Self-Efficacy in Dutch Preservice Teachers: Assessing Readiness for Inclusive Teaching

Name: Merel Drop
Student number: S4125290
University: University of Groningen
Faculty: Faculteit der Gedrags- en Maatschappijwetenschappen
Track: Orthopedagogiek (PAMA5166)
Name first supervisor: R. Tan, assistant professor
Name second supervisor: S. Field, assistant professor
Date: 10–01–2025
Number of words: 7880

Table of Contents

Abstract

The self-efficacy of Dutch preservice teachers in inclusive education is examined in this study, with particular attention paid to self-efficacy in collaborative learning, classroom management, and instructional practices. The study used Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) questionnaire and semi-structured interviews as part of a mixed-methods methodology. Although qualitative data revealed ongoing difficulties in real-world implementation, quantitative results showed modest self-efficacy across all categories, with controlling classroom behavior receiving the highest score. Internships, mentorship quality, and structural obstacles like big class sizes and a lack of resources were all factors that affected self-efficacy. The results highlight the necessity of emphasizing real-world, experiential learning, improved mentoring, and methods to overcome structural obstacles in teacher preparation programs. By addressing these issues, preservice teachers' readiness for inclusive education can be greatly increased, which will help create more equal learning environments.

Keywords: *Inclusive education, preservice teachers, self-efficacy, Dutch education, TEIP scale*

Introduction

Fundamental right to inclusive education

Inclusive education is recognized as a fundamental human right. Rooted in key international policies such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) and the UNESCO Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education (United Nations, 2006; World Conference on Special Needs Education, 1994). The Salamanca Statement represents a fundamental principle that all children should learn together, regardless of differences and difficulties some children may have (World Conference on Special Needs Education, 1994). Furthermore, the United Nations have formed international goals to provide a shared blueprint for peace and prosperity for people, now and in the future, this blueprint is called the Sustainable Development Goals (*THE 17 GOALS | Sustainable Development*, z.d.). The Sustainable Development Goals underscores the significance of inclusive and equitable quality education in promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all individuals (Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda For Sustainable Development, 2015).

Inclusive education, a cornerstone of modern pedagogy, encompasses an educational approach aimed at ensuring equal access to learning for all students, regardless of their diverse needs or backgrounds (United Nations, 2006; World Conference on Special Needs Education, 1994). At the basis, inclusive education advocates for the full participation and success of every learner within a mainstream educational setting, stimulating a sense of belonging and acceptance among all students. Inclusive education focuses on creating learning environments that embrace diversity, accommodate individual differences, and encourage collaboration and mutual respect among students with varying abilities, socio-economic statuses, linguistic backgrounds, and cultural identities (Avramidis et al., 2000; UNESCO, 2023).

Inclusive education in the Netherlands

The goal of inclusive education in the Netherlands is in line with the international goal. It is to guarantee that every student, including those with special needs, has access to a fair and encouraging learning environment. A major step toward promoting inclusivity was taken in 2014 with the implementation of the Passend Onderwijs ("Appropriate Education") policy, which integrated students with a range of needs into mainstream schools using customized and

adaptable teaching strategies (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, 2014). This policy places a strong emphasis on collaboration between regional school associations, which are made up of special education and mainstream schools that collaborate to offer all students individualized help and suitable placements. The policy's main principles are modifying instructional strategies, providing adapted materials, and encouraging collaborations between families and schools.

The role of teachers in inclusive education

Teachers are essential to the success of inclusive education because they are the main creators of circumstances that allow all students to flourish, despite their varied requirements and experiences. Their attitudes, expertise, and practices greatly influence the degree to which inclusive concepts can be converted into successful teaching techniques. Research has shown that one of the most important factors influencing student success is the quality of instruction, especially in classrooms with students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, linguistic backgrounds, cultural identities, and ability levels (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). In addition to carrying out individualized instruction, teachers are also in charge of creating a welcoming and inclusive environment in the classroom. Their ability to engage with students, build relationships, and adapt teaching practices is essential for addressing the complex dynamics of inclusive education (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002).

However, these responsibilities place significant demands on teachers, often requiring them to balance diverse educational needs while maintaining high academic standards. This challenge underscores the theoretical and practical importance of understanding teachers' self-efficacy, a concept rooted in Bandura's (1977, 1996) social cognitive theory.

According to Bandura's (1977, 1996) social cognitive theory (SCT), human behavior is shaped by the dynamic interaction of personal, behavioral, and environmental factors. Central to SCT is the concept of self-efficacy, which refers to an individual's belief in their ability to execute actions required to achieve a specific outcome. Self-efficacy influences behavior by determining the goals individuals set, their perseverance in the face of challenges, and their emotional reactions to success or failure. Four primary sources of self-efficacy are identified: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and emotional or physiological

states (Bandura, 1996). These sources interact with other SCT constructs, such as observational learning and outcome expectations, to shape how individuals manage their behavior.

Teachers´ self efficacy and influencing factors

In the context of education, self-efficacy refers to teachers' beliefs in their ability to influence student learning and manage classroom challenges, and it is a critical factor in determining how they approach inclusive education. Teachers with high self-efficacy are more likely to embrace inclusion, demonstrating higher confidence in their ability to implement strategies that support all learners effectively (Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Weisel & Dror, 2006). Moreover, prior research suggests that self-efficacy enhances teachers' resilience and adaptability, enabling them to persevere in the face of challenges associated with inclusive teaching (Savolainen et al., 2020). In order to create more inclusive and equal learning environments, teachers who believe in their own abilities are better able to differentiate instruction, control a variety of classroom behaviors, and cultivate collaborative relationships with both parents and students (Sharma et al., 2011).

Therefore, advancing inclusive education as a whole depends on understanding and assisting teachers' self-efficacy. Educational systems may boost teachers' confidence and competence by providing them with the required training, materials, and assistance, guaranteeing that every student receives the top-notch education they deserve.

Teachers´ self-efficacy: three key dimensions

Teachers' self-efficacy can be understood as containing three key dimensions: inclusive instruction, managing the classroom, and collaboration. Each of these dimensions reflects a critical area where teachers' confidence in their abilities influences their effectiveness in providing inclusive classrooms. The first dimension, *efficacy in inclusive instruction*, refers to teachers' beliefs in their ability to design and implement effective teaching methods that address the diverse needs of students in inclusive settings. Teachers with high self-efficacy in this area are more likely to use differentiated instruction, adapt lessons, and implement innovative teaching practices to ensure that all students, including those with special needs, can access and succeed in the curriculum (Dibapile, 2012). For example, teachers with high self-efficacy in

inclusive instruction are more confident in modifying lesson plans for students with disabilities or language barriers (Sharma et al., 2011).

The second dimension, *efficacy in managing classroom behavior*, involves teachers' confidence in their ability to establish a positive and organized classroom environment. Teachers who feel competent in this area are more likely to set clear expectations, use proactive behavior-management strategies, and maintain an inclusive classroom climate that supports students' emotional and behavioral needs (Savolainen et al., 2020). High self-efficacy in managing behavior is linked to better classroom control and the support of a sense of safety. This is essential in inclusive classrooms where students may exhibit diverse behavioral challenges (Weisel & Dror, 2006).

