# Primary Schools' Competences for Inclusive Education Practices from The Window of Classroom Teachers

**Assist. Prof. Dr. Fadime İşcen Karasu**
Sivas Cumhuriyet Universtiy - Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0003-3703-3343
fiscen@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

**Assist. Prof. Dr. Didem Kayahan Yüksel**
Sivas Cumhuriyet University - Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0002-0184-6070
didemkayahan@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

## Abstract

*The purpose of this research is to examine the competencies of primary schools for inclusive education practices from the point of view of classroom teachers. The research was designed in a quantitative scanning design. The study group of the research consists of 221 classroom teachers working in primary schools in Sivas province in the Central Anatolia Region of Turkey. As a data collection tool, the "Competence Scale for Inclusive Education Practices of Schools" developed by Yazıcıoğlu and Sümer-Dodur (2021) was used. Scale; It consists of four dimensions and 25 items in the form of teacher knowledge level, school guidance services, environmental educational regulation and support education room services. After obtaining the relevant permissions, the research data were collected by the researchers through the selection of voluntary participants by interviewing the school administrations one by one and giving information about the research. An online data collection tool was sent to the teachers who volunteered to participate in the study. The data collection process took 85 days. SPSS-29 was used in the analysis of the data obtained from the research, and descriptive statistics, T-test and ANOVA test were performed. According to the findings obtained from the research, the qualifications for inclusive education practices are lower in village schools than in provincial and district schools. There is a significant difference between the low socio-economic level and the middle socio-economic level in favor of the middle level. In addition, there is a parallelism between the physical competencies of schools and their competencies for inclusive education practices. There is a positive significant difference between the presence of a supportive education classroom and guidance service in schools and their competencies for inclusive education practices. There is a similar relationship in the case of information activities and collaboration in schools. In this context, it is recommended to policy makers to improve physical facilities, especially starting from schools in rural areas, and to establish separate support education rooms and guidance services in schools. In addition, curricula can be developed in order to increase the existing collaboration and information in schools. Researchers can design studies that examine the impact of collaboration and information on the success of inclusive education practices.*

**Keywords:** *Special education, Inclusion, Inclusive education practices, Primary school, Classroom teacher.*

## INTRODUCTION

Education is the process by which the child is harmonized with society and the world through various methods in an environment where his or her individuality is taken into account. This process takes place through instructional activities starting from kindergarten and extending to doctoral studies, and schools are actually rehearsal places for the environments in which children will live in the future. Therefore, the harmonization between children to be provided at school is important (Toprakçı, 2017). This importance makes education a fundamental and integral part of human rights and reminds us that no student should be excluded from the scope of education for any reason such as gender, language, disability, etc. Inclusive education aims to enable all students with and without special needs to benefit from education rights and opportunities at the highest level in line with their needs, without being separated from their physical and social environments. Inclusive education practices include arrangements to ensure that all students have active and equal access to and access to educational resources. Diversity is welcomed in inclusive education environments. Each student's unique contribution is valued (Ainscow, 2020; İşcen-Karasu, 2021; İşcen-Karasu, 2022; Nutbrown et al., 2013; Open Society Foundations, 2019; UNESCO, 2017; Yılmaz-Atman, 2022).

Especially in the 1960s, developments in the world on issues such as human rights and equality reminded the education rights of individuals with special needs (Kargın, 2003). The first legal regulations regarding the planning and execution of educational services to which these individuals are entitled began in the mid-1970s under the leadership of the USA (1975 / Public Law 94-142 - Education for All Handicapped Children Act). In the following years, the scope of these legal regulations, on which many countries are based, was expanded in line with the changing resources and requirements over time. Today, the education rights of individuals with special needs are guaranteed in many parts of the world, especially in the context of inclusive Education (Brown & Guralnick, 2012).

In Turkey, this process started with the Law on Children in Need of Special Education in 1983. Inclusive education has found its legal basis more specifically with the Decree Law No. 573 on Special Education issued in 1997. In the Special Education Services Regulation, the scope of which has been expanded in line with these laws, the most recent version of which has been in force since 2018, the inclusive education rights of individuals with special needs have been highlighted (Yazıcıoğlu, 2018).

With all these legal regulations in the world and in Turkey, an increasing number of students with special needs are in general education environments. When applied successfully, not only students with special needs, but also all stakeholders in the same environment can obtain positive outcomes from inclusive Education (Hehir et al., 2016; Sucuoğlu & Kargın, 2006). Schools are the first formal education environments that come to mind, where formal education activities are carried out on a purposeful and programmed basis (Demirel & Kaya, 2018). With the acceptance of inclusion in the education system, the roles and responsibilities of schools are changing in order to obtain the expected benefit from inclusive education for all (Yazıcıoğlu & Sümer-Dodur, 2021).

Ainscow (2020) has also formulated a framework on how to promote inclusion and equity in the education system, placing schools at the center of the framework. Accordingly, for the success of inclusion, schools must focus on fostering, and developing their potential for, the participation and learning of an increasingly diverse range of students. Schools' inclusion initiatives should be about improving their schools, not trying to integrate special needs groups into their existing arrangements. Ainscow describes this as the "inclusive turn" of schools.

In order to move forward on the path of inclusion, schools must first adopt inclusiveness as a principle in the context of policy. In this context, they are expected to see all members of the society as stakeholders and to be warm and supportive to everyone. In the context of practices, they are expected to use the evidence obtained by identifying the factors that support or hinder inclusivity, develop various strategies to monitor and support the development of all students, and create a culture of collaboration with all stakeholders from inside the school to the outside of the school door and from the micro level to the macro level (Ainscow, 2020; Thomas, 1997; Villa & Thousand, 2005). In summary, all information reveals the need for schools to take increasing responsibility for the education of groups previously excluded from general education, especially students with disabilities, and to make necessary changes in school policies, practices and curricula while educating them with appropriate support in neighborhood schools (Kinsella, 2020).

The basic criteria that inclusive schools must meet at the international level are reported. In particular, subjects such as to provide teachers with educational support for inclusive practices, to increase the collaboration and participation of families, to make the physical environment accessible, to provide access to education programs and tools for all children, to provide specialist, environment and consultancy support for support special education services, to maintain collaboration with other institutions, provide visible administrative support are some of the important criteria that schools should meet (Clark et al.,1999; McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998; McLeskey et al., 2014; Yazıcıoğlu & Sümer-Dodur, 2021). Of course, while all these criteria are met, it should be remembered that inclusion is more than just providing money and better resources, and it is made to give everyone a chance to share the shared wealth and culture of the school (Thomas, 1997).

In Turkey, there are basic criteria that schools are expected to meet for inclusive practices from pre-school to secondary education on a legal basis. Regulations such as establishing Individualized Education Program (IEPs) development units, opening support resource rooms, conducting needs assessment studies, physical and educational environment arrangements, informing students, families, teachers and other employees for inclusion, preparing support education programs, planning and implementation of school guidance services are some of them (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2017, 2018; Yazıcıoğlu & Sümer-Dodur, 2021).

So, do schools meet the basic criteria required for the successful implementation of inclusion? In other words, what are the qualifications of schools for inclusive practices? There are studies that seek answers to this question in the world and in Turkey.

In the literature, there are many studies in which the needs, opinions and difficulties are determined in general or according to various parameters (eg IEPs, collaboration, staff preparation) for the inclusive practices of various stakeholders such as teachers, parents, administrators, typically developing children at different education levels (e.g. Akalın, 2014; Akalın et al., 2014; Adderley et al., 2015; Graham & Spandagou, 2011; Öncül & Batu, 2005; Saraç & Çolak, 2012; Schwab et al., 2015; Vlachou et al., 2016; Yılmaz & Batu, 2016; Zagona et al., 2017 etc.). Among the important results from these studies is evidence showing that inclusive schools are able to meet important criteria such as enhancing teachers' professional development, effective classroom management and behavior control, effective IEPs development and implementation, family involvement and collaboration to a limited extent.

In the literature, there are also studies conducted using measurement tools developed to evaluate the inclusive practices of schools according to more than one parameter. For example, Carrington et al. (2023), spent a year working on reviews, improvement and change in a middle school with the "Index for Inclusion" developed by Booth & Ainscow (2011). The results showed that as the stages of the index were implemented in the school, the dialogue between the staff and the students improved, and the sense of commitment and belonging to the school increased. Loreman (2013) and Kyriazopoulou & Weber (2009) developed tools based on input-process-output evaluation logic to determine inclusive education and inclusive schools qualifications according to the research literature. In various studies, the adequacy of integrating practices in schools were evaluated in the context of the literature with these tools. (e.g. Hosshan et al., 2020; Van Mieghem et al., 2020 etc.). Although limited, such studies are also found in Turkey. For example, Yılmaz (2014) focused on evaluating the quality of classroom environments, which is one of the basic subsystems of schools, at the preschool level, with the "Inclusive Classroom Profile - (ICP)" developed by Soukakou (2012). The researcher found that preschool classrooms are located in the inadequate-limited category. Similarly, Bakkaloğlu et al. (2017) evaluated the quality of preschool inclusive classrooms from the perspective of teachers and independent observers with The Classroom Quality Measurement Form (CQMF) developed by Sandall & Schwartz (2008). The results showed that the quality of the classes was low. Günlü & Özgür-Yılmaz (2022), "Inclusion Regulations Scale - (KIDO)" developed by Kargın et al. (2010) determined their situation regarding inclusive practices in schools from the eyes of teachers working in various school types and grade levels from different branches. The results showed that instructional and physical arrangements were highly used in classroom practices in schools.

