



*Araştırma Makalesi • Research Article*

**Investigation of the Attitudes of Primary School Teachers Towards Refugee Students**

***Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Mülteci Öğrencilere Yönelik Tutumlarının İncelenmesi***

Veysel Kara\*, Mehmet Başaran\*\*

**Abstract:** This study aims to examine the attitudes of primary school teachers with refugee students in their classes towards these students. The convergent parallel design, one of the mixed research designs, was used. The study data were obtained from 311 primary school teachers, 197 females and 114 males, working in the Şahinbey and Şehitkamil districts of Gaziantep. Ethics Committee approval was obtained from Gaziantep University (08.10.2021-E.96398). In the study, "Demographic Information Form," "Refugee Student Attitude Scale," and "Semi-structured Interview Form" prepared by the researchers were used as the data collection tools. The quantitative data obtained with the data collection tools were analyzed by SPSS program, and the qualitative data were analyzed by descriptive analysis. According to the results of the statistical analysis, it was determined that the overall scale and the proficiency sub-dimension differed in favor of male teachers in terms of gender variable, and the efficacy sub-dimension in terms of age variable in favor of the 51-60 age group. In terms of the years of service variable, it was found that the sub-dimension of proficiency differed significantly in favor of teachers who had served for 21 years or more, and the overall scale in terms of the number of refugee students in the teachers' classrooms, and favor of teachers with a refugee student in the sub-dimensions of adaptation and proficiency. The proficiency dimension favors teachers who served 21+ years in terms of years of service. In the content analysis of the interviews, it was revealed that the teachers had a language problem with their communication with the refugee students, and they tried to overcome this problem through Turkish-Arabic-speaking students or translators, which was a language problem in the adaptation of the refugee students and those parents had a negative view of co-education, that teachers planned activities and group games to overcome the adaptation problem. In addition, considering that the language problem and reading comprehension are the biggest problems in refugee education, the teachers underlined that there should be no discrimination and that language education should be provided to the refugee students and their parents as the key recommendations. The findings were discussed in the light of the literature, and the recommendations were made for the practitioners and researchers.

**Keywords:** inclusive education, refugee student, primary school teachers' attitude

**Öz:** Araştırmanın amacı sınıfında mülteci öğrenci bulunan sınıf öğretmenlerinin mülteci öğrencilere yönelik tutumlarının incelenmesidir. Araştırmada karma araştırma desenlerinden yakinsayan paralel desen kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın verileri Gaziantep'te Şahinbey ve Şehitkamil ilçelerinde görev yapan 311 sınıf öğretmeninden elde

\* Expert, Ministry of National Education

ORCID: 0000-0002-7130-5767, [veyselkara28@gmail.com](mailto:veyselkara28@gmail.com)

\*\* Asst. Prof. Dr., Gaziantep University, Education Faculty, Curriculum and Instruction

ORCID: 0000-0003-1871-520X, [mehmetbasaran@gantep.edu.tr](mailto:mehmetbasaran@gantep.edu.tr) [corresponding author]

This paper has been derived from the first author's MA dissertation completed under the supervision of the second author.

This research was carried out after being approved by the decision of Gaziantep University (08.10.2021-E.96398).

**Cite as/ Atif:** Kara, V. & Başaran, M. (2022). Investigation of the attitudes of primary school teachers towards refugee students.

*Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(3), 981-1001. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18506/anemon.1111750>

**Received/Geliş:** 30 April/Nisan 2022

**Accepted/Kabul:** 26 Ağustos/Ağustos 2022

**Published/Yayın:** 30 December/Aralık 2022

edilmiştir. Veri toplama araçları "Demografik Bilgi Formu", "Mülteci Öğrenci Tutum Ölçeği" ve araştırmacının hazırladığı, "Yarı Yapılandırılmış Görüşme Formu"dur. Elde edilen nicel verilerin analizinde SPSS programı, nitel verilerin analizinde betimsel analiz yöntemi kullanılmıştır. İstatistiksel analiz sonuçlarına göre cinsiyet açısından ölçeğin geneli ve yeterlik alt boyutunun erkek öğretmenler, yaş açısından yeterlik alt boyutunun 51-60 yaş, hizmet yılı açısından yeterlik alt boyutunun 21+ yıl hizmette bulunmuş öğretmenler ve sınıflarındaki mülteci öğrenci sayısı açısından ölçeğin geneli, uyum ve yeterlik alt boyutlarında 1 mülteci öğrencisi bulunan öğretmenler lehine anlamlı farklılığı bulunmuştur. Yapılan görüşmelerin betimsel analizinde, öğretmenlerin mülteci öğrenciyle iletişimlerinde dil sorunu olduğu, bunu Türkçe-Arapça bilen öğrenciler veya tercümanlarla aşmaya çalışıkları, mülteci öğrencilerin uyumlarında dil sorunu olduğu, velilerin bir arada eğitime sıcak bakmadıkları, öğretmenlerin uyum sağlama amacıyla etkinlikler ve grup oyunları planladıkları, mülteci eğitiminde dil sorunuyla okuduğunu anlamama en büyük sorunlar olarak dile getirilmiş olup öğretmenler çözüm olarak ayrılmama, mülteci öğrenci ve velilerine dil eğitimi verilmesi gerektiğini belirtmişlerdir. Elde edilen bulgular literatür ışığında tartışılmış, uygulayıcı ve araştırmacılarla yönelik önerilere yer verilmiştir.

**Keywords:** kapsayıcı eğitim, mülteci öğrenci, tutum

## Introduction

People have migrated from one place to another for different reasons from the past to the present. Migration is the movement people take for social, political, or economic reasons in or out of the region where they live forcefully or willingly to achieve a prosperous life (Aksoy, 2012). Erder (1986) defined the phenomenon of migration as the fact that the displaced changes occurred at a certain distance and occurred in a process that had enough effect. Based on the definitions, we can define the phenomenon of migration as a movement of displacement in a certain period, whether in groups or individually, to have more prosperous living conditions, whether temporarily or permanently, for political, social, or economic reasons. As a result of migrations, the concept of refugees emerged.

Turkey is affected by migration movements and receives intensive migration due to its location in a region where the continents meet (Karayel, 2016; Ansen, 2012). Today, the Republic of Turkey is home to nearly four million refugees from Syria alone. There are 3,739,859 Syrian refugees registered in Turkey as of February 3, 2022, and under temporary protection (Directorate General of Migration Management [GIGM], 2022). The countries where other refugees living in our country have citizenship, and their numbers are as follows:

- Iraqi refugees, 162,760 people
- Afghan refugees, 125,104 people
- Iranian refugees, 24,300 people
- Other refugees 10,024 people (UNHCR, 2021).

Turkey has over four million refugees. Many are inevitable, and various arrangements will be made for refugees. The government's arrangements regarding refugees are made in education, economic, health, and social fields.

