sustainability

MDPI

Article

Does the School Really Support My Child? SOFIA: An Assessment Tool for Families of Children with SEN in Spain

Laura Sánchez-Pujalte [1], María Teresa Gómez-Domínguez [2], Ana Soto-Rubio [3,*] and Diego Navarro-Mateu [2]

[1] Department of Education, Faculty of Education, Valencian International University, 46002 Valencia, Spain; marialaura.sanchez@campusviu.es

[2] Department of Educational Psychology and Special Educational Needs, Faculty of Teaching and Educational Sciences, Catholic University of Valencia, 46001 Valencia, Spain; mt.gomez@ucv.es (M.T.G.-D.); diego.navarro@ucv.es (D.N.-M.)

[3] Department of Personality, Assessment and Psychological Treatments, Faculty of Psychology, University of Valencia, 46010 Valencia, Spain

* Correspondence: ana.soto@uv.es

Received: 18 August 2020; Accepted: 20 September 2020; Published: 23 September 2020

Abstract: The integration of the family in educating their children allows for the optimization of educational intervention. Despite its relevance, there is not much research aimed at collecting the voice of the families of students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) about their relationship with the school system. The present study aims to develop and validate a questionnaire of the family perception of the support received from the educational system, the Satisfaction of Family in Inclusive Education Assessment (SOFIA) Questionnaire, conformed of 26 indicators. Analyses of the psychometric properties of the instrument support that they are good for use in this area. Specifically, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses support the internal structure of the instrument (confirmatory factorial analysis (CFA) = SBχ^2 = 607.11, $p < 0.001$; χ^2/df = 2.07; Comparative Adjustment Index (IFC) = 0.902; Incremental Adjustment Index (IFI) = 0.903; the root mean square error approximation (RMSEA) = 0.071) in the same way, all dimension showed adequate reliability (Cronbach's alpha ranged from 0.91 to 0.94; CR ranged from 0.91 to 0.95). The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) results also showed adequate results (0.55 to 0.68). Our research results indicate that the SOFIA Questionnaire's psychometric properties are adequate for the Spanish context. The SOFIA Questionnaire is presented as a valid and reliable instrument to collect the families' perception of the support they receive from the educational system.

Keywords: special educational needs; family; support; school; satisfaction; SEN; assessment

1. Introduction

Attention to the most vulnerable students must be a priority for the education system and today's society [1]. Inclusive education is the most effective way to address this need [2–4]. Inclusive education has had its origins in special education, which has been conceptually overtaken [5–7].

As defined by specialists and institutions [2,8–12], inclusion understands diversity beyond the concept of difficulties, disabilities, and specific educational needs. It implies individualized educational attention designed for and within each context and is addressed to all and each of the school members [8,10,12]. Its goal is to avoid the barriers that prevent or hinder the presence, learning, and participation of all students, with particular attention to those most vulnerable [8–10]. Inclusion concerns all children and young people: it focuses on presence and participation,

including teachers and parents, and involves combating all forms of exclusion [9–12]. Inclusion is also a process that is never finished [10,12]. Its ultimate goal is to transform educational systems and learning environments to provide an appropriate response to students' unique needs [13]. However, achieving a truly inclusive school is no easy task, as it involves a profound transformation of educational centers [14–16].

In Spain, the total number of students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) who received scholarly attention other than ordinary care amounted to 623,268 students during the 2017–2018 school year, representing 7.8% of the total student population, which implies a considerable number of families in this situation [17]. Of these, 35.7% presented SEN associated with disability or severe disorder; 5.4% due to high intellectual capacity; 3.7% due to late integration into the educational system; and 54.2% due to other categories of needs (learning disabilities, language, and communication development disorders and situations of socio-educational disadvantage). The distribution of these students between public centers and subsidized education is practically equal, representing 3% and 2.9% of the total student population.

Spain is a decentralized country with 17 autonomous communities. Although each community has the authority to design and implement a specific model of attention to diversity, all must devote some personnel resources to students with SEN, since there are common standards in this area, as established by the Organic Law for the Improvement of the Quality of Education (LOMCE) [18]. The most commonly developed support model of integration of students with SEN in Spain is based on the notion of 'remedial education', which is basically the special needs education model transferred to mainstream schools, where schools tend to organize themselves in a somewhat fragmented manner, creating separate spaces for providing support outside the main classroom [18]. Therefore, most of Spain's supports are of a personal nature (Hearing and Language or Therapeutic Pedagogy.)

The development of an inclusive and quality education necessarily requires the real and effective participation of the family and other social agents in the education of children and young people [19,20]. Furthermore, to assess whether and to what extent such real and effective participation occurs, reliable and valid measuring instruments are needed. These instruments would make it possible not only to evaluate the situation at a given time but also the possible change it may have undergone due to an intervention program [21].

Various research studies [22–24] have shown the benefits of adequate family participation in schools on students' specific aspects, such as school performance, emotional development, and self-esteem. Greater participation of parents has been related to better student performance [25–28]; higher attendance and graduation rates [29]; fewer disciplinary problems [27,30,31]; and improved psychological well-being of parents while improving children's outcomes, skill development, and psychological adjustment [32–34].

The family's integration in educating their children allows for optimizing an educational intervention [20,21,35]. The degree of family participation is an indicator of the quality of an educational center [36,37] since it benefits the center as a whole, both students and teachers, and the families themselves [38].

A valuable method for determining the quality of inclusion within schools is to ascertain the experiences of the parents of children with disabilities [39], and it is necessary to have reliable and valid measuring instruments for this purpose.

Despite their importance, too often, the relationship between family and school has been characterized by a lack of communication [40], disagreement between the two parties [41], or a considerable gap between expectations and reality [38]. A previous step to improve the relations between families and the educational system must start with understanding the perception that families have of these relations and their satisfaction with them. Families demand actions aimed at both the attention provided to their children and themselves. Concerning the first aspect, several authors highlight the right of vulnerable students to be attended by qualified professionals who understand and respond to their educational needs [42–44]. Likewise, various studies stress the need to ensure

that schools are truly adapted and designed to embrace all types of students, without exception, in response to the right to an inclusive and quality education for all [44–46]. However, studies such as that of Navarro et al. [47] indicate that the various supports and structures established by the school administration to address any student's vulnerability are not working in a fully satisfactory manner for families. This situation generates feelings of helplessness, lack of information and coordination, and feelings of misunderstanding about what is happening with their children in educational contexts. Therefore, it is necessary to rethink how the families of students with SEN participate in educational centers, by promoting more collaborative formulas where each one can develop his or her role, joining all efforts in favor of inclusive and high-quality education, and shortening the distance between the participation model established in educational legislation and what is actually happening. Achieving these ambitious and necessary goals is not possible if there are no instruments to assess families' perspectives on these aspects.

Despite its relevance, there is not much research aimed at collecting the voice of the families of students with SEN about their relationship with the school system and their perception of it [48]. Many studies that analyze the parents' perceptions of their relationship with the school focus on analyzing the parent's perceptions regarding inclusive educational placements [49–52]. Similarly, most studies in this area have focused specifically on one disorder, usually Autism Spectrum Disorder, Cerebral Palsy, or Learning Disabilities [39,53–55]. Simultaneously, much of the research in the field use qualitative techniques, mainly semi-structured interviews, and focus or discussion groups [56–60], making it difficult to collect, compare and generalize data [61]. The few studies using questionnaires [53,59,60] have focused, as discussed above, either on specific disorders or in student's and teacher's variables [62–69], often leaving aside the perception of the parents. For all the above reasons, there is a need to assess the opinion of the parents of children with SEN regarding the education their children receive, and to give them a voice through a tool that is reliable and valid and that allows studies to be carried out in this respect, in order to enhance the participation of these parents in the inclusive education of their children.

Given the significance of family involvement in promoting inclusive education, and the absence of a self-administered instrument that measures the families' perception of the support received from the educational system, the present study has as its main aim the development and validation of a questionnaire that assesses the family perception of the support received from the educational system: the Satisfaction of Family in Inclusive Education Assessment (SOFIA) Questionnaire, from now on the SOFIA Questionnaire.

It is hoped that the development and validation of this instrument will contribute to the future design of lines of action that promote an optimal collaborative relationship between families and schools, with the ultimate goal of benefiting the student body and the entire system in general.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Participants

The population under study consists of 207 families with children with SEN. The average age of the respondents is 44.64 years (SD = 6.77). The minimum age was 25 years, while the maximum age was 67 years. Regarding the children's sociodemographic characteristics, the respondents indicated an average age of 11.62 years (SD = 5.49). The minimum age was 3 years old, while the maximum age was 25 years old (63% male). The descriptive data of the families and the children are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive data of the participants.

Variable		Percentage
Family		
Kinship	Mother	79%
	Father	20%
	Other	1%
Level of education	Compulsory education	34%
	Vocational training	34%
	University education	32%
Occupation	Working	65%
	Unemployed	35%
Children with SEN		
Stage of education	Pre-school or primary	56%
	Secondary or higher	44%
Special Educational Need	ASD	23%
	ADHD	18%
	Intellectual disability	17%
	Specific learning difficulties	16%
	Serious behavioral disorder	1%
	High capacity	2%
	Visual Deficit	2%
	Audition deficit	3%
	Motor disability	1%
	Other types of ASD	17%
Typology of needs	Language and communication	24%
	Learning	23%
	Social relations	18%
	Attention	14%
	Hearing	1%
	Visual	2%
	Cognitive	11%
	Motor	4%
	Other areas	3%

Note: ASD = Autistic Spectrum Disorder, ADHD = Attentional Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder.

2.2. Instrument

The SOFIA Questionnaire is made of 26 indicators, grouped in 3 blocks or dimensions: Factor 1: Perception of the school's educational response (e.g., "Do you receive information on how to evaluate your child's learning?"); Factor 2: Attitude of the school towards inclusion (e.g., "Is your child included in all aspects of the school's daily life?"); Factor 3: SEN psycho-educational assessment (e.g., "Did you feel that the professionals who conducted your child's evaluation involved you in the process?"), with different response formats on a Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree/Very inadequate) to 5 (Strongly Agree/Very adequate). The instrument presents adequate psychometric properties ($\alpha = 0.97$). The questionnaire pass lasts between 30 and 40 min. It has been designed to be self-administering, although it can also be conducted in an interview. Additionally, it may be completed in the on-line mode or paper format.

2.3. Procedure

A quantitative cross-cultural design was used in this study. This study respected the Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research of the British Educational Research Association [70], with particular emphasis on the anonymization of the data collected, confidentiality, and non-discrimination of participants. All participants were of legal age and voluntarily agreed to participate in the study.

All families that participated in the study received information about the object of the research. They were also informed that their participation was completely voluntary and that they could leave the study at any time if they so wished. They were also given information about their rights as participants, which were guaranteed by the informed consent they were required to sign. This document explained the protection of anonymity and confidentiality of the collected data. The instruments were given to the families through the school counselors and the participating associations. The data collection took place during the 2017–2018 school year.

For the instrument's construction and validation, the International Test Commission's recommendations were followed [71]. About the development of the instrument, the proposal of the items of the initial pool was made by taking into consideration three elements: (a) the scientific literature existing to date, (b) the Spanish legislative framework, and (c) the proposal of relevant content by the committee of experts based on their knowledge and experience. From there, and once the data have been collected, the statistical analysis of the data is what allows us to analyze which items work best and how they are grouped, resulting in the SOFIA Questionnaire and its excellent psychometric properties. In other words, to proceed with the instrument's design and subsequent validation, three phases were carried out: Phase 1. Bibliographic review and legislative analysis; Phase 2. Preparation of the SOFIA Questionnaire and analysis of its contents' validity through expert judgment; Phase 3. Analysis of the psychometric properties of the instrument.

2.3.1. Phase 1. Bibliographic Review and Legislative Analysis

First, a search was done for studies that delved into the topic to determine which aspects were the most important in the assessment instrument's first proposal. Several studies were used as a basis for the proposal of different important aspects to be taken into account in the construction of the questions by the experts in phase 2 (among those that stand out are: [1,3–5,10,12,16,18,20,23,30,39,43,45,47,51,55,61,66]). Based on the literature review and the detailed analysis of the existing legislation, the main dimensions were proposed to design the SOFIA Questionnaire, which has subsequently been subjected to an analysis of its content validity through expert judgment, as suggested by the International Test Commission [71]. Although the items were not defined at this stage, the information collected was fundamental to work with the panel of experts in phase 2. Regarding the school, three main themes were identified as important for parents of children with SEM. First, the general attitude of the school regarding inclusion. Second, the psychological and educational assessment of the SEN. Finally, the educational response of the school. These themes laid the foundation for the design of the items in phase 2.

2.3.2. Phase 2. Preparation of the SOFIA Questionnaire and Analysis of the Validity of Its Contents through an Experts Judgment

For the questionnaire's initial design, the research team members were involved in drawing up a list of aspects to be assessed based on their experience, supplemented with the information collected in phase 1. Based on this information, a 45-item pull was designed, which was subsequently subjected to content validity through the judgment of 19 experts representing all members of the educational community and families: school guidance counselors, representatives of associations of families of children with SEN, teacher training technicians, university teachers, parents of students with SEN and education inspectors, all of whom were chosen for their extensive experience and in-depth knowledge in the field of inclusive education.

Once the experts had been selected, they were given the document, a four-part Validation Guide Part I. Letter of presentation of the questionnaire; Part II. Instructions for the response process; Part III. Questionnaire items; Part IV. General evaluation of the questionnaire, in which the objectives, both general and specific, of the designed questionnaire were presented, and they were asked, as experts, to evaluate the "relevance" (importance for the dimension or area to be measured) and "pertinence" (the suitability of the item to that area) of the described items using, for this purpose, a Likert scale

with four categories of responses: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor. They also had a space to express the observations, modifications, contributions, or recommendations they considered appropriate. After the experts' analysis and validation of the contents, it was decided to make the corresponding modifications by eliminating 10 items from the initial questionnaire. This decision was taken because each item retained in the questionnaire was considered relevant by the expert committee members unanimously. At the same time, in those items where consensus was not reached, the committee's experts reached the consensus that it was better to eliminate them because they were not considered relevant to the object of study. In summary, the decision to eliminate those ten items and keep the rest was taken unanimously by the expert committee after arguing the relevance of each of them for the measurement instrument's design.

2.3.3. Phase 3. Analysis of the Psychometric Properties of the Instrument

Based on expert opinion, the final version of the questionnaire was drawn up, consisting of 35 items grouped into three factors, which was then applied to a sample of 207 families of children with SEN, and an analysis of the psychometric properties was carried out. The instrument's validity was analyzed in the first step employing the corresponding exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. Previously, sample adequacy was determined using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test (KMO) and the Bartlett sphericity test. The results of that analysis are provided in the present study in the results section. Following the recommendations of Lloret-Segura, Ferreres-Traver, Hernández-Baeza, and Tomás [72], an exploratory factorial analysis (EFA) was performed using the Maximum Verosimilitude (MV) extraction method, with the approximately normal distribution of the elements making up the scale (values of asymmetry and kurtosis less than 3 or −3). Subsequently, the Oblimin standardized direct rotation method and the Parallel Analysis method were used to determine the number of factors. To determine the fit of the extracted model, the residual root mean square coefficients (RMSR) were analyzed (<0.05) [73], as well as the gamma index or goodness of fit (GFI) (>0.95) [74], proposed by Tanaka and Huba [75]. To perform the confirmatory factorial analysis (CFA), Bentler [76] recommends applying the Robust Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MVR) method to correct for a possible absence of multivariate normality using statistical criteria such as the χ^2 proposed by Satorra-Bentler [77]. Therefore, the overall adjustment assessment was carried out using different goodness-of-fit indices, such as the significance of chi-square and the robust correction of Satorra-Bentler (S-B χ^2) [76,78,79]. Coefficients were also calculated to test the appropriateness of the proposed model, such as the ratio of the proportion of χ^2 to its degrees of freedom χ^2/df [80], the coefficients of the indices of the goodness of fit: the Comparative Adjustment Index, the [81], and the Incremental Adjustment Index (IFI) (values above 0. 90 indicate a good fit) [82,83], as well as the root mean square error approximation (RMSEA, ≤0.08) [82,83]. To increase the empirical evidence on construct validity, the convergent and discriminant validity of the scale was observed based on the CFA [84]. To this end, the adoption of the criterion of Fornell-Larcker [85] has been widely accepted by many authors e.g., [86–91]. This criterion postulates that the measurement model's convergent validity can be assessed using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and Composite Reliability (CR). In contrast, the discriminant validity can be assessed by comparing the amount of the variance captured by the construct (AVE) and the shared variance with other constructs, where the square root of the AVE value of the factors is greater than the correlation coefficients between each of the factors of the proposed scale. Kline [92] suggests that the correlations between various factor pairs should be less than 0.85.

The properties of the items and the reliability of the instrument were then analyzed. In the case of the items' descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation), observations of the item-total correlation coefficients and the values of asymmetry and kurtosis were made. Also, the scale's reliability was analyzed by calculating Cronbach's alpha coefficient and verifying the possibility of its improvement if one or more items were eliminated. The Composite Reliability (CF) and the Measurement of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) of each of the factors were also analyzed [93].

2.4. Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis was conducted using the programs: SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version 25), EQS (Structural Equation Modeling Software, Version 6.4), and FACTOR (Version 10.7).

3. Results

3.1. Validity Analysis

First, the adequacy of the data for a factorial analysis was analyzed. Both the KMO index (KMO = 0.94) and Bartlett's sphericity test (4815.5, df = 406; $p \leq 0.01$) suggest that the data are adequate to proceed with this type of analysis. Then, following the process recommended by Lloret-Segura et al., [72], an exploratory factorial analysis (EFA) was performed for the 35 items associated to family satisfaction with the supports received from the educational system, verifying through the Parallel Analysis the factorial solution that best fit the object of study. However, six items (15, 16, 20, 31, 34, and 35) were eliminated due to theoretical inconsistency and because they presented factor loads below 0.30 or above 0.30 on two or more factors. Given that the instrument's validity is something desirable in its construction, and the present study's objective is to find a valid and reliable instrument with good psychometric properties, these six items were eliminated, following indications from the scientific literature on the subject [72]. Therefore, a new exploratory factor analysis was performed (see Table 2).

Table 2. Rotated factorial structure of the Satisfaction of Family in Inclusive Education Assessment (SOFIA) Questionnaire, Communalities, and Cronbach's alpha.

	F1	F2	F3	Com.
Factor 1				
Item 6	0.45			0.433
Item 7	0.347			0.459
Item 8	0.476			0.581
Item 9	0.643			0.699
Item 10	0.524			0.593
Item 11	0.502			0.639
Item 12	0.775			0.627
Item 13	0.863			0.604
Item 14	0.718			0.613
Item 17	0.391			0.393
Item 22	0.413			0.274
Factor 2				
Item 18		0.66		0.620
Item 19		0.595		0.803
Item 21		0.552		0.627
Item 23		0.548		0.575
Item 24		0.871		0.674
Item 25		0.733		0.532
Item 26		0.664		0.658
Item 27		0.517		0.563

Table 2. *Cont.*

	F1	F2	F3	Com.
Item 28		0.79		0.502
Item 29		0.622		0.512
Item 30		0.49		0.489
Item 32		0.728		0.616
Item 33		0.83		0.682
Factor 3				
Item 1			0.883	0.737
Item 2			0.783	0.629
Item 3			0.803	0.723
Item 4			0.831	0.693
Item 5			0.679	0.671
Cronbach's Alpha	0.92	0.95	0.91	
Auto-value	14.36	2.47	1.51	
Variance explained (%)	49.52	8.54	5.24	
Number of items	11	13	5	

Note: Com. = Communalities.

The results of this new factorial analysis showed a good fit for the factorial structure as the RMSR index was 0.05, below the recommended cut-off point (<0.50), and the GFI index value was 0.99, above the recommended cut-off point (>0.95) [94]. All factor loads of the items were higher than 0.30, and no factor loads higher than this saturation were observed in two or more factors. Thus, the three factors into which the remaining 29 items were grouped explained 63.30% of the variance. The three factors extracted were called as follows: Factor 1. Perception of the school's educational response; Factor 2. Attitude of the school towards inclusion; and Factor 3. SEN psycho-educational assessment.

Then, after the exploratory factor analysis, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed. The following steps were taken: (1) model specification, (2) identification, (3) model estimation, (4) test model fitting, and (5) model re-specification [95]. The three-factor model consisting of the perceptions of family satisfaction with the supports received from the education system was submitted to the AFC with a total of 29 items. Goodness-of-fit indices showed that the three-factor model fit the data.

The chi-square statistic for the model obtained was significant (SBχ^2 = 830.43, $p < 0.001$). Besides, the standardized chi-square value (χ^2/df = 2.22) was below the recommended cut-off value of less than 3.00 [96]. The RMSEA (0.077) also indicated a reasonable adjustment while the IFC (0.874), IFI (0.875), and NNFI (0.863) did not exceed the suggested cut-off value (>0.90) [83,97]. Table 3 shows the Goodness-of-Fit Indices for the questionnaire.

Table 3. SOFIA Questionnaire's Goodness-of-Fit Indices.

Model	S-Bχ^2	df	χ^2/df	RMSEA	CFI	IFI
3 Factors—29 items	830.43	374	2.22	0.077	0.874	0.875
3 Factors—26 items	607.11	296	2.07	0.071	0.902	0.903

Note: S-B = Satorra Bentler; df = degrees of freedom; RMSEA = Mean Square Approximation Error (≤0.080); IC = RMSEA Confidence Interval; IFC = Comparative Adjustment Index; IFI = Incremental Adjustment Index; IFC, IFI (≥0.90); χ^2/df (≤5.00).

The model was then re-specified by removing items 13, 22, and 30. In the resulting model, the chi-square statistic was significant (SBχ^2 = 607.11, $p < 0.001$). Also, the normalized chi-square

value (χ^2/df = 2.07) was below the recommended cut-off value. The RMSEA (0.071) also indicated a reasonable adjustment while the IFC (0.902) and IFI (0.903) exceeded the suggested cut-off value.

Discriminant validity was examined by analyzing the correlations between factors. The result indicated that all inter-factor loads were sufficiently below the recommended threshold (0.85) by Kline [92], in each of the dimensions. It also shows how Fornell and Larcker [84] criterion is fulfilled, which indicates that the root of AVE must be higher than each pair of correlations. Table 4 shows the correlations between factors associated with the perception by families of students with SEN of the support received from the education system.

Table 4. Correlations between factors of the SOFIA questionnaire.

	F1	F2	F3
Factor 1. Perception of the school's educational response.	0.74		
Factor 2. Attitude of the school towards inclusion.	0.71 *	0.77	
Factor 3. SEN psycho-educational assessment.	0.63 *	0.59 *	0.83

* Correlation is significant at level 0.01 (bilateral). The diagonal offers the values of the $\sqrt{}$AVE.

3.2. Item Analysis and Reliability Analysis

The 26 elements of the SOFIA Questionnaire were analyzed. The final items, averages, standard deviations (*SD*), asymmetry (A) and kurtosis (K), total item correlations ($r_{jx)}$, and Cronbach's alphas if the item is deleted (α-x) are shown in Table 5. Mainly, the contribution of each item to the scale seems to be adequate. The elimination of any element does not seem to improve the reliability of the entire scale (α = 0.97). Likewise, to continue studying the reliability of the scale, the values of Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, the Composite Reliability (CR), and the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) were analyzed. Cronbach's Alpha and CR values for the factors were higher than the recommended threshold of 0.70 [85]. Finally, the AVE value for the factors ranged from 0.55 to 0.68, above the recommended threshold of 0.50 [98]. Table 5 shows the reliability data of the questionnaire.

Table 5. Item properties and reliability of the SOFIA questionnaire.

	Mean	*SD*	A	K	r_{jx}	α-x
Factor 1. AVE = 0.55; CR = 0.92; α = 0.92						
Item 6	4.01	1.11	−1.05	0.45	0.62	0.96
Item 7	3.15	1.37	−0.20	−1.15	0.68	0.96
Item 8	3.20	1.43	−0.21	−1.26	0.77	0.96
Item 9	3.48	1.24	−0.46	−0.68	0.80	0.96
Item 10	3.60	1.26	−0.70	−0.55	0.75	0.96
Item 11	3.65	1.28	−0.72	−0.50	0.79	0.96
Item 12	3.69	1.21	−0.72	−0.38	0.68	0.96
Item 14	3.69	1.17	−0.58	−0.54	0.68	0.96
Item 17	3.41	1.21	−0.40	−0.58	0.62	0.96
Factor 2. AVE = 0.59; CR = 0.95; α = 0.94						
Item 18	3.77	1.18	−0.82	−0.19	0.78	0.96
Item 19	3.87	1.22	−0.85	−0.29	0.89	0.96
Item 21	3.79	1.12	−0.87	−0.01	0.77	0.96
Item 23	3.44	1.15	−0.34	−0.79	0.76	0.96
Item 24	4.26	1.05	−1.44	1.57	0.72	0.96
Item 25	4.27	0.95	−1.30	0.98	0.65	0.96
Item 26	3.96	1.20	−0.99	−0.03	0.76	0.96
Item 27	3.72	1.17	−0.63	−0.46	0.74	0.96

Table 5. *Cont.*

	Mean	*SD*	A	K	r_{jx}	α-x
Item 28	3.82	1.21	−0.81	−0.40	0.59	0.97
Item 29	3.57	1.33	−0.57	−0.76	0.73	0.96
Item 32	4.04	1.11	−1.01	0.02	0.71	0.96
Item 33	4.24	0.95	−1.22	0.74	0.77	0.96
Factor 3. AVE = 0.68; CR = 0.91; α = 0.91						
Item 1	3.71	1.17	−0.58	−0.54	0.56	0.97
Item 2	3.83	1.11	−0.77	−0.15	0.60	0.96
Item 3	3.76	1.17	−0.82	−0.07	0.69	0.96
Item 4	3.74	1.23	−0.72	−0.51	0.60	0.96
Item 5	3.56	1.20	−0.43	−0.75	0.71	0.96

Note: Ave = mean variance extracted; CR = Composite Reliability; α = Cronbach's Alpha; *SD* = Standard Deviation; A = Asymmetry; K = kurtosis; r_{jx} = total item correlations; α-x = Cronbach's alphas if item is deleted.

The analysis of the one-dimensional scale related to the respondents' general satisfaction has been measured by Cronbach's Alpha index 0.97, higher than the recommended threshold of 0.70 [85].

The content of each of the items included in the final version of the SOFIA questionnaire can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Contents of the items included in the final version of the SOFIA questionnaire.

	Content of the Item
	Factor 1: Perception of the school's educational response
Item 6	Do you agree with your child's schooling?
Item 7	Do you receive any orientation or educational guidelines from the center to follow with your child at home?
Item 8	Do you receive information on how to assess your child's learning?
Item 9	Do you feel that the assessment of your child's learning is appropriate?
Item 10	Do you feel that the educational team working with your child is coordinated?
Item 11	Is the school's way of communicating your child's progress good?
Item 12	Do you feel that what your child is learning in school is appropriate to his/her needs?
Item 14	Do you think your child is being prepared for his/her future?
Item 17	Is there coordination between teaching and non-teaching staff?
	Factor 2: Attitude of the school towards inclusion
Item 18	Do they pay attention to what you tell them without judging you, your child, or your family?
Item 19	Are you generally satisfied with the relationship between you and the school?
Item 21	How do you feel about the school's acceptance of students with SEN?
Item 23	Do you feel that the school values the difference as something positive?
Item 24	Has your child been well received at the school?
Item 25	Is your child included in all daily aspects of the school?
Item 26	Do you help and encourage your child to socialize or develop friendships with peers?
Item 27	If the transition between educational stages has occurred, are you satisfied with the way it has been handled?

Table 6. *Cont.*

	Content of the Item
Item 28	Do you feel that the relationship between your child and his/her peers is satisfactory?
Item 29	Regarding the supports for students with SEN that are provided at the school your child attends, has it been easy to obtain them?
Item 32	When he/she goes to school, does he/she feel welcomed by the professionals of the school?
Item 33	Are the professionals of the school close and open to communication?
	Factor 3: SEN psycho-educational assessment
Item 1	Did you feel that the professionals who conducted your child's assessment involved you in the process?
Item 2	Do you think the questions you were asked for assessment and diagnosis were clear and understandable?
Item 3	Do you feel that the professionals who conducted your child's assessment were involved in the process? (The concept of involvement should be understood as being involved and/or committed to all aspects related to the child.)
Item 4	Did they explain to you the data contained in the report?
Item 5	Do you feel that you were sufficiently informed and oriented regarding your son or daughter's present and future SENs?

4. Discussion

Inclusive education is a key policy objective for children and young people with special educational needs (SEN) and disabilities [99].

The participation of families is essential to achieve the goals of inclusive education successfully. As the literature suggests, a precious method for determining the quality of inclusion within schools is to ascertain the experiences of the parents of children with disabilities [45].

Despite its relevance, there is not much research aimed at collecting the voice of the families of students with SEN about their relationship with the school system and their perception of it [46]. Such studies are even scarcer if we consider SEN in general and not as specific disorders [59–61]. At the same time, much of the research in this field use qualitative techniques, mainly semi-structured interviews, and focus or discussion groups [64,65], making it difficult to collect, compare, and generalize data.

For all these reasons, the present study makes sense, since its main aim was to develop and validate a questionnaire of the family perception of the support received from the educational system, the Satisfaction of Family in Inclusive Education Assessment (SOFIA) Questionnaire, the SOFIA Questionnaire.

To this end, the recommendations of the International Test Commission were followed [71]. To proceed with the design and subsequent validation of the instrument, three phases were carried out: Phase 1. Bibliographic review and legislative analysis; Phase 2. Preparation of the SOFIA Questionnaire and analysis of its contents' validity through expert judgment; Phase 3. Analysis of the psychometric properties of the instrument.

Based on the results obtained, an instrument is proposed to measure the families' perception of the educational system's support. This instrument is built taking into account the previous scientific literature. It has been constructed following the most rigorous methods, taking into account the validation of the contents by a committee of experts and the international test commission's procedures. The model resulting from this work that is proposed for the SOFIA Questionnaire has been developed from three factors with 9, 12, and 5 items related to (1) perception of the educational response of the school to the SEN, (2) perception of the school's attitude towards inclusion, and (3) perception of the psycho-pedagogical evaluation of the SEN. The dimensions found are similar to those proposed in other previous studies on the perception that parents have of the support received by the school

system [57,67]. Therefore, they are nourished by previous research contributions while adapting to the study sample used in this research. At the same time, analyses of the instrument's psychometric properties support that they are good for this area. Specifically, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses support the internal structure of the instrument (CFA = SBχ^2 = 607.11, $p < 0.001$; χ^2/df = 2.07; IFC = 0.902; IFI = 0.903; RMSEA = 0.071) in the same way, all dimension showed adequate reliability (Cronbach's alpha ranged from 0.91 to 0.94; CR ranged from 0.91 to 0.95). The AVE results also showed adequate results (0.55 to 0.68). Likewise, each item seems to contribute adequately to the whole scale, and the Cronbach Alpha did not improve eliminating any of them. All the data collected appear to confirm that the SOFIA Questionnaire is an instrument with adequate validity and reliability.

Despite the interest of the study, it is not without certain limitations. Among them, one refers to the sample under study. The selection of this sample was not probabilistic but intentional, which could affect representativeness. Moreover, following Kline's [78] criteria on sample size, the sample is within the limits of what is considered adequate for confirmatory factor analysis. However, the size may also have affected the representativeness, and consequently, the generalization of the results. Another notable limitation is that the questionnaire's design has been made partly based on the Spanish regulations on inclusive education, making it challenging to apply in other countries with a different organizational and political structure in terms of inclusive education. Future research could address these limitations by extending the sample under study to other contexts and countries and using probability sampling. Considering the SOFIA questionnaire's excellent psychometric properties on the Spanish sample, it seems promising to test it on other languages and adapt it to other countries so that a broader population may benefit from its use.

In conclusion, our research results indicate that the SOFIA Questionnaire's psychometric properties are adequate for the Spanish context. The SOFIA Questionnaire is presented as a valid and reliable instrument to collect the families' perception of the support they receive from the educational system. The results obtained from its application can provide knowledge that allows professionals and the responsible administrations to design and plan actions to guarantee an inclusive and quality education for all, including families.

These results could be interesting for the advance of the study of the satisfaction of the families of minors with SEN of the support they receive from the educational system, with clinical and research applications. Among the main applications of this validation would be the possibility of having a suitable tool to know the main weaknesses of the system in the provision of supports and services to families and students with SEN that should guide them in the establishment of corrective actions aimed at achieving an inclusive and quality education for all. Therefore, this type of study contributes to a better understanding of families' views about the support they receive from the education system and the school environment. The voices of parents of pupils with SEN are rarely considered concerning their relationship with the school system. Families of students with SEN will feel considered when they can express their opinions regarding those aspects of the education system, about their relationship with them, that do not meet their expectations. On the other hand, the information provided by this type of work allows being useful for the administrations in charge of marking the educational policies in the matter of inclusion, bringing the theory closer to the reality of the families and shortening the way between the theoretical contributions of the most recent studies and the reality of the schools. These findings should be disseminated, putting into value the conquests reached and consolidated.

The results obtained in the present study allow to advance and consolidate the research on inclusive education, a field of study with an eminent social utility, since it contributes to guaranteeing one of the most important rights for children, especially those who are most vulnerable, which is the right to an inclusive and quality education for all. Similarly, from a psychological and professional point of view, the results, in general, stimulate useful considerations for promoting best practices that guarantee inclusive and quality education for all.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, L.S.-P. and D.N.-M.; Data curation, L.S.-P., M.T.G.-D. and A.S.-R.; Formal analysis, A.S.-R.; Funding acquisition, M.T.G.-D.; Investigation, L.S.-P., M.T.G.-D. and D.N.-M.;

Methodology, A.S.-R.; Resources, L.S.-P., M.T.G.-D. and D.N.-M.; Software, A.S.-R.; Supervision, D.N.-M.; Validation, L.S.-P., M.T.G.-D., A.S.-R. and D.N.-M.; Visualization, L.S.-P., M.T.G.-D., A.S.-R. and D.N.-M.; Writing—original draft, L.S.-P., M.T.G.-D., A.S.-R. and D.N.-M.; Writing—review & editing, L.S.-P., M.T.G.-D., A.S.-R. and D.N.-M.. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments: To the families and the schools that participated in the study.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. UNESCO. *Declaración de Salamanca y Marco de Acción Para las Necesidades Educativas Especiales: Acceso y Calidad*; UNESCO: Genova, Italy, 1994.
2. Arnaiz, P. *Educación Inclusiva, una Escuela Para Todos*; Aljibe: Málaga, Spain, 2003.
3. Haug, P. Understanding inclusive education: Ideals and reality. *Scand. J. Disabil. Res.* **2017**, *19*, 206–217. [CrossRef]
4. Moriña, A. Inclusive education in higher education: Challenges and opportunities. *Eur. J. Spec. Needs Educ.* **2017**, *32*, 3–17. [CrossRef]
5. Echeita, G.; Verdugo, M.A. Diez años después de la Declaración de Salamanca sobre las necesidades educativas especiales en España. Entre la retórica esperanzadora y las resistencias al cambio. *Siglo Cero* **2005**, *6*, 5–12.
6. Yada, A.; Savolainen, H. Japanese in-service teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education and self-efficacy for inclusive practices. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* **2017**, *64*, 222–229. [CrossRef]
7. Butakor, P.K.; Ampadu, E.; Suleiman, S.J. Analysis of Ghanaian teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2020**, *24*, 1237–1252. [CrossRef]
8. Wehmeyer, M. Autodeterminación y la tercera generación de prácticas de inclusión. *Rev. Educ.* **2009**, *349*, 47–67.
9. Ainscow, M.; Booth, T.; Dyson, A. *Improving Schools, Developing Inclusion*; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2006.
10. Echeita, G.; Ainscow, M. La educación inclusiva como derecho. Marco de referencia y pautas de acción para el desarrollo de una revolución pendiente. *Tejuelo* **2011**, *12*, 26–46.
11. Escudero, J.M.; Martínez, B. Educación Inclusiva y cambio escolar. *Rev. Iberoam. Educ.* **2011**, *55*, 85–105. [CrossRef]
12. UNESCO. *Inclusive Education: The Way of the Future*; UNESCO: Genova, Italy, 2008.
13. Gallego, J.L.; Rodriguez, A. *La Alteridad en Educación. Teoría e Investigación*; Pirámide: Madrid, Spain, 2016.
14. Ainscow, M.; Howes, A.; Tweddle, D. *Moving Practice Forward at the District Level*; Ainscow, E.M., West, M., Eds.; Improving Urban Schools: Leadership and Collaboration; Open Univerity Press: Berkshire, UK, 2006; pp. 70–80.
15. Byrne, B. How inclusive is the right to inclusive education? An assessment of the UN convention on the rights of persons with disabilities' concluding observations. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2019**, 1–8. [CrossRef]
16. Love, H.R.; Horn, E. Definition, Context, Quality: Current Issues in Research Examining High-Quality Inclusive Education. *Top. Early Child. Spec. Educ.* **2019**. [CrossRef]
17. Spanish Ministry of Education (Ministerio de Educación y Formación Profesional), 2019. Available online: http://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/eu/servicios-al-ciudadano/estadisticas/no-universitaria/alumnado/necesidades-apoyo.html (accessed on 14 August 2020).
18. Sandoval Mena, M.; Simón Rueda, C.; Echeita Sarrionandia, G. A critical review of education support practices in Spain. *Eur. J. Spec. Needs Educ.* **2019**, *34*, 441–454. [CrossRef]
19. Jigyel, K.; Miller, J.A.; Mavropoulou, S.; Berman, J. Parental involvement in supporting their children with special educational needs at school and home in Bhutan. *Australas. J. Spec. Incl. Educ.* **2019**, *43*, 54–68. [CrossRef]
20. Amor, A.M.; Hagiwara, M.; Shogren, K.A.; Thompson, J.R.; Verdugo, M.Á.; Burke, K.M.; Aguayo, V. International perspectives and trends in research on inclusive education: A systematic review. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2019**, *23*, 1277–1295. [CrossRef]
21. Xu, Y. Partnering with Families of Young Children with Disabilities in Inclusive Settings. In *Family, School, and Community Partnerships for Students with Disabilities*; Springer: Singapore, 2019; pp. 3–15.

22. Epstein, J.L. *School, Family and Community Partnerships. Preparing Educators and Improving Schools*; WESTVIEW Press: Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2011.
23. Glasgow, N.A.; Whitney, P.J. *What Successful Schools Do to Involve Familie*; Sage: London, UK, 2009.
24. San Fabián, J.L. La participación. *Cuad. Pedagog.* **1994**, *222*, 18–21.
25. Fan, X.; Chen, M. Parent involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* **2001**, *13*, 1–22. [CrossRef]
26. Jeynes, W.H. A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Educ.* **2005**, *40*, 237–269. [CrossRef]
27. Powell, D.R.; Son, S.H.; File, N.; San Juan, R.R. Parent–school relationships and children's academic and social outcomes in public school pre kindergarten. *J. Sch. Psychol.* **2010**, *48*, 269–292. [CrossRef]
28. Topor, D.R.; Keane, S.P.; Shelton, T.L.; Calkins, S.D. Parent involvement and student academic performance: A multiple mediational analysis. *J. Prev. Interv. Community* **2010**, *38*, 183–197. [CrossRef]
29. Epstein, J.L.; Sheldon, S.B. Present and accounted for: Improving student attendance through family and community involvement. *J. Educ. Res.* **2002**, *95*, 308–318. [CrossRef]
30. Rogers, M.A.; Wiener, J.; Marton, I.; Tannock, R. Parental involvement in children's learning: Comparing parents of children with and without attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). *J. Sch. Psychol.* **2009**, *47*, 167–185. [CrossRef]
31. Sheldon, S.B.; Epstein, J.L. Improving student behavior and school discipline with family and community involvement. *Educ. Urban Soc.* **2002**, *35*, 4–26. [CrossRef]
32. Cunningham, B.J.; Rosenbaum, P.L. Measure of processes of care: A review of 20 years of research. *Dev. Med. Child Neurol.* **2014**, *56*, 445–452. [CrossRef]
33. King, G.; Chiarello, L. Family-centered care for children with cerebral palsy: Conceptual and practical considerations to advance care and practice. *J. Child Neurol.* **2014**, *29*, 1046–1054. [CrossRef]
34. Schenker, R.; Rigbi, A.; Parush, S.; Yochman, A. A Survey on Parent-Conductor Relationship: Unveiling the Black Box. *Int. J. Spec. Educ.* **2017**, *32*, 387–412.
35. Alfonso, B. Alumnos/as con NEE, familia y escuela, juntos por la integración. Temas para la Educación. *Rev. Digit. Prof. Enseñanza* **2010**, *9*, 143–166.
36. Marchesi, A. La Familia, Entre el Agobio y la Despreocupación. In *Qué Será de Nosotros, los Malos Alumnos*; Marchesi, E.A., Ed.; Alianza Editorial: Madrid, Spain, 2004; pp. 197–221.
37. Rosário, P.; Mourao, R.; Núñez, J.C.; González-Pineda, J.A.; Solano, P. Escuela-familia: ¿es posible una relación recíproca y positiva? *Pap. Psicol.* **2006**, *27*, 171–179.
38. García-Bacete, F.J. Las relaciones escuela-familia: Un reto educativo. *Infanc. Aprendiz.* **2003**, *26*, 425–437. [CrossRef]
39. Pivik, J.; McComas, J.; Laflamme, M. Barriers and facilitators to inclusive education. *Except. Child.* **2002**, *69*, 97–107. [CrossRef]
40. Serdio, C. Famila y escuela: Del desencuentro a la relación cooperativa. *Pap. Salmant. Educ.* **2008**, *10*, 85–100.
41. Fernández-Enguita, M. *La Profesión Docente y la Comunidad Escolar: Crónica de un Desencuentro*; Morata: Madrid, Spain, 1993.
42. Abu-Hamour, B.; Muhaidat, M. Parents' Attitudes towards Inclusion of Students with Autism in Jordan. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2014**, *18*, 567–579. [CrossRef]
43. Hotulainen, R.; Takala, M. Parents' views on the success of integration of students with special education needs. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2014**, *18*, 140–154. [CrossRef]
44. Verdugo, M.A.; Rodríguez-Aguilella, A.; Sarto Martín, P.; Calvo Álvarez, I.; Santamaría Domínguez, M. Situación Actual de la Inclusión Educativa en España. In *Informe de Investigación. Confederación Española de Organizaciones en Favor de las Personas con Discapacidad Intelectual (FEAPS) e Instituto de Integración en la Comunidad*; Universidad de Salamanca (INICO): Salamanca, Spain, 2009.
45. Villegas, M.; Simón, C.; Echeita, G. La inclusión educativa desde la voz de madres de estudiantes con Trastornos del Espectro Autista en una muestra chilena. *Rev. Española Discapac.* **2014**, *2*, 63–82. [CrossRef]
46. Yssel, N.; Engelbrecht, P.; Oswald MEloff, I.; Swart, E. Views of Inclusion: A Comparative Study of Parents' Perceptions in South Africa and the United States. *Remedial Spec. Educ.* **2007**, *28*, 356–365. [CrossRef]
47. Navarro, D.; Gómez, T.; Escorcia, C.T. *Satisfacción de las Familias de Alumnos con NEAE en Referencia a los Apoyos Prestados por Parte del Sistema Escolar. En A. Rodríguez-Martín (Compilador). Prácticas Innovadoras e Inclusivas. Retos y Oportunidades*; Universidad de Oviedo: Oviedo, FL, USA, 2017; pp. 755–762.

