Inclusive education

Exploring Dutch pre-service teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes

Name: Tom de Haan
Student number: 3665984
E-Mail: T.de.haan.10@student.rug.nl
University: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
First Supervisor: Dr. Run Tan
Second Supervisor: Dr. Sarahanne Field
Date: 15 – 01 – 2025
Number of words: 8047

Table of Contents

Contents

Abstract

This study examines the self-efficacy and attitudes of Dutch pre-service primary teachers toward inclusive education, exploring their preparedness and perceptions of its feasibility. A mixed-method approach was employed, integrating both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The TEIP scale was used to measure self-efficacy, while the MATIES assessed attitudes toward inclusion. To strengthen the findings and explore the factors influencing self-efficacy and attitudes, semi-structured interviews were conducted. Additionally, the study investigated how self-efficacy influences attitudes toward inclusion; however, no significant relationship was found. The results suggest that preservice teachers exhibit a relatively consistent and moderately high sense of self-efficacy across the three domains. Attitudes reflect optimism about inclusivity's societal benefits, such as fostering empathy and diversity, alongside concerns about systemic barriers like insufficient training and resources. Factors influencing self-efficacy include systemic barriers (e.g., lack of resources, time constraints), practical experience through internships, mentorship quality, perceived importance of inclusion, and challenges in managing classroom behavior. These factors collectively shape teachers' confidence and ability to implement inclusive practices effectively.

Keywords: inclusive education, self-efficacy, TEIP scale, attitudes, MATIES scale, pre-service teachers

Introduction

The growing demand for inclusive education is evident as developed countries and an increasing number of developing nations are implementing policies to support this model. The emphasis is on the philosophy that schools should adapt their practices to meet the diverse needs of all students. Rather than attributing difficulties to individual students, inclusive education acknowledges the role of educational practices. Since the introduction of the “wet passend onderwijs” in 2014, Dutch schools are required to provide suitable education for all students based on their abilities and needs (Ministerie van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap, 2017; Nederlands Jeugdinstituut, 2024). The goal is to include as many students as possible in regular schools, with special schools providing intensive support when necessary. The government aims for fully inclusive education by 2035. This approach aligns with global task 4.5 which aims to eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations (United Nations, 2024). In order to successfully include students with special educational needs in mainstream classrooms, it is essential that school staff in regular schools are willing to adopt the principles and practices of inclusive education (Ainscow, 2007).

Role of self-efficacy in Inclusive Education

Inclusion largely relies on the willingness of classroom teachers to accept and effectively teach students with disabilities (Saradha & S, 2017; Underwood et al., 2023). This willingness is largely influenced by the positive beliefs that teachers hold about inclusive education (Jordan et al., 2009). This combination of willingness and positive beliefs essentially describes teachers’ self-efficacy, which can be viewed as a key ingredient in creating successful inclusive environments. According to Sharma et al. (2011), heightened levels of self-efficacy among teachers correlate with greater confidence in their ability to effectively instruct students with disabilities within regular classroom settings. Conversely, teachers with low levels of self-efficacy may lack belief in their capability to teach an inclusive class effectively.

The conceptual foundation of self-efficacy is deeply rooted in Bandura’s (1997) social cognitive theory, which posits that individuals act based on their belief in their capabilities to successfully perform specific tasks. Self-efficacy is defined as the belief in one's ability to "organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). In the context of teaching, self-efficacy plays a vital role in the effort teachers are willing to invest and their perseverance when facing challenges (Pajares, 1996).

In inclusive education, teacher self-efficacy is considered a key factor in the success of inclusive practices. The Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale, developed by Sharma, Loreman, and Forlin (2012), serves as a tool to measure teachers’ self-efficacy in inclusive

classrooms. The scale identifies three dimensions: efficacy in using inclusive instruction, efficacy in collaboration and efficacy in managing behavior. Each of these dimensions highlights specific skills essential for inclusive education, such as designing differentiated instruction, effectively collaborating with colleagues and parents, and managing classroom behavior.

According to Bandura's theory, self-efficacy is strengthened through mastery experiences, social encouragement, and the successful handling of specific tasks. Teachers with high self-efficacy are more likely to adopt innovative and effective teaching methods while responding positively to challenges in inclusive classrooms.

Self-Efficacy and Attitudes

As stated earlier, the self-efficacy has an influence on the attitudes towards inclusive education. Research supports the notion that there is a positive correlation between teachers' self-efficacy and their attitudes towards inclusive education (Meijer and Foste 1988; Soodak et al. 1998; Weisel and Dror 2006). According to the article of Savolainen et al. (2022) the significance of attitudes towards inclusive education is twofold. Firstly, attitudes are regarded as a crucial determinant influencing the acceptance and effective implementation of inclusive education by teachers. Positive attitudes towards inclusion may foster better support for students with diverse educational needs, while negative attitudes may engender resistance and barriers. Secondly, the article emphasizes that attitudes are not solely based on ideological considerations but also on practical concerns regarding the feasibility of implementing inclusive education in practice.

To measure attitudes comprehensively, Mahat (2008) developed the Multidimensional Attitudes Toward Inclusive Education Scale (MATIES), a psychometric tool designed to capture the multidimensional nature of attitudes. The MATIES conceptualizes attitudes as comprising cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. The cognitive dimension reflects beliefs about inclusive education, such as the effectiveness of curriculum adaptations; the affective dimension captures emotional responses, including empathy or frustration; and the behavioral dimension relates to actions or intentions, like adapting teaching methods. Rooted in Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behavior (1991), the MATIES framework highlights the interplay between attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control, emphasizing how these factors shape teachers' behaviors toward inclusion. This framework underscores the importance of understanding teachers' attitudes not only as ideological stances but also in relation to the practical challenges they face in fostering physical, social, and curricular inclusion (Mahat, 2008).

Inclusive education in the Netherlands

Most of the research on self-efficacy and attitudes towards inclusive education has been conducted in other countries. The study by Tan et al. (2021) highlighted the impact of cultural values on teachers' attitudes towards inclusion. With this in mind, it is valuable to conduct more research in

the Netherlands. In the Netherlands, while international agreements advocate for inclusive education, the country historically maintained separate systems for mainstream and special education. Recent legislation, such as the Duty to Care in Appropiate Education law, seeks to change this by promoting inclusion and increasing collaboration between regular and special schools (Fanchamps et al. 2011). However, teachers often express support for inclusion but not all of them feel prepared to accommodate students with special educational needs in their own classrooms, indicating a need for further training and support (de Moor et al. 2008). Furthermore, the study by de Moor and Bakker (2009) revealed that 79% of the surveyed mainstream teachers expressed a requirement for further training to effectively educate students with special educational needs. The study by Civitillo et al. (2016) found that pre-service teachers maintained neutral beliefs regarding the overarching philosophy and expected outcomes of inclusive education. Conversely, they held more negative attitudes towards the practical application of inclusive practices within the classroom.

Gaps in Current Research and the Need for this Study

Research highlights that teachers often perceive themselves as inadequately prepared to teach in inclusive classrooms (de Moor et al., 2008). While some factors influencing preservice teachers' sense of self-efficacy have been identified, such as theoretical knowledge of inclusive and special education, cognitive pedagogical mastery, simulated modeling, positive feedback and encouragement, and practical mastery experiences (Tan & Amrhein, 2019), a gap remains in understanding how these factors specifically shape the attitudes and self-efficacy of Dutch teachers. Empirically investigating these influences, as well as exploring additional contextual factors, is crucial to address this lack of preparedness. Furthermore, assessing self-efficacy is essential, as it is intrinsically linked to teachers' attitudes toward inclusion (Weisel & Dror, 2006).

Research questions and hypothesis

This study aims to assess the self-efficacy levels and attitudes of Dutch pre-service teachers, as well as to explore the relationship between these two variables. To achieve this, several research questions have been formulated to guide the study. The first research question addresses the self-efficacy of Dutch pre-service teachers: How does Dutch pre-service teachers' self-efficacy to implement inclusive education look like? The hypothesis is that Dutch pre-service primary teachers will report low levels of self-efficacy. Previous studies suggest that pre-service teachers often feel less confident in their ability to teach in an inclusive classroom (de Moor and Bakker, 2009). It is expected that teachers will rank their self-efficacy higher on the subscales; Inclusive and Collaboration compared to Managing Behavior. This expectation aligns with the findings of Sharma et al. (2012), who identified Managing Behavior as the most challenging aspect of inclusive education according to teachers.

The second research question focuses on attitudes toward inclusion: How does Dutch pre-service primary teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education look like? It is hypothesized that Dutch pre-service primary teachers will exhibit neutral to slightly positive attitudes toward inclusive education. These teachers are expected to hold more favorable views on its overarching philosophy and societal benefits, while demonstrating more negative perceptions of its practical implementation within classrooms. Research by Civitillo et al. (2016) supports this hypothesis, indicating that pre-service teachers often hold neutral beliefs about the philosophy and expected outcomes of inclusive education but display skepticism about its practical feasibility. Moreover, Dutch teachers frequently report feeling underprepared to accommodate students with special educational needs, which may negatively influence their attitudes toward the practical aspects of inclusion (de Moor et al., 2008; de Moor & Bakker, 2009).

The third research question investigates the relationship between self-efficacy and attitudes: How do Dutch pre-service teachers' self-efficacy influence their attitudes? We expect that higher levels of self-efficacy among Dutch pre-service primary teachers will positively influence their attitudes toward inclusive education, leading to more favorable perceptions of its feasibility and benefits. Teachers with higher self-efficacy are more likely to feel confident in their ability to implement inclusive practices effectively, which fosters a more optimistic attitude toward inclusion (Sharma et al., 2011; Savolainen et al., 2022). Studies have shown that when teachers believe in their capacity to manage diverse classrooms, they are more inclined to view inclusive education as both achievable and beneficial (Soodak et al., 1998; Weisel & Dror, 2006). Pre-service teachers with lower self-efficacy may feel overwhelmed by the perceived challenges of inclusion, contributing to more negative attitudes toward its implementation (Jordan et al., 2009).

The fourth research question examines influencing factors: What are the factors influencing the self-efficacy and attitudes of the Dutch pre-service primary teachers? It is hypothesized that the self-efficacy and attitudes of Dutch pre-service primary teachers are influenced by practical experience, teacher training, and systemic barriers within the educational system. Practical experience, such as internships in inclusive classrooms, is expected to be a critical determinant of self-efficacy. Pre-service teachers with hands-on exposure to diverse learning environments are anticipated to report higher confidence in their ability to implement inclusive practices, which may foster more positive attitudes toward inclusion (Sharma & Sokal, 2015). Another factor hypothesized to influence self-efficacy and attitudes is the quality and content of teacher training programs. Training that emphasizes inclusive instructional strategies and behavior management skills is expected to enhance self-efficacy and positively shape attitudes toward inclusion (Tan & Amrhein, 2019). Without adequate preparation, pre-service teachers are anticipated to feel underprepared to manage the challenges of inclusion, potentially leading to lower self-efficacy and more negative perceptions of its practicality. Finally, it is hypothesized that systemic barriers, such as limited resources, time constraints, and insufficient

support from colleagues and school leadership, will play a pivotal role. Teachers often express frustration with such barriers, which are expected to undermine their confidence and diminish their attitudes toward inclusive education (Woodcock et al., 2023). Addressing these barriers through improved funding, resource allocation, and professional development is hypothesized to create a more supportive environment for pre-service teachers to develop both their self-efficacy and attitudes.

Method

In this study, a mixed-method approach was employed, integrating both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Adopting a mixed-method approach allows for the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, facilitating a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon under investigation (Flick, 2023). It is important in this research to measure both self-efficacy and attitudes, while also examining the underlying reasons and thought processes. The qualitative component of the study enables an exploration of the rationales behind the current statistics assessed by the quantitative aspect.

Quantitative Phase

Instrument

In this phase, the Teacher Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practices Scale (TEIP) (Sharma et al., 2011) was used to measure self-efficacy. The TEIP scale is a 6-point Likert scale, allowing respondents to rate their agreement with statements ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree). It is designed to assess teachers' confidence in their ability to teach effectively in inclusive classrooms. The scale evaluates three main areas: the use of inclusive teaching strategies, e.g., "I can use a variety of assessment methods to evaluate student learning."; behavior management, e.g., "I can successfully manage disruptive behaviors in an inclusive classroom."; and collaboration, e.g., "I can work collaboratively with other professionals to support student needs." These dimensions collectively reflect a broader construct of self-efficacy for inclusive teaching, which suggests that the scale can be analyzed as both multidimensional and unidimensional.

The scale has been validated internally, showing strong reliability across its dimensions: use of inclusive teaching strategies (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.85$), behavior management (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.91$), and collaboration (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.93$). The overall reliability of the scale is excellent, with a total Cronbach's α of 0.89 (Sharma et al., 2011). The TEIP scale has also been evaluated in various research studies, demonstrating its validity and reliability. For instance, Loreman et al. (2013) examined the scale across four countries; Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, and New Zealand, highlighting its applicability in diverse cultural contexts. Additionally, Park et al. (2016) investigated the scale's dimensionality and factor structure in a sample of pre-service teachers in early childhood

education within the United States. Their findings indicated that the TEIP scale can be interpreted as capturing a single overarching construct, supporting its consistency as a tool for assessing teachers' self-efficacy in inclusive education.

The Multidimensional Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education Scale (MATIES), developed by Mahat (2008), was used to measure participants' attitudes toward inclusive education. This scale is designed to evaluate three interconnected dimensions of attitudes: affective, cognitive, and behavioral aspects. The affective dimension captures teachers' emotional responses to inclusive education, such as the satisfaction they feel when working with students with diverse needs. An example item is: "I enjoy the idea of working with students with diverse needs." The cognitive dimension reflects teachers' beliefs and perceptions about the benefits of inclusive education, such as the idea that it promotes diversity and benefits all students. A sample item for this dimension is: "Inclusive education benefits all students by promoting diversity." The behavioral dimension assesses teachers' willingness to adapt their teaching practices to meet the needs of all students, including making physical and instructional modifications in their classrooms. An example of this dimension is: "I would modify my teaching methods to accommodate all students."

The MATIES employs a 6-point Likert scale, where respondents rate their level of agreement with various statements, ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree.' The scale has been thoroughly validated and demonstrates strong internal consistency. The reliability scores for the subscales are 0.77 for the cognitive dimension, 0.78 for the affective dimension, and 0.91 for the behavioral dimension, indicating particularly high reliability for the behavioral component. These results highlight the MATIES as a reliable and practical tool for capturing teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education. Furthermore, Mahat (2008) emphasized that the scale not only allows for the examination of the individual dimensions but also provides a broader view of attitudes, making it a valuable resource for both research and practice.

Participants

The participants consisted of pre-service primary teachers enrolled in the Academic Teacher Training Program for Primary Education (*Academische Opleiding Leraar Basisonderwijs*, AOLB) at the University of Groningen. The total cohort includes 400 students, and the survey was distributed to the entire group. This resulted in a response rate of 20% for the questionnaire. According to Cohen (2013), in social science research, a sample size that achieves a statistical power of 0.80 is generally considered adequate to detect medium effect sizes (Cohen's $d = 0.5$) at a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. However, not all participants completed the entire questionnaire. To ensure the reliability and quality of the data, participants with more than 25% missing responses were excluded. After applying this

criterion, 61 valid respondents remained for further analysis. The same rule is applied for the TEIP scale resulting in a total of 51 respondents.

Procedure

The TEIP and MATIES scales were made available online via Qualtrics, with the survey link being distributed to AOLB students through an email sent by the thesis supervisor. The email provided an overview of the study, including its purpose, the topic being researched, and the estimated time required to complete the survey. The email also included the link to the questionnaire. The email is included in appendix 3 for reference. To encourage participation, a follow-up email was sent as a reminder. The survey link was also shared on Brightspace, the university's online learning environment. This announcement complemented the email, ensuring that all AOLB students had access to the survey through multiple channels.

Despite these efforts, initial participation was lower than expected. To increase response rates, the researchers attended three lectures as assigned by the thesis supervisor. These lectures, each with approximately 30 students in attendance, provided an opportunity for the researcher to personally introduce the study. The introduction lasted about two minutes and included a brief explanation of the research objectives and the importance of student participation. At the end of the introduction, a QR code linking directly to the survey was displayed on the lecture hall screen. Students were encouraged to scan the code and complete the survey during the lecture, although they were also given the option to finish it later.

Within the survey itself, clear instructions were provided to guide participants. The instructions included details on how to answer the questions, the approximate time needed to complete the survey, and a reminder about the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses. These measures were taken to ensure that participants felt comfortable and confident in completing the questionnaire.

Analysis

The data has undergone analysis utilizing descriptive statistics and comparative statistics processed with SPSS. Descriptive statistics were employed to summarize and describe the main features of the collected data. Comparative statistics, on the other hand, were used to identify and analyze differences between groups within the data. Spearman’s rho correlation was conducted to explore relationships between self-efficacy (total TEIP score and subscale scores) and attitudes (MATIES score). This non-parametric test was chosen due to the ordinal nature of the Likert scale data. Statistical significance was determined at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Scale validation

Before data collection, the TEIP and MATIES scale underwent a validation process to ensure its reliability and validity within the Dutch context. This process included translating the scale into Dutch. The researchers collaborated to guarantee both accuracy and consistency in the translation. Each student translated the scale individually, after which the translations were compared and discussed collectively to resolve any inconsistencies of differences in interpretation. The researchers reached consensus on the most appropriate translation for each item.

To assess scale validity the researcher examined the coherence and consistency of the items of the scale. To ensure the reliability and validity of the translated TEIP scale, a Cronbach alpha analysis was conducted to evaluate the internal consistency of the scale. Cronbach's Alpha is a statistical measure that provides an estimate of the average inter-item correlation and reflects the degree to which the items measure the same underlying construct (Kennedy, 2022). Internal consistency was assessed both within the three categories and for the overall scale. An acceptable value of Cronbach's Alpha is often debated (Taber, 2017). In this study a threshold value of 0.70 was selected, as Taber (2017) commonly regarded as an acceptable limit.

Qualitative Phase

Interview

The interview aimed to explore the factors influencing teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes towards inclusive education. The interview questions, which can be found in the appendix 2, were collaboratively developed by two researchers to ensure thorough coverage of the topic. This semi-structured interview format allowed for flexibility, enabling the researchers to probe deeper into responses and explore relevant themes as they emerged during the conversation.

Participants

During this phase, the researcher has recruited 5 participants who are enrolled in the AOLB program at the University of Groningen. These participants had already taken the survey, which includes an option to indicate their willingness to participate in the interview. The selection of 5 participants was based on the need to obtain in-depth data while ensuring manageability within the scope of this study. The final number of interviews was determined based on the concept of data saturation, which refers to the point at which no new information or themes are observed in the data (Flick, 2023). Smaller samples are often suitable for in-depth, thematic analysis when focused on a specific subgroup (Creswell & Creswell, 2018)

Procedure

Participants were invited by mail to take part in semi-structured interviews. The mail addresses were given in the survey. The interviews were conducted at the Heymans building in Groningen. All interviews were audio-recorded. Prior to the interview, participants were asked to sign a consent form, which also can be found in the appendix (Appendix 1). The interviews were transcribed afterwards with Atlas.ti and with Amberscript.

Analysis

A thematic analysis was employed to explore the factors influencing participants' self-efficacy and attitudes towards inclusive education (Flick, 2023). Using Atlas.ti software, the researcher analyzed the interview transcripts to identify recurring patterns and themes. The process began with a detailed reading of the data, followed by coding segments that reflected meaningful patterns or concepts. Initial codes were generated both inductively from the participants' responses and guided by pre-existing themes from the literature, such as practical experience, teacher training and systemic barriers.

In the next stage, codes were organized into broader categories and potential themes, with attention to relationships and connections between them. This iterative process allowed the researcher to refine themes, ensuring they accurately captured the data. Key themes, such as the challenges and importance of inclusive education, emerged as central to understanding participants' perspectives. Throughout the analysis, a rigorous process of constant comparison was applied to ensure consistency and depth in identifying themes and their relevance to the research questions.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

For the quantitative phase, only pre-service primary teachers enrolled in the AOLB program at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen has been included. Participants must be currently enrolled and actively participating in the program.

Ethical Considerations

All participants provided informed consent before participating in the study. They were informed about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of their participation, and their right to withdraw at any time without consequence (Appendix 1).

Results

Quantitative results

Reliability Analysis

TEIP

To evaluate the reliability of the TEIP scale, Cronbach's alpha was measured for each of the three categories as well as for the overall scale. This analysis presents the internal consistency of the items within each category and provides an indication of how well the scale measures the underlying constructs.

Cronbach's alpha for the first category, efficacy in inclusive instruction, is .667. In the second category, efficacy in managing behavior, Cronbach's alpha is .787 and in the third category, efficacy in collaboration has a value of .861. All the values are above the generally accepted threshold of 0.7 except for the first category. A Cronbach's alpha of 0.7 or higher is typically considered acceptable, indicating sufficient internal consistency among the items. For the categories with values above 0.7, this suggests that the items in these scales are reliably measuring the intended constructs. However, for the first category, the lower Cronbach's alpha of .667 indicates lower internal consistency, which may suggest that the items in this category are less cohesive in measuring the underlying construct. The total TEIP scale has a value of .889, indicating strong consistency between the total set of items. This suggests that while the first category is less reliable on its own, the overall scale remains robust.

Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha Values by Category for the TEIP

Scale	**Items included**	**Cronbach's Alpha**
Efficacy in Inclusive Instruction	1 – 6	**.667**
Efficacy in Managing Behavior	7 – 12	**.787**
Efficacy in Collaboration	13, 15 – 19	**.861**
Total TEIP Scale	1 - 13, 15 – 19	**.889**

MATIES

To evaluate the reliability of the MATIES scale, Cronbach's alpha was also calculated for each of the three subscales, Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral, as well as for the overall scale. Cronbach's alpha for the Cognitive subscale is .411, which is well below the generally accepted threshold of 0.7, indicating low internal consistency. For the Affective subscale, Cronbach's alpha is .686, which approaches the threshold but does not meet it, suggesting moderate internal consistency. The Behavioral subscale shows stronger reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of .778, exceeding the 0.7 threshold and indicating acceptable internal consistency. The total MATIES scale has a Cronbach's alpha of .820, which reflects strong consistency among the items when considered as a whole. These results suggest that while the Behavioral subscale and the overall scale reliably measure their intended constructs, the Cognitive and Affective subscales demonstrate weaker reliability.

Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha Values by Category for the MATIES

Scale	**Items included**	**Cronbach's Alpha**
Cognitive	1 - 6	**.411**

Affective	7 – 12	**.686**
Behavioral	13 - 18	**.778**
Total MATIES Scale	1 - 18	**.820**

Descriptive statistics

This section presents the descriptive statistics for the survey assessing the self-efficacy of prospective teachers. The survey aimed to measure participants' confidence in their ability to teach inclusively, manage classroom behavior effectively, and collaborate with colleagues. The results are categorized based on these three dimensions and provide an overview of the participants' perceived self-efficacy. By analyzing the mean scores, standard deviations, and response distributions, this section offers insights into the general trends and variability within the dataset.

Inclusive instruction

In this category the questions were designed to measure the self-efficacy as for their ability to give inclusive instructions. The results are given in table 3.

Table 3: the Mean and SD of the Statements in the Category "Efficacy in Inclusive Instructions"

	N	Mean	SD
I can use a variety of assessment strategies (e.g., portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance-based assessment, etc.)	**50**	**4,72**	**,882**
I am able to provide an alternate explanation or example when students are confused	**50**	**5,06**	**,620**
I am confident in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with disabilities are accommodated	**50**	**4,04**	**1,029**
I can accurately gauge student comprehension of what I have taught	**50**	**4,42**	**,785**
I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students	**48**	**4,44**	**,897**
I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups	**49**	**4,76**	**,778**
Total	**50**	**4,57**	**,508**

The average scores for the statements measuring self-efficacy in inclusive instruction ranged from 4,04 to 5,06, indicating varying levels of agreement among respondents. The highest average

score was observed for the statement, "I am able to provide an alternate explanation or example when students are confused" (M = 5,06). The second-highest score was for the statement, "I am confident in my ability to get students to work together in pairs or in small groups" (M = 4,76). The lowest average score was found for the statement, "I am confident in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with disabilities are accommodated" (M = 4,04). The total mean score across all statements was 4,57, suggesting that respondents generally provided moderately high ratings across the scale. The moderately high total mean score indicates that respondents generally have a positive sense of self-efficacy in inclusive instruction, reflecting confidence in their abilities across the measured skills.

Managing Behavior

The questions in this category focus on the self-efficacy for their ability to effectively manage student behavior in the classroom. The results can be found table 4.

Table 4: the Mean and SD of the Statements in the Category "Efficacy in Managing Behavior"

	N	Mean	SD
I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behavior in the classroom before it occurs.	**50**	**4,10**	**1,055**
I can control disruptive behavior in the classroom	**50**	**4,46**	**0,930**
I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy.	**49**	**4,57**	**0,816**
I am able to get children to follow classroom rules.	**49**	**4,84**	**0,590**
I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive.	**50**	**3,56**	**1,358**
I can make my expectations clear about student behavior.	**50**	**5,06**	**0,712**
Total	**50**	**4,43**	**0,659**

In the domain of behavior management, the scores ranged from 3,56 to 5,06, reflecting considerable variation in perceived confidence levels. Respondents felt most assured in their ability to clarify behavioral expectations, as evidenced by the top score of "I can make my expectations clear about student behavior" (M = 5,06). Following closely 'I am able to get children follow classroom

rules." also scored highly, at 4,84. However, "I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive" was seen as a challenge, as indicated by the lowest score of 3,56. The total mean score of 4,43 points to a generally positive perception of behavior management skills. This suggests that respondents generally have a positive sense of self-efficacy in behavior management, despite variations in confidence across specific areas.

Collaboration

This category examines teachers' self-efficacy regarding their ability to collaborate with colleagues and those involved. The results are displayed in table 5.

Table 5: the Mean and SD of the Statements in the Category "Efficacy in Collaboration"

	N	Mean	SD
I can assist families in helping their children do well in school.	**49**	**3,82**	**0,905**
I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g., aides, other teachers) to teach students with disabilities in the classroom	**50**	**4,88**	**0,918**
I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with disabilities.	**49**	**4,06**	**1,144**
I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school.	**49**	**4,53**	**1,101**
I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g., itinerant teachers or speech pathologists) in designing educational plans for students with disabilities.	**49**	**4,47**	**1,209**
I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities.	**50**	**3,74**	**1,352**
Total	**50**	**4,24**	**0,852**

The average scores for the statements measuring self-efficacy in collaboration ranged from 3,74 to 4,88, indicating varying levels of agreement among respondents. The highest average score

was observed for the statement, " I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g., aides, other teachers) to teach students with disabilities in the classroom" (M = 4,88). The second-highest score was for the statement, "I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school" (M = 4,53). The lowest average score was found for the statement, "I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities" (M = 3,74). The total mean score across all statements was 4,24, suggesting a slightly less but still moderately high rating across the scale. The overall average reflects a generally strong sense of self-efficacy in collaboration, though confidence varies across specific skills.

Correlation between the self-efficacy and the attitudes

To see if self-efficacy has an influence on the attitudes a Spearman's rho correlation test has been taken. The outcome is presented in table 6.

Table 6: the Correlation Coefficient and its Significance of the Total TEIP and MATIES scores

		TEIP	MATIES
TEIP	Correlation Coefficient	**1,000**	**-,259**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	**.**	**.070**
	N	**50**	**50**
MATIES	Correlation Coefficient	**-,259**	**1,000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	**0.70**	**.**
	N	**50**	**74**

The Spearman's rho correlation coefficient between elf-efficacy and the attitudes is -0,259, indicating a weak negative correlation between the two variables. This means that as self-efficacy increases, the attitude tends to decrease slightly, and vice versa. The significance level for this correlation is 0.070, suggesting that there is a 7% probability that this relationship occurred by chance.

A common threshold for statistical significance is a p-value of 0.05 or lower. Since the p-value here is 0.070, which is slightly above this threshold, the correlation is not considered statistically significant at the 0.05 level. In other words, based on this data, we cannot confidently conclude that there is a meaningful relationship between the self-efficacy and the attitudes in the population.

A Spearman's rho correlation test was also conducted to examine the relationship between attitudes and the three subscales of the TEIP scale. The outcome is presented in table 7.

Table 7: the Correlation Coefficient and its Significance of the three independent subscales of the TEIP and the MATIES scores

	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Instruction	**-0,177**	**0,422**	**50**
Managing Behavior	**-0,276**	**0,055**	**50**
Collaboration	**-0,212**	**0,144**	**50**

The correlation between attitudes and the Inclusive Instruction subscale is weakly negative (-0,177) and not statistically significant ($p = 0,422 > 0.05$). This suggests that there is no clear evidence of a relationship between attitudes and the ability to provide instruction as measured by this subscale. The correlation with the Managing Behavior subscale is moderate and negative (-0,276). While the significance level approaches the commonly used threshold of 0.05, it remains slightly above it ($p = 0.055$). This indicates a potential trend where higher scores on attitudes may be associated with lower perceived ability in managing situations, but this finding is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The correlation for the collaboration subscale is weakly negative (-0,212) and not statistically significant ($p = 0,144 > 0.05$). This result implies no clear evidence of a relationship between attitudes and perceived ability to cooperate. While there is a weak to moderate negative correlation between attitudes and the three TEIP subscales, none of these correlations are statistically significant.

Qualitative results

This section explores key factors shaping the attitudes and self-efficacy of future teachers regarding inclusive education. A combination of deductive and inductive thematic analysis was employed to identify both pre-defined themes derived from existing literature and emergent themes uncovered during data analysis. The pre-defined themes include systemic barriers, practical experience, and classroom management challenges. Additionally, the coding process revealed new insights, such as the importance of inclusion, which emerged directly from the participants' responses. studies. An example of the coding process can be found in appendix 5.

Systemic Barriers

Systemic barriers, such as a lack of teacher expertise, time constraints, and limited resources, were identified as significant obstacles to inclusive education. Respondents expressed concerns that these barriers negatively affected their attitudes toward inclusion. For example, teachers indicated frustration with inadequate support systems, which often led to feelings of being overwhelmed. As one respondent noted, "I sometimes fear that the level of teachers is not high enough to keep up with the

rapid changes" (Respondent 5). This lack of systemic support undermines teachers' confidence in their ability to implement inclusive practices effectively.

Practical Experience and Training

Practical experience emerged as a critical factor in shaping both attitudes and self-efficacy. Teachers who had participated in internships or had direct exposure to inclusive classrooms reported significantly higher confidence in their abilities. For instance, one respondent shared, "I feel quite confident, mainly because of my internships" (Respondent 5). In contrast, respondents without sufficient experience expressed lower self-efficacy and more hesitant attitudes. One teacher stated, "At the moment, I wouldn't feel capable, simply because I don't have enough experience" (Respondent 1).

The Importance of Inclusion

The belief in the importance of inclusion emerged as a key factor positively shaping teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education. Respondents emphasized the societal and educational value of diverse classrooms, highlighting how inclusion fosters empathy, reduces stigma, and prepares students for a diverse society. One respondent noted, "Inclusive education helps children learn to interact with a diverse range of people" (Respondent 1). This perspective positions inclusion not as a challenge, but as an opportunity to promote broader social goals and encourage meaningful interactions among students.

Challenges in Managing Behavior

Managing behavior in inclusive classrooms is a significant factor influencing both attitudes and self-efficacy. Respondents described how behavioral issues could lead to feelings of frustration and helplessness, particularly when faced with additional students with special needs. One teacher noted, "In my current class, where there are already behavioral problems, adding students with special needs would make it even harder" (Respondent 3).

Additional Factors

Several practical considerations also shape teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy. These include funding constraints, insufficient accessibility in school infrastructure, and the challenges of mixed-level classrooms. Respondents emphasized that a lack of resources often made inclusion seem unattainable, leading to negative attitudes and reduced self-efficacy. Additionally, many highlighted the need for enhanced teacher training to better prepare for the complexities of inclusive education.

Discussion

This discussion addresses the central research questions of this study by reflecting the finding with existing literature.

What is the self-efficacy of Dutch pre-service primary teachers according to inclusive education?

The hypothesis posited that Dutch pre-service primary teachers would report low levels of self-efficacy, particularly in the subscale Managing Behavior. This expectation was grounded in previous studies, such as Sharma et al. (2012), which identified Managing Behavior as the most challenging domain for teachers. Similarly, research by de Moor and Bakker (2009) suggests that pre-service teachers often feel unprepared to manage diverse classroom dynamics, leading to lower self-efficacy in this area. The results of this study, however, reveal that pre-service teachers report moderate to high levels of self-efficacy across all domains, with Inclusive Instruction ranking slightly higher than Managing Behavior and Collaboration. This partially supports the hypothesis, as Managing Behavior indeed emerged as the most challenging domain, aligning with Sharma et al. (2012). However, the overall self-efficacy scores were higher than expected, suggesting that Dutch pre-service teachers may feel more confident in their abilities than previously anticipated. These findings diverge somewhat from earlier studies, such as de Moor and Bakker (2009), which emphasized low confidence levels among pre-service teachers. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is that earlier studies were conducted over a decade ago, during a period when inclusive education was less integrated into the educational system. Research by Ledoux et al. (2020) highlights that systemic changes, like improved collaboration between special and regular education schools, have positively influenced teacher attitudes and preparedness.

How does Dutch pre-service primary teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education look like?

The hypothesis suggested that Dutch pre-service teachers would exhibit neutral to slightly positive attitudes, particularly favoring the philosophy of inclusion over its practical implementation. This expectation was informed by research from Civitillo et al. (2016) and de Moor et al. (2008), which noted that teachers often appreciate the societal value of inclusion but feel skeptical about its feasibility in practice. The findings confirm this hypothesis. Respondents demonstrated optimism about the societal benefits of inclusion, such as fostering empathy and diversity, while expressing concerns about systemic barriers and the practical challenges of implementation. For instance, they frequently highlighted a lack of resources and training as significant obstacles to inclusive education. This aligns closely with Civitillo et al. (2016), who found that pre-service teachers tend to hold neutral or slightly positive attitudes toward inclusion's overarching philosophy. However, consistent with de Moor et al. (2008), respondents in this study expressed doubts about their ability to implement inclusive practices effectively. These results reinforce the importance of addressing practical barriers within teacher training programs to bridge the gap between attitudes and practice.

How do Dutch pre-service teachers' self-efficacy influence their attitudes?

It was hypothesized that higher levels of self-efficacy would positively influence attitudes toward inclusive education, fostering more favorable perceptions of its feasibility and benefits. This expectation was based on studies by Sharma et al. (2011) and Savolainen et al. (2022), which

emphasized the role of self-efficacy in shaping optimistic views about inclusion. Contrary to the hypothesis, no significant relationship was found between self-efficacy and attitudes toward inclusive education in this study. While teachers with higher self-efficacy demonstrated confidence in their abilities, this did not consistently translate into more favorable attitudes toward inclusion. This finding diverges from prior studies, such as Soodak et al. (1998) and Weisel & Dror (2006), which reported a positive correlation between self-efficacy and attitudes. These findings may reflect cultural factors. For instance, cultural factors, such as reluctance to admit self-doubt or overestimation of one's abilities, might influence the accuracy of self-reported measures.

What are the factors influencing the self-efficacy and the attitudes of the Dutch pre-service primary teachers?

The study's findings highlight several factors that influence self-efficacy and attitudes, confirming some of the initial hypotheses. Systemic barriers, such as limited resources, time constraints, and inadequate teacher expertise, were frequently mentioned as obstacles to inclusive education. These barriers appear to undermine both confidence and attitudes, as respondents reported feeling unsupported and overwhelmed in their efforts to implement inclusive practices. This aligns with findings by Woodcock et al. (2023), who identified systemic constraints as significant challenges in fostering inclusive education. Practical experience also emerged as a critical determinant of self-efficacy and attitudes. Respondents with internships or direct exposure to inclusive classrooms reported higher confidence and more positive perceptions of inclusion. These findings support prior research by Sharma and Sokal (2017), which underscores the role of hands-on experience in enhancing teacher self-efficacy and fostering optimism about inclusive practices. In contrast, participants without sufficient practical training often expressed lower confidence and skepticism, suggesting a need for more structured, experiential learning opportunities within teacher training programs. The importance of inclusion as a guiding philosophy was another key factor shaping attitudes. Respondents recognized the societal and educational value of inclusive education, such as fostering empathy and reducing stigma. This belief positively influenced their attitudes and provided motivation to overcome challenges. This aligns with the findings of Savolainen et al. (2020) who highlighted that teachers with positive attitudes toward inclusive education are more likely to overcome challenges and remain motivated to implement inclusive practices effectively, even in the face of systematic barriers. However, managing behavior in inclusive classrooms remained a significant concern. Respondents described frustration and doubt about their ability to handle diverse student needs effectively, mirroring findings by Tan and Amrhein (2019), who identified behavior management as a common challenge among pre-service teachers. Lastly, funding constraints and insufficient accessibility in school infrastructure were cited as additional barriers. These factors not only limited teachers' ability to implement inclusion effectively but also contributed to more negative attitudes, highlighting the need for systemic improvements. Enhanced resource allocation and professional development

opportunities are essential to support pre-service teachers in developing the skills and confidence required for inclusive education.

Conclusion

The study highlights several important findings about Dutch pre-service teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes toward inclusive education, contributing valuable insights into an underexplored context. While some findings align with and strengthen earlier research, providing further validation for established theories, others reveal discrepancies or novel perspectives. These unique findings underscore the need for further investigation, particularly in understanding the systemic and contextual factors influencing self-efficacy and attitudes. This research adds to the growing body of knowledge on inclusive education by shedding light on specific challenges and opportunities within Dutch teacher training programs, offering practical and theoretical implications for improving teacher preparation and inclusive practices.

Findings

This study shows that future teachers generally perceive themselves as moderately capable in inclusive teaching practices, with strengths in collaboration and behavior management, but challenges in designing tasks for students with disabilities and managing aggressive behavior. Attitudes toward inclusion were predominantly positive, driven by a belief in its societal benefits, although systemic barriers and a lack of resources tempered their optimism. Practical experience emerged as a crucial factor, with hands-on exposure to inclusive classrooms significantly enhancing both confidence and attitudes. Furthermore, the findings revealed no significant correlation between self-efficacy and attitudes, suggesting that these constructs function independently of one another.

Limitations

While the study provides valuable insights, it is not without limitations. First, the relatively small sample size, particularly for the qualitative phase, may limit the generalizability of the findings. A response rate of 20% for the quantitative survey further restricts the extent to which the results can represent the larger population of pre-service teachers. Second, the use of self-reported measures such as the TEIP and MATIES scales may introduce biases, as participants might overestimate or underestimate their self-efficacy and attitudes. Lastly, although the internal validation of the TEIP and MATIES scales ensured their reliability within the Dutch context, the lower internal consistency of specific subscales, such as the Cognitive dimension of MATIES, may have affected the accuracy of the results.

Recommendations

Addressing Systemic Barriers

Systemic barriers, such as inadequate support systems and limited resources, contribute to lower self-efficacy. Previous studies confirm that these barriers make it difficult for teachers to meet the demands of inclusive classrooms (Woodcock et al., 2023). To foster positive attitudes, policymakers and schools must invest in improved funding, professional development, and collaboration between stakeholders. This includes ensuring that teachers have access to adequate resources and infrastructure to support diverse classrooms. Structural changes that prioritize teacher support can create an environment where inclusion is more feasible and sustainable.

Enhancing Practical Training

Practical experience is crucial for building both skills and confidence. As indicated by Sharma & Sokal (2017) and Tan & Amrhein (2019), hands-on exposure to inclusive settings enhances self-efficacy and makes inclusion more tangible. Additionally, findings from the evaluation of the Dutch Act of Passend Onderwijs highlight that practical experience plays a vital role in preparing teachers for the challenges of inclusive education (Ledoux et at., 2020). Teachers with real-world exposure to diverse classrooms reported feeling better equipped to address the needs of all students, reinforcing the importance of practice-based learning opportunities. Schools and teacher training programs should prioritize internships and structured training sessions in inclusive classrooms to equip future teachers with the necessary skills to handle diverse classrooms effectively. Programs that emphasize real-world applications help bridge the gap between theory and practice, fostering greater readiness for inclusive education.

Promoting the Importance of Inclusion

Recognizing the broader societal and educational value of inclusion can enhance teachers' motivation and sense of purpose. This belief fosters resilience and encourages teachers to overcome challenges in inclusive education (Savolainen et al., 2020). Moreover, embedding discussions about empathy, diversity, and the societal benefits of inclusion into teacher training curricula can deepen teachers' understanding and commitment. By emphasizing these values, institutions can cultivate a stronger sense of purpose among educators.

Further research

While this study provides valuable insights, it also raises new questions. Future research could delve into the long-term effects of incorporating inclusive experiences more extensively into teacher training programs to better prepare future educators. Additionally, investigating how systemic changes, such as increased funding and collaboration, influence teacher readiness could offer further actionable strategies. By building on these findings, the education field can continue to advance inclusive practices and better support both teachers and students in diverse learning environments.

While this study provides valuable insights, it also raises important questions for further exploration. Research consistently demonstrates that training is an essential tool in preparing teachers for inclusive education. For instance, Sharma and Sokal (2017) found that training significantly enhances teachers' attitudes and confidence in managing classroom diversity. Similarly, Tan and Amrhein (2019) highlighted its positive impact on preservice teachers' self-efficacy, particularly in designing inclusive lesson plans and fostering collaboration. Future research could investigate the long-term effects of integrating inclusive experiences more extensively into teacher training programs to better equip educators for diverse classrooms. Moreover, examining how systemic changes, such as increased funding and improved collaboration between stakeholders, influence teacher readiness could provide actionable strategies for enhancing inclusive practices. Ledoux and Waslander (2020) support this findings by emphasizing the importance of addressing specific areas in future research. These include defining clear long-term goals for inclusive education, strengthening teacher professionalization, improving data collection on students receiving support, and exploring ways to integrate inclusive practices more effectively into regular schooling. By addressing these gaps, the education field can continue to advance inclusive practices, offering better support to both teachers and students in diverse learning environments.

Literature

Ainscow, M. (2007). Taking an inclusive turn. *Journal Of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *7*(1), 3–7. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2007.00075.x

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Civitillo, S., De Moor, J. M., & Vervloed, M. P. (2016). Pre-service teachers' beliefs about inclusive education in the Netherlands: An exploratory study. *Support For Learning*, *31*(2), 104–121. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9604.12119

Cohen, J. (2013). Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. In *Routledge eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Fanchamps, J., De Otter, M., Siebelink, J., & Haccou, R. (2011). Barometer assessment of inclusiveness of policies and practice of inclusive education in the Netherlands. *Brussels: European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilites.[Online at http://www. investt. eu/sites/default/files/National-report-The-Netherlands-FINAL. pdf]*.

De Moor, J.H., Bakker, J., Geerdink, J. and Van De Berg, G. (2008) *Onderzoek naar de attitudes en competentie-beleving van leraren in het regulier onderwijs t.a.v. Passend onderwijs [Research on attitudes and competencies of teachers in mainstream education with regard to Appropriate Education]*. Nijmegen: Radboud University.

De Moor, J.H. and Bakker, J. (2009) *Passend onderwijs: onderzoek naar attitudes, competentie-beleving en ondersteunings- en scholingsbehoefte bij 304 leraren in het regulire onderwijs* [Appropriate education: a study on attitudes, competence and need for assistance and education among 304 teachers in regular education]. Nijmegen: Radboud University.

Flick, U. (2023). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications Limited.

Goal 4: Quality education - The Global Goals. (2024, 23 januari). The Global Goals. https://www.globalgoals.org/goals/4-quality-education/

Jordan, A., Schwartz, E., & McGhie-Richmond, D. (2009). Preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms. Teaching and Teacher Education, 25(4), 535–542. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.02.010

Kennedy, I. (2022). Sample size determination in Test-Retest and Cronbach Alpha Reliability Estimates. University Of Benin, 2(1), 17–29. https://doi.org/10.52589/bjce-fy266hk9

Ledoux, G., Waslander, S., & Ton Eimers. (2020). Evaluatie passend onderwijs. Kohnstamm Instituut.

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)

Mahat, M. (2008). The development of a psychometrically-sound instrument to measure teachers' multidimensional attitudes toward inclusive education. *International Journal Of Special Education (IJSE)*, *23*(1), 82–92. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ814377.pdf

Meijer, C.J.W., and S.F. Foste. 1988. The effect of teacher self-efficacy on referral change. Journal of Special Education 22, no. 3: 378–85.

Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap. (2017, 3 november). *Toelating en zorgplicht*. Speciaal Onderwijs | Inspectie van het Onderwijs. https://www.onderwijsinspectie.nl/onderwijssectoren/speciaal-onderwijs/wet-en-regelgeving/garantie-toegang-tot-onderwijs

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. Review of Educational Research, 66(4), 543–578. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543066004543

Saradha, P. S., & S, T. (2017). Effect of Selected Variables on Regular School Teachers Attitude towards Inclusive Education. *I-manager's Journal Of Educational Psychology/I-manager Journal Of Educational Technology*, *10*(3), 28. https://doi.org/10.26634/jpsy.10.3.10381

Savolainen, H., Malinen, O. P., & Schwab, S. (2022). 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

Sharma, U., & Sokal, L. (2013). The impact of a teacher education course on pre-service teachers' beliefs about inclusion: an international comparison. Journal Of Research in Special Educational Needs, 15(4), 276–284. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12043

Sharma, U., & Sokal, L. (2015). Can Teachers' Self-Reported Efficacy, Concerns, and Attitudes toward Inclusion Scores predict their actual inclusive classroom practices? Australasian Journal of Special Education, 40(1), 21–38. https://doi.org/10.1017/jse.2015.14

Soodak, L.C., D.M. Podell, and L.R. Lehman. 1998. Teacher, student, and school attributes as predictors of teachers' responses to inclusion. The Journal of Special Education 31, no. 4: 480–97.

Tan, R., Lichtblau, M., Wehmeier, C., & Werning, R. (2021). 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

Tan, R., & Amrhein, B. (2019). Impact of training on preservice teachers' sense of self-efficacy to implement inclusive teaching in the English language classroom. *Rijksuniversiteit Groningen*, *2*(3), 365–382. https://doi.org/10.4119/hlz-2474

Underwood, K., Valeo, A., & Wood, R. (2023). Understanding Inclusive Early Childhood Education: a Capability approach. *Toronto Metropolian University*. https://doi.org/10.32920/24150474.v1

Wat is inclusief onderwijs? | Nederlands Jeugdinstituut. (2024, 12 september). https://www.nji.nl/verbinding-onderwijs-en-jeugdhulp/wat-is-inclusief-onderwijs#waarom-is-inclusief-onderwijs-belangrijk?

Weisel, A., and O. Dror. 2006. School climate, sense of efficacy and Israeli teachers' attitudes toward inclusion of students with special needs. Education, Citizenship and Social Justice 1, no. 2: 157–74

Appendix 1

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:

Appendix 2

Interview questions

- How do you understand the term "inclusive education"?
- What have you learned about inclusive education in your studies?
- What would you like to improve in your own abilities regarding inclusive education and what do you need to achieve this?
- What have you learned about inclusive education in your studies?
- What do you need from your studies to effectively implement inclusive education, in your opinion?
- What are the key experiences during your training that have contributed to your development as a teacher and how do they influence your confidence in teaching?
- How confident are you in your ability to successfully apply inclusive education?
- What do you think about inclusive education?
    - What do you think are the benefits of inclusive education?
    - Are there any disadvantages to inclusive education? If so, what are they?
- Do you believe that all students, regardless of their abilities, should share the same classrooms and teachers? Why or why not?
- Do you think inclusive education is achievable in all types of schools and classrooms? Why or why not?
- Which students benefit from inclusive education? (and which not, (don’t ask this directly))
- How do you think inclusive education can contribute to a positive school culture?
- What do you think are the biggest challenges in implementing inclusive education in schools?
- What changes would you like to see in the education system to better support inclusive education?
- What steps do you think should be taken to improve and promote inclusive education for students who end up in the education system?

Appendix 3

Ben jij al klaar voor inclusief onderwijs?

Diversiteit en inclusiviteit zijn belangrijke waarden die bijdragen aan een rechtvaardige en gelijkwaardige samenleving. Iedereen moet de kans krijgen om volledig mee te doen en zich te ontwikkelen. Het zijn waarden die steeds meer aandacht krijgen in onze samenleving. Zo ook binnen het onderwijs; inclusief onderwijs krijgt steeds meer aandacht binnen de onderwijswetenschappen. Het idee dat leerlingen, ongeacht hun individuele behoeften, gelijke toegang moeten hebben tot regulier onderwijs, staat centraal. Dit is een opkomend thema in Nederland, waar nog weinig onderzoek naar is gedaan. Daarom willen wij graag uw gedachten hierover horen!

Onderzoekers M. Drop, T. de Haan en F. de Boer van de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen zijn enthousiast om te ontdekken hoe leraren in opleiding zich voorbereiden op inclusief onderwijs. We geloven dat uw input van onschatbare waarde is, omdat uw ideeën en overtuigingen een cruciale rol spelen in deze ontwikkeling.

Alhoewel we begrijpen dat inclusiviteit een stuk breder is, zijn we voor dit onderzoek specifiek geïnteresseerd in uw zelfeffectiviteit en attitudes ten opzichte van inclusief onderwijs. Daarom nodigen we gepassioneerde kandidaten uit om deel te nemen aan ons onderzoek. Met behulp van twee vragenlijsten willen we een helder beeld krijgen van uw standpunten en voorbereiding.

Het invullen van de vragenlijst zal slechts ongeveer 10 minuten van uw tijd in beslag nemen. Uw bijdrage kan een grote impact hebben op het onderwijslandschap van morgen.

Als u deel wilt nemen aan dit onderzoek, dan kan dit via onderstaande link:

https://rug.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_cUw68T1UuXzxVSC

Appendix 4

Consent form questionnaire

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.

Appendix 5

Quotes	Codes	Sub-Themes	Themes
Ik snap het ideaal heel goed. Ik denk ook dat het voor ouders gezien een fijn streven is.	Attitude	Positive perception of inclusion	The importance of inclusion
Want ik denk dat wij uiteindelijk als academisch geschoolde leerkrachten, daar wel een beetje het voortouw in moeten gaan nemen.	Belang goede voorbereiding	Role of teachers in promoting inclusion	Practical experience and training
Dat moet wel open worden voor iedereen. Zeg maar of jij nou in een rolstoel zit of niet.	Toegankelijkheid Scholen	Ensuring universal accessibility	The importance of inclusion
Onder inclusief onderwijs versta ik dat alle kinderen in het basisonderwijs, maar ook voortgezet onderwijs mee worden genomen met de reguliere onderwijslessen.	Definitie inclusief onderwijs	Comprehensive understanding of inclusion	The importance of inclusion
Veel leerkrachten vinden het gewoon ook spannend, zeg maar, om dergelijke leerlingen ook in hun normale groep te hebben.	Kwaliteit leraar	Teacher apprehensions	Challenges in managing behavior
Ik heb stage gelopen op een asielzoekersschool.	Stage	Practical exposure to diverse contexts	Practical experience and training
Wij hebben op de AOLB verschillende vakken daar ook waar het bij over gaat en vooral ook op stage, dat wij er veel aan doen.	Geleerd op de opleiding	Focus on inclusion during training	Practical experience and training
Ik denk dat leerlingen die nu naar het SBO gaan, dat die er het meeste baat zouden hebben zolang de scholen het voor elkaar krijgen om kwalitatief goed onderwijs.	Leerlingen die baat hebben bij inclusief onderwijs	Benefits for specific student groups	The importance of inclusion

Ik snap niet hoe ik dat moet aanpakken als een kind speciale behoeften heeft.	ik weet niet hoe ik daar naar moet handelen	Struggles with implementing strategies	Challenges in managing behavior
Je moet heel veel differentiëren in zo'n dag in zo'n stage, want sommige kinderen spreken ook geen Nederlands.	Differentieren	Tailoring methods for diverse needs	Practical experience and training
Er zijn ook veel docenten die nu al de houding hebben van ik heb het druk genoeg, ik wil er niet meer werkdruk bij.	Momenteel is het al veel	Concerns about increased workload	Systemic barriers
Ben benieuwd in hoeverre het doorgaat op een gegeven moment, waar de grens gesteld wordt van dit kind is niet meer passend.	Waar ligt de grens	Defining inclusion boundaries	Challenges in managing behavior
Inclusief onderwijs helpt kinderen leren omgaan met diversiteit.	Belang van inclusief onderwijs	Promoting empathy and diversity	The importance of inclusion
Het grootste is de training van docenten, het behapbaar houden van werk en het verkrijgen van financiële middelen vanuit overheid.	Geld	Essential systemic support	Systemic barriers
Je hebt op de opleiding wel veel theorie, maar hoe je het daadwerkelijk aanpakt leer je minder.	Wat er mist in de opleiding	Practical skill deficits in training	Practical experience and training
Ik ben bang dat sommige docenten niet weten hoe ze kinderen met speciale behoeften moeten helpen.	Nodige kwaliteiten	Addressing teacher skill gaps	Challenges in managing behavior
Veel klassen worden steeds groter. Sommige leerkrachten hebben er al moeite mee om die te managen zonder leerlingen met extra zorg.	Problematiek inclusieve klas	Challenges with large class sizes	Systemic barriers
Een leerachterstand, als je daar in de opleiding meer op focust, dan kun je	Wat is er nodig?	Addressing learning gaps early	Practical experience and training

als beginnend leerkracht direct schakelen.			
Toegankelijkheid van scholen is nog een groot probleem.	Toegankelijkheid Scholen	Structural accessibility barriers	Systemic barriers
Er zijn leerlingen die sociaal-emotioneel groeien doordat ze worden blootgesteld aan inclusieve onderwijsomgevingen.	Verschil regulier en sbo	Social-emotional growth in inclusive settings	The importance of inclusion
Gedragsproblemen in een klas zorgen ervoor dat de tijd voor andere leerlingen afneemt.	Problematiek inclusieve klas	Managing time amidst behavioral issues	Challenges in managing behavior
Meer geld naar onderwijs om inclusief onderwijs mogelijk te maken.	Geld	Funding as a critical factor	Systemic barriers
Het is belangrijk dat docenten zelfvertrouwen hebben om kinderen met diverse behoeften te ondersteunen.	Vertrouwen in eigen kunnen	Building teacher confidence	Practical experience and training
Inclusief onderwijs bereidt ons voor op een inclusieve samenleving.	Belang van inclusief onderwijs	Fostering societal inclusiveness	The importance of inclusion