In Türkiye, the education of refugees is carried out with various applications, and recently inclusive education practices have been included among these practices. Inclusive education is that the individual's needs should be highlighted rather than handled alone and that all disadvantaged groups can benefit from educational services in the same educational environments by diversifying the appropriate educational content (UNESCO, 2008). Inclusive education aims to ensure that all individuals have access to quality education and learn success, to ensure that children attend school by preventing exclusion and discrimination, and to reach a society where all individuals have rights, and these rights are democratically recognized (Puri & Abraham, 2004; Dusik & Santarosa, 2016; Barton, 1997). The basic idea of inclusive education is to ensure that all students benefit equally from educational opportunities and to create quality educational environments, regardless of biased opinions such as gender, race, religious beliefs, different characteristics, special needs, and socioeconomic status. The Inclusive Education Project, which was carried out by the Turkish Ministry of National Education (MEB) General Directorate of Teacher Training and Development (ÖYGM) with the support of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), was implemented in 3 phases. The

first phase of the project was carried out with Syrian teachers to improve the quality of the education carried out in the Temporary Education Center (GEM) under the heading ‘Training of Syrian Teachers,’ and the second phase was carried out with Foreign Nationals in the ‘Class of Foreign Nationals in the Class.’ Under the title of ‘Teacher Education with Students’, it was made to support teachers with refugee students in their classrooms, and in the third stage, the project was detailed in ten modules and redeveloped under ‘Inclusive Education.’ With this training, ÖYGM aimed to eliminate the exclusion applied to refugee students by centering the student, seeing the differences of refugee children as wealth, not as a problem, and including them in all educational activities (ÖYGM, 2018). According to General Directorate of Lifelong Learning (HBOGM) 2021 data, the age population in education, excluding university education in our country, is 1,272,691 people, while the number of students enrolled in the school is 831,801 (HBOGM, 2021). The aged population and the number of refugee students enrolled in the school show how important inclusive educational practices are for teachers and refugee students.

Refugee students guide classroom teachers at the elementary level. These positions make classroom teachers’ attitudes towards refugee students essential. This study was carried out to shed light on the communication of classroom teachers at the elementary level, which is one of the main steps in integrating refugee students into society and the education system, the adaptation problems experienced by refugee students, and the problems in general.

When the relevant literature was examined, it was seen that only Kazu and Deniz’s (2019) research was in the context of inclusive education when we looked at the research aimed at examining teachers’ attitudes regarding refugee students. This research is separated from other research in terms of inclusive education. Other similar studies aimed at examining teachers’ attitudes towards refugee students examined teachers’ attitudes towards refugee students in terms of Sağlam and Kanbur’s (2017) three variables, Köse, Bülbül, and Uluman’s (2019) five variables, and Akman (2020) five variables. This research is also essential for examining teachers’ attitudes towards refugee students by taking 13 variables for teachers. However, answers to the following questions were sought, predicting that classroom teachers’ attitudes could not be independent of the characteristics or some variables they had.

1. Is there any significant difference between the attitudes of classroom teachers with refugee students in their class in terms of gender, age, number of refugee students in the classroom, year of service, whether they receive education for inclusive education, marital status, number of children in the family, and educational status variables?
2. What is the extent of teachers’ communication with refugee students?
3. How do teachers evaluate refugee students’ integration in school/classroom?
4. What are the problems teachers have in refugee student education, and what are the solutions to these problems?

## **Method**

This part of the research includes a research approach, working group, data collection tools, data collection and analysis, validity, and reliability studies.

### **Research Pattern**

This study, which was carried out to examine classroom teachers’ attitudes toward refugee students in inclusive education, is mixed-method research, and the study used a parallel design that converges from a mixed-method research design. In the convergent parallel design, a mixed-method research pattern, quantitative and qualitative data are collected and analyzed separately, and finally, the data is compared or associated with each other (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2014).

### **Workgroup**

Ethics Committee approval was obtained from Gaziantep University (08.10.2021-E.96398). Creating the research group was criteria for the target group to work as public-school classroom teachers and have at least one refugee student. For this reason, the criterion sampling method was used when creating the research sample. In this sampling method, the researcher determines the characteristics of the sample group, and the people who have these qualities are selected for the sample group (Büyüköztürk et al., 2018).

In the quantitative dimension of the study, 311 classroom teachers working in the Şahinbey and Şehitkamil districts of Gaziantep province worked together. The demographic characteristics of the classroom teachers in the quantitative working group are included in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Demographic Characteristics of the Class Teachers Who Make up the Study Group in the Quantitative Dimension of the Study

Variable	Option	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Female	197	63.3
	Male	114	36.7
Marital Status	Married	217	69.8
	Single	94	30.2
Age	20-30	101	32.5
	31-40	111	35.7
	41-50	70	22.5
	51-60	29	9.3
Education Status	Undergraduate	268	86.2
	Master	43	13.8
Year of Service	0-5	91	29.3
	6-10	47	15.1
	11-15	49	15.8
	16-20	55	17.7
	21+	69	22.2
Teachers' Status of Having Children	No Children	106	34.1
	1	51	16.4
	2	113	36.3
	3+	41	13.2
Number of Refugee Students in the Classroom	1	47	15.1
	2	41	13.2
	3	47	15.1
	4+	176	56.6
Inclusive Education In-Service Training Status	Yes	189	60.8
	No	122	39.2

When table 1 is examined, 63.3% of the teachers who participated in the quantitative dimension of the study were female, 36.7% were male, 69.8% were married, 30.2% were single, and 32.5% were between the age of 20 and 30, 35.7% are aged between 31-40, 22.5% are between 41-50 years old, 9.3% are between 51-60, 86.2% are undergraduate, and 13.8% are graduates. 29.3% of teachers have a service year between 0-5 years, 15.1% between 6-10 years, 15.8% between 11-15 years, 17.7% have no children between 16 and 20 years, 22.2% have no children in their family for more than 21 years, 16.4% have one child, 36.3% have two children, and 13.2% have three or more children.

15.1% of the teachers who participated in the study had one refugee student in their class, 13.2% had two refugee students, 15.1% had three refugee students, and 56.6% had four or more refugee students. It is seen that 60.8% of teachers receive in-service training related to inclusive education, and 39.2% do not receive in-service training related to inclusive education.

In the qualitative dimension of the study, the criteria sampling method was used, and qualitative interview questions were selected from nine volunteer classroom teachers who studied on a quantitative

scale and worked with these teachers. In the light of the data obtained in the quantitative research, interviews were conducted with the teachers who had refugee students in their classes to understand the current situation. Having refugee students in the class was determined as a criterion. Demographic characteristics of classroom teachers in the qualitative dimension of the research are given in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Demographic Characteristics of the Class Teachers Who Make Up the Study Group in the Qualitative Dimension of the Study

Variable	Option	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Female	4	44.4
	Male	5	55.5
Marital Status	Married	7	77.7
	Single	2	22.2
Age	20-30	5	55.5
	31-40	2	22.2
	41-50	1	11.1
	51-60	1	11.1
Education status	Undergraduate	7	77.7
	Master	2	22.2
Year of Service	0-5	3	33.3
	6-10	2	22.2
	11-15	1	11.1
	16-20	1	11.1
Teachers' status as having children	21+	2	22.2
	No Children	5	55.5
	1	1	11.1
Number of Refugee Students in the Classroom	2	1	11.1
	3+	2	22.2
	1	0	0
Inclusive Education In-Service Training Status	2	0	0
	3	0	0
	4+	9	100
Inclusive Education In-Service Training Status	Yes	5	55.5
	No	4	44.4

When table 2 is examined, 44.4% of the teachers who participated in the qualitative dimension of the study were female, and 55.5% were male.

