

## The Effect of School Principals' Entrepreneurial Characteristics on Teachers' Attitudes towards Inclusive Education and Their Self-Efficacy

Özgür UYGUR<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

It is aimed to determine whether there is a significant difference between teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy towards inclusive education and the entrepreneurial characteristics of the school principals they work with. The population of the study consists of 6367 teachers working in public and private schools in Isparta in the 2023-2024 academic year. The sample consists of 585 teachers selected through convenience sampling. In the data collection process of the study, the School Principal's Entrepreneurial Competencies Scale developed by Köybaşı (2016), the Teacher Attitude Scale towards Inclusive Education developed by Kielblock (2018) and the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale towards Inclusive Education were used. It was concluded that the scales were highly reliable and had significant validity. Correlation analysis and regression analysis were used in statistical analyses. As a result of the research, it was seen that school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics positively affect teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and their self-efficacy at a moderate level. It was concluded that school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics predicted 25% of teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and there was a positive moderate relationship between them, and school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics predicted 31% of teachers' self-efficacy towards inclusive education and there was a positive moderate relationship between them.

**Keywords:** Inclusive education, entrepreneurship, school principal, teacher, self-efficacy, attitude

**Article History:** Received: 12.04.2025  
Research Article

Accepted: 27.06. 2025

**Recommended Citation:** Uygur, Ö. (2025). The effect of school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and their self-efficacy, *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications (IJONTE)*, 16 (1), 23-34.

### Introduction

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author: Dr., Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Isparta, Türkiye, uygurozg@gmail.com, ORCID: 0009-0007-4994-5821

Finding a place for oneself in the society in which one lives is an important element. This element is expected to provide an acceleration in terms of self-development. Education as a system enables the individual to ensure his/her own development and to adapt to the environment in which he/she lives. Within the framework of today's scientific, technological and all kinds of advances, it is the responsibility of the education system, one of the biggest systems of the state, to educate qualified manpower that will ensure progress, innovation and change in society (Adigüzel & Sağlam, 2009). School principals and teachers working in educational institutions, which are the main actors of the education system, have important duties and responsibilities in the training of qualified manpower in interaction. Although this situation varies according to the dynamics of the educational institution, the basic duties and responsibilities are fulfilled in all educational institutions in line with the same national and international goals.

In the 21st century, these goal mentioned above, with the realisation of advances in a very rapid process, learning environments especially in educational institutions should be made suitable for these processes. From the traditional teacher-centred understanding of education, a learner-centred understanding, which has been valid more recently, has a say today. Yılmaz (2021) stated that it is a priority for students with different characteristics to benefit from qualified and equal educational opportunities in heterogeneous classes rather than homogenous-based classes. Educational institutions should create learning environments with an inclusive understanding that fully accepts all differences. Inclusion, which is an approach in which individuals are accepted and included rather than excluding individuals, is an important approach (Göngür & Pehlivan, 2021). Qvortrup & Qvortrup (2018) stated that the inclusion approach includes not only students with special needs but also all students and that they should be actively involved in learning processes. The main purpose of inclusion is the acceptance and understanding of individuals with special needs who are labelled as 'other' in education (Şimşek et al., 2019). In this process, it is directly related to teachers who are directly responsible for students' learning processes in educational institutions. Teachers' approach, understanding, competence and attitudes during classroom management affect this process. Sağlam & Kanbur (2017) stated that the approach, understanding, attitude and competences of teachers are related to the successful adaptation process of students in the inclusive education process. In addition, Demirkol (2022) also attributes the achievement of the goal of inclusive education studies to teacher competences. Teachers' knowledge and attitudes towards the inclusive education process are guided by teachers' competences (Dedeoğlu & Yılmaz-Atman, 2022). Teachers' attitudes are important for students to be accepted in their environment. A negative attitude can push students away, while a positive attitude can facilitate the adaptation process of students (Yıldırım, 2017). Rabi & Zulkefli (2018) stated that the inclusive education programme positively affects social awareness about education for all students with special needs.

