JOURNAL OF NEW APPROACHES IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
2022, VOL. 11, NO. 2, 226-245, e-ISSN: 2254-7339
https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2022.7.937

ORIGINAL

Inclusive Leadership From the Family Perspective in Compulsory Education

Emilio Crisol-Moya[1], María Asunción Romero-López[1], Antonio Burgos-García[1] and Yessica Sánchez-Hernández[2]

[1]Department of Didactics and School Organization, University of Granada, Spain
[2]Department of Pedagogy, University of Jaén, Spain

ABSTRACT

Distributed and pedagogical leadership plays a key role in the creation and upholding of inclusive school practices as a strategy for improvement and success in the management of quality education for students. Aims: describe, through an inclusive perspective, the actions and initiatives implemented to promote attention to diversity by school leadership teams, from the point of view of families. Methodology: Descriptive-exploratory design with a cross-sectional, quantitative focus. Sample: 25 schools (public schools, N = 18, and charter schools, N = 7) with 631 families. These families completed the questionnaire, "Leading inclusive education in compulsory-education schools-families". Results: identifying actions and strategies aimed at the prevention of truancy through a school environment that generates respect, recognition and appreciation of the different needs of their students. Conclusions: Actions taken are advancing the development of a school culture where the family plays a key role. Some of the actions implemented focus on respecting the different needs of students and the educational community in order to develop an inclusive school climate. However, schools should both make families aware of the importance and benefits and promote the participation of students and the educational community in the school.

Keywords INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP, FAMILY, COMPULSORY EDUCATION, SCHOOL MANAGEMENT TEAM, INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Received 2021-10-01
Revised 2021-10-08
Accepted 2022-01-17
Published 2022-07-15

Corresponding Author
Emilio Crisol-Moya,
ecrisol@ugr.es

Campus Universitario de Cartuja, S/N, 18071 Granada, Spain.

DOI https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2022.7.937
Pages: 226-245

Funding: Ministry of Science and Innovation, Spain (Award: PID2019-106250RB-I00)

Distributed under
CC BY-NC 4.0

Copyright: © The Author(s)

OPEN ACCESS

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent decades there has been growing interest in improving the handling of diversity in education (Lewis, 2016; Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018), due to the fact that school leadership is failing to respond appropriately to this need (Camarero-Figuerola, Tierno-García, Barrios-Arós, & Iranzo-García, 2020). This situation requires more attention to be given to the question of how leadership can enable inclusion and promote values of equality and social justice (Wang, 2018).

Teachers, headteachers and/or administrators need to be made aware of the rights of students and their families, and of their responsibilities and obligations to attend to them in a suitable and optimal way (Bertrand & Bratberg, 2007). This idea is key to achieving academic success (Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008), and to obtaining a solid family commitment to recognizing the identity and social and emotional development of their students. Ultimately, it is a question of ensuring an inclusive environment that values respect for diversity in schools (DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2014).

Historically, the idea of "inclusion" has been associated with disability and special educational needs but, more recently, students and families have begun to occupy a special place in decision-making about inclusive practices as a way of making the community aware of and active participants in the life of the school (Murillo & Hernández-Castilla, 2011; Rashid & Tikly, 2010). According to Llorent-Bedmar, Cobano-Delgado, and Navarro-Granados (2019), Óskarsdóttir, Donnelly, Turner-Cmuchal, and Florian (2020) and Sotomayor, Muñoz, Martínez, and Araya (2020), this situation brings into being the concept of school inclusion, which emerges as a process of creating equal opportunities for people who have undergone, in the words of Ossa et al. (2014, p. 2) "exclusion in many areas (poverty, disability, gender, ethnicity, among others), and which involve developing cultural and individual changes in policies and practices in the social and educational community".

Furthermore, talking about inclusion at school level involves an active and positive relationship between family and school. Both family and school are experts and fundamental educational models for those who want to learn, hence the importance of and need for collaboration if the educational task is to reach its full potential. This is especially true since the scientific literature has shown that such collaboration contributes to improved school performance and motivation; reduces school dropout rates (Álvarez Blanco & and, 2016); improves the school climate and reduces problems of coexistence (Cross & Barnes, 2014; Roberts, 2018); and promotes the democratization and dynamism of the school (Batanova & Loukas, 2014; Roberts, 2018).

In this sense, inclusion and inclusive practices based in schools set out the need for democratic leadership based on a "distributed" and "pedagogical" model. According to (Murillo, 2006), these are the two most important leadership styles for improving education, with the benchmark being the participation of the whole school community through a competence-based perspective founded on collaboration and commitment (Murillo & Hernández-Castilla, 2011; Navarro-Granados, 2017). This creates a sense of belonging for families and students, with the result being a shared emotional connection (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2019). Inclusive leadership involves or requires strengthening the links between family, school and community, inviting school leaders to reflect on their role in new ways of managing educational institutions (strengthening the involvement of all families and their participation in decision-making) (Okoko, 2019).

Headteachers and school managers can improve the quality of inclusive education through various channels, such as the interactions between the school and the community,

thus promoting co-responsibility (Gamero-Burón & Lassibille, 2018; Rojas, Salas, Falabella, & Guerrero, 2018). Valdés (2018) argues that one of the great challenges of inclusivity in education is extracting evidence of the leadership practices of school management teams, as it is known that these teams influence and build inclusive cultures, but less is known about their procedures or how they function.

The family-school relationship has traditionally been marked by disagreement and a mutual lack of trust (León & López, 2017). The role of headteachers and school managers is key to creating effective connections between families, the world of work and the local community, based on the shared aim of increasing school success (Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008).

An inclusive leadership context must be characterized by active participation, particularly of families. This aspect is very important because the family is a key institution in society and a sphere wherein a social bond is formed between different agents. Within this framework of social relations, there is a special relationship with education. The family, therefore, is defined as a social institution where ties and/or functions are configured in solidarity (Collet-Sabé, 2020).

Some results indicate that the relationships between teachers and families still have clear margins for improvement. In this sense, families need to be involved in policy design, decision-making and other processes that involve influence or power, involving the whole education community (Köpfer & Óskarsdóttir, 2019).

Many studies have shown the positive effect of involving the families of students on their academic success and socio-emotional development (Collet-Sabé & Tort, 2017; Hehir et al., 2016): "a greater and better connection between the school and the families, particularly those that are less familiar with school culture, makes it possible to improve academic results" (Collet-Sabé & Tort, 2017, p. 40). Other studies stress the contribution of families and their community to the improvement of education, the schools themselves and, more specifically, inclusion programmes (Barrientos, Silva, & Antúnez, 2016; Mara, Mara, Andrei, & Danciu, 2011; Okoko, 2019; Stivers, Latonya, & Straus, 2008).

