



## **Content Analysis of Master's and Doctoral Dissertations on Inclusive Education in Turkey**

### **Türkiye'de Kaynaştırma Eğitimi Üzerine Yapılan Yüksek Lisans ve Doktora Tezlerinin İçerik Analizi**

Engin YILMAZ<sup>1</sup>

#### **Abstract**

The aim of this study is to review master's theses and doctoral dissertations carried out inclusive education in special education in Turkey. Studies were examined in Council of Higher Education (CoHE) National Thesis Centre's web site. A total of 181 master theses and dissertations analyzed which were from 1990 up till 2016 in this subject. Information about inclusion education and laws in Turkey were also given. Data were analyzed descriptively with 13 research questions and presented in graphics, frequency and percentage tables. According to the results the number of dissertations prepared have increased for the last ten years and have been prepared mostly at Anadolu University, Gazi University and Ankara University. Additionally, the studies are conducted by using one to 50 participants who were mostly selected with purposive sampling. The dissertations used in the study generally were prepared at special education department and disciplines. Qualitative methods were used mostly.

**Keywords:** Content analysis, inclusive education, children with special needs.

#### **Öz**

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye'de özel eğitimde kaynaştırma eğitimi ile ilgili yapılmış yüksek lisans ve doktora tezlerini incelemektir. Araştırmalar, Yükseköğretim Kurulu (YÖK) Ulusal Tez Merkezi web sitesinde incelenmiştir. Bu konuyla ilgili 1990 yılından 2016 yılına kadar toplam 181 yüksek lisans ve doktora tezi yapılmıştır. Ayrıca Türkiye'de kaynaştırma eğitimi ve yasalar hakkında bilgi verilmiştir. Veriler 13 araştırma sorusu ile betimsel olarak analiz edilmiş; grafik, frekans ve yüzde tablolarında sunulmuştur. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre, hazırlanan tez sayısı son on yılda artmış olup daha çok Anadolu Üniversitesi, Gazi Üniversitesi ve Ankara Üniversitesi'nde hazırlanmıştır. Ayrıca, çalışmaların çoğunlukla amaçlı örneklem ile seçilen bir ile 50 katılımcı aralığında gerçekleştirildiği anlaşılmıştır. Çalışmada kullanılan tezler genel olarak özel eğitim bölümlerinde hazırlanmıştır. Nitel araştırma yöntemleri çoğunlukla kullanılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** İçerik analizi, kaynaştırma eğitimi, özel gereksinimli çocuklar.

1. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Eskişehir, Türkiye; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8390-9452>

## 1. Introduction

Inclusion means preparing necessary educational editing and adaption to special education students to educate them with their peers in general education classes (Acarlar, 2013). As seen in definition; inclusion does not mean and should not be understand as if the students who need special education to be included in general education classes without necessary editing and adaptation. Contrary to this; inclusive education must maintain in general classes with special education support to the students who need special education (Sucuoğlu and Kargın, 2006).

Batu (2012) indicated that inclusive education setting started with 2916 Counted Special Education Indigent Children Law in 1983. This law expressed special education indigent children must be educated in general classes with peers and must be taken educational precautions. Until today, there have been prepared legal regulations related to inclusion education. We can array legal regulations by this means; 2916 counted Special Education Indigent Children Law in 1983, Special Education Schools Instruction in 1985, Special Education Services Instructions in 2000, Psychological Counselling and Guidance Instructions in 2001, 5378 counted Law Apropos The Handicapped in 2005, Circular of Inclusive Education Implementation in 2008, Circular of Dissemination Project Inclusive Education in Preschool in 2009, and Circular of Opening Support Room in 2015 (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [MEB], 2017). We see commonly Special Education Services Instructions in use and implementation. Legal regulation related to inclusive education in Turkey looks coherent, fulfilled and inclusive. The responsibility that the educators and researchers now have is that carrying out the legal responsibilities and fulfilling the related provisions (Batu, 2012).

According to Ministry of National Education's 2015-2016 education statistics (MEB, 2017) in 1268 schools/classes 288.489 students who need special education were educated in Turkey. 1399 students hold to preschool education, 81.380 students hold to primary school education, 92.032 students hold to secondary school education, and 27.730 students hold to high school education with inclusive education implementation. Totally, 202.541 students hold to inclusive education implementation. That shows us %70 of students who are in inclusive education implementation to all educated students who need special education. In the present study, 181 dissertations examining inclusive education in Turkey between 1990 and 2016 were used.

