

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19948912

# BARRIERS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS WITH INTELLECTUAL DISABILITIES IN BURAYDAH, SAUDI ARABIA

Saleh Nasser Alajaji

*Assistant Professor of Special Education  
Department of Special Education, College of Education, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia*

Received: 15/03/2026  
Accepted: 18/04/2026

Corresponding Author: Saleh Nasser Alajaji  
4304@qu.edu.sa

## ABSTRACT

*This study aimed to identify the barriers and requirements for implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the city of Buraydah from the perspective of their teachers. A descriptive research design was employed, using a questionnaire developed by the researcher consisting of 25 items. The instrument included two main dimensions: the first examined barriers to implementing inclusive education, covering legal, conceptual, and attitudinal aspects; the second addressed the requirements necessary for implementing inclusive education. The sample comprised 148 teachers of students with intellectual disabilities working in special education programs in Buraydah. The findings indicated the presence of multiple barriers hindering the implementation of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities from the teachers' viewpoint. These barriers were related to regulations, laws, and legislation; teachers' concepts and knowledge regarding inclusive education; and teachers' attitudes toward the concept and practices of inclusive education. The results also showed a high level of agreement among teachers regarding the requirements needed to implement inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities. These requirements consisted of five key elements for the proper implementation of inclusive education: (1) enacting specific laws and legislation regulating inclusive education and its practices, (2) preparing and training teachers, (3) improving the school environment and its facilities, (4) adapting the general curriculum to meet students' needs, and (5) providing adequate financial support. In addition, the results revealed statistically significant differences in teachers' responses concerning the barriers to implementing inclusive education according to the study variables of years of experience, in favor of teachers with 16 or more years of experience, and educational stage, in favor of primary school teachers.*

**KEYWORDS:** Inclusive Education; Barriers; Requirements; Intellectual Disability.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has devoted considerable attention to education in general and to special education in particular, with the aim of enabling all members of society to achieve positive engagement in different life domains. Specifically, the government has sought to provide the best services, support, and procedural facilitations for persons with disabilities, including those with intellectual disabilities, in order to raise their functioning to the highest possible level, make them active, independent, and productive members of their communities, and provide them with appropriate educational environments and services in settings that are more integrated into society.

The educational environment is a key factor influencing students' learning, motivation, and participation in academic activities (Atta,2020). It encompasses a set of social, psychological, and educational conditions that collectively form this environment. The physical setting constitutes the primary component of the educational environment, whereas teaching methods and educational systems represent the other major component (Alkafesh, 2018). At the national level, the Disability Rights Law in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (2023) guarantees the right of persons with disabilities, including those with intellectual disabilities, to be placed in appropriate educational environments. Article 8 of the Law affirms the right of persons with disabilities to receive all educational and training services and related support at all stages, and within suitable educational environments that ensure maximum academic, vocational, and social progress without discrimination and on the basis of equal opportunities. In addition, the Regulatory Rules for Institutes and Special Education Programs (1422 H) in Saudi Arabia emphasized that educational directorates must ensure that schools provide inclusive education for children with disabilities (Al Suhaibani, 2021).

Inclusive education is one of the most important contemporary global trends that seeks to improve and develop general educational environments. The concept of inclusive education emerged in the early 1980s through the work of philosophers such as Jean Jacques Rousseau, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Henry David Thoreau, with the aim of promoting school inclusivity rather than focusing solely on less restrictive environments (Jahnukainen,2015). They advocated developing the individual to achieve the highest possible level of performance (Hassanein, 2015). In the modern era, John Miller is considered a pioneer of inclusive education and argues that

inclusive education should not be defined merely as a specific method or approach, but rather as a model or a set of core assumptions and principles that can be implemented in different ways (Hassanein, 2015).

The philosophy of inclusive education is grounded in the principle that all learners with disabilities have the right to access general education (Hettiarachchi, & Das,2014). This contributes to reinforcing the principle of equality for all students, regardless of their abilities or disabilities, within their educational environments, and to the adoption of inclusive education as a broader and more comprehensive concept within general education (Al Talib, 2022).

In this context, UNESCO (2020) conceptualizes inclusive education as a system that enhances the capacity of the education system to reach all learners. Despite the clarity of the core principle of inclusive education, there is no single agreed upon definition of inclusive education (Slee,2022). This may be due to narrow definitions that limit the concept to educating students with intellectual disabilities in general education settings, whereas inclusive education is in fact a much broader process (Al Shahri, 2024, UNESCO, 2020). It involves addressing and responding to the diversity of learner needs by increasing participation in learning, contributing to school cultures, engaging fully in community activities, and reducing exclusion from education (Makura, (Milovanović), 2012). Priyadarshini and Thangarajathi (2017) define inclusive education as the process of establishing effective schools and classrooms that meet the educational needs of all students, including those with disabilities (Hassanein, 2015).

Implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities contributes to multiple goals in various areas (Almalki, 2017). Inclusive education supports the academic achievement of students with intellectual disabilities in their educational environments, helps them acquire social skills, and increases their ability to interact and build relationships with others (Abu Al Ghayth, Al Shammari, 2023). It also contributes to modifying undesirable behaviors among students with intellectual disabilities (Duldey-Buns,2015), and to reducing negative stigma associated with this group (Alsahly,2015). Inclusive education helps these students enhance their personal skills and self-expression through participation in activities with their typically developing peers, which positively affects their self-confidence and independence skills(Saber, et al,2019, Almalky, 2017, and Hawasin, 2023).

Despite the significant positive impact of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities, translating inclusive practices into reality faces many barriers and challenges that may lead to improper implementation. Numerous studies (Gaines, 2015, Aktan, 2021, Alzemaia, 2019, Aanizi, 2020, Al Suhaibani, 2021) have indicated that teachers' knowledge and attitudes toward inclusive education constitute major barriers to implementing this concept. Some Saudi teachers view inclusive education as synonymous with "integration", and they often use terms such as integration, placement, or substitution interchangeably with inclusive education, even though each term refers to a distinct concept (Bin medhesh, 2022). This creates a conceptual challenge for inclusive education (Hassanein, 2015). Other studies (Mngo, & Mngo, 2018, Butakor, et al, 2018) have shown that general education teachers may hold negative attitudes toward inclusive practices, which leads them to prefer educating students with disabilities in segregated special education settings rather than in inclusive environments. Furthermore, weak collaboration and limited joint work between general and special education teachers—whether in planning, teaching, or sharing responsibility for all students—represent a major challenge to effective implementation of inclusive education (Magen, 2014, Nadera, 2017, Alrabeean, & Almutiri, 2019).

School culture also represents a significant barrier to the implementation of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities and to the promotion of inclusive practices. Several studies (Al-Shahrani, 2022, Hossawi and Ibn Rajeh, 2015, Al-Rais and Al-Jumai'i, 2016, Al-Qahtani and Rabaa, 2019) have shown that school culture, the learning environment, and school leadership are critical determinants for achieving the desired changes in educational practices and improving educational outcomes. Additional challenges include the lack of school environments that ensure universal access for all students, insufficient physical adaptations of educational spaces to meet all learners' needs, and limited in-service training for teachers on inclusive education. There are also challenges related to adapting curricula to meet the needs of all students, including those with intellectual disabilities, selecting appropriate instructional strategies, limited financial support, and insufficient availability of support services and assistive technologies. Other challenges concern the nature of laws and regulations related to inclusive education, and weak family and community engagement in supporting inclusive practices (Al-Rabeean and Al-Mutairi, 2019,

Al-Muntashri et al., 2024, Al-Shammari, 2019, Al-Shahrani, 2022, Al-Hassan, 2020, Al-Anzi, 2021, Al-Otaibi and Al-Shalawi, 2019).

On the other hand, some researchers have emphasized that the scale of challenges facing students with intellectual disabilities in inclusive schools necessitates overcoming these barriers by providing a set of requirements that can help address them (Othman, 2018). Several studies (Ahmad, 2012, Ghoneim, 2018, Al-Zahrani and Saleh, 2024, Al-Muntashri et al., 2024, Al-Rabeean and Al-Mutairi, 2019) have identified key requirements for the successful implementation of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities. These include, but are not limited to, creating inclusive educational environments that welcome all students regardless of gender, ethnicity, or special educational needs; ensuring that school infrastructure enables access to services for all students, including those with intellectual disabilities; developing curricula to meet the demands of inclusive education; and strengthening inclusive school culture to improve teachers' and students' attitudes toward full inclusion. Other essential requirements relate to legal and regulatory frameworks that support inclusive education, school leadership and administration, teacher preparation and training, the provision of support services and adequate school resources, and community participation in raising awareness about the importance of accepting students with intellectual disabilities as integral members of society. All these requirements are supported by international conventions and legislation that affirm the right of persons with disabilities, including students with intellectual disabilities, to receive their education in inclusive settings (Al-zahrani and Saleh, 2024).

In light of this, there is a clear need to examine the nature of the barriers and challenges encountered in implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the city of Buraydah in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, as well as to determine the means by which these barriers can be overcome. This can be achieved by identifying the key requirements that contribute to addressing the obstacles to inclusive practices in Buraydah from the perspective of teachers of students with intellectual disabilities.

### **1.1. Problem of the Study**

Inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities has emerged as a relatively recent and increasingly important research trend in recent years. The philosophy of inclusive education is based on recognizing and respecting differences among

children in age, gender, ethnicity, language, and disability, and primarily aims at providing a quality of education that accepts all students while respecting diversity, differing needs and abilities, and educational expectations of learners and local communities.

With rapid developments in the field of education, there has been growing international interest in educating students with disabilities, including those with intellectual disabilities, in inclusive schools, regardless of their abilities or backgrounds. The goal is for them to learn alongside their typically developing peers in general classrooms and to receive the same curricula, teaching methods, and educational resources. This requires implementing the concept of inclusive education by creating appropriate environments, providing all services that support the success of students with intellectual disabilities in schools, and removing barriers that prevent them from achieving their goals. Providing curricula that meet their needs while taking individual differences into account, and offering assistive technologies, educational devices, and support services in inclusive schools, can enhance their academic outcomes and independence in their learning environments (Almalky, 2017, Alajaji, 2025).

Despite the importance of inclusive education as a relatively new educational model in society that helps provide equal learning opportunities and inclusion of students with intellectual disabilities in general education settings, the concept remains controversial and subject to differing views and opinions regarding its implementation, mainly due to the challenges it faces (Al-Muntasheri et al., 2024). One study summarized the most prominent of these challenges in four main domains: conceptual challenges, legal challenges, guidance related challenges, and contextual challenges (Bin medhesh, 2022). Other researchers (Ahmad, 2021, Aanizi, 2020) have added disability related and community related challenges. At the same time, numerous studies have shown that fulfilling certain requirements can help overcome these obstacles and enable proper implementation of inclusive practices, such as teacher preparation and training, curriculum development, improving school infrastructure, and providing support services and necessary school equipment (Al-Rabeaan and Al-Mutairi, 2019, Othman, 2018).

At the local level, Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 for education emphasizes improving the quality and expanding the range of services provided to students with intellectual disabilities. Inclusive education is an

integral part of Vision 2030 and represents a qualitative leap in developing special education programs and shaping a promising future for upcoming generations. The Kingdom, through the "Tatweer" Company, has launched a project to implement and develop inclusive education based on specific standards and conditions, making inclusive education one of the modern educational practices in Saudi Arabia and its cities (Al-Shahrani, 2023, Al-Sufyani, 2021).

Based on the foregoing, there is an urgent need to investigate the barriers and requirements for implementing inclusive practices in the city of Buraydah in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and to benefit from the experiences of leading countries and their expertise. Most local studies have addressed challenges in specific domains, such as conceptual, contextual, or community related barriers, whereas there is a scarcity of studies that examine multiple dimensions, including legal, attitudinal, and environmental aspects. Although several studies have examined barriers related to inclusive education in Saudi Arabia, there is, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, a marked paucity of studies addressing the requirements for implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities, and no studies were found that specifically examined the barriers and challenges to inclusive practices for these students in the city of Buraydah.

Accordingly, this study seeks to answer the following main question:

What are the barriers and requirements for implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the city of Buraydah from the perspective of their teachers?

## 1.2. Research Questions

The present study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What are the barriers that hinder the implementation of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the city of Buraydah from the perspective of their teachers?
2. What are the requirements that must be met to achieve inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the city of Buraydah from the perspective of their teachers?
3. Are there statistically significant differences in teachers' responses regarding the barriers to implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the city of Buraydah attributable to the study variables

(years of teaching experience and educational stage)?

### 1.3. Aims of the Study

The present study aims to:

1. Identify the barriers that hinder the implementation of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the city of Buraydah from the perspective of their teachers.
2. Identify the key requirements that must be met to implement inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the city of Buraydah from the perspective of their teachers.
3. Identify the extent of differences in teachers' responses regarding barriers to implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the city of Buraydah according to the study variables (years of teaching experience and educational stage).

### 1.4. Significance of Study

The significance of the present study lies in the following aspects:

- It contributes to raising awareness among teachers and stakeholders involved in the education and care of students with intellectual disabilities about the concept of inclusive education for this group.
- There is a scarcity of Arabic studies that have addressed inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
- From an applied perspective, the findings and educational recommendations of the study are expected to provide information and evidence for teachers and stakeholders regarding inclusive education practices for students with intellectual disabilities. The results may support decisionmakers and specialists in identifying barriers and determining the requirements related to inclusive education, thus helping to meet these requirements, overcome obstacles to inclusive education in Buraydah, and reconsider educational plans and programs to improve inclusive practices.

### 1.5. Delimitations of the Study

1. Human delimitation: All teachers of students with intellectual disabilities in special education programs in general education schools affiliated with the Ministry of Education in the city of Buraydah.

2. Spatial delimitation: Special education programs in general education schools in the city of Buraydah.
3. Temporal delimitation: The study was conducted in the first semester of the academic year 1447 AH.
4. Topical delimitation: The study was limited to identifying the main barriers and requirements related to the implementation of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the city of Buraydah in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

### 1.6. Definitions of Terms

- **Barriers:** All difficulties that hinder the inclusion of students with disabilities in inclusive education programs and limit their ability to continue and receive their education alongside their typically developing peers in general education classrooms.
- **Operationally, barriers** are defined as all challenges that prevent students with intellectual disabilities from learning in general education classrooms with their typically developing peers.
- **Requirements:** All principles, standards, and needs that ensure the successful inclusion of students with disabilities in inclusive schools with their typically developing peers.
- **Operationally, requirements** are defined as all needs and provisions that must be available to enable schools to be prepared to receive all students, whether with disabilities or without disabilities.
- **Inclusive Education:** The education of students with intellectual disabilities in general education classrooms, where they are taught by the general education teacher with support from the special education teacher, and where all necessary adaptations required by students with intellectual disabilities are provided.

Operationally, inclusive education is defined as an instructional approach in which students with intellectual disabilities are educated in general schools and classrooms alongside their typically developing peers, using the same curricula and learning experiences, with appropriate support to meet their educational needs and match their abilities and potentials.

- **Intellectual Disability:** According to the American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD, 2021), intellectual disability is characterized by significant limitations in both intellectual

functioning and adaptive behavior, which covers many everyday social and practical skills, and originates before the age of 22 years.

Operationally, students with intellectual disabilities are defined as those who exhibit limitations in intellectual functioning and marked deficits in adaptive behavior and who receive their education in special education programs in general schools.

- **Teachers of Students with Intellectual Disabilities:** All teachers who hold a bachelor's degree in special education with a specialization in intellectual disability, or a diploma in special education, and who have teaching experience working with students with intellectual disabilities.

Operationally, they are defined as all special education teachers working in special education programs in general schools under the administration of education in the Qassim region (Buraydah city) and who teach students with intellectual disabilities.

### 1.7. Theoretical Framework

#### **First: The concept of inclusive education**

Inclusive education represents one of the most important modern global approaches in the educational field. Therefore, the concept of inclusive education has become a significant topic addressed by scientific research, as well as receiving substantial attention from international organizations and bodies. Since the adoption of the Salamanca Statement in 1994, which stated that the main idea of inclusive education is that all students, including those with intellectual disabilities, learn alongside their typical peers regardless of their individual differences, it has clarified that the inclusive school is the most effective means to combat discrimination and create an educational community that welcomes everyone and provides more effective and efficient education (UNESCO, 1994).

The philosophy of inclusive education is based on the "Zero Reject Philosophy," which means not excluding any individual due to their disability, cultural background, or ethnicity. Education is planned according to the individual's strengths rather than placing them based on the type and severity of their disability in special educational environments (Salem & Salem, 2016). Inclusive education also relies on modifying the educational environment in all its components—curricula, instructional methods, strategies, and assessment—along with preparing and training teachers to meet the needs of students with disabilities (Al Tarjumi,

2023). This aims to achieve the principle of equality and make schools inclusive for all.

In this regard, Muñoz-Martínez (2021) defined inclusive education as educating students with intellectual disabilities alongside their typical peers in the same classroom through restructuring curricula and providing them with assistive technologies and diverse instructional materials to achieve the maximum possible educational outcomes. Horini (2014) added that the concept of inclusive education encompasses multiple dimensions, including celebration of diversity, respect for human rights, achieving social justice, quality, and equity, and can be considered a process that responds to the diversity of needs and abilities of all students, increases their participation in educational, cultural, and community processes, and reduces their exclusion from the educational system (Al Jabri & Shaaban, 2023).

#### **Second: The foundations of inclusive education.**

Inclusive education is based on several key foundations:

- **Legal foundation:** Based on the principle that education is a right for every individual regardless of the nature of their challenges.
- **Social foundation:** Based on the principle that no individual, including those with disabilities, can be isolated from the society in which they live.
- **Ethical foundation:** Based on the principle that integration programs enable meeting the needs and desires of individuals with disabilities within society while respecting their humanity and requirements (Salem & Salem, 2016).

#### **Third: Goals of inclusive education**

Salem and Salem (2016) indicated that the inclusive school, which includes heterogeneous groups of students including those with intellectual disabilities, aims to achieve several important goals consistent with the nature and philosophy of inclusive education. These goals can be summarized as follows, as outlined by Sharaf (2008):

##### **1. Developing social skills and community participation:**

Inclusive education contributes to developing social skills for students with disabilities, including those with intellectual disabilities, by providing opportunities for direct interaction and communication with their typical peers, establishing positive relationships, and participating in social roles according to their abilities and potential. This achieves psychological, personal, and social adjustment.

##### **2. Developing academic skills:**

Inclusive education grants all students the right to

education and contributes to their academic development by modifying activities, methods, and teaching strategies to suit all students and enhance their potential comprehensively, equipping them with knowledge, skills, and theoretical and practical experiences related to various academic subjects (Al Mutairi & Al Rabeean, 2019).

### **3. Achieving educational equality:**

The primary goal of inclusive education is to provide equal educational opportunities for all students in school without discrimination, which realizes the principle of educational democracy. This means educating all students according to their abilities, potential, and diverse educational interests to the maximum possible extent, ensuring the right to educational equality regardless of circumstances or abilities, reflecting social justice and community solidarity (Almalki, 2022).

### **4. Modifying teachers' and general education students' attitudes toward students with disabilities:**

Negative attitudes among teachers and students in general education schools pose a barrier to implementing inclusive education. These attitudes cannot be changed when students with disabilities are in separate classrooms. Therefore, placing students with disabilities in general classrooms with their typical peers will have a significant impact on changing and modifying those attitudes (Al Suhaibani, 2021).

### **5. Modifying students with disabilities' attitudes toward themselves and society's view of them:**

The social and educational isolation of students with disabilities makes them feel inferior and less productive in society, negatively affecting their self-perception and how society views them. Removing this isolation by integrating them into general classrooms with typical peers will modify their attitudes, improve their self-view, and increase their motivation to learn (Salem & Salem, 2016).

## **1.9. Fourth: Inclusive education in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia**

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is at the forefront of Arab countries in caring for and supporting individuals with disabilities, as evidenced by significant efforts and support to empower persons with disabilities through education and providing all necessary support services. The Kingdom seeks to adopt the latest educational approaches for teaching students with disabilities, with inclusive education at the forefront. The Kingdom has pioneering experience in this approach, currently implemented

in Riyadh, positioning it as a leader at the local level in applying this type of education (Al Tarjumi & Al Huwaiti, 2023).

On this note, regulations, laws, and legislation have been a fundamental pillar in achieving and implementing inclusive education. Moreover, the Kingdom has been committed to international conventions and agreements to ensure a dignified life for all members of society, including those with intellectual disabilities. This is evident from the Kingdom's ratification and signing of numerous agreements, including the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2008 (Human Rights Commission, 2021).

Locally, Abu Nayan (2014) noted that special education laws in Saudi Arabia are based on two main pillars: First, the System of Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which prominently includes the right to appropriate education; second, the Regulatory Rules for Institutes and Special Education Programs, renamed in 2015 to the Organizational and Procedural Guide for Special Education Programs—a regulatory document for operations in special education programs (Al Shahri, 2023).

In general, the overarching philosophy of special education in the Kingdom is that the natural environment for all students, including those with disabilities, is the general school (Regulatory Rules for Institutes and Special Education Programs, 1422 AH). This has been affirmed by numerous local conventions that support implementing inclusive education practices. Additionally, Saudi Vision 2030 emphasizes empowering persons with disabilities, their social integration, providing all services and needs, and ensuring access to appropriate education and employment opportunities (Al Shahri, 2024). This aligns with the Kingdom's development plans, such as the Ninth Development Plan (1431-1435 AH) for improving the system of education for students with disabilities, the gifted, and the elderly, and the Tenth Development Plan (1436-1440 AH) aimed at providing equal educational opportunities for all students (Akhdar & Al Zughaybi, 2023).

## **2. PREVIOUS STUDIES**

This section reviews selected international and local studies that have addressed barriers and requirements for implementing inclusive education for students with disabilities in general, and for those with intellectual disabilities in particular.

Ibn Mad'hesh (2022) conducted a qualitative study to identify challenges and difficulties facing the implementation of inclusive education from the perspective of academics specializing in the

education of students with disabilities in Saudi universities. Using semi structured interviews with a sample of 12 specialists, the study classified the challenges into four main categories: conceptual, legal, guidance related, and contextual challenges, and offered recommendations to address them.

Al Suhaibani (2021) examined the attitudes of general education female teachers toward inclusive education in light of selected variables. The study sample consisted of 26 general education teachers working in inclusive schools, and a questionnaire was used as the main data collection tool. Results indicated that teachers held positive attitudes toward inclusive education in the cognitive and behavioral domains, while their attitudes in the affective domain were neutral.

Othman (2018) aimed to identify the requirements for implementing inclusive education to empower marginalized groups in Egypt in light of the experiences of some countries. Using a descriptive analytical approach, the study examined key approaches to inclusive education, such as child centered approaches, multi sector and stakeholder approaches, partnership approaches, and gender inclusive approaches, and the benefits of inclusive education. The study proposed a conceptual framework of requirements for implementing inclusive education, including: (1) enacting educational legislation supporting inclusive education, (2) school leadership requirements, (3) teacher preparation requirements, (4) curriculum development requirements to meet inclusive education needs, and (5) school environment requirements that support inclusive education.

Al Rabeean and Al Mutairi (2019) investigated barriers to inclusive education for students with mild intellectual disabilities from the perspective of educators. The main sample included 89 teachers working in inclusive schools in Riyadh and 27 special education supervisors. Using a questionnaire, the study found that curriculum related barriers and barriers related to instructional practices and collaboration between general education teachers, assistant teachers, and special education teachers were the most prevalent and were rated as highly frequent. No statistically significant differences were found in participants' responses according to years of experience or training courses.

Al Zahrani and Saleh (2024) explored the attitudes of teachers of students with intellectual disabilities toward inclusive education in Jeddah. Semi structured interviews were conducted with 14 teachers in intellectual disability institutes. Findings revealed a split in teachers' views between

supporters and opponents of inclusive education. Reported benefits included increased self-confidence, improved social skills, and enhanced ability to form relationships and friendships among female students with intellectual disabilities. However, the study also identified barriers, particularly those related to parents (e.g., rejection and non-acceptance of inclusive settings) and student related issues such as bullying and social neglect. The authors recommended gradual improvement steps that take into account the needs and abilities of students with intellectual disabilities when implementing inclusive education.

In another study, Al Zahrani (2024) aimed to identify the requirements for including students with disabilities in inclusive education settings in Saudi Arabia using a descriptive analytical approach. The findings highlighted the need to evaluate special education legislation, give maximum consideration to the needs of students with disabilities, and provide measures that support their academic and social development in inclusive schools.

Hawazen (2023) reviewed the challenges and solutions related to inclusive education for students with disabilities in primary inclusive schools, using a literature review methodology. The study identified key challenges such as infrastructure limitations, inadequate teacher training, deficiencies in curricula, and weak communication among inclusive education team members. Proposed solutions included facilitating access and adapting school infrastructure, modifying curricula to meet students' needs, and using teaching strategies appropriate to the abilities of students with disabilities.

Al Otaibi (2019) examined barriers to adopting inclusive education from the perspective of general education teachers in Riyadh. Using a descriptive analytical design and a 63-item questionnaire administered to 60 teachers in inclusive schools, the study found generally positive attitudes toward inclusive education, good teacher awareness of inclusive teaching strategies, and adequate financial support for implementing inclusive education.

Wasim (2018) discussed barriers to inclusive education for children with intellectual disabilities, noting that an estimated 113 million children worldwide are deprived of their basic human right to education and that children with disabilities likely represent a high proportion of this figure. UNICEF's East Asia and Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO) estimates that only 1 in 50 children with disabilities has access to education. Although inclusive education seeks to remove all barriers to learning and participation for learners at risk of exclusion,

successful implementation remains limited due to various barriers. Environmental, curricular, attitudinal, and communication barriers are among the main factors hindering effective inclusion of children with intellectual disabilities, and the paper discusses strategies to overcome them so that all children with special needs benefit from inclusive education.

Giasemi (2020) examined the legal framework of inclusive education for children with intellectual disabilities in Greece over different historical phases and explored the social and educational challenges they face. The study also provided a comparative analysis of inclusive education practices between European and non-European countries, showing how children with special educational needs, particularly those with intellectual disabilities, are served under different educational and social policies and legislation. The paper concluded that inclusive education aims at the holistic development of children with disabilities across all environments.

Dewi (2024) evaluated the effectiveness of implementing inclusive education in culturally diverse classrooms, identified challenges, and explored opportunities. Using a literature review and case analysis approach, the study found that inclusive education improves learning quality and develops students' social skills and empathy, while major challenges include limited teacher understanding and training, insufficient resources, and social and cultural barriers. The results underscored the importance of supportive policies, investment in educational technologies, and collaboration among government, educational institutions, and local communities.

George et al. (2024) investigated the implementation of inclusive education for children with intellectual disabilities by focusing on four specific objectives: examining the availability of teaching and learning materials, identifying classroom teaching strategies that enhance academic performance, and assessing the availability of qualified teachers to implement inclusive education in primary schools. Using a qualitative design with interviews and observations involving 30 participants, the study found inadequate teaching and learning materials, heavy reliance on lecture-based instruction, shortages of qualified teachers, environmental challenges, low academic performance, limited motivation, and language related assessment issues, all of which contribute to the failure of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities. The authors recommended creating supportive primary school environments,

employing qualified special education teachers, and using interactive strategies and appropriate materials to improve the implementation of inclusive education.

Al Wada'ani (2023) proposed a framework for implementing inclusive education for students with disabilities in early childhood. Using a descriptive approach, the study discussed the conceptual framework, importance, rationale, and barriers of inclusive education and concluded that inclusive education can be implemented in early childhood by adapting educational buildings, preparing and training teachers, developing inclusive education goals for early childhood, adopting inclusive models, expanding funding sources, and providing the necessary requirements for implementation.

### **2.1. Commentary on Previous Studies**

Upon reviewing all previous studies related to the research topic through relevant Arabic and English databases, it can be stated that numerous studies have addressed inclusive education for students with disabilities in general. These studies varied in their objectives: some focused on specific areas such as societal, conceptual, and legal challenges (Giasemi, 2020; Bin Mad'hesh, 2022; Dewi, 2024), while others examined curricula and teaching strategies that enhance academic performance in inclusive schools (George et al., 2024). In contrast, many studies investigated barriers related to teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education (Al Otaibi, 2019; Al Zahrani & Saleh, 2024).

However, the current study differs from previous studies in that it examines multiple aspects of barriers—legal, conceptual, and attitudinal—while specifically focusing on students with intellectual disabilities. On the other hand, this study also differs from Al Zahrani (2024) and Ghoneim (2018) in that it investigates the requirements necessary for implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities specifically in Buraydah from teachers' perspectives, whereas those two studies addressed requirements theoretically without field investigation of their nature.

Additionally, there is a lack of research exploring the most important requirements for implementing the concept of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in general. Furthermore, to the researcher's knowledge, this is the first study to investigate this topic specifically in Buraydah city in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

This section presents the procedures followed in the study to obtain the results, including the research design, population, sample, instrument development, validity and reliability procedures, study variables, and statistical analyses used.

#### 3.1. Research Design

To achieve the aim of the study – identifying the barriers and requirements for implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in the city of Buraydah – the descriptive analytical method was employed. This approach is based on collecting, classifying, and organizing data and facts about a given phenomenon in order to describe it and obtain accurate information, as defined by Obeidat et al. (2017).

#### 3.2. Population

The study population consisted of all teachers of students with intellectual disabilities working in special education programs in public schools in the city of Buraydah (Qassim region), Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, during the 1447 AH (2025) academic year, with a total of 232 teachers of intellectual education.

#### 3.3. Sample

The sample included the entire study population (232 teachers of intellectual education). A total of 148 teachers of students with intellectual disabilities in special education programs in general education schools in Buraydah responded to the questionnaire and constituted the study sample.

Table 1 presents the distribution of the sample according to the study variables.

**Table 1: Distribution of the sample according to study variables.**

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Years of experience	5-10 years	37	25.0%
	11-15 years	52	35.1%
	16 years or more	59	39.9%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Educational stage	Primary	80	54.1%
	Intermediate	46	31.1%
	Secondary	22	14.9%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

As shown in Table 1, the majority of the sample had 16 or more years of teaching experience (39.9%), representing the largest experience group. Teachers whose experience ranged from 11 to 15 years accounted for 35.1%, whereas those with 5-10 years of experience represented 25.0% of the sample. The table also shows that most participants taught at the primary stage (54.1%), followed by the intermediate

stage (31.1%), while teachers at the secondary stage represented 14.9% of the sample.

#### 3.4. Instrument

Drawing on the theoretical framework and previous studies, the researcher developed a questionnaire to measure barriers and requirements for implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities from the perspective of their teachers in Buraydah, Saudi Arabia.

##### The instrument consisted of two parts:

- Part one: General information about the participants, including the following variables: years of experience (5-10 years, 11-15 years, 16 years or more) and educational stage (primary, intermediate, secondary).
- Part two: A questionnaire composed of two domains:
- First domain: Items addressing barriers to implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah, including three dimensions (legal barriers, conceptual barriers, and attitudinal barriers).
- Second domain: Items addressing the requirements necessary for implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah.

##### Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

###### Validity

###### 1. Face validity

The questionnaire was presented to eight faculty members in special education departments at Saudi universities to obtain their views on the suitability of the items for the study objectives and sample characteristics, the accuracy and clarity of wording, and the adequacy of the instructions. The percentage of agreement among the experts was then calculated. The panel reported at least 80% agreement that all items were relevant to the objectives and that the wording of most items was appropriate. Based on the experts' comments, some wording modifications and reordering of items were made.

###### 2. Internal consistency validity

After establishing face validity, the questionnaire was administered to a pilot sample, and the data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of its respective domain.

**Table 2: Pearson correlation coefficients between each item and its domain total score.**

Item No.	Correlation Coefficient	Item No.	Correlation Coefficient
1	0.774**	14	0.839**

2	0.724**	15	0.737**
3	0.779**	16	0.760**
4	0.789**	17	0.773**
5	0.749**	18	0.689**
6	0.826**	19	0.756**
7	0.770**	20	0.760**
8	0.812**	21	0.823**
9	0.685**	22	0.790**
10	0.689**	23	0.814**
11	0.851**	24	0.759**
12	0.882**	25	0.774**
13	0.895**		

The results in Table 2 indicate that all item–total correlations are statistically significant at the 0.01 level, demonstrating high internal consistency and supporting the validity of the questionnaire items.

### Reliability

Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which reflects the stability and internal consistency of the instrument. The overall reliability coefficient for the questionnaire was 0.950, and the overall validity coefficient (square root of reliability) was 0.975, indicating a high level of reliability suitable for field application.

**Table 3. Reliability and validity coefficients of the questionnaire domains.**

Domain / Dimension	No. of items	Cronbach's alpha	Validity coefficient
First domain: Barriers to implementing inclusive education			
- Legal and legislative barriers	5	0.814	0.902
- Conceptual barriers	5	0.813	0.901
- Attitudinal barriers	4	0.890	0.943
Second domain: Requirements for implementing inclusive education	11	0.930	0.964
Overall scale	25	0.950	0.975

### Relative Weights and Statistical Processing

To achieve the study objectives and analyze the collected data, appropriate statistical methods were used via SPSS. After coding and entering the data, the length of the five-point Likert scale categories (lower and upper limits) was determined. The range (5 – 1 = 4) was divided by the number of scale categories (5) to obtain the cell length (4 / 5 = 0.80). This value was then added sequentially to the minimum scale value (1) to determine the upper bound of each response category. The categories were thus interpreted as

shown in Table 4.

**Table 4. Relative weights and interpretation of response means.**

No.	Mean range	Verbal interpretation
1	1.00 to less than 1.80	Strongly disagree
2	1.80 to less than 2.60	Disagree
3	2.60 to less than 3.40	Neutral
4	3.40 to less than 4.20	Agree
5	4.20 to less than 5.00	Strongly agree

### Statistical Analyses

The following statistical procedures were employed:

1. Cronbach's alpha coefficient to assess reliability.
2. Pearson correlation coefficient to assess internal consistency validity.
3. Frequencies, percentages, and means to describe participants' responses to the instrument items and domains.
4. Standard deviations to rank items in favor of those with lower dispersion when means were equal.
5. One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine differences according to the study variables.
6. Scheffé post hoc test to identify the source of significant differences where applicable.

## 4. RESULTS

### 4.1. First research question

What are the barriers that hinder the implementation of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah from the perspective of their teachers?

#### 1. Legal and legislative barriers

Table 5 shows that teachers' responses regarding legal and legislative barriers to implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah were generally high. The overall mean for this dimension was 4.123, indicating agreement at the "agree" to "strongly agree" level.

The item "The absence of binding regulations and laws that require implementing inclusive education practices as essential educational practices for students with intellectual disabilities" obtained the highest mean (4.027) with "strongly agree". The remaining items—concerning inconsistent interpretation of regulations across educational directorates, teachers' limited knowledge of inclusive education legislation, lack of organizational and procedural guides, and the scarcity of laws that can be used to implement inclusive practices—received means ranging between 4.020 and 4.202 and were rated "agree".

These results indicate that, from teachers' perspectives, legal and regulatory issues constitute a major barrier to implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities.

## 2. Conceptual barriers

Table 6 presents the means of teachers' responses to items related to conceptual barriers. The overall mean for this dimension was 4.096, reflecting a high level of agreement regarding the presence of conceptual barriers.

The item "The absence of a clear, specific, and agreed upon definition of inclusive education in the organizational guides for special education programs" had the highest mean (4.250) and was rated "strongly agree". Other items, such as insufficient teacher knowledge of the principles and foundations of inclusive education, equating inclusive education with integration, and considering self-contained classes attached to general schools as a form of inclusive education, were all rated "agree", with means ranging approximately from 3.987 to 4.101.

These findings suggest that conceptual ambiguity about inclusive education and confusion between inclusive education and related concepts (e.g., integration, special classes) hinder the correct implementation of inclusive practices for students with intellectual disabilities.

## 3. Attitudinal barriers

Results for the attitudinal dimension (teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education and its practices) likewise showed high means, indicating that negative or unclear attitudes represent an additional barrier. Teachers agreed that unclear understanding of inclusive education among teachers of intellectual disabilities negatively affects their practices and the success of inclusive education.

Overall, the three dimensions—legal, conceptual, and attitudinal—collectively point to substantial barriers to implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities from teachers' perspectives.

### 4.1.2. Second research question

What are the requirements that must be met to implement inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah from the perspective of their teachers?

Table 8 summarizes teachers' responses regarding the requirements for implementing inclusive education. The overall mean for this domain was 4.16, indicating a high level of agreement about the importance of these requirements.

The item "Building positive attitudes, values, and

beliefs among teachers of students with intellectual disabilities toward inclusive education practices" had one of the highest means (4.229) and was rated "strongly agree". Similarly, "Providing necessary school equipment, tools, and assistive technologies to implement inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities" also scored 4.229 ("strongly agree"). Items related to enacting supportive legislation, clarifying the definition of inclusive education in the Saudi context, developing organizational guides for correct practices, building a supportive school culture, preparing and training teachers (through courses, workshops, and seminars), adapting school environments, strengthening school-family-community partnerships, modifying curricula, and providing sufficient financial support were all rated "agree", with means above 4.0.

These results highlight a coherent set of legal, cultural, pedagogical, infrastructural, and financial requirements that teachers believe are necessary for effective implementation of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities.

### 4.1.3. Third research question

Are there statistically significant differences in teachers' responses regarding barriers to implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah attributable to the study variables (years of experience and educational stage)?

#### 1. Differences according to years of experience

One way ANOVA indicated statistically significant differences in teachers' responses on all three barrier dimensions (legal/legislative, conceptual, and attitudinal), according to years of teaching experience, at significance levels ranging from 0.002 to 0.016. This suggests that experience plays a significant role in how teachers perceive barriers to inclusive education.

Scheffé post hoc tests showed that these differences were mainly between teachers with 5–10 years of experience and those with 16 or more years of experience. For all three dimensions, teachers with 16 or more years of experience reported higher mean scores for barriers than those with 5–10 years of experience, indicating that more experienced teachers perceive the legal, conceptual, and attitudinal barriers more strongly.

#### 2. Differences according to educational stage

ANOVA results also revealed statistically significant differences in teachers' responses regarding barriers to implementing inclusive education according to the educational stage

(primary, intermediate, secondary). Post hoc comparisons indicated that primary school teachers reported higher perceived barriers, particularly in relation to legal and conceptual aspects, compared with teachers at other stages.

These findings imply that primary stage, where inclusive placements for students with intellectual disabilities are more common, is where teachers most strongly experience and recognize the barriers to inclusive education.

#### 4.2. Discussion

The results clearly show that teachers perceive substantial legal/legislative barriers, such as the absence of binding inclusive education regulations, limited and inconsistently interpreted laws, and a lack of detailed organizational and procedural guides specifying inclusive practices. These findings align with previous work emphasizing the need to review, clarify, and expand national legislation to support inclusive education at the practical level.

Conceptual barriers, including the lack of a clear operational definition of inclusive education and confusion between inclusive education, integration, and special classes, were also prominent. Such conceptual ambiguity can lead to the implementation of segregated models under the label of “inclusive education”, undermining the philosophy of educating students with intellectual disabilities alongside their peers in general classrooms.

Attitudinal barriers, reflected in teachers’ perceptions and beliefs, further complicate implementation. Negative or uncertain attitudes may stem from insufficient training, limited exposure to successful inclusive practices, or concerns about workload and classroom management. At the same

time, teachers strongly emphasized the importance of building positive attitudes, values, and beliefs as a key requirement, suggesting that targeted professional development and school wide culture change could be effective levers.

The high level of agreement on requirements – such as enacting supportive legislation, preparing and training teachers, developing clear guides, improving school environments and resources, adapting curricula, strengthening school culture and community partnerships, and providing adequate financial support – points to a comprehensive framework for moving toward effective inclusive education in Buraydah.

Finally, the fact that more experienced teachers and those working at the primary level reported higher perceived barriers may reflect their deeper engagement with inclusive placements and accumulated experience with practical challenges. This highlights the need for policy and training efforts that specifically consider the realities of primary level implementation and draw on the insights of highly experienced teachers when designing reforms.

#### 4.3. Results and Discussion

##### First question

What are the barriers that hinder the implementation of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah from the perspective of their teachers?

This question was answered using frequencies, percentages, means, and ranks of teachers’ responses to the barrier items, as shown below.

##### Dimension 1: Legal and legislative barriers

*Table 5. Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations of responses to legal barriers.*

No.	Item	Mean	SD	Rank	Tendency
1	The absence of binding regulations and laws that require implementing inclusive education practices as basic educational practices for students with intellectual disabilities.	4.027	0.788	1	Strongly agree
2	Variation in the interpretation of regulations and rules from one education directorate to another, which leads to placing students in separate classes inside the school called inclusive education classes.	4.121	0.925	3	Agree

3	Limited knowledge among teachers of students with intellectual disabilities about regulations, laws, and legislation related to inclusive education.	4.202	0.903	2	Agree
4	Lack of organizational and procedural guides for inclusive education practices for students with intellectual disabilities.	4.020	1.059	5	Agree
5	Scarcity of regulations and laws that can be used to implement inclusive education practices for students with intellectual disabilities.	4.047	1.102	4	Agree
<b>Total score (dimension)</b>		4.132	-	-	-

The results in Table 5 show that legal and legislative barriers to implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah were rated, overall, at the “strongly agree” level, with a mean of 4.123 for this dimension. All items in this dimension were rated “agree” except item 1, which was rated “strongly agree”. The means for this dimension ranged approximately between 4.02 and 4.20.

These findings are consistent with Ibn Mad’hesh (2022), who reported that the absence of binding regulations and laws that address inclusive education as a basic educational practice for students with disabilities, including those with intellectual disabilities, negatively affects the nature of special educational services, which may then be provided in more segregated alternatives. This aligns with Medhash (2019), who indicated that one of the main legal challenges in implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities lies in differing interpretations of limited existing regulations and laws. Locally, inclusive education is only briefly referenced in the Regulatory Rules for Institutes and Special Education Programs in paragraph 18 of Chapter Three, stating that “the regular school is the natural environment for children with disabilities, and the regular classroom is the primary option...”. Although this statement implicitly points to inclusive education, differences in how it is interpreted by stakeholders may lead to placing students with disabilities in segregated settings inside general schools. This variability in interpretation has been identified as a contemporary issue in the education of students with intellectual

disabilities.

Other studies (Al Hussan, 2020; Al Munshtri, Al Baqmi, & Sulaymani, 2023; Al Shahri, 2023; Slee & Tait, 2022; Almalki, 2022) have agreed on the need to review and modify laws, regulations, and legislation to align them with inclusive education practices. In the Saudi context, the field of intellectual disability education relies heavily on the Organizational and Procedural Guide for Institutes and Special Education Programs as the primary official reference for legal and regulatory procedures in educational practice, yet this guide requires extensive amendments and additions to define clearly the legal and legislative framework of inclusive education. It is even necessary to devote a separate, detailed chapter to inclusive education within the guide. Al Hussan (2020) similarly called for amending laws and regulations related to the education of students with disabilities.

Al Shahri (2023) further indicated that, in the United States, the drafting of laws and regulations has significantly influenced the design of educational programs and their alignment with legal standards, whereas in Saudi Arabia there is still a lack of detailed laws and regulations that specify procedures for implementing inclusive education in practice, despite its status as a recent global educational approach. This underscores the need to reconsider the drafting of laws and regulations that clearly define inclusive education and its procedures for students with disabilities in general and for those with intellectual disabilities in particular, as this is closely linked to the quality of services provided.

## Dimension 2: Conceptual barriers

*Table 6: Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations of responses to conceptual barriers.*

No.	Item	Mean	SD	Rank	Tendency
6	Teachers of students with intellectual disabilities have insufficient knowledge of the principles, concepts, and foundations of inclusive education.	4.047	1.039	4	Agree
7	There is no clear, specific, and agreed-upon definition of inclusive education in the organizational guides for special education programs.	4.250	1.036	1	Strongly agree
8	There is no difference between inclusive education and integration; they are synonymous and carry the same meaning.	4.095	1.012	3	Agree
9	Self-contained classes attached to general schools are considered a form of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities.	4.101	1.008	2	Agree
10	The lack of a clear concept of inclusive education among teachers of intellectual disabilities negatively affects their practices and the success of inclusive education.	3.987	1.056	5	Agree
<b>Total score (dimension)</b>		4.096	-	-	-

Table 6 indicates that conceptual barriers to implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah were rated at a high level overall, with a mean of 4.096. All items were rated "agree", except item 7, which was rated "strongly agree".

The results show clear conceptual barriers related to inclusive education, with substantial weaknesses in teachers' knowledge of the basic concepts and principles of inclusive education. This finding is in line with Ibn Mad'hesh (2022), who reported conceptual and knowledge related challenges stemming from the absence of a clear definition of inclusive education and from the lack of a unified, explicit definition, which he described as one of the contemporary issues in the education and care of persons with disabilities. In addition, teachers often confuse related concepts such as placement and integration with inclusive education, even though these terms differ in definition and purpose.

The wording of item 9 in particular ("Self-contained classes attached to general schools are considered a form of inclusive education...") highlighted that many teachers believe such programs represent inclusive education, whereas, conceptually, inclusive education involves full integration into the general educational environment, curriculum, and teaching methods. The responses thus reflect the actual level of conceptual understanding teachers possess about inclusive education. This may be due to the limited number of awareness programs and training courses on inclusive education, both in pre service teacher preparation programs and in universities.

These results differ from those reported by Al Shahri (2023) and Al Talib (2024), who found that teachers' awareness and knowledge of inclusive education concepts was at a medium level. The discrepancy may be attributable to differences in the study samples: the present study focused on male

teachers of students with intellectual disabilities, whereas the other studies examined female general education teachers.

The researcher believes that weaknesses in conceptual knowledge of inclusive education constitute a major barrier to correct implementation in practice. For teachers, this can negatively impact their instructional practices and their ability to apply inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities and to use inclusive strategies effectively in inclusive settings. This underscores the need for clear legal and regulatory definitions of inclusive education, systematic efforts to build teachers' conceptual understanding, and targeted professional preparation and training in inclusive practices.

**Dimension 3: Attitudinal barriers**

*Table 7. Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations of responses to attitudinal barriers.*

No.	Item	Mean	SD	Rank	Tendency
11	Teachers of intellectual education have a limited understanding of the importance of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities.	4.068	1.086	1	Agree
12	Teachers of students with intellectual disabilities hold low expectations regarding their students' outcomes in inclusive schools.	3.932	1.147	4	Agree
13	Teachers of students with intellectual disabilities have a low desire to work in inclusive schools.	4.047	1.150	2	Agree
14	Teachers of students with intellectual disabilities are not convinced of the concept of inclusive education and its quality as an educational practice.	4.047	1.150	3	Agree
	<b>Total score (dimension)</b>	4.023	-	-	-

Table 7 shows that attitudinal barriers to

implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah were rated "agree" overall, with a mean of 4.023 and item means ranging from 3.93 to 4.06.

The results indicate that there are clear attitudinal barriers; teachers of students with intellectual disabilities display weak attitudes toward the concept and practices of inclusive education. This finding is consistent with Al Shammari and Abu Al Gaith (2023) and Al Talib (2024), who found that teachers hold negative attitudes toward inclusive education, despite the central importance of attitudes in ensuring correct implementation. Ibn Mad'hesh (2022) reported that teachers of intellectual education have negative attitudes toward inclusive education due to limited awareness of its importance and its potential positive impact on their students, as well as resistance or rejection of the concept.

Similarly, Al Zahrani and Saleh (2024) reported negative attitudes among teachers of students with intellectual disabilities toward inclusive education, attributing this to psychological and behavioral issues experienced by students with intellectual disabilities, which teachers believe complicate their inclusion in general classrooms and may disrupt instruction. Teachers' attitudes may also depend on the type and severity of disability, particularly the linguistic and adaptive behavior difficulties associated with intellectual disability, and on perceptions of the difficulty of the general curriculum for these students.

These attitudinal findings are also related to the conceptual barriers identified earlier, as teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and values strongly influence their attitudes toward inclusive practices.

On the other hand, the current results differ from those of Al Jabri and Shaaban (2023), Al Otaibi (2019), Al Shahri (2023), and Al Suhaibani (2021), who found that teachers held positive attitudes toward inclusive education. Those studies suggested that positive attitudes resulted from sufficient knowledge about the rights of students with intellectual disabilities and from conviction in the benefits of inclusive education in reducing isolation and negative labels and in providing a positive, interactive environment that enhances social and communication skills. This is consistent with Al Anzi (2021), who noted that positive attitudes toward inclusive education are among the most important teacher competencies and contribute to successful implementation.

**Second question**

What are the requirements that must be met to implement inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities from the perspective of their

teachers?

This question was answered using frequencies,

percentages, means, and ranks of responses to the requirement items.

**Table 8. Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations of responses to requirements for implementing inclusive education.**

No.	Item	Mean	SD	Rank	Tendency
15	Enacting educational regulations, laws, and legislation that support the implementation of inclusive education practices.	4.121	0.856	8	Agree
16	Building positive attitudes, values, and beliefs among teachers of students with intellectual disabilities toward inclusive education practices.	4.229	0.897	1	Strongly agree
17	Having a clear, specific, and agreed-upon definition of inclusive education in the Saudi educational context.	4.189	0.978	4	Agree
18	Ministry and education directorates preparing and providing guides that specify correct applied practices of inclusive education.	4.182	1.050	6	Agree
19	Building a school culture that supports and attracts inclusive education practices.	4.196	0.980	3	Agree
20	Providing professional preparation and development for teachers (training courses, workshops, seminars) to enhance their skills for teaching within inclusive education.	4.054	1.029	11	Agree
21	Adapting and preparing the school environment to accommodate the needs of students, including those with intellectual disabilities.	4.141	1.069	7	Agree
22	Activating community partnership and cooperation between family, school, and community institutions to support and achieve inclusive schools.	4.121	1.100	9	Agree
23	Providing the necessary school resources, including tools and assistive technologies, to implement inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities.	4.229	1.120	2	Strongly agree
24	Making the necessary modifications and	4.115	1.152	10	Agree

	adaptations to the curriculum to suit the needs of all students, including those with intellectual disabilities.				
25	Providing adequate financial support for inclusive schools.	4.189	1.045	5	Agree
	<b>Total score (domain)</b>	4.16	-	-	-

Table 8 shows that teachers’ responses regarding the requirements for implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah were rated “agree” overall, with a total mean of 4.16. Items 16 and 23 were rated “strongly agree”, while all other items were rated “agree”.

The results indicate that inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in general schools faces major challenges, such as large individual differences between students with intellectual disabilities and their peers, but that these can be mitigated by providing a set of key requirements. This is consistent with previous studies (Al Sufyani, 2021; Al Mutairi & Al Rabeean, 2019; Al Wada’ani, 2022; Al Zahrani, 2024; Hawazen, 2023; Al Jabri & Shaaban, 2023; Almaki, 2022), which identified requirements that reduce the negative impact of barriers on inclusive education for students with disabilities.

These requirements can be grouped into six main categories:

1. Legislation and policy: Enacting specific laws and regulations that define and mandate inclusive education and its procedures, ensuring proper implementation, evaluation, accountability, and clarity of concepts.
2. Teacher preparation and training: Preparing competent teachers with the necessary teaching skills, positive attitudes, and knowledge of inclusive principles, including how to deal with disabilities and individual differences.
3. Curriculum adaptation: Modifying general education curricula to accommodate the needs of all students, including those with intellectual disabilities, and designing curricula based on universal design for learning principles.
4. Financial support: Providing sufficient budgets to support physical modifications, school facilities, school leadership, personnel preparation, assistive technologies, and support services.
5. School environment and resources: Ensuring barrier free, well equipped school environments that minimize physical, sensory,

and cognitive barriers and provide necessary facilities, security, and assistive tools.

6. School culture and community partnership: Building a supportive school culture, strengthening family-school-community cooperation, and raising societal awareness of the rights and inclusion of students with intellectual disabilities.

**Third question**

Are there statistically significant differences in teachers’ responses regarding barriers to implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities according to the study variables (years of experience and educational stage)?

To answer this question, one way ANOVA was used to examine differences in mean scores according to years of experience and educational stage.

A. Differences by years of experience

*Table 9: One way ANOVA for differences in barrier scores by years of experience.*

Dimension	Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Legal	Between groups	4.320	2	2.160	4.243	0.016*
	Within groups	73.805	145	0.509		
	Total	78.124	148			
Conceptual	Between groups	6.887	2	3.444	6.058	0.003*
	Within groups	82.430	145	0.568		
	Total	89.318	148			
Attitudes	Between groups	11.872	2	5.936	6.612	0.002*
	Within groups	130.171	145	0.898		
	Total	142.042	148			

*\*Significant at the 0.05 level.*

Table 9 shows that F values are statistically significant at 0.05 for all three dimensions (legal, conceptual, and attitudinal), indicating significant differences according to years of experience.

To identify the source of the differences, Scheffé’s test was used.

Table 10. Scheffé post hoc comparisons for differences in barrier scores by years of experience

**Table 10. Scheffé post hoc comparisons for differences in barrier scores by years of experience.**

Dimension	Years of Experience (I)	Years of Experience (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
Legal	5-10 years	11-15 years	-0.28285	0.15344	0.186	-0.6624 to 0.0967
Legal	5-10 years	≥16 years	-0.43546	0.14961	0.016	-0.8055 to -0.0654
Legal	11-15 years	5-10 years	0.28285	0.15344	0.186	-0.0967 to 0.6624
Legal	11-15 years	≥16 years	-0.15261	0.13570	0.533	-0.4882 to 0.1830
Legal	≥16 years	5-10 years	0.43546	0.14961	0.016	0.0654 to 0.8055
Legal	≥16 years	11-15 years	0.15261	0.13570	0.533	-0.1830 to 0.4882
Conceptual	5-10 years	11-15 years	-0.43565	0.16216	0.030	-0.8367 to -0.0346
Conceptual	5-10 years	≥16 years	-0.53468	0.15811	0.004	-0.9257 to -0.1436
Conceptual	11-15 years	5-10 years	0.43565	0.16216	0.030	0.0346 to 0.8367
Conceptual	11-15 years	≥16 years	-0.09902	0.14341	0.788	-0.4537 to 0.2557
Conceptual	≥16 years	5-10 years	0.53468	0.15811	0.004	0.1436 to 0.9257
Conceptual	≥16 years	11-15 years	0.09902	0.14341	0.788	-0.2557 to 0.4537
Attitudinal	5-10 years	11-15 years	-0.50169	0.20378	0.051	-1.0057 to 0.0023
Attitudinal	5-10 years	≥16 years	-0.71885	0.19869	0.002	-1.2103 to -0.2274
Attitudinal	11-15 years	5-10 years	0.50169	0.20378	0.051	-0.0023 to 1.0057
Attitudinal	11-15 years	≥16 years	-0.21716	0.18022	0.486	-0.6629 to 0.2286
Attitudinal	≥16 years	5-10 years	0.71885	0.19869	0.002	0.2274 to 1.2103
Attitudinal	≥16 years	11-15 years	0.21716	0.18022	0.486	-0.2286 to 0.6629

\* Differences are statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

The results in Table 10 indicate significant differences at the 0.05 level between teachers with 5-10 years of experience and those with 16 or more years of experience in all barrier dimensions, with higher scores among the more experienced group.

The researcher interprets this as reflecting the accumulation of professional experience among teachers of students with intellectual disabilities; those with longer experience have more direct

knowledge of the characteristics, needs, and inclusion potential of their students, and thus are more aware of the barriers to inclusive education. This is consistent with Al Talib (2022) and Priyadarshini & Thangarajathi (2017), who found that teachers with more years of service have better understanding of their students and their needs.

These results differ from those of Al Shahri (2024), Al Shaddadi & Al Hussain (2022), and Al Mutairi (2025), who reported that teachers' experience with inclusive education is relatively recent and that their knowledge of inclusive practices is still limited.

**B. Differences by educational stage**

**Table 11. One way ANOVA for differences in barrier scores by educational stage.**

Dimension	Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Legal	Between groups	4.952	2	2.476	4.907	0.009*
	Within groups	73.172	145	0.505		
	Total	78.124	148			
Conceptual	Between groups	4.745	2	2.372	4.068	0.019*
	Within groups	84.573	145	0.583		
	Total	89.318	148			
Attitudes	Between groups	4.013	2	2.006	2.108	0.125
	Within groups	138.029	145	0.952		
	Total	142.042	148			

\*Significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 11 shows statistically significant differences by educational stage in the legal and conceptual dimensions, with  $F(2,145) = 4.907, p = 0.009$  for legal barriers, and  $F(2,145) = 4.068, p = 0.019$  for conceptual barriers. No significant differences were found in the attitudinal dimension ( $F = 2.108, p = 0.125$ ).

Scheffé/Tukey post hoc results (Table 12) indicated that significant differences were between primary and intermediate stages in both legal and conceptual barriers, in favor of the primary stage (higher perceived barriers).

Table 12 Scheffé post hoc test for differences in teachers' responses regarding barriers to implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities in Buraydah according to educational stage

**Multiple Comparisons (Scheffé).**

Dependent variable	(I) Educational stage	(J) Educational stage	Mean difference (I-J)	Std. error	Sig.	95% CI for difference
Legal barriers	Primary	Intermediate	0.39750*	0.13145	0.008	0.0862 to 0.7088

	Primary	Secondary	0.27932	0.17101	0.235	-0.1256 to 0.6843
	Intermediate	Primary	-0.39750*	0.13145	0.008	-0.7088 to -0.0862
	Intermediate	Secondary	-0.11818	0.18414	0.797	-0.5542 to 0.3179
	Secondary	Primary	-0.27932	0.17101	0.235	-0.6843 to 0.1256
	Secondary	Intermediate	0.11818	0.18414	0.797	-0.3179 to 0.5542
<b>Conceptual barriers</b>	Primary	Intermediate	0.37739*	0.14132	0.023	0.0428 to 0.7120
	Primary	Secondary	0.31455	0.18385	0.205	-0.1208 to 0.7499
	Intermediate	Primary	-0.37739*	0.14132	0.023	-0.7120 to -0.0428
	Intermediate	Secondary	-0.06285	0.19797	0.946	-0.5316 to 0.4059
	Secondary	Primary	-0.31455	0.18385	0.205	-0.7499 to 0.1208
	Secondary	Intermediate	0.06285	0.19797	0.946	-0.4059 to 0.5316
<b>Attitudinal barriers</b>	Primary	Intermediate	0.31630	0.18054	0.190	-0.1112 to 0.7438
	Primary	Secondary	0.35682	0.23488	0.285	-0.1994 to 0.9130
	Intermediate	Primary	-0.31630	0.18054	0.190	-0.7438 to 0.1112
	Intermediate	Secondary	0.04051	0.25291	0.986	-0.5584 to 0.6394
	Secondary	Primary	-0.35682	0.23488	0.285	-0.9130 to 0.1994
	Secondary	Intermediate	-0.04051	0.25291	0.986	-0.6394 to 0.5584

*\*Significant at the 0.05 level.*

The ANOVA results indicated statistically significant differences between the mean scores of teachers' responses according to educational stage in the "legal barriers" dimension, where the F value was 4.907 at a significance level of 0.009, which is less than 0.05. Post hoc comparisons (Scheffé/Tukey) showed that the statistically significant differences were between the primary and intermediate stages, in favor of the primary stage.

The ANOVA results also revealed statistically significant differences between the mean scores according to educational stage in the "conceptual barriers" dimension, with an F value of 4.068 at a significance level of 0.019. Post hoc results indicated that these differences were between the primary and intermediate stages, again in favor of the primary stage. In contrast, no statistically significant differences were found in the "attitudinal barriers" dimension according to educational stage, as the F value (2.108) at a significance level of 0.125 was greater than 0.05.

This may be explained by the fact that teachers of intellectual education in the primary stage constituted 54.1% of the sample, compared with

31.1% at the intermediate stage, which may directly contribute to the observed differences in responses. In addition, the number of students in special education programs in primary schools is much higher than in other stages, which may enhance primary teachers' understanding of the characteristics, abilities, and needs of students with intellectual disabilities, and thus sharpen their perception of barriers to implementing inclusive practices, particularly for younger students in primary schools.

The finding of no significant differences in attitudinal barriers by educational stage agrees with Al Jabri and Shaaban (2023), who reported that teachers across school stages share similar knowledge backgrounds and positive, convergent views about inclusive education, likely due to similar preparation and training conditions during their initial teacher education, which helped unify their attitudes toward inclusion. However, the present study differs in some respects from Al Zahrani and Saleh (2024), who found variation in teachers' views ranging from acceptance to conditional acceptance, to rejection of inclusive education practices. In their study, teachers supported inclusive education but

conditioned its success on several factors, including enrolling students with intellectual disabilities in inclusive schools at an early age, ensuring accurate diagnosis, and limiting inclusion to students with mild intellectual disabilities and slow learners. This can be interpreted as reflecting teachers' belief that including students with intellectual disabilities at earlier educational stages is more appropriate than including them in later stages, because children's behavior can be shaped, modified, and reinforced more easily at a younger age, which applies to all students with and without disabilities, thereby fostering more positive attitudes toward inclusive education.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

- Review, develop, and update existing regulations and legislation to align with the principles of inclusive education, by encouraging decision makers to enact binding laws that support the implementation of inclusive education.
- Expand the implementation of inclusive education for students with intellectual disabilities to include all general education schools across the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and its regions.
- Promote positive attitudes among teachers of students with intellectual disabilities toward concepts related to inclusive education, through in service training courses and pre service preparation programs.
- Conduct further studies and research on the attitudes of parents of students with intellectual disabilities toward inclusive education practices.

**Acknowledgments:** The researcher extends his deep gratitude and appreciation to Qassim University, represented by the Deanship of Graduate Studies and Scientific Research, for their financial support of this research under grant number (2024-W-1-HSRC-56756) during the academic year 1447-2026.

## REFERENCES

- Abu Al Ghayth, K., & Al Shammari, S. (2023). Inclusive education for female students with intellectual disability and its role in developing their social communication skills from teachers' perspectives: A qualitative study. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 16(56), 244-282.
- Akhdar, A., & Al Zughaybi, M. (2023). A guide to adapting curricula for students with disabilities according to the inclusive education system. Dar Al Mawso'a.
- Al Talib, M. (2022). Teachers' knowledge of inclusive education to support female students with learning difficulties, their attitudes towards it, and their training needs to implement it. *Umm Al Qura University Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 16(3), 98-111.
- Bradley, D., Caesar, M., & Soutlik, W. (2011). Full inclusion: Educating exceptional learners in regular schools (Z. Al Sartawi, A. Al Shakhis, & A. Abdel Jabbar, Trans.). International Publisher.
- Bin Medhesh, A. (2022). Challenges facing inclusive education from the perspective of academics in Saudi universities specializing in educating students with disabilities. *Saudi Journal of Special Education*, 25, 53-73.
- Al Tarjumi, A., & Al Huwaiti, M. (2023). Competencies required for teachers of students with intellectual disabilities for inclusive education from their perspectives in Al Madinah region. *Arab Journal of Disability and Talent Sciences*, 26, 111-146.
- Al Jabri, R., & Shaaban, M. (2023). Attitudes of primary general education teachers toward implementing inclusive education for students with intellectual disability. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 16(56), 310-358.
- Hassanein, B. (2019). Inclusive education: The gateway to quality of life. In *Proceedings of the 21st Scientific Conference: Science Education and Quality of Life*, Cairo.
- Al Hussan, B. (2020). Barriers to including female students with disabilities in general education schools from the perspective of special education teachers. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 12(3), 219-254.
- Hanafi, A. (2015). From integration to full inclusion of deaf students in general education schools: Questions and requirements between theory and practice. *Childhood and Development Journal*, 6(23), 81-128.
- Al Rabeen, A., & Al Mutairi, H. (2019). Barriers to inclusive education for students with mild intellectual disability from the perspective of educators in light of some variables. *College of Education Journal*,

- 35(9), 570–615.
- Vision 2030 of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. National Transformation Program. <https://www.vision2030.gov.sa/ar/v2030/vrps/ntp/>
- Al Rayis, T., & Al Juma'i, W. (2016). Barriers to full inclusion of deaf and hard of hearing children in kindergarten from their teachers' perspectives in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 15(4), 8–38.
- Al Zahrani, M. (2024). Requirements for including persons with disabilities in inclusive schools in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal for Publishing Research and Studies*, 5(59), 178–196.
- Al Zahrani, N. (2014). Special education teachers' use of technology in teaching students with special needs in integrated schools in Al Jouf region, Saudi Arabia (Published master's thesis). Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.
- Al Zahrani, H., & Saleh, A. (2024). Intellectual education teachers' perspectives on inclusive education in Jeddah. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 17(59), 48–101.
- Salem, O., & Salem, O. (2016). Contemporary trends in addressing challenges and barriers to full inclusion of children with autism in kindergarten. *Benha Faculty of Education Journal*, 109(2), 429–452.
- Al Suhaibani, I. (2021). Attitudes of general education teachers toward implementing inclusive education in light of some variables. *Saudi Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7, 1–20.
- Al Sufyani, A. (2021). The reality of inclusive education in Saudi Arabia in light of the forces and factors affecting it. *Arab Journal for Scientific Publishing*, 30, 257–277.
- Al Shaddadi, D., & Al Hussain, A. (2022). Teachers' readiness level to implement a multi tiered system of support in inclusive schools. 46(5), 114–140. (Journal title to be added from source.)
- Al Shammari, I. (2019). Training needs of special education teachers in Saudi Arabia from their perspectives. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 9(31), 113–144.
- Al Shahrani, B. (2023). The reality of inclusive education culture in girls' schools in Saudi Arabia from teachers' perspectives. *Journal of Educational Sciences and Human Studies*, 28, 251–279.
- Al Shahrani, R. (2022). A proposed vision of the ideal classroom environment for students with disabilities in inclusive schools from the perspectives of general and special education teachers: A mixed study. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 14(50), 80–114.
- Al Shahri, R. (2024). Factors influencing the implementation of inclusive education in the United States and Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 18(65), 1–29.
- Obeidat, Z., Abdel Haq, K., & Adas, A. (2017). *Scientific research: Its concept, tools, and methods* (17th ed.). Dar Al Fikr.
- Al Otaibi, A. (2019). Barriers to adopting inclusive education for students with intellectual disability from the perspective of general education teachers in Riyadh. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 9(30), 43–81.
- Al Otaibi, B., & Al Shallawi, H. (2016). Barriers to integrating students with multiple disabilities in general education schools from the perspectives of special education institute teachers. *International Specialized Educational Journal*, 5(10), 15–37.
- Al Otaibi, B., & Rajeh, M. (2021). The effect of using a reinforcement chart on increasing attention among students with intellectual disabilities during written tasks in class. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 1(45), 13–37.
- Othman, R. (2018). Requirements for implementing inclusive education to empower some marginalized groups in Egypt in light of the experiences of some countries. Paper presented at "Educating Marginalized Groups in Arab Societies to Achieve Sustainable Development Goals – Opportunities and Challenges", Faculty of Education, Menoufia University.
- Al Ajaji, S. (2025). The importance of using assistive technologies to enable students with intellectual disabilities to access general education curricula. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 19(68), 69–102.
- Al Asiri, H. (2023). Inclusive education for students with disabilities: Challenges and solutions. *Journal of the College of Education for Human Sciences, Tikrit University*, 30(6), 387–405.
- Al Anzi, M. (2022). Competencies of inclusive education teachers from the perspective of special education specialists. *Islamic University Journal for Educational and Psychological Studies*, 30(1), 391–422.
- Ghoneim, R. (2018). Requirements for implementing inclusive education to empower marginalized groups in Egypt in light of the experiences of some countries. *College of Education Journal, Menoufia University*, 33, 334–373.

- Al Qahtani, M., & Al Khaldi, B. (2020). Use of co teaching by female teachers with students with intellectual disabilities in inclusive schools. *Culture and Development Journal*, 20(157), 86–120.
- Al Qahtani, M., & Rababah, A. (2019). Readiness to implement inclusive education from teachers' perspectives in Saudi Arabia. *International Specialized Educational Journal*, 8(9), 122–178.
- Makura, M. (Milovanović). (2012). Toward a broader concept of inclusive education for teacher preparation: A case study of Serbia. UNESCO Publications Center, 42(1), 25–55.
- Al Malki, N., & Al Harithi, B. (2020). The importance of using assistive technology with female students with intellectual disabilities in inclusive schools. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 44(2), 266–298.
- Al Mutairi, F. (2025). Barriers to using co teaching with students with intellectual disabilities in inclusive education programs. *Al Tarbiyah (Education) Journal*, 77(6), 95–166.
- Al Munshtri, T., Al Baqmi, L., & Sulaymani, M. (2024). Challenges of including students with disabilities in light of the concept of inclusive education in Saudi Arabia: A systematic review. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 17(60), 36–59.
- United Nations. (2008). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. United States of America. <https://www.ohchr.org/ar/HRBodies/CRPD/Pages/ConventionRightspersonsWithDisabilities.aspx>
- UNESCO. (2020). Summary of the Global Education Monitoring Report: Inclusive education for all – No one left behind (Arabic ed.). <https://ar.unesco.org/gem-report>
- Al Wada'ani, N. (2023). A proposed vision for implementing inclusive education for persons with disabilities in early childhood. *Journal of Education*, 200(1), 43–87.
- Ministry of Education (A). (1436–1437 AH). Organizational guide for special education. Ministry of Education, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Riyadh. <https://www.moe.gov.sa/ar/Pages/default.aspx>
- Ministry of Education (B). (1436–1437 AH). Procedural guide for special education. Ministry of Education, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Riyadh. <https://www.moe.gov.sa/ar/Pages/default.aspx>
- Siddaway, A. (2014). What is a systematic literature review and how do I do one? *University of Stirling*, 1(1), 1–3.
- Giasemi, M. (2020). The inclusive education of children with intellectual disabilities in Greece. Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences, November 10.
- Wasim, A. (2018). Barriers of inclusive education for children with intellectual disability. [Publisher/journal details to be completed].
- Almalki, S. (2022). Inclusive education: America and Saudi Arabia's attempts at including students with intellectual disability in the classroom. *Assiut University Journal*, 38(3), 1–32.
- Nishan, F. (2018). Challenges of regular teachers in implementing inclusive education in schools of Maldives. [Journal title], 3(10), 88–103.
- Alqallaf, B., Alsayou, H., & Alenezi, N. (2021). Barriers of the inclusion of children with special educational needs in mainstream classes from pre-service teachers' viewpoints. [Journal title], 45(3), 302–340.
- Jahnukainen, M. (2015). Inclusion, integration, or what? A comparative study of the school principals' perceptions of inclusive and special education in Finland and in Alberta, Canada. *Disability & Society*, 30(1), 59–72.
- Hassanein, E. E. A. (2015). Inclusion, disability and culture. Springer. New York, USA.
- Slee, R., & Tait, G. (2022). Ethics and inclusive education: Disability, schooling and justice (Vol. 6). Springer Nature. New York, USA.
- UNESCO. (2020). Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373718>
- 55.Bin Medhesh, A. (2019). Inclusion of deaf students in Saudi primary schools [PhD dissertation]. Victoria University, Australia.
- Ahmed, F. I. A. (2021). Teachers' perspectives on barriers of inclusion of autistic students in Saudi Arabia schools. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(1), 63–79.
- Alanazi, A. (2020). Critical analysis of the challenges faced in implementing inclusive education practices for students with intellectual disabilities in Saudi Arabia. *Electronic Interdisciplinary Miscellaneous Journal*.
- Dudley, M., & Burns, D. (2014). Two perspectives on inclusion in the United States. Boston College. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1055208.pdf>

- Butakor, P. K., Ampadu, E., & Suleiman, S. J. (2018). Analysis of Ghanaian teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1-16.
- Mngo, Z. Y., & Mngo, A. Y. (2018). Teachers' perceptions of inclusion in a pilot inclusive education program: Implications for instructional leadership. *Education Research International*, 1-13.
- Alzemaia, F. A. (2019). An exploration of inclusive education in elementary mainstream schools in Saudi Arabia [Doctoral dissertation, University of Northumbria]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Nadera, M. (2017). The yes...but dilemma: Implementing inclusive education in Emirati primary school. *British Journal of Special Education*, 44(1), 27-45.
- Hettiarachchi, S., & Das, A. (2014). Perceptions of 'inclusion' and perceived preparedness among school teachers in Sri Lanka. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 43, 143-153.
- Resnawaty, R., Darwis, R. S., & Riana, A. W. (2018). Challenges and opportunities for school inclusion in Bandung. [Journal title to be completed].
- Sajir, A. P. K. A., & Abdul Salam Jawad Kazem, A. (1970). Ways to achieve academic integration for people with special needs. *Ishraqat Tanmawia*. <https://www.iasj.net/iasj/article/188311>
- Priyadarshini, S. S., & Thangarajathi, S. (2017). Effect of selected variables on regular school teachers' attitude towards inclusive education. *Journal on Educational Psychology*, 10(3), 28-38.
- Aktan, O. (2021). Teachers' opinions towards inclusive education interventions in Turkey. *Anatolian Journal of Education*, 6(1), 29-50.
- American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD). (2021). Definition of intellectual disability. <https://www.aaid.org/intellectual-disability/definition>
- Francis, R., & Joyce, B. (2018). Examining the physical environment of Ghanaian inclusive schools: How accessible, suitable and appropriate is such environment for inclusive education? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*.
- Al-Suhaili, A. (2015). *Inclusion ethics for students with special needs*. Tanta Book House for Publishing.