The study carried out by DeMatthews (2021) identifies certain leadership practices that are key to creating effective inclusive schools: (1) creating a culture of collaboration with families, a crucial aspect that guides the process to be followed; (2) planning and assessing the educational actions and/or experiences carried out and/or provided; (3) building capacity through cooperation with families and the school's social and community environment; and (4) developing/revising plans, taking contextual family and socio-economic variables into account.

Another study, by Köpfer and Óskarsdóttir (2019), shows how the administrators of inclusive schools need a series of key competences (ability to motivate, to manage pedagogically and to communicate with families – responsibility) in order to foster the inclusion and learning of all students. This reality becomes clear in the different policies applied to inclusive leadership, in which the leaders should "promote collaboration with families" (Spain) or "focus on cooperation between institutions and parents" (Europe).

In other studies, there are also constant references to "successful" administrators working in collaboration with leadership teams known as "communities of learning" (Valdés & Gómez-Hurtado, 2019), in which special attention is given to families' voices alongside administrators/managers and teachers in the planning, management and assessment of the education project (Márquez & Padua, 2015). The idea is for them to gain understanding of pedagogical practices, service provision models, resource distribution and the leadership capacity of teachers utilised in the school (DeMatthews, Kotok, & Serafini, 2019).

Most studies analyse the work of management in the processes of inclusion, from the perspective of teachers or school staff (Poon-McBrayer, 2017; Szeto & Cheng, 2018; Cardno et al., 2018; Woodcock & Woolfson, 2019) (Cardno, Handjani, & Howse, 2018; Poon-McBrayer, 2017; Szeto & Cheng, 2018; Woodcock & Woolfson, 2019). However, studies that take the families' perspective are practically non-existent (Liang & Cohrssen, 2020). This is yet another example of the secondary role given to families in the policies and practices of schools, and of the scant interest shown until now by researchers in including their point of view and in making their participation possible in improving schools (Poon-McBrayer, 2017; Simón & Barrios, 2019).

Few studies have looked at leader-driven practices to facilitate inclusion, address diversity, promote the participation of all families (Kiyama & Harper, 2018) or enhance community openness and development (Barrientos et al., 2016).

If we wish to progress toward truly inclusive education in which families feel represented, valued and welcome, we need studies to be both inclusive and to involve families in the analysis of the educational reality and in the processes of improvement. This study collects, from the perspective of the family, the degree to which actions undertaken by school authorities to promote inclusion in compulsory education have been implemented. The aims of this study are:

1. Describe, from the families' point of view, the initiatives carried out by the management teams to promote the opening of the school to the community and the environment.
2. Identify actions aimed at promoting participation in the school and making it an inclusive space.
3. Find the weaknesses that hamper inclusive practices.
4. Determine differences according to sociodemographic, academic and relational variables of the participants.

This initiative forms part of a research project funded by the "Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación" in Spain (PID2019-106250RB-I00. SRA –State Research Agency– 10.13039/501100011033).

This is an inclusive study that is open to participation by all families, giving them visibility and a central role, helping them to feel appreciated, recognized and valued. The study collects their contributions and facilitates their participation in the improvement of inclusive school leadership, which is a key factor for the creation of quality schools for everyone (León & López, 2017). This study will help to increase the limited knowledge that exists

about families' perceptions of the work undertaken by management teams on inclusion in their institutions.

2 METHODS

2.1 Participants

In order to calculate the sample size, we estimated an expected proportion of 66% (based on the data from the pilot) and a precision of 5% (Hernández, Fernández, & Baptista, 2010). The necessary number for significance was established at 101 schools in the city of Granada (Spain); 64 state schools and 37 charter schools (with public-private funding). Although all were invited to participate, in the end 25 schools –18 state and 7 charter schools– responded, resulting in purposive sampling. The following criteria were adopted: type of school (state, charter) and the educational levels taught by the school (primary education, secondary education, and both primary and secondary education).

The number of families that completed the questionnaire was 631. Of these, 75.3% (n = 475) were women and 24.7% (n = 156) men. Of the total of participants, 444 (330 women and 114 men) were from state schools, and 187 (145 women and 42 men) from charter schools, while 23.5% (n = 148) were fathers, 74.8% (n = 472) mothers, and 1.8% (n = 11) legal guardians. All the descriptive data about the participants can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1 Sociodemographic and relational data of the participants

Variables		
Age	Under 30 years old	22 (3.5%)
	From 30 to 39 years old	170 (26.9%)
	From 40 to 49 years old	384 (60.9%)
	From 50 to 59 years old	51 (8.1%)
	Over 60 years old	4 (0.6%)
Gender	Female	475 (75.3%)
	Male	156 (24.7%)
Type of family relation	Father	148 (23.5%)
	Mother	472 (74.8%)
	Guardian	11 (1.8%)
Type of school	State	444 (70.4%)
	Charter	187 (29.6%)
Educational levels taught at the school	Primary education	444 (70.4%)
	Secondary education	15 (2.4%)
	Primary education and Secondary education	172 (27.3%)
Socio-economoic level in the school district	High	4 (0.6%)
	Middle	451 (71.5%)
	Middle-Low	131 (20.8%)
	Low	45 (7.1%)

2.2 Instrument

The LEI-Q-Familia questionnaire uses a Likert-type scale with four response options: 1. Not implemented; 2. Partially implemented; 3. Substantially implemented; and 4. Fully implemented. It comprises twenty-six items distributed into two dimensions: "Openness to the community" (items 1 to 14), which analyses the initiatives of the management team to make the school more open to the community, and those aimed at overcoming the situations that hinder the success of all students and equality of opportunity; and "The school as an inclusive space" (items 15 to 26), which evaluates the actions undertaken by the management team to promote participation, manage diversity and prevent and handle conflicts in the school.

The instrument included the items that make up the two dimensions of the questionnaire, and variables dedicated to gathering sociodemographic and academic information on the participants were presented as follows: sex (male or female), age, type of family connection, type of school (state, charter), educational levels taught by the school (primary, secondary, and primary and secondary combined) and socioeconomic level of the school's district.

The instrument used was tested for validity by means of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to determine the goodness of fit and the validity of the scale. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) established the validity and reliability of the model fit (Blunch, 2013).

The model obtained through the EFA produced two factors that explained 47% of the variance. The psychometric properties (López-López, Léon-Guerrero, & Moya, 2021), with values of GFI (0.983), AGFI (0.980), CFI (1.005) and RMSR (0.0236), indicated an excellent fit and an acceptable model. The CFA confirmed the factorial structure, obtaining favourable values –RMSEA (0.058), SRMR (0.061), CFI (.903) and TLI (0.895)– which showed a good model fit (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2018). The consistency of the two dimensions can be considered highly reliable (D'Ancona, 2001; Fox, 1987; George & Mallery, 2006), with satisfactory results in terms of Cronbach's alpha, both for the questionnaire as a whole (0.944) and for the two dimensions (first dimension: 0.897; second dimension: 0.920).

