



International Journal of psycho-educational sciences

## Integrated Education Receiving Students during Socialization According to Teacher Opinions

Durmuş KILIÇ<sup>5</sup>, Aytaç ŞAHİN<sup>6</sup>, Şükrü ADA<sup>7</sup>, & Yavuz SÖKMEN<sup>8</sup>

### Abstract

---

<sup>5</sup> Assoc. Dr. Atatürk University, Turkey

<sup>6</sup> Classroom Teacher, Provincial Directorate of National Education, Turkey,

<sup>7</sup> Assoc. Prof. Dr. Atatürk University, Turkey

<sup>8</sup> Res. Assist., Atatürk University, Turkey

*In this research, examining of primary education classroom teachers' integrated students' socialization levels in terms of several variables is being targeted. Research population and sampling are comprised of 102 first-grade teachers from 26 primary schools of Erzurum Provincial Directorate of National Education in Turkey between 2009-2010 school years. As a tool to collect data, "Integrated Education Survey" was used. This survey was used by Battal (2007) and its reliability and validity was confirmed. According to the variables in the statistical analyses, t-test was used to find out whether there was a difference between two groups in terms of socialization levels of integrated students and one way ANOVA was used to find out whether there was a difference between socialization levels of three or more integrated student groups. According to the research results, it is found out that there were major differences between socialization levels of integrated students according to their class teachers' faculty of graduation*

**Key words:** Integration, Integrated Education, Special Education, Classroom Teacher.

## **Introduction**

Education is a process of change and development, helping the individual to build up social skills. In this process, developing social skills is needed to ensure that some students benefit the most of academic education. Self sufficiency in social skills, peer and teacher acceptance, success in after school/professional life and independent continuation of life is increasingly related with integration (Zirpoli ve Melloy, 1997).

Should the literature be examined, a variety of definitions are available for integrated education. Integration is the practice where children with special needs are placed in normal education classes (Osborne ve Dimattia, 1994). Integration is an educational outcome of normalisation principle which was first put forward in Scandinavian countries in 1970's and spread to Europe and America later on, with the ideal of "providing everyone with equal educational opportunities" (Diler, 1998, Sucuoğlu, 2006 ).

The approach of the school to integration is in parallel of its personnel's beliefs since negative attitudes have the tendency to reduce the potential of integration (Elliott ve McKenney, 1998). The classroom teacher, under every class circumstance is a strong mediator especially in the integration of children with special needs to classes where normally developing children are present, in terms of social climate and behaviour of the class (Walker ve Lamon, 1987).

Every child is different from the other physically, consciously and emotionally. However, in children among whom there are major differences, general education proves to be insufficient and special educational services are needed. (Eripek, Özyürek ve Özsoy, 1996).

Individuals who are in need of special education also need to be included in the educational environment, socialize as normal class students and determine their status in the society. Integrated education environment is such that it aims enabling disabled children to become self sufficient without being separated from the society, by interaction among peers. (Jenkinson, 1997, Gottlieb ve Leyser, 1996; Kuz, 2001; Kayaoğlu, 1999; Lewis ve Doorlag, 1999).

Many researchers share the view that teachers lack knowledge on how the attitude regarding integration and, education and support services provided to individuals with special needs should be (Barton, 1992; Batu, 1997; Diken, 1998; Familia-Garcia, 2001; Mağden ve Avcı, 1999; Metin ve Güleç, 1998; Sargin, 2002). Despite the availability of some researches regarding classroom teachers on this issue (Akçamete ve Kargin, 1994), it was not possible to

find researches focusing on in-service and pre-service information provided to branch teachers regarding integration.

In this research, identification of problems faced by integrated education receiving students during their socialization process is being targeted according to teachers' opinion. In the research, answers were sought for the following questions.

1. Is there any difference between class teachers' seniorities and integrated students' socialization levels?
2. Is there any difference between class teachers' sexual differences and integrated students' socialization levels?
3. Is there any difference between class teachers' faculty of graduation and integrated students' socialization levels?
4. Is there any difference between class teachers' attending class and integrated students' socialization levels?
5. Is there any difference between class teachers' in-service trainings and integrated students' socialization levels?

## **Method**

### *Method of Research*

This research is a general screening type descriptive study which is aimed at determining the socialization levels of primary school integrated students. General screening models are, in a multi member population, screening arrangements made on the entire population or a group, example or sample extracted from the population with the purpose of reaching a general conclusion on the population (Karasar, 2006).

