The International Journal of
INDIAN PSYCHOLOGY

Research Paper

A Study of Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Among Pre-Service Teachers of District Nainital of Uttarakhand

Mr. Ajit Kumar Saini[1]*, Prof. L.M. Pandey[2]

ABSTRACT

This study examines pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy in Nainital, Uttarakhand, India B.Ed. Colleges. The study examines whether gender, locality, institution type and age of pre-service teachers affect their inclusive practice self-efficacy. The scale and a survey measured inclusive practise self-efficacy in 100 randomly selected pre-service teachers from four B.Ed. Institutes in Nainital. Gender, institution type, and age did not affect pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy. However, locality significantly affected inclusive practice self-efficacy. The study examined pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy by gender, locality, institution type, and age. The study's findings affect teacher preparation programmes, inclusive education policies and practise in Nainital, Uttarakhand, India, and pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy. Remember the limited sample size and specialised context when extrapolating the study's conclusions to other situations or groups. The study's findings may improve inclusive education and pre-service teacher training in Nainital, Uttarakhand, India, and other places. This study adds to the literature on self-efficacy for inclusive practice among pre-service teachers in India. It sheds light on pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy and emphasises the need for focused interventions to strengthen inclusive education teacher preparation and training programmes.

Keywords: *Self Efficacy, Inclusive Practice, Pre-Service Teachers*

In order to survive in this world, one needs to be educated. For a person's total growth, it is essential that every child in this country is guaranteed the fundamental right to receive free and obligatory education from the age of six to fourteen, according to the "Right to Education Act 2009." The most disadvantaged members of Indian society, including girls who live in various conditions, street children, youngsters from far-flung villages, and the extremely impoverished, continue to struggle for their right to an education. Children with disabilities (also known as differently abled children) are among them and are the most mistreated group in our society; they frequently experience discrimination, particularly in the area of education. In order to end such bias and promote equality, it is crucial to integrate these educationally disadvantaged kids into the general school system. Inclusive education adjusts teaching techniques, curriculum, and infrastructure to accommodate all pupils. It

[1]Assistant Professor & Research Scholar, Teacher Education (B.Ed.), Department, L.B.S. Government P.G. College, Halduchaur, Nainital, Uttarakhand (India)
[2]Professor & Head, Teacher Education (B.Ed.), Department, L.B.S. Government P.G. College, Halduchaur, Nainital, Uttarakhand (India)
*Corresponding Author

understands that each child is unique and needs different support to learn. This can involve teaching methods, assistive technology, accessible infrastructure, and sensitive teachers. Inclusive education fosters social and cultural change by breaking preconceptions, promoting acceptance, and fostering inclusion at all levels. It fosters collaboration among children with varied abilities, improving social skills and preparing them to be inclusive citizens. Differently abled children received their education for a very long period in distinct classrooms or schools. However, society's perception of these kids has evolved. It has evolved into a crucial component of the existing educational policies. It is made feasible by the advent of "inclusive education", one of the motivating notions.

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Inclusive education provides quality education to all children regardless of their backgrounds, abilities, or differences. This approach supports diversity and removes barriers that prevent some pupils from fully engaging in education. Inclusive education aims to make all students feel welcome, respected, and supported. Inclusive education integrates students with disabilities into mainstream classrooms, so they have equal educational opportunities and resources. This strategy allows disabled children to interact with classmates, learn new skills, and build social relationships in a supportive and inclusive setting. Inclusive education also supports low-income and minority pupils (UNESCO, 1994). Inclusive education fosters student empathy and understanding. Students appreciate diversity by studying and working with varied peers. This builds community and reduces discrimination. Inclusive education can also be challenging. Educators may lack the expertise and support needed to teach different learners. Insufficient facilities and resources might also make it hard to support disabled pupils (UNESCO, 2009). Social attitudes towards diversity and inclusion can also hinder inclusive education attempts. Policymakers, educators, parents, communities, and students must encourage inclusive education to address these problems. This may require providing continual training and support to educators, expanding access to resources and accommodations, and influencing cultural attitudes towards diversity and inclusion. In conclusion, inclusive education is a crucial educational reform that removes barriers to quality education for all children (AuCoin, Porter, & Baker-Korotkov, 2020). This method fosters diversity, equity, fairness, and justice and can help students develop empathy, understanding, and social cohesion. Inclusive education is difficult to accomplish and requires stakeholder cooperation. Inclusive education also prioritises student needs, interests, and abilities. Inclusive education encourages educators to adopt flexible teaching approaches and change their approach to meet the different requirements of their students. Individualised help, alternative evaluation, and a more collaborative and participatory learning environment are examples. Inclusive education involves families and communities. Involving parents, carers, and community people in education improves learning (Ainscow, 2020). This includes assisting families, encouraging community engagement in school events, and strengthening educator-family relationships.

