

School Support in Inclusive Education: Mixed Method Research

DOI: 10.26466/opus.595504

Serhat Arslan* - Zeynep Merih Özçelik**

* Doç. Dr. Sakarya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Sakarya/ Türkiye

E-Posta: serhatarslan@sakarya.edu.tr

ORCID: [0000-0003-4422-8421](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4422-8421)

** Uzman, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Sakarya/ Türkiye

E-Posta: zeynep_merih@windowslive.com

ORCID: [0000-0003-4790-1722](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4790-1722)

Abstract

In this study, the effect of various factors on the school support perception of the class and branch teachers who have inclusive students was investigated. Moreover, it's aimed to examine teachers' views on "school support in inclusive education" thanks to semi-structured interviews. The study group of the quantitative research consists of 318 teachers (117 class teachers and 201 branch teachers) who work in primary and secondary schools in Kocaeli province in the 2018-2019 academic year, apply inclusive education and have inclusive students. The study group of the qualitative research consists of 20 volunteer teachers who participated in the quantitative research and have free time for the interviews. The research is formed by using mixed method that consists of quantitative research methods and qualitative research methods. In the quantitative research "Perceived School Support Scale in Inclusive Education" which was adapted to Turkish by Arslan and Kılıç (2016) was applied to teachers by using descriptive method of research. In qualitative research, semi-structured interview technique was used. In both stages, "Personal Information Form was used to learn teachers' personal features. In summarizing the data obtained from the quantitative study, definitive statistics are presented as tables that consist of average, standard deviation and standard error depending on the pattern of continuous variables. Categorical variables are summarized as numbers and percent. The normality of the numerical variables was checked by the Kolmogorov Smirnov test. In the comparison of two independent groups, where the numerical variables have normal distribution, Independent Samples t test was used. In the comparison of more than two independent groups, One-Way ANOVA test was used if the numerical variables have normal distribution and if the numerical variables don't have normal distribution, Kruskal-Wallis H test was used. Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was used to investigate the relationships between numerical variables. It is concluded that teachers' perception of school support in inclusive education vary significantly depending on their educational background and whether a special education teacher exists in the schools where they work. However, it's stated that variables such as gender, age, branch, professional experience, type of education, class size, diagnosis of inclusive students and existence of school counsellors have no effect on teachers' perception of school support. In the findings part, the people who support teachers in the process of inclusive education, the areas in which teachers need support, the importance and effects of school support and teachers' opinions on their own competences in inclusive education are examined in detail.

Keywords: Special Education, Inclusive Education, School support, Special Needs

Kaynaştırma Eğitiminde Okul Desteği: Karma Yöntem Araştırması

*

Öz

Bu çalışmada kaynaştırma öğrencisi bulunan sınıf ve branş öğretmenlerinin okul desteği algısında çeşitli değişkenlerin etkisi incelenmiştir. Ayrıca yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler ile öğretmenlerin kaynaştırma eğitiminde okul desteğine yönelik görüşlerinin incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Nicel araştırmanın çalışma grubunu; 2018-2019 eğitim öğretim yılında Kocaeli ilinde kaynaştırma eğitimi uygulanan ilkokul ve orta okullarda görev yapan ve kaynaştırma öğrencisi bulunan 117 sınıf ve 201 branş öğretmeni olmak üzere toplamda 318 öğretmen oluşturmuştur. Nitel araştırmanın çalışma grubunu ise görüşme durumu ve zamanı uygun olan gönüllü 20 öğretmen oluşturmuştur. Araştırma nicel araştırma yöntemleri ve nitel araştırma yöntemlerinin birlikte kullanıldığı karma yöntemle desenlenmiştir. Nicel araştırmada betimsel tarama modeli kullanılarak öğretmenlere Arslan ve Kılıç (2016) tarafından Türkçeye uyarlanan “Kaynaştırma Eğitiminde Algılanan Okul Destek Ölçeği” uygulanmıştır. Nitel araştırmada yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme tekniği kullanılmıştır. Her iki aşamada da öğretmenlerin kişisel bilgilerini öğrenmek için “Kişisel Bilgi Formu” kullanılmıştır. Nicel çalışmadan elde edilen verilerin özetlenmesinde tanımlayıcı istatistikler sürekli değişkenler için dağılıma bağlı olarak ortalama, standart sapma ve standart hata olarak tablo halinde verilmiştir. Kategorik değişkenler sayı ve yüzde olarak özetlenmiştir. Sayısal değişkenlerin normallik testi Kolmogorov Smirnov testi ile kontrol edilmiştir. Bağımsız iki grup karşılaştırılmalarında, sayısal değişkenlerin normal dağılım gösterdiği durumlarda Independent Samples t testi kullanılmıştır. Bağımsız ikiden fazla grup karşılaştırmalarında, sayısal değişkenlerin normal dağılım göstermediği durumlarda Kruskal-Wallis H testi kullanılmıştır. Sayısal değişkenler arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesinde Pearson Korelasyon katsayısı kullanılmıştır. Kaynaştırma eğitiminde öğretmenlerin okul destek algısının, aldıkları eğitime ve görev yaptıkları okullarda özel eğitim öğretmeni olma değişkenlerine göre anlamlı farklılık gösterdiği sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Ancak cinsiyet, yaş, branş, mesleki kıdem, aldığı eğitim türü, sınıf mevcudu, kaynaştırma öğrencilerinin tanısı ve rehber öğretmen bulunma durumu gibi değişkenlerin öğretmenlerin okul desteği algısında bir etkisinin olmadığı belirlenmiştir. Öğretmenlerin kaynaştırma eğitim sürecinde destek aldıkları konular ve kişiler, desteğe ihtiyaç duydukları alanlar, okul desteğinin önemi ve etkileri, kaynaştırma eğitiminde kendi yeterlilikleri hakkındaki görüşleri bulgular kısmında ayrıntılı olarak ele alınmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Özel Eğitim, Kaynaştırma Eğitimi, Okul Desteği, Özel Gereksinimli Çocuk

Introduction

Every child has different and similar characteristics, and an education process that takes account of their differences and similarities and helps them to adopt to the developing and evolving world is needed (Ersoy and Avcı, 2000). Although all children have individual differences and needs, some children have significant differences and needs compared to their normally-developing peers. Those children are defined as special needs children for having a variety of deficiencies in mental, physical, emotional and social aspects that are among the areas of development (Acarlar, 2013; Chandler, 1994; Senemoğlu, 2011, as cited in Çerezci, 2015). Special education is defined as an education that are provided by specially trained persons and through special education programs in appropriate conditions in order to meet educational and social needs of the special needs children that are different from their peers in terms of individual and developmental characteristics and educational competencies (Özel Eğitim Hizmetleri Yönetmeliği, 2018).

It was asserted until the mid-way through 19. and 20. centuries that special needs children should receive education in special separate educational environments (Kuz, 2001). However, it was found that such practices make it difficult for special needs children to adapt to society and prevent their socialization (Metin, 1997). Over time, inclusive education that consists of educating special needs children together with their peers in general education classes has come to be accepted more and more along with the developments in human rights and national and international legal regulations. Modernity exists to the extent that individuals in many countries around the world can benefit from all services equally in line with their needs. Spread of special education services can be shown as an example of modernization of our society. Currently, special education services should be considered as providing education in the most suitable and the least restricted environments in the manner needs of the special needs children can be met, not only as providing them with education in environments that are suitable for their needs (Cavkaytar and Diken, 2007).

Inclusive is an education that is provided to special needs children full time or part time in general education classes which are educational environments that are the least restrictive for them by enabling them to receive necessary support services (Gulliford and Upton,1992; Kırcaali-İftar,1992, as cited in Batu, Kırcaali-İftar and Uzuner, 2004). While inclusive practices have been among the most preferred placement environments for special needs children in the recent years, they bring with them many problems during their application. Some of the problems are failing to inform class teachers on special needs children and inclusive practices, not receiving support sufficiently; limited knowledge of teachers on social skills teaching techniques, difficulty for teachers in this matter due to the lack of adequate study on IEP to be prepared for inclusive children, failing to ensure parent-school cooperation, neglecting other students while spending time with Inclusive students, lack of material, excessive classroom size, failing to ensure acceptance of inclusive students by their peers (As cited in Çalışoğlu and Tanışır, 2018). These problems are solved to a large extent through qualified special education and support services. Inclusive education may give better results if the required support services are provided to the inclusive students and teachers in schools (Batu and Topsakal, 2003). Inclusive education is not a model that a teacher can assume full responsibility. Therefore, teachers should be backed up by a team to support them and all studies should be done with this team (Sucuoğlu, 2006). Special education teachers and general education teachers are required to develop work strategies to overcome the failure of students and share their facilities and skills (Eripek,2005).

School support is the support that they get from their immediate environment (school administration, school counselors, other teachers, parents of the students) when they need it in their education and training activities. Teacher' judgement on sufficiency of the school support can be defined as school support perception. According to Smith (1995), support relations exist anywhere anytime. The support services to be provided vary by the needs of individuals and time. Every individual needs support. Individuals get support from their friends, family relatives, colleagues, social services, public institutions, etc. to maintain their daily life. Life for everyone is a support system (As cited in Diken, 2015). As every individual, teachers also need to feel that they are a member of the group

and they are valuable for their students, school administration, family and colleagues (Cenkseven Önder and Sarı, 2009). Teachers are primarily responsible for raising students as versatile (in academic, social and psychological aspects) and healthy individuals in the school environment. Among the factors that affect the success of teachers in inclusive education, school support is the most important. Inclusive education becomes efficient if the school environment support the teacher in the areas that he or she has difficulty, if the teacher is not left alone in the process and the responsibility is shared by everyone, if the teacher is supported through solution suggestions. From time to time, teachers needs support from the environment on education. The support they need increases a lot if they have special needs students. Teachers should at first sense that they need support. They should know which person can give support on what matter. The need of teachers for support, their request for support from their environment and that they begin to use the support affect their perception (Bruhnn and Philips, 1984; as cited in Karadağ, 2007). Considering the historical process; The studies on special education go back to the 2nd constitutional period. Reflection of special education to our country, individuals who need special education in terms of mental and intelligence were provided to receive special education (Karagöz, 2018; Karagöz, 2019). Nowadays; According to the Ministry of National Education's formal education statistics in the 2016-2017 academic year, 3.585 mainstreaming students, 94.897 primary school students, 109.684 primary school students and 34.320 mainstreaming students continue their primary education (Yazicioglu, 2018). Despite this increase in the number of students receiving inclusion education, some problems are encountered for teachers and students in practice. As in many other educational activities, teachers are the main implementers of the education program in inclusive education. In the mainstreaming education practices, classroom teachers and branch teachers should have some competences (Battal, 2007).

With the support to be given to the student and the teacher, it is important that the inclusive education would be implemented successfully while the support to be provided to the teachers can contribute to the field of study since there are no related studies, and that the teacher supporting studies for the future can be carried out. In our country, a lot of research

has been done on the inclusive practices. When these studies are examined, studies are generally conducted to determine the views and attitudes of the individuals or groups involved in the process of inclusion education (Sucuoğlu and Akalın, 2010). In addition, studies on the subject of "support" were examined and studies in the form of support education services offered to the students with special needs were found.

The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of various variables on school support perception of class and branch teachers that have Inclusive students and to get the opinions of teachers on school support in inclusive education. The sub-problems of the research are given below:

- Is there a significant difference in school support perception of the teacher by gender?"
- Is there a significant difference in school support perception of the teacher by age?
- Is there a significant difference in school support perception of the teacher by age?
- Is there a significant difference in school support perception of the teacher by age?
- Is there a significant difference in school support perception of the teachers by the presence of school counselor and special education teacher in their school?
- What is the opinions of the teachers on the importance of school support in inclusive education?
- What is the the opinions of the teachers on the results of school support in inclusive education?
- What is the opinions of teachers in the departments that they need support in inclusive education?
- What is the opinions of teachers on sufficiency states in inclusive education?

Method

This study is formed by using mixed method that consists of qualitative and quantitative research methods together. Descriptive survey method with general survey model is applied in the qualitative and quantitative research. Descriptive survey method is an approach that aims to describe

past or current case as is. The individuals and cases in the study are tried to be described as is on their own terms. No attempt is made to change or affect the present situation. There is a case that is desired to be known and it stands as is. It is essential to observe and describe it most appropriately (Karasar, 2006).

Study Group

The study group of the quantitative research consists of 318 teachers (117 class teachers and 201 branch teachers) who work in primary and secondary schools in Kocaeli province in the 2018-2019 academic year, apply inclusive education and have Inclusive students. The study group of the qualitative research consists of 20 volunteer teachers who participated in the quantitative research and have free time for the interviews.

Data Collection Tools and Data Collection Processes

In data collection process of the study, Personal Information Form, Perceived School Support Scale in Inclusive Education and semi-structured interview form were used. In this study, the data were obtained at two stages. At the first stage; school support scale was applied to the class and branch teachers that apply inclusive education by using descriptive survey method that is one of the quantitative research methods. At the second stage, the data were obtained by using the semi-structured interview form that is included in the qualitative research method and developed by the researcher.

School Support Scale: In order to measure the school support perception of the teachers, "Perceived School Support Scale in inclusive Education (PSSSIE)" that was developed by Masud Ahmed in 2013 and adapted to Turkish by Serhat Arslan and Yıldırım Kılıç in 2016 was used. The scale consists of one dimension and eight items. Participants select the option that they consider appropriate between 1-5 in 5-point Likert Scale. The meaning of these items selected by the participants is as follows: (1) Never, (2) Seldom, (3) Sometimes, (4) Mostly, (5) Always. The scale adapted in

the study carried out by Arslan and Kılıç (2016) was applied to 221 teachers. It is observed in the confirmatory factor analysis that the model conforms very well. In order to examine psychometric characteristics of the scale, internal consistency, item and factor analysis studies were carried out. Internal consistency analysis result of the scale was found .85 and the scale was found to be at adequate reliability level. Results of the item discrimination and confirmatory factor analysis indicate that original single-factor structure of the scale is appropriate for Turkish sample ($\chi^2= 97.57$, $sd= 20$, $RMSEA= .133$, $NFI=.92$, $NNFI= .91$, $CFI = .93$, $IFI=.93$, $SRMR=066$, $GFI= .90$).

Interview Form: In order to get the opinions of class and branch teachers that have İclusive students on school support, a descriptive study was carried out. Semi-structure interview technique that is one of the interview techniques was used as data collection tool. Literature review was made for forming the interview form and 8 draft question forms were prepared in this direction. In order to determine the scope and construct validity of the draft question form, they were presented to three academic members. The questions were reviewed in terms of being clear and understandable, being capable of giving detailed information and being within the scope of the subject. In the same time, pre-application interviews were made with three teachers to test the interview questions, and clearness and conformity of the questions were evaluated by the teachers. Necessary adjustments were made on the questions in line with all these studies, and the number of questions was reduced to five. The interview form was applied in its final form. The data obtained from the interviewed teachers were categorized through content analysis, and codes and main themes were formed. Different codes were formed for every interview question, and the data were organized according to these themes and codes. Inductive analysis method was used to analyse the data in the interview form.

Findings

When the first sub-problem of the question "Is there a significant difference in school support perception of the teacher by gender?" was examined, independent group t test was carried out in order to determine if the

school support scale vary by gender. When gender variable of the teachers that participate in the study in Table 1 was examined, it is found that 129 of the teachers are male (40,6%), and 189 of them are female (59,4%).

Table 1. t Test Results Related to Differences in School Support Perception of Teachers by Gender

Gender	N	*	ss	Sh+	t Test		
					t	Sd	p
Male	129	22,98	6,93	0,610	-0,349	316	0,727
Female	189	23,25	6,42	0,467			

When it is examined if there is a statistical difference between the teachers' genders and point averages of school support perception scale, it is found that school support perception scale average of female teachers are ($X = 23,25$), school support perception scale average of male teachers are found ($X = 22,98$), and the two results are close. Accordingly, it is concluded that there isn't any statistically significant difference between the school support perception scale averages by gender ($p = 0,727$).

When the second sub-problem of the question "Is there a significant difference in school support perception of the teacher by age?" was examined, Pearson correlation analysis was carried out in order to determine if school support scale varies by age.

