of view. This result suggests that we need more improvisational playfulness in
315 day-care center, as Lobman (2006) pointed out. Similarly, Samuelsson and Johansson (2009) have suggested that
316 educational aims of teachers make playfulness of teachers not reach to the children's. Therefore, teachers in early
317 childhood education need to plan less play. At the same time, rather than teaching through play with children,
318 they should be seeped naturally into improvisational, free play of children.

319 This study observed free playtime in a single classroom to explore viewpoints of teachers and children to the
320 teacher's role in play in play-centered childcare. Teachers' role may vary depending on the circumstances of play
321 as well as the individual teachers and institutions. Therefore, one limitation of this study is that the finding
322 may not generalize to more various play scenes or other play-centered child care centers. However, this study is
323 significant in that it tried to reveal teachers' role in children's view points through participant observation for
324 an extended time period. Also, this study provides a ground for further questions for future studies: Is it really
325 impossible that we, adults and teachers, become a real friend to children, not a teacher who is like a friend? Or
326 is it unnecessary work? How can a teacher be a friend of children to make a play be more like a real play? Isn't
327 there any teacher who is a real friend to children? If there is any, what are the characteristics of such teachers?
328 With future research addressing these questions, we will be able to understand better the best way for us to
329 participate in child play and children's play itself.

330 V.¹

¹Between "a friend" and "like a friend": Differences in Viewpoint between Children and Teacher about Teacher's Role in Play of Child-Care Center



Figure 1:

1

Collected data	Types and characters of data	The way of collecting
Observation	Researcher's observation journal of free play scene of participants	Video recording and field notes.
Interview	Interview with children and teachers	The whole interview was recorded and transcribed.
Teacher's Journal	?Child-care daily journal ?Child observation journal	Teachers provided their journals about play of the participants.

Figure 2: Table 1 :

331 .1 Acknowledgment

332 I thank the teachers in Pooreun Childcare Center for allowing me to observe their classes. I also thank the
333 children in that class. They always showed lots of hospitality and opened their life-world to me.

334 [Farne ()] , R Farne . *Pedagogy of play. Topoi* 2005. 24 p. .

335 [Park ()] *case study on the changing process of isolated children's peer relationship through teacher's intervention strategies*, E M Park . <http://library-english.-hanyang.ac.kr/eng/index.jsp> 2007. Seoul,
336 Republic of Korea. Hanyang University (Master's thesis)

337 [Jones ()] 'Children's Encounters with Things: Schooling the Body'. L Jones . *Qualitative Inquiry* 2013. 19 (8)
338 p. .

339 [Saldana ()] *Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*, J Saldana . 2009. London: SAGE.

340 [Yin ()] 'Contact with my Teacher's Eyes'. Y Yin . *Phenomenology & Practice* 2013. 7 (1) p. .

341 [Cannella ()] *Deconstructing Early Childhood Education*, G S Cannella . 1997. New York: Peter Lang.

342 [Stanton-Chapman and Hadden ()] 'Encouraging peer interactions in preschool classrooms: The role of the
343 teacher'. T Stanton-Chapman , D S Hadden . *Young Exceptional Children* 2011. 14 (1) p. .

344 [Holt et al. ()] N Holt , H Lee , C A Millar , J C Spence . *Eyes on where children play: a retrospective study*,
345 2013.

346 [Hoorn et al. ()] V J Hoorn , P M Nourot , B Scales , K R Alward . *Play at the Center of the Curriculum*, (New
347 Jersey) 2011. Pearson.

348 [Hoorn et al. ()] V J Hoorn , P M Nourot , B Scales , K R Alward . *Play at the Center of the Curriculum*, (New
349 Jersey) 2011. Pearson.

350 [Lobman ()] 'Improvisation: An analytic tool for examining teaching-child interactions in the early childhood
351 classroom'. C L Lobman . *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 2006. 21 (4) p. .

352 [_____ ; Phenomenology et al. ()] 'Interaction or interruption? Five child-centred philosophical
353 perspectives'. Practice _____ ; Phenomenology , S Ca ; Widger , A Schofield . *Australasian Journal
354 of Early Childhood* 2014. 2012. 37 (4) p. .

355 [Jeon ()] *Phenomenological study on children's relationship-making revealed in play (Doctoral dissertation*, G
356 I Jeon . <http://library.snu.ac.kr/search/DetailView.ax?sid=6&cid=4107303> 2013. Seoul,
357 Republic of Korea. Seoul National University

358 [Ashiabi ()] 'Play in the preschool classroom: Its socioemotional significance and the teacher's role in play'. G
359 Ashiabi . *Early Childhood Education Journal* 2007. 35 (2) p. .

360 [Wing ()] 'Play is not the work of the child: Young children's perception of work and play'. L A Wing . *Early
361 child Research Quarterly* 1995. 10 p. .

362 [Thomson and Philo ()] 'Playful Spaces? A Social Geography of Children's Play in Livingstion'. J L Thomson ,
363 C Philo . *Scotland. Children's Geographies*, 2004. 2 p. .

364 [Leavitt ()] *Power and emotion in infanttoddler day care*, R L Leavitt . 1994. NY: State University of New York
365 Press

366 [Yeu ()] 'Questions of reflexivity and research techniques in phenomenologicallyoriented qualitative research in
367 education'. H R Yeu . *The Journal of Child Education* 2009. 6 (1) p. .

368 [Fumoto ()] 'Teacher-child relationship and early childhood practice: early years'. H Fumoto . *An International
369 Journal of Research and Development* 2011. 31 (1) p. .

370 [Van Manen ()] 'The call of pedagogy as the call of contact'. M Van Manen . *Phenomenology & Practice* 2012. 6
371 (2) p. .

372 [Yeu ()] 'The meaning if Reggio Emilia documentation as a hermeneutic text: The ambivalent duality of
373 pedagogical anxiety and hope'. H R Yeu . *Journal of Early Childhood Education* 2012. 32 (5) p. .

374 [Smith ()] *The meaning of children: A hermeneutic study. Doctoral dissertation*, D G Smith . 1983. University
375 of Alberta, Canada.

376 [Samuelsson and Johansson ()] 'Why do children involve teachers in their play and learning?'. I P Samuelsson ,
377 E Johansson . *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal* 2009. 17 (1) p. .

378 [King ()] 'Work and play in the classroom'. N R King . *Social Education* 1982. 46 p. .

379 [Jo ()] *Writing and assessing qualitative research*, Y H Jo . 2011. Seoul. The Seoul National University Center
380 for Teaching and Learning

381 [One ()] *You're allowed to play: Children's right at Playcenter. New Zealand Research in Early Childhood
382 Education*, S T One . 2010. 13 p. .