

Contribution of Teachers' Self-Efficacy to Inclusive Education Practices in Schools

Kiran Chalise, Mid-West University, Nepal

The Paris Conference on Education 2025
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Self-efficacy is essential for successful inclusion of students. Teachers are the key actors in imparting their knowledge and are the key facilitators in realizing, approaching, and ensuring the goals of inclusive education. Self-efficacy always boosts teachers' confidence and supports students' learning achievements. This paper reveals the contribution of teachers' self-efficacy to inclusive education practices. A binary logistic regression was applied to find out the contribution of the teachers' self-efficacy to different themes of the inclusive education practices. A sample (182 teachers) was taken from the schools of Nepal where children with hearing impairments are studying. The study reveals that teachers' self-efficacy is the main predictor of ensuring the availability of rights, roles and responsibilities and a learning environment in schools.

Keywords: self-efficacy, inclusive education practices, special need education, rights, learning environment

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their capacity to take initiative and influence their actions, serving as a core component of human agency. According to Bandura and Locke (2003), self-efficacy is connected to other success factors such as motivation and self-regulation through cognitive processes. Bandura and Jourden (1991) further asserted that individuals with higher self-efficacy are more likely to set ambitious goals and remain committed to them. In educational settings, teachers' self-efficacy is a significant predictor of student motivation and achievement. It not only shapes their instructional behaviors but also affects classroom practices and the overall learning environment (Klassen et al., 2011).

Research indicates that teacher self-efficacy directly influences how teachers plan, instruct, and manage classrooms. Rowan et al. (1997) highlighted that such classroom environments have a notable impact on student outcomes. Furthermore, teacher quality plays a vital role in maintaining an effective learning environment that promotes student success.

Self-efficacy also plays a central role in student learning. As noted by Baron and Byrne (2004), self-efficacy impacts learning activities by enabling students to plan, execute tasks independently, and maintain motivation for academic achievement. In this context, teachers must feel competent and confident in their instructional decision-making, a view supported by Macmillan and Meyer (2006). Confidence in teaching is essential for effectively meeting students' needs and fulfilling school responsibilities.

Whalen (2009) emphasized that teacher self-efficacy is especially critical for integrating students with autism into general education classrooms. Instructors' beliefs in their ability to accommodate diverse needs affect their implementation of modifications and supports. Macmillan and Meyer (2006) similarly stressed that strengthening teacher self-efficacy helps policymakers design inclusive pathways that benefit all learners.

Simpson et al. (2003) identified five key areas necessary for successful inclusion: adaptation, educational techniques, commitment, ongoing evaluation, and multifaceted support. Moore and Esselman (1992) found that teacher self-efficacy was a substantial predictor of student accomplishment, reinforcing the idea that confident educators enhance educational outcomes.

In Asian contexts, environmental variables such as gender, age, and class size also influence teaching effectiveness in inclusive classrooms. Ahsan and Malak (2020) asserted that effective inclusive education requires a systemic approach to boost both teacher and professional efficacy.

A study by Ahmmed et al. (2013) in Bangladesh showed that in-service primary teachers' self-efficacy for inclusion was strongly linked to their perceptions of school support. When teachers felt supported, they expressed higher confidence in their inclusive teaching abilities. This reinforces the idea that institutional support plays a significant role in enhancing teacher self-efficacy and, consequently, the quality of inclusive practices.

Teachers are central actors in facilitating learning and implementing inclusive education. Their role is particularly vital when teaching children with disabilities. However, inclusive education remains a challenge when teachers lack the necessary knowledge, attitudes, and pedagogical skills. To achieve inclusion, teachers must develop not only technical skills but also a positive attitude and deep understanding of inclusive principles.

Teachers' attitudes toward the inclusion of students with disabilities have also received scholarly attention. Van Reusen et al. (2000) found that teacher attitudes significantly impact the classroom learning environment. Similarly, Hellmich et al. (2019) concluded that attitudes, knowledge, and self-efficacy are interrelated components that support the implementation of high-quality inclusive practices.

Yet, negative attitudes toward disability persist, influenced by sociocultural ideologies, curriculum limitations, and unclear policies (Thapaliya, 2018). Aryal (2013) identified factors affecting teacher attitudes toward inclusion, such as age, gender, type of teacher, education level, and location. Ahsan and Sharma (2018) reported that Bangladeshi pre-service teachers showed less favorable views toward including children with high support needs, including those requiring Braille, sign language, or individualized education programs.

