IJPES
www.ijpes.com
International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies
ISSN: 2148-9378

Teaching Practices in Inclusive Classrooms from the Perspective of Primary School Teacher Candidates: An Observation Study

Hanifi SANIR[1], Tamer KARAKOÇ[2], Ufuk ÖZKUBAT[3]

[1] *Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey* *0000-0002-2598-569X*

[2] *Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey* *0000-0002-3080-6326*

[3] *Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey* *0000-0002-9626-5112*

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Received 07.04.2022
Received in revised form 10.08.2022
Accepted 12.09.2022
Article Type: Research Article

ABSTRACT

As a result of the nature and outcomes of classroom education, questions concerning what constitutes successful teaching persist. This study intends to characterize, from the perspective of primary school teacher candidates, the practices of primary school teachers in terms of effective instruction in inclusive classrooms. Observations of nonparticipants were used to collect qualitative data for this study. The research study group consists of the final-year primary school teaching students and the teachers at the schools where these students do their internships. Students' observations yielded qualitative data that was examined using content analysis. The study revealed that classroom teachers are deficient in their use of teaching tactics, particularly in adjusting instruction, classroom management, and behavior management. The acquired results were reviewed within the context of the issues encountered by classroom teachers in terms of successful teaching in inclusive classrooms and the suitability of undergraduate programs that prepare teachers for general education.

Keywords:
Inclusive education, instruction, observations to inform professional development, teacher classroom practies

1. Introduction

Since the anactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act (2015) in the United States, issues pertaining to the need for teachers to implement research-based interventions in their classrooms, the quality of their instruction, and their professional competence have reemerged.. In Turkey, new decisions are taken to improve students' academic performance, ensure that they are educated according to the needs of the age, and improve teacher competencies (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2017). These initiatives support teachers' effective teaching practices, create positive learning environments for all students, including students with special needs, and examine how teachers teach.

Effective teaching practices are a) intensive instruction, b) explicit instruction, c) systematic instruction, and d) individualized teaching practices. (Archer and Hughes, 2011; Vaughn et al., 2012). Among the practices, intensive instruction refers to arranging the teaching according to the needs of the students; explicit instruction refers to making content and disciplinary processes visible by naming, labeling, and demonstrating skills and strategies; and systematic instruction refers to providing comprehensive support for a variety of skills.

[1]Corresponding author's address: Gazi University, Faculty of Education, Department of Special Education, Ankara /Turkey
e-mail: hanifisanir@gazi.edu.tr
Citation: Sanır, H., Karakoç, T. & Özkubat, U. (2022). Teaching practices in inclusive classrooms from the perspective of primary school teacher candidates: An observation study. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, *9*(4), 1244-1256. https://dx.doi.org/10.52380/ijpes.2022.9.4.878

Individualized instruction encompasses performance-based planning and modifications (Morris-Mathews et al., 2021).

Effective teaching emerges from instructional interactions that respond to students' academic, emotional, and social needs (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Sameroff, 2009). In addition, student learning results from this effective teacher-student interaction (Hamre et al. 2012), and these interactions occur in a highly structured classroom or environment. For effective teaching to take place, teachers adapt these behaviors according to students' current knowledge and skills instead of using certain teaching behaviors (Connor et al., 2011). Instructional adaptations and interactions that support the learning of students with special needs are clearly defined as teaching behaviors that support student learning and require being sensitive to them (Jones & Brownell, 2014; Swanson et al., 1999). Teaching studies conducted for students with special needs and risk groups show that these students need teaching in which classroom management is good, different teaching methods and techniques are used, and the content is conveyed simply and clearly (Swanson & Deshler, 2003; Swanson & Sachse- lee, 2000).

In order for students with special needs to be successful, general education classes should be organized to support the components of effective teaching (Horner et al., 2010). Teachers carry out effective teaching practices in classrooms where attention is not distracted, communication and interaction are established within the framework of respect, and teaching acceleration is not interrupted (Brophy, 2006). At the same time, teachers provide behavioral support by constantly reinforcing correct behaviors to monitor students' behaviors, establish classroom rules, quickly eliminate or reduce off-task or disturbing behaviors, and contribute to the formation of effective teaching (Pua et al., 2021). Effective teaching includes the teacher's knowledge, practices, and beliefs (Bell et al., 2012).

The realization of all these practices on effective teaching in inclusive environments is obviously related to teacher competence. Studies also show that teachers are the most important factor affecting students' learning (Hanusek, 2014; Hattie, 2009). Clearly, the quality of teaching is a determinant of students' learning outcomes. For this reason, it is very important how teachers to realize the components of effective teaching in inclusive environments where students with special needs are present. In this regard, observation studies have started to attract more attention in terms of examining and evaluating teacher competencies and providing feedback on the content of education that students with special needs receive in inclusive environments (Biancarosa et al., 2010; Johnson et al., 2021; Reddy et al., 2021).

Observation studies on the teaching characteristics of the classrooms, in which inclusive practices have been carried out in Turkey, and the practices of classroom teachers investigated teachers' knowledge of individualizing, adapting, rewarding, effective teaching practices, and classroom management for students with special needs (Güner, 2011; Güner-Yıldız & Melekoğlu, 2016; Sazak-Pınar & Güner-Yıldız, 2017; Sucuoğlu & Demirtaşlı, 2009). These studies show that classroom teachers have problems in the areas mentioned above.

