

## SELF-EFFICACY IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AMONG TEACHERS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAM: "EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS FOR AN INCLUSIVE SCHOOL"

ELENA MARIA ERDELI<sup>1</sup> – FELICIA ALINA ROMAN<sup>2</sup> – CSANÁD ALBERT-LŐRINCZ<sup>3</sup>

### Abstract

Inclusive education is a broad process that involves transforming the educational system to meet the needs of all students, not just those with disabilities. It is an educational approach that values diversity and equity, grounded in children's rights and the social imperatives of participation and non-discrimination. Inclusive education relies not only on systemic reforms but also on teachers' self-efficacy, which influences their ability and willingness to apply inclusive practices and manage diverse classrooms.

This research aims to analyze the impact of the training program "*Educational Projects for an Inclusive School*" on teachers' self-efficacy in working with students with special educational needs (SEN). The program, conducted in Bihor County, Romania, between October 19, 2024, and January 15, 2025, aimed to develop the professional skills necessary for initiating and implementing inclusive educational projects. The findings show that training significantly enhanced teachers' self-efficacy, particularly in classroom management, student motivation, and applying diverse teaching strategies. These results highlight the importance of training programs in strengthening professional competencies for inclusive education.

**Keywords:** education, school integration, social integration, children with SEN, educational project, professional skills for inclusive education, self-efficacy.

### Theoretical background

By analyzing the resources related to special education, we can identify the double meaning of education: the first refers to education in general, addressing specific aspects of schooling, access to, and participation in educational institutions; the second refers to special education – an adapted form of education that has been carried out for over 200 years, primarily through separate school units, namely special schools. This is a specific type of education tailored to certain individuals and can be delivered not only in special schools but also within the family or in other environments open to all children. In the current context, disability must be understood as a natural component of human diversity. This topic should concern

---

<sup>1</sup> Elena Maria Erdeli PhD-student at Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Science; erdelielena@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0001-6927-9968

<sup>2</sup> Felicia Alina Roman PhD Professor at Aurel Vlaicu University of Arad, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Psychology and Social Work and Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences; alina.roman@uav.ro; ORCID: 0000-0003-2812-581X

<sup>3</sup> Csanád Albert-Lőrincz PhD (Corresponding Author) Associate Professor at Partium Christian University of Oradea, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences; alcs@partium.ro; ORCID: 0009-0002-2925-4736

society as a whole, given that disability can occur at any time, as a result of an accident, illness, or aging. Although physical limitations are visible, the most difficult challenges for people with disabilities often arise in the area of social relations. Throughout history, societies have approached the issue of disability in different ways, influenced by moral and political factors, often fluctuating between support and exclusion (World Health Organization & World Bank, 2011).

According to Bateman and Cline (2016), special education is characterized by four essential elements: individualization, adaptation of teaching strategies, systematic monitoring of progress, and provision of related services.

Emphasizing the dimension of equity and participation, Gheorghiu (2005) draws attention to the fact that, in the absence of an adequate approach to these special requirements, one cannot truly speak of equalizing opportunities for access, participation and integration in the educational system and, implicitly, in social life.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2007), which proposed, in collaboration with 22 member states, a classification of SEN into three broad categories, depending on the type of difficulties identified and the nature of the educational intervention required:

1. category A includes the special educational requirements of children with disabilities determined by various organic deficiencies (sensory, motor or neurological);
2. category B includes the special educational needs of people who present learning, language or behavioural difficulties, without having an obvious disability, and who do not fall directly into the other two categories;
3. category C refers to educational difficulties associated with socio-economic, cultural and/or linguistic factors, coming from disadvantaged contexts, for which education has a reparative role.

According to Cucuș (2002), school integration can be understood in two senses. In a narrow sense, it refers to the schooling of students with special educational needs, implying their inclusion in mainstream education units. In a broad sense, integration aims to adapt each child to the requirements of the school in which he has been integrated.

Integrated education represents an intermediate stage, between segregation and inclusion, in which students with SEN are accepted in mainstream schools, but in which the educational system is not fully transformed to respond to diversity. Ungureanu (2000) addressed the issue of educational integration and proposed a synthesis of the organization and implementation of the integration process. Depending on the existence of a conscious intention and the degree of organization, one can distinguish between spontaneous and structured integration. Regarding the targeted area, integration can be educational, social-community or professional. From the perspective of its impact and direction, integration can be direct, indirect or reverse, when a previously non-integrated person ends up being accepted by others without an active contribution from them. Depending on the effects on the personality and behavior of the integrated person, we can talk about total or partial integration. The time allocated to the process can vary, resulting in full-time or part-time integration. Integration can also be carried out individually, in a group or at an institutional level. The resources used can be common, specific or centralized, and

from the point of view of space and mobility, integration can be stationary, institutional, at home or itinerant.

Inclusive education emerged as a term in 1994 at the UNESCO Conference held in Salamanca, being defined as action that responds to the learning needs of all with a focus on those vulnerable to social exclusion and marginalization (UNESCO, 1994).

Ainscow (2000) and Moran (2007) associate the concept of inclusive education with the right of children to a quality education regardless of their social, economic, cultural or ethnic affiliation by supporting educational values such as equity, diversity and social justice. Loreman and Deppler (2002) define school inclusion as the inclusion of children with different disabilities in all school activities in which all children participate, by adapting activities to meet the needs of children with disabilities. In other words, integration is subordinate to inclusion.

Inclusive education eliminates labeling, categorization, hierarchization; students even if they are different have equal chances and opportunities. Inclusive education aims not only at integrating children with SEN, but also those from disadvantaged social-cultural, geographical or ethnic backgrounds that do not allow them access to education. Inclusion, according to Armstrong, is seen as a process that involves a reassessment of the premises on which education systems are based (Armstrong, 2003).

Implementing inclusive education depends not only on systemic reforms but also on teachers' confidence in managing diverse classrooms. Teachers' confidence, or teacher self-efficacy, is often measured because it directly influences their willingness and ability to implement inclusive teaching practices, engage diverse learners, and manage complex classroom environments. In these terms, *teacher self-efficacy* is a well-researched construct used to assess teachers' beliefs in their ability to positively influence student learning.

Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy as the belief in one's own abilities to organize and execute the courses of action necessary to produce certain achievements. In Bandura's understanding, a person's self-efficacy is specific to a particular task or role; it is not a generalized personality trait that guides behavioral choices in all situations.

According to Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998), self-efficacy is a teacher's confidence in his or her ability to perform the actions necessary to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a given context. According to this definition, self-efficacy is a trait specific to the instructional task and context.

Based on a historical analysis of this research, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) concluded that a new measure of teacher efficacy is needed that is both reliable and valid because a difficult issue in measuring self-efficacy involves the level of specificity required in relation to the range of tasks and contexts in which self-efficacy beliefs are assessed.

Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) believe that to be useful, the measurement of teacher self-efficacy must utilize teachers' assessments of their competence across the broad range of activities and tasks they are expected to perform, proposing a model in which self-efficacy is a common function of both the teacher's analysis of the teaching task and the teacher's assessment of personal teaching competence called the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale or TSES, previously called the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

There are two versions of the scale: long Form (24 items) – more detailed, often used in research and short Form (12 items) – quicker to administer, good for

surveys or evaluations. Both forms assess three key dimensions which refer to a teacher's perceived capability to engage students, implement effective instructional strategies, and manage classroom environments.

There is a body of research on measuring self-efficacy perceptions in relation to important outcomes related to teacher performance and student achievement (see, for example, Ashton & Webb, 1986; Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998).

## **Research design and methodology**

This research aims to analyze the impact of the training program "*Educational Projects for an Inclusive School*" on teachers' self-efficacy in working with students with special educational needs (SEN), presenting partial results from a doctoral study. The purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of a training and mentoring individualized (1:1), conducted between 19.10.2024 - 15.01.2025, on the development of teachers' professional skills, skills necessary for initiating and implementing inclusive educational projects.

The program is part of the training offer of the Bihor County Teacher Training House, in the category of approved programs organized in hybrid format with a total of 20 hours of which 8 hours of physical presence and 12 hours of asynchronous online presence. The approved training program entitled: "Educational projects for an inclusive school" includes 5 modules:

1. Theoretical approaches to project management (introductory notions);
2. Integrated project management (scoping, activity planning, managing the use of project resources, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and project impact;
3. Models of good practice on project implementation Completion of the application form for local, county, projects included in the Calendar of Out-of-School Education Projects, eTwinning projects;
4. Inclusive education specific practices (recognizing the diversity of learners, restructuring the school environment, promoting cooperation and partnership in school, exchange of experiences, teamwork and positive teacher-pupil-parent relationships)
5. Evaluation.

The objectives of the above mentioned training program are aimed at changing the attitude of teachers towards students with special needs, increasing the self-efficacy of teaching staff, developing inclusive education practices at the level of primary and pre-school education units, developing professional skills for inclusive education by initiating and implementing educational projects.

The targeted competences include:

- Communication and interpersonal skills;
- psycho-pedagogical competences;
- psycho-social competences;
- organizational and structuring skills;
- digital competences;
- managerial skills;
- professional competences for inclusive education;

- methodological competences;
- skills for writing and implementing educational projects; and
- teamwork, evaluation and self-evaluation skills.

Following the launch of the call for participation in the program,  $n = 365$  teachers completed the training course and filled out the Google Forms questionnaire. An additional control group ( $n = 416$ ), consisting of teachers who did not participate in the training course, also completed the same questionnaire. All participants were teachers from urban and rural school institutions in Bihor County, Romania.

To analyze the quantitative components of the research, repeated measures were used at two time points – pre-test (T1) and post-test (T2) – to track the evolution of scores over time and the differences between the experimental (intervention) and control groups. Based on these data, a series of statistical analyses were conducted to highlight the impact of the intervention and assess the magnitude of the effects on changes in teachers' self-efficacy. The items of the scale are rated on a 9-point Likert scale, from 1 to 9, with higher scores indicating greater self-efficacy.

We chose to use the short version of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) in this research, a decision justified, on the one hand, by the need to evaluate the impact of the training program on teachers' self-efficacy perceptions in the context of implementing educational projects for children with special educational needs (SEN), and on the other hand, by the scale's widely recognized validity. By administering the TSES at two different times (before and after the training) and to a control group of teachers who did not participate in the training program considered as the intervention, we aim to assess the effectiveness of the program and examine how teachers' perceptions of their own efficacy evolve within the context of inclusive education. The inclusion of the control group contributes to the objectivity of the comparative evaluation.

The short version of Tschannen-Moran and Hoy's (2001) TSES questionnaire was distributed via the Google Forms platform to participants in the training course at two time points: T1 and T2. The T1 questionnaire was completed between October 15 and November 12, 2024, by the experimental group before the training, while the T2 questionnaire was completed in February 2025, after the training. For the control group, the questionnaire was administered between November 2024 and February 2025.

The questionnaires were not anonymous, each participant completing the instrument with name, position and contact details. However, at the data processing and reporting stage, the confidentiality of participants' identities was ensured, so that individual information is not publicly disclosed or associated with respondents' names. The data was used exclusively for the purposes of the research.

This study investigates the following research question: To what extent does self-efficacy mediate the relationship between participation in the training program and the development of professional skills? Based on this, the following hypothesis was formulated: The experimental group will demonstrate significant improvements in the design and implementation of educational skills following the intervention, compared to the control group.

Statistical processing was performed using Excel and SPSS programs using descriptive and comparative techniques.

## Participants in the study

Two distinct groups, intervention and control, participated in the present study. The first group, assessed at T1 and T2, consisted of teachers who enrolled in the training course ( $n = 365$ ), while the second group, consisting of teachers from Bihor County who did not participate in the training course, served as the control group ( $n = 416$ ).

Of the 365 participants who attended the training, 138 were from rural areas and 227 from urban areas. Of the participants in the control group ( $n = 416$ ), 206 were rural and 210 urban. To test the significance of differences in the environmental distribution between the two groups, we used Pearson's chi-square test. The results indicated a significant difference between groups ( $\chi^2(2, n = 781) = 11.68, p < .01$ ), thus rural participants are more numerous in the control group (205) than in the training group (136), suggesting that rural people are less involved in training activities.

The majority of participants in both groups were between 36 and 55 years old, indicating a predominance of mid-career professionals. The experimental group had a slightly younger profile, with more participants in the 26–35 age range, while the control group included more participants in the older age brackets, particularly 46–55 and 56–65 years. Results showed a significant difference between groups in the age distribution,  $\chi^2(4, n = 781) = 15.62, p < .01$ . This result suggests that people in this age group may be more motivated to participate in vocational training, while the young and elderly tend to be less involved.

The data show a wide range of teaching experience among participants, with both groups fairly evenly distributed across seniority levels. The largest share of participants in both the training and control groups falls within the 25–29 years and 20–24 years categories. The training group has more participants with under 15 years of experience, while the control group includes more teachers with over 30 years of experience. According to the results of Pearson's chi-square test, we found a significant difference between groups in the distribution of seniority in education ( $\chi^2(7, n = 781) = 24.54, p < .01$ ). Thus it can be concluded that people with average professional experience have a higher propensity to engage in in-service training, while beginning and end-of-career teachers are less involved. This trend indicates the need to attract beginners, who are underrepresented in these programs, to in-service training.

The correlation between age and seniority in teaching in the training participants is strong positive and statistically significant ( $r_s(365) = .78, p < .01$ ), and in the control group this correlation is very strong  $r_s(416) = .85, p < .01$ .) These strong correlations reveal considerable stability in the profession, and long-term retention of teachers in the education system.

Most participants in both groups hold a bachelor's or master's degree, with a slightly higher proportion of master's degree holders in the training group ( $n = 209$  compared to  $n = 181$  in the control group). The control group includes more participants with only undergraduate studies. Results showed a significant difference between groups, ( $\chi^2(3, n = 781) = 17.67, p < .01$ ), suggesting that the distribution of educational attainment varies with participation in training. Individuals with advanced degrees (master's or doctorate) are more active in professional development, which may reflect both a need for further training and an increased interest in career advancement. In contrast, those with a bachelor's degree or less are less engaged in training, which may suggest either a lower perceived need for further training or limited access to such opportunities.

In terms of teaching level, the research participants show the following characteristics: among the training participants, the majority are pre-school teachers (n = 193), followed by primary teachers (n = 112), secondary teachers (n = 27), high school teachers (n = 18) and special education teachers (n = 15). In the control group, the number of pre-school teachers is similar (n = 180), but there are more primary school teachers (n = 183), more secondary school teachers (n = 44), fewer secondary school teachers (n = 7) and a very small number of special education teachers (n = 2). Chi-square test indicates a statistically significant association ( $\chi^2(4, n = 781) = 33.20, p < .01$ ), in that participation in the training is associated with teaching level, with a higher representation of pre-school and high school teachers in the participant group, while primary and secondary teachers are more numerous in the control group.

### **Assessment of the self-efficacy using the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale**

In this section, we present partial results from a doctoral thesis, as outlined in the methodology, focusing on the changes observed in Teachers' Sense of Efficacy scores following the completion of the training program *"Educational Projects for an Inclusive School."* In the reliability analysis of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), Cronbach's Alpha coefficient indicated excellent internal consistency in all three groups analyzed ( $\alpha$  coefficient  $> .95$ ). Thus, the TSES scale proved to be highly reliable in measuring teachers' self-efficacy, regardless of the time of assessment or their involvement in the training program. The analysis of the cumulative scores obtained for the 12 items of the scale reveals an increase in the sense of self-efficacy among teachers who participated in the training. Before the training, the average score reported by the participants was 7.67 (SD = 1.03), while after completing the training program, it increased to 8.00 (SD = .94). This increase indicates a perceptible improvement in teachers' confidence in their own teaching and management capabilities. In comparison, the control group, which did not receive training, had a relatively similar mean before and after the intervention (MD = 7.75, SD = 1.00), suggesting stability in self-efficacy perceptions in the absence of a professional development program.

In order to evaluate the effects of training on perceptions measured by the TSES scale, the Wilcoxon paired-samples test was used, comparing the results obtained before and after training. The result revealed a statistically significant difference between the two measurements,  $Z = -4.54, p < .01$ , indicating a significant increase in teachers' sense of self-efficacy after training.

Regarding the TSES scale, the mean ranks were MR = 349.74 for training participants (MD = 7.67) and MR = 354.44 for non-participants (MD = 7.75) (Mann-Whitney U = 60,860.00,  $Z = -0.31, p = .76$ ), thus there are no significant differences between the two groups.

*Table 1. TSES scale items and measured values*

	Item	Group	n	M	MD	SD	Variance
1	To what extent can you control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	before training + non-participants	781	7.03	7	1.461	2.135
		after training	344	7.4	8	1.366	1.867
2	How much can you motivate students who are	before training + non-participants	781	7.16	7	1.294	1.675

	disinterested in the subject matter?	after training	344	7.53	8	1.18	1.392
3	How much can you encourage students to have confidence that they are doing well in schoolwork?	before training + non-participants	781	7.68	8	1.208	1.46
		after training	344	7.92	8	1.139	1.297
4	How much can you help students appreciate the knowledge they have learned?	before training + non-participants	781	7.57	8	1.207	1.456
		after training	344	7.86	8	1.109	1.23
5	To what extent can you design appropriate questions for students?	before training + non-participants	781	7.95	8	1.144	1.308
		after training	344	8.19	8	0.98	0.96
6	How much can you do to get children/students to follow classroom rules?	before training + non-participants	781	7.73	8	1.159	1.344
		after training	344	7.99	8	1.085	1.178
7	How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	before training + non-participants	781	7.43	8	1.286	1.653
		after training	344	7.73	8	1.209	1.462
8	How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	before training + non-participants	781	7.6	8	1.222	1.492
		after training	344	7.92	8	1.088	1.183
9	To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	before training + non-participants	781	7.62	8	1.218	1.482
		after training	344	8.03	8	1.044	1.089
10	To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example for unsure students?	before training + non-participants	781	8	8	1.167	1.363
		after training	344	8.25	9	0.97	0.942
11	How much support can you offer families to help their children do well in school?	before training + non-participants	781	7.53	8	1.357	1.841
		after training	344	7.88	8	1.189	1.414
12	How well can you implement alternative classroom strategies?	before training + non-participants	781	7.49	8	1.281	1.64
		after training	344	7.95	8	1.082	1.17

*Source: Author's own dataset*

The TSES scale items, as presented in Table no. 1, generally reflect a positive perception of teachers' own abilities. The table includes the results of the scale for the pre-training group and for those who did not participate in the course, in cumulative form ( $n = 365+416 = 781$ ), as no significant differences were identified between the two groups in this respect. In contrast, the participants in the training course ( $n = 344$ ) recorded significantly higher median scores for certain professional skills. Teachers reported improved control of disruptive behavior after the training, with an increase in the median from 7.00 (SD = 1.46) before the training to 8.00 (SD = 1.37), with a slight decrease in the variance of the responses. Also, the item "How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?" had the same median of 8.00, but with a decrease in standard deviation (SD = 1.21 after training vs. SD = 1.29 before training).



The item "How much can you motivate uninterested students?" showed an improvement, with an increase in the median from 7.00 to 8.00 and a reduction in the variability of responses ( $SD = 1.29$  before training vs.  $SD = 1.18$  after training). The item "How much can you help students appreciate/value the knowledge learned?" recorded a constant median of 8.00, but a reduction in the variability of responses from  $SD = 1.21$  to  $SD = 1.11$ .

In relation to teaching skills and classroom management, teachers reported improvements in their ability to devise appropriate questions for students ( $MD = 8.00$ ,  $SD = 0.98$  after training, compared to  $MD = 8.00$ ,  $SD = 1.14$  before training).

Similarly, "How well can you establish a classroom management system?" recorded a constant median of 8.00, but with a decrease in standard deviation following training ( $SD = 1.09$  after training versus  $SD = 1.22$  before training).

Teachers felt more confident in using alternative teaching strategies after training, with an increase in the median for the item "To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example?" from 8.00 before training to 9.00 after training. In this regard, the homogeneity of the responses also increased ( $SD = 1.16$  before training compared to  $SD = 0.97$  after training), indicating an increase in the homogeneity of the responses and a greater confidence in this teaching competence.

Based on the results of the analysis of descriptive statistics for the TSES scale items, it can be concluded that there was an increase in self-efficacy in teaching and a possible development of pedagogical competences among the participants in the training course.

## Discussion

The present study investigated the impact of the training program "*Educational Projects for an Inclusive School*" on teachers' self-efficacy and the development of professional skills required for inclusive education. Grounded in both theoretical and empirical research, the findings provide insights into how teacher self-efficacy mediates the relationship between program participation and the enhancement of teaching competencies, particularly in working with students with special educational needs (SEN).

