

Obstacles to the adaptation of curriculum objectives and content for students with learning disabilities in Saudi Arabia



Mahmoud Mohamed Eltantawy*, Nouf Abdullah Alsudairy, Sarah Hamed Aljihani

Department of Special Education, College of Education, Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU), Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 19 September 2025

Received in revised form

3 February 2026

Accepted 16 February 2026

Keywords:

Adaptation

Objectives

Content

Curriculum

Learning disabilities

ABSTRACT

Curriculum adaptation of objectives and content plays an important role in improving the academic performance of students with learning disabilities and in achieving specific educational outcomes. Therefore, this study aims to examine the obstacles to adapting curriculum objectives and content from teachers' perspectives. It also investigates whether there are significant differences in teachers' views of these obstacles according to their years of experience, academic degree, and gender. The study adopts a descriptive survey method. A structured questionnaire was developed to collect data from a sample of 299 teachers working in public schools that offer learning disability programs in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. The participants were selected using simple random sampling. The results indicate that teachers face several major obstacles in adapting curriculum objectives and content for students with learning disabilities. These obstacles were rated at a high level, with a mean score of 3.61 for curriculum objectives and 3.75 for curriculum content. The findings also show statistically significant differences in teachers' responses based on years of experience, in favor of teachers with fewer years of experience. However, no statistically significant differences were found based on academic degree or gender.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by IASE. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Learning disabilities are a complex educational concept that has garnered significant attention in recent decades due to their direct impact on students' academic performance and skill acquisition within the school environment. Cortiella and Horowitz (2014) defined individuals with learning disabilities as: "Those who exhibit significant difficulties in the acquisition and use of listening, speaking, reading, writing, reasoning, or mathematical abilities, which are a result of a neurological disorder. These difficulties do not stem primarily from intellectual disability, sensory impairments, emotional disturbances, or a lack of education." This definition highlights the neurological nature of learning disabilities, which necessitates specialized educational responses and appropriate curriculum adaptations to guarantee

that these students have equitable access to educational opportunities comparable to those of their peers.

Tailored curricula designed to meet the specific needs of students with learning disabilities are considered a fundamental factor that directly influences their learning. Studies have shown that modifying curricula to simplify concepts and incorporate diverse practical activities significantly enhances students' understanding and academic performance. Evidence suggests that adapting curricula and implementing appropriate educational interventions helps reduce the learning gaps between typically developing students and those with disabilities, while also promoting their effective inclusion in the educational environment. The adaptation of curriculum objectives and content is an essential step toward achieving inclusive education that accommodates individual differences among learners. Recent research confirms that effective curriculum adaptation boosts student motivation and improves academic performance. This is achieved when learning objectives are designed with flexibility and are delivered through multiple modalities that are responsive to diverse learning styles (Deunk et al., 2018). Curriculum adaptation denotes the systematic modification of content,

* Corresponding Author.

Email Address: mmeltantawy@imamu.edu.sa (M. M. Eltantawy)

<https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2026.02.018>

Corresponding author's ORCID profile:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5886-7200>

2313-626X/© 2026 The Authors. Published by IASE.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

teaching strategies, or assessment methods to fulfill the individual demands of students with disabilities or learning disabilities. This process allows these students effective access to the general curriculum provided to all students. It encompasses all procedures applied to the curriculum, including adding, removing, substituting, or modifying its objectives or content. The primary goal of curriculum adaptation is not to lower academic standards, but rather to ensure equitable access to the curriculum, promote participation, and support the academic success of all students (Florian, 2015).

The adaptation of curriculum objectives and content has several positive effects. It mitigates the exclusion of students and enhances inclusivity for special education students, such as those with learning disabilities, thereby ensuring greater equity in learning opportunities (UNESCO, 2017). Furthermore, this adaptation boosts teacher competence and simplifies the teaching process by providing content that is appropriate for students' diverse levels and abilities, which makes teaching more effective. The process also facilitates the creation of clear individualized plans and allows for the fair assessment and monitoring of student progress.

