



مجلة الجامعة الإسلامية للعلوم التربوية والاجتماعية

مجلة علمية دورية محكمة

تصدر أربع مرّات في العام خلال الأشهر
(مارس ، يونيو ، سبتمبر ، ديسمبر)

العدد	المجلد	الشهر	السنة
27	55	ربيع الأول / سبتمبر	2026 / 1448

معلومات الإيداع في مكتبة الملك فهد الوطنية

النسخة الورقية

رقم الإيداع: 1441/7131

تاريخ الإيداع: 1441/06/18

رقم ردمد : 1658-8509

النسخة الإلكترونية

رقم الإيداع: 1441/7129

تاريخ الإيداع: 1441/06/18

رقم ردمد : 1658-8495

معلومات وسائل التواصل

الموقع الإلكتروني للمجلة



<https://journals.iu.edu.sa/ESS>



ترسل البحوث على موقع المجلة

البريد الإلكتروني للمجلة



iujournal4@iu.edu.sa

حساب المجلة على منصة X



[@iujournal4](https://twitter.com/iujournal4)



مجلة الجامعة الإسلامية للعلوم التربوية والاجتماعية

● البحوث المنشورة في المجلة
تعبّر عن آراء الباحثين ولا تعبّر
بالضرورة عن رأي المجلة

● جميع حقوق الطبع محفوظة
للجامعة الإسلامية



قواعد وضوابط النشر في المجلة

أن يتسم البحث بالأصالة والجدية والابتكار بالإضافة المعرفية في التخصص.

لم يسبق للباحث نشر بحثه.

أن لا يكون مستلّاً من أطروحة الدكتوراه أو الماجستير سواء بنظام الرسالة أو المشروع البحثي أو المقررات.

أن يلتزم الباحث بالأمانة العلمية.

أن تراعى فيه منهجية البحث العلمي وقواعده.

أن لا تتجاوز نسبة الاقتباس في البحوث التربوية (25%)، وفي غيرها من التخصصات الاجتماعية لا تتجاوز (40%).

أن لا يتجاوز مجموع كلمات البحث (12000) كلمة بما في ذلك الملخصين العربي والإنجليزي وقائمة المراجع.

لا يحق للباحث إعادة نشر بحثه المقبول للنشر في المجلة إلا بعد إذن كتابي من رئيس هيئة تحرير المجلة.

أسلوب التوثيق المعتمد في المجلة هو نظام جمعية علم النفس الأمريكية (APA) الإصدار السابع، وفي الدراسات التاريخية نظام شيكاغو.

أن يشتمل البحث على : صفحة عنوان البحث، ومستخلص باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية، ومقدمة، وطلب البحث، وخاتمة تتضمن النتائج والتوصيات، وثبت المصادر والمراجع، والملاحق اللازمة مثل: أدوات البحث، والموافقات للتطبيق على العينات وغيرها؛ إن وجدت.

أن يلتزم الباحث بترجمة المصادر العربية إلى اللغة الإنجليزية.

يرسل الباحث بحثه عبر موقع المجلة، بصيغة (WORD) وبصيغة (PDF) مع موافقته بأن البحث لم يسبق نشره، وأنه غير مقدم للنشر، ولن يقدم للنشر في جهة أخرى حتى تنتهي إجراءات تحكيمه في المجلة.

لا يحق للباحث سحب البحث بعد قبوله للنشر.

المجلة لا تفرض رسوما للنشر.



الهيئة الاستشارية:

معالي أ.د : محمد بن عبدالله آل ناجي

مدير جامعة حفر الباطن سابقاً

معالي أ.د : سعيد بن عمر آل عمر

مدير جامعة الحدود الشمالية

معالي د : حسام بن عبدالوهاب زمان

رئيس هيئة تقويم التعليم والتدريب

أ. د : سليمان بن محمد البلوشي

عميد كلية التربية بجامعة السلطان قابوس

أ. د : خالد بن حامد الحازمي

أستاذ التربية الإسلامية بالجامعة الإسلامية سابقاً

أ. د : سعيد بن فالح المغامسي

أستاذ الإدارة التربوية بالجامعة الإسلامية

أ. د : عبدالله بن ناصر الوليعي

أستاذ الجغرافيا بجامعة الملك سعود





مجلة الجامعة الإسلامية
للعلوم التربوية والاجتماعية

هيئة التحرير:

رئيس التحرير:

أ.د. عبدالله بن عبدالمحسن الحربي

أستاذ المناهج وطرق التدريس بالجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة

مدير التحرير:

أ.د. محمد بن جزاء بجاد الحربي

أستاذ أصول التربية بالجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة

أعضاء التحرير:

معالي أ.د. راتب بن سلامة السعود

وزير التعليم العالي الأردني سابقا
وأستاذ السياسات والقيادة التربوية بالجامعة الأردنية

أ.د. محمد بن يوسف عفيفي

أستاذ أصول التربية بالجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة

أ.د. عبدالرحمن بن يوسف شاهين

أستاذ المناهج وطرق التدريس بالجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة

أ.د. خالد بن إبراهيم الدغيم

أستاذ المناهج وطرق التدريس بجامعة القصيم

أ.د. أحمد بن محمد شبيب حسن

أستاذ علم النفس التربوي بجامعة الأزهر بالقاهرة

أ.د. ياسر بن عايد السميري

أستاذ التربية الخاصة بالجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة

أ.د. محمد بن إبراهيم الدغيري

وكيل جامعة شقراء للدراسات العليا والبحث العلمي
وأستاذ الجغرافيا الاقتصادية بجامعة القصيم

أ.د. نور هيدايانتو سيتيو بوترو

أستاذ علم النفس التربوي بجامعة نيجيري يوجياكارتا بإندونيسيا

أ.د. منصور بن سعد فرغل

أستاذ الإدارة التربوية بالجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة

أ.د. إبراهيم بن علي الربيعي

أستاذ التاريخ الإسلامي بالجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة

د. رجاء بن عتيق المعيلي الحربي

أستاذ التاريخ الحديث والمعاصر المشارك بالجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة

د. عادل بن عيد الجهني

أستاذ أصول التربية المشارك بالجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة

د. رشدي بن مامو طاهر

أستاذ التربية الإسلامية المساعد بجامعة الأمير سونكلا بتايلاند

د. حاجي بن شيخ تونكارا

دكتورة في أصول التربية الإسلامية
والملحق القنصلي بقنصلية جامبيا في جدة

الإخراج والتنفيذ الفني:

أ. محمد بن سعد الشال

التنسيق العلمي:

أ. أحمد شفاق بن حامد

سكرتارية التحرير:

أ. سعيد يعقوب حسيني

أ. دابري عبد الكريم



فهرس المحتويات : *

م	عنوان البحث	الصفحة
1	تأثير تطبيقات الذكاء الاصطناعي في تعزيز الشمولية الأكاديمية والاجتماعية للطلبة ذوي الإعاقة بالجامعات السعودية في ضوء معايير الاعتماد الأكاديمي الوطني د. أحمد سعيد عبد العزيز إبراهيم صالح	12
2	برنامج تدريبي مقترح للقيادات الإدارية بجامعة الملك خالد لدعم ممارسات إدارة الموارد البشرية الخضر د. حنان محمد عبدالله آل هيض	61
3	Evaluating AI-Based UDL Interventions to Improve Accessibility and Engagement in Special Education د. أضواء بنت علي الأحمري	103
4	تطبيق التعليم المدمج المعزز بالتكنولوجيا الرقمية وعلاقته بتنمية مهارات الفهم العميق والتفكير الناقد لدى طلاب الجامعات الأهلية بجدة في ضوء التحول الرقمي لرؤية 2030 د. رنده أحمد محمد حريزي	124
5	مدى إسهام المرونة النفسية في التنبؤ بالتحفيز الذاتي الأكاديمي لدى طالبات الجامعة بمدينة الرياض: دراسة وصفية تنبؤية د. تهاني بنت إبراهيم بن سعيد الدوسري	170
6	مستوى متعة الحياة وعلاقتها ببعض سمات الشخصية الإيجابية لدى طلاب معهد تعليم اللغة العربية لغير الناطقين بها بالجامعة الإسلامية بالمدينة المنورة د. علي بن عبدالله السويهي	219
7	Barriers to Implementing Early Intervention Programs for Children with Learning Disabilities in Saudi Arabia from the Perspective of Teachers د. بلسم عبد الله الرشيد	263
8	تصورات المعلمين حول استخدام تطبيقات الذكاء الاصطناعي التوليدي في تعليم العلوم د. أمل بنت فالح العنزي	283
9	تطبيق إدارة المخاطر في المدارس الحكومية للبنات بمحافظة الخرج د. ندى بنت فهد بن إبراهيم الهزاع	336
10	العرفاء وأثرهم في الضبط الاجتماعي والبناء الإداري في العصر النبوي دراسة تاريخية حضارية د. بندر بن محمد الحجري	385

* ترتيب الأبحاث حسب تاريخ ورودها للمجلة مع مراعاة تنوع التخصصات



مجلة الجامعة الإسلامية
للعلوم التربوية والاجتماعية

معرفة
e-Marefa



المنظومة
ALMANDUMAH

Arcif
Analytics

**Barriers to Implementing Early Intervention
Programs for Children with Learning Disabilities in
Saudi Arabia from the Perspective of Teachers**

معوقات تطبيق برامج التدخل المبكر للأطفال ذوي صعوبات التعلم
في المملكة العربية السعودية من وجهة نظر المعلمات

إعداد

Dr. Balsam Abdullah Alrasheed

Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership and Policies
Department of Early Childhood - College of Education and
Human Development - Princess Nourah bint Abdulrahman
University

د. بلسم عبد الله الرشيد

أستاذ مساعد تخصص قيادات وسياسات تربوية

قسم طفولة مبكرة - كلية التربية والتنمية البشرية - جامعة الأميرة نورة

بنت عبد الرحمن

Email: babalrasheed@pnu.edu.sa

DOI: 10.36046/2162-000-027-027

تاريخ القبول: 2026/02/12 م

تاريخ التقديم: 2026/01/07 م

Abstract

This study describes the scope of obstacles to early intervention programs among children with learning disabilities in the kindergartens in Riyadh by surveying a representative group of teachers. Participants completed a questionnaire adapted from prior research that examines barriers across administrative, educational/training, technical/environmental and family/social domains. Descriptive statistics examined how teachers rated barriers in each domain and across demographic groups. Findings indicate that lack of specialist staff and unclear oversight were most frequently reported, followed by training shortfalls and family involvement issues; technical and environmental barriers appeared less often. This pattern suggests that targeted leadership engagement and standardized professional development could strengthen multiple domains of early intervention. The study's regional focus on Riyadh limits generalizability; future research should explore these findings in other regions and examine longitudinal effects of coordinated reforms on program effectiveness and child outcomes. As a whole, this work provides a contextual framework and meaningful perspective for policymakers and practitioners to prioritize interventions and to explore coordinated strategies that address interconnected barriers to early intervention delivery.

Keywords: Early Intervention Programs, Learning Disabilities, Barriers, Kindergartens.

المستخلص

تتناول الدراسة الحالية المعوقات التي تعترض برامج التدخل المبكر للأطفال ذوي صعوبات التعلم في رياض الأطفال بمدينة الرياض، وذلك عبر إجراء مسح على مجموعة ممثلة من المعلمات، أكملت المشاركات بالدراسة استبانة تم تبنيتها من الدراسات سابقة، تتناول المعوقات المتعلقة بالمجالات الإدارية، والتعليمية/التدريبية، والتقنية/البيئية، والأسرية/الاجتماعية، كما تم استخدام الإحصاء الوصفي لتحليل كيفية تقييم المعلمات لهذه المعوقات في كل مجال، وعبر مختلف المجموعات الديموغرافية، وتشير النتائج إلى أن "نقص الكوادر المتخصصة" و "عدم وضوح الإشراف" كانا الأكثر شيوعاً، تليهما "أوجه القصور في التدريب" و "القضايا المتعلقة بالمشاركة الأسرية"؛ بينما ظهرت المعوقات التقنية والبيئية بشكل أقل، ويشير هذا النمط إلى أن الانخراط القيادي الموجه والتطوير المهني المقنن يمكن أن يعززا مجالات متعددة للتدخل المبكر، ويُعد التركيز الإقليمي للدراسة على شمال الرياض حداً من حدود تعميم النتائج؛ لذا ينبغي أن تستكشف الأبحاث المستقبلية هذه النتائج في مناطق أخرى، وأن تدرس الآثار الطويلة للإصلاحات المنسقة على فاعلية البرامج ومخرجات الأطفال، بشكل عام، يقدم هذا العمل إطاراً سياقياً ومنظوراً ذا مغزى لصانعي السياسات التعليمية والممارسين، لتحديد أولويات التدخلات، ولاستكشاف استراتيجيات فعالة تتناول المعوقات المترابطة التي تعترض تقديم خدمات التدخل المبكر.

الكلمات المفتاحية: برامج التدخل المبكر، صعوبات التعلم، المعوقات/الحواجز، رياض الأطفال.

Introduction

The early intervention services for children with disabilities in Saudi Arabia remain scarce and underutilized (Abu el-fetouh, 2014). Home-based programs provide scheduling flexibility and family engagement but suffer from unrealistic expectations and limited specialist training (Bedaiwi et al., 2025). In kindergarten settings, inclusive practice is hampered by disability severity, absent special education aides, overcrowded classrooms and inadequate teacher preparation (Aalatawi, 2018).

The phrase specifically, learning disabilities (SLD) has existed in literature and practice for many years (Pesova et al., 2014). This study primarily focuses on a specific group of pupils who experience learning difficulties but are not mentally disabled, emotionally disturbed, or educationally neglected, and who exhibit normal vision, hearing, and speech. The most plausible explanation for their learning difficulties is the presence of cognitive impairments associated with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) (Pesova et al., 2014). It is estimated that learning disabilities (LDs) are present in nearly 8% of children overall (Stone et al., 2023). In the sample of 30 schools in East Lombok, there were 283 students having functional learning barriers which calculates to 10% of the 2763 students overall (Yunitasari et al., 2025). Within this population, cognitive disabilities and dyslexia predominantly present as disabilities (Yunitasari et al., 2025). Moreover, children with learning and developmental difficulties exhibit a high prevalence of emotional and behavioral problems (Gore et al., 2014). For example, 30 per cent of young children aged zero to three with learning disabilities experience behavior problems (Emerson and Einfeld, 2010).

In addressing these challenges, early intervention encourages schools not to wait for problems to arise but should try to identify the "at risk" students early (Pesova et al., 2014). Early intervention (EI) programs, as stated in Part C of those with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), can lead to improved developmental outcomes, reduced secondary behavioral issues, and increased families' confidence in caring for their child (Nordhov et al., 2012; Bailey et al., 2005). Rather than waiting for that challenge to be fully experienced, the rationale for early intervention is to reduce or prevent future distress or challenges that would predictably be experienced by individuals, families, and society (Gore et al., 2014). An effective model of early prevention and intervention is to sequence teaching into a continuum or levels, whereby it begins with effective practice that is focused on the whole class, and then meets the needs of the students who need additional support and monitoring the outcome and progress as part of the teaching process within the classroom (Pesova et al., 2014).

Regarding the special help given at the earliest levels, instruction with students in small, interactive groups is connected to higher accomplishment (Vaughn & Linan-Thompson, 2003). Direct, clear instruction is associated with higher levels of achievement (Vaughn & Linan-Thompson, 2003). Working in smaller groups provides for more time for interactions among teachers and students, as well as increased individualization of instruction, tasks, oversight by teachers, and feedback (Slavin, 1996). Specialized teaching, intervention, and supports are critical

components of high-quality inclusion as we seek to implement best practices to achieve the outcomes we want for children and their families (NPDCI, 2009). Examples of specialized instructional practices implemented in inclusive settings include naturalistic intervention approaches, such as embedded learning opportunities (Horn & Banerjee, 2009), activity-based interventions (Ozen & Ergenekon, 2011), and peer-mediated interventions (Robertson, Green, Alper, Schloss, & Kohler, 2003).

Implementation can be hindered by pressing challenges. Disruptions for teachers can be the result of a lack of teacher knowledge and training, limited school resources and facilities, teachers and school leaders having difficulty balancing the administrative responsibilities of their roles, a deficiency of care from parents and society members, and challenges associated with implementing an adaptive program (Yunitasari et al., 2025). Many schools lack adequate facilities to provide adequate instruction for students who learn differently (Yunitasari et al., 2025). Dickson & Bursuck note that time and supplies are insufficient to provide additional concentrated teaching that is often necessary for students with disabilities (Dickson & Bursuck, 1999). Systemic barriers established similar constraints in that professionals had limited or no time to optimize advocacy for children while exploring their emotional underpinnings, staff guidelines inconsistent from one institution to another or even from one institution to another, and staff confusions regarding the use of the protocol, instruments to be used or questions that arise when they are not directly involved or if a problem is not explicitly clear (Stone et al., 2023). There is still no universal access to inclusive programs for children monetarily from the birthday till age 5 with disabilities (Odom et al., 2011). Even when early intervention is the logical service approach, obtaining money, developing services and having guidance and research tends to be more of a challenge to obtain because of the funding bodies requesting products or birth to age 5 interventions not yet prevalent (Gore et al., 2014).

Regarding educators, they responded positively about being supported for inclusion, but only modestly (Lee et al., 2015). Regular classroom teachers reported feeling insufficiently prepared and inadequately trained to implement inclusive education (Equal Opportunities Commission, 2012). Yuen and Westwood (2002), as reported in Lee et al. (2015), found that many Hong Kong secondary school teachers perceived students with special educational needs as an additional burden and believed that they should not be included in their already demanding work environment. Teachers reported having difficulty in changing their teaching approaches (Yunitasari et al., 2025). Teachers informed that they were unable to modify instruction according to all student needs, particularly in terms of academic testing and assessment (Yunitasari et al., 2025). Barriers consisted of "misconceptions that may impede detection" and "time restrictions which limited professionals' opportunities to advocate for children" (Stone et al., 2023). Teachers who had received training in special education were more likely to report that they advocate for the inclusion of children with disabilities, including intellectual disabilities and impairments in vision, hearing, and speech and language (Lee et al., 2015).

Leadership engagement and professional development should strengthen an intervention-oriented culture (Shanawani, 2021) since family engagement requires expanded service centers and improved information dissemination to address low

parental awareness and access barriers (Alotaibi & Almalki, 2016). These factors indicate barriers at administrative, educational, technical and family/social levels, and this study examines teacher-reported obstacles to early intervention in Riyadh.

Administrative obstacles

Administrative obstacles examine scarce funding, staff shortages and inadequate training support. For example, in the Tabuk region, teacher surveys indicated weak program facilities as primary challenges in learning-disability programs (Al-Zoubi & Al-Nefaie, 2019). Because budget allocations rarely cover specialized staff or adaptive materials, schools must replace comprehensive services with minimal provision, thus limiting the scope of early intervention. Furthermore, when training workshops are infrequent or generic, teachers lack the practical skills needed to conduct tailored interventions, and untrained personnel struggle to meet diverse learner needs. Since administrative policies do not define clear benchmarks for staffing ratios or specialist qualifications, educators often juggle multiple roles, but without dedicated support, service quality remains inconsistent across regions and settings.

Educational obstacles

Educational obstacles provide concerns about curriculum suitability and teacher preparedness. Home-based interventions indicate limited specialist readiness (Bedaiwi et al., 2025) and kindergarten contexts reveal insufficient teacher training (Aalatawi, 2018). Similarly, when curricula are not adapted to accommodate varying disability profiles, teachers must conduct ad-hoc modifications, which can lead to uneven instructional quality. Although some programs suggest generic activity plans, educators report that these materials fail to address the nuances of dual exceptionalities, and therefore overlook gifted learners with concurrent disabilities (Al-Sumairi & Al-Jahni, 2019). Because pre-service training rarely emphasizes diagnostic techniques, teachers indicate low confidence in identifying and supporting diverse learner profiles, and this gap further impairs sustained program effectiveness.

Logistical obstacles

Technical and logistical obstacles examine resource availability and classroom infrastructure. Digital tools guided by Universal Design for Learning provide ways to mitigate these constraints (Rao et al., 2021). For example, calculators and educational games strengthen mathematical understanding among young learners (Long & Bouck, 2023), and computers and mobile devices facilitate memorization and participation (Husin, 2017). Digital pens support note-taking and formative assessment (Ok & Rao, 2017), but schools often lack reliable internet access or charging facilities, and outdated hardware must replace missing upgrades. Therefore, when classrooms do not provide secure storage or maintenance plans, even effective technologies remain underutilized. Similarly, without designated technical support staff, teachers spend valuable instructional time troubleshooting devices, and this logistical burden further constrains early intervention delivery.

Family and social obstacles

Family and social obstacles emphasize parental awareness and home-school collaboration constraints. Parents perceive limited service availability and underrecognize its importance for children with autism (Abu el-fetouh Ahmad Omar, 2014), and access barriers persist because of socioeconomic status, parental education and child age (Al-Shahri, 2018). Because families often lack clear information about program goals and procedures, they may hesitate to participate fully in intervention planning, and low engagement reinforces teachers' concerns about continuity of support. Furthermore, families suggest expanding service centers and increasing specialist staffing to improve information dissemination (Alotaibi & Almalki, 2016), but community outreach remains sporadic, and channels for feedback are undefined. Thus, without structured home-school partnerships, parental engagement remains a critical barrier to consistent early intervention outcomes.

Review of literature

The following review synthesizes international and local research concerning early intervention (EI) for learning disabilities. It organizes identified barriers into administrative, educational, technical, and social domains while contextualizing these challenges within the unique educational landscape of Saudi Arabia.

The characterization of functional learning disabilities in elementary education was explored through an action research approach involving 30 schools in Indonesia (Yunitasari et al., 2025). The objective of this study was to identify prevalent disability types and the obstacles to inclusive practice. Using questionnaires and focus group discussions with 120 teachers as the primary tools, the research revealed that approximately 10% of the 2,763 participating students presented with disabilities, most commonly dyslexia and cognitive disorders. Key results indicated that inclusion was hindered by administrative overload, rigid national curricula, and a lack of specialized facilities. The study recommended a transition toward functional-learning models and a strengthening of teacher competency through collaborative frameworks.

The systemic reasons behind the under-diagnosis of learning disabilities (LD) were investigated through a qualitative lens (Stone et al., 2023). This study aimed to identify the barriers professionals face during the screening and identification process. Data were gathered through interviews with 40 professionals, identifying two primary barrier categories: gaps in professional education and systemic hurdles. The findings highlighted significant misconceptions, such as the belief that a high IQ precludes an LD diagnosis, alongside systemic issues like time constraints and inconsistent institutional guidelines. The authors concluded that improving early identification rates requires more specific guidance and enhanced professional education for practitioners.

An update on the integration of developmental and intervention science provided a framework for modern EI practices (Guralnick, 2017). The objective was to examine how family interaction patterns serve as developmental pathways for children with delays. This review utilized the Developmental Systems Approach (DSA) as a theoretical tool to analyze child and family resources. The results emphasized that "sensitive responsiveness" during parent-child interactions is positively correlated with improved language outcomes. Recommendations focused on the necessity for

inclusive preschool settings to facilitate social competence by addressing risks at the child, family, and resource levels simultaneously.

The facilitators and barriers to inclusion were contrasted through a qualitative study of the "Step-up" program (Warren, 2017). The objective was to determine which factors contribute to a successful inclusive culture for parents and students. By comparing the experiences of 14 parents using a qualitative thematic analysis tool, the study identified five core themes. Key results suggested that exclusion from decision-making and negative beliefs about home literacy acted as barriers, while two-directional communication and shared philosophies acted as facilitators. The author recommended that schools focus on building a culture that values parents as partners to foster confidence in both the learner and the family.

Attitudes toward inclusion among 410 preschool educators in Hong Kong were examined to determine how professional training influences classroom environment (Lee et al., 2015). The objective was to measure acceptance levels across various disability types using a survey instrument. The results indicated that while teachers generally supported inclusion for students with learning difficulties, there was significant hesitation regarding children with ASD and ADHD. Notably, special education training increased acceptance for sensory and intellectual disabilities but had little impact on attitudes toward behavioral challenges. The study recommended focused, disability-specific training to address behavioral management within inclusive contexts.

The manifestation of emotional and behavioral risks in young children was the focus of an evidence-based review regarding early intervention expansion (Gore et al., 2014). The objective was to establish the necessity of support systems before "proof" of delay is fully evident. Utilizing the "caregiver system" model as a conceptual tool, the authors reported that behavioral problems often emerge as early as age three in children with learning disabilities. The findings suggested that negative behaviors are often reciprocal between child and caregiver. The researchers recommended the immediate implementation of role function-based behavioral interventions at the family level to mitigate the effects of poverty and adverse life experiences.

The lack of a universal definition for Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) and its impact on identification was analyzed in a comparative synthesis (Pesova et al., 2014). The objective was to advocate for early identification to prevent students from being incorrectly labeled. The authors compared traditional discrepancy models with the Responsiveness-to-Intervention (RTI) framework. The results favored the RTI model for its ability to link identification directly to student outcomes. Recommendations included the use of small interactive groups and direct instruction, emphasizing that special education must be intensive and well-defined to be effective.

Barriers to the follow-through of referrals for EI services were identified through interviews with parents and service employees (Jimenez et al., 2012). The objective was to understand why families often fail to complete the evaluation process. The study found that ineffective communication was the primary barrier, as parents often misinterpreted a pediatrician's lack of urgency as a sign that no delay existed. Logistical hurdles and fears regarding the involvement of protective services were

also significant factors. The authors recommended a clearer explanation of EI logistics and purpose to families to improve evaluation completion rates.

The evolution of early childhood inclusion definitions over a 25-year period was examined to assess progress in the field (Odom et al., 2011). The objective was to analyze the shift from simple placement-based definitions to those focused on "belonging" and "participation." By synthesizing data from national research centers, the authors identified collaboration and specialized instruction as the cornerstones of high-quality inclusion. The findings suggested that both disabled and typically developing peers benefit from inclusive settings, though universal access remains elusive. The study recommended the adoption of precise quality measures and the broader application of the RTI framework in early childhood.

While the existing literature provides a robust foundation for understanding early intervention, there are significant similarities and differences between these previous studies and the current research. Like the work of Yunitasari et al. (2025) and Stone et al. (2023), this study focuses on the identification of systemic and administrative barriers that prevent the effective delivery of services. It shares the perspective found in Lee et al. (2015) that teacher training and attitudes are pivotal to the success of inclusion. Furthermore, this study aligns with the recommendations of Odom et al. (2011) and Pesova et al. (2014) regarding the necessity of moving toward functional, response-based frameworks like RTI. A primary distinction lies in the geographic and policy-driven focus of this research. While previous studies have examined these issues in Indonesia, Hong Kong, or the West, this study specifically investigates the Riyadh, Saudi Arabia context in light of Vision 2030. Unlike Guralnick (2017) or Warren (2017), who focused heavily on home settings or parental perspectives, this study prioritizes the kindergarten teacher as the primary agent of identification. There is currently a gap in empirical data regarding how Saudi teachers translate high-level policy into classroom reality; this study addresses that gap by moving beyond theoretical mandates to investigate the day-to-day administrative and technical obstacles in Riyadh's kindergarten schools.

Research Questions

The central issue addressed in this research relates to the systemic gap between the theoretical expectation of early intervention (EI) frameworks being available and the practical inability of teachers to implement these frameworks into their classroom practice. Despite evidence suggesting that early intervention is efficacious, educators in Saudi Arabia are faced with an intricate set of administrative grey areas, pedagogic gaps in teacher training, and insufficient engagement of families. Consequently, this study identifies and prioritizes the administrative, educational, technical, and social barriers that prevent the successful delivery of services to children with learning disabilities.

- RQ1: What administrative obstacles, including financial support, staffing and training, do teachers report as most critical to early intervention implementation?
- RQ2: To what extent do educational and training limitations, for example specialized curricula and teacher skills, impede program effectiveness?

- RQ3: How do technical and environmental constraints, such as classroom design and assistive tools, affect program delivery?
- RQ4: Which family and social barriers, for instance parental engagement and home support, influence early intervention outcomes?

Study Objectives

To address the scope of this research, the study aims to achieve the following three objectives:

1. Identify and prioritize the primary administrative and educational obstacles, such as funding shortages and curriculum suitability, that hinder the implementation of early intervention programs.
2. Measure and evaluate the impact of technical and environmental constraints, including classroom infrastructure and the availability of assistive tools, on program delivery.
3. Examine the influence of family and social barriers, specifically parental awareness and home-school collaboration, on early intervention outcomes.

Study Purpose

The primary purpose of this study is to identify and prioritize the obstacles hindering the implementation of early intervention programs among children with learning disabilities in Saudi kindergartens as reported by teachers. By surveying practitioners, the research seeks to provide a data-driven ranking of the severity of barriers across administrative, educational, technical, and social domains.

Study Significance

The significance of this study lies in its potential to inform and support evidence-based reforms in the Saudi early childhood education sector. By hierarchically categorizing barriers, the findings offer the Ministry of Education and school administrators a strategic roadmap for resource allocation, shifting focus from generic funding to targeted administrative and training support. Furthermore, this research empowers practitioners by validating the specific logistical and social hurdles they face, ultimately facilitating the creation of more resilient, inclusive kindergarten environments that align with the national goals of Vision 2030.

Method

This study employed a descriptive survey methodology to systematically examine obstacles in early programs of intervention for children with learning disabilities. This approach allows the researcher to describe phenomena within their contextual framework while ensuring sampled populations reflect broader communities.

Participants

The target population comprised of kindergarten teachers in northern Riyadh (N $\approx$ 515) selected because of their direct role in implementing early intervention programs. Then, a sample size of 220 teachers was determined using statistical standards (95 % confidence level, 5 % margin of error, 50 % probability estimate) to ensure representativeness. Simple random sampling was applied to minimize

selection bias and enhance generalizability, although limitations persisted in accessing large populations and specific subgroups.

Actual respondents totaled 224 teachers, thus exceeding the target. Participants were predominantly female (202), held bachelor's degrees or higher (190), and represented diverse marital statuses (single: 101; married: 104) and administrative regions (Central: 121; Northern: 45).

Instrument Development & Validation

A questionnaire adapted from Al-Zoubi and Al-Nafie (2019) served as the primary instrument and measured four domains: educational/training obstacles, administrative obstacles, family interaction barriers and logistical obstacles (Al-Zoubi & Al-Nefae, 2019). To ensure the questionnaire aligned with the objectives of the current study, several updates were made considering the opinions of specialists in the field of education. First, interrogative phrasing was converted to declarative statements, for instance, "The administration does not provide sufficient financial support", to enhance precision. Next, vague terminology was replaced with field-specific language, such as "specialized training programs." Subsequently, content scope was expanded to address sensory tools, parental communication challenges and technology barriers. Finally, four dimensions were established. Content validity was ensured via expert review by Dr. Ruba Hamam and Dr. Nawal Al-Rubaian; their feedback prompted modifications that improved conceptual clarity and thematic coverage.

To attain the internal consistency of the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted with a random sample of 30 teachers not included in the main study group. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, which describes the relationship between the items within each domain. The findings elicited an overall reliability coefficient of (.89), which is above the .70 threshold that is considered as statistically acceptable and signifies high internal consistency. The Cronbach's Alpha values in the four domains of administrative, educational, technical, and family obstacles, were between (.81) and (.94). The data indicates that the instrument is reliable and provides justification for its use as a formal instrument for this study.

Ethical considerations were respected in the research process. The study commenced following formal approval from both the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the Standing Committee for Scientific Research at Princess Nourah University. Informed consent was obtained electronically from all participants prior to data collection. The first section of the electronic survey presented the study and stated the participation's voluntary nature and the choice to withdraw at any time. To ensure privacy, the survey was anonymous, collecting no personally identifiable information such as names or specific school identifiers, and participants were informed that all data is used exclusively for scientific research purposes.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data was collected electronically via Google Forms to document responses efficiently and to cover the geographic area. Meanwhile, WhatsApp groups facilitated survey dissemination, and introductory text emphasized confidentiality. The target sample (220) was achieved within the defined collection period.

Descriptive statistical measures such as frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations, were applied using SPSS because this method aligns with the research's aim to identify barriers rather than model predictions.

Results of the Study

This study analyzed responses from 224 kindergarten teachers in northern Riyadh concerning barriers to the implementation of early intervention programs for children with learning disabilities. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, arithmetic means, and standard deviations, were applied to four predefined domains of obstacles, with responses measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

The participant demographics (Table 1) indicate a predominantly female sample (202, 91.4 %) compared to male teachers (19, 8.6 %). Regarding academic qualifications, 190 participants (86.0 %) held bachelor's degrees or higher, whereas 23 teachers (10.4 %) had secondary education. Marital status results show 104 married participants (47.1 %) and 101 single participants (45.7 %). Geographically, 121 teachers (54.8 %) worked in the Central Region, 45 (20.4 %) in the Northern Region, 20 (9.0 %) in the Eastern Region, 18 (8.1 %) in the Southern Region and 17 (7.7 %) in the Western Region.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Study Participants (N = 221)

Demographics		Frequency	percentage	Absolute percentage	Cumulative percentage
Gender	male	19	8.6	8.6	8.6
	Female	202	91.4	91.4	100.0
Academic qualification	uneducated	4	1.8	1.8	1.8
	secondary	23	10.4	10.4	12.2
	middle	4	1.8	1.8	14.0
	Bachelor's degree or higher	190	86.0	86.0	100.0
marital status	Single	101	45.7	45.7	45.7
	Married	104	47.1	47.1	92.8
	widow	4	1.8	1.8	94.6
	divorced	12	5.4	5.4	100.0
Administrative region	Northern Region	45	20.4	20.4	20.4

	Eastern Region	20	9.0	9.0	29.4
	Southern region	18	8.1	8.1	37.6
	Western Region	17	7.7	7.7	45.2
	Central region	121	54.8	54.8	100.0

First, administrative obstacles (Table 2) reveal strongest agreement with lack of ongoing specialized training programs ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.82$), shortage of trained administrative staff ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.83$) and inadequate classroom preparation ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 1.04$). Agreement regarding unavailable technical equipment was moderate ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 1.15$).

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Administrative Obstacles to Early Intervention ($N = 221$)

Items of Administrative Obstacles	Mean	Standard deviation
Lack of adequate financial support from the administration to implement early intervention programs.	4.0407	0.83294
Lack of trained administrative staff in program management, which affects the quality of their implementation.	4.1674	0.82794
The administration's failure to provide ongoing and specialized training programs to support teachers in implementing early intervention programs.	4.1719	0.81872
Weak administrative guidance for teachers and the absence of professional support, which affects their ability to implement early intervention programs.	4.1448	0.82948
Lack of clarity in the communication dynamics between management and staff regarding early intervention program needs.	4.1176	0.84998
The administration's failure to respond effectively to the requirements for developing educational resources (such as updating educational tools or providing modern technologies).	4.1312	0.86127
The classrooms are not equipped, in terms of design and equipment, to meet the requirements of children with learning difficulties.	4.1312	1.03834

Lack of technical equipment and devices necessary to effectively implement early intervention programs (such as computers, smart boards, tablets).	3.8364	1.15492
---	--------	---------

Second, educational and training obstacles (Table 3) illustrate highest agreement on curriculum deficiencies such as lack of specialized curricula ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 1.03$) and shortage of educational tools ($M = 4.01$, $SD = 1.11$). Training-related items showed minimal agreement: insufficient teacher preparation ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.03$) and difficulty using modern technologies ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.11$).

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Educational and Training Obstacles ($N = 221$)

Items of Educational and training obstacles	Mean	Standard deviation
The lack of specialized and appropriate educational curricula for children with learning difficulties.	4.0543	1.02989
Lack of educational tools and technologies designed to meet the requirements of children with learning disabilities	4.0136	1.10979
Insufficient training for teachers to supply them with the skills needed to effectively implement early intervention programmes.	3.5660	1.02862
The lack of continuous and renewed instruction programs in the domain of early intervention, which limits opportunities for teacher development.	3.5660	1.13526
Lack of specialized training on strategies for dealing with children with learning difficulties in the classroom.	3.7170	1.16648
Difficulty in using modern educational technologies or strategies by teachers.	3.2453	1.10776
The lack of comprehensive training programs to help teachers develop their skills in effective communication and deal with children with learning difficulties.	3.6792	1.12273

Third, technical and logistical (Table 4) obstacles demonstrate that teachers documented unsuitable work environments lacking resources and training ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 1.02$) and psychologically unsupportive classroom settings ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 1.18$).

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Technical and Logistical Obstacles ($N = 221$)

Items of Technical and logistical obstacles	Mean	Standard deviation
Lack of a suitable work environment for teachers to implement early intervention programs (such as lack of resources, training, and increased job burdens).	4.0633	1.02050

Lack of an educational environment that provides psychological safety and behavioral support for children with learning difficulties.	3.8500	1.17829
--	--------	---------

Fourth, family and social obstacles (Table 5) report strongest concerns about parental unawareness of programs ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.96$), unsupportive home environments ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.92$) and communication challenges ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.99$). Parental refusal of intervention showed marginal agreement ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.07$).

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Family and Social Obstacles (N = 221)

Items of Family and social obstacles	Mean	Standard deviation
A lack of awareness among some parents regarding the existence of early intervention programs and their importance in improving child development.	4.1182	0.95785
Some parents do not cooperate with teachers' instructions and do not want to develop their children.	3.9773	1.06176
Some parents refuse early intervention because they believe it is unnecessary, which affects the child's benefit from educational programs.	3.9409	1.07319
Poor family participation in school activities such as meetings and events, which reduces communication with specialists about the child's needs.	4.0092	0.94548
Lack of a home environment equipped with the tools and time to support early intervention program activities.	4.0829	0.92423
There are challenges in communicating between families and the school about the child's educational needs.	4.0182	0.98835
Lack of professional development opportunities for teachers, such as workshops and educational supervision, which affects the quality of implementation of early intervention programs.	4.0000	1.02034

Finally, a comparison of overall obstacle domains (Table 6) shows administrative obstacles ranked highest ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.57$), followed by educational/training obstacles ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 0.89$), family/social obstacles ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.74$) and technical/logistical obstacles ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.97$).

Table 6

Summary of Means and Standard Deviations Across All Obstacle Dimensions (N = 221)

All dimensions	Mean	Standard deviation
Administrative obstacles	4.0949	0.56794
Educational and training obstacles	4.0304	0.88773
Technical and logistical obstacles	3.9593	0.96797
Family and social obstacles	4.0225	0.74363

Discussion

Overall, this study indicates that administrative obstacles pose the greatest barrier to early intervention ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.57$), followed closely by educational/training ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 0.89$), family/social ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.74$) and technical/logistical challenges ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.97$). The narrow margin between the first three domains suggests that strengthening administrative support could yield benefits across training access and family engagement.

The high consensus on administrative barriers indicates consistent recognition of issues such as insufficient specialist staff and weak supervision. This finding corresponds with reports that kindergartens lack dedicated early intervention coordinators and clear management protocols ([Abu el-fetouh Ahmad Omar, 2014](#)). In light of this, leadership engagement and systematic oversight must extend across schools to improve program consistency and accountability ([Shanawani, 2021](#)). Within the educational/training domain, teachers most strongly agreed that ongoing specialist training is absent ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.82$). The variability in responses ($SD = 0.89$) implies uneven access to professional development across schools and reflects gaps in teacher preparation identified by [Al-Zoubi & Al-Nefaie \(2019\)](#). Because Vision 2030 emphasizes educator capacity building, rolling out standardized in-service training and certification in early intervention techniques is a plausible next step.

Family and social obstacles demonstrate substantial concerns about parental unawareness of services ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.96$) and unsupportive home environments ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.92$). These findings indicate low parental engagement noted by [Abu el-fetouh Ahmad Omar \(2014\)](#) and link socioeconomic factors to access barriers ([Al-Shahri, 2018](#)). Therefore, culturally tailored outreach campaigns and partnerships with community centers could improve home-school collaboration. Although technical/environmental obstacles ranked lowest, they remain significant: inadequate classroom resources ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 1.02$) and unsupportive learning environments ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 1.18$). The high variability in this domain suggests disparities in resource allocation. Studies show that digital tools for learning can enhance engagement and outcomes when used effectively ([Long & Bouck, 2023](#); [Rao et al., 2021](#)), thus targeted investment in assistive technologies and hands-on workshops for teachers could mitigate these gaps.

These findings reveal that isolated initiatives, whether focused solely on training, family outreach or technology, are unlikely to resolve the multifaceted barriers teachers face. First, empowering kindergarten leaders with clear mandates and resources is necessary to oversee early intervention. Then, implementing regular,

standardized training modules for educators and administrators will address pedagogical and technical competencies. Next, launching outreach campaigns to raise parental awareness and foster home–school collaboration can strengthen family engagement. Finally, allocating dedicated funding for specialized curricula, educational tools and assistive technologies is essential to ensure equitable resource distribution across regions.

Limitations of the Study

This study's descriptive survey design and focus on northern Riyadh impose limitations on its generalizability. Future research should propose mixed-method approaches, including multiple regions and track the impact of implemented reforms over time. Longitudinal studies would explore how integrated interventions influence early intervention effectiveness and child outcomes across Saudi Arabia.

Conclusion

In summary, this study defined four barrier domains such as administrative, educational/training, technical/environmental and family/social based on a literature review and teacher reports. It described a descriptive survey of 224 Riyadh kindergarten teachers, documented these obstacles with a validated questionnaire and applied descriptive statistics to examine their severity. Results showed that administrative barriers topped concerns, with educational/training and family/social challenges close behind. Technical and environmental obstacles varied markedly between schools. In light of these findings, the first step may be to bolster administrative support and offer regular professional development for both teachers and leaders. Similarly, reaching parents through culturally relevant outreach and providing targeted technological resources could strengthen home–school collaboration and address equity gaps. While this study focuses on northern Riyadh, its insights can guide policymakers and practitioners in setting clear priorities. Future research could combine surveys with interviews across multiple regions to explore how coordinated reforms affect program delivery and child outcomes over time. On the whole, collaboration among education authorities, school leaders and community stakeholders will be necessary to address these interrelated barriers and advance early intervention for children with learning disabilities in Saudi Arabia.

Practical Implications

- The results of the present investigation provide important guidance for policymakers, school leadership, and teachers to put the Vision 2030 ambitions for inclusivity into daily practices.
- For Policymakers (Ministry of Education): The predominance of administrative barriers implies that money alone will not suffice without the structural change. Policies must explicitly require a "Coordination of Early Intervention" to be appointed in every kindergarten cluster to close the gap between the administration and the teachers in classrooms. Additionally, policies should establish a standardized teacher-to-student ratio that recognizes the intensive needs of children with learning disabilities to reduce teacher burnout.

- For School Leaders: Principals overloaded with school management responsibilities need to provide specialized training rather than general professional development. Principals could provide workshops with a Response to Intervention (RTI) focus. The workshops would provide practical screening tools for teachers and help teachers determine "at-risk" children earlier in the school year without relying on a formal medical diagnosis to define a "learning disability".
- For Universities: Higher education leaders need to evaluate their core early education teacher preparation course to ensure a mandated practicum in special education is included as part of their program. Placing diagnostic skills, as well as differentiated instruction strategies, into the education of pre-service teachers will eliminate some of the "educational barriers" identified in this study.
- To Enhance Community Engagement: Schools should create "Parent Partnership" programs, based on the considerable family barriers noted. These programs should extend beyond traditional meetings to include educational workshops for families on the identification of learning disabilities, reducing stigma around early intervention, and fostering a base of home-school relationships.

Suggestions for Future Research

With these findings and study limitations in mind, it is recommended that researchers investigate the following research directions:

- A Comparative Study of Early Intervention Barriers: Urban vs Rural Kindergartens in Saudi Arabia.
- Parental Experiences with Early Intervention: Examining Awareness and Barriers to Family-Human Relationships with Schools.
- The Influence of Targeted Training: Measuring Improvements of Noticing Learning Disabilities in Teachers.
- School Leadership and inclusion: The principal's role regarding administrative barriers to early intervention.
- Assistive Technology in Saudi Kindergartens: Availability, Use, and Impact among Students with Learning Disabilities.
- Longitudinal Effects of Early Intervention: Tracing Academic Outcomes from Kindergarten to Elementary School for "At Risk" Children.

The "Early Intervention Coordinator": A Case Study of Administrative Effectiveness in inclusive schools.

References

- Aalatawi, R. (2018). Teachers' perceptions of the barriers to inclusive education of kindergarten students with disabilities in Saudi Arabia. *XJournals*. <https://xjournals.com/collections/articles/Article?qt=jh/gJJCQfwN3CKyuRaLXvfP5Tv n6GZeqJFY2BGY2hrY=>
- Abu El-Fetouh Ahmad Omar, D. M. (2014). Early intervention services as perceived by parents of children with autism in Egypt and Saudi Arabia. *The International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, 3(1), 238–249.
- Alotaibi, F., & Almalki, N. (2016). Parents' perceptions of early interventions and related services for children with autism spectrum disorder in Saudi Arabia. *International Education Studies*, 9(10), 128–136. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v9n10p128>
- Bailey, D. B., Jr., Hebbeler, K., Spiker, D., Scarborough, A., Mallik, S., & Nelson, L. (2005). Thirty-six-month outcomes for families of children who have disabilities and participated in early intervention. *Pediatrics*, 116(6), 1346–1352. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2004-1239>
- Bedaiwi, R. M., Bagadood, N. H., & Sulaimani, M. F. (2025). Home-based early intervention services for children with disabilities in Saudi Arabia: Opportunities and challenges from a specialists perspective. *Early Years*, 45(1), 90–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2024.2310579>
- Dickson, S. V., & Bursuck, W. D. (1999). Implementing a model for preventing reading failure: A report from the field. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 14(4), 191–202.
- Emerson, E., & Einfeld, S. (2010). Emotional and behavioural difficulties in young children with and without developmental delay: A bi-national perspective. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51(5), 583–593. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2009.02179.x>
- Equal Opportunities Commission. (2012). *Equal opportunities awareness survey 2012*.
- Gore, N., Hastings, R., & Brady, S. (2014). Early intervention for children with learning disabilities: Making use of what we know. *Tizard Learning Disability Review*, 19(4), 181–189. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLDR-02-2014-0005>
- Guralnick, M. J. (2017). Early intervention for children with intellectual disabilities: An update. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 30(2), 211–229. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12233>
- Horn, E., & Banerjee, R. (2009). Understanding curriculum modifications and embedded learning opportunities in the context of supporting all children's success. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 40(4), 406–415. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2009/08-0026](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2009/08-0026)
- Husin, M. R. (2017). Exploring the use of digital devices among pupils with learning disabilities. *The International Journal of Multimedia & Its Applications*, 9(4/5/6), 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.5121/ijma.2017.9607>
- Jimenez, M. E., Barg, F. K., Guevara, J. P., Gerdes, M., & Fiks, A. G. (2012). Barriers to evaluation for early intervention services: Parent and early intervention employee perspectives. *Academic Pediatrics*, 12(6), 551–557. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2012.06.002>
- Lee, F. L. M., Yeung, A. S., Tracey, D., & Barker, K. (2015). Inclusion of children with special needs in early childhood education: What teacher characteristics matter. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 35(2), 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121414566014>

- Long, H. M., & Bouck, E. C. (2023). Calculators and online games: Supporting students with learning disabilities in mathematics. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 58(4), 280–286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512221093787>
- National Professional Development Center on Inclusion. (2009). *Research synthesis points on early childhood inclusion*. FPG Child Development Institute, University of North Carolina. <http://community.fpg.unc.edu/npdci>
- Nordhov, S. M., Ronning, J. A., Ulvund, S. E., Dahl, L. B., & Kaarsen, P. I. (2012). Early intervention improves behavioral outcomes for preterm infants: Randomized controlled trial. *Pediatrics*, 129(1), e9–e16. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2011-0247>
- Odom, S. L., Buysse, V., & Soukakou, E. (2011). Inclusion for young children with disabilities: A quarter century of research perspectives. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 33(4), 344–356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053815111430094>
- Ok, M. W., & Rao, K. (2017). Using a digital pen to support secondary students with learning disabilities. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 53(1), 36–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451217692567>
- Ozen, A., & Ergenekon, Y. (2011). Activity-based intervention practices in special education. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 11(1), 359–362.
- Pesova, B., Sivevska, D., & Runceva, J. (2014). Early intervention and prevention of students with specific learning disabilities. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 149, 701–708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.08.274>
- Rao, K., Torres, C., & Smith, S. J. (2021). Digital tools and UDL-based instructional strategies to support students with disabilities online. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 36(2), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162643421998327>
- Robertson, J., Green, K., Alper, S., Schloss, P. J., & Kohler, F. (2003). Using peer-mediated intervention to facilitate children's participation in inclusive child care activities. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 26(2), 182–197.
- Shanawani, H. A. (2021). Activating the role of kindergartens' leaders in Saudi Arabia to establish the early intervention culture in the light of international experiences. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 34(1–3), 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.31901/24566322.2021/34.1-3.1204>
- Slavin, R. E. (1996). Preventing learning disabilities. *Educational Leadership*, 53(5), 4–7.
- Stone, L. A., Benoit, L., Martin, A., & Hafler, J. (2023). Barriers to identifying learning disabilities: A qualitative study of clinicians and educators. *Academic Pediatrics*, 23(6), 1166–1174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2023.01.011>
- Vaughn, S., & Linan-Thompson, S. (2003). What is special about special education for students with learning disabilities? *The Journal of Special Education*, 37(3), 140–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224669030370030301>
- Warren, S. R. (2017). Hidden voices: Parents' perspectives on the barriers to and facilitators of inclusion on their preschool children with disabilities. In *Working with families for inclusive education* (International Perspectives on Inclusive Education, Vol. 10, pp. 151–174). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-363620170000010009>
- Yuen, M., & Westwood, P. (2002). Teachers' attitudes toward integration: Validation of a Chinese version of the Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Scale (ATMS). *Psychologia*, 45(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.2117/psysoc.2002.1>
- Yunitasari, D., Lasmawan, I. W., Arnyana, I. B. P., & Ardana, I. M. (2025). Breaking barriers: Advancing inclusive education through early identification of learning challenges. *Nazhruna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 8(1), 139–153. <https://doi.org/10.31538/nzh.v8i1.6214>

Arabic References:

- الزعيبي، س.، والنفيعي، ر. (2019). التحديات التي تواجه برنامج صعوبات التعلم في منطقة تبوك بالمملكة العربية السعودية. *مجلة دراسات: العلوم التربوية*، 46(1).
- السميري، ي.، والجهني، س. (2019). المشكلات التي تواجه معلمي صعوبات التعلم في تحديد الطلاب الموهوبين ذوي صعوبات التعلم في مدينة ينبع. *المجلة التربوية بكلية التربية بسوهاج*.
<https://doi.org/10.21608/edusohag.2019.37723>
- الشهري، ك. أ. (2018). معوقات خدمات التدخل المبكر للأطفال ذوي الإعاقة من وجهة نظر أولياء الأمور. *مجلة التربية الخاصة والتأهيل*، 6(25)، 125-159. <https://doi.org/10.21608/sero.2018.91491>

Romanization of the Arabic References:

- Al-Shahri, K. A. (2018). Obstacles to early intervention services for children with disabilities from the parents' point of view. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 6(25, second part), 125-159. <https://doi.org/10.21608/sero.2018.91491>
- Al-Sumairi, Y., & Al-Jahni, S. (2019). Problems facing learning disabilities teachers in identifying gifted students with learning disabilities in Yanbu city. *Educational Journal of the Faculty of Education in Sohag*. <https://doi.org/10.21608/edusohag.2019.37723>
- Al-Zoubi, S., & Al-Nefaie, R. (2019). Challenges facing the learning disabilities program in Tabuk region in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Dirasat: Educational Sciences*, 46(1).





مجلة الجامعة الإسلامية
للعلوم التربوية والاجتماعية

معرفة
e-Marefa



المنظومة
ALMANDUMAH

Arcif
Analytics



KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF MADINAH



Islamic University Journal For
Educational and Social Sciences

Islamic University Journal For Educational and Social Sciences

Refereed periodical scientific journal



Published four times a year in:
(March, June, September and December)

Issue

Volume

Month

Year

27

55

August / Rabi al-Awwal

2026 / 1448