KURAM VE UYGULAMADA EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES: THEORY & PRACTICE

Received: January 13, 2016
Revision received: September 9, 2016
Accepted: October 29, 2016
OnlineFirst: January 9, 2017

www.estp.com.tr
DOI 10.12738/estp.2017.2.0034 • April 2017 • 17(2) • 463–492

Research Article

Classroom Teachers' Behaviors and Peers' Acceptance of Students in Inclusive Classrooms

Hasan Avcıoğlu[1]
Cyprus International University

Abstract

The objective of this study is to determine the behavior of teachers in inclusive classrooms and peers' acceptance levels towards students with intellectual disabilities in these classrooms. The qualitative research method was selected for collecting adequate data for the study. Information was collected from 16 teachers and 371 students in 16 inclusive classrooms in four schools where the inclusive method is used, and data were collected through observation, interviews, and socio-metric assessment. As a result of the observation process, differences were determined to exist between classroom teachers' and students' interactions. Furthermore, the findings demonstrated differences between the interactive behavior of classroom teachers toward students with normal development and toward those with intellectual disabilities in the classroom. However, the findings obtained from the face-to-face interviews with classroom teachers and the findings obtained from observations were also seen to not be the same; teachers stated they had not displayed different behavior towards the students in general. Furthermore, the peers with normal development were observed to prefer half of the students with intellectual disabilities, while the other half was not preferred by any peer. The behavior of the teachers in the classroom and their interactive behavior with the students were found to affect students' interactions, which in turn differentiated the level that students with normal development accepted those with intellectual disabilities.

Keywords

Inclusion • Teacher behavior • Interactive behavior • Peer acceptance • Students with intellectual disabilities

1 **Correspondence to:** Hasan Avcıoğlu (PhD), Department of Special Education, Cyprus International University, Nicosia, North Cyprus Mersin 10 Turkey. Email: hasanavcioglu@gmail.com

Citation: Avcıoğlu, H. (2017). Classroom teachers' behaviors and peers' acceptance of students in inclusive classrooms. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *17*, 463–492. http://dx.doi.org/10.12738/estp.2017.2.0034

Educational environments should be designed in different ways based on the requirements of students with special needs. These environments vary between general education classrooms where these children can coexist with their normally developing peers and special boarding educational institutions as based on their needs. While deciding which educational environment to place these students in, they should be placed to primarily receive education in general education classrooms alongside their peers with normal development if there is no adequate reason to not do this. Based on their abilities, each student with special needs should participate at the highest possible level in academic and non-academic in- and out-of-class services and activities alongside their peers with normal development (Avcıoğlu, 2015).

In the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (2004), inclusion stipulates placing students with special needs in the general education classroom. Similarly, Statutory Decree No. 573, published in 1997 in Turkey, establishes that educating individuals who require special education is to be conducted using adequate methods and techniques at every type and level of educational institutions alongside their peers in accordance with their designed individual education plans (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [MEB], 1997). Inclusive education is defined in Special Education Services Regulation (MEB, 2015) as a special educational application where individuals who require special education receive their training in public and private preschool, primary, secondary, and non-formal education institutions alongside their peers without disabilities by providing supportive educational services. Placing students with special needs alongside their normally developing peers through the practice of inclusion is considered to be able to create an opportunity for these students' successful social interaction (Westwood, 1997). Thus, applying inclusive education is thought to be able to develop social interaction and peer-acceptance between students with special needs and their peers who demonstrate normal development (Avcıoğlu, 2008).

When peers with normal development accept students with special needs, significant opportunities for emotional, social, academic, lingual and intellectual development of these children can result. Thus, providing social acceptance and, therefore, social integration among students can mark the beginning of an important opportunity for both students with normal development and those with special needs (Avcıoğlu, 2008). Students who are not accepted by their peers carry the scars from this not just during school years but throughout their entire life. Therefore, peer relations and peer acceptance can be quite significant for school-age children (Özaydın, Tekin-İftar, & Kaner, 2008).

In addition to providing for special needs students' disabilities, one needs to provide the necessary support services and active applications for students who are not accepted by their peers due to an incompetence in social interaction skills (Craig-

Unkefer & Kaiser, 2002). Applying inclusive education is led by support services and practices like developing and implementing social integration programs and enabling positive relationships among students in class. Families, students, school administrations, physical environments, and teachers factor in implementing these programs and establishing positive relationships among students in class (Avcıoğlu, 2008; Odluyurt & Batu, 2010). However, the most significant factor are teachers who play a significant role especially in meeting the needs of students in class, as well as establishing and maintaining in-class interactions (Odluyurt & Batu, 2010).

Interactive behavior and communication styles between teachers and students have quite a significant function within the classroom. The type of communication and interactive behavior that the teacher uses in class affects student behavior and becomes a model for students (Gürsel, 2005). Mutual social interaction between teachers and students in school and class affect students' achievements and learning process, as well as inter-student behavior in particular (Birch & Ladd, 1998; Crosnoe, Johnson, & Elder, 2004). Thus, teachers should pay attention to their in-class interactive behaviors and create a positive classroom environment. Students' in-class behaviors can demonstrate very different characteristics. These differences can be affected by students' individual traits, as well as teachers' behaviors and attitudes towards the students in class. Creating a positive class environment can also affect students' admiration and respect for the teacher. Teachers who are admired and respected by their students can positively influence students. As a result, students' positive in-class behaviors increase and interactive behaviors among students improve (Erden, 2000). The results of studies conducted on interactive behaviors between teachers and students in interactive-classroom schools demonstrate that teacher behavior and student behavior directly correlate (Greenwood & Carta, 1987). At the same time, these studies show that when teachers positively change their behavior, student behavior can also change as a result of active classroom management (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). This finding implies that teacher behaviors affect student behavior, especially social behavior (Denham & Burton, 1996).

Several studies have been conducted over inclusive applications. These studies mostly focus on determining the views of teachers, school administrators, parents with or without children with special needs (Atay, 1995; Diken, 1998; Kayaoğlu, 1999; Öncül & Batu, 2005; Özbaba, 2000; Turhan, 2007; Uysal, 1995), peer relations (Batu & Uysal, 2007), the academic development of students with special needs participating in inclusive applications (Çolak, 2007; Deretarla, 2000; Vuran, 2005), their social skills, and their condition (Baydık & Bakkaloğlu, 2009; Vuran, 2005). In addition to these, studies have also investigated teachers' in-class behaviors (Akalın, 2007; Marzano & Marzano, 2003; Sazak-Pınar & Güner-Yıldız, 2013; Uysal, Akbaba Altun, & Akgün, 2010; Wallace, Anderson, Bartholomay, & Hupp, 2002) but were

predominantly observed attempting to determine the correlation between teacher behavior and students' academic achievement.

These studies' findings provide significant information on inclusive applications. However, the information obtained from these studies can instead be seen covering the effects of inclusive education on children with special needs and the problems that occur during implementation, as well as determining the relations between teacher and students and social relations among peers. Furthermore, interviews, attitude scales, and surveys were for the most part used as data collection instruments in these studies. In addition to the limited number of studies examining teacher-student interactive behavior in inclusive applications using direct observation, no study determined the level of peer-acceptance of students with intellectual disabilities or the in-class behaviors of these classroom teachers.

Social acceptance of students with intellectual disabilities within the classroom, school and society is considered to be quite significant, and classroom teachers play a significant role in providing this acceptance. Thus, determining teachers' in-class behaviors in inclusive applications and how students with intellectual disabilities are accepted by their peers in the same class in this study will fill an important gap in the literature. Therefore, the aim of the study is to determine teachers' in-class behaviors in inclusive applications, as well as the level of peer-acceptance towards students with intellectual disabilities in these classes. For this purpose, answers to the following questions are investigated: (a) What in-class behaviors do teachers who instruct inclusive classrooms have towards the students?, (b) What are these teachers' views on the behavior they exhibit towards the students in the classroom?, (c) What are their views on the level of acceptance towards students with intellectual disabilities by students with normal development?, and (d) What are the levels of acceptance towards students with intellectual disabilities by students with normal development?

Method

Research Model

The qualitative research method was used to collect data in this study. Qualitative research is defined as a method where qualitative processes are adopted to realistically and holistically demonstrate perceptions and events in their natural environment using qualitative data collection methods such as observations, interviews, and document analyses (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008).

Participants

Data were collected from the selected working group (classroom teachers who instruct predetermined inclusive classrooms and students with intellectual disabilities and students with normal development who attend the inclusive classrooms) for the study. Data were collected by research practitioners (undergraduate students who worked as observers in inclusive classrooms in a department for learning how to teach individuals with intellectual disabilities and the author).

