



ARTICLE




<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01802-y>

OPEN

The concept of inclusive education from the point of view of academics specialising in special education at Saudi universities

Abdullah Madhesh ¹ 

Inclusive education is one modern trend that many countries seek to adopt as an innovative concept and pursue to practice as an application in conjunction with scientific progress, the education of people with disabilities, and in order to fulfil and abide by the relevant international conventions. As a result, this study aims to discover what inclusive education means among Saudi universities and academics specialising in special education. To achieve the goal of the study, qualitative research was used by employing semi-structured interviews as the single elementary tool for data collection by interviewing the study sample, which consisted of 12 faculty members specialising in special education. Through complete analysis, the study reached a set of general results, which is the presence of ambiguity in the concept of inclusive education among the participants, with confusion between the concept of inclusive education and some other concepts such as “integration,” “mainstreaming,” and “placement.” In addition, there is a belief that there is a correlation between the concept of inclusive education and special education. Finally, the study concluded with some recommendations on the topic of research.

¹Special Education Department, Shaqra University, Shaqra, Saudi Arabia. email: mdhsh@su.edu.sa

Introduction

Inclusive education is one of the recent trends that many international organisations interested in educating people with disabilities seek to promote in various educational systems around the world. Therefore, many relevant international organisations have urged the need to adopt this concept as a cornerstone in any educational system that seeks to be an integral part of the global education system and other related human rights, such as the right to citizenship and the right to belonging. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 stated that education is a human right for everyone (Munongi, 2022). Specifically, with regard to inclusive education, in 1994, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) organised its international conference in Salamanca, Spain, under the title “The International Conference on Education for People with Special Needs: Access and Quality,” which resulted in the 1994 Salamanca statement and framework. This statement was signed by 92 countries and 25 international organisations. The main objective of this statement was to promote and develop inclusive education systems globally (Ainscow et al. 2019).

Historically, there is no specific starting point for the concept of inclusive education agreed upon by scholars and specialists in this field, and several factors contributed to the emergence of this concept. Factors include questions about special education practices, medical and psychological practices towards people with disabilities, the emergence of some social theories, such as critical and social theory, and the rise of disability studies (Slee, 2011). However, many scholars agree that the Salamanca statement and framework of 1994 played a critical role in inclusive education and was a strong milestone for the concept of inclusive education globally. (Magnússon, 2019).

Subsequently, many successful efforts contributed to the promotion of inclusive education. One of which was the invitation of UNESCO in 2000 to the concept of education for all and the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities by the United Nations (UNCRPD) (Rieser, 2012). Another was the adoption of procedural evidence for the enactment of laws and legislation for inclusive education in 2009 by UNESCO. Finally, the adoption of the World Education Forum included several goals: (a) the right to education, (b) equality in education, (c) inclusive education, (d) quality education, and (e) lifelong learning (Madhesh, 2019).

Inclusive education in Saudi Arabia. Despite Saudi Arabia’s signing of the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education (UNESCO, 1994), inclusive education still faces a great deal of uncertainty in the Saudi context at both a theoretical and practical level. Madhesh (2019) confirmed that the Regulations of Special Education Programs and Institutes (RSEPI) in Saudi Arabia did not adopt the concept of inclusive education, nor did it provide a clear stipulation, but it does promote special education and its concepts in all theoretical and practical aspects. Indeed, many practices of exclusion in Saudi education are labelled as inclusive, riding the wave of the global trend toward inclusive education (Madhesh, 2019). However, some efforts are currently seeking to promote the concept and practices of Inclusive education in the correct manner compatible with relevant global philosophies, including the current study.

Definition of inclusive education. Inclusive education does not have a single, universally agreed-upon definition, as explained by Roger Slee in his famous book *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling, and inclusive education* (Slee, 2011). Bates et al. (2015, p. 1929) argue that “there is, as yet, no consensus about what

inclusive education is or how it should be implemented in schools.” The absence of a unified definition of inclusive education was attributed to several reasons. These reasons varied based on the diversity of each research school that touched on this aspect. For example, Loreman et al. (2014) attributed this absence to a fundamental reason, including the lack of a unified definition of inclusive education approved by relevant international organisations. On the other hand, Jahnukainen (2015) emphasised that the lack of a unified definition of inclusive education is due to the overlap and confusion in the use of various and multiple terms such as “integration,” “mainstreaming,” and “placement” as well as the variation in terms from one country to another and one educational system to another.

In addition, the lack of agreement on a unified definition of inclusive education may be attributed to the divergence of view. This perspective has caused several debates regarding the concept of inclusive education itself in terms of acknowledgment of its importance or opposition to its generalisation and adoption by specialists in the field. However, various factors and efforts have contributed to the emergence of many definitions of inclusive education that share some of their general concepts. They all aim to reach a concept that is applied and practiced rather than theorised.

One of the most important factors that contributed to the clear vision of the concept of inclusive education, the diversity, and the multiplicity of its definitions is the diversity of international institutions and research schools. Each sought to create a definition commensurate with its orientations towards this concept. In these limited subsequent lines, I will review some definitions to reach a concept that contains the basics that must be present for this practice to be called inclusive education. To begin, one important definition, which was introduced at the Salamanca Conference in 1994, concluded with the definition of inclusive education as a process of solving and responding to the different needs of all students. Society as a whole focuses more on teaching and learning processes while also accepting different cultures and societies so that people are perceived to be less excluded from the education system and society in general. The process includes changes and treatments of content, curriculum, structure, and strategy. This process holds a common vision that includes all children of the same age with the sole and complete belief that the regular education system is responsible for educating all children while meeting their diversity and educational needs (Ainscow et al. 2013).

In 2009, the International Conference on Education included an additional definition of inclusive education. It was introduced as a process in which regular schools and all early-year environments are transformed and adapted so that all children and students are supported to meet their expectations and academic and social needs. This includes the removal of all barriers in diverse environments, communication, and interaction, curricula, teaching, socialisation, and assessment at all levels (Forlin, 2013). One of the important definitions in this field, although it may be seen as more general than others, is what Loreman and Deppeler (2002) tended to, that inclusive education is a right of all students with disabilities and including these students in order to obtain the same educational services provided to non-disabled students in the same classrooms with celebration and acceptance of difference and diversity. Ainscow et al. (2006) define inclusive education as the reduction of barriers to learning, the full participation of all students, and an increase in the school’s ability to accommodate all students regardless of their differences. This is an effort to treat them in ways that reflect that they are of equal value and status.

Indeed, the definitions, as mentioned earlier, are many and varied, but I must conclude with points mentioned by Loreman

(2009) as characteristics that distinguish inclusive education as a distinctive practice from others. These factors can be summarised in the following:

1. All children can enrol at the closest school to their home.
2. All schools have a “zero-rejection policy” when it comes to enrolling and educating children at the school closest to their homes. All students are welcome and appreciated.
3. All children learn in regular and heterogeneous classrooms with peers of the same age.
4. All children follow substantially similar study programmes, with curricula that can be adapted and modified if necessary and teaching methods varied to respond to all needs without discrimination.
5. All children participate fully in regular educational activities and events in schools and classrooms with a celebration and appreciation of diversity in these classrooms.
6. All children are supported to make friends and achieve social success with their peers.
7. Adequate resources and training shall be provided to all specialists and stakeholders within the school, classroom, and educational district to support the proper implementation of inclusive education.

This study implements the above definition as a valid concept of inclusive education that is used as a criterion for studying and analysing the responses of the participants in this study along with the theoretical framework of this study (as discussed below). A condition for achieving an accurate practice of inclusive education, in addition to this definition, is the availability of two methodologies, including the following: The flexible curriculum strategy, as the definition above clarifies. The need to implement the differentiation strategy, which entails planning and developing a variety of inclusionary teaching methods in an interactive manner by attending to the needs of every student, as well as assessing each student’s performance according to their study plan and abilities, but there are no universal assessment standards for all students.