Inclusive education benefits non-disabled and wealthy students. Diverse classrooms teach empathy, communication, and problem-solving. Inclusive education lowers bullying and discrimination, encourages variety, and fosters harmony and equality. Inclusive education promotes social fairness. It promotes great education for all students. Inclusive education believes that all students need a supportive, inclusive environment to learn, grow, and succeed.

ROLE OF TEACHER IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Teachers are crucial to inclusive education. Teachers create inclusive classrooms that meet all students' learning requirements. Inclusive education requires teachers to use new strategies to

meet the needs of all students. Inclusive classroom teachers need knowledge, abilities, and attitude. Inclusive education teachers detect and analyse students' various learning requirements (Bandura, 2006b). This involves a deep grasp of student learning styles, abilities, and requirements. Teachers must utilise multiple methods to assess pupils' strengths and weaknesses. This data can be utilised to create student-specific learning strategies. To meet all kids' requirements, teachers must be flexible. To engage all students, inclusive education involves a variety of instructional styles and tools. Assistive technology, visual aids, and hands-on activities for diverse learning styles are used. Teachers must adapt their methods to each student's needs and create a positive learning atmosphere (UNESCO, 2016). Teachers must also promote diversity and inclusion principles in inclusive education. Teachers must foster a welcoming, varied learning atmosphere. Challenge negative stereotypes and biases and promote understanding, empathy, and diversity. Teachers, parents, and community members must collaborate to help special needs pupils. Teachers must work with special education, counselling, and therapists to support pupils. Teachers must involve families and the community to create a welcoming learning environment. Finally, teachers create an inclusive and fair learning environment for all pupils. Diverse classroom teachers must meet students' needs (Yada & Savolainen, 2017). Diversity and inclusion may create a safe inclusive learning environment that respects students' backgrounds.

TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY

As per the view of Bandura (1977), Teacher self-efficacy ensures high-quality instruction and support for all students in inclusive education. Inclusive education encourages teachers to accommodate pupils with impairments, language problems, and other requirements. Teachers must believe they can teach all kids to accomplish this. Student outcomes are closely correlated with instructor self-efficacy. Self-efficacy helps teachers establish difficult goals, provide more feedback and support, and use more teaching tactics. This boosts student achievement and classroom engagement. Teacher training and support affect self-efficacy. Professional development and mentoring help teachers build self-efficacy and teach inclusively. Teachers with excellent support networks and favourable school cultures also have higher self-efficacy (Duncan, Punch & Croce, 2021). Teacher attitudes about their abilities also affect self-efficacy. Teachers with a growth mindset—the conviction that they can improve with hard work—has stronger self-efficacy. In inclusive classrooms, teachers who believe they can enhance their skills via study and practice are more successful. Schools and districts can enhance inclusive educator self-efficacy in several ways. Teachers need continual professional development and mentoring, especially in inclusive education and dealing with diverse learners. Schools can also foster a healthy school culture that celebrates diversity and provides tools and support for instructors dealing with various student populations. Schools can also encourage inclusive education and offer teachers with resources. This may involve providing assistive technology, customising curricula to meet the needs of diverse learners, and building collaborative teaching teams that support all students in the classroom (Bandura, 2006a). Teacher self-efficacy is essential to providing high-quality education and support in inclusive classrooms. Schools and districts may increase teacher self-efficacy and create inclusive learning environments for all kids by providing teachers with training, support, and resources.