The adaptation of curriculum objectives and content helps meet the individual educational demands of students, enabling them to engage in learning in accordance with their individual rate of progress and abilities. This, in turn, improves their academic achievement and fosters their motivation toward learning. Moreover, it contributes to building and developing educational curriculum, selecting appropriate tools, accommodations, and activities for curriculum implementation, and provides the basis from which the evaluation process should begin. This allows teachers to assess the effectiveness and success of teaching in achieving the desired behavioral change in the learner. Therefore, modifying curriculum to be compatible with students' abilities reduces frustration caused by difficult content, which positively reflects on both academic and behavioral performance within the classroom (Collins et al., 2018).

Given that, students with learning disabilities require high-quality education to achieve academic goals that enable them to be as equal as possible to their peers. This makes it essential to adapt to the curriculum so they can gain genuine access to the content of the general education curriculum.

Gilson and Biggs (2024) examined the perspectives of special education teachers and instructional assistants regarding collaboration in general education settings. It was found that shared responsibility, joint planning, and clearly defined roles are critical elements for providing appropriate support to students with disabilities. Participants emphasized that effective collaboration between special education teachers and general education staff is essential for promoting inclusive education and enhancing student learning in integrated classrooms (Gilson and Biggs, 2024). Effective access

to the curriculum depends on a teacher's willingness to make changes and their ability to plan for adaptations to curriculum content (Nilsen, 2017). One of the most important factors for the successful adaptation of curriculum is for teachers to be knowledgeable about the different methods they can use to create curriculum content plans that allow for the adaptation of both curriculum and teaching strategies.

Several obstacles impede teachers when adapting to the general education curriculum. These include the curriculum's lack of suitability for students' characteristics and cultures, its inflexibility in allowing for differentiated teaching to provide a variety of learning experiences, and the difficulty of adapting content and activities to meet the diverse needs of different students. Therefore, the curriculum should be designed in a way that assists teachers in adapting content to suit the needs of students with disabilities.

The primary objective of curriculum adaptation is to achieve the desired learning goals without altering the core content of the curriculum, but rather by simplifying its concepts to make them more accessible to learners. However, teachers often encounter challenges in this process because the existing curricula are not always suitable for the characteristics and needs of students with disabilities.

Building on this, recent research highlights that traditional curricula frequently hinder students with learning difficulties by emphasizing uniform academic standards that fail to consider individual differences. Teachers also struggle to develop individualized educational goals due to limited professional support and training. While standards-based reforms further intensify the challenge by creating tension between achieving general academic expectations and addressing diverse learner needs.

In addition, the intensive nature of curriculum content and the difficulty of simplifying or reducing it while maintaining educational objectives are regarded as major barriers to effective curriculum adaptation for students with learning disabilities. It is imperative to strengthen inclusive education in all schools to ensure that students with disabilities have equal access to education and enjoy educational justice.

Teachers have also reported that they need more support in how to adapt the curriculum in a way that supports each student (Nilsen, 2017; Petersen, 2016). Research indicates that teachers generally express positive attitudes toward curriculum adaptation in terms of content and objectives. However, successful implementation requires adequate training, technological infrastructure, and institutional support.

In the Saudi Arabian context, the Kingdom's recent transition toward inclusive education has imposed a heavy burden on teachers in both general and special education settings. This has highlighted the issue of teacher competence and their ability to

undertake curriculum adaptation for students with learning disabilities, as well as the obstacles they face. Although a small number of studies conducted in Saudi Arabia examined the obstacles faced by special education teachers in general regarding curriculum adaptation, they have not focused specifically on the learning disabilities category. Therefore, this study intends to delineate the obstacles to adapting curriculum objectives and content for students with learning disabilities as perceived by their teachers. It further seeks to ascertain whether the perceptions of these obstacles by teachers of students with learning disabilities differ based on the variables of years of experience, academic degree, and gender. The research problem can be framed by the subsequent questions: What are the obstacles to adapting curriculum objectives and content for students with learning disabilities as perceived by their teachers? Are there any differences with statistical significance in the perspective of teachers with learning disabilities regarding the obstacles to adapting curriculum objectives and content that can be attributed to the variables of years of experience, academic degree, and gender?