### *Population and Sampling*

Research population comprises first-grade classroom teachers from primary schools of Erzurum Provincial Directorate of National Education in Turkey between 2009-2010 school years. A total of 102 class teachers from 26 schools, one of which is private, located within the boundaries of Erzurum Province, Central Palandöken and Çat Towns constitute the sampling of this research.

### *Data Collection methods and analyses*

In the development of data collection tools used in this research the master thesis "Evaluation of the Abilities of Classroom Teachers and Branch Teachers on integrated Education" by Battal (2007) was made use of. The reliability and validity of the survey was verified by experts and hereby "Integrated Education Survey" was developed and used. In the analyses of the collected data, variables of classroom teachers' seniorities, education levels, gender, attended classes and in-service training were used.

Initially, frequencies and percentage distributions of teachers who took part in the survey are given according to variables. Afterwards, for each variable, arithmetic average and standard deviation are given for determining socialization levels of integrated students. According to the variables, t-test was used to find out whether there was a meaningful difference between two groups of integrated students in terms of socialization levels and one way ANOVA was used to find out whether there was a meaningful difference between three or more groups of integrated student in terms of socialization levels. In the event where a

meaningful difference was noticed, LSD test among Post Hoc tests was conducted. In testing the hypothesis, the lowest level of significance is accepted as 0.05

## Findings

Table 1. *Arithmetic Average and Standard Deviation for Integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' Seniorities.*

Seniority	X	N	Ss
1-5 years	3.41	29	0.65
6-10 years	3.16	26	0.64
11-15 years	3.37	19	0.80
16-20 years	3.57	18	0.84
21 and over	2.89	10	0.68
Sum	3.32	102	0.73

According to Table 1; 1-5 years senior classroom teachers' integrated students' arithmetic average of socialization levels is ( $X=3,41$ ), 6–10 years senior classroom teachers' ( $X=3,16$ ), 11–15 years senior classroom teachers' ( $X=3,37$ ), 16–20 years senior classroom teachers' ( $X=3,57$ ) and 21 years and more senior classroom teachers' ( $X=2,89$ )

Table 2. *One way ANOVA Test Results for Integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' Seniorities.*

Variance source	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	p
Intergroup	3.92	4	0.98	1.92	.113
In group	49.50	97	0.51		
Sum	53.41	101			

$p < .05$

In Table 2, it is apparent that there is not a meaningful difference between Integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' Seniorities ( $p < .113$ ).

Table 3. *T-test results for Integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' Gender*

Gender	N	X	SD	t	p
Male	52	3.40	0.74	1.18	.24 *
Female	50	3.23	0.71		

In Table 3 it is apparent that there is not a meaningful difference between integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' Gender ( $t: 1.18$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

Table 4. *Arithmetic Average and Standard Deviation Values for Integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' Faculty of Graduation*

Graduation	X	N	SD
Faculty of Education	3.31	55	.65
4 years college of education	3.59	6	1.02
2 years institute of education	2.59	7	.61
Faculty of Arts and Sciences	3.55	21	.81
Other	3.23	13	.62
Sum	3.32	102	.72

According to Table 4; arithmetic average of integrated students' socialization levels according to faculty of education graduated classroom teachers is ( $X=3,31$ ), four years college of education graduated classroom teachers is ( $X=3,59$ ), two years institute of education graduated classroom teachers is ( $X=2,59$ ), faculty of arts and sciences graduated classroom teachers is ( $X=3,55$ ) and other faculties and schools graduated classroom teachers is ( $X=3,23$ )

Table 5. *One way ANONA Test Results for Integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' Faculty of Graduation*

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	p
Intergroup	5.53	4	1.33	2.69	.036
In group	48.09	97	0.50		
Sum	53.41	101			

$p < .05$

In table 5 it is apparent that there is a meaningful difference between Integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' Faculty of Graduation ( $p < .05$ ). In order to find out in which groups the differences emerge, groups were compared in doubles with LSD test. According to results achieved; between 2 years institute of education and faculty of education, 4 years college of education and faculty of arts and sciences there is a meaningful difference in favour of faculty of education, 4 year college of education and faculty of arts and sciences. Meaningful differences between other groups could not be observed. According to these results, it can be concluded that classroom teachers' faculty of graduation is determinant on integrated students' socialization levels.