Significance of the Study

Inclusion depends on teachers. Educators are crucial. Inclusive classrooms need competent teachers. They must help disabled children succeed and educate all kids. Thus, pre-service teachers must be confident in inclusive teaching in a typical classroom. Teachers' confidence

in their teaching skills is called teaching efficacy. High-performing students have effective teachers. Teachers show this through working hard, making judgements, being patient, and motivating students. People can self-reflect, self-regulate, and self-organize. Mastery, comparable behaviours, social approval, and emotional and physiological experiences affect logical thinking (Paneque & Barbetta, 2006). Mastery involves completing things and feeling accomplished. Seeing others succeed boosts self-efficacy. Social acceptance and support also boost self-efficacy. Tasks can cause anxiety, tension, and stress. Recalling these events boosts self-confidence. Inclusive education emphasises equal educational rights for all children, regardless of ability (Bandura, 1977). Teachers are responsible for helping disabled children reach their full potential and educating all students. Pre-service teachers must be confident in inclusive classrooms. Teachers' efforts, decisions, patience, and passion lead to high-performing students (Tschannen-Moran et al. 1998). Mastery, comparable conduct, social acceptance, and emotional and bodily experiences affect self-efficacy and confidence in pre-service teachers.

Objectives of the Study

1. To assess if "male and female pre-service teachers'" inclusive practice self-efficacy differs significantly.
2. To assess if rural and urban pre-service teachers have substantial mean differences in inclusive practice self-efficacy.
3. To assess if Government and Private pre-service teachers have substantial mean differences in inclusive practice self-efficacy.
4. To assess if "self-efficacy for inclusive practice" differs significantly across "pre-service teachers" aged 20-24 and more than 25 years.

Hypothesis of the Study

- H-1: There is no appreciable average disparity in pre-service teachers' self-efficacy for inclusive practice between males and females.
- H-2: There is no appreciable average disparity in pre-service teachers' self-efficacy for inclusive practice between rural and urban areas.
- H-3: There is no statistically meaningful difference in "pre-service teachers' self-efficacy" for inclusive teaching across private and public institutions.
- H-4: There is no substantial difference in teacher "self-efficacy for inclusive" practice between pre-service teachers in the age groups of 20–24 years and above 25 years.

Research Method and Procedure

Research methodology is crucial to research success. Empirical survey research was used in this study. Participants completed "The Teacher Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Scale" for the study. Exploratory and descriptive are addressed in the investigation. Exploratory research is done when there is little or no prior study on a topic to comprehend the research problem. Descriptive research accurately depicts a phenomenon. This descriptive survey study assessed inclusive practice instructor self-efficacy. A literature review helped researchers comprehend self-efficacy and inclusive education. The researcher identified literature gaps and created study questions. The researcher created a closed-ended survey. The questions assessed participants' confidence in inclusive teaching. The IRB approved the survey instrument once the researcher developed it. Before data collection, each participant gave informed consent. Participants were surveyed online. Participants completed the survey at their leisure via a link.

Population and Sample

The generalizability of research findings depends on population and sample selection. This study focused on Nainital, Uttarakhand pre-service teachers. For survey research, a 100-person sample is sufficient. The researcher randomly sampled Kumaon University-affiliated government and private B.Ed. colleges. A lottery ensured that all pre-service teachers had an equal chance of being selected. The sample must appropriately represent its population. Thus, the sample must reflect the population's age, gender, ethnicity, and other characteristics. Random sampling guarantees population representation. Stratified and cluster sampling could have provided a more accurate population representation. Stratified sampling divides the population into subgroups and randomly selects participants from each segment to ensure equal representation in the sample. Cluster sampling, on the other hand, randomly selects individuals from groups (clusters) with comparable characteristics, such as location.

TOOL USED

"The Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale" was developed and standardized by Earle *et al.* 2011.

