

Montessori Method of Education in Terms of Philosophical Anthropology

Zeynep Başerer Berberⁱ
Ataturk University

Dilek Başererⁱⁱ
Gazi University

Mehmet Ali Dombaycıⁱⁱⁱ
Gazi University

Abstract

Since its existence, the subject of man has been difficult and painful to understand. Philosophical anthropology comes to the fore as the field that deals with the essence and function of man to make sense of him. Philosophical anthropology tries to evaluate man from his birth to death. By doing so, philosophical anthropology draws on various philosophers. The process of understanding man, which started with Kant, is shaped by names such as Scheler, Cassirer, Mengüşoğlu, and Hartmann. In philosophical anthropology, besides these names, Maria Montessori, who assessed man as a child, is also significant. She contributed to philosophical anthropology by actualizing theoretical structures with the Montessori method of education, which is based on the understanding of a child who stands on his/her own feet and which presents a new perspective on the man. This study is considered important in terms of grounding the aforementioned contribution and guiding future studies on the subject.

Keywords: Montessori, Philosophical Anthropology, Education, Child.

DOI: 10.29329/ijpe.2022.431.16

ⁱ **Zeynep Başerer Berber**, Assist. Prof. Dr., Department of Social Work, Ataturk University, ORCID: 0000-0002-5422-8532

Correspondence: zeynep.baserer@atauni.edu.tr

ⁱⁱ **Dilek Başerer**, Dr., Philosophy Group Education Department, Ataturk University, ORCID: 0000-0001-7098-3645

ⁱⁱⁱ **Mehmet Ali Dombaycı**, Assoc. Prof. Dr., Philosophy and Related Sciences Education, Gazi University, ORCID: 0000-0002-2428-8884

INTRODUCTION

It is very difficult to understand a man, who has a complex structure compared to other living beings in terms of his developmental process. Because human beings are living beings that think, produce, tries to complete himself by filling the gaps in his life.

He takes steps towards self-realization by performing various activities from birth to death. Although it seems very difficult to understand man, this difficulty can be eliminated with the help of philosophical anthropology since philosophical anthropology was founded to address the essence or function of man and emerged as a way to make himself the object and subject (Çotuksöken, 2002). Therefore, philosophical anthropology plays an important role in understanding man. The effort to understand man begins with his birth and continues until the end of his life. Putting an effort to understand man, Maria Montessori also created her education method from this thought. Believing that development can be achieved through education, Montessori tried to understand man by revealing his whatness. Although Montessori drew on the views of philosophers such as Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Fröebel while developing the Montessori philosophy of education, she focused also on man's different characteristics that separated him from animals and on the essence of man. These show that Montessori philosophy of education is similar to philosophical anthropology (Güral, 2015).

However, such a relationship has not been found in the literature within the authors' knowledge. Therefore, the purpose of the present study is to reveal this relationship. For this purpose, in the study, Maria Montessori's method of education is discussed in terms of philosophical anthropology. Providing a new framework for philosophical anthropology, the study is believed to be important in terms of putting forth the relationship between Montessori's understanding of education and philosophical anthropology. In addition, it is believed that the revealed relationship will provide proof for the need to use ideas from philosophical anthropology in the formation of new educational methods today. For this, the study first discusses the basic foundations of philosophical anthropology and Montessori's method of education and its stages. Then, the relationship between Montessori's method of education and philosophical anthropology is presented by comparing the two.

Basic Fundamentals of Philosophical Anthropology

Although philosophical anthropology emerged as an independent philosophical discipline only in the 20th century, it was implicitly or explicitly discussed and researched in every philosophical activity in every period of history since man is the subject of history and culture. The steps towards philosophical anthropology taken in the 20th century are very prominent in Kant's thoughts does not show that Kant's activities are far from, for example, Aristotle's. Thus, it seems preferable to adopt an attitude that implicitly emphasizes the importance of historicity, more specifically, the history of philosophy. There was a resistance that emerged as an opposition to the idea of *emptiness and meaninglessness of human life* in the face of history's important wars, pandemics, and deaths with the fact that man was shaped by religious authority, mathematics, and biology were explained in many different ways. In this resistance, Kant turned man into an independent field that needs to be examined ontologically by focusing on the question of "What is man?" and in this way, he led to the emergence of philosophical anthropology, which he based on ontological foundations (Mengüsoglu, 2015).