The idea of inclusion coming from the nature of the education programme highlights that every student has an equal opportunity to receive a high-quality education, regardless of their unique needs or obstacles (UNESCO, 2017). This increased consciousness creates the groundwork for a more inclusive society in which people are valued for who they are, regardless of their apparent shortcomings. According to inclusive education fosters vital life skills that go well beyond the classroom. Through the cultivation of teamwork, communication, and problem-solving abilities, it gives pupils the means by which to maneuver an ever more interconnected world. Inclusive classrooms help kids learn how to interact productively with people of different origins and viewpoints (OECD, 2023). A learner-centered approach is applied, whereby the environment is modified to meet the diverse requirements of the students (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). It has been noted that this tactic favors pupils' learning and developmental results (Vantieghem, 2023). According to Walker et al. (2024), an educational environment that utilizes inclusive education may successfully lessen the perceived differences between children who have typical and atypical neurological development.

Within the development of a pupil, inclusion is a concept that can be handled in many ways. Inclusive education is more than anything else. Today, it is mentioned in many fields from international relations to industry, from politics to education. Inclusion in education has become a much talked about agenda in recent years. Inclusive education is an 'understanding' that requires each student's access to education in line with their learning and developmental characteristics, interests and needs, their participation in educational environments, and processes to support the professionals related to them in this direction. Inclusive education is more than a programme, curriculum or approach, it is

above all an understanding. Inclusive education has sociological, political, philosophical and ideological foundations. At its most basic level, the word 'inclusive' is etymologically derived from the Latin verb 'to include' (includerere), which means to be included, to belong.

The idea of teacher self-efficacy has been found to be connected to how teachers conduct their classes, as mentioned by Tschannen Moran et al. (1998). The influence of believing in their abilities extends to teachers' thoughts about themselves and their behavior and attitudes toward teaching (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007). Additionally, teachers' attitudes can impact the way they think and make judgments about inclusion, ultimately affecting their teaching practices (Kuyini et al, 2020). According to Tschannen Moran et al. (1998), the concept of teacher efficacy suggests that a teacher's level of confidence affects how hard they work in a teaching situation and their determination to overcome challenges. Furthermore, teacher self-efficacy is a factor that relies on teachers' personal perceptions of their teaching skills rather than an objective evaluation of their abilities (Tschannen et al., 2009).

The use of the concept of entrepreneurship in its present sense is linked to the dominance of the capitalist mode of production. In fact, the introduction of the concept into the economic literature dates back to the 19th and 20th centuries. The French economist Cantillon introduced the concept to the economy. Jean Baptiste Say gave the concept the meaning we use today. According to Say, the concept of entrepreneur is an individual who brings all factors of production together to produce a good that is thought to be valuable and takes the risk for the profit to be obtained. Say's definition of entrepreneur is based on having both risk-taking and managerial competences (Binks-Vale, 1990). The research conducted by the World Entrepreneurship Platform (Global Entrepreneur Monitor (GEM)) among 29 countries shows that countries with high entrepreneurial activities show development above the average economic growth. In fact, although entrepreneurship activities have been active since the beginning of capitalism, the main reasons why it has become so popular after the 1980s are due to its positive contributions to job creation, the establishment of new enterprises, the proliferation of innovations, the growth of the economy and the increase in the welfare level of the society. There are many studies, analyses and reports on these factors in the literature in the USA, the European Union and our country (Birch, 1979; Drucker, 1985; Morris and Lewis, 1995; Coulter, 2003; Audretsch, 2002). It is useful to examine these factors, which can also be considered as the results or effects of entrepreneurship, in more detail.

When the literature is examined, it is seen that there is no study on the effect of school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and their self-efficacy. Teachers' approaches, competences and attitudes towards inclusive education have an important role in inclusive education practices as well as in the general success of the education process. Determining teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy levels in this field provides important information about how effective inclusive education will be. With this study, it is especially important to determine the effect of school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and their self-efficacy. In this context, the research is valuable, on the other hand, the research is unique in terms of associating the effect of the entrepreneurial characteristics of school principals with inclusive education. In addition, inclusive education has become directly or indirectly important in human life, and the research is on the agenda and up-to-date because it is a research on such an element. At this point, the importance of the relationship between school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics and teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and self-efficacy and whether school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics have an effect on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and self-efficacy has emerged. In this context, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. According to teachers' perceptions, what is the level of school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics and teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy towards inclusive education?'
2. Is there any relationship between school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics and teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy towards inclusive education?'
3. Is there any significant difference between teachers' perceptions of school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics according to gender, age, educational status and years of service variables?

4. Do school principals' entrepreneurship characteristics have any effect on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education?
5. Do school principals' entrepreneurship characteristics have an effect on teachers' self-efficacy towards inclusive education?

### Method

In this study, survey technique, one of the quantitative research methods, was used. In line with the purpose of the study, the data obtained from the participants were analysed using Jamovi 2.5.4 statistical package programme. In the first stage of this process, the data of 17 participants who answered the control question in the questionnaire form incorrectly were excluded from the analysis. Subsequently, the validity and reliability of the measurement tools were checked. Finally, 585 teachers took part in the study.

### Purpose and Model of the Research

This study examines the effect of school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and their self-efficacy. In this context, it is a relational research. According to Karasar (2010), in the relational research model, the researcher examines the change or the degree of change between at least two variables.

### Population and Sample of the Research

The population of the study consists of participants working in public and private schools in Isparta province in the 2023-2024 academic year. There are a total of 6,367 people in Isparta province (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2024). The sample of the study consists of 585 participants working in public and private schools in Isparta province in the academic year 2023-2024. Simple random sampling, one of the random sampling methods, was used in the sampling of administrators. Simple random sampling method is among the random sampling methods. Büyükoztürk et al. (2012) explains randomness as the equal probability of the units taken as the basis for sampling to be selected for the sample. In the table below, descriptive statistics related to demographic characteristics (gender, title, branch, age, professional seniority, educational status, school type, length of service in the school, number of teachers in the school and number of students in the school) are given.

### Demographic Findings

The demographic characteristics of the participants who participated in the study are given in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Demographic Findings*

Demographic Characteristics	Category	N	Valid Percentage (%)
<b>Gender</b>	Male	270	46.2 %
	Woman	315	53.8 %
<b>Title</b>	Administrator	90	15.4 %
	Teacher	495	84.6 %
<b>Branch</b>	Professional Branches	56	9.6 %
	Numerical Branches	96	16.4 %
	Verbal Branches	365	62.4 %
	Talent Branches	68	11.6 %
<b>Age</b>	20-32	58	9.9 %
	33-45	289	49.4 %
	46 and above	238	40.7 %
<b>Professional Seniority</b>	0-10 Years	119	20.3 %
	11-21 Years	227	38.8 %
	22 Years and above	239	40.9 %

<b>Education Status</b>	PhD	3	0.5 %
	Master's Degree	91	15.6%
	Licence	481	82.2 %
	Associate Degree	10	1.7 %
<b>School Type</b>	Anatolian High School	79	13.5 %
	Anatolian Imam Hatip High School	37	6.3 %
	Science High School	10	1.7 %
	Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School	77	13.2 %
	Preschool	32	5.5 %
	Middle School	212	36.2 %
	Primary School	138	23.6 %
	<b>Length of service at your school</b>	0-10 Years	458
11-20 Years		94	16.1 %
21 Years and Over		33	5.6 %
<b>Number of teachers in the assigned school</b>	0-20	287	49.1 %
	21-40	156	26.7 %
	41-60	120	20.5 %
	61 and above	22	3.8 %
<b>Number of students in the school</b>	0-250	320	54.7 %
	251-500	150	25.6 %
	501-750	81	13.8 %
	751 and above	34	5.8 %

