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SUMMARY

*The purpose of this research is to determine the opinions of school administrators working in independent kindergartens on the inclusion practices. The qualitative research method was used in the research and the study was carried out with 12 school administrators who had mainstream students in the school. Thus, it is possible to examine the data obtained through the interviews in depth Based on the findings of this study, it is evident that managers do not serve the purpose of cohesion training; but it is emphasized that it is a useful application for children if appropriate conditions are met. Managers; it is stated that they do not have as much knowledge as the competence of integration training and that vocational education for managers and teachers is important and should be supported with in-service trainings. It has been explained by the administrators that the mainstreaming student is not socialized by the teachers, students and parents, the school is overcrowded due to physical and hardware insufficiency, and the multiple obstacles of the mainstreaming student cause various problems in the classroom. In addition, as a result of the research, managers have made various proposals such as making in-service training, provision of personnel and hardware support, preparation for preliminary studies and part-time integration so that the mainstreaming education can be successfully implemented.*
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INTRODUCTION

The social and physical development that the individuals are in ,has a direct effect on learning and education of individuals.
The development of children can be guided by inter-individual interactions established at school or outside the school.The main factors that affect the atmosphere of the organization and the quality of the relations between the individuals and the groups are the behaviours of the administrators behaviours. (Şahin, 2013).

Individuals in executive position should be willing to do this profession, be open to innovation and renewal, be a researcher, have the necessary knowledge and skills, have personality traits in accordance with this position and be the leader individuals who can guide the structure of the group (Vural, 2008). Manager; must be insightful, objective and fair, give importance to human relations and participation, show visionary managerial features, share their thoughts with the environment (Can, 2008), have leadership qualities, must follow people and love his/her job(Aktepe, 2014). In contemporary societies, school administrators are expected to be successful, knowledgeable, self-confident, successful in people's relations, able to correctly identify and solve problems, take decisions in crisis moments, and effectively communicate (Çelikten, 2016).

Education management is to use the resources of the educational organization effectively to achieve the predetermined objectives of education organizations and to implement and manage the policies and decisions taken within the framework of the specific objectives of the educational organization in accordance with the general aims and principles of education (Taymaz, 2009) It is expected from the education manager that the management accomplishes organizational goals and facilitates life for education employees (Cemaloğlu, 2005). The knowledge, skills and behaviors of educational administrators are also effective on other individuals around the school. First of all, all school staff, especially the school principal, should exhibit positive and supportive attitudes towards students in need of special education and they should accept and respect that these students have the right to be educated in normal educational settings and believe that inclusion is a useful practice (Varol, 2010: 17).

 The opinions of the school administrators are also important in the educational practices carried out by means of inclusion, which are included for the education of children with special needs. It can be said that school administrators' views on mainstreaming education practices are determinative in this regard. According to Taymaz (2009: 64), it is very difficult to make changes in the field of education that managers and teachers do not find appropriate. According to Article 23 of the Regulation on Special Education Services of Ministry of Education ; trainings of individuals in need of special education is defined as ‘’support education services are provided, together with their peers who are not deficient; preschool, primary education, secondary education and special education practices based on the continuation of non-formal education institutions’’. . For these applications, the thoughts and practices of school administrators are very important. In this study, it was aimed to determine the opinions of the school administrators in preschool education institutions about the mainstreaming practices in this research.

Model of Research

The study was conducted in the case study pattern of qualitative research methods. The case study pattern relates to the intensive study of an event to express different things in different disciplines. This study includes an in-depth longitudinal examination of the data obtained by interviews (Glesne, 2013). In the case study pattern, factors related to a situation are investigated with a holistic approach and are focused on how they affect the situation and how they are affected by the situation (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). Content analysis method was used in this study. Content analysis used in social sciences and frequently used in qualitative research is a systematic, repeatable technique in which some words of a text are summarized with smaller content categories based on certain rules (Büyüköztürk et al. 2013). The fundamental process of content analysis is to bring together similar data within the framework of specific concepts and themes and to interpret them in a way that the reader will understand (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011, p. 227).

Study Group

 The study group consisted of 12 principals working in independent nursery schools in the districts of Yenişehir and Toroslar in the city center of Mersin. The district of Yenişehir is thought to be on the upper socio-economic level in terms of socio-economic level, and the Toroslar district is on the lower socio-economic level. The aim of the typical situation sampling is to study the average situation and to have an idea about a particular area (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011).