In this research, it is aimed to determine the current situation of primary schools from the perspective of classroom teachers with the "Competence Scale for Inclusive Education Practices of Schools" developed by Yazıcıoğlu & Sümer-Dodur (2021). Yazıcıoğlu and Sümer-Dodur showed that the scale measures most of the internationally specified criteria in a valid and reliable way. It is thought that

the results of our research will contribute to the literature, as it allows a wider range of evaluations compared to previous studies conducted with primary school teachers in Turkey. Approximately 35% of the students who continue their education through inclusion in Turkey receive education at primary school level (National Education Statistics Formal Education 2021/'22). Making evaluations based on the statements of the classroom teachers, who are most responsible for the execution of educational activities in these schools, will help to reach more information. It is hoped that the evidence to be obtained as a result of the research will guide research and practices that aim to refine the quality of inclusion in schools. The questions to be answered in line with the purpose of the research are listed as follows:

- What are the qualifications that schools have for inclusive education practices?
- Is there a significant difference between the qualifications of primary schools for inclusive education practices and the characteristics of the schools (the location of the school, the socio-economic level of the school, the physical facilities of the school, the status of being a support education class, the status of being a guidance service, informing, collaborating)?

# METHOD

This research is a quantitative research in screening design. In the study, which was handled with a descriptive approach, single scanning and relational scanning models were used. The tendencies, attitudes and views of the group can be determined based on the data obtained from the study group with the screening design (Creswell, 2013). While descriptive statistical values can be reached with the single survey model, estimations can be made about the situation of more than one variable against each other with the relational survey model (Karasar, 2005). In this study, these methods were used because both the descriptive values obtained from the scale and the level of differentiation in terms of variables were examined.

### 1. Study Group

In the research, the competencies of primary schools for inclusive education practices are determined in line with the opinions of classroom teachers. In this context, the study group of the research cinsists of 221 classroom teachers working in the central, district and village schools of Sivas Province, located in the Central Anotolia region. Demographic information about the teachers included in the study group is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** *Descriptive information of teachers*

| Variable | | *N* | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Gender** | Woman | 91 | 41.2 |
| | Male | 130 | 58.8 |
| **Age** | 20-35 | 62 | 28.1 |
| | 36-50 | 111 | 50.2 |
| | 51 and Above | 48 | 21.7 |
| **Professional Experience** | 1-10 | 43 | 19.5 |
| | 11-20 | 82 | 37.1 |
| | 21-30 | 65 | 29.4 |
| | 31 and Above | 31 | 14.0 |
| **Educational Status** | Licence | 190 | 86.0 |
| | Postgraduate | 31 | 14.0 |
| **Status of Trained on Inclusion** | Yes | 167 | 75.6 |
| | No | 54 | 24.4 |
| **Inclusive Education Experience** | Yes | 172 | 77.8 |
| | No | 49 | 22.2 |
| **Total** | | 221 | 100 |

As seen in Table 1, 91 of the teachers are female and 130 are male. There are 62 teachers in the age range of 20-35, 111 teachers in the age range of 36-50, 48 teachers in the age range of 51 and above, 43 of whom are 1-10 years, 82 are 11-20 years, 65 are 21-30 years and 31' i Has 31 years or more of professional experience. 190 teachers have undergraduate education and 31 teachers have postgraduate education. 167 of the teachers have attended a training on inclusive education before and 172 teachers have previous inclusive education experience. In this study, since the competencies of primary schools for inclusive education practices are examined, the research variables are descriptive information about the schools where the teachers work. For this reason, descriptive information about the primary schools where teachers work is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** *Descriptive information of schools*

| Variable | | f | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Location of the School** | Province | 161 | 72.9 |
| | District | 33 | 14.9 |
| | Village | 27 | 12.2 |
| **Socio-Economic Level of the School** | Good | 37 | 16.7 |
| | Middle | 118 | 53.4 |
| | Low | 66 | 29.9 |
| **The School's Physical Facilities** | Sufficient | 73 | 33.0 |
| | Middle | 115 | 52.0 |
| | Insufficient | 33 | 14.9 |
| **Support Training Class** | Yes | 140 | 63.3 |
| | No | 81 | 36.7 |
| **Counseling Service** | Yes | 148 | 67.0 |
| | No | 73 | 33.0 |
| **Information** | Yes | 166 | 75.1 |
| | No | 55 | 24.9 |
| **Collaboration** | Yes | 187 | 84.6 |
| | No | 34 | 15.4 |
| **Total** | | 221 | 100 |

As seen in Table 2, there are 161 provinces, 33 districts and 27 village schools. When the socio-economic characteristics of the schools are examined, 37 is good, 118 is medium and 66 is low. It is understood that the physical facilities of the schools are sufficient in 73 schools, 115 secondary schools and 33 schools insufficient. There are support education classes in 140 schools and guidance services in 148 schools. Information activities are carried out in 166 schools and collaboration activities are carried out in 187 schools.

### 2. Data Collection Tool

In the research, an information form and "Competence Scale for Inclusive Education Practices of Schools" were used for data collection. The information form was developed by the researcher and includes questions about demographic information about teachers and descriptive information about the school they work at. The Competence Scale for Inclusive Education Practices of Schools was developed by Yazıcıoğlu & Sümer-Dodur (2021). There are four dimensions and 25 items in the scale called "teacher knowledge level, school guidance services, environmental educational regulation and support education room services". According to the confirmatory factor analysis findings, the scale had acceptable goodness-of-fit values and the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was calculated as .95. Permission was obtained from the authors to use the scale.

### 3. Data Collection Process

During the research process, permission was obtained from the Social and Human Sciences Board of Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Scientific Research and Publication Ethics, dated 30.03.2022 and numbered E-60263016-050.06.04-149786. After obtaining the necessary permission from the Ministry of National Education Provincial Directorate of National Education, the researcher interviewed the schools one by one and gave information about the research. An online measurement tool was directed to the teachers who volunteered to participate in the study. The data collection process took 85 days and no teachers were forced to participate in the process, gifts etc. incentives such as.

### 4. Analysis of Data

SPSS 29 was used in the analysis of the data obtained from the research. In order to determine the tests to be used in this context, the normality test was performed. The normality test results for the scale and its sub-dimensions are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** *Normality test results*

| Dimensions | X | sd | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher knowledge level | 3.52 | .809 | .045 | -.613 |
| School guidance services | 3.59 | 1.290 | -.688 | -.651 |
| Environmental and educational regulation | 3.56 | .973 | -.565 | -.131 |
| Support training room services | 3.69 | 1.098 | -.727 | -.307 |
| Scale Total | 3.59 | .819 | -.245 | -.684 |

As it can be seen in Table 3, since the skewness and kurtosis values are between +1 and -1, it provides the assumption of normality (Hair et al., 2013). The data obtained from the research were analyzed with descriptive analysis, T test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA test). In the presentation of the findings of the descriptive analysis results, the expressions in each dimension and dimension were interpreted one by one. During the interpretation phase, 1-1.8 very low, 1.81-2.6 low, 2.61-3.4 medium, 3.41-4.2 high, 4.21-5 very high values were taken into account in determining the level

381

of agreement of the study group. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for this study was calculated as .856 for the teacher knowledge level dimension, .981 for the school guidance services dimension, .903 for the environmental and educational arrangement dimension, .936 for the support education room services dimension and .956 for the scale total. It can be said that the scale and its sub-dimensions have a high level of reliability (Tezbaşaran, 1997).

# FINDINGS

## 1. Findings Regarding the First Sub-Aim

Within the scope of the research, "What are the qualifications of primary schools for inclusive education practices?" search for an answer to the question. In this context, the descriptive findings obtained from the research are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4.** *Descriptive statistics of competence scale for inclusive education practices of schools*

