SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS' EFFICACY: IMPLEMENTATION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Dr.Ghulam Haider
Assistant Professor,
Professional Studies Section,
Ali Institute of Education (Chartered Institute), Lahore, Pakistan,
haider038@gmail.com

Ali Raza
M.Phil
Al-Khair University, Pakistan,
alirazajt@gmail.com

Tariq Nadeem Khan
PhD (Scholar),
Department of Special Education,
University of The Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan,
tnk414@gmail.com

Abstract
This study aimed to find the efficacy of special education teachers that could address the specific needs of inclusive setup. Literature was reviewed and a questionnaire which contained twenty six questions was developed to collect data using a five point likert's scale from the conveniently random selected sample of special education teachers were engaged to answer queries. The objective was to look into the teaching efficacy of the teacher that could lead to a successful inclusion. The data were calculated to find inferences about the efficacy that came up as strong link in students' achievement and they were teachers' concern and belief. It was found that these two elements of efficacy seemed to have greater impact on the outcomes of teaching and learning. The study reflected that the teachers were not only willing but also capable to implement inclusive education.
Key Words
Teaching efficacy; Inclusion; implementation of Inclusion; concerns and beliefs of teachers

Introduction

Teaching is a scientific process which entails planning delivery and evaluation. The process revolves around a teacher or a student with definite objectives and outcomes. Teaching learning situation may present itself in different forms ranging teacher centered to student centered. In either type the role of a teacher is significant as he/she serves as the pivotal link between the learner and the content. The attributes that lay behind the successful teaching may incorporate knowledge; skill and belief on the part of teacher were later defined in terms of efficacy by researchers and scholars. Efficacy relies on one's belief and self-confidence to get good results. Essentially, in other wordsself-efficacy is a power to manage in different situations and modify these situations towards the required objectives. It does not straightlydepend on the results. It is the effort of a teacher that he puts for the achievements of his students according to his belief.

In this study we concluded two scopes of teachers' efficacy i.e. general efficacy and personal efficacy.Efficacy of teacher depends upon teacher's belief and his confidence through which he puts his efforts for the education of the students. High level of confidence and strong belief of a teacher encourages hard work by application of new strategies and high student achievement.

Now, inclusive education has become a global agenda and countries like Pakistan are also striving to achieve this goal. Fast Track Initiative for education which provided scope for investment in inclusive education (UNICEF, 2010). These developments have positioned schools as facilitators for exercise of "Right to Education". They recognize 'comprehensive schooling for all' and lay down the standards for inclusion.

Inclusive education enrolls each and every student under oneroof irrespective of their individual difference. Inclusion is a set of services containing regular education and special services given to a child having special needs. The factual meaning of inclusive education is" Education for all" respecting the rights to every human being according to his/her needs. It requires commitment and tolerance of a person who carry out inclusive education program. Inclusive education is a different educational practice that requires knowledge, beliefs and active participation of teacher in respect of values. It systematically focuses on flourishing learning environment for students. Inclusive education makes the teacher a critical influence in education for inclusion and the development of the inclusive setting.
Efficacious teachers tend to engage in showing productivity and desired behavior as compared to teachers having low self-efficacy. Low efficacious teachers easily give up in a tough situation especially when they encounter the students having learning problems, which leads tolimited expectations, efforts and resulting in low student achievement.The efficacy of special education teachers about inclusive education program is required for its better implementation.Teacher education and teacher efficacymay ensure successful implementation of inclusive policies and practices. The pedagogic skills of a teacher and the efforts of implementation are the key to success.

The researcher conceived the idea to look for efficacy of teacher serving in special education setup in Pakistan because they would play a pivotal role in implementing appropriate education for students with special needs. Since the research has identified an obvious link between a student achievement and teacher efficacy, the study holds its importance to discuss the special education teacher's efficacy in terms of inclusion. The teaching efficacy components as mentioned in literature include, teachers belief, motivation, willingness, readiness, performance, confidence, concern and competence. This study research aims to find the efficacy of teachers serving in Special Education to implement inclusive education programs.

Since teaching efficacy is a strong correlate of student achievement and success, the researcher aimed to explore the teacher efficacy with particular reference to inclusive education. The study was planned to find out awareness, competence, skill and readiness among special education teachers regarding inclusive education in Pakistan.

Objectives of the study

Objectives of the study include:
1.   To explore the awareness level about efficacy among special education teachers.
2.   To compare the efficacy with gender, age, qualification, experience and area with teaching efficacy.
3.   To find out efficacy of teachers serving in special education.

Literature Review

For the purpose literature the following studies such as;Good &Brophy, (2000); Haider, (2008); Vinson, (1994); Bandura (1995); Felder and Porter, (1994) ; Carl Rojers (1902-1987); Singh R (1984); Albert Bandura (1997) ; Denham & Lieberman (1980); Housego (1992); Culver (1984);Jerald (2007);Henson (2001) and Harvey (2003) were reviewed. With the help of the said studies efficacy as well as the teacher efficacy in respect of inclusion,the components which determine the teacher efficacy including readiness, willingness and motivation, teacher's confidence, performance and competence as a correlate to teacher efficacy have been discussed.

Inclusion is the program which does not focus on just putting the students with disabilities in regular setting. The education programming in inclusion is also based on learners' need. It is essential to understand the different requirements of the students having different needs.Efficacy depends on one's belief and self-confidence to achieve better learning outcomes. Basically, in other wordsself-efficacy is a power to handle in diverse circumstances and to change these circumstances towards the desired purpose. It does not straightlydepend on the results. It is the effort of a teacher that he puts for the achievements of his students according to his belief.

The role of school and the society is to promote a comprehensive education program that accommodates all the students regardless of their disability. This chapter also pointed out the trends and practices of inclusion which are taking place globally. Teacher's role and contribution towards the inclusion were also discussed.

Experimental researches showed that teacher efficacy can predict the teacher's competence and motivation of teaching. Wheat-ley (2005) also concludes that efficacious teachers seem to be more satisfied with their job and always ready to accept new and innovative ideas. They try to take part in extra activities in school both individually and collectively.Tshcannen-Moran and colleagues (1998) designed a model that reflects the teacher efficacy depends on teacher's own judgments about their own potential. Bandura, A. (ed.) (1995) also recognized four different basis of efficacy: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and arousal.

In order to work further on this hypothesis the researcher has conceived this entire effort in pursuit of the situation within Punjab province. Teachers from special education setup were questioned in order to develop a view point about the phenomena of teacher efficacy about inclusive education. The subsequent chapters will discuss the procedural out lay of the study; that led to the final conclusion in this particular subject matter.

Methodology

A descriptive survey was used to investigate the research problem formulated in this study. The independent variables were represented by teachers' gender, age, teaching experience and Area of respondent. Teachers 'efficacy about inclusive education was dependent variable. The tools comprised of 26 questions specifically designed to gauge the efficacy of special education teachers in southern Punjab and entailed question. The collected data was analyzed by Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Turkish International Journal of Special Education and Guidance & Counseling   2016, volume 5, issue 1

Population comprised special education teacher serving in department of special education government of Punjab in Punjab Province. Punjab District comprises three zones, i.e. Northern, Central and Southern Punjab. For the sake of convenience Southern Punjab was addressed in terms of Divisions, namely Multan, Bahalwalpur and Dera Ghazi Khan. Govt. of the Punjab has launched a project named as "Punjab Inclusive Education Project". The researcher tried to study about teacher efficacy on the basis of said project. Six institutions from each division were selected on the basis of urban and rural classification on convenient basis. The sample was selected on the basis of convenient sampling and constituted 150 teachers, serving in Government Special Education Institutions in Southern Punjab.

The instrument of the study was a questionnaire. It had 26 questions. The tool was specifically designed to evaluate the Special education teachers' efficacy on a five point likert's scale. The questionnaire administrated to 150 teachers and personally collected by the researcher.

Questionnaire was piloted on 14 teachers of two different Government institutions. Item analysis was performed on filled in questionnaire. The Cronbach alpha reliability co-efficient was calculated to find out the reliability of the questionnaire for pilot testing. The value of alpha reliability co-efficient for pilot testing was 0.87.

Data were collected from 18 special education institutions of special education Government of Punjab. These institutions were situated in Multan, Bahawalpur and Multan divisions of Punjab province. The researcher personally collected the data.

The collected data was analyzed by the researcher by using SPSS. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for interpretation of the results on the basis of empirical data. Data was analyzed and interpreted for inferences. Recommendations were made in the light of findings.Higher statistical tools including t-Test have been used to infer relationship between the demographic variables and efficacy.

