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ABSTRACT

This research reports the results of a Chilean study exploring EFL pre-service teacher data of teaching self-efficacy towards inclusive education. The study offers an exploratory picture of English pre-service teachers’ preparedness to teach in inclusive classrooms in Chile. The sample consists of 40 EFL pre-service teachers who answered a close-questionnaire (TEIP scale) based on self-efficacy perceptions in three dimensions: inclusive instructions, managing behavior and collaboration. Data were collected from three institutions in Chillan. Results indicated that participants had a high level of self-efficacy towards inclusive education. Other aspects regarding teaching self-efficacy for inclusion include the teacher preparation programs, knowledge about inclusion laws and policy, previous interactions with SEN, and prior teaching experience and training working with students with SEN. Implications of this study for further improvement of EFL pre-service teacher initial formation for inclusive education in Chile are discussed.

Keywords: inclusive education, inclusion, TEIP scale, Self-efficacy, EFL, pre-service teacher, SEN.

RESUMEN

La presente investigación da a conocer los resultados de un estudio en Chile el cual explora las percepiones de los estudiantes de pedagogía en inglés en relación a sus prácticas en educación inclusiva. El estudio ofrece un panorama exploratorio de la preparación de los futuros profesores de inglés para enseñar en aulas inclusivas en Chile. La muestra consiste
de 40 estudiantes de pedagogía en inglés quienes respondieron un cuestionario cerrado (escala TEIP) basado en las percepciones de auto-eficacia en tres dimensiones: instrucciones inclusivas, manejo de comportamiento y colaboración. La información fue recogida de tres instituciones en Chillán. Los resultados indicaron que los participantes tenían niveles altos de auto-eficacia hacia la educación inclusiva. Otros aspectos en relación a la eficacia en educación inclusiva incluye los programas de preparación de docentes de inglés, el conocimiento acerca de las leyes y las políticas inclusivas, experiencias previas con estudiantes con necesidades educativas, y las experiencias previas de enseñanza y entrenamiento trabajando con estudiantes con discapacidades. Las implicaciones de este estudio son analizadas con el objeto de un mejoramiento de la formación inicial de profesores de inglés para la educación inclusiva en Chile.

Palabras claves: educación inclusiva, inclusión, escala TEIP, auto-eficacia, EFL, profesor practicante, NEE.
1. INTRODUCTION

Inclusion of children from diverse backgrounds, as children with disabilities and children from socially disadvantaged background, in the mainstream regular education is a global trend in recent years to ensure rights to education for all (UNESCO, 2009). Inclusive education is considered as an educational reform that aims to make obstacles disappear in the education system by bringing all children into regular schools, regardless of their diversity and backgrounds (UNESCO, 1994). The move towards inclusion is focused on improving education systems for all, more than including disadvantaged groups in the existing settings (Ainscow, 2005). To do so, a strong national policy framework is necessary to ensure such school improvement for IE.

As many other countries, Chile has gone through a number of policy reforms in the subject. In 2003, Chile made twelve-year education compulsory for all children, by legislating the Compulsory Education Act (Nº 19.876). In terms of inclusion, Chile enacted People Social Integration Law Nº19.284 in 1994, which increased opportunities for people to have access to better education, health and job. The same year, MINEDUC enacted the Engagement Act for the Integration of Children and Young People with SEN (Tenorio, 2005). Decrees such as nº374 (MINEDUC, 1999), made possible to have access to public resources so that schools could create Integration Programs. A new stage started in 2005, with the Especial Education National Policy, establishing the lineaments for SEN students to make real the right to quality education, the equality of opportunities and the participation in mainstream. The LGE has also meant a relevant contribution for SEN students, having a preferential dealing that involves different conditions to ensure their educational progress with the same conditions than their peers. This
was concreted through Curriculum adaptations, particular population flexibility and coverage, and evaluation and learning and competences certification. (MINEDUC, 2010b).

In order to guarantee that these policy and legislative mandates are translated into teaching practices at the classroom level, restructuring in teacher education programs as well as in teaching practices at classroom practices are required (Forlin, 2008: 2010). Studies have shown that educators, who go through a teacher education program that promotes the values of inclusive education, are willing to include students from diverse backgrounds and are more likely to create successful inclusive classrooms (Martínez, 2003; Romi & Leyser, 2006). Despite having a broader understanding of SEN, it is reported for some researchers that teachers feel uncomfortable in including with special needs in their English class. Consequently, not having inclusive strategies, methodologies, techniques and skills have an important impact on students’ achievement. Some authors have suggested that the time of pre-service teacher preparation could be the best time to address educators concerns’ and make them feel more positive towards inclusion (Bechham & Rouse, 2011; Shade & Stewart, 2001).

Several studies have found that participation in inclusive or special education courses (Lancaster & Bain 2007, 2010; Oh, Rizzo, So, Chung, Park & Lei, 2010; Sari, Çeliköz & Seçer, 2008; Woodcock, 2008) or embedding evidence-based practice in the pre-service teacher education program (Bain, Lancaster, Zundans & Parkes, 2009) have a positive impact on pre-service teachers’ knowledge and skill development to teach in inclusive classrooms as well as developing high teacher-efficacy and positive attitudes towards inclusive education. Studies (Ben-Yehuda, Leyser & Last, 2010; Forlin, Cedillo and Romero-Contreras, 2010; Romi & Leyser 2006; Sharma, Moore, & Sonawane, 2009) have shown that pre-service teachers who participate in training programs about teaching in inclusive classrooms express their readiness by
showing high degree of teaching-efficacy and welcoming attitudes towards students with diverse learning needs.

In order to explore the teaching-efficacy in EFL pre-service teachers in Chile, this study reports the results of an exploratory research examining pre-service teacher perceptions of teaching self-efficacy for inclusive education in three universities in the city of Chillan, Chile. Results suggest a number of implications for teacher educators.

1.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The inclusive model of education aims to allow SEN students to be part of a regular classroom and ensures their full participation in regular classroom activities by providing certain services. It is based on the premise that students with disabilities would be socially and academically successful when participating in general education classroom activities (Tiwari, A., Das, A., & Sharma, M., 2015).

Policy frameworks to promote inclusive practices along the country have accompanied the shift in ideologies on inclusion. Chilean policies on inclusion of students with special educational needs in mainstream classrooms have currently focused their attention on implementing schools and supporting groups of in-service teachers, providing the strategies to make SEN students succeed. MINEDUC intends SEN students gain access, take part and progress in the national curricula on equal terms and opportunities (General Law of Education and Law 20.422). However, these efforts are not enough. According to O’Neil (1995), inclusion calls for a fundamental restructuring of the schools. It involves changes of pedagogy and changes in the curriculum, staff allocation, teacher education, and so on. The goal of inclusion is to create
a world in which all children are welcomed, and all children grow up comfortable with, knowledgeable about and supportive of all kinds of other children (O’ Neil, 1995). Inclusive Education (IE) is considered as an educational transformation that aims to wipe out barriers in the education system by bringing all children into regular education, regardless of their diversity and backgrounds (UNESCO, 1994).

As it is mentioned before, often the implementation does not translate into successful inclusion of SEN students in general education classrooms (Johansson, 2014; Singal, 2008, 2010). In United Kingdom, a survey study concluded that inclusion practices were unsuccessful largely due to teacher’s lack of training in special education instructional methods (Avramidis, Bayliss, and Burden, 2000).

In order to guarantee that these policies and legislative decrees are translated into better teaching practices at the classroom level, reform in teacher education programs as well as in teaching-learning practices are needed (Forlin, 2008:2010).

In the Chilean context, one of the aspects that should be strengthened is initial formation. From several talks with pre-service students from English teaching programs in Chile, it is perceived that one of their main concerns is inclusive education. Once working at schools, the system is not different. Teachers from history, science, math and language are usually the ones who receive pedagogic support from specialist teachers in order to do both curricular adaptations and differentiated assessments in schools, whereas teachers from other subjects are ignored.

Nevertheless, teachers from all the subjects are expected to have certain skills on inclusive teaching, including English teachers. EFL subject then, may become a bigger issue since teachers of English are expected to provide the same help with nothing more than the experience. As a result, teachers may misjudge students’ behaviors labeling them as lazy or
having disruptive behavior rather than having a medical condition that can be overcome with suitable inclusive strategies. This is also a shared feeling among in-service teachers in Finland, who perceive SEN students as “misfits” in the general education classroom. According to Mäniken (2013) teachers perceive inclusive education as a “one size fits all” approach.

Ignoring theory and practice not only cause problems for teachers, but also for SEN students who usually decrease their expectancy of success in the EFL subject because of continuous failure (Dörney, 1998). Moreover, students who experience language-learning difficulties in their mother tongue may have problems in learning another language at school. Nonetheless, there are many students who only have difficulties with learning a new language system, and who are not dyslexic or have a learning disability. This is one of the most significant reasons why the foreign language teacher should be trained in special pedagogy. He or she should be able to recognize student’s special educational needs and know which approaches work with this student and how.

Students who have difficulties in most or all the four language skills/components (i.e. reading, writing, listening and speaking) are likely to experience many problems while learning a foreign language, particularly in traditional language classrooms. Research suggests that there is no specific disability for learning a foreign language; rather the difficulties are an extension of a continuum from very good to very poor language learners (Abdallah, 2015).

Having said that professional development in the English language is essential for EFL teachers to meet their new learning needs, recent studies have revised the assumption that holding the required knowledge and skills is enough for effective teaching. Teachers’ attitudes and beliefs are also found to contribute to their effectiveness as educators (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 1992; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Teacher efficacy—in other
words, teachers’ beliefs in their ability to influence student outcomes (Tournaki & Podell, 2005)—has been found to be directly related to many positive teacher behaviors and attitudes (Bandura, 1997; Campbell, 1996; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998; Yost, 2002) as well as student achievement (Henson, 2001; Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004).

In the Chilean context, a self-efficacy study concerning inclusion in the initial formation has not been explored. This issue becomes more unknown when talking about future EFL teachers in the country. Therefore, this research investigates EFL pre-service teachers’ self-efficacy as one of the first steps towards an inclusive EFL classroom in Chile aiming education can reach all learners.

1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1.2.1 General Objective.

• To explore pre-service teachers of English perceptions about teaching in inclusive EFL classrooms in Chillan, Chile.

1.2.2 Specific Objectives.

• To identify EFL pre-service teachers’ perceptions in relation to inclusive instruction in EFL classrooms in Chillan, Chile.
• To identify EFL pre-service teachers’ perceptions in relation to managing behavior in EFL classrooms in Chillan, Chile.
• To identify EFL pre-service teachers’ perceptions in relation to collaboration in EFL classrooms in Chillan, Chile.
1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

• Do pre-service teachers of English from Chillan have high levels of teaching self-efficacy with respect to inclusive instruction?

• Do pre-service teachers of English from Chillan have high levels of teaching self-efficacy with respect to managing behavior?

• Do pre-service teachers of English from Chillan have high levels of teaching self-efficacy with respect to collaboration?

1.4 JUSTIFICATION AND MOTIVATION OF THE STUDY

In Chile, as in many countries, there is an increasing awareness of what inclusion is about. Gradual but steady ideological changes from “mainstreaming” to “inclusion” of SEN students have led to global social movement, encouraging several national policies in favor of inclusive classrooms. However, inclusion is a policy that has not been fully translated into practice yet. This can be perceived through conversations held with teachers and pre-service teachers of English as well. Both claiming it is a challenge for them to teach SEN students in mainstream classrooms since they were not prepared in their teaching programs.

This research emerges from the lack of training teachers of English have in relation to inclusion and the acknowledgment of the impact beliefs and misconceptions have on current teaching practices. The motivation for the study is based on the belief education is a right of every human being. Young children and students with special education needs have the same
rights to a high quality education as people of the same age who do not have special education needs. Second, regarding diversity, learning styles should be taken into consideration since people are different, and therefore, we should never assume that there is one way (or one-size-fits-all) way of treating all students. Thus, inclusive education requires instruction to be tailored to meet the unique needs of each individual child (Sharma & Das, 2015). Finally, English language teachers should be aware of those innovative/specific methods, techniques, and/or interventions that should be employed inside the classroom to reach all learners.

1.5 THE RELEVANCE AND CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY

A recent research in Delhi reported several barriers to successful inclusion. Among others, the barriers included a lack of trained teachers and negative attitudes among teachers, and a fear of reducing the overall academic performance of the class (Das and Shah, 2014). Moreover, studies have shown teachers who go through a teacher education program that promotes values of Inclusive Education (IE) are more likely to create successful inclusive classrooms (Martínez, 2003; Romi & Leyser, 2006). This is also supported by Woolfson and colleagues (2007) who claim that the connection between teacher beliefs and their behaviors in the classroom are linked to personally based beliefs, values and principles. Even international recommendations from UNESCO (2009) to include content on inclusion as part of teacher training programs are getting stronger.

The information provides evidence of the need of implementing effective inclusion in both teaching programs and in-service teachers of English to ensure students teachers have the adequate training and solid theoretical background when facing an inclusive classroom.
Although little research has been done in the area of Inclusive Education in Chile within EFL context, this initiative has its roots in a growing recognition that teachers of English in Chile are not sufficiently well prepared for dealing with the range of the differences in schools today. This study aims to explore misconceptions and beliefs trainee teachers have in Chillan since they may have useful implications both for policy makers as well as teacher trainers. The findings would provide an insight about the benefits and/or constraints of the implementation to keep in mind for further research.

1.6 LIMITATIONS

This research aims to explore perceptions on inclusion pre-service teachers of Chillan have in the Chilean educational context. Due to the fact that it is an exploratory research, the results cannot be generalized. Further research should acknowledge:

- **Time extension**: The questionnaire was carried out during the first and second weeks of December via online, yet students can take more time to answer the questionnaire or ignore it.

- **Group extension**: The instrument was applied to pre-service teachers from the different English Teaching Programs in Chillan, who are currently in their last semester, in order to have a wider perception of their teaching preparation. However, pre-service teachers are perceived as having a natural sense of lack of knowledge and/or preparation because of anxiety and this may affect students’ perceptions.

1.7 VIABILITY

Nevertheless, the research was still viable considering the following factors:
• **Access to the participants:** the researcher has the access to all universities in Chillan, since it is a low number of English teaching programs in the city. Furthermore, because the researcher is part of the teacher staff in one of the universities and alumni, in another one too.

• **Means:** Students are expected to answer through an online questionnaire so that they are not forced to be physically present in a meeting, which is difficult since it is a numerous group.

• **Length of time:** The researcher has the time enough to carry out the survey and it is possible to contact pre-service students by using different means.
2. CONTEXTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section contextualizes where the study was set.

2.1 TEACHING ENGLISH IN CHILE

As Chile’s economy has opened to the world through various trade agreements, there was a need for qualified bilingual professionals. Consequently, the Chilean Government started investing highly in English language teaching through the Ministry of Education’s English Open Doors Program and promoting several other policies that provided funding for in-service training, graduate studies, the Semester Abroad program, among others. Recently, MINEDUC elaborated standards for Teaching Programs in which they consider diversity and inclusion, as one of the expected competences students from pedagogy should have.

The Chilean Curriculum promotes the teaching of EFL or English as a Foreign Language, which occurs within an environment in which English is not the first language or the mother tongue. This implies, according to Brown (2007), motivation in EFL context tend to have lower levels of intrinsic motivation in students since English is not part of their daily lives. In other words, students are exposed a few hours a week to the English language, which makes difficult to learn it. This may be one of the several factors affecting EFL in Chile; still there are others that should be addressed.

According to the statements from the national government, education is moving towards inclusion so that every single child has the right to be educated. As it is expressed in the Article 19,10°, paragraph 4-5, of the Political Constitution (2010), it says "Basic education and Secondary education are compulsory, so that the State must finance a free system for this
purpose, aimed at ensuring accessibility for all people [...]” (pp. 14-15). For UNESCO (1994) inclusive schools are described as schools in which all children learn together, regardless of any difficulties or differences they may have, receiving quality education and support through appropriate curricula, organizational arrangements, their communities. Yet, this ideology is not translated into practice for most English teachers.

The first issue detected is inclusion is not being put into practice within initial teacher preparation programs. Several universities in the country do not have practicums on inclusive settings or courses based on inclusion. It is believed future teachers would know how to manage the class once they are provided theoretical background where students have the opportunities to learn, discuss, read and analyze different special needs, but also when they face the classroom reality.

As a second aspect, it is unknown for most of in-service teachers of English how to use specific inclusive methodologies and appropriate adaptations in order to make barriers disappear for SEN students. This may cause lack of motivation in them and failure. Besides, teachers may get confused making wrong judgments on SEN students, considering them lazy, disobedient, and even regarding them as not capable as their peers. This should be also part of a bigger coordination in which schools provide support for teachers of English once they become part of the school community.

As teachers and society should embrace inclusion, institutions such as universities, schools and Government should work together to re-design English teaching programs so that inclusion can be present in terms of knowledge and skills. Levels of teacher self-efficacy then will be higher as well as students’ expectations on the EFL subject.
Since no research have been found within the Chilean context regarding pre-service teachers of English self-efficacy, on the next section some similar studies conducted in other countries are described.

2.2 STUDIES

Das (2002) argues that a large number of teachers in India report no training in SEN education in their initial teacher preparation programs. Furthermore, the teachers report a lack of professional development and training opportunities in instructing students with disabilities.

Romi and Leyser (2006) conducted a study involving pre-service teachers in Israel and concluded that a positive sense of self-efficacy related to teaching lower achieving students was higher than general teaching self-efficacy and that female students were more positive about inclusion and had higher self-efficacy scores than did males. Clearly, there was an aspect of their teacher education program that enabled these pre-service teachers to view themselves as competent when it came to adjusting their teaching practice to teach a wider range of students.

Lancaster and Bain (2007) found that pre-service teacher measures of self-efficacy correlated strongly with their level of participation in an inclusive education course. As noted in previous work, the important area regarding pre-service teacher perceptions of teaching self-efficacy with respect to inclusion, which is the focus of this study, has not been adequately addressed.

In a study conducted in Delhi, Sharma, Moore and Sonawane (2009) discovered that teachers tend to resist inclusion practices due to a lack of essential tools for instructing SEN students. Policy makers have not successfully provided training opportunities while implementing inclusive education programs.
Hettiarachchi and Das (2014), Shah et al. (2014), Tiwari (2014) found that a lack of distribution of information about inclusion policies has been a major challenge in the implementation of educational reform policies.

The global movement towards more inclusive education has also had implications for the research on teacher self-efficacy. There seems to be a growing interest towards what is required from teachers of inclusive classrooms and many recently developed instruments measuring self-efficacy contain items dealing with student diversity (Chan, 2008a; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). However, the number of studies with teacher self-efficacy for inclusive education as their main focus is limited (Sharma, Loreman, & Forlin, 2011). These studies have often implemented general teacher efficacy scales (Almog & Shechtman, 2007; Romi & Leyser, 2006; Soodak, Podell, & Lehman, 1998). To fill this gap Sharma et al. (2012) have developed a new research instrument, Teacher Self-efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale.

The TEIP scale aims to measure perceived teacher efficacy for teaching in inclusive settings and its developers as well as the study by Savolainen, Engelbrecht, Nel, and Malinen (2011) suggest that the scale can be divided into three sub-scales efficacy in using inclusive instructions, for efficacy in collaboration, and efficacy in managing behavior.

2.3 CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

The present study was conducted in the city of Chillan, Bio-Bio Region, in Chile. 40 EFL pre-service teachers were part of the research sample. The participants are currently in their last semester in public and private universities, located in both urban and near rural areas. Two institutions belong to the private sector, while one of them is a public university.
In Chile, there are three types of tertiary institutions established by law: universities, professional institutes and technical training centers, which must be licensed to operate and complete an accreditation process for students to be eligible for financial aid. With respect to autonomy, higher education institutions in Chile enjoy a great amount of autonomy. For this reason, many institutions offering teaching programs may have slowed their process of updating curriculum towards inclusion.

As in Chilean schools, reforms in tertiary level are currently happening. According to the British Council (2015) in a recent report, the objective is to change the accreditation system so that government can provide possible students with more information on the quality of courses and institutions. Additionally to the measures promoted in primary and secondary education, in 2012 the English Opens Doors program directed its attention to initial teacher education for English pedagogy students.

On account of the fact that English is considered a foreign language, teaching EFL might be a challenge itself. In fact, only a small part of the population in Chile speaks English. As might be expected, the British Council (2015) reported 70% from 500 survey respondents studied English during secondary school and 61% of them informed the reason was English was a mandatory subject. Based on current data, Chilean government is looking to revitalize the English teaching profession through the help of foreign experts, workshops, camps and professional programs as one of the causes of the poor number of English speakers in the country is related to issues with teacher quality, including a general lack of English proficiency limited and knowledge of effective pedagogies for language training.

For the above reasons, this research aims to provide useful information for Chilean English teaching educators identify areas that should be enhanced so that all students can have
the possibility to learn English by using new inclusive methodologies in English pedagogy. Therefore, this study follows a series of research exploring teaching self-efficacy in the area of inclusive teaching practice (Forlin, Sharma, Loreman, & Earle 2006; Loreman, T., Earle, C., Sharma, U., & Forlin, C. 2007; Forlin, Sharma, Loreman, & Earle 2009; Forlin, Sharma, & Loreman, 2008; Sharma, Loreman, & Forlin, 2012) in other countries. In order to assume inclusive education, this should be along the national curriculum. Consequently, this type of research will address the issue and provide a first perspective for teacher educators of English in Chile with respect to how pre-service teachers of English perceive their teaching self-efficacy for inclusive teaching practice in three areas; inclusive instructions, managing behavior and collaboration, so that more effective measures may be taken to address pre-service teachers’ concerns and fulfill current Chilean government’s expectations.
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The topic of teacher education with respect to inclusive education has attracted increasing interest from teacher educators worldwide. Considerable literature records relevant theoretical and applied studies of teacher education on inclusion and its relationship with teacher training programs. However, the multiple ways in which inclusive education is conceptualized turns into varied numbers of approaches that are far from an inclusive philosophy. In the case of EFL trainee teachers, many future teachers do not feel that their teaching training has prepared them for including learners with SENs in their classroom. This section describes the evolution of the concepts of special education, integration and inclusion through history, their development within the Chilean educational system as well as the role of English as a Foreign Language into the national curricula.

3.1 EFL

According to the Ministry of Education, English learning constitutes a fundamental area in the national curriculum due to its relevancy as a way of access to diverse areas of knowledge and its character of global language of communication. Through English, it is possible to have an open door to a wide range of information across the mass media and technologies as well as to get to know other cultures and realities.

In the context of our country, English language is defined as a foreign language, since it is not used as a language to communicate among its inhabitants, and the students do not have
immediate access to its use out of the classroom. Having said this, it represents a big challenge to teach this language, both regarding methodologies and the development of motivation to learn it.

Diverse studies about language education and language learning emphasize the importance of considering the particularities of the context in which the foreign language is taught besides the diverse characteristics learners may have, so that methodological decisions can be made based on previous knowledge. Taking this into account it is required to consider diversity in the classrooms, not only related to social or cultural differences but also in terms of clinical conditions, particularly SEN students.

In Chile, learning English has acquired an increasing concern due to the insertion in the globalization process. This process is associated to a wide world use of the English language in areas such as science, economy, technology and education. Consequently, the skill of communicating in this language facilitates the possibility of getting involved into the globalization dynamics, being able to face its challenges and benefiting from its contributions.

Through the development of communicative English language skills, it is believed Chilean students will have the possibility to acquire the required tools to have access to information and to take part in communicative situations in this foreign language, by means of both reading and writing.

The learning of EFL or English as a Foreign Language in Chile promotes the personal development of students. The aimed communicative skills allow students to grow in the intellectual and formative aspect as well as the personal evolution since they are expected to know different cultures, traditions and ways of thinking. Speaking and writing promote the use of English to communicate in the foreign language in different familiar contexts from every day life and students’ personal interests. Thus, learning English has not only the purpose of learning
the language as content in the curriculum but also seeks to develop the formative aspect of Chilean students.

For the reasons mentioned above, it is relevant for EFL educators to be able to teach all the students inside the classroom effectively, leaving barriers behind to embrace diversity as it is a right of every child to be educated. Then, this imply EFL teacher educators and schools to work together in order to provide future teachers the tools for them to success in making children learn a foreign language in addition to other multiple many benefits to know other cultures can have.

3.2 SEN

3.2.1 SEN in the world.

Students fail in school for a variety of reasons. Nonetheless, there is one group of students who need specialized instruction because of specific learning disabilities. SEN Students learning English are usually in disadvantage by a lack of appropriate assessment instruments and personnel trained to conduct linguistically and culturally relevant educational assessments (Valdés & Figueroa, 1996). In other words, English language learners who need special education services are further disadvantaged by the shortage of special educators who are trained to address their language and disability related needs simultaneously. Although it is acknowledged SEN involves several other aspects, this research only focused its attention on teacher training preparation on SEN in order to meet the challenges that society requires from educators.
The Warnock Report (1978) in the United Kingdom was a starting point, “…in the development of both resources and the conceptualization of children with special needs”. It defined three areas of integration: physical, social and functional (as cited in Lepe and Neira, 2013, p.15). Then, Forham P. (1992) quoting Jomtien (1992) in *The World Conference on Education for All* the bases for *Meeting of the Basic Learning Needs* were established, especially those items related to: quality, efficiency and equality, which one of the main concerns of SEN, integration and inclusion is (pp. 41-72).