| Dimensions | Scale Items | Never f | Never % | Rarely f | Rarely % | Sometimes f | Sometimes % | Most of the time f | Most of the time % | Always f | Always % | X | sd |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher knowledge level | Teachers received in-service training on inclusive education. | 12 | 5.4 | 41 | 18.6 | 89 | 40.3 | 54 | 24.4 | 25 | 11.3 | 3.17 | 1.03 |
| | Teachers have knowledge and skills related to inclusive education. | 6 | 2.7 | 22 | 10.0 | 79 | 35.7 | 77 | 34.8 | 37 | 16.7 | 3.52 | .97 |
| | Teachers have knowledge and skills on preventive classroom management. | 2 | .9 | 31 | 14.0 | 68 | 30.8 | 81 | 36.7 | 39 | 17.6 | 3.56 | .96 |
| | Teachers have knowledge and skills on behavior control. | 0 | 0 | 18 | 8.1 | 58 | 26.2 | 92 | 41.6 | 53 | 24.0 | 3.81 | .89 |
| School guidance services | The school guidance service cooperates with teachers in inclusive education practices at school. | 25 | 11.3 | 18 | 8.1 | 45 | 20.4 | 55 | 24.9 | 78 | 35.3 | 3.64 | 1.33 |
| | School guidance service cooperates with relevant persons, institutions and organizations in the execution of educational services for students with special needs. | 26 | 11.8 | 17 | 7.7 | 39 | 17.6 | 63 | 28.5 | 76 | 34.4 | 3.66 | 1.33 |
| | School guidance service plans family trainings for families of students with special needs. | 30 | 13.6 | 20 | 9.0 | 37 | 16.7 | 54 | 24.4 | 80 | 36.2 | 3.60 | 1.40 |
| | The school guidance service regularly monitors the education of students with special needs in the support education room. | 33 | 14.9 | 23 | 10.4 | 39 | 17.6 | 53 | 24.0 | 73 | 33.0 | 3.49 | 1.42 |
| | The school guidance service organizes events such as meetings, conferences and panels for teachers on inclusive education practices. | 38 | 17.2 | 19 | 8.6 | 50 | 22.6 | 45 | 20.4 | 69 | 31.2 | 3.39 | 1.44 |
| | The school guidance service has knowledge and experience in directing students to be evaluated for special education eligibility to the Guidance Research Center (RAM). | 28 | 12.7 | 5 | 2.3 | 47 | 21.3 | 46 | 20.8 | 95 | 43.0 | 3.79 | 1.35 |
| | The school guidance service follows the progress of students with special needs who benefit from the support education room service. | 28 | 12.7 | 22 | 10.0 | 47 | 21.3 | 50 | 22.6 | 74 | 33.5 | 3.54 | 1.37 |
| | The school guidance service is knowledgeable in conducting family guidance services for families of students with special needs. | 28 | 12.7 | 20 | 9.0 | 50 | 22.6 | 42 | 19.0 | 81 | 36.7 | 3.57 | 1.38 |
| | The school guidance service is knowledgeable in conducting family guidance services for families of students who do not have special needs. | 31 | 14.0 | 13 | 5.9 | 46 | 20.8 | 51 | 23.1 | 80 | 36.2 | 3.61 | 1.38 |
| Environmental and educational regulation | Environmental regulations (access to places such as classroom, playground, gym, etc., ramps, toilets, inscriptions on doors, etc.) are sufficient for inclusive education practices at school. | 18 | 8.1 | 21 | 9.5 | 66 | 29.9 | 59 | 26.7 | 57 | 25.8 | 3.52 | 1.20 |
| | Necessary educational arrangements (individualization of instruction, educational material, methods and techniques used, measurement and evaluation, etc.) are sufficient for inclusive education practices at school. | 11 | 5.0 | 22 | 10.0 | 78 | 35.3 | 63 | 28.5 | 47 | 21.3 | 3.51 | 1.08 |
| | Necessary tools, materials and materials are sufficient for inclusive education practices at school. | 18 | 8.1 | 28 | 12.7 | 71 | 32.1 | 76 | 34.4 | 28 | 12.7 | 3.30 | 1.10 |
| | The physical environment of the classrooms (rows, heat, light, lighting, etc.) and the safety of other environments in the school are sufficient for all students. | 8 | 3.6 | 17 | 7.7 | 56 | 25.3 | 69 | 31.2 | 71 | 32.1 | 3.80 | 1.08 |
| | The physical environment at the school (size of classes, student sizes, etc.) is sufficient for students with special needs. | 17 | 7.7 | 22 | 10.0 | 49 | 22.2 | 59 | 26.7 | 74 | 33.5 | 3.68 | 1.24 |
| Support training room services | The school has a number of support education rooms where students with special needs can receive education. | 43 | 19.5 | 23 | 10.4 | 55 | 24.9 | 39 | 17.6 | 61 | 27.6 | 3.23 | 1.45 |
| | Educational services are carried out within the plan and program in the support education room(s) at the school. | 18 | 8.1 | 14 | 6.3 | 46 | 20.8 | 65 | 29.4 | 78 | 35.3 | 3.77 | 1.22 |
| | Physical conditions such as heat, light, width and hygiene of the support training room(s) are sufficient. | 28 | 12.7 | 10 | 4.5 | 44 | 19.9 | 57 | 25.8 | 82 | 37.1 | 3.70 | 1.34 |
| | Support training room(s) are far from noisy environments. | 32 | 14.5 | 15 | 6.8 | 47 | 21.3 | 60 | 27.1 | 67 | 30.3 | 3.52 | 1.36 |
| | Instructional objectives for the students who will receive education in the support education room(s) are determined by the IEP development unit. | 22 | 10.0 | 12 | 5.4 | 43 | 19.5 | 70 | 31.7 | 74 | 33.5 | 3.73 | 1.25 |
| | A sufficient number of teachers are assigned in the support education room(s) according to the educational needs of the students. | 22 | 10.0 | 9 | 4.1 | 39 | 17.6 | 56 | 25.3 | 95 | 43.0 | 3.87 | 1.28 |
| | All students are encouraged to participate in activities outside the curriculum (cultural, sporting, social, family, etc.). | 8 | 3.6 | 10 | 4.5 | 48 | 21.7 | 59 | 26.7 | 96 | 43.4 | 4.01 | 1.07 |

382

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that teachers agree at a moderate level in terms of teacher knowledge level, while they agree at a high level in other statements. The general average of the dimension is 3.52 and it is understood that teachers generally agree with the statements in this dimension at a high level. When the statements in the dimension of school guidance services are examined, it is seen that the teachers moderately agree with the statement that the school guidance service organizes activities such as meetings, conferences and panels for teachers on inclusive education practices, while they agree at a high level with the other statements. Its size average is 3.59, which is high. In terms of environmental and educational regulation, "The necessary tools, materials and materials are sufficient for inclusive education practices at school." It is understood that they have moderate level of agreement with the statement, and high level of agreement with the other statements. Its size average is 3.56, which is high. In the dimension of support education room services, they agreed at a low level to the statement of having a number of support education rooms where students with special needs can receive education, at a high level to the other statements. The size average is 3.69, which is high. When the whole scale is examined, the mean of the scale is 3.59, which is high. In line with the views of the working group, the situations where inclusive education practices are at a moderate level, teachers receive in-service training on inclusive education, the school guidance service organizes events such as meetings, conferences and panels for teachers on inclusive education practices, the adequacy of the tools, materials and materials required for inclusive education practices at school and It is in the form of having a number of support education rooms in the school where students with special needs can receive education.

### 2. Findings Related to the Second Sub-Problem

Within the scope of the research, "Is there a significant difference between the qualifications of primary schools for inclusive education practices and the characteristics of the schools (the location of the school, the socio-economic level of the school, the physical facilities of the school, the status of being a support education class, the status of being a guidance service, informing, collaborating)?" search for an answer to the question. In this context, the ANOVA test findings regarding the school location variable are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5.** *ANOVA test results of the competence scale for inclusive education practices of schools according to the variable of school location*

| Location of the School | | N | X | sd | Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | Mean of Squares | F | p | Significant Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teacher knowledge level** | Province[a] | 161 | 3.49 | .785 | Between groups | 3.324 | 2 | 1.662 | 2.570 | .079 | |
| | District[b] | 33 | 3.79 | .694 | Within groups | 140.960 | 218 | .647 | | | - |
| | Village[c] | 27 | 3.36 | 1.017 | Total | 144.283 | 220 | | | | |
| **School guidance services** | Province[a] | 161 | 3.72 | 1.253 | Between groups | 21.873 | 2 | 10.937 | 6.924 | .001[*] | a>c |
| | District[b] | 33 | 3.64 | 1.191 | Within groups | 344.343 | 218 | 1.580 | | | b>c |
| | Village[c] | 27 | 2.75 | 1.354 | Total | 366.217 | 220 | | | | |
| **Environmental and educational regulation** | Province[a] | 161 | 3.60 | .974 | Between groups | 10.902 | 2 | 5.451 | 6.013 | .003[*] | |
| | District[b] | 33 | 3.82 | .840 | Within groups | 197.610 | 218 | .906 | | | a>c |
| | Village[c] | 27 | 3.00 | .938 | Total | 208.512 | 220 | | | | b>c |
| **Support training room services** | Province[a] | 161 | 3.78 | 1.078 | Between groups | 23.174 | 2 | 11.587 | 10.429 | .001[*] | a>c |
| | District[b] | 33 | 3.93 | .846 | Within groups | 242.200 | 218 | 1.111 | | | b>c |
| | Village[c] | 27 | 2.83 | 1.132 | Total | 265.375 | 220 | | | | |
| **Scale Total** | Province[a] | 161 | 3.65 | .811 | Between groups | 11.812 | 2 | 5.906 | 9.473 | .001[*] | a>c |
| | District[b] | 33 | 3.79 | .656 | Within groups | 135.904 | 218 | .623 | | | b>c |
| | Village[c] | 27 | 2.98 | .800 | Total | 147.715 | 220 | | | | |

*p<.05

When the table is examined, there is no significant difference in the dimension of teacher knowledge at the p<.05 significance level in terms of the location of the school. There is a significant difference in the dimensions of school guidance services (p=.001), environmental and educational regulation (p=.003), support education room services (p=.001) and the scale total (p=.001). When the direction of the significant difference is examined, there is a significant difference between the province and the village in favor of the province and between the district and the village in favor of the district in terms of school guidance services, environmental and educational arrangement, support education room services and scale total. In other words, provincial and district schools are at a better level than village schools in terms of all dimensions except teacher knowledge level and their competencies for

inclusive education practices. The ANOVA test findings regarding the socio-economic level variable of the school are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6.** *ANOVA test results of the competence scale for inclusive education practices of schools according to the variable of the socio-economic level of the school*

| Socio-Economic Level of the School | | N | X | sd | Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | Mean of Squares | F | p | Significant Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teacher knowledge level** | Good[a] | 37 | 3.52 | .742 | Between groups | 1.246 | 2 | .623 | .949 | .389 | |
| | Middle[b] | 118 | 3.58 | .744 | Within groups | 143.038 | 218 | .656 | | | - |
| | Low[c] | 66 | 3.40 | .947 | Total | 144.283 | 220 | | | | |
| **School guidance services** | Good[a] | 37 | 3.64 | 1.187 | Between groups | 11.778 | 2 | 5.889 | 3.622 | .028* | |
| | Middle[b] | 118 | 3.77 | 1.253 | Within groups | 354.438 | 218 | 1.626 | | | b>c |
| | Low[c] | 66 | 3.24 | 1.357 | Total | 366.217 | 220 | | | | |
| **Environmental and educational regulation** | Good[a] | 37 | 3.48 | .882 | Between groups | 9.975 | 2 | 4.987 | 5.476 | .005* | |
| | Middle[b] | 118 | 3.75 | .983 | Within groups | 198.537 | 218 | .911 | | | b>c |
| | Low[c] | 66 | 3.27 | .939 | Total | 208.512 | 220 | | | | |
| **Support training room services** | Good[a] | 37 | 3.56 | 1.074 | Between groups | 12.766 | 2 | 6.383 | 5.508 | .005* | |
| | Middle[b] | 118 | 3.91 | 1.066 | Within groups | 252.609 | 218 | 1.159 | | | b>c |
| | Low[c] | 66 | 3.37 | 1.095 | Total | 265.375 | 220 | | | | |
| **Scale Total** | Good[a] | 37 | 3.55 | .776 | Between groups | 7.776 | 2 | 3.888 | 6.057 | .003* | |
| | Middle[b] | 118 | 3.75 | .796 | Within groups | 139.939 | 218 | .642 | | | b>c |
| | Low[c] | 66 | 3.32 | .822 | Total | 147.715 | 220 | | | | |