One of the most important reasons for the continuing success gap between students with special needs studying in the same classroom with their peers in inclusive environments is that effective teaching practices are not sufficiently implemented in general education classrooms (Johnson et al., 2021). On the other hand, pre-service teachers are in the process of developing their teaching skills by modeling teachers' effective teaching practices during the transition to service. Therefore, pre-service teachers' observations about effective teaching are important in their role in general education classrooms. It is expected that the results to be obtained from this research will expand the findings regarding the problems that teachers have experienced while performing effective teaching practices, which are pointed out in the current studies. Studies in the field of inclusive education mostly focus on the quality of teaching in the classroom for students with special needs, and it is expected that this will reflect on the success of students with special needs. Therefore, there is a need for studies that provide in-depth information on how classroom teachers implement effective teaching practices in inclusive environments. This study also stemmed from such a need, and it aimed to describe primary school teachers' practices regarding effective teaching in inclusive classrooms from the perspective of primary school teacher candidates.

2. Methodology

2.1.Research Model

The study is a case study, which is one of the qualitative research methods, as it aims to reveal the effective teaching practices of classroom teachers who have students with special needs in their classrooms from the perspective of classroom teacher candidates. The case study is defined as examining and describing activities for students and subjects (eg, teaching process) in a certain organization, such as a school or teacher's classroom (Yin, 2018). In this study, the teaching practices of classroom teachers who have students with special needs in their classrooms were taken as a case and were described by primary school teacher candidates as a result of observations.

2.2. Study Group

Within the scope of the research, classroom teachers were observed by teacher candidates who are the final year students of the classroom teaching undergraduate program. During their education, they took classroom management classes and special education integration. Before the observation, the observation training process for teacher candidates was organized by the first and second authors of this study. At the end of the training process, 17 classroom teachers were observed by 53 teacher candidates in the classroom environment. Pre-service teachers are senior undergraduate students who continue their education at Gazi University, Department of Basic Education, Division of Classroom Instruction Education. Pre-service teachers are students who attend special education and inclusion courses.

When the demographic characteristics of the teachers observed in the study and the students with special needs in their classes are examined, two of the teachers are male, and 15 are female, they have between 16 and 20 years of professional experience, and their ages range from 38 to 62. Observed schools are located in Çankaya, Yenimahalle, and Keçiören districts of Ankara. Observations were made in eight different schools in these districts. When the diagnoses of students with special needs are examined, eight have learning difficulties, three have attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder, three have intellectual disability, two have autism spectrum disorder, and one has language and speech difficulties.

2.3. Data Collection

In this study, data were collected with a classroom observation form. The classroom observation form was developed in three stages: the literature review, expert opinion, and pilot study. The first stage examined the literature on classroom management and adaptations for students with special needs (Gilmour et al., 2019; Jones & Brownell, 2014; Pua et al., 2021). In the second stage, two special education and two classroom teacher education field experts evaluated the created observation form. An expert opinion form was used to carry out this evaluation. The expert opinion form was prepared in 3-point Likert type, as appropriate (3), undecided (2), not appropriate (1). The form includes the titles and explanations of the situations to be observed. Items related to titles and explanations, which all experts gave 3 points, were used. Third, a pilot study was conducted by observing the classroom of a teacher who was not involved in the research.

The observation form, which was created as a result of the three stages described above, consists of two columns as competencies and descriptions/comments, and the lines of subject/content knowledge, organization, interaction, teaching methods, presentation, classroom management and behavior control, responsiveness/sensitivity, adaptations and personal characteristics. In the research, the observation form was turned into a booklet consisting of 11 pages. On the first page are demographic features related to the observation date, place, class, and the observed teacher, while the following pages contain the titles on the lines. In the title of subject/content knowledge, teachers' ability to have in-depth knowledge of the subject they teach and to show them while lecturing; in the organization title, the competence of organizing the subject that the teachers will teach, being ready for the lesson and giving details, explaining the objectives of the lesson clearly, emphasizing and summarizing the main points, presenting the lesson at the designated date and time, monitoring the course of the lesson in the process and presenting the lesson efficiently; in the title of interaction, the competence of teachers to attract students' attention, to approach each student with fairness and impartiality, to give feedback, to encourage participation in the lesson, to interact with students and to teach the lesson enthusiastically; in the title of teaching methods, teachers' use of relevant teaching methods, assistive technology, and materials, diversifying the course presentation, including all students in the course,

ability to use simple, understandable, plain, precise and appropriate examples, and to realize their goals by focusing on the goals they will teach throughout the course; in the title of the presentation, the competence of the teachers to create a classroom environment conducive to learning during teaching, to make eye contact with the students, to explain the lesson in an appropriate tone for the whole class to hear, to use the tone of voice to attract the attention of the students; in the title of classroom management and behavior control, teachers use of time efficiently, interacting with students during the lesson, maintaining discipline and control, using the area / scene where they teach effectively, ignoring problematic behaviors, drawing students' attention to appropriate behaviors, offering alternative behaviors, highlighting other (positive) behaviors, giving clues about positive behaviors, reinforcing positive behaviors; in the title of responsiveness/sensitivity, the competence of teachers to be sensitive to students with special needs and students from different cultures; in the title of adaptations, the competence of teachers to make adaptations for students (physical adaptation, adapting the content, adapting the teaching presentation, adapting the assessment); in the title of personal characteristics, the competence of teachers to exhibit behaviors that show their self-confidence in professional and personal competence are covered. In addition, pre-service teachers were asked to write their general impressions of the observations in the relevant section on the last page of the booklet.