There are 181 graduate dissertations between 1990 and 2016 related to inclusive education in Turkey. The studies used 1-50 sample group to 200 and more sample group with special education needs students, other students, parents, teachers and administrators. Studies made with students involve different disadvantages and different educational levels. Forms, tests, scales and qualitative data collection tools were used in the studies. Data's were analysed with quantitative and qualitative analysis methods.

Previous studies have shown that; teacher's attitudes are adverse to inclusive education implementation (Atay, 1995); informing meetings for class teachers can be positive to inclusive education students (Kayaoğlu, 1999); educational structure are not proper enough for physically challenged students (Yılmaz, 2004); class and branch teachers find themselves adequate about inclusive education implementation (Battal, 2007); teachers who have disadvantaged students in their classes come through more exhaustion comparing to teachers who don't have disadvantaged students in their classes (Özdemir, 2008); no collaboration between parents and teachers found in united classes' inclusive education, inclusive education students were excluded, and inclusive education students don't find themselves adequate enough (Hasanoğlu, 2013); when giving education about preparing individualized education program, teachers' qualifications are increasing (İlik, 2015).

The present study examined graduate dissertations about inclusion education implementation which applied to special needs students between 1990 and 2016 in Turkey. Dissertations were analysed according to distribution by year, universities that they were prepared at, the disciplines and departments, data collection tools, data analyses methods, degrees, sampling sizes and types, participant properties, application time, participants' school degrees, issue, and validity and reliability methods. During the review of the studies, the meaning of inclusion education implementation, how inclusion education applied in Turkey, what are the legal regulations related to inclusive education in Turkey, what are the numbers of special education needs in Turkey have been investigated.

This study numerically the most special educational needs in inclusive education that individuals receive training in Turkey (around %70) related work is important to examine in detail. When the literature was examined, it was necessary to carry out the research in question, since limited studies were found about the detailed examination of the master and doctorate thesis related to the inclusive education.

## Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to perform a content analysis of dissertations published in Council of Higher Education (CoHE) National Thesis Centre's web site on inclusion. The present study investigates the graduate degree dissertations about inclusion from 1990 up till 2016. Other aim of the study is to reflect trends in master and doctoral degree dissertations about inclusive education in Turkey and show the bounden studies. The following research questions (RQ) were addressed to analyse those studies:

- RQ1: What is the distribution of the dissertations that were about inclusion by the year according to university degree in Turkey?
- RQ2: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to the universities that they were prepared at?
- RQ3: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to sampling size?
- RQ4: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to sampling types?
- RQ5: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to institute they were prepared at?
- RQ6: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to department that they were prepared at?
- RQ7: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to disciplines that they were prepared at?
- RQ8: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to method?
- RQ9: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to participant properties?
- RQ10: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to application times?
- RQ11: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to participants (students only) school degrees?
- RQ12: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to data collection tools?
- RQ13: What is the distribution of the dissertations according to data analysis methods?

## 2. Method

Content analysis method has been chosen because of the aim of the study. Content analysis brings together similar data in context of certain concepts and themes while describing and organizing them in a way that readers can understand (Dirlikli, Aydın & Akgün, 2016; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011, p. 227).

### Data Collection Tools and Procedure

All data were collected from CoHE National Thesis Centre's web site. The term "inclusion" was written and searched with selected in title, all Access type and all dissertations type. 188 records were found from 1990 to 2016 in 10 March 2017. Seven of the dissertations were not related to term "inclusion" within the meaning of special education. Those were related to; institute of electrical and electronically engineers (2), department of urban and regional planning (1), department of architecture (1), department of geodesy and photogrammetry (1), and department of English teaching (1) and department of agriculture (1). The rest of the 181 dissertations were included to the present study. Allowed 170 dissertations were downloaded. To reach the rest of the dissertations, the authors were e-mailed.