Later, in Salamanca (UNESCO, 1994) the concept of inclusion was accepted as part of the international agenda. The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special-Needs Education was launched to guarantee actions to benefit SEN students. Subsequent, the Council of Europe, Political Declaration and Action Plan (2006-2015) and the United Nations International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006) set the frame of what they understood as the education premise, as stated in Articles 24-29 of the International Convention on the agreements in favor of SEN.

Within the English context, the term SEN is used officially to refer to those children who require additional or different provision for their learning difficulties and disabilities. Four dimensions of SEN are recognized officially and within each of these dimensions various classifications of SEN are identified. First dimension corresponds to cognition and learning needs, which refer to specific learning difficulty. The second is related to sensory and physical needs, such as hearing impairments. The third is associated to language and communication needs, such as autism. Behavior is the fourth, which is related to emotional and social development needs.
The framework for special needs education within the UK was established in the 1981 education legislation based on the Warnock Report (1978) as it is mentioned previously. The Warnock Report recommended that all teachers needed to appreciate the extent and range of special educational needs; the patterns of provision that were available for them; procedures for identifying special educational needs; the importance of working closely with parents; the significance and usefulness of inter-professional collaboration for these children; and the importance of positive attitudes and the skills required to work with these pupils. The Report also recommended a ‘special education element’ in all courses of initial teacher training including the PGCE programs. It is notable that these priorities for teacher preparation have remained basically unchanged over this period, despite the introduction of the language of inclusive education (Nash Tricia & Norwich Brahm, 2010).

Since the Warnock Report was launched, several academics around the world have researched on special needs, not only being witnesses of the evolution of the concept, but also providing the guidelines for others to apply it in their own context.

3.2.2 SEN in Chile.

The challenge of teaching SEN students in the world began in the 70s. In Chile, the first special schools were created at the beginning of the last century; nevertheless, it was in the 70s when the expansion and improvement of the technical capacity started, attending students with disability.

Among these actions, it is important to mention establishment of the Department of Education of the Headquarters of Special education. Another important fact was the creation of
the Commission 18, from which the centers and microcenters of diagnosis (today multi-professional teams) and the distinguishing groups were established; they prepared the first plans and programs of studies for population with disability and they developed improving instances for teachers that were working with students with learning difficulties and disabilities.

Another significant contribution was the creation of guided courses to “profesores normalistas” (Chilean teachers) in order to train them as specialist teachers. In 1964, the University of Chile created the Center of Specialists' Formation in Shortcoming Mental, and later, in 1966 and 1970, the undergraduate courses were opened in audition, vision, and language disorders.

The selection of the professionals was in charge of the university, which was awarded with a scholarship, during two years, for the Department of Education because of the achievement of the studies mentioned above.

In 1974, diverse private institutions created special schools, incorporating more people with disability to the education system.

With the beginning of inclusion and integration in the educational speech and concept of special educational needs, encouraged by the Warnock Report in 1978, a new approach to understand special education began.

The Warnock Report affirms that all students should receive quality education; despite the problems they meet along the learning process. From this angle, education should be in a constant search of answers, in order to ensure learning achievement for students with diverse needs.
This change of perspective expands the concept of special education, leaving behind the old paradigm in which special education and general education used to work as separated realities.

Propelled by this new approach in the 80s, students with sensory disabilities started to be included into regular education. To benefit SEN students’ access and permanence in the educational system, certain regulations were dictated. Evaluations were differentiated according to students’ disabilities and in some cases the exemption of subjects such as Physical Education was carried out. These first steps towards the integration were marked by a series of difficulties, as the isolation and disconnection of special education from the regular one, the lack of resources and teaching materials as well as the insufficient teacher training in these matters.

In 1989 new plans and programs of study are prepared for different disabilities, which would be approved in 1990.

From the 90s, Chile initiates the Educational Reform process in order to achieve a quality education with equity. To accomplish this goal, diverse actions are carried out to modernize the system and guarantee quality in education for Chilean students along the country.

Between 1992 and 1997, the Department of Education helped the line of MECE / BASIC Program, directed to teachers of special schools that allowed, after many years, specific training for teachers and specialists in new approaches, so that challenges on special needs field could be met.

During the 90s, world organizations as UNICEF and UNESCO, generated diverse meetings, declarations and commitments among countries of Latin America, the Caribbean Sea and countries around the world in general, with the intention of impelling new conditions in the
educational systems for globalizing the access to education, encourage the equity, reduce inequality and defeat the discriminations of the more vulnerable groups.

In this global context, Chile promulgated the Supreme Decree of Education Nº 490/90 that establishes regulations for the first time to integrate pupils with disability in establishments of regular education, highlighting an important step for the special education in the country, since it marked the beginning of a new stage in this area.

Four years later, Law Nº 19.284 (MINEDUC, 1994) was promulgated on the full social integration of the persons with disability, which order the Department of Education to regulate and to assure the integration to the education as well as to regulate the school population with disability (Supreme Decree of Education Nº 1/98).

Since 1998, special education counted with financial resources in the National budget that allowed developing diverse actions to support and deliver pedagogic resources, not only to special schools, but also to mainstream schools with integration, reaching important advances in the field.

During the last years, special education has played an important role in the opportunities of the pupils with special educational needs. Several actions have been taken to promote the attention of diversity and the acceptance of individuals differences in the regular educational system, supporting the educational communities with financial and human resources so that students receive professional support, technical staff and necessary materials to assure access, progress and permanence in the regular school system.

The educational system contemplates different options as: special schools, in which students diagnosed with sensory, intellectual, physical disability, and specific disorders of the language attend classes. In 2009, there were 129,994 in the educational who presented special
educational needs and received specializing support. From these, 100.521 were present at special schools and 29.473 were students of regular schools with integration projects, reaching 3.7% of the whole of the registration of the country.

The following principles of policies of education indicates the way to develop students, who present special educational needs, so that they are able to gain access, progress and leave the educational system with the necessary competences to integrate and take part entirely in the family, social, labor and cultural life of the society.

- The education is a right for all.
- The diversity is a wealth source for the development and learning of the educational communities.
- The construction of a more just, democratic society and united.
- The improvement of the quality, equity and relevancy of educational offer demands to attend people who present special educational needs.
- The active and informed participation of the families, teachers, pupils and communities in the different instances of the educational process. (MINEDUC 2005)

One of the main objectives at that time was the initial formation of teachers in Chile. Sergio Bitar (2005), through MINEDUC stated the goals for the future were:

- To propitiate a joint work with universities and professional institutes that offer teaching programs so that these include knowledge and strategies to educate in the diversity and to attend to the special educational needs.
- To generate more improving instances and training to teachers and professionals of the education special and regular in the attention of the needs educational special and the diversity.
In our country, both integration and inclusion are legal (1990, 1999, 2012). Curricular actions have been taken to encourage the integration and inclusion of SEN students into mainstream. Regarding the curricular aspects, the Ministry of Education (2013) declares that “The concept of special educational needs (SEN) has to do with how to understand and work with difficulties or barriers experienced by students, and on how to learn and participate in the school curriculum.” Additionally, based on the OECD (2007), it also defines that these SEN: “… can be of different types, including disabilities and identifiable impairments; not attributable difficulties learning disabilities or deficiency; and difficulties due to socioeconomic, cultural or linguistic disadvantages” (p.7).

3.2.2.1 PIE.

In order to promote inclusion in regular classrooms, MINEDUC created PIE (Integration Educative Project), which is a strategy from Chilean educational system, whose objective is to contribute to continuous improvement of the quality of education. It aims not only to favor the presence of SEN students into regular classrooms, but also the participation and the achievement of learning goals of each and one of them. PIE is now present along the country, promoting learning success for those students who require professional help on specific learning disabilities.

At the beginning, the main goal of this initiative was to include SEN students in regular schools and create required conditions for integration. In 2009, with the publication of Decree Nº170, it also aims to contribute improving quality of education of all students. This change of approach is based on the value of individual differences as well as the respect for diversity, within a more inclusive perspective of education.

To achieve inclusive quality education, three strategies are considered fundamental:
-The incorporation of specialist teachers: it refers to qualified teachers as SEN teachers and psychopedagogists within the classrooms to co-work with the teacher in order to help SEN students, diversifying pedagogical strategies and thus enable learning for all students.

- The support of specialists outside the classroom for those who have special needs and require more attention.

- The coordinated work with the entire school community, to benefit the respect for diversity and contribute to a more inclusive education. (MINEDUC, Decree Nº170)

PIE not only provides the resources to hire qualified professionals, but also supports schools with resources in other three areas: coordination, cooperative work and evaluation (which is expected to promote co-work among teachers); training (which involves activities to invite school community to be aware of school diversity) and teaching materials (this includes specific equipment, adapted teaching materials and assessment tools).

In 2013, MINEDUC signed the UNICEF Agreement (2000) which stated that: “It is expected that the students with SEN can overcome learning barriers by receiving aid and special resources they need, either temporarily or permanently, into the regular educational context” (p.7).

3.2.2.2 Decrees and Regulations.

In this direction, MINEDUC has propitiated also important advances in the area of the special education, impelled by the agreements in the ambience of human, social, economic and cultural rights of the persons, what it has implied a new politics and decrees that allow
substantial progress in terms of access and participation in the school system of students who present someone disability.

A clear example was the promulgation of the Law of Social Integration of People with Disability Nº 19. 284 in 1994, which not only was opening opportunities of gaining access to a better education, but also to a better health, recreation and work, improving the quality of life of children and young people. This year, the Department of Education, representatives of organizations and entities establishments advocates educational they signed “engagement Record for the Integration of Children, Girls and Young people with N. E. E. ” (Tenorio, 2005).

To finish with the prescribed in the Law Nº 19.284 related to educational environment, the Decree Nº 01 was promulgated in 1998 “School integration of pupils and pupils with spatial educational needs”, and the Decree Nº 374 in 1999. In these decrees, it was established educational alternatives to offer options that allow and facilitate the access, permanence and progress in the common school system, indicating the need to carry out curricular adequacies. It also makes possible across the project creation of school integration (PIE) to obtain resources to implement this initiative.

It is necessary to point out that MINEDUC has stimulated the regular schools to integrate students with disability in its classrooms, trying on one hand to answer the changes in the way of conceiving learning and disability, and on the other hand, the need of increasing the students’ curricular coverage with SEN in the regular schools, owe to the pressure of the international organizations that determine the success of inclusion targets, among other aspects (Tenorio, 2005).

During 1990, the design of educational policies and strategies that promoted the generation of conditions facilitating the school integration were characterized. They adopted
legal measurements that position the subject matter forming one reality, and tried to regulate
general orientations, procedures and forms to grant a real alternative of access, permanence and
progress in the common school system.

With the National Politics of Special education 2005 a new stage begins in this area,
lineaments are established for students with SEN. Experts’ goal is to ensure quality education as
an effective right, equality of opportunities as well as the participation in extra-curricular
activities within the school community. This firm intention is underlined by the MINEDUC to
advance in more inclusive and respectful communities (MINEDUC, 2010). One of the central
points of the policies mentioned above has been to promote with the school integration of
students’ with some disability and specific disorders of language to the mainstream school
system. Thus, the public institutional capacity has been used to reach public and subsidized
schools principally.

The school integration has been based principally on an ideological and cultural option in
favor of minorities and the social and economic demand of granting equality of opportunities to
people, who usually were socially excluded.

The General Law of Education (LGE), has also achieved a significant contribution
regarding SEN students, creating diverse conditions to assure its educational progress in equality
of conditions with its pairs. Because of this, it has underlined the need to advance in curricular
setting in at least three dimensions: modernization of the curriculum, flexibility and coverage of
specific populations, and evaluation and certification of learning and competitions. (MINEDUC,
2010).

In spite of the important changes and advances, the school integration proposal in Chile
has been occurring gradually, and has implied a reflection and a process of learning experiences,
both national and international. Its implementation has demanded important changes in the regular school and the special education that have not been absent of criticism, disinformation and difficulties of understanding the inclusion policies. The diverse actors have caused certain tensions inside the school system, originating different conceptions on how to apply this innovation.

The phenomenon of the integration has generated certain controversy, especially discussing about the concrete benefits that it could carry to children and young people that are educated inside SEN system. The education in special schools is seen, on one hand, as a way of preventing the attention to SEN as a group of disabled students, but also, is conceived like a way of perpetuating the social segregation in students. Therefore, the school integration as an educational phenomenon is not estimated as an equal system by the different actors, because of the benefits that it might bring for the children with SEN and the rest of the students (Tenorio, 2009).

Among in-service teachers, different visions exist with regard to the topic, those who are influenced by a series of factors, emphasizing “characteristics of the school organization and its management, the school culture that reigns in the school, the initial formation received in teaching programs, mainly in relation to the concepts of diversity and learning, which are translated into a certain pedagogic practice”. (Tenorio 2005: 828).

