Top Educational Review Journal
Volume.15, Number 6; June-2024;
ISSN: 2836-5224 | Impact Factor: 7.70
https://zapjournals.com/Journals/index.php/terj
Published By: Zendo Academic Publishing

INCLUSIVE TEACHING ENVIRONMENT ON TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY

[1]Wu Hao

Article Info

Keywords: teaching environment, self-efficacy, enhancement, inclusive teaching

DOI
10.5281/zenodo.11610955

Abstract

Education has undergone significant transformations, increasingly prioritizing diversity and inclusion. This study is situated within this context, as it aimed to evaluate the inclusive teaching environment and the self-efficacy of educators, with the ultimate goal of devising an enhancement program, "Empowering Educators for Inclusivity" (EEI), for the institutions under examination.

Using a correlation research method, 120 teachers participated in the survey. Results indicated a high level of agreement and consistency in educators' preparedness and attitudes toward inclusive teaching (mean=3.61), interdisciplinary approaches (mean=3.57), and a critical examination of norms and biases (mean=3.52). Notably, student agency and participation (mean=3.82) ranked highest, demonstrating the strong engagement of students in the learning process. The overall inclusive teaching environment was perceived positively (mean=3.63).

Further assessment of self-efficacy revealed strong consensus in support and interaction (mean=3.61), instructional management (mean=3.63), and collaboration (mean=3.65), with adaptability (mean=3.44) identified as an area for improvement. The Pearson r Coefficient of 0.43, with a p-value of 0.000, indicated a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between inclusive teaching environments and educators' self-efficacy.

Based on these findings, the EEI program is recommended to bolster areas of strength and address adaptability needs, with the expectation of enhancing the efficacy and inclusivity of teaching practices at the surveyed institutions.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the educational landscape worldwide has been rapidly evolving, placing increasing emphasis on creating environments that embrace diversity and inclusion. China, with its rich history and global prominence, is no exception.

Chinese universities, traditionally renowned for their rigorous academic standards, are now at the forefront of this transformative movement, striving to redefine educational norms and paradigms. This transition toward inclusivity is not just a response to global trends but also a reflection of the broader societal shifts within China

[1] Adamson University

itself, encompassing changes in demographics, increased awareness of individual rights, and recognition of the value of diversity.

While there is much to laud about these developments, the real crux of any educational change lies in its execution. At the heart of this transformation are educators who are tasked with translating the lofty ideals of inclusivity into day-to-day teaching practices, ensuring that every student, regardless of background or ability, is provided an equitable opportunity to thrive.

The concept of an "inclusive teaching environment" is multifaceted. It is not merely about the physical infrastructure or resources available as it encompasses a broader spectrum, including pedagogical strategies, curriculum adaptation, and, most importantly, the mindset with which educators approach their vocation. Here lies the connection to the psychological construct of self-efficacy—an individual's belief in their capability to achieve desired outcomes. It is particularly pertinent to educators operating within inclusive settings. Their belief in their ability to cater to diverse needs, manage potential challenges, and foster a sense of belonging for all students can be the determining factor between success and struggle.

Adjustments have been made at Xinyang Agriculture and Forestry University in the way teachers comprehend and assist all students to develop inclusive teaching. Inspired by this accomplishment, Xinyang province's local government partners have expanded their financing for inclusive education projects. Thus far, many instructors in all pilot schools have adopted inclusive teaching strategies. Furthermore, as part of their course offerings, some Teacher Colleges have established an undergraduate course on Inclusive Education.

Given this backdrop, this study sought to probe deeper into Chinese universities. This study aimed to understand how these institutions are cultivating inclusivity and, more critically, how this environment impacts the self-efficacy of the educators within them. Are teachers in Chinese universities feeling empowered and confident in the evolving landscape? How does the inclusive environment shape their beliefs about their abilities? How do these beliefs influence their teaching practices and eventual student outcomes?

1.1. Background of the study

In the vast and diverse world of academia, the importance of an inclusive teaching environment in educational settings has been increasingly emphasized. The foundational literature delineates inclusive education as one that aims to remove barriers to learning, ensuring that every student, regardless of background, disability, or other individual characteristics, has an equal opportunity to receive a high-quality education. Such inclusivity resonates with the principles of equity and social justice, presenting the idea that every student deserves a chance to learn and thrive.

Many studies focus on the challenges educators face in creating and maintaining inclusive environments. Many scholars have highlighted the complexities of training teachers to effectively meet diverse student needs. The intricate dynamics of teaching a varied group of students can strain even seasoned educators, calling into question the preparedness of teaching faculties across institutions to manage these challenges.

Central to this discussion is the concept of teacher self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is defined as the belief in one's capabilities to execute actions required to manage prospective situations. Within the realm of education, teacher self-efficacy relates to an educator's belief in their ability to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among students who may be difficult or unmotivated. Moreover, the confidence derived from high self-efficacy can empower teachers to innovate, adapt, and cater to diverse student populations.

However, a noticeable gap exists in the literature regarding the direct impact of inclusive teaching environments on teacher self-efficacy, especially within the context of Chinese universities. While individual studies have

explored aspects of inclusivity and self-efficacy, a holistic examination of how an inclusive teaching environment shapes, challenges, or bolsters the self-efficacy of educators in China remains scant.

Considering the unique cultural, historical, and pedagogical dynamics of Chinese higher education, filling this lacuna is crucial. Understanding this relationship has potential implications for curriculum development, teacher training, and policy-making in Chinese universities and can offer insights for institutions worldwide grappling with similar challenges.

1.2. Statement of the problem

This study comprehensively evaluated the current state of inclusive teaching environments and teacher self-efficacy at targeted educational institutions. By rigorously assessing these factors, the research aimed to identify key areas for improvement and implement strategic interventions that can significantly elevate the quality and effectiveness of inclusive education practices within these schools. Specifically, this study provided answers to the following research questions:

1. What is the assessment of the respondents on the inclusive teaching environment terms of
1.1. Educator preparedness and attitudes;
1.2. Interdisciplinary approaches and models;
1.3. Critical examination of norms and biases;
1.4. Student agency and participation
2. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the respondents regarding the inclusive teaching environment when compared according to their demographic profile?
3. What is the assessment of the respondents on their self-efficacy in terms of
3.1. Support and interaction;
3.2. Instructional management;
3.3. Adaptability; and
3.4. Collaboration
4. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the respondents' self-efficacy when compared with their demographic profile?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the inclusive teaching environment and self-efficacy of teachers?

1.3. Significance of the study

This study promises multifaceted advantages tailored to distinct audiences within the educational ecosystem:

Teachers. The insights derived from this research can empower educators by illuminating the nexus between participative attitudes and enhanced management courses. Recognizing this relationship, teachers can refine their pedagogical techniques by drawing on strategies that accentuate their strengths and address their areas of growth.

Students. Beyond the classroom's four walls, the study offers students an understanding of the profound impact their learning environment exerts on their academic achievements. By discerning the characteristics of a conducive environment, students can proactively mold their surroundings, thus optimizing their learning experiences.

Academic leaders. For those steering the academic ship, this research unveils the intricate web of factors influencing teachers' perspectives on the teaching milieu and its ramifications on their participative attitudes. The findings highlight the criticality of fostering a nurturing, conducive environment that ultimately culminates in elevated academic excellence.

Education officials. This study serves as an invaluable resource for policymakers and officials, offering a nuanced perspective on the current state of tertiary education in China. The research emphasizes the pivotal role of

cooperative learning and provides actionable insights for honing educators' coaching proficiencies, laying down a roadmap for holistic institutional improvement.

Future researchers. For scholars and researchers on the brink of delving into the realms of inclusive teaching environments, this study paves the way. It underscores the importance of the symbiotic relationship between educators' participative attitudes and students' learning capabilities, laying the foundation for more profound, nuanced explorations in the future.

1.4. Scope and delimitation

The scope of this research was to evaluate the teaching environment at Xinyang Agriculture and Forestry University located in Xinyang City, Henan Province, China, with a specific focus on examining teacher participation and proposing an enhanced management program tailored for the educators at the institution.

The study involved 120 educators from the university as participants. To facilitate understanding, the survey instruments employed were translated into Chinese. Despite efforts to maintain accuracy, the translation process may have introduced minor challenges related to word choice and subtleties in meaning, which could affect the interpretation of the questions and the integrity of the data collected.

In addition, the study faced geographical and temporal limitations. Data gathering was conducted remotely from the Philippines, adding a layer of complexity due to the physical distance and potential communication barriers between the researcher and the participants. The entire research process was constrained to a two-month period, which limited the depth and breadth of engagement with participants and possibly the thoroughness of the data analysis phase. This compressed timeline may have impacted the development and refinement of the management program proposed, restricting the opportunity for iterative feedback and adjustment based on preliminary findings.

1.5. Theoretical framework

Bandura's (1986) Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) emphasizes the dynamic interplay between individuals, their behavior, and their environment. Central to this theory is the concept of self-efficacy, which refers to an individual's belief in their ability to execute tasks and achieve desired outcomes. When examining the landscape of Chinese universities and their push toward more inclusive teaching environments, the role of teacher self-efficacy becomes paramount. Teachers who possess a robust sense of self-efficacy are more likely to believe in their ability to positively impact student outcomes, navigate the complexities of diverse classrooms, and surmount the challenges that inclusive settings often present.

Delving deeper into SCT, Bandura introduced the notion of triadic reciprocal determinism. This idea suggests a continuous and bidirectional influence between personal factors such as beliefs, behaviors, and the environment. Within the context of Chinese universities, the inclusive teaching environment serves as an environmental factor. It can be shaped by teachers' self-efficacy beliefs (the personal factor) and their subsequent teaching behaviors. To illustrate, a nurturing inclusive environment might enhance teachers' self-efficacy, propelling them to adopt and experiment with inclusive teaching practices. As they do so, their experiences can further refine and influence the teaching environment, creating a feedback loop of continuous improvement.

Furthermore, SCT underscores the significance of observational learning, positing that individuals often learn by observing others. Within a university ecosystem, this can be particularly relevant for newer or less experienced faculty members. By witnessing their seasoned colleagues manage and flourish in inclusive classrooms, these teachers can learn vicariously, bolstering their own self-efficacy beliefs. Such observations highlight the inherent value of mentorship and the fostering of a collaborative academic community.

Another pivotal component of SCT is the emphasis on mastery experiences. Bandura posited that experiencing success after exerting effort can significantly enhance self-efficacy. By this logic, providing teachers with specialized training and opportunities to teach in inclusive environments and allowing them to experience successes, even if small, can fortify their self-efficacy. Additionally, the power of verbal persuasion and feedback cannot be overlooked. Positive reinforcement, encouragement, and even constructive criticism from peers, students, and administrators can amplify teachers' belief in their capabilities.

In essence, Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory offers a rich, layered perspective on understanding the nuances of inclusive teaching environments and the pivotal role of self-efficacy. For Chinese universities, harnessing these insights from SCT can pave the way for a more supportive, dynamic, and effective approach to inclusive education.

2. Methodology

This section describes the research locale, study respondents, sampling technique, data collection process, and statistical analysis.

2.1. Research locale

Xinyang Agriculture and Forestry University, situated in the heart of Xinyang city, Henan Province, served as the focal setting for the research. Originally founded in 1910 as the Runing-fu Industrial School, the institution underwent a series of evolutions, most notably its transition from Xinyang Agricultural College.

Over its storied history, the university steadfastly promoted the ethos of "creation and advance, friendship and prominence," continuously inspiring students to aim high and pursue academic brilliance. Particularly, the Faculty of Agronomy stood out as a beacon of excellence among the university's vast academic offerings.

2.2. Sample and sampling technique

To determine the anticipated population size of 550, the Raosoft calculator was employed to compute the sample size. Factoring in a margin of error of 7.92%, a confidence level of 95%, and a response distribution rate of 50%, the projected sample size was set at 120 teacher-respondents. The sampling technique used was stratified random sampling. The subsequent table provides the frequency distribution of the sample, categorized by their respective departments.

Table 1.

Teacher population and sample

Department	Population	Sample
School of Agronomy	50	12
School of Forestry	28	5
School of Fisheries	12	8
School of Tea Science	8	3
School of Animal Science and Veterinary Medicine	36	11
School of Food Science and Technology	34	10
School of Horticulture	66	8
School of Planning and Design	25	7
School of Information Engineering	44	14
School of Business Administration	57	7
School of Finance and Economics	20	8
School of Foreign Languages	12	2
School of Pharmaceutical Engineering	13	3
School of Tourism Management	58	5
School of Convergence Media	12	2
School of Physical Education	75	15

Total	550	120

Table 1 shows the distribution of teacher-respondents from various departments: 12 from the School of Agronomy, 5 from the School of Forestry, 8 from the School of Fisheries, 3 from the School of Tea Science, 11 from the School of Animal Science and Veterinary Medicine, 10 from the School of Food Science and Technology, 8 from the School of Horticulture, 7 from the School of Planning and Design, 14 from the School of Information Engineering, 7 from the School of Business Administration, 8 from the School of Finance and Economics, 2 from the School of Foreign Languages, 3 from the School of Pharmaceutical Engineering, 5 from the School of Tourism Management, 2 from the School of Convergence-media, and 15 from the School of Physical Education.

2.3. Data gathering procedure

The procedure for data collection in this study was systematic, ensuring the integrity and reliability of the gathered information. The initial step involved drafting a comprehensive letter to the president of Xinyang Agriculture and Forestry University. This letter outlined the objectives, significance, and methodology of the study, emphasizing the importance of teacher participation.

Upon obtaining the president's approval, a schedule was coordinated with department heads or designated coordinators to ensure the seamless distribution of questionnaires. This coordination ascertained the best time frames, likely when teachers were least occupied, to increase the response rate and ensure thoughtful completion. The questionnaires, meticulously designed based on an extensive literature review and the study's objectives, were handed out to the selected teacher respondents. Clear instructions accompanied these questionnaires, emphasizing confidentiality and the importance of honest responses. A designated drop-off point was established for the completed questionnaires, or they were collected by the research team at a pre-agreed time.

After collecting all the questionnaires, the data were subjected to preliminary sorting to check for completeness. Any ambiguities in the responses were clarified with the respective respondents, ensuring data accuracy.

The gathered data were then encoded into specialized statistical software for thorough analysis. This process involved descriptive statistics, inferential analyses, and other relevant methods suitable for the research design and objectives.

Finally, after the analysis and interpretation phases, a comprehensive report, including the proposed outputs and recommendations based on the study findings, was prepared. It was anticipated that a formal presentation and discussion session would be organized with key stakeholders at Xinyang Agriculture and Forestry University during the academic year 2023–2024. This session provided an avenue for feedback, suggestions, and further collaboration.

2.4. Statistical analysis

For the analysis of the collected data, the study used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software, ensuring precision and reliability in interpreting the results.

1. Frequency Count and Percentage:

   The demographic profile of the teacher respondents, namely age, sex, and years of teaching experience, was evaluated using frequency count and percentages. This approach provides a clear and succinct representation of the sample's characteristics.

2. Arithmetic and Composite Mean:

   To determine the teachers' perspectives regarding the teaching environment and their participative attitudes, the arithmetic mean was calculated for each item or statement. This offered an average score, giving insights into the prevalent sentiments of the respondents.

3. T-test / ANOVA:

Differences in participative attitudes based on demographic variables were analyzed using specific statistical tests. Specifically, the t-test was employed to discern significant disparities in participative attitudes when gender was the distinguishing factor. In contrast, ANOVA was used to analyze variances based on age and years of teaching experience.

4. Pearson's r Correlation Analysis:
   To determine the strength and direction of the relationship between the assessment of the teaching environment and the teachers' participative attitude, Pearson's r correlation analysis was adopted. This elucidated any significant interplay between these two primary variables.

Hypothesis testing hinged on a significance level set at 0.05. Should the computed significance value exceed the predetermined value of 0.05, the null hypothesis is upheld. Conversely, if it fell below this threshold, the null hypothesis would be rejected, suggesting the presence of a significant relationship or difference.

To understand the results of the assessments on an inclusive teaching environment, the following scale was used:

Score Range	*Verbal Descriptor*	*Interpretation*
3.51 – 4.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Consistent
2.51 – 3.50	Agree	Moderately Consistent
1.51 – 2.50	Disagree	Slightly Consistent
1.00 – 1.50	Strongly disagree	Poorly Consistent

To understand the results of the assessments On the assessment of self-efficacy, the following scale was used:

Score Range	*Verbal Descriptor*	*Interpretation*
3.51 – 4.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Manifested
2.51 – 3.50	Agree	Moderately Manifested
1.51 – 2.50	Disagree	Slightly Manifested
1.00 – 1.50	Strongly disagree	Poorly Manifested

3. Results and analysis

This section offers an in-depth examination of the data collected from the participants. It outlines the results and their relevance in the context of predetermined research inquiries.

The initial results focused on an inclusive teaching environment and the teachers' assessments related to it.

Table 1.

Summary of the inclusive teaching environment

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Description and Interpretation	Rank
Educator Preparedness and Attitudes	3.61	0.52	Strongly Agree/ Highly Consistent	2
Interdisciplinary Approaches and Models	3.57	0.53	Strongly Agree/ Highly Consistent	3
Critical Examination of the Norms and Biases	3.52	0.59	Strongly Agree/ Highly Consistent	4
Student Agency and Participation	3.82	0.30	Strongly Agree/ Highly Consistent	1
Inclusive Teaching Environment (Composite Mean)	3.63	0.48	Strongly Agree/ Highly Consistent	-

Scale: 1–1.50: Strongly Disagree/Poorly Consistent; 1.51–2.50: Disagree/Slightly Consistent; 2.51–3.50: Agree/Moderately Consistent; 3.51–4.00: Strongly Agree/Highly Consistent

Table 1 consolidates the overarching assessment of an inclusive teaching environment by summarizing the collective mean scores, standard deviations (SDs), and ranks of the four previously detailed categories: Educator Preparedness and Attitudes, Interdisciplinary Approaches and Models, Critical Examination of Norms and Biases, and Student Agency and Participation.

In this summary, each category is judged to strongly agree with high consistency on its effectiveness in contributing to an inclusive teaching environment.

"Educator Preparedness and Attitudes" received a mean of 3.61 and an SD of 0.52, ranking 2nd among the categories. This indicates a strong and consistent belief among educators in their preparedness and attitude toward inclusive teaching.

"Interdisciplinary Approaches and Models" holds a slightly lower mean of 3.57 with an SD of 0.53, ranked 3rd. This suggests a robust, albeit slightly less consistent, recognition of the importance of interdisciplinary methods in fostering inclusivity.

The Critical Examination of Norms and Biases is rated with a mean of 3.52 and an SD of 0.59, positioned at rank 4. While still strongly agreeing, this category shows the highest SD, pointing to a slightly more varied response among participants regarding their critical examination practices.

Remarkably, "Student Agency and Participation" was rated the highest, with a mean of 3.82 and the lowest SD of 0.30, earning the top rank of 1. This score reflects the educators' strong and highly consistent agreement on the centrality of student agency in an inclusive environment.

Overall, the inclusive teaching environment itself has a mean score of 3.63 and an SD of 0.48, demonstrating a strong, consistent agreement across the board. The data points to a clear consensus among educators on the effectiveness of their strategies in creating an inclusive learning atmosphere, with particular emphasis on promoting student agency and participation. This summary suggests that educators feel positive about their inclusive teaching environment, which is consistent with Miesera et al. (2019), who reported positive attitudes and intentions among teachers regarding inclusive education.

Table 2.

Summary of Self-Efficacy

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Description and Interpretation	Rank
Support and Interaction	3.61	0.47	Strongly Agree/ Highly Consistent	3
Instructional Management	3.63	0.47	Strongly Agree/ Highly Consistent	2
Adaptability	3.44	0.57	Agree/Moderately Manifested	4
Collaboration	3.65	0.46	Strongly Agree/ Highly Consistent	1
Self-Efficacy (Composite Mean)	3.58	0.49	Strongly Agree/ Highly Consistent	-

Scale: 1–1.50: Strongly Disagree/Poorly Consistent; 1.51–2.50: Disagree/Slightly Consistent; 2.51–3.50: Agree/Moderately Consistent; 3.51–4.00: Strongly Agree/Highly Consistent

Table 2 summarizes the overall self-efficacy of educators across four key areas: Support and Interaction, Instructional Management, Adaptability, and Collaboration. This summary table assigns mean scores, standard deviations (SDs), and ranks to each area, with verbal descriptions for an additional context.

"Support and Interaction," which pertains to the emotional and interpersonal support provided to students, has a mean score of 3.61 and an SD of 0.47. It is ranked 3rd and is described as being strongly agreed upon and highly consistent among the educators.

"Instructional Management" received a slightly higher mean of 3.63 with an identical SD of 0.47, placing it at rank 2. This indicates that educators feel strongly and consistently confident in their ability to manage and tailor instruction within their classrooms.

"Adaptability" scored a mean of 3.44 with a higher SD of 0.57, ranked 4th, and is the only category described as agreed upon and moderately manifested. This suggests that while there is agreement on the importance of adaptability in inclusive education practices, there is less consistency and confidence in this area compared with other areas.

"Collaboration" emerged as the highest-ranked area, with a mean of 3.65 and the lowest SD of 0.46, reflecting strong agreement and consistency in the educators' ability to collaborate effectively with their peers for the benefit of student learning.

The overall self-efficacy across all areas was characterized by a mean of 3.58 and an SD of 0.49, illustrating a strong agreement and a high level of consistency among educators in their self-reported efficacy.

This comprehensive assessment reflects a generally high level of confidence among educators in their self-efficacy, with a particularly strong emphasis on their ability to collaborate and manage instruction. It also indicates an area for potential growth in adaptability, where educators may benefit from further support and development opportunities. Table 13 summarizes self-efficacy, revealing strong agreement and consistency in educators' beliefs about their capabilities, which resonates with Woodcock, Gibbs, Hitches, and Regan's (2023) findings that beliefs about inclusive education are closely linked to self-efficacy.

Table 3.

Relationship between an inclusive teaching environment and self-efficacy

Variables		Educator Preparedness and Attitudes	Interdisciplinary approaches and models	Critical Examination of the Norms and Biases	Student Agency and Participation	Inclusive Teaching Environment
Support and Interaction	Pearson *r*	0.49	0.38	0.42	0.37	0.46
	p-value	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03
Instructional Management	Pearson *r*	0.35	0.45	0.33	0.46	0.39
	p-value	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.03
Adaptability	Pearson *r*	0.39	0.43	0.30	0.37	0.34
	p-value	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
Collaboration	Pearson *r*	0.44	0.36	0.37	0.33	0.48
	p-value	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.02
Self-Efficacy	Pearson *r*	0.49	0.37	0.49	0.38	0.43
	p-value	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.00

**Level of Significance = 0.05*

Table 3 presents a detailed correlation analysis between various educational factors and the inclusive teaching environment and teacher self-efficacy at a specific educational institution. This analysis uses Pearson's r coefficients to measure the strength of relationships and p-values to assess the statistical significance of these correlations, with a designated level of significance set at 0.05.

The table delineates correlations between five main variables of educational practice—Educator Preparedness and Attitudes, Interdisciplinary Approaches and Models, Critical Examination of Norms and Biases, Student

Agency and Participation, and the overarching Inclusive Teaching Environment—and their impact on Support and Interaction, Instructional Management, Adaptability, Collaboration, and Self-Efficacy.

For Support and Interaction, the Pearson r values ranged from 0.37 to 0.49, suggesting moderate to strong positive correlations with the educational variables assessed, indicating that as educator preparedness, interdisciplinary approaches, the ability to critically examine norms and biases, and student agency increase, so does the level of support and interaction within the educational setting. The corresponding p-values, all below the 0.05 significance level, affirm the reliability of these correlations.

Similarly, Instructional Management shows Pearson r values from 0.33 to 0.46, with all related p-values below the threshold of significance, indicating statistically significant correlations. This suggests a strong linkage between instructional management effectiveness and the variables studied, particularly with interdisciplinary approaches and student agency, which exhibit higher correlations within this category.

Adaptability is another focal area, with Pearson r values ranging from 0.30 to 0.43. This range highlights a varying degree of correlation, with the strongest links shown with interdisciplinary approaches. Here, too, all p-values indicate statistical significance, supporting the hypothesis that greater adaptability in teaching correlates with more robust interdisciplinary approaches, critical examination of norms, and overall educator preparedness.

Collaboration, which is essential for a successful inclusive environment, also displays significant correlations, particularly with Educator Preparedness and Attitudes and the Inclusive Teaching Environment, which have Pearson r values of 0.44 and 0.48, respectively. These strong correlations underscore the importance of collaboration as a facet of an effective educational framework.

Finally, self-efficacy correlates strongly with all educational variables, especially Educator Preparedness and Attitudes and Critical Examination of Norms and Biases, both showing Pearson r values of 0.49. The significant p-values across the board validate these findings, suggesting that self-efficacy among educators is profoundly influenced by their preparedness, the teaching environment's inclusivity, and their capacity to engage with diverse educational approaches and critical examinations of existing norms.

This comprehensive analysis not only illuminates the interconnectedness of these variables but also underscores the critical role that an inclusive teaching environment plays in enhancing educational outcomes through increased educator efficacy and more effective teaching practices.

The corresponding interpretation aligns with the literature on the impact of inclusive education practices on teacher attitudes and behaviors. Studies such as those by Miesera et al. (2019) and Gerdes et al. (2020) support the idea that positive perceptions of one's teaching environment, including factors such as support, collaboration, and adaptability, correlate with higher self-efficacy. Teachers who perceive their environment as inclusive may feel more competent and confident in their teaching abilities, which, in turn, can lead to better educational outcomes for all students, as per the inclusive education model.

Furthermore, this correlation emphasizes the importance of creating and sustaining an inclusive teaching environment as a means to empower educators. This idea resonates with the research suggested by zokcu (2018) and Desombre et al. (2019), where a positive attitude and a high sense of self-efficacy among teachers were found to be critical for the success of inclusive education.

This study presents a comprehensive analysis of the multifaceted aspects of inclusive education and its relationship with educators' self-efficacy. The data extracted from the survey, encapsulated in Tables 1–4, reveal insightful trends and correlations within the teaching community regarding inclusive practices.

Self-efficacy, assessed through different lenses—support and interaction, instructional management, adaptability, and collaboration—emerged as a salient factor in educators' professional identities. While adaptability is seen as

an area for potential enhancement, overall, educators report high levels of self-efficacy, reflecting confidence in their capabilities and a readiness to tackle the demands of inclusive education.

The relationship between the inclusive teaching environment and self-efficacy, characterized by a moderate positive correlation, underscores the interdependency of these constructs. A nurturing and supportive inclusive environment not only promotes equity and accessibility for students but also enhances educators' belief in their own effectiveness—a cyclical reinforcement that benefits all stakeholders in the educational ecosystem.

This study reaffirms the imperative of ongoing professional development and systemic support to bolster educators' inclusive capacities. It emphasizes the necessity of providing resources, training, and institutional backing to sustain gains in self-efficacy and advance the implementation of inclusive practices.

The findings resonate with the broader literature, drawing parallels to global research that advocates comprehensive training, reflective practices, and collaboration to optimize the inclusivity of educational environments. The evidence points toward the need for an inclusive education policy that transcends mere compliance, aspiring instead to an ethos of inclusivity ingrained in the fabric of educational institutions.

As the landscape of education continues to evolve, this study contributes to the dialog on inclusive education, signaling directions for future research and practice. It advocates for a sustained commitment to nurturing an inclusive teaching environment that is intrinsically linked to the professional growth and self-efficacy of educators, ultimately impacting the quality and accessibility of education for all learners.

REFERENCES

Aas, H. K. (2019). Teachers talk on student needs: Exploring how teacher beliefs challenge inclusive education in a Norwegian context. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 24*(6), 620–635. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1698065

Alabdallat, B., Alkhamra, H., & Alkhamra, R. (2021). Special education and general education teacher perceptions of collaborative teaching responsibilities and attitudes towards an inclusive environment in Jordan. *Frontiers in Education,* 6, 739384. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.739384

Alduais, A., & Deng, M. (2023). The quadripartite system of inclusive education provision in China: A qualitative synthesis of policy documents. *International Journal of Chinese Education*, 12(2), 2212585X2311686–2212585X2311686. https://doi.org/10.1177/2212585x231168677

Anh, V. T. K. (2022). English teachers' attitude and challenges in facing immediate online teaching: A case study in Vietnam. *Journal of Nusantara Studies, 7*(2), 495–511. https://doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol7iss2pp495-511

Bielik, M., Čulíková, L., Rotko, O., & Voronska, N. (2022). Pre-service primary school teacher university training for inclusive education in the Czech Republic and Ukraine: An exploratory study. *European Education, 54*(1), 37–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/10564934.2022.2140061

Bii, P. K., Too, J. K., & Mukwa, C. W. (2018). Teacher attitude towards use of chatbots in routine teaching. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 6*(7), 1669–1677. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.060719

Bodhi, R., Singh, T., Joshi, Y., & Sangroya, D. (2021). Impact of psychological factors, university environment and sustainable behaviour on teachers' intention to incorporate inclusive education in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-02-2020-0113

Bonner, P. J. (2018). Transformation of teacher attitude and approach to math instruction through collaborative action research. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 33*(3), 27–44.

Brozmanova, M., Cabanova, M., & Lynch, Z. (2022). Teachers' self-efficacy in inclusive education. *Slavonic Pedagogical Studies Journal, 11*(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.18355/pg.2022.11.1.4

Çikili, Y., & Karaca, M. A. (2019). Examination of teacher candidates' attitudes, emotions, and anxieties regarding inclusive education by different variables.

Comarú, M. W., Lopes, R. M., Braga, L. A. M., Mota, F. B., & Galvão, C. (2021). A bibliometric and descriptive analysis of inclusive education in science education. *Studies in Science Education, 57*(1), 26–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2021.1897930

Cooper, K. M., et al. (2020). Fourteen recommendations to create a more inclusive environment for LGBTQ+ individuals in academic biology. *CBE-Life Sciences Education, 19*(3). https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.20-04-0062

Demchenko, I., Maksymchuk, B., Bilan, V., Maksymchuk, I., & Kalynovska, I. (2021). Training future physical education teachers for professional activities under the conditions of inclusive education. *Brain*, 12(3), 227–240. https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/12.3/227

Demo, H., Garzetti, M., Santi, G., & Tarini, G. (2021). Learning mathematics in an inclusive and open environment: An interdisciplinary approach. *Education Sciences, 11*(5), 199. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11050199

Desombre, C., Lamotte, M., & Jury, M. (2019). French teachers' general attitude toward inclusion: The indirect effect of teacher efficacy. *Educational Psychology, 39*(5), 600–617. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2018.1472219

Domović, V., Vizek Vidović, V., & Bouillet, D. (2019). Student teachers' beliefs about the teacher's role in inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 32*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2016.1194571

Dzhaman, T. V. (2021). Methodological aspects of monitoring the professional readiness teachers to work in an inclusive education environment.

Farias, C., Hastie, P. A., & Mesquita, I. (2019). Towards a more equitable and inclusive learning environment in sport education: results of an action research-based intervention. *Sport Education and Society, 22*(4), 424–439. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2015.1040752

Gerdes, J., Goei, S.L., Huizinga, M., & de Ruyter, D.J. (2020). Creating an optimal environment for inclusive education: co-location and transformation in interdisciplinary collaboration. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 35*(5), 613–627. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2020.1786912

Hordiichuk, O., Nikolenko, L., Shavel, K.E., Zakharina, M., & Khomyk, T. (2022). Analysis of models of inclusive education in European countries (experience for Ukraine). Eduweb. https://doi.org/10.46502/issn.1856-7576/2022.16.04.3

Huang, Y., & Zhang, M. (2019). A study on the allocation of special education resources in China. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 6(2), 14–22. https://doi.org/10.14445/23942703/ijhss-v6i2p103

Islahi, F., & Nasrin. (2019). Exploring teacher attitude towards information technology with a gender perspective. *Contemporary Educational Technology, 10*(3), 283–297. https://doi.org/10.30935/cet.512527

Kazhiyakpar, G.K., Alipbek, A.Z., & Kosherbayeva, A.N. (2023). Preparing future teachers to work in an inclusive education environment. *Pedagogy and Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.51889/2680.2022.76.73.018

Keppens, K., Consuegra, E., De Maeyer, S., & Vanderlinde, R. (2021). Teacher beliefs, self-efficacy and professional vision: disentangling their relationship in the context of inclusive teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 53(*2), 152–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2021.1881167

Kukushkina, V., Krovopuskov, P., Pachina, N., Kazachkova, O., Bordyugova, Y., & Reshetova, M. (2022). Information and educational environment in the inclusive education practice. 2022 2nd International Conference on Technology Enhanced Learning in Higher Education (TELE). https://doi.org/10.1109/tele55498.2022.9800997

Lavrysh, I. (2023). The educational and upbringing functions of children's musical theatre in the inclusive education environment. *Aesthetics and Ethics of Pedagogical Action*. https://doi.org/10.33989/2226-4051.2023.27.282152

Lim, S. (2020). The capabilities approach to inclusive education: Re-envisioning the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act's least restrictive environment. *Disability & Society, 35*(5), 836–857. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1649119

Lindner, K.-T., & Schwab, S. (2020). Differentiation and individualisation in inclusive education: a systematic review and narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 24*(12), 1237–1259. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1813450

Lintangsari, A. P., & Emaliana, I. (2020). Inclusive education services for the blind: Values, roles, and challenges of university EFL teachers. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 9*(2). https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i2.20436

Love, H. R., & Beneke, M. R. (2021). Pursuing justice-driven inclusive education research: Disability critical race theory (DisCrit) in early childhood. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121421990833

Majoko, T. (2019). Teacher key competencies for inclusive education: Tapping pragmatic realities of Zimbabwean special needs education teachers. SAGE Open, 9(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018823455

Malian, I., & McRae, E. (2020). Co-teaching beliefs to support inclusive education: Survey of relationships between general and special educators in inclusive classes.

Miesera, S., DeVries, J. M., Jungjohann, J., & Gebhardt, M. (2019). Correlation between attitudes, concerns, self-efficacy and teaching intentions in inclusive education evidence from German pre-service teachers using international scales. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 19. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12432

Miyauchi, H., & Miyauchi, H. (2020). A systematic review on inclusive education of students with visual impairment. *Education Sciences, 10*(11), 346. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10110346

Nagase, K., Tsunoda, K., & Fujita, K. (2020). The effect of teachers' attitudes and teacher efficacy for inclusive education on emotional distress in primary school teachers in Japan. *Frontiers in Education*, 5, 153. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.570988

Okech, J.B., Yuwono, I., Yuwono, I., & Abdu, W.J. (2021). Implementation of inclusive education practices for children with disabilities and other special needs in Uganda. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research, 8*(1), 97–102. https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2021.81.97.102

Özokcu, O. (2018). The relationship between teacher attitude and self-efficacy for inclusive practices in Turkey. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 6*(3), 123–131. https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i3.3034

Pappas, M. A., Papoutsi, C., & Drigas, A. (2018). Policies, practices, and attitudes toward inclusive education: The case of Greece. *The Social Sciences, 7*(6), 90. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci7060090

Reynaga-Peña, C. G., Sandoval-Ríos, M., Torres-Frías, J., López-Suero, C., Lozano Garza, A., Dessens Félix, M., González Maitland, M., & Ibanez, J. G. (2018). Creating a dialogic environment for transformative science teaching practices: towards an inclusive education for science. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 44*(1), 58–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1422620

Ruth, O. O., Ejiwale, O. A., & Busuyi, F. J. (2020). Pre-service teachers' knowledge and their beliefs towards inclusive education: Implications for teacher education programme. *Journal of Education and Behavioral Sciences, 6*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.31578/jebs.v6i1.224

Sanır, H., Karakoç, T., & Özkubat, U. (2022). Teaching practices in inclusive classrooms from the perspective of primary school teacher candidates: An observation study. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies, 9*(4). https://doi.org/10.52380/ijpes.2022.9.4.878

Sedem, M., Siljehag, E., Westling Allodi, M., & Odom, S. L. (2022). Reliability and validity of a teacher impressions scale to assess the social play of Swedish children in inclusive preschools. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*. https://doi.org/10.1177/15345084221100416

Tashmakova, S.M., Sagilova, Z.K., Salmanova, V.M., & Akhmedova, E.T. (2021). Inclusive education in the general education environment. https://doi.org/10.20323/978-5-00089-532-0-2021-241-247

Uli, A. A., & Kurniawati, F. (2019). Teacher's attitudes toward inclusive education and their emotional support for students with special education needs: A study in inclusive preschools.

Wahono, B., & Chang, C.-Y. (2019). Assessing teacher's attitude, knowledge, and application (AKA) on STEM: An effort to foster the sustainable development of STEM education. *Sustainability*, *11*(4), 950. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11040950

Wang , C. (2018). An inclusive society starts from an inclusive education. Save the Children. https://www.savethechildren.net/news/inclusive-society-starts-inclusive-education

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

Zaborniak-Sobczak, M. (2022). Beliefs on inclusive education among teachers and students of pedagogical faculties in South-Eastern Poland. *The New Educational Review, 70(*4), 148–160. https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2022.70.4.11

Zulkipli, N. H., & Musa, M. (2022). Education 4.0: An analysis of teachers' attitude towards the use of technology in teaching mathematics. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology, 12*(7), 537–541. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2022.12.7.1660