The third dimension involves *efficacy in collaboration*. This dimension focuses on teachers' beliefs in their ability to work with colleagues, parents, and other professionals to support the inclusion of all students. Teachers who are confident in this dimension are more likely to engage in team-based practices, share strategies, and collaborate on creating individualized learning plans for students with special educational needs. They are also more willing to seek advice from others and participate in ongoing professional development (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002).

Previous research has extensively examined the relationships between these dimensions of self-efficacy and inclusive education outcomes. Previous study has found that high self-efficacy in instructional strategies predicted greater adoption of inclusive teaching practices (Sharma et al., 2011). Similarly, another study highlighted that classroom management self-efficacy was linked to fewer disciplinary issues and improved classroom climate, which are critical for successful inclusion (Savolainen et al., 2020). Studies on collaboration have suggested that teachers with high efficacy in this domain are better able to address the individual interests and motivations of learners, which contributes to better academic and social outcomes (Dibapile, 2012).

Factors influencing teachers´ self-efficacy

Various factors have been identified as critical in developing and sustaining teachers' self-efficacy, including professional development, teaching experience, school culture, and

support systems. These factors significantly shape how teachers perceive their roles and their ability to support diverse learners, with self-efficacy serving as a key predictor of inclusive attitudes (Tümkaya & Miller, 2020).

Participation in professional development programs stands out as a particularly influential factor. Targeted training provides teachers with strategies such as differentiated instruction and behavioral interventions. Therefore, strengthening their confidence in addressing the complexities of inclusive classrooms (Woodcock et al., 2023). Preservice teachers who receive high-quality, hands-on training in inclusive education also report greater self-efficacy. A previous study emphasized that practical training enhances teacher confidence and prepares them to engage more effectively in inclusive practices (Pfitzner-Eden, 2016).

Teaching experience further shapes self-efficacy, as experienced teachers report higher levels of confidence due to their familiarity with diverse classroom challenges and the development of adaptive strategies over time (Wray et al., 2022). In contrast, novice teachers often require additional guidance to build their skills and confidence, particularly in inclusive settings. The current study will focus on preservice teachers, which means they are seen as novice teachers.

It is impossible to ignore the importance of school culture and leadership. An enabling environment for teachers is produced by schools that value inclusive policies, encourage collaboration, and offer resources for classroom modifications and training. In order to boost teachers' perception of efficacy, supportive leadership is especially important. It encourages them to try out novel strategies and provides helpful criticism (Chao et al., 2016; Tan et al., 2022).

Another important factor in self-efficacy is peer cooperation and mentoring. Professional learning groups and mentorship from seasoned colleagues are beneficial to teachers because they offer forums for discussing problems, trading solutions, and improving methods (Savolainen et al., 2020). Teachers are better equipped to meet the unique requirements of each kid when they have access to outside support networks like special education experts. Additional resources, such as workshops and online platforms tailored to inclusive education, also improve teachers' readiness and perceived competence (Forlin & Sin, 2010).

Finally, emotional and psychological factors play a significant role in shaping teachers' self-efficacy. Teachers who feel emotionally supported and resilient are more likely to view challenges as opportunities for growth. In contrast, those experiencing high levels of stress or burnout may struggle to maintain confidence (Weisel & Dror, 2006). Schools that provide emotionally supportive environments and implement stress management mechanisms contribute to teachers' overall sense of efficacy and their persistence in inclusive settings.

Self-efficacy among teachers in the Netherlands

It was decided to concentrate on self-efficacy in the Dutch context because of the distinctive features of the Dutch educational system. Teachers must adjust their instruction to each student's unique needs while simultaneously controlling the dynamics of the entire classroom, according to policies like the Passend Onderwijs ("Appropriate Education") policy (de Boer et al., 2011; Pijl, 2010). Teachers' perceptions of their own skills and confidence in using inclusive methods are influenced by these particular demands. Analyzing self-efficacy in this setting offers important insights into how training programs, legislation, and support networks influence Dutch teachers.

In the Dutch context, research on self-efficacy has provided valuable insights into fostering inclusive education. According to de Boer et al. (2011), teachers' beliefs encompass their attitudes toward the value of inclusion, their confidence in their own ability to implement inclusive practices, and their perceptions of the resources and support available to them. Previous studies emphasized the critical role of teacher preparation and support in creating inclusive classrooms, highlighting significant associations between teachers' beliefs and the development of inclusive practices (Boer et al., 2011; Pijl, 2010. Additionally, Hopman et al. (2018) found that strong teacher–student relationships and self-efficacy can ease the effects of disruptive behaviors on teacher well-being, further underlining the importance of self-efficacy in educational settings. Despite these findings, gaps remain in understanding how preservice teachers in the Netherlands develop self-efficacy and how this influences their readiness to adopt inclusive practices. Addressing these gaps is essential for providing teachers with the skills and confidence needed to navigate the demands of inclusive education effectively. Despite empirical advances, there is a

need for more comprehensive research on the factors influencing preservice teachers' self-efficacy toward inclusion within the Dutch context.

This paper seeks to explore the relationship between preservice teachers' self-efficacy and their preparedness for inclusive education, with a particular focus on the Dutch educational context. Building on existing research, the current study aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of how to enhance teacher training and support systems to ensure the successful implementation of inclusive education.

Research questions and hypotheses

Given the absence of prior research specifically addressing preservice teachers' self-efficacy in the Netherlands, this study utilized an exploratory approach. The central research question is as follows: How do Dutch preservice teachers articulate and assess their levels of self-efficacy, particularly concerning their readiness for inclusive teaching practices? Understanding this is crucial for uncovering the nuances of self-efficacy in inclusive education. Based on the existing literature, I hypothesize that Dutch preservice teachers will report moderate levels of self-efficacy, particularly in the context of inclusive education. Since a previous study found that preservice teachers often feel less confident in their ability to manage diverse classrooms despite having had theoretical training (Sharma et al., 2012).

This current study also investigated potential differences across the three dimensions of self-efficacy—classroom management, instructional strategies, and collaboration defined by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). I hypothesize that self-efficacy levels in classroom management will be lower than self-efficacy in instructional strategies and collaboration. Studies have consistently found that classroom management is often rated as the most challenging aspect of teaching in inclusive settings. Teachers frequently report higher self-efficacy in instructional strategies and collaboration because these areas are more structured and align more directly with their training and experiences (Sharma et al., 2012; Malinen et al., 2013).

Additionally, I will be exploring potential factors influencing preservice teachers' self-efficacy, such as prior experience with diverse learners, the quality of teacher training programs, and the existence of support systems within educational institutions. Current research question was as follows: What are the potential factors that influence preservice teachers'

self-efficacy? I hypothesize that teachers who had prior experience in working with diverse learners and who had received higher-quality, hands-on training in inclusive education would exhibit higher levels of self-efficacy. This hypothesis aligns with findings by Pfitzner-Eden (2016), who highlighted the role of real-world teaching experience in strengthening teacher confidence. Another study emphasized the importance of emotional and practical support in providing self-efficacy (Gibbs & Miller, 2014).

