



Research Article

© 2022 Sultan Aldehami.

This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Received: 10 May 2022 / Accepted: 27 June 2022 / Published: 5 July 2022

Saudi Arabia Special Education Teachers' Perspectives toward Obstacles to Educational Rehabilitation for Students with Intellectual Disability

Sultan Aldehami

Department of Special Education,
College of Science and Arts,
Qassim University, Ar Rass,
Saudi Arabia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2022-0103>

Abstract

This study examined Saudi Arabia teachers' perceptions of obstacles to educational rehabilitation for students with intellectual disability (ID). An online survey was completed by 84 special education teachers of students with ID. Results show statistically significant differences in these teachers' perspectives on the obstacles based on the grade levels they taught; there were no differences based on the other demographic variables studied (i.e., gender, level of education, and teaching experience). Moreover, the results show no statistically significant differences in teachers' perspectives on obstacles to educational rehabilitation related to demographic characteristics of gender, level of education, teaching experience, and grade level, compared to their views on other obstacles such as those related to (a) the tools used in educational rehabilitation, (b) school administration and equipment, and (c) students with ID. Also, there were no statistically significant effects of multiple demographic factors on teachers' perspectives on overall obstacles.

Keywords: special education, intellectual disability, educational rehabilitation, obstacles, special education teachers

1. Introduction

There has been notable development in the field of special education over the past few decades in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. This development covers many areas such as services provided and support for people with special needs in all regions, cities, and governorates of the Kingdom as well as creating social rehabilitation facilities and organizations. Saudi Arabia has designated the Rules and Regulations of Special Education Programs (RRSEP), which mainly make it possible for students with special needs the right to join special education programs. Thus, based on the RRSEP, students with special needs become entitled to join transition education and associated services, early intervention programs, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), free and appropriate public education (FAPE) and make use of health services and rehabilitation services made available (Aldabas, 2015; Alquraini, 2010; Ministry of Education of Saudi Arabia, 2002).

The issue of rehabilitation is considered a relatively new topic in the field of special education, compared to early intervention, community awareness of people with disabilities, and inclusion. Rehabilitation may be medical, social, educational, or economic but all types aim to help individuals with disabilities to the maximum possible degree (Evans, 1976). Hence, rehabilitation is defined as

the organized and continuous process that assists individuals with disabilities to access the maximum possible degree of medical, social, educational, and economic support (Hellbom et al., 2011; Kumar et al., 2012).

Educational rehabilitation is considered one of the basic rights of people with special needs, and it consists of training and rehabilitating the disabled individual to the highest possible level of development and integration of their personality, self-realization, and acceptance of their disability from either an educational or a social point of view. In addition to integrating disabled people into society and helping them gain confidence, educational rehabilitation involves creating tools and activities for educational, sports, cultural, and work environments to improve individuals' cognitive and functional capabilities (Dally, 1997; Gohel & Choudhary, 2011).

1.1 Literature Review

Chesaro (2020) examined the challenges that teachers and an administrator faced while teaching students with ID in Kenya. Results indicated that a lack of adequate support for the challenged learners by both fellow teachers and parents as well as insufficient physical and financial resources were the main challenges these teachers faced. Faiz and colleagues (2019) examined the challenges teachers faced in teaching students with ID and other types of disabilities at the primary school level. The study sample consisted of 258 teachers from the special education institutes of the Lahore district of Pakistan. Results indicated that teachers faced challenges such as giving students more attention when they needed it, organizing students for group activities, and dealing with students' misbehavior.

Charles and Mkulu (2020) conducted a study to determine the management challenges faced by school administrators and the effects of those challenges on pupils' academic performance in public primary schools. Results indicated that challenges included insufficient budget, weak collaboration with education stakeholders, weak infrastructure, and lack of teaching and learning resources. These challenges had negative effects on students' performance which led to student absences from school. Chacha and Zhong (2013) examined challenges at the primary education level in Tanzania and noted that textbooks were not updated to match information changes and that school materials and tools were insufficient. McLeskey et al. (2017) reported that some students with special needs were not taught in schools which impacted their academic performance. Likewise, Al-amarat (2011) found problems in the Tafila, Jordan public schools related to a lack of educational facilities causing challenges to school management. Bozkus (2021) aimed to develop a standardized data collection tool to identify the problems faced by school administrators. Results indicated that school administrators faced issues related to workload, personal rights, school climate, education systems, and organizational commitment. Other researchers reported that school administrators complained about communication issues, shortage of resources, financial problems, lack of organizational structure, and inferior school infrastructure (Demir, 2016; Doş et al., 2015; Karakose et al., 2014). Mayaru (2015) also indicated that some parents transferred their children from public schools to private schools because public school administrators' inability to deal with problems was clearly associated with not providing necessary school equipment.

Furthermore, Bullock et al. (2017) and Udoba (2014) indicated some challenges that teachers faced in teaching students with disabilities such as large numbers of students in classrooms, inappropriate learning environments and atmospheres, extensive paperwork, and separate classrooms and curricula. S'lungile et al. (2015) explained that the majority of teachers who taught students in inclusive classrooms were not trained for inclusive education. Similarly, Faiz et al. (2019) indicated that lack of teacher training, limited teaching material, and large class sizes were major challenges. Additionally, Faiz et al. reported that experienced teachers faced fewer problems than new or younger teachers. Likewise, Mastropieri and Scruggs (2017) found that teachers had less experience working with students with disabilities due to fewer training and preservice programs. Bryant et al. (2017) illustrated that some teachers lacked experience in teaching students with severe

disabilities, especially if those students needed more attention and adaptation in school settings. These studies' findings align with Fuchs's (2010) observation that some of the obstacles special education teachers met were a lack of administrative support and a lack of adequate professional training.

Moreover, Aldehami (2022) indicated statistically significant differences based on teachers' levels of education. Teachers with higher education level were significantly different from teachers with lower level. Also, researchers found that teachers who expressed sufficient knowledge had enrolled in professional development programs or taken college-level courses (Bell et al., 2010; Van Laarhoven & Conderman, 2011). Moreover, Faiz et al. (2019) found a significant difference based on gender and age in teachers' perceptions of the challenges they faced while teaching. Likewise, Sharma et al. (2015) revealed differences among teachers based on gender: Female special education teachers were more comfortable than males in working with and accepting students with special needs. However, Onivehu et al. (2017) pointed out that teachers' attitudes were not influenced by either gender or years of teaching experience. Jon (2015) made the point that some formal education programs were inadequate because they did not prepare teachers to deal with challenges in the school workplace environment. Finally, Chimhenga (2016) indicated that teachers' attitudes, whether positive or negative, about their students with special needs had a significant effect on these students' academic performance.

1.2 *Problem Statement*

I have noticed that special education teachers who teach students with ID face obstacles that limit their ability to fulfill their role in teaching students with ID. Teachers have also noted limitations in the practice of educational rehabilitation for students with ID, whether they are related to teachers' capabilities or the tools and methods they use which may be influenced by their educational qualifications. Hence, this research, conducted in the central region of Saudi Arabia, examined teachers' perceptions of obstacles to the educational rehabilitation of students with ID.

It is important to consider this topic because special education, as a research expertise, is still evolving, especially in the area of ID. Furthermore, teachers' perspectives on their needs and obstacles have not been sufficiently considered. Also, previous studies discussing the level of obstacles to educational rehabilitation for students with ID faced by teachers are not evident. Rather, many studies at the global level have focused on the effects and educational pressures resulting from the state of disability, whether on disabled individuals themselves or on their families. Some research conducted on habilitation and rehabilitation has explained that rehabilitation requires enormous material and human capabilities which may not be available to many societies, especially in suburban regions. Rehabilitation is a process that affects different people with disabilities regardless of severity, degree, and time of occurrence of the disabilities. On the other hand, rehabilitation is also defined as retraining disabled individuals in specific skills that complement their residual abilities. Therefore, habilitation is a process that may bring challenges to people with disabilities in general. In addition, there is a lack of codified measures of the capabilities or personalities of students with disabilities in light of either educational rehabilitation or other types of rehabilitation (Dally, 1997; Evans, 1976; Hellbom et al., 2011; Kumar et al., 2012; Manisha, 2011).

1.3 *Purpose of the Study*

It is beyond dispute that teachers' perspectives is an essential element in the learning process. Thus, I looked at teachers' perspectives on obstacles related to educational rehabilitation for students with ID. It also considers how teachers face and deal with these challenges based on four types of obstacles related to (a) teachers of students with ID, (b) tools used in educational rehabilitation, (c) school administration and equipment, and (d) students with ID. This study examined Saudi teachers' perspectives on obstacles to educational rehabilitation for students with ID to understand Saudi

teachers' overall perspectives and then to identify any differences in these perspectives on four separate subscales of obstacles based on demographic characteristics. I also investigated the impact of demographic factors on teachers' overall perspectives on obstacles to educational rehabilitation for students with ID.

1.4 Research Questions and Analyses

The salient question behind this study was: What are Saudi Arabia special education teachers' perspectives on obstacles to educational rehabilitation for students with ID in the Qassim region? The following Six subquestions were actually addressed:

1. What are the obstacles to educational rehabilitation for students with intellectual disabilities based on Saudi teachers' perspectives?
2. What are the differences in Saudi teachers' perspectives on the obstacles faced by teachers of students with intellectual disabilities based on demographic characteristics of gender, level of education, teaching experience, and grade level taught?
3. What are the differences in Saudi teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to the tools used in educational rehabilitation based on demographic characteristics of gender, level of education, teaching experience, and grade level taught?
4. What are the differences in Saudi teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to school administration and equipment based on demographic characteristics of gender, level of education, teaching experience, and grade level taught?
5. What are the differences in Saudi teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to students with intellectual disabilities based on demographic characteristics of gender, level of education, teaching experience, and grade level taught?
6. To what extent do Saudi teachers' gender, level of education, teaching experience, and grade level taught influence these teachers' overall perspectives on obstacles to educational rehabilitation?

2. Method

2.1 Research Design and Sampling Methods

A cross-sectional survey was conducted to gather data. According to Modell (2011) quantitative research is the method mainly used in collecting, analysing, interpreting, and presenting numerical information. The current study employed an online cross-sectional survey to investigate the overall levels of teachers' perspectives related to obstacles to educational rehabilitation for students with ID, to describe differences based on demographic characteristics on the four subscales of obstacles, and to determine if several demographic factors were significant predictors of teachers' overall perspectives when obstacles were examined all together. The survey included 41 questions divided into four sections: obstacles related to teachers of students with ID, obstacles related to the tools used in educational rehabilitation, obstacles related to school administration and equipment, and obstacles related to students with ID. Each section posed specific questions related to obstacles to educational rehabilitation. A simple random sampling method was used to recruit 84 special education teachers of students with ID who lived in Qassim.

2.2 Instruments

Two tools were utilized to gather data from the informants: a demographic questionnaire and a researcher-developed survey. The questionnaire contained five questions focusing on teachers' gender, level of education, years of teaching experience, and grade level taught. In brief, three experts in the field of special education at Qassim University were asked to measure the content validity by examining the tools.

2.3 Data Analysis

To answer RQ1-6, descriptive statistics frequencies and percentages were used for all variables. Additionally, RQ2-5 focused on the differences in the four separate subscales of obstacles based on demographic variables. Because there were two groups identified by gender as males and females, a *t*-test of independent samples was conducted. Furthermore, the three variables, namely, the education level, years of teaching experience and grade level taught were analyzed by a one-way ANOVA in order to define the relevance between these variables and four separate subscales of obstacles regarding the educational rehabilitation of students with ID. Also, the researcher used multiple regression analysis to answer RQ6, determining which of these independent variables (IVs; i.e., teachers' gender, level of education, teaching experience, and grade level taught) significantly influenced teachers' overall perspectives on obstacles.

3. Results

3.1 Reliability Data Collection

Before running the statistical analysis, internal consistency/reliability assessment in Cronbach's alpha was carried out separately for every dependent variable (DV) scale as well as for the overall scale. Results showed that reliability coefficients on the four subscales reported were .85, .87, .90, and .91 while the reliability coefficient on the overall scale was .95, indicating acceptability as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Reliability Coefficients in Cronbach's Alpha

Subscales	No. of Items	Reliability Coefficient
		Current Study
Obstacles related to teachers of students with intellectual disability	15	.91
Obstacles related to tools used in educational rehabilitation	9	.85
Obstacles related to school administration and equipment	6	.87
Obstacles related to students with intellectual disability	11	.90
Total	41	.95

3.2 Descriptive Analysis Results

The demographic characteristics of the 84 special education teachers who participated in this study are shown in Table 2. For gender, 56.5% of the survey respondents were male and 43.5% were female. Regarding education level, 82.4% of the teachers held bachelor's degrees, 15.3% held Master's degrees, and 2.4% held doctoral degrees. Additionally, 10.6% of the teachers had 5-8 years of teaching experience, 36.5% had 9-12 years of teaching experience, and about half (52.9%) had over 12 years of teaching experience. Regarding grade level taught, 51.8% of the teachers taught in elementary school, 24.7% taught in middle school, and 23.5% taught in high school.

Table 2: Demographics of Teacher Respondents

Variables	(N = 84)	
	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	48	56.5
Female	37	43.5
Education level		
Completed Bachelor's degree	70	82.4

Variables	(N = 84)	
	Frequency	Percentage
Completed Master's degree	13	15.3
Completed PhD degree	2	2.4
Teaching Experience		
5-8 years	9	10.6
9-12 years	31	36.5
Over 12 years	45	52.9
Grade Level Taught		
Elementary	44	51.8
Middle	21	24.7
High	20	23.5

3.3 Results Related to RQ1

3.3.1 Obstacles Related to Teachers of Students with ID

Table 3 displays the means and SDs of obstacles associated with the estimation of teachers of students with ID of their ability to face obstacles to educational rehabilitation for students with ID. Item 4 coded as *Teacher receives inadequate continuous training to enhance the abilities and skills to teach with students with intellectual disabilities* produced the highest mean score ($M = 3.49$) of all items. In comparison, Item 13 coded as *Teachers' negative attitude toward individuals with intellectual disabilities* yielded the lowest mean score ($M = 2.75$) among all items. Moreover, Item 5 coded as *The teachers' practical experience with various tests and standards for intellectual disabilities is limited* revealed the most dispersion ($SD = 1.201$) among all items while Item 3 coded as *Teachers lack specialized competence that contributes to educational rehabilitation* indicated the least variance ($SD = .945$) among all items.

Table 3: Means and Standard Deviations (SD) of Teachers of Students With Intellectual Disability Scale

Item Code	Mean	SD
1: Teacher is unaware of educational rehabilitation of students with intellectual disabilities.	3.01	1.006
2: Teacher showed inadequate educational experience required to practice educational rehabilitation for individuals with intellectual disabilities.	3.05	1.011
3: Teacher lacks specialized competence that contributes to educational rehabilitation.	2.85	.945
4: Teacher receives inadequate continuous training to enhance the abilities and skills to teach with students with intellectual disabilities.	3.49	1.054
5: The teacher's practical experience with various tests and standards for intellectual disabilities is limited.	3.28	1.201
6: Teacher faces instability at their schools due to vacations, transfers, and assignments.	3.16	1.184
7: Teacher is reluctant to cooperate with a team of members from different majors to rehabilitate individuals with intellectual disabilities.	3.08	1.115
8: Teacher is unable to interpret the results of a variety of tests and assessments used to diagnose intellectual disabilities.	3.20	.986
9: Teacher uses some educational tests that are inappropriate for the rehabilitation process.	2.88	1.005
10: The teacher's diagnosis perspectives on individuals with intellectual disabilities are poor.	3.00	1.012
11: The teacher fails to keep up with developments in the rehabilitation of individuals with intellectual disabilities.	3.09	1.098
12: The teacher lacks the necessary skills to work with individuals with intellectual disabilities.	2.80	1.089
13: Teacher has a negative attitude toward individuals with intellectual disabilities.	2.75	1.079
14: Teacher believes that the educational rehabilitation of students with intellectual disabilities is impossible.	2.89	1.185
15: The time allotted to the teacher for educational rehabilitation planning is insufficient.	3.16	.949

3.3.2 Obstacles related to the tools used in educational rehabilitation

Table 4 shows the means and SDs of obstacles related to the tools used in educational rehabilitation (TUIER) scale concerning the teachers' estimation of their ability to face obstacles to educational rehabilitation for students with ID. Among all the TUIER items, the item coded as (TUIER -5): *The school lacks audio-visual equipment that helps in the educational rehabilitation of students with intellectual disabilities* showed the highest mean ($M = 3.93$). In comparison, the item coded as (TUIER -6): *The school does not support services for the rehabilitation of students with intellectual disabilities* revealed the lowest mean ($M = 3.52$). Moreover, the item coded as (TUIER -2): *Some schools fail to meet the requirements of educational tests for students with intellectual disabilities* showed the highest variance based on the dispersion of the scores ($SD = 1.089$) among all TUIER items while the item coded as (TUIER -4): *Some measures are inappropriate for the ages of students with intellectual disabilities* revealed the lowest variance ($SD = .968$) among all TUIER items.

Table 4: Means and Standard Deviations (SDs) of (TUIER) Scale

Item Code	Mean	SD
TUIER -1: The school lacks modern psychological standards regarding the educational rehabilitation of students with intellectual disabilities	3.80	1.078
TUIER -2: Some schools fail to meet the requirements of educational tests for students with intellectual disabilities	3.80	1.089
TUIER -3: The school lacks specialized staff capable of applying psychological measures and diagnostic tests to students with intellectual disabilities	3.81	1.086
TUIER -4: Some measures are inappropriate for the ages of students with intellectual disabilities	3.73	.968
TUIER -5: The school lacks audio-visual equipment that helps in the educational rehabilitation of students with intellectual disabilities	3.93	.973
TUIER -6: The school does not support services for the rehabilitation of students with intellectual disabilities	3.52	1.031

TUIER = Tools used in educational rehabilitation

3.3.3 Obstacles related to school administration and equipment

Table 5 displays the means and SDs of obstacles related to school administration and equipment (SAE) as indicated by results on the SAE scale measuring teachers' estimation of their ability to face obstacles to educational rehabilitation for students with ID. The item coded as (SAE -9): *No multidisciplinary team committed to assisting students with intellectually disabilities* produced the highest mean score ($M = 3.91$) among all the SAE items. In comparison, the item coded as (SAE -5): *The data for the development of educational rehabilitation programs is inadequate* revealed the lowest mean score ($M = 3.13$) among all SAE items. Additionally, the item coded as (SAE -2): *The school lacks funding sources and support for educational rehabilitation activities and programs for students with intellectual disabilities* displayed the most dispersion ($SD = 1.270$) among all SAE items while the item coded as (SAE -5): *The data for the development of educational rehabilitation programs are inadequate* indicated the least variance ($SD = .910$) among all SAE items.

Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations (SDs) of (SAE) Scale

Item Code	Mean	SD
SAE -1: The school administration is unfamiliar with the concept and significance of educational rehabilitation for students with intellectual disabilities.	3.41	1.061
SAE -2: The school lacks funding sources and support for educational rehabilitation activities and programs for students with intellectual disabilities.	3.35	1.270
SAE -3: The rooms used for the educational rehabilitation process for students with intellectual disabilities are not suitable.	3.46	1.018

Item Code	Mean	SD
SAE -4: The administrators lack the experience to enhance the infrastructure for the rehabilitation of intellectually disabled students.	3.25	1.045
SAE -5: The data informing the development of educational rehabilitation programs are inadequate.	3.13	.910
SAE -6: There is no administrative support for educational rehabilitation activities and programs for students with intellectual disabilities.	3.28	.995
SAE -7: The administration does not provide moral support for teachers.	3.36	1.056
SAE -8: The school administration does not support educational rehabilitation programs.	3.42	.956
SAE -9: There is no multidisciplinary team committed to assisting intellectually disabled students.	3.91	1.042

SAE = School administration and equipment

3.3.4 Obstacles related to students with intellectual disabilities

Table 6 shows the means and SDs of obstacles related to the students with intellectual disabilities (SWID) scale measuring Saudi teachers' estimation of their ability to face obstacles to educational rehabilitation for SWID. Among all SWID items, the item coded as (SWID -9): *Interference by some parents of children with intellectual disabilities impairs the effectiveness of educational rehabilitation of intellectually disabled students* indicated the highest mean ($M = 3.55$). In comparison, the item coded as (SWID -8): *Students with intellectual disabilities are unwilling to work with their teachers* revealed the lowest mean score ($M = 2.94$). Moreover, the item coded as (SWID -7): *The number of students per teacher is very high* indicated the highest dispersion ($SD = 1.099$) among all SWID items while the item coded as (SWID -4): *Students with intellectual disabilities lack motivation to adhere to their educational rehabilitation plans* indicated the lowest variance ($SD = .748$) among all SWID items.

Table 6: Means and Standard Deviations (SDs) of (SWID) Scale

Item Code	Mean	SD
SWID -1: The severity, type, and degree associated with intellectual disabilities	3.34	.983
SWID -2: Failure of students with intellectual disabilities to engage in educational rehabilitation programs	3.07	.910
SWID -3: The frequent absence of the student from educational rehabilitation sessions	3.29	.949
SWID -4: Students with intellectual disabilities lack motivation to adhere to their educational rehabilitation plans.	3.19	.748
SWID -5: Students' low intellectual abilities make it difficult for them to engage in educational rehabilitation programs.	3.13	.884
SWID -6: Some students with intellectual disabilities are not interested in participating in the educational rehabilitation process.	3.29	.961
SWID -7: The number of students per teacher is very high.	3.35	1.099
SWID -8: Students with intellectual disabilities are unwilling to work with their teachers.	2.94	.992
SWID -9: Interference by some parents of children with intellectual disabilities impairs the effectiveness of educational rehabilitation for intellectually disabled students.	3.55	.982
SWID -10: Inadequate cooperation between parents and teachers during the educational rehabilitation of disabled students	3.35	1.032
SWID -11: Inadequate participation of families of children with intellectual disabilities in educational rehabilitation activities sponsored by schools	3.47	.894

SWID = Students with intellectual disabilities

3.3.5 Teachers' perspectives on overall obstacles to educational rehabilitation and on four scales

Table 7 displays the means and SDs of the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles to educational rehabilitation for SWID as measured by the survey's four scales. Information on the teachers' perspectives on overall obstacles is also shown. The obstacles related to the tools used in educational rehabilitation produced the highest mean score ($M = 3.76$, $SD = .65$) among all obstacles. The mean

score and SD for obstacles related to school administration and equipment were $M = 3.39$, $SD = .71$, and results show $M = 3.27$, $SD = .57$ for obstacles related to SWID. In contrast, obstacles related to teachers of SWID yielded the lowest mean score ($M = 3.04$, $SD = .60$). Statistics on teachers' perspectives on overall obstacles were $M = 3.37$, $SD = .49$.

Table 7: Means and Standard Deviations (SDs) of the Four Scales and Overall Obstacles

Item code	Mean	SD
Obstacles related to teachers of students with intellectual disabilities	3.04	.60
Obstacles related to the tools used in educational rehabilitation	3.76	.65
Obstacles related to school administration and equipment	3.39	.71
Obstacles related to students with intellectual disabilities	3.27	.57
Overall Obstacles	3.37	.49

3.4 Results Related to RQ2

3.4.1 T-Test Results

An independent *t*-test was conducted to examine variation in teachers' perspectives on obstacles related to teachers of SWID, based on gender. As Table 8 shows below, the test revealed no significant difference between males ($M = 45.04$, $SD = 9.56$) and females ($M = 46.59$, $SD = 8.47$) in their perspectives on obstacles related to teachers of SWID, $t(83) = -.780$, $p = .33$.

Table 8: *t*-Tests for Teachers' Responses

Variables		N	Mean	SD	T	Df	Sig.
Gender	Male	48	45.04	9.56	-.780	83	.33
	Female	37	46.59	8.47			

3.4.2 Results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Regarding the level of education variable, the results revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to teachers of SWID, $F(2, 82) = 1.371$, $p = .260$, as shown in Table 9. Furthermore, there was little difference based on mean scores: doctoral ($M = 52$, $SD = 1.41$), Master's ($M = 48.61$, $SD = 8.33$), and bachelor's ($M = 45$, $SD = 9.22$). Bonferroni test analysis was not needed.

Additionally, the results for the years of teaching experience variable revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to teachers of SWID, $F(2, 82) = .389$, $p = .679$, as shown in Table 9. Therefore, there was little difference based on mean scores: 5-8 years ($M = 43.77$, $SD = 7.56$), 9-12 years ($M = 45.22$, $SD = 9.17$), and over 12 years ($M = 46.44$, $SD = 9.39$). Bonferroni test analysis was not needed.

However, the results on the grade level taught variable showed that there were statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to teachers of SWID based on the grade levels they taught, $F(2, 82) = 3.718$, $p = .028$, as shown in Table 9. Therefore, there was little difference based on mean scores: elementary school ($M = 43.20$, $SD = 8.11$), middle school ($M = 48.42$, $SD = 7.34$), and high school ($M = 48.40$, $SD = 11.32$). As shown in Table 10, Bonferroni test analysis indicated that the teachers who taught in elementary school were slightly different from teachers who taught in middle school with marginal statistical significance ($p = .08$). Also, teachers who taught in elementary school were slightly different from teachers who taught in high school with marginal statistical significance ($p = .09$).

Table 9: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Variable		N	Mean	SD		Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Education Level	Bachelor's	70	45	9.22	Between G.	224.147	2	1.371	.260
	Master's	13	48.61	8.33	Within G.	6705.077	82		
	Doctoral	2	52	1.41	Total	6929.224	84		
Teaching Experience	5-8 years	9	43.77	7.56	Between G.	65.138	2	.389	.679
	9-12 years	31	45.22	9.17	Within G.	6864.086	82		
	Over 12 years	45	46.44	9.39	Total	6929.224	84		
Grade Level Taught	Elementary	44	43.20	8.11	Between G.	576.122	2	3.718	.028
	Middle	21	48.42	7.34	Within G.	6353.102	82		
	High	20	48.40	11.32	Total	6929.224	84		

Table 10: Post Hoc Analysis (Bonferroni Test)

Variables		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Grade Level				
Elementary	Middle	-5.22403	2.33457	.084
	High	-5.19545	2.37375	.094
Middle	Elementary	5.22403	2.33457	.084
	High	.02857	2.75013	1.000
High	Elementary	5.19545	2.37375	.094
	Middle	-.02857	2.75013	1.000

3.5 Results Related to RQ3

3.5.1 T-Test Results

An independent *t*-test was conducted to examine variation in teachers' perspectives on the obstacles they faced related to the tools used in educational rehabilitation based on gender. Results revealed no significant difference between males ($M = 23.25$, $SD = 3.33$) and females ($M = 21.72$, $SD = 4.45$) in their perspectives on the obstacles they faced related to tools used in educational rehabilitation, $t(83) = 1.799$, $p = .15$, as shown in Table 11.

Table 11: *t*-Tests for Teachers' Responses

Variables		N	Mean	SD	T	df	Sig.
Gender	Male	48	23.25	3.33	1.799	83	.15
	Female	37	21.72	4.45			

3.5.2 Results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Regarding the level of education variable, the results revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to tools used in educational rehabilitation, $F(2, 82) = .100$, $p = .905$, as shown in Table 12. Furthermore, there was little difference based on mean scores for education level: doctoral ($M = 22$, $SD = 2.82$), Master's ($M = 23$, $SD = 3.05$), and bachelor's ($M = 22.52$, $SD = 4.10$). Bonferroni test analysis was not needed.

Also, the results for the years of teaching experience variable revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to tools used in educational rehabilitation, $F(2, 82) = 1.722$, $p = .185$, as displayed in Table 12. Therefore, there was little difference based on mean scores for years of teaching experience: 5-8 years ($M = 24.66$, $SD = 2.12$), 9-12 years (M

= 22.74, $SD = 3.10$), and over 12 years ($M = 22.06, SD = 4.54$). Bonferroni test analysis was not needed.

In addition, the results for the grade level taught variable revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to tools used in educational rehabilitation based on the grade levels they taught, $F(2, 82) = .227, p = .798$, as shown in Table 12. Therefore, there was little difference in the mean scores for the grade level taught: elementary school ($M = 22.70, SD = 3.68$), middle school ($M = 22.09, SD = 4.72$), and high school ($M = 22.85, SD = 3.61$). However, Bonferroni test analysis was not needed.

Table 12: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Variable		N	Mean	SD		Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Education Level	Bachelor's	70	22.52	4.10	Between G.	3.145	2	.100	.905
	Master's	13	23	3.05	Within G.	1283.443	82		
	Doctoral	2	22	2.82	Total	1286.588	84		
Teaching Experience	5-8 years	9	24.66	2.12	Between G.	51.853	2	1.722	.185
	9-12 years	31	22.74	3.10	Within G.	1234.735	82		
	Over 12 years	45	22.06	4.54	Total	1286.588	84		
Grade Level	Elementary	44	22.70	3.68	Between G.	7.070	2	.227	.798
	Middle	21	22.09	4.72	Within G.	1279.519	82		
	High	20	22.85	3.61	Total	1286.588	84		

3.6 Results Related to RQ4

3.6.1 T-Test Results

An independent *t-test* was conducted to examine variation in teachers' perspectives on obstacles related to school administration and equipment based on gender. Results revealed no significant difference between males ($M = 30.06, SD = 6.25$) and females ($M = 31.24, SD = 6.58$) in their perspectives on obstacles related to school administration and equipment, $t(83) = -.843, p = .90$, as shown in Table 13.

Table 13: *t*-Tests for Teachers' Responses

Variables		N	Mean	SD	T	Df	Sig.
Gender	Male	48	30.06	6.25	-.843	83	.90
	Female	37	31.24	6.58			

3.6.2 Results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Regarding the level of education variable, the results revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to school administration and equipment, $F(2, 82) = .494, p = .612$, as displayed in Table 14. Furthermore, there was little difference in the mean scores for education level: doctoral ($M = 32.50, SD = 4.94$), Master's ($M = 32, SD = 6.35$), and bachelor's ($M = 30.25, SD = 6.46$). Bonferroni test analysis was not needed.

Additionally, the results for the years of teaching experience variable revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to school administration and equipment, $F(2, 82) = .563, p = .572$, as shown in Table 14. Therefore, there was little difference in the mean scores for years of teaching experience: 5-8 years ($M = 32.55, SD = 6.20$), 9-12 years ($M = 30.70, SD = 5.52$), and over 12 years ($M = 30.08, SD = 7.009$). Bonferroni test analysis was not needed.

Also, the results of the grade level variable revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to the school administration and equipment, $F(2, 82) =$

.431, $p = .652$, as displayed in Table 14. Therefore, there was little difference in the mean scores for the grade level taught variable: elementary school ($M = 30.09$, $SD = 6.05$), middle school ($M = 30.52$, $SD = 7.27$), and high school ($M = 31.70$, $SD = 6.33$). Bonferroni test analysis was not needed.

Table 14: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Variable		N	Mean	SD		Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Education Level	Bachelor's	70	30.25	6.46	Between G.	40.882	2	.494	.612
	Master's	13	32	6.35	Within G.	3391.871	82		
	Doctoral	2	32.50	4.94	Total	3432.753	84		
Teaching Experience	5-8 years	9	32.55	6.20	Between G.	46.499	2	.563	.572
	9 -12 years	31	30.70	5.52	Within G.	3386.254	82		
	Over 12 years	45	30.08	7.009	Total	3432.753	84		
Grade Level	Elementary	44	30.09	6.05	Between G.	35.678	2	.431	.652
	Middle	21	30.52	7.27	Within G.	3397.074	82		
	High	20	31.70	6.33	Total	3432.753	84		

3.7 Results Related to RQ5

3.7.1 T-Test Results

An independent *t*-test was conducted to examine variation in teachers' perspectives on obstacles related to SWID based on gender. Hence, as displayed in Table 15, results revealed no statistically significant difference between males ($M = 36.16$, $SD = 6.28$) and females ($M = 35.75$, $SD = 6.33$) in their perspectives on obstacles related to SWID, $t(83) = .297$, $p = .91$.

Table 15: *t*-Tests for Teachers' Responses

Variables		N	Mean	SD	T	df	Sig.
Gender	Male	48	36.16	6.28	.297	83	.91
	Female	37	35.75	6.33			

3.7.2 Results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Regarding the level of education variable, results revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to SWID, $F(2, 82) = 1.521$, $p = .225$, as shown in Table 16. Furthermore, there was little difference in the mean scores for education level: doctoral ($M = 42$, $SD = .00$), Master's ($M = 37.53$, $SD = 6.59$), and bachelor's ($M = 35.52$, $SD = 6.21$). Bonferroni test analysis was not needed.

Also, results for the years of teaching experience variable revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to SWID, $F(2, 82) = .299$, $p = .742$, as displayed in Table 16. However, there was little difference in the mean scores for years of teaching experience: 5-8 years ($M = 36.44$, $SD = 6.44$), 9 -12 years ($M = 36.58$, $SD = 7.11$), and over 12 years ($M = 35.48$, $SD = 5.70$). Bonferroni test analysis was not needed.

In addition, results for the grade level taught variable revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to SWID, $F(2, 82) = 1.595$, $p = .209$, as shown in Table 16. Therefore, there was little difference in the mean scores for grade level taught: elementary school ($M = 34.88$, $SD = 6.33$), middle school ($M = 36.61$, $SD = 6.95$), and high school ($M = 37.75$, $SD = 5.07$). Bonferroni test analysis was not needed.

Table 16: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Variable		N	Mean	SD		Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Education Level	Bachelor's	70	35.52	6.21	Between G.	118.315	2	1.521	.225
	Master's	13	37.53	6.59	Within G.	3188.674	82		
	Doctoral	2	42	.00	Total	3306.988	84		
Teaching Experience	5-8 years	9	36.44	6.44	Between G.	23.973	2	.299	.742
	9-12 years	31	36.58	7.11	Within G.	3283.015	82		
	Over 12 years	45	35.48	5.70	Total	3306.988	84		
Grade Level	Elementary	44	34.88	6.33	Between G.	123.854	2	1.595	.209
	Middle	21	36.61	6.95	Within G.	3183.134	82		
	High	20	37.75	5.07	Total	3306.988	84		

3.8 Results Related to RQ6

3.8.1 Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

A multiple regression analysis identified which IVs (i.e., teachers' gender, level of education, teaching experience, and grade level taught) could significantly influence teachers' perspectives on overall obstacles to educational rehabilitation. Results indicate no statistically significant effects on teachers' perspectives on overall obstacles: $F(4,80) = 1.381, p > .248$; with an R^2 of = .018, as shown in Table 17. Furthermore, the adjusted R^2 was .018, indicating that the model explained 1.8% of why some teachers saw more or fewer obstacles to educational rehabilitation for SWID.

Table 17: Regression Analysis

	B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
Model					
(Constant)	123.455	10.530		11.725	.000
Gender	.080	4.389	.002	.018	.986
Education Level	6.041	4.850	.138	1.246	.216
Teaching Experience	-1.383	3.193	-.047	-.433	.666
Grade Level Taught	4.357	2.712	.180	1.606	.112

Adjusted R Square = .018. Teacher's gender was coded as male = 0 and female = 1.

4. Discussion

4.1 RQ1

Most of the teachers in this study estimated their capacity to face the obstacles related to tools used in educational rehabilitation with the statement *The school lacks audio-visual equipment that helps in the educational rehabilitation of students with intellectual disabilities*, and saw great obstacles to educational rehabilitation for SWID while other teachers estimated their ability to face obstacles related to teachers of SWID with the statement *Teachers' negative attitude toward individuals with intellectual disabilities*, and saw few obstacles to educational rehabilitation for SWID. This result is consistent with former studies indicating that teachers faced some challenges such as insufficient physical resources, lack of educational facilities, lack of teaching material, and insufficient tools for use in schools (Al-amarat, 2011; Chacha & Zhong, 2013; Chesaro, 2020; Faiz et al., 2019; Mayaru, 2015). Moreover, Faiz and colleagues (2019) indicated that teachers faced challenges such as needing to give students more attention during learning when they needed it and dealing with students' misbehavior.

4.2 RQ2

Results revealed no significant differences in special education teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to teachers of SWID based on gender. This finding contradicts a previous study finding (Faiz et al., 2019) of a significant difference based on gender in teachers' perspectives on the challenges they faced during teaching. Also, Sharma et al. (2015) explained that female special education teachers were more comfortable working with and accepting SWID than male teachers.

Regarding the level of education variable, results have shown no significant differences in these teachers' perspectives on the obstacles related to teachers of SWID, $F(2, 82) = 1.371, p = .260$. Nevertheless, it is essential to notice the unequal distribution of education level, as 82.4% of these teachers held only bachelor's degrees, which may have impacted the results. This result does not align with Aldehami's (2022) outcomes indicating that teachers with higher level of education were significantly different from teachers with lower-level education. Researchers also explained that teachers who claimed sufficient levels of knowledge had enrolled in professional development programs or had taken college-level courses (Bell et al., 2010; Van Laarhoven & Conderman, 2011).

Also, the results for the years of teaching experience variable revealed no statistically significant differences in the teachers' perspectives, $F(2, 82) = .389, p = .679$. Nevertheless, it is essential to note that these results showed no equal representation of teaching experience in this sample, as 52.9% of these teachers had over 12 years of teaching experience, which could have affected the results. This result conflicts with prior studies' results. Faiz et al. (2019) reported that teachers who had more teaching experience faced fewer problems than newer or younger teachers. Likewise, Mastropieri and Scruggs (2017) and Bryant et al (2017) found that teachers who had less experience teaching students with special needs faced more teaching problems.

However, the results for the grade level taught variable in the current study revealed statistically significant differences in these teachers' perspectives, $F(2, 82) = 3.718, p = .028$. Results showed that the teachers who taught in elementary school were slightly different from teachers who taught in middle school with marginal statistical significance ($p = .08$). Also, teachers who taught in elementary school were slightly different from teachers who taught in high school with marginal statistical significance ($p = .09$). Nevertheless, it is essential to look at the unequal proportions of grade levels taught, as 51.8% of the teachers taught in elementary school, which may be the cause for the variances. This finding is important as McLeskey et al. (2017) stated that some students with special needs are not educated in schools as they should be which may impact their academic performance. Likewise, Al-amarat (2011) found some problems in public schools related to a lack of educational facilities which causes problem and challenges for teachers and school administrators. Chacha and Zhong (2013) indicated some challenges at the primary education level such as books not being updated to match historical changes and insufficient materials and tools needed in schools.

4.3 RQ 3, 4, and 5

Comparisons of teachers' perspectives on the other three obstacles related to the tools used in educational rehabilitation, school administration and equipment, and SWID based on gender show no significant differences between male and female special education teachers. This finding contradicts the previous study results of Faiz et al. (2019) indicating that teacher gender was a significant factor in differences in teachers' perspectives on the challenges they faced during teaching. Also, Sharma and colleagues (2015) explained that female special education teachers expressed more satisfaction than male teachers in working with and accepting students with special needs.

Furthermore, the results for the level of education, years of teaching experience, and grade level taught variables in the current study revealed no statistically significant differences in these teachers' perspectives on the other three obstacles related to the tools used in educational rehabilitation, school administration and equipment, and SWID. These findings are important because they contrast with Aldehami's (2022) results indicating that the perspectives of teachers who had obtained higher

academic degrees were significantly different from teachers who had obtained lower-level degrees. Researchers also explained that teachers who expressed sufficient levels of knowledge had enrolled in professional development programs or had taken college-level courses (Bell et al., 2010; Van Laarhoven & Conderman, 2011). Furthermore, Faiz et al. (2019) reported that teachers who had more teaching experience faced fewer classroom problems than newer or younger teachers. Likewise, Mastropieri and Scruggs (2017) and Bryant et al. (2017) found that teachers who had less experience teaching students with special needs faced more teaching problems.

Additionally, other researchers have reported that school administrators complained about such challenges as limited communication, shortage of resources, financial problems, lack of organizational structure, and poor school infrastructure (Demir, 2016; Doş et al., 2015; Karakose et al., 2014; Sincar, 2013). Furthermore, the current study findings contrast with previous studies by Charles and Mkulu (2020) and Chacha and Zhong (2013) indicating that school administrators and students faced challenges including insufficient budget, weak collaboration with education stakeholders, books not being updated to match historical changes, insufficient materials and tools used in schools, weak infrastructure, and lack of teaching and learning resources which may affect students' performance. Also, Bullock et al. (2017) and Udoba (2014) indicated that teachers faced some challenges teaching students with disabilities such as large numbers of students in classrooms, inappropriate learning environments and atmospheres, and an overwhelming amount of paperwork.

4.4 RQ6

This study's last research question aimed to identify which of four IVs (i.e., teachers' gender, level of education, teaching experience, and grade level taught) significantly influenced teachers' perspectives on overall obstacles to educational rehabilitation. Results indicate no statistically significant effects on teachers' perspectives on overall obstacles: $F(4,80) = 1.381, p = .248$. These findings do not align with previous studies indicating that teachers face some challenges while teaching SWID such as insufficient physical and financial resources (Faiz et al., 2019). Also, Chacha and Zhong (2013) and Alamarat (2011) mentioned challenges such as books not being updated to match historical changes, lack of educational facilities, and insufficient materials and tools used in schools; these challenges affected both school administrators and students' academic development.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

This study investigated Saudi teachers' perspectives on obstacles to educational rehabilitation for SWID by examining these teachers' perspectives on overall obstacles to educational rehabilitation, and then identifying any differences in these teachers' perspectives on the four separate subscales of obstacles based on demographic characteristics. Findings indicate no statistically significant differences in teachers' perspectives on obstacles related to teachers of SWID based on gender, level of education, and teaching experience. However, these teachers' perspectives did differ based on the grade levels they taught. Furthermore, this study's findings indicate no statistically significant differences in teachers' perspectives toward obstacles to educational rehabilitation related to other obstacles related to (a) tools used in educational rehabilitation, (b) school administration and equipment, and (c) SWID based on gender, level of education, and teaching experience. There were no statistically significant influences of multiple demographic factors on teachers' perspectives on overall obstacles.

Also, in light of the aforementioned shortage of studies on teachers' experiences of obstacles to educational rehabilitation for SWID, this study attempted to contribute to the existing research by examining Saudi teachers' perspectives on obstacles to educational rehabilitation for SWID. This study's findings may display certain issues which could prompt public awareness of the education-related obstacles special education teachers face.

Additionally, alternative research methods may be useful in future research. Qualitative

measures may be used to study the levels of obstacles to educational rehabilitation for SWID that teachers experience. Moreover, gaining further information by including larger samples in future research would generalize and reinforce the conclusions of the present study. It might also compensate for any statistical shortcomings reported.

References

- Al-amarat, M. S. (2011). The classroom problems faced by teachers at the public schools in Tafila Province, and proposed solutions. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(1), 37-48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09751122.2011.11890007>
- Aldabas, R. A. (2015). Special education in Saudi Arabia: History and areas for reform. *Creative Education*, 6(11), 1158-1167. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2015.61114>.
- Aldehami, S. (2022). Saudi Arabia special education teachers' attitudes toward assistive technology use for students with intellectual disability. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 14(2), ep353. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/11541>
- Alquraini, T. (2010). Special education in Saudi Arabia: Challenges, perspectives, future possibilities. *International Journal of Special Education*, 25, 139-147. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ909292.pdf>
- Bell, S. M., Cihak, D. F., & Judge, S. (2010). A preliminary study: Do alternative certification route programs develop the necessary skills and knowledge in assistive technology? *International Journal of Special Education*, 25(3), 110-118. Retrieved from <http://www.internationaljournalofspecialeducation.com/>
- Bozkus, K. (2021). The problems of School Administrators Scale. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 10(1), 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.17583/ijelm.0.7069>
- Bryant, D. P., Bryant, B. R., & Smith, D. D. (2017). *Teaching students with special needs in inclusive classrooms*. Sage Publications.
- Bullock, L. M., Zolkoski, S. M., Lusk, M. E., & Hovey, K. A. (2017). Educators' perceptions of school-based factors that impact their effectiveness in working with students with challenging behaviors: A pilot investigation. *World Journal of Education*, 7(3), 92-102. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v7n3p92>
- Chacha, G., & Zhong, Y. (2013). The challenges of primary education level in Tanzania: Department of Education Economic and Management, College of Education Science, Nanjing Normal University, *Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 16(3), 01-06. Retrieved from <https://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol16-issue3/A01630106.pdf>
- Charles, A., & Mkulu, D. G. (2020). Management challenges facing school administrators and pupils' academic performance in public primary schools in Sengerema District Mwanza, Tanzania. *Journal of Humanities and Education Development (JHED)*, 2(3), 191-207. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/jhed.2.3.5>
- Chesaro, E. (2020). Challenges faced by teachers in teaching mentally challenged and communication deficient learners in Mbagathi Special Unit, Kenya. *African Research Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 7(3), 48-58. Retrieved from: <https://bit.ly/3i1kr3r>
- Chimhenga, S. (2016). Attitudes of teachers towards students with disabilities in mainstream classes: The case of teachers in some selected secondary schools in Zimbabwe. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 4(4), 36-41. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3ace/c5f883d6649136d36368216329a7adf400de.pdf>
- Dally, W. C. (1997). Some mentally retarded children can benefit from placement with peers. *Education*, 117(4), 553. Retrieved from <https://eds-p-ebshost.com.sdl.idm.oclc.org/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=4&sid=5c172f73-e953-451b-aba8-48cb6ce9478b%40oredis>
- Demir, M. K. (2016). Problems encountered by school principals: Unchanging facts of changing Turkey. *The Anthropologist*, 23(3), 629-640. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2014.11891983>
- Dos, I., Sagir, M., & Cetin, R. B. (2015). Classifying daily problems of school managers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 2040-2045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.568>
- Evans, E. (1976). The grief reaction of parents of the retarded and the counsellor's role. *Australian Journal of Mental Retardation*, 14(4), 8-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03124077608549486>
- Faiz, Z, Arif, A, & Zia, S. (2019). Challenges faced by teachers during teaching students with developmental disability at primary school level in Lahore. *Journal of Inclusive Education*, 3(1), 19-31. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342562344>
- Fuchs, W. W. (2010). Examining teachers' perceived barriers associated with inclusion. *SRATE Journal*, 190, 30-35. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ948685.pdf>
- Gohel, M., Mukherjee, S., & Choudhary, S. K. (2011). Psychosocial impact on the parents of mentally retarded in Anand District. *Healthline*, 2(2), 62. Retrieved from: http://www.healthlinejournal.org/index_pdf/50.pdf

- Hellbom, M., Bergelt, C., Bergenmar, M., Gijssen, B., Loge, J. H., Rautalathi, M., Smaradottir, A., & Johansen, C. (2011). Cancer rehabilitation: A Nordic and European perspective. *Acta Oncologica*, 50(2), 179-186. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0284186X.2010.533194>
- Jon, T. (2015). Recognizing non-formal and informal learning: Modernizing Russian higher education or irrelevant? *Obrazovanie i Nauka*, 1(4), 142-157. <https://doi-org.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.17853/1994-5639-2015-4-142-157>
- Karakose, T., Yirci, R., & Kocabas, I. (2014). A qualitative study of the novice principal's problems in the school management process and solutions. *Pakistan Journal of Statistics*, 30(6), 1365-1378. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289955218>
- Kumar, S. G., Roy, G., & Kar, S. S. (2012). Disability and rehabilitation services in India: Issues and challenges. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 1(1), 69. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2249-4863.94458>
- Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2017). *The inclusive classroom: Strategies for effective differentiated instruction*. Pearson.
- Mayaru, M. O. (2015). *The challenges facing the public primary school teachers in their teaching career in Tanzania: A case of Mbogwe District, Geita*. Open University of Tanzania. Retrieved from: <http://repository.out.ac.tz/id/eprint/1441>
- McLeskey, J. L., Rosenberg, M. S., & Westling, D. L. (2017). *Inclusion: Effective practices for all students*. Pearson.
- Ministry of Education of Saudi Arabia. (2002). *Rules and regulations of special education*. Retrieved from <https://departments.moe.gov.sa/SPED/Documents/serules.pdf>
- Modell, S. (2011). Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences. *EUROPEAN ACCOUNTING REVIEW*, 20(1), 183-186. <https://doi-org.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/09638180.2010.524372>
- Onivehu, A. O., Ohawuiro, O. E., & Oyeniran, B. J. (2017). Teachers' attitude and competence in the use of assistive technologies in special needs schools. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*, 10(4), 21-32. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1164985.pdf>
- Sharma, U., Shaikat, S., & Furlonger, B. (2015). Attitudes and self-efficacy of preservice teachers towards inclusion in Pakistan. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 15(2), 97-105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12071>
- S'lungile, K. T., Ntinda, K., & Hlanze, B. (2015). Lived experiences of parents of children with disabilities in Swaziland. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 3(4), 206-215. <https://doi.org/10.1114/jets.v3i4.902>
- Udoba, H. A. (2014). Challenges faced by teachers when teaching learners with developmental disability. [Unpublished Master's thesis.] University of Oslo. Retrieved from: <http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-46844>
- Van Laarhoven, T., & Conderman, G. (2011). Integrating assistive technology into special education teacher preparation programs. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 19(4), 473-497. Retrieved from <https://www.aace.org/pubs/jtate/>