In Japan, Yada and Savolainen (2017) observed that general attitudes toward inclusive education were slightly above neutral ($M = 2.69$), with the most positive attitude found in personal engagement with persons with disabilities ($M = 3.38$). However, attitudes toward including students with disabilities in general classrooms remained neutral ($M = 2.58$), and concerns about potential challenges were the least acknowledged ($M = 2.37$).

These studies collectively suggest that when teachers lack self-efficacy, knowledge, and a positive attitude toward children with hearing impairments, it negatively affects students' learning experiences. Furthermore, the overall quality of inclusive education practices becomes questionable. Low teacher self-efficacy often results in student demotivation, hindering educational attainment and achievement. Conversely, strong self-efficacy empowers teachers and improves student performance.

This study contributes to reveal the contribution of teachers' self-efficacy to inclusive education practices (roles and responsibilities of educational authority, important knowledge, availability of rights, participation, learning environment, equality and inclusiveness) in the context of Nepal.

Methodology

The research design for the study is inferential with applying logistic regression methods. The study is a survey research design where the quantitative data were collected through a survey. This study generalizes the situation of the schools where children with hearing impairments survey in 20 districts of Nepal, based on the head teachers' and teachers' perceptions. It has used the quantitative method by applying binary logistic regression analysis.

Study Area, Population and Sampling

The study area of the research is 20 districts of Nepal namely Jhapa, Morang, Sunsari, Rautahat, Bara, Saptari, Siraha, Kathmandu, Kavre, Sindhupalchowk, Sindhuli, Makwanpur, Kaski, Syanjha, Baglung, Gorkha, Rupendehi, Dang, Surkeht and Doti. The districts were selected where there were mostly the schools (special schools, integrated schools and resource classes) for CWHI. The districts were avoided where there were only resource classes as there were only one or two teachers available in the resource classes. To ensure maximum number of teachers and to gather data from the diverse school categories with diverse experiences of teachers in inclusive education, the districts were selected. I collected

a list of teachers in the available schools. The total teachers teaching in the schools were the population for this study.

Here in the study, special schools were also incorporated for the study purpose because of the fact that there is diversity in the special schools also in terms of linguistic, ethnicity, class, caste, age, gender, socio-economic background, levels/intensities of disabilities within similar category can be found in the special setting also. In special education also, particular category of disability will have also differences. When we talk about children with disabilities, among the similar category, there will also be undeniably diversity. We can take an example of children with hearing impairments. Hearing loss can range from mild to severe to profound. It can affect one or both ears, making it difficult to hear conversational speech or loud sounds (WHO, 2021). People who are “hard of hearing” have mild to severe hearing loss. Hard of hearing people typically communicate through spoken language and can benefit from hearing aids, cochlear implants, and other assistive technologies, as well as captioning. The majority of “deaf” persons have substantial hearing loss, which means they have little or no hearing. They frequently communicate through sign language (WHO, 2021).

Similarly, such categories will also be there in intellectual disability (ID) from severity classifications. To indicate the intensity of the disease, the phrases “mild,” “moderate,” “severe,” and “profound” have been employed. The vast majority of people with ID have modest intellectual disability (Sattler, 2002). In the same way, there is a wide range of vision impairments. The International Classification of Diseases 11 (2018) divides vision impairment into two categories: distance vision impairment and close vision impairment. Many distinct elements influence a person’s perception of vision impairment. This covers, for example, the availability of prevention and treatment treatments, access to vision rehabilitation (including assistive items such as spectacles or white canes), and whether the person has difficulty accessing buildings, transportation, and information (WHO, 2019).

The respondents were teachers and head teachers of the districts, on which male and female, including as much diversity, were maintained as far as possible. Here in the study, the population was teachers teaching children with hearing impairments in different districts of Nepal. In the study, the sample was the teachers teaching children with hearing impairments in different districts of Nepal.