2.4. Data Analysis

Within the scope of the research, data were collected with an observation form. In the observation form, the students observed the teachers under eight main headings (subject content knowledge, organization, interaction, teaching methods, presentation, classroom management and behavior control, responsiveness/sensitivity, and adaptations). The students submitted their observations in an unstructured way. Qualitative data obtained as a result of students' observations were analyzed by content analysis. Content analysis is a family of methods in which researchers systematically analyze text data to classify and identify themes and patterns (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The answers of the students were thoroughly examined, and categories were created. The categories obtained are described in tables with their frequencies. Since more than one observer observed a teacher, the reliability of the observation process was evaluated by examining the compatibility between the categories created in line with the answers given by the students. Fleiss Kappa, Krippendorff alpha, and Kendall W coefficients were calculated to examine the agreement between the categories created in line with the answers given by the participants who observed the same teacher. These coefficients calculated for each teacher are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Evaluation of the Reliability of Observations*

Classrooms	Number of observers	Kappa	Krippendorff	Kendall W
C1	4	0,41	0,45	0,61
C2	3	0,24	0,27	0,51
C3	3	0,32	0,32	0,56
C4	4	0,32	0,35	0,54
C5	2	0,31	0,40	0,69
C6	3	0,21	0,27	0,51
C7	3	0,18	0,34	0,57
C8	3	0,24	0,19	0,50
C9	3	0,34	0,33	0,59
C10	4	0,28	0,33	0,49
C11	3	0,25	0,30	0,56
C12	4	0,30	0,39	0,55
C13	3	0,21	0,32	0,55
C14	2	0,89	0,89	0,94
C15	2	0,43	0,43	0,72
C16	4	0,34	0,36	0,52
C17	3	0,11	0,14	0,47

It is seen that teachers were observed by at least two and at most four teacher candidates. The Fleiss kappa values calculated for teachers are between 0.11 and 0.89. It is seen that Krippendorff alpha values vary between 0.14 and 0.89, and Kendall w values vary between 0.47 and 0.94. Correction was used in calculating the Kendall w value due to inter-rater relation. Fleiss kappa and Krippendorf alpha coefficients cannot give such a correction. Since the relationship between the students who made the observations cannot be prevented within

the scope of the study, it seems more appropriate to use the corrected Kendall w values. As Kendall w values approach 1, it can be said that there is an inter-observer agreement, and as it approaches zero, there is no inter-observer agreement. When the values are examined, it can be said that the observations made according to Kendall omega are moderately reliable.

2.4. Ethical

The ethics committee approval for this study was obtained from Gazi University's Committee on Scientific Research, and Publication Ethics with the decision numbered 13/12/2021_E.237253.

3. Findings

The candidate teachers who made observations within the scope of the research were asked to evaluate the subject content knowledge to have in-depth knowledge of the subject that the teachers teach and to show this knowledge while teaching. Thirty-nine of the candidate teachers stated that they were sufficient in terms of subject content knowledge, 10 of them stated that the teacher had knowledge but could not reflect it, and three of them stated that the teacher did not have enough knowledge. As a result of the in-depth examination of the teacher candidates' evaluations of the teaching processes of the teachers who have students with special needs in their classes, 16 categories were obtained. The categories obtained were gathered under the themes of positive and negative behaviors and presented in Table 2.

Table 2. *Evaluation of Teachers' Teaching Processes*

Themes	Categories	f
Positive Behaviours	Delivers content in an engaging way	4
	Shares additional information and content on the subject	2
	Enriches the topic with examples	5
	Does research/make efforts to improve himself/herself	2
	Uses methods to enrich content presentation	3
	Gives clues about future topics	2
	Presents content appropriate to student level	5
	Relates the subject to daily life	2
	Makes the necessary preparations before the lesson	2
	Tries to detect and correct missing learning	2
Negative Behaviours	Adheres to book and EBA contents	7
	Does not teach according to student level	1
	Ignores important points by distracting the topic	1
	Uses lecturing only	1
	Sticks to his/her experiences/does not update his/her knowledge	3
	Does not have enough knowledge for the special student in the class	2

The teacher candidates who made observations within the scope of the research were asked to evaluate the organizational skills of the teachers. Teachers' organizational skills are grouped under seven basic categories and presented in Table 3.

Table 3. *Evaluation of Teachers' Organizational Skills*

Organizational Skills	Yes		Partially		No		No opinion expressed	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Comes prepared for the subject to be taught	20	37,74	5	9,43	9	16,98	19	35,85
Explains the purpose of the course	12	22,64	2	3,77	9	16,98	30	56,60
Emphasizes important points of the topic	15	28,30	2	3,77	4	7,55	32	60,38
Gives details on the subject	6	11,32	2	3,77	5	9,43	40	75,47
Uses the time effectively	20	37,74	6	11,32	8	15,09	19	35,85
Monitors the progress of the course	10	18,87	3	5,66	3	5,66	37	69,81
Summarizes the topic	5	9,43	4	7,55	2	3,77	42	79,25
Other	21	39,62	0	0,00	0	0,00	32	60,38

According to Table 3, in the observation made by the candidate teachers for the classroom teachers who have students with special needs in their class, the skills that students highlight about organizational skills are that the teacher is prepared for the subject to be taught and uses the lesson time effectively. In addition, teacher's explaining the purpose of the lesson and emphasizing important points about the lesson are among the

prominent observations of the candidate teachers about organizational skills. However, it was observed that the teachers did not exhibit the behaviors of summarizing the subject and giving details. The other negative opinions of the pre-service teachers as a result of their observations of the classroom teachers are that the teachers stick to the book, do not give attention-grabbing expressions, and use the lecturing method. In particular, students stated that teachers do not deal with students with special needs and do not carry out special practices for them. Only one student stated that the teacher adapted the learning outcomes for special-needs students. There are also positive opinions given under the other title. Some candidates stated that teachers try to attract students' attention by using different teaching methods and techniques, keeping students active without going beyond the subject, and monitor their readiness. A teacher candidate stated that the teacher improvised the lesson based on his experience. The fact that most of the candidate teachers did not express their opinions on organizational skills can be interpreted as the classroom teachers they observed did not exhibit these behaviors in their classrooms.