*\*p<.05*

When Table 6 is examined, there is no significant difference in the dimension of teacher knowledge at p<.05 significance level. There is a significant difference in the dimensions of school guidance services (p=.028), environmental and educational regulation (p=.005), support education room services (p=.005) and the scale total (p=.003). The direction of the significant difference is in favor of the middle socio-economic level between the middle socio-economic level and the low socio-economic level in terms of school guidance services, environmental and educational arrangement, support education room services and scale total. In this context, the fact that the socio-economic level is at a medium level has a positive effect on the competences other than the teacher's knowledge level, since it is at a low level. ANOVA test findings regarding the school's physical facilities variable are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7.** *ANOVA test results of the competence scale for inclusive education practices of schools according to the variable of school's physical facilities*

| The School's Physical Facilities | | N | X | sd | Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | Mean of Squares | F | p | Significant Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teacher knowledge level** | Sufficient[a] | 73 | 3.65 | .755 | Between groups | 4.067 | 2 | 2.033 | 3.161 | .044* | |
| | Middle[b] | 115 | 3.51 | .814 | Within groups | 140.217 | 218 | .643 | | | a>c |
| | Insufficient[c] | 33 | 3.23 | .859 | Total | 144.283 | 220 | | | | |
| **School guidance services** | Sufficient[a] | 73 | 3.97 | 1.187 | Between groups | 16.349 | 2 | 8.175 | 5.094 | .007* | a>b |
| | Middle[b] | 115 | 3.43 | 1.296 | Within groups | 349.867 | 218 | 1.605 | | | a>c |
| | Insufficient[c] | 33 | 3.29 | 1.330 | Total | 366.217 | 220 | | | | |
| **Environmental and educational regulation** | Sufficient[a] | 73 | 4.07 | .766 | Between groups | 45.761 | 2 | 22.881 | 30.648 | .001* | a>b |
| | Middle[b] | 115 | 3.50 | .874 | Within groups | 162.751 | 218 | .747 | | | a>c |
| | Insufficient[c] | 33 | 2.66 | 1.019 | Total | 208.512 | 220 | | | | b>c |
| **Support training room services** | Sufficient[a] | 73 | 4.09 | .981 | Between groups | 33.310 | 2 | 16.655 | 15.646 | .001* | a>b |
| | Middle[b] | 115 | 3.67 | 1.031 | Within groups | 232.065 | 218 | 1.065 | | | a>c |
| | Insufficient[c] | 33 | 2.88 | 1.136 | Total | 265.375 | 220 | | | | b>c |
| **Scale Total** | Sufficient[a] | 73 | 3.94 | .730 | Between groups | 20.514 | 2 | 10.257 | 17.579 | .001* | a>b |
| | Middle[b] | 115 | 3.53 | .784 | Within groups | 127.202 | 218 | .583 | | | a>c |
| | Insufficient[c] | 33 | 3.01 | .760 | Total | 147.715 | 220 | | | | b>c |

*\*p<.05*

When the table is examined, the level of teacher knowledge (p=.044), school guidance services (p=.007), environmental and educational arrangement (p=.001), support education room services (p=.001) in terms of physical facilities variable at p<.05 significance level. .001) and scale total (p=.001) there is a significant difference. When the direction of the significant difference is examined, there is a significant difference in favor of sufficient between sufficient and insufficient in the dimension of teacher knowledge level. There is a difference in favor of adequate between adequate, medium and insufficient in the dimension of school guidance services. There is a significant difference between adequate, medium and insufficient in favor of adequate and between moderate and inadequate in favor of moderate in environmental and educational arrangement, support education room services and scale total. In this context, the adequacy of the school's physical facilities positively affects the inclusive

education practices of the schools. T-test findings regarding the variable of being a supportive education class at school are presented in Table 8.

**Table 8.** *T-Test results of the competence scale for inclusive education practices of schools according to the variable of being a support education class at school*

| Status of being a support training class | | N | X | sd | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teacher knowledge level** | Yes | 140 | 3.58 | .786 | 1.626 | .053 |
| | No | 81 | 3.40 | .840 | | |
| **School guidance services** | Yes | 140 | 3.88 | 1.189 | 4.701 | .001* |
| | No | 81 | 3.08 | 1.303 | | |
| **Environmental and educational regulation** | Yes | 140 | 3.82 | .833 | 5.614 | .001* |
| | No | 81 | 3.11 | 1.034 | | |
| **Support training room services** | Yes | 140 | 4.17 | .776 | 10.587 | .001* |
| | No | 81 | 2.85 | 1.071 | | |
| **Scale Total** | Yes | 140 | 3.87 | .701 | 7.384 | .001* |
| | No | 81 | 3.11 | .790 | | |

*\*p<.05*

When Table 8 is examined, there is no significant difference in the dimension of teacher knowledge in terms of the variable of being a supportive education class at school at p<.05 significance level. There is a significant difference in the dimensions of school guidance services (p=.001), environmental and educational regulation (p=.001), support education room services (p=.001) and scale total (p=.001). In other words, being a support education class at school positively affects the aforementioned dimensions and the inclusive education proficiency level of the school. Table 9 presents the T-test findings according to the variable of being a school guidance service.

**Table 9.** *T-Test results of the competence scale for inclusive education practices of schools according to the variable of having a counseling service at school*

| Status of being a Guidance Service | | N | X | sd | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teacher knowledge level** | Yes | 148 | 3.51 | .789 | -.179 | .429 |
| | No | 73 | 3.53 | .855 | | |
| **School guidance services** | Yes | 148 | 3.97 | 1.048 | 6.865 | .001* |
| | No | 73 | 2.82 | 1.393 | | |
| **Environmental and educational regulation** | Yes | 148 | 3.58 | 1.024 | .492 | .312 |
| | No | 73 | 3.52 | .865 | | |
| **Support training room services** | Yes | 148 | 3.80 | 1.074 | 2.223 | .014* |
| | No | 73 | 3.46 | 1.116 | | |
| **Scale Total** | Yes | 148 | 3.72 | .819 | 3.374 | .001* |
| | No | 73 | 3.33 | .761 | | |

*\*p<.05*

When the table is examined, there is no significant difference between teacher knowledge level and environmental and educational regulation dimensions in terms of the variable of being a guidance service at school at p<.05 significance level. There is a significant difference between the dimensions of school guidance services (p=.001), support education room services (p=.014) and the total scale (p=.001). significant difference is in favor of schools with guidance service at school. In other words, the aforementioned dimensions and the sum of the scales are at a better level in schools with guidance services. Table 10 presents the T-test findings according to the variable of informing activities at school.

**Table 10.** *T-Test results of the competence scale for inclusive education practices of schools according to the variable of providing information activities at school*

| Information activities at school | | N | X | sd | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teacher knowledge level** | Yes | 166 | 3.65 | .744 | 4.480 | .001* |
| | No | 55 | 3.11 | .867 | | |
| **School guidance services** | Yes | 166 | 3.91 | 1.137 | 7.042 | .001* |
| | No | 55 | 2.63 | 1.254 | | |
| **Environmental and educational regulation** | Yes | 166 | 3.78 | .866 | 6.383 | .001* |
| | No | 55 | 2.89 | .979 | | |
| **Support training room services** | Yes | 166 | 3.96 | .963 | 6.990 | .001* |
| | No | 55 | 2.88 | 1.086 | | |
| **Scale Total** | Yes | 166 | 3.82 | .715 | 8.578 | .001* |
| | No | 55 | 2.88 | .695 | | |

*\*p<.05*

As can be seen in Table 10, according to the information activities at school, teacher knowledge level (p=.001), school guidance services (p=.001), environmental and educational arrangement (p=.001), support at p<.05 significance level. There is a significant difference between the dimensions of education room services (p=.001) and the total scale. Significant difference is in favor of schools where information activities are carried out. In other words, inclusive education practices in schools that are informed are higher than schools that do not have proficiency levels. Table 11 presents the T-test findings according to the variable of collaboration at school.

**Table 11.** *T-Test results of the competence scale for inclusive education practices of schools according to the variable of collaboration at school*

| Collaboration | | N | X | sd | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher knowledge level | Yes | 187 | 3.56 | .789 | 2.074 | .020* |
| | No | 34 | 3.25 | .877 | | |
| School guidance services | Yes | 187 | 3.70 | 1.282 | 3.205 | .001* |
| | No | 34 | 2.95 | 1.150 | | |
| Environmental and educational regulation | Yes | 187 | 3.70 | .903 | 5.106 | .001* |
| | No | 34 | 2.82 | 1.020 | | |
| Support training room services | Yes | 187 | 3.81 | 1.043 | 4.013 | .001* |
| | No | 34 | 3.02 | 1.163 | | |
| Scale Total | Yes | 187 | 3.69 | .791 | 4.691 | .001* |
| | No | 34 | 3.01 | .732 | | |

*p<.05

When the table is examined, in terms of the variable of collaboration at school, teacher knowledge level at p<.05 significance level (p=.020), school guidance services (p=.001), environmental and educational arrangement (p=.001), support education room services dimensions. (p=.001) and a significant difference in the total scale. The significant difference is in favor of the collaborating schools. In other words, the inclusive education practices of the cooperated schools are at a better level than the ones without qualifications.