2.3 Procedure

The study received authorization from the Ethics Committee of the University of Granada (n. 952/CEIH/2019). For access to the families, prior authorization was obtained from the school administrations, which acted as intermediaries. The participants were informed about the purpose of the study, and were guaranteed anonymity and data confidentiality (Osterlind, 1989). The information was gathered in person in January and February 2021 using questionnaires on paper and online through the Google Docs link sent from the email of the school administrations.

2.4 Data Analysis

The IBM SPSS version 24 statistical software package was used for the data analysis, as it is suitable for the objectives of the study. In order to achieve these, we first carried out descrip-

tive analyses (mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis) and frequency analyses to characterize the sample. The results showed that we should proceed to non-parametric statistics, since the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test gave results below 0.05. Then, in order to examine the comparisons between groups, we conducted the Mann-Whitney U test for the variables of gender and type of school, and the Kruskal-Wallis test for the variables of family connections, educational levels taught by the school, and the socioeconomic level of the school district. The aim was to define which groups showed significant differences compared to the others according to the variables studied. Furthermore, in order to determine the degree to which the phenomenon of interest is present in our sample, we calculated Hedges' *g* (Grissom & Kim, 2005; Hedges & Olkin, 1985) to analyse the effect size, using the effect size calculator for non-parametric tests: Mann-Whitney-U, Wilcoxon-W and Kruskal Wallis-H (Lenhard & Lenhard, 2016). For interpretation, the following effect size values were considered: 0.20 (small), 0.50 (medium) and 0.80 (large) (B. Thompson, 1998).

3 RESULTS

3.1 Description of the LEI-Q-Familia Questionnaire

The responses given by the families connected to the participating schools concerning the actions undertaken by the management teams (Table 2) indicate that the schools have mostly implemented the two dimensions, both the initiatives that open up the school more to the community (M = 3.21), and those that improve the school as an inclusive space (M = 3.17).

More specifically, the families' responses highlight that, within the first dimension "Openness to the community" the most implemented actions were: 11 (M = 4.00) and 13 (M = 4.00). The rest of the actions in this first dimension, according to the families, were the least implemented by the management teams.

Regarding the actions that characterize the "School as an inclusive space", the most implemented action was 25 (M = 4.00), and the rest of the actions in this first dimension, according to the families, were the least implemented.

Table 2 Description of "LEI-Q-Familia"

N	Actions	Median	Range	Skewness	Kurtosis
	Dimension 1: Openness to the community	3.21	3	-.716	-.030
1.	Promotes initiatives that favour the participation of community members in the education process and in the life of the school	3.00	4	-.755	-.099
2.	Establishes an action plan drawn up in collaboration with other members of the community to foster relationships between school and community and to manage student diversity	3.00	4	-.595	-.352
3.	Participates in the actions undertaken by other institutions/organizations of the community that are educational in nature	3.00	4	-.684	-.394

Continued on next page

Table 2 continued

4.	Makes the school's facilities and resources available for activities	3.00	4	-.814	-.382
5.	Informs the family, through different channels of communication, of the curriculum that guides the school's educational activities	3.00	4	-.823	-.158
6.	Promotes actions to increase family awareness of the importance and benefits of inclusion	3.00	4	-.549	-.677
7.	Promotes actions that enable the communication and participation of all families in the educational activities undertaken inside and outside the school	3.00	4	-.700	-.425
8.	Listens to and takes into account the needs and demands of all families	3.00	4	-.831	-.064
9.	Promotes activities that enhance the mutual knowledge, exchange, and harmony of both the families and the members of the school	3.00	4	-.664	-.284
10.	Has set up measures to counteract the negative influence that a family situation might have on student success	3.00	4	-.391	-.797
11.	Ensures that the services offered by the school respect the different needs of the students	4.00	3	-1.258	.923
12.	Ensures that the school has material and human (specific professionals) resources to advance improvement processes	3.00	3	-.647	-.365
13.	Works to establish a school climate in which all students are recognized, cared for and valued	4.00	4	-1.137	.790
14.	Fosters a shared outlook between teachers and educational community on organization, goals and activities, in order to make them participants in a common educational project	3.00	4	-.965	.676
	Dimension 2: The school as an inclusive space	3.17	3	-.757	-.006
15.	Establishes disciplinary measures against the use of symbols and actions that encourage exclusion	3.00	4	-.966	.350
16.	Develops educational programmes to prevent discriminatory attitudes among students	3.00	4	-.875	.112
17.	Shares authority and responsibility with teachers	3.00	4	-1.208	1.347
18.	Creates opportunities for all members of the education community to participate effectively in decisions	3.00	4	-.789	.193
19.	Makes it possible for the different members of the education community to participate in the evaluation of the management's work	3.00	4	-.604	-.282
20.	Promotes actions to welcome and care for all students	3.00	4	-1.136	.824
21.	Encourages the participation of students in the school's governing bodies	3.00	4	-.539	-.443
22.	Establishes mechanisms to promote student participation in the control of conflicts that arise in the school environment	3.00	4	-.728	.011
23.	Ensures that equal opportunities are guaranteed, mobilizing resources (material and human) in order to foster inclusion	3.00	4	-.826	.028

Continued on next page

Table 2 continued

24.	Provides transparent information regarding the admission process and enrolment to guarantee that it reaches all interested parties equally	3.00	4	-1.004	.504
25.	Takes measures to prevent and avoid truancy	4.00	4	-1.520	1.885
26.	Enable students to express their opinions and needs freely	3.00	4	-1.705	3.124

Note: M = Median; R = Range.

3.2 Differences According to the Identifying Variables of the Study

On applying an independence hypothesis test between belonging to one of the age groups and the perception of the families about the actions carried out by the school administrations regarding inclusive leadership, we observed statistically significant differences with a low effect size in six of the fourteen management team initiatives aimed at improving the openness of the school to the community (actions 4, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 13), and five of the twelve actions aimed at enhancing the school as an inclusive space (actions 18, 19, 20, 21 and 23) (Table **??**).

The family members aged 60 or over, unlike the rest of the age groups, perceived that actions 4 ($\chi 2 = 9.844$, $p < 0.05$), 6 ($\chi 2 = 14.663$, $p < 0.05$), 8 ($\chi 2 = 14.663$, $p < 0.05$), 10 ($\chi 2 = 11.416$, $p < 0.05$), 13 ($\chi 2 = 11.229$, $p < 0.05$), 18 ($\chi 2 = 12.294$, $p < 0.05$), 20 ($\chi 2 = 12.404$, $p < 0.05$) and 21 ($\chi 2 = 21.910$, $p < 0.05$) (Table 3) were the most implemented. However, family members under the age of 30, in contrast to the other age groups, believed that the management teams have implemented actions 9 ($\chi 2 = 23.249$, $p < 0.05$), 19 ($\chi 2 = 16.805$, $p < 0.05$) and 23 ($\chi 2 = 16.205$, $p < 0.05$) the most.

Table 3 Kruskal-Wallis test according to age

Actions	Under 30 (n = 22)		30 to 39 (n = 170)		40 to 49 (n = 384)		50 to 59 (n = 51)		60 and over (n = 4)		$\chi 2$	df	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
4	3.55	.800	3.23	.970	3.12	.960	3.06	.810	3.75	.500	9.844	4	.043*
6	3.50	.673	3.11	.949	2.92	.957	2.92	.900	3.75	.500	14.663	4	.005*
8	3.55	6.71	3.33	.852	3.12	8.98	3.16	.784	3.75	.500	14.083	4	.007*
9	3.73	.456	3.15	.959	2.94	.959	2.86	.895	3.50	.577	23.249	4	.000*
10	3.36	.727	2.93	.952	2.79	.983	3.02	8.20	3.50	.577	11.416	4	.022*
13	3.55	.596	3.49	.724	3.28	.847	3.25	.796	3.75	.500	11.229	4	.024*
18	3.52	.602	3.17	.864	2.98	.978	2.92	.829	3.67	.577	12.294	4	.015*
19	3.43	.676	3.03	.867	2.74	1.054	2.66	1.099	3.33	.577	16.805	4	.002*
20	3.86	.351	3.37	.824	3.17	.967	3.16	.746	4.00	.000	21.910	4	.000*
21	3.05	.621	2.97	.987	2.77	1.049	2.58	.942	3.67	.577	10.639	4	.031*
23	3.45	.671	3.27	8.92	2.99	.993	2.88	.918	3.25	.500	16.205	4	.003*

Note: D1 = Dimension 1: Openness to the community; D2 = Dimension 2: The school as an inclusive space; M = Median; R = Range; * = significant at 0.05; g = effect sizes ("g" of Hedges)

In terms of gender, statistically significant differences were obtained in perceptions of the management's initiatives to improve the openness of the school to the community, also

with a low effect size, in actions 1 (Z = -2.522, p < 0.05), 3 (Z = -2.618, p < 0.05), 5 (Z = -2.277, p < 0.05), 7 (Z = -2.092, p < 0.05) and 9 (Z = -2.059, p < 0.05); while in those aimed at making the school an inclusive space, actions 19 (Z = -2.086, p < 0.05), 20 (Z = -2.337, p < 0.05), 21 (Z = -2.851, p < 0.05) y 22 (Z = -2.481, p < 0.05) were statistically significant. It was the women, more than the men, who mostly perceived these actions (Table 4).

Table 4 Mann–Whitney U test according to gender

Actions	Women (n = 475)		Men (n =156)		U	Z	p	g
	M	R	M	R				d
D1	3.29	3	3.25	3	34.464.500	-2.093	.036*	.10
1	3.00	3	3.00	4	32.403.500	-2.522	.012*	.21
3	3.00	3	3.00	4	31.908.000	-2.618	.009*	.23
5	3.00	4	3.00	4	32.589.000	-2.277	.023*	.19
7	3.00	3	3.00	3	32.748.000	-2.092	.036*	.21
9	3.00	4	3.00	4	33.129.500	-2.059	.039*	.20
D2	3.14		3.08		30.093.000	-2.330	.020*	.28
19	3.00	4	3.00	4	31.619.500	-2.086	.037*	.19
20	3.00	4	3.00	4	31.306.000	-2.337	.019*	.20
21	3.00	4	3.00	4	28.728.000	-2.851	.004*	.26
22	3.00	4	3.00	4	29.958.500	-2.481	.013*	.23

Note: D1 = Dimension 1: Openness to the community; D2 = Dimension 2: The school as an inclusive space; M = Median; R = Range; * = significant at 0.05; g = effect sizes ("g" of Hedges)

As for the family relationship type of the family members who participated in this study, we found statistically significant differences in only three actions: 3 ($\chi 2 = 10.620$, $p < 0.05$), 10 ($\chi 2 = 7.983$, $p < 0.05$) and 21 ($\chi 2 = 16.205$, $p < 0.05$). The members identified as legal guardians were those who perceived these actions most. The effect size of the differences obtained was also low (Table 5).

Table 5 Kruskal-Wallis test according to type of family relation

Actions	Father (n = 148)		Mother (n = 472)		Guardian (n = 11)		$\chi 2$	df	p	g
	M	R	M	R	M	R				
D1	3.14	3	3.21	3	3.82	2	8.090	3	.044*	.198
3	3.00	3	3.00	4	4.00	1	10.620	3	.014*	.23
10	3.00	3	3.00	4	4.00	1	7.983	3	.046*	.196
21	3.00	4	3.00	4	3.50	1	9.942	3	.019*	.226

Note: D1 = Dimension 1: Openness to the community; M = Median; R = Range; * = significant at 0.05; g = effect sizes ("g" of Hedges)

As a function of the type of school, the results showed statistically significant differences with a low effect size, in two initiatives of the school management to make the school more open to the community –10 (Z = -3.000, p < 0.05) and 14 (Z = -2.059, p < 0.05)– and in two other actions designed to make the school more inclusive –15 (Z = -2.353, p < 0.05) and 21 (Z = -3.049, p < 0.05) (Table 6). The charter schools presented higher scores than the state schools in the actions of both dimensions.

Table 6 Mann–Whitney U test according to type of school

Actions	State		Charter		U	Z	p	g
	(n = 444)		(n = 187)					
	M	R	M	R				
10	3.00	3	3.00	4	34.947.500	-3000	.003*	.25
14	3.00	4	3.00	4	37.232.000	-2059	.040*	.14
15	3.00	4	3.00	4	33.894.500	-2353	.019*	.21
21	3.00	4	3.00	4	32.938.500	-3049	.002*	.27

Statistically significant differences were observed according to the levels of education taught by the school, with the administrations of schools that teach both primary and secondary education being those that implemented more actions, as perceived by the families. For the openness of the school to the community, these were actions 9 ($\chi 2 = 11.041$, $p < 0.05$), 10 ($\chi 2 = 9.834$, $p < 0.05$), 12 ($\chi 2 = 11.062$, $p < 0.05$) and 14 ($\chi 2 = 7.743$, $p < 0.05$); while for the school as an inclusive space, they were numbers 15 ($\chi 2 = 7.184$, $p < 0.05$) and 24 ($\chi 2 = 6.979$, $p < 0.05$). The effect size of these differences was once again low (Table 7).

Only the secondary-school families highlighted that their management teams promoted the participation of students in the school's governing bodies ($\chi 2 = 10.966$, $p < 0.05$), compared with the schools of other educational levels.

Table 7 Kruskal-Wallis test according to the educational levels taught by the school

Actions	Primary		Secondary		Primary and Secondary		$\chi 2$	df	p	g
	(n = 444)		(n = 15)		(n = 172)					
	M	R	M	R	M	R				
D1	3.21	3	2.79	2	3.29	3	4.353	2	.028*	.123
9	3.00	4	2.00	3	3.00	4	11.041	2	.004*	.242
10	3.00	3	3.00	3	3.00	4	9.834	2	.007*	.225
12	3.00	3	2.00	3	3.00	3	11.062	2	.004*	.242
14	3.00	4	3.00	4	3.00	4	7.743	2	.021*	.192
15	3.00	4	3.00	2	3.00	4	7.184	2	.028*	.182
21	3.00	4	3.00	2	3.00	4	10.966	2	.004*	.241
24	3.00	4	3.00	4	4.00	3	6.979	2	.031*	.179

Note: D1 = Dimension 1: Openness to the community; M = Median; R = Range; * = significant at 0.05; g = effect sizes ("g" of Hedges)

Lastly, regarding the socio-economic level of the school district, statistically significant differences were obtained in twelve of the twenty-six actions with a low effect size (Table 8). The school administrations located in districts with a low socio-economic level were, with respect to the other levels, those that were perceived to have implemented most actions 4 ($\chi 2 = 6.027$, $p < 0.05$), 8 ($\chi 2 = 14.096$, $p < 0.05$), 10 ($\chi 2 = 14.204$, $p < 0.05$), 12 ($\chi 2 = 7.063$, $p < 0.05$), 13 ($\chi 2 = 6.273$, $p < 0.05$), 14 ($\chi 2 = 6.328$, $p < 0.05$), 17 ($\chi 2 = 10.452$, $p < 0.05$), 20 ($\chi 2 = 9.350$, $p < 0.05$), 23 ($\chi 2 = 13.676$, $p < 0.05$) and 24 ($\chi 2 = 8.940$, $p < 0.05$). In contrast, the schools located in a middle-low socio-economic district, unlike those in either middle- or low-level socio-economic districts, were perceived to have implemented actions 2 ($\chi 2 =$

6.769, $p < 0.05$) and 21 ($\chi 2 = 11.326$, $p < 0.05$) the most.

Table 8 Kruskal-Wallis test according to the socio-economic level of the school district

Actions	High (n = 4)		Middle (n = 451)		Middle-Low (n = 131)		Low (n = 45)		$\chi 2$	df	p	g
	M	R	M	R	M	R	M	R				
2	3.50	2	3.00	4	3.00	3	3.00	4	6.769	2	.034	.175
4	4.00	2	3.00	3	3.50	4	4.00	4	6.027	2	.049	.161
8	4.00	0	3.00	3	3.00	4	4.00	4	14.096	2	.001	.281
10	3.00	1	3.00	3	3.00	4	3.00	4	14.204	2	.001	.282
12	3.00	1	3.00	3	3.00	3	4.00	3	7.063	2	.029	.181
13	3.50	1	3.00	4	4.00	3	4.00	4	6.273	2	.043	.166
14	3.50	2	3.00	4	3.00	4	4.00	4	6.328	2	.042	.167
17	3.50	1	3.00	4	3.00	4	4.00	4	10.452	2	.005	.234
20	4.00	2	3.00	4	4.00	4	4.00	4	9.350	2	.009	.218
21	2.00	2	3.00	4	3.00	4	3.00	4	11.326	2	.003	.246
23	2.50	3	3.00	4	3.00	3	4.00	4	13.676	2	.001	.275
24	3.50	1	3.00	4	3.00	3	4.00	4	8.940	2	.011	.211

Note: M = Median; R = Range; * = significant at 0.05; g = effect sizes ("g" of Hedges)

4 DISCUSSION

The results of the study allow us to affirm that, from the point of view of the families, the implementation of inclusive actions in schools by the management teams was perceived to be at a good level. In this regard, in the opinion of Valdés (2018), management teams should undertake initiatives aimed at overcoming the situations that hamper the success of all students and equal opportunity, and launch actions to promote participation, manage diversity, and prevent and handle conflicts in the school.

We can thus state that the actions aimed at preventing and avoiding truancy are the most important to be implemented (Álvarez Blanco & and, 2016; Collet-Sabé & Tort, 2017). This concern confirms that the work of the management teams in dealing with diversity has to be achieved through inclusive leadership that pays particular attention to what the families have to say in the planning, management and assessment of the education project (Llorent-Bedmar et al., 2019).

With regard to schools' openness to the community, the families highlighted those measures aimed at providing services that respect students' different needs (religious sensibilities, food intolerances, health problems, etc.). They also emphasised the measures to create a school climate in which all students are recognized, cared for and valued, giving emphasis to one of the main factors in the building of an inclusive school culture, which is the appreciation of diverse identities (Sugiyama et al., 2016).

Other results that showed some significant differences in this study concern the variable of "age". Family members older than 60 stressed the importance and use of school facilities, resources and tools adapted to the need for inclusion and diversity required by the education

community. In this regard, H. Thompson and Matkin (2020) underscore the importance of heightening awareness of the benefits of inclusion in order to undertake educational interventions to counteract the negative influence that a family situation could have on student learning. Another concern of this age group is the need to create a school climate in which all students are recognized, cared for and valued, creating equal opportunities. This need is also stressed by authors such as Quiroga and Aravena (2018) and Dematthews, Billingsley, Mcleskey, and Sharma (2020), whereby all the members of the education community genuinely participate in decision-making, for example on the promotion of actions for welcoming all students and for genuine participation in the school's governing bodies.

However, the youngest family members, under the age of 30, highlighted the promotion of activities that foster the sharing of knowledge between the families and other members of the school. They focused on aspects such as the participation of different members of the educational community in the assessment of the work of the administration (Óskarsdóttir et al., 2020) and mobilising resources to guarantee equal opportunity in order to promote inclusion (Dematthews et al., 2020; Quiroga & Aravena, 2018).

In terms of gender, it was the women who considered that some of the actions that improve the openness of the school to the community were implemented more: on the one hand, participation both in the school (at all levels) and in other educational institutions related to the exchange of information and knowledge; and on the other, those aimed at the school as an inclusive space, regarding participation in evaluation of the school management, acceptance of students, integration in governing bodies, and, as per Crisol and Romero (2020), in the handling of conflict. These three key elements are in line with those set out by the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (2019) regarding the creation and management of inclusive schools.

Looking at the type of family relation, the legal guardians –as opposed to the mothers and fathers– perceived greater implementation of participation in actions undertaken by other institutions/organizations within the educational community, with these actions being essential to optimize collective decision-making on inclusivity. This aspect is understood, in the words of Sotomayor et al. (2020), as a central element of leadership, whereby inclusive values are emphasized in the development and implementation of inclusive cultures.

The significant differences found as a function of the type of school were very similar to those shown for the family members over sixty years of age, with reference to the studies by Quiroga and Aravena (2018), Sotomayor et al. (2020) and Dematthews et al. (2020). These differences showed, among other aspects, that the management teams of charter schools were more committed than their state counterparts to promoting the following: actions to counteract the negative influence that a family situation might have on student success; a shared outlook (on organization, goals and activities so they can participate in a common educational project); establishing punishments for the use of symbols and actions that encourage exclusion; and student participation in the school's governing bodies. This last statement was also shared in this study by the families of secondary schools.

According to the families, the administrations of schools that teach both primary and secondary education promoted activities that foster mutual knowledge (exchange and good relations between families and other members of the school) –an aspect that has been emphasised by the European Agency for Inclusive Education (2019). They also highlight the need to have measures to counter the negative influence a family situation might have through aid campaigns, learning support, school for parents, and so on, and providing the school with material and human resources (specialized professionals) to promote processes for improvement between teachers and the education community through a shared outlook –as established in the study by Francis et al. (2016) and corroborated by the European Agency (2019). This should be achieved through goals and activities to make all stakeholders participants in a common educational project with the purpose of providing transparent information regarding the process of admission and matriculation in order to ensure that it reaches everyone equally (Espósito, Tang, & Kulkarmi, 2019).

Lastly, the leadership teams of schools located in a district with a low socio-economic level were perceived to have been more effective in: sharing authority and responsibility with the teaching staff; listening and taking into account the demands and needs of all families; working to create a climate in the school in which all students are recognized, looked after and valued; promoting actions to welcome all students; providing transparent information with regard to the admission and matriculation process to ensure that it reaches everyone equally; guaranteeing equal opportunities by mobilising resources to favour inclusion; providing the school with human and material resources to promote processes of improvement; fostering a shared outlook on organization between the teachers and the school community, through a competence-based perspective founded on collaboration and commitment (Murillo & Hernández-Castilla, 2011; Navarro-Granados, 2017) and goals and activities to make them participants in a common educational project; and providing the school facilities and resources for carrying out activities.

The management team needs to see the importance of contextual analysis and the necessity of guaranteeing equal opportunity, meaning that they must promote the participation of teachers, students and families in the work of management. This includes providing information and heeding the comments of all interested parties, which is key to continual improvement (Óskarsdóttir et al., 2020).

According to Valdés (2018), the fact that the families from schools located in a low-level socio-economic area were those who most highly rated the inclusive actions undertaken by school management could be related to the need that these schools have for maintaining a good school-family relationship to contribute to the academic success of their students. This perspective, as Poon-McBrayer (2017) and Szeto and Cheng (2018) show, could be related to the schools' desire to maintain a good social image –an issue that affects the decisions and actions undertaken by schools to promote inclusion.

Only the management teams of the schools in an area with a medium-low socioeconomic level included –in addition to the aforementioned actions– an action plan that, according to Navarro-Granados (2017), should promote relations between the school and the community, as well as manage the diversity of the student body in collaboration and engagement

with other members of the community and promote student participation in the school governing bodies.

5 CONCLUSIONS

This research was conducted as part of a study centred on describing the actions undertaken by school administrations and the degree to which they have been implemented, from the point of view of the families. A central tenet of this is the idea that, to advance towards inclusive, fair and equal education, a school needs to open up to the diversity of the families and their environments, enabling mutual exchange, active participation, the feeling of belonging, and effecting the co-responsibility of family and school in the education of the children (Ainscow, Dyson, Hopwood, & Thomson, 2016; Kiyama & Harper, 2018; Simón & Barrios, 2019). We can conclude, following the discussion and results, that the most promoted actions by school management teams to foster an inclusive culture, from the point of view of the families, were based on the school offering services aimed at: respecting the different needs of students; developing a school climate in which every student is recognized, cared for and valued; and preventing and avoiding truancy (first and second aims)

In terms of the third aim, the rest of the actions, although substantially implemented according to the families' perception, should be increased as key factors in achieving an inclusive culture. Finally, regarding the fourth aim of the study, the results reveal that there were significant differences in the families' perspectives as a function of the sociodemographic and relational variables. Hence, the family members aged under 30 or over 60 are those who most perceived the actions implemented by school management aimed at enhancing management of diversity and promoting inclusion. Likewise, women rather than men perceived more actions and initiatives aimed at overcoming situations that harm the chances of every student attaining success and equal opportunity. In addition, the management teams of schools that taught both primary and secondary education were those that, according to the families, implemented the actions that improved the openness of the school to the community more, as well as the actions aimed at making the school an inclusive space. Lastly, the school administrations located in districts with a low socio-economic level, in contrast to the other levels, were those that were perceived to have demonstrated a greater implementation of actions aimed at fostering participation, caring for diversity, and preventing and managing conflicts in the school.

This study reveals some of the shortcomings of the inclusive work undertaken by the management of schools of compulsory education, and also sets out some of the contextual, cultural and social aspects that affect its implementation. There are certain limitations to this study, related to the sample size and its representativeness (non-probabilistic and limited to a specific context at a specific time). It would therefore be interesting to expand the research with other experimental studies using probability sampling or longitudinal studies that will make it possible to analyse the evolution of families' perceptions of the inclusive leadership practised by school management.

5.1 Implications for Practising Inclusivity in Schools

Through this study, several "important implications" emerge, all centred on the need to promote an increase in family participation in the internal dynamics of schools through the development of effective and innovative strategies.

First, the creation of a School for Families. This space of social participation would function as an assembly. It would not be made up solely by families but would be an open space for debating and sharing subjects of educational and community interest. The purpose of this "school" would be to raise awareness regarding training and to analyse different learning techniques.

Second, the creation of reflective distributed leadership structures that promote both inclusion and "high-quality education (school success)". School management should establish internal training-participation structures that enable processes and procedures which foster inclusion. These would be developed through supervision according to identification based on data, both of the needs and the descriptors of the quality of the school (internal diagnostics-analysis of the inclusive state of the school). Management would develop, within the social and family environment of the school, a series of specific meeting "spaces" for cooperating and collaborating with one another (for example, a Special Needs Committee, and a Positive Behaviour in the School Support Committee, etc.). The purpose of each meeting would be to establish discussion groups for creating "communication-feedback" channels with families, where the need to make periodic contributions is encouraged. This type of action-programme makes it possible to identify the importance of creating expectations and/or models regarding inclusion, thus taking on a team focus that values tolerance, ethical commitment and social fairness and justice.

Third, the setting up of "Assemblies" that guarantee social participation and inclusive management-organization by the representative sectors of the community. In this regard, it is worth highlighting two types of assembly:

- Assemblies with family tutorials, in which inclusive pedagogical matters are dealt with. It is an example of turning into reality the idea that everything that is done should be shared with the families, opening up spaces for debate and dialogue to collect proposals for improvement and for their voice to be heard.
- Student assemblies, where all classes participate at least once a month. Here, they could vote on projects for the school, agree on rules for getting along harmoniously, and pitch ideas for consideration in staff meetings and/or the school council.

Lastly, the design of a Committee for Inclusive Coordination. This would be similar to the school council: to democratize the educational project for inclusivity, based on the need to "open the doors" of the school council to the entire education community, creating a space devoted to analysing and supervising the strategies and/or resources that could advance key inclusive aspects in the school. Moreover, this would not only deal with bureaucratic subjects but would also be a space for debate and making proposals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"El liderazgo de la dirección escolar y su contribución a la mejora de la inclusión en educación obligatoria", Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (PID2019-106250RB-I00)

Funded by: Ministry of Science and Innovation, Spain

Funder Identifier: http://dx.doi.org/10.13039/501100004837

Award: PID2019-106250RB-I00

REFERENCES

Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., Hopwood, L., & Thomson, S. (2016). *Primary schools responding to diversity: barriers and possibilities*. Cambridge.

Álvarez Blanco, L., & and, R. A. M.-G. (2016). Cooperación entre las familias y los centros escolares como medida preventiva del fracaso y del riesgo de abandono escolar en adolescentes. *Revista latinoamericana de educación inclusiva*, *10*(1), 175–192. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-73782016000100009

Barrientos, C., Silva, P., & Antúnez, S. (2016). El papel directivo y la promoción de la participación de las familias y la comunidad en las escuelas básica. El caso de la Comuna de Panguipulli-Chile. REICE. Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad. *Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, *14*(3), 145–165. https://doi.org/10.15366/reice2016.14.3.008

Batanova, M., & Loukas, A. (2014). Unique and interactive effects of empathy, family, and school factors on early adolescents' aggression. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *43*(11), 1890–1902.

Bertrand, L., & Bratberg, W. D. (2007). Promoting the success of all students: the principal's role in providing quality special education services. *Academic Leadership*, *5*(3). Retrieved from https://scholars.fhsu.edu/alj/vol5/iss3/14/

Blunch, N. J. (2013). *Introduction to Structural Equation Modeling Using IBM SPSS Statistics and Amos*. SAGE.

Camarero-Figuerola, M., Tierno-García, J. M., Barrios-Arós, C., & Iranzo-García, P. (2020). Liderazgo y éxito escolar en contextos desfavorecidos: la perspectiva de los directores. *Revista de Educación*, *388*, 167–192. https://doi:10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2020-388-451

Cardno, C., Handjani, M., & Howse, J. (2018). Leadership practices and challenges in managing diversity to achieve ethnic inclusion in two NewZealand secondary schools. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *53*(1), 101–117. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40841-017-0096-x

Collet-Sabé, J. (2020). Las relaciones entre la escuela y las familias desde una perspectiva democrática: ejes de análisis y propuestas para la equidad. *Educar*, *56*(1), 241–258. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/educar.1012

Collet-Sabé, J., & Tort, A. (2017). *Escuela, familias y comunidad*. Octaedro.

Crisol, E., & Romero, A. (2020). El liderazgo inclusivo como estrategia para evitar el abandono escolar: opinión de las familias. *Educatio Siglo XXI*, *38*(2), 45–66. https://doi.org/10.6018/educatio.414871

Cross, D., & Barnes, A. (2014). Using Systems Theory to Understand and Respond to Family Influences on Children's Bullying Behavior: Friendly Schools Friendly Families Program. *Theory into Practise*, *53*(4), 293–299.

D'Ancona, M. A. C. (2001). *Metodología cuantitativa: estrategias y técnicas de investigación social*. Síntesis.

DeMatthews, D. (2021). Undoing systems of exclusion: exploring inclusive leadership and systems thinking in two inclusive elementary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *59*(1),

5–21. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2020-0044

Dematthews, D., Billingsley, B., Mcleskey, J., & Sharma, U. (2020). Principal Leadership for Students with Disabilities in Effective Inclusive Schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *58*(5), 539–554. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2019-0177

DeMatthews, D., Kotok, S., & Serafini, A. (2019). Leadership preparation for special education and inclusive schools: beliefs and recommendations from successful principals. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, *15*(4), 303–329. https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775119838308

DeMatthews, D. E., & Mawhinney, H. (2014). Social justice leadership and inclusion: exploring challenges in an urban district struggling to address inequities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *50*(5), 844–881. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13514440

Espósito, M. C. K., Tang, K., & Kulkarmi, S. S. (2019). Ensuring inclusive environments for students with disabilities: School leaders play a linchpin role. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *51*(1), 43–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2018.1515185

European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education. (2019). *Inclusive School Leadership: Exploring Policies Across Europe*. Retrieved from https://www.european-agency.org/resources/publications/inclusive-school-leadership-synthesis

Fox, D. (1987). El Proceso de Investigación en Educación. Eunsa.

Francis, G., Blue-Banning, M., Turnbull, A. P., Hill, C., Haines, S., & Gross, J. (2016). Culture in inclusive schools: Parental perspectives on trusting family-professional partnerships. Education and training in autism and developmental disabilities. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, *51*(3), 281–293. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/24827524

Gamero-Burón, C., & Lassibille, G. (2018). Work engagement among school directors and its impact on teachers' behavior at work. . *The Journal of Developing Areas*, *52*(2), 27–39. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1353/jda.2018.0020 https://doi.org/10.1353/jda.2018.0020

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2006). *SPSS for Windows Step-by-Step: A Simple Guide and Reference (14.0 update)*. Allyn & Bacon.

Grissom, R. J., & Kim, J. J. (2005). *Effect Sizes for Research. A Broad Practical Approach*. LEA.

Hair, J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. (2018). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Prentice Hall.

Hedges, L. V., & Olkin, I. (1985). *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. Academic Press.

Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Freeman, B., Lamoreau, R., Borquaye, Y., & Burke, S. (2016). *A summary of the evidence on inclusive education*. Alana-Abt.

Hernández, R., Fernández, C., & Baptista, P. (2010). *Metodología de la Investigación* (5th ed.). McGrawHill.

Kiyama, J., & Harper, C. E. (2018). Beyond Hovering: A conceptual argument for an inclusive model of family engagement in higher education. *The review of higher education*, *41*(3), 365–385. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2018.0012

Köpfer, A., & Óskarsdóttir, E. (2019). Analysing Support in inclusive education systems -a comparison of inclusive school development in Iceland and Canada since the 1980s focusing on policy and in- school support. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *23*(7-8), 876–890. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1624844

Lenhard, W., & Lenhard, A. (2016). *Calculation of Effect Sizes*. Psychometrica. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3478.4245

León, M. J., & López, M. C. (2017). La formación del líder inclusivo. In J. C. Núñez (Ed.), *Perspectivas psicológica y educativa de las necesidades educativas especiales* (pp. 215–225). SCINFOPER.

Lewis, K. (2016). Social justice leadership and inclusion: A genealogy. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *48*(4), 324–341. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2016.1210589

Liang, X. M., & Cohrssen, C. (2020). Towards creating inclusive environments for LGBTIQ-parented

families in early childhood education and care settings: A review of the literature. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, *45*(1), 43–55. https://doi.org/10.1177/1836939119885304

Llorent-Bedmar, V., Cobano-Delgado, V., & Navarro-Granados, M. (2019). School leadership in disadvantaged contexts in Spain: Obstacles and improvements. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *47*(1), 147–164. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217728084

López-López, M. C., Léon-Guerrero, M. J., & Moya, E. (2021). Inclusive Leadership of School Management from the View of Families: Construction and Validation of LEI-Q. *Education Science*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11090511

Mara, D., Mara, E. L., Andrei, O., & Danciu, E. L. (2011). The Role of School-Family Partnership in the Implementation of Inclusive Education in Romania. *The New Educational Review*, *26*(4), 228–237.

Márquez, M. J., & Padua, D. (2015). Comunidad gitana y educación pública. La necesidad de construir un proyecto social y educativo compartido. *Revista Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, *85*(35.1), 91–101. Retrieved from https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/274/27446519009.pdf

Murillo, F. J. (2006). Una dirección escolar para el cambio: del liderazgo transformacional al liderazgo distribuido. REICE. Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad. *Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, *4*(4), 11–24. Retrieved from https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=55140403

Murillo, F. J., & Hernández-Castilla, R. (2011). Una dirección escolar comprometida con la justicia social. *Observatorio Social de la Educación*, *4*, 19–28.

Navarro-Granados, M. (2017). Hacia un liderazgo educativo para la justicia social en las escuelas. *Revista del Cisen Tramas/Maepova*, *5*(1), 161–173. Retrieved from http://oaji.net/articles/2020/7304-1588102423.pdf

Okoko, J. M. (2019). Towards school leadership development: The essence of working with culturally and linguistically diverse newcomer families in Saskatchewan. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, *4*(2), 195–229. https://doi.org/10.30828/real/2019.2.1

Óskarsdóttir, E., Donnelly, V., Turner-Cmuchal, M., & Florian, L. (2020). Inclusive school leaders: Their role in raising the achievement of all learner. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *58*(5), 521–537. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2019-0190

Ossa, C., Castro, F., Castañeda, M., & Castro, J. (2014). Cultura y liderazgo escolar: factores claves para el desarrollo de la inclusión educativa. *Revista Electrónica "Actualidades Investigativas en Educación"*, *14*(3). https://doi.org/10.15517/aie.v14i3.16157

Osterlind, S. J. (1989). *Constructing Test Items*. Kluwer Academic.

Poon-McBrayer, K. F. (2017). School leaders' dilemmas and measures to instigate changes for inclusive education in Hong Kong. *Journal of Educational Change*, *18*(3), 295–309. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-017-9300-5

Quiroga, M., & Aravena, F. (2018). La Respuesta de directores escolares ante las políticas de inclusión escolar en Chile. *Calidad en la Educación*, *49*, 82–111. http://doi.org/10.31619/caledu.n49.577

Rashid, N., & Tikly, L. (2010). *Inclusion and diversity: Guidelines for inclusion and diversity in schools*. British Council. Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.es/sites/default/files/british-council-guidelines-for-inclusion-and-diversity-in-schools.pdf

Roberts, G. (2018). Respuestas del sector de la educación frente al consumo de alcohol, tabaco y drogas (Vol. 10). . (Vol. 10). Unesco Publishing.

Rojas, M. T., Salas, N., Falabella, A., & Guerrero, P. (2018). Diversidad e inclusión escolar: ¿Cómo liderar los nuevos desafíos del país? *Cuadernos para el desarrollo del liderazgo educativo*, *9*. Retrieved from https://educacion.uahurtado.cl/wpsite/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/diversidad-inclusion-escolar.pdf

Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. (2018). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, *28*(2), 176–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.003

Simón, C., & Barrios, A. (2019). Las Familias en el corazón de la educación inclusiva. *Aula Abierta*, *48*(1), 51–58. http://doi.org/10.17811/rifie.48.1.2019.51-58

Sotomayor, P., Muñoz, J., Martínez, P., & Araya, A. (2020). Liderazgo, cultura y prácticas inclusivas desde la mirada de equipos directivos de establecimientos educativos. *Revista de Investigación en Comunicación y Desarrollo*, *11*(1), 5–15. http://doi.org/10.33595/2226-478.11.1.375

Stivers, J., Latonya, F., & Straus, M. (2008). Educating families about inclusive education - A month-by-month guide for teachers of inclusive classes. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *44*(1), 10–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451208318683

Sugiyama, K., Cavanagh, K., Van, C., Van Esch, C., Bilimoria, D., & Brown, C. (2016). Inclusive leadership development: Drawing from pedagogies of women's and general leadership development programs. *Journal of Management Education*, *40*(3), 253–292. http://doi.org/10.1177/1052562916632553

Szeto, E., & Cheng, A. Y. N. (2018). How do principals practice leadership for social justice in diverse school settings? A Hong Kong case study. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *56*(1), 50–68. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2016-0087

Theoharis, G., & Causton-Theoharis, J. N. (2008). Oppressors or Emancipators: Critical Dispositions for Preparing Inclusive School Leaders. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *41*(2), 230–246. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680801973714

Thompson, B. (1998). Statistical Significance and Effect Size Reporting: Portrait of a Possible Future. *Research in the Schools*, *5*(2), 33–38.

Thompson, H., & Matkin, G. (2020). The evolution of inclusive leadership studies: A literatura review. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *7*, 15–31. https://doi.org/10.12806/V19/I3/R2

Valdés, R. (2018). Liderazgo inclusivo: La importancia de los equipos directivos en el desarrollo de una cultura de la inclusión. *Revista de investigación educativa de la Rediech*, *9*(16), 51–65. https://doi.org/10.33010/ie_rie_rediech.v9i16.73

Valdés, R., & Gómez-Hurtado, I. (2019). Competencias y prácticas de liderazgo escolar para la inclusión y la justicia social. *Perspectiva educacional. Formación de Profesores*, *58*(2), 47–68. https://doi.org/10.4151/07189729

Wang, F. (2018). Social Justice Leadership-Theory and Practice: A case of Ontario. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *54*(3), 470–498. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18761341

Woodcock, S., & Woolfson, L. M. (2019). Are leaders leading the way with inclusion? Teachers' perceptions of systemic support and barriers towards inclusion. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *93*, 232–242. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2018.11.004