### Data Collection Tools

In the quantitative part of the study, the Refugee Student Attitude Scale [RSAS], consisting of 24 articles developed by Sağlam & Kanbur (2017) with communication, compliance, and proficiency sub-dimensions, was used to measure the attitudes of classroom teachers towards refugee students. Internal coefficients of consistency were examined to determine the reliability of the Refugee Student Attitude Scale. The internal consistency coefficient (Alpha) for the scale's reliability is calculated as .91. This value indicates that the substances that make up the scale are consistent. Internal consistency reliability coefficients were also calculated for each sub-factor. The reliability coefficient for the first sub-factor was .88, the reliability coefficient for the second sub-factor was .88, and the reliability coefficient for the third sub-factor was .80. Our research calculated internal consistency coefficients separately for the communication, compliance, and proficiency sub-dimensions of the Refugee Student Attitude Scale. The reliability coefficient for the communication subdivision is .93, the reliability coefficient for the compliance subdivision is .89, the reliability coefficient for the proficiency subdivision is .78, and the reliability coefficient for the scale-wide is .94.

In the qualitative dimension of the research, the researcher prepared semi-structured interview questions consisting of 10 questions following the sub-dimensions of the Refugee Student Attitude Scale. In the process of developing the qualitative data collection tool, before the questions were prepared, ten questions that were thought to be complementary to the communication, adaptation, and competence sub-dimensions of the scale were prepared by making use of the Refugee Student Attitude Scale, which will be used in the quantitative dimension of our research. Experts in the field were consulted regarding the prepared interview questions. According to expert opinions, after necessary linguistic and morphological corrections were made to the interview questions, the interview form with ten open-ended questions was applied to nine volunteer classroom teachers who had refugee students in their class and were selected according to the criterion sampling. It was considered a criterion for the teachers to have at least one refugee student and to work in a public school.

The researcher created a "Personal Information Form" for both methods to collect information on the demographic characteristics of the classroom teachers participating in the study. In this form, there are questions about gender, age, whether the teachers who participated in the research voluntarily received education for inclusive education, the year of service, marital status, the status of teachers having children, and the number of refugee students in their class and their educational status.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

The scale used within the scope of the quantitative dimension of the study was sent online to classroom teachers with the link created by the researcher in the fall semester of the 2021-2022 academic year, and 311 classroom teachers answered the scale online. In writing, teachers are told about the purpose of the research and how to apply it. In addition, it has been explained that selecting substances that reflect their actual attitudes in this data collection tool has an essential role in achieving the purpose of the research. Thus, their motivation for the data collection tool was increased. The data collection process was carried out thoroughly. The first research question, "Is there a significant difference between the attitudes of classroom teachers with refugee students in their classrooms in terms of gender, age, number of refugee students in the classroom, year of service, whether or not they receive education for inclusive education, marital status, number of children in the family and educational status variables?" was obtained by analyzing the data on the quantitative dimension with the SPSS 22.0 package program.

Data on the qualitative dimension of the research were collected on the exact dates as the collection dates following the research pattern. The researcher encouraged the participants to participate in the research process by informing them. The data collection process is terminated when it is thought that sufficient numbers of data have been reached. Data that does not meet the criteria has been extracted, and the data has been finalized. Three sub-questions regarding the qualitative dimension of the study were sought. These are the ones that are going to

"What is the extent of teachers' communication with refugee students?

How do teachers evaluate refugee students' integration in school/classroom?

What are teachers' problems in refugee student education, and what are the solutions to these problems?"

The findings from these questions were analyzed by the method of depiction analysis.

### **Validity and Reliability Studies**

The personal information form was applied to teachers, and the data obtained from the scale were digitized using the SPSS 22.0 package program, and data were analyzed with this program. During the analysis of the data, the following statistical procedures were performed.

Frequency and percentage retrieval procedures were applied for descriptive statistical analyses related to the personal characteristics of the teachers participating in the scale (gender, age, in-service education for inclusive education, year of service, marital status, teachers' status of having children, number of refugee students in the classroom and educational status). The scale was subjected to the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency test to test the Refugee Student Attitude Scale's subdivision

reliability. Kolmogorov-Smirnov decided whether the data showed normal distribution within the groups by looking at the distortion pressure coefficients to determine the analyses. T-test (Independent Sample t-test) was used in two independent group comparisons in normal distribution data. One-way Variance (Oneway ANOVA) analysis was used to compare more than two unrelated groups, and the Bonferroni test from post hoc tests was used to determine the source of the difference. Levene statistics have determined whether the variances are homogeneous to determine the homogeneity of the variance. The Pearson correlation coefficient looked at the relationship between the variables. 0.05 significance level was used to interpret whether the obtained values were meaningful.

The data collection form has been prepared following the scientific process to ensure the internal validity of the qualitative interview form of the research, Codes for teachers' attitudes towards refugee students are supported by direct citations to ensure internal credibility. In qualitative research, it is seen as necessary for the validity of the research to include direct excerpts from the statements of the participants of the study and explain the results achieved (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2016). Who is the teacher whose idea is mentioned when the excerpts are made? T1, T2, T3... is encoded with numbers in the teacher's order in the list. In order to ensure external reliability and validity, the method of research and the research process are explained in detail.

In order to ensure the validity and reliability of the interview forms applied, the questions were prepared according to the Refugee Student Attitude Scale and presented to the opinions of 5 experts in their fields, one of whom is a Turkish teacher. After the necessary content arrangements and shapely linguistic arrangements were made on the questions after the returns, the data were evaluated by the descriptive analysis method. The themes were created by different researchers at different times and encoded in specific themes. The analysis of the data by the researcher was carried out by the descriptive analysis method. Descriptive analysis is an analytical approach that includes processing qualitative data, identification, and interpretation of findings, depending on a predetermined framework (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011). Within the scope of the research, it has been pledged that the information given in the personal information form will not be included as a result of the research in order for the teachers whose opinions are consulted to express their opinions comfortably.

The themes of the study were made according to the answers given to the questions in the written interview form, considering the scale's communication, compliance, and proficiency sub-dimensions. The research themes were "problems and solutions in communication, adaptation and refugee education." In addition, frequency analysis was performed according to the repetition of the teachers' responses.

## Results

In this section, the findings of the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of the research are given.

### Findings on the Quantitative Dimension of Research

The findings of the Refugee Student Attitude Scale used in the quantitative dimension are included in this research. The findings in this section include the findings of the first sub-problem of the study.

### **Findings of the First Sub-Problem of the Study**

The scale was subjected to the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency test to test the Refugee Student Attitude Scale's subdivision reliability. Table 3 provides findings on the reliability analysis of scale scores.

**Table 3. Reliability Analysis of Scale Score**

Scale and Subscales		Cronbach's Alpha
Scale Dimensions	Communication	.93
	Harmony	.89
	Proficiency	.78
Refugee student attitude scale		.94

Table 3. When examined, it is seen that the refugee student attitude scale is at a level where the reliability of the Proficiency Dimension is acceptable, and the scale scores of other dimensions are at a high level of reliability.

### **Findings on the Normality of Scales**

Table 4 contains descriptive statistics of scales and findings on the conformity of the data to normal distribution.

**Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Scales and Findings on the Conformity of the Data to Normal Distribution**

Scales	Statistics				Skewness	Kurtosis
	Min.	Max.	$\bar{X}$	Ss		
Communication	12.00	44.00	36.78	6.81	-.95	.70
Harmony	9.00	36.00	24.88	6.31	.08	-.64
Proficiency	4.00	16.00	10.52	3.11	.25	-.89
Refugee student attitude scale	28.00	96.00	72.17	14.41	-.25	-.41

In order to determine the analyzes to be made, it was decided whether the data showed a normal distribution within the groups by looking at the skewness coefficients. When Table 4 is examined, the values obtained by dividing the kurtosis and skewness values, which are widely used and reliable methods for normality, by their standard errors are considered to be between  $\pm 2.0$ , and the values are considered to be normally distributed (George & Mallery, 2010). Statistical analyzes were performed with parametric tests.

A t-test (Independent Sample t-test) was used in two independent group comparisons in normal distribution data. One-way variance analysis (One-way ANOVA) was used to compare more than two unrelated groups, and the Bonferroni test from post hoc tests was used to determine the source of the difference. Levene statistics have determined whether the variances are homogeneous to determine the homogeneity of the variance.

### **Findings on Comparing Scales and Dimensions with Some Variables**

T-test was used in two independent group comparisons, One-way Variance Analysis was used to compare more than two unrelated groups, and the Bonferroni test from post hoc tests was used to determine the source of the difference. Comparisons were made with Levene statistics to determine whether the variances were homogeneous.

Table 5 provides findings on comparing refugee student attitude scale and scale subdivision scores by gender of teachers.

**Table 5.** Findings on Comparing Refugee Student Attitude Scale and Subsidize Scores by Gender of Teachers

Scales	Gender	n	$\bar{X} \pm S.D.$	t	Sd	p
Communication	Female	197	36.39±6.57	-1.320	309	.18
	Male	114	37.45±7.19			
Harmony	Female	197	24.49±6.34	-1.437	309	.15
	Male	114	25.55±6.23			
Proficiency	Female	197	10.05±3	-3.588	309	.01
	Male	114	11.33±3.14			
Refugee student attitude scale	Female	197	70.92±13.97	-2.021	309	.04
	Male	114	74.33±14.94			

According to table 5, the communication dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the gender of the individuals ( $t=-1.320$   $p>0.05$ ). Male and female teachers scored close in the communication dimension. The adaptation dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the gender of the individuals ( $t=-1.437$   $p>0.05$ ). In other words, male and female teachers scored close in the fit dimension.

The proficiency dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale show a statistically significant difference according to the gender of the individuals ( $t=-3.588$   $p<0.05$ ). When the mean values are considered, the proficiency dimension Scale Scores of men ( $11.33\pm3.14$ ) are higher than that of women ( $10.05\pm3$ ). The scores show a statistically significant difference according to the gender of the individuals ( $t=-2.021$   $p<0.05$ ). Attitude Scale Scores of men toward refugee students ( $74.33\pm14.94$ ) compared to women ( $70.92\pm13.97$ ) are higher. Table 6 compares refugee student attitude scale and scale subdivision scores according to teachers' marital status.

**Table 6.** Findings on Comparing Refugee Student Attitude Scale and Subsidize Scores According to Teachers' Marital Status

Scales	Marital Status	n	$\bar{X} \pm S.D.$	t	df	p
Communication	Married	217	36.6±6.94	-.70	309	.48
	Single	94	37.19±6.51			
Harmony	Married	217	24.78±6.3	-.40	309	.69
	Single	94	25.1±6.36			
Proficiency	Married	217	10.52±3.06	-.01	309	.99
	Single	94	10.52±3.22			
Refugee student attitude scale	Married	217	71.9±14.53	-.51	309	.61
	Single	94	72.81±14.17			

According to Table 6, the communication dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference in the individual's marital status ( $t=-0.70$   $p>0.05$ ). In other words, married and single teachers scored close in the communication dimension.

The adaptation dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the individual's marital status ( $t=-0.40$   $p>0.05$ ). Married and single teachers got close scores from the adjustment dimension. The proficiency dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the individual's marital status ( $t=-0.01$   $p>0.05$ ). In other words, married and single teachers got close scores from the competency dimension. The scores do not show a statistically significant difference according to the individual's marital status ( $t=-0.51$   $p>0.05$ ). Married and single teachers scored close on the refugee student attitude scale. Table 7 compares refugee student attitude scale and scale subdivision scores according to teachers' educational status.

**Table 7.** Findings on Comparing Refugee Student Attitude Scale and Subsize Scores According to Teachers' Educational Status

Scales	Education Status	n	$\bar{X} \pm S.D.$	t	df	p
Communication	Undergraduate	268	36.83±6.77	.35	309	.73
	Master	43	36.44±7.09			
Harmony	Undergraduate	268	24.92±6.38	.28	309	.78
	Master	43	24.63±5.93			
Proficiency	Undergraduate	268	10.48±3.12	-.51	309	.61
	Master	43	10.74±3.02			
Refugee student attitude scale	Undergraduate	268	72.23±14.46	.18	309	.86
	Master	43	71.81±14.23			

According to Table 7., the communication dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the educational status of the individuals ( $t=0.35 p>0.05$ ). In other words, the scores of those with undergraduate education and the teachers with master's degrees were close to each other in the communication dimension. The adaptation dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the educational status of the individuals ( $t=-0.28 p>0.05$ ). The scores of those with a bachelor's degree in education and those of teachers with a master's degree were close. The proficiency dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the educational status of the individuals ( $t=-0.51 p>0.05$ ). In other words, the scores of those with a bachelor's degree in education and the proficiency of teachers with a master's degree were close to each other. The scores do not show a statistically significant difference according to the educational status of the individuals ( $t=0.18 p>0.05$ ). In other words, the scores of those with undergraduate education and teachers with master's degrees got close to each other on the Refugee Student Attitude Scale.

Table 8 provides findings on comparing refugee student attitude scale and scale subdivision scores according to teachers' inclusive education status.

**Table 8.** Findings on Comparing Refugee Student Attitude Scale and Subsize Scores According to Teachers' Inclusive Education Status

Scales	Training Status	n	$\bar{X} \pm S.D.$	t	df	p
Communication	Yes	189	36.39±7.11	-1.26	309	.21
	No	122	37.39±6.3			
Harmony	Yes	189	24.65±6.44	-.79	309	.43
	No	122	25.23±6.1			
Proficiency	Yes	189	10.72±3.08	1.47	309	.14
	No	122	10.2±3.14			
Refugee student attitude scale	Yes	189	71.76±14.82	-.63	309	.53
	No	122	72.81±13.77			

According to Table 8., the communication dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the educational status of the teachers ( $t=-1.26 p>0.05$ ). In other words, the scores of those who received in-service training and the teachers who did not receive in-service training received close scores in the communication dimension. The adaptation dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the educational status of the teachers ( $t=-0.79 p>0.05$ ). In other words, the scores of those who received in-service training and those of teachers who did not receive in-service training received close scores from the fit dimension. The proficiency dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the educational status of the teachers ( $t=1.47 p>0.05$ ). In other words, the scores of those who received in-service training and the teachers

who did not receive in-service training received close scores from the proficiency dimension. The scores do not show a statistically significant difference according to teachers' educational status ( $t=-0.63$   $p>0.05$ ). In other words, the scores of those who received in-service training and the teachers who did not receive in-service training received close scores from the Refugee student attitude scale.

Table 9 compares refugee student attitude scale and scale subdivision scores according to teachers' ages.

**Table 9.** Findings on Comparing Refugee Student Attitude Scale and Subsize Scores by Teachers' Ages

	Age	n	$\bar{X} \pm S.D.$	S.V.	S.S.	M.S.	F	p	Difference
Communication	a20-30	101	36.97±6.35	B.G.	226.16	75.39	1.64	.18	
	b31-40	111	36.74±6.4	W.G.	14143.53	46.07			
	c41-50	70	37.59±6.52	Sum	14369.69				
	d51-60	29	34.31±9.78						
Harmony	a20-30	101	24.81±6.36	B.G.	102.62	34.21	.86	.46	
	b31-40	111	24.25±5.73	W.G.	12234.74	39.85			
	c41-50	70	25.61±6.65	Sum	12337.36				
	d51-60	29	25.72±7.37						
Proficiency	a20-30	101	10.22±3.27	B.G.	105.80	35.27	3.75	.01*	b<d
	b31-40	111	10.07±2.75	W.G.	2887.85	9.41			
	c41-50	70	11.11±3.13	Sum	2993.65				
	d51-60	29	11.83±3.31						
Refugee student attitude scale	a20-30	101	72±14.02	B.G.	463.53	154.51	.74	.53	
	b31-40	111	71.06±13.16	W.G.	63865.09	208.03			
	c41-50	70	74.31±14.67	Sum	64328.62				
	d51-60	29	71.86±19.2						

According to Table 9., the communication dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference in the teachers' ages ( $f=1.64$   $p>0.05$ ). The adaptation dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the teachers' ages ( $f=0.86$   $p>0.05$ ). The scores do not show a statistically significant difference according to the age of the teachers ( $f=0.74$   $p>0.05$ ).

The proficiency dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale show a statistically significant difference according to the teachers' ages ( $f=3.75$   $p<0.05$ ). According to the Bonferroni multiple comparison test, which was conducted to understand which groups the difference is, the scores of those aged between 31-40 ( $10.07\pm2.75$ ) are significantly lower than those of 51-60 years ( $11.83\pm3.31$ ).

Table 10 provides findings on comparing refugee student attitude scale and scale subdivision scores by teachers' year of service.

**Table 10.** Findings on Comparing Refugee Student Attitude Scale and Subsidize Scores by Teachers' Year of Service

	Year of Service	n	$\bar{X} \pm S.D.$	S.V.	S.S.	M.S.	F	p	Difference
Communication	a0-5	91	37.23±5.91	B.G.	40.55	10.14			
	b6-10	47	36.77±7.16	W.G.	14329.14	46.83			
	c11-15	49	36.51±6.22	Sum	14369.69		.22	.93	
	d16-20	55	36.91±6.89						
	e21-+	69	36.28±8.04						
Harmony	a0-5	91	24.45±6.22	B.G.	142.97	35.74			
	b6-10	47	25.11±6.87	W.G.	12194.38	39.85			
	c11-15	49	23.96±4.5	Sum	12337.36		.90	.47	
	d16-20	55	24.84±6.69						
	e21-+	69	25.97±6.81						
Proficiency	a0-5	91	10.3±3.23	B.G.	114.86	28.71			
	b6-10	47	10.32±2.91	W.G.	2878.80	9.41			
	c11-15	49	9.67±2.62	Sum	2993.65		3.05	.02*	c<e
	d16-20	55	10.51±3.18						
	e21-+	69	11.55±3.15						
Refugee student attitude scale	a0-5	91	71.98±13.3	B.G.	387.80	96.95			
	b6-10	47	72.19±15.56	W.G.	63940.83	208.96			
	c11-15	49	70.14±11.3	Sum	64328.62		.46	.76	
	d16-20	55	72.25±14.96						
	e21-+	69	73.8±16.57						

According to Table 10. The communication dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the teachers' years of service ( $f=0.22$   $p>0.05$ ). The adaptation dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale show a statistically significant difference according to the teachers' years of service. does not differ ( $f=0.90$   $p>0.05$ ). The scores do not show a statistically significant difference in teachers' years of service ( $f=0.46$   $p>0.05$ ).

The proficiency dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale show a statistically significant difference according to the teachers' years of service ( $f=3,705$   $p<0.05$ ). According to the Bonferroni multiple comparison test, which was conducted to understand between which groups the difference was, the scores of those whose years of service were between 11-15 ( $9.67\pm2.62$ ) were significantly different according to the scores of those whose years of service were 21 and above ( $11.55\pm3.15$ ). is lower.

Table 11 provides findings comparing refugee student attitude scale and scale subdivision scores according to teachers' status of having children.

**Table 11.** Findings on Comparing Refugee Student Attitude Scale and Subsidize Scores According to Teachers' Child Ownership Status

	Number of Children	n	$\bar{X} \pm S.D.$	S.V.	S.S.	M.S.	F	p
Communication	No	106	36.99±6.3	B.G.	25.64	8.55	.18	.91
	1	51	36.73±6.25	W.G.	14.344.05	46.72		
	2	113	36.44±7.01	Sum	14.369.69			
	3+	41	37.22±8.25					
Harmony	No	106	24.73±6.38	B.G.	33.08	11.03	.28	.84
	1	51	25.22±6.16	W.G.	12.304.28	40.08		
	2	113	24.63±6.23	Sum	12.337.36			
	3+	41	25.54±6.67					
Proficiency	No	106	10.17±3.22	B.G.	34.52	11.51	1.19	.31
	1	51	10.9±2.66	W.G.	2.959.13	9.64		
	2	113	10.46±2.96	Sum	2.993.65			
	3+	41	11.1±3.65					
Refugee student attitude scale	No	106	71.89±14.15	B.G.	193.97	64.66	.31	.82
	1	51	72.84±12.76	W.G.	64.134.65	208.91		
	2	113	71.53±14.44	Sum	64.328.62			
	3+	41	73.85±17.05					

According to Table 11., the communication dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference in the number of children in the families of the teachers ( $f=0.18$   $p>0.05$ ). does not show a significant difference ( $f=0.28$   $p>0.05$ ). The proficiency dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the number of children in teachers' families ( $f=1.19$   $p>0.05$ ). The scores do not show a statistically significant difference according to the number of children in teachers' families ( $f=0.31$   $p>0.05$ ).

Table 12 compares refugee student attitude scale and scale subdivision scores against the number of refugee children in teachers' classrooms.

**Table 12.** Findings on Comparing Scale and Subsidize Scores by the Number of Refugee Children in Teachers' Classrooms

	M. number in class	n	$\bar{X} \pm S.D.$	S.V.	S.S.	M.S.	F	p	Difference
Communication	1	47	38.51±7.06	B.G.	268.63	89.54	1.95	0.12	1>4+
	2	41	37.51±6.53	W.G.	14.101.06	45.93			
	3	47	37.19±6.64	Sum	14.369.69				
	4+	176	36.03±6.79						
Harmony	1	47	27.79±6.35	B.G.	906.93	302.31	8.12	0.01*	1>4+
	2	41	26.54±6.69	W.G.	11.430.43	37.23			
	3	47	25.83±6.34	Sum	12.337.36				
	4+	176	23.46±5.82						
Proficiency	1	47	11.64±2.99	B.G.	113.93	37.98	4.05	0.01*	1>4±
	2	41	10.93±2.99	W.G.	2.879.72	9.38			
	3	47	10.87±3.09	Sum	2.993.65				
	4+	176	10.03±3.09						

Refugee student attitude scale	1	47	77.94±14.61	B.G.	3.258.46	1.086.15			
	2	41	74.98±14.57	W.G.	61.070.16	198.93			
	3	47	73.89±13.82	Sum	64.328.62		5.46	0.01*	1>4±
	4+	176	69.52±13.93						

According to Table 12. The communication dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale do not show a statistically significant difference according to the number of refugee children in the teachers' classes ( $f=1.95$   $p>0.05$ ).