The Publishing Classification Form prepared by Çiltaş, Güler and Sözbilir (2012) was used to classify the dissertations. Some titles (such as participant properties, disciplines, student's education degrees etc.) were added by researcher different from Form. All dissertations were categorized one by one according to classification titles. Frequency and percentage tables and descriptive graphics were presented. Classification form comprise of some titles; year, university, department and discipline, sampling types and sampling sizes, data collection tools, analyses method and types, degree, participant properties, application time, school degrees of student participant, issues, and validity and reliability methods. In form all classifications were made and discussed together domain experts.

### Data Analysis Processes

All of the dissertations were analysed by the researcher. In this study, content analysis was used. The results were presented by using descriptive statistics (percentage and frequency). Data were recorded in a Microsoft Excel document by titles. All variables were equal to 181 in total. After analysing the data, the results have been transplanted to graphics, frequency and percentage tables.

## 3. Findings

Collected data which were regulated by researchers according to title presented with tables.

Findings about the yearly distribution of the dissertations on inclusive education according to university degree in Turkey were presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Distribution of the dissertations according to sampling size.**

Year	Doctorate	Master's	%
1990	-	1	0,55
1995	1	-	0,55
1997	-	2	1,10
1998	1	-	0,55
1999	-	2	1,10
2000	-	3	1,65
2002	-	1	0,55
2003	-	5	2,76
2004	-	5	2,76
2005	1	3	2,20
2006	-	8	4,41
2007	3	14	9,39
2008	-	10	5,52
2009	1	15	8,83
2010	2	21	12,70
2011	2	11	7,18
2012	3	3	3,31
2013	-	7	3,86
2014	1	12	7,18
2015	2	22	13,25
2016	4	15	10,49
Total	22	159	100,00

According to findings of the distribution of the dissertations by year, after 2003 the studies started to increase gradually. Inclusive education has been more important in Turkish education system for the last ten years and researchers studied in that field. Dissertations are at peak in 2015 with total of 24 in a year.

Findings about the dissertations on inclusive education according to universities they were prepared at were presented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Distribution of the dissertations by the prepared university according to degree**

University	Doctorate	Master's	%
İstanbul University	-	2	1.10
Karadeniz Teknik University	-	1	0.55
Fatih University	-	2	1.10
Okan University	-	2	1.10
Fırat University	-	2	1.10
Gazi University	3	16	10.49
Gedik University	-	1	0.55
Selçuk University	-	9	4.97
Zonguldak Karaelmas University	-	1	0.55
Dokuz Eylül University	2	9	6.07
Afyon Kocatepe University	-	3	1.65
Beykent University	-	3	1.65
Yeditepe University	-	5	2.75
Mehmet Akif Ersoy University	1	4	2.20
Erciyes University	-	1	0.55

University	Doctorate	Master's	%
Çukurova University	-	3	1.65
Ege University	-	2	1.10
Marmara University	-	5	2.76
Maltepe University	-	1	0.55
Gaziantep University	-	2	1.10
Trakya University	-	3	1.65
Cumhuriyet University	-	2	1.10
Atatürk University	-	1	0.55
Süleyman Demirel University	-	1	0.55
19 Mayıs University	-	1	0.55
Uludağ University	1	-	0.55
Anadolu University	3	31	18.78
Giresun University	-	1	0.55
Necmettin Erbakan University	1	2	1.65
Pamukkale University	-	1	0.55
Abant İzzet Baysal University	-	13	7.18
Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University	1	-	0.55
İstanbul Aydın University	-	2	1.10
Bülent Ecevit University	-	1	0.55
Orta Doğu Teknik University	1	1	1.10
Ankara University	8	9	9.39
Amasya University	-	1	0.55
Zirve University	-	4	2.20
Eskişehir Osmangazi University	-	1	0.55
Hacettepe University	1	7	4.41
Çanakkale 18 Mart University	-	2	1.10
Akdeniz University	-	2	1.10
TOTAL	22	159	100.00

According to Table 2, most of the dissertations were prepared at three universities: Anadolu University with 34 dissertations (%18.78), Gazi University with 19 dissertations (%10.49), and Ankara University with 17 dissertations (%9.39). Because these universities have special education department for long time, this might yield the result turn out this way. As seen on Table 2, new universities have started studying inclusive education.

According to the findings of the distribution of the dissertations according to sampling size, the biggest sampling size is the one including 50 people in researches (f=84, %46.40), 101-200 people (f=33, %18.23), 51-100 people (f=, %12.70) and non-available (f=5, %2.76). This can be because of the studies made in schools and samples mostly chosen as a student in class or teacher.

According to finding of distribution of the dissertations according to sampling types, the sampling type the most used is non-random sampling (Purposive Sampling) with (f=147, %81.27), simple random sampling (f=20, %11.04) and stratified sampling (f=4, %2.20). This can be reason of the fact that researchers wanted to study on explicit area or people. For that reason researchers chose sampler for a purpose.

According to finding of distribution of the dissertations according to institute they were prepared at, most of the dissertations have been prepared in educational sciences department (f=100, %55.24), social sciences (f=67, %37.01), health sciences (f=7, %3.86) and physical sciences (f=7, %3.86). This can be reason of the fact that special education department is a part of education sciences institute. The other institute is social sciences. This can be reason of the fact that most of special education department is a part of social sciences institute.

According to finding of distribution of the dissertations according to department that they were prepared at, the most inclusive education studies were prepared at special education department with 72 with %39.77, at primary education with 42 with %23.20, and at education sciences with 21 with %11.60.

According to finding of distribution of the dissertations according to disciplines that they were prepared at; inclusive education studies prepared at special education discipline the most with 54 with %29.83 percentages, and at primary

class education with 28 %15.46 percentages as a second and at education inspection with 13 with %7.18 percentage as a third biggest one.

Findings about the dissertations on inclusive education according to method of the dissertations were presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. Distribution of the dissertations according to method.**

Method	f	%
N/A (Non Available)	1	0.55
Qualitative	119	65.74
Quantitative	37	20.44
Mixed (Qualitative +Quantitative)	15	8.28
Action Research	5	2.76
Single Subject Research Model	3	1.65
Mixed (Qualitative +Action Research)	1	0.55
TOTAL	181	100.00

According to Table 3; distribution of inclusive education studies' methods prepared with qualitative research the most with %65.74 and second the most prepared with quantitative research method with %20.44, and mixed research %8.28 as a third one. According to the finding of the distribution of the dissertations according to participant properties, a majority of the dissertations (f=131, %63.90) were made with teachers -especially class teachers-, made with inclusive students (f=65, %31.70) -especially with mental retardation students-. There can be different disabled kind and different teacher branches in same research. 205 dissertations came into existence in that way. According to the finding of the distribution of the dissertations according to application times analysed, it is seen that a majority of the dissertations (f=95, %52.48) were prepared in 33-48 weeks. 5-12 weeks (f=12, %6.62), 13-20 weeks (f=10, %5.52) and 0-4 weeks (f=6, %3.31). This result showed that the most dissertations prepared in one education term year. Dissertations started to prepare when education year starts in September till June.

**Table 4. Distribution of dissertations on inclusive education according to participants (students only) school degrees.**

Participants	f	%
Non Available	1	2.12
Pre-School	3	6.38
Primary School (1-4. Classes)	15	31.91
Secondary School (5-8. Classes)	10	21.27
High School (9-12. Classes)	6	12.76
Elementary Education (1-8. Classes)	12	25.53
TOTAL	47	100.00

Findings about the dissertations on inclusive education according to participants (students only) school degrees were presented in Table 4.

When Table 4 was analysed it is seen that a majority of the dissertations (f=15, %31.91) were studied with primary school students.

Findings about the dissertations on inclusive education according to data collection tools were presented in Table 5.

**Table 5. Distribution of data collection tools.**

	Collection Tool	f	%
Form	Personal Info Form	82	67.76
	Assessment Form	4	3.30
	Survey	28	23.14
	Other	7	5.78
	Total	121	100.0

	Collection Tool	f	%
Test	Peabody Test	2	10.00
	Written Expression Test	2	10.00
	Other	16	80.00
	Total	20	100.0
Scales	Attitude Scale	15	30.00
	Adaptive Behaviour Scale	3	6.00
	View Scale	20	40.00
	Self-Conception Scale	2	4.00
	Other	20	40.00
	Total	50	100.0
Quantitative Tools	Interview	63	41.17
	Observation	15	9.80
	Recordings	73	47.71
	Student Products	2	1.30
	Total	153	100.0
Non Available	Non Available	1	100
TOTAL		344	100

When Table 5 was analysed we have seen that a majority of the dissertations (f=153, %44.47) were collected with quantitative tools and (f=121, %35.17) were collected with forms. These results showed us, dissertations the most prepared with quantitative methods and quantitative data tools.