The decade of 2000 has raised the achievement of a series of studies and investigations tending to take the pulse of the educational situation of the students with SEN inside the regular system and evaluate the integration results at national level, trying to identify those facilitators and shacklers in its implementation. These studies have allowed the design of some
modifications and precisions, translated in instructive and decrees to improve those critical points detected, creating more similar conditions to the reality of the schools and SEN students.

A concrete product was the instructive Nº 191 of 2006, whose objective is to clarify some aspects of Decree 01/98, regulating specific procedures for the presentation, implementation and evaluation of the programs of school integration, as a form of guaranteeing the quality of the educational processes of integrated students (MINEDUC, 2006). The same year MINEDUC creates the Decree Nº 1398, which grants Basic Education License to students who have studied following the Chilean special education curriculum (MINEDUC, 2010).

In 2007, Law Nº 20. 201 is promulgated, that increase the financial resources of the special education (subsidy) to the students with severer and complex needs, being extended also to students with attention deficit and learning difficulties. In 2009, Decree Nº 170 fixed the regulations to evaluate and diagnosed students who will be beneficiaries of the subsidies established in the Law earlier mentioned (MINEDUC, 2009). This measurement constitutes a new incentive so that the schools get involved with the integration processes; the conditions are improved and more opportunities are given for SEN students.

As a product of new meetings and agreements, Law Nº 20.422 is approved in 2010 which norms equal opportunities and social inclusion for people with disabilities, replacing Law Nº 19. 284.

The regulations promulgated in the last decade have meant a fundamental contribution to improve quality and equity in people’s life presenting disability, being the regulations and decrees of the educational setting, accompanied by specific programs supporting both the teaching and the evaluation of SEN children, which have been developed by diverse institutions of higher education of our country. Nevertheless, it is necessary to keep on advancing in
improving quality and learning achievements of students with SEN. Therefore, it turns out to be essential to gather obtained information from carried out studies and to take the corresponding measures (Tenorio, 2009).

3.2.2.3 Data on SEN students in Chile.

In terms of legislation, policies and statements, the Chilean government appears to be committed to the principles of inclusion, even though the local interpretation of inclusive education is not exactly the same as the broad definition of inclusion promoted by international organizations such as UNESCO (2009).

The Chilean education system is moving from the integration model towards a more inclusive education model as an acknowledgement of the multiple benefits inclusiveness bring to students and society. Therefore, the aim is to educate most children with special educational needs in regular classrooms. At the same time, special schools are maintained as centers of expertise supporting the work of regular schools and providing education for the students with more profound special education needs. During the last decade, numbers reflect the progressive increase in the number of integrated students to the school along the country. The coverage of children in the integration program who are SEN has particularly increased. The number of enrollment in schools with PIE in 2005 was 451,023 and in 2009 was 68,117. This can also be explained because of the increase in the subsidy of special education. The information shows the entire expense in PIE in 2005 in public schools was $2,377,428, while in 2009 increased to $47,680,036; in the subsidized system, 2005 was of $929,614 and in 2009 came to $21,331,797 (MINEDUC, 2010b). As it is perceived, the Chilean model of inclusive education (through PIE)
has expanded rapidly and the majority of in school students registered as having disabilities are already studying in regular classes.

Nevertheless, Ferreira (2015) provided a slightly different point of view on the subject. In his research he informed the available data on disabilities (INE, 2004), reported 12.9% of Chilean population suffer from some type of disability. At the same time, the same institution (INE, 2004) informed 4.6% of those persons, with disabilities, were within the age range 0-20 years, what corresponds to the majority of the students that attend the educational system from Pre-K up to 12th grade.

In 2012, according to the MINEDUC, SEN students accounted for 158,138 distributed in 96,154 men and 61,984 women (p. 7). The INE (2004) informed that 94% of students showing some disability or impairment are actually formally enrolled (p. 52). From the total number of subjects offered by the educational system as compulsory, the two subjects that present the highest number of exclusions are: physical education and English as a Foreign Language (EFL).

Despite international and local initiatives been held to promote integration and inclusion of all impaired and disabled students in regular classes, the above data show that little has been done, which poses tension between the legal and curricular domains. In that respect, Zúñiga (2012), reports that in our country about 20% of the students, from Elementary Education up to Tertiary Education, present some type of SEN.

Referring to elementary and secondary education, almost 40% of the schools and high schools have incorporated to some sort of SEN integration initiatives, better known in Chile as PIE (Integration Educative Project). However, only 3% of students do receive SEN assistance, what ultimately shows the tension between what law states and what schools actually do.
3.3 INTEGRATION AND INCLUSION

3.3.1 From integration to inclusion.

The transition from an emphasis on special education to a focus on integration and inclusive education has produced confusion between these two concepts. When special education was challenged for determining the course of children’s lives (Tomlinson, 2012), the philosophy of integration became the dominant policy since it recognized the right to education of children with special needs in mainstream schools (Vislie, 2006). In other words, mainstream schools had to find ways to accommodate children with diverse needs; thus, the organization of the provision of special education within the mainstream schools became essential to policies and practices (Slee, 2009). Therefore, the much-criticized system of segregated special education was reproduced in mainstream schools under the name of integration (Symeonidou, S., & Phtiaka, H., 2014).

Integration traditionally refers to the education of children with special needs in main settings, associated to the bodily health state, the psychiatric ailments as well as the psychological diagnosis and treatment. Though integration was viewed typically as a Western movement, inclusion became a global descriptor (Vislie, 2006) with many advocates around the world.

3.3.2 Inclusion.

Through 1990s, inclusive education replaced integration as the key word in policies and discourses in the field (Vislie, 2006, p.408). Nevertheless, in Chile the concept of inclusion is
being adopted since a few years ago. Inclusive education is a concept that may carry different meanings in different contexts, though for the research purpose will be defined within the framework of special needs.

As mentioned before and regardless of growing international consensus towards inclusion as a universal goal, there is not any single universally accepted definition of inclusive education (Ainscow, Booth, & Dyson 2006, p. 27; Allan & Slee, 2008, pp. 27e41; Kavale & Forness, 2000). However, Mitchell (2005) noticed there is some international agreement on basic features of inclusive education for children with disabilities. Those features included regular classes in regular schools, sharing the classroom with other same-age children, having the access to support services and aids, and access to individualized programs. Most people relate inclusion with values such as equity and participation, but not with the educational practices involved (Ainscow et al., 2006).

While in some countries inclusion is concerned with students with disabilities and other “special needs”, in other parts of the world is considered as something irrelevant (Artiles & Dyson, 2005; Singh, 2009).

The global recognition of a universal concept of inclusion came with the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994), which addressed clearly the right to education of all children in inclusive schools. Inclusive schools were defined as schools in which all children learn together, regardless of any difficulties or differences they may have, receiving quality education and support through appropriate curricula, organizational arrangements, their communities (UNESCO, 1994). Currently, inclusion is comprehended as a wider concept relating to all groups of children excluded from school. The educational and social arguments for inclusion are seen justifiable also by economical arguments (UNESCO, 2009). It is suggested by some recent
research that fostering inclusive practices in schools may result in the overall learning outcomes of the entire school. According to Jenkinson (1997), these initiatives have lead to a considerable growth in the literature on integration and inclusive education, which it is discussed as follows.

For Reganick (1995), Inclusive Education means that all students in school, regardless of their strengths or weaknesses in any area, become part of the school community. They are included in the feeling of belonging to other students, teachers and support staffs. It is based in the idea that every child and family is valued equally and deserves the same opportunities and experiences. Inclusive education is about children with disabilities, building friendships and having opportunities just like everyone else.

In 1995, O’Neil stated that children have the right to be with other children at their own age. The vision of inclusion for him involves schools being restructured so that they should be supportive and nurturing communities that really meet the needs of all children. This claims a much bigger understanding of inclusion. It goes beyond the classrooms, changing aspects such as curriculum, pedagogy, staff allocation and teacher education.

For Barry (1995), the goal of inclusive education is to create a world in which children are welcome and growing comfortable with. It is consistent with diversity, aiming to create a world in which more people have opportunities to know, play and work with another one.

Vaidya and Zaslavsky (2000), claim the philosophy of inclusion aims at helping all children in regular classrooms. Children learn at their own pace and style. Inclusion is about providing the help for children who need to learn and participate in meaningful ways. Children with or without disabilities learn together and from each other in inclusive classes. However as noted by Villa and Thousand (2005), inclusion is still an elusive term. Part of the confusion
arises from the varying assumptions that people associate with inclusive education, standing it is a “program” or that it is a research-devised strategy.

In 2006, The United Nations Convention states in article 24 that people with disabilities should have access to an inclusive, quality, free education on an equal basis with others in the communities in which they live.

Acedo et al. (2009) reflecting on the 48th session of the International Conference on Education (ICE) recommended that policy makers should acknowledge that inclusive education is an on-going process aimed at offering quality education for all while respecting diversity and the different needs students have.

In 2010, the conclusions of the Council of the European Union, note that EU needs to ensure both equity and excellence, by improving educational attainment, reducing poverty and fostering social inclusion.

While mainstreaming allows students with disabilities to be part of a regular education classroom, inclusion ensures their full participation in regular classroom activities by providing certain services.

Salend (2011) defines inclusive education as characterized by:

- A philosophy of acceptance and belonging within a community;
- A philosophy of student, family, educator and community collaboration;
- Celebration of the diversity and value of all learners;
- Valuing educating learners in high-quality schools;
- Valuing educating learners alongside their age peers;
- Valuing educating learners in mainstream classrooms;
- Valuing educating learners in schools in their local community.
For MINEDUC (2013), “educational special needs are not forwarded only to clinical diagnosis categories, but in which are considered as relevant the contextual aspects of the students’ environments associated to the educational, familial and social” (p.12). This is one of the most recent and updated statements in which MINEDUC proposes a broader perspective of inclusion inside the regular school system.

In order to explore the effectiveness of how inclusive education definition is translated into classrooms, it is important to examine how well pre-service teachers are being prepared for inclusive classrooms through teacher education programs.

3. 4 TEACHER TRAINING

3.4.1 Inclusive Pedagogy.

It has been known for three decades that provision of education predicated on predictions of ‘potential’ on the basis of current achievement, reproduces social inequalities (e.g. Ball, 1981), by reifying hierarchies (Hart, Dixon, Drummond & McIntyre, 2004) and by undermining the sense of sense of self-worth in some pupils (Hargreaves 1982, Boaler, William and Brown, 2000). Inclusive pedagogy rejects ability labeling, and offers an alternative framework for organizing learning. Informed by the work of Susan Hart and her colleagues (Hart, op cit), inclusive pedagogy urges teachers to create environments, which do not limit the expectations of both teacher and pupils.

Specifically inclusive pedagogy is opposed to practices, which address education for all by offering provision for most with additional or different experiences for some. Instead it
demands that teachers extend what is ordinarily available so that it is accessible to all (Florian, 2010).

The notion of inclusive pedagogy is not a call for a return to a model of whole class teaching where equality is notionally addressed by providing identical experiences for all.

On the contrary, it advocates an approach whereby the teacher provides a range of options, which are available to everybody. Human diversity is seen within the model of inclusive pedagogy as strength, rather than a problem, as children work together, sharing ideas and learning from their interactions with each other. The inclusive pedagogical approach fosters an open-ended view of each child’s potential to learn (Spratt, J., & Florian, L., 2013).

3.4.2 Teacher Training.

The international moves towards more inclusive education have been evident for more than a decade (Salamanca Declaration, UNESCO, 1994). One of the key issues in promoting inclusive developments has been the initial training and education of teachers to work in a more inclusive school system (Booth, Nes, & Stromstad, 2003).

Several researchers have emphasized the need of training future teachers on inclusion in order to carry out inclusive practices within the classrooms. For Rouse (2010), teacher education on special needs to be re-evaluated to ensure teachers’ efficacy in “knowing” (knowledge), “being” (values) and “doing” (skills). Some academics in the field of inclusive education point out the importance of developing positive values towards inclusion, together with theoretical and practical knowledge. Moreover, Forlin suggests that:

Preparing teachers for inclusion requires teachers to gain both theoretical and practical knowledge. Most critically, though, unlike other educational reforms in recent years, it
also imposes directly on a person’s belief system by challenging their own innermost thoughts about what they consider is right and just. Thus, in addition to gaining formal and practical knowledge during their training, teachers need to have developed positive values, supportive ideas, high moral principles and strong ethical understandings regarding accepting responsibility for the education of all children regardless of the diversity of their needs. (Forlin, 2010b: 649)

Therefore, developing inclusive education means a different reform, which aims to change teachers and societies old paradigms in relation to diversity and special needs. This seems to rely on universities and teachers education programs. Though, any discussion about the nature of teacher education programs on inclusion is considered incomplete if the manner in which they differ from teacher training is not highlighted.

Teacher training emphasizes the development of classroom skills, subject knowledge and the knowledge of official documentation (Reynolds, 2001). Teacher-training institutions often follow such approaches to certify that their graduates have reached predetermined standards. Reynolds (2001) argues that teacher-training institutions, such as the Teacher Training Agency in the UK, detail the skills and knowledge that are required for accreditation purposes but do not include in their programs the educational and evaluative principles that underpin appropriate practice. As a result, teachers who are trained in the required skills may become able to teach effectively, but this does not guarantee that they will value all children in their class equally, a fundamental principle of inclusive education. Teacher training is often associated with in-service courses that aim to promote teachers’ continued professional development. In contrast, teacher education courses are offered by universities rather than teacher-training institutions, and they
are expected to provide teachers with a balanced content and facilitate their development of knowledge, skills and positive attitudes towards inclusion (Symeonidou et al, 2014).

3.4.3 The need to strengthen teacher education.

Cardona in 2009, stresses the importance of developing initial teacher education institutions’ understanding of disability and inclusion. This research recognizes the importance of teacher training preparation within English Teaching Programs in the country since it is a worldwide issue. Not only involves education, but also it is a way to achieve greater social cohesion. In order to have a wider perspective on the topic, several institutions will be quoted to strengthen the idea of preparing pre-service teachers towards an inclusive classroom.

According to the Commission of the European Union (2008), stressed, “the quality of teachers, trainers and other educational staff is the most important within school factor affecting student performance” (p.8).

The Communication from the European Commission on improving competences for the 21st century also emphasized the need for the initial teacher education to improve the balance between theory and practice, and to present teaching as a problem-solving or research-in-action activity linked to children’s learning and progress (Commission of the European Union, 2008a).

Regarding teacher education, the World Report on Disability (World Health Organization, 2011) states:

The appropriate training of mainstream teachers is crucial if they are to be confident and competent in teaching children with diverse needs. The principles of inclusion should be
built into teacher training programs, which should be about attitudes and values, not just knowledge and skills. (World Health Organization, 2011:222)

According to the project synthesis report Teacher Education for Inclusion Across Europe-Challenges and Opportunities (2011), the reform of teacher education must be part of a wider reform. This will involve policy makers to ensure a holistic approach to address the challenges of exclusion. It also highlights the need to clarify the language around inclusion and diversity, so that labeling children and young people can be stopped. This report makes a precedent going beyond teacher’s knowledge, and pointing that pre-service teachers should be ideally placed in inclusive settings with mentors who are trained to demonstrate attitudes and values that support inclusion.

In the report on the International Conference on Inclusive Education it is argued that:
Inclusive education is based on a series of conceptions and values regarding the type of society to be built and the ideal person to be developed. If we want to have more inclusive societies, which are more peaceful and respectful of differences, it is essential that students have the opportunity to develop and experience these values in their education, whether in schools or non-formal settings (UNESCO, 2008:11).

Therefore, it can be seen the narrow idea of inclusion understood as a deficit has moved on accepting it concerns all areas in which human beings are involved.

The International Conference on Inclusive Education states that:
Applying a rights-based approach to education in order to move towards inclusion will require comprehensive school system reform including modification of constitutional guarantees and policies, curricula, teacher training systems, materials, learning environments, methodologies, resource allocation, etc. Above all, it will require a change
in attitudes of all people, throughout the system, to welcome diversity and difference and see these as opportunities rather than problems. (UNESCO, 2008:29)

Thus, both literature and research support the need to move forward initial teacher education that prepares all teachers, to work in inclusive settings. This preparation must maintain academic rigor, educating rather than training teachers. It essentially implies sharing certain terminology and appropriate use of inclusive language (Saloviita, 2005), acquiring certain attitudes and values in relation to integration and inclusion, as well as the knowledge and skills relevant for teaching in inclusive classrooms.

3.5 SELF-EFFICACY

The concept of self-efficacy was first introduced by Bandura (1977). According to him, self-efficacy is a judgment of capability to execute a given type of performance (2006b). Self-efficacy is based on the social cognitive theory which claims people are able to exercise some control over their self-development and life circumstances even though many things depend at least partly on chance (Bandura, 2006a). Seen from this perspective, people are self-organizing, proactive, self-regulating and self-reflecting. Self-efficacy is constructed from four main sources: mastery experiences, seeing people similar to oneself manage task demands successfully, social persuasion and somatic and emotional states (Bandura, 1977; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). From these four sources, mastery experiences are seen as the most powerful (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

Self-efficacy, or “…a belief in one’s personal capabilities…”, (Bandura, 1997, p. 4) is important for teachers to develop in the area of teaching in inclusive classrooms because of its
role in regulating classroom teaching practice. This regulation takes place in four ways, which are cognitive, for example involving what aspirations a teacher has to practice inclusively, and what tasks they choose to undertake; motivational, for example the goals they set and how much they persevere in the face of obstacles; mood or affective, for example, the levels of stress they encounter as a result of engaging in inclusive teaching practice; and selective approaches, the decisions they make in the classroom with respect to creating an inclusive environment and engaging in inclusive pedagogy (Bandura, 1994). According to Bandura, self-efficacy beliefs are developed through experience. These include prior experiences of mastery of the task, social persuasion (where others tell an individual that they are good at something), identifying with another seen as competent in the area (called vicarious experiences), and the emotional variable and physiological state of the individual (Klassen, 2004).

In 1994, Gusky and Passaro also defined teacher efficacy as “teachers’ belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be considered difficult or unmotivated”. Teacher efficacy emerges from a cyclical nature: Higher levels of efficacy beliefs lead to greater efforts by teachers, which in turn leads to better performances, which again provides information for forming higher efficacy beliefs (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

When experienced teachers are exposed to new training, efficacy beliefs seem to remain quite stable. However, even experienced teachers with firm efficacy beliefs may have to re-evaluate their beliefs when facing new challenges, such as teaching in a new type of setting. In addition, it must be remembered that teacher efficacy is context-specific. In other words, teachers may feel efficacious for teaching certain subjects to certain students in certain settings while
perceiving themselves as less efficacious under different circumstances (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Teacher efficacy research has been divided into two strands. In the 1970s, the RAND organization, a non-profit research and analysis institution, added two items dealing with teacher efficacy to their questionnaire. This RAND strand has commonly divided teacher efficacy into the dimensions of general and personal teacher efficacy. The general teacher efficacy refers to teachers’ beliefs about how teachers in general can influence on student learning whereas personal teacher efficacy is a more individual and specific belief about the efficacy of their own teaching.

The second strand of teacher efficacy research, sometimes called the Bandura strand, defines teacher efficacy as a type of self-efficacy. During the last decades, many scales have been built along the Bandura strand of teacher self-efficacy. The effect of various demographic and contextual factors on teacher self-efficacy has also been studied (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). The present study follows Bandura’s definition of teacher efficacy as a type of self-efficacy.

Recent research findings have supported the idea that teacher self-efficacy should be conceptualized as a multidimensional construct. This seems to be true across various countries and cultural contexts. The number of teacher self-efficacy dimensions found in studies has usually varied from three to six, most likely depending on the measurement instrument and the focus of the research. The dimensions have often been associated with classroom management, instruction, motivating and engaging students, and, more recently, cooperating with colleagues and parents (Chan, 2008a, 2008b; Klassen et al., 2009; Romi & Leyser, 2006; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007, 2010; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, 2007).
Teaching self-efficacy is a context specific construct. The notion of general self-efficacy is vague at best and implies the dubious belief that a person can be good at virtually all things, with Bandura noting that self-efficacy occurs within the confines of a particular situation (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). Therefore, teaching self-efficacy studies should be framed in terms of perceptions about performance in a given area. In this study, that area is teaching self-efficacy for inclusive practice. This means exploring feelings of personal competence for teaching in a classroom in which all students, regardless of ability, are educated together in common educational contexts (Andrews & Lupart, 2000). The type of skills involved typically include differentiating instruction, adjusting and configuring curriculum, and adopting pedagogical methods that satisfy the learning needs of a wide variety of learners. Possibly as a result of low feelings of teaching self-efficacy in inclusive teaching practice some educators have reported feelings of anxiety about the implementation of the approach (Macmillan & Meyer, 2006), viewing themselves as being under-trained and under-skilled to meet the demands of managing an increasingly diverse classroom (Andersen, Klassen, & Georgiou, 2007). Research indicates that feelings of teaching self-efficacy for inclusive teaching practice in pre-service teachers are inversely proportional to the perceived severity of the disabilities of students included in the class, i.e. the more severe the disabilities, the less efficacious pre-service teachers feel (Lifshitz & Glaubman 2002). These research findings are of concern because research from general self-efficacy area suggests that teaching is “…powerfully related to many meaningful educational outcomes, including teachers’ persistence, enthusiasm, commitment and instructional behavior, and student outcomes, such as achievement, motivation, and self-efficacy beliefs” (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001, p. 783).
3.5.1 Research on teacher self-efficacy for inclusive education.

The global move toward more inclusive education has also had implications for the research on teacher self-efficacy. There seems to be growing interest towards what is required from teachers of inclusive classrooms and many recently developed instruments measuring self-efficacy contain items dealing with student diversity (Chan, 2008a; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). However, the number of studies with teacher self-efficacy for inclusive education as their main focus is limited (Sharma, Loreman, & Forlin, 2011). These studies have often implemented general teacher efficacy scales (Almog & Shechtman, 2007; Romi & Leyser, 2006; Soodak, Podell, & Lehman, 1998).

Romi and Leyser (2006) conducted a study involving pre-service teachers in Israel and concluded that a positive sense of self-efficacy related to teaching lower achieving students was higher than general teaching self-efficacy and that female students were more positive about inclusion and had higher self-efficacy scores than did males. Clearly, there was an aspect of their teacher education program that enabled these pre-service teachers to view themselves as competent when it came to adjusting their teaching practice to teach a wider range of students. Lancaster and Bain (2007) found that pre-service teacher measures of self-efficacy correlated strongly with their level of participation in an inclusive education course. As noted, the important area regarding pre-service teacher perceptions of teaching self-efficacy with respect to inclusion, which is the focus of this study, has not been adequately addressed.

To fill this gap Sharma et al. (2011) have developed a new research instrument, Teacher Self-efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale. The TEIP scale aims to measure perceived teacher efficacy for teaching in inclusive settings and its developers as well as the recent study by Savolainen, Engelbrecht, Nel, and Malinen (2012) suggest that the scale can be divided into
three sub-scales efficacy in using inclusive instructions, for efficacy in collaboration, and
efficacy in managing behavior.

Meijer and Foster (1988) discovered that Dutch teachers with higher self-efficacy scores
were more likely to feel that it was appropriate to place a problem student in a regular classroom.
Weisel and Dror (2006), who studied Israeli elementary school teachers, concluded that teachers
with a high level of self-efficacy had more positive attitudes towards inclusive education.
Furthermore, the results of Soodak et al. (1998) indicated that US general educators’ receptivity
towards inclusion was associated with higher teacher efficacy. A path analysis by Brownell and
Pajares (1999) revealed that teacher efficacy beliefs had a direct effect on their perceived success
in instructing special education students studying in regular classrooms. Moreover, Almog and
Shechtman (2007), who observed Israeli inclusive classrooms, concluded that teachers with
higher teacher efficacy were coping better with several types of student problem behavior.
Additionally, Savolainen et al. (2012) who studied Finnish and South African in-service teachers
by using the Teacher Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale found that the self-
efficacy, especially efficacy in collaboration, had positive relationship with the attitudes towards
inclusive education. Several studies have also found that teachers who have previous experience
teaching students with special educational needs hold more positive attitudes than teachers with

Other researchers have also noted the episodic nature of beliefs. Their studies have shown
that the educational beliefs that students of teaching hold significantly influence their perceptions
and judgments that they make about their own and others’ teaching, as well as their interpretation
and development of professional knowledge (e.g., Calderhead, 1988; Calderhead & Robson,
1991; Clark, 1988; Feiman Nemser & Remillard, 1996; Goodman, 1988).
Woolfson and colleagues (2007) claimed that the connection between teacher beliefs and their behaviors in the classroom are linked to personally based beliefs, values and principles. Therefore, initial formation of pre-service teachers is pointed out as one of the key aspects to transform inclusive policies into classroom practices.

Harvey et al. (2010) reported a number of advantages in current practice in teacher preparation at the pre-service level concerning inclusion. First, they noted significant agreement that institutions were offering coursework to pre-service candidates regarding exceptional children and/or special education across all departments and program areas; second, they found that students were taking introductory courses in this area; third, the respondents indicated that field experiences provided opportunities for pre-service teachers to collaborate across disciplines and major fields of study. In general, research has shown that when teachers have positive mindsets toward inclusion, they more readily adapt their teaching methods to meet a variety of student learning needs. This conclusion suggests that the inclusion movement would benefit from research that identifies effective ways to assist teachers in the formation of positive attitudes and beliefs toward inclusion (Leyser & Tappendorf, 2001; Voltz, Brazil, & Ford, 2008). Consequently, pre-service training may be viewed as the appropriate time to examine teachers' feelings and modify any negative attitudes about inclusion or individuals with disabilities.

