



# Teachers Perspectives On Facilitating Factors And Challenges Of Inclusion For Students With Hearing Impairemetns

Abdullatif Arishi\*

\*Ed.D. King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia, Aarishi@kku.edu.sa

**Citation:** Abdullatif Arishi. et al. (2024), Teachers Perspectives on Facilitating Factors and Challenges of Inclusion for Students with Hearing Impairemetns, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(2), 368-374, Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i2.1319

## ARTICLE INFO

## ABSTRACT

Concerns about student participation in inclusive schools have arisen as several nations transition to inclusive education. In addition to gaining insight into the types of facilitating factors and challenges to full participation, the purpose of this study was to investigate participants perspectives of the existing situation regarding the inclusion of deaf or hard-of-hearing elementary pupils (6–12 years old). To gather information from participants, a quantitative method that included questionnaires was used. Participants filled out a the questionnaire, comprising 66 teachers from Riyadh and 82 teachers from Jazan. According to a framework analysis of the data, the participants' comprehension of inclusive teaching, inclusive education, and full involvement was lacking.

**Keywords:** Inclusion, teachers, perspeprtives, hearing impairments, students.

## Introduction

Since UNESCO's proclamation of inclusive education in Salamanca in Spain in 1994, many countries including the United Kingdom, the United States of America, New Zealand, Australia and the Kindom of Saudi Arabia have embraced the concept of inclusive education as a process to provide education for all. Saudi Arabia signed and ratified the UN Convention on the Rights Of persons with Disabilities in 2008. A core aspect of the pursuit of inclusive education is full participation (Berlach & Chambers, 2011; Florian, 2010). Despite significant achievements in expanding access to quality education in inclusive schools, full participation of students with disabilities remains a restricted education opportunity, which is mainly accessible to some students that most teachers consider are easy to teach (Armstrong et al., 2011; Booth & Ainscow, 2011; Genova, 2015; Graham & Spandagou, 2011; Kliwer, 1998; Low, Lee, & Ahmad, 2018; Petriwskyj, 2010). The pursuance of quality education continues to be the driving force toward transformations in education systems worldwide to enable access and full participation of all students in inclusive schools (Armstrong & Barton, 2008; Berlach & Chambers, 2011; Jordan, Glenn & McGhie-Richmond, 2010; Thomazet, 2009). Some concrete indicators of this are the adoption of pragmatic policies, provision of more funding, professional support, and enhancement in teacher quality to support the full participation of students with disabilities and special education needs in inclusive schools (D'Alessio, 2011; Petriwskyj, 2010).

This study explored the facilitators and barriers to 'full participation' of male and female students who are deaf or hard of hearing in Saudi inclusive elementary schools (6-12 year olds). Full inclusion means that all students, regardless of their disability, special education needs or severity, will be in a regular classroom or programme with access to all services in that setting (Florian, 2010). Previous research findings indicate that full participation of students with disabilities in inclusive schools provide more opportunities for students to learn with their peers without disabilities to develop social and academic skills and contribute to building strong and cohesive societies (Cologon, 2013; Florian, 2010). It is believed that the adoption of the concept of full participation in inclusive schools may prevent special schools being used as "dumping grounds" for the difficult-to-teach students (Vallecorsa, deBettencourt & Zigmund, 2000 in Snowman & McCown, 2015, p. 194). Despite the benefits of full participation, macro-and micro exclusionary practices continue to serve as barriers to full participation in inclusive schools or programmes. Macro exclusion is easy to recognise and occurs when a student is "excluded from mainstream education and segregated into a 'special' school or a 'special' class or unit for all or part of the day, week or year (or denied education at all" (Cologon, 2013, p. 14). Micro-exclusion

from full participation is situated in the lack of clear understanding of inclusive education resulting in schools' lack of making modifications or adjustments in policy, pedagogy and practice to meet the educational and learning needs of all students (Cologon, 2013; D'Alessio, 2011; Florian, 2010). The term micro-exclusion was coined by D'Alessio (2011) to refer to the misunderstanding that physical presence or placement of students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms is inclusion. Students can remain segregated and excluded within a so-called inclusive setting when they do not fully participate in the programmes that the school offers. This is an important problem to address because student full participation is a human rights issue, and is fundamental to the principles of full inclusion (Runswick-Cole & Hodge, 2009).