Working group. The present study was conducted in primary schools within the municipality of Nicosia in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC), which has inclusive classrooms. The present study group included classroom teachers who have inclusive students in their primary school classrooms, students with intellectual disabilities, and students who demonstrate normal development. To determine the working group for the study, meetings were held with the Directorate of Primary Education for TRNC's Ministry of Education to identify the number of schools that have inclusive students. The author was informed that Nicosia has 54 inclusive students in 6 schools within its borders.

However, students taking their internship course in the Department of Teaching Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities at Cyprus International University were chosen for the study because of the time it would take to observe teachers' in-class behaviors, the classroom teachers, and the students from these schools. After determining the inclusive classrooms/schools where the study would be conducted, the author informed the classroom teachers instructing these classes about the aim and content of the study. Teachers were informed that no interviews would be conducted with them within the context of the study nor would observations be conducted in their classrooms and that their classrooms would be excluded from the study if they chose not to participate in the study. After this information was passed along, only teachers who volunteered and their respective students were included in the study's working group. Data in the study were collected from 16 teachers working in 16 inclusive classrooms in 4 schools that implement inclusive classrooms and the 371 students attending these classes. The participants included 12 female and 4 male teachers, 10 female and 6 male students with intellectual disabilities, and 162 female and 193 male students with normal development.

Research practitioners. During the study, undergraduate students from a department for learning how to teach individuals with intellectual disabilities observed the in-class behaviors of inclusive teachers and played such a part in data collection process. The author collected data using interview and socio-meter technique application.

Individuals that conducted in-classroom observation. Because 16 teachers voluntarily participated in the research process, 32 students were chosen to be observers in these teachers' classrooms. The students were selected from a teaching department for individuals with intellectual disabilities and who had elected to take school practice and inclusion applications courses. The author trained these students to use the observation forms developed by the author to observe teachers' in-class behaviors in their inclusive classrooms. Detailed information was provided about the teacher behaviors they needed to observe, the teacher-behavior observation form, how to use the form, how to impersonally record their observations by focusing on teachers' in-class behaviors instead of any one-on-one conversations outside of class and by focusing on the behaviors mentioned in the teacher-behavior observation form instead of all the behaviors exhibited by teachers during observation, and how to record their observations and observational results onto the teacher-behavior observation form. Students who were trained as observers had previously taken the courses, "Applied Behavioral Analysis" and "Educational and Behavioral Assessment;" this provided them with preliminary information about observation.

Researcher. The researcher works as a faculty member in a university, and has instructed educational-behavioral measurement and assessment, inclusion and support special educational services, daily life with individuals with intellectual disabilities and social skills, school practice and inclusive applications, and practice courses undergraduate programs in teaching individuals with intellectual disabilities during certain semesters. Therefore, the researcher is experienced in topics such as inclusion applications, student evaluations, and social acceptance in these courses. The researcher developed the observation form and interview questionnaire and collected interview and social acceptance data.

Data Collection

In compliance with the general objective of the study and to answer the questions designed for the sub-objectives of the study, the qualitative research techniques of semi-structured interviews, structured observations, and socio-metric evaluations were used together in the present study for collecting the necessary data. Information about the utilized data collection tools and methodology are provided below.

Data collection from interviews. The semi-structured interview technique was used to determine the views of participating classroom teachers on the in-classroom behavior they exhibit towards students with normal development and students with intellectual disabilities. An interview form containing semi-structured questions was developed by the researcher for data collection purposes. The semi-structured questions on the interview form were constructed from the interviews conducted with teachers during the classroom visits performed within the context of school experiences and

inclusion applications using the information collected from the literature review. A total of eight questions were initially prepared, after which expert opinions on these questions were obtained from three experts on special education. After receiving the expert opinions, interviews were conducted with three inclusive classroom teachers to obtain their opinions about the constructed semi-structured questions. As a result of the expert opinions and teacher interviews, these questions were determined suitable for collecting the targeted data, as they are clear and comprehensible. No alterations were made to the questions as a result of the expert opinions and teacher interviews. After the research questions were finalized, the classroom teachers were approached to determine the date and time for the interviews. The researcher explained the objective of the study to the teachers before conducting the interviews. The researcher particularly stressed the utmost significance that teachers express their views on the questions without reservation. Furthermore, the researcher explained to the teachers the great importance of keeping interviews fluent and recording all conversations during the interviews with a voice recording device for the study, stressing that the researcher and only one other special education expert would listen to session recordings. It was explained to the teachers that, in addition to their replies to the predetermined questions, they could add anything they wanted anytime they wished, and if the teachers had any questions about the interview questions during the interview, the researcher would answer these promptly. After these instructions, the interviews were conducted at the predetermined time and day in the teachers' respective classrooms with the interview questions asked in the predetermined order.

Data collection from observations. Data on the behavior of classroom teachers instructing inclusion classrooms towards students who exhibit normal development and students with intellectual disabilities were collected using the structured observation technique. According to Ekiz (2003), the structured observation technique applies observations based on a predetermined and constructed format over situations that occur in educational environments that need to be observed. The teacher-behavior observation form was developed by the author to examine inclusive classroom teachers' in-class behaviors. A literature review on teachers' in-class behaviors was conducted for designing the observation form (Çalışkan, 2003; Dağlı & Öner, 2002; Güçlü, 2000; Sünbül, 1996; Terzi, 2002), and a list of behaviors was constructed as a result. Expert opinions were obtained for this constructed list. It was then reexamined based on these expert opinions and similar behaviors were excluded from the list. The final list includes 58 behaviors. Afterwards, these behaviors were grouped under three main topics: interactive teachers' behavior towards the students (TSIB), their behavior towards undesirable (negative) student behavior (TBUSB), and their behavior towards positive student behavior (TBPSB). Teachers' in-class interactive behaviors toward students included 26 behaviors under TSIB, 26 under TBUSB, and 5 under TBPSB. These inclusion teachers' in-class behaviors, grouped

under three topics, were examined by three special education experts to obtain their views on the designed observation form. After this, interviews were conducted with three classroom teachers to obtain their views on the behaviors included on the observation form. This process was undertaken to see whether any behaviors had not been included on the observation form that needed to be, as well as to check its ability to observe and measure the behaviors included on the observation form. Afterwards, no amendments were made to the included behaviors. These behaviors are measured using a five-point rating observation form (1 – all the time; 2 – frequently; 3 – usually; 4 rarely, 5 – never). TBUSB questions 19, 20, 21, and 22 were reverse-scored. Behaviors on the observation form that observers did not witness were scored with a zero. Before collecting the study data, the researcher obtained proper approval for the procedure from the relative school administrators and informed the classroom teachers about the study, obtaining their approval as well. A total of 16 teachers participated in the study, and 2 observers were placed in each classroom. Undergraduate students who had been trained as observers were asked to observe the inclusive classroom teachers in class during the study one day per week over a 14-week period. Later on, they were asked to assess the teachers' in-class behaviors based on their observations using the most adequate scoring option next to the related behavior on the observation form. Observers completed the observation forms based on in-class observations separately for the teacher's behavior towards students with normal development and for the teacher's behavior towards students with intellectual disorders. Two observers in each class conducted two independent observations, and the researcher averaged the obtained data.

Data collection using socio-metrics. The socio-metrics technique was utilized for determining the level that peers socially accepted students with intellectual disabilities in the classroom. Socio-metric scoring, based on preference and ordering, evaluates the quality of relations among individuals in a group. This technique makes it possible to determine the level of preference that members of a group have for each other, while at the same time providing information on the group's interaction patterns. A socio-metric test was implemented in the study to arrive at a classification system of socio-metric status. In this test, students who have already prepared papers distributed by the researcher were asked to choice and write to the paper the name of three peers who they wanted to study, play and sit together with in the classroom.

Data Analysis

Frequency distribution and content analysis were used in analyzing the study data. Data analysis methods utilized in analyzing the interview, observation, and socio-metric data are discussed below.

Interview-data analysis. Data collected from the interviews were analyzed using content analysis and then digitizing the obtained data. Using the semi-structured interview and structured observation techniques utilized in the present study, all interviewees were asked same questions and the same observation form was used in an attempt to standardize the collected data. For the content analysis, interview questions were first scrutinized individually, and all teachers' responses were noted under the related question. As a result, the interview coding key was organized based on words repeated in the teachers' responses to each question of the interview form. This key includes the research questions and categories grouping their collected responses. Two experts independently evaluated selected interview forms based on the interview coding key. To determine the consistency of this evaluation, notes on the interview coding key and each teacher's responses were examined and compared for each question. Notes that agreed or disagreed were identified during this comparison. Options marked the same were accepted as agreement, and options marked with different choices were considered as disagreement. The following agreement rate formula was used to calculate the study's reliability (P = [NA / (NA + ND) x 100], where P = Percentage of Agreement; NA = Number of agreements, and ND = Number of disagreements; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Seventy percent agreement is considered acceptable when calculating reliability (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008). Reliability rates for each interview question were calculated in the study. The mean percentage of reliability for all questions (whose reliability range = 94-100%) was observed to be 97%. This finding reflected the research's reliability. Furthermore, data obtained for each question on the interview form were marked based on the choices depicted on the interview coding key. Thus the data became further and more easily comprehensible. For this purpose, frequency distributions were calculated for each question. These frequency distributions were assessed along with the quotes from the interviews to interpret the study's findings.