As seen before, some theorists in the field education point out the importance of developing positive values towards inclusion, alongside theoretical and practical knowledge. For example, Forlin suggests that:

Preparing teachers for inclusion requires teachers to gain both theoretical and practical knowledge. Most critically, though, unlike other educational reforms in recent years, it also imposes directly on a person’s belief system by challenging their own innermost
thoughts about what they consider is right and just. Thus, in addition to gaining formal and practical knowledge during their training, teachers need to have developed positive values, supportive ideas, high moral principles and strong ethical understandings regarding accepting responsibility for the education of all children regardless of the diversity of their needs. (Forlin, 2010b: 649)

As inclusive education continues to gain strength through years, it is important to understand how educators perceive the academic outcomes of students with diverse needs and abilities (Hemmings & Woodcock, 2011). Since it is discussed previously, it is well known that teacher’s initial formation can shape knowledge and provide strategies to work with SEN students in a better way. It is also known teachers’ past experiences as learners are powerful in shaping conceptions and expectations about teaching students, and form beliefs about the process of teaching during their pre-service training as well. It is also being stressed that once a belief has been held for a long time it becomes difficult to change (Woolfolk-Hoy & Spero, 2005). Consequently, pre-service training is a critical period during which beliefs are more likely to be influenced by external sources.

To measure teachers’ self-efficacy for inclusive education, in the context of inclusive education of special needs children, Sharma, Loreman and Forlin (2012) developed the teacher efficacy for inclusive practices (TEIP) scale to measure and analyze data collected in four different countries. Based on results from an exploratory factor analysis (EFA), Sharma, Loreman and Forlin (2012) (see Figure 1) identified three factors that cause the data for eighteen items in the TEIP scale, namely: efficacy to use inclusive instructions (EII), efficacy in collaboration (EC) and efficacy in managing behavior (EMB).
The first dimension in the scale corresponds to inclusive instructions, specifically related to teachers’ instructional skills and behavior management strategies (Romi and Leyser, 2006). For Ahsan, Deppeler & Sharma in 2013 in their study (2013), a number of specific instructional strategies that early childhood educators would particularly need in inclusive classrooms include embedded instruction, differentiated instruction, and activity-based and experiential learning. Their research showed that in spite of challenges experienced by pre-service teachers in managing student behavior in inclusive settings, pre-service teachers that reported higher levels of self-efficacy had more success in managing student behavior in inclusive classrooms (Main and Hammond, 2008; Mergler and Tangen, 2010).

The sense of collaboration is another factor measured by the TEIP scale (Sharma, Loreman and Forlin, 2012). The dimension of self-efficacy in collaboration refers to cooperation with student families and professionals. Collaboration among teachers and other professionals is especially necessary for pre-school and elementary school teachers because of the nature of their position. For example, early childhood educators are required to collaborate with speech, physical or occupational therapists to meet the needs of children with disabilities in their classrooms (Friend and Cook, 2013).

The third scale factor in the TEIP scale relates to managing behavior. This factor reflects the conception that teacher’s self-efficacy towards inclusion shapes students’ achievement and behaviors as well as teachers’ attitudes and classroom management skills (Ahsan, Sharma and Deppeler, 2012; Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2001).
4. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The following part describes the methodological paradigm that was used in this study as well as the instrument and participants involved.

4.1 METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

This study is considered to be a quantitative survey-based research rather than qualitative, even though there is a questionnaire that measures the perceptions of self-efficacy, quantitative inquiry allows to organize perceptions in high and low levels, which is the case here.

This study used quantification to determine the EFL pre-service teachers who had higher levels of perception of self-efficacy to then further analyze answers and previous experiences related to SEN in their teaching programs. Furthermore, the research design corresponds to a non-experimental design. According to Sampieri (2010) non-experimental studies correspond to those without intended manipulation of variables and the phenomena are observed in their natural environment to analyze them later. It is considered suitable for this research since the aim is not modify the conditions, as it is also an exploratory research.

As mentioned above, an exploratory study was chosen since examining the perceptions of self-efficacy to teach inclusion within pre-service teachers of English has not been studied in this particular setting before (Sampieri, 2010). It is not only an unknown topic in the city, but also within the country. This allowed the researcher to obtain information about the possibility to carry out a more complete research on the area of self-efficacy in inclusion so that improvements can be planned for English teaching programs and local schools.
Additionally, the data collection instrument that satisfied the main relevant areas related to this approach, was a Likert scale. It is defined by Sampieri (2010) as set of items that appear as affirmative sentences to measure the reaction of the subject in three, five or seven categories. For the purpose of this research, a five-category scale was selected. This permitted the researcher to assign a specific number, and results can be obtained adding up the answers in each statement, in an additive scale. The instrument used was the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices Scale known as TEIP (Loreman, Sharma and Forlin, 2013), which was used for other researchers in different countries recently. Although previous versions were answered through paper, this instrument was sent via online, so that pre-service teachers from different places can have better access to answer the survey.
Figure 1

Previous version of TEIP Scale

Appendix A: Self-efficacy in Implementing inclusive practices scale

This survey is designed to help us understand the nature of factors influencing the success of routine classroom activities in creating an inclusive classroom environment. Please circle the number that best represents your opinion about each of the statements. Please attempt to answer each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the context of inclusive education of special needs children, Sharma, Loreman and Forlin (2012) developed the teacher efficacy for inclusive practices (TEIP) scale to measure teachers’ self-efficacy for inclusive education and analyzed TEIP data collected in four different countries. Based on results from an exploratory factor analysis (EFA), Sharma, Loreman and Forlin (2012) (see Figure 1) identified three factors that cause the data for eighteen items in the TEIP scale, namely: efficacy to use inclusive instructions (EII), efficacy in collaboration (EC) and efficacy in managing behavior (EMB).

In another study, the TEIP scale was used to examine differences in self-efficacy to teach in inclusive classrooms of pre-service teachers from Canada, Australia, Hong Kong and Indonesia (Loreman, Sharma and Forlin, 2013). It was also used to identify variables that impact the perceived teaching efficacy of pre-service teachers towards inclusive education in Bangladesh (Ahsan, Sharma and Deppeler, 2012).

The TEIP items include those relating to assessment, classroom management, instruction, working with others, and professional issues. Respondents indicate their answers on a six-point Likert scale of Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Disagree Somewhat (3), Agree Somewhat (4), Agree (5), and Strongly Agree (6). A higher score suggests more positive feelings of teaching self-efficacy specific to inclusive education.

Given this increasing trend of using the TEIP scale in studies on readiness of pre-service teachers to teach in inclusive classrooms (Loreman, Sharma and Forlin, 2013), it is considered the most appropriate collecting instrument to use it within the Chilean context, in the city of Chillan.

The TEIP scale is considered suitable since questionnaires are appropriate instruments for collecting data on what people think or believe about certain issues (Griffèe, D. T., 2012).
Besides, it is expected to gather a substantial amount of data in a fairly period of time available. A questionnaire is also a flexible instrument, which allows to be managed in a large group, by different means, such as telephone or e-mail. Although the questionnaire has been developed and used by others, the questionnaire was applied as a pilot version within the context of this research, in order to ensure statements were clear and understood by everyone. Thus, a small sample of similar characteristics was surveyed in one of the three universities mentioned before, but including this time, a group of undergraduate students enrolled in fourth year.

Within the TEIP questionnaire, self-efficacy in inclusion could be constructed by analyzing its three main components; Efficacy to use inclusive instructions, efficacy in collaboration and efficacy in managing behavior. Those three domains have six statements as table 1 details.

**Table 1**

**Descriptor and their domain in the TEIP Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy to use inclusive instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 RESEARCH SAMPLE

Participants are a purposeful sample of pre-service teachers enrolled in an undergraduate teacher preparation program as a teacher training institution in the city of Chillan, a city located 416 kilometers south of Santiago, in Chile. All pre-service teachers are preparing to teach in regular classrooms at preschool, primary or secondary level.

According to the curriculum, pre-service teachers are usually sent to schools at least in two instances so that they can be exposed to the educative community and the interactions the entire process involves. Usually, the first instance pre-service teachers have is the practicum in fourth year. This normally happens during the second semester of the year, while they are attending classes in other courses too. Simultaneously, they are provided a course on practicum that intends to offer the theoretical aspects such as group management techniques, as well as to teach pre-service teachers the administrative role teachers have at schools. In fifth year as part of the subjects in the teaching program, pre-service teachers are insert in a school during a semester where they take responsibilities as an in-service teacher, being in charge of a group of students, but guided by a supervisor from the university and a teacher at school. The aim of this instance is
to prepare trainee teachers for the authentic teaching scenario, having almost all responsibilities a regular teacher has.

Though it is well known by teacher educators that many trainee teachers exposed for the first time to the classroom environment can suffer from anxiety, it is also acknowledged, that at this stage in their formative education, future teachers have a better perspective of the competences and tools they have acquired when graduating university.

Although previous versions of the instrument were in hard copy, participants answered an online version of the TEIP scale for this research. The data was collected via online because of the difficulties trainee teachers may have to attend meetings. It was also considered a better option in terms of time availability.

It was decided to focus this survey on the three English Teaching Programs in the city of Chillan, Chile in order to obtain a broader perspective in the results. The three universities providing English teaching programs in the city were invited to participate in the survey. Once providers agreed to be contacted, the online survey access details were sent out to the Program Directors. They were also asked to send the list of info of their undergraduate students that are in the last year of their teaching program so that the web-link can be distributed.

4.3 DATA COLLECTION

The open access online of the questionnaire is going to be used rather than a paper questionnaire to maximize the response rate and to aid analysis. Respondents would complete the questionnaire and the website will save the information automatically.
The questionnaires were piloted with the first group at one of the universities mentioned before. Comments on the format and asseverations within the questionnaire were expected to make proper modifications.

After modifying, universities authorities were contacted for legal permission. Pre-service students were mailed, together with a letter and a web link to complete the questionnaire. Once it was completed, the collected data was tabulated for further analysis and interpretation using Excel and SPSS 21.

According to the classic theory, the reliability is defined as the grade in which an instrument of several items measures consistency a sample of the population. The consistency measurement refers to the grade in which a measurement is free of errors. The reliability coefficient expresses itself with the letter r and indicates the force of the association. The value r changes between -1 and +1, a value of 0 indicates that relation does not exist between two scores, while a value near to –1 or to +1 indicates a very nearby, negative or positive relation, respectively. A positive value indicates that the people with high score place in the first application of the scale also will punctuate high place during the second occasion.

The coefficient alpha was described in 1951 by Lee J. Cronbach. It is an index used to measure the reliability of the type internal consistency of a scale, that is to say, to evaluate the magnitude in which the items of an instrument are correlated (Cortina 1993; Kupermintz 2004). In other words, the Cronbach alpha is the average of the interrelations between the items that do part of an instrument (Streiner, 2003). Also it is possible to conceive this coefficient as the measurement in which some construct, concept or measured factor is present in every item. Generally, a group of items that explores a common factor shows a high value of alpha of Cronbach (Cortina 1993; Rogers, W. M., Schmitt, N., & Mullins, M. E., 2002).
4.4 EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This research was conducted in a particular context, when there is a strong criticism of teacher education and training, and a growing concern with respect to SEN and inclusion, as discussed. On one hand, MINEDUC is making efforts creating policies and managing resources to provide Chilean students quality education. Most universities on the other hand, are working to meet the requirements the new standards of quality have, restructuring their curriculum as well as being part of several meetings with the English Opens Doors Program (PIAP) in the last years, including SEN as one of their more recent concerns.

This study aims to explore pre-service teachers of English self-efficacy with respect to inclusion. A study on this topic is relevant and may bring heightened awareness of issues that need to be addressed within the EFL area in Chile. Since the efforts made by the country encourage teachers to work within a diverse classroom, it should be a main concern to provide the right tools to those pre-service teachers who will be in charge of educating the new generations.

This exploratory research is also a base for future descriptive research in order to have more data in relation to inclusion effectiveness and how English Teaching Programs are providing tools for students within the city and along the country.

Research such as this will inform teacher educators with respect to how pre-service teachers feel about their teaching self-efficacy for inclusive teaching practices, so that more effective courses may be developed to address pre-service teachers’ concerns.

One limitation of this study is the risk of a low response rate from the participants that can be regarded as tentative results. A second limitation is the condition of self-administered
questionnaires. Once it is mailed to participants, the completion is under varying conditions, unknown to the researcher.

It must be remembered that this study examines reported inclusion teaching self-efficacy, not actual efficacy in classroom practice. Many teacher educators know that where pre-service teachers are concerned, perception does not always match the reality of classroom practice (Gravett, Henning, & Eiselen, 2011). In that respect, this study does not represent any sort of program evaluation in terms of how well each institution is preparing its pre-service teachers of English for inclusion, though some teaching programs may be unwilling to respond because of this.

A higher score indicates more positive feelings of teaching self-efficacy specific to inclusive education.
5. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

As it is explained earlier, this research aims to explore EFL pre-service teachers’ self-efficacy. To do so, the *Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice* (TEIP) scale (Sharma, Loreman and Forlin, 2011) was used to measure pre-service teachers’ beliefs on their own abilities towards inclusive practices, in other words, their perceived teaching-efficacy for inclusive education. The TEIP scale consists of 18 items (e.g. I am able to provide an alternative explanations or example when students are confused) that measure three different aspects of perceived teaching-efficacy for inclusive education. These items are distributed across three subscales that measure Efficacy to use inclusive instructions, Efficacy in collaboration and Efficacy in managing behavior. This scale uses a six-point Likert scale of Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (6). The TEIP scale yields a total score, the value of, which can range from 18 to 108. Higher scores indicate high magnitude of perceived teaching-efficacy of EFL pre-service teachers for inclusive education.

5.1 DATA ANALYSIS

The statistical data analysis was done using SPSS Statistics 21 and Microsoft Excel 14.4.8. The reliability of the scale was analyzed by means of Cronbach’s alpha using the following formula:

\[
\alpha = \frac{K}{K - 1} \left[ 1 - \frac{\sum S_i^2}{S_T^2} \right]
\]
Cronbach’s alpha for the TEIP scale was 0.85. The reliability coefficient for the total scale was 0.97 suggesting that the scale has adequate reliability to measure the construct.

With the SPSS 21 software, mean scores and standard deviation were analyzed for both each item, and also for each of the three dimensions (Efficacy to use inclusive instructions, Efficacy in collaboration and Efficacy in managing).

To measure variance and analyze extra information related to EFL pre-service teachers connection with Inclusive Education, Microsoft Excel was used.

5.2 RESULTS

The questionnaire was sent through e-mail to the whole population, that is, 44 EFL pre-service teachers, yet 40 students respond the questionnaire. Thus the sample reached 91% from the total population.

Mean scores correspond to the average score. Data was analyzed to obtain mean score for each item, which are shown in table 2.

Table 2:
Mean score and standard deviation in each item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy to use inclusive instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficacy in collaboration
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1,477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficacy in managing behavior**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The overall mean score of the perceived teaching-efficacy of the pre-service teachers on the TEIP scale was 4.22. A score close to value 4 on the TEIP scale refers to participants “Agree somewhat” with the statements that measure their perceived teaching-efficacy towards inclusive education. Thus, pre-service teachers in this study had relatively high level of perceived teaching-efficacy towards inclusive education. Scores of the EFL pre-service teachers in three factors of the TEIP were also analyzed. It was revealed that pre-service teachers had highest score (M=4.24) in Efficacy in managing behavior factors, followed by (M=4.22) Efficacy to use inclusive instructions. Among three factors, the lowest level of teaching-efficacy (M=4.19) was found in Efficacy in collaboration factor. For the purpose of this research, data from each item will be analyzed based on the participants’ responses.
Graph 1 shows EFL pre-service teachers had high levels of self-efficacy in relation to the use of assessment strategies, only 9 of them believed they were not completely able to work with different instruments of assessment. The mean score was 4.48.

Graph 2

As graph 2 shows, more than 60% of the participants thought they were able to provide more clear instructions for those students who do not understand. The mean score was 4.65.
In terms of task designs, 44% of the participants are not confident enough, the term disabilities is included in the statement, which can make results vary. The mean score was 3.85.

**Graph 4**

In graph 4, the answers show participants had higher levels of self-efficacy in relation to the judgment on student comprehension. The mean score was 3.83.
In item 5, pre-service teachers evidenced high levels of self-efficacy in terms of challenging capable students. The mean score was 4.55.

In relation to anticipate disruptive behavior, 70% of EFL trainee teachers answered positively. The mean score was 4.03.
With respect to the ability to handle disruptive behavior only a 20% of participants think they can’t control disruptive behavior. The results suggest students have high self-efficacy in terms of classroom management. The mean score was 4.33.

Graph 8

From Graph 8, 9 participants answered they were not able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy. The mean score was 4.25.
From 44 participants, 31 thought they were capable of getting children to follow the rules of the classroom, while 9 of them thought they were not. The mean score was 4.65.

As graph 10 shows, there are only a few participants in the extremes, while the majority remains in the middle. Results suggest EFL pre-service teachers thought they have some difficulties to deal with physically aggressive students. The mean score is 3.70. As expected EFL pre-service presented rather low level of self-efficacy in terms of aggressive behavior in students.
In relation to graph 11, 34 participants show positive levels of self-efficacy on providing clear expectations about student behavior. The mean score is 4.50.

**Graph 12**

In relation to collaboration with families, 18 participants thought they had low levels of self-efficacy in this area. Results may be explained because of the low level of exposure trainee teachers have to parents. The mean score is 4.15.
Graph 13 shows a high level of self-efficacy in terms of working collaboratively with others.

Results suggest EFL pre-service teachers are willing to work with other professionals to teach SEN in the EFL classroom. The mean score was 4.83.

**Graph 14**

As it is shown by graph 14, pre-service teachers expressed low levels of self-efficacy in relation to make parents get involved. This is may be one of the lowest results, which could be explained because of the lack of exposure to the entire school community during their practicums. The mean score was 3.85.
From graph 15, 13 participants expressed they disagree with the statement in relation to parent collaboration, while a 27 have positive levels of self-efficacy. The mean score was 4.58.

An important 47% of the participants feel they are not prepared to work with other professionals in curricular design for students with disabilities. The results may suggest one of the most relevant weaknesses or aspects that need to be strength. The mean score was 4.08.
With respect to confidence levels in collaboration, very interesting information was revealed. Graph 17 shows an important number of EFL pre-service teachers who thought they were not confident enough to share their theoretical knowledge on inclusion of students with disabilities. This could be complemented with information obtained in Graph 20 where only a 10% of the participants said they received theoretical knowledge on inclusion as part of their initial formation. Data collected suggests a more solid theoretical background should be provided. This item represents the lowest mean score that was 3.65.

**Graph 18**

### Item 18

- 0 Strongly disagree
- 6 Disagree
- 9 Disagree somewhat
- 14 Agree somewhat
- 8 Agree
- 3 Strongly agree

18. I am confident in adapting school-wide or state-wide assessment so that students with all **disabilities can be assessed.**
In graph 18, most participants’ opinions remain in the middle of the descriptors. There are a considerable number of pre-service students who thought they are not able to adapt assessments for all the diverse disabilities students may have. This item does not focus on a certain disabilities but it refers to SEN in general. Results suggest again that theory on inclusion, specifically curricular adaptations should be enhanced. Yet, the mean score was 3.98 considered as positive levels of self-efficacy in this area.

As the data collected shows, the lowest levels of self-efficacy are related to the dimension of collaborative work, especially with parents but also with other professionals in terms of collaborative work adapting plans and assessment. Another aspect that should be highlighted is the lack of confidence that almost half of the participants showed in relation to laws and other theoretical knowledge on the subject.

Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy (1998) suggest in their studies, the importance of efficacy emerges from its nature: higher levels of efficacy beliefs lead to greater efforts by teachers which in turn leads to better performances, which again provides information for forming higher efficacy beliefs.

Nevertheless self-efficacy should be considered as context-specific, which means teachers may feel efficacious for teaching certain subjects to certain students in certain settings while perceiving themselves as less efficacious under different circumstances (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998)

5.3 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

In addition to the TEIP scale, participants responded 2 questions for information about theoretical and practical knowledge on inclusive education.
From Graph 19 it can be concluded only a 10% of the sample had a course or a unit on inclusion in their English teaching programs, while there is 90% of them who did not have theoretical knowledge provided by universities.

Graph 20: Initial formation on practical knowledge on inclusion

The results in Graph 20 show 57% of EFL pre-service teachers were exposed to work with SEN students, while 43% did not have the opportunity. This 43% of the participants may have a disadvantage for those EFL trainee teachers when they have to face inclusive classrooms.

Research suggests (Loreman, T., Sharma, U., & Forlin, C., 2013:28) how teachers perceive their teaching self-efficacy has a lot to do with the attitudes they hold, and the
knowledge and skills they believe they have developed. Therefore, results from these extra questions could be supplemented by the knowledge, skills and attitudes EFL pre-service teachers had from their own training and experience.

Having a broader perspective of the data gathered, it can be identified the highest and lowest mean scores in the TEIP scale. The highest perception of self-efficacy to teach in inclusive classrooms corresponded to the item 13, in which the mean score reached 4.83. The item refers to working collaboratively with others. Results in Graph 13 suggest EFL trainee teachers are willing to work with other professionals to teach SEN in the EFL classroom, so that students can have equal opportunities to learn a foreign language. This shows pre-service teachers have a positive attitude towards collaborative work, but also towards inclusion. There is recognition of the access of education regardless physical impairment or disabilities. It is also a positive aspect to emphasize that current generations of EFL trainees are able to do team work with other professionals inside schools, which is something necessary to improve the quality of education.

On the contrary, a 3.65 32 was the lowest mean score belonging to the same dimension, which is collaboration. Nevertheless, the item is related to share the theoretical knowledge on inclusion of students with disabilities. The low score can be explained because pre-service teachers may feel rather insecure of their own knowledge, but also can be understood better as a group of students who are not prepared from the theoretical point of view to face inclusive settings. This can be reinforced with the results obtained in Graph 20, where only a 10% of the participants responded they received theoretical knowledge on inclusion as part of their initial formation. Willingness is important, as well as attitude, yet is not enough when it comes to do an
effective work teaching in EFL inclusive classrooms. Data collected suggests a more solid theoretical background should be provided by universities.
6. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate Chillan EFL pre-service teachers’ self-efficacy for inclusive education. This research replicated previous studies in other countries (Sharma et al., 2011; Savolainen P., Mannering F., Lord D., & Quddus M., 2011) using the TEIP scale (Sharma et al., 2012) as an instrument to measure the levels of self-efficacy teachers have towards inclusion. The TEIP scale is a Likert scale that can be divided into three sub-scales: efficacy in using inclusive instructions, efficacy in collaboration, and efficacy in managing behavior.

As it is mentioned in the introduction, the main objective was to explore the perceptions in relation to how prepared future teachers of English are regarding inclusive scenario that they will have to face in schools in Chillan since the Chilean government and many other international institutions promote inclusive education as not only SEN students benefit from it, but the whole society. Three specific objectives aimed to identify EFL pre-service teachers’ perceptions in relation to the three dimensions or subscales in the TEIP scale. The dimensions are: self-efficacy in inclusive instructions, self-efficacy in collaboration and self-efficacy in managing behavior.

As it has already been explained, self-efficacy in inclusive instructions is characterized by using strategies to adapt instructions to multiple ways necessary for students, in order to achieve the desire outcome. It also involves teachers to analyze the language needs of students, and their individual characteristics. In literature, inclusive instruction is associated to teachers’ effectiveness to promote inclusion and support children’s learning in inclusive settings (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Dozier and Berlotti, 2000). For instance, a number of specific instructional
strategies that educators would need particularly in inclusive classrooms include embedded instruction, differentiated instruction, activity-based and experiential learning.

The sense of collaboration is another factor measured by the TEIP scale (Sharma, Loreman and Forlin, 2012). The dimension of self-efficacy in collaboration refers to cooperation with student families and professionals. Collaboration among teachers and other professionals is especially necessary for pre-school and elementary school teachers because of the nature of their position. For example, early childhood educators are required to collaborate with speech, physical or occupational therapists to meet the needs of children with disabilities in their classrooms (Friend and Cook, 2013).

The third scale factor in the TEIP scale relates to managing behavior. This factor reflects the conception that teacher’s self-efficacy towards inclusion shapes students’ achievement and behaviors as well as teachers’ attitudes and classroom management skills (Ahsan, Sharma and Deppeler, 2012; Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2001).

In order to examine the responses provided by pre-service teachers’ of English towards inclusive instruction in EFL classrooms, data was analyzed to calculate the mean among the items in each dimension.

Items within the factor of inclusive instructions obtained a mean score of 4.22, which represents a positive level of self-efficacy. Graphs previously examined in chapter 5 demonstrated the lowest levels of self-efficacy are found in the estimation of the students’ comprehension. Results could be explained as teachers’ lack of knowledge on the medical conditions can lead them to misjudge students’ comprehension or interest in the lesson.

