Full text open access online (Since 2009)

PRINT: ISSN 0975-1122 ONLINE: ISSN 2456-6322
Int J Edu Sci, 54(1): 1-19 (2026)
DOI: 10.31901/24566322.2026/54.1.1368

Teachers' Perception About Educational Support Services and School Facilities for Students with Disabilities and Behavioural Problems

Rakan M. Alshammari

Department of Psychology, College of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Northern Border University, Arar, Saudi Arabia
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0550-7674
E-mail: <Rakan.alshmmari@nbu.edu.sa>,
<Rakan790@gmail.com>

KEYWORDS Academic Evaluation. BehaviourIssues. Disabilities. Inclusive Education. Problem Behaviours. Quality Standards

ABSTRACT In the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, many students with disabilities such as autism, mental disabilities and behavioural and emotional disorders, receive their education in general education schools. This study aims to identify the availability of educational support services and school facilities for students with disabilities and behavioural problems in schools in Saudi Arabia. The study employs a descriptive research methodology to find out the opinions of teachers about the services provided to these students. The sample size (n = 106) of both male and female teachers answered the online survey. Results indicated that educational support services and school facilities for students with disabilities, such as healthcare services and psychologists for students with disabilities electric elevators and recreational services are not mostly provided in schools. Also, analytical behavioural rehabilitation services and special classrooms for students with behavioural problems are not provided at all schools. Limitations and recommendations for researchers are provided.

INTRODUCTION

Many students with disabilities are educated in inclusive classrooms. Students with disabilities have been taught in public schools since 1960. Some students with disabilities are educated through inclusive education, and these disabilities may include learning disabilities, behavioural problems, hearing impairments, blindness, and physical disabilities. However, students with autism and intellectual disabilities are still educated in special education classrooms. Saudi Arabia has now begun to provide educational support and services for all students with disabilities in schools (Abu Alghayth et al. 2022; Aldabas 2015). Francisco et al. (2020) defined special education as special instructions, educational environments and curriculums for students with disabilities in private and public schools, special institutions, home, classrooms, and hospitals.

All students, with and without disabilities, have the right to pursue their education in an appropriate educational environment that can contribute to improving their academic and educational skills by providing them with universal access programs in their schools (Al-Jaidi 2021; Sudairi and Abdullah 2018; Abu Al-Mawaheb 2016). In this vein, students with disabilities have the right to pursue an inclusive education, for which they must be provided with the facilities they need to adapt in schools (Alnahdi et al. 2019; Ball 2012). It is important to measure teachers' perspectives in an inclusive education classroom and their ability to teach students with disabilities with their peers and provide them with all appropriate educational services they need. Students with disabilities also have the right to receive appropriate education in public and private schools (Block and Obrusnikova 2007; Koh and Shin 2017).

Many students with disabilities receive their education in general education schools. The vision of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia 2030 aims to improve the education system for students with disabilities and provide them with equal educational opportunities. To this end, this study aims to determine the availability of educational support services (ESS) and educational facilities for such students at general education schools. It further aims to identify educational obstacles and assess the level of quality of life (QOL) for students with different categories of disabilities. To achieve its aims, the study analyses teachers' perspectives regard-

ing inclusive education classrooms and their ability to teach students with disabilities along with their peers and provide them with appropriate educational services. The results and suggestions of this study will contribute to improving the learning process and providing a supportive educational environment for all students with and without disabilities.

Literature Review

Schools are an important place where all children receive their education effectively, including students with disabilities. Students with disabilities may need more services than regular students. For example, students with physical problems may need elevators and special vehicles. Indeed, few studies have investigated education support services and school facilities (SF) for students with disabilities, especially in Saudi Arabia (Haimour and Abu-Hawwash 2012). Little (2005) surveyed 148 female and male teachers to analyse their perceptions of the most common behavioural problems in school. These behaviours included talking out of turn, hindering others, idleness, disobedience, unnecessary noise, and aggressive behaviours.

Little (2005) indicated that students with behaviour problems also need more services, which is one of the most common problems in schools. Especially, these students with a high exhibition of behavioural problems may need to be educated in special classrooms. These indicated that teachers need more supportive services to help them deal with these behaviours, such as having co-teachers with them in classrooms. Also, these teachers must increase their knowledge of how to deal with these behaviours by undergoing professional training in using evidence-based interventions. One of these pieces of knowledge is that teachers need to know how they use assistive technology. Assistive technology is one of the most common tools that can help teachers provide an effective education for students with disabilities (Edyburn 2004). These include smart boards, projectors, TVs, videos, audio players and recorders, seat cushions, GlassOuse hands-free mouse, videotaped social skills, and laptops (Edyburn 2004).

Sacks and Kern (2008) found a lack of QOL, as well as ESS, for students with behaviour problems compared with general students. Students with behavioural problems can be impacted negatively in many ways, such as poor well-being, depression, and a lack of feeling of belonging. They also found that students with emotional and behavioural disorders are educated better in private schools than in public schools, as private schools may provide appropriate educational services for these students and their needs that may not be provided in public schools.

Al-Zboon et al. (2015) used a descriptive survey to investigate 320 teachers' perceptions of QOL of teachers who work in schools in Jordan-Amman that provide services for students with disabilities. They found that special education teachers have more knowledge and high-quality practice in dealing with students with disabilities than general teachers.When teachers have knowledge to deal with students with any type of disabilities, they can makean inclusive education successful for these students and provide them with an appropriate educational environment (Stiefel et al. 2018).

Moreno-Rodriguez et al. (2017) examined 1,145 teachers in Ecuador by using a questionnaire. The participants indicated many factors that negatively impact students with disabilities, one of which is the lack of academic training for teachers who work with students with disabilities in general schools. Teaching students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms requires intensive education services, such as the use of technology, professionals who can deal with students with disabilities, and frequent professional training for both special and general teachers.

Ahmed (2018) found assistive technology to be a crucial tool in classrooms for students with disabilities to create an effective education environment. Similarly, Edyburn (2004) stated that assistive technology can help both students with and without disabilities to improve academically. Moreover, parents of students with disabilities need support from their children's schools to know how to deal effectively with their children and cooperate with schools (Al Awaji et al. 2021).

Haimour and Abu-Hawwash (2012) recruited 306 parents of children with mental retardation, learning disabilities, autism, and physical disabilities to evaluate their QOL. The researchers found a significant difference between the four groups of disabilities in terms of support services required at schools or homes. However, often not all the support needed is available for these children. Edwards et al. (2003) also found that students with disabili-

ties need appropriate ESS. They also found that students with disabilities live a lower quality of educational life than general students, whether in or out of school.

In Saudi Arabia, many schools provide education for students with disabilities and students with behavioural problems. However, it is important to analyse whether these students receive appropriate education services and special education tailored to their needs. For instance, students with learning disabilities need many services such as the use of evidence-based strategies and special educational techniques (Al-Farra 2017). To this end, one of the most common barriers that teachers face in such schools is the lack of professional training to deal with such students (Moreno-Rodriguez et al. 2017).

Sacks and Kern (2008) also found that students with emotional and behavioural disorders who are educated in private school feel better than those who were educated in public schools. It is important to know educational services and barriers and facilities that students with disabilities and students with problem behaviours face in Saudi schools. There are many services that are required to be provided to students with physical disability and visual disability in schools, such as facilitating access to classes for all students (Block and Obrusnikova 2007). Also, students with learning disabilities need many services such as using evidence-based strategies and using educational techniques that need to be provided to them in schools (Al-Farra 2017). However, there are many students who exhibit many behavioural problems or are diagnosed with behavioural and emotional disturbances who need adaptive educational services to help them receive appropriate educational techniques in public schools (Yahya 2018). When these students receive effective educational support and services, they can be successful students (Justice et al. 2014; García-Carrión et al. 2018).

Definition of Terms

Problem Behaviours

Problem behavioursare defined as verbal and physical behaviours. Many types of problem behaviours can be exhibited by individuals. Inappropriate verbal behaviours can be screaming, threatening, telling lies, and joking, talking without permission in classrooms, while the inappropriate physicalbehaviours can be hitting, throwing stuff, and biting. These problem behaviours can impact negatively on students' academic performance (Amstad and Müller 2020).

Quality of Life

Teaching students with disabilities requires an understanding of their life situations and their needs. The optimum QOL for students with disabilities include access to healthcare services, policies, education services, employment services, and personal well-being (Toulabi et al. 2013; Turkoglu et al. 2014).

Students with Disabilities

A student with disabilities is a person who is diagnosed with one of the special education categories, such as autism, blindness, deafness, behavioural and emotional disorders,speech or language impairment, learning disabilities, hearing disability andother health impairment. A disability means that people who have physical or mind impairments that prevent them from doing their activities the same as those without these disabilities. These students need special services, such as motivation in their curriculums, special classrooms, special education teachers, and special methods of teaching (Koller et al. 2018).

Education Support Services

ESS is any educational support that students with and without disabilities may need in their schools. Students with disabilities may need a specific service. ESS includes any services needed for students, such as appropriate chairs and tables, smart boards, iPads, special classrooms, special education teachers, welfare service systems, behavioural teacher training, elevators at schools, behavioural health support, and health services at schools. These services can be general or special, such as services for students with disabilities. These services must be appropriate for students depending on their disability (Gagne et al. 2018; Hiebert-Murphy et al. 2011).

Research Problem

All students with or without disabilities have the right to receive their education in an appropri-

ate educational system that can contribute to the development and improvement of their cognitive abilities and skills, such as social and academic skills (Theoharis and Causton 2014). Many students with disabilities fail to receive comprehensive education in public schools, as some services may not be available (Alnahdi et al. 2019). Students with behavioural problems may not receive appropriate educational services, such as special classrooms and specialist teachers (Al-Farra 2017). Moreover, students with disabilities need to be educated in prepared schools and classrooms that are appropriate for their disabilities (Block and Obrusnikova 2007).This study highlights the importance of identifying the obstacles in general schools that render them inefficient in providing a high QOL for students with disabilities. Also, this study aims to provide scientific recommendations through which these services can be improved for all students with disabilities across general, special, and inclusive education systems.

Objectives

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Know teachers' opinions regarding ESS and the rehabilitation of buildings for students with disabilities in general education.
2. Identify obstacles in general and comprehensive education schools that can prevent students with disabilities from succeeding academically
3. Determine the categories of disability most and least affected in terms of access to services in public education.

Research Questions

The study aims answer the following three primary research questions guided this study:

1. **Q1:** To what extent are teachers satisfied with the ESS provided to students with disabilities?
2. **Q2:** What are the obstacles to teaching students with disabilities in general education?
3. **Q3:** Which of the categories of special education benefit most from the services provided, and who is the least benefited?

Research Hypothesis

The study also aims to answer the following three hypotheses for this research that are:

1. ***H1*:** Not all ESS and appropriate school building facilities are available for all categories of special students.
2. ***H2:*** Some obstacles impede the educational process for some categories of special education.
3. ***H3*:** Students with physical disabilities and emotional behavioural disorders might receive the least educational services in schools.

METHODOLOGY

The study aims to investigate teachers' perceptions of ESS and SF for students with disabilities and behavioural problems. Two types of questionnaires were administered to the teachers, one focused on ESS for students with disabilities, while the other focused on those for students with behavioural problems. Through this, the study also aimed to determine the future needs of students with disabilities and behavioural problems and achieve the three research objectives.

Participants

The participants in the study were special education teachers who work at different levels of education, such as elementary, middle, and high schools. A total of 106 teachers responded to the study's survey. Both female and male teachers participated in the study.

Settings

The online survey was sent to all teachers in the city of Rafha in the Northern Borders Province of Saudi Arabia, which included both private and public schools.

Design and Instrument

This study employed a descriptive research design, using an online questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent to teachers to gather their perceptions about ESS and SF for students with disabilities and behavioural problems. It aimed to find out what schools have ESS, such as special education teachers, and if the schools have SF such as special classes for students with behavioural problems.

The study used two primary questionnaires, and each one of them had the same demographic questions, such as gender and educational level. Also, each survey has two secondary services that were for ESS and SF. The first survey included 23 items, while the second included 22 items. The first survey included 12 items on ESS and another 11 on SF for students with disabilities. The second survey included 12 items on ESS and another 10 on SF.

Procedure

The study was ethically approved by the Institutional Review Board at Northern Borders University. Moreover, before sending out the final online survey to all the participants, its reliability was checked using Cronbach's alpha to measure the internal consistency of the items. The link to the survey was sent to all teachers who work in the city of Rafha in the Northern Border Province schools. After all the participants had responded to the survey, the data was statistically analysed.

Statistical Analysis

The study used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software version 21. The data were expressed as percentages, mean, and SD.

RESULTS

The study aimed to investigate teachers' perceptions of ESS and SF for students with disabilities and behavioural problems. This section presents the responses of the study's 106 participants to the two primary online surveys differently, one that is related to students with disabilities, and another is for students with behavioural problems.

First Survey on Students with Disabilities

The first survey was on educational services and SF for students with disabilities. The results section presents the responses of 106 participants who took the online survey.

Reliability Analysis Survey for Students with Disabilities

The reliability analysis performed is robust and demonstrates strong internal consistency for the measured constructs (Table 1). Cronbach's alpha is a widely accepted measure of internal consistency, wherein values of 0.70 or higher are generally considered acceptable for established scales in social science research. The analysis revealed Cronbach's alpha coefficients for three essential scales of ESS (12 items, α=0.832), SF (11 items, α= 0.922), and an overall scale including all 23 items (α=0.929). Hence, the alpha coefficients reported indicate that the survey items within each scale are closely related and can reliably measure the intended underlying constructs.

Table 1: Reliability analysis of the survey on students with disabilities

Scales	*N of items*	*Cronbach's Alpha*
Educational Support Services	12	0.832
School Facilities	11	0.922
All Items	23	0.929

Source: June, 2024

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Table 2 shows the demographic characteristics of the participants in the survey on students with disabilities. Gender representation is relatively balanced, with 55.7 percent male and 44.3 percent female participants. Regarding educational level, the majority (85.8%) hold a bachelor's degree, while 14.2 percent have a master's degree. This indicates that the sample predominantly comprises educators with a graduate level of training, which is common in many education systems. The school-type breakdown shows that the majority (87.7%) work in government/public schools, compared to the 12.3 percent who work in private schools. The data on years of experience revealed a relatively even spread, with the most prominent groups having 5 to 10 years (31.1%) and 10 to 15 years (28.3%) of experience. There are also meaningful representations of early-career (<5 years, 27.4%) and more experienced (15-20 years, 10.4%; >20 years, 2.8%) educators.

In terms of education, the majority (80.2%) are general education teachers, while 11.3 percent specialise in special education. This suggests that the sample captures the perspectives of both general and specialised educators working with students with disabilities. The educational stage breakdown shows the most considerable proportions of teach-

Table 2:Demographic characteristics of the participants in the survey on students with disabilities

Variables	*Number*	*Percentage*
Gender		
Female	47	44.3
Male	59	55.7
Educational Level		
Bachelor	91	85.8
Master	15	14.2
School Type		
Government	93	87.7
Private	13	12.3
Years of Experience		
Less than 5	29	27.4
5 to 10	33	31.1
10 to 15	30	28.3
15 to 20	11	10.4
More than 20	3	2.8
Field of Education		
Special Education Teacher	12	11.3
General Teacher	85	80.2
Others	9	8.5
Educational Stage		
Kindergarten	17	16.0
Primary	46	43.4
Medium	33	31.1
Secondary	10	9.4
Enrollment in Special Education Training Courses		
No	38	35.8
Yes	68	64.2
Teaching Students With Disabilities		
No	29	27.4
Yes	77	72.6

Source: June, 2024

ing at the primary (43.4%) and middle/secondary (31.1%) levels, with more miniature representations at the kindergarten (16.0%) and high school (9.4%) stages. Finally, a sizable majority (64.2%) reported enrolling in training courses related to working with students with disabilities. Likewise, 72.6 percent have worked previously with students with disabilities. This indicates that the sample includes educators with and without specialised professional development in this area.

Educational Support Services Scale

Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of the ESS scale in the survey on students with disabilities. Several items showed high levels of availability, with over 60 percent of participants agreeing that their schools have learning resource rooms (mean = 2.63 ± 0.708), student counselling (mean = 2.38 ± 0.771), and technological equipment like projectors and smart boards for students with disabilities (mean = 2.52 ± 0.878). However, the results also highlight significant gaps in certain services. For example, only 14.2 percent of participants reported that their schools have healthcare services (mean = 1.42 ± 0.730), and 50 percent reported that their schools have dedicated psychologists for students with disabilities (mean = 2.16 ± 0.917), pointing to a lack of comprehensive health and mental health support. Similarly, less than one-third of the participants indicated that their schools provide transportation or individualised exam accommodation (mean = 1.90 ± 0.894), suggesting that these critical access and assessment supports are not consistently available.

The scale also revealed mixed results around the presence of special education staff (mean = 2.18 ± 0.934) and inclusive education practices. While over 50 percent of participants indicated that their schools have special education teachers, only 12.3 percent reported having a collaborating special education teacher to support instruction. Additionally, half the sample agreed that their schools embrace an inclusive education philosophy (mean = 2.15 ± 0.924), underscoring the need for more systemic adoption of inclusive policies and practices. Examining the mean scores on the scale provides an overall assessment of available ESS. The total mean of 2.07 ± 0.508 out of a possible 3.0 suggests a moderate level of support services on average across the sample. This indicates room for improvement in strengthening the breadth and quality of support resources for students with disabilities in these schools. On the other hand, Table 4 shows the demographic factors in the ESS scale in the survey on students with disabilities. Educational level, year of experience, educational stage, enrollment in training courses, and teaching students with disabilities did not significantly differ ($P > 0.05$).

In contrast, the gender parameter showed a significant difference, wherein females had a significantly higher mean score (2.18 ± 0.476) than males (1.99 ± 0.520), with a ($P = 0.047$). School type also showed a significant difference, wherein private school teachers had a significantly higher score (2.50 ± 0.297) than government school teachers (2.01 ± 0.504), with a ($P < 0.001$). Further, regarding the educational field, special education teach-

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of the educational support services scale in the survey on students with disabilities

Item		*Disagree*	*Not sure*	*Agree*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Response level*
The school has a learning resource room for students with disabilities.	%	13.2	10.4	76.4	2.63	0.80	High
The school has student counseling services for students with disabilities and their families	%	17.0	14.2	68.9	2.52	0.77	High
The school has healthcare services for students with disabilities	%	71.7	14.2	14.2	1.42	0.73	Low
The school has a psychologist for students with disabilities.	%	34.9	14.2	50.9	2.16	0.91	Moderate
Equipping all classrooms with technological devices such as projector or smart board for students with disabilities.	%	26.4	9.4	64.2	2.38	0.87	High
The school provides transportation services for students with disabilities	%	45.3	19.8	34.9	1.90	0.89	Moderate
The school provides special adaptations for students with disabilities to take exams.	%	45.3	13.2	41.5	1.96	0.93	Moderate
The school has special education teachers at the school	%	35.8	10.4	53.8	2.18	0.93	Moderate
The school has a cooperating teacher such as special education teacher to collaborate with the general teacher to assist in the teaching process for students with disabilities in the same classroom during the teaching process.	%	78.3	9.4	12.3	1.34	0.68	Low
The school adopts the philosophy of inclusive education by providing services to multiple categories of students with disabilities and others.	%	35.8	13.2	50.9	2.15	0.92	Moderate
The school provides curriculum appropriate adaptation services to suit students with disabilities.	%	43.4	12.3	44.3	2.01	0.94	Moderate
The school provides individualized educational services for its students with disabilities if the need arises.	%	32.1	13.2	54.7	2.23	0.90	Moderate
Total mean score of the scale					2.07	0.80	Moderate

Source: June, 2024

Table 4: Demographic factors in educational support and school facilities services scale in the survey on students with disabilities

Variables	*Category*	*Educational support services*				*School facilities services*			
		Mean	*SD*	*Test value*	*p-value*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Test value*	*p-value*
Gender	Female	2.18	0.476	T= 2.010	0.047*	2.12	0.574	T= 1.902	0.060
	Male	1.99	0.520			1.88	0.730		
Educational Level	Bachelor	2.09	0.522	T= 0.600	0.550	2.02	0.665	T= 1.066	0.289
	Master	2.00	0.418			1.82	0.719		
School Type	Government	2.01	0.504	T= 3.393	<0.001**	1.91	0.665	T= 5.525	<0.001**
	Private	2.50	0.297			2.59	0.369		
Years of Experience	less than 5	2.16	0.444	F= 1.211	0.311	2.20	0.489	F= 2.379	0.057
	5 to 10	2.11	0.537			2.11	0.671		
	10 to 15	2.01	0.486			1.77	0.751		
	15 to 20	1.83	0.596			1.76	0.750		
	more than 20	2.36	0.591			1.70	0.448		
Field of Education	Special Education Teacher	2.49	0.366	F= 5.915	0.004**	2.39	0.631	F= 2.510	0.086
	General Teacher	2.00	0.511			1.93	0.685		
	Others	2.24	0.342			2.03	0.438		
Educational Stage	Kindergarten	2.32	0.324	F= 1.701	0.172	2.14	0.529	F= 1.765	0.159
	Primary	2.03	0.535			1.99	0.730		
	Medium	2.04	0.518			1.81	0.653		
	Secondary	1.98	0.547			2.29	0.590		
Enrollment in Special Education Training Courses	No	2.11	0.500	T= 0.519	0.605	2.05	0.530	T= 0.698	0.487
	Yes	2.05	0.515			1.96	0.743		
Teaching Students with Disabilities	No	2.06	0.509	T= 0.158	0.875	2.07	0.515	T= 0.829	0.410
	Yes	2.08	0.511			1.96	0.725		

Source: June,2024

ers had a significantly higher mean score (2.49 ± 0.336) than general teachers (2.0 ± 0.551), with a (P = 0.004).

School Facilities Scale

Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics of the SF scale in the survey on students with disabilities. The 11-item scale assessed a range of facility-related domains. The response patterns across the scale items revealed a mixed picture of the adequacy of SF for supporting students with disabilities. On the positive side, most participants (62.3%) indicated that their schools provide dedicated parking spaces for students with disabilities (mean = 2.36 ± 0.875), and around half reported that their schools have accessible entry/exit points, appropriately organised classrooms (mean = 2.15 ± 0.924), and easy access to the cafeteria (mean = 2.16 ± 0.906). However, the result also highlights significant limitations in the accessibility and inclusiveness of school facilities in many areas. Over two-thirds of the participants disagreed that their schools had electric elevators (mean = 1.56 ± 0.852), and a majority indicated a lack of recreational spaces (mean = 1.61 ± 0.846), universal access services (mean = 1.74 ± 0.876), and equipped restrooms for students with disabilities (mean = 1.61 ± 0.846). The mean of 1.99 ± 0.673 out of a possible 3.0 indicates a moderate level of accessibility and accommodations on average across the sample. This suggests that schools still have room for improvement in ensuring their physical environments and infrastructure are designed and equipped to support students with disabilities effectively.

Overall, the SF scale provided a comprehensive assessment of how the physical school environment meets the needs of students with disabilities. The mixed results highlight the importance of ongoing efforts to improve the accessibility and inclusiveness of SF to facilitate this student population's full participation and success. Table 4 shows the items pertaining to demographic data on the SF scale in the survey on students with disabilities regarding demographic data in the study. School type was the only parameter that showed a significant difference, wherein private school teachers had a significantly higher score (2.59 ± 0.369) than government school teachers (1.91 ± 0.665), with (P < 0.001).

Table 5: Comparison of factors in School Facilities scale in the survey on students with disabilities

Items		*Disagree*	*Not sure*	*Agree*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Response level*
The presence of special parking spaces for students with disabilities at the school.	%	26.4	11.3	62.3	2.36	0.875	High
Ease of entry and exit from the school for students with disabilities.	%	35.8	13.2	50.9	2.15	0.924	Moderate
Easy and safe navigation for all students with disabilities between corridors and school facilities.	%	41.5	14.2	44.3	2.03	0.931	Moderate
Organize classes and seats appropriately for students with disabilities.	%	41.5	11.3	47.2	2.06	0.944	Moderate
Electric elevators are provided for students with disabilities at school.	%	67.9	8.5	23.6	1.56	0.852	Low
The school provides universal access services for students with disabilities.	%	54.7	17.0	28.3	1.74	0.876	Moderate
Rehabilitation of all integration classes in terms of equipment and seats in the school.	%	38.7	16.0	45.3	2.07	0.918	Moderate
Provide all means of safety for students with disabilities at school.	%	35.8	23.6	40.6	2.05	0.877	Moderate
The school has recreational services such as rooms equipped for sports and cultural activities suitable for students with disabilities.	%	62.3	14.2	23.6	1.61	0.846	Low
Easy access for students with disabilities to the school canteen.	%	34.0	16.0	50.0	2.16	0.906	Moderate
The school has equipped toilets for students with disabilities.	%	36.8	15.1	48.1	2.11	0.919	Moderate
Total mean score of the scale					1.99	0.673	Moderate

Source: June,2024

Second Survey on Students with Behavioral Problems

The second survey was also on educational services and SF for students with behavioural problems. The results section presents the responses of 106 participants who took the online survey.

Reliability Analysis

Table 6 shows the survey's reliability, demonstrating solid internal consistency across the measured constructs. The survey included 22 items split between two subscales of ESS (12 items) and SF (10 items). The reported Cronbach's alpha coefficients were excellent, indicating high interrelatedness among the items within each subscale. Specifically, the ESS subscale had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.868, the SF subscale had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.899, and the full 22-item survey had an overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.929. These values suggest that the items within each subscale could reliably measure a unified underlying construct.

Table 6: Reliability analysis of the survey on students with behavioral issues

Scales	*N of items*	*Cronbach's Alpha*
Educational Support Services	12	0.868
School Facilities	10	0.899
All Items	22	0.929

Source: June, 2024

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Table 7 presents an overview of the demographic characteristics of the participants in the survey on students with behavioural issues. The survey was taken by 106 respondents, including male (56.6%) and female (43.4%) participants. Regarding educational level, the sample was heavily skewed toward those holding a bachelor's degree (86.8%), with only 13.2 percent having a master's degree. The majority of participants (90.6%) work in government-run schools, while only 9.4 percent are employed in private school settings. This likely reflects the broader landscape of the education system in the region. Regarding years of teaching experience, the sample exhibits a fairly diverse distribution, with the largest groups being those with

Table 7: Demographic characteristics of the participants in the survey on students with behavioral issues

Variables	*Number*	*Percentage*
Gender		
Female	46	43.4
Male	60	56.6
Educational Level		
Bachelor	92	86.8
Master	14	13.2
School Type		
Government	96	90.6
Private	10	9.4
Years of Experience		
Less than 5	31	29.2
5 to 10	37	34.9
10 to 15	24	22.6
15 to 20	11	10.4
More than 20	3	2.8
Field of Education		
Special Education Teacher	15	14.2
General Teacher	84	79.2
Others	7	6.6
Educational Stage		
Kindergarten	15	14.2
Primary	49	46.2
Medium	32	30.2
Secondary	10	9.4
Enrollment in Training Courses		
No	38	35.8
Yes	68	64.2
Teaching Students with Disabilities		
No	23	21.7
Yes	83	78.3

Source: June,2024

5 to 10 years (34.9%) and less than 5 years (29.2%) of experience. This range of experience levels can enhance the comprehensiveness of the survey findings.

The field of education is predominantly represented by general teachers (79.2%), with 14.2 percent being special education teachers and a small percentage (6.6%) from other educational backgrounds. The educational stages covered in the sample include kindergarten (14.2%), primary (46.2%), middle (30.2%), and secondary (9.4%) levels. This spread across different grade levels provides a multifaceted understanding of the issues faced by students with behavioural challenges. A significant majority of participants (64.2%) have enrolled in training courses related to their work, which may contribute to their knowledge and sensitivity in addressing the needs of students with behavioural issues. Lastly, the survey population included a significant proportion (78.3%) of teach-

ers who had prior experience working with students with disabilities, which could have further informed their perspectives and approaches to the survey.

Educational Support Services Scale

Table 8 shows the descriptive statistics of the ESS scale in the survey on students with behavioural issues. It consists of 12 items that assess the availability and quality of support services provided to students with behavioural challenges within the educational setting. The mean scores for the individual items range from 1.39 to 2.65, indicating a wide variability in the perceived level of ESS. Items such as, "The school has student counselling services for students with behavioural problems and their families" (mean = 2.65 ± 0.704) and "The school has a learning resource room for students with behavioural problems" (mean = 2.58 ± 0.729) have high mean scores, and aggregable level more than 70 percent, suggesting a relatively strong presence of these support services.

In contrast, items like, "The school has a cooperating teacher such as a special education teacher to collaborate with the general teacher to help with the teaching process for students with behavioural problems in the same class and during the teaching process" (mean = 1.39 ± 0.684) and "The school provides adaptive services for the curriculum to suit students with behavioural problems" (mean = 1.55 ± 0.806) have low mean scores, indicating a perceived lack of these particular support services. In addition, items such as "The school has a psychologist for students with behavioural problems" (mean = 2.11 ± 0.908) and "The school provides behavioural and social support services for students with behavioural problems" (mean = 2.06 ± 0.914) indicate a moderate presence of these support services. The response level categorisation (low, moderate, high) further highlights the uneven distribution of support services. Only 3 out of the 12 items were perceived as having a high level of support, while 5 items were considered moderate, and 4 items were rated as low-level support. The overall mean score for the ESS scale is 1.89 ± 0.524, which falls within the moderate response level. This suggests that, on average, the respondents perceive the availability and quality of ESS for students with behavioural issues as moderately adequate, with room for improvement in certain areas.

Table 9 presents the demographic data in the ESS scale in the survey on students with behavioural issues. Educational level and school type did not significantly differ, with a ($P > 0.05$). In contrast, the gender parameter showed a significant change, wherein females had a significantly higher mean score (2.15 ± 0.556) than males (1.68 ± 0.396), with a ($P < 0.001$). Years of experience also showed a significant difference in the ESS services score, wherein teachers with less than 5 years and more than 20 years of experience had a significantly higher score (2.19 ± 0.455 and 2.22 ± 0.752, respectively) than other teachers, with a ($P = 0.001$). Further, regarding the educational field, general education teachers had a significantly lower mean score (1.81 ± 0.537) than special education teachers (2.14 ± 0.322) and other teachers (2.27 ± 0.393), with a ($P = 0.009$).

Moreover, the educational stage showed a significant difference in the ESS score, wherein kindergarten teachers had a significantly higher mean score (2.30 ± 0.544) than primary (1.88 ± 0.538) and middle school teachers (1.72 ± 0.462), with a ($P = 0.004$). Enrollment in training courses also showed significant changes, wherein teachers who did not enrol in training courses had a significantly higher mean score (2.06 ± 0.520) than those who did (1.79 ± 0.503), with a ($P = 0.009$). Lastly, teachers who did not teach students with disabilities had a significantly higher mean score (2.06 ± 0.433) than those who did (1.84 ± 0.538), with a ($P = 0.044$).

School Facilities Scale

Table 10 shows the descriptive statistics of the SF scale in the survey on students with behavioural issues. It consists of 10 items that assess the availability and suitability of the school's physical environment and support services for students with behavioural challenges. The mean scores for the individual items range from 1.30 to 2.59, indicating a moderate to low level of perceived adequacy of the SF. Items such as "The school provides monitors to monitor all normal students and behavioural problems in the school canteen" (mean = 2.59 ± 0.714) and "Ease of entry and exit from school for students with behavioural problems" (mean = 2.19 ± 0.906) have relatively high mean scores, suggesting a relatively more robust presence of these SF.

Table 8: Table 8: Descriptive statistics of the Educational Support Services scale in the survey on students with behavioral issues

Items		*Disagree*	*Not sure*	*Agree*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Response level*
The school has a learning resource room for students with behavioral problems.	%	14.2	13.2	72.6	2.58	0.729	High
The school has student counseling services for students with behavioral problems and their families.	%	13.2	8.5	78.3	2.65	0.704	High
The school provides applied behavior analysis services for students with behavioral problems.	%	67.9	12.3	19.8	1.52	0.807	Low
The school has a behavioral training specialist for normal students and those with behavioral problems.	%	67.9	18.9	13.2	1.45	0.719	Low
The school has a psychologist for students with behavioral problems.	%	35.8	17.0	47.2	2.11	0.908	Moderate
Individual behavioral programs and plans for students with behavioral problems are implemented at school.	%	52.8	17.9	29.2	1.76	0.879	Moderate
The school provides behavioral and social support services for students with behavioral problems.	%	38.7	17.0	44.3	2.06	0.914	Moderate
Students with behavioral problems are trained in independence and life skills at school.	%	48.1	19.8	32.1	1.84	0.885	Moderate
The school has a cooperating teacher such as a special education teacher to collaborate with the general teacher to help with the teaching process for students with behavioral problems in the same class and during the teaching process.	%	72.6	16.0	11.3	1.39	0.684	Low
The school adopts the philosophy of inclusive education by providing services to multiple categories of students with behavioral and emotional disorders and others.	%	38.7	17.9	43.4	2.05	0.909	Moderate
The school provides adaptive services for the curriculum to suit students with behavioral problems.	%	65.1	15.1	19.8	1.55	0.806	Low
The school provides individualized educational services to its students with behavioral problems if the need arises.	%	56.6	19.8	23.6	1.67	0.836	Moderate
Total mean score of the scale					1.89	0.524	Moderate

Source: June,2024

Table 9: Demographic factors in educational support and school facilities services scale in the survey on students with disabilities

Variables	*Category*	*Educational support services*				*School facilities services*			
		Mean	*SD*	*Test value*	*p-value*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Test value*	*p-value*
	Female	2.15	0.556	T= 4.798	<0.001**	2.11	0.527	T= 1.843	0.068
	Male	1.68	0.396			1.90	0.672		
Educational Level	Bachelor	1.91	0.533	T=1.316	0.191	2.11	0.527	T= 1.208	0.230
	Master	1.71	0.453			1.90	0.672		
School Type	Government	1.86	0.527	T= 1.910	0.059	1.93	0.619	T= 6.907	<0.001**
	Private	2.18	0.402			2.56	0.207		
Years of Experience	less than 5	2.19	0.455	F= 5.214	0.001**	2.34	0.407	F= 4.564	0.002**
	5 to 10	1.79	0.447			1.94	0.652		
	10 to 15	1.69	0.509			1.79	0.628		
	15 to 20	1.68	0.581			1.76	0.667		
	more than 20	2.22	0.752			1.50	0.436		
Field of Education	Special Education Teacher	2.14	0.322	F= 4.931	0.009**	2.43	0.315	F= 4.974	0.009**
	General Teacher	1.81	0.537			1.90	0.636		
	Others	2.27	0.393			2.10	0.548		
Educational Stage	Kindergarten	2.30	0.544	F= 4.631	0.004**	2.27	0.502	F= 3.529	0.018*
	Primary	1.88	0.538			1.99	0.609		
	Medium	1.72	0.462			1.77	0.636		
	Secondary	1.83	0.276			2.31	0.547		
Enrollment in Special Education Training Courses	No	2.06	0.520	T= 2.651	0.009**	2.14	0.499	T= 2.088	0.039*
	Yes	1.79	0.503			1.91	0.666		
Teaching Students with Disabilities	No	2.06	0.433	T=2.078	0.044*	2.06	0.491	T= 0.665	0.510
	Yes	1.84	0.538			1.97	0.653		

Source: June,2024

Table 10: Descriptive statistics of the school facilities scale in the survey of students with behavioral issues

Items		*Disagree*	*Not sure*	*Agree*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Response level*
The presence of special classes for students with behavioral problems in school.	%	79.2	11.3	9.4	1.30	0.635	Low
Ease of entry and exit from school for students with behavioral problem	%	33.0	15.1	51.9	2.19	0.906	Moderate
Easy to move smoothly and safely for all students and students with behavioral problems between corridors and school facilities.	%	34.9	17.0	48.1	2.13	0.906	Moderate
Organize classes and seats appropriately for students with behavioral problems.	%	40.6	14.2	45.3	2.05	0.930	Moderate
The school has security cameras in the corridors to follow the behavior of students at school.	%	35.8	15.1	49.1	2.13	0.916	Moderate
The school provides universal access services of students with disabilities who have behavioral issues.	%	38.7	17.0	44.3	2.06	0.914	Moderate
Rehabilitation of all Integration classes in terms of equipment and seats in the school for students with behavioral problems.	%	43.4	18.9	37.7	1.94	0.903	Moderate
Provide all means of safety for students with behavioral problems at school.	%	42.5	16.0	41.5	1.99	0.921	Moderate
The school has recreational services such as rooms equipped for sports and cultural activities suitable for students with behavioral problems.	%	64.2	18.9	17.0	1.53	0.771	Moderate
The school provides monitors to monitor all normal students and behavioral problems in the school canteen.	%	13.2	14.2	72.6	2.59	0.714	Moderate
Total mean score of the scale					1.99	0.620	Moderate

Source: June, 2024

In contrast, items like, "The presence of special classes for students with behavioural problems in school" (mean = 1.30 ± 0.635) and "The school has recreational services such as rooms equipped for sports and cultural activities suitable for students with behavioural problems" (mean = 1.53 ± 0.771) had low mean scores, indicating a perceived lack of these specific SF.

The response level categorisation (low, moderate, high) further highlights the uneven distribution of SF. Only 1 out of the 10 items was perceived as having a low level of support, while the remaining 9 items were considered moderate. The overall mean score for the SF scale is 1.99 ± 0.620, which falls within the moderate response level. This suggests that, on average, the respondents perceived the availability and suitability of SF for students with behavioural issues as moderately adequate, with room for improvement in certain areas.

Table 9 presents demographic data on the SF scale in the survey on students with behavioural issues. The gender, educational level, and teaching students with disabilities did not make a significant difference in the total ESS scale score ($P > 0.05$). In contrast, school type showed a significant difference in the SF score, wherein private school teachers had a significantly higher score (2.56 ± 0.207) than government school teachers (1.93 ± 0.619), with a ($P < 0.001$). Years of experience also showed a significant difference, wherein teachers with less than 5 years had a significantly higher score (2.34 ± 0.407) than other teachers, with a ($P = 0.002$). Further, regarding the educational field, special education teachers had a significantly higher mean score (2.43 ± 0.315) than general teachers (1.90 ± 0.636), with a ($P = 0.009$).

Moreover, the educational stage showed a significant difference in the SF scale score, wherein kindergarten and secondary teachers had a significantly higher mean score level (2.27 ± 0.502 and 2.31 ± 0.547, respectively) than other teachers, with a ($P = 0.018$). Finally, enrollment in training courses also changed significantly, wherein teachers who did not enrol in training courses had a significantly higher mean score (2.14 ± 0.499) than those who did (1.91 ± 0.666), with a ($P = 0.039$).

DISCUSSION

A total of 106 teachers participated in this study, most of whom work in government schools. In general, the participants indicated that their schools provide many ESS and facilities to students with disabilities and behavioural problems. The sample included more male participants than female teachers. Recent changes in teaching practices involve having female teachers instruct both male and female students in early childhood education. This investigation indicated that participant responses were often influenced by the gender of the student, with male participants' responses typically reflecting their experiences with male students. Therefore, it is important to investigate how female teachers in early childhood education perceive and address behavioural problems in both male and female students.

Male participants were more prevalent than female participants in both surveys. None of the participants hold doctoral degrees, but most of them have a bachelor's degree, with some holding a master's degree. Additionally, there were fewer participants from private schools compared to those from government schools. The teachers from private schools reported a positive response, suggesting that their schools may offer more services, such as ESS and SF, for students with disabilities and behavioural problems. This does not imply that governmental schools do not provide these services to these students.

Many government schools provide appropriate services for these students. However, some schools may not have students with disabilities and behavioural problems altogether. Results indicated that teachers in the governmental schools generally responded positively, noting that their schools offer ESS and facilities for students with disabilities and behavioural issues. However, students with behavioural problems may not receive as many services as students with other disabilities. Participants from both private and governmental schools indicated that there are no specialised classrooms for these students. Alnoaim and Alharbi (2023) indicated that schools in Saudi still need to provide appropriate educational services for students with disabilities and their parents, such as having effective cooperation between schools, teachers, and students' parents. Schwab et al. (2024) indicated teachers are the primary element for provide effective educational support and services for students with disabilities and problem behaviors. They need to be prepared and trained well for each type of disabilities. Also, students

with problematic behaviours and other types of disabilities still need to receive appropriate education, especially in inclusive classrooms (Elder 2015; Justice et al. 2014; García-Carrión et al. 2018).

Several essential services must be provided, yet some schools do not offer them. These issues are discussed in the following two primary sections with one covering participants' responses regarding educational support and facilities services for students with disabilities, and the other addressing services for students with behavioural problems. Results of this study indicated that schools do not have special classrooms for students with behavioural and emotional disorders or students who exhibit high behavioural problems. These students can distract other students in inclusive classrooms, and it is necessary to provide appropriate educational support and services for all students with and without disabilities. Yahya (2018) and García-Carrión et al. (2018) also indicated students with disabilities, especially students with problem behaviours, need to receive intensive services and educational techniques in schools. Aalatawi (2023) also indicated that schools in Saudi still need to provide appropriate ESS and SF to students with disabilities and problem behaviours, such as appropriate classrooms and special teachers, especially for students with behavioural and emotional disorders.

Education Support Services for Students with Disabilities

The results indicated varying responses for the 12 types of ESS, including learning resource rooms, counselling, healthcare, psychological services, assistive technology, transportation, exam accommodations, special education staffing, and inclusive education philosophy. The study found that the most provided ESS in schools were learning resource rooms, student counselling, and technological equipment like projectors and smart boards for students with disabilities. However, other services, such as healthcare services and psychologists for students with disabilities, were not available in all schools.

Moreover, the results show significant gaps that need to be addressed by ensuring healthcare services and psychologists are available in schools. Also, transportation services are essential for students with disabilities, particularly those who need specialised buses to attend government schools. It is also crucial to recognise that general teachers may struggle to manage all students in their classrooms, especially when they have students both with and without disabilities. Further, when general teachers have students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms, they may need to get help from special education teachers to help them teach and support these students in inclusive classrooms.

School Facilities for Students with Disabilities

This survey included 11 items, most of which indicated that schools have many facilities and services for students with disabilities. The eight facilities provided include parking, entry/exit, corridors, classroom seating, rehabilitation of inclusive classrooms, safety, spaces, cafeteria access, and accessible restrooms. However, three facilities were not provided in most of the schools, namely electric elevators, universal access services, and recreational services such as rooms equipped for sports and cultural activities suitable for students with disabilities.

Educational Support Services for Students with Behavioural Problems

The survey on educational support for students with behavioural problems consisted of 12 items, all of which aimed to investigate the provision of ESS for students with behavioural problems. The facilities included a learning resource room, counselling services, rehabilitation services, training education services, a psychologist, individual behavioural programs and plans for students with behavioural problems, behavioural and social support services, training services for students with behavioural problems, a cooperating teacher, inclusive education, adaptive services for the curriculum, and individualised educational services. Overall, the results indicated that the schools provided most of these ESS for students with behavioural problems.

However, certain ESS indicated low provision in schools for students with behavioural problems. First, schools still need to provide analytical behavioural rehabilitation services. These students need these services to help them to manage their behaviours and not negatively affect their peers. Second, providing a behavioural training special-

ist for these students is also important. Third, general teachers cannot manage a class with more than 20 students, especially when they have students with behavioural problems. It is necessary to support these general teachers by providing them with a cooperating teacher. Fourth, schools must provide adaptive services for the curriculum to suit students with behavioural problems.

The results indicated three educational services as moderate provision, namely individual behavioural programs and plans, training services for students with behavioural problems in independence and life skills, and individualised educational services at their schools. As these services are not expensive, schools must consider implementing them to help these students address their needs. The results of the study are like other studies by Al-Farra (2017) and Moreno-Rodriguez et al. (2017) that with students there is a lack of professional training for teachers and providing appropriate educational services for students with disabilities and problem behaviours in schools.

Schools Facilities Services for Students with Behavioural Problems

The results indicate that most schools cater to the twelfth item related to facilities for students with behavioural problems. Only one item, that is, special classes for students with behavioural problems, indicated insufficient or zero provision. This situation must be improved, as these students may not get appropriate education in general classes, and it may be hard for general teachers as well to educate them. Ali et al. (2024) also indicated that students with problem behaviours need to have several SF services in their schools, such as special classrooms and teachers to help them behave safely.

In this study, two items indicated moderate provision for these students. These items are rehabilitation of all integration classes including students with behavioural problems, providing safety services, and recreational services as rooms equipped for sports and cultural activities for students with behavioural problems. These facilities and services are necessary not for only students with behavioural problems, but for other students to feel safe around students with behavioural problems. The participants indicated that the remaining facilities and services are provided for students with behavioural problems, such as smooth passage and safe entry and exit. Although these services may alleviate some of the teachers' duties, monitoring students with behavioural problems in general classes can be challenging, especially when only one teacher is responsible for a large number of students.

CONCLUSION

Students with disabilities and behavioural problems still need to receive educational support services and SF services as other students. The ESS still needs to provide students with disabilities healthcare services and psychologists, and SF services areelectric elevators, universal access services and recreational services. Also, the ESS still need for students with problem behaviours are analytical behavioural rehabilitation services, behavioural training specialists, and cooperating teachers, and school facilitates services are safety services, recreational services, and rehabilitation services. Students, including those with problem behaviorsand disabilities, are the future of their countries, and thus, they have the right to get an appropriate education to benefit their government and become productive citizens. Students with disabilities and behavioural problems must be educated in inclusive classrooms. These students can significantly benefit from schools that provide appropriate educational support services and SF in many skills, such as improvement in their social skills, interaction with their peers, development of their academic competence, and improvement in their learning progress. Therefore, schools must provide all students' needs, such as educational support services and SF services for their students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite its merits, this study has certain recommendations. First, future research should focus on each disability to find more information about each one. Second, future research should include teachers from several different regions in Saudi Arabia. Third, future research should include many teachers, including both those who work in private and those who work in government schools, to compare their responses, and this may provide more information on the differences between ESS and SF for students with disabilities

and behavioural problems available depending on the type of school. Fourth, future research in this area should focus more specifically on teachers who work with students with disabilities and behavioural problems, and this may provide deep information about how to overcome the said problem more effectively. Fifth, future research must involve a larger sample to enhance the generalizability of the findings. Sixth, future researchers should investigate the effectiveness of using cooperating teachers for teaching students with disabilities in inclusive settings. Seventh, future studies should investigate each disability in depth, such as hearing disabilities and autism. Eighth, future studies should use a quantitative method or mixed method that allows participants to add more information in detail. Finally, in Saudi Arabia, the education facilities are divided based on gender, and further, early childhood education in the country is provided by female teachers. Therefore, future studies should investigate the topic of concern by also taking the gender of the students into consideration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors extend their appreciation to the Deanship of Scientific Research at Northern Border University, Arar, KSA, for funding this research work through the project number NBU-FFR-2024-385-01.

REFERENCES

Aalatawi R 2023. Teachers' perceptions of the barriers to inclusive education of kindergarten students with disabilities in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research,* 22(2): 338-357.

Abu Al-Mawaheb M 2016. Quality standards for integration programs for people with disabilities in regular schools in the Al-Jawf region in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of the College of Education*, 32(1): 414-438.

Abu Alghayth KM, Catania N, Semon S, Lane D, Cranston Gingras A 2022. A brief history of special education policy on the inclusion of students with intellectual disabilities in Saudi Arabia. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 50(2): 178-187.

Ahmed A 2018. Perceptions of using assistive technology for students with disabilities in the classroom. *International Journal of Special Education*, 33(1): 129-139.

Al Awaji N, Aldhahi M, Akil S, Awad S, Mortada E 2021. Quality of life, needs and fears of mothers of children with disabilities in Saudi Arabia during the COVID-19 lockdown. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(21): 11442.

Aldabas R 2015. Special education in Saudi Arabia: History and areas for reform. *Creative Education*, 6(11): 1158-1167.

Al-Farra AS 2017. Difficulties in learning to read, diagnosing them, and methods for observing and treating them according to the opinions of stage teachers basic (1-6). *Journal of the Islamic University for Educational and Psychological Studies,* (2): 25.

Ali S, Jan SU, Elbatal I, Khan SU, Qazi A 2024. Emotional and behavioral problems among higher-grade students. *Journal of Disability Research*, 3(3): 20240023.

Al-Jaidi SA 2021. The degree of achieving the requirements of school accreditation standards in secondary schools in the city of Mukalla Light of Arab Education for the Gulf States.*Al-Andalus Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, (49): 157- 218.

Alnahdi GH, Saloviita T, Elhadi A 2019. Inclusive education in Saudi Arabia and Finland: pre service teachers' attitudes. *Support for Learning*, 34(1): 71-85.

Alnoaim J, Alharbi Y 2023. The involvement of parents of special needs students in schools in Saudi Arabia. *Inf Sci Lett*, 12(3): 1451-1456.

Al-Zboon EK, Alkhatib AJ, Alkhawaldeh MF 2015. Quality of life of teachers of children with disabilities. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2): 40-46.

Amstad M, Müller CM 2020. Students' problem behaviors as sources of teacher stress in special needs schools for individuals with intellectual disabilities. *Frontiers in Education,* 4(159). DOI:10.3389/feduc.2019.00159

Ball KF 2012. An investigation of the attitudes of school leaders toward the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education setting. Behavioral and emotional disorders in Omani children. *Arab Childhood Magazine,* (66): 37-71.

Block ME, Obrusnikova I 2007. Inclusion in physical education: A review of the literature from 1995-2005. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 24(2): 103.

Edwards TC, Patrick DL, Topolski TD 2003. Quality of life of adolescents with perceived disabilities. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 28(4): 233-241.

Edyburn DL 2004. Rethinking assistive technology. *Special Education Technology Practice*, 5(4): 16-23.

Elder BC 2015. Right to inclusive education for students with disabilities in Kenya. *Journal of International Special Needs Education*, 18(1): 18-28.

Francisco MP, Hartman M, Wang Y 2020. Inclusion and special education. *Education Sciences*, 10(9): 238.

Gagne CA, Finch WL, Myrick KJ, Davis LM 2018. Peer workers in the behavioral and integrated health workforce: Opportunities and future directions. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 54(6): S258-S266.

García-Carrión R, Molina Roldán S, Roca Campos E 2018. Interactive learning environments for the educational improvement of students with disabilities in special schools. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9: 1744.

Haimour AI, Abu-Hawwash RM 2012. Evaluating quality of life of parents having a child with disability. *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, 1(2): 37-43.

Hiebert-Murphy D, Trute B, Wright A 2011. Parents' definition of effective child disability support services: Implications for implementing family-centered practice. *Journal of Family Social Work*, 14(2): 144-158.

Justice LM, Logan JA, Lin TJ, Kaderavek JN 2014. Peer effects in early childhood education: testing the assumptions of special education inclusion. *Psychol Sci*, 25: 1722-1729.

Koh MS, Shin S 2017. Education of students with disabilities in the USA: Is inclusion the answer? *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 16(10): 1-17.

Koller D, Pouesard ML, Rummens JA 2018. Defining social inclusion for children with disabilities: A critical literature review. *Children & Society*, 32(1): 1-13.

Little E 2005. Secondary school teachers' perceptions of students' problem behaviours. *Educational Psychology*, 25(4): 369-377.

Moreno-Rodríguez R, Lopez JL, Carnicero JD, Garrote I, Sánchez S 2017. Teachers' perception on the inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular education classroom in Ecuador. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5(9): 45-53.

Sacks G, Kern L 2008. A comparison of quality of life variables for students with emotional and behavioral disorders and students without disabilities. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 17: 111-127.

Stiefel L, Shiferaw M, Schwartz AE, Gottfried M 2018. Who feels included in school? Examining feelings of inclusion among students with disabilities. *Educational Researcher*, 47(2): 105-120.

Sudairi ST, Abdullah A 2018. A proposed vision for preparing general education teachers in comprehensive education according to (Vision of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia 2030). *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 6(24 Part Two): 135-165.

Schwab S, Resch K, Alnahdi G 2024. Inclusion does not solely apply to students with disabilities: Pre-service teachers' attitudes towards inclusive schooling of all students. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 28(2): 214-230.

Theoharis G, Causton J 2014. Leading inclusive reform for students with disabilities: A school-and systemwide approach. *Theory Into Practice*, 53(2): 82-97.

Toulabi Z, Raoufi M, Allahpourashra Y 2013. Investigating the relationship between teacher s' happiness and the components of working life quality. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 84: 691-695.

Turkoglu D, Ozbey S, Buyuktanir A 2014. Analysis of the life satisfaction of preschool prospective teachers according to some variables. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116: 4175 -4181.

Yahya AB 2018. Behavioral problems in the primary stage: a field study in schools in the city of Laghouat. *Researcher Magazine in Humanities and Social Sciences,* (35): 1057-1066.

Paper received for publication in August, 2024
Paper accepted for publicaiton in April, 2026