Table 6. *Arithmetic Average and Standard Deviation Values for Integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' attending classes*

Grades	X	N	Ss
1. Grade	3.13	16	.77
2. Grade	3.32	21	.68
3. Grade	3.24	19	.77
4. Grade	3.49	28	.65
5. Grade	3.27	18	.82
Sum	3.32	102	.73

According to Table 6; arithmetic average of integrated students' socialization levels according to 1. Grade attending classroom teachers is ( $X=3,13$ ), 2. Grade attending classroom teachers is ( $X=3,32$ ), 3. Grade attending classroom teachers is ( $X=3,24$ ), 4. Grade attending classroom teachers is ( $X=3,49$ ) and 5. Grade attending classroom teachers is ( $X=3,27$ )

Table 7. *One way ANOVA Test Results for Integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' Attending Classes*

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	p
Intergroup	1.56	4	.39	.73	.574
In group	51.85	97	.54		
Sum	53.41	101			

$p < .05$

In Table 7 it is apparent that there is not a meaningful difference between integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' attending classes (  $p > .05$  ). According to these results it can be concluded that attending classes of classroom teachers is not determinant on integrated students socializing levels.

Table 8. *T-test results for Integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' in-service training on integration.*

<b>In-Service Training</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Ss</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
Received	51	3.38	.77	.86	.40
Not Received	51	3.25	.68		

$p < .05$

In table 8 it is apparent that there is not a meaningful difference between Integrated Students' Socialization Levels, in Terms of Classroom Teachers' in-service received training (t: .86,  $p > .05$ ).

## **Discussion and Conclusion**

Findings achieved reveal that it is important for classroom teachers to receive pre-service and in-service trainings on integrated education. Findings of this research show similarities with the results achieved of other researches on the same issue (Chow, 1976; Kilgor, 1982; Leyser ve Abrams, 1983). Fulfilment of the needs in the class, establishing and sustaining healthy interactions in the class, acceptance of children with special needs to class, school and even society largely depends on the teacher (Avcı, 1998).

It is considered beneficial in terms of their socialization that individuals with special needs receive education with normal class students. When increasing numbers of disabled persons also in Turkey, as in the rest of the world be taken into consideration, integrated education must be efficiently sustained (Şahin, 2010).

It is found out that there isn't a meaningful difference between integrated students' socialization levels and classroom teachers' seniorities ( $p < .113$ ). According to this result, seniorities of classroom teachers taking part in this research, not being effective on integrated students' socialization levels can be explained by insufficient pre-service and in-service training. This is in parallel with the assertion of Kayaoğlu (1999), indicating that teachers' being unequipped on this issue creates negative attitudes and prevents integration programme from succeeding.

In the researches of Larivee and Cook (1979), Bain and Dolbel, (1991) it is revealed that experience, knowledge of integration and in-service training in teachers play an important role in developing positive attitudes. These assertions do not match with the research findings. It is evident that there is not a meaningful difference between classroom teachers' attending classes and socialization levels. It can also be asserted that results are similar in terms of classroom teachers' attending different grade classes.

It is believed that including of compulsory integration lessons to classroom teacher and branch teacher undergraduate programmes will have a positive influence on teachers' attitudes towards integration and accordingly increase the success of integration. As per the findings of this research, there is a meaningful difference between integrated students' socialization levels in terms of classroom teachers' faculty of graduation. That this difference is in the favour of four year faculty can be explained with classroom teachers' wider knowledge on integration training. According to these findings, the following could be brought forward:

For getting a successful result from integration education, training of classroom teachers and families is important. In-service training implementations concerning integration education can be carried out in a more effective way. Conducting activities that will increase the social acceptance of integration students among normal class students may prove to be useful. The scope of the integration education related courses given in educational institutes should be broadened and more application-oriented studies have to be carried out.

This research was limited with 102 classroom teachers serving in the 2009-2010 school year, within 26 schools under the Provincial Directorate of National Education of Erzurum, Turkey. Due to this reason, evaluating the findings of the research by considering this limitation will be convenient.

## References

- Akcamete, G. & Kargin, T. (1994). Effect of in-service training programs on the teachers' attitudes towards the hearing impaired. *Special Education Magazine*, 1(4), 13–19.
- Avci, N. (1998). Integration and integrated classroom teacher. *Destek*, 1(1), 20–24.
- Bain L.& Dolbel S.(1991). *The Handbook of Stuttering* (5th. Ed.)Sandiego: Singular Publishing Group.
- Barton, M. L. (1992). *Teachers' opinions on the implementation and effects of mainstreaming*.  
Web:<http://www.ericfacility.net/servlet/com.artesiotech.servlet.search.SearchServlet?action=9>. internet.
- Battal, I.(2007). *Evaluation of Classroom and Branch Teachers' Competency on Integration Education*, (Unpublished Postgraduate Thesis), Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Afyon.
- Batu, S. (1997). Knowledge and views of primary and secondary education organization teachers concerning the handicapped and integration. Fourth National Congress of Education Sciences, Eskisehir.
- Chow, S. H. L. (1976). *Effects of a mediated training course on teachers and students in mainstreaming programs*.  
<http://www.ericfacility.net/servlet/com.artesiotech.servlet.search.SearchServlet?action=9>. Internet.
- Diler, N. (1998). *Concept of integration, integration implementations and things to do for effective integration*. Eight National Congress of Special Education, Edirne.
- Diken, H. İ. (1998). *Comparison of the attitudes of teachers that have and don't have mentally disabled children in their classes, concerning the integration of mentally disabled children*. (Unpublished Postgraduate Thesis), Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.
- Elliot, D., & McKenney M. (1998). Four inclusion models that work. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 30(4), 54-58.
- Eripek, S., Ozyürek, M. ve Ozsoy, Y. (1996). *"Mentally Retarded Children" Introduction to Special Education*. Karatepe Publications, Ankara.
- Familia-Garcia, M. (2001). Special and regular education teacher's attitudes towards inclusive programs in an urban community school. New York City Board of Education. U.S., New York.

- Gottlieb, J. & Leyser, Y.( 1996). ‘Attitudes of Public School Parents Toward Mainstreaming: Changes Over a Decade’, *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 23(4), 12-28.
- Jenkinson, J.C. (1997). *Mainstreaming or special? Educating students with disabilities*, Routledge Press, London and New York .
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Scientific Research Method*, Nobel Publication Distribution, Ankara.
- Kayaoglu, H.(1999). Effect of Informative Program on the Normal Classroom Teachers’ Attitudes towards the Hearing Impaired Children within the Integration Environment, (Unpublished Postgraduate Thesis), Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Kilgore, A.M. (1982). *Implementing educational equity practices in a field-based teacher education*. Nebraska: The National Conference of the Association of Teacher Educators.
- Kuz, T. (2001). *Examination of Attitudes towards Integration Education*, T.R. Prime Ministry, Administration for Disabled People Publications /17, Ankara.
- Larrivee, B. & Cook, L. (1979). Mainstreaming: a study of the variables affecting teacher attitude. *The Journal of Special Education*, 13 (3), 315–24.
- Leyser, Y., & Abrams, P.D. (1983). A shift to the positive: An effective programme for changing pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward the disabled. *Educational Review*, 35(1) 35–43.
- Lewis B.R.. & Doorlag. H.D. (1999). *Teaching special students in general education classrooms*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc..
- Mağden, D., & Avcı, N. (1999). *Views of teacher candidates concerning integration of handicapped students*. The Fourth National Congress of Educational Sciences, Eskisehir.
- Metin, N., & Guleç, H. (1998). *Examination of primary school educationists’ opinions concerning the programs where handicapped children are integrated with normal children*. The Eight National Congress of Special Education, Edirne.
- Osborne ,A. G.& Dimattia, P.(1994). “The Least Restrictive Environment Mandate: Legal Implications” *Exceptional Children* , 61,1:6-14.
- Sahin, A. (2010). *Examination of the Problems Experienced in the Process of Socializing by Students Educated Through Integration According to the Teachers’ Views*, (Unpublished Postgraduate Thesis), Ataturk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Erzurum.
- Sargin, N. (2002). *A study on the teacher attitudes towards the mentally handicapped children in nursery classes*. Declarations of the Eleventh National Congress of Education. Konya: Education Bookshop Publications.
- Sucuoglu, B. and Kargin T. (2006). *Integration Implementations in Primary Education*, Morpa Culture Publications, Istanbul.
- Zirpoli, T.J. & Melloy, K.J.( 1997). *Behavior management: Applications for teachers and parents*, An Imprint of Prentice Hall, Merrill, New Jersey .
- Villa ,R.A ,Thousand ,J.S, Meyers ,H. & Nevin , A. (1996) Teacher and administrator perceptions of heterogeneous education .*Exceptional Children*,63 (1) ,29-45.



Walker, H. & Lamon, W. (1987). Social behavior standards and expectations of Australian and U.S. teacher groups. *Journal of Special Education*, 21, (3), 56-82.