According to Kant (2007; 2018), man is being equipped with incomplete tools when he is born. All the physiological needs necessary for survival must be met by himself. While meeting these needs, other species that will guide him and that he compare himself with are the animals. However, in this comparison, man has neither the strength of a bear, nor the speed of a hound, nor the strength of a tiger. All the characteristics animals need are given at birth. There is no need to teach a newly born rabbit what to eat and how to eat it. Yet, man needs someone to teach those to him. According to Kant (2018), the difference between man and animals is that man develops himself with his natural abilities, conveys his achievements, and possesses a structure that educates and is educated. For this reason, Kant stated that the most basic need for human development is education. Education is an art and a specialization that must be brought to perfection over generations. The capacity of man is developed

by transferring information from generation to generation through education. Based on ontological foundations, Kant's anthropology is an approach that does not place man in any value judgments or prejudices but tries to understand a man with the concrete things he has done. In this approach, Kant does not discuss man only biologically or psychically because, according to him, he is not static, he reveals his ontic integrity concretely with his achievements. All of his doings as a whole come from his achievements. After Kant, Max Scheler, another philosopher who has an important place in philosophical anthropology, also tried to understand man. In his philosophy, Scheler addressed the subject of man as with a personality and as a person. According to him, man is an entity gathering all the elements and laws of existence within himself. Arguing that man cannot be distinguished from animals as a biological entity, Scheler also stated that a definition with a biological basis for man cannot be given (Scheler, 1988).

The unique entity and value limit that can be found among living beings is not there between man and animals. Although both of them are living beings, they can move from one to the other categorically in terms of genetics and for other reasons. The alternative to this is possible by discussing the boundary between the person and the organism, that is, between the *geist* (the unique being that is not made into an object) and the living being (Mengüşoğlu, 1949; 2015). Opposing Kant's unilateral understanding of man based on reason alone, Scheler stated that what makes man human is not only reason but also emotional acts and love. Therefore, Scheler pointed out that the concept of man has two meanings. The first of these is the concept of man that puts man among the vertebrates and presents man as a certain animal species. The second is the concept of man that gives man a special place in the universe and separates him from animals. In this second meaning, man is nothing but a spiritual-biotic being who emerges as a person. Man, as a microcosm (reflection of the whole universe), is a being that carries every real essence of what exists within himself. While presenting the idea of the totality of man, Scheler considered the man who became conscious of himself, nature and God, the spiritual-biotic entity, and the historical man, not a man who is an animal species. According to him, the totality of man is a man who carries all the possibilities of his essence. However, since humanity carries an infinite number of developments within itself, there are endless forms of the totality of man for every period in history (Scheler, 1988). While Scheler followed the aforementioned ways to understand human beings, Ernst Cassirer tried to answer the question of "What is man?" within the framework of cultural anthropology.

Cassirer objected to the treatment of man as a rational being and regarded him as a being of symbols. Man does not live in the "world of reality" but in the "world of symbols", and this world consists of myth, language, religion, history, art, and science because the man can construct a cosmos of symbol forms in myth, language, religion, art, and science. This cosmos enables man to interpret and understand his experiences and lives, and to establish connections with the world of thoughts. Thus, according to Cassirer, anthropology should show the nature and structure of various symbol forms such as myth, language, art, religion, history, and science (Mengüşoğlu, 2015). Cassirer explained "what is man", the common point of cultural elements produced over the centuries, with the unity behind the diversity of culture. However, the answer Cassirer seeks is not a concrete answer to the unity of cultural elements. A functional answer that will help us in determining the unity of cultural elements and explaining cultural elements stemming from itself because, according to Cassirer (1980), there is no substance about the man. He argued that if there is any definition of the essence or nature of man, this definition can only be understood as a functional definition, not as a substantive one. He believed that we can define man neither by an innate principle constituting his metaphysical essence nor by any natural faculty or instinct that can be investigated by empirical observation. The remarkable distinguishing mark of the man is his work, not his metaphysical nature. Therefore, Cassirer (1980) stated that the answer to the question of "What is man?" should be given by looking at man's concrete productions and he distinguished man from other living beings with this characteristic.