2. Methodology

The study's sample is composed of 299 teachers of both genders from the elementary stage in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, including 141 males and 158 females. This sample is representative of teachers of students with learning disabilities in public schools providing a learning disabilities program at the elementary stage. The research tool has been administered in the first term of the school year 2024-2025. Table 1 illustrates the demographic characteristics of the study sample. The Obstacles to Curriculum Objectives and Content Adaptation Questionnaire was developed to identify the obstacles that teachers perceive when adapting curriculum objectives and content for students with learning disabilities. The development of the instrument followed several steps. First, previous studies related to obstacles in curriculum adaptation were reviewed. Based on this review, an initial version of the questionnaire was prepared, consisting of 15 items. The preliminary version was presented to 12 specialists in special education, particularly in the field of learning disabilities. The purpose of this review was to examine the suitability of the instrument for the study objectives and to assess the clarity and relevance of its items. Based on the experts' feedback, revisions were made, and the final version of the questionnaire was prepared. The final questionnaire consists of two main sections. The first section collects demographic information, including years of experience, academic degree, and gender. The second section includes the main dimensions of the questionnaire, which consist of two dimensions:

- Obstacles related to adapting curriculum objectives

- Obstacles related to adapting curriculum content

This section includes a total of 11 items. The dimension related to curriculum objectives includes obstacles such as difficulty in formulating educational objectives that align with modern educational trends and challenges in developing objectives that meet the specific needs of students with learning disabilities. It also addresses difficulties in designing appropriate cognitive, affective, and skill-based objectives for these students, as well as challenges in specifying instructional objectives that can be achieved within the allocated time.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the participants

		n	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	141	47.2%
	Female	158	52.8%
	Total	299	100.0%
Years of experience	Less than five years	87	29.1%
	five to ten years	86	28.8%
	More than ten years	126	42.1%
	Total	299	100.0%
Academic degree	Bachelor's degree	206	68.9%
	Postgraduate studies	93	31.1%
	Total	299	100.0%

n: Number

The dimension related to curriculum content adaptation includes obstacles such as difficulty in preparing suitable instructional activities, challenges in making curriculum content engaging and appropriate, lack of clear instructional guidelines for adaptation procedures, insufficient knowledge about students' individual needs, and difficulty in considering the linguistic abilities of students with learning disabilities during the adaptation process. The questionnaire uses a five-point Likert scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. The instrument was administered to a pilot sample of 70 male and female teachers. The psychometric properties of the questionnaire were examined by assessing its internal consistency. This was done by calculating the correlation coefficient between each item and the total.

The study utilizes a descriptive methodology, and data have been combined via an online questionnaire created on the Google Forms platform. This was done after obtaining approval from the Local Committee for Research Ethics at Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University and the Saudi Arabian Ministry of Education to administer the questionnaire to teachers in public schools. The questionnaire link has been sent to school principals, who in turn distributed it to the targeted male and female teachers. Upon completion of data compilation, the data were analyzed using the SPSS-27 statistical software to answer the study's questions. The analysis relied on several appropriate statistical methods, including percentages, means, and standard deviations. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the Shapiro-Wilk test have also been used to ensure the normality of the data distribution, and a

one-way ANOVA and a t-test have been employed for group comparisons.

3. Results

To address the first research question, the means, standard deviations, and percentages were calculated for the responses of teachers of students with learning disabilities regarding the obstacles to curriculum objectives and content adaptation, based on their perspectives. The questionnaire items were rated using a five-point Likert scale. To facilitate the interpretation of the results, a weighted scoring system was applied to determine the response level for the two dimensions of the instrument. The response options were assigned the following weights: Absolutely Agree = 5, Agree = 4, Neutral = 3, Disagree = 2, and Absolutely Disagree = 1. The mean scores were then classified into five equal intervals

to indicate the level of response: Very High (4.21–5.00), High (3.41–4.20), Moderate (2.61–3.40), Low (1.81–2.60), and Very Low (1.00–1.80). Table 2 reveals the responses of the study’s sample to the questionnaire dimensions, which were at a high level. The mean scores for the two dimensions have ranged from 3.53 to 4.05, with a standard deviation of 0.95 to 1.09.