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the participants. A total of 585 male (n=270, 46.2%) and female (n=315, 53.8%) school administrators and teachers participated in the study. Regarding the titles of the participants, 90 (15.4%) were administrators and 495 (84.6%) were teachers. When the branches of the participants were analysed, 9.6% (56) were vocational branches, 16.4% (96) were numerical branches, 62.4% (365) were verbal branches and 11.6% (68) were skill branches. When Table 1 is analysed, it is seen that 58 (9.9%) of the participants are in the 20-32 age group, 289 (49.4%) are in the 33-45 age group and 238 (40.7%) are in the 46 and over age group. It is seen that 20.3% (58) of the participants have 0-10 years of seniority, 38.8% (10) have 11-21 years of seniority, and 40.9% (239) have 22 years or more of seniority. Considering the educational status of the participants in the study, 3 (0.5%) participants have a doctorate degree, 91 (15.6%) participants have a master's degree, 481 (82.2%) participants have a bachelor's degree and 10 (1.7%) participants have an associate degree. When the distribution of the school types in which the participants in the study work is examined, 79 (13.5%) participants work in Anatolian High School, 37 (6.3%) participants work in Anatolian Imam Hatip High School, 10 (1.7%) participants work in Science High School, 77 (13.2%) participants work in Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School, 32 (5.5%) participants work in Preschool, 212 (36.2%) participants work in Secondary School and 138 (23.6%) participants work in Primary School. When the tenure of the participants in the institutions where they work is analysed, 458 (78.3%) participants work 0-10 years in the institution, 94 (16.1%) participants work 11-20 years in the institution and 33 (5.6%) participants work 21 years or more in the institution. When the number of teachers in the institutions where the participants work is analysed, 287 (49.1%) have 0-20 teachers, 156 (26.7%) have 21-40 teachers, 120 (20.5%) have 41-60 teachers and 22 (3.8%) have 61 or more teachers. When the number of students in the institutions where the participants work is analysed, 320 (54.7%) institutions have 0-250 students, 150 (25.6%) institutions have 251-500 students, 81 (13.8%) institutions have 501-750 students and 34 (5.8%) institutions have 751 or more students.

#### Data Collection Technique and Scales

For the purpose of the study, 3 measurement tools consisting of 71 items in total were used. The rating of these measurement tools, the scale of entrepreneurial competences of the school principal was made with a five-point Likert-type scale, and the scales of teacher self-efficacy towards inclusive education and teacher attitude towards inclusive education were made with a seven-point Likert-type scale. In addition, 12 questions were asked to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants. Basic information about the measurement tools is presented below.

Teacher Attitude Scale towards Inclusive Education Scale was developed by Kielblock (2018). The scale prepared to determine teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education consists of 38 items and four dimensions (vision, differentiation, general practices and support).

Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale for Inclusive Education Scale was developed by Kielblock (2018). The scale prepared to determine teachers' self-efficacy levels towards inclusive education consists of one dimension and 18 items.

School Principal's Entrepreneurial Competencies Scale was developed by Köybaşı (2016). The scale developed to determine the entrepreneurial competences of school principals consists of one dimension and 15 items.

### Statistical Methods Used in the Study

Firstly, the construct validity of the measurement tools used in the study was tested. Six items (attitude1, attitude9, attitude15, attitude18, attitude19 and attitude36) from the Teacher Attitude Scale towards Inclusive Education were not included in the analysis because they did not carry the required factor loadings. As a result of the analyses, the values obtained were found to be acceptable and at a good level (see Table 1.). In addition, the factor loads of the items of the Teacher Attitude Scale towards Inclusive Education were between .58 and .90, the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale towards Inclusive Education was between .57 and .91, and the Scale of School Principal's Entrepreneurial Competencies was between .54 and .95.

**Table 2**

*Goodness of fit values of the scales*

Scales	$\chi^2/df$	RMSEA	CFI	TLI	SRMR
<b>Teacher Attitude Scale towards Inclusive Education</b>	4.897	.081	.911	.901	.065
<b>Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale for Inclusive Education</b>	6.638	.098	.935	.923	.034
<b>School Principal's Entrepreneurial Competencies Scale</b>	6.376	.095	.969	.969	.018

*Reference good fit values: Schermelleh-Engel vd., 2003, s. 52; Simon vd., 2010, s. 239*

After the confirmatory factor analysis, it was examined whether the data were normally distributed and their reliability. It was observed that the skewness and kurtosis values of the variables subject to the analysis were between -1 and +1. Therefore, the variables fulfil the requirement of normal distribution (Morgan et al., 2011, p. 51). In addition, the Cronbach Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) internal reliability coefficients of the variables and the average variance explained (AVE) and composite reliability (CR) values indicate that the measurement tools used are reliable (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hinton et al., 2014, p. 359) (see Table 2).

### Ethical information

Before the data were collected, the approval of the ethics committee was obtained with the decision of Isparta University of Applied Sciences Ethics Committee dated 14/05/2024 and numbered 193-01.

### Findings

The frequencies of the participants' gender, professional career, position, educational status, branch, age, professional seniority, school type, length of service in the school, number of teachers in the school, and number of students in the school were taken, the relationship between attachment styles and job satisfaction and organisational commitment was examined by correlation analysis, and

regression analysis was performed to determine the extent to which attachment styles predict job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

In order to answer the question 'According to teachers' perceptions, what is the level of school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics and teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy towards inclusive education?' the scale items were averaged. The findings are presented in Table 3. It is seen in Table 3 that teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education are at the lowest level and school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics are at the highest level according to teachers' perceptions.

**Table 3**

*General information about the scales*

	Attitude	Self-efficacy	Entrepreneurship
Number of Participants	585	585	585
Mean	3.71	4.07	4.06
Standard Deviation	1.34	0.834	1.04

In order to answer one of the sub-problems of the study, 'Is there any relationship between school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics and teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and their self-efficacy?' correlation analysis was performed to check the relationship between variables. The findings are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4**

*Relationships between variables*

	Vision	Differentiation	Supporting	General	Self-efficacy	Entrepreneurship
Vision	—					
Differentiation	0.847 ***	—				
Supporting	0.632 ***	0.630 ***	—			
General	0.224 ***	0.265 ***	0.303 ***	—		
Self-efficacy	0.651 ***	0.651 ***	0.506 ***	0.192 ***	—	
Entrepreneurship	0.479 ***	0.486 ***	0.372 ***	0.101 *	0.564 ***	—

Not. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

In Table 4, it is seen that the highest correlation value between entrepreneurship and attitude scale. 48 between the differentiation dimension of the attitude scale and the entrepreneurship dimension. At the same time, there is the lowest significant relationship between the general dimension of the dimensions of the attitude scale and entrepreneurship ( $r=.10$ ;  $p<.01$ ). There is a positive and significant relationship between self-efficacy scale and entrepreneurship scale ( $r=.56$ ;  $p<.01$ ) (Köklü et al., 2006).

In order to answer one of the sub-problems of the study, 'Do school principals' entrepreneurship characteristics have an effect on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education?' regression analysis was performed to control the relationship between variables. The findings are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5**

*Regression analysis results on the level of entrepreneurship explaining attitude*

	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	Sd.	F	D. W.	SS. H.	$\beta$	t	p	Tolerans	VIF
Vision	.50	.25	.25	.15	50	1.98	.154	.746	14.8	.001	1	1
Differentiation	.47	.23	.22	.47	174	2.09	.053	.702	13.1	.001	1	1
Supporting	.48	.23	.23	.48	80	1.98	.051	.690	13.4	.001	1	1
General	.37	.13	.13	.37	93	1.97	.026	.698	9.66	.001	1	1
Self-efficacy	.10	.01	.00	.10	5	1.94	.032	.496	2.44	.001	1	1

While vision, differentiation, support and general dimensions of the attitude scale were considered as independent variables, entrepreneurship was considered as the dependent variable. Looking at the R2 values in Table 5, it is seen that entrepreneurship explains 25% of the attitude. When analysed statistically,  $F(3-801) = 50$ ,  $p = .001$ , it can be explained according to the analysis that the model is significant. According to the table, it can be said that vision ( $\beta = .702$ ;  $t = 13.1$ ;  $p < .05$ ), differentiation ( $\beta = .690$ ;  $t = 13.4$ ;  $p < .05$ ), support ( $\beta = .698$ ;  $t = 9.66$ ;  $p < .05$ ) and general ( $\beta = .496$ ;  $t = 2.44$ ;  $p < .05$ ) dimensions of the attitude scale are positively significant predictor variables on entrepreneurship. According to these findings, it can be stated that school principals' entrepreneurship characteristics have an effect on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education.

In order to find an answer to one of the sub-problems of the study, 'Do school principals' entrepreneurship characteristics have an effect on teachers' self-efficacy towards inclusive education?' the effect of entrepreneurship on self-efficacy was determined by regression analysis. The findings are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6**

*Regression analysis results on the level of explanation of self-efficacy by entrepreneurship*

	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	Sd.	F	D. W.	SS. H.	$\beta$	t	p	Tolerans	VIF
Self-efficacy	.56	.31	.31	.56	272	2.14	.027	.070	16.5	.001	1	1

Self-efficacy, which is the only dimension of the self-efficacy scale, was taken as the independent variable and entrepreneurship was taken as the dependent variable. Looking at the R2 values in Table 6, it is seen that entrepreneurship explains 31% of self-efficacy. When analysed statistically,  $F(3-801) = 272$ ,  $p = .001$ , it can be explained according to the analysis that the model is significant. According to the table, it can be said that self-efficacy ( $\beta = .070$ ;  $t = 16.5$ ;  $p < .05$ ) of self-efficacy scale is a positively significant predictor variable on entrepreneurship. According to these findings, it can be stated that school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics have an effect on teachers' self-efficacy towards inclusive education.

As a result of the analyses, no significant difference was found according to gender, age, educational status and years of service variables.

**Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations**

This study, which investigated the effect of school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and their self-efficacy, was conducted to show that school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics have an effect on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education and their self-efficacy. It is accepted that there is an important relationship between the characteristics of school principals' entrepreneurial competences and teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy. In achieving the goals of the education and training process, the entrepreneurial characteristics of the school principal affect the attitudes and self-efficacy of teachers regardless of the content in the learning environment. Such an important process has become even more important today, especially in the inclusive education process. On the other hand, there is no study addressing the relationship between entrepreneurship, attitude and self-efficacy.



Özkan et al. (2021) stated that people should be evaluated with their positive and different qualities rather than being alienated from society with the contribution of humanist philosophical thought systems that have passed through various processes throughout history and have left an impact all over the world since the 1960s. The utilisation of the same learning environment by making it easier for all students to access education is described as inclusive education (UNESCO, 2009). The person who transforms the concept of the same learning environment into a quality and qualified environment is the school principal. Sakız (2022) stated that school administrators should take the initiative and determine the vision and mission together with all stakeholders in the school, and this process should be planned and implemented. Jenkinson (1997), Scruggs and Masropieri (1996), Subban and Sharma (2006) emphasised that teacher attitudes are a significant element in inclusive education and its practices. Başar et al. (2013) stated that the concept of entrepreneurship has become widespread with the concept of innovation since the 20th century. Entrepreneurial school administrators are expected to make their schools ready for the change and transformation processes taking place in the world, and for this, they are expected to influence teachers directly and indirectly by making the planning, implementation and evaluation processes in the best way (Bozdağ & Akın, 2023).

According to the results of the research, it is seen that teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education are at the lowest level and school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics are at the highest level according to teachers' perceptions. This situation is to be interpreted as that not only the school principal has an effect on the formation of attitudes, but also individuals in different roles provide this effect.

It is seen that the highest correlation value between entrepreneurship and attitude scale is between the differentiation dimension and entrepreneurship dimension of the attitude scale. At the same time, there is the lowest significant relationship between the general dimension of the dimensions of the attitude scale and entrepreneurship. There is a positive and significant relationship between self-efficacy scale and entrepreneurship scale. In the research, the fact that the differentiation dimension has the highest relationship with the entrepreneurship dimension can be expressed as this dimension meets the concept of inclusiveness in the clearest way. Because Yıldırım (2016) stated that it would facilitate other students to show positive attitudes and behaviours towards students with different elements in the learning environment.

According to the results of the research, it was found that the effect of school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education was positively significant. Accordingly, vision, differentiation, support and general dimensions of the attitude scale can be explained as a positive significant predictor variable on the concept of entrepreneurship. The fact that the entrepreneurial characteristics of the school principal positively affect teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education indicates that school administrators in leadership positions in inclusive schools play an important role in determining a vision for the school in the context of inclusion, finding support for this vision, and making the school a successful school by working with school staff (Dedeoğlu, H & Yılmaz Atman, B., 2022).

It was found that the effect of school principals' entrepreneurial characteristics on teachers' self-efficacy towards inclusive education was positively significant. Accordingly, the self-efficacy dimension of the self-efficacy scale is to be explained as a positively significant predictor variable on the concept of entrepreneurship. This situation shows that the knowledge, skills, attitudes and dispositions that teachers should have when working with children with various characteristics, needs and expectations in classroom environments are important in determining the inclusive quality of that learning environment (Dedeoğlu, H & Yılmaz Atman, B., 2022). For this reason, teachers can only adapt to changing social and educational conditions by realising continuous professional development and self-efficacy.

In this study, which investigates the relationship between the entrepreneurial characteristics of school principals and the attitudes and self-efficacy of teachers towards inclusive education, it has been observed that the entrepreneurial characteristics of school principals positively affect the attitudes and self-efficacy of teachers towards inclusive education at a moderate level. In order to provide the expected benefits from inclusive education, its quality needs to be improved. The most important element in the development of quality is teachers. The attitudes and self-efficacy of teachers towards

this process are directly related to the performances of school principals who have entrepreneurial competencies and can use these competencies. In this context, school principals are expected to be open to innovation, inspire their employees, give continuous feedback, share, visionary, work in cooperation within and outside the institution, be a role model in developing positive attitudes, and support individual differences. As a result, it has been observed that the attitudes and self-efficacy of teachers, who play a key role in achieving the goals of inclusive education, are significant and that the entrepreneurship of school principals contributes significantly to the development of these attitudes and self-efficacy.

### Research and Publication Ethics

In this study, all rules specified in the "Directive on Scientific Research and Publication Ethics of Higher Education Institutions" were followed. None of the actions specified under the second section of the Directive, "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics", have been carried out.

### Disclosure Statements

1. Contribution rate statement of researchers: Author 100%.
2. No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

### CRedit authorship contribution statement

Özgür UYGUR: Writing – review & editing, data collection, data analysis, methodology, conceptualization

### References

- Adıgüzel, A., & Sağlam, M. (2009). Öğretmen eğitiminde program standartları ve akreditasyon. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(3), 83-103.
- Audretsch, D. B. (2002). Entrepreneurship: A Survey of The Literature, *Entreprise Directorate-General European Commission, Institute for Development Strategies, Indiana University & Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR)*.
- Binks, M., & Vale, P. (1990). *Entrepreneurship and Economic Change*, McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Birch, D. (1979). *The Job Generation Process*. MIT Program on Neighborhood and Regional Change.
- Bozdağ, İ., & Akın, M. A. (2023). Okul Yöneticilerinin Hizmetkâr Liderlik Özellikleriyle Girişimcilik Becerileri İlişkisinin Analizi. *Eğitim ve İnsani Bilimler Dergisi: Teori ve Uygulama*, 14(28), 357-385. <https://doi.org/10.58689/eibd.1390400>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Pegem A.
- Coulter, M. K. (2003). *Entrepreneurship in Action*, 2. Baskı, Prentice Hall.
- Dedeoğlu, H., & Yılmaz-Atman, B. (2022). *Eğitimde Kapsayıcılık*. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- Demirkol, M. (2022). Kapsayıcı eğitimde öğretmen yeterlikleri. Altındağ Kumaş, Ö. ve Süer, S. (Ed.), *Nitelikli Kapsayıcı Eğitim (Kuramdan Uygulamaya)* içinde (51-85). Pegem A.
- Drucker, F. P. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship Practise & Principles*. Harper & Row.
- Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5), 813–828.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error: Algebra and Statistics. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 382-388. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3150980>

- Güngör, T. A., & Pehlivan, O. (2021). Kapsayıcı eğitimin Türk Eğitim Sistemindeki yeri ve önemi. *Studies in Educational Research and Development*, 5(1), 48-71.  
<https://serd.artvin.edu.tr/en/download/article-file/1416759>
- Hinton, P., McMurray, I., & Brownlow, C. (2014). *SPSS explained*. (2nd Edition). Routledge.
- Jenkinson, J. C. (1997). *Mainstream or Special? Educating Students with Disabilities*. Routledge.
- Karasar, N. (2010). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler*. Nobel.
- Kielblock, S. (2018). *Inclusive education for all: Development of an instrument to measure the teachers' attitudes*. Justus Liebig University Giessen, Germany, Macquarie University Sydney, Australia
- Köklü, N., Büyüköztürk, Ş., & Çokluk Bökeoğlu, Ö. (2006). *Sosyal bilimler için istatistik*. Pegem Akademi.
- Kuyini, A. B., Desai, I., & Sharma, U. (2020). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes and concerns about implementing inclusive education in Ghana. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(14), 1509-1526.
- MEB (2024). *2023-2024 academic year education statistics*. Available on 30/09/2024 from [https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb\\_iys\\_dosyalar/2024\\_10/11230736\\_meb\\_istatistikleri\\_orgun\\_egitim\\_2023\\_2024.pdf](https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2024_10/11230736_meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2023_2024.pdf)
- Morris, M. H., & P. S. Lewis (1995). The Determinants of entrepreneurial activity. Implications for marketing, *European Journal of Marketing*, 29 (7); 31-48.
- OECD. (2023) *Equity and inclusion in education: finding strength through diversity*. Publishing. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1787/e9072e21-en>. OECD.
- Özkan, Ş. Y., Kirgöz, S., & Beşdere, B. (2021). *Normalleştirilmeden kapsayıcı eğitime: Tarihsel gelişim*. H. Gürgür & S. Rakap içinde, Kapsayıcı eğitim özel eğitimde bütünleştirme (s. 17-53).
- Qvortrup, A., & Qvortrup, L. (2018). Inclusion: Dimensions of inclusion in education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 22(7), 803-817.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1412506>
- Rabi, N. M., & Zulkefli, M. Y. (2018). Mainstream teachers' competency requirement for inclusive education program. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business And Social Sciences*, 8(11), 1779-1791. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v8-i11/5354>
- Sağlam, H. İ., & Kanbur, N. İ. (2017). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin mülteci öğrencilere yönelik tutumlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 7(2), 310-323. <https://doi.org/10.19126/suje.335877>
- Sakız, H. (2021). *Eğitimde Bir Kalite Modeli Olarak Kapsayıcı Eğitim*. Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research*, 8(2), 23-74.
- Scruggs, T. E. & Mastropieri, M. A. (1996). Teacher perceptions of mainstreaming/inclusion, 1958–1995: *A Research Synthesis*. 63 (1), 60-70.
- Simon, D., Kriston, L., Loh, A., Spies, C., Scheibler, F., Wills, C., & Härter, M. (2010). Confirmatory factor analysis and recommendations for improvement of the Autonomy-Preference-Index (API). *Health Expectations*, 234-243. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2009.00584.x>
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of educational psychology*, 99(3), 611.
- Subban, P., & Sharma, U. (2006). Primary school teachers' perceptions of inclusive education in Victoria, Australia. *International Journal of Special Education*, 21 (1), 42-52.

- Şimşek, H., Dağistan, A., Şahin, C., Koçyiğit, E., Dağistan Yalçinkaya G., Kart, M. & Dağdelen, S. (2019). Kapsayıcı eğitim bağlamında Türkiye’de temel eğitim programlarında çok kültürlülüğün izleri. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5(2), 177-197.  
<https://doi.org/10.31592/aeusbed.563388>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of educational research*, 68(2), 202-248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & McMaster, P. (2009). Sources of self-efficacy: Four professional development formats and their relationship to self-efficacy and implementation of a new teaching strategy. *The elementary school journal*, 110(2), 228–245.
- UNESCO (2009). *Policy Guidelines on Inclusion in Education*. Available on 03/22/2023 from [http://www.unesco.org/new/en/media-services/singleview/news/unescos\\_new\\_policy\\_guidelines\\_on\\_inclusion\\_in\\_education/](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/media-services/singleview/news/unescos_new_policy_guidelines_on_inclusion_in_education/)
- UNESCO (2017). *A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education*.  
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000248254>.
- Vantieghem, W., Roose, I., Goosen, K., Schelfhout, W., & Van Avermaet, P. (2023). Education for all in action: Measuring teachers’ competences for inclusive education. *PLoS one*, 18(11), e0291033. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0291033>
- Walker, T., Burbidge, E., Arden-Close, E., & Panourgia, C. (2024). Knowing me, knowing you: how school educators cope with the challenges of inclusion in deprived and non-deprived areas. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1-16.
- Yıldırım, E. (2017). *Sosyal bilgiler dersinde sığınmacılara yönelik kapsayıcı eğitimin incelenmesi* [Doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi
- Yıldırım, S. (2016). *Kosova'daki Öğretmenlerin Çokkültürlü Eğitime Yönelik Bilgi, İnanç, Tutum ve Özyeterliliklerinin Sınıf İçi Uygulamalarıyla İlişkisinin İncelenmesi*. [Doktora tezi, Balıkesir Üniversitesi]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi
- Yılmaz, E. (2021). *Yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin kapsayıcı eğitime yönelik tutumları ve öz yeterliliklerinin değerlendirilmesi* [Yüksek lisans tezi, Erciyes Üniversitesi]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi