

ÖĞRETMENLERİN KAYNAŞTIRMAYA İLİŞKİN ALGILARI (SAKARYA İLİ ALAN TARAMASI ÖRNEĞİ)

Hülya AKSAKAL KUC¹ Nesri GİRGİN² Mehmet ATASAYAR³

CORRESPONDENCE

¹ Dr. Psychological Counselor, Sakarya Serdivan Guidance and Research Center, aksakal54@gmail.com

² Specialist Psychological Counselor, Sakarya Serdivan Guidance and Research Center, girginnesri@hotmail.com

³ Specialist Psychological Counselor, Sakarya Adapazarı Guidance and Research Center, mehmetata42@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In this research; the research subject is the perception of special education, thoughts and necessary equipment of the teachers that work in primary and secondary schools and having students with special needs in their classrooms in the city of Sakarya. The area of the subject of the research is consisting of teachers who are working in primary and secondary schools in the city of Sakarya and having students with special needs in their classrooms. The sample group is consisting of 1174 teachers. The model of this research is descriptive survey model. In this research, Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education was being developed. Along with the scale for Validity and Reliability, a personal information form of three questions was being used. Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education is a quintet of Likert scale and it is subject to scale construction and visual validity works. The application of the scale is conducted in the virtual environment by the teachers in accordance with the provided instructions. In accordance with the answers of the teachers for the total of 15 questions in Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education and 3 questions that has been stated in the interview form; it was determined that whether the sample group had mainstream students and their perception and qualification levels on special education along with their gender, years in the occupation and whether is there any significant relationship between the perception and qualification levels. It has been determined that a significant relationship was found between the perception and qualifications levels of the teachers regarding the special education that is experienced between 15 to 20 years and more on the profession of being a teacher. The group with the least perception and qualification levels is the group that just have been started in the profession.

Keywords: Mainstreaming, mainstream education, special needs student, teacher, qualification, scale

ÖΖ

Bu çalışmada; Sakarya İlinde ilk ve orta derece okullarda görev yapan ve sınıfında özel gereksinimli öğrencisi olan öğretmenlerin özel eğitim ile ilgili algıları, düşünceleri ve gerekli donanıma sahip olup olmadıkları araştırılmaktadır. Çalışmanın evrenini Sakarya ilinde ilk ve orta derece okullarda görev yapan ve sınıfında özel gereksinimli öğrencisi olan öğretmenler oluşturmaktadır. Örneklem grubu 1174 öğretmenden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmanın modeli betimsel tarama modelidir. Bu araştırmada Özel Eğitime İlişkin Algı ve Yeterlilik Ölceği gelistirilmiştir. Gecerlilik ve Güvenilirlik Calışması yapılan ölcekle beraber 3 soruluk kişisel bilgi formu kullanılmıştır. Özel Eğitime İlişkin Algı ve Yeterlilik Ölçeği beşli Likert tipi olup ölçek yapı ve görünüş geçerliliği çalışmalarına tabi tutulmuştur. Ölçeğin uygulanması verilen yönergeler doğrultusunda öğretmenler tarafından sanal ortamda yapılmıştır. Özel Eğitime İlişkin Algı ve Yeterlilik Ölçeği'ndeki toplam 15 soru ve görüşme formunda yapılandırılmış 3 soruya öğretmenlerin verdiği cevaplar; örneklem grubunu özel eğitim algı ve yeterlilik düzeyleri ile cinsiyet, meslekte geçirdiği yıllar ve daha önce kaynaştırma öğrencisi olup olmadığı ile özel eğitime ilişkin algı ve yeterlilik düzeyleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olmadığı, öğretmenlik mesleğinde 15-20 ve üzeri kıdemi olan öğretmenlerin özel eğitime ilişkin algı ve yeterlilik düzeyleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki tespit edilmiştir. En az algı ve yeterliliği olan grup ise mesleğe yeni başlayan gruptur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kaynaştırma, kaynaştırma eğitimi, özel gereksinimli öğrenci, öğretmen, yeterlik, ölçek

INTRODUCTION

Mainstreaming is an application aimed in recent years as for the students from various disability groups in Turkey and their peers significantly expanding rapidly be channelled into the education process of these students differ. The successful implementation of inclusion is the purpose of each school that carries out the mainstreaming practice.

Mainstreaming is a type of application that has become popular in the recent years in a quick manner for the students from various disability groups in Turkey which is different in a significant manner from its peers which targets the channelization of these students to the education process. The successful implementation of the mainstreaming is the purpose of each school that carries out the mainstreaming application.

Mainstreaming works are being carried out in many ways both in quantitative and qualitative manners and its implementation was tried to be shaped based on the opinions of the teachers upon various students. Besides, education based on the mainstreaming in Turkey started to have a new approach. All new applications based on the mainstreaming shall focus on the easier integration of the students with special needs to the social life(Batu,1998).

Mainstreaming applications have various benefits and the most important benefit is regarding the children with special needs. Mainstream enables students with special needs to observe peers and adults around them and shape their behaviours and to obtain applicable behaviour in accordance with the expectations of the society as they are with other people in the social life (Eripek, 1986; Göksu and Çevik, 2004; Cavkaytar, 1999). Mainstreaming environment which provides inclusion creates significant opportunities for the children with special needs to gain social skills and to learn behaviour that is accepted by the society (Hepler, 1994, cited in Sahbaz, 2003).

Mainstreaming processes have positive effects on students with special needs as well as students with normal levels of development. These applications provide awareness to students with normal development to how to approach individuals with special needs in the following years (Wolfensberger, 1972, cited in Eripek, 1986). In addition, mainstreaming provides a sense of responsibility and sensitivity to individuals with special needs (Vuran, 2007). Children with normal development skills, develop further skills of cooperation and contribution with group and peer workshops to be held (Kırcaali-İftar, 1998). At the same time, qualification areas of the teacherscan be listed as a positive approach, positive expectations and professional qualifications (Sucuoğlu and Kargın, 2006, cited in Turhan, 2007). In addition, in accordance with the research that has been conducted by Bailey and Winton (1987) mainstream applications provide the following to the form teachers: (a) having realistic expectations and developing positive attitudes towards the mainstreaming (b) obtaining additional educational training in the qualification that may be beneficial to all students that may increase the social interaction, (c) to become happy to help the children with different characteristics (d) to develop new relationships by cooperating with experts from different science areas (Bailey and Winton 1987, cited in Turhan, 2007).

It is thought that the elements necessary for the success of the mainstreaming practices in which students with special needs benefit from the least restrictive education environment are the family factor in the press. Because it is a successful teamwork, where co-operation and cooperation climate prevails. Therefore, it is important to know the knowledge levels of teachers about the mainstreaming practices in order to conduct the integration practices applied in schools in a healthy way.

It is thought thatthe leading element that is required for success in the mainstreaming applications that provide benefit for students with special requirements in the best manner in the least restrictive education environment is the family factor. Because mainstreaming is a successful teamwork, such cooperation is essential. Therefore, it is important to know the knowledge levels of teachers about the mainstreaming applications in order to conduct the integration practices applied in schools in a healthy way.



EQUIPMENT AND METHOD

In this part of the research, the model, subject area, sample, data collection tool, the scales used in data collection and the validity and reliability studies of these scales, the manner in which the data were collected and the techniques used in the analysis of these data were included.

1. Model of Research

The model of this research is descriptive survey model. The descriptive model defines a certain given situation as careful and precise as possible. In the educational field researches, the most common descriptive model is scanning research. Because researchers summarize the characteristics (abilities, interests, values, preferences, behaviours, etc.) of individuals, groups or physical environments. Examples of descriptive studies in the field of education may be identifying the success of various student groups and identifying the behaviour of teachers, managers or consultants. In this research, it is aimed to determine whether there is a gender, year of service and inclusion student in the sample group, and to try to determine the meaningful differences between them and the scale developed accordingly. The situation that enables our research as a descriptive model is to determine the following aspects of the teachers: gender, year of service and whether they have been mainstreaming students and to determine meaningful differences between them and the scale that has been developed in accordance with previous matters.

2. The Area of Subject and Samples

The area of subject of the research consists of teachers working in the city of Sakaryathat havestudents with special needs in their classrooms. The sample group consisted of 1174 teachers who have participated in the application of measurement instruments.

Table 1.Characteristics of the Teachers Who Created the Sample

		N	%	CumulativePer- centage
Gender	Female	559	47,6	47,6
	Male	615	52,4	100
Proffesional Year	0-5 Years	308	26,2	26,2
	5-10 Years	281	23,9	50,2
	10-15 Years	236	20,1	70,3
	15-20 Years	179	15,2	85,5
	20 Years and Up	170	14,5	100,0
He/shehada mainstreamingsto	I- Yes	848	72,2	72,2
dentbefore	No	326	27,8	100

Table.2. The Distribution of the Teachers of the Sample by District

	Adapazarı		Akyazı		Апууе		Erenier	:	Ferizii		Geyve	Johnson	uellaek	Varianina	vot induited
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
282	24,1	87	7,43	105	8,97	106	9,05	30	2,56	87	7,43	37	3,16	32	2,73
	Karasu		Kaynarca		Kocaall		. Ратикола		Sapanca		Serdivan	::	ningoc	Tarable	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
68	5,81	40	3,41	71	6,06	33	2,82	33	2,82	121	10,3	17	1,45	18	1,53

3. Data Collection Tools

In this research Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education that has been developed by the researcher applied for the data collection tools. In addition, a personal information form regarding the participants was used by the researcher for the participants.

- Personal Information Form

In this form that has been prepared by the researcher, a total of 3 questions were asked to sample group in order to determine the gender, years of experience in the profession and whether they had mainstreaming students with special needs before.

- Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education Validity and Reliability Studies

Comprehensive literatureresearch was conducted while developing "Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education" by the researches. An item pool was generated by both Turkish and foreign literature. In addition to the literature research, scales that are measuring similar qualifications were also included in this repository. The generated item pool includes 3 (three) Special Education Expert, 1 (one) Psychological Counseling and Guidance Expert, 1 (one) Education Program Expert, 1 (one) Assessment and Evaluation Expert, in order to determine whether it is appropriate in terms of language and meaning. 1 (one) Turkish Language Expert; as a total of 7 individuals in the field were consulted in this research and further redactions.

The item pool of 15 items was applied to 1174 form teachers working in the districts of the city of Sakarya in a virtual environment.



The scale which was developed by the research is a quintet Likert type and the teachers which are consisting the sample group had been requested to mark one of the following answers:1 (I don't agree), 2 (Partiallyl don't agree), 3 (Undecisive) 4 (Partiallyl agree) and 5 (I agree). All items of the scale are consisting of basic items and scoring was executed in accordance with the results of the statistical analysis, during this process no reversal of any item was not required.

Validity and Reliability Studies

Validity Studies

Validity studies for "Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education" were examined under the titles of structure and appearance validity.

Structure Validity

When analyzing the structure validity of "Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education" data analysis had started by factor analysis. In this research, subscales of the scale, factory loads of the items and the correlation between subdimensions were examined with exploratory factor analysis.

In order to determine whether data are subject to factor analysis in the "Exploratory Factor Analysis" ("EFA"), KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) and Barlett tests were applied. The general KMO value of the scale was found to be, 953 and since this value is close to 1.00; it has been determined that the value meets the criteria (sig. ,000).

During the research of the dimensions of the scale, these dimensions with the same content were named by the researcher. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, a single factor structure emerged on a 15-item scale.

Table.3. "Special EducationPerceptionandCompetenceScale" Factor Analysis Information and Factor Loads

ItemNumber	FactorLoad	ItemNumber	FactorLoad
i.n.1	,590	i.n.9	,798
i.n.2	,752	i.n.10	,767
i.n.3	,736	i.n.11	,794
i.n.4	,753	i.n.12	,801
i.n.5	,764	i.n.13	,678
i.n.6	,781	i.n.14	,813
i.n.7	,779	i.n.15	,808
i.n.8	,803		
Total VarianceExplained: % 58,246			

Appearance Validity

In the research regarding the appearance validity of "Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education", expert opinions were consulted. Following the completion of the statistical studies that are required for the scale items (factor analysis, factor loads and reliability coefficients) the experts have been consulted on the visual (face) measurement of the items were subject to the determination whether they meet the desired element. In accordance with the information that has been obtained by the experts, factor analysis was conducted and as a result of the analysis, it has been determined that all items are located applicable to the factors that are included in terms of content.

Reliability Studies

During the calculation of reliability of the scale, Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients were evaluated and for the analysis of the items, total correlation coefficients of the 15 test items were subject to evaluation.

Table.4. "Special EducationPerceptionandCompetenceScale"Item Test CorrelationCoefficients

ItemNumber	r	ItemNumber	r	ItemNumber	r
1	0,600	6	0,777	11	0,790
2	0,756	7	0,776	12	0,799
3	0,741	8	0,802	13	0,684
4	0,754	9	0,796	14	0,810
5	0,764	10	0,765	15	0,803

In Table-4, the correlation coefficient between the points for items that are remaining after removing some of the items from the scale as a result of the factory analysis and points that have been removed from the entire scale has been included. As can be seen, there is a positive correlation between the scores that have been obtained from the item and the points that have been obtained from the scale. In other words, as the total score from the scale increases, the points obtained from the items are also increasing.

Internal Consistency Reliability

For the scale of "Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education", internal consistency coefficients were found to be .948 for the whole scale.

Rating and Interpretation of the Scale

"Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education" is a quintet of Likert scale consisting of 15 items. The highest score that can be obtained from the scale is 75 points and the lowest score is 15 points. As the total score decreases it can be seen that the perception and competence levels of the teachers are not sufficient and as the total score increases it can be seen that the perception and competence levels of the teachers are sufficient. "Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education" scale have been evaluated by the researcher in three different categories. From the scale the following results can be obtained; Teachers with a score of 35 and under have low sufficiency on special education perception and competency, teachers with a score between 35 to 55 have medium sufficiency on special education perception and competency, with a score of 55 and above have high sufficiency on special education perception and competency,



4. Operation Path of the Research

In the academic years of 2015 – 2018, a total of 1174 teachers working in various primary and secondary schools in the city of Sakarya were subject to Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education. In addition, the sample group had filled a personal information form that has been prepared by the researcher in order to determine the gender, years of experience in the profession and whether they had any mainstreaming student before. The application was conducted on a virtual environment and before starting the application in the virtual environment, the researcher had provided the necessary explanations and the participants were asked to complete the scales with sincerity and truthfulness.

5.Data Analysis Techniques that are Used in Research

Data obtained from the sample group were coded by the researcher and analyzed by transferring to SPSS 16.00 Windows Package program. With the data obtained from the sample group, it has been tried to be determined that whether special education perception and competency levels of the students vary on in accordance with the gender, year of the profession and whether they had mainstreaming student before.

Before starting the data analysis of the research, validity and reliability studies of the Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education was developed by the researcher. For validity studies, structure and appearance validity of the Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education was evaluated. For structure validity, exploratory factor analysis was executed to determine the factor structure for the scale and subscales. For reliability analysis, item-total correlations were examined for internal consistency item analysis. Test-retest reliability research was conducted on 1174 teachers working in the city of Sakarya.

While the appropriate data analysis was selected in the research, t-test was also evaluated to determine whether there was a significant difference between two variables (first, gender; there are two variables as man and woman variable) within the special education perception and competency levels of the sample group for the special education and in addition, f test was conducted to evaluate to determine if the sample group had a significant difference in the levels of perception and competency levels for the special education with three or more variables (the second one is the years of experience in the profession). In addition, Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was examined in order to look at the level of relationship between the sub-dimensions of the scale and to determine what kind of (positive-negative) relationship is present.

FINDINGS

In this part of the research, statistical results were included regarding the sample groups that have participated in the research, their special education perception and competency levels and gender, the years they spent in the profession and whether there was an inclusion student before, and their answers to the options of each item.

1. Findings on the Evaluation of the Special Education Perception and Competency Level in terms of Gender Variable of the Sample Group Participants of the Research

T-test technique was used for the relevance test on the determination of the difference between two means on the evaluation of the differences between the samples of female and male teachers that have participated in the research in terms of Special Education Perception and Competency levels. N numbers, arithmetic averages, standard deviations and t-test results of the Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education in accordance with the genders of the sample group teachers that have participated in the research are provided in Table-5.

Table.5. Comparison of Teachers' Special Education Perception and Qualification Levels by Gender

Levels of Teachers' Special Education	Gender	N	x	s	Sd	τ	P
	Female	559	56,04	13,34			
Perception and Qualification	Male	615	57,07	14,48	1172	1,263	,208

As it is shown in Table-5, N numbers, arithmetic averages, standard deviations in accordance with the genders of the teachers that constitute the sample group of this research have been provided and the difference between the final score of these teachers on Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education with such data has been evaluated with the T-test in accordance with the gender variable. According to these results, the arithmetic average of the scores of female teachers from Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education is 56,04; The average score of the male teachers in Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education is 57,07. The difference between the scores of these two groups was not found as statistically significant (t(1172)=,208 p<.01). In short, special education perception and competencylevels of teachers does not indicate any significant difference according to their gender.



2. Findings Regarding Special Education Perception and Competency in Accordance with the Years of Professional Experience of the Sample Group Participants of the Research

The findings obtained from ANOVA results that have been conducted to determine whether the special education perception and competency levels of the sample groups that have participated in the research were significantly different depending on their years of Professional experience is stated in Table-6 and Table-7.

Table.6. Level Averages, N Numbers and Standard Deviations of Special Education Perception and Competency Levels of the Professional Years of the Sample Participated in the Study

		N	Mean	Standarddeviation
	0 - 5 Years	308	54,5130	14,60009
	5 - 10 Years	281	55,0071	14,56243
Professional	10 - 15 Years	236	56,5085	13,09458
Year	15 - 20 Years	179	59,0503	12,16288
	20 YearsandUp	170	60,4765	13,60526
	Total	1174	56,5877	13,95445

One-way variance analysis was used to determine whether there is any significant difference between the groups were evaluated and stated in Table-7.

Table.7. The Results of Variance Analysis Regarding the Effects of the Professional Years of Teachers on Special Education Perception and Competency Levels

	Source of Variance	Total of squares	df	Average of Squares	F	p
	BetweenGroups	5685,593	4	1421,398	7,460	,000
Professional Year	In-group	222728,870	1169	190,529		
	Total	228414,463	1173			

N numbers, averages, standard deviations and the results of tone way analysis of the variance applied to these values of the teachers that are consisting of the sample groups are stated in the Table-6 and Table-7. As a result of the variance analysis that has been conducted to determine the difference between the years of professional experience of the teachers that are consisting the sample group on Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education points difference, a statistically significant difference was found in terms of average scores of Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education of the

teachers (f0,05:4-1169:,000, p<0,05). In order to determine the extent of this difference in the Professional years of experience of the teacher "LSD Multiple Comparison Test" was conducted. As a result, a significant difference was found between those with the professional years of experience between 0 to 5 years to 15 - 20 years and 20 years and more.

3. Findings Regarding Evaluation on whether Sample Group Participants of the Research had Mainstreaming Students in accordance with the Special Education Perception and Competency Levels

T-test technique was used to determine the difference between two means in the evaluation of the difference between the sample group participating in the research in terms of Special Education Perception and Competency Levels and whether they had previously a mainstreaming student or not. N numbers, arithmetic means, standard deviations and t-test results of the Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education were stated in Table-8 according to the sample group's previous experience on whether they had mainstreaming students.

Table.8. Comparing Special Education Perception and Competency Levels of Teachers According to have Main streaming Students or Non-Main streaming Students

	Had Main streaming Students before	N	х	s	Sd	т	P
Levels of Teachers' Special Education Perception and Qualification	Yes	848	57,45	13,70	1172	3,47	,083

As it is stated in Table-8, N numbers, arithmetic averages of the obtained numbers and the standard deviations has been provided whether the teachers of the sample group of the research had been mainstreaming students before and the difference between the scores that are obtained from these teachers from Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education was examined with t-test, based on the variable of whether they had a mainstreaming student before. According to these results, the arithmetic average of the scores of the teachers who have had mainstreaming students before the Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education are 57,45 and the average score of the teachers who did not have mainstreaming students before are 54,31. The difference between the scores of these two groups was not statistically significant (t(1172)=,083 p<.01). In short, special education perception and competency levels of teachers do not state any significant difference according to whether they had a mainstreaming student previously.

4. Descriptive Statistics of the Scale Items

The numbers and ratios (statistics) of the options of the 15-items that constitute Perception and Competency Scale for Special Education are provided in the tables below.

Table.9:1. Item, I prepare my lesson plan considering the student with special needs

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	I do not agree	69	5,9	5,9
	PartiallyDisagree	84	7,2	13,0
ІТЕМ:1	Undecided	54	4,6	17,6
ITEI	PartiallyAgree	356	30,3	48,0
	Agree	611	52,0	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 1, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 17,6%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 80%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

Table10:2. Item, I know what kind of legal work I will do for students with special needs (how many students will be in class, related commissions, course passing system)

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	I do not agree	101	8,6	8,6
	PartiallyDisagree	94	8,0	16,6
ІТЕМ:2	Undecided	132	11,2	27,9
ITEI	PartiallyAgree	424	36,1	64,0
	Agree	423	36,0	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 2, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 27,9%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 70%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

Table11:3. Item, I know what to do about the orientation/diagnosis of a student with special needs (Medical diagnostics)

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	I do not agree	130	11,1	11,1
	PartiallyDisagree	107	9,1	20,2
ITEM:3	Undecided	160	13,6	33,8
ITEI	PartiallyAgree	427	36,4	70,2
	Agree	350	29,8	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 3, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 33,8%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 70%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

Table12:4. Item, I know which way I will follow for guidance to Guidance Research Centers (GRC)

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	l do not agree	86	7,3	7,3
	PartiallyDisagree	81	6,9	14,2
ITEM:4	Undecided	99	8,4	22,7
ITEI	PartiallyAgree	379	32,3	54,9
	Agree	529	45,1	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 4, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively [22,7%]. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around [80%]) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.



Table13:5. Item, I know how to benefit from Guidance Research Centers (GRC) if I have a student with special needs

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	I do not agree	99	8,4	8,4
	PartiallyDisagree	84	7,2	15,6
ITEM:5	Undecided	139	11,8	27,4
ITEI	PartiallyAgree	421	35,9	63,3
	Agree	431	36,7	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 5, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 27,4%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 70%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

Table 14: 6. Item, I know how toact on the behaviour of the student with special needs in class (incompatible with classrules)

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	l do not agree	61	5,2	5,2
	PartiallyDisagree	82	7,0	12,2
1:6	Undecided	136	11,6	23,8
ITEM:6	PartiallyAgree	487	41,5	65,2
	Agree	408	34,8	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	5,2

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 6, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 23,8%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 75%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

Table15:7. Item, I have sufficient knowledge about special education methods, techniques and methods

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	l do not agree	140	11,9	11,9
	PartiallyDisagree	125	10,6	22,6
ITEM:7	Undecided	230	19,6	42,2
ITEI	PartiallyAgree	484	41,2	83,4
	Agree	195	16,6	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 7, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 42,2%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 60%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

Table 16: 8. Item, I have enough knowledge about the function and function of the Individual Education Plan Commission

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	I do not agree	148	12,6	12,6
	PartiallyDisagree	140	11,9	24,5
тем:8	Undecided	208	17,7	42,2
ITEI	PartiallyAgree	443	37,7	80,0
	Agree	235	20,0	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 8, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 42,2%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 60%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.



Table 17: 9.ltem, I know what forms of special education are like an Individual Education Plan, Individualized Education Plan etc.

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	I do not agree	116	9,9	9,9
	PartiallyDisagree	118	10,1	19,9
<i>N</i> :9	Undecided	184	15,7	35,6
ITEM:9	PartiallyAgree	452	38,5	74,1
	Agree	304	25,9	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 9, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 35,6%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 65%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

Table 18: 10. Item, I use special education forms like Individual Education Plan, Individualized Education Plan etc. if I have students with special needs

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	I do not agree	84	7,2	7,2
	PartiallyDisagree	84	7,2	14,3
тем:10	Undecided	112	9,5	23,9
ITEN	PartiallyAgree	397	33,8	57,7
	Agree	497	42,3	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 10, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 23,9%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 70%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

Table 19: 11. Item, I know how to work with school guidance service for students with special needs

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	l do not agree	72	6,1	6,1
	PartiallyDisagree	91	7,8	13,9
ІТЕМ:11	Undecided	118	10,1	23,9
ITEN	PartiallyAgree	390	33,2	57,2
	Agree	503	42,8	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 11, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 23,9%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 70%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

Table20:12. Item, I know exactly what is the difference between Full-time Mainstreaming, Part-Time Mainstreaming, Special Education Class and Special Education Schools

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	l do not agree	115	9,8	9,8
	PartiallyDisagree	102	8,7	18,5
1:12	Undecided	179	15,2	33,7
ITEM:12	PartiallyAgree	424	36,1	69,8
	Agree	354	30,2	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 12, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 33,7%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 70%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.



Table 21: 13. Item, The school administration in forms and guides me about special education and Mainstreaming

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	I do not agree	103	8,8	8,8
	PartiallyDisagree	101	8,6	17,4
ITEM:13	Undecided	157	13,4	30,7
ITEN	PartiallyAgree	394	33,6	64,3
	Agree	419	35,7	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 13, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 30,7%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 70%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

Table 22: 14. Item, I have enough knowledge about how toapply Full-Time Mainstreaming/ Part Time Mainstreaming education for students with special needs

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	I do not agree	123	10,5	10,5
	PartiallyDisagree	122	10,4	20,9
1:14	Undecided	197	16,8	37,6
ITEM:14	PartiallyAgree	461	39,3	76,9
	Agree	271	23,1	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 14, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 37,6%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 65%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

Table 23: 15. Item, I know how to be have about the psychological structures and character traits of families with children with special needs

		Frequency	Percentages	CumulativePercentage
	l do not agree	88	7,5	7,5
	PartiallyDisagree	96	8,2	15,7
ITEM:15	Undecided	173	14,7	30,4
ITEN	PartiallyAgree	448	38,2	68,6
	Agree	369	31,4	100,0
	Total	1174	100,0	

Upon examining the answers of the sample group participating in the research on item 15, the ratio of those who statistically selected one of the I don't agree, Partially I don't agree and Undecisive answers are cumulatively 30,4%. From this point of view, the majority of the teachers (around 70%) have answered in "I agree" type of answers in this item.

DISCUSSION, RESULTS AND SUGGESTIONS

In this research, the target of this course to describe the perceptions, thoughts and competency with regards to Special Education and to learn, prepare and determine the thoughts and feeling regarding the preparation and application of BEP (Individualized Education Program) between students with special education needs and special education teachers that are in direct and indirect relationships with these students and form teachers. As a result of the information gathered from the teachers, there are different results in some items with regards to the perceptions, thoughts and competency of the teachers regarding the Special Education, preparation and application of the BEP. In general, it has been concluded that the teachers generally considered themselves to be competent in special education. From this point of view, the results that have been obtained are consistent with the researches of Batu and Kırcaali-İftar (2005) and Battal (2007).

In accordance with the results of the research, it has been observed that the perceptions and competency of the teachers towards special education did not change by the gender variable. Responses of the male and female teachers did not differentiate for the scale items and they have resulted as parallel to each other. This result eliminated the perception that female teachers are more adequate for special education that is expressed in society as an external reflection. According to the results and average perception and competency level, male teachers obtained better results than female teachers. The results that have been obtained are consistent with the researches of Öncül (2003) and Yigen (2008).

The other most important result that has been obtained by this research is the group of teachers who have the highest professional experience for 20 years or more. In accordance with this result, the fact that the teachers feel the most adequate when their professional experience years are increasing. The group with the least perception and competency is the group that just started in the profession.

The other result of the research is the findings regarding the mainstreaming students. In accordance with this result, perception and competency regarding the special education do not change whether there were mainstreaming students previously. Whether there is a mainstreaming student in the classroom of a teacher does not change the perception and competency of the special education.



In accordance with the results of the scale items that have been applied to the teachers; teachers think that they are sufficient about 70% in special education in preparing BEP plan, cooperating with RAM's (Guidance Research Centers) and using tools and equipment. The results that have been obtained are consistent with the researches of Yıkmış and Gözün (2003) and Karamanlı (1998).

The accuracy of the results in terms of development and progress of the special education in our country for the last decade has been controversial. It is still uncertain that how the special education classes that are included in a limited manner the educational programs of the education faculties of the universities on 2005 and before to be included in the educational programs and to be transferred to the students of the educational faculties in a functional manner. In addition, in case of need to examine this situation in terms of National Education, the number of classrooms which are suitable for special education students for their studies are limited in the available or newly constructed schools. Even if the classrooms are available, it is difficult to find and appoint a teacher who is an expert in special education. Suggestions to be made regarding the findings of the research and the special education can be listed as follows;

Studies must be conducted to make RAM (which is included in the regulation of special education services) to become more functional in subjects such as RAM's operation and service delivery. Follow-up for BEP's should be conducted by the expert teams. BEP team members should participate in the BEP meetings and continuation of their participation must be ensured and Ministry of National Education should take necessary measures to ensure the implementation of the decisions that have been taken by the team.

By providing the parents of the students who need the special education to be informed about the subject of BEP, contribution to the process shall be achieved by encouraging the families to participate in BEP meetings and participation for their children to develop their BEP's.

Parents with the children with special need to have more awareness levels and the fact that the main shortcomings and obstacles are the neglect of the education services which should be offered to the children with special needs in schools. This fact must be grasped by the parents of children with special needs and requirements. It is thought that the parents who are aware of this issue could be able to contribute more to the development of their children with special needs.

Teachers with the students with special needs to have information regarding the legal regulations and legislation on this manner and to provide necessary cooperation with the relevant individuals and units in the process shall enable the special education process in schools and classrooms to be able to function much healthily and efficiently.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, D. ve Winton, P. (1987). Stability and Change in Parents'Expectations about Mainstreaming. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 7(1):* 73–88
- Battal, A. (2007). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin ve Branş Öğretmenlerinin Kaynaştırma Eğitimine İlişkin Yeterliliklerinin Değerlendirilmesi (the Evaluation of theSufficiency of the Class andBranchTeachers on FusionEducation (Sample of Uşak City). *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyonkarahisar. (InTurkish).
- Batu, E. S. (1998). Özel Gereksinimli Öğrencilerin Kaynaştırıldığı Bir Kız Meslek Lisesindeki Öğretmenlerin Kaynaştırmaya İlişki Görüş ve Önerileri (the Opinions and Suggestions of Teachers Who Work in a Vocational School for Girls Where Special Need Students are Main streaming). *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi*. Anadolu Üniversitesi Eskişehir.(InTurkish).
- Batu, E. S. ve Kırcaali-İftar, G. (2005). Kaynaştırma (Mainstreaming), Ankara: Kök Yayıncılık. (InTurkish).
- Cavkaytar, A. (1999). Zihinsel Engellilere Öz Bakım ve Ev içi Becerilerinin Öğretiminde Bir Aile Eğitimi Programının Etkinliği (TheEffectiveness of a FamilyEducation Program in Teaching Self CareandDomesticSkillsforMentallyHandicapped). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.(InTurkish).
- Eripek, S. (1986). Engelli Çocukların Normal Sınıflara Yerleştirilmesi-Kaynaştırma(Placing the Disabled Children in Normal Classes). *Anadolu Üniversitesi Egitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 1, (2)*: 157-169. (InTurkish).
- Göksu, ve Çevik, T. (2004). Özel Eğitime Giriş(Introductionto Special Education). Adana. (InTurkish).
- Gözün, Ö. ve Yıkmış, A. (2003). Öğretmen Adaylarının Kaynaştırma Konusundaki Bilgilendirmelerinin Kaynaştırmaya Yönelik Tutumların Değişimindeki Etkililiği(Effectiveness of Teacher Candidates' Information on Mainstreaming in the Change of Attitudes Towards Mainstreaming). XII. Ulusal Özel Eğitim Kongresi Bildirgeleri. Eskişehir: Karatepe Yayınları, 136-147. (InTurkish).
- Hepler, J.B. (1994). Mainstreaming Children with Learning Disabilities: HaveWelmprovedTheirSocial Environment? *Social Work in Education, 16, (3):* 143-154.
- Karamanlı, D. (1998). Okul Öncesi Dönemde Entegrasyon Sınıflarında Bulunan 5-6 Yaş Grubundaki Normal Çocukların ve Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Zihinsel Engelli Çocukların Sosyal Uyum Davranışları Hakkındaki Algılamalarının İncelenmesi (A Research on Normal Pre-school Children's at the Ages of 5 and 6, and Class Teachers' Way of Perceiving the Adaptation Behaviour of Mentally Retarded Children). Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara. (InTurkish).
 - Kırcaali-İftar, G. (1998). Kaynaştırma ve Destek Özel Eğitim Hizmetleri(Özel Eğitim. Mainstreaming and Support Special Education Services). Özel Eğitim (Special Education). S. Eripek (Ed.), Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.(InTurkish).



REFERENCES

- Öncül, N. (2003). Kaynaştırma Uygulaması Yapılan İlköğretim Okuluna Devam Eden Zihin Özürlü Öğrencinin Bulunduğu Sınıfta Normal Çocuk Annelerinin Kaynaştırma Uygulamasına İlişkin Görüşleri (TheOpinions of RegularEducationStudentsMothers in a PrimarySchool towardInclusion). *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Anadolu Üniversitesi Eskişehir.(InTurkish).
- Sahbaz, Ü. (2003). Kaynaştırma Sınıflarına Devam Eden Zihin Engelli Öğrencilerin Sosyal Kabul Düzeylerinin Belirlenmesi (Determination of Social Acceptance Levels of Students with Mental Retardation in Mainstreaming Classes). Özel Eğitimden Yansılamalar (*Reflectionsfrom Special Education*). A. Konrot (Ed.). Ankara: Kök Yayıncılık.(InTurkish).
- Sucuoglu, B. ve Kargın, T. (2006). İlköğretimde Kaynaştırma Uygulamaları, Yaklaşımlar, Yöntemler Teknikler (*MainstreamingPractices, Approaches, Methods, Techniques*). İstanbul: Morpa Yayınları. (InTurkish).
- Turhan, C. (2007). Kaynaştırma Uygulaması Yapılan İlköğretim Okuluna Devam Eden Normal Gelişim Gösteren Öğrencilerin Kaynaştırma Uygulamalarına İlişkin Görüşleri (the Opinions about Mainstreaming Practice sof Typically Developing Primary School Students 'Who Attend Primary School Where Mainstreaming Practices are Applied). *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.(InTurkish).
- Vuran, S. (2007). Sosyal Yeterliliklerin Geliştirilmesi. İlköğretimde Kaynaştırma(Development of Social Competences. *Mainstreaming in Primary School*). S. Eripek (Ed.). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.(InTurkish).
- Wolfensberger, W. (1972). The Principle of Normalization in Human Services. Toronto: *National Institute on Mental Retardation.*
- Yigen, S. (2008). Çocuğu İlköğretim Kademesinde Kaynaştırma Uygulamalarına Devam Eden Anne-Babaların Kaynaştırmaya İlişkin Görüş ve Beklentileri. (the Thoughts and Expectations of the Families Whose Children are Attending to Inclusive Environments during the Primary School Years). *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Eskisehir. (InTurkish).