The second specific objective of this study was to identify EFL pre-service teachers’ perceptions in relation to managing behavior in EFL classrooms. The mean score in the
dimension reached 4.24, as it is considered as high level of self-efficacy. Therefore, results indicate EFL pre-service teachers’ perceptions in relation to managing behavior are positive. EFL trainee teachers expressed they were able to make students follow classroom rules, while the lowest level of self-efficacy in this dimension was the confidence in dealing with students with aggressive behavior.

The third specific objective was to identify EFL pre-service teachers’ perceptions in relation to collaboration in EFL classrooms. The dimension of self-efficacy in collaboration refers to cooperation with student families and professionals. The examination of the EFL pre-service teachers responses revealed that one of the highest level of self-efficacy in the dimension of collaboration was in relation to co-teaching with other specific professionals inside the classroom. On the contrary, the item with the lowest level of self-efficacy in collaboration indicated lesson plan design for students with disabilities was perceived as difficult. Another interesting result from this dimension was the low level of self-efficacy EFL pre-service teachers had to support parents with SEN students. The information collected suggests future teachers of English should be exposed to real inclusive situations as it is considered that the beliefs that are developed during practicums and initial formation are the base of educators’ decisions.

Previous information is supported by an important group of researchers in literature such as Guo, Justice and Sawyer (2011), Hoy and Spero (2005), McGinty, Justice and Rimm-Kaufman (2008) who stand the value of encouraging collaboration among teachers, school professionals and parents. Additionally, increased collaboration among school personnel is viewed as strong predictors of successful classroom instruction (Marks and Louis, 1997; McGinty, Justice and Rimm-Kaufman, 2008). Guo, Justice and Sawyer (2011) note that collaboration is one of the main factors that may enable teachers to improve their management of
difficult situations connected to teaching children with low level of engagement, therefore supporting teachers’ self-efficacy. For Guo, Justice and Sawyer (2011) to improve teachers’ self-efficacy, it is critical to promote collaboration among teachers since teachers’ higher level of collaboration is positively connected to self-efficacy.

To sum up, due to the fact that TEIP scale has been used in various research projects, it can be considered as a reliable and valid instrument. Furthermore, from the three self-efficacy factors, efficacy in managing behavior had the highest mean score (4.24), which can be translated as EFL pre-service teachers having high levels of confidence in classroom management in inclusive classrooms. This dimension was followed by efficacy in inclusive instructions collaboration with mean score of 4.22. Results are also positive in this area, where trainee teachers’ perceptions show they feel able to provide inclusive instructions. In contrast, the dimension with the lowest mean score in inclusive education was efficacy in collaboration (4.19). Results obtained had a significant relationship with extra information asked to the participants in which they evidenced the lack of knowledge on inclusive education (see Graph 19). General mean score was 4.22, which indicated a high level of self-efficacy in students from English teaching programs in Chillan.

As can be seen, these results suggest that future pre- and in-service teacher education in English training programs should emphasize developing teachers’ self-efficacy, particularly collaboration skills. In addition, competence in classroom instruction and behavior management should be also trained. Building self-efficacy in collaboration may require changes in initial teacher training programs as providing courses on inclusive education as well as inclusive practicums. Self-efficacy theory and the findings of this study suggest that self-efficacy of future teachers might be higher towards inclusion if they had more positive learning experiences in
inclusive teaching in collaboration with their peer teacher trainees during initial teacher training programs.
The results of this study have a number of implications for English teacher educators. Firstly, it must be considered that pre-service teachers involved in this research were at the end of their studies. This means they are expected to have a wider perspective of the tools and specific competences obtained in EFL, but mostly those general competences in teaching strategies universities have provided for them in terms of pedagogical knowledge and training. Nonetheless, the three groups examined had different levels of training, different number of hours in schools and singular courses in their teacher preparation programs. In that respect, this study does not represent any sort of program evaluation in terms of how well each institution is preparing its pre-service teachers of English for inclusion. Rather, the results provide information for program emphasis in order to address specific areas of low teaching self-efficacy.

Secondly, it must be remembered that this study examines reported inclusion teaching self-efficacy perceptions, not actual efficacy in classroom practice. Many teacher educators know that where pre-service teachers are concerned, perception does not always match the reality of classroom practice (Gravett, Henning, & Eiselen, 2011). For this reason, a direct link between higher teaching self-efficacy for inclusion scores on this scale and subsequent competent inclusive classroom practice should not be assumed. Therefore, this measure represents only their personal perception of confidence, knowledge, fears, doubts and beliefs with respect to inclusion and their own skills.

7.1 LIMITATIONS

Though 90% of EFL trainee teachers in the city were covered in this research, representing the level of self-efficacy in Chillan, this study does not represent the situation of all
Chilean EFL pre-service teachers. Besides, the three factors of teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practices that were extracted in the current study may not be able to reveal the complexity of such self-efficacy totally and there may be other factors contributing to EFL pre-service teachers’ sense of efficacy.

Finally, the results were based on a cross-sectional analysis. Hence inferences about teacher self-efficacy towards inclusive education have to be done with caution as no observation was carried out to determine self-efficacy correlated with real practice inside schools.

**7.2 SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**7.2.1 Suggestions**

Findings of this study have several implications for further research but also for EFL teaching educators in the Chilean context.

An interesting possibility could be using TEIP scale with larger samples and diverse populations of pre-service teachers in order to have a more accurate perspective of what English teaching programs in the country need to reinforce in the curriculum. Longitudinal data would tell us more about how changes in time and contextual factors affect teacher self-efficacy and attitudes towards inclusion.

Another option is to expand the approach taken in this study as a descriptive research in which observation and other instruments could be applied to identify factors affecting EFL teachers to work successfully in inclusive English classrooms in order to provide better tools for teaching programs, but also to satisfy current educational demands. This research could also be expanded to the other aspects and members of the community such as parents and students perspectives.
Other implications would be to consider EFL in-service teachers to analyze their level of self-efficacy as they are also expected to be flexible enough to provide inclusive environments in their classrooms. Relevant findings can be discovered since they were taught under different EFL/ESL approaches; because they are required to work changing their teaching styles and strategies, levels of self-efficacy may change.

Results of this research might be homogenous, and it can be explained since Chillan is a small city and the notion of inclusion is mainly associated to disabilities. However, relevant information could be extracted if the location of this research is changed to a different city, where inclusion can be expanded to social aspects, such as immigrants in Santiago or in Calama. In the same way, TEIP scale could also be applied to measure self-efficacy in other inclusive contexts as EFL teachers in hospitals and prisons.

A final suggestion would be to measure EFL pre-service teachers’ perceptions in other cities where the number of universities is larger, taking into account EFL trainees are exposed to more varied inclusive contexts than in Chillan. Thus, collecting future data from similar studies is going to be fundamental to improve the inclusive model in the EFL area.

### 7.3 Recommendations

While the results obtained suggest that inclusive teaching dimensions such as managing behavior or inclusive instruction have high levels on self-efficacy, important areas for attention by teacher preparation programs, regardless of context, include raising the confidence of English pre-service teachers in teaching students with disabilities, and providing them with opportunities for authentic face-to-face interactions and practical teaching experiences with students with disabilities in inclusive settings.
As in Bandura’s words high self-efficacy is relevant since it is a predictor of increased motivation to achieve goals and feeling more comfortable in coping with unfavorable environments (Bandura, 1997). For many other researchers self-efficacy has many benefits such as Woolfolk (2007) who stands teachers’ perceived teaching-efficacy has a relationship with students’ academic achievement, likewise changes in the level of teaching-efficacy beliefs are associated with teachers' performance. Teachers who have a high level of perceived teaching-efficacy use a range of behavior management techniques (Woolfolk, Rosoff, & Hoy, 1990), do more practical activities and follow effective teaching-learning methods (Guskey, 1988). They also take more initiatives in order to meet learning needs of all students and set higher level of goals to be achieved by themselves and their students (Mergler & Tangen, 2010). Moreover, teachers with high teaching-efficacy tend to show behavioral characteristics such as effort taking, decision making, keeping patience in challenging situations and also improving students’ motivation, which results in their students’ high achievement (Paneque & Barbetta, 2006). For the reasons mentioned above, EFL teaching institutions should provide more reflective environments where students can develop critical thinking on their own practices and challenges so that students can be aware of their levels of self-efficacy in EFL inclusive classrooms.
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APPENDIX

APPENDIX A: LETTERS

Chillán, Lunes 23 de Noviembre de 2015

Directora Pedagogía en Inglés:

Mi nombre es Karla Venegas, actualmente estudiante de Postgrado del Magíster en Enseñanza del Inglés como Lengua Extranjera de la Universidad Andrés Bello, sede Concepción.

El propósito de esta carta es solicitar su autorización para realizar el cuestionario TEIP (Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices), el cual tiene relación con los conceptos que los estudiantes de quinto año de pedagogía en inglés tienen acerca de la inclusión. Esto, como un requerimiento para obtener el título de Magíster en Enseñanza del Inglés como Lengua Extranjera.

Debido a lo mencionado anteriormente, es que solicito a usted autorización para llevar a cabo la encuesta y al mismo tiempo solicito acceso a los correos de los estudiantes para enviarles el link de este breve cuestionario.

Es relevante mencionar que toda la información es de carácter confidencial y anónima. Muchas gracias por su tiempo.

Cordialmente,

Karla Venegas Zurita

16.734.852-1

Alumna Tesista UNAB
APPENDIX B: TEIP SCALE USED THROUGH INTERNET.

TEIP Scale

Dear student, this is a questionnaire designed to help us understand the nature of factors influencing the success of routine classroom activities in an inclusive classroom environment. Please circle the number that best represents your opinion about each of the statements. Thanks for your time!

1=Strongly disagree; 2= Disagree; 3=Disagree somewhat; 4=Agree somewhat; 5=Agree; 6=Strongly agree

*Obligatorio

1. I can use a variety of assessment strategies (for example, portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance-based assessment, etc.). *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

2. I am able to provide an alternate explanation or example when students are confused. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

3. I am confident in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with disabilities are accommodated. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree
4. I can accurately estimate student comprehension of what I have taught. *
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree    Strongly agree

5. I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students. *
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree    Strongly agree

6. I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behavior in the classroom before it occurs. *
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree    Strongly agree

7. I can control disruptive behavior in the classroom. *
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree    Strongly agree

8. I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy. *
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree    Strongly agree

9. I am able to get children to follow classroom rules. *
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree    Strongly agree

10. I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive. *
   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree    Strongly agree
11. I can make my expectations clear about student behavior. *
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

12. I can assist families in helping their children do well in school. *
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

13. I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g., assistants, other teachers) to teach students with disabilities in the classroom. *
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

14. I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with disabilities. *
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

15. I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school. *
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

16. I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g., itinerant teachers or speech pathologists) in designing educational plans for students with disabilities. *
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

17. I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities. *
18. I am confident in adapting school-wide or state-wide assessment so that students with all disabilities can be assessed. 

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

The University where I study includes a course or a unit about inclusion during the whole program

○ Yes
○ No

During my practicums I have the opportunity to deal with students with special needs
(part of Proyecto de Integración Escolar)

○ Yes
○ No

Enviar

100 %: ¡Lo lograste!
APPENDIX C: TEIP SCALE, A SELF-EFFICACY IN IMPLEMENTING INCLUSIVE PRACTICES SCALE

This survey is designed to help us understand the nature of factors influencing the success of routine classroom activities increasing an inclusive classroom environment. Please circle the number that best represents your opinion about each of the statements. Please attempt to answer each question.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>Agree somewhat</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I can use a variety of assessment strategies (for example, portfolio assessment, modified tests, performance-based assessment, etc.).
2. I am able to provide an alternate explanation or example when students are confused.
3. I am confident in designing learning tasks so that the individual needs of students with disabilities are accommodated.
4. I can accurately estimate student comprehension of what I have taught.
5. I can provide appropriate challenges for very capable students.
6. I am confident in my ability to prevent disruptive behavior in the classroom before it occurs.
7. I can control disruptive behavior in the classroom.
8. I am able to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy.
9. I am able to get children to follow classroom rules.
10. I am confident when dealing with students who are physically aggressive.
11. I can make my expectations clear about student behavior.
12. I can assist families in helping their children do well in school.
13. I am able to work jointly with other professionals and staff (e.g., aides, other teachers) to teach students with disabilities in the classroom.
14. I am confident in my ability to get parents involved in school activities of their children with disabilities.
15. I can make parents feel comfortable coming to school.
16. I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g., itinerant teachers or speech pathologists) in designing educational plans for students with disabilities.
17. I am confident in informing others who know little about laws and policies relating to the inclusion of students with disabilities.
18. I am confident in adapting school-wide or state-wide assessment so that students with all disabilities can be assessed.

Notes: *Scale provided by Sharma, Loreman and Forlin (2012, p. 16)

**Disabilities are considered in general.