

**AN ANALYSIS OF PRE-SCHOOL TEACHERS' AND STUDENT
TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TO INCLUSION AND THEIR SELF-EFFICACY**

Hakan Sarı,
Nadir Çeliköz
and
Zarife Seçer
University of Selçuk, Konya

The aim of this study was to investigate what the self-efficacy and attitudes of pre-school teachers and student teachers towards inclusive education were and to elucidate the relationship between self-efficacy and the attitudes on inclusion. Therefore, the present study investigated the self-efficacy perceptions and attitudes of student teachers towards inclusive education, who received the special education course in the Department of Preschool Education at Faculty of Vocational Education in Selçuk University and pre-school education teachers who work in nursery classes and nursery schools affiliated to Konya Local Education Authority. Two scales were used in the study. These were: (1) the Opinions Relative to Inclusion Scale and (2) the Teacher Self-efficacy Perception Scale. Results indicated that: (a) attitudes of pre-school education teachers and the student teachers were undecided; (b) the two groups considered themselves efficient for being teachers in terms of the three dimensions of the self efficacy scale; (c) the attitudes' scores of the student teachers towards inclusive education were higher than the teachers' scores; (d) the scores of the teachers' self efficacy were higher than the student teachers' scores; (e) the attitudes of the teachers towards inclusive education were effected by their self efficacy perceptions in terms of teaching dimension; (f) the student teachers' perceptions on self efficacy were not effected by their attitudes towards inclusive education; (g) the student teachers should receive more courses on education of children with special educational needs during their university education; and (h) teachers should receive more support services than they have for how to educate children with SEN from the support units in accordance with the child's needs, type and severity of the child's handicap conditions. Further research is needed due to the fact that there may be a difference between the student teachers' scores on their attitudes towards special education according to how many credits they have received the courses on special education and practice in schools what they have learned from the courses regarding special education.

According to the Turkish Ministry of National Education (2006), inclusive education concerns special educational applications based on the principle that individuals requiring special education continue their education together with their peers without handicaps in institutions of preschool, primary, secondary and non-formal education and where support services are offered (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [MEB], 2006). In inclusive education, children with Special Educational Needs [SEN] are included within a programme for children demonstrating a normal progress from pre-school education onwards and efforts are made to get them to socialise and adapt to the society they live in.

Early intervention is an important factor in ensuring the children's socialiation and adaptation to the society (Cole, Dale, & Mills, 1991). The earlier these children attend pre-school education, the higher their level of progress and skills becomes (Bailey & Wolery, 1992). Therefore, inclusive education should not be ignored in pre-school education. Kırcaali-iftar (1992) cites basic benefits of special education services offered in early childhood and pre-school periods as acceleration in children's growth, prevention of their disability from turning into a handicap and a reduction in the family's emotional and social problems. Avcı and Ersoy (1999), on the other hand, stated that inclusive

education given in pre-school period effects both children with handicaps and children without handicaps positively, and that this effect is concentrated mainly on attitudes, interaction and learning.

Due to these favourable contributions made with inclusive education, many countries attempt to make legislation with the purpose of consolidating the place of inclusive education within the educational system and obtaining maximum individual and social benefits from the applications. Accordingly, the legal basis of inclusive education in Turkey was formed with 573 Special Education Legislation, which came into practice in 1997. According to this law (1997), it has been established as a framework that; (1) pre-school education programmes cover both normal children and children who need special education, (2) pre-school education is mandatory for children diagnosed with a need for special education, (3) education will be offered in special schools and institutions of pre-school education, and (4) durations of pre-school education for children with SEN can be extended by taking into consideration of their developmental and individual characteristics.

Though legal foundations have been laid with this Legislation, it is understood both from observations made by researchers and the studies (Artan & Balat, 2003) that practices of inclusive education have not become common yet in Turkey and that the required and expected levels of individual and social benefits have not been obtained. The reason for this may be that success of inclusive education depends on many factors. Some of these factors can be cited as; a) teachers' and school personnel's adoption of the inclusive education, b) preparation of the inclusive class, c) individualisation of the educational programme and d) use of effective classroom management techniques (Kircaali-İftar, 1998; Hyde & Power, 2004). It can be argued that the most important one among these factors is the teacher factor, for harmonization of normal children and connected primarily with the teacher. Pre-school teachers' knowledge, emotions and skills about inclusive education are of particular importance because of their special mission in inclusive education and because it is primarily the institutions of pre-school education where children needing special education can receive initial inclusive education (Artan & Balat, 2003). Therefore, teachers' self-efficacy is seen as an important variable for inclusive education.

The concept of self-efficacy was derived from the theory of social learning proposed by Bandura (Bandura, 1977, 1986). The perception of self-efficacy is the individual's faith in his ability to successfully demonstrate behaviours required to attain an expected result (Bahadır, 2002). Bandura's (1986) self efficacy perception affects an individual's: a) choice of activities, b) perseverance in the face of hardships, c) level of their efforts and d) performance. According to Bandura (1986), individuals with high self-efficacy perception concerning a specific situation make a great effort to accomplish a task, do not simply backtrack when they encounter a trouble and act with persistence and perseverance (Aşkar & Umay, 2001). In the literature (Soodak, Podell, & Lehman, 1998), the level of self-image and self-efficacy of the teachers effect their quality of work in their professional life. It has been found that teachers with high self-efficacy tend to get better accustomed to changes in their professional life than teachers with lower self-efficacy (Larrivee & Cook, 1979; Soodak & Podell, 1994; Soodak et al., 1998; Buell, Gamel-McCormick, & Hallam, 1999; Weisel & Dror, 2006). On the other hand, conflicting results have been obtained in studies predicting the relationship between the adaptation of effective teaching methods for children with handicaps and teachers' self-efficacy in teaching (Bender, Vail, & Scott, 1995).

When viewed from this perspective, it can be said that one of the most important factors in the success of inclusive programmes is a teacher's attitude. Teachers' attitudes regarding inclusive education (Bacon & Schultz, 1991) are such important variables as handicapped child's quality of life (Beckwith & Mathewss, 1994) and his receiving inclusive education (Stewart, 1990) effects relations with students with educational needs.

Class teachers have influences on the success of children with SEN and inclusive programmes; for a successful inclusion, on the other hand, the teacher should have positive attitude towards and sufficient knowledge and skills for inclusive education and be enthusiastic to the student (Chandler, 1994; Artan & Balat, 2003). These issues are important because individuals' beliefs effect their behaviours in coping with the difficulties in life (Sharp, 2002). In addition, teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education are effected by variables such as: their ages, the type of child's handicap, the level of the handicap, the level of the support the teacher and the students receive from the school and Local Education Authority administration, the support services, their knowledge about inclusion and in-service training courses they can receive (Sarı, 2007).