Observation-data analysis. The observation technique was used in this study to determine the integration classroom teachers' in-class behaviors towards students with normal development and students with intellectual disabilities. The frequency and percentages of observations that observers indicated for behaviors on the teacher-behavior observation form were calculated to determine the teachers' in-class behaviors. The study also scrutinized the fit between the observers' obtained scores. According to Özgüven (2005), observations should be conducted by as many observers as possible, and the same event should be observed together by many observers to prevent and control possible mistakes from individual observers. This study decided to observe teachers' classroom behavior using two observers in order to prevent and control any possible mistakes they could make during this kind of observation. Thus, each of the sixteen teachers' in-class behaviors were observed by two observers in each class, and the observer average was obtained from the data provided by each of

these two independent observers in order to test consistency. The Spearman correlation coefficient was used to assess the score averages from each of the two observers as obtained from simultaneous measurements in 16 classrooms. The agreement between the scores obtained from both observers was found to be significant ($r = 1.00$, $p < .01$). Based on these results, one can argue that the observers' observations and the information obtained from them in this study has been reliably collected.

Data analysis using socio-metrics. In the analysis of the data obtained with socio-metrics, students' answers (i.e., which friends they preferred in their classroom and the degree of preference) were first recorded onto the data assessment table. This process was performed for all students within the scope of the study, and students' scores were calculated based on the preference levels they received. Scores were calculated by assigning three points for preference "1," two points for preference "2," one point for preference "3," and zero points for no preference. Students' total scores were determined accordingly, as were the scores of students with intellectual disabilities in the inclusive classroom and their level of acceptance by peers with normal development. The reliability coefficient for the socio-metric results was examined based on the given criteria. Variations in correlations were observed based on different and similar occurrences of the given criteria. Three different criteria were given in this study, and the students were asked to choose three individuals for each of the three different measures. The correlations for preference related to students with normal development for students with special needs in the same class differed between .59 and .91 based on their preferences for "friend to study with," "friend to play with," and "friend to sit next to" in the inclusive classroom. The highest correlation was between the friends they would play games with and the friends they would sit together with; the lowest correlation was between the friends they would like to study with and the friends they would play with.

Findings

Teachers' In-Class Behaviors towards Students

This section discusses teachers' in-class behaviors demonstrated towards students with normal development (SND) and those with intellectual disabilities (SID). The frequencies and percentages of these behaviors are presented in Table 1 based on the in-class observations.

Table 1
Observational Findings on Teachers' In-Class Behaviors towards Students with Intellectual Disabilities and Students with Normal Development

	Always		Frequently		Often		Rarely		Never	
	SND	SID	SND	SID	SND	SID	SND	SID	SND	SID
Teachers' Interactive Behaviors toward Students										
1. Addresses students by name.	16	14				2				
2. Accepts students as they are.	10	9	1	1	4	3	1	3		
3. Develops empathy while interacting with students.	7	5	2	3	4	3	2	4	1	1
4. Is sympathetic while interacting with students.	11	8	2		3	4		4		
5. Approaches students with love and compassion.	12	9	1	3	3	2		2		
6. Respects students.	11	9	4	2		4	1	1		
7. Listens quietly to what students say.	11	11	3	2	1	1	1	1		1
8. Shows behaviors such as nodding the head, leaning forward, and smiling while listening to what students says.	10	9	2	1	2	3	2	2		1
9. Maintains same distance from all students during class (far or close).	10	10	4	2	1	2	1	2		
10. Communicates according to the student's level of development	9	8	6	2		5	1	1		
11. Values students' ideas.	10	8	5	3		1	1	4		
12. Acts fair and equal towards students.	9	6	3	5	3	3	1	2		
13. Shows consistent behavior towards students for the same situation.	10	8	2	2	3	5	1	1		
14. Always tries to solve students' problems with patience and understanding.	9	8	2	4	4	2		1	1	1
15. Encourages students to work independently.	7	7	2	2	3	2	4	4		1
16. Creates opportunities for students to take responsibility in class.	8	6	2	4	4	2	2	2		2
17. Works to reduce students' stress when realizing they are stressed in class.	6	6	2	3	3	1	5	5		1
18. Moves quickly to reduce/eliminate disruptions as they occur in class.		7	1	2	6	4	2	3	7	
19. Waits for 4-5 seconds to let students refocus when they get distracted from the current subject.		5	5	3	3	4	2	3	6	1
20. Helps students in their studies and supports their learning efforts.	1	7	2	2	1	2	2	4	10	1
21. Encourages, supports, and helps students who are frustrated by learning activities.		6	2	1	3	4	4	4	7	1
22. Supports students in their success.	8	8	3	3	3	1	2	3		1
23. Gives examples to students on how to study.	8	8	3	1	3	3	2	3		1
24. Draws and maintains students' attention of the students in class.	7	6	3	3	1	2	5	5		
25. Provides information about topics students have missed after they return from missing class.	5	4	2	4	5	3	3	3	1	2

Table 1
Observational Findings on Teachers' In-Class Behaviors towards Students with Intellectual Disabilities and Students with Normal Development

	Always		Frequently		Often		Rarely		Never	
	SND	SID	SND	SID	SND	SID	SND	SID	SND	SID
Teacher Behaviors toward Undesired (Negative) Student Behavior										
1. Tries to understand when students exhibit undesirable behavior.	8	7	2	5	4	3	2	1		
2. Ignores undesired student behavior that is transient/discontinuous.	8	7	4	5	2	3	2			1
3. Ignores attentive student behavior.	6	5	6	5		2	1	2	3	2
4. Warns the student (physical intervention) by touching (physical intervention) during an unwanted behavior.	4	12	2		5	3	3	1	2	
5. Warns the student verbally about the unwanted behavior.	10	8	1	2	5	2		4		
6. Speaks directly with students about undesirable behavior when undesirable (negative) student behavior is encountered.	7	8	2	2	4	2	2	4	1	
7. Attracts students' attention when there's undesirable student behavior.	8	4	1	5	6	5	1	2		
8. Warns students using body when there's undesirable student behavior.	5	8	3	4	5	3	2	1	1	
9. Warns by establishing eye contact when there is undesirable student behavior.	9	4	2	2	4	7	1	3		
10. Warns by approaching the student when there is undesirable student behavior.	5	7	4	2	3	3	3	4	1	
11. Warns silently when there is undesirable student behavior.	6	5		3	5	2	4	3	1	3
12. Warns by asking indirect questions when there is undesirable student behavior.	2	5	2	1	5	4	6	1	1	5
13. Verbally prompts the student who is exhibiting improper behavior to ask to speak.	6	2		4	5	3	3	3	2	4
14. Changes the seat of the student who exhibits undesirable behavior.	5	4	2	1	4	8	4		1	3
15. Interrupts teaching and reminds students of the rules when there's undesirable student behavior.	4	4	1	2	8	2	1	4	2	4
16. Adjusts the class to make students feel there is something wrong when undesirable student behavior is encountered.	4	3	1	3	1	2	6	6	4	2
17. Easily redirects students to a different topic than they were currently studying when undesirable student behavior is encountered.	4	4	2	2	4	4	5	2	1	4

Table 1
Observational Findings on Teachers' In-Class Behaviors towards Students with Intellectual Disabilities and Students with Normal Development

	Always		Frequently		Often		Rarely		Never	
	SND	SID	SND	SID	SND	SID	SND	SID	SND	SID
18. Exhibits the desired behavior herself/ himself to provide a role model when undesirable student behavior is encountered.	5	4	1		5	1	2	8	3	3
19. Reprimands students who exhibit undesirable behavior.	2	2	3	3	2	3	6	4	3	4
20. Gets angry with the students who exhibit undesirable behavior.	3	4	7	7	1	1	3	1	2	3
21. Shouts at students who exhibit undesirable behavior.	2	8	2	2	1	2	8	1	3	3
22. Says negative things to students who exhibit undesirable behavior.	2	3	1	2	3	2	2	4	8	5
23. Gives various responsibilities (i.e., classroom supervision, bringing in equipment, checking assignments) to students who exhibit undesirable behavior, thinking this will keep them interested more.	6	4	3	3	1	6	3		3	3
24. Talks about the reasons for and consequences of undesirable behavior with students who exhibit undesirable behavior when they do not change their behavior despite all warnings.	5	3	3	2	5	5		2	3	4
25. Resorts to punishment when all other methods fail to correct undesirable behavior.	4	6	1		6	4	3	1	2	5
26. Explains why they are being punished in detail when resorting to punishment.	8	6	1	2	4	2	1		2	6
27. Resorts to punishment commensurate with the behavior committed.	7	11	4	2	1	1		1	4	1
Teacher Behaviors Toward Positive Student Behavior										
1. Supports positive student behavior with gestures such as smiling.	13	8	2	4		2		1	1	1
2. Supports positive student behavior with positive words.	13	9	3	3		2		2	1	
3. Reinforces positive student behavior using primary and secondary reinforcements.	9	10	2	3	2	1	1	1	2	1
4. Emphasizes positive student behavior.	9	9	4	3	1	2	1	2	1	
5. Encourages students to repeat positive student behavior.	10	10	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1