### Research questions

1. What are teachers' perspectives of facilitating factors and challenges of inclusion for students with hearing impairments?
2. Are there significant differences in teachers' perspectives according to (a) gender, and (b) region (urban/rural)?

### Methods

For the aims of integration, in-depth comprehension, and validation of the research topic, the research questions of this study required quantitative data (Bazeley, 2009; Creswell, 2012). This is in line with the claim made by Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) that a quantitative research methodology can provide a clear picture of the issue under study. The participants' information was gathered via a questionnaire (Creswell & Clark, 2017, Clark & Creswell, 2010).

### Participants

This study was carried out in the Saudi Arabian cities of Riyadh and Jazan using data from 15 elementary schools in Riyadh and 12 elementary schools in Jazan that reported using inclusion practices or enrolling general education and hard-of-hearing students. These schools sent an invitation to all of their teachers to volunteer for this program. To be allowed to participate, teachers from the participating schools had to fill out consent papers. Because they agreed to take part in the study, the elementary school instructors were included. During the participant selection process, the sample sizes in Riyadh and Jazan were not determined by random sampling or sample-size computation. 66 participants (44.6%) from Riyadh and 82 participants (55.4%) from Jazan completed the final sample of 200 questionnaires given to elementary school teachers and returned the questionnaires for this research project. The incomplete questionnaires were not returned, despite my reminders to the participants to encourage more answers. As a result, the ultimate response rate was 74% (148), which is considered good by Nulty (2008).

**Table 1 participants**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Location</b>
Teachers	66	Riyadh
Teachers	82	Jazan
<b>Total</b>	148	

### Data collection

In this study, teachers' responses to a questionnaire were used to gather data. It was crucial to carefully analyze during the questionnaire development process how the end product would enable the collection of pertinent, legitimate, and trustworthy data to address the research issues raised in this study (Campanelli, 2008). A variety of techniques were employed to create the questionnaire utilized in this investigation. These methods are described in the following section.

The conceptualization step was the first in the questionnaire's creation process. Fowler and Cosenza (2008) state that the conceptualization phase of a questionnaire enables me to pinpoint important topics on which to concentrate my item writing. In order to determine the important topics and characteristics that the questionnaire should include, I examined Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory as well as the literature on inclusive education and full involvement during the conceptualization stage. To help with the formulation of the questionnaire items, a number of variables were chosen as the key emphasis areas, including attitudes, impediments, knowledge of inclusive teaching techniques, facilitators, and concerns. In addition to identifying specific, quantifiable concepts, this meticulous approach to questionnaire construction gave rise to indications about the ways in which the concept of full participation was implemented in Saudi inclusive primary schools (Billiet, 2006).

### Questionnaire review

The first draft has been revised as part of the second stage. I forwarded the questionnaire to the study supervisors for assessment and feedback once the initial items were created. Certain things were suggested to be removed by the study supervisors due to their unclear nature. It was discovered that certain items measured multiple variables, so those items were also marked for revision. In addition to making structural modifications, the supervisors improved the readability of some of the items by making grammatical and syntactical adjustments.

### Data collection

The questionnaire's goal was to evaluate the attitudes, expertise, methods, facilitators, and obstacles that prevent deaf or hard-of-hearing pupils from participating fully in inclusive elementary schools. At first, I intended to hand deliver the paper copies of the surveys, but the participants recommended that I send the electronic version so they could fill it out and email it back to me. I entered the data into my password-protected, securely secured computer as soon as the questionnaires were returned. In order for me to perform the pertinent analysis specific to the two contexts where the data were obtained, each questionnaire was labeled with a number (U1, U2 for Urban, and R1, R2 for Rural). To evaluate how the participants answered the different items, a preliminary analysis of the questionnaire was done. Some of the interview questions for the study's second phase were developed using the results of this initial inspection.

### Data analysis

Information from the surveys was coded and entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24 program because Likert-type scale questions were utilized. Positive and negative comments were scored on a 5-point Likert scale, with highly agreeing being represented by a score of 5 and strongly disagreeing by a score of 1. At data entry, every negative item was changed to the opposite. "Strongly disagree" received a score of 1, while "strongly agree" received a score of 5. The coding for negative statements was reversed (1 strongly agree, and 5 strongly disagree). The quantitative data were subjected to descriptive analysis in order to ascertain the frequency, percentages, means, and standard deviations for every inquiry. Then, using these means, independent samples t-tests were performed to find variations in the answers to each item between the instructors in Jazan and Riyadh, as well as between the teachers who were male and female.

## Results and Discussions

### Participants' information

The first section of the questionnaire inquired about the participants' age, gender, professional function, professional qualification, and work location (rural or urban). On Parts 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the questionnaire, independent sample t-tests have been performed based on gender and location.

**Table 3 Age of participants**

Range	Frequency (%)
20-29	8 (5.4%)
30-39	71(48.0%)
40-49	54(36.5%)
50+	15(10.1%)
Total	148 (100.0%)

The findings indicate that the instructors' ages range, most of them are under 50. Given that Saudi Arabia's retirement age for educators is sixty years old, these educators still have time to support the government's inclusive practice agenda.

To find out what function each person played in their individual school, questions were posed to them. Understanding this is crucial to appreciating the assistance provided to deaf and hard-of-hearing students. For instance, a large concentration of therapists or special education instructors would indicate that there are certain specialized abilities available for use by other educators when instructing these pupils.

**Table 4 Professional roles**

Roles	Frequency (%)
Administrator/principal	2 (1.4%)
General education teacher	54 (36.5%)
Special education teacher	85 (57.4%)
Teaching assistant	1 (0.7%)
Therapists/special educator	6 (4.1%)
Total	148 (100%)

The distribution of participant roles in the table is concerning due to the low number of therapists and teaching assistants, but it is encouraging because there are many special education teachers available to support deaf and hard of hearing students in inclusive schools. The Saudi government's significant investment over the past ten years to train more special education teachers domestically and internationally in order to support the implementation of inclusive education in Saudi Arabia may be the reason for the rise in the number of special education teachers in general education schools (Alnahdi, 2014).

**Table 5 Years of teaching experience**

Age range	Frequency (%)
Less than 5 yrs	13(8.8%)
5-10yrs	47(31.8%)
11-15yrs	26(17.6%)
16-20yrs	31(20.9%)
21+yrs	31(20.9%)
Total	148(100%)

The distribution of years of professional experience among the participants is shown in Table 5. The teachers are primarily seasoned educators in their respective schools, as evidenced by the distribution of experience among them.

**Table 6 Qualification of participants**

Level	Frequency (%)
PhD	1(0.7%)
Master's Degree	17(11.5%)
Bachelor Degree	118(79.7%)
Diploma	10(6.8%)
Certificate	2(1.4%)
Total	148(100%)

The contestants' qualifications are displayed in Table 6. It shows that a resounding majority of participants possess the general or special education qualifications needed to teach in primary schools, and that they are better equipped to implement inclusive education initiatives that benefit every student.

### **Participants' perspectives of facilitators and barriers to full participation**

This part of the questionnaire collected information on participants' perspectives on facilitators and barriers to full participation of students who are deaf or hard of hearing in inclusive elementary schools. The table contains the percentage distribution of their conflicting perspectives. In terms of barriers, 49.3% (73) felt unsupported and 33.7% (50) felt supported by their administrators when faced with challenges presented by students who are deaf or hard of hearing in my classroom and the rest 16% (25) were undecided. This is similarly reflected in the feeling that colleagues were not willing to help 47.3% (70), and willing to help 34.5% (51) with issues that arose when students who are deaf or hard of hearing were included in their classrooms. A low number of the participants 18.2% (27) were undecided with regards to their colleagues' help when they uncounted problems. Other barriers relate to lack of adequate administrative support for staff 54.7% (81), inadequate support staff for teachers 57.5% (85), low parent participation 61.5% (91), schools not having enough funds for implementing programmes successfully 50.0% (74), and not enough support for teachers' work 64.9% (96).

The results identify some facilitators worth noting. For example, the majority 73.7% (109) of the participants responded that the school districts provided sufficient opportunities for teachers to appropriately teach students who are deaf or hard of hearing. Another 77.1% (114) of the participants agreed that parents supported teachers in the education of deaf or hard of hearing students at home, and slightly over half 52.7% (78) stated that their schools had adequate resources to support all deaf or hard of hearing students to fully participate in class.

An independent t-test on the overall subscale of barriers and facilitators was not significant as the means of Urban and Rural participants were relatively the same. When individual items were tested, a significant difference was identified on one item (see Table 24 & 25, Appendix 1). This item relates to the schools not having enough funds for implementing inclusive programmes successfully Urban ( $M=3.53$ ,  $SD=1.07$ ) and Rural ( $M=3.09$ ,  $SD=1.41$ );  $t(2.121)$ ,  $p=.036$ . This shows that Urban teachers feel their schools are less resourced than teachers in the Rural area.

**Table 8 Percentage distributions on facilitators and barriers**

Questionnaire items	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree %(n)	Not sure %(n)	Strongly Agree/Agree %(n)
1. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges presented by students who are deaf/hard of hearing in my classroom.	49.3(73)	16.9(25)	33.7(50)
2. My district provides me with sufficient opportunities in order for me to appropriately teach students who are deaf/hard of hearing.	17.6(26)	8.8(13)	73.7(109)
3. My colleagues are willing to help me with issues, which may arise when I have students who are deaf/hard of hearing in my classroom.	47.3(70)	18.2(27)	34.5(51)
4. Parents support teachers in the education of deaf/hard of hearing students.	10.9(16)	12.2(18)	77.1(114)
5. My school has adequate resources to support all deaf/hard of hearing students to fully participate in our class.	33.1(49)	14.2(21)	52.7(78)
6. Government support for our school is great.	38.5(57)	23.0(34)	38.5(57)
7. Parents care a lot about their students' education and progress.	38.5(57)	13.5(20)	48.0(71)
8.The teachers in my school work as a team	52.7(78)	10.8(16)	36.5(54)
9. I am provided with sufficient materials in order to be able to make appropriate accommodations for students with special needs.	14.8(22)	10.1(15)	75.0(111)
10. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges in my classroom.	36.0(68)	13.5(20)	40.6(60)
11. My administrators provide me with sufficient support when I have deaf/hard of hearing students in my classroom.	32.5(48)	17.6(26)	50.0(74)
12. There is not enough administrative support for staff.	29.0(43)	16.2(24)	54.7(81)
13. There are inadequate support staff for teachers.	28.4(42)	14.2(21)	57.5(85)
14. My school has difficulty in accommodating deaf students because of inappropriate resources.	48.6(72)	16.9(25)	34.4(51)
15. Parents' level of participation is low.	26.3(39)	12.2(18)	61.5(91)
16.My school does not have enough funds for implementing programs successfully	36.5(60)	13.5(20)	50.0(74)
17.I do not receive enough support for my work	27.0(40)	8.1(12)	64.9(96)

**Table 24 Group statistics for barriers and facilitators**

Item	Urban			Rural		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
1. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges presented by students who are deaf/hard of hearing in my classroom.	66	2.70	1.25	82	2.74	1.38
2. My district provides me with sufficient opportunities in order for me to appropriately teach students who are deaf/hard of hearing.	66	3.71	1.13	82	3.59	1.29
3. My colleagues are willing to help me with issues, which may arise when I have students who are deaf/hard of hearing in my classroom.	66	2.70	1.35	82	2.66	1.40
4. Parents support teachers in the education of deaf/hard of hearing students.	66	3.77	1.03	82	3.82	1.03
5. My school has adequate resources to support all deaf/hard of hearing students to fully participate in our class.	66	3.06	1.16	82	3.29	1.34
6. Government support for our school is great.	66	3.09	1.29	82	2.74	1.29
7. Parents care a lot about their students' education and progress.	66	2.82	1.26	82	3.21	1.20
8.The teachers in my school work as a team	66	2.70	1.39	82	2.57	1.49
9. I am provided with sufficient materials in order to be able to make appropriate accommodations for students with special needs.	66	3.73	1.05	82	3.78	1.04
10. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges in my classroom.	66	2.77	1.33	82	2.70	1.50
11. My administrators provide me with sufficient support when I have deaf/hard of hearing students in my classroom.	66	3.12	1.28	82	3.27	1.26
12. There is not enough administrative support for staff.	66	3.29	1.37	82	3.38	1.29
13. There are inadequate support staff for teachers.	66	3.61	1.12	82	3.29	1.27
14. My school has difficulty in accommodating deaf students because of inappropriate resources.	66	2.80	1.19	82	2.95	1.27
15. Parents' level of participation is low.	66	3.85	1.07	82	3.48	1.41
16.My school does not have enough funds for implementing programs successfully	66	3.53	1.07	82	3.09	1.41
17.I do not receive enough support for my work	66	3.82	1.14	82	3.61	1.37

**Table 25 Independent sample test for barriers/facilitators**
**Independent Samples Test for Urban and Rural**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances					Mean Diff.
	F	t	df	Sig.		
1. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges presented by students who are deaf/hard of hearing in my classroom.	1.428	-.215	146	.830	-.05	
		-.217	143.795	.829	-.05	
Equal variances assumed	1.990	.628	146	.531	.13	



2. My district provides me with sufficient opportunities in order for me to appropriately teach students who are deaf/hard of hearing.	Equal variances not assumed	.637	144.754	.525	.13
3. My colleagues are willing to help me with issues which may arise when I have students who are deaf/hard of hearing in my classroom.	Equal variances assumed	.787	.169	146	.866
	Equal variances not assumed		.170	141.342	.866
4. Parents support teachers in the education of deaf/hard of hearing students.	Equal variances assumed	.097	-.260	146	.796
	Equal variances not assumed		-.259	139.161	.796
5. My school has adequate resources to support all deaf/hard of hearing students to fully participate in our class.	Equal variances assumed	3.624	-1.102	146	.272
	Equal variances not assumed		-1.119	145.023	.265
6. Government support for our school is great.	Equal variances assumed	.156	1.626	146	.106
	Equal variances not assumed		1.627	139.682	.106
7. Parents care a lot about their students' education and progress.	Equal variances assumed	.775	-1.911	146	.058
	Equal variances not assumed		-1.901	136.305	.059
8. The teachers in my school work as a team	Equal variances assumed	1.975	.517	146	.606
	Equal variances not assumed		.521	142.775	.603
9. I am provided with sufficient materials in order to be able to make appropriate accommodations for students with special needs.	Equal variances assumed	.067	-.308	146	.758
	Equal variances not assumed		-.308	139.139	.758
10. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges in my classroom.	Equal variances assumed	3.293	.329	146	.743
	Equal variances not assumed		.333	144.452	.739
11. My administrators provide me with sufficient support when I have deaf/hard of hearing students in my classroom.	Equal variances assumed	.213	-.701	146	.485
	Equal variances not assumed		-.699	138.108	.486
12. There is not enough administrative support for staff.	Equal variances assumed	1.254	-.411	146	.682
	Equal variances not assumed		-.409	135.754	.683
13. There are inadequate support staff for teachers.	Equal variances assumed	4.084	1.570	146	.119
	Equal variances not assumed		1.591	144.746	.114
14. My school has difficulty in accommodating deaf students because of inappropriate resources.	Equal variances assumed	1.565	-.726	146	.469
	Equal variances not assumed		-.731	142.385	.466
15. Parents' level of participation is low.	Equal variances assumed	21.716	1.778	146	.078
	Equal variances not assumed		1.830	145.569	.069
16. My school does not have enough funds for implementing programs successfully	Equal variances assumed	14.857	2.121	146	.036*
	Equal variances not assumed		2.184	145.567	.031
17. I do not receive enough support for my work	Equal variances assumed	10.620	.993	146	.322
	Equal variances not assumed		1.013	145.846	.313

\*Mean difference is significant at the  $P < 0.05$  level.

### Differences in male and female teacher perspectives

Independent sample t-test was conducted to assess if the opinions of female participants differed from their male counterparts on barriers and facilitators of full participation on the overall subscale. This type of analysis is important considering that the education system in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is segregated on the basis of gender. Although the computation for the overall subscale did not identified a significant difference, a further t-test on the individual items identified significant difference between females and males' responses to items (3 & 14) which are shown in Tables 26 and 37 in Appendix 1 respectively. These are "colleagues are willing to help with issues which may arise when students who are deaf or hard of hearing are included in the classroom," Female( $M=2.43$ ,  $SD=1.36$ ) and Male( $M=3.84$ ,  $SD=1.01$ );  $t(2.061)$ ,  $p=.041$  and "my school has difficulty in accommodating deaf or hard of hearing students because of inappropriate resources," Female( $M=2.56$ ,  $SD=1.12$ ) and Male( $M=3.26$ ,  $SD=1.25$ );  $t(-3.593)$ ,  $p=0.000$ .

**Table 1 Independent T-Test (female/male) barriers/facilitators**

Item	Female			Male		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
1. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges presented by students who are deaf/hard of hearing in my classroom.	80	2.79	1.29	68	2.65	1.36
2. My district provides me with sufficient opportunities in order for me to appropriately teach students who are deaf/hard of hearing.	80	3.81	1.10	68	3.44	1.32
3. My colleagues are willing to help me with issues, which may arise when I have students who are deaf/hard of hearing in my classroom.	80	2.89	1.35	68	2.43	1.36
4. Parents support teachers in the education of deaf/hard of hearing students.	80	3.84	1.01	68	3.75	1.06
5. My school has adequate resources to support all deaf/hard of hearing students to fully participate in our class.	80	3.14	1.28		3.25	1.27
6. Government support for our school is great.	80	2.86	1.27	68	2.94	1.34
7. Parents care a lot about their students' education and progress.	80	2.96	1.26	68	3.12	1.22815
8. The teachers in my school work as a team	80	2.56	1.46	68	2.69	1.44
9. I am provided with sufficient materials in order to be able to make appropriate accommodations for students with special needs.	80	3.75	1.05	68	3.76	1.04
10. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges in my classroom.	80	2.74	1.40	68	2.72	1.45
11. My administrators provide me with sufficient support when I have deaf/hard of hearing students in my classroom.	80	3.09	1.28471	68	3.34	1.24
12. There is not enough administrative support for staff.	80	3.26	1.39	68	3.43	1.24
13. There are inadequate support staff for teachers.	80	3.44	1.23	68	3.4265	1.20

14. My school has difficulty in accommodating deaf students because of inappropriate resources.	80	2.56	1.12	68	3.26	1.25
15. Parents' level of participation is low.	80	3.73	1.21	68	3.54	1.35
16. My school does not have enough funds for implementing programs successfully	80	3.31	1.31	68	3.25	1.25
17. I do not receive enough support for my work	80	3.54	1.36	68	3.90	1.13

**Table 2 Independent Samples Test for females and males regarding facilitators and barriers**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		Test for Equality of Means		
		F	t	df	Sig.	Mean Diff.
1. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges presented by students who are deaf/hard of hearing in my classroom.	Equal variances assumed	.495	.644	146	.520	.14
	Equal variances not assumed		.642	139.552	.522	.14
2. My district provides me with sufficient opportunities in order for me to appropriately teach students who are deaf/hard of hearing.	Equal variances assumed	5.655	1.864	146	.064	.37
	Equal variances not assumed		1.837	131.018	.068	.37
3. My colleagues are willing to help me with issues which may arise when I have students who are deaf/hard of hearing in my classroom.	Equal variances assumed	.237	2.061	146	.041*	.46
	Equal variances not assumed		2.059	141.710	.041	.46
4. Parents support teachers in the education of deaf/hard of hearing students.	Equal variances assumed	.136	.514	146	.608	.09
	Equal variances not assumed		.512	140.032	.609	.09
5. My school has adequate resources to support all deaf/hard of hearing students to fully participate in our class.	Equal variances assumed	.009	-.534	146	.594	-.11
	Equal variances not assumed		-.534	142.402	.594	-.11
6. Government support for our school is great.	Equal variances assumed	1.081	-.367	146	.714	-.08
	Equal variances not assumed		-.365	139.576	.716	-.08
7. Parents care a lot about their students' education and progress.	Equal variances assumed	.011	-.756	146	.451	-.16
	Equal variances not assumed		-.758	143.178	.450	-.16
8. The teachers in my school work as a team	Equal variances assumed	.019	-.486	146	.627	-.12
	Equal variances not assumed		-.487	142.742	.627	-.12
9. I am provided with sufficient materials in order to be able to make appropriate accommodations for students with special needs.	Equal variances assumed	.200	-.085	146	.932	-.01
	Equal variances not assumed		-.085	142.650	.932	-.01
10. I feel supported by my administrators when faced with challenges in my classroom.	Equal variances assumed	.627	.072	146	.943	.02
	Equal variances not assumed		.072	140.411	.943	.02
11. My administrators provide me with sufficient support when I have deaf/hard of hearing students in my classroom.	Equal variances assumed	.007	-1.202	146	.231	-.25
	Equal variances not assumed		-1.205	143.595	.230	-.25
12. There is not enough administrative support for staff.	Equal variances assumed	2.907	-.751	146	.454	-.16
	Equal variances not assumed		-.758	145.708	.450	-.16
13. There are inadequate support staff for teachers.	Equal variances assumed	.161	.055	146	.956	.01
	Equal variances not assumed		.055	143.223	.956	.01
14. My school has difficulty in accommodating deaf students because of inappropriate resources.	Equal variances assumed	3.635	-3.593	146	.000**	-.70
	Equal variances not assumed		-3.562	135.974	.001	-.70
15. Parents' level of participation is low.	Equal variances assumed	4.314	.857	146	.393	.18
	Equal variances not assumed		.850	135.847	.397	.18
16. My school does not have enough funds for implementing programs successfully	Equal variances assumed	.552	.294	146	.769	.06
	Equal variances not assumed		.296	144.213	.768	.06
17. I do not receive enough support for my work	Equal variances assumed	12.332	-1.729	146	.086	-.36
	Equal variances not assumed		-1.754	145.960	.082	-.36

\*Mean difference was significant at  $p=0.05$  level.

\*\*Mean difference is significant at  $p=0.01$  level.

### **Implication, recommendations, and conclusion**

There are important ramifications for school principals from this study. If strong leadership with an inclusive orientation does not assist teachers in their pursuit of inclusive education, it can be difficult for them to make progress (Agbenyega & Sharma, 2014; Timothy & Agbenyega, 2019). It is crucial that school principals take on strong leadership roles and implement policies and visions for their institutions, as this survey shows that inclusive teaching and full involvement are not yet completely developed in the Saudi elementary schools that took part in the study. In order to be inclusive, these ideas and programs would need to include parents and the entire school community in an open and consultative manner. Research has suggested that inclusive practices flourish in environments where the entire school community collaborates and thinks as a unit (Elder, Rood & Damiani, 2018, Flrian, 2014). There is a clearer understanding of expectations and more opportunities for supporting innovation when inclusive education, inclusive teaching, and full participation practices are positioned within the broader school agenda (Sharma, Loreman & Forlin, 2012).

### **Acknowledgment**

The authors extend their appreciation to the Deanship of Scientific Research at King Khalid University for funding this work through Small Group Research Project under grant number RGP1/345/44

### **References**

1. Al-Mousa, N. A. (2010). The experience of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in mainstreaming students with special educational needs in public schools (a success story). *Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: UNESCO*.
2. Abu-Alghayth, K. M., Lane, D., & Semon, S. (2023). Comparative exploration of inclusive practices taught in special education preparation programs in Saudi universities. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 1-25. doi: [10.1080/1034912X.2023.2197284](https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2023.2197284)
3. Abu-Alghayth, K. M., Catania, N., Semon, S., Lane, D., & Cranston-Gingras, A. (2022). A brief history of special education policy on the inclusion of students with intellectual disabilities in Saudi Arabia. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 50(2), 178-187.
4. Bazeley, P. (2009). Mixed methods data analysis. In S. Andrew & E. Halcomb (Eds.), *Mixed methods research for nursing and the health sciences* (pp. 84-118). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
5. Brebner, C., Hammond, L., Schaumloffel, N., & Lind, C. (2015). Using relationships as a tool: Early childhood educators' perspectives of the child-caregiver relationship in a childcare setting. *Early Child Development and Care*, 185(5), 709-726. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2014.951928>
6. Billiet, J. (2006). The standard questionnaires. In Billiet, J. and Waage, H. (Eds.). *Een samenleving onderzocht (A society surveyed)*, (pp. 223-283). De Boeck, Antwerp.
7. Broberg, M., & Sano, H. O. (2018). Strengths and weaknesses in a human rights-based approach to international development—an analysis of a rights-based approach to development assistance based on practical experiences. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 22(5), 664-680.
8. Campanelli, P. (2008), Testing survey questions. In: De Leeuw, E., Hox, J. and Dillman D. (Eds.). *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*. Lawrence Erlbaum, New York, pp 176-200.
9. Clark, V., & Creswell, J. W. (2010). *Understanding research: A consumer's guide*. Enhanced Pearson eText.
10. Creswell, J. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). Boston, Person Educational, Inc.
11. Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
12. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Sage Publications.
13. Creswell, J. W., Klassen, A. C., Plano Clark, V. L., & Smith, K. C. (2011). Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research. *Best practices for mixed methods research in the health sciences*, 1-37.
14. Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications.
15. Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage.
16. Florian, L. & Spratt, J. (2013): Enacting inclusion: a framework for interrogating inclusive practice. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 28 (2), 119-135  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2013.778111>
17. Florian, L. (2009). Preparing teachers to work in 'school for all'. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(4), 533-534. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.02.004
18. Fowler, F. and Cosenza, C. (2008). Writing effective survey questions. In: De Leeuw, E., Hox, J. and Dillman D. (Eds.), *International Handbook of Survey Methodology* (pp 136-160), New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
19. Gable, A. S. (2014). Disability theorising and real-world educational practice: a framework for understanding. *Disability & Society*, 29(1), 86-100.
20. doi:10.1080/09687599.2013.776485
21. Genova, A. (2015). Barriers to inclusive education in Greece, Spain and Lithuania: results from emancipatory disability research. *Disability & Society*, 30(7), 1042-1054.  
doi:10.1080/09687599.2015.1075867
22. Nind, M., Flewitt, R., & Theodorou, F. (2014). Play and inclusion. In K. Cologon (Ed). *Inclusive education in the early years: Right from the start* (pp. 341--358). Australia and New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
23. Nulty, D. D (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33 (3), 301-314.
24. Oliver, M., & Barnes, C. (2010). Disability studies, disabled people and the struggle for inclusion. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(5), 547-560. doi:10.1080/01425692.2010.500088.
25. Runswick-Cole, K, and Hodge, N. (2009). Needs or Rights?: A Challenge to the Discourse of Special Education' *British Journal of Special Education*, 36(4), 198-203.
26. Schulze, M. (2010). A Handbook on the Human Rights of Persons with Disabilities: Understanding the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.