As of a document in “Disabled Focus Inclusive Education Simplifier Book, 2018” published by Education and Human Resource Development Center, there are a total of 33 special schools, 23 integrated schools, and 380 resource classes for children with disabilities. Out of 290 teachers, I collected responses from 182 teachers. Thus, the total number, i.e., the population of teachers in selected schools was 290, from which a total of 182 responses were collected through the formula of Krejcie and Morgan (1970) because sample size was known.

$$n = \frac{\chi^2 N p (1 - p)}{e^2 (N - 1) + \chi^2 p (1 - p)} \quad (1)$$

Here, n = sample size N = population size = 290 e = acceptable error = 0.05 of sample size χ^2 = Chi-square $df = 1$ and reliability level 95% ($\chi^2 = 3.841$) p = the population proportions (Assumed to be 0.5). When the population is known, this formula is best suited that is why it the formula was chosen.

So, after using the formula as (2):

$$n = \frac{\chi^2 N p (1 - p)}{e^2 (N - 1) + \chi^2 p (1 - p)} \quad (2)$$

$$n = 3.841 \times 290 \times 0.5(1 - 0.5) / 0.0025(290-1) + 3.841 \times 0.5(1 - 0.5)$$

$$n = 278.47 / 0.7225 + 0.96025$$

$$n = 278.47 / 1.68275$$

$$n = 165$$

Thus, the actual sample size for the study was 165. To reach the sample size, I clustered all the selected districts schools. By doing that I reached to 20 district's 40 schools. Clusters are natural groupings of people—for example, electoral wards, general practices, and schools. Cluster sampling involves obtaining a random sample of clusters from the population, with all members of each selected cluster invited to participate (Sedgwick, 2014). Thus, to ensure all teachers' representation in the clustered schools, I spent two days in the district. After visiting the 19th district as indicated in the Table 3 i.e Doti, the sample size reached to 162. There was a need of 165 samples as of the calculation, so I visited another district i.e Kathmandu then the sample size reached to 182. Then I stopped visiting another clustered districts namely Dhading, Humla and Jumla of Nepal to collect the data from the school.

Here,

Population: 290 teachers of 23 districts

Sampling Frame: List of teachers who were working in the schools

Sample needed size: 165 (As of Krejcie & Morgan, 1970)

Sample reached size: 182

(I used cluster sampling by visiting clustered districts' schools and collected data from each school and stopped collecting the data from the districts as soon as it reached to sample size).

Here, the binary logistic regression was applied to find out the contribution of the self-efficacy of teachers to different factors/themes (roles and responsibilities of educational authority, important knowledge, availability of rights, participation, learning environment, equality and inclusiveness) of the inclusive education practices in the schools. Here, the thematic area of inclusive education practices in the schools is applied through the theoretical backup of inclusive education and educational theory (Knight, 1999). For this, self-efficacy was the independent variable, whereas the different factors of inclusive education practices were the dependent variables.

For logistic regression analysis, first, the mean value of both independent and dependent variables was figured out. The mean value of self-efficacy (independent variable) was categorized into three categories as high (3), medium (2), and low (1), dividing the high Likert scale 5 by 3. Thus, the low level falls between 1-1.66, the medium level falls between 1.66-3.32 and the high level falls between 3.32-5. Then, the three categories were transferred to two categories, low/medium as the first category and high as the second category. Similarly, the mean values of the dependent variables (roles and responsibilities of educational authorities, important knowledge, availability of rights, participation, learning environment, equality and inclusiveness) were categorized into two categories. It was categorized that a scale of 1-3 falls under low-level (1), and a scale of 3-5 falls under high level (2). After doing all these, the binary logistic regression analysis was done through the

SPSS. Here, for determining the contribution of self-efficacy of the teachers to the inclusive education practices, integrated and resource class teachers' perceptions (Table 1) were taken into consideration removing the perceptions of special school teachers. And, the contribution of self-efficacy of the teachers to the practices was also figured out (Table 2) by considering integrated schools, resources classes and special schools' responses. The output of the logistic regression reveals accordingly.

Results

Table 1

Relationship Between Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Roles and Responsibilities of Educational Authority, Important Knowledge, Availability of Rights, Participation, Learning Environment, Equality and Inclusiveness (Considering Integrated Schools and Resource Classes)

| Dependent Variables | B | S.E. | Exp (B) (Odds Ratio) | Nagelkerke R Square |
|--|--------|------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Roles and Responsibilities of Education Authority | -1.099 | .720 | .333** | .044 |
| Important Knowledge | -.427 | .699 | .652** | .007 |
| Availability of Rights | -1.897 | .775 | .150** | .129 |
| Participation | -.495 | .681 | .610 | .009 |
| Learning Environment | -.999 | .778 | .368** | .034 |
| Equality | -.833 | .687 | .435 | .026 |
| Inclusiveness | -.288 | .736 | 1.333 | .003 |

Table 1 shows the R Square value and the odds ratio value with its significance level. The R Square shows how much each predictor (self-efficacy) contributed to the dependent variables. The odds ratio value, which is also known as the binary logistic regression value.