The teacher candidates who made observations within the scope of the research were asked to evaluate the interaction skills of the teachers. Teachers' interaction skills were gathered under six categories and presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *Evaluation of Teachers' Interaction Skills*

Interaction Skills	Yes		Partially		No		No opinion expressed	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Engages students	15	28,30	2	3,77	15	28,30	21	39,62
Treats each student fairly, respectfully, and impartially	20	37,74	6	11,32	12	22,64	15	28,30
Gives feedback	12	22,64	4	7,55	2	3,77	35	66,04
Encourages participation	13	24,53	9	16,98	4	7,55	27	50,94
Interacts with students	8	15,09	6	11,32	4	7,55	35	66,04
Teaches enthusiastically	8	15,09	4	7,55	18	33,96	23	43,40
Other	17	32,08	0	0,00	0	0,00	36	67,92

According to Table 4, 37.74% (n = 20) of the candidate teachers stated that teachers approached each student fairly, respectfully and impartially in their class where there are special needs students while 11.32% (n = 6) stated that students were partially treated fairly, respectfully and impartially, and 22.64% (n = 12) stated that teachers did not approach every student with a fair, respectful, and impartial manner. Also, 28.20% (n = 15) of the teacher candidates did not express an opinion on this issue. It is seen that 28.30% (n = 15) of the teacher candidates stated that the teachers behaved in a way that would attract the students' attention, while 28.30% (n = 15) stated the opposite. In addition, the number of candidate teachers (15.09%; n = 8) who stated that the teachers taught the lesson enthusiastically was significantly less than the number of candidate teachers (33.96%; n = 18) who expressed the opposite opinion. The opinions in the other heading indicate that the teacher does not interact with students with special needs, does not encourage them, gives them negative feedback, makes fun of the children, does not tolerate mistakes and wrong answers, behaves differently when it comes to their success, sticks to the textbook, and does not relate the subject to daily life.In the other category, only one opinion is positive: "teacher reinforces the correct answer and makes students treat each other with respect". Only one teacher's reinforcement of a student's correct answers shows that teachers' classroom management knowledge is insufficient.

The candidate teachers who made observations within the scope of the research were asked to evaluate the skills of teachers in using teaching methods. Teachers' skills in using teaching methods are grouped under six basic categories and presented in Table 5.

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that the candidate teachers emphasize the view that teachers especially use assistive technology and materials (yes: n = 20, 37.74%; partially: n = 19, 35.85%) regarding the skills in using teaching methods. It was stated by the candidate teachers that teachers actively benefit from the projection and smartboard. In addition, it was stated by 37.74% (n = 20) of the teacher candidates that the teachers used simple, understandable, plain, precise, and appropriate examples. It was seen that 20.75% (n = 11) of the candidate teachers stated that the teachers diversified the course presentation, but 20.75% (n = 11) of them stated that the teachers did not diversify the course presentation, and 15.09% (n = 8) expressed that teachers partially diversified. Regarding the ability of teachers to use the relevant teaching methods, 18.87%

(n = 10) of the candidate teachers stated that teachers used these methods, 11.32% (n = 6) of them stated partial use, and 22.64% of them (n = 12) stated that teachers did not use them. This may indicate that teachers with students with special needs in their class have problems choosing the relevant teaching method and diversifying the course presentation. On the other hand, the fact that most of the candidate teachers did not express their opinions about the classroom teachers' appropriate teaching methods may indicate that the classroom teachers are unable to demonstrate such teaching skills.

Table 5. *Evaluation of Teachers' Skills in Using Teaching Methods*

Teaching Methods	Yes		Partially		No		No opinion expressed	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Uses relevant teaching methods	10	18,87	6	11,32	12	22,64	25	47,17
Uses assistive technology and materials	20	37,74	19	35,85	5	9,43	9	16,98
Diversifies the course presentation	11	20,75	8	15,09	11	20,75	23	43,40
The lesson taught includes the whole group	10	18,87	1	1,89	8	15,09	34	64,15
Uses simple, clear, precise and appropriate examples	20	37,74	0	0,00	4	7,55	29	54,72
Realizes his/her goals by focusing on the goals to be taught throughout the course	10	18,87	4	7,55	1	1,89	38	71,70

The candidate teachers who made observations within the scope of the research were asked to evaluate the presentation skills of the teachers. Teachers' presentation skills are grouped under four basic categories and presented in Table 6.

