

ATTITUDES, SELF-EFFICACY, AND INTENTION TO TEACH IN INCLUSIVE CLASSROOMS OF IN-SERVICE TEACHERS IN CHILE: VALIDATING SCALES¹

ATTITUDES, AUTOEFICÁCIA E INTENÇÃO DE ENSINAR EM AULAS INCLUSIVAS DE PROFESSORES EM SERVIÇO NO CHILE: VALIDAÇÃO DE ESCALAS

Constanza SAN MARTÍN²

Rubén CALVO³

Umesh SHARMA⁴

Chenda RAMÍREZ⁵

Yolanda MUÑOZ⁶

ABSTRACT: The main purpose of this study was to analyse the psychometric properties of the Chilean-Spanish version of the Attitudes towards Inclusion Scale (AIS), the Intention to Teach in Inclusive Classrooms Scale (ITICS), and the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale. The secondary objective was to establish whether the intention to teach in inclusive classrooms is influenced by attitudes and self-efficacy. Participants were 569 in-service teachers. The results indicated adequate reliability scores for the three instruments. The results of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the AIS confirmed the existence of two factors. The ITICS was determined to be unidimensional. The factor structure of the TEIP scale differed substantially from that of the original scale, and two factorial solutions were determined to be the best fit for Chilean teachers. Self-efficacy for inclusive practices and attitudes towards inclusion had a positive effect on intention to implement inclusive practices. The implications of the findings for teacher education programmes are discussed.

KEYWORDS: Inclusive education. Attitudes. Teaching efficacy. Intentions. In-service teachers.

RESUMO: O principal objetivo deste estudo foi analisar as propriedades psicométricas da versão chileno-espanhola da Escala de Atitudes em relação à Inclusão (AIS), da Escala de Intenção de Ensinar em Salas de Aula Inclusivas (ITICS) e da escala de Eficácia do Professorado para Práticas Inclusivas (TEIP). O objetivo secundário foi determinar se a intenção de ensinar em salas de aula inclusivas é influenciada por atitudes e autoeficácia. Os participantes foram 569 professores em serviço. Os resultados indicaram níveis de confiabilidade adequados para os três instrumentos. Os resultados da análise fatorial exploratória (EFA) da AIS confirmaram a existência de dois fatores. A ITICS foi determinada como sendo unidimensional. A estrutura fatorial da escala TEIP diferiu substancialmente da escala original, e duas soluções fatoriais foram determinadas como sendo as mais adequadas para os professores chilenos. A autoeficácia para práticas inclusivas e as atitudes em relação à inclusão tiveram um efeito positivo na intenção de implementar práticas inclusivas. As implicações dos resultados para os programas de formação de professores são discutidas.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Educação inclusiva. Atitudes. Eficácia do ensino. Intensões. Professores em serviço.

¹ <https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-54702024v30e0101>

² Universidad Diego Portales. Facultad de Educación. Santiago de Chile/Chile. E-mail: constanza.sanmartin@mail.udp.cl. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5948-1329>

³ Universidad Católica de Chile. Facultad de Historia, Geografía y Ciencia Política. Santiago de Chile/Chile. E-mail: ricalvo@uc.cl. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1424-4746>

⁴ Monash University. Faculty of Education. Melbourne/Australia. E-mail: umesh.sharma@monash.edu. ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5198-9379>

⁵ Universidad Viña del Mar. Centro Regional de Inclusión e Innovación Social. Campus Recreo. Viña del Mar/Chile. E-mail: chenda.ramirez@uvm.cl. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0438-2398>

⁶ Universidad de Alcalá. Facultad de Educación. Guadalajara/España. E-mail: yolanda.munozm@uah.es. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4001-0214>

1 INTRODUCTION

Many international declarations ratify and recognise the importance of fundamental human rights such as education (United Nations [UN] General Assembly, 1948; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2016). Participating nations have committed to ensuring that their educational systems guarantee access to equitable learning opportunities for all students. From this perspective, inclusive education (IE) emerges as a clear means of providing high-quality education to all. Inclusive education is defined as education that promotes respect and acknowledges the value of the diversity of all people in educational environments, which themselves are characterised by learning and institutional culture based on these fundamental principles (UNESCO, 2020). Inclusion in schools refers to all students who participate, learn, and are engaged in a general education classroom, with regular classroom teachers taking on responsibility for their learning and overcoming exclusion (Booth & Ainscow, 2011; Ismailos et al., 2019; Muñoz & Porter, 2018). This vision defends education and development based on human rights and dignity (UNESCO, 2016), equity, and justice (Ainscow, 2020; Slee, 2019).

Latin America is characterised by high levels of segregation among its population and is one of the most unequal regions in the world in terms of access to education and the distribution of income (Oxhorn & Jouve-Martín, 2017). Students with disabilities are often excluded from participating in education across Latin American contexts (Manjarrés Carrizalez & Vélez Latorre, 2020). In Chile, where the present study was conducted, school segregation occurs largely according to students' socio-economic level, combined with systemic issues in the educational system that promote competition between schools (Valenzuela et al., 2014). Public and private school attendance is subsidised through a voucher system. There is no national or regional hiring system; each school, both public and private, makes an annual offer and teachers apply for those positions. In the same way, it is the families who choose the type of school their children will attend, which is mediated by socioeconomic status and generates a highly segregated and stratified educational system (Hernández & Raczynski, 2015). The value of funding received through voucher systems depends on the number of students, their level of vulnerability, and average school attendance per classroom. The value of the voucher varies according to the classification assigned to each student. Students identified as having special educational needs (SEN) are classified as having transitory (e.g., language disorders, attentional deficits) or permanent educational needs (e.g., intellectual disability, autism spectrum disorder) – Decree no. 170, May 14, 2009.