Statistical Techniques Employed

This study employed mean, SD, and t-test. Data's mean is a central tendency measure. This study calculated pre-service teachers' inclusive education efficacy using mean. The mean score shows the data's central tendency and pre-service teachers' teaching efficacy. Standard deviation measures data spread. It shows score deviation from the mean. This study examined pre-service teacher teaching efficacy scores using standard deviation. A high standard deviation means scores are widely spread from the mean, while a low standard deviation means scores are clustered around the mean. T-tests compare group means. This study compared pre-service teachers' inclusive education efficacy using t-test. The t-test determines if two group means differ significantly. The t-test was employed to evaluate if pre-service instructors from government and private B.Ed. colleges varied in teaching efficacy. This study employed proper statistical methods to analyse data and answer research questions. Mean and standard deviation gave descriptive statistics on teaching efficacy, while the t-test allowed inferential statistics to assess for significant group differences. These methods showed pre-service teachers' inclusive education efficacy.

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

Objective-1:

"To assess if male and female pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy differs significantly."

Hypothesis-1:

H-1: "In terms of self-efficacy for inclusive practice, there is no statistically important mean difference between male and female pre-service teachers."

Table – 01 Mean, S.D. and t- Score of Pre-Service Teachers' Self Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Based on Gender.

Pre-service Teachers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Total Number of the Sample	"t-value"	"Degree of Freedom (df)"	"Table value of t-test at 0.05 Level"	"Level of significance at 0.05 (Confidence Level of 95%)"
Male	86.9	10.73	40	0.53	98	1.98	There is no Significant Mean Difference.
Female	85.78	9.53	60				

Table 01 presents the t-test results to assess whether male and female pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy differs significantly. TEIP scale t-value is 0.53, and the degree of freedom is 98. The calculated and tabulated t-values at 0.05 and degrees of freedom are compared to interpret the t-test findings. With 98 degrees of freedom and a 0.05 significance threshold, the tabulated t-value is 1.984. Since the computed t-value (0.53) is less than the tabulated t-value (1.984), we fail to reject the null hypothesis, meaning there is no significant mean difference between male and female pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy. Thus, the research does not indicate that male and female pre-service teachers have different inclusive practice self-efficacy. The study's sample of 100 pre-service instructors yielded this result. Research is needed to apply the finding to all pre-service instructors. The study only examined the mean difference between males and females, not other aspects that may affect inclusive practice self-efficacy.

Objective-2:
"To assess if rural and urban pre-service teachers have substantial mean differences in inclusive practice self-efficacy."

Hypothesis-2:
H-2: "There is no appreciable average disparity in pre-service teachers' self-efficacy for inclusive practice between rural and urban areas."

Table – 02 Mean, S.D. and t- Score of Pre-Service Teachers' Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Based on Locality (Rural and Urban)

Pre-service Teachers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Total Number of the Sample	"t-value"	"Degree of Freedom"	"Table value of t-test at 0.05 Level"	"Level of significance at 0.05 (Confidence Level of 95%)"
Rural	88.22	11.49	50	2.05	98	1.98	There is a significant Mean Difference.
Urban	83.34	12.27	50				

Table 02 shows rural and urban pre-service teachers' inclusive practise self-efficacy mean scores and standard deviations. The estimated t-value for this comparison is 2.05, which exceeds the tabulated t-value at the 0.05 significance level with 98 degrees of freedom. This suggests that rural and urban inclusive practice self-efficacy scores differ significantly. The large disparity in rural and urban pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy reflects variations in education and training. Urban pre-service teachers may receive more inclusive teaching training and have stronger self-efficacy because of this. However, rural pre-service

teachers may lack exposure to inclusive teaching practices and training, lowering their self-efficacy.

Objective -3:
"To assess if Government and Private pre-service teachers have substantial mean differences in inclusive practice self-efficacy."

Hypothesis-3:
H-3: "There is no statistically meaningful difference in "pre-service teachers' self-efficacy" for inclusive teaching across private and public institutions."

Table – 03 Mean, S.D. and t- Score of Pre-Service Teachers' Self Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Based on Type of Institutions (Government and Private).

Pre-service Teachers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Total Number of the Sample	"t-value"	"Degree of Freedom (df)"	"Table value of t-test at 0.05 Level"	"Level of significance at 0.05 (Confidence Level of 95%)"
Government	84.68	10.47	50	0.73	98	1.98	There is no Significant Mean Difference.
Private	86.22	10.63	50				

Table 03 compares government and private pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy using the TEIP scale. The calculated t-value is 0.73, tabulated t-value at 0.05 threshold of significance with 98 degrees of freedom is 1.984. The computed t-value is less than the tabulated t-value. Therefore, government and private pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy is not significantly different. Thus, pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy is unaffected by their institution's kind. The study found no evidence that pre-service teachers from government institutions have better inclusive practice self-efficacy than those from private institutions or vice versa.

Objective-4:
"To assess if self-efficacy for inclusive practice differs significantly across pre-service teachers aged 20-24 and more than 25 years."

Hypothesis-4:
H-4: "There is not a substantial variance in teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practice between pre-service teachers in the age groups of 20–24 years and 25–and up."

Table – 04. Mean, S.D. and t- Score of Pre-Service Teachers' Self Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Based on Age Group (20-24 years and 25 years & above).

Pre-service Teachers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Total of the Sample	"t-value"	"Degree of freedom (df)"	"Table value of t-test at 0.05 Level"	"Level of significance at 0.05 (Confidence Level of 95%)"
20-24 Years (Age, Group)	87.52	8.11	50	1.06	98	1.98	There is no Significant Mean Difference.
25 & Above (Age Group)	85.32	12.15	50				

Table 04 shows the mean differences in pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy between 20-24 and above 25 years old. This analysis's TEIP t-value is 1.06. The null hypothesis is that pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy is not significantly different between the two age groups. 1.984 is the t-value at 0.05 with 98 degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected because 1.06 is smaller than 1.984. Thus, pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy does not differ across the 20-24 and above 25 years age groups. The sample size of 100 pre-service teachers is modest, which may affect statistical power. Cultural and socioeconomic disparities between age groups may also affect inclusive practice self-efficacy. To corroborate the results, more research with a larger sample size and a more diverse population is needed.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the "Teacher Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practice Scale" assessed pre-service teachers' inclusive classroom practises. Pre-service teachers from Government and Private B.Ed. Colleges affiliated with Kumaon University in Nainital, Uttarakhand, India, were studied. B.Ed. colleges randomly selected 100 pre-service teachers.

Analyses included mean, standard deviation, and t-test. Male and female pre-service teachers had similar inclusive practice self-efficacy. Pre-service instructors aged 20-24 and 25 and older had no significant mean difference. The study indicated a substantial mean difference in inclusive practice self-efficacy between rural and urban pre-service teachers. The findings imply that both rural and urban pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy needs to be improved. In conclusion, pre-service teachers in rural and urban regions should practise inclusive teaching. The findings could assist policymakers and educators in creating effective training programmes to boost pre-service teachers' inclusive practice self-efficacy.

Educational Implications

This study investigated the "pre-service Teachers self-efficacy" for Inclusive practice and the interaction between these demographic variables, i.e., Gender, Locality, Types of Institutions, and Age group (20-24 years and Above 25 Years). Based on research findings and conclusions, this study suggests a few implications.

The fact that male and female pre-service teachers had equivalent self-efficacy for inclusive practice suggests that both genders are confident in their inclusive teaching abilities. Inclusive education training programs should be gender-neutral. The education department should make that pre-service teacher training programs are accessible to men and women and meet their needs. Training programs should discuss how instructors can establish a safe and inclusive learning environment for all students and how male and female students may perceive exclusion or prejudice. The finding that male and female pre-service teachers' self-efficacy for inclusive practice is similar is encouraging because it suggests that inclusive education efforts can be tailored to the needs of all pre-service teachers.

A result indicates a significant difference between Rural and Urban "pre-service teachers" concerning teachers' "self-efficacy for Inclusive practice". Separate teaching practices should be planned for rural and urban "pre-service teachers" for inclusive practice in schools as per their needs.

The findings suggest that Government and Private "pre-service teachers" had no significant difference in teacher "self-efficacy for Inclusive practice", so the Indian government should

open a department of education in the government and private sector to organize training programs for Inclusive education.