Table 6. *Evaluation of Teachers' Presentation Skills*

Presentation Skills	Yes		Partially		No		No opinion expressed	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Creates a classroom environment conducive to learning	19	35,85	11	20,75	5	9,43	18	33,96
Makes eye contact with students	28	52,83	3	5,66	1	1,89	21	39,62
Teaches in an appropriate tone for the whole class to hear	32	60,38	9	16,98	5	9,43	7	13,21
Uses tone of voice to attract students' attention	10	18,87	4	7,55	3	5,66	36	67,92
Other	4	7,55	0	0,00	0	0,00	49	92,45

When Table 6 is examined, according to the candidate teachers, in terms of presentation skills, teachers teach the lesson with an appropriate tone of voice so that the whole class can hear (Yes: n = 32, 60.38%; partially: n = 9, 16.98%) and they make eye contact with the student (Yes: n = 28, 52.83%; partially: n = 3, 5.66%). The statements of candidate teachers who expressed their opinions as "other" are that they provide students with freedom of movement, have high classroom dominance, and address students by name. One of the candidate teachers who expressed his opinion as "other" stated that the teacher never noticed the student who did not attend the lesson.

Teacher candidates who made observations within the scope of the research were asked to evaluate teachers' classroom management and behavior control skills. Teachers' classroom management and behavior control skills are gathered under seven basic categories and presented in Table 7.

Table 7. *Evaluation of Teachers' Classroom Management and Behavior Control Skills*

Classroom Management and Behavior Control Skills	Yes		Partially		No		No opinion expressed	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Uses time efficiently	24	45,28	8	15,09	7	13,21	14	26,42
Interacts with students during class	15	28,30	5	9,43	1	1,89	32	60,38
Maintains discipline and control	21	39,62	9	16,98	6	11,32	17	32,08
Effectively uses the area/scene	9	16,98	1	1,89	13	24,53	30	56,60
Ignores problem behavior	3	5,66	8	15,09	29	54,72	13	24,53
Promotes/reinforces positive behaviors	24	45,28	2	3,77	4	7,55	23	43,40
Hints/directs positive behavior	8	15,09	1	1,89	7	13,21	37	69,81
Other	4	7,55	0	0,00	0	0,00	49	92,45

According to Table 7, 45.28% (n =24) of the candidate teachers stated that teachers use time efficiently, 45.28% (n = 24) said that teachers emphasize and reinforce positive behaviors, 39.62% (n = 21) expressed that the teacher maintains discipline and control. In terms of teachers' classroom management and behavior control

skills, 28.30% (n = 15) of the teacher candidates stated that the teachers interacted with the students during the lesson. While 16.98% (n = 9) of the candidate teachers stated that the teacher used the area/scene effectively, 24.53% (n = 13) said they did not use the area/scene effectively, 1.89% (n = 13). 1) said that the teacher partially used the area/stage where he lectured effectively. This situation can be interpreted as that there are some problems in using the classroom space effectively in terms of teachers' classroom management and behavior control. In addition, 54.72% (n=29) of teacher candidates stated that teachers do not ignore problem behavior. Teachers are interested in students' problem behaviors by not ignoring the problem behavior. In fact, problem behaviors that will not disrupt the lesson and that are not important can be ignored, and the problem behavior can be prevented. Especially if the problem behavior's function is to attract attention, post-behavior attention/attention can be withdrawn and ignored. The observation of candidate teachers in this regard is that teachers do not ignore such behaviors. One of the candidate teachers who expressed an opinion in the other category stated that the teacher used reinforcements for successful students, another stated that the teacher did not interact with unsuccessful students, another did not reinforce the positive behaviors of the student exhibiting undesirable behavior, and another stated that the way the teacher intervened in the undesirable behavior changed according to the success of the student. Another candidate teacher who gave an opinion in the category of other is that the classroom teacher did not solve the problems that the students had with each other, and instead of understanding the problem, he asked the students to solve the problem during recess.

The candidate teachers who made observations within the scope of the research were asked to evaluate their sensitivity of the teachers. Responsiveness-sensitivity of teachers were gathered under five basic categories and presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *Evaluation of Teachers' Responsiveness/ Sensitivity*

Responsiveness/ Sensitivity	Yes		Partially		No		No opinion expressed	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sensitive to students with special needs	16	30,19	7	13,21	14	26,42	16	30,19
Sensitive to students from different cultures	16	30,19	2	3,77	10	18,87	25	47,17
Sensitive to gender differences	16	30,19	1	1,89	8	15,09	28	52,83
Creates a non-threatening learning environment	11	20,75	0	0,00	5	9,43	37	69,81
Gives appropriate answers to student predictions about the content of the course	11	20,75	1	1,89	2	3,77	40	75,47
Other	3	5,66	0	0,00	0	0,00	50	94,34

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that teachers are sensitive in creating a non-threatening environment and giving appropriate answers to students' predictions regarding the lesson's content. While 30.19% (n = 16) of the candidate teachers stated that teachers are sensitive to students with special needs, 26.42% (n=14) of teachers are not sensitive to students with special needs, and 13.21% (n = 14) 7) stated that they are partially sensitive. At this point, it makes us think that classroom teachers with students with special needs are not sensitive enough to students with special needs. In terms of being sensitive to students from different cultures, 30.19% (n=16) of candidate teachers stated that teachers are sensitive, 3.77% (n = 2) stated that teachers are partially sensitive, and 18.87% (n = 10) stated that they are not sensitive. When evaluated in terms of being sensitive to gender differences, 30.19% (n = 16) of the candidate teachers indicated that the teachers they observed were sensitive, 1.89% (n = 1) teachers were partially sensitive, and 15.09% (n = 1). 8) stated that they were not sensitive. In the other category, it was stated that a teacher identified the students who had problems in their families and acted accordingly. On the other hand, one student stated that in line with his observations, the teacher treated his student with a low socioeconomic level more harshly than other students. On the other hand, a student stated that the teacher left the control of the student with special needs to the shadow teacher.

The teacher candidates who made observations within the scope of the research were asked to evaluate the adaptations made by the teachers for the special needs student in their classroom. The adaptations made by the teachers for the special needs student in the classroom are grouped under four basic categories and presented in Table 9.

Table 9. *Evaluation of Teachers' Adaptations for the Special Needs Student in the Classroom*

Adaptations	Yes		No	
	f	%	f	%
Physical Adaptation	13	24,53	40	75,47
Adapting Content	9	16,98	44	83,02
Adapting the Teaching Presentation	7	13,21	46	86,79
Adapting Assessment	9	16,98	44	83,02

When Table 9 is examined, 24.53% (n = 13) of the candidate teachers stated that physical adaptations were made for special needs. The physical adaptations made include seating the student with special needs next to a successful student, placing the students with special needs in a way that they are not isolated from their friends, placing the student with special needs in the front row close to the teacher, and seating the student with special needs where they can see the blackboard. Of the teacher candidates, 16.98% (n = 9) stated that the content was adapted for students with special needs. The content adaptations consist of teaching different subjects with the shadow teacher, adapting the accomplishments to the level of the student, offering the student additional activities, asking questions appropriate to the level of the student, and organizing activities suitable for the student, as well as enriching with visual materials and providing familiar examples. Also, 13.21% (n = 7) of the teacher candidates stated that the instructional presentation was adapted for students with special needs. The teaching adaptations include allocating extra time outside of the classroom, creating a collaborative working environment for students with academic failure, staying close to the student during the lesson and intervening when he does not understand, giving examples that will attract the attention of the student with special needs during the lesson, engaging in activities that can effectively involve students with special needs in the lesson, and selecting an appropriate assessment tool. . As for assessment adaptations, 16.98% (n = 9) of teacher candidates stated that assessment was adapted for students with special needs. Evaluation adaptations include preparing a different exam with more visual elements for the student, paying close attention to using clearer and more understandable language in the exam, using a little more reinforcement for students with special needs, and evaluating these students according to their levels and what they can do, providing worksheets that are appropriate for the student's level, and evaluating the student by taking into account the special circumstance.One of the candidate teachers stated that the teacher made the evaluations by exchanging views with the shadow teacher. Another candidate teacher stated that a teacher who had a student with speech difficulties in the class evaluated the student in a written way rather than verbally.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Teachers' use of the components that make up effective teaching in today's inclusive classrooms is an integral part of the development of students with special needs. Questions about what constitutes effective teaching, arising from the nature and effects of classroom instruction, still dominate much of the current debate (Jones & Brownell, 2014). This study aims to describe the teaching practices of classroom teachers with students with special needs in their classrooms by the classroom teacher candidates through observation.

In the study, when the findings regarding the content presentations of the classroom teachers are examined, it is seen that the teachers do not prepare materials for the content they will teach, they use the activities on the websites they are members of, and they adhere to the contents of the Education Information Network (EBA) and the book. In their study, Güneş et al. (2016) observed the classroom teachers, and it was revealed that the teachers adhered to the EBA and book contents in the same way and did not prepare any materials even in lessons such as teaching reading. These results may be due to teachers' thinking that the materials available in the program are sufficient and their indecision about preparing materials. However, students with special needs need instruction that includes specially designed practices and a set of teaching strategies (Morris-Mathews et al., 2021).

Within the scope of the study, it is seen that very few classroom teachers use teaching strategies such as explaining the purpose of the lesson, giving details, summarizing the content or concepts. This finding is in line with the results of previous observational studies, which stated that teachers' teaching strategies such as summarizing the topic and explaining the purpose of the lesson are the least used strategies (Reddy et al., 2021; Sucuoğlu & Demirtaşlı, 2009). Although the tools and observers used in this study and other studies are

different, the similarity of the findings gives an idea that teachers do not use such strategies. In addition, the interaction skills of classroom teachers with students during the lesson were observed. In this direction, it has been determined that the rate of teachers exhibiting behaviors toward individual learning of students such as giving feedback on academic and non-academic behaviors, attracting attention, and encouraging participation in the lesson during the lesson, is low. Likewise, several research results support the findings of this study and show that classroom teachers are insufficient in the process of providing feedback to students and ensuring students' participation in the lesson (Güner & Melekoğlu, 2016; Reddy et al., 2021).

In inclusive environments, where there are students with special needs, the classroom teachers do not carry out the teaching process by thinking of these students, in other words, the lesson taught does not include all the students in the class (Sucuoğlu & Demirtaşlı, 2009), the teaching presentation and method for students with special needs or at risk are not diversified (Morris-Mathews et al., 2021). These results can be considered as an indication that the qualifications of classroom teachers cannot meet the teaching needs of students with special needs. Actually, the fact that today's general education teacher training programs train classroom teachers based on the constructivist approach (Reddy et al., 2021; Güneş, 2016) may be a reason why students with special needs remain in the background in inclusive environments. In the constructivist approach, the teacher carries and facilitates the students' high-level thinking skills further and creates a rich discussion environment with high-level questions posed by the students (Pua et al., 2021). As a matter of fact, students with special needs in inclusive environments may not be able to respond to this expectation. Cognitive load theory advocates that direct, clear, and systematic instruction should be given to students with special needs to reduce cognitive load (Morris-Mathews, 2021), and teachers should use a set of teaching skills, routines, and strategies to help these students remember and retain information by structuring instructions for them (Archer & Hughes, 2011). By providing direct and explicit instruction, teachers can reduce cognitive load, avoid overloading working memory, and facilitate productive interactions between long-term memory and working memory. Organizing such a teaching process and using different teaching methods can increase the participation of students with special needs and enable them to be more successful. In fact, due to the increasing number of students with special needs in mainstream environments, general education teacher training programs can be updated to include a variety of teaching strategies, and the basic competencies of teacher candidates can be enhanced before they enter the actual classroom (Gottfried et al. 2019). These recommendations can be put into practice when it is thought that education through certification is generally ineffective in increasing teacher competence (Harris & Sass, 2011).

Teachers need to use classroom management and behavior control skills effectively in the realization of an effective teaching process. Unfortunately, it is seen that classroom teachers do not perform their classroom management and behavior control skills adequately in the classrooms where inclusive practices are carried out (Güner, 2011; Sazak-Pınar & Güner-Yıldız, 2017; Sucuoğlu & Demirtaşlı, 2009). These findings may be because classroom teachers do not have sufficient knowledge about classroom management, and adequate training on classroom management and behavior control is not included in general education teacher training programs (Gilmour et al., 2019). At the same time, it is another important finding of this study that primary school teachers are quite inadequate in adapting the physical adaptation, the content of the course, and the assessment. However, the results of the study showed that only 24.53% of classroom teachers were able to make adjustments in the physical area, 16.98% in the content area, 16.98% in the teaching presentation, and 16.98% in the evaluation process.. These rates confirm the findings of a previous study (Sucuoğlu & Demirtaşlı, 2009). Physical and instructional adaptations are very important in inclusive environments, and adapting the physical characteristics of the classroom, the content of the course, and the teaching methods increase student participation in the lesson and prevent possible problem behaviors (Güner-Yıldız & Melekoğlu, 2016; Sucuoğlu & Demirtaşlı, 2009). The fact that primary school teachers do not use teaching strategies that constitute effective teaching suggests that their knowledge and experience about students with special needs and inclusion are insufficient. Due to the fact that primary school teacher candidates take only one course related to special education during their undergraduate education, they are unable to practice and gain knowledge of other teaching approaches, such as classroom management, individualized education, open education, systematic education, and intensive education.However, research on students with special needs underlines that open intensive individualized instruction directly increases student achievement (Al Otaiba et al., 2011; Connor et al., 2013). Teaching these practices as a part of effective teaching to teachers working with students with special needs in general education classrooms seems like a necessity.

Findings of the present study show that classroom teachers cannot perform the teaching and classroom management needed by students with special needs in inclusive environments. To prevent the failure of mainstreaming practices that have been going on for a long time, and for general education teacher training programs to train classroom teachers who can meet the needs of students with special needs, undergraduate education should be revised. It is necessary to prepare teacher training programs that will appeal to all children without excluding children with special needs from education by strengthening the general education structure.

5. Recommendation for Teaching Practices

Our study highlights the needs of classroom teachers working in inclusive environments. Classroom teachers should know how to apply teaching strategies, classroom management skills, intensive, systematic and individualized teaching approaches to meet the more specific needs of students with special needs in inclusive settings. Indeed, studies indicate that intensive, systematic and individualized teaching approaches are beneficial to meet the needs of students with special needs (Morris et al., 2021). In addition, observation studies provide information about the teaching processes implemented by classroom teachers in the classroom and offer important feedback to improve the quality of teaching processes (Reddy et al., 2021). In future research, coaching training can be given to classroom teachers in line with the feedback. The feedback provided during the coaching training process can increase the frequency and quality of effective teaching practices teachers implement in the classroom.

6. Limitations

Although this study is one of the first studies in Turkey to examine the teaching practice processes of classroom teachers with students with special needs in their classrooms through the observations of classroom teacher candidates, there are some limitations of the study. First of all, Fleiss Kappa, Krippendorff alpha, and Kendall W coefficients were calculated to examine the harmony between the categories created in line with the answers given by the participants who observed the same teacher was found that the observations made according to Kendall Omega were moderately reliable. Secondly, candidate teachers who made observations within the scope of the study consisted of students studying only in an undergraduate program. Moreover, although more than one candidate teacher observed a teacher in the study, only seventeen classroom teachers were observed. Therefore, the generalizability of the results is limited. Future research can expand the findings of the study by observing more classroom teachers in more different provinces. Thirdly, the results of the study are based on the data written by candidate classroom teachers on the observation form. The results of the study may have been affected by the fact that teacher candidates' writing skills and knowledge about special education differ. Finally, the results of our study are based on observation data only. The opinions of the classroom teachers can support the data obtained during the observation process and the data can be diversified to enrich the research results. In future studies, teacher behaviors can be observed on a larger sample with the validity and reliability tested observation tools, and extensive and in-depth data can be obtained for classroom teaching.

7. References

Al Otaiba, S., Connor, C. M., Folsom, J. S., Greulich, L., Meadows, J., & Li, Z. (2011). Assessment data-informed guidance to individualize kindergarten reading instruction: Findings from a cluster-randomized control field trial. *Elementary School Journal, 111*(4), 535–560. https://doi.org/10.1086/659031

Archer, A. L., & Hughes, C. A. (2011). *Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching*. Guilford.

