Higher Education Faculty Staff Members’ Knowledge of Providing Accommodations for Students with High Incidence Disabilities in Saudi Arabia
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Abstract

The study's goal was to find out how well-versed Saudi Arabia's higher faculty members were in making accommodations for the country's large population of disabled pupils. The research also assessed the effect of gender, academic level, university locale, kind, lodging services, and training on the knowledge of higher faculty members. Two hundred forty-seven faculty members, including those from higher education, completed the poll. A cross-sectional survey methodology used multiple linear regression analysis to examine the data. The findings indicated that higher education faculty members generally have a proper understanding of providing accommodations for students with high incidence disabilities in Saudi Arabia. Higher education connected faculty members' knowledge to available accommodations, experience, training, and geography. The data also showed that faculty members’ awareness of making accommodations for Saudi Arabian students with a high incidence of disabilities was unrelated to gender, academic level, university region, or institution type.
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1. Introduction

The number of students with disabilities in higher education has risen in recent years throughout the rules governing disabilities in higher education. In higher education, it can be difficult to uphold the highest standards while still abiding by state legislation and providing these students with fair chances (Trainor et al., 2016). Students with impairments were long denied the opportunity to pursue higher education anywhere around the globe. According to recent legislation, they can now enroll and pursue opportunities just like their counterparts without disabilities. According to research, more than 2.5 million students enrolling in higher education declared having a disability (Synder & Dillow, 2005).

Most of the evidence points to two primary factors responsible for the rise in the number of students with disabilities enrolled in higher education (Prater, 2016). Implementing laws requiring children with disabilities to access education in public schools is one of the contributing elements. For kids with disabilities to obtain the best education possible, the Disabilities Education Act (1991) and the Education Act (1996) mandate that schools identify them. Direct access to free public education for students with impairments is necessary (Sabornie et al., 2005). According to research, international support for students with disabilities is growing, and other nations are modeling their policies and regulations after those developed in the United States (Agrawal et al., 2019). Many countries have studied various facets of impaired students' access to higher education. There hasn't been a recent study that examines the learning and teaching of such issues from an interdisciplinary and comparative standpoint.

In addition to students, some university academic members and staff members have claimed to have disabilities and to have encountered prejudice (Sabornie et al., 2006). Federal anti-discrimination rules are in place to safeguard the 43 million disabled American employees (Bishop & Jones, 1993). In institutions and on campuses, it is possible to determine if someone has a disability using reasonable data. Therefore, it is likely that there are fewer professors and staff employees with disabilities in higher education than in American society due to qualification constraints and historical discrimination. In many instances, the obligations of higher education
positions are not specific to those found in those institutions. It is difficult to discover the faculty members' disability rate (Sabornie et al., 2005). Due to tenure, academic retention rates are a little higher than those of other professions worldwide. It's also possible that faculty members were not disabled when they were hired but later developed disabilities and still working as professors.

Both students and faculty with disabilities are protected by laws (Bishop & Jones, 1993). Learning institutions are required by law to provide accommodations for known disabilities (Sabornie et al., 2006). Institutions are also prohibited from altering their standards or curriculum to accommodate individuals with disabilities. As a result, it has fallen on the students to make sure they can disclose more about their disability and ask for more accommodations. However, educational institutions are not responsible for any prejudice, especially regarding students who are unaware of or do not comprehend their disability (Cook et al., 2006).

2. Literature Review

2.1 High Incident Disability Definition and Type

For teaching kids who have been chosen to have high incidences of disabilities, the cross-sectional approach has long been recognized as the most effective strategy (Rothstein, 2004). Learning difficulties, emotional issues, and modest intellectual disabilities are all prevalent disabilities. There are typically more parallels than differences between their behavioral and academic traits (Marshak et al., 2010). The features of students with high-incidence abilities have been the subject of several studies. The findings imply that students with a high incidence of disabilities—specifically, behavioral, learning, and intellectual—have similar social profiles. They do, however, appear to differ in their cognitive and behavioral processes. (Sabornie et al., 2005)

Teachers, researchers, school professionals, and psychologists are all interested in the numerous similarities and distinctions of students with high incidence impairments.

Individuals with high-incidence disabilities are often able to interact with their peers and achieve academic growth (Sabornie et al., 2006). When provided with the cross-categorical special education or classes that offer general education, such students share the teachers, behavioral programs, and the academic curriculum. Researchers have suggested that students with high incident-capabilities should be categorized according to their behavioral characteristics, but not their disability level (Becker & Palladino, 2016). Further studies also indicated that students with disabilities are likely to have similarities in their behavioral capabilities and academic instruction. When comparing students with disabilities, characteristics such as social adjustment, underachievement, and personality are given an upper hand (Lombardi & Lalor, 2017). Grouping disability labels based on instructions has not been found to be an effective process. Therefore, recommendations, such as using the noncategorical model, have been identified as the best, as it is driven by social deficits and academic behavior. Interests based on identifying high incidence disability, programming, and placement have reduced in recent times.

2.2 Accommodation Definitions and Type or Model

Colleges should ensure that they don’t discriminate against students based on their disabilities. However, for students to have reasonable and good accommodations, they should meet the academic standards that have been set (Wolanin & Steele, 2004). Any accommodations that would change the routine and the programs of the school or impose a fee higher than what is expected should not be accepted at all. For students to receive accommodations, they must take the initiative to ensure that they request the accommodation and disclose their disabilities. Moreover, such students should also ensure that they document their disabilities (Sabornie et al., 2005). Accommodations should provide students with equal opportunities and all the benefits of higher education. For individual students with disabilities, accommodations are tailored and could include extended examinations and designated parking spaces.

The implementation of effective accommodations for students with disabilities is usually affected by academic cultures and faculty attitudes. Faculty may have a difficult time relating to students with disabilities (Trainor et al., 2016). Faculty are also often unaware of their responsibilities, and therefore they cannot be relied on to offer good accommodations for students with disabilities. Faculty sometimes question the legitimacy of students with disabilities and, therefore, do not offer the institutions available accommodations (Sabornie et al., 2005). However, on some campuses, skills on how to handle students with disabilities are provided for both the graduate and the faculty students. Model project assistance and technical and professional development is sometimes offered to ensure that the students with disabilities get quality accommodations and relevant academic training in higher education.

This is important as individuals with disabilities can occupy more than 40% of the population on college
campuses. Recently, the removal of architectural barriers, such as the provision of curbs and ramps, has been some of the steps put forward to ensure that students with disabilities are well catered for and are not discriminated against. Most students with disabilities have lower incomes, as compared to the other students without disabilities. However, the students usually rely on institutional programmers and the federal states to receive adequate income and feel well accommodated (Sabornie et al., 2006). However, these individuals can still have financial problems, as the grants are often not equivalent to income earned by their peers without disabilities.

The inadequate financial aid decreases available educational opportunities, as well as the provision of necessary accommodations. It is also difficult for students with disabilities to afford the needs associated with academic life and social well-being (Sabornie et al., 2005). It is often difficult for them to get additional means of income. Therefore, they cannot live like their counterparts at the universities who don’t have disabilities. Students with disabilities also need to be allocated more time for self-care and to complete their academic tasks. Because students with disabilities often take a long time to complete their studies, their university costs are often higher than their peers without disabilities.

2.3 Faculty Member’s Knowledge of Disability Laws and Accommodations

The university faculty must make sure that students with disabilities can obtain a good and high-quality higher education. However, the faculty’s capacity to provide high-quality services to students with disabilities is influenced by various factors (Prater, 2016). One aspect that affects the faculty’s propensity to make reasonable concessions is their values. The beliefs also influence the ability of students with disabilities to have the best institutional support and knowledge of their legal responsibilities. Training programs have been implemented to ensure that the faculty’s personal beliefs improve, that accommodations are provided, and that the students with disabilities are provided with the best support they deserve.

Many positive personal ideas toward students with disabilities have resulted from teaching students with disabilities (Sabornie et al., 2006). Faculty and community members who have worked with the students with disabilities often have learned a lot from their experiences, and they are often the best at understanding and assisting these individuals. These experienced faculty members also stated they incorporate diversity into their coursework. Students with disabilities also often assist the tutors in finding the most ideal teaching methodologies to teach them (Sabornie et al., 2006).

There have been a growing number of students with disabilities, especially learning disabilities, in the postsecondary institutions (Konur, 2006). Most of these students encounter many problems in and out of the classroom. To improve the quality of the learning process quality, the faculty members have increased their understanding of students with learning disabilities. This includes involvement with practical techniques, information, and techniques to improve their learning process (Trainor et al., 2016). The process has also helped them to be able to relate well with other college students and makes them feel accommodated at all costs.

There has been an increase in faculty development opportunities to meet the needs of the diverse student population (Prater, 2016). During the training process, effective ways to interact and teach students with disabilities are adequately addressed. The main challenge that students with disabilities face in postsecondary schools is the faculty’s lack of sufficient support (Zhang et al., 2010). However, some postsecondary schools are working hard to ensure that the faculty is provided with enough resources and knowledge to work with students with disabilities (Sabornie et al., 2005). When there is a good relationship between the faculty and the students with disabilities, there is a tendency to have a lot of success in handling students with disabilities (Sabornie et al., 2006). This can also improve faculty member’s attitudes toward individuals with disabilities. The faculty member’s attitudes towards the characteristics and needs of the students with disabilities often hinder the accommodation requests, to which the students with disabilities are entitled to. However, many faculty members lack the necessary skills and knowledge to provide reasonable and appropriate accommodations. Studies have also shown that faculty lacks the appropriate knowledge about the federal laws legal obligations concerning students with disabilities (Sabornie et al., 2005). The number of students with disabilities is increasing day by day, and therefore there is a greater demand to provide support for such students. There is also a need to increase the faculty’s knowledge and skills to improve their understanding of the students with disabilities.

The institutional support and the knowledge of legal responsibilities directly affect the accommodation of the students with disabilities (Trainor et al., 2016). Personal beliefs also play a greater role in providing accommodations to students in higher education. The personal beliefs entail the accommodations needs, course integrity, and the academic freedom of the college instructor.
2.4 Influence of Variables on Higher Faculty Members’ Knowledge of Providing Accommodations

It was crucial to evaluate the existing research on the effects of gender, academic standing, university region, accommodation services, experience, and training on higher faculty members’ understanding of offering accommodations to students with high incidence disabilities. The majority of the statistics currently available concern general disabilities rather than disabilities with a high frequency. As a result, the current research will add to our understanding of high-incidence disabilities and contribute new knowledge to the field of special education.

Previous findings indicated gender did statistically significantly affected faculty member’s knowledge of the special education legal framework and intent to provide accommodations (Papadakaki et al., 2022). A questionnaire was completed by 80 faculty members at a university in Greece to better understand their knowledge and attitudes toward special education. The findings indicated females, in particular, were more knowledgeable of special education practices, such as the legal framework required to educate and provide accommodations for students with disabilities. On the other hand, Rao and Gartin (2004) did not discover a link between gender and faculty members’ readiness to make modifications. Regarding academic rank, Papadakaki et al. (2022) also found faculty members’ rank and position impacted their knowledge and attitudes toward the legal framework associated with special education and their intent to provide accommodations. Specifically, their findings suggested employees with non-permanent work positions were more likely to make necessary accommodations. Conversely, full time employees with a higher rank were less willing to provide accommodations. Zhang et al. (2010), utilized a survey to assess the impact academic rank had on 206 faculty members’ willingness to provide accommodations in a southern state in the United States. Their findings suggested academic rank was not an influencing factor in the faculty members’ provision of accommodations.

University region has also been shown to affect faculty members’ knowledge and willingness to provide accommodations. Agrawal et al. (2019) conducted a systemic review in various countries to assess differences in the provision of special education services. The findings revealed there was a difference based on geographical location. It seemed most countries adopted practices based on the legislation in the United States. However, there were differences in legislation and implementation of policies (Agrawal et al., 2019). Wolman et al. (2004) assessed faculty members willingness to provide accommodations at a University in the United States and a different university in Mexico. Their findings suggested both countries were similarly willing to provide necessary accommodations.

Regarding accommodations, previous research assessed faculty members’ knowledge of available accommodations. Sniatecki et al. (2019) found university faculty members were not aware of all the accommodations their university could provide, and incorrectly believed their university could offer accommodations, such as transportation services, which were not even available for students with mobility impairments. Their findings indicated more training is imperative to ensuring faculty are equipped with the knowledge to provide necessary accommodations for individuals with disabilities.

Sniatecki et al. (2015) found experience positively affected faculty members’ knowledge regarding the special education legal framework, including accommodations. However, other findings indicated faculty members’ experience negatively affected their knowledge and willingness to provide accommodations for individuals with disabilities in an inclusive environment (Williamson, 2000). Rao and Gartin (2003) had similar findings, suggesting the more experience faculty members had, the less willing they were to provide accommodations for individuals with disabilities.

Regarding training, findings from an anonymous survey distributed to university faculty anonymously revealed the faculty could benefit from additional training (Sniateckiet al., 2015). University faculty were not knowledgeable of all available accommodations and expressed their interest in learning more. Specifically, respondents were interested in training workshops where faculty could learn from the perspectives of individuals with disabilities. Lombardi et al. (2011) similarly found training does positively affect faculty knowledge regarding accommodations. Papadakaki et al. (2022) substantiated this finding, suggesting training positively impacts faculty knowledge regarding legal frameworks and faculty members’ intent to provide accommodations.

3. Procedure

3.1 Data and Sampling

For this study, a quantitative research methodology has been employed. A cross-sectional survey approach has also been used to reach the research goals. Through a questionnaire survey divided into manageable portions to gauge the primary research topic, this design would aid in measuring, analyzing, and discussing the study...
findings.

3.2 Instrumentation
Researchers created the survey tool used in this study to gauge faculty members' understanding of how to accommodate Saudi Arabian students with a high incidence of impairments. The survey's first page of background details, including directions on completing it, listed the study's title, goal, informed consent statement, anticipated completion time, and participants' rights. Two components comprise the survey questionnaire: (a) participant demographic data; and (b) knowledge items.

3.3 Validity and Reliability
In Saudi Arabia, the researcher ran a preliminary test on 18 academics. The researcher determined the survey's feasibility and validity and the instrument's reliability and reality during the pilot test. The researcher took all 18 faculty members' comments into account. The outcome subsequently canceled low-reliability items from the pilot test. The pilot test also addressed the instrument throughout the literature study to establish the measurement goals. Three quantitative research specialists were invited to establish the truth of the survey. The research took the opinions and suggestions of all experts into account.

3.4 Survey Distribution
The researcher designed and formatted the survey using the Qualtrics survey platform. The researchers may automatically arrange data collection and organize information thanks to the Qualtrics software, enabling the survey to be linked on the website. Additionally, a link to the Qualtrics survey was made and provided to the participants.

3.5 Analysis
The information gathered from the field was examined using a quantitative research methodology. SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was used to examine the data. The distribution of the variables' variance was shown to be expected. Categorical variables were employed in this study and described as numbers or percentages before being shown in tables. Additionally, a multiple regression analysis was carried out to see how much each factor predicted faculty members' understanding of how to accommodate students with high incidence impairments. Saudi Arabian Arabia.

To represent the variables of faculty member academic rank and university locations in statistical methods, The research also utilized dummy coding. Academic rank for faculty members was coded from 1 to 5 (1 being teacher assistant, 2 being a lecturer, 3 being assistant professor, 4 being associate professor, and 5 being a full professor), with teacher assistant serving as the reference group. University regions were coded from north to south, east to west, south to east, west to west, and centre to centre, with the north region serving as the reference group.

4. Conclusion

4.1 Response Rate and Statistical Findings
This study employed the Qualtrics platform, a popular platform for researchers to collect data, to answer its research questions. Two hundred forty-seven higher education faculty members responded in total during the six months of data collection.

4.2 Gender
The study sample included 247 higher faculty members in Saudi Arabia, of whom 77 (31.2%) were female, and 170 (68.8%) were male, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Description of Sample by Gender (N = 247)

| Gender | N = 247 | Percentage |
|--------|---------|------------|
| Men    | 170     | 68.8%      |
| Women  | 77      | 31.2%      |

4.3 Years of Teaching Experience
Through an open-ended text box, each participant was required to respond to a question indicating their number of years of teaching. The participants had an average of 6 years of teaching experience during their employment, ranging from 0 to 35 years. The researcher created categories with low and high levels of expertise from the data.
Table 2 demonstrates that whereas 39.7% of participants had good teaching experience, 60.3% of individuals reported having little teaching experience.

Table 2. Description of Sample by Teaching Experience (N = 247)

| Teaching Experience   | N  = 247 |
|-----------------------|----------|
|                       | Frequency | Percentage |
| Low Experience        | 149      | 60.3%      |
| High Experience       | 98       | 39.7%      |

4.4 Academic Position

According to Table 3's data, assistant professors were the most prevalent educational function for higher-ranking faculty members. Teachers' assistants made up 44 (17.8%) of the participants, lecturers made up 83 (33.6%), assistant professors made up 88 (35.6%), associate professors made up 20 (8.1%), and full professors made up just 12 (4.9%).

Table 3. Participants’ Academic Ranks (N = 247)

| Academic Rank       | N  = 247 |
|---------------------|----------|
| Assistant Teacher   | 44       | 17.8%     |
| Lecturer            | 83       | 33.6%     |
| Assistant Professor | 88       | 35.6%     |
| Associate Professor | 20       | 8.1%      |
| Full Professor      | 12       | 4.9%      |

4.5 University Region

In the survey, participants had five options to indicate their university regions. Participants were asked to choose from the following choices: north region, south region, east region, west region, and center region. Results indicated that 19 (7.7%) were from the north region, 33 (13.4%) were from the south region, 24 (9.7%) were from the east region, 103 (41.7%) were from the west region, and 68 (27.5%) were from the center region (see Table 4). The highest number of participants in this study (41.7%) were from the West region.

Table 4. University Region of the Research Sample (N = 247)

| Region of the University | N  = 247 |
|--------------------------|----------|
| North Region             | 19       | 7.7%     |
| South Region             | 33       | 13.4%    |
| East Region              | 24       | 9.7%     |
| West Region              | 103      | 41.7%    |
| Center region            | 68       | 27.5%    |

4.6 Type of University

According to responses, 74 respondents (30%) were from non-Nascent universities, whereas 170 (70%) were from Nascent universities, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Percentage of Participants from Nascent and Non-Nascent Universities (N = 247)

| University Type          | N  = 247 |
|--------------------------|----------|
| Nascent University       | 173      | 70%      |
| Non-Nascent University   | 74       | 30%      |

4.7 Housing Services

The question of whether their colleges offer services for students with high incidence impairments was put to the
participants. According to responses, 146 respondents (59.1%) disagreed with the prior claim that their university provides housing services for students with high-frequency disabilities, whereas 101 respondents (40.9%) agreed with it (see Table 6).

Table 6. Percentage of Universities Provide Accommodation Services (N = 247)

| Accommodation Services | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Yes                    | 101       | 40.9%      |
| No                     | 146       | 59.1%      |

4.8 Instruction

Participants were questioned about whether or not they had received training to assist students with severe disabilities. According to responses, 107 respondents (43.3%) received this training, while 140 respondents (56.7%) had not. (see Table 7).

Table 7. Percentage of Universities Provide Training for Accommodation (N = 247)

| Training Services | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Yes               | 107       | 43.3%      |
| No                | 140       | 56.7%      |

4.9 Reliability Estimates

The value of Cronbach's alpha was used to evaluate the dependability of the variable about higher faculty members' awareness of offering accommodations for students with high incidence impairments in Saudi Arabia. Table 8 shows that the variable has a good alpha coefficient value of 0.97. Alpha's coefficients are regarded as statistically trustworthy when their scores range from 0.70 to 0.95.

Table 8. Knowledge of Higher Faculty Members: Reliability Statistics.

| Questionaires                                | Cronbach’s Alpha |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Teachers’ expertise (7 Units)                 | 0.966            |

4.10 Results of Question 1 Research

Investigating higher faculty members' understanding of making adjustments for Saudi Arabian students with high incidences of disabilities was one of the study's goals. The investigation used seven items from the variable to ask questions of the study's participants. Each item had five options ranging from “No Knowledge” (1) to “Superior knowledge” (5). The other options were “Excellent Knowledge” (4), “Adequate Knowledge” (3) and “Inadequate Knowledge” (2). As shown in Table 9, the overall mean score is 3.0, which shows that higher education faculty members had, in general, adequate knowledge of providing accommodations for Saudi Arabian pupils who experience a high incidence of impairments.

Table 9. Higher Education Faculty Members’ Knowledge of Providing Accommodations for Saudi Arabian students who experience a high incidence of impairments.

| Commodity                                               | M      | SD    |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------|-------|
| 1 I have knowledge about the resources provided to students with HID at the university | 2.84   | 1.17  |
| 2 I have knowledge about the necessary accommodations that help students with HID to succeed at a university | 2.89   | 1.23  |
| 3 I have knowledge of the resources about students with HID outside of a university | 2.87   | 1.13  |
| 4 I have the ability to modify the curriculum according to the characteristics of students with HID | 3.06   | 1.27  |
| 5 I am aware of the strategies used to facilitate the process of education within the inclusion classrooms | 2.98   | 1.19  |
| 6 I have the ability to create a classroom corresponding with the characteristics of students with HID | 3.07   | 1.30  |
| 7 I have knowledge about the importance of accommodations for students with HID | 3.34   | 1.29  |
| Total                                                   | 3.00   | 0.17  |
Moreover, from individual items point of view, higher education faculty members had the most knowledge about the importance of accommodations for students with HID (M = 3.34), whereas they had the least knowledge about the resources provided to students with HID at the university (M = 2.84).

4.11 Regression Analysis Results

Using SPSS, the multiple linear regression analysis was carried out (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The analysis’s goal was to determine the effects of gender, academic standing, university region, kind, accommodation services, and training on higher faculty members’ understanding of how to accommodate Saudi Arabian students with a high incidence of impairments. The results are provided in Table 10. The findings revealed a positive significant relationship exists for accommodations services (β = .385, p < .05), training (β = .854, p < .001), and region. For region, east (β = 5.494, p < .001), west(β = .868, p < .002), and central regions (β = .783, p < .005) are all significantly higher than the comparison north region. Further, years of experience, is negatively related to accommodation services (β = -.307, p<.02). Therefore, it may be said that faculty members with higher levels of training and whose universities offer accommodation services for students with high incidence disabilities likely to have better expertise in doing so in Saudi Arabia. Additionally, faculty members reported having more information about providing accommodations for students with high incidence disabilities than those in the northern region in different parts of Saudi Arabia, notably the east, west, and central regions. Additionally, professors with less experience tend to be better knowledgeable about how to accommodate students in Saudi Arabia. The latter has a greater incidence of disabilities than those with more experience in the classroom. On the other hand, there was no correlation between faculty members’ awareness of making adjustments for Saudi Arabian students with a high incidence of disability and their gender, academic position, or kind of university.

Table 10. In Saudi Arabia, a regression analysis of higher education faculty members’ knowledge of offering accommodations to students with common disabilities

| Category                | Nonstandardized Figure | Standardized Figure | t     | Sig.  |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|
|                         | B          | Std. Mistake | Experimental |       |       |
| Gender                  | 0.144      | 0.145      | 0.06       | 0.994 | 0.321 |
| University Type         | 0.283      | 0.17       | 0.116      | 1.663 | 0.098 |
| Accommodations services | 0.385      | 0.166      | 0.169      | 2.321 | 0.021 |
| Training                | 0.854      | 0.148      | 0.378      | 5.785 | <0.001|
| Lecturer                | 0.295      | 0.188      | 0.124      | 1.569 | 0.118 |
| Help Professor          | -0.311     | 0.184      | -0.133     | -1.692| 0.092 |
| Partner Professor       | -0.166     | 0.266      | -0.041     | -0.626| 0.532 |
| Full Professor          | -0.4       | 0.359      | -0.077     | -1.115| 0.266 |
| South Region            | 0.568      | 0.291      | 0.173      | 1.949 | 0.052 |
| East Region             | 1.612      | 0.293      | 0.427      | 5.494 |<0.001|
| West Region             | 0.868      | 0.271      | 0.383      | 3.200 | 0.002 |
| Central Region          | 0.783      | 0.279      | 0.313      | 2.811 | 0.005 |
| Years of Experience     | -0.307     | 0.132      | -0.134     | -2.337| 0.020 |

5. Discussion and Interpretation

5.1 Research Question 1: What Do Higher Faculty Members Know About Making Accommodations for Saudi Arabian Students with High Incidence Disabilities?

Faculty members in higher education reported having a sufficient understanding of accommodations for students with HID in Saudi Arabia. However, faculty members reported knowledge was a mean of 3, which indicates “adequate knowledge.” Additional training could enhance faculty members’ knowledge. The findings from this research align with findings by Zhang et al. (2010) who found higher education faculty members are knowledgeable regarding the provision of accommodations for students with HID.

Specifically, the findings suggest higher education faculty members had the most knowledge about the importance of accommodations for students with HID. This aligns with previous findings suggesting educators realize the importance of providing necessary accommodations for individuals with disabilities (Zhang et al., 2010). Faculty members reported having the least knowledge about the resources provided to students with HID.
at the university. Zhang et al. (2010) also found faculty needed additional support in order to provide accommodations most effectively. Sniatecki et al. (2005) affirmed this finding, as well, suggesting faculty were not aware of the available accommodations at their university, warranting the need for additional training and support.

5.2 Research Question 2: To What Extent Do Gender, Academic Rank, University Region, University Type, Accommodation Services, and Training Explain Higher Faculty Members’ Knowledge of Providing Accommodations for Students with High Incidence Disabilities in Saudi Arabia?

The findings indicated that faculty members whose universities provide accommodation services for students with high incidence disabilities, and those whose universities provide training generally had higher knowledge of providing accommodations for students with high incidence disabilities in Saudi Arabia. However, only 40.9% of the faculty members reported having necessary accommodations at their university. Rao and Gartin (2003) similarly found their universities did not provide adequate accommodations for students with special needs, despite increases in tuition. It seems faculty at universities need additional resources for individuals with HID. It is also possible faculty are not aware of the accommodations and resources that do exist. Sniatecki et al.’s (2005) findings affirmed faculty members were not aware of the accommodations available for students with special needs at their university. This finding is important to note for the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia to ensure funds are allocated to ensure students with HID receive the accommodations of which they are entitled, while also ensuring faculty are adequately trained and knowledgeable of all the available resources universities have to offer. Previous research on training substantiated this finding that additional training would be beneficial for university faculty (Lombardi et al., 2011; Sniatecki et al., 2015).

The findings also indicated that region of Saudi Arabia plays a significant role in faculty members’ knowledge. Particularly, faculty members in the east, west and central regions claimed to know more about the provision of accommodations for students with high incidence disabilities than the reference region of the north. Grisham-Brown et al. (1998) similarly found faculty from rural or remote areas of the state had less access and knowledge to resources for individuals with special needs. However, Bin Battal (2016) stated special education services should be available in all areas of Saudi Arabia, no longer only in rural or remote areas. Additional research on available accommodations for students with HID in different regions of Saudi Arabia is needed to affirm these findings. It is important the Ministry of Education ensures there is congruency with available accommodations in different regions of Saudi Arabia.

The results also suggest that faculty members’ claimed understanding of how to accommodate Saudi Arabian students with a high incidence of disability was inversely correlated with their level of expertise. According to earlier studies, experience may harm a faculty member’s awareness of and willingness to offer modifications to students with disabilities (Rao & Gartin, 2003; Williamson, 2000). Sniatecki (2015) conversely found experience positively affected faculty members’ knowledge regarding the special education legal framework, including accommodations. Further research is needed to better understand the discrepancy. It seems possible that teachers without experience are more excited about teaching and willing to provide accommodations, while experienced teachers may be more burnt out from teaching and providing necessary accommodations. Another possibility is that faculty with fewer years of experience completed their graduate education more recently, and were more likely to have learned about disabilities and accommodations than faculty members who completed their graduate education at a time when there were fewer accommodations for disabilities.

The expertise of Saudi Arabian faculty members in providing accommodations for students with high incidence disabilities did not substantially correlate with gender, academic rank, or kind of university. The finding regarding gender aligned with findings by Rao and Gartin (2003) but contradicted findings by Papadakaki et al. (2022) which suggested females were more knowledgeable of special education practices. Regarding academic rank, Papadakaki et al. (2022) also found faculty members’ rank and position impacted their knowledge and attitudes toward the legal framework associated with special education and their intent to provide accommodations, as full-time faculty were less willing to provide accommodations than their colleagues with non-permanent work positions. However, Zhang et al.’s (2010) findings aligned with this research, suggesting faculty rank does not have a relationship with faculty members knowledge of accommodations for disabled students.

5.3 Future Research Recommendations

This research findings provide insight into faculty members’ reported knowledge regarding accommodations for individuals with HID. The findings suggest faculty members are overall somewhat knowledgeable regarding accommodations available for students with HID, and accommodations, available training, region, and
experience significantly related to their knowledge. Future research is needed to substantiate these findings. Future research should include additional research methods, other than solely a survey, as sometimes respondents will respond as they feel they should with self-reported surveys. Future research is also needed to ensure remote and desolate areas of Saudi Arabia are equitably equipped with accommodations and special education services. This should be done by research targeted to parents and students, to ensure they feel they are receiving adequate accommodations for their (and their child’s) disabilities. Additionally, research targeted to administrators and decision makers from the Ministry of Education should assess their attitudes toward faculty training at universities in Saudi Arabia and the provision of accommodations. Additionally, the Ministry of Education should assess training programs and generate additional training based on the findings to ensure faculty are adequately trained and knowledgeable of accommodations for students with HID. This could be done through qualitative research, including open-ended responses, and interviews to better understand faculty attitudes and knowledge regarding accommodations for students with HID. Workshops and training can then be designed accordingly, so they are most effective.

6. Conclusion

Observations for the aim of the study was to examine the knowledge of higher faculty members in Saudi Arabia regarding the provision of accommodations for students with high incidence disabilities, as well as the impact of gender, academic rank, university region, university type, accommodation services, and training. The results showed that faculty members in higher education believe they have a sufficient understanding of how to accommodate Saudi Arabian students with a high incidence of disability. The results also showed that faculty members who work in the east, west, or central region, who have less teaching experience, and whose universities offer training and accommodation services for students with high incidence disabilities in Saudi Arabia, have higher knowledge of offering accommodations for students with high incidence disabilities in Saudi Arabia. On the other hand, the results showed that faculty members’ understanding of making accommodations for Saudi Arabian students with high incidence disabilities is unaffected by gender, academic rank, university region, or institution type. Further Study. These findings could provide valuable insight to the Ministry of Education, shedding light on available accommodations, teachers’ knowledge of aforementioned accommodations, and variables impacting their knowledge. More research is needed to affirm these findings.
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