48. Simón, C.; Giné, C.; Echeita, G. Escuela, Familia y Comunidad: Construyendo alianzas para promover la inclusión. *Rev. Latinoam. Educ. Inclusiva* **2016**, *10*, 25–42. [CrossRef]
49. Duhaney, L.M.G.; Salend, S.J. Parental Perceptions of Inclusive Educational Placements. *Remedial Spec. Educ.* **2000**, *21*, 121–128. [CrossRef]
50. Leyser, I.; Kirk, R. Parents' Perspectives on Inclusion and Schooling of Students with Angelman Syndrome: Suggestions for Educators. *Int. J. Spec. Educ.* **2011**, *26*, 79–91. Available online: http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=EJ937177 (accessed on 15 August 2020).
51. Parsons, S.; Lewis, A.; Davison, I.; Ellins, J.; Robertson, C. Satisfaction with Educational Provision for Children with SEN or Disabilities: A National Postal Survey of the Views of Parents in Great Britain. *Educ. Rev.* **2009**, *61*, 19–47. [CrossRef]
52. Vianello, R.; Lanfranchi, S. Looking beyond the Alibi That Not Everything Function Perfectly in Italy: A Response to Anastasiou, Kauffman and Di Nuovo. *Eur. J. Spec. Needs Educ.* **2015**, *30*, 454–456. [CrossRef]
53. Alsem, M.W.; Verhoef, M.; Gorter, J.W.; Langezaal, L.C.M.; Visser-Meily, J.M.A.; Ketelaar, M. Parents' perceptions of the services provided to children with cerebral palsy in the transition from preschool rehabilitation to school-based services. *Child Carehealth Dev.* **2016**, *42*, 455–463. [CrossRef]
54. Chu, S.Y.; Lo, Y.L. Taiwanese families' perspectives on learning disabilities: An exploratory study in three middle schools. *J. Res. Spec. Educ. Needs* **2014**, *16*, 77–88. [CrossRef]
55. Syriopoulou-Delli, C.K.; Polychronopoulou, S.A. Organization and management of the ways in which teachers and parents with children with ASD communicate and collaborate with each other. *Int. J. Dev. Disabil.* **2019**, *65*, 31–48. [CrossRef]
56. Hu, X.; Turnbull, A.; Summers, J.A.; Wang, M. Needs of Chinese Families with Children with Developmental Disabilities: A Qualitative Inquiry. *J. Policy Pract. Intellect. Disabil.* **2015**, *12*, 64–73. [CrossRef]
57. Lalvani, P. Disability, Stigma and Otherness: Perspectives of Parents and Teachers. *Int. J. Disabil. Dev. Educ.* **2015**, *62*, 379–393. [CrossRef]
58. Rizvi, S. Exploring British Pakistani mothers'perception of their child with disability: Insights from a UK context. *J. Res. Spec. Educ. Needs* **2015**, *17*, 87–97. [CrossRef]
59. Woods, A.D.; Morrison, F.J.; Palincsar, A.S. Perceptions of communication practices among stakeholders in special education. *J. Emot. Behav. Disord.* **2018**, *26*, 209–224. [CrossRef]
60. Ryan, C.; Quinlan, E. Whoever shouts the loudest: Listening to parents of children with disabilities. *J. Appl. Res. Intellect. Disabil.* **2017**, *31*, 203–214. [CrossRef]
61. Opoku, M.P.; Cuskelly, M.; Pedersen, S.J.; Rayner, C.S. Applying the theory of planned behaviour in assessments of teachers' intentions towards practicing inclusive education: A scoping review. *Eur. J. Spec. Needs Educ.* **2020**, 1–6. [CrossRef]
62. Zanobini, M.; Viterbori, P.; Garello, V.; Camba, R. Parental satisfaction with disabled children's school inclusion in Italy. *Eur. J. Spec. Needs Educ.* **2017**, *33*, 597–614. [CrossRef]
63. Vuorinen, K.; Erikivi, A.; Uusitalo-Malmivaara, L. A character strength intervention in 11 inclusive Finnish classrooms to promote social participation of students with special educational needs. *J. Res. Spec. Educ. Needs* **2019**, *19*, 45–57. [CrossRef]
64. Lundqvist, J.; Westling Allodi, M.; Siljehag, E. Values and needs of children with and without special educational needs in early school years: A study of young children's views on what matters to them. *Scand. J. Educ. Res.* **2019**, *63*, 951–967. [CrossRef]
65. Fernández-Archilla, J.A.; Álvarez, J.F.; Aguilar-Parra, J.M.; Trigueros, R.; Alonso-López, I.D.; Echeita, G. Validation of the index for inclusion questionnaire for compulsory secondary education students. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 2169. [CrossRef]
66. Breyer, C.; Lederer, J.; Gasteiger-Klicpera, B. Learning and support assistants in inclusive education: A transnational analysis of assistance services in Europe. *Eur. J. Spec. Needs Educ.* **2020**, 1–4. [CrossRef]
67. Goldan, J. Demand-oriented and fair allocation of special needs teacher resources for inclusive education–Assessment of a newly implemented funding model in North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2019**, 1–5. [CrossRef]
68. Majoko, T. Teacher key competencies for inclusive education: Tapping pragmatic realities of Zimbabwean special needs education teachers. *Sage Open* **2019**, *9*. [CrossRef]
69. You, S.; Kim, E.K.; Shin, K. Teachers' Belief and Efficacy toward Inclusive Education in Early Childhood Settings in Korea. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 1489. [CrossRef]

70. British Educational Research Association [BERA]. *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*, 4th ed.; British Educational Research Association [BERA]: London, UK, 2018; Available online: https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018 (accessed on 11 September 2020).
71. International Test Commission. Directrices Internacionales para el Uso de los Tests de la Comisión Internacional de Tests (ITC) 2000. Available online: https://www.intestcom.org/page/16 (accessed on 10 August 2020).
72. Lloret-Segura, S.; Ferreres-Traver, A.; Hernández-Baeza, A.; Tomás, I. El análisis factorial exploratorio de los ítems: Una guía práctica, revisada y actualizada. *An. Psicol.* **2014**, *30*, 1151–1169. [CrossRef]
73. Harman, H.H. *Análisis Factorial Moderno*; Saltés: Madrid, Spain, 1980.
74. Ruiz, M.A.; Pardo, A.; San Martín, R. Modelos de ecuaciones estructurales. *Pap. Psicol.* **2010**, *31*, 34–45.
75. Tanaka, J.S.; Huba, G.H. A general coefficient of determination for covariance structure models under arbitrary GLS estimation. *Br. J. Math. Stadistical Psycology* **1989**, *42*, 233–239. [CrossRef]
76. Bentler, P.M. On tests and índices for evaluating structural models. *Personal. Individ. Differ.* **2007**, *42*, 825–829. [CrossRef]
77. Chou, C.P.; Bentler, P.M.; Satorra, A. Scaled test statistics and robust standarderrors for non normal data in covariance structure analysis: A Montecarlo study. *Br. J. Math. Stat. Psycology* **1991**, *44*, 347–357. [CrossRef]
78. Kline, R.B. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*, 3rd ed.; Guilford Press: New York, NY, USA, 2011.
79. Satorra, A.; Bentler, P.M. Corrections to test statistics and standars errors in covariance structure ananalisys. In *Latent Variables Analysis: Aplications for Developmental Research*; von Eye, A., Clogg, C.C., Eds.; Sage: Newbury Park, CA, USA, 1994; pp. 399–419.
80. Wheaton, B.; Muthén, B.; Alwin, D.F.; Summers, G.F. Assessing reliability and stability in panel models. *Sociol. Methodol.* **1977**, *8*, 84–136. [CrossRef]
81. Bentler, P.M. Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psicol. Bull.* **1990**, *107*, 238–246. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
82. Browne, M.W.; Cudeck, R. Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Sage Focus Ed.* **1992**, *154*, 136. [CrossRef]
83. Hu, C.; Bentler, P.M. Evaluating model fit. In *Structural Equation Modeling: Concept, Issues and Applications*; Hoyle, R., Ed.; Sage Publications, Inc.: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 1995; pp. 76–99.
84. Jöreskog, K.G. A general approach to confirmatory maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika* **1969**, *34*, 183–202. [CrossRef]
85. Fornell, C.; Larcker, D. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservables variables and measurement error. *J. Mark. Res.* **1981**, *10*, 1364–1370. [CrossRef]
86. Antunes, A.C.; Caetano, A.; Pina, E.; Cunha, M. Reliability and Construct Validity of the Portuguese Version of the Psychological Capital Questionnaire. *Psychol. Rep.* **2017**, *120*, 520–536. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
87. Etchezahar, E.; Prado-Gascó, V.; Jaume, L.; Brussino, S. Validación argentina de la Escala de Orientación a la Dominancia Social. Rev. *Latinoam. Psicol.* **2014**, *46*, 35–43.
88. Lai, S.L.; Pham, H.-H.; Nguyen, H.-K.T.; Nguyen, T.-C.; Le, A.-V. Toward Sustainable Overseas Mobility of Vietnamese Students: Understanding Determinants of Attitudinal and Behavioral Loyalty in Students of Higher Education. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 383. [CrossRef]
89. Muhammed, A.; Shariff-Ghazali, S.; Said, S.M.; Hassan, M.; Lee, K. Psychometric Properties of a Theory of Planned Behavior Questionnaire for Assessing the Midwives' Intention to Provide Planned Home Birth Services in Nigeria. *J. Community Health Nurs.* **2020**, *37*, 77–88. [CrossRef]
90. Prado-Gasco, V.J.; Quintanilla, I.; Calabuig, F.; Vveinhardt, J. Knowledge management in R&D teams at a Spanish technical university: Measurement and relations with organizational culture. *Eng. Econ.* **2015**, *26*, 398–408. [CrossRef]
91. Schumaher, M.L.N.; Milani, D.; Alexandre, N.M.C. Psychometric properties evaluation of the Psychological Empowerment Instrument in a Brazilian context. *J. Nurs. Manag.* **2019**, *27*, 404–413. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
92. Kline, R.B. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*, 2nd ed.; Guilford Press: New York, NY, USA, 2005.
93. Hair, J.F.; Black, W.C.; Babin, B.J.; Anderson, R.E.; Tatham, R.L. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 6th ed.; Prentice Hall: Upper Sadle River, NJ, USA, 2006.
94. Lance, C.; Butts, M.; Michels, L. The sources of four commonly reported cut-off criteria: What did they really say? *Organ. Res. Methods* **2006**, *9*, 202–220. [CrossRef]

95. Tabachnick, B.; Fidell, G. *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 5th ed.; Allyn & Bacon: Boston, MA, USA, 2007.
96. Bollen, K.A. *Structural Equations with Latent Variables*; John Wiley and Sons, Inc.: New York, NY, USA, 1989. [CrossRef]
97. Loehlin, J.C.; Beaujean, A.A. *Latent Variable Models: An Introduction to Factor, Path, and Structural Equation Analysis*; Taylor y Francis: New York, NY, USA, 2017.
98. Bagozzi, R.P.; Yi, Y. Specification, evaluation, and interpretation of structural equation models. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* **2012**, *40*, 8–34. [CrossRef]
99. Lindsay, G. Educational psychology and the effectiveness of inclusive education/mainstreaming. *Br. J. Educ. Psychol.* **2007**, *77*, 1–24. [CrossRef]