 The age of the managers in the study group ranged between 32-49 years of age and 9 of them were female and 3 of them were male. Two of the executives are PhD graduate. In graduation fields, 10 of them are graduates of preschool education undergraduate program while one of them is a graduate of child development and education department and one of them is a graduate of guidance and psychological consultancy. When we look at the management period, 4 of them are 1-5 years, 6 are 6-10, one is 11-15 years and one is 16-20 years.

Data collecting

 Research data were obtained by interview. During the interview, a semi-structured interview form which was structured by the researchers was used. In the form of semi-structured interview, preschool institutions were asked 12 open-ended questions. Before the actual implementation of the interview forms, two executives were piloted. In the pilot application, the suitability of the questions for the purpose of the research is understood and it is evaluated to be appropriate and can be used in the main application. The interview form consists of two parts. In the first part, demographic information of the working group and the second part are the questions of the study. The female executives included in the study group were given names from Y1 up to Y12.

PROCESS

Information was given about the study by discussing with the school principals in the scope of Mersin Provincial Directorate of National Education.
Then, between 01.07.2017 and 01.10.2017, the participants who wanted to participate in the study were interviewed at different days and times. Before the meeting, the participants were informed about the purpose of the study and the confidentiality of the interview and asked whether they were willing to participate. The interviews were conducted at the schools where managers work. The interviews were conducted in the form of mutual conversations with the participants and the participants were asked to write their responses on the forms. Interviews with each of the participants included in the study included a total of 12 people with a mean duration of 30 minutes and lasted approximately 360 minutes (6 hours) in total.

Data Analysis

After the interviews with the participants, the data were first conceptualized and then the content analysis method was used, which requires logical regulation according to the emerging concepts and the themes that explain the data accordingly (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). Data were read and analyzed by researchers.

Validity and Reliability

It is seen that the researchers' expressing the methods and stages of the research in a clear and understandable way, and keeping the raw data of the research in such a way that they can be examined by others are the subjects that provide the external reliability of this research. For the research questions being clearly expressed, the research data being required to be collected in a detailed and appropriate manner as required by the questions, and the comparison of the two different codes generated by the researchers is evaluated as the qualities that provide the internal reliability of the research (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011).

Evidence and Discussion

The school administrators who were involved in the study were asked whether there is an inclusion student in the school they work in, and if there is, what kind of inclusion education is available. It was determined that a total of 27 children, including 12 in Yenişehir and 15 in Toroslar district, received full-time inclusion; 8 in Yenişehir and 21 in Toroslar district, received part-time inclusive education. The children attending the school of executives except for 7. Y and 12. Y are either part-time or full-time mainstreaming. 12. The school where the Y.12 coded administrator serves ,6 children are served part time ,2 children are served full time, In the school where the Y.7 coded manager serves, 6 children are served full time and 2 children are served part-time inclusive education. 8. The Y-coded manager stated that 3 children were children of inclusion, but he didin’t know whether they were serving part-time or full-time education. Here are some excerpts that can be given as an example of managers' descriptions:

"There are three mainstreaming students in our school. They are all written full-time in their report, but because they are severely disabled, parents bring them part-time". (Y1)

"We have 8 inclusive students. 6 of them are served full time education". (Y7)

"In each class we have a iclusion student. We have 8 classes. 6 of them are part-time educated". (A12)

As it can be seen from the table, in Toroslar district which is in the lower socioeconomic level more children receive inclusion education. Sherman points out that children at low socio-economic levels are more likely to experience and compare the risk factors such as familial stress, parental depression, and medical problems, and the incidence and rates of these factors are higher than the families and children of high socioeconomic levels (Ruffolo, Evans, & Lukens, 2003). ).

The findings of the school administrators' views on the implications of inclusion practices are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency and Percent Distributions of School Administrators' Views on Inclusion Practices

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Considerations for fusion f | % |
| It does not serve its purpose 7 | 36.8 |
| It is a useful application for children 5 | 26.3 |
| A useful application when applied part-time 2 | 10.5 |
| Beneficial if appropriate conditions are provided 2 | 10.5 |
| Benefit varies by individual 1 | 5.3 |
| I don't think it benefits children 1 |  5.3 |
| Not responding 1 | 5.3 |
| Total 19  | 100.0 |

As it can be seen in Table 1,generally it is seen as a useful application for children by connecting to the conditions such as the application of part time or appropriate conditions. Only one person has not responded and stated that it is not useful. Although the school administrators considered inclusion practices as a useful application, they also evaluated them as non-serving practices (f = 7).