Adaptation dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale show a statistically significant difference according to the number of refugee children in teachers' classes ( $f=8.12$   $p<0.05$ ). According to the Bonferroni multiple comparison test, which was conducted to understand between which groups the difference was, the scores of teachers who had four or more refugee children in their class ( $23.46±5.82$ ) were compared to the scores of teachers who had one child in their class ( $27.79±6.35$ ) and two children. It is significantly lower than the scores of the teachers ( $26.54±6.69$ ) who are The proficiency dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale show a statistically significant difference according to the number of refugee children in the teachers' classrooms ( $f=4.05$   $p<0.05$ ). According to the Bonferroni multiple comparison test, which was conducted to understand between which groups the difference was, the scores of teachers who had four or more refugee children in their class ( $10.03±3.09$ ) were significantly different compared to the scores of teachers who had one child in their class ( $11.64±2.99$ ) is lower. The scores show a statistically significant difference according to the number of refugee children in teachers' classes ( $f=5.46$   $p<0.05$ ). According to the Bonferroni multiple comparison test, which was conducted to understand between which groups the difference was, the scores of teachers who had four or more refugee children in their class ( $69.52±13.93$ ) were significantly higher than the scores of teachers who had one child in their class ( $77.94±14.61$ ) is lower.

### Correlation Analysis for the Relationship of Scale Scores

The relationship between the refugee student attitude scale and subdivision scores of the scale was looked at with the Pearson correlation coefficient.

Correlation analysis is a statistical method used to determine the degree and direction of the relationship between variables, regardless of whether they are dependent or independent. The number of correlation multiples (  $r$  ) takes values ranging from -1 to +1, indicating the relationship's direction and strength. Table 13 contains the relationship results between the subdivisions of scale and scale.

**Table 13.** Examination of the Relationship between Refugee Student Attitude Scale and Subdivision Scores

	Scales		
		Communication	Harmony
Harmony	r	.69	
	p	.01	
	n	311	
Proficiency	r	.55	.73
	p	.01	.01
	n	311	311
Refugee Student Attitude Scale	r	.89	.92
	p	.01	.01
	n	311	311

Table 13 shows a statistically significant positive moderate correlation between the communication dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale and the adjustment dimension scores ( $r: 0.69$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). There is a statistically significant positive and moderate correlation between

the communication dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale and the proficiency dimension scores ( $r: 0.55, p<0.05$ )

There is a statistically significant positive and high-level correlation between the communication dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale and the scores ( $r: 0.89, p<0.05$ ). There is a statistically significant positive high correlation between the adaptation dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale and the efficacy dimension scores ( $r: 0.73, p<0.05$ ). There is a statistically significant positive and high-level correlation between the adaptation dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale and the scores ( $r: 0.92, p<0.05$ ). There is a statistically significant positive high-level correlation between the proficiency dimension scores of the refugee student attitude scale and the scores ( $r: 0.79, p<0.05$ ).

### **Findings on the Qualitative Dimension of the Study**

The findings of the semi-structured interview form used in the qualitative dimension are included in this part of the research. This section includes findings related to the study's second, third, and fourth sub-problems.

#### **Findings of the Second Sub-Problem of the Study**

The second sub-problem sought the question, "What extent are the teachers' communication with refugee students?". Table 14 contains the results of the descriptive analysis of the second sub-problem.

**Table 14.1** Citations on Codes, Frequencies, and Codes in the Communication Theme

Theme 1: Communication		
Codes	Frequency-Teacher's Code	Citation
Language problem	(8) T1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	T2 – "The most fundamental problem in my communication is the language problem."
Turkish-Arabic translation	(3) T4, 8, 9	T4 – "Students who were able to translate Turkish-Arabic in my class in my first years."
Translator	(3) T4, 5, 9	T5 – "We communicate through translators."

When we look at the codes and frequencies in which the teachers of the class given in Table 14 indicated the extent of communication for refugee students, it is seen that they have language problems and problems in translation direction. There have been some who have expressed that they can contact interpreters in schools in communication problems. The table shows that the problems in terms of language problems have the highest frequency (eight people). Turkish-Arabic translation and interpreter codes have the same frequency (three persons) as frequency.

Single teachers in terms of marital status variable in the communication subdivision of quantitative scale, teachers who served for 0-5 years in terms of service year variable, teachers who were not trained in terms of whether or not they received in-service training for inclusive education, male teachers in terms of gender variable and graduate teachers in terms of education status variable had a higher attitude. In a similar interview, the teacher Ö4, who was single, male, undergraduate, had 0-5 years of service and did not receive training for inclusive education, said, "As a class rule, we have banned Arabic speaking in the classroom except in essential situations, and we have also suggested that conversations with families about this issue should be in Turkish. I observed that our refugee students gradually learned Turkish and expressed themselves by understanding it. In this case, we have no problem communicating currently. I think they will not have problems in their later educational lives." From here, we can comment that quantitative data support qualitative data.

### **Findings Related to the Third Sub-Problem of the Study**

In the third sub-problem, the question "How is the adaptation of refugee students to school/classroom evaluated by teachers?" was sought. Table 15 contains the results of the descriptive analysis of the third sub-problem.

**Table 15.** Excerpts on Codes, Frequencies, and Codes in the Harmony Theme

Theme 2: Harmony		
Codes	Frequency-Teacher's Code	Citation
Language problem	(6) T1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8	T1 – "We have severe problems with language."
Events	(7) T1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9	T3 – "Activities for the development of their communication."
Group games	(7) T1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9	T8 – "Playing group games."
Parents do not like education together	(3) T1, 3, 4	T1 – "they do not like the education of their children together with refugee students"

When we look at the codes and frequencies in which the class teachers given in Table 15 indicated the extent of adaptation to refugee students, it is seen that the language problem is also in the dimension of harmony and is one of the high frequency (six persons) codes of this size. It is seen that teachers conduct activities and group games to ensure the adaptation of refugee students to school/classroom and have the highest frequency (seven persons) in the size of these codes. The frequencies of teachers (three people) who say that other parents do not like their children to be educated in the same environment as refugee students are also included in the dimension of harmony.

### **Findings Related to the Fourth Sub-Problem of the Study**

In the fourth sub-problem, the question "What are the problems that teachers have in refugee student education and the solutions to these problems?" was sought. Table 16 contains the results of the descriptive analysis of the fourth sub-problem.

**Table 16.** Excerpts on Codes, Frequencies, and Codes Set out the Theme of Problems Experienced in Refugee Student Education and Solutions

Theme 3: Problems in refugee education and solutions		
Codes	Frequency-Teacher's Code	Citation
Language problem	(9) T1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	T2 – " <i>language problem at the beginning of the problems.</i> "
Not understanding what you are reading	(6) T1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9	T9 – " <i>the biggest problem is the intimidation and language problem.</i> "
Language education for students	(4) T3, 6, 7, 9	T7 – " <i>collectively learning languages in certain schools.</i> "
Language teaching to parents	(3) T1, 8, 9	T8 – " <i>Parents should be taught Turkish.</i> "
Not discriminating between students	(3) T4, 5, 9	T5 – " <i>Without any distinction between students.</i> "

When we look at the codes and frequencies in which the teachers of the class given in Table 16 stated the problems and solutions in refugee education for refugee students, it was stated that the language problem is also in this section and that it is the only frequency (nine people) that everyone who participated in the study expressed as a problem. Another problem that teachers express is the problem of not understanding reading, which has a high frequency (six people) in this theme.