Table 4.1
showing Demographic Statistics in Terms of Gender

	Frequency	Percentage
	41	27.3
	109	72.7

Table 4.1 shows the demographic data in terms of gender. There were 72.7 percent females and 27.3 percent males in the study.

Table 4.2
Teaching Experience of the respondents

Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1 - 15 years	123	82
Above 15 years	27	18

Table 4.2 shows the demographic data in terms of teaching experience. There were 18 percent of the respondents have 1-15 years teaching experience and 82 percent of the respondents have teaching experience more than 15 years in the study.

Table 4.3
Age Wise Distribution of the Data

Age	Frequency	Percentage
21 - 35 years	96	64
Above 35 years	54	36

Table 4.3 shows the demographic data in terms of age. There were 64 percent of the respondents that fall in the age group of 21 - 35 years while 36 percent of the respondents are above the age of 35 years in the study.

Table 4.4
Academic Qualification of the Respondents

Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
Below M.A	23	15.3
M.A and Above	127	84.6

Table 4.4 shows the demographic data in terms of Qualification. There were 23 percent of the respondents who were below M.A and 84.6 percent of the respondents who have M.A and Above Qualification in the study.

Table 4.5
Area Wise Distribution of the Sample

Area	Frequency	Percentage
Urban	83	44.7
Rural	67	55.3

Table 4.5 shows the demographic data in terms of area. There were 44.7 percent of the respondents who were teaching in rural centers and 55.3 percent of the respondents who were teaching in urban centers in the study.

Table 4.6
Institutions wise and data

Division	Name of institution	Area	Respondents
Multan	Government Special Education Center Kabeerwala	Rural	09
	Government Girls High School Multan	Urban	08
	Government Special Education Center Vehari	Urban	08
	Government Special Education Center for Deaf Vehari	Urban	08
	Government Special Education Center Burewala	Rural	06
	Government Special Education Center Mailsi Multan	Rural	11
Bahawalpur	Government Degree College Special Education Bahawalpur	Urban	10
	Government Institute of Slow learner Bahawalpur	Urban	08
	Government special Education School for Deaf	Urban	11
	Government Special Education Center Sadar Bahawalpur	Rural	08
	Government Special Education Center Ahamad-pur	Rural	05
	Government Special Education Center Hasilpur	Rural	08
Dera Ghazi Khan	Government Institute for Slow Learners DG Khan	Urban	09
	Government Shaadab School for Mentally Challenged Children DG Khan	Urban	11
	Government Special Education Center Layyah	Urban	10
	Government Special Education Center Jampur	Rural	06
	Government Special Education Center KotAddu	Rural	07
	Government Special Education Center KotChutta	Rural	07
3	**Total**	18	150

The Table 4.6 depicts the institution wise data. 18 different institutions were randomly selected from three administrated division of southern Punjab including Multan, Bahawalpur and Dera Ghazi Khan.6 Institutions were selected from each division in which, 3 from urban and 3 from rural area. The sample of study was comprised of 150 teachers serving in these above said mentioned institutions.

Table 4.7
Teacher's Belief

Sr. No	Item	*Nothing*	*Very Little*	*To some extent*	*Quite a bit*	*A great extent*
1	How much can you do to make the school a safe place?	0(0%)	0(0%)	42(28%)	72(48%)	36(24%)
2	How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	0(0%)	0(0%)	24(16%)	60(40%)	66(44%)
3	How well can you establish a classroom management system with eachgroup of students?	0(0%)	18(12%)	31(21%)	29(19%)	72(48%)

Table 4.7 depicts teacher's belief as a component of the efficacy. As is evident from the Table. In response to the first statement above, 48 percent of the respondents felt that they can do "Quite a bit" to make school a safe place. 44 percent of the respondents reported that they can get studentsto believe they can do well in school work to "A great extent". 48 percent of the respondents agreed that they can establish a classroom management system with eachgroup of students as "A great extent".

Table 4.8
Teacher's Motivation

Sr. No	Item	*Nothing*	*Very Little*	*To some extent*	*Quite a bit*	*A great Extent*
1	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?	0(0%)	12(8%)	34(23%)	59(39%)	45(30%)

2	How much can you do to help your students, value learning?	0(0%)	4(2.5%)	21(14%)	67(44.5%)	58(39%)
3	How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	0(0%)	22(14.6%)	66(44%)	43(28.6%)	19(12.6%)

Table 4.8 depicts that Teacher's motivation as a component of the efficacy. As is evident from the table. 39 percent of the respondents agreed that they can do "Quite A Bit" to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork. 44.5 percent of the respondents reported that they help their students, value learning "Quite a bit". 44 percent of the respondents agreed that they can assist families in helping their children do well in school but "To Some Extent"

Table 4.9
Teacher's Willingness

Sr. No	Item	Nothing	Very Little	To some extent	Quite a bit	A great extent
1	How much can you do to make students enjoy coming to school?	0(0%)	10(6.6%)	34(22.6%)	71(47.3%)	35(23.3%)
2	How much can you do to reduce school dropout?	0(0%)	2(1.3%)	26(17.3%)	43(28.6%)	79(52.6%)
3	How much can you do to teach all the students with different abilities?	0(0%)	4(2.6%)	39(26%)	58(38.6%)	49(32.6%)

Turkish International Journal of Special Education and Guidance & Counseling   2016, volume 5, issue 1

Table 4.9 depicts that Teacher's Willingness as a component of the efficacy. As is evident from the table. 47.3 percent of the respondents were in agreementto "Quite a bit" inmaking students enjoy coming to school. 52.6 percent of the respondents reported that they reduce school dropout to "A great extent".While,38.6 percent of the respondents realized that they can teach all the students with different abilities.

Table 4.10

Teacher's Readiness

Sr. No	Item	Nothing	Very Little	To some extent	Quite a bit	A great extent
1	How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	0(0%)	2(1.3%)	23(15.3%)	64(42.6%)	61(40.6%)
2	To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	0(0%)	32(21.3%)	56(37.3%)	37(24.6%)	25(16.6%)
3	How much can you do to foster student achievement?	0(0%)	9(6%)	21(14%)	67(44.6%)	58(38.6%)

Table 4.10 depicts that Teacher's Readiness as a component of the efficacy. As is evident from the table. 42.6 percent of the respondents felt that they can establish routine to keep activities running smoothly to "Qiute a bit". 37 percent of the respondents reported "To some extent" about crafting good questions for the students. 44.6 percent of the respondents agreed to have a great role in fostering students' achievement at "Quite a bit" level.

Table 4.11
Teacher's Performance

Sr. No	Item	Nothing	Very Little	To some extent	Quite a bit	A great extent
1	How much can you do to promote learning when there is lack of support from the home?	0(0%)	1(0.6%)	28(18.6%)	71(47.3%)	50(33.3%)
2	How much can you adapt the curriculum according to learners need?	11(7.3%)	26(17.3%)	48(32%)	37(24.6%)	28(18.6%)
3	How much can you do to increase students' memory of what they have been taught in previous lessons?	0(0%)	17 (11.3%)	31(20.6%)	65(43.3%)	37(24.6%)

Table 4.11 depicts that Teacher's Readiness as a component of the efficacy. As is evident from the table. 47.3 percent of the respondent agreed that they can promote learning when there is a lack of support from home to "Quite a bit". 32 of the respondent reported that they can adapt the curriculum according to learner's need "To some extent"while43.3 percent of the respondents agreed that they are confident to have their role increasing student's memory to "Quite a bit" level.

Table 4.12
Teacher's Confidence

Sr. No	Item	Nothing	Very Little	To some extent	Quite a bit	A great Extent
1	How much can you express your views freely on important school matters?	0(0%)	3(2%)	49(32.6%)	40(26.6%)	58(38.6%)
2	How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	0(0%)	3(2%)	48(32%)	63(42%)	36(24%)
3	How much can you do to help your students think critically?	0(0%)	2(1.3%)	33(22%)	58(38.6%)	57(38%)
4	How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	0(0%)	0(0%)	46(30.6%)	41(27.3%)	63(42%)

Table 4.12 depicts that Teacher's Confidence as a component of the efficacy.As is evident from the table. 38.6 percent of the respondents agreed toexpress their views freely on important school mattersto "A great extent". 42 percent agreed with to get through to the most difficult students "Quite a bit" level while 38.6 percent of the respondents reportedthat they can develop critical thinking in studentsup till "Quite a bit". Finally, 42 percent of the respondents realized to have abilities in controlling disruptive behavior in the class room to "A great extent".