Hartmann, another thinker in the field of philosophical anthropology, has an important place in this field. According to him, man consists of various levels of reality. Hartmann argued that man is not composed of two separate and unrelated fields of existence (psycho-vital and *geist*), but four fields of existence/levels similar to the real world (Mengüşoğlu, 2015). The first of these levels of reality is

the field of existence where inanimate objects are located and are the inorganic level or the material level. The second level of reality is the level where living beings are. The third level of reality is the emotional level that is conscious but not yet a spiritual being. Finally, the last level of reality consists of spiritual beings. According to Hartmann (2005), the essence of man can only be comprehended with the levels of reality only within the integrity of the same level system found within the real world. Just as we cannot understand the world without understanding man, man cannot be understood without understanding the world in which he lives and is a member.

Drawing on Hartmann's theory of levels of reality, Mengüsoğlu (2015) discussed man concretely and reached the fact that man is an independent entity. He referred to the man as an entity that knows, does, hears values, takes an attitude, foresees, predetermines, desires, is historical, ideates, devotes himself/herself, educates himself/herself, can be educated, founds countries, believes, creates art, and speaks. According to him, it is difficult to understand the man with just the concept of intelligence since man does not live day to day like an animal. Man's life depends on the realization of certain goals. According to Mengüsoğlu (2015), a man who can educate and can be educated is a being that bends accordingly. He stated that man has the opportunity to get a new form in this way and that such a situation does not exist in animals and that they are static beings Mengüsoğlu argued that man comes with core abilities and that it is possible to reveal and develop these abilities through education. As can be understood from the above explanations, philosophical anthropology emphasizes the "whatness" of man. In other words, it tries to show the characteristics of man that distinguish him from other beings, his structural features, and his unique place in existence (Mengüsoğlu, 2015).

Montessori and Montessori Method of Education

Maria Montessori was born in Italy in 1870. Being the first female medical doctor in her country, Montessori developed a new education method by working with children and thus became one of the important names of her period. Dedicating her life to the education of children, Montessori first worked with intellectually disabled children. She helped their development by putting them through special education (Montessori, 2016). Acting on the idea that children's minds are not completely unusable but they are just not used, she first examined the works of pioneers in the field of special education and developed special education and observation programs to be used in the education of intellectually disabled children. She observed the desire and need of intellectually disabled children to play that was not examined before and encouraged people to educate them. When the intellectually disabled children she worked with achieved the same success as normal students in the exams done in Italian public schools, she thought that the education system she applied could also be applied to normal students and she tried to implement this system. For this reason, she directed her works to the field of education and laid the foundations of a unique education method (Danişman, 2012; Durakoğlu, 2010; Oğuz & Akyol, 2006).

The main purpose of the educational method developed by Montessori (1997) is the discovery and liberation of the child. The first problem she faced was to engage directly with the child's existence, and the second was to provide him/her with the necessary assistance as he/she progressed towards maturity. This method is a method of education that gives children opportunities to research, experiment, make mistakes and correct their mistakes on their own. Therefore, it prioritizes the individuality of the child because, according to Montessori, every child is an individual with a unique development (Koçyiğit & Kayılı, 2008; Montessori, 1997). The child who learns by himself/herself has a great desire to learn because he/she does what he/she wants. For this reason, the method provides the child with lifelong learning motivation. In addition, this method does not allow the child to be engaged in any activity that he/she does not see himself/herself ready for, as it allows the child to grow naturally and without environmental influence (Malloy, 1989).

While creating this method of education, Montessori categorized developmental stages into 0-6 years old, 6-12 years old, and 12-18 years old and determined each plane according to the sensitivity, needs, and characteristics of children at those ages. In the Montessori method of education,

the first plane of development, which includes children 0-6 years, consists of two sub-planes. The first sub-plane is between the ages of 0-3 and the second sub-plane between the ages of 3-6. According to Montessori, in the first sub-plane, adults cannot even come close to the child's mind. There is no school for children in this period. In the second sub-plane, although the mind is the same, the child becomes open to the influence of adults in some ways. The personality goes through changes at this sub-plane and the child reaches an intelligence where he/she can go to school (Montessori, 2015). Furthermore, at this sub-plane, it is as if a separate window for learning is opened in the brain, all attention is directed to the environment or certain areas. As a result, the child learns easily (Danişman, 2012). According to Montessori, this plane should not be seen just as a transitional stage on the path to adulthood because childhood has a unique development plan, and children are equipped with many abilities during this period. These abilities manifest themselves as the "absorbent mind", "sensitive periods", and "sense of order". According to Montessori, children with these abilities can achieve many gains even during infancy, which is perceived as the inactivity plane (Altınışık, 2014).

Children's abilities are discussed in detail as follows;

The principle of the absorbent mind, which is the basis of the Montessori method, refers to the child's ability to absorb all the spiritual, mental, and physical aspects of the environment without any effort and untiringly. This plane, which covers the ages of 0-6, is the period when the child's brain absorbs everything around him/her. In this plane, the importance of individual choice and self-directed learning increases. Children are starting to build their knowledge. In this way, learning becomes more individualized and the level of being curious about acquiring information increases (Lloyd, 2008; Zarybnisky, 2010). The absorbent mind principle aims to reveal the mental activities of the child. Therefore, in Montessori education, the child is never forced to attain mental achievements (Montessori, 2015).

Sensitive periods are the periods in which the child can master certain skills and inherited programmed periods are explained. The child's sensory and mental abilities are guided by sensitive periods. These are excessive learning desires for specific and various environmental situations. Montessori believes that these sensitivities are not accidental and that this process occurs throughout the development because the development process has a structured plan and according to this plan, people develop as much as they interact with their environment. If the child cannot realize or get the experiences in these periods that nature planned for him/her, his/her future development will be jeopardized. For this reason, the child needs to complete the sensitive periods positively. At these periods, issues such as order, detail, use of hands, walking, social and communal skills, and language acquisition are at the forefront. These periods are important for maturation and learning. However, Montessori focused more on learning because what maturation brings to the child is just a step for him/her. The important thing for the child is to be able to climb these planes comfortably and with the highest power. For this, there is a need for an environment that can correctly structure the child's potential and well-prepared learning opportunities (Doğru, 2009).

According to Montessori, the child is also extremely sensitive to order. For her, the sense of order is to memorize the place of each object in its environment and to mark where it should be. In other words, the sense of order is to adapt oneself to the environment and thus to dominate it down to the smallest detail. The desire for order in children is different from that of adults. While order provides the adult with a degree of outward pleasure, it is indispensable for the child because the child gains the opportunity to dominate the environment thanks to his/her sensitivity to order. The child's intense sensitivity towards order is for distinguishing the relationships between objects. For this reason, Montessori considered the child's unique need for order as the construction of the personality and knowledge within the individual (Montessori, 1997; Durakoğlu, 2010; Arslan, 2008).

The second plane of the Montessori method of education goes from six to twelve. According to Montessori, on this plane, the child is calm and happy. The child is mentally healthy and strong and self-confident (Montessori, 2015). In this stage, the child begins to become conscious of good and evil. Children who questioned only personal behaviors in the previous period, try to make sense of

social events by approaching them from different perspectives in this period. The knowledge/skills to be acquired in this period; justice and moral judgments, social relations, money and economy, imagination, using tools and machines, perception of time and history, perceiving human traits, perception of belonging to a family, and being aware of the workings of the world (Montessori, 2015; 2016).

The third and last plane of the Montessori method of education goes from 12 to 18. This is a time of many changes. In this period, which is divided into two sub-places (12-15 and 15-18), physical changes are experienced and the body reaches full adulthood (Montessori, 2015). In this plane, which is built on indecisions, the child requires protection and safety due to physical change. During this period, knowledge and skills such as confidence, self-expression, analytical thinking, commitment, and responsibility are attained. In addition to these, social and religious feelings also develop in this plane. Moral teaching can now be done for the child who has started to gain spiritual feelings since the child's moral and social consciousness has now reached the level of maturity (Arslan, 2008; Danişman, 2012; Durakoğlu, 2011).

The Relationship between Philosophical Anthropology and the Montessori Method of Education

Philosophical Anthropology

As mentioned at the beginning, although Montessori drew on from the views of philosophers such as Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Fröebel while creating her understanding of education, she developed her method with the belief that the qualities, purposes, and elements of the spiritual life stemming from man's existential structure. Montessori set out from the idea that to know the child, it is necessary to know man. This idea of Montessori is similar to the general mentality of philosophical anthropology. Philosophical anthropology also emerged from the idea of the essence of man and its realization in a certain concrete life. Thus, it can be said that the Montessori method of education has similar points with philosophical anthropology. At this point, it is necessary to discuss Montessori's understanding of man.

While analyzing how the child learns, Montessori turned her attention from the human body to the human mind and tried to make sense of the man through the mind (Durakoğlu, 2011). While doing this, she approached the man as a biological being. For this purpose, Montessori tried to put forth her various judgments about a man with the difference between man and animals. According to Montessori, man, unlike animals, is not born with a predetermined character. She believed that the instincts of animals reveal themselves easily. However, since the soul of man remains in the depths, it does not have a predetermined characteristic. The man also has innate psychological characteristics. Yet, they are not predetermined as in animals. All movement patterns such as running, jumping, and climbing seen in animals are determined by heredity. They carry the formations in their hereditary characters throughout their lives. Man, on the other hand, has unlimited adaptability power, unlike animals. Due to this characteristic, man can attain countless forms of work and habits. In addition, man has the opportunity of endless change and development with the characteristics they reveal in the external world. To sum up, the differences between man and animals reveal that while animals are closely tied to heredity, a man certainly does not accept an unchangeable behavior that comes with an inherited behavior. While it is known in advance what the offspring of animals will be like when they mature, it is not known how human beings will be when they mature (Montessori, 2002).

According to Montessori, another feature that distinguishes man from animals is the presence of a soul and creative intelligence in man's entity as a biological being. Thanks to the psychophysical functions that are embedded in the soul and creative intelligence and that enable us to exhibit human behavior, the child becomes a superior biological being that has the power to reveal his/her free will with his/her own choices. According to Kant's anthropology based on ontological foundations, man is a biological and psychic entity but also an entity that concretely reveals his ontic integrity with his

achievements. Kant believed that all of man's doings as a whole come from his achievements. According to Montessori, man is a living being that develops by being educated, and nature characterizes man with his instinct to work. According to Kant, man, unlike animals, is a being who conveys his achievements, educates, and is educated. The main purpose of the Montessori method of education is the discovery and liberation of the child. Thanks to the desire to learn, the child, who goes through different stages, gains his/her freedom in this way. According to Mengüsoğlu, man is a liberal being. According to Montessori, every child has an individual personality with a unique development. For this reason, Montessori developed an education method that prioritizes the individuality of the child (Kant, 2007; 2018; Montessori, 2007; 2015; 2016).

According to Scheler, the unique entity and value limit that can be found among living beings is in a man who passes from one to the other without interruption in genetic and systematic terms. According to Montessori, the development process has a structured plan and according to this plan, people develop as much as they interact with their environment. There is a need for an environment that can correctly structure the child's potential and well-prepared learning opportunities. According to Mengüsoğlu, man has a predetermining feature that knows, does, hears values, takes an attitude, and sees in advance. Similarly, Cassirer stated that if there is any definition of the essence or nature of man, this definition can only be understood as a functional definition, not as a substantive one. It can be said that Cassirer, who lived in the same period as Montessori, had similar beliefs since he stated that we can define man neither by an innate principle constituting his metaphysical essence nor by any natural faculty or instinct that can be investigated by empirical observation. According to Montessori, the ideal man is a man of nature. Man is not only a member of nature but also a member of nature which is his product. Man dominates nature thanks to this creation. For this reason, Montessori emphasized the importance of the environment in which one lives. Similarly, Hartmann discussed the importance of the environment by saying just as we cannot understand the world without understanding man, man cannot be understood without understanding the world in which he lives and is a member. The man of nature, Montessori's ideal human type, is discussed in parallel with her principle of 'normalization' principle, which is one of the goals of her method. As it can be understood, the principle refers to the process of adapting the individual to his/her nature. Based on this, the principle of 'normalization' was developed to help people regain their deteriorated nature over time. Montessori's man of nature is characterized by his/her working instinct and creates his/her environment. This person can also be identified with productivity. According to Montessori, man is not only a member of nature but also a member of nature which is his product. Man dominates nature thanks to this creation. Therefore, man gradually begins to adopt the environment he has created and makes this environment the basic element of his life. Thus, as a man of nature, he/she dominates the environment is through a continuous fight and education (Durakoğlu, 2010).

Montessori Method of Education

According to Montessori philosophy, the child is the ancestor of man. He/she must be respected and his/her dignity should be protected. The child is the carrier and reflector of culture. Rewards and punishments disrupt the child's internal structure. The child is eager to learn and it is in their nature. The rewards are also in himself/herself. The child should learn naturally. The adult should arrange the environment following the child's structure and needs. The nature of the child leads him/her to normality. The materials used by the child who learns naturally should also be natural since materials are toys that help children to do over and over. Materials should teach life and scientific knowledge. The Child who enjoys doing tasks should not move on to the next before they mastered the previous skill. Then there is no learning. Mind development is fueled by movement. Hands are especially important. Like all living things, children have sensitive periods. These periods are important in terms of education (Montessori, 1999; Morrison, 2007). As these show, there are common points between the development and education of the child and view of man in the Montessori method and philosophical anthropology.

Since man is a living being that develops by being educated, the basis of Montessori's pedagogy is intertwined with philosophical anthropology because Montessori questions the child both

as an educator and as a doctor physiologically. However, despite being a doctor, her physiological questioning should not be limited to physiology. According to Montessori, the child should be kept active from the moment he/she is born until he/she comes of age, and he/she should be helped step by step to develop his/her personality. Montessori summarized this basic idea as “help me to do it myself”. The image of the child in Montessori’s child anthropology is that the child is not a small adult, but is different from an adult in terms of both spiritual and physical development. The child has a structure that differs from the adult in terms of representing a unique being and a special form of life (Arslan, 2008).

A person's life is shaped by certain content, energy, meaning, and purpose, starting from childhood since this period is the period when the foundations of the totality of existence are laid. The child's experiences, impressions, and behaviors affect his/her behaviors and everything that will be done when they reach adulthood. This brings to mind that the qualities, purposes, and elements of the spiritual life stemming from man's existential structure are under their way to a totality of existence, and that totality also includes unchangeability to some extent. Therefore, knowing the child forms the basis of the art of knowing man (Güller, 2013). According to Montessori, the child has a mysterious structure in himself/herself that cannot be understood by adults. The mysteriousness of this structure comes mainly from temporary forces. The child forms his/her personality with the help of the forces that are activated in the sensitivity period. Thanks to his/her desire to learn, which one of these forces is, the child who passes through different planes is liberated. In other words, the child changes by passing through these planes, but he/she also moves towards a kind of uniformity as he/she moves towards liberation. Because of these characteristics, the child can be described as an individual who represents a special period of life quite different from the adult. Montessori also treats the child as an individual independent from the species. At this point, to reveal and support the development process of the individual's personality, Montessori advocates a fair education specific to the individual in which the individual tries to individualize and socialize. Therefore, Montessori gives importance to the formation of personality. She advocates keeping the method in the background in education to emphasize personality. Montessori considers the development of personality, which is revealed in individualization and socialization, as the ability of the individual to get together with other individuals and to protect his/her liberal individuality. Here, Montessori does not regard childhood as a transitional stage to becoming an adult. On the contrary, Montessori regards this period as a unique developmental stage with its own rules. Stating that the child is the architect of his/her humanity and the people around him/her, Montessori also expressed that children have a construction plan of their own at this architectural stage and they try to improve themselves within the framework of their views by following this plan. However, in this construction process, adults should not have any influence because it is the child who forms the basis of this architecture and only he/she knows this construction plan. The untimely intervention of the adult can change the whole plan. The important thing is to guide the child in the right place and time and to ensure the individualization and socialization of the child. At this point, the responsibility of the adults is to awaken the ability and hidden power in the child and to support him/her in the development process. In addition to all these, the child is also regarded as God's creation in the Montessori method. According to Montessori, the laws of development in nature are determined by God and there is a divine sanction in the development plan of the child. The vital needs of the child are the requests commanded by God. This shows that God has given the child tremendous strength for his/her path of life. Giving the child the power to learn on his/her own, this energy has an important role in Montessori's pedagogy because this is the basis of all behaviors and this requires love, respect, and responsibility. In fact, at the beginning of Montessori's educational goals comes individuals taking responsibility and respecting themselves and others (Arslan, 2008; Montessori, 1997; 2007; 2016). In this way, Montessori discussed the child as both a biological and independent man and as a man created by God, as well as a separate entity from the adult (Morrison, 2007).

CONCLUSION

Montessori presented a view on the man with his/her method of education, acting from the understanding of a child who is free, individual, and standing on his/her own feet to become an adult

individual. While doing this, it can be seen that the theoretical and practical integrity lost in education today is concretized in philosophical anthropology. Although Montessori's views seem to be practical, it can be said that philosophical anthropology feeds the theoretical aspect of the method, and one side complements each other in terms of theoretical value and the other in terms of practical value. In line with the aforementioned argument, it can be stated that by going deeper into these two theories, focusing on integrity and especially focusing on philosophical anthropology, Montessori's views will be carried to the next current level and updated without losing their content, because in areas where people and education are concerned, updating is not like a phone being updated. When each update in the social sciences does not give enough attention to the theory, it destroys the subject it has updated and causes today's education to become dysfunctional and lose various values by wasting its solid foundations regarding man.

As a result, it is important to train teachers who know how to teach and use various methods well in order not to fall into the position of a technician in education. For this, it may be necessary to develop a model that integrates philosophical anthropology and Montessori's educational method.

REFERENCES

- Arslan, M. (2008). Günümüzde Montessori pedagojisi [Montessori pedagogy today]. *Milli Eğitim*, 177, 65-79.
- Altınışık, Ş. (2014). Montessori eğitiminde metalaşma [Commodification in Montessori Education]. *Eleştirel Pedagoji Dergisi [Journal of Critical Pedagogy]*, 35, 50-52.
- Cassirer, E. (1980). *İnsan üstüne bir deneme (An essay on man)*. (N. Arat, Trans.), İstanbul: Remzi.
- Çotuksöken, B. (2002). *Felsefe: Özne- söylem*. [Philosophy: Subject- discourse.] İstanbul: İnkılâp.
- Doğru, S. S. (2009). Özel eğitimde kullanılan alternatif programlar (Montessori yaklaşımı). [Alternative programs used in special education (Montessori approach).] *Tubav Bilim Dergisi*, 2 (1), 107-116.
- Durakoğlu, A. (2010). *Maria Montessori'ye göre çocuğun doğası ve eğitimi*. [The nature and education of the child according to Maria Montessori.]Doktora Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Durakoğlu, A. (2011). *Maria Montessori'ye göre okul öncesi çocukluk döneminin özellikleri*. [The characteristics of preschool childhood according to Maria Montessori.] *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16, 133-145.
- Güller, E. (2013). Çocuk kavramının felsefi antropoloji alanında ele alınması ve mimari çıkarımlar. [The concept of child in the field of philosophical anthropology and architectural implications.] *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2 (3), 1-12.
- Güral, M. (2015). Montessori eğitim yaklaşımında çocuğun özgürlüğü, [Freedom of the child in the Montessori educational approach] *International Journal of Social Science*, (37),447-457.
- Danişman, Ş. (2012). Montessori yaklaşımına genel bir bakış ve eğitim ortamının düzenlenmesi. [An overview of the Montessori approach and the organization of the educational environment.] *Eğitimde Politika Analizi Dergisi, [Journal of Policy Analysis in Education]* 1 (2), 85-113.
- Hartman, N. (2005). *Ontolojide yeni yollar (New ways of ontology)*. (L. Yarbaş, Trans.), İzmir: İlya.
- Kant, I. (2018). *Eğitim üzerine (Über Pädagogik)*. (S. E. Berkman, Trans.). İstanbul: İz.