However, since the Salamanca Declaration (UNESCO, 1994), some positive changes have occurred in Chilean society and the country's educational system. This has made it possible to update the legislation and guide legislators towards a more inclusive approach (Marchesi, 2019). Through the formulation of public policy, the Chilean State has made efforts to promote an increasingly inclusive educational system. Support programmes and increased resources have been made available to facilitate the education of students with SEN in both special and integrated schools (San Martín et al., 2019). In this regard, data from the MINEDUC indicate that, as of November 2019, there were a total of 2,027 special schools and 5,998 integrated schools, that is, schools that receive public funding and voluntarily choose to operate a School Integration Programme to support students identified with SEN. The programme is defined

as an educational strategy with an inclusive approach, whose purpose is to favour the participation and achievement of the learning objectives of all students, providing resources (human and material) and equalizing educational opportunities especially for those who have greater needs for support to progress in their learning (MINEDUC, 2016, p. 9). These integrated schools provided support to a total of 385,993 students, including 62,268 students identified as having an intellectual disability. Although there has been progress in educational policies, tension persists in both their formulation and implementation. For example, whereas most recent policies seem to be influenced by the social model of disability, implementation of the policies seems to be largely guided by the medical model of disability (Manghi et al., 2020).

To provide IE, legislation consistent with its principles is required, as well as financial resources and teacher training that allow progress in this direction (Ainscow, 2020). Consistent with the emergence of policies that seek to advance towards IE the Chilean State has promoted the development of teacher education programmes with a key focus on IE and diversification of teaching, largely based on the principles of universal design for learning (San Martín et al., 2020). These teacher education programmes have been developed in response to Decree 83/2015, which establishes that all schools, including special schools, must work in accordance with the national curriculum. The Decree further proposes a gradual discontinuation of education practices implemented in 1990 and influenced by a medical approach that determined curricular activities based on the diagnostic label of a student (San Martín et al., 2017). This scenario challenges teachers not only in terms of their pedagogical and content knowledge but also in regard to their intentions, practices, attitudes, and beliefs about self-efficacy, encouraging them to teach in inclusive classrooms.

1.1 THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS INCLUSION

Past research suggests that positive attitudes on the part of teachers are a key component in creating inclusive classrooms (Saloviita, 2020a), that these attitudes are a predictor of teachers' intentions (Opoku et al., 2020; Song et al., 2019; Yan & Sin, 2014), and that intentions to act in a certain way are the basis of teacher behaviour (Ajzen, 2011). It is therefore not surprising that researchers have, in recent decades, examined educators' attitudes towards inclusion (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Heyder et al., 2020; Leatherman & Niemeyer, 2005; Mata et al., 2020) and the factors (e.g., age, gender, educational experience) that influence educators' attitudes. Studies focused on teaching experience show that the attitudes of young teachers aged between 20 and 30 years are more positive than those of teachers aged between 40 and 50 years (Schmidt & Vrhovnic, 2015). Positive experience in inclusive classrooms is related to more positive attitudes on the part of teachers (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Leatherman & Niemeyer, 2005). Some studies indicate that male teachers have comparatively less positive attitudes than their female counterparts (Saloviita, 2020b); however, others highlight that there is no correlation between attitudes towards IE and gender (Monsen et al., 2014). In summary, although some factors (e.g., experience of teaching in inclusive classrooms) have consistent predictable relationships with educators' attitudes, other factors have mixed results (e.g., gender).

1.2 SELF-EFFICACY FOR INCLUSIVE PRACTICES

Teaching efficacy is frequently studied as a variable for understanding teachers' classroom practices (Paneque & Barbetta, 2006; Savolainen et al., 2020). Bandura (1997, 2006) defines it as the beliefs that an individual has concerning their own abilities to execute a series of required behaviours in a successful manner and to obtain expected results in a specific teaching-related situation or task (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk, 2001).

These beliefs affect students' academic development (Bandura, 1997) and are associated with teaching performance (Woolfolk, 2007). Teachers with high self-efficacy beliefs undertake initiatives designed to meet the learning needs of all students and improve their motivation (Paneque & Barbetta, 2006) and to establish a higher level of goals to be achieved (Mergler & Tangen, 2010). In summary, the theory indicates that teachers' sense and level of effectiveness influences their motivation, decisions, and actions as educators. On the other hand, elements that would be influencing teacher self-efficacy have also been described in the literature. In this regard, in addition to teachers' gender, and previous contact experiences, also teachers' professional experiences/familiarity with inclusive education and/or special needs education has been studied as predictors of both, teachers' self-efficacy as well as their attitudes (Alnahdi, 2019). Sharma and Sokal (2015) found that improving in special education is a significant predictor of self-efficacy. Also, Schwab (2019) confirmed higher self-efficacy in special needs teachers than regular teachers.

A number of authors agree that teaching efficacy is a context- and task-specific construct (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk, 2001). In this sense, the field of IE has been considered a specific context (Sharma & Sokal, 2015) and a construct that has cross-cultural validity (Alnahdi, 2019; Miesera et al., 2019). Inclusive teaching efficacy is made up of three subconstructs (Sharma et al., 2012): the effectiveness of collaborative teaching (referred to the perceptions of teacher self-efficacy to work with families and other professionals), the implementation of inclusive teaching strategies (refers to perceived self-efficacy to implement inclusive teaching and instructional practices in the classroom), and the management of challenging behaviour (referred to the perception of self-efficacy to address the manifestation of disruptive behaviors in the classroom).

1.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTENTION, ATTITUDE, AND TEACHING EFFICACY

Teachers with positive beliefs towards inclusion and a high level of teaching efficacy are more likely to use inclusive practices in their classrooms (Kuyini et al., 2018). Research indicates that there is a positive relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes towards IE (Hofman & Kilimo, 2014; Savolainen et al., 2020; Yada & Savolainen, 2017).

In more recent years, some researchers have suggested that attitudes and efficacy do not directly influence teaching practices, but that, together, they influence teaching intentions, which ultimately influence their teaching practices. Intentions to exhibit certain behaviours are, in turn, the best predictors of actual behaviour (Ajzen, 1991; Opoku et al., 2020; Sharma et al., 2017). This correlation between the two constructs has been demonstrated by research examining the relationships between intentions and behaviours (Armitage & Conner, 2001).

Research examining the relationships of intention, attitude, and teaching efficacy with IE in countries in the South American region and, more specifically, Chile, is in its infancy (Kuitinnen, 2017). In the present study, we explore the intentions of in-service teachers to implement inclusive practices in Chile and examine whether their intentions are influenced by attitudes towards inclusion and self-efficacy for inclusive practices. The lack of research in the countries of the region could partially be explained by the lack of reliable and valid scales that could be used to measure educators' attitudes, efficacy, and intentions in each local context. As such, further research is required into identification of a social paradigm, to which an important contribution has been made by the development of the Teachers' Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale, the Attitudes towards Inclusion Scale (AIS) and Intention to Teach in Inclusive Classroom Scale (ITICS).

Limited access to reliable scales has slowed research progress on important constructs in Latin American countries. The availability of psychometrically sound scales to measure educators' attitudes, efficacy, and intentions may be significant within the new policy framework in Chile and other countries across the region. Such instruments can be used by teacher educators, researchers, and departments of education to determine the extent to which educators are applying inclusive practices in countries like Chile. They can also point to specific areas (subscales of different scales) in which greater effort should be invested in order to prepare educators to teach in inclusive classrooms.

The present study, which is part of a larger research project developed with the same sample of participants, (San Martín et al., 2021), addresses Chilean teachers and examines their intention to educate in inclusive classrooms and their attitudes towards inclusion and self-efficacy for inclusive practices. Our main objective presented here was to report on the psychometric qualities provided by the AIS, ITICS, and TEIP scales and to assess them in a South American context. The secondary objective was to establish whether the intention to teach in inclusive classrooms is influenced by attitudes and self-efficacy.

According to these objectives, the present study addressed the following research questions:

- Are the AIS, ITICS, and TEIP scales valid assessment methods in the Chilean educational context?
- Is the intention to teach in inclusive classrooms in Chile influenced by attitudes towards inclusion and self-efficacy for inclusive practices?

2 METHOD

2.1 PARTICIPANTS

Participants were 569 in-service teachers working in private schools (7.7%), private subsidised schools (43.3%), and public schools (49%) located in Northern (14.1%), Central (69.8%), and Southern (16%) Chile. A large majority self-identified as female (n=456, 80.1%), 111 self-identified as male (19.5%), and 2 self-identified with another gender (0.35%). Participants were working at special schools (22.3%), regular primary schools (65.9%), and high schools (9.9%). Participants included preschool teachers (7.6%), primary education te-

achers (32.1%), special education teachers (38.7%), secondary education teachers (20.3%), teachers of specific subjects (0.9%), and professional technical teachers (0.4%). The majority held a Bachelor of Education Degree (61.5%) and had teaching experience ranging from 4-10 years (30.6%) and 11-20 years (30.8%). The teachers were between the ages of 21 and 65 years, and the majority were aged between 26 and 35 years (32.5%).

2.2 INSTRUMENTS

Data were collected using a four-part survey questionnaire. Part 1 consisted of the Attitudes towards Inclusion Scale (AIS), which is a seven-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) with 10 items, two of which were phrased in negative terms (items 5 and 6). The AIS shows two constructs: one factor includes four items related to beliefs concerning inclusion, and the second measures feelings about inclusion. Part 2 consisted of the Intention to Teach in Inclusive Classroom Scale (ITICS), which focuses more on actions than beliefs, and comprises seven items. Both the AIS and ITICS yield total scores, and higher scores are indicative of stronger attitudes and a high level of intention to teach in inclusive classrooms.

Part 3 consisted of the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale, which uses a six-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree). The TEIP scale has 18 items divided into three factors: efficacy in using inclusive instruction, efficacy in collaboration, and efficacy in managing behaviour. Higher scores in each of the three factors indicate a greater magnitude of perceived efficacy to teach in inclusive classrooms. The scale is widely used internationally and is found to have strong reliability across different international contexts (Malinen et al., 2012; Miesera et al., 2019; Song et al., 2019; Yada & Savolainen, 2017).

Finally, part 4 gathered the teachers' demographic and professional information, including educational qualification, teaching experience, and experiences dealing with persons with disabilities.

Each scale was originally written in English and was translated into Spanish by two native Spanish speakers, one of whom was fluent in English and the other of whom was bilingual. The results were translated by a third party (an English native speaker), and minor changes were made to adapt them culturally. Prior to this research, the instruments were tested on 64 in-service teachers, and minor changes were made to improve comprehension while maintaining the meaning and intent of the original scale items. This procedure constitutes one of the first steps in the process of transcultural adaptation of instruments that we have followed in this study based on the recommendations provided from the literature (Guillemín et al., 1993; Sousa, & Rojjanasrirat, 2011), which has been used in different studies with the same scales that we report here (Laranjeira et al., 2023; Martins & Chacon, 2020).

2.3 PROCEDURES

Data were collected from in-service teachers working at public and private schools registered in a database of participants from previous research (San Martín et al., 2021) which were obtained from public databases of the Ministry of Education where the registry of all schools in the country and their contact information is found. A link to the four-part online

questionnaire was sent by email to school principals, who then provided the link to their teachers. The study was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki. Informed consent was provided before participants accessed the instruments.

We exclude participants responses if they were incomplete. We also test for the presence of outliers values (values over ± 3 standard deviations from the mean), but none of the observation meet this criteria. Hence, the sample size used for validation and regression analysis was 569 participants.

2.4 ANALYSIS

Data were analysed using the Stata 15 and SPSS statistical package version 24. To internally validate the scales, we conduct both Cronbach's Alpha statistic and Factor Analysis. In doing so we test the validity of this scales in the Chilean context. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the main components was performed in order to validate the theoretical constructs of the three instruments. The mean scores of the overall scales and subscales were used to assess the teachers' degree of intention to teach in an inclusive classroom (ITICS), their attitudes towards inclusive education (AIS), and their self-efficacy for inclusive practices (TEIP). Finally, regression analyses were conducted to measure the effect of these last two variables (AIS and TEIP) on the intention to teach in inclusive classrooms (ITICS). An ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model was used, including control variables such as age, gender, teaching experience, teacher qualification, academic degree, and contact with persons with disabilities.

3 RESULTS

Our first aim was to determine whether the AIS, ITICS, and TEIP scales are valid measures in the Chilean educational context. Concerning the analysis of consistency and validity, the AIS obtained a Cronbach's alpha of 0.89 after eliminating items 5 and 6 due to the results of alpha coefficients. If these two items remain, the scale consistency decreases to 0.842. Subsequently, when we distinguished between the subscale on beliefs regarding inclusion (0.87) and the second subscale on measured feelings concerning inclusion (0.87), high levels of consistency were also observed.

Similarly, when the TEIP scale and ITICS were analysed, positive results were observed. The Cronbach's alpha statistic for the TEIP scale was 0.91, and it was also positive for its three reported subscales: managing behaviour (0.83), collaboration (0.78), and inclusive instructions (0.89). Finally, in the case of the ITICS, a Cronbach's alpha of 0.85 indicated a high level of consistency.

After measuring the reliability of the scales, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed to describe the existence of each scale's underlying theoretical constructs. The EFA results of the AIS confirm the existence of two factors that explain 73.2% of the variance. The first four items are related to beliefs about inclusion, and the last four items are related to feelings about inclusion (see Table 1).

Table 1*Statistics and Varimax-rotated factor matrix for 8 items of the AIS (n=569)*

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2
I believe that all students regardless of their ability should be taught in regular classrooms.		0.8431
I believe that inclusion is beneficial to all students socially.		0.805
I believe that inclusion benefits all students academically.		0.8405
I believe that all students can learn in inclusive classrooms if their teachers are willing to adapt the curriculum.		0.7466
I am pleased that I have the opportunity to teach students with lower academic ability alongside other students in my class.	0.8088	
I am excited to teach students with a range of abilities in my class.	0.8735	
I am pleased that including students with a range of abilities will make me a better teacher.	0.7531	
I am happy to have students who need assistance with their daily activities included in my classrooms.	0.8298	

Note. Blanks represent $\text{abs}(\text{loading}) < .3$.

Regarding the ITICS, the results of the EFA demonstrate the existence of one factor that explains 53.5% of the variance. This result, along with the alpha coefficients, implies a high level of consistency and one-dimensionality of the scale with the Chilean sample (see Table 2).

Table 2*Statistics and Varimax-rotated factor matrix for 7 items of the ITICS (n=569)*

Variable	Factor 1
Change the curriculum to meet the learning needs of a student with learning difficulty enrolled in your class.	0.7534
Consult with the parents of a student who is struggling in your class.	0.7209
Consult with your colleagues to identify possible ways you can assist a struggling student in your class.	0.7681
Undertake a professional development program so you can teach students with diverse learning needs well.	0.6816
Consult with a student who is displaying challenging behaviors to find out better ways to work with him/her.	0.7798
Include students with severe disabilities in a range of social activities in your class.	0.5989
Change the assessment tasks to suit the learning profile of a student who is struggling (e.g., providing longer time to complete the task or modifying test questions).	0.8054

In the case of the TEIP scale, the results of the exploratory factor analysis using all items are not entirely consistent with the three constructs reported in other studies (Sharma

et al., 2012). The results indicate the existence of three factors; however, an intersection between the subdimensions of the TEIP construct is observed. Thus, the dimension of Inclusive Instructions does not appear to be consistently represented in the factors obtained. In addition, the items of the collaboration and managing behaviour dimensions are sometimes not only associated with the corresponding factors but also share their weight towards the other two factors obtained (see Table 3).

Table 3

Varimax-rotated factor matrix, reliabilities, and summary statistics for 18 items of the TEIP scale (n=569)

	Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
1	I can make my expectations clear about student behavior.	0.368	0.4919	
2	I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy.	0.7514		
3	I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school.	0.384	0.6331	
4	I can assist families in helping their children do well in school.	0.4006	0.5897	
5	I can accurately gauge student comprehension of what I have taught.	0.5002		0.4256
6	I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students.		0.3153	0.5479
7	I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behavior in the classroom before it occurs.	0.8131		
8	I can control disruptive behavior in the classroom.	0.8716		
9	I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with disabilities.	0.3328	0.6791	
10	I am confident in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with disabilities are accommodated.		0.531	0.4911
11	I am able to get children to follow classroom rules.	0.6943	0.3155	
12	I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g., aides, other teachers) to teach students with disabilities in the classroom.		0.7432	
13	I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g., itinerant teachers or speech pathologists) in designing educational plans for students with disabilities.		0.7558	
14	I am confident in my ability to get students to work together <i>in pairs or in small groups</i> .	0.3536	0.5302	0.3797
15	I can use a variety of assessment strategies (e.g., portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance-based assessment).			0.6589
16	I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities.			0.7631

	Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
17	I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive.	0.4801		0.4825
18	I am able to provide an alternate explanation or example when students are confused.	0.4386		0.4833

Note. Blanks represent $\text{abs}(\text{loading}) < .3$.

