

In-Service Teacher Teaching Efficacy Towards Inclusive Education Scale

***Ms. Poonam Devi, Research Scholar,
Department of Education,
Panjab University, Chandigarh.
Email id- poonam.haldhuan.9@gmail.com**

****Dr. Balwinder Kaur
Associate Professor
Government College of Education
Sector-20D Chandigarh**

Abstract

The paper deals in detail with the development and standardization of in-service teacher teaching efficacy towards inclusive education. At the initial stage, the scale consisted of 85 items. Then number of items was reduced to 66 after extensive scrutiny by the subject experts. Subsequently item-analysis was carried out. Finally, a set of 41 items were retained for the final scale. The final version of the in-service teacher teaching efficacy towards inclusive education scale consists of 41 positive and zero negative items. The test- retest reliability was found to be 0.984. The concurrent validity of the scale was assured by evaluation from subject experts.

Key words: Teaching Efficacy, In-service Teachers, and Inclusive Education.

Introduction

The idea is that the concept of integration should be replaced by a move towards inclusive education. Integration demand that "additional arrangements was made to accommodate pupils with disabilities "within a system of schooling that remains largely unchanged", inclusive education on the other hand, aims to restructure schools in order to respond to respond to the learning needs of all children. Thus integration calls for separate arrangements in the regular school for exceptional children mainly those traditionally labelled as disabled, through such practices as withdrawal, remedial education and mainstreaming. Inclusive education in agreement in practice at national and local level. Inclusive education in different parts of the world led UNESCO to convene, with assistance of the government of Spain, the 1994 World Conference at Salamanca. At the end of the conference, the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action was unanimously adopted by acclamation (UNESCO, 1994).

Teaching efficacy, is a teacher's belief that effective teaching can bring about student learning regardless of external variables such as home environment, family background, and parental influences. Teacher efficacy is the conviction that an individual educator can shape student outcome in a positive manner (Barco, 2007; Brownell & Pajares, 1999). Teacher efficacy is a two-dimensional conviction about reaching students that comprises general teaching efficacy, or a belief about the general power of teaching to reach students, and personal teaching efficacy, which is a belief, that one is personally capable of reaching students (Solomon, 2007).

1.1 Steps of Development of Tool

For developing this scale following steps were followed:

1. Preliminary research and writing dimensions of the scale
2. Selection of the content and items for preliminary draft
3. Expert opinion and pre try out of the test
4. Preparation of final draft, try-out and item analysis
5. Establishing reliability and validity

1.1.2 Preliminary Research and Writing Dimensions of the Scale

The main focus of education is to develop in-service teacher teaching efficacy towards inclusive education. It is very difficult task to frame items without having a sound base. Thus for constructing the scale, the researcher had to survey and scans the literature thoroughly. The researcher had gone through various tools available related to teaching efficacy towards inclusive education like Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practice (TEIP) scale (Sharma, Loreman and Forlin, 2011), Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), Teachers Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale (Sharma et al., 2012). Various books on teaching efficacy towards inclusive education were also gone. Researcher also deliberated on various inclusive education Journals, Newspapers, Periodicals, Magazines and Web sites for the present study. After careful exploration and survey, two dimensions of in-service teacher teaching efficacy towards inclusive education scale were finalized by the researcher by manipulating the dimensions given by (Protheroe, 2008) and (Hoy, 2000). Due changes were made in finalizing the dimensions as keeping in mind the level of the teachers. These dimensions are: general teaching efficacy and self efficacy.

1.1.3 Selection of the Content and Framing items for Preliminary Draft

On the basis of review of literature and various tools available, numbers of statements were framed by investigator for each of the selected dimension of in-service teacher teaching efficacy towards inclusive education scale. These statements were discussed with the supervisor. Total 49 items were selected for preliminary draft. Out of these, 47 items were positive and 2 items were negative. Following points were kept in mind while framing the items for the scale:

- Each item was related to the identified dimension of in-service teacher teaching efficacy towards inclusive education.
- The language was kept simple so that it is easily understood and interpreted by the respondent in terms of situations expressed in the items.
- Contradictory statements were avoided.
- Number of items prepared was much more than to be retained in the final scale.

1.1.4 Type of items

Present in-service teacher teaching efficacy towards inclusive education scale is a five point Likert scale. Every item is in the form of statement. Positive and Negative statements are included. Five alternatives are given for each item. These alternatives are:

- I. Strongly agree
- II. Agree
- III. Undecided
- IV. Disagree
- V. Strongly disagree

The subject is required to mark a response option that indicates his/her actual teaching efficacy towards inclusive education.

1.1.5 Expert Opinion and Pre try out of the Test

The first draft consisting of 85 items was given to the experts to seek their valuable, considerate, expert advice and opinion. As the scale measure in-service teacher teaching efficacy towards inclusive education, experts from the related field was chosen which includes Faculty members of University Department, Teacher Educators, Research Scholars, School Teachers and Principals.

Preliminary draft of the scale was given to the experts along with dimensions, operational definitions and objectives of the tool. The experts were requested to freely add or delete any item from the subscales which they consider relevant or irrelevant respectively. On the basis of expert advice and opinion, 36 items were dropped. So the second draft consisted of 49 items, in two dimensions. Now in the second draft there were 49 items out of which 47 items were positive and 2 items were negative. These items were ready for further try out and item analysis.

1.1.6 Directions for Administration of the Scale

For administering this scale the researcher has to distribute the booklets with directions on first page of scale. Although the directions are self explanatory still assistance can be given to the respondents in case of difficulty whenever required. Guidelines given in the scale includes:

- The scale can be administered to an individual.
- The scale is in the form of consumable booklet and the responses are to be given on the booklet itself.
- The subject has to read each statement carefully and then give the response.
- The respondent is required to tick only one response which is most truthful and spontaneous.
- There is no right or wrong response. It is only the respondents' actual behaviour.
- There is no time limit.

1.1.7 Scoring Procedure

In-service teacher teaching efficacy towards inclusive education scale is manually score able. The weightage given to each alternative ranges from 5 to 1. For positive items 5 marks are given for 'Strongly Agree', 4 marks are given to 'Agree', 3 marks are given to 'Undecided', 2 mark are given to 'Disagree' and 1 mark is given to 'Strongly Disagree'. For negative items the range of weightage is reversed.

1.1.8 Pre-try out

Before try out of the scale, test was carried out. It was given to ten English teachers of Government schools to remove any language difficulty in understanding the content.

1.1.9 Try-out of the Scale for Item Analysis

Then the second draft of the scale after incorporating the suggestions of the experts was prepared and then the scale was administered to 30 Government school teachers of Chandigarh.

1.1.10 Item Analysis

The tool should not be too easy or too difficult but each item of the scale should discriminate between teachers showing high and low efficacy. The procedure which judges the quality of an item or which made to know the effectively of an item in a test/scale is called item analysis. Discriminating Power of an item tells us about the worth of an item. Item to item and item to total score was calculated using coefficient of correlations high item to item correlation was found. Only those item were selected for final scale where value of correlation was greater than 1.97 at significant 0.05 levels. Item discrimination was conducted by forming two groups using Kelley's (1939) method. T-test was conducted on upper and lower group. So, finally forty one items were left after item analysis.

Correlations

		test	retest
test	Pearson	1	.984**
	Correlation		
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
retest	N	100	100
	Pearson	.984**	1
	Correlation		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	100	100

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
206.69	171.307	13.088	49

Item No.	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Item No.	Corrected Item- Total Correlati on	Item No.	Corrected Item-Total Correlation
1	.530*	21	.223*	41	.119
2	.479*	22	.559*	42	.433*
3	.230*	23	.323*	43	.616*
4	-.125	24	.316*	44	.424*
5	.397*	25	.269*	45	.340*
6	.566*	26	.635*	46	.493*
7	.578*	27	.411*	47	.514*
8	.230*	28	.337*	48	.310*
9	.167	29	.331*	49	.324*
10	.144	30	.535*		
11	.575*	31	.448*		
12	.566*	32	.392*		
13	.485*	33	.415*		
14	.612*	34	.316*		
15	.555*	35	-.025		
16	.368*	36	.010		
17	.076	37	.300*		
18	.246*	38	.323*		
19	.300*	39	.538*		
20	.171	40	.535*		

NOT
E:
Items
with
* sign
were
accep
ted
for
the
final
draft
of in-
servic
e
teach
er
teachi
ng

efficacy scale significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level.

Component wise distributions of items in final draft

S.No	Dimension	Items		Total items
		Positive items	Negative items	
1	General efficacy	1,2,3,5,6,7,8,11,12,13,14,15,16,18,19,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32	0	27
2	Self efficacy	33,34,37,38,39,40,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49	0	14

Total numbers of items in final draft after item analysis are 41, out of which 27 items are positive and 14 items are negative.

1.1.11 Determination of the Reliability of the Scale

On final 41 items Cronbach's alpha coefficient was applied and internal consistency of the scale was established which was found to be .911. Reliability refers to the degree to which a measuring tool gives constant results. It is the consistency with which a test score measures what it intends to measure. For determining the reliability the researcher used the test-retest method. The scale was administered to 100 teachers of government schools with an interval of one month and then reliability was calculated using product moment coefficient of correlation which comes out to be 0.984 which was significant at 0.01 confidence level.

1.1.12 Establishing the Validity of the scale

Validity means truthfulness of the tool. It refers to the degree to which it measures what it claims to measure. Content validity involves the adequacy of the sample. The scale furnished by researcher represents well defined content. The content of the scale was developed keeping in view various standardized tests and questionnaires. The tool was given to the experts for the content validity. The face validity was established by modifying the items of the scale according to the guidance and suggestions of the experts.

1.1.13 Setting of the time limit of the scale

The average time taken by the 75% respondents to reach the item was fixed as the duration to complete the test. Thus 20 minutes was fixed as the time limit for the test, including the time to read the instruction.

References

Barco, M. (2007). The relationship between high school general education teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes as they relate to teaching learning-students' with disabilities in the inclusive setting (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.

Brownell, M., & Pajares, F. (1999). Classroom teachers' efficacy to instruction special education students. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 22, 154-164.

Cronbach, L.J. (1960). *Essentials of psychological testing*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Kelley, T.L. (1939). The selection of upper and lower groups for the validation of test items. *Journal of educational psychology*, 30, 17-24. Retrieved on February 7, 2016 from www.inf.ufsc.br/~cezar/tri_material/Artigo27%25.pdf.

Parkash,J.& Hooda,S.(2016) A comparative study of attitude of primary and secondary school teachers towards inclusive education. *International Journal Of Science Technology And Management*.5(8). Retrieved on February 7, 2018 from http://www.ijstm.com/images/short_pdf/1472026047_148_IJSTM.pdf

Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of psychology*, 140, 1-55. Retrieved on February 7, 2016 from www.voteview.com/pdf/Likert_1932.pdf.

Parkash,J.& Hooda,S.(2016) A comparative study of attitude of primary and secondary school teachers towards inclusive education. *International Journal Of Science Technology And Management*.5(8). Retrieved on February 7, 2018 from http://www.ijstm.com/images/short_pdf/1472026047_148_IJSTM.pdf

Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2011). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, doi:10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01200.x.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805.

UNESCO (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*. Adopted by the World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality. Salamanca, Spain, 7-10 June. U. (2014). .