Based on observers' in-class observations, one can see in Table 2 that classroom teachers mostly concentrate on the "Always" and "often" options for the following behaviors. Teachers were seen the most under the topics of "Teachers' Interactive Behaviors toward Students" addressing students by name (16 SND, 14 SID), approaching students with love and affection (13 SND, 12 SID), listening silently to what students are saying (14 SND, 13 SID), maintaining the same distance (far or

close) from all students during class (14 SND, 12 SID); and under "Teacher Behaviors toward Positive Student Behavior," supporting positive student behavior by using gestures such as nodding their head or smiling (15 SND, 12 SID), supporting positive student behavior with positive words (16 SND, 12 SID), emphasizing positive student behavior (13 SND, 12 SID), and encouraging students to repeat positive behaviors (13 SND, 13 SID).

Based on the in-class observations, one can see that classroom teachers are the least concentrated on the "never" and "rarely" options for the behaviors that follow. Classroom teachers are the least adapted to helping students in their studies, supporting students' learning efforts (12 SND, 5 SID); encouraging, helping, and supporting students who were frustrated with learning activities (11 SND, 5 SID); pausing instruction for 4-5 seconds and waiting to let students regain focus when necessary (8 SND, 4 SID); and concentrating on studies that reduce students' stress when noticing students are under stress (5 SND, 6 SID) under the topic of "Interactive Behavior of Teachers Towards the Students," and uttering negative words when they encounter undesirable student behavior (10 SND, 9 SID), making students feel that they have behaved undesirably by changing the course (10 SND, 8 SID), reprimanding students who exhibit undesirable behavior (9 SND, 8 SID), shouting at students who exhibit undesirable behavior (11 SND, 4 SID), and demonstrating desirable behavior themselves to provide a role model when encountering undesirable student behavior (5 SND, 11 SID) under the topic of "Teacher Behavior Towards Undesirable (Negative) Student Behavior."

As based on in-class observations, classroom teachers were concentrated more on the options of "always" and "frequently" with students having normal development compared to students with intellectual disabilities for the following behaviors: being sympathetic when interacting with students (13 SND, 8 SID), warning with eye contact when undesirable student behavior is encountered (11 SND, 6 SID), showing respect towards the students (15 SND, 11 SID), respecting students' ideas (15 SND, 11 SID), choosing communication appropriate to students' level of development (15 SND, 10 SID), encouraging positive student behavior with positive words (16 SND, 12 SID), and encouraging positive behavior using gestures such as nodding one's head or smiling (15 SND, 12 SID).

Classroom teachers were more concentrated on the options of "always," and "frequently" with students having intellectual disabilities compared to students with normal development based on in-class observations for the following behaviors: helping students in their studies and encouraging their learning efforts (3 SND, 9 SID); encouraging, supporting, and helping students who are frustrated in learning activities (2 SND, 7 SID); pausing the instruction for 4-5 seconds and waiting to

let students focus their attention again when necessary (5 SND, 8 SID); warning students who show undesirable behavior through touch (physical intervention; 6 SND, 12 SID); and warning using body language when undesirable student behavior is encountered (8 SND, 12 SID).

In-class observations show that classroom teachers were concentrated less on the options of "never" and "rarely" with students having normal development compared to students with intellectual disabilities for the following behaviors: being sympathetic in student interactions (4 SID), verbally warning the student who committed undesirable behavior (4SID), pausing instruction and reminding students of the rules when undesirable student behavior is encountered (3 SND, 8 SID), exhibiting desirable behavior themselves by providing a role model when undesirable student behavior is encountered (5 SND, 11 SID), talking about the reasons and consequences of undesirable behavior with students who exhibit this behavior when they don't change their behavior despite all warnings (3 SND, 6 SID), and explaining to students why they are being punished when a punishment is implemented (3 SND, 6 SID).

Classroom teachers were less concentrated on the "never" and "rarely" options with students having intellectual disabilities compared to students with normal development based on in-class observations for the following behaviors: helping students in their studies and encouraging their learning efforts (12 SND, 5 SID); encouraging, supporting, and helping students who are frustrated in learning activities (11 SND, 5 SID); acting quickly to reduce or eliminate when there is a disruption in class (9 SND, 3 SID); pausing instruction for 4-5 seconds and waiting to let students concentrate their attention again when necessary (8 SND, 4 SID); shouting at students who commit undesirable behavior (11 SND, 4 SID); and warning the student who committed undesirable behavior through touch (physical intervention; 5 SND, 1 SID).

Based on the in-class observations, teachers were determined to exhibit more interactive behaviors toward SNDs (X = 107.88, SD = 20.62) compared to SIDs (X = 99.94, SD = 27.24), exhibited more behaviors towards SNDs in response to negative student behavior (X = 94.19, SD = 18.92) compared to SIDs (X = 90.62, SD = 22.52), and exhibited more behaviors towards SNDs for positive student behavior (X = 21.62, SD = 5.30) compared to SIDs (X = 20.94, SD = 5.37).

Classroom Teachers Views on their In-Class Behaviors toward Students

Classroom teachers' behaviors toward students were scrutinized in the dimensions of teachers' interactive behaviors towards students, teachers' behaviors toward undesirable (negative) student behavior, and teachers' behaviors toward positive student behavior. In view of these three dimensions, teachers' views on the classroom

behaviors they exhibit towards students with intellectual disabilities (SID) and students with normal development (SND) were obtained and presented in this section.

Classroom teachers' views on their in-class behaviors towards students with intellectual disabilities.

What are your in-classroom interactions with students who have intellectual disabilities; how do you view these behaviors? Four of the 16 class teachers that participated in the study stated interacting with these students based on their interests; four stated determining their interactive behaviors by asking and deciding with the special education teacher; two stated making eye contact with the students; two stated generally motivating students' actions; one said trying to provide more guidance; and one stated providing feedback based on student behavior. Two teachers stated that neither they nor other students were able to interact with the student.

All teachers were determined to have stated that the in-class interactive behaviors they exhibited were effective.

> I try to make eye contact with the students who do not take warnings into account. I try to follow individual regulations. Then the students obey the rules. I'm trying to be as helpful as I can. I do not know if it was always like this or if it happened as of late. I observe student acting well in the classroom. (T2)

> First of all, I establish eye-contact. I ask his/her friends to act that way as well. Every morning I ask his/her friends to take the student in. While playing games, I would like them to include the student in the activities they engage in. (T4)

> He does not react to many things and is often unresponsive to his interactions with me. I usually make a star on his work as a reward for following the directions given. He interacts with me as a result. The necessary dialogue is also inadequate, as these behaviors are very limited. (T12)

> My student sits alone in the class. Sits alone! We tried to put somebody beside the student in the beginning, but the student now sits alone because we had problems as he tears and scribbles on others' books and disturbed them all the time. We try to do lettering studies suitable for him and try to make him replicate these. At first the student would not settle, but now he is better adapted to class rules. The student makes sounds, different kinds of sounds. In time, when he stopped making these sounds, he adapted better to his friends [stressing that they were not able to interact with their students]. (T7)

How do you behave towards students when a student with intellectual disabilities exhibits undesirable (negative) behaviors in class; how do you view your behavior? Of the 16 interviewed teachers, seven stated that they talked with the student; five stated that they were unresponsive; two teachers stated that they did not behave differently than with other students; and two stated that the behavior they exhibited changed based on the student in question. The teachers were determined to also express having positive results from the behavior they exhibited in the classroom.