Table 2. Pearson's r Test Results Related to Differences in School Support Perception of Teachers by Age Variable

	Pearson's r	p
Total Point of Perceived School Support Scale		
Age	-0.024	0.669

When it is examined if there is a relation between the age of teachers and point average of school support perception scale in Table 2, it is found that there is not a statistically significant, linear correlation ($r = -0,024$, $p = 0,669$).

When the third sub-problem of the question "Is there a significant difference in school support perception of the teacher by branch?" was examined, independent group t test was carried out in order to determine if school support scale varies by branch.

Table 3. *t* Test Results Related to Differences in School Support Perception of Teachers by Branch

Department	N	\bar{X}	ss	Sh \bar{X}	<i>t</i> Test		
					<i>t</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>p</i>
Class	117	23,78	6,79	0,628	1,309	316	0,192
Branch	201	22,77	6,51	0,459			

When the department of graduation of the teachers that participate in the study in Table 3 were examined, the number of branch teachers is 201 (63,20%) while the number of class teachers is 117 (36,79%). When it is examined if there is a difference between point averages of school support perception scale of the teachers, school support perception scale average of the class teachers is found ($\bar{X} = 23,78$) while the average of the branch teachers is found ($\bar{X} = 22,77$). Accordingly, it is concluded that there isn't a statistically significant difference between the departments of graduation of the teachers and school support perception scale averages ($p=0,192$). The department of graduation of the teachers doesn't have any effect on school support.

When the fourth sub-problem of the question "Is there a significant difference in school support perception of the teachers by their educational background on inclusive?" was examined, independent group *t* test was carried out in order to determine if school support scale varies by educational background.

Table 4. *t* Test Results Related to Differences in School Support Perception of Teachers By Their Educational Background on inclusive

Educational Background	N	\bar{X}	ss	Sh \bar{X}	<i>t</i> Test		
					<i>t</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>p</i>
Yes	187	23,96	6,47	0,473	2,649	316	0,008
No	131	21,98	6,68	0,584			

While the number of teachers stating that they received training before among the teachers that participate in the study in Table 4 is 187 (58,8%), the number of teachers that haven't received any training is 131 (41,19%). When it is examined if there is difference in point averages of school support perception of teachers by their educational background, statistically

significant difference is found ($p=0,008$) between school support perception scale average of the teachers stating that they received training ($\bar{x}=23,96$) and the average of the teachers stating that they haven't received education ($\bar{x}=21,98$). Point average of school support perception scale of the teachers that have received training is significantly higher than those who haven't received education. The teachers that have received education before are found to get school support more.

When the fifth sub-problem of the question "Is there a significant difference in school support perception of the teachers by the presence of school counselor and special education teacher in their school?" was examined, independent group t test was carried out in order to determine if school support scale varies by the presence of school counselor and special education teacher.

Table 5. t test results related to the difference in school support perception of the teachers by the presence of school counselor and special education teacher in their school

School Counselor	N	*	ss	Sh+	t Test		
					t	Sd	p
Yes	294	23,26	6,51	0,380	1,103	316	0,271
No	24	21,71	7,91	1,615			
Special Education Teacher							
Yes	130	24,09	6,76	0,593	2,141	316	0,033
No	188	22,48	6,46	0,471			

When it was examined if there is a difference between point averages of school support perception scale of the teachers that participate in the study by the presence of school counselor and special education teacher in their school in Table 5, the average of the presence of school counselor in schools is found ($\bar{x}=23,6$), the average of the presence of special education teacher is found ($\bar{x}=24,09$). Accordingly, while statistically significant difference was not observed between the point averages of school support perception scale by the presence of school counselor in their school ($p=0,271$), statistically significant difference was observed between the point averages of school support perception scale by the presence of special education teacher ($p=0,033$). It is found that school support perception scale point of the teachers with special education teacher present in their

school is statistically higher than that of the teachers without the presence of special education teacher in their school, and other teachers receive support from special education teacher.

Findings on Qualitative Research

Sixth sub problem of the study is determined by “opinions of the teachers on the importance of school support in inclusive education”. Themes and codes were formed according to answers of the teachers. Opinions of the teachers are set out in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Opinions of the Teachers on Importance of School Support in inclusive Education

Theme (Categories)	Codes	Frequency	%
Importance of School Support	Ensuring the Effectiveness of the Process (E3,E5,E8,E9,E16,E19,E20	7	31,8%
	Attitude development(E6,E7,E10,E12,E15	5	22,7%
	Achieving the Desired Result (E3,E4,E13,E17	4	18,18%
	Preventing the Teachers from Feeling Themselves Inadequate (E2,E11,E18	3	13,63%
	Division of Responsibility(E1,E19,E14	3	13,63%

When Table 6 is examined, the teachers stated that environmental support is very important in inclusive education practices. At the most, 31.8% of the teachers highlighted that inclusive education process is more efficient in cases environmental support is received. 22,7% of them expressed that that both themselves and normal children developed positive attitudes towards Inclusive students thanks to the support, 18,8% of them expressed they could achieve the desired result for the student thanks to the environmental support. Below are the opinions of teachers that represent this situation.

“If teachers are able to receive support from the school administration, families or other teachers, they will think that they are not alone in the Inclusive process and not only the burden of teachers will be eased, but also they will have the motivation needed to be successful in the inclusive education. Therefore, support is very important.”(E1)

“Environmental support is very important. Family of my student is concerned, they immediately take account of what I say; the school administration also have positive attitude towards the Inclusive students on the practices. Other students are also influenced by attitudes of me and other persons and learn not to exclude those students.”(E15)

Seventh sub-problem of the research is “the opinions of the teachers on the results of school support in inclusive education”. According to answers of the teachers, two sub-themes and codes were formed for the results for the teacher and the student.

Table 7. Opinions of the Teachers on the Results of School Support in Inclusive Education

Theme(Categories)	Codes	Frequency	%
For Teacher	Teacher motivation (E1,E6,E9,E14,E16,E19,E20)	7	33,3%
	Facility of IEP preparation and implementation (E3,E4,E13,E14,E15)	5	23,8%
	Communication, cooperation (E7,E12,E14,E18,E20)	5	23,8%
	Positive attitude (E1,E10,E16,E17)	4	19,1%
For Students	Increase in success (E1,E2,E3,E5,E8,E9,E11,E16,E20)		
	Socialization (E1,E4,E8,E6,E20)		
	Feeling themselves valuable (E16,E20)	9	56,25%
		5	31,25%
		2	12,5%

When results of the environmental support in inclusive education in Table 7 is examined, that environmental support provides teachers with motivation was stated at the rate of 33,3% at the most in the results for teacher. 23,8% of the teachers stated that it provides facility of IEP preparation and implementation for teacher and enables to be in communication and cooperation with people in the environment who are included in the inclusive process. When the results for students are examined, at the most, 56,25% of them stated that academic achievement of the inclusive students have increased thanks to the support. 31,25% of them stated that it enables the inclusive students to become socialized. Below are the teacher opinions that represent this situation.

“It enables the teacher to be in cooperation with other school personnel and families. The cooperating people enable the child to become socialized and the process to be quicker and more efficient through shared decision making for the lessons.”(E4)

The teacher and student that receive support from the environment become more self-confident. The teacher becomes motivated to teach something to students and to handle problematic behaviors. (E9)

Eight sub-problem of the study is “opinions of teachers in the departments that they need support in inclusive education”. A theme and codes were formed within the scope of this question.

Table 8. Opinions of Teachers in the Departments That They Need Support in inclusive Education

Theme(Categories)	Codes	Frequency	%
The Areas	Activities, teaching (E6,E2,E3,E7,E11,E13)	6	25
	Information (E4,E5,E8,E18,E19)	5	20,8
Requiring Support	IEP preparation (E6,E9,E14,E17)	4	16,6
	Support education room (E10,E15,E16,E20)	4	16,6
	Handling problematic behaviors (E1,E4,E19)	3	12,5
	Material (E1,E12)	2	8,3

When Table 8 is examined, at the most, 25% of the teachers stated that they have difficulty in the activities and teaching for Inclusive students, and therefore they need support. 20% of the teachers expressed that they don't have knowledge of the characteristics of special needs students and they need support for being informed of this situation. In addition to this, 16,6% of them highlighted that teachers need support for preparing IEP for their students and for providing supplementary education in an environment other than the classroom environment for the lessons in which those students have low competence. Below are the teacher opinions that represent this situation.

“I haven't received any education on inclusion education before, therefore I need support on what the diagnosis of my autistic student in my class is and what it means, what the characteristics are, how I should act.”(E5)

“I prepared an individualized education plan for my inclusive students, but I have difficulty in implementing this plan in in-class practices. I give the same activities and homework to all my students.”(E7)

Ninth sub-problem of the study is “Opinions of teachers on sufficiency states in inclusive education”. Themes and codes were formed according to the answers given by the teachers.

Table 9. Opinions of Teachers on Sufficiency States in inclusive Education and the Reasons

Theme(Categories)	Codes	Frequency	%
Sufficiency States	Finding it inadequate (E1,E2,E4,E6,E10 E1 E11,E15,E16,E17,E19,E20)	12	60%
	Finding it partly adequate (E3,E5,E7,E9,E14)	5	25%
Causes	Finding it adequate (E12,E13,E18)	3	15%
	Unable to ensure learning (E10,E11,E15,E17,E20)	5	35,7%
Finding it Insufficient	Lack of information (E2,E4,E6,E8)	4	28,5%
	Unable to allocate specific time (E1,E7,E16)	3	21,4%
	Unable to handle problematic behavior (E4,E20)	2	14,2%
	Enabling socialization (E5,E7,E9)	3	60%
Finding It Partly Adequate	According to student diagnosis (E3,E14)	2	40%
	Experiences	2	66,6%
Finding It Adequate	Implementation of what is thought	1	33,4%

When Table 9 is examined, 60% of the teachers stated that they find themselves inadequate in inclusive education, 25% of them find themselves partly sufficient, 15% of them find themselves sufficient. When the reasons of the teachers for finding themselves inadequate are examined, at the most, 35,7% of them stated that the reason is being unable to ensure learning for the Inclusive student, for 28,5%, it is lack of information on the special needs students and the methods and techniques suitable for them, for 21,4%, it is being unable to deal with the inclusive student and allocate time. When the reasons of the teachers that find themselves partly adequate are examined, 60% of them stated that they could enable the inclusive students to become socialized with their normally-developing peers although they are not able to achieve their academic development very much. In addition, 40% of them stated that whether they feel themselves adequate or not depends on diagnosis of the student. When the

teachers that find themselves adequate are evaluated, 66,6% of them highlighted that they have experience with their previous Inclusive students and find themselves sufficient, 33,4% of them they achieve success by applying what they learn from their environment in the classroom environment and find themselves sufficient. Below are the teacher opinions that represent this situation.

“No, I don’t find myself adequate at all. I don’t know any method that I can apply alternatively. I mostly regard Inclusive students as the same as normal students and I cannot understand how they fail.”(E6)

“Whether I feel myself adequate or not varies by the level of Inclusive students, their diagnosis, and classroom size. While I can feel myself adequate for my student with learning disability, I don’t think the same for my autistic student.(E10)”

Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

In quantitative section of the study, effect of various variables on school support perception of the class and branch teachers that have inclusive students is examined.

The first sub-problem of the study is stated as “Is there a significant difference in school support perception of the teacher by gender?”. Statistically significant difference wasn’t found between the gender of the teachers and the school support perception scale points. It is concluded that the rate of receiving support is similar for male teachers and female teachers. It can be remarked that participations of male and female teachers in the items are similar. Bilen (2007) concluded in the study that he examined the opinions and solution suggestions for problems encountered by class teachers that there isn’t any statistically significant difference between gender variable of the class teachers and their opinion on Inclusive. Asiltürk (2011) didn’t find a statistically significant difference by gender in opinions of the teachers that participate in the study on the problems of RAM Special Education Services Department in his study on evaluation of supportive education programs for the mentally handicapped in terms of some variables in teachers’ aspect. Both studies that state no significance by gender variable and results of this study are similar.

It is concluded that there isn't a statistically significant, linear correlation between the ages of teachers and the point average of school support perception scale. The teachers at different ages receive support at similar rates. Ünal (2017) stated that ages of the class teachers don't make a difference in their opinions on the factors that affect the success of Inclusive practices. In different studies, (Bilen, 2007; Cankaya, 2010; Ekşi, 2010; Yaralı, 2015) similarly concluded that ages of the class teachers don't make statistically significant difference Inclusive practices. Results of this study are in parallel with the results of these studies.

No statistically significant difference is found between the departments of teachers and the school support perception scale points. In this study, teachers are categorized as class teachers and branch teachers. It is observed that scale averages of both teacher groups are similar. Fazlıoğlu and Doğan (2013) found significant difference between the attitudes of teachers towards Inclusive and the branch variable. They determined that attitudes of the class teachers are more positive compared to those the branch teachers. Minke, Bear, Deemer and Griffin (1996) concluded in their study that class teachers perceive themselves as less adequate than teachers that graduate from other departments. This case can be construed in the manner that the teachers that perceive themselves as less adequate need more support.

Statistically significant difference isn't found between the point averages of school support perception scale of the teachers by the place of taking any course/seminar/lesson on inclusive education. It is determined that averages of school support scale of the teachers that have received education in undergraduate education/in-service trainings or special education course are close. Ünal (2017) concluded that there isn't a significant difference between the opinion of the class teachers on the factors that affect the success of inclusive practices and the variable of type of education they have received on special education. Accordingly, it is established that the lessons, courses, in-service trainings or seminars related to special education don't affect the opinions of the class teachers on the factors that affect the success of inclusive practices.

A theme on the importance of school support was formed according to the opinion of teachers. Five codes were determined according to this theme. It was mostly stated at the rate of 31,8% that it enables the Inclusive

implementation process to be more effective about importance of school support received in inclusive education. Sart, Ala, Yazlık and Yılmaz (2004) revealed in their study that Inclusive cannot be achieved completely in case of inadequacy of individual education programs, counseling service support, informing teachers and families of inclusive education, material support and class equipment. Both studies can be interpreted as supporting each other by concluding that it is difficult to implement inclusive education completely and properly without school support. Baker and Zigmond (1995) stated that supportive special education services are prerequisite for effectiveness of inclusive education. Haider (2008) concluded that cooperation of class teachers and special education teachers have great importance; school administration, teachers and experts are also required to participate in inclusive education process (As cited in Sığırmaç et al. 2011). Likewise, the teachers in this study stated that positive attitudes are developed towards the Inclusive process through environmental support. Giving class teachers support (McLeskey, Waldron, So, Swanson and Loveland; 2001; McLeskey and Waldron, 2002), and informing them (Metin, Güleç and Şahin, 2009; Türkoğlu, 2007) (As cited in Sadioglu et al., 2012) enabled them to change their opinions and attitudes positively. It is observed that the results of the studies that were carried out in this matter this study are consistent.

Two themes were formed the results for teacher and the results for students within the scope of the results of school support in line with the opinions of the teachers. Four codes were formed for the results for teacher; three codes were formed for the results for students. In the results for the teacher that is the 1. theme, 33,3% of the teachers mostly concluded that teachers will be motivated more by not feeling themselves alone in the process in inclusive education if they receive support, 23,8% of them that facility of IEP preparation and implementation through school support and, at the same rate, that it enables to be in communication and cooperation with the persons that give support for the Inclusive process. Kara (2016) concluded that support of all related persons to class teachers (school administration, family, and other persons) in the inclusive process influence motivation of the teachers positively. Likewise, the result of this study that supported teachers become more motivated for inclusive education is consistent with the results of that study. Yaman (2017) stated that

teachers feel themselves inadequate on IEP and therefore they need to be informed through in-service trainings. Karaca (2018) concluded that teachers need to receive training on IEP preparation, implementation and evaluation. According to these conclusions, teachers will have adequate knowledge thanks to the support. Therefore, it can be inferred that IEP preparation and implementation process will be facilitated through support. It is observed that results of these studies are indirectly in accordance with the results of this study.