Table 4.13
Teacher's Concern

Sr. No	Item	Nothing	Very Little	To some extent	Quite a bit	A great Extent
1	To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	0(0%)	12(8%)	38(25.3%)	57(38%)	43(28.6%)
2	How much can you do to get students to work together?	0(0%)	4(2.6%)	30(20%)	38(25.3%)	78(52%)
3	How much can you do to get children to do their homework?	0(0%)	3(2%)	25(16.6%)	71(47.3%)	51(34%)
4	How much can you do to enhance collaboration between teachers, parents and the administration to make theschool run effectively?	0(0%)	6(4%)	23(15.3%)	52(34.6%)	69(46%)

Table 4.13 depicts that Teacher's Concern as a component of the efficacy as is evident from the table. 38 percent of respondents agreed thatthey can make their expectations clear about student behavior "Quite a bit".52percent of the respondents thought that they can do to "A great extent" toget students to work together. 47.3 percent of the respondents realized that they can do "Quite a bit" to get children to do their homework while 46 percent of the respondents agreed that they can enhance collaboration between teachers, parents and the administration to make theschool run effectively upto "A great extent".

Table 4.14 Teacher's Competence

Sr. No	Item	*Nothing*	*Very Little*	*To some extent*	*Quite a bit*	*A great Extent*
1	How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individualstudents?	0(0%)	7(4.6%)	64(42.6%)	43(28.6%)	36(24%)
2	How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	0(0%)	5(3.3%)	44(29.3%)	59(39.3%)	42(28%)
3	How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	0(0%)	15(10.3%)	56(37.3%)	42(28%)	37(24.6%)

Table 4.14 depicts that Teacher's Competence as a component of the efficacy. As is evident from the table. 42.6 percent of the respondents were in agreement that they can adjust lessons to the proper level for individualstudents as "To some extent". 39.3 percent agreed that theywere confident "Quite a bit" in using a variety of assessment strategies with, here in the second statement. 37.3 percent of the respondents reported that they can implement alternative strategies in their classroom "To some extent".

Table 4.15
Combine Mean of Efficacy Components

Efficacy Components	*M*	*SD*
Teacher's Belief	3.09	0.81
Teacher's Motivation	2.83	0.83

Turkish International Journal of Special Education and Guidance & Counseling   2016, volume 5, issue 1

Teacher's Willingness	3.03	0.88
Teacher's Readiness	2.94	0.87
Teacher's Performance	2.75	1.02
Teacher's Confidence	3.03	0.9
Teacher's Concern	3.12	0.91
Teacher's Competence	2.78	0.87

Table 4.15 reflects upon the combined mean of the teacher efficacy components. As is evident teacher's concern noticed to have a greatest value in terms of mean and standard deviation is3.12 and 0.91 respectively. The next significant component is teaching belief which has a mean of 3.09 and standard deviation 0.81.

Table 4.16
Comparison of self-efficacy level of teachers on the basis of gender

Gender	N	M	Df	t	Sig
Male	41	78.95	148	2.517	.002
Female	109	79.40	68.20		

*P < .05 Level of Significance

Table 4.16 shows that there is a significant difference in the self-efficacy level of male and female. It shows that female teachers have more efficacy level as compared to the male teachers.

Table 4.17
Comparison of teacher efficacy on the basis of area

Area	N	M	Df	t	Sig
Rural	67	78.9	148	1.517	.008
Urban	83	79.5	125.37		

*P < .05 Level of Significance

Turkish International Journal of Special Education and Guidance & Counseling   2016, volume 5, issue 1

Table .4.17 shows that there is a significant difference in the teacher efficacy on the basis of area. It shows that urban respondents have more efficacy level as compared to the rural.

Table 4.18
Comparison of teacher efficacy on the basis of experience

Experience	N	M	Df	t	Sig
1-15 years	123	77.39	148	3.517	.23
Above 15 years	27	80.52	147		

*P < .05 Level of Significance

The table 4.18 shows that there is no significant difference between the teachers with experience 1-15 years and with the experience above 15years. It concluded that experience does not affect the teacher efficacy with the increasing of number of years.

Table 4.19
Comparison of teacher efficacy on the basis of age

Age	N	M	Df	t	Sig
Age 21-35 years	96	69.39	147	2.952	.89
Above 35 years	54	72.52	145		

*P < .05 Level of Significance

Table 4.19 depicts that there is no significant difference between the teachers with age level from 21-35 years and with the age above 35 years. It means that teacher efficacy does not affect with the increasing of age.

Table 4.20
Comparison of teacher efficacy on the basis of Qualification

Education	N	M	Df	t	Sig
Below MA	23	69.39	143	2.952	.003
MA and Above	127	77.52	144		

*P < .05 Level of Significance

Table 4.20 shows that there is a significant difference between the teachers with below MA qualification and the teachers with MA and higher qualification. It can be concluded that the qualification affect the teacher efficacy positively.

Findings

- 48% of the teachers felt that they can make school a safer place.
- 44% of the teachers realized that they can make students believe in them.
- 48% of the teachers agreed they can establish a classroom management system.
- 39% of the teachers thought that they can motivate the students to show interest in the school work.
- 44.5% of the teachers reported that they can help the students' value learning.
- 44% of the teachers agreed that they can assist families in helping their children do well in school.
- 47.3% of the teachers agreed that they can make students enjoy coming to school.
- 52.6% of the teachers agreed that they can reduce school dropout.
- 38.6% of the teachers felt that they can teach students with different abilities.
- 42.6% of the teachers reported that they can establish routines to keep activities running smoothly.
- 37.3% of the teachers agreed that they have skills to craft good questions for the students.
- 44.6% of the teachers felt that they can increase student's achievement.
- 47.3% of the teachers reported that they can promote learning when there is lack of support from home.
- 32% of the teachers thought that they can adapt the curriculum according to learner's need.
- 43.3% of the teachers were confident about their role to increase student memory.
- 38.6% of the teachers believed that they can express their views freely on important school matters.
- 42% of the teachers agreed to get through the most difficult students at times.
- 38.6% of the teachers reported that they can develop critical thinking in students.
- 42% of the teachers realize their strengths in controlling disruptive behavior in class rooms.
- 38% of the teachers agreed that they can make their expectation clear aboutstudents' behavior.
- 52% of the teachers feel that they can make the students work together.
- 47.3% of the teachers are confident that they can do a great deal to get students do their home work.
- 46% of the teachers agreed that they can enhance their collaboration between teachers, parents and administration to make schools run effectively.
- 42.6% of the teachers agreed that they can adjust lesson to the level of individual students.
- 39.3% of the teachers reported that they can confidently use assessment strategies.
- 37.3% of the teachers agreed that they can use and implement alternative strategies in class rooms.
- Teachers concern and belief are the most effective component of efficacy.
- The efficacy levels of female teachers are more than that of male.
- Urban teachers tend to have better efficacy scores that rural.
- There lies no significant difference in experience and efficacy, i.e. efficacy does not change with the increasing number of years in experience.
- There lies no significant difference in experience and efficacy, i.e. efficacy does not change with the increasing numbers of years in age.
- There is a positive impact of education on efficacy. More academic qualifications will yield better efficacy.

Conclusions:

The following conclusions are being made on the above findings:

The special education teachers exhibit to have qualities that are reflective of their teaching efficacy. Higher scores on the key efficacy components were witnessed, i.e in teachers belief, concern, willingness and confidence. It can be concluded that the teacher's in special education are not only skillful and experienced but the willingness on their part for adapting the content and instructional option for students with different abilities, is reflective of their eagerness towards implementation of inclusion. The reported abilities of the teachers in the form of fostering critical thinking, persuasion, controlling disruptive behaviors and sharing expectations enables them to address to the diversified needs of students in an inclusive set up.

The teaching efficacy levels of female and urban teachers are found on the higher side as compared to males and rural teachers respectively and are depictive of their respective focus on inclusion. The age and experience does not seem to effect teaching efficacy however academic increment has been found as a critical factors in improving teaching efficacy.

Recommendations

In the light of the conclusions above it is recommended that special education teachers may be readily placed in inclusive setups since they possess the essential abilities for inclusive class rooms. Since age and experience have been found to have a less significant relationship with teaching efficacy, teachers of all age groups should be given opportunity to participate in inclusion. Inclusion should be started in urban areas prior to rural and suburbs since the teachers have a more inclination in cities.

It is further recommended that an identical study be conducted on a larger scale with a bigger sample size. It is also recommended that the efficacy of regular teachers may also be analyzed in terms of inclusion. A separate study should address to elements of age and experience in reference to the teaching efficacy as well.

References

Ajay K, Das. Ahmed B. Kuyini, Ishwar P. Desai. (2013). Inclusive Education in India: Are the Teachers Prepared?. International Journal of Special Education. Vol 28   Issue 2.

Ashton, P. & Webb, R. (1986). Making a difference: Teacher's sense

Ashton, P. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A motivational paradigm for effective teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 35, 287–232.

Ballard, K. (2003) The analysis of context: Some thoughts on teacher education, culture, Association of Special Education, 10(1), 33-41

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

Bandura, A. (ed.) (1995). Self-efficacy in changing societies
Bandura, A. (Ed.) (1995). Self efficacy in changing societies. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Turkish International Journal of Special Education and Guidance & Counseling   2016, volume 5, issue 1

Barton,L.(1997)Inclusiveeducation:Romantic,subversiveorrealistic?InternationalJournalofInclusiveEducation,1(3),231 –242.

Barton,L.(2009).ThePoliticsofRecognitionandthePositionoftheDisabilityMovement,inInAlur,M.andTimmons,V.(eds.)Inc lusiveEducationAcrossCultures:CrossingBoundaries,SharingIdeas.SAGEPublicationsIndiaPvtLtd.pp.3-11.

Booth,T.,Ainscow,M.,Black-Hawkins,K.,Vaughan,M.andShaw,L.(2000)IndexforCambridgeUniversityPress,Cambridge.

Cardona,C.M.(2009)Teachereducationstudents'beliefsofinclusionandperceivedcompetencetoteachstudentswithdisabiliti esinSpain.JournaloftheInternational

Chamberlin,R.,T.Wragg,G.HaynesandC.Wragg(2002),"Performance-RelatedPayandtheTeachingProfession:AReviewoftheLiterature",ResearchPapersinEducation,17(1),pp.31-49.

Christensen,C.A.1992. 'SocialJusticeandtheConstructionofDisabilityinSchools',inAustralianAssociationofSpecialEduca tionNewsletter,3:6–8. Colonizationandinequality.InBoothT.,NesK.,andStromstadM.(eds.)Developingcompetitive,andindividualisticlearning,4t hed.Boston,Allyn&Bacon.

Culver,R.(1984).Survivors:QualitySchoolOrchestraPrograms.

Cummings,C.,Dyson,A.&Millward,A.(2003).ParticipationandDemocracy:What'sInclusionGottoDoWithIt?Allan,J.(ed.), Inclusion,ParticipationandDemocracy:WhatisthePurpose?,KluwerAcademicPublishers.PrintedintheNetherlands.pp.49-65.

Denham,C.;Lieberman,A.,eds.1980.Timetolearn.Washington,DC,NationalInstituteofEducation.Educationforinclusiveed ucation.TeachingandTeacherEducation,25(4),594-601Exerciseofpersonalandcollectiveefficacyinchangingsocieties.

Felder,R.M.&Porter,R.L.(1994).Teachingeffectivenessforengineeringprofessors.Workshophandbook.Raleigh,NC:North CarolinaStateUniversityCollegeofEngineering.

Finland.InAcedoC.(September2009.)ProspectsQuarterlyReviewofComparativeEducation,39(3),

Florian,L.andRouse,M.(2009)TheinclusivepracticeprojectinScotland:Teacher

Goddard,R.D.,Hoy,W.K.,&Hoy,A.W.(2000).Collectiveteacherefficacy:Itsmeaning,measure,andimpactonstudentachieve ment.AmericanEducationalResearchJournal,37(2),479-507.

Goe,L.,K.BiggersandA.Croft(2012),LinkingTeacherEvaluationtoProfessionalDevelopment:FocusingonImprovingTeach ingandLearning,NationalComprehensiveCenterforTeacherQuality,Washington,DC.

Good,T.;Brophy,J.2000.Lookinginclassrooms,8thed.NewYork,Longman.

Guskey,T.R.(1988).Teacherefficacy,self-concept,andattitudestowardtheimplementationofinstructionalinnovation.TeachingandTeacherEducation,4(1),63–69.

HaiderSI.(2008).Pakistaniteachers'attitudestowardsinclusionofstudentswithspecialeducationalneeds.PakistanJournalof MedicalScience2008;24(4):632-6.

Harvey-Beavis,O.(2003),"Performance-BasedRewardsforTeachers:ALiteratureReview",paperdistributedatthethirdworkshopofparticipatingcountriesintheOEC Dactivity"Attracting,DevelopingandRetainingEffectiveTeachers",Athens,4-June,www.oecd.org/edu/teacherpolicy.

Henson,R.K.(2001).Effectofparticipationinteacherresearchonteacherefficacy.TeachingandTeacherEducation,17,819–836.

Hipp,K.A.(1996).Teacherefficacy:Influenceofprincipalleadershipbehavior.PaperpresentedattheAnnualMeetingoftheAmericanEducationalResearchAssociation,NewYork.

Housego,B.E.J.(1991).Monitoringstudentteachers'feelingsofpreparednesstoteach,personalteachingefficacyandteachingefficacyinanewsecondaryteachereducationprogram.TheAlbertaJournalofEducationalResearch,38(1),49-64.

Hoy,A.W.(2000)Changesinteacherefficacyduringtheearlyyearsofteaching.PaperpresentedattheAnnualMeetingoftheAmericanEducationalResearchAssociation,NewOrleans.

Hoy,W.K.,&Miskel,C.G.(2008).Educationaladministration:Theory,research,andpractice(8thed.).NewYork:McGraw-Hill.

Hoy,W.K.,Sweetland,S.R.,&Smith,P.A.(2002).Towardanorganizationalmodelofachievementinhighschools:Thesignificanceofcollectiveefficacy.EducationalAdministrationQuarterly,38(1),77-93.

Appendix 1
Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES)

Name_____   Age_____
Gender_____Qualification_____
Teaching Experience_____
Name of Institution_____

This questionnaire is designed to gauge the teacher efficacy regarding implementation of inclusive education program.

You can record your response on five point lickert scale ranging from 0-4 while 0 indicating nothing and 4 indicates to great extant.

0.   Nothing
1.   Very Little
2.   To Some Extant
3.   Quite A Bit
4.   A Great Extant

1.	How much can you do to make the school a safe place?	0	1	2	3	4
2.	How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	0	1	2	3	4
3.	How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	0	1	2	3	4
4.	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	0	1	2	3	4
5.	How much can you do to help your students, value learning?	0	1	2	3	4
6.	How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	0	1	2	3	4
7.	How much can you do to make students enjoy coming to school?	0	1	2	3	4

	0	1	2	3	4
8. How much can you do to reduce school dropout?	0	1	2	3	4
9. How much can you do to teach all the students with different abilities?	0	1	2	3	4
10. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	0	1	2	3	4
11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	0	1	2	3	4
12. How much can you do to foster student achievement?	0	1	2	3	4
13. How much can you do to promote learning when there is lack of support from the home?	0	1	2	3	4
14. How much can you adapt the curriculum according to learners need?	0	1	2	3	4
15. How much can you do to increase students' memory of what they have been taught in previous lessons?	0	1	2	3	4
16. How much can you express your views freely on important school matters?	0	1	2	3	4
17. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	0	1	2	3	4
18. How much can you do to help your students think critically?	0	1	2	3	4
19. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	0	1	2	3	4
20. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	0	1	2	3	4
21. How much can you do to get students to work together?	0	1	2	3	4
22. How much can you do to get children to do their homework?	0	1	2	3	4
23. How much can you do to enhance collaboration between teachers, parents and the administration to make the school run effectively?	0	1	2	3	4
24. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	0	1	2	3	4
25. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	0	1	2	3	4
26. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	0	1	2	3	4

Appendix II

Name of institution
1.   Government Special Education Center Kabeerwala
2.   Government Girls High School Multan
3.   Government Special Education Center Vehari
4.   Government Special Education Center for Deaf Vehari
5.   Government Special Education Center Burewala
6.   Government Special Education Center Mailsi Multan
7.   Government Degree College Special Education Bahawalpur
8.   Government Institute of Slow learner Bahawalpur
9.   Government special Education School for Deaf
10.   Government Special Education Center Sadar Bahawalpur
11.   Government Special Education Center Ahamad-pur
12.   Government Special Education Center Hasilpur
13.   Government Institute for Slow Learners DG Khan
14.   Government Shaadab School for Mentally Challenged Children DG Khan
15.   Government Special Education Center Layyah
16.   Government Special Education Center Jampur
17.   Government Special Education Center KotAddu
18.   Government Special Education Center KotChutta