Most of the studies (Vuran, 2005) in Turkey reflect that teachers have negative attitudes towards inclusive education and students with SEN who receive inclusive education do not have positive attitudes from their peers. More than half of the teachers who do not want a child with SEN in their classes (Sarı, 2007). Uysal (2003) state that teachers believe that inclusion is not useful and consists of various deficiencies because they experience many difficulties in practice, and it makes things harder for them. Metin & Çakmak (1998) emphasises that teachers feel that inclusion means extra burden for them.

Studies in this regard (Anderson & Antonak, 1992), teachers' attitudes towards students with handicaps are described as multi-dimensional and complex. Some studies (Larrivee & Cook, 1979; Bacon & Schultz, 1991; D'Alonzo & Ledon, 1992) stated that teachers believed that special needs children could be educated in separate environments and they did not want those students in their classes that they adopted negative attitudes towards inclusion (Alghazo & Gaad, 2004), and that in some cases teachers prefer physically handicapped students to students with cognitive, emotional and behavioural problems (Jobe, Rust, & Brissie, 1996). There are also findings suggesting that teachers have a favourable opinion of inclusive education but that they have some concerns on this kind of education (Odom, 2000), such as teachers' incompetency in their profession, physical circumstances, lack of enough support from the school administrators, and the parents with normal children who have lack of adequate knowledge. It is also reported that cases such as allocation of funds for inclusion of students with SEN in normal classes and developing policies encourage favourable attitudes whereas expectations of inappropriate behaviour and poor grades from handicapped students foster unfavourable attitudes (Altman, 1981). Moreover, according to the researchers (Beattie, Anderson, & Antonak, 1997) teachers who believe that they can be successful in teaching students with SEN may exhibit more positive attitudes towards inclusive education.

İzci (2005) and Nizamoğlu (2006) emphasised that class teachers and student class teachers do not possess adequate knowledge and skills regarding special education and inclusive education (Diken, 1998; Sarı, 2005). Therefore, it is believed that teacher training is essential prior to the start of the inclusive education (Sarı, 2007). According to Yıkılmış (2006), school administrators approve of inclusive education but suggest that personnel who are in charge in the school where inclusion takes place should also be educated. Experts (Şahbaz, 1997; Yıkılmış, Şahbaz, & Peker, 1998; Diken, 1998; Özyürek, 1988, 1989; Gözün & Yıkılmış, 2003; Sarı, 2005) state that information given to teachers about inclusion has positively altered their attitudes.

In the light of these explanations it can be said that teachers' attitudes in Turkey concerning inclusive education seemed to be negative. On the other hand, inclusive education starting from early years is beneficial for both students with and without SEN. However, the most important person in the success of inclusive education is the teacher who should have positive attitudes towards inclusion. Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate what the self-efficacy and attitudes of pre-school teachers and student teachers were towards inclusive education and to elucidate the relationship between self-efficacy and the attitudes on inclusion.

Method

Research Method

In this research, the researchers used a survey method (Karasar, 1986; Robson, 1997). The researchers wanted to generate large amounts of data by reaching many student teachers who were selected with the help of cluster sampling system, and preschool education teachers selected using systematic random sampling technique. In addition, the researchers also used this method to obtain valid information from the respondents about what they are thinking, feeling or believing on inclusive education and their self-efficacy perceptions in Turkey (Hakim, 1987).

Sample

Pre-school education teachers, working in nursery schools and nursery classes in primary schools in Konya Local Education Authorities and senior class students, who are enrolled in pre-school education department in Vocational Education Faculty at Selcuk University, participated in the study. The sample of student teachers was selected in accordance with the cluster sampling system. On the other hand, the research sample consists of 198 student teachers who were in the class when the research instruments were administered to the student teachers. The research instruments were administered to 264 pre-school education teachers selected in accordance with the systematic random sampling technique from Konya LEA, to whom the instruments were sent by post and all of them were returned.

The student teachers are final year students and enrolled in the department of preschool education in Selcuk University. The sample of this study includes 99% female teachers. Two third of the participants are below 35 age of years. The mean of the sample's age is 33.4. Most of the teachers (91.1%) graduated from the University but approximately two third of the teachers participated in this study had experience less than ten years. All the students participated in this research are female students because in Turkey the females mostly prefer to become preschool teacher and they are given special education course with the three credits in the faculty.

Research Instruments

Two types of data collection instruments were used in this study. These are: (1) Opinions Relative to Mainstreaming Scale and (2) Teacher Self-efficacy Perception Scale. The Opinions Relative to Mainstreaming Scale is a scale developed by Antonak and Larrivee (1995) to determine the teacher attitudes towards integrating handicapped children into normal classes. The Opinions Relative to Mainstreaming Scale was adapted to Turkish by Kırcaali-Iftar (1997) and its validity and reliability was tested. In the adaptation of the scale to Turkish, the construct validity was investigated via factor analysis whereas internal consistency was tested via item analysis. In construct validity, 20 out of 25 items were brought together in five factors as a result of the Factor Analysis and Screen Test conducted through Varimax Rotation. Cronbach Alpha internal consistency, on the other hand, was calculated as being 0.80. The scale was used by Sari (2007) before this research was started.

The self-efficacy perceptions of pre-school teachers and student teachers concerning their ability in *guidance, teaching* and *classroom management* were obtained via a scale developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk (2001) and adapted to Turkish teachers by Çapa, Çakıroğlu and Sarıkaya (2005). There are three sub factors entitled *guidance, teaching* and *classroom management* in the Likert type scale, which consists of 24 items. According to the validity and reliability of the study for the scale, the reliability values of sub dimensions of the scale were as follows; *guidance*, (.82), *teaching*, (.86) and *classroom management*, (.84). The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient calculated for all items in the scale was found to be (.93).

Data Analysis

When the data were analysed in the study, the attitude and self-efficacy scores were calculated for all respondents included in the sample concerning inclusion. While the Opinions Relative to Inclusive Scale was scored, taking positive and negative sentences into consideration, response categories were scored from positive to negative in the form from five to one whereas they were scored in the form of one to five in negative sentences. The highest and the lowest scores that could be obtained from the scale were determined to be 100 and 20 respectively. If the scores close to 100 points describe highly positive attitudes and scores close to 20 describe highly negative attitudes.