Observing these results (Table 3), the decision was taken to test the subscales of the TEIP instrument separately, removing and adding items in order to establish a combination that resulted in theoretically significant factors. In this way, it was possible to maintain the subscales of Collaboration and Managing Behaviour, while leaving aside the subscale of Inclusive Instructions, as it is not distinguishable from the other factors. To do this, we removed items 1, 16, and 17 (Table 3). This factorial solution explains 65.5% of the variance of these items (Table 3), which is a greater proportion than the 57.6% of the variance explained when we included all 18 items of the TEIP scale.

Table 4

Varimax-rotated factor matrix, reliabilities, and summary statistics for the Collaboration and Managing Behaviour items of TEIP scale (n=569)

	Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Uniqueness
3	I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school.		0.6079	0.4645
4	I can assist families in helping their children do well in school.		0.599	0.4464
9	I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with disabilities.		0.6967	0.3594
13	<i>I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g., itinerant teachers or speech pathologists) in designing educational plans for students with disabilities.</i>		0.8302	0.3068
12	I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g., aides, other teachers) to teach students with disabilities in the classroom.		0.8022	0.3192
2	I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy.	0.7694		0.3929
7	I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behavior in the classroom before it occurs.	0.8329		0.2564
8	I can control disruptive behavior in the classroom.	0.8833		0.1909
11	I am able to get children to follow classroom rules.	0.726		0.3614

In general, good results are obtained for the AIS and ITICS. However, the results of the TEIP scale are not consistent with those reported in other international contexts. As such, we were able to maintain two subscales of this instrument for the next analysis: Influence of attitude, and teaching efficacy on intentions to teach in inclusive classrooms.

The second question we want to answer is whether the intention to teach in inclusive classrooms is influenced by attitudes towards inclusion and perceived self-efficacy for inclusive practices. Considering the good results regarding the validity and reliability of the scales, a multiple OLS regression analysis was conducted using the following model as the basis:

$ITICS_i = \beta_1 AIS_i + \beta_2 TEIP_i + \beta X_i + e_i$, where ITICS is the average score of the ITICS, AIS is the average of its total items, TEIP is the total average of the collaboration and managing behaviour subscales, and X is a matrix of teachers' socio-demographic characteristics that could have an effect on their intention to teach in inclusive classrooms.

As seen in Table 4, the AIS and TEIP scale are progressively included in columns 1 and 2. A second OLS regression model is estimated by disaggregating the AIS and TEIP subs-

cales as follows: $ITICS_i = \beta_1 AIS1_i + \beta_2 AIS2_i + \beta_3 TEIP1_i + \beta_4 TEIP2_i + \beta X_i + e_i$, obtaining a parameter b for each dimension of these instruments, where AIS1 corresponds to beliefs, AIS 2 corresponds to feelings, TEIP1 corresponds to collaboration, and TEIP 2 corresponds to managing behaviour.

Table 5

OLS regression model for the ITICS

	ITICS (1)	ITICS (2)	ITICS (3)
AIS	0.391*** (8.93)	0.297*** (7.19)	
TEIP		0.587*** (7.64)	
AIS 1			0.112*** (3.43)
AIS 2			0.168*** (4.12)
TEIP Collaboration			0.563*** (6.55)
TEIP Behavior			0.0513 (0.75)
Control variables			
Academic degree	Yes	Yes	Yes
Years of work experience	Yes	Yes	Yes
Knows person with disability	Yes	Yes	Yes
Teacher qualification	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gender	Yes	Yes	Yes
Level of knowledge of educational inclusion policies	Yes	Yes	Yes
Level of confidence to teach students with a disability	Yes	Yes	Yes

Type of school	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	3.544***	1.201***	1.127**
	(9.22)	(2.60)	(2.49)
Observations	567	567	567
Adjusted R ²	0.263	0.371	0.387

Note. *t* statistics in parentheses ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Based on these results (Table 5), we observe that attitudes towards inclusion (AIS) and self-efficacy for inclusive practices (TEIP) have a positive effect on intention to implement inclusive practices (ITICS). From this perspective, an increase of one unit in the average of the AIS implies an increase of 0.27 points on the ITICS. Additionally, an increase of one unit on the TEIP scale average is related to an increase of 0.599 points in the intention of the interviewees.

If we distinguish the results for each subscale of the AIS and TEIP instruments, we can see positive effects on both subscales of the AIS instrument. However, only self-efficacy in collaboration has a significant effect on the intention to implement inclusive practices within the classroom (0.557***). No significant effects of self-efficacy in managing behaviour were observed on intentions to teach in inclusive classrooms.

Regarding teachers' individual characteristics, we see that almost none of the demographic variables had a significant effect on the ITICS. However, the type of school where the teachers work does have a significant effect on intention to teach in an inclusive classroom (-0.383***).

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The aim of the present study was twofold. The first was to assess, in the Chilean educational context, the psychometric qualities of three instruments that seek to measure attitudes towards inclusion (AIS), intention of teaching in the inclusive classroom (ITICS), and teacher efficacy for inclusive practices (TEIP). The second aim was to establish whether the intention to teach in inclusive classrooms is influenced by attitudes and self-efficacy. The results show that the AIS, ITICS, and TEIP scales were valid measures for use in Chile.

Even though the AIS was originally conceived with only one factor, our results coincide with those of Sharma and Jacobs (2016), who obtained the same two factors with in-service teachers from Australia and India, and recently in Portugal (Laranjeira et al., 2023). Regarding analysis of reliability, the AIS obtained a Cronbach's alpha of 0.89 and high levels in both subscales (above 0.8). In the Chilean population, these results are even stronger than those obtained in the original study, because they showed acceptable levels of reliability (>.74) (Sharma & Jacobs, 2016). Thus, our results demonstrate the structural validity of the AIS in different educational contexts.

The results obtained concerning the validity and reliability of the Spanish version of the AIS present possibilities for studying teachers' attitudes towards inclusion in future comparative research studies in the same way that studies have been carried out in the English version

(Sahli Lozano et al., 2021), which gives possibilities to analyse how the different educational contexts and the characteristics of teacher training in different countries are related to attitudes towards inclusion. As discussed in the introduction, this scale was developed from an inclusive perspective, i.e., without focusing on one specific disability or using a deficit paradigm, but rather by addressing changes in context and environment. This gives us the opportunity to use it not only for research but also as part of professional teacher training, promoting reflection on the part of both in-service and pre-service teachers.

In the case of the ITICS, the results showed a strong degree of consistency and one-dimensionality with a Chilean sample. These results are different from those obtained by Sharma and Jacobs (2016), who reported the presence of two factors. It should be noted that the ITICS was originally developed under the hypothesis of having only one solution factor. However, in other studies (Sharma & Jacobs, 2016; Song et al., 2019), two factors have been identified (intention to change curriculum and intention to consult others). This points to a need to continue conducting analyses involving teachers in other educational contexts, both in-service and pre-service, to determine the structure of the factor. In addition, further items could be added to the scale, as low levels of reliability were reported for one of the two subscales (intention to change curriculum) in the original study (Sharma & Jacobs, 2016).

The commitment to providing quality education for each and every student requires that teachers not only have intentions to do so, but that they also develop increasingly inclusive practices and cultures in their respective communities. This is becoming ever more essential, especially in the current Chilean context of rapidly growing diversity, influenced in part by greater immigration (Ministry of Social Development of Chile, 2017). In addition, public policy in Chile has, since 2015, explicitly promoted the need to adapt and diversify the curriculum (Decree no. 83, 2015). As such, instruments that address intentions to teach in inclusive classrooms are highly pertinent and necessary, not only for in-service teachers but also for teachers-in-training in both general and special education and at all educational levels. Thus, the ITICS presents possibilities for use before, during, or at the end of the training process with teachers who could use these inputs as the basis of individual and collective reflection on their own pedagogical practices.

Regarding the TEIP scale, as in other studies (Ahsan et al., 2012; Forlin et al., 2014; Yada & Savolainen, 2017), our results indicate high levels of overall reliability (.91) and in the subscales (above .78). However, our results do not confirm the three-factor structure reported in other studies involving in-service teachers and preservice teachers (Cardona-Molto et al., 2020; Sharma et al., 2012). A similar case study was conducted in Brazil by Martins and Chacon (2020), who identified two factors and, as in our study, had to remove item 17 on the original scale.

Similar to a previous study (Sharma & Jacobs, 2016), we observe that attitudes towards inclusion (AIS) and self-efficacy for inclusive practices (TEIP) have a positive effect on the intention to implement inclusive practices in the classroom (ITICS) in Chile. Concerning these results, one contribution of the present work is its identification of the effect of the AIS and TEIP scale on the ITICS by controlling a set of socio-demographic variables, which redu-

ces the source of endogeneity of the coefficients associated with the AIS and TEIP scale (San Martín et al., 2021).

Our results present possibilities for teacher training that emphasise the promotion of positive attitudes towards inclusion and self-efficacy. In this sense, it is important to emphasise that, as seen in other research (Ahmmed et al., 2013; Sharma & Jacobs, 2016), collaboration emerges as a relevant element in the promotion of educational inclusion processes. Thus, training processes must include collaborative practices (i.e., coteaching) and provide experiences for teachers to learn how to work with others. This aspect is directly related to the school culture and to characteristics of people's relationships within the school (Booth & Ainscow, 2011), as well as the type of school, an aspect that also emerges as a predictor of the three constructs analysed.

The strengths of the present study include its large sample of in-service teachers. However, some limitations must be acknowledged. First, the measures, originally designed for use in Western countries, may not have been perfectly translated or adapted to a Latin American sample. To the best of our knowledge, this research is the first to analyse the psychometric properties of the AIS, ITICS, and TEIP instruments in a Chilean context, for which the scales were translated from English to Spanish. Although the equivalence of the two versions was carefully reviewed as part of the translation process, it is possible that some items in Spanish do not accurately reflect the meaning of the original version. Thus, further research is needed to examine the structure, specifically for the TEIP scale. In addition, future studies should explore pre-service teachers' intention to teach in inclusive classrooms, their attitudes towards inclusion, and their self-efficacy for inclusive practices.

The second limitation of these findings is that the study did not address the views of in-service teachers in order to understand their experiences and subjectivities. As such, future research would be enriched by a qualitative approach that provides insights into these results through interviews and classroom observation. This information would pave the way for the design and implement of contextualised teacher training programmes that meet the needs of teachers, thus driving progress towards an increasingly inclusive system of education.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, M., Sharma, U., & Deppeler, J. (2013). Variables affecting teachers' intentions to include students with disabilities in regular primary schools in Bangladesh. *Disability and Society*, 29(2), 317-331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2013.796878>
- Ahsan, M. T., Sharma, U., & Deppeler, J. M. (2012). Exploring pre-service teachers' perceived teaching-efficacy, attitudes and concerns about Inclusive Education in Bangladesh. *International Journal of whole schooling*, 8(2), 1-20.
- Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*. 6(1), 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)

- Ajzen, I. (2011). The theory of planned behaviour: Reactions and reflections. *Psychology & Health, 9*(26), 1113-1127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2011.613995>
- Alnahdi, G. (2019). Are we ready for inclusion? Teachers' perceived self-efficacy for inclusive education in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 67*(2), 182-193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2019.1634795>
- Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behavior: A meta-analytic review. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 40*(4), 471-499. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164939>
- Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 17*(2), 129-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250210129056>
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (2006). Adolescent development from an agentic perspective. In T. Urdan & F. Pajares (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (1st, ed., pp. 1-43). Information Age.
- Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for inclusion developing learning and participation in schools*. Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
- Cardona-Molto, M. C., Ticha, R., & Abery, B. H. (2020). The Spanish version of the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice (TEIP) Scale: Adaptation and psychometric properties. *European Journal of Educational Research, 9*(2), 809-823. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.9.2.809>
- Decree no. 83/2015*. Aprueba criterios y orientaciones de adecuación curricular para estudiantes con necesidades educativas especiales de educación parvularia y educación básica [Approves criteria and guidelines for curricular adaptation for students with special educational needs in kindergarten and basic education]. Ministry of Education of Chile. <https://especial.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2016/08/Decreto-83-2015.pdf>
- Decree no. 170, May 14, 2009*. Fija normas para determinar los alumnos con necesidades educativas especiales que serán beneficiarios de las subvenciones para educación especial [Establishes norms to determine students with special educational needs who will benefit from grants for special education]. Ministry of Education of Chile. https://especial.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2018/06/DTO-170_21-ABR-2010.pdf
- Forlin, C., Loreman, T., & Sharma, U. (2014). A system-wide professional learning approach about inclusion for teachers in Hong Kong. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 42*(3), 247-260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2014.906564>
- Guillemin, F., Bombardier, C., & Beaton, D. (1993). Cross-cultural adaptation of health-related quality of life measures: literature review and proposed guidelines. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 46*(12), 1417-1432.
- Hernández, M., & Raczynski, D. (2015). Elección de escuela en Chile: De las dinámicas de distinción y exclusión a la segregación socioeconómica del sistema escolar. *Estudios pedagógicos (Valdivia), 41*(2), 127-141. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052015000200008>
- Heyder, A., Südkamp, A., & Steinmayr, R. (2020). How are teachers' attitudes toward inclusion related to the social-emotional school experiences of students with and without special educational needs? *Learning and Individual Differences, 77*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.101776>

- Hofman, R. H., & Kilimo, J. S. (2014). Teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy towards inclusion of pupils with disabilities in Tanzanian schools. *Journal of Education and Training*, 1(2), 177-198. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jet.v1i2.5760>
- 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. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 26(2), 175-191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1642402>
- Kuitinnen, E. (2017). *Inclusive education from teachers' perspective: Exploring Chilean teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy* [Master's Thesis, University of Jyväskylä]. University of Jyväskylä Repository. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/56467/URN:NBN:fi:jyu-201712204823.pdf?sequence=1>
- Kuyini, A. B., Desai, I., & Sharma, U. (2018). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes and concerns about implementing inclusive education in Ghana. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(14), 1509-1526. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1544298>
- Laranjeira, M., Teixeira, M. O., Roberto, M. S., & Sharma, U. (2023). Measuring teachers' attitudes and intentions towards inclusion: Portuguese validation of Attitudes to Inclusion Scale (AIS) and Intention to Teach in Inclusive Classroom Scale (ITICS). *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 38(3), 408-423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2022.2107683>
- Leatherman, J. M., & Niemeyer, J. A. (2005). Teachers' attitudes toward inclusion: Factors influencing classroom practice. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 26(1), 23-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10901020590918979>
- Malinen, O. P., Savolainen, H., & Xu, J. (2012). Beijing in-service teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes towards inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(4), 526-534. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.12.004>
- Manghi, D., Solar, M. L. C., Ibarra, A. B., Godoy, I. A., Córdova, V. V., & Soto, K. D. (2020). Understanding inclusive education in Chile: An overview of policy and educational research. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 50(175), 114-134. <https://doi.org/10.1590/198053146605>
- Manjarrés Carrizalez, D., & Vélez Latorre, L. (2020). La educación de los sujetos con discapacidad en Colombia: abordajes históricos, teóricos e investigativos en el contexto mundial y latinoamericano. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, 78, 253-297. <https://doi.org/10.17227/rce.num78-9902>
- Marchesi, A. (2019). Salamanca 1994-2019: There is still a long way to Latin America. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(7-8), 841-848. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1622803>
- Martins, B. A., & Chacon, M. C. M. (2020). Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) Scale Validation. *Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial*, 26(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1413-65382620000100001>
- Mata, L., Clipa, O., & Lazar, I. (2020). Measuring in-service teachers' attitudes towards Inclusive education. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 67(2), 135-150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2019.1679723>
- Mergler, A. G., & Tangen, D. (2010). Using microteaching to enhance teacher efficacy in pre-service teachers. *Teaching Education*, 21(2), 199-210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210902998466>
- 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(2), 103-114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12432>
- Ministry of Education of Chile. (2016). *Programa de Integración Escolar. Manual de apoyo a la Inclusión Escolar en el marco de la Reforma Educacional* [School Integration Program. Support Manual for School Inclusion in the framework of the Educational Reform]. https://especial.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2016/09/Manual-PIE.leyOK_.web_-1.pdf
- Ministry of Social Development of Chile. (2017). *Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional CASEN* [CASEN National Socioeconomic Characterization Survey]. http://observatorio.ministeriodesarrollosocial.gob.cl/casen-multidimensional/casen/docs/Resultados_Inmigrantes_casen_2017.pdf
- Monsen, J. J., Ewing, D. L., & Kwoka, M. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards inclusion, perceived adequacy of support and classroom learning environment. *Learning Environments Research*, 17(1), 113-126. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-013-9144-8>
- Muñoz, Y., & Porter, G. L. (2018). Planning for all students: promoting inclusive instruction. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(14), 1552-1567. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1544301>
- Opoku, M. P., Cuskelly, M., Pedersen, S. J., & Rayner, C. S. (2020). Applying the theory of planned behaviour in assessments of teachers' intentions towards practicing inclusive education: A scoping review. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 36(4), 557-592. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2020.1779979>
- Oxhorn, P., & Jouve-Martín, J. R. (2017). Inequality and inclusion in Latin America. *Latin American Research Review*, 52(2), 203-207. <https://doi.org/10.25222/larr.62>
- Paneque, O. M., & Barbeta, P. M. (2006). A study of teacher efficacy of special education teachers of English language learners with disabilities. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(1), 171-193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2006.10162871>
- Sahli Lozano, C., Sharma, U., & Wüthrich, S. (2021). A comparison of Australian and Swiss secondary school teachers' attitudes, concerns, self-efficacy, and intentions to teach in inclusive classrooms: does the context matter? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1988158>
- Saloviita, T. (2020a). Attitudes of teachers towards inclusive education in Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 64(2), 270-282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2018.1541819>
- Saloviita, T. (2020b). Teachers' changing attitudes and preferences around inclusive education. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 69(6), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2020.1828569>
- San Martín, C., Ramirez, C., Calvo, R., Muñoz-Martínez, Y., & Sharma, U. (2021). Chilean teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education, intention, and self-efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Sustainability* 2021, 13, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042300>
- San Martín, C., Rogers, P., Troncoso, C., & Rojas, R. (2020). Path to Inclusive Education: Barriers and facilitators for cultures, policies and practices from the teaching voice. *Revista Latinoamericana de Educación Inclusiva*, 14(2), 191-211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/s0718-73782020000200191>
- San Martín, C., Salas, N., Howard, S., & Blanco, P. (2017). Acceso al currículum nacional para todos: oportunidades y desafíos de los procesos de diversificación de la enseñanza en escuelas diferenciales