A theme the areas requiring support was formed in line with the opinions of the teachers. Six codes were formed in this theme. Accordingly, activities and teaching for Inclusive students was the main code at the rate of 25%. Most of the teachers stated that they are unable to achieve teaching for Inclusive students and do activities appropriate for their level, and they need support in this matter. Sadiođlu et al. (2012) found that problems related to teaching are the main problems that class teacher encounter in educating Inclusive students. Findings of the both studies are consistent, and the teachers expressed that they need support for these problems.

Two themes were formed as the statuses and reasons of adequacy for their self-adequacy in inclusive education in line with the opinions of the teachers. Three separate sub-themes were formed for the theme the reasons. Three codes were determined for the statuses of adequacy, five codes for the reasons, and eight codes in total. In the statuses of adequacy that is 1. theme, 60% of the teachers concluded that they don't find themselves adequate in inclusive education, 25% of them find themselves partly adequate, 15% of them find themselves adequate. Horne and Timmons (2009) concluded that teachers are not trained to be adequate to meet the needs of Inclusive students (As cited in Denizli, 2015). Yatkın, Sevgi and Uysal (2012) received the opinions of 53 teachers on special training, and most of the teachers find themselves partly adequate or don't find themselves adequate at all in this field. The fact that teachers don't find themselves adequate in inclusive training that is one of the results of this study is similar to the studies made in the past.

As recommendations for the study results:

A systematic consultancy services should be provided in every school that has inclusive student. This consultancy service, as similar to counseling service, should be provided by the teachers that can support teachers, special needs children and their families when necessary, and assigned to their office as special education consultant staff given only to those that graduate from special education departments of universities not only as special education teachers in special education class. Teachers should be able to receive support from families, administrators, and other teachers when necessary. For this, positive attitude should be developed in the school environment. Active participation of families in the Inclusive process should be achieved. From time to time, meetings that only families of the Inclusive students participate should be made. In these meetings, seminars should be organized by school counselor or special education consultant for the relevant families in the matters determined by the teachers that have Inclusive students. Special education and inclusive lessons should be given in all teaching departments of the faculty of education in undergraduate study, and all prospective teachers should be enabled to have enough knowledge when they graduate; practices such as internship and observation should be made in general education classes with inclusive students or special education classes in special education schools in order to enable them to get to know special needs children closely. In-service trainings should be provided at regular intervals to teachers that provide inclusive education. In these trainings, seminars that can be beneficial for teachers can be given in the manner they contain good practice examples or successful methods.

Kaynakça / References

- Arslan, S and Kılıç, Y. (2016). Perceived School Support in inclusive Education. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(1), 1-11. DOI: 10.17556/jef.50307
- Asiltürk, E. (2011). *Zihin engelliler destek eğitim programlarının bazı değişkenler açısından uygulayıcı öğretmenler boyutuyla değerlendirilmesi* Yüksek Lisans Tezi. YÖK Tez Merkezi veri tabanından erişildi (Tez No: 302981).

- Baker, J.M. and Zigmond, N. (1995). The meaning and practice of inclusion for students with learning disabilities: Themes and implications from the five cases. *The Journal Of Special Education*, Virginia-Pennsylvania, 29(2), 163-180. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F002246699502900207>
- Battal, İ. (2007). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin ve branş öğretmenlerinin kaynaştırma eğitimine ilişkin yeterliliklerinin değerlendirilmesi:Uşak İli örneği*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyonkarahisar.
- Batu, S. and Topsakal, M. (2003). Özel eğitim süreci ve bir danışmanlık örneği. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 4 (1), 19-29. DOI: 10.1501/Ozlegt_0000000071
- Batu, S., Kırcaali-İftar, G. and Uzuner, Y. (2004).Özel gereksinimli öğrencilerin kaynaştırıldığı bir kız meslek lisesindeki öğretmenlerin kaynaştırmaya ilişkin görüş ve önerileri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(2) 33-50. Doi: 10.1501/Ozlegt_0000000082.
- Bilen, E. (2007). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin kaynaştırma uygulamalarında karşılaştıkları sorunlarla ilgili görüşleri ve çözüm önerileri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. YÖK Tez Merkezi veri tabanından erişildi (Tez No: 211466).
- Cavkaytar, A. and Diken, İ. (2007). *Özel eğitime giriş*. (3. Baskı). Ankara: Kök Yayıncılık.
- Cenkseven-Önder, F. and Sarı, M. (2009). Öğretmenlerde öznel iyi olmanın yordayıcıları olarak okul yaşam kalitesi ve tükenmişlik. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 9(3), 1205-1236. Accessed on 20.07.2019. file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/The_Quality_of_School_Life_and_Burnout_a.pdf
- Çalışoğlu, M and Tanışır, S.(2018).İlkokullarda kaynaştırma eğitimine ilişkin paydaş görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 4 (2), 21-45. DOI: 10.31463/aicusbed.465860
- Çerezci, Ö. (2015). *Okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarında yapılan kaynaştırma eğitimi uygulamalarının kaynaştırma kriterleri açısından değerlendirilmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, YÖK Tez Merkezi veri tabanından erişildi (Tez No: 381453).
- Denizli, H. (2015). *Fen bilimleri dersi öğretmenlerinin ve fen bilimleri dersini alan kaynaştırma öğrencilerinin kaynaştırma eğitimi uygulamaları sürecine ilişkin görüş ve önerileri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, YÖK Tez Merkezi veri tabanından erişildi (Tez No: 415476)

- Diken, H. İ. (Ed.) (2015). *Özel eğitime gereksinim duyan çocuklar ve özel eğitim*. (11.Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Eripek, S. (2005). *Zeka geriliği*. Ankara: Kök Yayıncılık.
- Ersoy, Ö ve Avcı, N. (2000). *Özel gereksinimi olan çocuklar ve eğitimleri 'Özel Eğitim'*. İstanbul: Yapa Yayınları.
- Fazlıoğlu, Y. and Doğan, M.(2013). Öğretmenlerin kaynaştırmaya ilişkin tutumlarının incelenmesi. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15(2), 223-234. Accessed on 20.07.2019. <http://dergipark.gov.tr/trakyasobed-/issue/30216/326182>
- Kara, Z. (2016). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin kaynaştırma eğitimi öğrencilerine yönelik tutumlarını etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. YÖK Tez Merkezi veri tabanından erişildi (Tez No: 432580)
- Karaca, M. A. (2018). *Kaynaştırma eğitimi programının öğretmenlerin kaynaştırma uygulamalarındaki mesleki yeterliliğe etkisi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. YÖK Tez Merkezi veri tabanından erişildi (Tez No: 509031)
- Karadağ, İ. (2007). *İlköğretim beşinci sınıf öğrencilerinin akademik başarılarının sosyal destek kaynakları açısından incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, YÖK Tez Merkezi veri tabanından erişildi (Tez No:206430).
- Karagöz,S. (2018). *İkinci meşrutiyetten harf inkılabına süreli yayınlarda eğitim (1908-1928)*. Ankara:Vize Yayıncılık.
- Karagöz,S.(2019). *Cumhuriyet dönemi eğitimine yön veren yerli ve yabancı uzman raporları (1911-1927)*. Ankara:Pegem Akademi.
- Karasar, N. (2006), *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kuz, T. (2001).*Kaynaştırma eğitimine yönelik tutumların incelenmesi*. Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Özürlüler İdaresi Başkanlığı Yayınları/17.
- MEB Özel Eğitim Hizmetleri Yönetmeliği (2018). http://orgm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2018_07/09101900_ozel_-_egitim_hizmetleri_yonetmeliği_07072018.pdf
- Metin, N.(1997). anaokuluna devam eden 4-6 yaş grubundaki çocukların anne babalarının normal ve özürlü çocukların kaynaştırıldığı programlar hakkındaki düşüncelerinin incelenmesi. Ankara Üniversitesi. 5. *Mitat Enç Özel Eğitim Günleri*. Ankara. Türkiye Sakatlar Konfederasyonu Yayınları.

- Minke, K. M., Bear, G. G., Deemer, S. A. and Griffin, S. M. (1996). Teachers' experiences with inclusive classrooms: implications for special education reform. *The Journal of Special Education*, 30(2), 152-156. doi: [10.1177/002246699603000203](https://doi.org/10.1177/002246699603000203)
- Sadioğlu, Ö., Batu, E. S. and Bilgin, A. (2012). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin özel gereksinimli öğrencilerin kaynaştırılmasına ilişkin görüşleri. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(2), 399-432. Accessed on 20.07.2019. <http://dergipark.gov.tr/uefad/issue/16696/173558>
- Sart, Z. H., Ala, H., Yazlık, Ö. and Yılmaz, F. K (2004, Temmuz) Türkiye kaynaştırma eğitiminde nerede? Eğitimciye öneriler. XIII. *Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı*, 216-217, Malatya-Türkiye. Accessed on 20.07.2019. <http://www.pegem.net/dosyalar/dokuman/77983222.pdf>
- Sığırtmaç, D. A., Hoş, G. and Abbak, S. B. (2011). Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Kaynaştırma Eğitiminde Yaşanan Sorunlara Yönelik Kullandıkları Çözüm Yolları ve Önerileri. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(4), 205-223. Accessed on 20.07.2019. <http://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423907606.pdf>
- Sucuoğlu, B. (2006) *Etkili kaynaştırma uygulamaları*. Ankara: Ekinoks Yayıncılık.
- Sucuoğlu, B. and Akalın, S. (2010). Kaynaştırma sınıflarına alternatif bir bakış: çevresel davranışsal değerlendirme ile öğretimsel özelliklerin incelenmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11(1) 19-37.
- Ünal, A., M. (2017). *Kaynaştırma uygulamalarının başarısını etkileyen etmenlerin değerlendirilmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, YÖK Tez Merkezi veri tabanından erişildi (Tez No: 461204).
- Yaman, A. (2017). *Kaynaştırma modeli ile eğitilen öğrenciler için bireyselleştirilmiş eğitim programının geliştirilmesi ve uygulanmasına yönelik sınıf öğretmenlerinin görüşlerinin belirlenmesi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). YÖK Tez Merkezi veri tabanından erişildi (Tez No: 471821)
- Yatkın, S., Sevgi, H. M. and Uysal, S. (2015). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin, kaynaştırma eğitimine ilişkin görüşleri ve çeşitli değişkenlere göre mesleki tükenmişliklerinin incelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(Special Issue), 167-180. Accessed on 20.07.2019. <http://efdergi.ibu.edu.tr/index.php/efdergi/article/view/1476/2336>

Yazıcıoğlu, T. (2018). Tersine kaynaştırma modeli ve uygulama örnekleri. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 4 (1), 39-48.

Kaynakça Bilgisi / Citation Information

Arslan, S. ve Merih-Özçelik, Z. (2019). School support in inclusive education: Mixed method research. *OPUS-International Journal of Society Researches*, 14(20), 643-666. DOI: 10.26466/opus.595504