The binary logistic regression analysis performed between different levels of self-efficacy of teachers and their level of roles and responsibilities of educational authority level reveals that teachers with low or medium level of self-efficacy are 0.333 times less likely to have high level of roles and responsibilities of educational authority on CWHI than those with a high level of self-efficacy. If teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, their chances of contributing to roles and responsibilities are 0.333 times lower. In this case, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 4.4%.

The binary logistic regression analysis performed between different levels of self-efficacy of teachers and their level of important knowledge reveals that teachers with high levels of self-efficacy are 0.652 times less likely to have high levels of important knowledge on CWHI than teachers with low or medium levels of self-efficacy. That is, if teachers have low/medium self-efficacy, their chances of contributing to important knowledge are reduced by 0.652 times. In this case, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 0.7%.

The binary logistic regression analysis done between different levels of self-efficacy of teachers and the availability of rights level reveals that in comparison to teachers with low or medium level of self-efficacy to those of having high level of self-efficacy are 0.150 times less likely to have high level of availability of rights in the schools. That means, if teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, the chances of contribution to the availability of rights are less likely to 0.150 times. Here, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 12.9%.

The binary logistic regression analysis done between different levels of self-efficacy of teachers and the participation level reveals that in comparison to teachers with a low or medium level of self-efficacy, those having a high level of self-efficacy are 0.610 times less likely to have a high level of participation in the schools. That means if teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, the chances of contribution to the participation are less likely to be 0.610 times. Here, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 0.9%. The binary logistic regression analysis done between different levels of self-efficacy of teachers and the learning environment level reveals that in comparison to teachers with low or medium level of self-efficacy to those of having high level of self-efficacy are 0.368 times less likely to have high level of learning environment in the schools. That means, if teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, the chances of contributors to the learning environment are less likely to 0.368 times. Here, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 3.4%.

The binary logistic regression analysis done between different levels of self-efficacy of teachers and the equality level reveals that in comparison to teachers with low or medium level of self-efficacy to those of having high level of self-efficacy are 0.435 times less likely to have high level of equality in the schools. That means, if teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, the chances of contribution to the equality in the schools are less likely to 0.435 times. Here, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 2.6%.

The binary logistic regression analysis done between different levels of self-efficacy of teachers and the inclusiveness level reveals that in comparison to teachers with a low or medium level of self-efficacy, those having a high level of self-efficacy are 1.333 times less likely to have a high level of inclusiveness in the schools. It means if teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, the chances of contributing to the inclusiveness are 1.333 times less. Here, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 0.3%.

The contribution of teachers' self-efficacy to the inclusive practices was also figured out by considering all types of available schools (Integrated, resource classes and special schools) for children with hearing impairments. The relationship reveals accordingly.

Table 2

Relationship Between Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Roles and Responsibilities of Educational Authority, Important Knowledge, Availability of Rights, Participation, Learning Environment, Equality and Inclusiveness (Considering Integrated Schools Resource Classes and Special Schools)

| Dependent Variables | B | S.E. | Exp (B) (Odds Ratio) | Nagelkerke R Square |
|---|--------|------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Roles and Responsibilities of Education Authority | -1.193 | .594 | .303** | .034 |
| Important Knowledge | -1.289 | .548 | .276** | .043 |
| Availability of Rights | -1.959 | .630 | .141** | .098 |
| Participation | -.712 | .542 | .491 | .013 |
| Learning Environment | -1.698 | .615 | .183** | .072 |
| Equality | -.746 | .582 | .474 | .013 |
| Inclusiveness | -.274 | .574 | .760 | .002 |

Here, the above table shows the binary logistic regression analysis performed between different levels of self-efficacy of teachers and their level of roles and responsibilities of educational authority level reveals that teachers with low or medium level of self-efficacy are 0.303 times less likely to have high level of roles and responsibilities of educational authority on CWHI than those with a high level of self-efficacy. If teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, their chances of contributing to roles and responsibilities are 0.303 times lower. In this case, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 3.4%.