The Teacher Self-efficacy Perception Scale, was scored from efficient to inefficient in the form of one to nine values were calculated for total and sub dimensions and used in the interpretation of the data. The offset values ($8/9=0.89$) of the scale calculated for total scores are as follows:

Table 1
Scoring System of The Teacher Self-Efficacy Perception Scale

Category	Score Range
Inefficient	(1) 1.00 - 1.89
Inefficient	(2) 1.90 - 2.78
Inefficient	(3) 2.79 - 3.67
Moderately efficient	(4) 3.68 - 4.56
Moderately efficient	(5) 4.57 - 5.45
Moderately efficient	(6) 5.46 - 6.34
Efficient	(7) 6.35 - 7.23
Efficient	(8) 7.24 - 8.12
Efficient	(9) 8.13 - 9.00

Different statistical techniques for the data analysis were used in this study. For example, frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean and standard deviation statistics used in determining attitudes and self-efficacies of the participants. In addition, independent t-test statistics technique was used in comparing their attitudes and self-efficacies, and also regression analysis was used to determine to what extent self-efficacies affect their attitudes. As shown in Table 1, it indicates that the scoring system of the

teacher self-efficacy perception scale is rated between efficient and inefficient and scoring number is between one and nine (see the Table 1 for detailed information).

Results

In this section, the findings of this study are presented. The interpretations are presented in accordance with the two research questions of 1) what the self-efficacy and attitudes of pre-school teachers and student teachers towards inclusive education were and 2) what the relationship between self-efficacy and the attitudes on inclusion were. Therefore, the study investigated firstly, the teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education; secondly, their self-efficacy levels, and the degree to which self-efficacies predict attitudes. In each research question, three tables are presented and interpreted in terms of teachers' and student teachers' responses, and comparison of teachers and student teachers' responses.

Attitudes of Teachers and Student Teachers towards Inclusive Education

The first question *What were the attitudes of teachers and student teachers towards inclusive education?* was asked to the teachers and the student teachers. The teachers and the student teachers' responses were presented in terms of twenty attitude statements and total attitude scores. Some statistical values are given about total attitudes of teachers and student teachers in Table 2 and 3.

Table 2
Pre-School Teachers' Attitudes towards Inclusive Education

Score Range	N	\bar{x}	SS	Min.	Max.	Total Score	Number of Items	Positive attitude	
								f	%
								$\bar{x} = 69-100$	
I totally disagree (1) 20.00 - 36.00 I do not agree (2) 36.01 - 52.00 I am undecided (3) 52.01 - 68.00 I agree (4) 68.01 - 84.00 I totally agree (5) 84.01- 100.00	264	57.63	0.48	33	92	1521.00	20	15	5.3

When Table 2 is examined, total attitude scores of pre-school teachers towards inclusive education are 1521.00. The lowest and the highest are 33.00 (I totally disagree), and 92.00 (I totally agree) respectively. It is understood that among the teachers there are those who have totally positive attitudes as well as those who have totally negative attitudes. For example, the rate of teachers with a positive attitude was found to be merely 5.3 % among all teachers. When teachers' scores are examined in terms of arithmetic means, the mean turns out to be ($\bar{X}=57.63$). When these values are compared with the scores taken from the scale, they reflect the attitude of *I am undecided* (3) and indicate that pre-school teachers remained undecided towards inclusive education. It was found that the teachers exhibit a neutral attitude towards the additional burden which are increasing difficulty of classroom interaction, normal and special educational needs students' being effected positively or negatively, social benefits of inclusion, the teacher's need to get additional training about inclusion, benefits of inclusion, possible behavioural problems and confusion. This can be interpreted, which is not sufficiently to be aware of the importance of inclusive education. They cannot perform the practices required with inclusion and they are not sufficiently trained about inclusive education. In addition, they do not hold negative attitudes towards inclusive education.

As indicated in Table 3, total attitude scores of the student teachers trained for pre-school education are 11869.00. The lowest and the highest are 31.00 (I totally disagree), and 95.00 (I totally agree). Although some student teachers and the teachers have positive attitudes some of those both groups have negative attitudes. As indicated in Table 3, that overall attitude score of the student teachers is ($\bar{X}=59.94$). When this value is interpreted in terms of the scores that can be obtained from the scale, it reflects the attitude of *I am undecided* (3) This further indicates that the student teachers are undecided towards inclusive education. In other words, student teachers exhibit a neutral attitude towards inclusion because they feel that when they have students with SEN in their classrooms they may have additional burden due to the fact that some have difficulties interacting with the students without SEN. The teachers also need to have additional training about effective inclusion, benefits of inclusion, possible behavioural problems reflected by the students in the classroom. This situation may reflect the

Table 3
Student Teachers' Attitudes towards Inclusive Education

Score Range	N	\bar{x}	SD	Min.	Max.	Total score	Number of items	Positive attitude	
								f	%
								$\bar{x} = 69-100$	
I totally disagree (1) 20.00 - 36.00 I do not agree (2) 36.01 - 52.00 I am undecided (3) 52.01 - 68.00 I agree (4) 68.01 - 84.00 I totally agree (5) 84.01 - 100.00	198	59.94	9.71	31	95	11869	20	24	11.6

student teachers who do not adequately appreciate the importance of inclusive education in terms of the behaviours they acquired during their education. It may equally be interpreted that they do not approach inclusive education negatively or that they are not impervious to it.

Table 4
A Comparison of the Attitudes of Teachers and Student Teachers towards Inclusive Education

Group	N	\bar{x}	SD	t	p
Teacher	264	57.63	7.74	2.766	0.006
Student Teacher	198	59.94	9.71		

As shown in Table 4, differences are obtained between the attitudes of pre-school teachers and student teachers towards inclusive education. Whereas teachers' attitude mean score towards inclusion education was ($\bar{X}=57.63$), student teachers' mean score was ($\bar{X}=59.94$). Despite the fact that the attitudes of both teachers and student teachers were indecision, student teachers' attitudes were more favourable than the teachers' attitudes ($t=2.766$, $p<0.05$). Although the teachers' attitudes were *undecided* in comparison with the student teachers' attitudes their scores reflect negative attitudes. The reason for this may be that student teachers' emotions and ideas concerning inclusive education have been formed on the basis of theory even if they have some practical experiences. Therefore, it can be said that student teachers feel the importance of inclusive education more strongly and believe in its social relevance more than the teachers because they may be less aware of the difficulties of inclusive education in Turkish schools.

Self-Efficacy Perceptions of Teachers and Student Teachers

In the second research question of this study, the question asked of *What are the self-efficacy perceptions of teachers and student teachers?* In seeking answers to this question, teachers and student teachers were asked a total of 24 questions on guidance, teaching and classroom management and their perceptions of self-efficacy were determined. Some statistical values regarding the self-efficacy perceptions of teachers (Table 5) and student teachers (Table 6) are given below while Table 6 presents t-test results for a comparison of their self-efficacy perceptions.

In terms of arithmetic means concerning pre-school teachers' self-efficacy perceptions, as shown in Table 5, their self-efficacy perception means are; ($\bar{X}=7.37$) for their efficacy in guiding students, ($\bar{X}=7.49$) for teaching, ($\bar{X}=7.54$) for classroom management and their overall self-efficacy perception mean is ($\bar{X}=7.47$). It can be said that not only do teachers have high self-efficacy in all sub dimensions but they also have high overall self-efficacy, which means that they consider themselves as being efficient. The number of teachers who do not consider themselves as being efficient does not reach 10% among all teachers. This can be interpreted that teachers' self-confidence concerning their teaching is high. Teachers generally believe that they can answer students' difficult questions in class, guiding students according to their individual differences, appropriate methods, techniques and strategies for effective education. These bring about desired behavioral changes, prevent undesirable situations that might arise in class, and set and enforce classroom rules. The fact that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions turned out to be high can be attributed to their pre-service education, their in-service training, their teaching experience and the length of service or it might be that they assess their self-efficacy according to the traditional view of education.

As indicated in Table 6, arithmetic means of student teachers' self-efficacy perceptions are ($\bar{X}=7.09$) for guiding students, ($\bar{X}=7.15$) for teaching, ($\bar{X}=7.14$) for classroom management and ($\bar{X}=7.13$) for

Table 5
Teachers' Perceptions of their Self-Efficacy in Inclusive Education

Dimensions	Score Range	N	\bar{x}	SD	Min.	Max.	Total Score	Number of Items	Efficient	
									f	%
									$\bar{x} = 6.38$	
Guidance	Inefficient (1) 1.00 - 1.89	264	7.37	0.70	5.50	9.00	1909.38	8	241	91.1
	Inefficient (2) 1.90 - 2.78									
	Inefficient (3) 2.79 - 3.67									
	Moderately efficient (4) 3.68 - 4.56									
	Moderately efficient (5) 4.7 - 5.45									
	Moderately efficient (6) 5.46 - 6.34									
	Efficient (7) 6.35 - 7.23									
	Efficient (8) 7.4 - 8.12									
	Efficient (9) 8.13 - 9.00									

Dimensions	Score Range	N	\bar{x}	SD	Min.	Max.	Total Score	Number of Items	Efficient	
									f	%
									$\bar{x} = 6.38$	
Teaching	Inefficient (1) 1.00 - 1.89	264	7.49	0.78	4.50	9.00	1961.75	8	247	93.5
	Inefficient (2) 1.90 - 2.78									
	Inefficient (3) 2.79 - 3.67									
	Moderately efficient (4) 3.68 - 4.56									
	Moderately efficient (5) 4.57 - 5.45									
	Moderately efficient (6) 5.46 - 6.34									
	Efficient (7) 6.35 - 7.23									
	Efficient (8) 7.24 - 8.12									
	Efficient (9) 8.13 - 9.00									

Dimensions	Score Range	N	\bar{x}	SD	Min.	Max.	Total Score	Number of Items	Efficient	
									f	%
									$\bar{x} = 6.38$	
Classroom Management	Inefficient (1) 1.00 - 1.89	264	7.54	0.76	5.25	9.00	1961.13	8	247	93.5
	Inefficient (2) 1.90 - 2.78									
	Inefficient (3) 2.79 - 3.67									
	Moderately efficient (4) 3.68 - 4.56									
	Moderately efficient (5) 4.57 - 5.45									
	Moderately efficient (6) 5.46 - 6.34									

	Efficient (7) 6.35 - 7.23 Efficient (8) 7.24 - 8.12 Efficient (9) 8.13 - 9.00											
Dimensions	Score Range	N	\bar{x}	SD	Min.	Max.	Total Score	Number of Items	Efficient			
									f	%		
									$\bar{x} = 6.42$			
Overall Self-Efficacy Perception	Inefficient (1) 1.00 - 1.89 Inefficient (2) 1.90 - 2.78 Inefficient (3) 2.79 - 3.67 Moderately efficient (4) 3.68 - 4.56 Moderately efficient (5) 4.57 - 5.45 Moderately efficient (6) 5.46 - 6.34 Efficient (7) 6.35 - 7.23 Efficient (8) 7.24 - 8.12 Efficient (9) 8.13 - 9.00	264	7.47	0.68	5.42	8.83	1920.71	24	243	92.0		

Table 6
Student Teachers' Perceptions of their Self-Efficacy in Inclusive Education

Dimensions	Score Range	N	\bar{x}	SD	Min.	Max.	Total Score	Number of Items	Efficient	
									f	%
									$\bar{x} = 6.38$	
Guidance	Inefficient (1) 1.00 - 1.89 Inefficient (2) 1.90 - 2.78 Inefficient (3) 2.79 - 3.67 Moderately efficient (4) 3.68 - 4.56 Moderately efficient (5) 4.57 - 5.45 Moderately efficient (6) 5.46 - 6.34 Efficient (7) 6.23 Efficient (8) 7.24 - 8.12 Efficient (9) 8.13 - 9.00	264	7.09	0.91	4.25	9.00	1404.13	8	160	80.8

Dimensions	Score Range	N	\bar{x}	SD	Min.	Max.	Total Score	Number of Items	Efficient	
									f	%
									$\bar{x} = 6.38$	
Teaching	Inefficient (1) 1.00 - 1.89 Inefficient (2) 1.90 - 2.78 Inefficient	264	7.15	1.04	4.00	9.00	1415.50	8	161	83.3

(3) 2.79 - 3.67 Moderately efficient										
(4) 3.68 - 4.56 Moderately efficient										
(5) 4.57 - 5.45 Moderately efficient										
(6) 5.46 - 6.34 Efficient										
(7) 6.35 - 7.23 Efficient										
(8) 7.24 - 8.12 Efficient										
(9) 8.13 - 9.00										

Dimensions	Score Range	N	\bar{x}	SD	Min.	Max.	Total Score	Number of Items	Efficient		
									f	%	
										$\bar{x} = 6.38$	
Classroom Management	Inefficient (1) 1.00 - 1.89	264	7.14	0.99	4.25	9.00	1413.63	8	156	79.8	
	Inefficient (2) 1.90 - 2.78										
	Inefficient (3) 2.79 - 3.67										
	Moderately efficient (4) 3.68 - 4.56										
	Moderately efficient (5) 4.57 - 5.45										
	Moderately efficient (6) 5.46 - 6.34										
	Efficient (7) 6.35 - 7.23										
	Efficient (8) 7.24 - 8.12										
	Efficient (9) 8.13 - 9.0										

Dimensions	Score Range	N	\bar{x}	SD	Min.	Max.	Total Score	Number of Items	Efficient		
									f	%	
										$\bar{x} = 6.42$	
Overall Self-Efficacy Perception	Inefficient (1) 1.00 - 1.89	264	7.13	0.92	4.58	8.96	1411.08	24	160	80.8	
	Inefficient (2) 1.90 - 2.78										
	Inefficient (3) 2.79 - 3.67										
	Moderately efficient (4) 3.68 - 4.56										
	Moderately efficient (5) 4.57 - 5.45										
	Moderately efficient (6) 5.46 - 6.34										
	Efficient (7) 6.35 - 7.23										
	Efficient (8) 7.24 - 8.12										
	Efficient (9) 8.13 - 9.00										

overall self-efficacy perception means. It is understood that the student teachers' self-efficacy is high in all sub dimensions and so is their overall self-efficacy, which means that they perceive themselves to be efficient. One-fifth of the student teachers do not consider themselves quite efficient. On the other hand, it should not be ignored that self-efficacy perception of student teachers is slightly above the medium level. However, it can still be suggested that pre-school student teachers have sufficient self-confidence concerning teaching. They believe that they can guide their students according to their

individual differences using appropriate teaching methods, techniques and strategies for their effective education. In turn, they can make the desired behavioral changes and prevent undesirable situations that might arise in class. It may be said that student teachers' pre-service education is highly influential with their high self-efficacy perceptions.

Table 7
A Comparison of the Self-Efficacy Perceptions of Teachers and Student Teachers in Inclusive Education

Dimensions	Group	N	\bar{x}	SD	t	p
Guidance	Teacher	262	7.37	.70	3.592	0.0001
	Student	198	7.09	.91		
Teaching	Teacher	262	7.49	.78	3.836	0.0001
	Student	198	7.15	1.04		
Classroom Management	Teacher	262	7.54	.76	4.460	0.0001
	Student	198	7.14	.99		
Overall Efficacy	Teacher	262	7.47	.68	4.446	0.0001
	Student	198	7.13	.92		

In Table 7, there are differences between self-efficacies of pre-school teachers and student teachers. The teachers' self-efficacies seem to be higher than those of student teachers' self-efficacies. According to the results of the t-test which indicates whether these differences were meaningful or not, the difference between teachers and student teachers was found to be significant at the level of 0.05 in terms of both *general* self-efficacy ($t=4.446$, $p<0.05$) and *guidance* ($t=3.592$, $p<0.05$), *teaching* ($t=3.836$, $p<0.05$) and *classroom management* ($t=4.460$, $p<0.05$) self-efficacies. It shows that self-efficacies of pre-school teachers are higher than the student teachers, which means that they consider themselves as being efficient. This is believed that this result comes from their teaching experiences and the practices.

The Degree to which Self-Efficacy Perceptions of Teachers and Student Teachers Predict Their Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education

In the third sub question, the question was whether the self-efficacy perceptions of teachers and student teachers predict their attitudes towards inclusive education. To answer this question, first, attitudes of teachers and student teachers towards inclusive education were determined using the attitude scale. Second, their self-efficacy perceptions concerning guidance, teaching and classroom management were determined using the self-efficacy scale. Finally, their self-efficacy perceptions were investigated. Table 8 and Table 9 give the results of the regression analyses and to what extent self-efficacy perceptions of teachers and student teachers respectively predict their attitudes towards inclusive education.

Table 8
Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Concerning the Extent to which Teachers' Self-Efficacies Predict Their Attitudes towards Inclusive Education

Variable	B	SH _B	β	t	P	Dual r	Partial r
Constant	58.820	5.338		11.020	.000		
Guidance	-1.185	1.168	-.107	-1.014	.312	-.030	-.064
Teaching	2.855	1.068	.286	2.674	.008	.066	.166
Classroom Management	-1.846	1.149	-.179	-1.607	.109	-.037	-.101

$R=0.17$ $R^2=0.029$ $F=2.506$ $P=0.060$

As indicated in Table 8, when dual and partial correlations between teachers' self-efficacies (predictive variables) and their attitudes towards inclusion (predicted) are examined, a positive correlation ($r=0.07$), though at a rather low level, was observed only between the self-efficacy concerning teaching and attitudes towards inclusion. When the other variables are checked, the correlation between the variables increases ($r=0.17$) but that the correlation is again at a low level. Though at a low level, the fact that the correlation is low means that the increase in teachers' self-efficacy positively effects and changes their attitudes towards inclusion. Teachers' self-efficacy perceptions concerning their guidance, teaching and classroom management and their attitudes towards inclusion do not yield a significant relationship ($R=0.17$, $R^2=0.029$, $p>0.05$). The three variables in question account for only

3% of the total variance regarding teachers' attitudes. This indicates that other variables have effects on teachers' attitudes towards inclusion.

According to regression analysis coefficients (β), though a significant effect is not observed, the relative order of significance of predictive variables for attitude scores regarding inclusion is; (1) teaching, (2) classroom management and (3) guidance. When the t-test results concerning the significance of regression coefficients are examined, it appears that of the three predictive variables, only the teaching self-efficacy is a significant predictor of attitudes towards inclusion.

Table 9
Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Concerning the Extent to which Student Teachers' Self-Efficacies Predict Their Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education

Variable	B	SH _B	β	t	P	Dual r	Partial r
Constant	59.794	5.517		10.838	.000		
Guidance	.180	1.306	.017	.138	.890	-.002	.010
Teaching	1.076	.883	.129	1.219	.224	.045	.087
Classroom Management	-1.239	1.213	-.133	-1.022	.308	-.027	-.073
R= 0.097		R ² =0.009		F= 0.611		P=0.609	

In Table 9, dual and partial correlations between self-efficacies of student teachers and their attitudes towards inclusion did not yield a significant relationship. From the point of the accuracy of regression model, student teachers' self-efficacy perceptions concerning guidance, teaching and classroom management and their attitudes towards inclusion do not yield a significant relationship (R=0.097, R²=0.009, p>0.05). The three variables in question account for only 1% of the total variance regarding student teachers' attitudes. This indicates that other variables such as appropriate settings for education of children with SEN have also effects on student teachers' attitudes towards inclusion.

Discussion

When the results obtained from the study are examined, neither teachers nor student teachers have positive attitudes towards inclusion; in other words, their attitudes towards inclusive education are ambivalent. In another study conducted in Turkey by Tuğrul, Üstün, Akman, Erkan and Şendoğdu (2002), it was concluded that teachers working at pre-schools have favourable attitudes towards inclusive education. However, in other countries, the researchers (Eiserman, Shisler, & Healey, 1995; Dinnebeil, McInerney, Fox, & Juchartz-Pendry, 1998) reported that pre-school teachers believed that children with SEN had to be placed in the environments of inclusive education but some of them were anxious about educating children with SEN because of having lack of enough information about their education in inclusive settings.

According to the results of the studies (Diken, 1998; Avcı & Ersoy, 1999), it can be argued that preschool teachers both in Turkey and other countries such as America and England have positive attitudes towards inclusive education because of quality of inclusion. There are two factors determining the quality of inclusive education in preschools. These are the quality and nature of pre-school environments (Odom, 2000). According to Kircaali-İftar (1998), students with special educational needs in pre-school period should be included in pre-school education programmes where their peers attend or they can attend separate special education schools/classes. Whichever of these programmes is concerned, the education programme of the students with SEN should be individualised. Short and long term goals should be determined for each of the areas of children's development according to the level of their functions. Activities should be prepared and implemented to get the student with SEN to attain the planned goals. Other studies (Diken, 1998; Avcı & Ersoy, 1999), show that the implementation of inclusive education in pre-school period and the initial results of the study are taken into consideration, the reason for the negative attitudes of teachers and student teachers towards inclusive education may be from the policy of the Local Education Authorities with which financial support is not given to the schools to do this.

According to Cook, Tankersley, Cook and Landrum (2000), another important factor determining the quality of inclusive education is the teachers' and student teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. Additionally, Alghazo and Gaad (2004) said that teachers, who need to learn how important their attitudes towards inclusive education are, have desires to accomplish inclusive education. In the light of this explanation, the attitudes of the teachers and the student teachers who are involved in the study are different towards inclusive education due to many reasons. For example, classrooms are not

properly equipped for inclusive education, as reflected in Sari (2007). Horne (1985) emphasized that if student teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education were positive starting with their education, their acceptance level for students with SEN could highly be increase. However, student teachers do not receive sufficient courses on inclusive education during their education in Turkey. Even with inservice training courses they do not benefit fully from in-service courses on inclusive education at the expected level, which indicates that teachers should have enough information about effective methods and techniques on effective inclusion.

Student teachers' attitudes towards inclusion are more positive in comparison with teachers. The fact that student teachers have just taken a course on special education can be suggested as the reason for their more positive attitude towards inclusion than the teachers' attitudes. As a matter of fact, Temel (2000) reported that teachers who took the course on *Education of children with special needs* consider themselves more efficient than those who did not regarding what should be done during the process of inclusion.

On the other hand, working conditions can be suggested as the reason for the negative attitudes of teachers towards inclusion in comparison with student teachers. In particular, factors such as working hours, physical conditions of classrooms, class size, lack of experts in schools to cooperate with regarding inclusive education, not benefiting from in-service courses and lack of enough knowledge about inclusive education can be cited as reasons for the lukewarm attitudes of teachers employed in the nursery classes of primary schools. Varlier and Vuran (2006) emphasised that pre-school teachers thought that students with SEN should receive pre-school education and this education should be given in inclusive environments. However, they can experience some difficulties in inclusive education in current conditions; moreover, they consider themselves inefficient and unsupported regarding students with SEN and therefore, feel themselves uneasy about the existence of inclusive students in their classes. As a result, they are unwilling to take part in the inclusive education, as reflected in Şahin (2004). Artan and Balat (2003) reported that although Turkish pre-school teachers do not have enough information about inclusion, they are keen on receiving information. In crosscultural studies concerning inclusive education, it was found that German and American teachers have more positive attitudes than Ghanaian, Filipino and Israeli teachers. It was reported that especially German teachers fostered a positive attitude despite the fact that they did not receive an official special education regarding inclusive education (Leyser, Kapperman, & Keller, 1994). The suitability of the working conditions, environments and programmes of inclusive education where inclusive education will be conducted can be cited as the reasons for German teachers' positive attitude towards this kind of education.

When the results of the study concerning self-efficacy levels are examined, it is observed that both teachers and student teachers consider themselves efficient regarding teaching and that teachers consider themselves more efficient than the student teachers in terms of self-efficacy. This is an expected result because the limited field experience of student teachers can be cited as the reason for the difference between themselves and the teachers regarding self-efficacy. According to Bandura (1997), the strongest source for a belief in self-efficacy is the experience which an individual lives directly. Individuals' possessing a positive view of their performances as a result of these experiences increases their self-efficacy. Another result of the study indicated that a positive relationship is observed between pre-school teachers' perception of teaching efficacy and their attitudes towards inclusion. In other words, as the pre-school teachers' self-efficacy concerning teaching increases, their attitudes towards inclusive education positively change. On the other hand, no relationship was determined between self-efficacy perception of guidance and classroom management and their attitudes towards inclusion.

Absence of a relationship between the perception of teaching efficacy and attitudes towards inclusive education can be attributed to the fact that teaching dimension is approached in a theoretical framework. In other words, when teachers do not believe that they can successfully apply the teaching methods and techniques in inclusive classes, they think that they may have hesitations about how they can implement guidance and classroom management issues in these classrooms. The reason underlying this thought might be that teachers do not have prior experience of inclusive education, nor do they have information and skills. In some studies related to this subject (Soodak et al., 1998; Buell et al., 1999; Weisel & Dror, 2006), a relationship was found between teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and their attitudes towards inclusion. As teachers' self-efficacy perceptions increase, so do their positive attitudes towards inclusive education. Teachers with low self-efficacy have negative attitudes towards inclusive education (Podell & Soodak, 1993; Soodak et al, 1998) and are not receptive to it. On the

other hand, conflicting results were obtained in other studies (Bender et al., 1995). Researchers arrived at the conclusion that if teachers' efficacy concerning inclusive education is enhanced, inclusive education will take place successfully (Mohd Ali, Mustapha, & Mohd Jelas, 2006). Therefore, authorities in the Ministry of Turkish National Education should support all pre-school teachers through in-service training courses. When the relevant literature is examined (Bender et al., 1995), it may be said that teachers, who can define pragmatic meanings of inclusion, can manage the inclusive classroom at the expected level. Accordingly, while legal regulations are being made concerning inclusive education in a detailed way, the views of teachers working in this field should be taken into account. Nevertheless, it was emphasised in studies (Bender et al., 1995) that although many teachers were aware of inclusive policies, possessed enough knowledge and skills in this regard and acknowledged the significance of inclusive education, they believed that it was hard to implement in terms of national education policies and the support systems for effective inclusion.

The last finding of the study is that there is no relationship between student teachers who consider themselves as being efficient in classroom management, guidance and teaching and their attitudes towards inclusive education. This can be attributed to the fact that student teachers do not have enough knowledge about inclusive education. Although they have course on inclusive education, they have very limited experience to practice their knowledge in inclusive classes. When programmes of department of nursery education are examined a number of special education courses, particularly courses on inclusive education, are very limited and that there are not opportunities for practice in inclusive education classes. In other words, it can be argued that student teachers may graduate without acquiring the necessary knowledge, skills and qualities regarding inclusive education.

Conclusion

Attitudes of pre-school teachers and student teachers towards inclusive education are neutral. They exhibit neither a positive nor a negative attitude towards inclusive education. However, attitudes of the teachers towards inclusive education are in tendency to be negative more than the student teachers' attitudes. Self-efficacy perceptions of pre-school teachers and student teachers are high because both groups regard themselves as being efficient in teaching. However, the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions concerning guidance, teaching and classroom management are higher than the student teachers' perceptions. Self-efficacies of pre-school teachers and student teachers are not major predictors of their attitudes towards inclusive education. The teachers' self-efficacies related to teaching yield a slightly significant relationship with their attitudes towards inclusion and as the teachers' self-efficacies concerning teaching increase their attitudes in a positive way. Therefore, these teachers can accept any student with SEN into the classroom to meet their needs adequately. However, some teachers in Turkey are reluctant to accept any student with SEN due to the fact that they have lack of self-efficacies leading to lack of adequate knowledge on effective education of a child with SEN.

Recommendations

The recommendations raised from the conclusion of the study should be considered by the experts in developing countries like Turkey. The recommendations presented include the following listed below.

(1) Curricula of Nursery Education Departments of the Universities should be revised and courses entitled inclusive education and all the students should receive its implications for practice.

(2) All teachers should follow in-service education organised by the Ministry of National Education on inclusive education and their duration should be extended.

(3) While policies are being revised regarding inclusive education, the views of teachers working in inclusive schools should be taken into account.

(4) The school and classroom environments where inclusive education will take place should be rearranged to meet the needs of children with SEN.

(5) Experts who will provide assistance to the pre-school teachers should also work with the school staff and necessary supports should be offered to the teachers when they need.

These recommendations should be practiced in all educational institutions to be able to meet the needs of children with SEN in inclusive schools. Otherwise, teachers may have difficulties harmonizing the individual differences in inclusive classrooms in developing countries. This may lead to not having effective inclusion in preschools without meeting needs of the children.

References

Alghazo, E. M., & Gaad, E. E. N. (2004). General education teachers in the United Arab Emirates and their acceptance of the inclusion of students with disabilities. *British Journal of Special Education*, 31(2), 94-99.

- Altman, B. M. (1981). Studies of attitudes toward the handicapped: The need for a new direction. *Social Problems*, 28, 321-337.
- Anderson, R.J., & Antonak. R. F. (1992). The influence of attitudes and contact on reactions to persons with physical and speech disabilities. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 34, 240-47.
- Antonak, R. F., & Larrivee, B. (1995). Psychometric analysis and revision of the opinions relative to mainstream scale. *Exceptional Children*, 62(2), 139-140.
- Artan, İ., & Balat, G. (2003). Okul öncesi eğitimcilerinin entegrasyona ilişkin bilgi ve düşüncelerinin incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 11(1), 65-80.
- Aşkar, P., & Umay, A. (2001). İlköğretim matematik öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin bilgisayarla ilgili öz-yeterlik algısı. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21,1-8.
- Avcı, N., & Ersoy, Ö. (1999). Okul öncesi dönemde entegrasyonun önemi ve uygulamalarda dikkat edilecek noktalar. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 144, 68-70.
- Bacon, E. H., & Schultz, J.B. (1991). A survey of mainstreaming practices. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 14(2), 144-149.
- Bahadır, A.K. (2002). Modernitenin Yıkıcı Etkileri Karşısında Savunmasız İnsan. *Selçuk Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13, 129-142
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundation of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive View*. Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Newyork: Freeman.
- Bailey, D. B., & Wolery, M. (1992). *Teaching infants and preschoolers with disabilities*. Columbus, OH: Macmillan.
- Beattie, J. R., Anderson, R. J., & Antonak, R. R. (1997). Modifying attitudes of prospective educators toward students with disabilities and their integration in to regular classrooms. *Journal of Psychology*, 131, 245-260.
- Beckwith, J. B., & Matthews, J. M. (1994). Measuring comfort in interacting with people with intellectual disabilities. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 46, 53-57.
- Bender, W. N., Vail, C. O., & Scott, K. (1995). Teachers' attitudes toward increased mainstreaming: Implementing effective instruction for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 28(2), 87-94.
- Buell, M. J., Gamel-McCormick, M., & Hallam, R. A. (1999). Inclusion in a childcare context: Experiences and attitudes of family childcare providers. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 19, 217-224.
- Chandler, P. (1994). *A Place for me: Including children with special needs in early care and education settings*. Washington DC: NAEYC.
- Cole, K. N., Dale, P. S., & Mills, P. E. (1991). Individual differences in language delayed children's responses to direct and interactive preschool instruction. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 11(1), 99-124.
- Cook, B. G., Tankersley, M., Cook, L., & Landrum, T. J. (2000). Teachers' attitudes toward their included students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 67(1), 115-135.
- Çapa, Y., Çakıroğlu, J., & Sankaya, H. (2005). Öğretmenlik öz yeterlik ölçeği Türkçe uyarlamasının geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 30 (137), 74-81.
- D'Alonzo, B. J., & Ledon, C. (1992). Successful inclusion of children with disabilities with nondisabled peers in early intervention and preschool settings. *The Transdisciplinary Journal*, 2, 277-283.
- Diken, İ. H. (1998). *Sınıfta zihin engelli çocuk bulunan ve bulunmayan sınıf öğretmenlerinin zihin engelli çocukların kaynaştırılmasına yönelik tutumlarının karşılaştırılması*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Bolu: Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi.
- Dinnebeil, L. A., McInerney, W., Fox, C., & Juchartz-Pendry, K. (1998). An analysis of the perceptions and characteristics of child care personnel regarding inclusion of young children with special needs in community based programs. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 18, 118-128.
- Eiserman, W. D., Shisler, L., & Healey, S. (1995). A community assesment of preschool providers' attitudes toward inclusion. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 19, 149-167.
- Gözün, Ö., & Yıkılmış, A. (2003, Kasım). Öğretmen adaylarının kaynaştırma konusunda bilgilendirilmelerinin kaynaştırmaya yönelik tutumlarının değişimindeki etkililiği. 13. Ulusal Özel Eğitim Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri, Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Hakim, C. (1987). *Research design: Strategies and choices in the design of the social research*. London: Allen & Unwin

- Horne, M. D. (1985). *Attitudes toward handicapped students: Professional, peer and parent reactions*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Hyde, M., & Power, D. (2004). Inclusion of deaf students: An examination of definitions of inclusion in relation to findings of a recent Australian study of deaf students in regular classes. *Deafness and Education International*, 6, 82-99.
- İzci, E. (2005). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının “özel eğitim” konusundaki yeterlikleri. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4, 106-114.
- Jobe, D., Rust, J. O., & Brissie, J. (1996). Teachers' attitudes toward inclusion of students with disabilities into regular classrooms. *Education*, 117(1), 148-154.
- Karasar, N. (1986). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*, Ankara: Bilim Kitabevi.
- Kırcaali-İftar, G. (1992). Kaynaştırma becerileri öz değerlendirme aracı. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5, 119-129.
- Kırcaali İftar, G. (1997). *Kaynaşturmaya ilişkin görüşler ölçeği'nin geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması*. Yayınlanmamış Araştırma Raporu, Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Kırcaali İftar, G. (1998). Erken çocukluk ve okul öncesi dönemlerinde özel eğitim. in S. Eripek (Editör), *Özel Eğitim* (pp. 29-35). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Larriee, B., & Cook, L. (1979). Mainstreaming: A study of the variables affecting teachers' attitude. *Journal of Special Education*, 13(3), 315-324.
- Leyser, Y., Kapperman, G., & Keller, R. (1994). Teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming: A cross-cultural study in six nations, *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 9, 1-15.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (1997). *573 Special Education Legislation*. Ankara: The Ministry of National Education Publications.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2006). *Özel Eğitim Hizmetleri Yönetmeliği (madde 4)*. Ankara: The Ministry of National Education Publications.
- Metin, N., & Çakmak, H. (1998, Kasım). *İlköğretim okullarındaki eğitimcilerin özürü çocuklarla normal çocukların kaynaştırıldığı programlar hakkındaki düşüncelerinin incelenmesi*. 8.Ulusal Özel Eğitim Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri, Edirne:Trakya Üniversitesi.
- Mohd Ali, M., Mustapha, R., & Mohd Jelas, Z. (2006). An emprical study on teachers' perceptions towards inclusive education in Malaysia. *International Journal of Special Education*, 21(3), 13-18.
- Nizamoğlu, N. (2006). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin kaynaştırma uygulamalarındaki yeterliklerine ilişkin görüşleri*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Bolu: Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi.
- Odom, S. L. (2000). Preschool inclusion: What we know and where we go from here. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 20(1), 20-27.
- Özyürek, M. (1988). *Engelli Kişilere Yönelik Değiştirilen Tutumların Sürekliliği*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Özyürek, M. (1989). İşitme Engellilerde Normalleştirme. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi*, 2(2), 107-111.
- Podell, D. M., & Soodak, L.C. (1993). Teacher efficacy and bias in special education referral. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86, 247-253.
- Robson, C. (1997). *Real world research: A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sarı, H. (2005). An analysis of the relationships between identity patterns of Turkish deaf adolescents and the communication modes used in special residential schools for the hearing impaired and deaf. *Deafness and Education International*, 7(4), 206-222.
- Sarı, H. (2007). The influence of an in-service teacher training (INSET) programme on attitudes towards inclusion by regular classroom teachers who teach deaf students in primary schools in Turkey. *Deafness and Education International*, 9(3), 131-146.
- Sharp, C. (2002). Study support and the development of self regulated learner. *Educational Research*, 44(1), 29-42.
- Soodak, L. C., & Podell, D. M. (1994). Teacher efficacy and student problem as factors in special education referral. *Journal of Special Education*, 27(1), 66-81.
- Soodak, L. C., Podell, D. M., & Lehman, L. R. (1998). Teacher, student and school attributes as predictors of teachers' responses to inclusion. *The Journal of Special Education*, 31(4), 480-497.
- Stewart, C. (1990). Effect of practical types in preservice adapted physical education curriculum on attitudes toward disabled populations. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 10, 76-83.
- Şahbaz, Ü. (1997). *Öğretmenlerin özürü çocukların kaynaştırılması konusunda bilgilendirilmelerinin kaynaşturmaya ilişkin tutumlarının değişmesindeki etkililiği*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Bolu: Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi.
- Şahin, N. (2004). Hegel Felsefesinde Kötülük Problemi, *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, XLV, 1, 71-83.

- Temel, Z. F. (2000). Okul öncesi eğitimcilerinin engellilerin kaynaştırılmasına ilişkin görüşleri, *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18, 148 -155.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17 (7), 783-805.
- Tuğrul, B., Üstün, E., Akman, B., Erkan, S., & Şendoğdu, M. C. (2002). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin özel eğitime gereksinim duyan çocukların normal yaşlılarıyla kaynaştırılmasına ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *MEÜ Tıp Fak Dergisi*, 3(4), 440-448.
- Uysal, A. (2003, Kasım). *Kaynaştırma uygulaması yapan öğretmenlerin kaynaşturmaya ilişkin görüşleri: Özel eğitimden yansımalar*, 13. Ulusal Özel Eğitim Kongresi Bildirileri, Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Varlıer G., & Vuran, S. (2006). Okul öncesi eğitim öğretmenlerinin kaynaşturmaya ilişkin görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 6(2), 553-585.
- Vuran, S. (2005). İlköğretim düzeyindeki kaynaştırma sınıflarında eğitim alan özel gereksinimli öğrencilerin sosyometrik konumları. *EJER Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 18.
- Yıkılmış, A., Şahbaz, Ü., & Peker, S. (1998, Kasım). *Özel eğitim danışmanlığı ve kaynaştırma dersinin öğretmen adaylarının kaynaşturmaya yönelik tutumlarına etkisi*. 8. Ulusal Özel Eğitim Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri, Edirne: Trakya Üniversitesi.
- Yıkılmış, A. (2006). *Zihin engelli çocuklara çarpma işlemleri'nin öğretiminde etkileşim ünitesi ile sunulan öğretimin etkililiği*. 16. Özel Eğitim Kongresi'nde Sunulan Bildiri, Samsun: 19 Mayıs Üniversitesi.
- Weisel, A., & Dror, O. (2006). School climate, sense of efficacy and Israeli teachers' attitudes toward inclusion of students with special needs. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1(2), 157-174.