386

## CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, it is aimed to determine the current situation of primary schools towards inclusive practices with the "Competence Scale for Inclusive Education Practices of Schools" developed by Yazıcıoğlu & Sümer-Dodur (2021), based on the reports of classroom teachers. For this purpose, based on the data obtained from 221 teachers with the scale, descriptive values and relational values showing the situations of various variables against each other were reached.

According to the descriptive findings obtained as a result of the research, the competency of schools towards inclusive practices is generally at a good level. Situations where inlusive applications are at a moderate level; teachers receive in-service training on inclusive education, the school guidance service organizes events such as meetings, conferences and panels for teachers on inclusion practices, the adequacy of the tools, equipment and materials required for inclusion practices in the school, and the availability of resource rooms in the school where students with special needs can receive education.

According to these results, the competency of schools towards inclusive practices seems to be better than that shown in some other relevant research results in the literature. According to Bakkaloglu et al. (2017) with CQMF and Yılmaz (2014) with ICP examined classes, which is an important subsystem of the school, even though they do not have schools. In both studies, it was determined that the quality of preschool inclusive classrooms was low. Carrington et al. (2023) examined the inclusion practices in a secondary school for 1 year with the Index for Inclusion. In this process, they also carried out development and changing activities at the school according to the criteria in the index. As the criteria in the index were implemented, the researchers were able to see that the school's efficacy towards inclusive practices increased in the context of staff-student dialogues, commitment to the school and sense of belonging.

Some striking results of Bakkaloğlu et al.'s (2017) study may explain why the results of this study seem better than the literature. Accordingly, the researchers did not try to determine the qualities of preschool inclusive classrooms with CQMF based solely on teacher reports. In addition, data were collected by independent observers with PhD degrees in the special Education and inclusion field with

the same tool. As a result of the analyzes, the researchers saw that the teachers evaluated their classes as "adequate" in terms of quality. On the other hand, they determined that independent observers described the same classes as "inadequate". Moreover, the difference between the teacher and the independent observers was also found to be significant. At the end of the study, the researchers decided that the quality of preschool inclusive classrooms was low by comparing all the qualitative and quantitative results obtained from all participants. In our study, the fact that the inclusive competencies of the schools were determined only on the basis of teacher reports may explain the fact that the results were better than those stated in the literature. Bakkaloğlu et al. think that the significant difference between the views of the two groups on the quality of inclusive classes in their research is due to the fact that independent observers may have more in-depth knowledge of the issues related to qualified inclusive practices. In this context, when evaluating the results of our research, it should be considered that the data were obtained only from teacher reports. In further research, the sub-dimensions of the scale used in this research can be made observable while determining the competencies of schools for integrating practices. In this way, observations can be made by independent experts who have in-depth knowledge and experience of inlusive practices in schools. In addition, with the scale we use, the competency of schools for inclusive practices can be demonstrated based on more evidence by making use of the reports of other stakeholders (families, administrators, counselors, etc.).

Similar to the results of this research, a study showing that schools have a good level of competence in inclusive practices was conducted by Günlü & Özgür-Yılmaz (2022). With KIDO, the researchers evaluated the competency of schools for inclusion according to more limited criteria (only in terms of instructional arrangements and physical arrangements) than in this study. According to the statements of teachers working in various school types and grade levels from different branches, instructional and physical arrangements are highly included in classroom practices in schools. Günlü and Özgür-Yılmaz also reached these results, which were obtained in parallel with our research, based on teacher reports, as in this study. It can be said that this result can be added as a proof to the literature (Akgün et al., 2011; Bakkaloğlu et al., 2017; Sucuoğlu et al., 2017), which states that teachers tend to evaluate their own practices more positively.

A large number of research results are encountered in the literature regarding the situations in which inclusive practices in schools are reported to be moderate by the teachers above. Regarding *teachers' in-service training on inclusive education;* it is reported that teachers need in-service training, training is generally based on theoretical knowledge transfer, and teachers have difficulties in reflecting the knowledge they have learned in these trainings to their practices (e.g. Babaoğlan & Yılmaz, 2010; Ergin et al., 2012; Srivastava et al., 2015 etc.). About *the school guidance service's organizing activities such as meetings, conferences and panels for teachers on inclusion practices*; counselors who provide these services have difficulties in providing guidance services because their knowledge and experience on inclusive practices are limited, and the guidance service cannot work actively enough (e.g. Akalın, 2014; Hanchon & Fernald, 2013; Saraç & Çolak, 2012 etc.). Regarding *the adequacy of the tools, materials and materials required for inclusion practices at school*; It is mentioned that there are not enough tools and materials in schools (Avramidis et al., 2000; Koçyiğit, 2015), and that missing materials are requested from families (Ağgül-Yalçın & Yalçın, 2018). Finally, about *the availability of support education rooms in the school where students with special needs can receive education*; there are results such as support services are not provided adequately (Akay et al., 2014), the number of resource rooms is gradually decreasing (Slobodzian, 2009) or the physical conditions and the qualifications of assigned teachers are limited even though resource rooms become widespread (Talas et al., 2016).

Within the scope of the research, the findings obtained as a result of the analyzes made to determine whether there is a significant difference in terms of primary schools' competency in inclusive practices and various characteristics of these schools are given below.

The inclusion qualifications of village schools are significantly lower than those of district schools, and those of district schools are significantly lower than those of provincial schools. More adequate inclusive practices are carried out in middle socio-economic level schools compared to low socio-economic level schools. As the physical facilities of the school increase, inclusive practice competencies increase. Having a resource and school guidance level at school positively affects inclusive practice competencies. Inclusion competency levels of the schools with which information activities and cooperated are significantly higher than those that do not. Teacher knowledge level is affected by the

physical facilities of the school, the information activities at the school and the collaboration in the school.

All these results coincide with a significant majority of the basic criteria that schools must meet in the literature for the "inclusive turn" of schools expressed by Ainscow (2020). Accordingly, collaboration in schools is underlined, especially in the "school development" and "education departments" components of the framework formulated by Ainscow (2020) to promote inclusiveness and equality in schools. Kinsella (2020) emphasizes the need to have physical accessibility, to accustom school personnel to collaborative thinking, to provide adequate counseling services, to inform teachers for organizing inclusive schools. Similarly, Kayahan-Yuksel & Polat (2022) emphasizes the importance of the physical qualities of schools and collaboration in their work. Villa & Thousand (2005) also draws attention to the importance of collaboration for creating an inclusive schools. On the other hand, Thomas (1997), reports that inclusion works in schools that are well-financed.

While evaluating the results of our research, it should be remembered that the data were obtained from a single province, with a single tool, and only based on the notifications of primary school teachers. In future research, it is possible to work with classroom teachers from different provinces, different school types and grade levels. Data can be collected from other branches or from different sources such as families, counselors, administrators, and students. In the data collection process, both qualitative and quantitative data diversity can be achieved with more than one tool. In this way, clearer evidence for the competency of inclusive practices in schools can be obtained through multidimensional assessments. On the other hand, researchers can focus on the variables determined to positively affect the efficacy of inclusive practices in schools in this study. Researchers can design and implement programs that include these features and examine the results of their implementation. It is hoped that the research results will contribute to the work of policy makers and all other relevant practitioners who are responsible for the planning and execution of effective integration practices.

388

# Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Penceresinden İlkokulların Bütünleştirme Uygulamalarına Yönelik Yeterlilikleri

**Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Fadime İşcen Karasu**
Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi - Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0003-3703-3343
fiscen@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

**Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Didem Kayahan Yüksel**
Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi - Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0002-0184-6070
didemkayahan@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

## Özet

*Bu araştırmanın amacı ilkokulların bütünleştirme uygulamalarına yönelik yeterliliklerinin sınıf öğretmenleri bakış açısı ile incelenmesidir. Araştırma nicel tarama deseninde tasarlanmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubu Türkiye'nin İç Anadolu Bölgesinde bulunan Sivas ilindeki ilkokullarda görev yapmakta olan 221 sınıf öğretmeninden oluşmaktadır. Veri toplama aracı olarak Yazıcıoğlu ve Sümer-Dodur (2021) tarafından geliştirilen "Okulların Bütünleştirme Uygulamalarına Yönelik Yeterlilik Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Ölçek; öğretmen bilgi düzeyi, okul rehberlik hizmetleri, çevresel eğitsel düzenleme ve destek eğitim odası hizmetleri şeklindeki dört boyut ve 25 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Araştırma verileri ilgili izinlerin alınmasının ardından araştırmacılar tarafından okul idareleri ile tek tek görüşülüp araştırma hakkında bilgi verilerek gönüllü katılımcıların seçimi yoluyla toplanmıştır. Araştırmaya katılmaya gönüllü olan öğretmenlere online ortamda veri toplama aracı gönderilmiştir. Veri toplama süreci 85 gün sürmüştür. Araştırmadan elde edilen verilerin analizinde SPSS-29 kullanılmış olup, betimsel istatistik, T-testi ve ANOVA testi yapılmıştır. Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgulara göre bütünleştirme uygulamalarına yönelik yeterlilikler köy okullarında il ve ilçe okullarına göre daha düşük düzeydedir. Düşük sosyo-ekonomik düzey ile orta sosyo-ekonomik düzey arasında orta düzey lehine anlamlı farklılık bulunmaktadır. Ayrıca okulların fiziksel yeterlilikleri ile bütünleştirme uygulamalarına yönelik yeterlilikleri arasında paralellik bulunmaktır. Okullarda destek eğitim sınıfı ve rehberlik servisinin olması ile bütünleştirme uygulamalarına yönelik yeterlilikleri arasında pozitif yönde anlamlı farklılık bulunmaktadır. Okullarda bilgilendirme faaliyetlerinin yapılması ve işbirliğinin sağlanması durumunda da benzer şekilde bir ilişki bulunmaktadır. Bu bağlamda özellikle kırsal bölgelerde bulunan okullardan başlanarak fiziksel imkânların iyileştirilmesi, okullarda ayrı destek eğitim odalarının ve rehberlik servislerinin kurulması politika yapıcılara önerilmektedir. Ayrıca okullarda var olan işbirliği ve bilgilendirmelerin artırılması amacıyla öğretim programları geliştirilebilir. Araştırmacılar, işbirliği ve bilgilendirmelerin bütünleştirme uygulamalarının başarısına etkisini inceleyen araştırmalar tasarlayabilir.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Özel Eğitim, Kapsayıcılık, Kapsayıcı eğitim uygulamaları, İlkokul, Sınıf öğretmeni.*

## Genişletilmiş Özet

***Problem:*** Eğitim çocuğun, bireyselinin de dikkate alındığı bir ortamda, çeşitli yöntemlerle toplum ve dünyayla uyumlandırıldığı süreçtir. Bu süreç anaokulundan başlayıp doktoraya kadar uzanan öğretimsel faaliyetlerle gerçekleşir ve okullar aslında çocukların gelecekte içinde yaşayacakları ortamların prova yerleridir. Bu yüzden okulda çocuklar arasında sağlanacak uyum önemlidir (Toprakçı, 2017). Bu önem, eğitimi insan haklarının temel ve ayrılmaz bir parçası yaparak hiçbir öğrencinin cinsiyet, dil, yetersizlik vb. gibi herhangi bir nedenden eğitimin kapsamının dışında bırakılamaması gerektiğini hatırlatmaktadır. Kapsayıcı eğitim, özel gereksinimleri olan ve olmayan tüm öğrencilerin, fiziki ve sosyal çevrelerinden ayrıştırılmadan, eğitim hak ve olanaklarından gereksinimleri doğrultusunda en üst düzeyde yararlanabilmelerini amaçlar. Kapsayıcı eğitim uygulamaları, tüm öğrencilerin eğitsel kaynaklara aktif ve eşit ölçüde erişim ve ulaşımlarını sağlayacak düzenlemeleri içerir. Kapsayıcı eğitim ortamlarında çeşitlilik memnuniyetle karşılanır. Her öğrencinin getirdiği benzersiz katkıya değer verilir (Ainscow, 2020; İşcen-Karasu, 2021; İşcen-Karasu, 2022; Nutbrown ve ark., 2013; Open Society Foundations, 2019; UNESCO, 2017; Yılmaz-Atman, 2022).

Dünyada ve Türkiye'de yasal gerekçelerle her geçen gün artan sayıda özel gereksinimli öğrenci genel eğitim ortamlarındadır. Başarıyla uygulandığında, yalnızca özel gereksinimli öğrenciler değil aynı ortamda yer alan tüm paydaşlar, kapsayıcı eğitimden olumlu çıktılar elde edebilmektedir (Hehir ve ark., 2016; Sucuoğlu ve Kargın, 2006). Amaçlı ve programlı olarak formal eğitim etkinliklerinin yürütüldüğü ilk akla gelen örgün eğitim ortamları okullardır (Demirel ve Kaya, 2018). Eğitim sisteminde bütünleştirmenin kabul görmesiyle, herkes için bütünleştirici/kapsayıcı eğitimden beklenen yararın elde edebilmesi adına, okulların rol ve sorumlulukları değişmektedir (Yazıcıoğlu ve Sümer-Dodur, 2021).

Bütünleştirme yolunda ilerleyebilmeleri için okulların öncelikle politika bağlamında kapsayıcılığı bir ilke olarak benimsemeleri gerekmektedir. Bu bağlamda toplumun tüm bireylerini paydaş olarak görmeleri, herkes için sıcak ve destekleyici olmaları beklenmektedir. Uygulamalar bağlamında ise kapsayıcılığa destek ya da engel olan etmenleri belirleyerek elde edilen kanıtları kullanmaları, tüm öğrencilerin gelişimlerinin izlenmesi ve desteklenmesi için çeşitli stratejiler geliştirmeleri, okul içinden okul kapsının dışına ve mikro düzeyden makro düzeye tüm paydaşlarla bir işbirliği kültürü oluşturmaları beklenmektedir (Ainscow, 2020; Thomas, 1997; Villa ve Thousand, 2005). Tüm bilgiler özetle okulların, daha önce genel eğitimden dışlanmış grupların, özellikle de engelli öğrencilerin eğitimi konusunda giderek daha fazla sorumluluk alması ve onları mahalle okullarında uygun destekle eğitirken, aynı zamanda okul politikalarında, uygulamalarında ve müfredatlarında gerekli değişiklikleri yapması gerekliliğini ortaya çıkarmaktadır (Kinsella, 2020).

Alanyazında birden fazla parametreye göre okulların bütünleştirme uygulamalarını değerlendirmeye yönelik geliştirilmiş ölçme araçları kullanılarak yürütülen araştırmalara rastlanmaktadır. Örneğin Carrington ve ark. (2023), Booth ve Ainscow (2011) tarafından geliştirilen "Index for Inclusion" ile bir yıl boyunca bir ortaokulda incelemelerde, geliştirme ve değişim için çalışmalarda bulunmuşlardır. Sonuçlar indeksin aşamaları okulda hayata geçirildikçe personel ve öğrenci diyaloglarının geliştiğini, okula bağlılık ve aidiyet duyusunun arttığını göstermiştir. Loreman (2013) ile Kyriazopoulou ve Weber (2009) araştırma alanyazınına göre kapsayıcı eğitim ve kapsayıcı okullar niteliklerini belirmek üzere girdi-süreç-çıktı değerlendirme mantığına dayalı araçlar geliştirmişlerdir. Çeşitli araştırmalarda bu araçlarla literatür bağlamında okullarda bütünleştirme uygulamalarının yeterlikleri vb. değerlendirilmiştir (örneğin, Hosshan ve ark., 2020; Van Mieghem ve ark., 2020). Türkiye'de de sınırlı da olsa böyle araştırmalara rastlanmaktadır. Örneğin Yılmaz (2014), Soukakou (2012) tarafından geliştirilen "Inclusive Classroom Profile - (ICP)" ile okulların temel alt sistemlerinden biri olan sınıf ortamlarının kalitesini okul öncesi düzeyde değerlendirmeye odaklanmıştır. Araştırmacı okul öncesi sınıflarının yetersiz-sınırlı kategorisinde konumlandığını bulmuştur. Benzer şekilde Bakkaloğlu ve ark. da (2017), Sandall ve Schwartz (2008) tarafından geliştirilen "The Classroom Quality Measurement Form - (CQMF)" ile okul öncesi kaynaştırma sınıflarının niteliğini öğretmenler ve bağımsız gözlemciler penceresinden değerlendirmişlerdir. Sonuçlar sınıfların niteliğinin düşük olduğunu göstermiştir. Günlü ve Özgür-Yılmaz (2022), Kargın ve ark. (2010) tarafından geliştirilen "Inclusion Regulations Scale - (KIDO)" farklı branşlardan çeşitli okul türleri ve sınıf düzeylerinde görev yapan öğretmenlerin gözünden okullardaki bütünleştirme uygulamalarına yönelik durumlarını belirlemişlerdir. Sonuçlar okullarda sınıf içi uygulamalarda öğretimsel ve fiziksel düzenlemelere yüksek oranda yer verildiğini göstermiştir.

390

Bu araştırmada Yazıcıoğlu ve Sümer-Dodur, (2021) tarafından geliştirilen "Competence Scale for Inclusive Education Practices of Schools" ile sınıf öğretmenlerinin penceresinden ilkokulların mevcut durumunun belirlenmesi hedeflenmiştir. Yazıcıoğlu ve Sümer-Dodur, ölçeğin uluslararası düzeyde belirtilen çoğu kriteri geçerli ve güvenilir bir şekilde ölçümlediğini göstermişlerdir. Ülkemizde ilkokul öğretmenleriyle yapılan önceki araştırmalara göre daha geniş bir yelpazede değerlendirmeye izin vermesi sebebiyle araştırmamızın sonuçlarının literatüre katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir. Türkiye'de bütünleştirme yoluyla eğitimine devam eden öğrencilerin yaklaşık %35'i ilkokul düzeyinde eğitim almaktadırlar (Milli Eğitim İstatistikleri Örgün Eğitim, 2021,'22). Bu okullarda eğitim-öğretim faaliyetlerinin yürütülmesinde sorumluluğu en çok olan sınıf öğretmenlerinin bildirimlerinden yola çıkarak değerlendirmeler yapmak daha fazla bilgiye ulaşmaya yardımcı olacaktır. Araştırma sonucunda elde edilecek kanıtlar okullarda bütünleştirmenin niteliğini arıtmayı hedefleyen araştırmalara ve uygulamalara yol göstereceği umut edilmektedir.

**Yöntem:** Bu araştırma tarama deseninde nicel bir araştırmadır. Betimsel bir yaklaşımla ele alınan araştırmada tekil tarama ve ilişkisel tarama modelleri kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubu İç Anadolu bölgesinde bulunan bir ilin merkez, ilçe ve köy okullarında görev yapmakta olan 221 sınıf öğretmeninden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmada veri toplama amacıyla bilgi formu ve "Okulların Bütünleştirme Uygulamalarına Yönelik Yeterlilik Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Bilgi formu araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilmiş olup öğretmenlere ilişkin demografik bilgiler ile görev yapılan okula ilişkin betimsel bilgilerle ilgili soruları içermektedir. Okulların Bütünleştirme Uygulamalarına Yönelik Yeterlilik Ölçeği ise Yazıcıoğlu ve Sümer-Dodur (2021) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Ölçekte "öğretmen bilgi düzeyi, okul rehberlik hizmetleri, çevresel eğitsel düzenleme ve destek eğitim odası hizmetleri" şeklinde adlandırılan dört boyut ve 25 madde bulunmaktadır.

Veri toplama sürecinde gerekli izinler alındıktan sonra araştırmacı tarafından tek tek okullar ile görüşülerek araştırma hakkında bilgi verilmiştir. Araştırmaya katılmaya gönüllü olan öğretmenlere online ortamda hazırlanmış olan ölçme aracı yönlendirilmiştir. Veri toplama süreci 85 gün sürmüş olup süreçte katılımlar için hiçbir öğretmen zorlanmamış, hediye vb. gibi teşvik edici unsurlar verilmemiştir. Araştırmadan elde edilen veriler betimsel analiz, T testi ve tek yönlü varyans analizi (ANOVA testi) ile analiz edilmiştir.

**Bulgular:** Elde edilen bulgulara göre okulların bütünleştirme uygulamaları yeterlilikleri iyi düzeydedir. Bütünleştirme uygulamalarının orta düzeyde kaldığı durumlar; öğretmenlerin kapsayıcı eğitim konulu hizmetiçi eğitim alması, okul rehberlik servisinin kaynaştırma uygulamaları konusunda öğretmenlere yönelik toplantı, konferans ve panel gibi etkinlikler düzenlemesi, okulda kaynaştırma uygulamaları için gerekli araç, gereç ve materyalin yeterliliği ve okulda özel gereksinimli öğrencilerin eğitim alabileceği sayıda destek eğitim odasının bulunması şeklindedir.

Köy okullarının bütünleştirme yeterlilikleri il ve ilçe okullarından anlamlı düzeyde düşük seviyededir. Düşük sosyo-ekonomik düzey ile orta sosyo-ekonomik düzey okullar arasında orta düzey okullar lehine anlamlı farklılık vardır. Bir başka ifadeyle orta sosyo-ekonomik düzey okullarda düşük sosyo-ekonomik düzeye göre daha yeterli bütünleştirme uygulamaları yapılmaktadır. Okulun fiziksel imkanları arttıkça bütünleştirme uygulama yeterlikleri artmaktadır. Okulda destek eğitim sınıfı ve okul rehberlik seviyesi olma durumu bütünleştirme uygulama yeterliliklerini olumlu yönde etkilemektedir. Bütünleştirme uygulamalarının başarıya ulaşması için sürekli bilgilendirme faaliyetlerinin ve tüm ilgililer arasında işbirliğinin sağlanması bir gerekliliktir. Bilgilendirme faaliyetleri ve işbirliği yapılan okulların bütünleştirme yeterlilik düzeyleri yapılmayanlardan anlamlı derecede yüksektir. Öğretmenler bütünleştirme uygulamalarının başarıya ulaşmasında anahtar roldedir. Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgulara göre öğretmen bilgi düzeyi okulun konumu, sosyo-ekonomik durumu, okulda destek eğitim odası ve rehberlik servisi bulunmasından etkilenmezken okulun fiziksel imkanlarının yeterli olması, okulda bilgilendirme faaliyetlerinin yapılması ve okulda işbirliği yapılması durumlarından etkilenmektedir.

**Öneriler:** Araştırma sonuçları değerlendirilirken verilerin tek bir ilden, tek bir araçla ve yalnızca ilkokullardan sınıf öğretmenlerinin bildirimlerinden hareketle elde edildiği sınırlılığı hatırlanmalıdır. Gelecek araştırmalarda farklı illerden, farklı okul türleri ve sınıf düzeylerinden sınıf öğretmenleriyle çalışılabilir. Diğer branşlardan ya da aileler, rehber öğretmenler, yöneticiler, öğrenciler gibi farklı kaynaklardan veriler toplanabilir. Veri toplama sürecinde birden fazla araçla hem nitel hem nicel veri

çeşitliliği sağlanabilir. Bu şekilde çok boyutlu değerlendirmeler yoluyla okullarda bütünleştirme uygulamalarının yeterliliklerine yönelik daha net bir kanıtlar elde edilebilir. Diğer taraftan araştırmacılar, bu araştırmada okullarda bütünleştirme uygulamalarının yeterliliklerini olumlu yönde etkilediği belirlenen değişkenlere de (fiziki erişebilirlik, rehberlik hizmetleri, hizmet içi eğitim, işbirliği gibi) odaklanabilir. Araştırmacılar bu özellikleri içeren programlar tasarlayabilir, uygulayabilir ve uygulama sonuçlarını inceleyebilirler. Araştırma sonuçlarının etkili bütünleştirme uygulamalarının planlanması ve yürütülmesinde sorumluluğu olan politika yapıcılardan diğer ilgili tüm uygulamacılara kadar çalışmalarına katkı sunması umut edilmektedir.

## KAYNAKÇA / REFERENCES

Adderley, R. J., Hope, M. A., Hughes, G. C., Jones, L., Messiou, K., & Shaw, P. A. (2015). Exploring inclusive practices in primary schools: Focusing on children's voices. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 30*(1), 106-121. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.964580

Ağgül Yalçın, F., & Yalçın, M. (2018). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerin okul öncesi eğitimin sorunlarıyla ilgili görüşleri: Ağrı ili örneği [Preschool teachers' views of preschool educational problems: Agri city sample]. *Ilkogretim Online, 17*(1). https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2018.413784

Ainscow, M. (2020). Inclusion and equity in education: Making sense of global challenges. *Prospects*, *49*, 123-134. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09506-w

Akalın, S. (2014). Okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarında çalışan rehber öğretmenlerin kaynaştırma uygulamalarına ilişkin gereksinimleri [Needs of preschool counselors about ınclusive practices]. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, *6*(1), 115-142.

Akalın, S., Demir, S., Sucuoglu, B., Bakkaloglu, H., & İşcen, F. (2014). The needs of inclusive preschool teachers about inclusive practices. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *54*, 39-60.

Akay, E., Uzuner, Y., & Girgin, Ü. (2014). Kaynaştırmadaki işitme engelli öğrencilerle gerçekleştirilen destek eğitim odası uygulamasındaki sorunlar ve çözüm gayretleri [The problems and solution efforts of the resource room application designed for the mainstreamed primary school aged hearing ımpaired students]. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi, 2*(2), 43-68.

Akgün, E., Yarar, M., & Dinçer, Ç. (2011). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerin sınıf içi etkinliklerde kullandıkları sınıf yönetimi stratejilerinin incelenmesi [The evaluation of classroom management strategies of preschool teachers in classroom activities]. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi, 1*(3), 1-9.

Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (2000). A survey into mainstream teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school in one local education authority. *Educational psychology, 20*(2), 191-211. https://doi.org/10.1080/713663717

Babaoğlan, E. & Yılmaz, Ş. (2010). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin kaynaştırma eğitimindeki yeterlikleri [Classroom teachers' competencies in inclusive education]. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi,18*(2), 345-354

Bakkaloğlu, H., Altındağ-Kumaş, Ö., & Aykaç, P. N. (2017). Okul öncesi kaynaştırma sınıflarının niteliğini öğretmenler ve bağımsız gözlemciler nasıl değerlendiriyorlar? [How do teachers and independent observers assess the quality of inclusive preschool classrooms?]. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 18*(3), 229-249. https://doi.org/10.17679/inuefd.303060

Booth, T., and M. Ainscow (2011). Index for Inclusion: Developing Learning and Participation inSchools. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Brown, S. E., & Guralnick, M. J. (2012). International Human Rights to early intervention for infants and young children with disabilities. *Infants & Young Children, 25*(4), 270–285. https://doi.org/10.1097/IYC.0b013e318268fa49.

Carrington, S. B., Saggers, B. R., Shochet, I. M., Orr, J. A., Wurfl, A. M., Vanelli, J., & Nickerson, J. (2023). Researching a whole school approach to school connectedness. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *27*(7), 785-802. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1878298

Clark, C., Dyson, A., Millward, A., & Robson, S. (1999). Theories of Inclusion, Theories of Schools: deconstructing and reconstructing the 'inclusive school'. *British educational research journal*, *25*(2), 157-177.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Araştırma deseni: Nitel,* nicel ve karma yöntem yaklaşımları [Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches]. (Trans. Ed. S. B. Demir). Eğiten Publishing.

Demirel, Ö., & Kaya, Z. (2018). *Eğitime* giriş [Introduction to education]. Pegem Akademi.

Engin, A. O., Tösten, R., Kaya, M.D. & Köselioğlu, Y.S. (2014). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin kaynaştırma uygulamasıyla ilgili tutum ve görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi (Kars ili örneği) [The evaluation of manners and point of views related to mainstreaming education having responsibilities of students who are in needs of special education for primary education (Example of Kars)]. *Kafkas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 13*(1), 27-44. https://doi.org/10.9775/kausbed.2014.003

Graham, L. J., & Spandagou, I. (2011). From vision to reality: Views of primary school principals on inclusive

392

education in New South Wales, Australia. *Disability & Society*, *26*(2), 223-237.
https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2011.544062

Günlü, Y., & Özgür-Yılmaz, Ç. (2022). Özel gereksinimli öğrencilerle çalışan öğretmenlerin kaynaştırmaya ilişkin görüşlerinin belirlenmesi [Determining the views of teachers who have special needs students in their classrooms on ınclusion]. *Bayterek Uluslararası Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi, 5*(2), 284-297.
https://doi.org/10.48174/buaad.52.12

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2013). *Multivariate data analysis.* Pearson Education Limited.