In case of self-efficacy and important knowledge, if teachers have low/medium self-efficacy, their chances of contributing to important knowledge are reduced by 0.276 times. In this case, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 4.3 %. In case of teachers' self-efficacy and availability of rights, if teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, the chances of contribution to the availability of rights are less likely to 0.141 times. Here, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 9.8%. Similarly, if teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, the chances of contribution to the participation are less likely to be 0.491 times. Here, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 1.3%.

In case of teachers' self-efficacy and learning environment, if teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, the chances of contributors to the learning environment are less likely to 0.183 times. Here, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 7.2%. Further in case of teachers' self-efficacy and equality, if teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, the chances of contribution to the equality in the schools are less likely to 0.474 times. Here, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 1.3%. Finally, in case of teachers' self-efficacy and inclusiveness, if teachers' self-efficacy is low/medium, the chances of contributing to the inclusiveness are 0.760 times less. Here, the total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is 0.2%.

It is found that when special schools' responses are incorporated, teachers' self-efficacy appears influential in facilitating rights availability (9.8%) and nurturing conducive learning environments (7.2%). Conversely, without special schools' responses, the emphasis shifts slightly, with teachers' self-efficacy being attributed greater significance in fostering rights availability (12.9%). Additionally, its role extends to delineating the roles and responsibilities of educational authorities (4.4%), alongside its continued influence on optimizing learning environments (3.4%).

Discussion

When examining the contribution of teachers' self-efficacy to the different factors/themes relating to inclusive education practices indicated that the contributions of predictors ranged differently. The contribution of low or medium levels of self-efficacy of the teachers was less likely to have a high level of contribution to the factors/themes of inclusive education practices. It means if the teachers have a low or medium level of self-efficacy, there is less chance of contribution to the inclusive education practices in CWHI focus schools in Nepal. The study revealed that in comparison to teachers with a low or medium level of self-efficacy to those of having a high level of self-efficacy are 0.333 times less likely to have a high level of roles and responsibilities of educational authority on CWHI, 0.652 times less likely to have a high level of important knowledge; 0.150 times less likely to have a high level of availability of rights; 0.610 times less likely to have a high level of participation; 0.368 times less likely to have a high level of the learning environment; 0.435 times less likely to have a high level of equality; and 1.333 times less likely to have a high level of inclusiveness in the

schools. The total contribution of self-efficacy seemed high in the theme “availability of rights (12.9%)” and “roles and responsibilities of educational authority (4.4%)” and “learning environment (3.4%)” of inclusive education practices than others (Important knowledge (0.7%), participation (0.9%), equality (2.6%) and inclusiveness (0.3%)). It means if teachers’ self-efficacy can be enriched, it will contribute highly to the availability of rights of the schools ensuring roles and responsibilities of educational authorities and learning environment of the schools.

The study revealed that the contribution of teachers’ self-efficacy to inclusiveness, participation, equality and important knowledge was very low compared to other factors. It was found that if teachers’ self-efficacy is low/medium, the chances of contributions to inclusiveness, participation, equality and important knowledge are less likely to a maximum percentage (133.3, 61, 43.5 and 65.2), respectively. The total contribution of the predictor (self-efficacy) is found very low than the other in these factors. The meaning of these findings is that teachers’ self-efficacy has a minimum level of contribution to inclusiveness, participation, equality and important knowledge in the children with hearing impairment (CWHI) focused schools than other factors/themes.

The study contributed to exploring the contribution of teachers’ self-efficacy to different factors/themes of inclusive education practices. In general, it is found that self-efficacy is the strongest contributor to upgrade inclusive education practices in the CWHI-focused schools in Nepal though the contribution to different factors differs. The study found that the contribution of self-efficacy to the availability of rights in the schools, roles and responsibilities of educational authority and learning environment seems high. That means if teachers’ self-efficacy is high, the chances of contribution to ensure the availability of rights in the schools and enriching learning environment and ensuring roles and responsibilities of educational authorities for CWHI students is possible significantly. So, it can be concluded that it is better to ensure teachers’ self-efficacy to enrich the quality of CWHI schools to ensure the availability of rights, a learning environment and roles and responsibilities of educational authorities.