- Kant, I. (2007). *Eğitim üzerine-toplu eserleri-1 ruhun eğitimi- ahlaki eğitim*. [His collective works on education-1 education of the soul- moral education](A. Aydoğan, Trans.), İstanbul: Say.
- Koçyiğit, S. & Kayılı, G. (2008). Montessorri eğitimi alan ve almayan anaokulu öğrencilerinin sosyal becerilerinin karşılaştırılması.[Comparison of social skills of kindergarten students with and without Montessori education.] *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20, 511–516.
- Lloyd, K. M. (2008). *An analysis of Maria Montessori's theory of normalization in light of emerging research in self-regulation*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oregon State University, Oregon.
- Malloy, T. (1989). *Montessori ve çocuğunuz (Montessori and your child)* (F. Öztaş & C. Gülten, Trans.). Ankara: Hatiboğlu.
- Mengüşoğlu, T. (1949). *Kant ve Scheler'de insan problemi "felsefi antropoloji için kritik bir hazırlık*. [In Kant and Scheler, the human problem is "a critical preparation for philosophical anthropology.] İstanbul: Pulhan Matbaa.
- Mengüşoğlu, T. (1959). Ontolojik esaslara dayanan felsefi antropoloji hakkında düşünceler. [Thoughts on philosophical anthropology based on ontological principles.] *Felsefe Arkivi*, 4(2), 1-8.
- Mengüşoğlu, T. (2015). *İnsan felsefesi*. [Human philosophy]Ankara : DoğuBatı Yayınları.
- Montessori, M. (1997). *Çocuk eğitimi/Montessori metodu [The screet of chidhood]* (5.Baskı). (G.Yücel, Trans.). Ankara:Özgür Yayınları
- Montessori, M. (1999). *Annelik sanatı.[The art of motherhood]* (C. Külhanbeyi, Trans.). İstanbul: Bahar.
- Montessori, M (2002). *The montessori method*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Montessori, M. (2015). *Emici zihin (The abzor bent mint)* (O. Gündüz, Trans.). İstanbul: Kaknüs.
- Montessori, M. (2016). *Çocuğun keşfi (The discovery of the child)* (O.Gündüz, Trans.). İstanbul: Kaknüs.
- Morrison, G. S. (2007). *Early childhood education today*. Melbourne: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Oğuz, V. & Akyol, A. (2006). Çocuk eğitiminde Montessori yaklaşımı. [Montessori approach in child education.] *Ç.U. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 15 (19), 243-256.
- Scheler, M. (1988). *İnsanın kosmostaki yeri (Die stellung des Menschen im Kosmos)* (T. Mengüşoğlu, Trans.), İstanbul: Yaprak.
- Zarybnisky, E. M. (2010). *A ray of light: A mixed-methods approach to understanding why parents choose Montessori education*. PHD. Faculty of The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln.