International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education (INT-JECSE)
DOI:10.48047/INTJECSE/V15I4.28 ISSN: 1308-5581 Vol 15, Issue 04 2023

Comparing Efficacy to Implement Inclusive Practices in US and Saudi Arabian Early Childhood Educators

Robin L. Dodds[a] and Nouf M. Aljallal[a]
[a]Division of Special Education and Counseling, California State University, Los Angeles

Author Note
Robin L. Dodds https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7748-0426
We have no known conflict of interest to disclose.
Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Robin L. Dodds, Division of Special Education and Counseling, 5151 State University Drive, Los Angeles, CA, 90032. Email: rdodds@calstatela.edu

Abstract
The purpose of the study was to investigate the efficacy of early childhood educators in the US and Saudi Arabia to implement inclusive practices. The sample contained 22 US and 29 Saudi Arabian early childhood educators. The online research questionnaire consisted of two sections; the first gathered demographic information and the second collected information through the Teachers' Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale.Saudi Arabianeducators reported feeling less efficacious in the implementation of inclusive practices than the US educators in inclusive settings. US educators displayedgreateroverall self-efficacy in the implementation of inclusive practices than the Saudi Arabianeducators, and specifically had higher levels of efficacy in managing challenging student behaviors and collaborating with other educational staff. There was no significant difference in efficacy for inclusive instruction between US and Saudi Arabian educators. The present research has implications for educators and policymakers to enhance teachers' efficacy for the support young students with disabilities in inclusive settings.
Keywords: *Inclusion, Early Childhood Education, Teacher Training, International, Self-efficacy*

In the last few decades, attention towards inclusive education programs has increased. In the US and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA), several inclusive education settings provide educational services to students with and without disabilities. Inclusion International (2018)
argued that it is the right of every person with a disability to receive an inclusive education. It is vital to protect the rights of students with disabilities by ensuring the participation of every person in the education process without discrimination or exclusion. Inclusive education settings welcome all students regardless of their background, personal characteristics, or disabilities (Malinen, Savolainen, & Xu 2012; Specht et al., 2016), reducing educational disparities and societal stigma around disability (Hyunjeong et al., 2014). Early childhood is a critical period to begin inclusive educational settings for children, as young children have not yet developed ideas about discrimination (Vaz et al., 2015). Therefore, early childhood teachers need to develop positive thoughts, beliefs, and understanding of children towards disability (Zee&Koomen, 2016). A key role of the teacher in inclusive settings is to model respect and acceptance of others with and without disability.

In the US, attempts to make education inclusive began with the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975), modified to be the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA, 2004), and finally shaped into a "whole-school" approach towards inclusion based in the principle of least restrictive environment (McMaster, 2013). In Saudi Arabia, the Legislation of Disability (LD) was passed in 1987 as the first legislation for people with disabilities in KSA which includes important provisions that guarantee individuals with disabilities rights equal to those of other people in society (Alquraini, 2011). Subsequently, the Saudi Government has paid special attention to disability code and regulation of school age special education programs and institutes in recent years. However, most early childhood inclusive

settings have continued to lack systematic methods, curricular content, and training for educators in both the US and KSA.

Prior studies have provided evidence about the positive impact of inclusive education including, emotional growth of children with and without disabilities. Teachers can play an effective role in actively organizing strategies for the positive growth of children in inclusive educational settings (Geerlings, Thijs, &Verkuyten, 2018). However, Sharma et al. (2015) suggested that it is self-efficacy that improves the effectiveness of the person at a task. Previous research showed that higher self-efficacy in teachers was positively correlated with student academic scores and educational achievement (Schmidt &Vrhovnik, 2015). Self-efficacy is important to develop in both teachers and students in inclusive settings for optimal student outcomes (Schmidt &Vrhovnik, 2015). Therefore, it is important to better understand the role of teacher self-efficacy in inclusive education systems.