In supporting to the findings on teachers’ self-efficacy and its contribution to inclusive education practices, compared to teachers with lower self-efficacy for implementing inclusive practices in the classroom, Sharma et al. (2012) found that teachers with higher self-efficacy for implementing inclusive practices are more likely to engage in teaching-learning practices that ensure effective learning of students with additional learning needs. Ahmed et al. (2012) found that perceived school support for implementing inclusive practices is a strong predictor of teachers’ self-efficacy for inclusion in a large sample of in-service primary school teachers in Bangladesh.

According to Ashton and Webb (1986), teachers with high levels of efficacy are more likely to have high expectations of learning and success, while teachers with low levels of effectiveness are more likely to have high expectations of failure. Self-efficacy is related to a person’s evaluations of his or her abilities and what can be accomplished, according to Bandura (1977). Self-efficacy beliefs influence behaviors, according to research on efficacy beliefs. Teachers’ decisions and classroom instructions are influenced by their efficacy beliefs (Brophy, 1986; Hunt, 1976; Kagan, 1992; Nussbaum, 1992; Rowan et al., 1997). Furthermore, efficacy belief is situation-specific (Bandura, 1977). As a result, teachers’ self-efficacy views had a significant impact on their ability to meet the challenges of implementing inclusive practices (Bandura, 1977).

Teachers with high self-efficacy are thought to be more likely than teachers with low self-efficacy to apply educational innovations in the classroom, use classroom management strategies, and employ appropriate teaching methods (Chacon, 2005; Korevaar, 1990). Through all these study findings, we can say that self-efficacy seems to be the strongest predictor to ensure better inclusive education practices in schools.

The self-efficacy of teachers is also influenced by their knowledge. The mastery of teaching and learning is also influenced by factors related to motivation, attitudes, and skills. In their 2012 model, Blomeke and Delaney identified cognitive skills and affective-motivational traits as the two primary elements of teachers' professional competence. Cognitive ability includes professional knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge. The affective and motivational characteristics include motivation, self-regulation, professional beliefs about teaching and learning, and the subject content (Blomeke & Delaney, 2012). As revealed by Hill et al. (2005), Baumert et al. (2010), and Voss et al. (2011), pedagogical content knowledge has more impact on student achievement than content knowledge. Similarly, higher general pedagogical/psychological knowledge will have an impact on higher cognitive activation, better instructional pacing and better student-teacher relationships.

Through this study, it is established that the learning environment and availability of rights in terms of inclusive education practices are more influenced by the level of self-efficacy of the teachers. When we talk about inclusive education practices, it is undoubtedly the constructivism-based inclusive education practices as angled by inclusive education and educational theory.

According to Hulgín and Drake (2011), inclusive education requires a constructivist approach to teaching and learning. They mentioned that constructivism rejects the notion that there are instructional strategies, and it acknowledges and respects the comprehensiveness and particularity of learning as contextually constructed. An example of constructivism-based inclusive education practices is active learning (Steele, 2005). Steele suggested that practices such as "teaching students to summarize, paraphrase, predict, and use visual images, helps students with learning disabilities understand and remember" (2005, p. 2). Some practices, such as summarizing, predicting, and using visuals, have also been found to have high to medium effects on students with special needs (Hattie, 2008).

In the constructive inclusive classroom, the belief is that students learn from experience and real-life application. The students will benefit most from following best practices, as reported by Hattie (2008), such as peer tutoring and cooperative learning.

The constructivist approach aligns closely with the social model of disability, which frames disability as a result of social arrangements and culturally constructed norms (Vehmas & Mäkelä, 2009). This model promotes a holistic view of children with special educational needs (SEN), emphasizing emotional, behavioral, physical, and social factors rather than medical diagnoses. It asserts that all teachers should be prepared to teach special education needs (SEN) children and that all schools should be inclusive of students regardless of background or ability. In this context, teacher self-efficacy becomes essential for implementing inclusive practices.

Analyzing the study's findings through this theoretical lens, it becomes evident that while self-efficacy is a strong predictor of inclusive education, its influence varies across different

dimensions. The most significant contributions are seen in enhancing the learning environment and ensuring the availability of rights. These findings reinforce the idea that strengthening teachers' self-efficacy is key to fostering inclusive education. This conclusion aligns with prior literatures and is substantiated by the study's empirical evidences.

This study is grounded in the theory of inclusive education and democratic educational theory, emphasizing seven thematic areas that contribute to effective inclusive practices. It also draws on the theory of self-efficacy and the theory of planned behavior to examine how these frameworks influence inclusive education in schools. From a quantitative perspective, the study emphasizes objectivity and measurable analysis, highlighting the role of teacher self-efficacy in shaping inclusive learning environments.

The findings align with the theoretical framework, confirming that self-efficacy significantly enhances the educational experience in schools. Baron and Byrne (2004) argued that self-efficacy plays a vital role in learning activities, helping teachers fulfill their responsibilities effectively. Similarly, Whalen (2009) found that understanding and supporting teacher self-efficacy is essential for integrating students with autism into mainstream classrooms. Ahsan and Malak (2020) further emphasized the need for systemic support to strengthen professional efficacy for inclusive practices. Recent research by Chen et al. (2022) during the COVID-19 pandemic found that self-efficacy was the strongest predictor of English language learning outcomes in blended learning contexts, demonstrating its continued relevance and importance.

These studies collectively show that teacher self-efficacy is not only linked to improved learning environments but also plays a crucial role in upholding educational rights and responsibilities in schools. It is a key predictor of student performance and a vital cognitive factor in achieving inclusive education goals. Therefore, teachers with high self-efficacy are more likely to contribute meaningfully to the educational environment, particularly in schools focused on CWHI, by enhancing learning conditions, advocating for rights, and supporting institutional responsibilities.

Conclusion

At the heart of every inclusive classroom is a teacher whose self-belief can shape the learning experiences of all children, especially those with hearing impairments. This study affirms that teachers' self-efficacy is not merely a psychological trait—it is a driving force behind inclusive practices. When teachers believe in their ability to reach every learner, they are more likely to foster classrooms where all students feel respected, valued, and understood.

Inclusive education is not achieved solely through policies or frameworks; it is realized through the confidence, care, and commitment of educators. Teachers with strong self-efficacy are more inclined to advocate for student rights, create accessible learning environments, and lead transformative change. Conversely, when teachers lack confidence, this hesitation can limit both their own growth and their students' opportunities.

Supporting inclusive schools begins with supporting teachers. Their self-efficacy is nurtured not just through training but also through trust, mentorship, and a collaborative culture. Inclusion becomes a shared endeavor—rooted in the collective belief in every child's potential. By investing in teachers' confidence, we invest in a future where every child, regardless of ability, has the opportunity to belong, learn, and thrive.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge Mid-West University (MU Institute of Cooperation and Development), Nepal Kathmandu University, School of Education, Nepal and IAFOR, Japan.

References

- Ahmed, M., Sharma, U., & Deppeler, J. M. (2012). Variables affecting teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education in Bangladesh. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 12(3), 132–140.
- Ahmed, M., Sharma, U., & Deppeler, J. M. (2013). Impact of demographic variables and school support on teacher efficacy in inclusive classrooms in Bangladesh. *The International Journal of Diversity in Education*, 12(2), 1–14.
- Ahsan, M., & Malak, M. (2020). Teaching efficacy and inclusive practices in Asian countries. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Inclusive and Special Education*. Oxford University Press.
- Ahsan, M. T., & Sharma, U. (2018). Pre-service teachers' attitudes toward inclusion of students with high support needs in regular classrooms in Bangladesh. *British Journal of Special Education*, 45(1), 81–97.
- Aryal, S. (2013). *Teachers' attitude towards inclusive education in Nepal* [Doctoral dissertation, Daegu University].
- Ashton, P., & Webb, R. B. (1986). Teachers' sense of efficacy, classroom behaviour, and student achievement. In P. Ashton & R. B. Webb (Eds.), *Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement* (pp. 125–144).
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A., & Jourden, F. J. (1991). Self-regulatory mechanisms governing the impact of social comparison on complex decision-making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 941–951.
- Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 87–99.
- Baron, R. S., & Byrne. (2004). *Social psychology*. Erlangga.
- Baumert, J., Kunter, M., Blum, W., Brunner, M., Voss, T., Jordan, A., Klusmann, U., Krauss, S., Neubrand, M., & Tsai, Y-M. (2010). Teachers' mathematical knowledge, cognitive activation in the classroom, and student progress. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(1), 133–180.
- Blomeke, S., & Delaney, S. (2012). Assessment of teacher knowledge across countries: A review of the state of research. *ZDM Mathematics Education*, 44, 223–247.
- Brophy, J. (1986). Teacher influences on student achievement. *American Psychologist*, 41(10), 1069–1077.
- Chacon, C. T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 257–272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.001>