The literature establishes that inclusive education requires systemic reforms as well as a shift in teachers' perceptions and practices (Ainscow, 2001; Moran, 2007). As the Salamanca Statement (1994) emphasizes, inclusive education must respond to the learning needs of all students by promoting equity and valuing diversity. However, such systemic changes can only be effective if teachers possess the necessary self-efficacy to implement inclusive practices successfully (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran-Hoy, 2001).

Teacher self-efficacy is a critical factor influencing not only instructional effectiveness but also teachers' willingness to adopt innovative strategies and manage diverse classroom environments (Tschannen-Moran et al, 1998). According to Bandura's social cognitive theory, self-efficacy is task- and context-specific, directly affecting motivation and behavior. Therefore, professional development programs aimed at enhancing inclusive practices must also focus on strengthening teachers' self-efficacy beliefs.

This study's research question – *To what extent does self-efficacy mediate the relationship between participation in the training program and the development of professional skills?* – is rooted in this theoretical framework. It posits that professional skills necessary for inclusive education cannot be fully developed without also

fostering teachers' belief in their own capacities. The empirical results support the theoretical assumptions. Before the training, teachers already reported relatively high levels of self-efficacy, but the variability in responses indicated individual differences in their perceived teaching effectiveness. After the training, the experimental group exhibited a statistically significant improvement in self-efficacy scores, particularly in areas related to classroom management, motivating disengaged students, applying alternative instructional strategies, and providing differentiated support. The role of self-efficacy as a mediating factor was also demonstrated by the fact that increases in teachers' confidence corresponded directly to their reported improvements in professional skills. This finding aligns with Bandura's (1997) theory, which emphasizes that confidence gained through mastery experiences – such as those provided by the training program – can significantly strengthen self-efficacy beliefs.

The Wilcoxon paired-samples test confirmed these improvements, with a significant increase in self-efficacy scores post-intervention ( $Z = -4.54, p < .01$ ). Meanwhile, no significant changes were recorded in the control group, which did not participate in the training. These findings also confirm the hypothesis that *the experimental group would demonstrate significant improvements in the design and implementation of educational skills following the intervention compared to the control group*.

Furthermore, the analysis of individual TSES items highlighted notable progress in teachers' perceived ability to manage disruptive behavior, motivate students, formulate appropriate questions, and use varied teaching methods. The reduced variability in responses after training indicates greater consistency and confidence among teachers regarding their professional competencies.

These findings suggest that educational policymakers and institutions should prioritize programs that integrate both skill development and self-efficacy enhancement to ensure the successful implementation of inclusive education principles.

## Conclusions

The concept of inclusive education has evolved from segregated special education to a model promoting equity, diversity, and participation for all learners, including those with special educational needs (SEN). Effective inclusion depends not only on systemic reforms but also on teachers' self-efficacy—their belief in their ability to manage diverse classrooms and apply inclusive teaching strategies. Research highlights the importance of measuring self-efficacy using validated tools like the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), which assesses teachers' confidence in engaging students, applying effective instruction, and managing classroom environments.

Before the training, teachers' self-efficacy, as measured by the TSES scale, was relatively high, but with a greater variability of responses, suggesting individual differences in the perception of teaching effectiveness.

The results obtained support the positive impact of the training program on teachers' perceptions of teaching effectiveness as measured by the TSES scale. Training participants reported significant improvement in managing student behavior, an increased ability to motivate students, strengthening teaching skills through greater confidence in questioning and classroom management, as well as increased adaptability in using alternative teaching strategies and explaining concepts through various methods.

After training, perceived self-efficacy becomes a more relevant factor, while in the control group it does not play a significant role, thus highlighting the importance of training programs in strengthening the perception of competences in inclusive education. The increase in self-efficacy after training suggests that the perception of competence is shaped by the confidence gained through training rather than by previous experience. After training, perceived self-efficacy (measured on the TSES scale) becomes a more relevant predictor, while in the control group it does not play a significant role.

These results demonstrate the importance of training programs in strengthening the perception of professional competences in the field of inclusive education.

## Bibliography

Ainscow, M. (2001): *Developing inclusive schools: Implications for leadership*. National College for School Leadership. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/252704856\\_Developing\\_Inclusive\\_Schools\\_implications\\_for\\_leadership](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/252704856_Developing_Inclusive_Schools_implications_for_leadership) [Accessed 15 March 2024].

Armstrong, F. (2003): *Spaced out: Policy, difference and the challenge of inclusive education*. New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-48164-2>.

Ashton, P.T., Webb, R.B. (1986): *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

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

Bateman, D.F., Cline, J.L. (2016): *A teacher's guide to special education*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, pp. 4–23.

Cucoş, C. (2013): *Education: Experience, reflections, solutions*. Iaşi: Polirom.

Gheorghiu, F. (2005): *Personalized intervention methods within integrated education*. Cluj-Napoca: Cluj University Press.

Loreman, T., Deppeler, J. (2002): Working towards full inclusion in education. *The National Issues Journal for People with a Disability*, 3(6), pp. 5–8.

Moran, A. (2007): Embracing inclusive teacher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 30(2), pp. 119–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619760701275578>.

OECD (2007): *Students with disabilities, learning difficulties and disadvantages: Policies, statistics and indicators*. Paris: OECD. [https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2008/02/students-with-disabilities-learning-difficulties-and-disadvantages\\_g1gh7e45/9789264027619-en.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2008/02/students-with-disabilities-learning-difficulties-and-disadvantages_g1gh7e45/9789264027619-en.pdf). [Accessed 15 March 2024].

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. (2001): Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), pp. 783–805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1).

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A., Hoy, W.K. (1998): Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), pp. 202–248. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543068002202>.

UNESCO (1994): *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*. Paris: UNESCO/Ministry of Education, Spain. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427> [Accessed 12 April 2025].

Ungureanu, D. (2000): *Integrated education and inclusive school*. Timișoara: Editura de Vest.

World Health Organization and World Bank (2011): *World report on disability*. Geneva: World Health Organization. Available at: <https://www.who.int/teams/noncommunicable-diseases/sensory-functions-disability-and-rehabilitation/world-report-on-disability> [Accessed 12 April 2025].

## **ÉNHATÉKONYSÁG AZ INKLUZÍV OKTATÁSBAN AZ "OKTATÁSI PROJEKTEK EGY INKLUZÍV ISKOLA SZÁMÁRA" PROGRAMBAN RÉSZTVEVŐ TANÁROK KÖRÉBEN**

ELENA MARIA ERDELI – FELICIA ALINA ROMAN –ALBERT-LŐRINCZ CSANÁD

Az inkluzív nevelés egy átfogó folyamat, amely magában foglalja az oktatási rendszer átalakítását annak érdekében, hogy az ne csak a fogyatékkal élők, hanem minden tanuló igényeinek megfeleljen. Egy olyan oktatási szemlélet, amely támogatja a sokszínűséget és az egyenlőséget, és a gyermekek jogain, valamint az aktív részvétel és a diszkriminációmentesség társadalmi követelményein alapul. Az inkluzív nevelés nemcsak rendszerszintű reformokra, hanem a pedagógusok énhatékonyságára is támaszkodik, amely hatással van képességeikre és hajlandóságukra az inkluzív gyakorlatok alkalmazására, valamint a sokszínű tanulócsoportok hatékony kezelésére.

Jelen kutatás azt vizsgálja, hogy az „Oktatási projektek egy inkluzív iskola számára” című képzési program hogyan befolyásolja a pedagógusok énhatékonyságát a sajátos nevelési igényű (SNI) tanulókkal való munkában. A program 2024. október 19. és 2025. január 15. között került megrendezésre Romániában, Bihar megyében, célja az inkluzív oktatási projektek kezdeményezéséhez és megvalósításához szükséges szakmai kompetenciák fejlesztése volt. A kutatási eredmények azt mutatják, hogy a képzés jelentősen növelte a pedagógusok énhatékonyságát, különösen az osztálytermi fegyelem fenntartásában, a tanulók motiválásában, valamint a különböző tanítási stratégiák alkalmazásában. Ezek az eredmények alátámasztják a képzési programok fontosságát az inkluzív neveléshez szükséges szakmai kompetenciák megerősítésében.

**Kulcsszavak:** oktatás, iskolai integráció, társadalmi integráció, SNI gyermekek, oktatási projekt, inkluzív neveléshez szükséges szakmai készségek, tanári énhatékonyság