Findings about the dissertations on inclusive education according to data analysis method were presented in Table 6.

**Table 6. Distribution of data analyses methods.**

	Analyses Method	f	%
Predictive	t-test	54	17,70
	ANOVA/ANCOVA	30	9,83
	MANOVA/MANCOVA	5	1,63
	Non Parametric Tests	30	9,83
	Correlation	12	3,93
	Regression	3	0,98
	Post Hoc	5	1,63
	Normal Distribution Test	1	0,32
	LSD Test	2	0,65
	Levene Test	1	0,32
	Tukey	3	0,98
	Chi-Square	7	2,29
	Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	5	1,63
	F Test	3	0,98
	Kolmogorov Smirnov Test	1	0,32
	Fischer's Exact Test	1	0,32
	Total	128	41,96
	Quantitative	Content Analyses	24
Descriptive Analyses		59	19,34
Frequency/Percentage Tables		29	9,50
Mean/Standard Deviation		8	2,62
Graphical Illustration		12	3,93
Document Analyses		6	1,96
Total		138	45,24
Single Subject Research Model	Single Subject Research Model	4	1,31
	Total	4	1,31

Analyses Method	f	%
TOTAL	305	100,00

When Table 6 was analysed we have seen that a majority of the dissertations (f=138, %45.24) quantitative methods, and predictive (f=128, %41.96) methods. Most of the dissertations were descriptive and showed with frequency and percentage tables.

#### 4. Conclusions and Suggestions

The present study offers a detailed analysis of the 181 dissertations written on inclusive education in Turkey between from 1990 up till 2016. Focus of the researches are to reveal distribution of the dissertations that were about inclusive education, a) by the year according to university degree, b) universities that they were prepared at, c) sampling size, d) institute, e) department, f) discipline, g) method, h) participant properties, i) application times, j) participants (students only) school degree, k) data collection tools and l) data analysis method.

Most of the dissertations on inclusive education were prepared after 2010 and dissertations are peak in 2015. This result shows us government gives importance to inclusive education (we can see percentages) and universities increase studies about inclusive education recently. Likewise Eripek (2004) in his research for mentally disabled children including them is extremely limited research in the last two decades, Turkey has stated that most of the research done in the last five years. This increase also emphasized the importance of opening special education departments in universities. We can say that the studies about inclusive education will continue increasingly with the opening of the universities of special education departments.

The three universities at which most of the dissertations on inclusive education were prepared at Anadolu University, Gazi University and Ankara University. Likewise Coşkun, Dündar and Parlak (2014) conducted research in the field of special education in the field of post-graduate thesis was found in the distribution of universities according to the most Gazi University. These universities have substructure for a long time about special education. The most of the dissertations were studied with 1-50 participants. The results show us that the studies worked with participants as students or teachers the most.

The most of the researchers studied with participants who were diagnosed with mental retardation, class teachers, and elementary school principals. Similarly Coşkun, Dündar and Parlak (2014) in their research in the field of special education in Turkey between the years 2008-2013 related to the graduate thesis; it was found out that studies were carried out mostly in the field of mental retardation.

The participants (students only) were primary school students generally. Purposive sampling is the most used sampling method because researcher have planned studies and had to choose participants. The most of the dissertations were prepared in educational science institute, special education department, and special education discipline.

The most of the studies on inclusive education in Turkey are qualitative studies. Similarly, Sucuoğlu (2004) pointed out that publications and researches related to inclusion in their study are mostly descriptive and current situation studies. Studies also used mixed types methods to explain qualitative and quantitative result of dissertations. Quantitative tools were used the most. Results of these studies were always descriptive. Some qualitative researches can be made studying the effects of practical and applied researches. The most used analyses methods were quantitative (descriptive analyses, content analyses, frequency/percentage tables). Regarding the application times, researchers used one education session the most.

Seventy percent of students who are involved in inclusive education implementation to all educated special education needs students are the important issue for government policy makers and universities which train teachers. If special education need people will be useful to society, problems on inclusive education must be solved. Universities can go towards to practical and applied implementation, take into consideration class total number of attendance, teacher education about special education, support rooms and after of inclusive education. The work to be done should not only be weighted by mental retardation but also include autism, special learning difficulty, attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder, hearing impaired students, physically disabled and visually impaired students. It is also not just barriers; occupational adjustment, early childhood inclusive education, behavior problems, accompanying health problems, family education, etc. issues should be addressed in future studies. Life goes on and special education needs students have to integrate not only in school but also all areas of life.



## 5. References

- Acarlar, F. (2013). Kaynaştırma modeli ve özel gereksinimli küçük çocukların özellikleri. In B. Sucuoğlu & H. Bakkaloğlu (Eds.), *Okul öncesinde kaynaştırma* (pp. 21-74). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Atay, M. (1995). Özürlü çocukların normal yaşları ile birlikte eğitim aldıkları kaynaştırma programlarına karşı öğretmen tutumları üzerine bir inceleme. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara, Turkey.
- Battal, İ. (2007). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin ve branş öğretmenlerinin kaynaştırma eğitimine ilişkin yeterliliklerinin değerlendirilmesi (Uşak ili örneği). Unpublished MA thesis, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Afyonkarahisar, Turkey.
- Batu, S. (2012). Yasal dayanaklar ve kaynaştırma. In E.S. Batu, A. Çolak & S. Odlyurt (Eds.), *Özel gereksinimli çocukların kaynaştırılması*. (pp. 9-27). Ankara: Vize Yayıncılık.
- Coşkun, İ., Dündar, Ş., & Parlak, C. (2014). Türkiye’de özel eğitim alanında yapılmış lisansüstü tezlerin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi (2008-2013). *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 15(2), 375-396.
- Çiltaş, A., Güler, G., & Sözbilir, M. (2012). Türkiye’de matematik eğitimi araştırmaları: Bir içerik analizi çalışması. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(1): 565-580.
- Dirlikli, M., Aydın, A. & Akgün L. (2016). Cooperative Learning in Turkey: A Content Analysis of Theses. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 16(4):1251-1273.
- Eripek, S. (2004). Türkiye’de zihin engelli çocukların kaynaştırılmalarına ilişkin olarak yapılan araştırmaların gözden geçirilmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(02): 25-32.
- Hasanoğlu, G. (2013). Birleştirilmiş sınıflardaki kaynaştırma eğitiminde yaşanan sorunlara ilişkin görüşler. Unpublished MA thesis, Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eskişehir, Turkey.
- İlik, Ş.Ş. (2015). Bireyselleştirilmiş eğitim programı eğitiminin kaynaştırma öğretmenlerinin BEP yeterliliklerine etkisi. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Konya, Turkey.
- Kayaoğlu, H. (1999). Bilgilendirme programının normal sınıf öğretmenlerinin kaynaştırma ortamındaki işleme engelli çocuklara yönelik tutumlarına etkisi. Unpublished MA thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara, Turkey.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (2017). MEB istatistikleri. Retrieved April 11, 2017 from [http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb\\_iys\\_dosyalar/2016\\_03/18024009\\_meb\\_istatistikleri\\_orgun\\_egitim\\_2015\\_2016.pdf/](http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2016_03/18024009_meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2015_2016.pdf/).
- Özdemir, N. (2008). Sınıfında kaynaştırma öğrencisi olan ve olmayan ilköğretim öğretmenlerinin tükenmişlik düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması. Unpublished MA thesis, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Afyonkarahisar, Turkey.
- Sucuoğlu, B. & Kargin, T.(2006). İlköğretimde kaynaştırma uygulamaları: Yaklaşımlar, yöntemler, teknikler. Ankara: Morpa Yayınları.
- Sucuoğlu, B. (2004). Türkiye’de Kaynaştırma Uygulamaları: Yayınlar/Araştırmalar. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(02): 15-25.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2011). Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yılmaz, B. (2004). Engelli kullanıcılar için temel eğitim binaları tasarımının kaynaştırma eğitimine yönelik incelenmesi. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya, Turkey.