The solutions offered by teachers regarding the problems are seen as teaching languages to students, teaching languages to parents, and not discriminating between students. The frequency of the language teaching code for students is four people, while the frequency of language teaching codes to parents and non-discrimination between students equals three people each.

As a matter of fact, in a similar interview, the teacher Ö9, who has a master's degree, has 21+ years of service, is in the age group between the ages of 51-60, has 3+ children, and has received education for inclusive education, said, "The problem of reading comprehension and language is our biggest problem. As for the solutions, parents and students can be supported in teaching Turkish." Based on these findings, it can be said that the findings obtained from quantitative data support the findings obtained from qualitative data.

### **Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations**

When the relevant literature was examined, it was observed that men scored higher than women in the lower level of proficiency and their attitudes differed significantly in the studies conducted by Ayten & Köse (2020) and Sağlam & Kanbur (2017). We can evaluate the results achieved as male teachers consider themselves more adequate than the sufficiency sub-dimension of the scale.

When we look at the age and service year variables, it is seen that there is a significant difference in the sub-dimension of proficiency in favor of teachers between the ages of 51-60 and having 21+ service years. When the relevant literature was examined, it was seen that there was no significant difference in the results in terms of age variable in the studies of Köse, Bülbül & Uluman (2019). However, Kazu & Deniz's (2019) research showed that teachers with a seniority year of 15+ differed significantly in the competence dimension. Based on these results, it can be said that the age variable in the lower dimension of proficiency does not give significant results but differs significantly in favor of teachers who have served 15 years or more in the proficiency subdivision of the year of service.

According to the research results, teachers do not differ significantly in their attitudes towards refugee students, depending on whether they receive in-service training related to inclusive education. When looking at the relevant studies, Ayten & Köse (2020), Köse, Bülbül & Uluman (2019), and Kazu & Deniz (2019) stated that the teachers' in-service training for refugees or participating in related seminars did not make a meaningful difference in their attitudes. Based on these studies, we can say that receiving in-service training for refugee students does not affect attitudes towards refugee students.

When we looked at the marital status variable, there was no significant difference in this situation in our research. Kanbur (2017) stated in his study that the marital status of teachers does not differ in attitudes towards refugee students. Given these results, it can be said that the marital status of teachers does not affect their attitudes towards refugee students.

According to the results of our research, there was no significant difference in teachers' attitudes towards refugee students regarding their educational status. Looking at the relevant studies, Köse, Bülbül & Uluman (2019) and Kazu & Deniz (2019) concluded that teachers' education levels did not differ significantly in their attitudes towards refugee students. Based on these results, it can be said that teachers' educational status does not differ in attitudes towards refugee students.

Our research concluded that teachers with one refugee student differed significantly across the scale and in the lower dimensions of compliance and proficiency according to the number of refugee students in their classrooms. When the relevant literature was examined, it was concluded that the studies were not related to the number of refugee students in the classroom but rather to whether there

were refugee students. When these studies were examined, they concluded that teachers who were refugee students in their classrooms in Keskin & Okçu (2019) and Sağlam & Kanbur (2017) had more meaningful attitudes in their classrooms than non-refugee teachers. We can say that the number of refugee students in teachers' classrooms or whether they are refugee students changes their attitudes towards refugee students positively. However, more research into the number of refugee students in teachers' classrooms is thought to make teachers more generalized in attitudes to refugee students than the number of refugee students in their classrooms.

Regarding the variable of teachers' status of having children, there was no significant difference in teachers' attitudes towards refugee students. Not enough studies have been found in the literature on this variable. However, in their study, Keskin & Okçu (2019) examined whether there was a significant difference in teachers' attitudes towards refugee students based on whether teachers had children in the family and not the situation of having children. Their studies concluded that the scale differed significantly in the lower dimensions of communication and competence in favor of teachers with children. Future studies on the child status variable in the family are expected to make this situation general.

Our research showed that language problems were the most fundamental problem in teachers' communication with refugee students. In order to solve this problem, we see that teachers try to use translations or interpreters of students. When the relevant literature was examined, Yiğit, Şanlı & Gökalp (2021) stated that the language problem is the most fundamental in teachers' communication. Avcı (2019) study stated that the main problem that refugee students have in school is the language problem, and they cannot communicate with their peers. In their study, Güven & İşleyen (2018) concluded that language differences and cultural dissonance are the most significant barriers to teachers' communication with refugee students. Based on these results, we can say that the most fundamental problem in teachers' communication with refugee students is the language problem.

When quantitative data were analyzed according to the teachers' demographic variables in this sub-problem, there was no significant difference in the communication subdivision of the scale. As a result of the data collected from teachers with different characteristics in semi-structured interviews, it was seen that the standard and most fundamental problem teachers have in communicating with refugee students is the language problem. General solutions to overcome this problem have been expressed as using interpreters and receiving support from students who speak Turkish Arabic, and it is seen that the answers given by the teachers do not differ much from each other. This information indicates that qualitative data support quantitative data obtained from teachers.

When the relevant literature was examined, Güven & İşleyen (2018) concluded that students did not adapt due to language differences and cultural factors. They stated that it is necessary to overcome this difficulty of adaptation in students, increase the quality of language education received by refugee students and that activities for adaptation should be spread over time. Yiğit, Şanlı & Gökalp (2021) concluded that the social activities of the teachers, the games they play, and the admission of administrators and teachers in the school increase the cohesion of refugee students. In his study, Avcı (2019) stated that the problem of harmony is due to cultural differences. When these results are considered, it can be said that the problems in adapting refugee students to school/classroom are language problems and cultural factors and that teachers plan to overcome this adaptation problem with activities and games. It can also be interpreted as saying that the school's admission of refugee students by administrators and teachers can help refugee students overcome adaptation problems.

There was no significant difference in the scale's harmony subdivision compared to teachers' demographic variables in this sub-problem. As a result of the data collected from teachers with different characteristics in semi-structured interviews, it was seen that the standard and most fundamental problem teachers have regarding adapting refugee students to school/classroom is the language problem. It is seen that teachers plan activities and group games in order to help refugee students overcome the problem of adaptation, and their responses do not differ much from each other. The fact that teachers' answers to interview questions about compliance do not differ much indicates that teachers' opinions

do not differ according to the variables. This information indicates that qualitative data support quantitative data obtained from teachers.

When the relevant literature was examined, Başar, Akan & Çiftçi (2018) concluded that the problems experienced by refugee students in the learning process were communication problems, regulatory problems, problems with parent support, and language differences problems with parents. In Sarıtaş, Şahin & Çatalbaş's (2016) studies, they concluded that the most significant problems experienced by teachers in refugee education are language problems and behavioral problems. Teachers have proposed solutions to the language problems, such as language courses or language training, and cooperation with the reward-punishment method, empathy method, and guidance regarding behavioral problems. In their studies, Cırıt & Güvenç (2019) concluded that Syrian students have sufficient reading skills but have problems understanding their reading and have difficulty communicating due to language problems. Güven & İşleyen (2018) concluded that communication and disciplinary problems are the most common problems experienced in refugee education.

When the results are taken into account, it can be said that the biggest problem experienced in refugee education is the language problem, behavior problems, not understanding what you are reading, the regulatory problem, and communication problems with parents are also common.

### Suggestions

The recommendations developed with the research results were collected under two headings: for researchers and practitioners

#### Recommendations for Researchers

- ⊕ This research was carried out with classroom teachers working in public primary schools in Sahinbey and Şehitkamil districts of Gaziantep province and with refugee students in their classrooms, and similar studies can be carried out in different regions and depending on different variables of different sample groups to obtain results that can be compared in a broader perspective.
- ⊕ Our research investigates gender, age, number of refugee students in the classroom, and year of service variables on attitudes towards refugee students.
- ⊕ Only classroom teachers make up the sample group of this research. A similar study with other branch teachers may offer the opportunity to examine the attitude levels of teachers of those branches in detail according to different variables.
- ⊕ This study involved 311 teachers and nine teachers in qualitative size. More generalized research results can be obtained in the studies to be carried out by increasing the number of samples.

#### Recommendations for Practitioners

- ⊕ According to the Refugee Student Attitude Scale, the study concluded that teachers aged 51-60 years and with 21+ years of service had a more positive attitude toward refugee students than other groups. Guidance or in-service applications can be developed where these teachers can transfer their experiences to teachers with less age and years of service.
- ⊕ According to the research results, studies can be carried out to provide language support to refugee students and their parents for the language problem, which is seen as one of the most critical problems in refugee student education.
- ⊕ Teacher candidates who have been educated in the teacher training departments of universities can be trained with refugee students and provide information about the process.
- ⊕ Appropriate educational environments can be created, considering refugee students' educational needs.
- ⊕ Orientation studies can be planned to quickly overcome the problems experienced by refugee students in school/classroom adaptation.

---

## References

- Aksoy, Z. (2012). International migration and intercultural communication. *Journal of International Social Research*, 5(20), 292-303.
- Akman, Y. (2020). Examination of the relationship between teachers' attitudes towards refugee students and perceptions of multicultural education. *Pamukkale University Faculty of Education Journal*, 49, 247-262. <https://doi.org/10.9779/pauefd.442061>
- Ansen, D.M. (2012). Refugees in Turkish foreign law. (Master's thesis). Obtained from the National Thesis Center of the Higher Education Board. (Publication No. 324985).
- Avcı, F. (2019). Teacher's views on the problems faced by refugee students attending preschool institutions in the classroom environment. *Language Teaching and Educational Research*, 2(1), 57-80. <https://doi.org/10.35207/later.537817>
- Ayten, B. K. & Köse, İ. (2020). The relationship between the attitudes of classroom teachers towards foreign students and their intercultural sensitivity levels. *Journal of Inonu University Institute of Educational Sciences*, 7(14), 56-78. <https://doi.org/10.29129/inujgse.790940>
- Barton, L. (1997). Inclusive education: romantic, subversive or realistic?. *International journal of inclusive education*, 1(3), 231-242.
- Başar, M., Akan, D. & Çiftçi, M. (2018). Problems in the learning process in classrooms with refugee students. *Kastamonu Journal of Education*, 26(5), 1571-1578. <https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.427432>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2018). *Scientific research methods* (25. Print). Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Cırıt Karaağaç, F. & Güvenç, H. (2019). Education problems for syrian refugee students attending official primary schools. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 11(18), 530-568. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.530733>
- Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2014). *Design and Execution of Mixed Method Research*. (p. 79). (Cev: Yüksel Dede & Selçuk Bashir Demir), Ankara: Memorial Publishing.
- Dusik, C. L. & Santarosa, L.M.C. (2016). Mousekey syllabic virtual keyboard: An assistive technology tool for people with physical disabilities. In: *ICT in Education* (pp. 171-197). Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22900-3\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22900-3_10)
- Erder, S. (1986). "Ghetto" and Turks in the welfare society. Istanbul: Technology Printing.
- George, D. & Mallory, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, update 17.0 (10a ed.)*. Boston: Pearson
- GIGM, (2022, January). *Statistics, Temporary Protection*. <https://www.goc.gov.tr/gecici-koruma5638> (Accessed On 26.01.2022).
- Güven, S. & İşleyen, H. (2018). Communication, communication barriers and Syrian students in classroom management. *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research (JSHSR)*, 5(23), 1293-1308.
- HBOGM, (2021). *2020 Monitoring and evaluation report*. Akt. from the Department of Migration and Emergency Education. HBOGM, <http://hbogm.meb.gov.tr>

- 
- Kanbur, N. İ. (2017). Examination of the attitudes of primary school teachers towards refugee students. (Master's thesis). Obtained from the National Thesis Center of the Higher Education Board. (Publication No. 471001).
- Karayel, A. (2016). The working rights (problems and solutions) of Syrian refugees residing in Mugla. (Unpublished master's thesis). Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University Institute of Educational Sciences, Mugla.
- Kazu, H. & Deniz, E. (2019). Examination of teachers' attitudes towards refugee students in the context of inclusive education in terms of various variables. *OPUS Journal of International Community Studies*, 14(20), 1336-1368. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.612341>
- Keskin, A. & Okçu, V. (2019). Examination of the attitudes of teachers and students towards refugee students in secondary schools. *Academia Journal of Educational Research*, 6(2), 311-332. <https://doi.org/10.53506/egitim.892264>
- Köse, N., Bülbül, Ö. & Uluman, M. (2019). Examination of the attitudes of classroom teachers towards refugee students in terms of various variables. *Journal of Continuous Vocational Education and Training*, 2(1), 16-29. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jcvet/issue/45284/520313>
- ÖYGM. (2018). *Inclusive education project*. <http://oygm.meb.gov.tr/www/kapsayici-egitim-projesi-inclusive-education/icerik/679>
- Puri, M., & Abraham, G. (2004). *Handbook of inclusive education for educators, administrators, and planners: Within walls, without boundaries*. (pp. 22-27) Sage.
- Sağlam, H. I. & Kanbur, N. I. (2017). Examination of the attitudes of classroom teachers towards refugee students in terms of various variables. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 7(2), 310-323. <https://doi.org/10.19126/suje.335877>
- Sarıtaş, E., Şahin, U. & Çatalbas, G. (2016). Problems encountered with foreign students in primary schools. *Journal of Pamukkale University Institute of Social Sciences*, (Appendix 1), 208-229. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/411863>
- UNESCO. (2008). *Burial an inclusive education agenda: Reflection around the 48th session of the international conference on education*. Geneva, Switzerland: Author.
- UNHCR, (2021). <https://www.unhcr.org/refugee-statistics/download/?url=PT1tJ>
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Qualitative research methods in social sciences*. Ankara: Seçkin.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2016). *Qualitative research methods in social sciences*. Ankara: Seçkin.
- Yiğit, A., Şanlı, E., & Gökalp, M. (2021). Views of teachers, school administrators and students regarding the school adaptation of Syrian students in Turkey. *Nineteen May University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 40(1), 471-496. <https://doi.org/10.37669/milliegitim.960414>

### Disclosure Statements

1. Contribution rate statement of researchers: All authors contributed equally.
2. No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.