Method

This current study used the convergent design, which is a mixed-methods approach. In a convergent design, quantitative and qualitative data are collected simultaneously and merged during the analysis phase to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research topic (Creswell, 2018). By using this method this current study can integrate the findings, enhancing the validity and the reliability of the results (Creswell, 2009). Ultimately, the integration of quantitative and qualitative data facilitates theory development, informs practical applications, and provides a foundation for decision-making and policy development in the field of inclusive education (Creswell, 2018).

Quantitative phase

Participants

The sample consisted of n = 46 (efficacy in using inclusive instruction), n = 48 (efficacy in managing behavior and efficacy in collaboration), and n = 43 for the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale preservice primary school teachers enrolled in the Academische Opleiding Leraar Basisonderwijs (AOLB) program at Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. The AOLB program is a study that combines pedagogical courses and teaching courses, and in Dutch, it is called the *academic study teacher primary education'* The AOLB program has approximately 400 total students. The AOLB research was part of a combined study involving multiple researchers, with two different questionnaires combined into one unified questionnaire taken at once. Originally, 79 participants responded to the first questionnaire, but only 42 continued to the second questionnaire. The second questionnaire was used for the current study. This sample size, though reduced, aligns with recommendations for small populations, where sampling approximately 10% can still produce reliable data without overextending resources (Israel,

1992). Smaller samples in multi-stage studies may decrease precision and increase the margin of error, according to previous research, but these studies are still useful for producing insights for pilot or exploratory investigations (Faber & Fonseca, 2014).

Instrument: Teacher Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale

In this research, the previously established TEIP scale was used (Sharma et al., 2011) (appendix source A) to measure preservice teachers' self-efficacy linked to implementing inclusive practices. This validated scale consists of items assessing teachers' confidence in their ability to effectively support diverse learners in inclusive settings.

The TEIP scale has undergone extensive validation in previous research. For example, a previous study that was conducted found validation for the TEIP scale across four countries, including Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, and New Zealand (Loreman et al., 2013). These findings highlighted the strong reliability and validity of the TEIP scale across four cultural contexts. The internal consistency of the scale was high, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from .89 to .96 across the four countries. Another previous study has also found high internal consistency, with Conbrach's alpha coefficients indicating strong reliability (Park et al., 2016). Additionally, confirmatory factor analysis supported the construct validity of the scale, demonstrating that it effectively measures teachers' self-efficacy related to inclusive practices (Loreman et al., 2013). The current study projected that the TEIP scale will be consistent and trustworthy in the Dutch environment due to its application in other various contexts.

The TEIP scale contains three dimensions. The first dimension is instructional strategies, which assesses a teacher's confidence in their ability to employ effective instructional strategies to support diverse learners in inclusive settings. One example of the TEIP scale's assessment of this dimension is, "I can use a variety of assessment strategies (for example, portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance-based assessment, etc.)." The second dimension, managing challenging behaviors, measures a teacher's confidence in managing the challenging behaviors exhibited by students in inclusive classrooms. One example of this dimension is, "I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behavior in the classroom before it occurs." The third dimension is collaboration, which evaluates a teacher's confidence in collaborating with

other professionals to provide comprehensive support for inclusive practices. One example of this construct is, “I can assist families in helping their children do well in school.”

Procedure

The TEIP scale was administered to the participants electronically by Qualtrics, with clear instructions provided regarding completion. The participants provided consent that was signed at the beginning of the questionnaire (appendix source B).

To guarantee maximum participation, the survey was delivered in two ways. First, a general message containing the survey link and instructions was posted on Brightspace, the digital learning platform used by the university. This message was accessible to all enrolled students of the AOLB, encouraging voluntary participation. The message included an overview of the study's purpose, the estimated time required to complete the survey, and assurances about confidentiality and anonymity.

Second, the researcher attended three separate lectures of different classes to personally introduce the study and distribute the survey link. During these sessions, the researcher briefly explained the research objectives, emphasized the importance of student participation, and answered any questions about the survey process. Students were then invited to access the survey using a QR code provided at the end of the introduction.

Data analysis

The data analysis involved several steps to assess reliability and explore differences across the three dimensions of self-efficacy. First, mean scores for each dimension—efficacy in inclusive instruction (EII), efficacy in managing behavior (EMB), and efficacy in collaboration (EC)—were created from individual item responses in SPSS. Reliability was evaluated using Cronbach’s alpha, with scores above 0.7 considered acceptable for internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). A repeated measures ANOVA was then performed to test for significant differences between the self-efficacy dimensions, applying Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity to assess whether the assumption of sphericity was met (Field, 2018). In this research, an alpha of 0.05 or lower was considered a significant difference between the subscales.

Quantitative data obtained from the TEIP scale was analyzed using appropriate statistical techniques with SPSS, such as descriptive statistics and inferential analyses, to examine patterns and relationships among variables. To make sure the scales were accurate and robust, their reliability was evaluated using accepted psychometric standards. The degree to which items on a scale consistently measure the same construct is known as internal consistency, and it is frequently assessed using Cronbach's alpha. This gives an indication of the dependability of the scale. The items are considered dependable and closely related if the Cronbach's alpha value is high, above 0.70 (Savolainen et al., 2020; Wray et al., 2022).

Scale validation

Prior to data collection, the TEIP scale underwent validation procedures to ensure its reliability and validity within the Dutch context. This included translation to the Dutch language. There was collaboration among the three researchers to ensure accuracy and consistency in the translation process of the scale. First, the scale was translated individually by each researcher into Dutch. Next, the translations were compared and discussed among the group to identify any discrepancies or differences in interpretation until all agreed. For example, Question 2 (“I am able to provide an alternate explanation or example when students are confused”) was discussed because of the translation of the word “confused.” We discussed the consequences of the two different translations we had generated, and we chose the translation that we thought reflected the nuance of the intended meaning of the word. We then engaged in a collaborative process to reconcile any discrepancies and reached a consensus on the most appropriate translation for each item on the TEIP scale.

Qualitative phase

Participants

A subset of participants (n=5) from the quantitative phase was purposely selected to participate in semi-structured interviews, ensuring that diverse perspectives were captured. It is generally thought that basic elements for meta themes are present within five interviews (Guest et al., 2006). Using five participants, the researchers in the current study were able to deeply explore individual experiences, ensuring a nuanced understanding of self-efficacy among preservice teachers while keeping the data manageable. Saturation was monitored through

iterative analysis, where continuous reflection after each interview helped determine whether the data was sufficiently rich and comprehensive.

Interview protocol

Semi-structured, open-ended interviews were conducted to explore the participants' experiences, beliefs, and challenges related to inclusive education. Interview questions were designed to elicit responses regarding factors influencing self-efficacy beliefs and the participants' confidence in their self-efficacy regarding inclusion. The formulation of these questions involved a collaborative effort between two of the researchers, ensuring a comprehensive approach to the subject matter. The supervisor's feedback was instrumental in refining the questions to ensure they were methodologically sound and effective in eliciting explorative, insightful data from the participants. The interview questions are reproduced in the appendix (appendix, source C). An example of a question in the interview is, "What are your previous experiences with children with disabilities?"

Procedure

The participants provided written consent before participating in the interview (appendix source C). The interviews were conducted in person, and all of the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed by hand by the researcher. The program Atlas.ti was used to facilitate the data analysis.

Data analysis

The analysis was conducted using reflexive thematic analysis (appendix, table 2), adopting a constructivist approach. Reflexive thematic analysis involves familiarization with the broad view of the data, generating initial codes to then generating themes, and lastly reviewing the themes, allowing for flexibility and depth in interpreting the data (Terry et al., 2017). This approach recognizes that the researcher has an active role in the development of themes, as themes are derived from the researcher's interaction with the data and contextual knowledge of the experiences of the participants (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

In exploring self-efficacy among preservice teachers, several sensitizing concepts provided valuable insights and served to generate the themes. The themes were as follows:

professional development, teaching experience, school culture, mentorship, external support, quality of teacher study, and direct experience with diverse learners. These themes can be seen as factors of self-efficacy, as each reflects a domain of skills, experience, and support systems that can shape preservice teachers' confidence in their abilities. The three dimensions of inclusive instruction, managing the classroom, and collaboration were also utilized as themes for comparison with the quantitative data.

The interviews were transcribed and processed to codes with Atlas.ti. The transcripts were coded, and the codes were then organized into themes. This approach emphasizes the construction of knowledge through the interaction between the researcher and the data, aligning with the constructivist view that reality is co-constructed (Lincoln et al., 1985).

Following this paradigm, the researchers actively engaged with the data by coding and organizing transcripts into themes, interpreting participant experiences through their theoretical lens. This process highlights the co-construction of reality, wherein the findings reflect both the participants' perspectives and the researchers' interpretative frameworks. By recognizing the subjective nature of this interaction, the study acknowledges that knowledge is not simply discovered but constructed, shaped by the researchers' methodological choices and conceptual understanding (Lincoln et al., 1985).

Results

Levels of self-efficacy in inclusive teaching

A reliability analysis was conducted to assess the internal consistency of the TEIP scale and its subscales, using Cronbach's alpha as the reliability coefficient. In the current study a Cronbach's alpha of 0.7 or higher is considered acceptable.

These results indicate that the total TEIP scale and the subscales for managing behavior (α= 0.787) demonstrates acceptable reliability. Collaboration (α= 0.861) and the total TEIP scale (α= 0.889) illustrate good reliability. However, the efficacy of the inclusive instruction subscale (α = 0.667) fell slightly below the commonly accepted threshold, suggesting moderate internal consistency. The means were all above 4.0 on the 1–6 scale, indicating that, on average, the

participants moderately agreed with the statements. This demonstrates that the participants were moderately confident across all of the scales.

The highest subscale was the efficacy in managing behavior subscale, with a mean of 4.41. The next subscale, efficacy in inclusive instruction, had a mean of 4.36, and the lowest subscale was efficacy in collaboration, with a mean of 4.26. However, the standard deviation of the subscales suggests much overlap between the three scales (Table 1).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Self-Efficacy Dimensions

Scale	**Items Included**	**Mean (M)**	**Standard Deviation (SD)**	**Cronbach's Alpha (α)**
Efficacy in Inclusive Instruction	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 20	4.36	0.53	0.667
Efficacy in Managing Behavior	7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	4.41	0.65	0.787
Efficacy in Collaboration	13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19	4.26	0.86	0.861
Total TEIP Scale	All items	4.34	0.60	0.889

These results were confirmed by the qualitative findings, which showed that preservice teachers felt moderately secure in a number of areas, including encouraging teamwork and raising awareness of diversity. As one participant noted, "Inclusive education helps children to develop understanding for the diversity in society,". The participants highlighted their capacity to establish inclusive and supportive learning environments in the classroom. Nonetheless, participants frequently felt unable to handle complicated behavioral challenges, and issues with classroom management and teaching tactics. "Severe autistic children in a class of 25 to 30 students, that doesn't work; they go completely crazy," one participant said, describing the difficulty of addressing a variety of emotional and behavioral needs. Another reflected on their

difficulties with behavioral management, stating, “I find dealing with behavioral difficulties the most difficult, especially when multiple students require attention at the same time.”

These challenges were heightened by large class sizes. The participants found that the class sizes narrowed the time and attention teachers could devote to individual students, particularly those with significant needs. Participants frequently mentioned the unpredictability of classroom dynamics as a source of stress, with one participant going as far as describing how managing students with diverse needs felt overwhelming and emotionally taxing.

Differences across dimensions of self-efficacy

A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to examine the potential differences across the three dimensions of self-efficacy: classroom management, instructional strategies, and student engagement. Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity was met, with all of the dimensions at $p = 0.071$. The results showed no significant differences between the self-efficacy dimensions, $F(2,84) = 1.34$, $p = 0.267$; $F(2, 84) = 1.34$, $p = 0.267$; and $F(2,84) = 1.34$, $p = 0.267$. This suggests that the participants reported similar levels of self-efficacy across the three dimensions.

However, the qualitative findings revealed a discrepancy between the participants’ self-reported confidence in managing classroom behavior and the actual challenges that they experienced. Despite classroom management receiving the highest mean score in the quantitative data, the participants frequently described it as one of the most challenging aspects of teaching. Many preservice teachers expressed difficulty in adapting theoretical knowledge to the practical realities of inclusive classrooms. For example, as one participant noted, “I find dealing with behavioral problems difficult, especially when multiple children demand attention at the same time.” This suggests that while the participants may have expressed moderate confidence in managing behavior on the TEIP scale, the actual classroom experience was more challenging, highlighting the importance of contextualizing self-reported confidence within real-world teaching experiences.

Factors influencing self-efficacy

The analysis identified multiple factors influencing preservice teachers' self-efficacy, categorized into emotional resilience, the training program, and external systemic barriers (appendix, table 2).

Emotional Resilience

The emotional resilience of preservice teachers emerged as a critical factor influencing their self-efficacy. Participants frequently described the emotional toll of managing diverse classrooms, particularly when dealing with behavioral challenges. The constant need to remain composed and adaptive under pressure was cited as both a challenge and a key area for growth.

One participant expressed the difficulty of maintaining emotional control, stating, "It's hard to stay calm when several students are acting out at once; I sometimes doubt if I can handle it long-term." Such moments often led to self-doubt, particularly when participants felt they lacked sufficient tools or strategies to de-escalate situations effectively. The unpredictability of classroom behavior compounded this stress, with participants noting that even well-prepared lesson plans could be disrupted by unexpected incidents, requiring quick thinking and emotional stability.

Despite these challenges, participants also recognized the potential for growth in this area. Some highlighted the importance of learning coping strategies and stress management techniques, both of which could strengthen their emotional resilience and, consequently, their self-efficacy.

The training program

Internships were consistently described as essential to developing professional confidence. The participants credited these practical experiences with providing critical opportunities to apply theoretical knowledge. As one participant noted, "My internships gave me much confidence; that's where you really learn how to implement inclusion."

While participants found that internships positively influenced areas such as professional identity and collaboration, participants acknowledged ongoing challenges in classroom management and differentiated instruction. Managing the complexities of diverse classroom

settings often revealed limitations in their preparation, with many participants feeling like they lacked the necessary tools to address behavioral challenges or change instruction effectively for varied student needs. For instance, one participant noted, “With added instruction you still have a lot of level differences. I find it difficult to handle.”

Differences in participants’ perceptions of the training program were also tied to the amount of mentorship and feedback they received during their respective internships. Some participants described strong support from mentors who guided them through challenges, which helped them build confidence in their teaching abilities. For instance, one participant stated, “Good guidance and collaboration within the team are essential to make inclusive education possible.”. However, others noted inconsistencies in mentorship quality, which left them feeling unsupported and uncertain about their ability to manage the demands of inclusive teaching effectively.

The participants frequently emphasized the importance of reflecting on their internship experiences with mentors and colleagues, as this process helped them to contextualize their learning and identify strategies for improvement. Ultimately, the value of internships lies not only in providing direct teaching experience but also in offering preservice teachers a framework for refining their practice.

However, participants did identify additional elements of the training program that had a favorable and negative impact on their sense of self-efficacy. Although they frequently lacked real-world applicability, theoretically oriented courses were thought to provide the essential groundwork for inclusive education. The statement "You learn a lot of theory in the program, but you only notice that in practice," was made by one participant. In domains like classroom management and differentiated instruction, where participants felt ill-prepared to handle behavioral issues and cater to students' differing academic levels, this gap between theory and reality was especially noticeable. "You still have a lot of level differences even with additional instruction," said another participant. It's hard for me to handle.

Finally, gaps in the training program were consistently mentioned as barriers to self-efficacy. Participants expressed a desire for more practical training, such as workshops or simulations, specifically focused on behavioral strategies and differentiation techniques. One

participant noted, “Behavior is left behind in the training; more training on that would be helpful.” These gaps often left participants feeling unprepared for the unpredictable and complex realities of inclusive classrooms.

In summary, the training program, particularly through internships, positively influenced self-efficacy by providing opportunities to develop professional identity and collaboration skills. However, challenges such as inconsistent mentorship, insufficient exposure to diverse settings, and a lack of practical training in key areas highlighted critical gaps. Addressing these limitations could enhance the program’s ability to prepare preservice teachers for the complexities of inclusive education.

External systemic barriers

Systemic issues such as insufficient resources, large class sizes, and limited institutional support emerged as significant barriers to preservice teachers’ self-efficacy. These challenges were frequently highlighted by participants, who expressed frustration with the lack of structural support necessary for implementing inclusive practices effectively.

One recurring issue was the inadequacy of classroom resources, particularly the absence of teaching assistants and other support staff. Participants noted that the complexity of managing diverse classrooms often required additional hands, especially when working with students with special needs. For instance, one participant stated, “Without support in the classroom, like teaching assistants, inclusive education is not feasible.” This lack of resources left many preservice teachers feeling overwhelmed and unable to meet the needs of all students, particularly those requiring individualized attention.

Another major obstacle was the size of the classes. Many participants stated that it was difficult to maintain order and deliver differentiated education in their classrooms due to the large number of kids. One participant highlighted the challenge of striking a balance between behavioral and academic demands in an inclusive environment by reflecting, "With such large classes, it's almost impossible to give everyone the attention they need." Their ability to properly manage classrooms and put policies in place for creating an inclusive learning environment was also hampered by these huge class numbers.

Additionally, institutional support varied significantly between schools, with some participants highlighting a lack of access to specialized training, resources, or collaborative opportunities. For example, one participant noted, “In some schools, you feel completely on your own, with no additional training or tools to help manage the classroom.” This inconsistency in institutional support created disparities in the extent to which preservice teachers felt equipped to handle the demands of inclusive education.

Finally, the absence of systematic structures for ongoing support exacerbated these barriers. Participants pointed out that inclusive education often required not only classroom-level adjustments but also school-wide policies and infrastructure to ensure its success. However, many schools lacked such systemic frameworks, leaving teachers to navigate challenges independently. One participant remarked, “It often feels like inclusive education is an ideal we’re supposed to achieve without the actual tools or systems to make it possible.”

Discussion

The goal of this study was to examine how well preservice teachers in the Dutch education system feel prepared for inclusive teaching, focusing on their self-efficacy in managing behavior, instructional strategies, and collaboration. Key factors influencing self-efficacy included emotional resilience, which enhanced confidence in addressing challenges, and teacher training programs, which provided foundational knowledge and hands-on experience through internships. However, gaps in practical preparation, such as limited focus on differentiated instruction, were noted. External systemic barriers, including large class sizes and insufficient resources, also emerged as critical challenges, affecting teachers’ ability to implement inclusive practices effectively (Sharma & Sokal, 2016; Pfitzner-Eden, 2016).

The first research question: How do Dutch preservice teachers articulate and assess their levels of self-efficacy, particularly concerning their readiness for inclusive teaching practices? The hypothesis is: Dutch preservice teachers will report moderate levels of self-efficacy, with lower confidence in managing diverse classrooms compared to other aspects of teaching, aligning with prior findings (Malinen et al., 2013; Sharma et al., 2011). The quantitative findings from the TEIP scale indicated moderate confidence across all dimensions, with mean scores exceeding 4.0 on a 1–6 scale. The dimension of managing classroom behavior scored the

highest, followed by inclusive instruction and collaboration. While these results suggest a balanced level of self-efficacy, they differ from previous research, where collaboration or inclusive instruction often emerged as the strongest dimensions (Malinen et al., 2013; Sharma et al., 2011). This deviation may reflect the context of Dutch teacher training programs, which emphasize classroom management as a critical component. While moderate confidence was reported across dimensions in the quantitative findings, the qualitative data highlighted nuanced challenges, particularly in managing classroom behaviors and implementing differentiated instructional strategies. Participants frequently emphasized the difficulties of translating theoretical knowledge into practical application. Classroom management and differentiated instructional strategies emerged as significant areas of concern, corroborating findings from other studies (Pfitzner-Eden, 2016; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

The second research question is: What are the potential factors that influence preservice teachers' self-efficacy? The hypothesis is: Preservice teachers with prior experience working with diverse learners and higher-quality, hands-on training in inclusive education will exhibit higher levels of self-efficacy. Internships emerged as crucial in this context, providing opportunities to apply theoretical knowledge in real-world settings. These opportunities were especially impactful when guided by effective mentorship and reflective feedback (Gibbs & Miller, 2014; Wilson et al., 2014). Effective mentorship allowed preservice teachers to build confidence, particularly in addressing classroom challenges like behavioral management and differentiation (Bandura, 1996).

However, several factors negatively influenced self-efficacy. Inconsistent mentorship, systemic barriers such as large class sizes and insufficient resources, and gaps in training programs were prominent concerns (Sharma & Sokal, 2016). Participants reported that theoretical courses often lacked practical application, leaving them underprepared for inclusive classrooms. These findings align with prior research highlighting the importance of mentorship, systemic support, and practical training in fostering teacher confidence (Pfitzner-Eden, 2016; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Addressing these issues through stronger mentorship, improved systemic support, and targeted practical training could significantly enhance preservice teachers' preparedness and confidence.

The third research question is: Are there differences in self-efficacy levels across the dimensions of classroom management, instructional strategies, and collaboration? The hypothesis is: Self-efficacy in classroom management will be lower compared to instructional strategies and collaboration. Quantitative analysis revealed no significant differences across the three dimensions, with preservice teachers reporting similar levels of confidence in classroom management, instructional strategies, and collaboration (Malinen et al., 2013; Sharma et al., 2011). However, qualitative findings revealed that classroom management was frequently identified as particularly challenging. Participants noted the emotional toll and unpredictability of managing behavioral issues as key stressors that were not fully reflected in the quantitative scores (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

By contrast, instructional strategies and collaboration were perceived as more manageable, especially when preservice teachers received strong mentorship and team support (Gibbs & Miller, 2014). These findings suggest that while self-reported confidence levels appear consistent across dimensions, classroom management remains a hidden area of difficulty that requires targeted interventions to address these challenges. This discrepancy highlights the limitations of self-reported confidence and underscores the importance of qualitative insights in contextualizing these findings (Bandura, 1996).

By integrating these findings with prior literature, it becomes evident that fostering preservice teachers' self-efficacy in inclusive teaching requires addressing both individual and systemic factors. Practical, hands-on training, robust mentorship, and adequate systemic support are essential for preparing teachers to navigate the complexities of inclusive education effectively.

Conclusion

The self-efficacy of Dutch preservice teachers in inclusive education was investigated in this study, with particular attention paid to their assurance in behavior management, instructional tactics, and teamwork. The TEIP scale was used to gather quantitative data using a mixed-methods approach, and open-ended responses were used to gather qualitative information. In every area, participants expressed a modest level of confidence, with managing behavior receiving the highest score. Qualitative data, however, showed difficulties putting theoretical

understanding into reality, especially when it came to behavior control and differentiated training.

Quantitative limitations

The quantitative findings revealed moderate confidence across all dimensions of self-efficacy, with no significant differences between them. This suggests that participants perceived themselves as equally competent in managing behavior, implementing instructional strategies, and fostering collaboration. However, the highest mean score for managing behavior diverges from prior research where collaboration typically scores highest (e.g., Malinen et al., 2013; Sharma et al., 2011). This difference may reflect the Dutch teacher training context, which emphasizes classroom management as a foundational skill for effective teaching.

The moderate reliability of the inclusive instruction subscale ($\alpha = 0.667$) is noteworthy, as it falls below the accepted threshold for internal consistency. This may be attributed to translation issues or cultural differences in how inclusive instruction is perceived. For instance, Dutch teacher training programs may not emphasize the pedagogical adaptations associated with inclusive instruction as much as other contexts. Future research should revalidate the TEIP scale in larger and more diverse Dutch samples to ensure its applicability.

Qualitative limitations

The qualitative findings highlighted a discrepancy between self-reported confidence and real-world experiences, particularly in managing classroom behavior. While participants expressed moderate confidence in managing behavior quantitatively, their qualitative responses revealed significant stress and difficulty in this area. This suggests that self-reported measures may not fully capture the challenges preservice teachers face in inclusive classrooms.

Internships emerged as a critical factor in developing self-efficacy. Participants credited these experiences with providing opportunities to apply theoretical knowledge and build confidence in fostering collaboration and diversity awareness. However, they also exposed gaps in preparation, particularly in managing behavioral challenges and implementing differentiated instruction. This disconnect between theoretical training and practical application was a recurring

theme, underscoring the need for more hands-on, experiential learning opportunities in teacher training programs (Pfitzner-Eden, 2016).

The qualitative findings also highlighted the role of systemic barriers, such as large class sizes, insufficient resources, and inconsistent mentorship. These factors not only hindered participants' ability to implement inclusive practices but also undermined their confidence. This reflects a broader issue where systemic challenges limit the effectiveness of individual training efforts.

Implications

The findings from this study highlight several important implications for teacher training programs, educational policymakers, and school systems aiming to enhance preservice teachers' self-efficacy for inclusive education. Addressing these implications can lead to more effective preparation and support for educators in managing diverse classrooms and fostering inclusive practices.

Enhancing teacher training programs

Teacher training programs must improve the link between theoretical knowledge and real-life application. Despite participants' moderate confidence in their capacity to collaborate, control behavior, and apply instructional strategies, qualitative responses showed that these skills were consistently difficult to master, especially when it came to classroom management and differentiated instruction (Malinen et al., 2013; Sharma et al., 2011).

Programs should expand and diversify internships to expose preservice teachers to a range of inclusive classroom situations in order to close these gaps in experiential learning (Gibbs & Miller, 2014). Real-world teaching experiences can be enhanced by case studies, role-playing games, and simulations centered on classroom management and differentiated instruction (Wilson et al., 2001). Furthermore, as this was repeatedly mentioned as a challenge, specialized training in creating and executing differentiated instruction ought to be a major part of teacher education (Tomlinson, 1999). To assist preservice teachers in placing their experiences in context and creating practical plans for growth, training programs should incorporate

reflective practices including assignments, peer discussions, and mentorship sessions (Bandura, 1996).

Addressing systemic barriers

Systemic challenges, such as large class sizes, limited resources, and inconsistent mentorship, were found to significantly influence preservice teachers' confidence and ability to implement inclusive practices effectively (Pfitzner-Eden, 2016). Educational policymakers and school leaders must address these barriers to create environments where preservice teachers can thrive.

Investing in classroom support, such as teaching assistants, specialized staff, and access to resources for differentiated instruction, is critical for reducing the burden on teachers and creating more manageable classroom environments (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Reducing class sizes would also enable teachers to provide more individualized attention to students, improving their ability to manage behavior and implement inclusive strategies effectively (Blatchford et al., 2011). Standardizing mentorship programs across schools would ensure that all preservice teachers receive consistent and structured guidance. Experienced mentors should be trained to provide targeted feedback and emotional support to help new teachers navigate the complexities of inclusive teaching (Gibbs & Miller, 2014; Wilson et al, 2001).

Aligning theory with practice

The findings revealed a recurring theme of a gap between theoretical training and practical application, particularly in classroom management and differentiated instruction. Teacher training programs should update their curricula to include case studies and examples that mirror real-world classroom issues, like handling various behaviors and addressing varying student ability levels, in order to better connect theory with practice (Tomlinson, 1999). Teachers can improve their abilities and adjust to new problems in inclusive education by having access to chances for continuous professional development (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Furthermore, promoting collaboration skills is essential, as these are vital for working with teaching assistants, families, and specialists to create effective inclusive environments

(Mahatmya et al., 2022). Collaboration, despite being a key component of inclusive education, scored the lowest in this study, emphasizing the need for targeted training in this area (Malinen et al., 2013).

Policy recommendations

At the policy level, these findings highlight the necessity of developing national standards for inclusive education training to ensure consistency and quality across teacher preparation programs (Sharma et al., 2011). In order to ensure that schools have enough personnel, supplies, and equipment to adequately support different learners, policymakers should also give inclusion a high priority when allocating resources (Pfitzner-Eden, 2016). Gaps in preservice teachers' preparation and support can be found and filled with the aid of monitoring and evaluation systems for teacher training programs and school-based support systems (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Teacher preparation programs and educational policymakers might better equip preservice teachers to handle the challenges of inclusive classrooms by addressing these consequences. In addition to helping teachers, these adjustments also make education more effective and equitable for all students.

References

Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (2000). A Survey into Mainstream Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Inclusion of Children with Special Educational Needs in the Ordinary School in one Local Education Authority. *Educational Psychology*, *20*(2), 191–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/713663717

Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 17*(2), 129–147. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250210129056

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review*, *84*(2), 191–215.

Bandura, A. (1996). Multifaceted Impact of Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Academic Functioning. In *Child Development* (Vol. 67, Issue 3, pp. 1206–1222).

Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., & Brown, P. (2011). Examining the effects of class size on classroom engagement and teacher-pupil interaction: Differences in relation to pupil prior attainment and primary vs. secondary schools. *Learning and Instruction, 21*(6), 715–730. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2011.04.001

de Boer, A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. (2011). Regular primary schoolteachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: a review of the literature. *International Journal Of Inclusive Education*, *15*(3), 331–353. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110903030089

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Chao, C. N. G., Forlin, C., & Ho, F. C. (2016). Improving Teaching Self-Efficacy for Teachers in Inclusive Classrooms in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *20*(11), 1142–1154. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1080/13603116.2016.1155663

Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches, 3rd ed. In *Sage*. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2008-13604-000

Creswell, J. W. (2018). Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research, 3rd ed. In *Sage*. https://catalog.maranatha.edu/index.php?p=show_detail&id=51811

Dibapile, W. T. S. (2012). Teacher efficacy and classroom management among Botswana junior secondary school teachers. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*. https://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2567&context=utk_graddiss

Faber, J., & Fonseca, L. M. (2014). How sample size influences research outcomes. *Dental Press Journal of Orthodontics, 19*(4), 27-29. https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-9451.19.4.027-029.ebo

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5th ed.). In *Sage*.
Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). In *McGraw-Hill*.

Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*(5), 813–828. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096

Forlin, C., & Sin, K. (2010). Developing Support for Inclusion: A Professional Learning Approach for Teachers in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, *6*(1), 7–26.

Gibbs, S., & Miller, A. (2013). Teachers' resilience and well-being: a role for educational psychology. *Teachers and Teaching*, *20*(5), 609–621. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.844408

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? *Field Methods*, *18*(1), 59–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822x05279903

Guskey, T. R., & Passaro, P. D. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions. *American Educational Research Journal, 31*(3), 627–643. https://doi.org/10.2307/1163230

Hopman, J. A. B., Tick, N. T., Van Der Ende, J., Wubbels, T., Verhulst, F. C., Maras, A., Breeman, L. D., & Van Lier, P. (2018). Special education teachers' relationships with students and self-efficacy moderate associations between classroom-level disruptive behaviors and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching And Teacher Education*, *75*, 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.06.004

Israel, G. D. (1992). *Determining sample size* [University of Florida]. https://www.tarleton.edu/academicassessment/wp-content/uploads/sites/119/2022/05/Samplesize.pdf#:~:text=URL%3A%20https%3A%2F%2Fwww.tarleton.edu%2Facademicassessment%2Fwp

Lincoln, Y. S., Guba, E. G., & Pilotta, J. J. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. *International Journal Of Intercultural Relations*, *9*(4), 438–439. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(85)90062-8

Loreman, T., Sharma, U., & Forlin, C. (2013). Do Pre-Service Teachers Feel Ready to Teach in Inclusive Classrooms? A Four Country Study of Teaching Self-Efficacy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(1)

Park, M., Dimitrov, D. M., Das, A., & Gichuru, M. (2016). The teacher efficacy for inclusive practices (TEIP) scale: dimensionality and factor structure. *Journal Of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *16*(1), 2–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12047

Mahatmya, D., Brown, E. L., Valenti, M., Celedonia, K. L., Sweet, T., & Bethea, C. (2022). Developing Social Capital through School-Based Collaborations: A Mixed Methods Social Network Analysis. *Journal Of Education Human Resources*, *42*(3), 354–381. https://doi.org/10.3138/jehr-2022-0005

Malinen, O. P., Savolainen, H., Engelbrecht, P., Xu, J., Nel, M., Nel, N., & Tlale, D. (2013). Exploring teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practices in three diverse countries. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 33,* 34–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.02.004

Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap. (2024, 27 maart). *Passend onderwijs*. Rijksoverheid.nl. https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/passend-onderwijs

Pfitzner-Eden F. (2016). Why Do I Feel More Confident? Bandura's Sources Predict Preservice Teachers' Latent Changes in Teacher Self-Efficacy. *Frontiers in psychology*, *7*, 1486. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01486

Pijl, S. J. (2010). Preparing teachers for inclusive education: some reflections from the Netherlands. *Journal Of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *10*(s1), 197–201. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2010.01165.x

Savolainen, H., Malinen, O. P., & Schwab, S. (2020). Teacher efficacy predicts teachers' attitudes towards inclusion–a longitudinal cross-lagged analysis. *International journal of inclusive education*, *26*(9), 958-972. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1752826

Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2011). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of research in special educational needs*, *12*(1), 12-21. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01200.x

Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What Are the Effects of Induction and Mentoring on Beginning Teacher Turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, *41*(3), 681–714. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041003681

Tan, R., Lichtblau, M., Wehmeier, C., & Werning, R. (2022). Preschool teachers' attitudes towards inclusion: a comparison study between China and Germany. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *37*(6), 994-1008. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2021.1997480

Terry, G., Hayfield, N., Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. In C. Willig, & W. Stainton Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology (17-37)*. (2nd). London: SAGE Publications https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526405555.n2

THE 17 GOALS | Sustainable Development. (z.d.). https://sdgs.un.org/goals

Tomlinson, C. A. (1999). *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners*. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED429944

Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. (2015). United Nations. https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching And Teacher Education*, *17*(7), 783–805. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0742-051x(01)00036-1

Tümkaya, G. S., & Miller, S. (2020). The perceptions of pre and in-service teachers' self-efficacy regarding inclusive practices: A systematised review. *Elementary Education Online*, *19*(2). 1061-1077. https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2020.696690

United Nations. (2006). Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities. https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html

Weisel, A., & Dror, O. (2006). School climate, sense of efficacy and Israeli teachers' attitudes toward inclusion of students with special needs. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *1*(2), 157-174. https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197906064677

What you need to know about inclusion in education. (2023). Unesco. Geraadpleegd op 28 mei 2024, van https://www.unesco.org/en/inclusion-education/need-know

Wilson, S. M., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations. *Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.* (PDF) Teacher Preparation Research: Current Knowledge, Gaps, and Recommendations

Woodcock, S., Gibbs, K., Hitches, E., & Regan, C. (2023). Investigating Teachers' Beliefs in Inclusive Education and Their Levels of Teacher Self-Efficacy: Are Teachers Constrained in Their Capacity to Implement Inclusive Teaching Practices? *Education Sciences*, *13*(3), 280. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13030280

Wray, E., Sharma, U., & Subban, P. (2022). Factors influencing teacher self-efficacy for inclusive education: A systematic literature review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *117*, 103800. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103800

World Conference on Special Needs Education. (1994). The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. In *World Conference On Special Needs Education: Access And Quality* [Conference-proceeding]. https://bice.org/app/uploads/2014/10/unesco_the_salamanca_statement_and_framework_for_action_on_special_needs_education.pdf

Appendix

Source A

TEIP scale questionnaire (Dutch)

1. Ik kan een verscheidenheid aan beoordeling strategieën gebruiken (bijvoorbeeld portfolio-beoordeling, aangepaste toetsen, prestatiegerichte beoordeling, enz.).
2. Ik kan een alternatieve uitleg of voorbeeld geven wanneer studenten in de war zijn.
3. Ik ben zelfverzekerd in het ontwerpen van leertaken zodat aan de individuele behoeften van leerlingen met een beperking wordt ondergebracht.
4. Ik kan nauwkeurig inschatten of leerlingen begrijpen wat ik heb onderwezen.
5. Ik kan geschikte uitdagingen bieden voor zeer capabele leerlingen.
6. Ik ben zelfverzekerd in mijn vermogen om leerlingen samen te laten werken in paren of in kleine groepen.
7. Ik ben zelfverzekerd in mijn vermogen om verstorend gedrag in de klas te voorkomen voordat het zich voordoet.
8. Ik kan verstorend gedrag in de klas onder controle houden.
9. Ik kan een leerling kalmeren die verstorend of luidruchtig is.
10. Ik kan leerlingen ertoe brengen om de klassenregels te volgen.
11. Ik ben zelfverzekerd in het omgaan met leerlingen die fysiek agressief zijn.
12. Ik kan mijn verwachtingen duidelijk maken over het gedrag van leerlingen.
13. Ik kan families ondersteunen om hun kinderen het goed te laten doen op school.
14. Ik kan het leren van een leerling die het niet goed doet verbeteren.
15. Ik ben in staat om samen te werken met andere professionals en personeel (bijv. assistenten, andere leraren) om leerlingen met een beperking in de klas te onderwijzen.
16. Ik ben zelfverzekerd in mijn vermogen om ouders te betrekken bij schoolactiviteiten van hun kinderen met een beperking.
17. Ik kan ouders zich op hun gemak laten voelen om naar school te komen.
18. Ik kan samenwerken met andere professionals (bijv. ambulante leraren of logopedisten) bij het ontwerpen van onderwijsplannen voor leerlingen met een beperking.

19. Ik ben zelfverzekerd in het informeren van anderen die weinig weten over wetten en beleid met betrekking tot de inclusie van leerlingen met een beperking.
20. Ik ben zelfverzekerd in het aanpassen van schoolbrede of landelijke beoordelingen zodat leerlingen met alle beperkingen kunnen worden beoordeeld.

1 Helemaal mee oneens
2 Mee oneens
3 Enigszins mee oneens
4 Enigszins mee eens
5 Mee eens
6 Helemaal mee eens

Source B

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. We are master's students in Special Needs Education at the University of Groningen (RUG). For our master's thesis, we are conducting research on the attitudes and self-efficacy of future teachers regarding inclusive education. By completing this questionnaire, you are contributing to our research—thank you in advance!

This questionnaire is intended only for AOLB students at the University of Groningen. If you do not fall into this category, you can close this window.
You are welcome to share the questionnaire with your fellow students.

The questionnaire will take a maximum of 10 minutes to complete and includes 18 statements about your attitude towards inclusive education and 20 statements about your self-efficacy regarding inclusive education.

The answers you provide will remain completely anonymous and will only be used for our thesis. You can stop participating at any time without providing a reason. We kindly ask you to answer the statements as truthfully as possible.

By proceeding to complete this questionnaire, you confirm that you have read and understood the above information and agree to participate in this study.

[ ] I consent to participate in this study.

Source C

Consent form

INFORMED CONSENT

"Unpacking Attitudes and Self-Efficacy in Dutch Preservice Teachers: Assessing Readiness for Inclusive Teaching"

- I have read the information about the research. I have had enough opportunities to ask questions about it.
- I understand what the research is about, what is being asked of me, which consequences participation can have, how my data will be handled, and what my rights as a participant are.
- I understand that participation in the research is voluntary. I myself choose to participate. I can stop participating at any moment. If I stop, I do not need to explain why. Stopping will have no negative consequences for me. I understand that after the valid date shown below, the consent will be immediately withdrawn, and all data will be deleted.
- Below I indicate what I am consenting to.

<u>Consent to participate in the research:</u>
[ ] Yes, I consent to participate; this consent is valid until 01-07-2025
[ ] No, I do not consent to participate

<u>Consent to make audio recordings during the research:</u>
[ ] Yes, I consent to make audio recordings of me as a participant in the research.
[ ] No, I do not consent to make audio recordings of me.

Participant's full name:	Participant's signature:	Date:

Full name of researcher present:	Researcher's signature:	Date:

The researcher declares that the participant has received extensive information about the research.

You have the right to a copy of this consent form.

Source C

Interview questions

- Wat versta jij onder inclusief onderwijs?
- Wat heb jij op de studie geleerd over inclusief onderwijs?
- Wat wil jij nog verbeteren aan jouw eigen kunnen op het gebied van inclusief onderwijs en wat heb je daarvoor nodig?
- Wat heb jij nodig uit de studie om inclusief onderwijs goed te kunnen uitvoeren volgens jou?
- Wat zijn de belangrijkste ervaringen tijdens je opleiding die hebben bijgedragen aan jouw ontwikkeling als docent en hoe beïnvloeden deze je zelfvertrouwen in het lesgeven?
- Hoeveel vertrouwen heb jij in jouw eigen kunnen om inclusief onderwijs succesvol toe te kunnen passen?
- Hoe denk jij over inclusief onderwijs? (attitude)
    - Wat zijn de voordelen van inclusief onderwijs volgens jou?
    - Wat zijn de nadelen van inclusief onderwijs volgens jou?
- Vind je dat alle leerlingen, ongeacht hun capaciteiten, dezelfde klaslokalen en leraren moeten delen? Waarom wel of niet?
- Denk je dat inclusief onderwijs haalbaar is in alle soorten scholen en klassen? Waarom wel of niet?
- Welke leerlingen hebben hier baat bij? *Wanneer ze uitleg geven eventueel op doorvragen dat misschien niet iedereen hier baat bij heeft*
- Hoe denk je dat inclusief onderwijs kan bijdragen aan een positieve schoolcultuur?

- Wat denk je dat de grootste uitdagingen zijn bij het implementeren van inclusief onderwijs in scholen?
- Welke veranderingen zou je graag zien in het onderwijssysteem om inclusief onderwijs beter te ondersteunen?
- Welke stappen denk je dat genomen moeten worden om inclusief onderwijs te verbeteren en te bevorderen voor studenten die later gaan werken in het onderwijssysteem?

Table 2

Data Structure

Open codes	**Intermediate codes**	**Themes**	**Positive/negative**
My internships gave me much confidence	Internship confidence	Educational experience	Positive
Working with refugee children gave me insight into cultural differences	Insight cultural differences	Cultural awareness	Positive
I have trouble with behavioral problems in students	Trouble behavioral problems	Behavioral management	Negative
Good guidance is essential	Good guidance	Educational experience, mentorship	Neutral
It doesn’t work without support in class	Without class support	Support systems	Negative/neutral
I feel unprepared to differentiate for diverse learners	Unprepared to differentiate	Inclusive instruction	Negative