- chilenas. *Revista latinoamericana de educación inclusiva*, 11(2), 181-198. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-73782017000200012>
- San Martín, C., Vega, V., Rojas, F., Ramírez, Ch., Martínez, M., & Paniagua, X. (2019). *Oportunidades de aprendizaje en matemáticas para estudiantes con discapacidad intelectual en escuelas especiales*. Informe FONIDE. Ministerio de Educación – Gobierno de Chile
- Savolainen, H., Malinen, O., & Schwab, S. (2020). Teacher efficacy predicts teachers' attitudes towards inclusion – A longitudinal cross-lagged analysis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 26(9), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1752826>
- Schmidt, M., & Vrhovnik, K. (2015). Attitudes of teachers towards the inclusion of children with special needs in primary and secondary schools. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*, 51(2), 16-30.
- Schwab, S. (2019). Teachers' student-specific self-efficacy in relation to teacher and student variables. *Educational Psychology*, 39, 4-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2018.1516861>
- Sharma, U., & Jacobs, D. K. (2016). Predicting in-service educators' intentions to teach in inclusive classrooms in India and Australia. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 55, 13-23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.12.004>
- Sharma, U., & Sokal, L. (2015). The impact of a teacher education course on pre-service teachers' beliefs about inclusion: an international comparison. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 15(4), 276-284. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12043>
- Sharma, U., Aiello, P., Pace, E. M., Round, P., & Subban, P. (2017). In-service teachers' attitudes, concerns, efficacy and intentions to teach in inclusive classrooms: an international comparison of Australian and Italian teachers. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 33(3), 437-446. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2017.1361139>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01200.x>
- Slee, R. (2019). Belonging in an age of exclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(9), 909-922. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1602366>
- Song, J., Sharma, U., & Choi, H. (2019). Impact of teacher education on pre-service regular school teachers' attitudes, intentions, concerns and self-efficacy about inclusive education in South Korea. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 86, 102901, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.10290>
- Sousa, V. D., & Rojjanasrirat, W. (2011). Translation, adaptation and validation of instruments or scales for use in cross-cultural health care research: a clear and user-friendly guideline. *Journal of evaluation in clinical practice*, 17(2), 268-274.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1)
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*. World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality. Salamanca, Spain. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427>

- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2016). *Education 2030: Incheon declaration and framework for action for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4*. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000245656_eng
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2020). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all*. UNESCO. <https://en.unesco.org/gem-report/report/2020/inclusion>
- United Nations General Assembly. (1948). *Universal declaration of human rights* (217 [III] A). <https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>
- Valenzuela, J. P., Bellei, C., & De Los Ríos, D. (2014). Socioeconomic school segregation in a market-oriented educational system. The case of Chile. *Journal of Education Policy*, 29(2), 217-241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2013.806995>
- Woolfolk, A. (2007). *Educational psychology*. Pearson Education.
- Yada, A., & Savolainen, H. (2017). Japanese in-service teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and self-efficacy for inclusive practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 64, 222-229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.02.005>
- Yan, Z., & Sin, K. F. (2014). Inclusive education: Teachers' intentions and behaviour analysed from the viewpoint of the Theory of Planned Behaviour. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(1), 72-85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2012.757811>

Received on: 06/06/2023

Reformulated on: 18/08/2023

Approved on: 05/09/2023