To respond to the second question, a One-Way ANOVA is used after confirming the normality of the distribution to identify significant differences among more than two independent groups based on the variable of years of experience. A t-test is conducted to delineate the differences between two independent groups (Independent Sample T-Test) for the variables: academic degree and gender. The following Tables 3-6 present the findings that have been reached.

Table 2: Obstacles to curriculum objectives and content adaptation

No.	Item	Absolutely agree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Neutral n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Absolutely disagree n (%)	Mean	SD	Rank
First dimension: Obstacles related to curriculum objectives adaptation									
1	Difficulty in developing educational objectives aligned with modern pedagogical approaches	83 (27.8)	113 (37.8)	48 (16.1)	46 (15.4)	9 (3.0)	3.72	1.12	1
2	Difficulty in developing objectives tailored to students’ specific needs	68 (22.7)	118 (39.5)	39 (13.0)	64 (21.4)	10 (3.3)	3.57	1.15	4
3	Difficulty in setting appropriate cognitive objectives	47 (15.7)	143 (47.8)	43 (14.4)	59 (19.7)	7 (2.3)	3.55	1.05	5
4	Difficulty in formulating appropriate affective objectives	49 (16.4)	139 (46.5)	74 (24.7)	33 (11.0)	4 (1.3)	3.66	0.93	2
5	Difficulty in creating appropriate skills-based objectives	57 (19.1)	117 (39.1)	60 (20.1)	56 (18.7)	9 (3.0)	3.53	1.09	6
6	Difficulty in setting objectives appropriate to allocated time	63 (21.1)	131 (43.8)	46 (15.4)	50 (16.7)	9 (3.0)	3.63	1.08	3
Second dimension: Obstacles related to curriculum content adaptation									
7	Difficulty in preparing suitable activities	68 (22.7)	111 (37.1)	55 (18.4)	58 (19.4)	7 (2.3)	3.59	1.11	5
8	Difficulty in adapting content to be stimulating	65 (21.7)	134 (44.8)	49 (16.4)	44 (14.7)	7 (2.3)	3.69	1.04	4
9	Lack of guideline outlining adaptation procedures	111 (37.1)	117 (39.1)	49 (16.4)	18 (6.0)	4 (1.3)	4.05	0.95	1
10	Inadequate knowledge of students’ individual needs	68 (22.7)	128 (42.8)	58 (19.4)	37 (12.4)	8 (2.7)	3.71	1.04	3
11	Difficulty in considering linguistic abilities	71 (23.7)	129 (43.1)	53 (17.7)	41 (13.7)	5 (1.7)	3.74	1.02	2

SD: Standard deviation

Table 3: One-way ANOVA of the differences in participants’ responses based on years of experience

Dimension	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom (df)	Mean square	F-value	Significance level
Obstacles related to curriculum objectives adaptation	Between groups	45.58	2	22.79	37.82	0.000
	Within groups	178.37	296	0.60		
Obstacles related to curriculum content adaptation	Between groups	25.77	2	12.89	24.13	0.000
	Within groups	158.07	296	0.53		

Table 3 illustrates that the F-values are significant at the 0.01 level for the dimensions of (obstacles related to curriculum objectives adaptation, obstacles related to curriculum content adaptation). The significance level for these dimensions has been 0.000, which indicates differences with statistical significance among the responses of the study’s sample regarding the obstacles to the curriculum objectives and content adaptation for students with learning disabilities in

those dimensions. To determine the direction of these differences, the Scheffé test was used as one of the post-hoc comparison tests to identify the source of these differences (Table 4).

As detailed in Table 4, there are differences with statistical significance at the 0.05 level, as follows. There are differences with statistical significance in the obstacles to curriculum objectives and content adaptation for students with learning disabilities between participants who have more than ten years

of experience and those who have less than five years of experience. The differences favor the group with less than five years of experience. Additionally, differences were observed between participants

with five to ten years of experience and those with more than ten years of experience, with the differences favoring the group with five to ten years of experience.