Indeed, many people who specialise in or are interested in disability studies have an issue with the idea of inclusive education since it can be ambiguous or confused with other ideas. These misunderstandings may have a significant impact on this concept in several ways. This includes the existence of a clear and approved definition, advocacy of the importance of activating it, seeking to enhance its practices and monitoring, and evaluating these practices in accordance with the scientific research practices they are based on. As a result, this study aims to eliminate the confusion and overlap surrounding the idea of inclusive education while also attempting to provide clear images and practices that have been developed and clarified by numerous scholars and specialists in this field worldwide. This is because the foundation for the validity of any practice in educational systems is the presence of a clear and accurate definition of such practice. Slee and Tait (2022) asserted that inclusive education is a global movement that has no rigid definition and is “contingent-changing” with the demands of specific aspects such as the country, politics, economy, time, and culture, despite the fact that this study is only focused on a Saudi setting. However, despite the dedication of many nations to inclusive education and the countless academic studies that have been done in this field since the Salamanca statement (1994), inclusive education still encounters the same problems and obstacles in many nations throughout the world.

Consequently, this study was guided by the following research question: what does Inclusive Education mean among Saudi university academics specialising in special education?

The theoretical framework of this study

This study uses Roger Slee’s inclusive education theory (Slee, 2011, 2018b) as a conceptual and philosophical framework. This framework had an impact on this study in a number of ways, including how it defined the problem, developed the main question, analysed the data, and then interpreted and connected it to a related literature review. This theory highlights a number of ideas, including the idea that every person has the right to receive appropriate and adequate educational services in public classrooms at the closest school to their house, regardless of their needs or ability. This concept also resists all forms of segregation and discrimination in educational organisations. One of the ideas in this theory is the ambiguity in the definition of inclusive education and how it overlaps with other ideas like “integration,” “placement,” and “accommodation.” Through this process, some special education practices are coloured and made to feel more like inclusive education, leading to practices that are carried out under the name of inclusive education but do not actually fit into it. Another concept that was adopted by this study is that inclusive education and special education are opposites to each other, and their practices are inversely related and not, as some portray it, as part of a whole.

Methodology

The method used in this study is the qualitative approach. This approach was employed due to the researcher’s quest to reach a deeper understanding of the concepts of inclusive education among the participants. Denzin and Lincoln (2017) emphasised that qualitative research has the greatest potential to provide a deep understanding of the issues surrounding the topic of research. Moreover, qualitative research allows the researcher to hear directly from participants’ experiences and perceptions about their personal experiences without going through other data collection methods (Merriam and Tisdell, 2015). Finally, this study seeks to allow hearing from the participants directly and to give them the opportunity to express all of their opinions without directing or determining their responses or being influenced by the limited responses, as sometimes happens in questionnaires.

Study tool. Semi-structured interviews were used to collect data in this study for several reasons. The researcher will summarise the discussion here on the most important reasons. First lies in the interview feature as a tool that provides a deep knowledge of the investigated phenomenon that goes beyond the researcher’s current assumptions about this phenomenon (Josselson, 2013). Second, because different people have different perspectives and backgrounds, conducting interviews is a highly effective method that can be used to collect a lot of information that is interesting, useful, and pertinent to the research phenomenon. As a result, the information gathered through the interviews contributes to the researcher’s knowledge and insight. Third, it supports understanding alternative perspectives on this phenomenon (Brennen, 2021).

To carry out the interviews, the researcher followed specific steps. First, the participants determined the time of the interview. All interviews were conducted remotely using the Google Meet application. The researcher recorded the interviews after notifying the participants of this intention and also took notes during the interview. Each interview took between 45 and 60 min. The main interview questions focused on the following:

1. How do you define inclusive education?
2. Can you give me some examples of inclusive education practices?
3. Is there a difference between inclusive education and special education?