- Chen, R., Iqbal, J., Liu, Y., Zhu, M., & Xie, Y. (2022). Impact of self-concept, self-imagination, and self-efficacy on English language learning outcomes among blended learning students during COVID-19. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.784444>
- Hattie, J. (2008). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hellmich, F., Loeper, M., & Gorel, G. (2019). The role of primary school teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy beliefs for everyday practices in inclusive classrooms: A study on the verification of the 'Theory of Planned Behaviour'. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 19*(S1), 36–48.
- Hill, H. C., Rowan, B., & Ball, D. L. (2005). Effects of teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 42*(2), 371–406.
- Hulgin, K. M., & Drake, B. M. (2011). Inclusive education and the No Child Left Behind Act: Resisting entrenchment. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 15*(4), 389–404.
- Hunt, D. E. (1976). Teachers are psychologists, too: On the application of psychology to education. *Canadian Psychological Review/Psychologie Canadienne, 17*(3), 210–218.
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implication of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist, 27*(1), 65–78.
- Klassen, R. M., Tze, V. M. C., Betts, S. M., & Gordon, K. A. (2011). Teacher efficacy research 1998–2009: Signs of progress or unfulfilled promise? *Educational Psychology Review, 23*(1), 21–43.
- Knight, T. (1999). Inclusive education and educational theory, inclusive for what? [Paper presentation]. *British Educational Research Association Conference, University of Sussex, Brighton*.
- Korevaar, G. (1990). Secondary school teachers' courses of action in relation to experience and sense of self-efficacy [Paper presentation]. *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston*.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 607–610.
- Macmillan, R., & Meyer, M. J. (2006). Inclusion and guilt: The emotional fallout for teachers. *Exceptionality Education*.
- Moore, W. P., & Esselman, M. E. (1992). Teacher efficacy, empowerment, and a focused instructional climate: Does student achievement benefit?
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED350252.pdf>

- Nussbaum, J. F. (1992). Effective teacher behaviors. *Communication Education*, 41(2), 167–180.
- Rowan, B., Chiang, F. S., & Miller, R. J. (1997). Using research on employees' performance to study the effects of teachers on students' achievement. *Sociology of Education*, 256–284.
- S. Vehmas, & T. Shakespeare (Eds.), *Arguing about disability: Philosophical perspectives*. Routledge.
- Sattler, J. M. (2002). *Assessment of children: Behavioral and clinical applications*. San Diego.
- 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.
- Simpson, R. L., de Boer-Ott, S. R., & Smith-Myles, B. (2003). Inclusion of learners with autism spectrum disorders in general education settings. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 23(2), 116–133.
- Steele, M. M. (2005). Teaching students with learning disabilities: Constructivism or behaviorism? *Current Issues in Education*, 8(10), 1–5.
- Thapaliya, M. P. (2018). *Moving towards inclusive education: How inclusive education is understood, experienced and enacted in Nepali higher secondary schools* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Canterbury].
- Van Reusen, A. K., Shoho, A. R., & Barker, K. S. (2000). High school teacher attitudes toward inclusion. *The High School Journal*, 84(2), 7–20.
- Vehmas, S., & Makela, P. (2009). The ontology of disability and impairment. In K. Kristiansen.
- Voss, T., Kunter, M., & Baumert, J. (2011). Assessing teacher candidates' general pedagogical/psychological knowledge: Test construction and validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(4), 952–969.
- Whalen, C. (2009). *Real life, real progress for children with autism spectrum disorders: Strategies for successful generalization in natural environments*. Brookes Publishing Company.
- World Health Organization. (2019). *World report on vision*. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/blindness-and-visual-impairment>
- World Health Organization. (2021). *World report on hearing*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240020481>
- Yada, A., & Savolainen, H. (2017). Japanese in-service teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education and self-efficacy for inclusive practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 64, 222–229.

Contact email: kchalise@gmail.com