"Inclusive education is very good in terms of adapting students to the society and life as individuals, but it has some problems. It is necessary for the students to have infrastructure and physical environments, and to be suitable for the current class numbers." (Y5)

In order to be able to carry out the inclusion practices in an appropriate and proper manner, it is necessary to make some preliminary preparations, arrangements, adaptations, fulfill the general principles and meet the basic criteria (Kargın, 2004). The purpose of mainstreaming practices can vary according to the school administrators, teachers' knowledge, skills and attitudes, school-family cooperation and the support of special education experts.

**The findings of the school administrators' opinions about the children included in the inclusion practices are presented in Table 2.**

|  |
| --- |
| Children included in the fusion f % |
| Special requirements for diagnosis by RAM 8 | 30.7 |
| Common developmental disorders (autistic, etc.) 3 | 11.5 |
| Patients with attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder 3 | 11.5 |
| Mentally handicapped 3 | 11.5 |
| Orthopedic disabilities 3 | 11.5 |
| Hearing problems 2 | 7.7 |
| Visual disorders 1 | 3.9 |
| Gifted 1 | 3.9 |
| Those with severe disabilities 1 | 3.9 |
| Special needs in multiple areas 1  | 3.9 |
| Total 26  | 100.0 |

As seen in Table 2, most of the responses for the individuals who are receiving the mainstreaming education were the special requirements (f = 8) sent by the most coded RAM. When the answers were examined, an information compatible with the literature emerged.

"Children with special needs benefit more." (Y6)

‘’Although it changes every year, autistic students benefit widely.’’(Y7)

 It can be said that there is a certain consensus in the grouping of children with special needs according to their inadequacies.

These groups include mental retardation, learning difficulties, emotional and behavioral disorders, severe and multiple deficiencies, hearing impairments, communication disorders, visual impairment, physical and health insufficiencies, gifted and talented (Eripek, 2004, 5).

Table 3 presents the findings on how to apply for enrollment and enrollment of children who come for inclusion practices.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage Distributions of School Admission and Registration for Children Admitted to School for Inclusion Practices

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Inclusion and admission of inclusion students f | % |
| All children admitted to school are accepted 4 | 30.8 |
| Registration is made in accordance with the regulation 3 | 23.0 |
| Saved from RAM 2 | 15.4 |
| Class varies according to the available 1 | 7.7 |
| One class is recorded in each class 1 | 7.7 |
| The school is the closest school to the child's home 1 | 7.7 |
| I am registering as a priority 1 | 7.7 |
| Total 13  | 100.0 |

When Table 3 is examined, it is stated that all children who applied to the school to receive mainstreaming education are taken (f = 4) and that they are registered and accepted in accordance with the regulations.

According to the Regulation on Special Education Services (2006), compulsory education period for individuals in need of special education starts from pre-school education period and includes secondary education period and the placement and registration of these individuals are carried out in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Table 4 presents the data on the distribution of the children who receive inclusion education to the classes.

Table 4. Frequency and percentage distributions of children included in inclusion practices in classrooms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Distribution of students to classroom f | % |
| I do placement according to class sizes 9 | 52.9 |
| Placing according to obstacle types 3 | 17.6 |
| I consider the age group 2 | 11.8 |
| I do one to each class 2 | 11.8 |
| Based on the regulation 1 | 5.9 |
| Total 17  | 100.0 |

As it can be seen in Table 4, school principals take the most class sizes into consideration when placing children in mainstreaming classes (f = 9). This situation is thought to be related to the need for more attention and need of the child who is involved in mainstreaming education.

"When the parent application is submitted, the report is taken into consideration." (Y8)

Table 5. Frequency and percentage distributions related to preliminary preparations for inclusion education

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Preparations made f | % |
| No preliminary preparation 15 | 88.2 |
| Not responding 2 | 11.8 |
| Total 17  | 100.0 |

When preliminary preparation studies before the introduction of mainstreaming education practices are done ,it is seen that preliminary studies are not included (f = 15).

"Can not be done." (Y4 "No." (Y6)

As a result of the research conducted by Varol (2010), in the screening model of 400 schools with inclusion of 26 schools in 26 provinces, class teachers and parents and in the screening model for the evaluation of mainstreaming practices in primary schools; the primary school administrators and teachers who have applied the mainstreaming process do not have sufficient knowledge about inclusion,it was stated that the students who were not informed before the mainstreaming education, they did not prepare adequately and did not receive support / help, the education services provided to the inclusion students were not given enough; found that the mainstreaming practices did not meet the expectations of the parents.

Table 6 presents the physical environment regulations for the children who receive inclusion education.

Table 6. Frequency and percentage distributions related to physical environment regulations for children

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Physical environment regulations f | % |
| No arrangements are made 4 | 23.5 |
| Staircase arrangement for disabled people 4 | 23.5 |
| Toilet and sink arrangement 4 | 23.6 |
| Classroom arrangements 3 | 17.6 |
| Not responding 2 | 11.8 |
| Total 17 | 100.0 |

When Table 6 is examined, it was determined that school administrators made toilet and sink arrangement (f = 4) with the most ramped ladder arrangement (f = 4) in their schools for the children who received mainstreaming education. There are also school administrators who do not make any arrangements (f = 4). This situation is thought to be related to the cost of physical arrangements to be made.

 "There has not been a situation in the physical environment of the integrated circuits until this time. Small class arrangements have been made." (Y7)

 "The ladder of the disabled etc. organizes the education areas of the teacher especially in the classroom by taking into consideration these children" (Y9)

 Yılmaz (2004), in his study examined the educational places of children with disabilities who have come to the elementary school age and examined the spatial status of orthopedic, visual and hearing impaired students in basic education schools and their suitability for mainstreaming education.

 and evaluated by observation, screening and description. As a result, it has been determined that the existing primary schools are not suitable for mainstreaming education but can be adapted by the arrangements to be made and the schools that apply the mainstreaming education are inadequate in spatial terms.

 Table 7 presents the data regarding the training activities carried out in the school within the scope of mainstreaming education practices.

 Table 7. Incidence and Percentage Distributions Regarding the Education Studies in School within the Scope of Inclusive Education Practices

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Training activities f | % |
| Training for families is carried out 5 | 29.4 |
| Training activities for teachers 4 | 23.5 |
| No training is carried out 3 | 17.6 |
| Seminar activities are provided for information purposes 2 | 11.8 |
| Social activities are included 1 | 5.9 |
| In-service training is carried out 2 | 11.8 |
| Total 17 | 100.0 |

As can be seen in Table 7, the education activities carried out in the school are mostly directed to parents (f = 5) and teachers (f = 4). Family education is very important for the education of children, especially those who require special needs. School-family cooperation is essential for further development of the individual with special needs.

"Yes. There are activities, social events, seminars or various activities for teachers and parents." (Y9)

"According to the inadequacies of children, our teachers plan and implement their work."

Preschool teachers and parents need to be supported in order to increase the success of preschool inclusion practices encountered in many problems in our country. In the mainstreaming process, both pre-school teachers and parents with special needs

It is very important to reduce the difficulties associated with inclusion practices. The implementation of support training programs to meet the needs of preschool teachers and parents can be useful in reducing these difficulties (Bayraklı and Sucuoğlu, 2017).

Data on duties and responsibilities of school administrators within the scope of mainstreaming education practices are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Frequency and Percent Distributions of School Administrators' Duties and Responsibilities within the Scope of Inclusion Practices

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Duties and responsibilities of school administrators f | % |
| Guidance when necessary 8 | 34.8 |
| To make training environment 5 | 21.8 |
| To prepare the IEP and BIB program 3 | 13.1 |
| Informations 2 | 8.8 |
| To do monitoring work 1 | 4.3 |
| Confirming the IEP plan 1 | 4.3 |
| Parent informing 1 | 4.3 |
| Organizing in-service training 1 | 4.3 |
| To provide necessary tools 1 | 4.3 |
| Total 23 | 100.0 |

 When the studies conducted within the scope of inclusion education practices, school administrators reported that they had the most guidance tasks (f = 8) and that they should make educational environment arrangements (f = 5). In addition, there are three managers who think that they have responsibility for preparing BEP and IIP.

 "Taking part in the study commission of guidance and psychological counseling services, examining teachers' plans, providing the necessary tools and equipment, and providing in-service training that teachers need." (Y12)

 The school administrators were asked who were the BAP and the CPP prepared by , and the responses were presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Findings of school administrators' opinions about who prepared the IEP and IEP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Those who prepared the IEP f | % |
| Teachers prepare 4 | 33.3 |
| Including the integration team 4 | 33.3 |
| The teacher prepares with the school administrator 2 | 16.8 |
| Prepares RAM 1 | 8.3 |
| Class and special education teacher prepare together 1 | 8.3 |
| Total 12  | 100.0 |

 When the findings were examined, 4 of the administrators reported that 4 of the teachers in the the mainstreaming team prepared the plans.In addition, two people reported that the teacher prepared together with the school administrator, and one person reported that they were prepared by RAM by the teacher and the special teacher. This shows that school administrators do not have enough knowledge about preparing IEP-IEPs.

 "Prepared by the teacher according to the needs of the child." (Y9)

 According to Article 10 of the Regulation on Special Education Services (MEB), an Education Plan Sample is prepared for each individual in need of special education. The training plan includes the individual's performance in all areas of development and academic discipline and the annual objectives determined according to the priority training needs. The educational plan of each individual for educational evaluation and diagnosis is prepared by the special education evaluation board. When the training plan is prepared again, the individual development report and the previous training plan of that year are taken into consideration. With the amendment made in the Special Education Services Regulation (14.3.2009 / 27169 RG), it is stated that the education plan of the students attending all types and degrees of official or private schools / institutions will be renewed every year by the PEP development unit. Article 23 of the same regulation (d) doğr In the schools and institutions where education is carried out through inclusion, a PEP development unit shall be established in accordance with the provisions of Article 73 of this Regulation .’’

 According to Article 73, the director of the school / institution or the deputy director to be appointed shall serve as the head of the individualized education program development unit. The duties of the head of the unit; In the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the PEP, it is necessary to take measures related to the internal regulations of the student in the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the PEP. to coordinate with the special education services board for the development or provision of equipment and training materials. Special Education Services In Article 72 of the Regulation, an individualized training program development unit is formed in order to prepare the PEPs in line with the educational performances and needs of the students in need of special education. Individualized education program development unit, head of school / institution or a deputy director to be appointed; a teacher who conducts a special education task, a counselor, a teacher assigned to prepare a training program, the student's class teacher, the student's course instructor related field teachers, the student's parents, students are composed.

The recommendations of the school administrators on the problems related to the application of inclusive education are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Frequency and percentage distributions related to the opinions of school administrators on the problems of inclusion education

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Problems in mainstreaming education f | % |
| Inadequacy of staff 5 | 19.2 |
| Crowd of classes 5 | 19.2 |
| The teacher does not want the child 3 | 11.6 |
| Vocational disability 2 | 7.7 |
| Dispatch of people with severe disabilities for inclusive education 2 | 7.7 |
| Full-time inclusion 2 | 7.7 |
| Students adaptation problems 2 | 7.7 |
| High expectation of parents 2 | 7.7 |
| Physical Inability 1 | 3.8 |
| Professional inadequacy of teaching 1  | 7.7 |
| Total 26 | 100.0 |

 When the findings were examined, the managers stated that the staff problems at the beginning of the school were insufficient (f = 5) and that the classes were crowded (f = 5). In addition, teachers do not want to be an inclusion student (f = 3); It was found that there was a vocational disability in the teachers (f = 2), and the fact that the students who had more than one disability in the classroom had a problem of inclusion in the classroom (f = 2), that full-time fusion made the education difficult (f = 2), and the students experienced adjustment problems (f = 2). ), the high expectation of the parents caused difficulties (f = 2), the presence of non-knowledgeable managers (f = 2) and physical disability (f = 1).

 "Lack of support staff, lack of pre-school teacher." (Y11)

"The density of the class population decreases the efficiency of the inclusion student.

. "(Y7)

 It is known that MEB is trying to solve the problem of increasing the schooling rate by providing more children with less staff in class environments. However, as a result of this practice, the number of children in the classroom due to the increase in the physical space, material deficiency and the frequency of problems in the classroom teachers show that the teachers experiencing difficulties in the face of problems.

 The recommendations of the school administrators on the problems related to the application of inclusive education are given in Table 11.