> We immediately question whether it is proper or not. We tell him that his friends are uncomfortable and his behavior hurts them. As I said, namely, I get feedback from my friends as a result of positive or negative behavior based on one-to-one conversations and by establishing mutual eye contact: "Did your friend make you unhappy? Yeah, wouldn't you be happier if he did not do that? Yes, would you like to upset your friends?" The child then says no and then chooses not to act the same way in order not to upset them. We say things like that. (T11)

> Usually, I would like the student to stop and think, for example, when the student is late for class. He stays standing there at the blackboard for two minutes. If he is late together with the other children, they think for two minutes together; I tell them what their mistake was. By the way, I keep on instructing the class. When I give a break for two minutes or three minutes, I raise awareness by asking them what their mistake was, what they'd do if they were late, and tell them they should not be late at all. (T10)

> When a student with intellectual disability exhibits negative behavior in the classroom, I am unresponsive to the student at first because if I react to every negative behavior, it distracts the class's attention, causing it to fall apart. If the negative behavior persists, I communicate my feelings to that student first by mimicking. For example, I put a sad expression on my face, make a "no" with eyebrows or using sounds, or shake my head from left to the right. I make sure that the other students do not realize what I am doing so that class discipline does not deteriorate. If it goes on any further, I make sure that the student stops the undesired behavior by uttering single directives such as "no," "sit down," or "don't." (T13)

What are your behaviors toward students when a student with intellectual disability exhibits positive behavior in class; how do you view your behavior? Of the 16 teachers, 14 stated awarding the student with special needs in various forms when the student exhibits positive behavior in class. The remaining two teachers stated not doing anything different with special needs students compared to other students; they reacted the same way they did with normally developing students. All teachers consider their behavior positively. Teachers who stated rewarding positive behaviors also pointed out that these rewards encouraged the students more and were motivating.

> When the student with intellectual disabilities exhibits positive behavior, I try to reward the student and try not to remain indifferent. This award could be in the form of applauding, smiling face, expression of endearment, drawing a star on the student's hand, hugging, caressing the hair or the face. Sometimes these behaviors are not enough, because if the student is bored, no reward will work. (T8)

> To motivate the student, I say "Friends, your friend behaved like this, he was able to do it and made us happy." I reinforce it by saying, "Let's applaud him now!" Or if the student does not answer my question right away, I encourage him by saying, "Do you think you could give us an answer on this topic?" I try to ensure that the student provides feedback in the end, and I always appreciate the student's positive behavior. When the classmates observe good behavior, for instance, they also notice and exhibit their appreciation by saying, "Our friend has done so and so." (T3)

Classroom teachers' views on their in-class behavior towards students with normal development.

What are your in-classroom interactive behaviors toward students with normal development; how do you view your behaviors? All participating teachers replied to this question by stating that in class they behave towards students with normal development the same way they behaved towards the students with special needs. Among the participating teachers, 14 stated that they were satisfied with their behavior, while 2 accepted that they could behave better than they currently do.

> I treat them the same, based on the reward system. I mean, I'm not a teacher who punishes, but I am a disciplined teacher. I prefer talking over punishing. I ask students why they did it. I then ask if they know the consequences of their behavior. We then talk about the fact that they shouldn't repeat the behavior. When the student does something nice, I say 'You made me happy, I hope you are happy, as well." I would continue by saying "Later, you'll act even better," rewarding the student. (T14)

How do you behave towards students when students with normal development demonstrate undesirable (negative) behavior in the classroom; how do you view your behavior? Thirteen teachers responded to this question by stating that they exhibit the same behavior towards students with normal development and students with intellectual disabilities when students act undesirably. One teacher stated first issuing a warning, another stated reacting to the behavior, while another stated always behaving appreciatively. Furthermore, all teachers believed their behavior under these circumstances to be adequate and effective.

> In fact, it's almost the same. I do not compare my regular students with my students with special needs. I treat them all equally. I try to engage in the same kind of dialogue socially and display the same interest because, every child is equal to me. I try to show the same warnings, give the same motivation, to all the same way; no one is to be disregarded or superior to me. (T8)

> I apply the same methods to students with normal development. However, these methods might be more successful with normally developing students compared to students with intellectual disabilities because one can get more successful results and feedback from students with normal development. I also can make lengthy suggestions about the students' misconduct. (T9)

Teachers who stated that they behaved towards students with intellectual disabilities differently shared their experiences as follows:

> I initially react; if a student exhibits improper behavior, I will tell them clearly "I don't like it; that behavior is not nice." I also tell the student what the behavior is that I don't like. I tell them how to behave and what I want. If the student does the same behavior again, I ask the student to take their chair and go over to the side and think about what they did. They already are used to this. If they intentionally hit a friend or threw something at them, they apologize to their friend. (T15)

> I initially warn. I often deprive the student of an enjoyed activity if they repeat their behavior. (T12)

> I always appreciate their behavior. The awards presented to others are definitely always appreciated. But I prefer to highlight positive and nice behavior before an event, especially positive behavior; I prefer that they learn from the example of positive behavior. (T16)

What are your behaviors toward students when students with normal development demonstrate positive behavior in class; how do you view your behavior? While 10 of the 16 interviewed teachers stated behaving the same way toward students with intellectual disabilities and those with normal development, four teachers stated motivating students in various ways as a result of this behavior. One teacher stated giving the necessary positive response for this situation, and another teacher said they would explain to the student's friends how the student had demonstrated the positive behavior. All teachers noted positive consequences as a result of their behavior.

Teachers who replied to this question stating that they behave differently to students with normal development and students with intellectual disabilities told the following:

> I demonstrate motivating behavior when I receive positive feedback by giving verbal feedback, applauding, making a high-five and saying, "You're great." And I want to add this. I am a mother. I treat other people's kids the way I want others to treat my child. And I do not apply any behavior that I do not approve of to my students. For this reason, they are all like my own children. I try to act as a mother who demonstrates her appreciation, protection, and approval to a child, and warns the child to turn negative behaviors into positive ones. (T10)

> In case students with normal development demonstrate positive behavior, I still give students the necessary positive reaction. This ensures students' self-confidence, happiness, and love for school; their dialogue with me becomes more comfortable. But I believe that conditioning with an award is not proper after every positive behavior because the child must know that all these behavior are actually part of their responsibilities. They should not behave appropriately just for the reward. (T16)

> I make an example of that student's case and say, "well done." If it is a very special case, I ask them to applaud. This develops their self-confidence. (T3)

> I caress the student's hair, hug, caress the student's cheek, and say, "great job." I make an example of the student by talking about their accomplishment with their peers. (T6)

Normally Developing Peers' Acceptance Levels towards Students with Intellectual Disabilities

This section includes both the findings obtained from interviews conducted with classroom teachers about the level of acceptance of students with intellectual disabilities by their peers with normal development, as well as findings obtained from the socio-metric evaluation of students with normal development.

Classroom teachers' views regarding normally developing peers' acceptance levels of students with intellectual disabilities.

How do you view normally developing peers' acceptance levels of students with intellectual disabilities? Of the 16 teachers interviewed, 10 said students with normal development easily accept students with intellectual disabilities, while four indicated that accepting was a bit difficult for the students. Expressions related to students with normal development who easily accept students with intellectual disabilities in class follow.

> Now I have to say this. I am a teacher with 20 years of experience, and I've had students with special needs in my classroom for the last 15 years. I had a week's training for this. Apart from that, I only attended some courses. I also think that I have a plus due to the training I mentioned. I think I am aware. In my classroom, a special-needs student has no problem. On the contrary, I observe that children are raised with a conscience these days. For that reason, I introduce the child with special needs to other students on the first day of school and tell them "each one of you has your own differences, and this friend has theirs, too. I want you to be aware of this and I ask you to help them when necessary." From the first day, children become more sensitive. For their friends and themselves, they decide to neither hurt nor harm, but to help those who need it. In , the classroom functions as if there is no special needs student in the classroom. They accept the student in his / her natural state and all becomes routine. I apologize for using a negative term, but this way the student blends in. T8 stated that Above all, students with normal development should love, protect, and provide unconditional support for students with intellectual disabilities. This means that a student with intellectual disabilities must be accepted by other students from day one. At this point, the teacher has a great responsibility. They need to ensure that unusual behavior from a student with intellectual disabilities could be unique to this student and should be accepted by other students as normal. Other students should not feel this type of behavior to be appropriate for them. If this student is accepted, they are protected in the classroom, helped and loved by others. Despite all the negative behavior of the student in my classroom (pulling on their peers' hair, hitting them), their peers protect him, look forward to holding hands, helping and loving him. (T8)

Among the teachers that stated students with normal development had difficulty accepting students with intellectual disabilities, the following has been expressed:

> If a student hurts their peers, it will be a little difficult for them to be accepted by the students. But on a day that the student is not present, I tell the kids that this child is different and we should demonstrate proper behavior for them. (T13)

> At first, when the student doesn't comply with class rules and the students complain about it, I explain to all that certain behaviors are inadequate. When the student hits others, I explain to the other students that the student has a special situation. The parents are also informed. We talk with the parents of those students who were exposed to violence about accepting the student. (T15)

Do your in-class behaviors affect the normally developing peers' acceptance levels of students with intellectual disabilities? If so, how do you think it affects them? All interviewed teachers stated that their in-class behaviors affect normally developing peers' acceptance levels of students with intellectual disabilities, as follows:

> The significance of classroom behavior on normally developing students' acceptance of students with intellectual disabilities is indisputable. As I mentioned before, we must make them feel that we do not separate this student from other students so that they accept the student with intellectual disabilities among themselves. In fact, this student should be demonstrated as different from the other students in general, but still one of them because I believe that when we make them feel this student is "one of them," but make them feel that the student is privileged, this could destroy their confidence in the teacher. Yet I believe this is preventable if students love and accept this student. (T8)

> Yes. So I will give you specifics: for example, recess. If my student is running during recess and falls down, other friends help him immediately. When the student falls, they lift them up from the floor and immediately come to me and let me know that the student had fallen down and that they picked the student up. This, in turn, is appropriate to the way the teacher stipulates and has instructed. I've had students with different disabilities in my classes for the last 15 years. For me, they are no different from any other because they are individuals and we should accept their presence in society and train society to be sensitive to them. This sensitivity will always exist in the years to come if students gain this sensitivity during their school years. For this reason, it is a plus for me that my class is an inclusive class. Thus, I have no problem with having such a student in my class every year, and I think this improves the sensitivity, knowledge, and awareness of other students. (T3)

> Of course there is. If we were to do something different, the students would not accept the child with special needs. They should be aware that everybody has a different level, some could come from behind and every kid is different after all. Since all have different levels of learning, everyone will come to the same level gradually. Since my students were aware of this, we did not have a problem. I believe this kind of conversations have an effect. (T2)

Normally developing peers' acceptance level of students with intellectual disabilities (S1-16). The socio-metric technique was utilized to collect data about normally developing students' acceptance levels of students with intellectual disabilities, as well as to determine the status of peers in the same class and their preferences for each other. Related findings are presented as follows.

Within the context of the present study, peers preferred eight of the students with intellectual disabilities in 16 different classrooms. The remaining eight students were not preferred for any of the three available situations (sitting together in class, playing together, or studying together) by their peers.

Students (S2, S3, S4, S8, S10, and S11) with intellectual disabilities were preferred by their peers with normal development for all three situations. While peers with normal development preferred S1 for sitting together in class and studying together, only one peer preferred S9 for playing together. Normally developing peers did not prefer S5, S6, S7, S12, S13, S14, S15, and S16 for all three situations.

S10 was the most preferred student by peers with normal development for sitting together in class (three students' first preference; two students' second preference) and for playing together (four students' first preference). The student that peers

wanted to study with the most is S8 (two students' first preference, one students' second preference, and two students' third preference).

Peers were determined to primarily prefer students with intellectual disabilities in the class for sitting together (a total score of 43 preferences: 8 first preferences [24], 7 second preferences [14], and 5 third preferences [5]), followed by playing together (a total score of 37 preferences: 8 first preferences [24], 3 second preferences [6], and 7 third preferences [7]). They were least preferred for studying together (a total score of 28 preferences: 5 first preferences [15], 4 second preferences [8], and 5 third preferences [5]).

Discussion

In this section, designated in line with the main objective of the study, the sub-objectives and their findings are discussed in comparison with each other and with the literature.

According to the information obtained through the first sub-objective of the study, the 14-week observation process of inclusive classroom teachers' in-class behaviors towards students with normal development and towards those with intellectual disabilities concluded that teachers exhibited different behaviors towards students within the classroom, namely their interactive behaviors towards the students with normal development and students with intellectual disabilities. Additionally, teachers' behaviors were determined to differ in situations when students with intellectual disabilities and those with normal development exhibited negative or positive behaviors in the class. When scrutinizing the literature review focused on classroom teachers' behaviors toward their students, several studies are observed to support this finding (Akalın, 2007, 2012; Alves & Gottlieb, 1986; Blanton, Blanton, & Cross, 1994; Güner-Yıldız & Sazak-Pınar, 2012; Hanrahan, Goodman, & Rapagna, 1990; Sazak-Pınar & Güner-Yıldız, 2013; Wallace et al., 2002). Among these, Akalın's (2012) study observed that classroom teachers who participated in the inclusion application offer more help and clues to students with special needs, reward them, listen to them when they begin speaking, and conduct individual work with them. Alves and Gottlieb's (1986) study determined that students with special needs interact more strongly with their teachers than their regularly developing peers; however, teachers directed less questions to students with special needs and provided them with more feedback than the students with normal development. This study established that teachers exhibit different interactive behaviors in the classroom, different than the teacher behaviors determined in the abovementioned studies. According to this study's observations, classroom teachers are perceived to more likely toward students with normal development to behave good-humoredly and respectfully in the classroom, warn more through eye-contact in response to negative

behaviors, respect ideas, and be supportive through positive words and gestures, such as smiling or a headshake than towards students with intellectual disabilities. On the other hand, teachers were observed to support students with intellectual disabilities in studying; endorsing their learning efforts; encouraging, supporting, and helping them when they show frustration during learning activities; waiting 4-5 seconds for them to refocus when they get distracted from the subject at hand, and warning them through body language (physical intervention) when these students exhibit negative behaviors more than their normally developing peers.

In the interviews conducted with the classroom teachers within the scope of the second sub-objective of the study, the teachers determined, albeit less so, to show interactive behaviors to students with intellectual disabilities by establishing eye-contact and motivating their activities with respect to their interests in the classroom. Teachers stated that when determining these interactive behaviors, they consulted the special education teacher in the school and decided on these interactive behaviors together. Some teachers also said there were no interactions with the students. Teachers were observed stating that when students with intellectual disabilities exhibit undesirable behavior in class, they preferred mostly speaking with them or remaining unresponsive; when students exhibit positive behavior in class, the teachers reward them in various ways, too. Classroom teachers were determined to state the same types of behavior in class toward students with either intellectual disabilities or normal development, stating no change in their interactive behaviors whether students behave positively or negatively. Additionally, teachers expressed positive attitudes and satisfaction with their behaviors. However, the 14-week observation process revealed differences in teacher behaviors despite their saying they had consistent behaviors in their interviews on differences in in-class behaviors toward students with normal development and those with intellectual disability). Hence, the findings obtained from the face-to-face teacher interviews and from the observation process conclusively do not support each other. Namely, the observation results conflict with teachers' statements about themselves. From the classroom observations and teacher statements, agreement was only determined for establishing eye-contact with students in the classroom. Other in-class behaviors exhibited no overlap between teachers' stated behaviors and the in-class behavior-observation results. These results indicate that classroom teachers don't exhibit the same behavior but exhibit different behaviors toward students in their class, especially according to students' characteristics, albeit unconsciously. When the results of this research are evaluated together with other research results, one can observe that teachers who work in inclusion classrooms generally behave differently within the classroom. This result suggests that teachers are unable to exhibit a common standard of classroom behaviors, even though they are instructed through the same education and training process. Because teacher behavior is one of the most important variables in effective classroom management, differences in teachers' in-class behaviors can lead

to differences in the desired behaviors conveyed to students in the class environment. When evaluating teachers' behaviors toward students with special needs and towards students with normal development, classroom teachers' interactive behaviors and the differences in their behaviors towards students in the case of positive and negative student behavior could be considered as positive teacher behavior. In particular, their behaviors toward students with intellectual disabilities when supporting their learning efforts, encouraging and supporting them when these students get frustrated during a learning activity, and pausing and waiting for them to gather attention, especially when their attention is distracted more than the students with normal development, indicate that the teachers are informed about their student with intellectual disabilities as the inclusive student. Also, the teachers' opinion that normally developing students should accept those with special needs suggests that teachers know about the importance of classroom behaviors and pay attention to it. This also suggests that teachers can make instructional adaptations in the classroom that take into account students' individual differences and that students with special needs can benefit most from educational activities performed toward their present potential.

When conducting the literature review on peers' level of acceptance of students with special needs in general education classes, studies were found to indicate high levels of acceptance among peers (Avcıoğlu, Demiray, & Eldeniz-Çetin, 2004; Ayral et al., 2013; Çulhaoğlu-İmrak & Sığırtmaç, 2011; English, Shafer, Goldstein, & Kaczmarek, 1997; Mcintosh, Vaughn, Schumm, Haager, & Lee, 1994; Sasso & Rude, 1988), as well as low or no level of acceptance (Alves & Gottlieb, 1986; Ciechalski, 1995, as cited in Sucuoğlu & Özokçu, 2005; Çolak, Vuran, & Uzuner, 2013; Farmer, Pearl, & Acker, 1996; Guralnick & Groom, 1987; Kabasakal, Girli, Okun, Çelik, & Vardarlı, 2008; Şahbaz, 2004). In this study, both teachers' and normally developing peers' opinions were evaluated in order to determine the level of acceptance for students with intellectual disabilities in inclusion classrooms. These data support each other. The majority of teachers stated that the normally developing students easily accept students with special needs. In addition, they also pointed out that their in-class behaviors towards students affect how students with normal development accept students with special needs. On the other hand, a few teachers stated that acceptance was somewhat difficult. In the socio-metric technique, which was applied in order to uncover the positions and preferences of the peers in the same class, while half of the students with intellectual disabilities included in the research were accepted by their normally developing peers, the other half were not accepted by any peer. Students with intellectual disabilities were determined to be mainly chosen by their peers for sitting together first, then for playing games together; they were least preferred for studying together.

In this study, teachers' and peers' acceptance of students with intellectual disabilities can be explained by teachers' interactive in-class behaviors. When

scrutinizing their in-class behaviors toward both normally developing students and those with intellectual disabilities when students are accepted by their peers, on can observe that the teachers more frequently employed interactive behaviors. These teachers were confirmed to address students by name in class, approach students with love and compassion, quietly listen to students when they speak, and maintain a consistent distance (far or near) from all students in class. Additionally, students' positive behaviors were determined to be encouraged through gestures such as nodding one's head, smiling, or speaking positively, as well as emphasizing students' positive behaviors and encouraging them to repeat their positive behaviors.

Interactive behaviors that can take place between teachers and students play an important role in the classroom. The teacher's interactive behaviors become a model for students' behaviors (Gürsel, 2005). Thus, teachers' interactions with students and the interactions among students in class also affect how students behave towards each other (Birch & Ladd, 1998; Crosnoe et al., 2004). The results of studies focusing on teacher-student behavior in inclusive classrooms indicate that both the positive and negative behaviors of students, with or without disabilities, directly relate to the teacher's behaviors (Akalın, 2007; Greenwood & Carta, 1987); through a classroom's effective teacher management and behavioral changes from the teacher, student behavior is also able to change (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). Accordingly, teacher behavior affects the students' social behavior (Denham & Burton, 1996). The findings obtained in the current study parallel this view. Therefore, it is important for teachers to become aware of how their behavior in the classroom affects student interactions and, accordingly, class conduct. Teachers need to become aware of the types of interactive behavior to exhibit, as well as the behaviors that should be adopted toward student behavior (positive or negative). Through peers' acceptance of students with intellectual disabilities and their being supported through effective teacher practices, these students are secured against encountering serious problems in school and in their social lives after school. In scrutinizing the findings on teacher behaviors from the in-class observations and teacher interviews together with the findings on normally developing peers' social acceptance of students with intellectual disabilities, students with intellectual disabilities are established as being more accepted by their normally developing peers when the teacher aims to evaluate students according to the interests they have in class, makes eye contact with students, addresses students by name, approaches them with love and compassion, behaves respectfully, supports students' positive behaviors using gestures such as smiles, encourages students positive behaviors with positive words, and emphasizes students' positive behaviors. These findings indicate that teachers' in-class interactive, verbal, and nonverbal behaviors towards their students affect students' behavior. As teachers' classroom behaviors influence students and as these behaviors can be considered as models for students, the importance of teacher behavior emerges, especially in terms of peers'

social acceptance of students with special needs and in terms of developing mutual social interactions. It is therefore important that teachers pay specific attention to their in-class behavior. This is supported by the fact that the students with intellectual disabilities most frequently preferred by their peers are in the classrooms of teachers who express interacting with the students according to their interests, as well as expecting different behaviors from students according to their level of differences.

According to the research results, teachers who work in inclusive classrooms can benefit from these findings by increasing their interactive behaviors in class and the social acceptance of students. Taking these results into account, it would be beneficial to systematize in-service training programs and provide training for teachers. This research composes information on the interactive behaviors between students with intellectual disabilities and their teachers, as well as the level of peer acceptance for these students. A future study could be conducted for students who need other types of special education and their normally developing peers by determining their mutual social acceptance. In order to increase the generalizability of the obtained findings, this same study could be repeated at different stages of formal education for different fields and with different teachers. In addition, more teacher views could be documented and more classroom observations conducted. It is also possible to plan different studies for teachers working in inclusive classrooms where students with different special educational needs are present with respect to different variables such as age, gender, professional experience, burnout, occupational satisfaction, and in-service training; these variables could be supported with quantitative research techniques.

References

Akalın, S. (2007). *İlköğretim birinci kademedeki sınıf öğretmenleri ile kaynaştırma öğrencisi olan ve olmayan öğrencilerin sınıf içi davranışlarının incelenmesi* [An investigation of the behaviors of the teachers and the students with and without disabilities in inclusive classrooms] (Master's thesis, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi

Akalın, S. (2012). *Bilgilendirme ve performans geribildirimine dayalı sınıf yönetimi müdahale programının kaynaştırma sınıflarındaki öğretmen-öğrenci çifti çıktıları üzerindeki etkileri* [Effects of a classroom management intervention based on teacher training and performance feedback on outcomes of teacher-student dyads in inclusive classrooms] (Doctoral dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi

Alves, A. J., & Gottlieb, J. (1986). Teacher interactions with mainstreamed handicapped students and their non-handicapped peers. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 9, 77–83.

Atay, M. (1995). *Özürlü çocukların normal yaşıtları ile birlikte eğitim aldıkları kaynaştırma programlarına karşı öğretmen tutumları üzerine bir inceleme* [A review of teacher attitudes toward on mainstreaming programs where handicapped and normal children are educated together] (Doctoral dissertation, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi

Avcıoğlu, H. (2008). *Etkinliklerle sosyal beceri eğitimi* [Social skills training through activities] (3rd ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Kök Yayıncılık.

Avcıoğlu, H. (2015). *A'dan Z'ye BEP: Bireyselleştirilmiş eğitim programlarının geliştirilmesi* [BEP from A to Z: Developing individualized training programs]. Ankara, Turkey: Vize Yayıncılık.

Avcıoğlu, H., Demiray, Z., & Eldeniz Çetin, M. (2004). Kaynaştırma sınıfına devam eden ortopedik engelli öğrencilerin karşılaştıkları güçlüklerin belirlenmesi [Determining the difficulties children with orthopedic disabilities face continuing to mainstream class]. In A. Yıkmış & E. Sazak (Eds.), *Özel Eğitimden Yansımalar/ 14. Ulusal Özel Eğitim Kongresi Bildirileri* [Special education reflections: 14th National Special Education Congress Reports] (pp. 226–231). Ankara, Turkey: Kök Yayıncılık.

Ayral, M., Özcan, Ş., Can, R., Ünlü, A., Bedel, H., Şengün, G., … Çağlar, K. (2013, June). *Kaynaştırma öğrencilerinin sosyal kabul düzeyleri* [Mainstreaming students' social acceptance levels]. Paper presented at the ELMIS 2013 International Special Education Congress. Akşehir, Konya, Turkey.

Batu, S., & Uysal, A. (2009). Günümüz sınıflarına engelli çocukların katılımını destekleme [Supporting the participation of children with disabilities in today's classes]. In G. Akçamete (Ed.), *Özel eğitim* [Special education] (pp. 469–479). Ankara, Turkey: Kök Yayıncılık.

Baydık, B., & Bakkaloğlu, H. (2009). Alt sosyo-ekonomik düzeydeki özel gereksinimli olan ve olmayan ilköğretim öğrencilerinin sosyometrik statülerini yordayan değişkenler [Predictor variables of sociometric status for lower socio-economic level primary school students with and without special needs]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, *9,* 435–447.

Birch, S. H., & Ladd, G. W. (1998). Children's interpersonal behaviors and the teacher-child relationship. *Developmental Psychology, 34,* 934–946.

Blanton, W. E., Blanton, L. P., & Cross, L. S. (1994). An exploratory study of how general and special education teachers think and make instructional decisions about special needs students. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 17,* 62–74.

Craig-Unkefer, L. A., & Kaiser, A. P. (2002). Improving the social communication skills of at risk preschool children in a play context. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 22*(1), 3–13.

Crosnoe, R., Johnson, M. K., & Elder, G. H. (2004). Intergenerational bonding in school: The behavioral and contextual correlates of student-teacher relationships. *Sociology of Education, 77,* 60–81.

Çalışkan, N. (2003). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sözel olmayan iletişim davranışlarının değerlendirilmesi* [Evaluating classroom teachers' non-verbal behaviors of communication] (Doctoral dissertation, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi

Çolak, A. (2007). *Kaynaştırma uygulanan bir ilköğretim sınıfındaki sosyal yeterlik özelliklerinin betimlenmesi ve iyileştirilmesi çalışmaları* [Studies describing and improving social competence in an applied mainstreaming primary school] (Doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi

Çolak, A., Vuran, S., & Uzuner, Y. (2013). Kaynaştırma uygulanan bir ilköğretim sınıfındaki sosyal yeterlik özelliklerinin betimlenmesi ve iyileştirilmesi çalışmaları [Studies describing and improving social competence in an applied mainstreaming primary school]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi, 14*(2), 33–49.

Çulhaoğlu-İmrak, H., & Sığrtmaç, A. (2011). Kaynaştırma uygulanan okul öncesi sınıflarda akran ilişkilerinin incelenmesi [Peer relations in preschool grades that apply mainstreaming]. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education, 3*(1), 38–65.

Dağlı, A., & Öner M. (2002). İlköğretim okullarının ikinci kademesinde okuyan öğrencilerin fen bilgisi öğretmenlerinin sınıf içi iletişim davranışlarına ilişkin algıları [Second grade students' perceptions toward science teachers' in-class behaviors of communication in primary schools]. *Çağdaş Eğitim, 29*(2), 23–30.

Denham, S. A., & Burton, R. (1996). A social-emotional intervention for at-risk 4-year olds. *Journal of School Psychology, 34*(3), 225–245.

Deretarla, E. (2000). *Kaynaştırma uygulaması yapan ilköğretim okullarının 3. sınıfına devam eden normal işiten ve işitme engelli öğrencilerin okuduğunu anlama becerilerinin incelenmesi* [Reading comprehension skills of third-grade students with and without hearing impairments in mainstreaming primary schools] (Master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi

Diken, İ. H. (1998). *Sınıfında zihinsel engelli çocuk bulunan ve bulunmayan sınıf öğretmenlerinin zihinsel engelli çocukların kaynaştırılmasına yönelik tutumlarının karşılaştırılması* [Comparing the attitudes of class teachers with and without mentally disabled children in class towards integrating mentally handicapped children] (Master's thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi

Ekiz, D. (2003). *Eğitimde araştırma yöntem ve metotlarına giriş* [Introduction to research procedures and methods in education]. Ankara, Turkey: Anı Yayıncılık.

English, K., Shafer, K., Goldstein, H., & Kaczmarek, L. (1997). Interaction among preschoolers with and without disabilities: Effects of across-the-day peer intervention. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 40,* 33–48.

Erden, M. (2000). Okul ve sınıf ortamı [School and classroom environments]. In E. Sözer, (Ed.), *Öğretmenlik mesleğine giriş* [Introduction to the teaching profession] (pp. 39–54). Eskişehir, Turkey: Anadolu Üniversitesi Açıköğretim Fakültesi Yayınları.

Farmer, W. T., Pearl, R., & Acker, R. M. V. (1996). Expanding the social skills deficit framework: A developmental synthesis perspective, classroom social networks and implications for the social growth of students with disabilities. *Journal of Special Education, 30*(3), 232–256.

Greenwood, C. R., & Carta, J. J. (1987). An ecobehavioral analysis of instruction within special education. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 19*(9), 1–12.

Guralnick, M. J., & Groom, J. M. (1987). The peer relations of mildly delayed and nonhandicapped preschool children in mainstreamed playgroups. *Child Development, 58*, 1556–1572.

Güçlü, N. (2000). Öğretmen davranışları [Teacher behaviors]. *Milli Eğitim, 14*(7), 21–23.

Güner-Yıldız, N., & Sazak-Pınar, E. (2012). Examining teachers' behavior related to students with special needs in inclusive classrooms. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 4*(2), 475–488.

Gürsel, O. (2005). Bireyselleştirilmiş eğitim programları (BEP) [Individualized training programs (ITP)]. In O. Gürsel (Ed.), *Bireyselleştirilmiş eğitim programlarının geliştirilmesi* [Developing individualized training programs] (pp. 1–12). Eskişehir, Turkey: Anadolu Üniversitesi Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları.

Hanrahan, J., Goodman, W., & Rapagna, S. (1990). Preparing mentally retarded students for mainstreaming: Priorities of regular class and special school teachers. *American Journal on Mental Retardation, 94*(5), 470–474.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2006-3/081406a.html

Kabasakal, Z., Girli, A., Okun, B., Çelik, N., & Vardarlı, G. (2008). Kaynaştırma öğrencileri, akran ilişkileri ve akran istismarı [Inclusion students: peer relations and peer abuse]. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 23,* 169–176.

Kayaoğlu, H. (1999). *Bilgilendirme programının normal sınıf öğretmenlerinin kaynaştırma ortamındaki işitme engelli çocuklara yönelik tutumlarına etkisi* [The effect of awareness programs on normal classroom teachers' attitudes toward hearing-impaired children in the inclusion environment] (Doctoral dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi

Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership, 61*(1), 6–17.

McIntosh, R., Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., Haager, D., & Lee, O. (1994). Observations of students with learning disabilities in general education classrooms. *Exceptional Children, 60,* 249–261.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (1997). *Özel eğitim hakkında kanun hükmünde kararname* [Decree law on special education]. Retrieved from http://orgm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2012_10/10111226_ozel_egitim_hizmetleri_yonetmeligi_son.pdf

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2015). *Özel eğitim hizmetleri yönetmeliği* [Special education services regulation]. Retriewed September 25 2015, from http://orgm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2012_10/10111226_ozel_egitim_hizmetleri_yonetmeligi_son.pdf.

Odluyurt, S., & Batu, E. S. (2010). Gelişimsel yetersizlik gösteren çocuklara kaynaştırmaya hazırlık becerilerinin öğretimi [Teaching preparation skills to mainstream students with developmental disabilities]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 10,* 1533–1572.

Öncül, N., & Batu, E. S. (2005). Normal gelişim gösteren çocuk annelerinin kaynaştırma uygulamasına ilişkin görüşleri [Views on mainstreaming of mothers with children who show normal development]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, Özel Eğitim Dergisi, 6,* 37–54.

Özaydın, L., Tekin-îftar, E., & Kaner, S. (2008). Arkadaşlık becerilerini geliştirme programının özel gereksinimi olan okul öncesi çocuklarının sosyal etkileşimlerine etkisi [The effect of the developing friendship skills program on the social interactions of children with special needs]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi, 9*(1), 15–32.

Özbaba, N. (2000). *Okul öncesi eğitimcilerin ve ailelerin özel eğitime muhtaç çocuklar ile normal çocukların entegrasyonuna (kaynaştırılmasına) karşı tutumları* [The thrifts of the preshool educators and families with their children against the integration for handicapped and non handicapped children who need meanstreaming program] (Master's thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi

Özgüven, (2005). *Bireyi tanıma teknikleri* [Individual recognition techniques] (6th ed.). Ankara, Turkey: PDREM Yayınları.

Sasso, G. M., & Rude, H. A. (1988). The social effects of integration on non-handicapped students. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 23*, 18–22.

Sazak-Pınar, E., & Güner-Yıldız, N. (2013). Investigating teachers' approval and disapproval behaviors towards academic and social behaviors of students with and without special needs. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 13*, 541–556.

Sucuoğlu, B., & Özokçu, O. (2005). Kaynaştırma öğrencilerinin sosyal becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi [Evaluating mainstreaming students' social skills]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi, 6*(1), 41–58.

Sünbül, A. M. (1996). Öğretmen niteliği ve öğretimdeki rolleri [Teacher qualifications and roles in teaching]. *Eğitimde Nitelik, 2*(1), 597–607.

Şahbaz, Ü. (2004). Kaynaştırma sınıflarına devam eden zihin engelli öğrencilerin sosyal kabul düzeylerinin belirlenmesi [Determing the social-acceptance levels of students with mental retardation continuing onto integration classes]. In A. Konrot (Ed.), *Özel Eğitimden Yansımalar/ 13. Ulusal özel eğitim kongresi bildirileri* [Reflections on Special Education: Reports from the 13th National Special Education Congress] (pp. 82–92). Ankara, Turkey: Kök Yayıncılık.

Terzi, A. R. (2002, Summer/Fall). Sınıf yönetimi açısından etkili öğretmen davranışları [Effective teacher behaviors in terms of classroom management]. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, Yaz-Güz 2002*, 155–156. Retrieved from http://yayim.meb.gov.tr/dergiler/155-156/terzi.htm

Turhan, C. (2007). *Kaynaştırma uygulaması yapılan ilköğretim okuluna devam eden normal gelişim gösteren öğrencilerin kaynaştırma uygulamalarına ilişkin görüşleri* [The views of normally developing students continuing to mainstreaming primary school on inclusion practices] (Master's thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi

Uysal, A. (1995). *Öğretmen ve okul yöneticilerinin zihin engelli çocukların kaynaştırılmasında karşılaşılan sorunlara ilişkin görüşleri* [Teacher and school administrators' views on problems encountered when mainstreaming children with mental retardation] (Master's thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi

Uysal, H., Akbaba Altun, S., & Akgün, E. (2010). The strategies preschool teachers use when confronted with children's undesired behaviors. *Elementary Education Online, 9*(3), 971–979.

Vuran, S. (2005). The sociometric status of students with disabilities in elementary level integration classes in Turkey. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 18,* 217–235.

Wallace, T., Reschly-Anderson, A., Bartolomy, T., & Hupp, S. (2002). An ecobehavioral examination of high school classrooms that include students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 68*(3), 345–359.

Westwood, P. (1997). *Commonsense methods for children with special needs strategies for the regular classroom* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* [Qualitative research designs in the social sciences]. Ankara, Turkey: Seçkin Yayıncılık.