Hanchon, T. A., & Fernald, L. N. (2013). The provision of counseling services among school psychologists: An exploration of training, current practices, and perceptions. *Psychology in the Schools, 50*(7), 651-671.
https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21700

Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Freeman, B., Lamoreau, R., Borquaye, Y., & Burke, S. (2016). A summary of the evidence on inclusive education. *Abt Associates*.

Hosshan, H., Stancliffe, R. J., Villeneuve, M., & Bonati, M. L. (2020). Inclusive schooling in Southeast Asian countries: A scoping review of the literature. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *21*(1), 99-119.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-019-09613-0

İşcen-Karasu, F. (2021). Bütünleştirme yoluyla eğitim [Inclusive education]. D. Kayahan-Yüksel ve F. İşcen-Karasu (Ed.). *Etkinlik örnekleriyle özel öğrenme güçlüğü olan öğrencilerin eğitimi [Education of students with special learning difficulties with examples of activities]*. Eğiten Kitap.

İşcen-Karasu, F. (2022). Erken çocukluk eğitiminde eşitlik ve kapsayıcılık politikaları [Equality and inclusion policies in early childhood education]. H. Kahraman ve N. Atış-Akyol (Ed.). *Erken çocukluk eğitimi politikaları [Early childhood education policies]*. Nobel.

Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi [Scientific research method].* Nobel Publishing.

Kargın, T. (2003). Cumhuriyetin 80. yılında özel eğitim [Special education in the 80th anniversary of the Republic of Turkey]. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi,* sayı160.
https://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/milli_egitim_dergisi/160/kargin.htm

Kargın, T., Güldenoğlu, B., & Şahin, F. (2010). Genel eğitim sınıflarında özel gereksinimli öğrenciler için yapılması gereken uyarlamalara ilişkin sınıf öğretmenlerinin görüşlerinin incelenmesi. [Opinions of the general education teachers on the adaptations for students with special needs in general education classrooms]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 10*(4), 2431-2464.

Kayahan- Yüksel, D. & Polat, K. (2022). Evaluation of the national education council decisions in line with the components of inclusive education: From 1939 to 2021. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 14*(3), 2400-2422.

Kinsella, W. (2020). Organising inclusive schools. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *24*(12), 1340-1356.
https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1516820

Koçyiğit, S. (2015). Ana sınıflarında kaynaştırma eğitimi uygulamalarına ilişkin öğretmen-rehber öğretmen ve ebeveyn görüşleri [The opınıons of teachers-counselors and parents about the applıcatıon of ıntegratıon ın kındergartens]. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi, 4*(1), 391-415.

Kyriazopoulou, M., & Weber, H. (Eds.). (2009). *Development of a set of indicators-for inclusive education in Europe.* European agency for development in special needs education.

Loreman, T. (2013). Measuring inclusive education outcomes in Alberta, Canada. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 18*(5), 459-483. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2013.788223

McGregor, G., & Vogelsberg, R. T. (1998). Inclusive schooling practices: Pedagogical and research foundations. A synthesis of the literature that ınforms best practices about ınclusive schooling.

McLeskey, J., Waldron, N. L., Spooner, F., & Algozzine, B. (2014). What are effective inclusive schools and why are they important. *Handbook of effective inclusive schools: Research and practice*, *3*, 3-16.

MoNE – Turkish Republic of Ministry of National Education (2017). 19.09.2017 tarihli ve 28 sayılı Kaynaştırma/Bütünleştirme Yoluyla Eğitim Uygulamaları Genelgesi [Circular of Education Practices through Inclusion/Integration dated 19.09.2017 and numbered 28]. Erişim Adresi:https://orgm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2017_09/21112929_kaynastirma_genelge.pdf

MoNE – Turkish Republic of Ministry of National Education (2018). Özel Eğitim Hizmetleri Yönetmeliği [Special Education Services Regulation]. 07.07.2018 tarihli ve 30471 sayılı Resmi Gazete. Erişim Adresi:
https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/07/20180707-8.htm

Milli Eğitim İstatistikleri: Örgün Eğitim 2021-2022 (National Education Statistics: Formal Education 2021-2022). Erişim adresi:
https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2022_09/15142558_meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2021_2022.p

Nutbrown, C., Clough, P., & Atherton, F. (2013). *Inclusion in the early years.* (Second edition). SAGE

Open Society Foundations (2019). The value of İnclusive education. Erşim adresi:
https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/explainers/value-inclusive-education

393

Öncül, N., & Batu, E. S. (2005). Normal gelişim gösteren çocuk annelerinin kaynaştırma uygulamasına ilişkin görüşleri [the opinions of regular education students' mothers in a primary school toward inclusion]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, *6*(02), 37-54.

Sandall, S., & Schwartz, S. I. (2013). *Özel gereksinimli okul öncesi çocukların öğretiminde temel yapı taşları* (2. baskı). (H. Bakkaloğlu, Çev. Ed.). Pegem Akademi. (Orijinal kitabın yayın tarihi 2008).

Saraç, T., & Çolak, A. (2012). Kaynaştırma uygulamaları sürecinde ilköğretim sınıf öğretmenlerinin karşılaştıkları sorunlara ilişkin görüş ve önerileri [Elementary school teachers' views and Suggestions regarding the problems encountered in the process of inclusive Applications]. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *8*(1).

Schwab, S., Holzinger, A., Krammer, M., Gebhardt, M., & Hessels, M. G. (2015). Teaching practices and beliefs about inclusion of general and special needs teachers in Austria. *Learning disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, *13*(2), 237-254.

Slobodzian, J. T. (2009). The devil is in the details: Issues of exclusion in an inclusive educational environment. *Ethnography and Education, 4*(2), 181-195. https://doi.org/10.1080/17457820902972804

Soukakou, E. (2012). Measuring quality in inclusive preschool classrooms: Development and validation of the Inclusive Classroom Profile (ICP). *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 27*, 478-488.

Srivastava, M., de Boer, A. A., & Pijl, S. J. (2015). Know how to teach me… Evaluating the effects of an in-service training program for regular school teachers toward inclusive education. *International Journal of school & educational psychology*, *3*(4), 219-230. https://doi.org/10.1080/21683603.2015.1064841

Sucuoğlu, N. B. & Kargın, T. (2006). *İlköğretimde kaynaştırma uygulamaları: Yaklaşımlar, yöntemler, teknikler [Inclusion practices in primary education: Approaches, methods, techniques.].* Morpa Yayınları.

Sucuoğlu, N. B., Bayraklı, H., Karasu, F. I., & Demir, Ş. (2017). The preschool classroom management and inclusion in Turkey. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education, 9*(2), 66-80. https://doi.org/10.20489/intjecse.341324

Talas, S., Kaya, F., & Yıldırım, N. (2016). Destek eğitim odaları ve öğretmenler üzerine betimsel bir çalışma: Tokat ili örneği [a descriptive study on resource room and teachers: Tokat sample]. *Journal of European Education, 6*(3), 31-42. https://doi.org/10.18656/jee.15436

Tezbaşaran, A. A. (1997). *Likert tipi ölçek geliştirme kılavuzu [Likert type scale development guide].* Turkish Psychological Association Publications.

Toprakçı, E. (2017). *Sınıf yönetimi* (3.Baskı) Pegem Yayıncılık

Thomas, G. (1997). Inclusive schools for an inclusive society. *British journal of special education*, *24*(3), 103-107.

UNESCO (2017). *A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education*. Paris: UNESCO.

Van Mieghem, A., Verschueren, K., Petry, K., & Struyf, E. (2020). An analysis of research on inclusive education: A systematic search and meta review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *24*(6), 675-689. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1482012

Villa, R. A., & Thousand, J. S. (Eds.). (2005). *Creating an inclusive school*. ASCD.

Vlachou, A., Karadimou, S., & Koutsogeorgou, E. (2016). Exploring the views and beliefs of parents of typically developing children about inclusion and inclusive education. *Educational Research*, *58*(4), 384-399.

Yazıcıoğlu, T. (2018). Kaynaştırma uygulamalarının tarihsel süreci ve Türkiye'de uygulanan kaynaştırma modelleri [The history of inclusive education and inclusive models which practiced in Turkey]. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi, 8*(1), 92-110.

Yazıcıoğlu, T., & Sümer-Dodur, H. M. (2021). Okulların bütünleştirme uygulamalarına yönelik yeterlilik ölçeği: Geçerlilik ve güvenirlilik çalışması. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi, 22*(4), 847-870. https://doi.org/10.21565/ozelegitimdergisi.741524

Yılmaz-Atman, B. (2022). Kapsayıcı eğitim [Inclusive education]. H. Bakkaloğlu, S. Çelik, G. Tomris (Ed.). *Araştırmadan uygulamaya erken çocukluk özel eğitimi el kitabı [Early childhood special education handbook from research to practice]*. Vize Akademik

Yılmaz, B. (2014). *Okul öncesi kaynaştırma sınıflarının kalitesinin değerlendirilmesi [Evaluating preschool inclusive classrooms' quality in Turkey]* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi University.

Yılmaz, E., & Batu, E. S. (2016). Farklı branştan ilkokul öğretmenlerinin bireyselleştirilmiş eğitim programı, yasal düzenlemeler ve kaynaştırma uygulamaları hakkındaki görüşleri [Opinions of primary school teachers about ındividualized education programme, legal regulation and ınclusion ımplementation]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, *17*(03), 247-268. https://doi.org/10.21565/ozelegitimdergisi.266140

Zagona, A. L., Kurth, J. A., & MacFarland, S. Z. (2017). Teachers' views of their preparation for inclusive education and collaboration. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *40*(3), 163-178. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417692969

394