As per the result, there was no meaningful difference between the age group 20-24 years and the age group 25 years & above pre-service teachers concerning teachers' "self-efficacy for Inclusive practice". The teaching programming should be planned and organized in the early stages.

This research work will be helpful in implementing the provisions for inclusive education in the New Indian Education Policy 2020.

REFERENCES

Ainscow, M., (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. Nord. J. Stud. Educ. Policy, 6, 7–16.

AuCoin, A.; Porter, G.; Baker-Korotkov, K. New Brunswick's, (2020), Journey to inclusive education. Prospects.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191e215.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

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

Bandura, A. (2006a). Adolescent development from an agentic perspective. In T., Urdan, & F., Pajares (Eds.), Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents (pp. 1e43). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Bandura, A. (2006a). Adolescent development from an agentic perspective. In T. Urdan, & F. Pajares (Eds.), Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents (pp. 1e43). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Bandura, A. (2006b). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In T., Urdan, & F., Pajares (Eds.), Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents (pp. 307e337). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Bandura, A. (2006b). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In T. Urdan, & F. Pajares (Eds.), Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents (pp. 307e337). Charlotte, NC: Information Age. Barber, M., &Mourshed

Booth, T.; Ainscow, M., (2011). Index for Inclusion Developing Learning and Participation in Schools; Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education: Bristol, UK,

Duncan, J., Punch, R., & Croce, N. (2021). Supporting Primary and Secondary Teachers to Deliver Inclusive Education. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 46(4). http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2021v46n4.6

Forlin, C., & Chambers, D. (2011). Teacher preparation for inclusive education: increasing knowledge but raising concerns. Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 39(1), 17-32. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2010.540850

Forlin, C., Earle, C., Loreman, T., & Sharma, U. (2011). The sentiments, attitudes, and concerns about inclusive education revised (SACIE-R) scale to measure pre-service teachers' perceptions of inclusion. Exceptionality Education International, 21, 50- 65. Retrieved from https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/eei/vol21/iss3/5

Forlin, C., Loreman, T., Sharma, U. & Earle, C. (2009). Demographic differences in changing pre-service teachers' attitudes, sentiments, and concerns about inclusive education. International Journal of Inclusive Education,13:2,195 – 209

Hamid, M. S., & Mohamed, N. I. A., (2021). An empirical investigation into teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: A study of future faculty of Qatari schools. Cypriot Journal of Educational Science. 16(2), 580- 593. https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i2.5636

Ismailos, L.; Gallagher, T.; Bennett, S.; Li, X.,(2019), Pre-service and in-service teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy beliefs with regards to inclusive education. Int. J. Incl. Educ.

Sharma, U., Loreman, T. & Forlin, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 12(1), 12-21. doi:10.1111/j. 1471- 3802.2011.01200.x.

Sharma, U., Loreman, T., &Forlin, C. (2011). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, doi:10.1111/j.1471-3802.20 11.01200.x

Slee, R. (2019). Belonging in an age of exclusion. Int. J. Incl. Educ., 23, 909–922.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education, 23(6), 944e956.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. Review of Educational Research, 68(2), 202-248.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. Review of Educational Research, 68(2), 202.

UNESCO (1994). Salamanca statement and framework for action on special education needs. Paris: United Nations.

UNESCO (2009). Inclusive education: The way of the future. Final Report of the International Conference of Education (48th Session). Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO, (2019). (United Nations Educational, Social, Cultural Organisation). State of the Education Report for India: Children with Disabilities. UNESCO, New Delhi.

UNESCO. Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action for the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4; UNESCO: London, UK, 2016.

UNESCO. Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education: All Means all; UNESCO: London, UK, 2020.

United Nation. (2006). Convention on the right of persons with disabilities. Retrieved from HTTP:// www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtm

United Nation. (2006). Convention on the right of persons with disabilities. Retrieved from HTTP:// www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml

Yada, A.; Savolainen, H., (2017), Japanese in-service teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and self-efficacy for inclusive practices. Teach. Teach. Educ., 64, 222–229.