 Table 11. Frequency and percentage distributions of school administrators' suggestions on the problems experienced

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Recommendations for success in fusion training f | % |
| In-service training must be done 6 | 30.0 |
| Support staff should be 3 | 15.0 |
| Preliminary preparation should be 2 | 10.0 |
| Special education and guidance from the teacher should be supported 2 | 10.0 |
| Classes should not be crowded 2 | 10.0 |
| Inclusive education should be done by special education 1 | 5.0 |
| Part time fusion should be done 1 | 5.0 |
| Collaboration with parents 1 | 5.0 |
| Family training should be carried out 1 | 5.0 |
| There should be no shortage of hardware 1 | 5.0 |
| Total 20 | 100 |

 When the findings were examined; It is observed that the in-service training (f = 6) and the presence of support staff (f = 3) will solve the problem to a large extent in order to achieve the success of inclusive education. At the same time, it was emphasized that preliminary studies (f = 2) and special education and support from guidance teachers (f = 2) were important. Successful co-inclusion training was a part of the period of time (f = 1), collaboration with parents (f = 1) and the importance of equipment (f = 1).

 "Training of teachers and administrators on this subject (Seminars, courses)" (Y9)

"The fusion should be part time. It should be done in the time period the teacher thinks. Besides, there should be no fusion in the classroom if there is 20 and above in class." (Y7)

 The special education needs of the student with special needs are provided in the normal education classes which are the least restricted training environment for him / her by providing necessary support services by providing the necessary support services. provision of education environment is very important (Batu and Kırcaali-Iftar, 2007, p. 7; Sucuoglu and Kargin, 2008, p. 29).

 RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

 The aim of this study is to determine the opinions of school administrators working in independent kindergartens on mainstreaming practices.

 In schools where school administrators work, there are children who are involved in inclusion. Twenty-two children, 12 of whom were in Yenişehir and 15 in Toroslar district, had full-time inclusion; A total of 29 children, eight of whom were in Yenişehir and 21 in Toroslar district, had part-time inclusive education. When the opinions of the school administrators about the mainstreaming practices were evaluated, it was determined that they evaluated these practices as useful but also evaluated as applications that did not serve their purpose. It has been shown that the most coded of answers to who is involved in inclusive education is the special requirements sent by RAM. When the opinions of the children taking inclusion education about their enrollment and admission were evaluated, it was determined that all children who applied to the school were taken and that they were registered and accepted in accordance with the regulations. It has been revealed that school principals take into account the most class size when placing children into mainstreaming classes and that they are not prepared for this. It was determined that the school administrators made the most of the physical environment arrangements in their schools for the children who received mainstreaming education. It was determined that the school education activities were carried out for parents and teachers, and that school administrators were mostly involved in organizing guidance and educational environment in relation to their duties within the scope of mainstreaming practices. When the findings about who should prepare PEP and IEP were examined, it was seen that 4 of the managers should be prepared by the teacher and 4 of them should be prepared by the inclusion team. At the beginning of the problems encountered by school administrators, problems were experienced due to the inadequacy of staff and the crowding of classrooms. In order to ensure that these problems do not occur, in-service training is provided for the success of inclusive education, including the employment of auxiliary support staff, including the preparation of preliminary studies and special education and guidance teachers support, part-time inclusion, cooperation with parents and hardware support are reported.

Some recommendations have been developed in line with these results:

1. It can be ensured that school administrators and teachers working in pre-school education institutions can participate in in-service training activities to increase their professional knowledge and skills about special needs children and inclusive education.
2. Necessary attention should be paid to developmental assessments of children referred to schools for mainstreaming practices

3. Inclusive staff support should be provided for inclusion applications.

4. Support rooms can be opened in schools in order to make integration applications more efficient

5. Legal arrangements can be made to keep class sizes low for mainstreaming practices.

6. In order to help the inclusion practices to reach the objective, preliminary studies may be given importance.

7. Special education teachers may be employed for inclusive education, although not for each school.

8. Teamwork should be encouraged in preparing the PEP and IEP.

9. The study group of this study consisted of school administrators working in pre-school education institutions. In another study, the views of the deputy directors, teachers, other staff in the school, and parents can be consulted.

10. The study was a qualitative study and was conducted through interviews. A quantitative study can be carried out on this subject.
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