Bell, C. A., Gitomer, D. H., McCaffrey, D. F., Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., & Qi, Y. (2012). An argument approach to observation protocol validity. *Educational Assessment, 17*(2-3), 62-87. https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2012.715014

Biancarosa, G., Bryk, A., & Dexter, E. (2010). Assessing the value-added effects of literacy collaborative professional development on student learning. *The Elementary School Journal, 111*(1), 7-34. https://doi.org/10.1086/653468

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Harvard University.

Brophy, J. (2006). History of research on classroom management. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 17–43). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Connor, C. M., Morrison, F. J., Fishman, B., Giuliani, S., Luck, M., Underwood, P. S., Bayraktar, A. Crowe, E. C., & Schatschneider, C. (2011). Testing the impact of Child Characteristics × Instruction interactions on third graders' reading comprehension by differentiating literacy instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 46*, 189–221. https//dx.doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.46.3.1

Every Student Succeeds Act, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2015). https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/senate-bill/1177

Gilmour, A. F., Majeika, C. E., Sheaffer, A. W., & Wehby, J. H. (2019). The coverage of classroom management in teacher evaluation rubrics. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 42*(2), 161-174. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406418781918

Gottfried, M. A., Hutt, E. L., & Kirksey, J. J. (2019). New teachers' perceptions on being prepared to teach students with learning disabilities: Insights from California. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 52*(5), 383-398. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219419863790

Guner, N. (2011). Investigation of classroom management knowledge levels of classroom teachers working in inclusive classrooms. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 19*(3), 691-708.

Guner-Yildiz, N., & Melekoğlu M.A. (2016). Investigating the academic engagement and problem behaviors of students in inclusive classrooms. *The Journal of Kesit Academy*, 2(3), 42-56. https://doi.org/10.18020/kesit.28

Gunes, F. (2016). Approaches and models in teacher education. *Ahi Evran Universty Journal of Kirsehir Education Faculty, 17*(3), 413-435.

Gunes, F., Uysal, H., Taç, İ. (2016). The process of early reading and writing: my teacher, can you teach me how to read and write? *Journal of Educational Theory and Practice Research, 2*(2), 23-33.

Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., Burchinal, M., Field, S., LoCasale-Crouch, J., Downer, J. T., Howes, C., LaParo, K., & Scott-Little, C. (2012). A course on effective teacher-child interactions. *American Educational Research Journal, 49*(1), 88-123. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211434596

Hanushek, E. A. 2014. Boosting teacher effectiveness. In C. E. J. Finn and R. Sousa (Eds.), *What lies ahead for America's children and their schools* (pp. 23–35). Hoover Institution Press.

Harris, D. N., & Sass, T. R. (2011). Teacher training, teacher quality and student achievement. *Journal of Public Economics, 95*(7-8), 798-812. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.11.009

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning. A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Anderson, C. M. (2010). Examining the evidence base for school-wide positive behavior support. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 42*(8) 1-14. https://doi.org/10.17161/foec.v42i8.6906

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277–1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Johnson, E. S., Reddy, L. A., & Jones, N. D. (2021). Introduction to the special series: Can direct observation systems lead to improvements in teacher practice and student outcomes? *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 54*(1), 3-5. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219420944795

Jones, N. D., & Brownell, M. T. (2014). Examining the use of classroom observations in the evaluation of special education teachers. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 39*(2), 112-124. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534508413514103

Lee Swanson, H., & Sachse-Lee, C. (2000). A meta-analysis of single-subject-Design intervention research for students with LD. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 33*(2), 114-136. https://doi.org/10.1177/002221940003300201

MoNE. (2017). *General competencies of teaching profession*. http://oygm.meb.gov.tr/www/ogretmenlik-meslegi-genel-yeterlikleri/icerik/39.

Morris-Mathews, H., Stark, K. R., Jones, N. D., Brownell, M. T., & Bell, C. A. (2021). Danielson's framework for teaching: Convergence and divergence with conceptions of effectiveness in special education. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 54*(1), 66-78. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219420941804

Pua, D. J., Peyton, D. J., Brownell, M. T., Contesse, V. A., & Jones, N. D. (2021). Preservice observation in special education: A validation study. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 54*(1), 6-19. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219420920382

Reddy, L. A., Lekwa, A., & Shernoff, E. (2021). Comparison of the effects of coaching for general and special education teachers in high-poverty urban elementary schools. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 54*(1), 36-53. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219420970194

Sameroff, A. J. (2009). *The transactional model of development: How children and contexts shape each other*. American Psychological Association.

Sazak-Pinar, E., & Guner-Yildiz, N. (2017). Investigation of problem behaviours exhibited by special needs students in general education classrooms and teacher reactions. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 25*(2), 551-566.

Sucuoğlu, B. & Demirtaşlı, N. (2009). *Evaluation of preventive classroom management knowledge and skills of classroom teachers working in mainstreaming classrooms* (2008-2009). Proje No: 108K-183.

Swanson, H. L., & Deshler, D. (2003). Instructing adolescents with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 36*(2), 124 135. https://doi.org/10.1177/002221940303600205

Swanson, H. L., Hoskyn, M., & Lee, C. (1999). *Interventions for students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis of treatment outcomes*. Guilford.

Yin, R, Y. (2018). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Sage.

Vaughn, S., Wanzek, J., Murray, C. S., & Roberts, G. (2012). *Intensive interventions for students struggling in reading and mathematics: A practice guide*. RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED531907.pdf