Foreman and Arthur-Kelly (2017) note that inclusive programs require the educational setting and environment to be modified according to student needs. This process necessitates a positive teacher attitude, flexibility, and leadership in such settings (Golmic& Hansen, 2012). Even though much of the literature reports teachers to be demonstrating positive attitudes towards programs directed towards inclusion, some have also been found to demonstrate negative attitudes towards such programs and scenarios. Gaines and Barnes (2017) highlights that teachers of the elementary grades have expressed more negative attitudes and perceptions in inclusive settings than teachers of older grades. Various factors influence teacher attitudes towards inclusion practices, including training, self-efficacy beliefs, and years of teaching experience. Negative attitudes can stem from lack of teacher training focused on disabilities, leading to stress as teachers feel unprepared to provide instruction that is modified far from the general lesson (Hwang & Evans, 2011). Research findings specific to preschool teachers similarly indicate that even though most preschool teachers have been found to have affirmative attitudes towards inclusion, others have reported negative and neutral teacher attitudes towards inclusion (Kayili et al., 2010). Further studies in this domain have revealed that pre-service teachers were more likely to exhibit positive attitudes towards inclusion for children with intellectual disabilities than children exhibiting emotional or behavioral problems (Räty et al., 2016).

Various studies have been conducted on teacher-student relationships in education settings of KSA, and several have explored the influence of teachers' and parents' attitudes regarding students with autism (Al Faiz, 2006) and the attitudes of teachers in inclusive education (Al-Abduljabber, 1994; Dubis, 1987). It has been observed that although both the US and Saudi Arabia acknowledge and work towards the goal of inclusive education, Saudi preschool teachers' attitudes are generally less positive. Saudi educators in a study by Alnahdi(2013) reported that teachers were happy to express positive attitudes towards inclusion as long as it did not entail that they perform additional work. A research study conducted by Alnahdi (2020) highlights that in Saudi Arabia, teachers working in inclusive environments believed they had the self-efficacy required for dealing with different children and their disabilities. Several items were measured along with this domain in which the teachers demonstrated varying efficacy levels. Results indicated that the teachers felt less confident dealing with children who exhibited physical aggressiveness. Such teachers also had reduced confidence in their ability to maintain classroom decorum. Furthermore, Saudi teachers were apt at giving alternative explanations and using different assessment strategies with students with SEN but were challenged in their ability to design learning tasks for a variety of learners. This implies that Saudi teachers need to work on their creativity and knowledge regarding designing classroom environments and lessons to effectively include students with disabilities.

Moreover, it was also found that teachers lacked the confidence in explaining inclusion related laws and policies as the Saudi Arabian government does not spend time publicly discussing such matters in detail. Furthermore, Saudi Arabia's culture does not promote the dissemination of knowledge related to laws and acts related to various areas of life, which is why teachers are likely to be unaware. Another conclusion derived from this study is that Saudi teachers need to be provided with ample teaching material and teacher preparation programs to teach students with disabilities (Alnahdi, 2020). All in all, even though preschool educators in Saudi Arabia generally demonstrate positive attitudes towards

inclusion, steps must be taken to enhance their skills and provide strategy training. Such teachers must also be trained to design learning tasks and deliver effective inclusive instruction (Sharma et al., 2018). One solution to enhance self-efficacy in teachers towards inclusive education is to ensure that their leaders and educational systems adequately support them.

There is a need to study early childhood teachers' efficacy to implement inclusive practices because these teachers are likely to design all lessons and activities and therefore directly influence their students' educational success. However, limited information is available on the teachers' sense of efficacy in establishing inclusive education settings in both the US and KSA.

Methods

This research's fundamental goal is to compare the experiences of early childhood educators and study their attitudes toward inclusion planning in the US and KSA. Educators were askedto take a brief online survey, and data was gathered from 62 teachers in total. The demographicsof respondents, data collection tools, as well as methods applied for the data analysis arediscussed below.

Participants

Early childhood educators from the US and KSA were among the participants in this research. Convenience sampling was employed by sharing a research flyer in English or Arabic with school administrative personnel for distribution to faculty in addition to posting the flyer to education related social media sites and a college of education listserv. In total, 62 early childhood educators participated. Among them, 25 were from the United States,and 37 were from Saudi Arabia. Most participants work as instructors for youngchildren with diverse backgrounds, learning disabilities, as well as emotional and behavioralchallenges.

Measures

This research utilized the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale. The TEIP is a prominent measure designed to understand the self-efficacy of early childhood educators for the inclusion of students with disabilities. It was designed to gather data on educators' understanding of and behaviors towards inclusion planning and implementation (Salkind, 2009). The developer used a content analysis of the literature on inclusion to identify: (a) core aspects of inclusion training; (b) efficient inclusion planning practices; and (c) educators' perception regarding their application of inclusion planning to build this into an effective and practical tool (Salkind, 2009). Teacher's Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) which uses a 6-point Likert scale (e.g., 1= strongly agree and 6= strongly disagree). This means that lower scoreson the scale indicate higher feelings of self-efficacy. The TEIP has 18 items and is divided intothree 6-item subscales; a) Efficacy in managing behavior; b) Efficacy in inclusive instruction; and c) Efficacy in collaboration. Additionally, teaching experience, impairment of learners, type of classroom environment, number ofinclusive classes offered, number of inclusion teacher training courses completed, outcomeslevels of inclusion planning, awareness of inclusion planning, and attitudes regarding inclusionplanning were among the categories of questions asked of the respondents.

Two versions of the TEIP were utilized: one in English and one in Arabic. Both versions of the measure were freely available for use online and have been used in previous research. A study by Martins and Chacon (2020) that measures reliability found the TEIP scale in English displays alpha scores above 0.88 indicating high internal consistency. Alnahdi and Hui (2019) then developed the Arabic version of the instrument and foundgood to strong internal consistencyfor the scale and each of its three subscales with alpha coefficients all greater than .8.

Data Collection

The information was gathered using two internet polls createdwith secure online survey software. Educators in the US accessed a survey in English. InKSA, an analogous survey was collected data in Arabic. Both online surveyswere accessible via the Qualtrics Survey Platform website, which also included an IRB approvedinformational cover letter outlining the study's purpose and explained that by continuing to the survey by clicking the button at the bottom of the screen the individual was giving their informed consent to participatein the study.

In the US, 25 teachers agreed to take part in the research. Most ofthese participants were enrolled in graduate studies in special education at an institution in theMidwestern US where extra credit was offered by their professor for participation. Of the educators in the US who
logged in to the survey 22 of 25 completed most items and were included in further analyses.Thirty-seven early educators in KSA agreed to take part in the research, and 29 of these respondents completed most items and are included in the analyses. Most of therespondents were early educators who worked in preschool programs across the country. The survey took
participants around 20 minutes to complete. A total sample of 51 early childhood educators were included in the final sample for analyses. Since not every participant provided answers to all items, differences in response rates will be noted in the tables included in thismanuscript.

Data Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The datawere classified into two groups based on national origin in SPSS version 27 software, and a series of t-tests were used toassess the significance of differences in TEIP total and subscalescores between the US andSaudi Arabian samples.

Reliability of the Scale

The TEIP scale was subjected toreliability tests, and coefficient alpha was calculated in SPSS to assess the psychometrics of the measure (Rudner and Schafer 2002). The reliability analysis revealed the Cronbach's alpha for theTEIP in the current total sample (US and KSA) was .83, which is in the good range of internal consistency according to the accepted rule of thumb. The internal consistency for the subscales of the TEIP was also calculated through reliability analysis. Cronbach's alpha of the first subscale, efficacy in managing behaviors,was .70 for 6 items which is in the acceptable range of internal consistency. The Cronbach'salpha reliability of the second subscale, efficacy in inclusive instructions, was also calculated at.70, which is also in the acceptable range of internal consistency. The reliability analysis alsoprovided information about the third subscale, efficacy in collaboration, andCronbach's alpha was .75, also inthe acceptable range of internal consistency. These values suggest that internal consistency of the measure and subscales are adequate for measuring differences between groups (Rudner and Schafer2002; Salkind2012).

Results

The descriptive data presented below is organized by country across three categories thatinclude (a) demographics; (b) education and employment; and (c)disability experiences (see table 1). Then, the comparative data (US and KSA) on the Teacher's Efficacy for InclusivePractices measure and its subscales are presented (see table 2).

Descriptive Data for US Educators

Demographics

The gender information was collected on the base on three categories that include male,
female and other. The US educators sample included 5 males (n=5), 15 females, and 2 other (See Table 2). US educators included one in the range between 19 – 23, nine between 24 -28 years, seven in the 29 – 33 years age range, one in the 34 – 38 years category, and four who reported being age 39 and above. Ten respondents reported their race/ethnicity as White, two were African American/ Black, 6 Latino/ Hispanic, two Asian American and two reported their race as Other.

Education and Employment

US educators reported their educational attainment as follows, one completed high school, 10 had a bachelor's degree, and 11 had a master's degree. Employment status reported by US participants was that eleven had full-time employment status, five had part-time
employment status, four were seeking employment opportunities, one was retired, and one reported others as their employment status. US participants reported a variety of levels of experience as an early childhood educator. Two had less than one year of experience, four had 1 – 2 years' experience, seven had 3 – 4 years' experience, two had 5 – 6 years' experience, and seven educators reported having more than 6 years of experience as early childhood educators.

Fifteen educators reported having work experience in inclusive settings while seven had not. Participants were also asked about the number of courses in Special Education they had taken
as part of their teacher preparation program. Three had not taken any special education courses, nine had 1 – 3 courses, two had 4 – 8 courses, and eight had taken more than 8 courses in special education.

Disability Experiences

The educators were asked whether anyone in their immediate family had a disability. Thirteen US respondents had a member of their immediate family with a disability, while nine
had no immediate family with a disability. The educators also were asked how many students with disabilities they have taught during their career. The responses ranged from 2 to 200 students with disabilities taught, with six participants not responding to the question.

Descriptive Data for KSA Educators

Demographics

The KSA educators' sample included one male and 28 females.Four educators reported being between 19 – 23 years old, eighteen were between 24 and 28, three were 29 – 33, two were 34 – 38, and two reported their age as 39 years and above. Instead of race/ethnicity data, regional data was collected for early childhood educators in Saudi Arabia. The categories collected included, the Central, Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern regions. Twenty participants reported being from the Central region, four were from the Eastern region, three were from the Western region, two from the Northern region, and no participants represented theSouthern region.

Education and Employment

All Saudi early childhood educators reported having achieved greater than a high school level of education. Twenty-two participants had a bachelor's degree, and seven had earned a masters' degree. Fifteen KSA educators reported they currently were employed full-time, three had part-time employment, eight were seeking employment opportunities, and three were retired.

Of the KSA educators, two had less than one year of experience as an early childhood educator, fourteen had 1 – 2 years of experience, five had 3 – 4 years' experience, two had 5 – 6 years' experience, and six from the KSA sample reported having more than 6 years of experience as early childhood educators. When asked about work experience in an inclusive setting as educators, twelve educators had some experience in inclusive settings while seventeen of KSA educators had no experience in inclusive settings. As for number of special education courses they had taken, eleven KSA educators reported having never a special education class, eleven
said they had 1 – 3 courses, one had 4 – 8 courses, and six had completed more than 8 courses focused on special education.

Disability Experiences

The KAS educators were asked whether a member of their immediate family has a disability. Seven participants responded "yes," while twenty-two educators said that they had "no" immediate family with a disability.Educators were also asked about the approximate number of students with disabilities theyhad taught during their career. 24. Seven KSA educators reported having taught no students with disabilities, three had taught one student, three had taught two students, two had taught three students, one educator had taught four students, one taught five students with disabilities, one had taught eight, one had taught ten, one taught sixteen, one educator taught forty students, one taught about fifty students, and one KSA educator taught approximately one hundred students with disabilities. Six educators did not
respond to the question.

US and KSA Comparative Data Analyses

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the means of US and KSA samples on the primary variable of Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP). Results of this analysis indicated a significant difference in mean between US and KSA educators, with US educators (M= 86.06, S.D = 8.29)reporting higher efficacy for inclusive practices than the KSA sample(M= 81.01, SD = 5.49), t (49) = 2.61, p = .01 with a Cohen's *d* effect size of 0.69. Further analysis of the subscales of TEIP showed that a significant difference in mean was present for the first subscale titled, "efficacy in managing behavior in

inclusive settings." US educators (M= 25.95, SD= 2.40) reported having a greater sense of efficacy in managing student behavior in inclusive settings than KSA educators (M= 24.12, SD = 2.55) with t (49) = 2.60, p = .01 with a Cohen's *d* =0.6 indicating a medium effect. This means that KSA early childhood educators feel less efficacious in managing the challenging behavior in inclusive settings than US educators. No significant mean difference was found for the second subscale, "efficacy in inclusive instruction"; US early childhood educators (M= 25.95, SD= 2.41) and KSA educators (M= 25.31, SD= 2.54) with t (49) = 0. 91, p= .36. The analysis revealed a significant mean difference between US educators (M= 26.62,SD= 3.69) and KSA educators (M= 24.62, SD= 2.89) on subscale three, "efficacy in collaboration," t (49) = 2. 2, p = .03 with a moderate effect size (*d* = 0.61). This means that KSA educators reported a lower sense of efficacy in the implementation of collaboration in inclusive settings than US early childhood educators.

Discussion

The current study was designed to understand the teacher's efficacy in implementing inclusive practices by the US and KSA early childhood educators. This study identified the attitudes and perceptions of the US and KSA early childhood educators towards inclusive practices by self-report measure. This study examined the differences in perception of early childhood teachers regarding efficacy in implementing inclusive education practices between US KSA educators. The results showed that US educators reported more teachers' efficacy for inclusive practices than the KSA. It means that US educators have high efficacy in the implementation of inclusive practices than the KSA educators. The results chapter concluded the analysis and information about implementing the inclusive practices by the US and Saudi Arabian's early childhood educators. This chapter of discussion provides information about the summary of the research results and also the limitations and implications of the current research for future researchers and clinicians.

Summary of Results

The results showed that US early childhood educators reported significantly higher scores on the TEIPscale than those in the KSA. This means that US educators have greater efficacy overall in the implementation ofinclusive practices in early childhood settings than KSA educators. Further analysis on the subscales of TEIP alsoshowed that a significant meandifferences were present for efficacy in managing behavior ininclusive settings. US educators reported greater efficacy in managing behavior in inclusive early childhood settings than KSA educators. No significant mean differencewas found between US and KSA educators for the implementation of inclusive instruction. Theanalysis did reveal a significant mean difference between US educators and KSA educators onefficacy in collaboration in inclusive settings, sothat KSA educators reported lowerefficacy to implement collaborative practices in inclusive early childhood settings than US educators.

Thelimited experience and training in special education reported by KSA participantscould partially explain the results and prove to be a long-term impediment to successful implementation of inclusive practices in early childhood programs in KSA. However, positive perceptions of inclusion and a positive attitude toward teaching students with disabilities may also play a large role. Soodak, Podel, and Lehman (1998) found a positive relationshipbetween the American teacher's self-efficacy and their attitude towards inclusion towardschildren with disabilities. A positive relationship was also found between the teacher's efficacyin collaboration inclusion and attitudes towards inclusive education (Malinen et al., 2012;Savolainen et al., 2012). Vaz et al. (2015) found that the teacher's sense of self-efficacy is associated withthe expression of a more positive attitude. Past research provided information about teachers'positive perception of inclusive practices and a positive effect on the implementation of efficacyin inclusive settings (Zee &Koomen, 2016). Teacher self-efficacy positively influences theimplementation of inclusive practices in the education classes (Vaz et al., 2015), so that teacherswho have positive beliefs towards the inclusive education of the children with disabilities tend tohave higher efficacy in implementing inclusive practices in classrooms (Lee, Yeung, Tracey &Barker, 2015).

Previous research also supports the evidence of this current research. Theresearchers suggested that the positive perception of the teachers towards inclusive education hasa positive relationship with

high self-efficacy and experience in the inclusive education settings(Porter &Towell 2017; Sharma, Shaukat &Furlonger, 2015).Other research has also found that the teachers' work experience with students withdisabilities positively impacted self-efficacy and increased the likelihood of their implementationof inclusive practices (Calero &Benasco, 2015; Mardied, 2015; Song, 2016). The findingsrelated to the number of students taught by the educators are also aligned with the previousresearch. Hofman and Kilno (2014) argued that teaching experience in inclusive settingsinfluenced the implementation of the inclusive practices. This may provide hope that as early childhood educators in KSA spend more time in inclusive settings and teach more students with disabilities, they may learn and successfully implement more inclusive practices, thereby developing their sense of efficacy and further contributing to a positive perception of inclusive early childhood education.

Limitations

The current research has a few limitations that can influence the generalization of the current study results. The main limitations are related to the sample size of the educators, the method of sampling, the self-reported survey method, and the reliability of the survey data.

The sample size of the current research consisted of 51 educators. There were 22 US educators and 29 KSA early childhood educators and is not likely a true representative of the entire US and KSApopulation of early childhood educators, and may have affected the validity of the results and decreased power to detect smaller effects (Hajian-Tilaki, 2014). Therefore, this study's findings may not be generalizable to all US andSaudi Arabia early childhood educators practicing in inclusive settings. Additionally, increasing sample size for future research using a brief self-report measure could improve the reliability of findings.

The second limitation is related to sampling technique: The data was collected through convenience sampling techniques which can directly affect the findings of the survey and their generalizability (Gill, Johnson, &Clark, 2010). The research also included data from educators who had noprior classroom experience in inclusive settings. In the future, researchers shouldemploy simple random or purposive samplingtechniques to ensure data is collected from educators currently working in inclusive settings.

The third limitation is that the researcher used a self-reported questionnaire to collect data from the US and KSA educators. There is a possibility of bias in responding to self-reported measures in that participants can provide answers that align with the way they perceive fits a pattern or puts them in a more favorable light (Taherdoost, 2016). It issuggested that future researchers can overcome this limitation by including some items with reverse coding. This will help participants to think more critically and understand the truenature of questions and report accordingly. The addition of observational measures could strengthen the reliability of future studies on inclusive practices in early childhood classrooms.

Future Research

The current research was created on the comprehensive base analysis of the literature review. The previous researchers also supported the results of the current study. Therefore, current research can be recommended for the implications for future research. It is suggested that more research is needed to investigate the attitude and behavior of the US and KSA educators.

The current research findings provide information about the attitude of the US and KSA educators towards the implementation of inclusive practices. But the findings lack clear elucidation of the factorsthat can affect the attitudes and behaviors of the US and KSA educators. Lee and Kim (2012)argued that students without disabilities interact more frequently with students with disabilities when educated in diverse inclusive classrooms, and this is especially true forearly childhood, when children have not formed strict ideas about difference. Nam and Park (2014) suggested that the diversity of the teacher preparation programsinfluence the behaviors of the educators. The diversity of the education program also influencesthe educators' empathy, acceptance of disabilities beliefs, and cultural sensitivity in educators.Geerlingset al. (2018) argued that ethnically diverse inclusive classrooms also enhance the teacher'sefficacy in implementing inclusive practices for students with disabilities. Therefore,

it issuggested that future research should address the factors mentioned above that can influence theattitudes and behaviors of the US and KSA educators.

The study found that KSA educators report less efficacy in implementing inclusive practices than US educators. Therefore, it is suggested that future research should find the hidden factors that influence the inclusive practices of the US educator that are absent in the KSA early childhood educators. Finally, it is also suggested that the present research can provide the basis for the training and development workshops of the US and KSA educators to enhance their efficacy for the inclusive settings. The following research can also help make such a policy that can enhance the awareness regarding educators' inclusive education and abilities in the future.

References

Al-Abduljabbar, A. M., 1994. “Administrators' and Educators' Perceptions of Inclusive Schooling in Saudi Arabia.” PhD diss., Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Alnahdi, Ghaleb. 2013. "Transition services for students with mild intellectual disability in Saudi Arabia." *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities* Dec.:531-544.

Alnahdi, Ghaleb Hamad. 2014."Special Education Programs for Students with Intellectual Disability in Saudi Arabia: Issues and Recommendations." *Journal of the International Association of Special Education* 15(1): 83-91.

Alnahdi, Ghaleb. 2020. "Are we Ready for Inclusion? Teachers’ Perceived Self-Efficacy for Inclusive Education in Saudi Arabia." *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education* 67(2): 182-193.

Alquraini, Turki. 2011. "Special Education in Saudi Arabia: Challenges, Perspectives, Future Possibilities." *International Journal of Special Education* 26(2): 149-159.

Calero, Jorge, and Ximena Pérez Benasco. 2015. "Quality factors of Inclusive Education in Europe: An Exploration." December 26.https://includ-ed.eu/sites/default/files/documents/quality_factors_of_inclusive_education_final_en.pdf

Dubis, Said Abdullah, 1987. “Educators' attitudes toward children with handicaps and the concept of mainstreaming in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.”PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh.

Foreman, Phil, and Michael Arthur-Kelly. 2017.*Inclusion in Action*. Cengage AU.

Gaines, Trudi, and Marsha Barnes. 2017. "Perceptions and Attitudes About Inclusion: Findings Across All Grade Levels and Years of Teaching Experience." *Cogent Education* 4(1): 1313561.

Geerlings, Jolien, Jochem Thijs, and MaykelVerkuyten. 2018. "Teaching in Ethnically Diverse Classrooms: Examining Individual Differences in Teacher Self-Efficacy." *Journal of School Psychology* 67: 134-147.

Gill, John, andPhil JohnsonClark. 2010. *Research Methods for Managers*. London: SAGE.

Golmic, Bruce A., and Mary A. Hansen. 2012. "Attitudes, Sentiments, and Concerns of Pre-Service Teachers after Their Included Experience." *International Journal of Special Education* 27(1): 27-36.

Hajian-Tilaki, Karimollah. 2014. "Sample Size Estimation in Diagnostic Test Studies of Biomedical Informatics." *Journal of Biomedical Informatics* 48: 193-204.

Hwang, Yoon-Suk, and David Evans. 2011. "Attitudes Towards Inclusion: Gaps Between Belief and Practice." *International Journal of Special Education*26(1): 136-146.

Hyunjeong, Jeong, Tandra L. Tyler-Wood, Lloyd Kinnison, and George Morrison. 2014. "The US and South Korean Pre-K through 6 Teachers' Beliefs about Inclusion Practices in their Countries: Cross Cultural Perspectives." *Journal of the International Association of Special Education* 15(2): 11-23.

Lee, Frances Lai Mui, Alexander Seeshing Yeung, Danielle Tracey, and Katrina Barker. 2015. "Inclusion of Children with Special Needs in Early Childhood Education: What Teacher Characteristics Matter." *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education* 35(2): 79-88.

Lee, T. S., and T. J. Kim. 2012. "The Awareness Compared of Inclusive Classroom Teachers’ Instructional Adaptation on Inclusive Education Valuables." *Korean Journal of Inclusive Education* 7: 101-121.

Malinen, Olli-Pekka, Hannu Savolainen, and Jiacheng Xu. 2012. "Beijing In-Service Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 28(4): 526-534.
McMaster, Christopher. 2013. "Building Inclusion from the Ground Up: A Review of Whole School Re-culturing Programmes for Sustaining Inclusive Change." *International Journal of Whole Schooling* 9(2): 1-24.
Nam, H. J., and S. H. Park. 2014. "Effects of a Diversity Education Program on the Students' Empathy Ability, Cultural Sensitivity and Disabilities Acceptance Attitudes in an Inclusive Elementary School." *The Korean Society of Special Education* 13(3): 53-76.
Porter, G., and D. Towell. 2017. "Advancing Inclusive Education: Keys To Transformational Change In Public Education Systems." *Inclusive Education Canada*May.https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5980c988f14aa1e9bb9e2b19/t/59970824ebbd1a09cdcf7d6c/1503070247135/Advancing-inclusive-education-2017.pdf
Rudner, Lawrence M., and William D. Schafer. 2002. *What Teachers Need to Know About Assessment*. Washington, DC: National Education Association. https://beboldnm.pbworks.com/f/assess_principles.pdf
Salkind, N. J. 2012. *Exploring Research*. Hoboken: Pearson Education.
Savolainen, Hannu, Petra Engelbrecht, Mirna Nel, and Olli-PekkaMalinen. 2012. "Understanding Teachers' Attitudes and Self-Efficacy in Inclusive Education: Implications for Pre-Service and In-Service Teacher Education." *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 27(1): 51-68.
Schmidt, Majda, and KsenijaVrhovnik. 2015. "Attitudes of Teachers Towards the Inclusion of Children with Special Needs in Primary and Secondary Schools." *Hrvatska Revija Za RehabilitacijskaIstraživanja* 51(2): 16-30.
Sharma, Umesh, Paola Aiello, Erika Marie Pace, Penny Round, and Pearl Subban. 2018. "In-Service Teachers' Attitudes, Concerns, Efficacy and Intentions to Teach in Inclusive Classrooms: An International Comparison of Australian and Italian Teachers." *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 33(3): 437-446.
Sharma, Umesh, Sadia Shaukat, and Brett Furlonger. 2015. "Attitudes and Self-Efficacy of Pre-Service Teachers Towards Inclusion in Pakistan." *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs* 15(2): 97-105.
Song, Jia. 2016. "Inclusive Education in Japan and Korea–Japanese and Korean Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education." *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs* 16: 643-648.
Specht, Jacqueline, Donna McGhie-Richmond, Tim Loreman, Pat Mirenda, Sheila Bennett, Tiffany Gallagher, Gabrielle Young, JamieMetsala, LynnAylward, Jennifer Katz et al. 2016. "Teaching in Inclusive Classrooms: Efficacy and Beliefs of Canadian Preservice Teachers." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 20 (1): 1-15.
Taherdoost, Hamed. 2016. "Sampling Methods in Research Methodology; How to Choose a Sampling Technique for Research." *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*5(2): 18-27.
- Vaz, Sharmila, Nathan Wilson, Marita Falkmer, Angela Sim, Melissa Scott, Reinie Cordier, and TorbjörnFalkmer. 2015. "Factors Associated with Primary School Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities." *PloS one* 10(8): https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0137002

Zee, Marjolein, and Helma MY Koomen. 2016. "Teacher Self-Efficacy and its Effects on Classroom Processes, Student Academic Adjustment, and Teacher Well-Being: A Synthesis of 40 Years of Research." *Review of Educational Research* 86(4): 981-1015.

Table 1
Participant Demographic Information

Demographic Data	US		KSA	
Gender				
Males	22. 7**%**	(5)	3. 4**%**	(1)
Females	68. 2**%**	(15)	96. 6**%**	(28)

Others	9. 1%	(2)	0.0%	(0)
Total	100. 0%	(22)	100. 0%	(29)
Age				
19 - 23 years old	4. 5%	(1)	13. 8%	(4)
24 – 28 years old	40. 9%	(9)	62.1%	(18)
29 – 33 years old	31. 8%	(7)	10. 3%	(3)
34 – 38 years old	4. 5%	(1)	6. 9%	(2)
39 and above years old	18. 2%	(4)	6. 9%	(2)
Total	100. 0%	(22)	100. 0%	(29)
Experience in Early Childhood				
Less than one year	9. 1%	(2)	6.9%	(2)
1 – 2 years	18. 2%	(4)	48. 3%	(14)
3 – 4 years	31. 8%	(7)	17. 2%	(5)
5 – 6 years	9. 1%	(2)	6. 9%	(2)
More than 6 years	31. 8%	(7)	20. 7%	(6)
Total	100. 0%	(22)	100. 0%	(29)
Experience in Inclusive Settings				
Yes	68. 2%	(15)	41. 4%	(12)
No	31. 8%	(7)	58. 6%	(17)
Total	100. 0%	(22)	100. 0%	(29)
Number Special Education Courses				
None	13. 6%	(3)	37. 9%	(11)
1 – 3 courses	40. 9%	(9)	37. 9%	(11)
4 – 8 courses	9. 1%	(2)	3. 4%	(1)
8 plus courses	36. 4%	(8)	20. 7%	(6)
Total	100. 0%	(22)	100. 0%	(29)
Family with a Disability				
Yes	59. 1%	(13)	24. 1%	(7)
No	40. 9%	(9)	75. 9%	(22)
Total	100. 0%	(22)	100. 0%	(29)

DOI:10.48047/INTJECSE/V15I4.28 ISSN: 1308-5581 Vol 15, Issue 04 2023

Table 2
US and KSA Teacher Efficacy for Inclusion Comparisons

Variable		M	SD	t (49)	*p*	Cohen's *d*
TEIP	US	86.0606	8.29292	2.61	.01**	0. 69
	KSA	81.0134	5.49026			
EMB	US	25.9545	2.40215	2.60	.01**	0.63
	KSA	24.1207	2.55840			
EII	US	25.9545	2.41697	.906	.36	0.26
	KSA	25.3161	2.54614			
EC	US	26.6212	3.69476	2.16	.03*	0.61
	KSA	24.6264	2.89007			

Note; *$p < .05$**$p \leq .01$, TEIP= Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices full measure, EMB= Efficacy in Managing Behaviors subscale, EII= Efficacy in Inclusive Instructions subscale, EC= Efficacy in Collaboration subscale