4. Do you think there are inclusive education practices in the Saudi context? Can you mention some examples?

Study sample (participants). This study used a purposive sampling strategy to select the participants. This strategy allows the selection of a participant who can provide the required data that adds the required quality, credibility, and rationality to the study (Padgett, 2016). As a result, there was a set of inclusion criteria for selecting participants, namely: (a) to have a doctorate, (b) to be a specialist in the education of people with disabilities, (c) to be a faculty member in the special education department at any Saudi governmental university. The number of participants reached was 12 faculty members from 7 universities. The variation in years of experience and discipline among the participants did not affect the responses. The collected data showed no variation that might be attributed to this diversity.

Table 1 shows some demographic information about the participants in this study so that the following coding (FM: Faculty Member) was used in the sense of a faculty member in order to preserve the privacy and confidentiality of the participants and in line with the ethics of the research:

Data analysis

The thematic analysis (TA) procedures and validation. The researcher employed the deductive approach in dealing with the collected data using the Thematic Analysis (TA) six-phased method (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The researcher read all transcripts severally to familiarise himself with the data while simultaneously evoking the theory and definition that the researcher adopted in this study, Roger Slee’s inclusive education theory (Slee, 2011, 2018b). Loreman (2009) definition, in addition to the availability of the two strategies, is a flexible approach and differentiation in assessment. In this regard, Braun and Clarke (2012, p. 58) argued that a deductive approach to data coding and analysis is a top-down approach, where the researcher brings to the data a series of concepts, ideas, or topics that they use to code and interpret the data.

During the reading circle phase, the researcher highlighted and coded all the meanings of inclusive education, whether explicitly or implicitly mentioned. After that, the researcher classified the highlighted codes, generated three experiential themes, and named them: identical definition, the ambiguity of definition, and relationship conception. Wiltshire and Ronkainen (2021) pointed out that experiential themes are created by describing

participants’ viewpoints and beliefs about the phenomena being studied.

For validation, the three experiential themes were sent to three academics and seven participants for their opinions (Scharp and Sanders, 2019). After collecting their feedback, the first theme was changed by adding the word “close” to become ‘identical or close definition.’ They argued that some definitions do not fully coincide with the concept of inclusive education but are close to it.

Findings

After applying the procedures for analysing the collected data according to what was explained above, the study reached a set of results that will be presented according to the previously classified themes:

Identical or close definition. By analysing the manuscript of all interviews (12 interviews), the participants did not appear to have a concept of inclusive education completely identical to the definition adopted in this study, but there were only two responses that were reasonably close to this definition. FM8 emphasised that inclusive education “is the inclusion of the child with disabilities in the general classification with his normal peers of the same age, with the necessity of having an individual plan for his education while providing all the capabilities he needs, and that this classroom is close to the child’s home” (FM8, line 9–10). On the other hand, FM10 stated that inclusive education “means integrating the student in the regular classroom in the neighbourhood school with students of the same age and providing all the services needed to participate effectively” (FM10, line 6).

Through the analysis of the two definitions above, it is clear that the concept of inclusive education among the participants (FM8 and FM10) is somewhat close, with the absence of mentioning some specifications and requirements to fully conform to the inclusive education concept, such as the following: applying the flexible curriculum, promoting the full participation of all students, affirming that every student is valued, celebrating difference and diversity while using differentiation in student assessment.

Ambiguity of definition. It became clear through the analysis of the collected data that there is ambiguity and confusion in the definition of inclusive education among 10 out of 12 participants, i.e., 83%. This ambiguity appeared through the response of the participants, as it was represented in two basic forms. The first is the lack of clarity on the concept of inclusive education among some participants. For example, FM7 stated that inclusive education is “giving an opportunity to all students that they have the right to education and to overcome all difficulties for their academic success in the least restrictive environment that the student can fit in” (FM7, line 5–7). In addition, both (FM3) and (FM6) emphasised that inclusive education means the least restrictive environment. Through these responses, it became clear that there is ambiguity in the concept of inclusive education among some of the participants in this study.

On the other hand, it became clear that there is great confusion between inclusion and integration among the participants, as this was evident in the responses of 6 participants, they are (FM2, FM4, FM5, FM9, FM11, FM12). Here are some examples of these responses: FM2 mentioned that inclusive education “is the integrating of students with disabilities into the regular classroom, taking into account the capabilities of the student before this integrating in terms of the degree of his/her disability, whether it allows him/her or not” (FM2, line 5–7). In addition, FM4 defined inclusive education as “integrating students with disabilities

Table 1 Participants’ demographic information.

Participant	Specialty	Working Experience	Gender
FM1	Behavioural Disorders	17 years	Female
FM2	Gifted Education	6 years	Female
FM3	Communication Disorders	3 years	Male
FM4	Intellectual Disability	8 years	Male
FM5	Intellectual Disability	5 years	Female
FM6	Learning Difficulties	3 years	Female
FM7	Learning Difficulties	3 years	Male
Participant	Specialty	Years of Experience	Gender
FM8	Deaf Education	11 years	Male
FM9	Deaf Education	8 years	Male
FM10	Autism Spectrum	6 years	Female
FM11	Autism Spectrum	4 years	Male
FM12	Visual Disability	9 years	Female

whose abilities allow them to be with ordinary students so that they are closer to the education of ordinary students” (FM4, line 3–4). Participant FM5 stated that the concept of inclusive education “is placing people with disabilities in the regular classroom, in short” (FM5, line 3). The previous examples are sufficient in this study to illustrate a situation that is widespread among some specialists in special education departments, which is the confusion between some concepts such as “inclusion,” “integration,” “mainstreaming,” and “placement.”

Relationship conception. Analysing all the participants’ responses about the nature of the relationship between inclusive and special education, it became clear that most participants (11 out of 12 participants) confirmed the existence of a relationship between these two concepts. For example, 7 participants emphasised that inclusive education is a part of special education, as this was evident in the responses of each of them (FM1, FM2, FM3, FM5, FM6, FM9, and FM12). On the other hand, FM4, FM7, FM10, and FM11 confirmed the exact opposite. They believe special education is part of inclusive education and falls under its umbrella. The necessity of the presence of a special education teacher in inclusive classrooms justified this. Indeed, only one participant (FM8) confirmed that these two concepts are contradictory in the philosophical and practical aspects.

Discussion

As previously mentioned, this study aimed to answer the main research question: what does Inclusive Education mean among Saudi university academics specialising in special education? As a result, this study adopts Loreman’s (2009) definition of inclusive education in addition to Roger Slee’s (Slee, 2011, 2018a) inclusive education theory as a lens and philosophical framework through which the results are analysed and discussed. By analysing the above results, they will be discussed according to the main themes that the researcher classified the participants’ responses.

First, regarding the identical or close definition of inclusive education, the results indicated a complete congruence between the adapted definition and concept of inclusive education in this study. Throughout the participants’ responses, it became clear that no single response matches the definition and concept of inclusive education in all its required aspects and characteristics. This absence of congruence indicates and is attributed to the absence of a unified, approved, and comprehensive definition in the Saudi field for inclusive education. This is in complete agreement with what Florian (2014) stated; there is no agreement on a unified definition of inclusive education, and there is a need for studies seeking to find a solution to this. Although there is no formal and internationally approved definition of inclusive education (Loreman et al. 2014; Slee, 2011), the various definitions have common concepts and characteristics. All of them agree in rejecting any practices of exclusion for students with disabilities, whether from the general classroom, curriculum, teaching methods, or evaluation.

On the other hand, there was a closeness between what the two participants mentioned about the concept of inclusive education with the adopted definition in this study, which is Loreman’s definition (2009). Where some important characteristics emerged in these two responses that characterise inclusive education. These characteristics were represented in the child’s presence in the general class, in the closest school to their home, and with same-age peers while providing all the required services to enhance participation in full effectiveness. This reflects that there are individual attempts to seek a correct definition of inclusive education that produces a correct practice of this concept. However, these individual attempts do not dispense the need for

organised work by all relevant authorities to adopt a unified and operational definition of inclusive education (Qvortrup and Qvortrup, 2018). Nor do they present all existing and future practices to this concept in order to judge each practice clearly and impartially. In short, Ainscow (2020) emphasised that unless there is a unified and shared understanding of inclusive education, progress in the correct practices of this concept will be difficult and challenging. So, there is a need to work towards unifying this definition.

Second, by analysing the above results, it became clear that there is an ambiguity in the definition of inclusive education among some faculty members in Saudi universities. For instance, two participants linked inclusive education to the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). Indeed, inclusive education is a broader and more comprehensive concept than LRE and linking it to this theory reduces it to mere accommodation or placement only (Maciver et al. 2018). In this context, Skilton-Sylvester and Slesaransky-Poe (2009) emphasised that a Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) is based primarily on the principle of placement as a priority differs from inclusive education as a broader and more complex concept.

Furthermore, there is confusion between inclusive education and the concept of integration, which was evident in the responses of 50% of the participants. The confusion between these two terms is a worldwide phenomenon among those concerned, including specialists and others, in the field of inclusive education. Loreman et al. (2014) assert that there is confusion and overlap in the use of many terms such as “integration,” “mainstreaming,” and “inclusion” as synonymous with one practice meaning inclusive education. Such confusion was a consequence of some reasons, such as the use of the two terms “inclusion” and “integration,” as synonymous in many studies related to inclusive education (Hassanein, 2015). Indeed, there is a difference and disparity between these two concepts in many respects.

First, integration comes from outside the school, so the focus is on the student and their abilities to include him/her in the Least Restrictive Environment, whether in the general classrooms or self-contained classes (Dash, 2006). Meanwhile, inclusion comes from inside the school in terms of creating all needed environments from all sides to be suitable for welcoming and valuing all students with disabilities (Nunez and Rosales, 2021). Second, “integration” considers the school as a partner in the accommodation and placement process. At the same time, the full responsibility for the success of this practice lies on the student with the disability (Frederickson and Cline, 2015). While the concept of “inclusion” views the school as an essential and important part of the preparation and initialisation process to implement inclusive education practices. This means it bears the responsibility to adapt curricula, teaching methods, and services that must be prepared to include students with disabilities (Madhesh, 2019) successfully. Third, “integration” does not mean restructuring school environments to accommodate students with disabilities. On the contrary, “inclusion” means restructuring these environments to suit the needs of all students regardless of their diversity (Obrusnikova and Block, 2020).

Additionally, with regard to the analysis of the results that clarify the relationship conception between inclusive education and special education from the point of view of the faculty members in Saudi universities, it was evident that the majority affirms the existence of a correlation between these two concepts (11 out of 12 participants) so that 7 participants confirmed that inclusive education is part of special education. On the contrary, 4 participants confirmed that special education is part of inclusive education. Indeed, only one participant emphasised that this relationship is inverse and that inclusive education is the opposite of the concept and practice of special education. This is accurate,

so many relevant studies agree that inclusive education is a philosophy and practice that is completely opposite to special education.

For example, special education stems from the ontological stance of the medical model of disability, which believes that disability is a pathological structure in the individual that must be treated and reformed to suit the surrounding environments (Dirth and Branscombe, 2017; Slee, 2011). At the same time, inclusive education stems from the ontological concept of the social model of disability, which affirms that disability is a product of the obstacles and barriers that exist in society and the surrounding environments, which causes the individual with a disability to be hindered from exercising his life appropriately and naturally (Barnes, 2019; Oliver, 2013).

Moreover, the concept of special education is based on the classification and labelling of each individual with a disability in order to distinguish them. In contrast, inclusive education seeks to resist any practices of classification or labelling that result in discrimination between individuals (Kauffman and Hornby, 2020). Additionally, one of the key distinctions between these two ideas is that special education frequently offers educational services to students with disabilities in their available educational settings, such as private institutions, separate classrooms affixed to public schools, or partially in general classrooms. These function with the reliance on the student's ability as a criterion to choose the appropriate educational placement (Madhesh, 2019). On the contrary, the concept of inclusive education resists all forms of segregation and the practices of providing educational services in isolated and private environments and believes only in the option of the general classroom in the nearest school to the student's home, which supports active and full participation (Dovigo, 2017).

Conclusion and recommendations

This study concluded several vital outcomes. First, there is no approved and unified definition of inclusive education in the Saudi context to be adopted or referred to by specialists in this field. Second, there is confusion and ambiguity about the concept of inclusive education among Saudi university faculty members specialising in special education, in addition to great confusion and overlapping between the concept of inclusive education and other concepts such as "integration", "mainstreaming" and "placement". Third, there is a deep-rooted understanding of an interrelated relationship between inclusive education and special education among these faculty members. This is contrary to reality as each concept carries an agenda and practices that are completely opposite to the other. From the foregoing, this study leads to some recommendations:

1. The necessity to seek, by the authorities related to the education of people with disabilities in the Saudi context, to adopt a comprehensive and unified definition of inclusive education. Then apply and evaluate all related practices in line with it to avoid ambiguity and discrepancy in practice.
2. Promoting correct concepts about inclusive education among academics and stakeholders through seminars, conferences, and various scientific and social events.
3. Supporting scientific studies that examine the reasons for this conceptual and applied shortcoming about inclusive education among Saudi university faculty members specialising in special education and the consequences thereof.
4. Enact laws and legislation that are based on the correct concept of inclusive education and strive to implement them.
5. Evaluate current practices according to the correct and previously approved definition of inclusive education.

Data availability

The collected data of this study is interview transcripts in Arabic language and is not possible to share publicly for participants' confidentiality.

Received: 8 January 2023; Accepted: 25 May 2023;

Published online: 02 June 2023

References

- Ainscow M (2020) Promoting inclusion and equity in education: lessons from international experiences. *Nord J Stud Educ Policy* 6(1):7–16
- Ainscow M, Booth T, Dyson A (2006) Inclusion and the standards agenda: negotiating policy pressures in England. *Int J Incl Educ* 10(4–5):295–308
- Ainscow M, Dyson A, Weiner S (2013) From exclusion to inclusion: ways of responding in schools to students with special educational needs. ERIC, UK
- Ainscow M, Slee R, Best M (2019) The Salamanca Statement: 25 years on. *Int J Incl Educ* 23(7–8):671–676
- Barnes C (2019) *Understanding the social model of disability: past, present and future*. Routledge, USA
- Bates H, McCafferty A, Quayle E, McKenzie K (2015) Typically-developing students' views and experiences of inclusive education. *Disabil Rehab* 37(21):1929–1939
- Braun V, Clarke V (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol* 3(2):77–101
- Braun V, Clarke V (2012) Thematic analysis. In: Cooper H, Camic PM, Long DL, Panter AT, Rindskopf D, Sher KJ (ed) *APA handbook of research methods in psychology*, 2nd edn. American Psychological Association, USA, p 57–71
- Brennen BS (2021) *Qualitative research methods for media studies*. Routledge, London
- Dash N (2006) *Inclusive education for children with special needs*. Atlantic Publishers & Dist, Bloomsbury
- Denzin NK, Lincoln YS (2017) *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. SAGE, Washington DC
- Dirth TP, Branscombe NR (2017) Disability models affect disability policy support through awareness of structural discrimination. *J Soc Issues* 73(2):413–442
- Dovigo F (2017) *Special educational needs and inclusive practices: an international perspective*. Springer, New York
- Florian L (2014) What counts as evidence of inclusive education? *Euro J Spec Needs Educ* 29(3):286–294
- Forlin C (2013) Changing paradigms and future directions for implementing inclusive education in developing countries. *Asian J Incl Educ* 1(2):19–31
- Frederickson N, Cline T (2015) *Special educational needs, inclusion and diversity*. McGraw-Hill Education, UK
- Hassanein EEA (2015) *Inclusion, disability and culture*. Sense Publishers, Rotterdam
- Jahnukainen M (2015) Inclusion, integration, or what? A comparative study of the school principals' perceptions of inclusive and special education in Finland and in Alberta, Canada. *Disabil Soc* 30(1):59–72
- Josselson R (2013) *Interviewing for qualitative inquiry: a relational approach*. Guilford Press, New York
- Kauffman JM, Hornby G (2020) Inclusive vision versus special education reality. *Educ Sci* 10(9):1–13
- Loreman T (2009) Straight talk about inclusive education. *CASS Connect* 6(4):43–47
- Loreman T, Deppeler J (2002) Working towards full inclusion in education. *Access: Natl Issues J People Disabil* 3(6):5–8
- Loreman T, Forlin C, Chambers D, Sharma U, Deppeler J (2014) *Conceptualising and measuring inclusive education*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, UK
- Maciver D, Hunter C, Adamson A, Grayson Z, Forsyth K, McLeod I (2018) Supporting successful inclusive practices for learners with disabilities in high schools: a multisite, mixed method collective case study. *Disabil Rehabil* 40(14):1708–1717
- Madhesh A (2019) *Inclusion of Deaf Students in Saudi Primary Schools*. Dissertation, Victoria University, Australia
- Magnússon G (2019) An amalgam of ideals—images of inclusion in the Salamanca Statement. *Int J Incl Educ* 23(7–8):677–690
- Merriam SB, Tisdell EJ (2015) *Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey
- Munongi L (2022) Townships' high school learners' views on the implementation of the right to education: a social justice perspective. *Athens J Educ* 1(10):153–172

- Nunez R, Rosales S (2021) Inclusive education: perceptions and attitudes among filipino high school teachers. *Asian ESP* 17(6.1):151–172
- Obrusnikova I, Block ME (2020) Historical context and definition of inclusion. In: Haegele J, Hodge S, Shapiro D (ed) *Routledge handbook of adapted physical education.*, 1st rd. Routledge, London, p 65–80
- Oliver M (2013) The social model of disability: thirty years on. *Disabil Soc* 28(7):1024–1026
- Padgett DK (2016) *Qualitative methods in social work research.* Sage publications, Washington DC
- Qvortrup A, Qvortrup L (2018) Inclusion: dimensions of inclusion in education. *Int J Incl Educ* 22(7):803–817
- Rieser R, Secretariat C (2012) *Implementing Inclusive Education: A Commonwealth Guide to Implementing Article 24 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.* Commonwealth Secretariat, London. <https://books.google.com.sa/books?id=14wxPDD-v5MC>
- Scharp KM, Sanders ML (2019) What is a theme? Teaching thematic analysis in qualitative communication research methods. *Commun Teacher* 33(2):117–121
- Skilton-Sylvester E, Slesaransky-Poe G (2009) More than a least restrictive environment: living up to the civil covenant in building inclusive schools. *Penn GSE perspectives on. Urban Education* 6(1):32–37
- Slee R (2011) *The irregular school: exclusion, schooling and inclusive education.* Routledge, London
- Slee R (2018a) Defining the scope of inclusive education. Paper commissioned for the 2020 global education monitoring report, inclusion and education, UNESCO, Paris, France
- Slee R (2018b) *Inclusive education isn't dead, it just smells funny.* Routledge, London
- Slee R, & Tait G (2022) *Ethics and Inclusive Education: Disability Schooling and Justice* (Vol. 6). Springer Nature, London, UK
- UNESCO (1994) The salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education. Paper presented at access and quality conference, Salamanca, Spain, 7–10 June 1994
- Wiltshire G, Ronkainen N (2021) A realist approach to thematic analysis: making sense of qualitative data through experiential, inferential and dispositional themes. *J Crit Realism* 20(2):159–180

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the Deanship of Scientific Research at Shaqra University for supporting this work.

Competing interests

The authors declare no Competing interests.

Ethical approval

This study was conducted in accordance with the Shaqra University Research Ethics Committee. The ethical approval of this study (No: ERC_SU_20220099) was obtained from this committee before collecting the data from participants as a prerequisite for conducting this study and all committee requirements have been fulfilled.

Informed consent

Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to their participation in interviews.

Additional information

Supplementary information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01802-y>.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Abdullah Madhesh.

Reprints and permission information is available at <http://www.nature.com/reprints>

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2023