Table 4: Scheffé test for differences based on the variable of years of experience

Dimension	Comparison (years of experience)	Mean difference	p-value	Significant
Obstacles related to curriculum objectives adaptation	Less than 5 years vs. more than 10 years	0.80	< .05	Yes
	5-10 years vs. more than 10 years	0.77	< .05	Yes
	Less than 5 years vs. 5-10 years	0.03	> .05	No
Obstacles related to curriculum content adaptation	Less than 5 years vs. more than 10 years	0.62	< .05	Yes
	5-10 years vs. more than 10 years	0.56	< .05	Yes
	Less than 5 years vs. 5-10 years	0.06	> .05	No

To determine whether there are differences with statistical significance in the responses of the study sample regarding the obstacles to curriculum adaptation for students with learning disabilities from their teachers' perspectives, based on the variable of educational qualification, a t-test has been used to analyze the differences in the responses of the study sample. Table 5 reveals that the t-values

are not significant in the two dimensions: obstacles related to curriculum objectives adaptation and obstacles related to curriculum content adaptation. This indicates that there are no differences with statistical significance in the responses of the study sample regarding the obstacles to curriculum objectives and content adaptation for students with learning disabilities in these two dimensions.

Table 5: T-test for the significance of differences in participants' responses based on educational qualification

Dimension	Educational qualification	n	Mean	Standard deviation	T-value	Significance level
Obstacles related to curriculum objectives adaptation	Bachelor's degree	206	3.62	0.83	0.25	0.804
	Postgraduate studies	93	3.59	0.94		
Obstacles related to curriculum content adaptation	Bachelor's degree	206	3.74	0.77	0.45	0.655
	Postgraduate studies	93	3.78	0.82		

To ascertain if there were differences with statistical significance in the responses of the study sample regarding the obstacles to curriculum objectives and content adaptation based on the

gender variable, a t-test has been used to analyze the differences in the responses of the study sample members. The results are illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6: T-test for the significance of differences in participants' responses based on to gender

Dimension	Sample's gender	n	Mean	Standard deviation	T-value	Significance level
Obstacles related to curriculum objectives adaptation	Male	141	3.62	0.88	0.19	0.850
	Female	158	3.60	0.85		
Obstacles related to curriculum content adaptation	Male	141	3.75	0.85	0.01	0.989
	Female	158	3.75	0.73		

Table 6 demonstrates that the t-values are not significant in the two dimensions: obstacles related to curriculum objectives adaptation and obstacles related to curriculum content adaptation. This indicates no differences with statistical significance in the responses of the study sample regarding the obstacles to curriculum objectives and content adaptation for students with learning disabilities in those two dimensions, which can be attributed to the sample's gender variation (male-female).

4. Discussion

Regarding the first question, Table 1 indicates that most teacher responses in the first dimension, "Obstacles related to curriculum objectives adaptation," fall under the response (Agree). This indicates that teachers of students with learning

disabilities perceive the existence of these obstacles. The teachers believe that all items in the first dimension present a high degree of difficulty, with a mean score ranging from 3.53 to 3.72 and a standard deviation ranging from 1.09 to 1.12.

Regarding the second dimension, "Obstacles related to curriculum content adaptation," all the teachers' responses are at a high degree of agreement ("Agree"). This indicates that teachers of students with learning disabilities perceive the existence of these obstacles. The teachers consider all items in the second dimension to be a high-degree obstacle, with a mean score ranging from 3.59 to 4.05 and a standard deviation ranging from 0.95 to 1.11.

The study's findings also reveal that teachers' responses are at a high level of agreement ("Agree") for all items on the questionnaire. This clearly

indicates that these teachers face a set of obstacles when adapting the objectives and content of the curriculum to suit the requirements of students with learning disabilities.

It appears that among the most prominent challenges they face when adapting curriculum objectives is the difficulty of formulating educational objectives that align with the characteristics of these students, both regarding the nature of their disabilities and the alignment of these objectives with modern pedagogical approaches. Furthermore, many teachers find it difficult to adjust objectives to fit within the time allocated for their achievement. Such outcomes may be attributable to the inadequacy of in-service training and professional development opportunities available to teachers. On the other hand, these difficulties may also stem from some teachers' lack of awareness of their students' actual performance levels, which makes it challenging for them to adapt curriculum objectives to those levels. In addition, the increasing administrative burdens placed on teachers act as a real barrier, preventing them from dedicating sufficient time and effort to adequately adapt to educational objectives. The lack of integrating students' interests into the objective adaptation process and limited professional knowledge in the field of designing appropriate educational objectives are all factors that negatively impact the effectiveness of adapting educational objectives. This concurs with the results of prior research by [Alkhaldeh and Khasawneh \(2022\)](#), [Alhassan and Abosi \(2017\)](#), [Mpofu and Sefotho \(2024\)](#), and [Florian and Black-Hawkins \(2011\)](#).

Regarding the adaptation of curriculum content, the study reveals that teachers also face significant difficulties in this area. Some of these challenges include the absence of a guideline that outlines the permissible procedures and steps for adapting the curriculum for students with learning disabilities. Furthermore, accommodating the varying linguistic abilities among students is a major challenge when adapting content, especially given the lack of specialized training in this field. It is also observed that teachers' limited knowledge of effective content adaptation strategies contributes to the widening gap between the general education curriculum and the needs of students with learning disabilities, a finding that has been corroborated by previous studies ([Ahmad and May, 2018](#); [Al-Busaidi and Tuzlukova, 2018](#); [Strnadová et al., 2024](#)).

The findings of the present study, concerning the questionnaire items on obstacles to curriculum objectives and content adaptation, align with the conclusions of several previous studies. The teachers' perspectives collectively agreed that multiple obstacles hinder the adaptation of objectives and content to meet the needs of students with disabilities ([Alkhaldeh and Khasawneh, 2022](#); [Alhassan and Abosi, 2017](#)).

With respect to the second question, the results reveal differences with statistical significance in the mean responses of the study's sample concerning

the obstacles to curriculum objectives and content adaptation for students with learning disabilities, ascribed to the varying number of years of experience. The study established that the differences in the two dimensions, "obstacles to adapting curriculum objectives and curriculum content," are in favor of the less experienced participants.

The research findings indicated that teachers who have less experience in teaching students with learning disabilities perceive the obstacles facing them in adapting curriculum objectives and content to suit these students' demands more significantly than their more-experienced counterparts. This is likely attributable to the fact that less-experienced teachers often lack the specialized practical skills and sufficient expertise necessary to manage the complex and diverse instructional situations that may arise while teaching students with learning disabilities. Furthermore, these teachers may encounter a deficiency in professional support and guidance from their more experienced colleagues or the school administration, which can exacerbate their feelings of frustration, psychological stress, and low self-efficacy during the execution of their teaching duties.

In accordance with [Guskey \(2002\)](#) Teacher Professional Development Model, teacher performance evolves progressively from theoretical learning to practical application, and subsequently to developing conviction in the effectiveness of instructional practices based on student learning outcomes. Accordingly, the greater perception of curriculum adaptation obstacles by less-experienced teachers can be interpreted as being in the early stages of professional development, where they lack practical experience and confidence in their capacity for adaptation to curriculum. Conversely, more-experienced teachers demonstrate greater flexibility and accumulated expertise, enabling them to confront obstacles and devise practical solutions for curriculum adaptation in line with the requirements of their students.

This finding is in conformity with the results of the study by [Suprayogi et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Gibbs \(2023\)](#), which indicated that teaching experience performs a pivotal function in a teacher's ability to implement curriculum adaptation. More-experienced teachers possess superior skills in applying differentiated instruction strategies, whereas less-experienced teachers feel burdened by the planning and implementation demands when attempting to adapt education to satisfy the demands of all students. This makes them more cognizant of the obstacles related to time and resource limitations, reinforcing their sense of difficulty in effectively implementing differentiated instruction.

The current research's findings align with this perspective, demonstrating that limited professional experience is correlated with an increased teacher perception of challenges and a corresponding lower self-efficacy in their capacity to adapt curriculum

objectives and content in accordance with the demands of students with learning disabilities.

This result, therefore, underscores the importance of enhancing support for less-experienced teachers of students with learning disabilities. This should be facilitated through targeted training, rigorous educational supervision, and the exchange of expertise with their more experienced teachers of students with learning disabilities. Such measures would assist them in developing their skills and mitigating their perceived obstacles in curriculum adaptation for students with learning disabilities.

The results of the current study, which have shown that more experienced teachers rely on their expertise to overcome obstacles related to curriculum objectives and content adaptation, while less experienced teachers feel these obstacles more acutely, leading to weaker curriculum adaptation, are consistent with the findings of the following studies ([Ahmad and May, 2018](#); [Genovesi et al., 2022](#)).

Regarding the variables of academic degree and gender, the results have shown no differences with statistical significance in the responses of the study's sample concerning the obstacles to curriculum objectives and content adaptation for students with learning disabilities based on either academic degree (bachelor's vs. postgraduate) or gender (male-female). This can be explained by the fact that both genders work under similar conditions and receive the same training. The availability of resources, educational aids, and the overall school environment are also comparable. Additionally, the characteristics of the curriculum delivered to students with learning disabilities are the same for all teachers. Teachers of both genders are tasked with performing the same duties to adapt to the curriculum, so it is logical that no differences have been found. This finding, which suggests that an academic degree does not influence the study's results, is consistent with the research of [Alkhalwaleh and Khasawneh \(2022\)](#), who also found no differences with statistical significance based on this variable.

Despite the contributions of this research, it encountered several limitations that need to be considered when interpreting the findings. The most salient of these limitations is that the self-report questionnaire was used as the primary data collection tool. Consequently, teacher responses relied on subjective self-assessment, potentially leading to a social desirability bias where participants might incline toward providing positive responses or avoiding the disclosure of negative aspects of their instructional practices. Furthermore, the questionnaire format precludes the opportunity to observe actual behaviors within the educational setting, which restricts the verification of congruence between declared statements and on-the-ground reality. Additionally, teacher comprehension of the questions may have varied according to their different backgrounds and experiences, thereby impacting the internal

consistency of the data. An additional limitation is that the research sample was restricted to male and female teachers of students with learning disabilities in Riyadh. This diminishes the research's generalizability to other regions within the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, as educational, environmental, and training conditions often differ significantly across geographical areas.

5. Conclusion

The results demonstrate that the obstacles to curriculum objectives and content adaptation for students with learning disabilities, as perceived by their teachers, are determined to be at a high level. It has also been found that the number of years of experience plays a significant role in a teacher's awareness of the obstacles they face when adapting curriculum objectives and content. In contrast, academic degrees and gender do not influence the adaptation of curriculum objectives and content, as both genders work under the same conditions and receive the same training.

This research is considered among the initial studies in the Arab world and Saudi Arabia to investigate the obstacles to curriculum objectives and content adaptation for students with learning disabilities as perceived by their teachers. Adapting curriculum objectives and content is a fundamental component for ensuring effective and inclusive education in the Arab context. This adaptation responds to the need for a flexible curriculum that accommodates individual differences among students, enabling them to attain their optimal learning potential based on their specific abilities. Considering modern educational trends that emphasize inclusive education and the principle of education for all, there is a growing need to develop adaptable curricula that contribute to enhancing the academic achievement and social integration of students with learning disabilities within the Arab context.

The study's findings recommend enriching the curriculum with diverse scientific activities, images, and visual aids that are appropriate for students with learning disabilities. The research further recommends that educational objectives be clearly defined and made achievable based on their specific abilities, while ensuring the content itself is clear. Furthermore, the study proposes rephrasing curriculum content using simplified language that considers the attributes of students with learning disabilities, avoiding abstract concepts and complex terminology. The focus should be on a gradual presentation of information and linking it to real-life experiences. The findings also recommend the development of specialized training programs for teachers in curriculum adaptation, to include skills for modifying objectives and content. Additionally, it is crucial to review educational policies at the ministerial level to ensure clear and approved mechanisms for curriculum adaptation within the national framework for curriculum and evaluation,

and to provide the necessary resources for their implementation in the educational field. Finally, the study recommends conducting further research on the challenges related to adapting curriculum objectives and content, particularly using mixed methods approaches. Future studies are encouraged to utilize multiple data collection tools, such as direct observation and interviews. Additionally, expanding the sample to include participants from various geographical regions is advised. These steps would strengthen the credibility of future findings and enhance their generalizability.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the teachers who generously shared their time and experiences to participate in this study.

Compliance with ethical standards

Ethical considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee at Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (Approval No. 638623681656319867). Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured.

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Ahmad NA and May YS (2018). Challenges in preparing teachers for inclusive education and its impact to students with learning disabilities. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education & Development*, 7(3): 569–581. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPEd/v7-i3/4575>
- Al-Busaidi S and Tuzlukova V (2018). Teachers' perceptions of practices and challenges of innovating for the inclusion of special needs university English language learners in Oman. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 12(4): 659–671. <https://doi.org/10.53543/jeps.vol12iss4pp659-671>
- Alhassan ARK and Abosi CO (2017). Teachers' pedagogical competence in adapting curricula for children with learning difficulties (LD) in primary schools in Ghana. *Journal of the American Academy of Special Education Professionals*, 12(2): 41–61. <https://doi.org/10.64546/jaasep.336>
- Alkhalwaldeh MA and Khasawneh MAS (2022). Problems faced by English language teachers in teaching students with learning disabilities. *Science and Education*, 3(5): 677–687.
- Collins SE, Clifasefi SL, Stanton J et al. (2018). Community-based participatory research (CBPR): Towards equitable involvement of community in psychology research. *American Psychologist*, 73(7): 884–898.

- <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000167>
PMid:29355352 PMCID:PMC6054913
- Cortiella C and Horowitz SH (2014). *The state of learning disabilities: Facts, trends and emerging issues*. Third Edition, National Center for Learning Disabilities, New York, USA.
- Deunk MI, Smale-Jacobse AE, de Boer H, Doolaard S, and Bosker RJ (2018). Effective differentiation practices: A systematic review and meta-analysis of studies on the cognitive effects of differentiation practices in primary education. *Educational Research Review*, 24: 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.02.002>
- Florian L (2015). Inclusive pedagogy: A transformative approach to individual differences but can it help reduce educational inequalities? *Scottish Educational Review*, 47(1): 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1163/27730840-04701003>
- Florian L and Black-Hawkins K (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5): 813–828. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096>
- Genovesi E, Jakobsson C, Nugent L, Hanlon C, and Hoekstra RA (2022). Stakeholder experiences, attitudes and perspectives on inclusive education for children with developmental disabilities in sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review of qualitative studies. *Autism*, 26(7): 1606–1625. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13623613221096208>
PMid:35635316 PMCID:PMC9483198
- Gibbs K (2023). Voices in practice: Challenges to implementing differentiated instruction by teachers and school leaders in an Australian mainstream secondary school. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 50: 1217–1232. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-022-00551-2>
- Gilson CB and Biggs EE (2024). Perspectives of special education teachers and paraprofessionals on working together in general education settings. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 28(14): 3341–3356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2023.2216206>
- Guskey TR (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching*, 8(3): 381–391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135406002100000512>
- Mpofu J and Sefotho MM (2024). Challenges of competency-based curriculum in teaching learners with learning disabilities. *African Journal of Disability*, 13: 1268. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ajod.v13i0.1268>
PMid:38628957 PMCID:PMC11019064
- Nilsen S (2017). Special education and general education—coordinated or separated? A study of curriculum planning for pupils with special educational needs. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21(2): 205–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2016.1193564>
- Petersen A (2016). Perspectives of special education teachers on general education curriculum access: Preliminary results. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 41(1): 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1540796915604835>
- Strnadová I, Danker J, Dowse L, and Tso M (2024). Supporting students with disability to improve academic, social and emotional, and self-determination and life-skills outcomes: Umbrella review of evidence-based practices. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 28(14): 3606–3622. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2023.2221239>
- Suprayogi MN, Valcke M, and Godwin R (2017). Teachers and their implementation of differentiated instruction in the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67: 291–301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.020>
- UNESCO (2017). *A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education*. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris, France.