

# Curriculum implemented for students with specific learning disabilities in Jordanian resource rooms

Eman Al-Zboon<sup>1</sup>, Kholoud Al-Dababneh<sup>1</sup>, Haitham Baibers<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Hashemite University, Queen Rania Faculty for Childhood, Special Education Department, Jordan

<sup>2</sup> The Hashemite University, Queen Rania Faculty for Childhood, Early Childhood Education Department, Jordan

## HOW TO CITE:

Al-Zboon, E., Al-Dababneh, K.,  
& Baibers, H. (2022).  
Curriculum implemented  
for students with specific learning  
disabilities in Jordanian  
resource rooms.

*International Journal  
of Special Education*, 37(2), 150-159.

## CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Eman Al-Zboon;  
emank@hu.edu.jo

## DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.52291/ijse.2022.37.48>

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine the curriculum implemented in resource rooms for students with specific learning disabilities in Jordan. Multiple data collection methods were used during this study: semi-structured interviews with 35 teachers, document analysis of 35 timetables and 35 individual education plans (IEPs), and field observations of 35 resource rooms. The results revealed that the curriculum field for students with learning difficulties is disorganized, random, and not comprehensive. There is an obvious lack of competence among teachers regarding working in an inclusive setting, as well as a lack of curriculum for those with specific learning difficulties (SLD). Teachers reported training needs in many fields; effective curriculum implementation is constrained by many barriers. The implications of these findings for the curriculum of students with SLD and directions for future research are discussed.

## COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2022 Authors.  
Open access publication under  
the terms and conditions  
of the Creative Commons  
Attribution (CC BY)  
license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**Keywords:** curriculum, specific learning disabilities, resource rooms, inclusion.

## INTRODUCTION

Students with specific learning difficulties (SLD) experience many problems that affect their school performance, among them attention problems (Shaywitz et al., 1992), memory problems (Smith, 2004), an impulsive cognitive style (Al-Dababneh & Al-Zboon, 2017) and problems processing sensory information (Kemp et al., 2009). Students with SLD may also have metacognitive domain problems when it comes to the active control and monitoring of learning strategies (Bender, 2008).

Additionally, SLD has an effect on the social domain, leading to low social status and peer rejection (Prior et al., 1999). Numerous studies have revealed that SLD can cause anxiety and frustration (Edwards, 1994). Many pupils with SLD will suffer from poor motivation (Glasser, 1993) and low self-esteem (Humphrey, 2002) due to a history of failure. Academically, students with SLD may have greater difficulties than students without SLD (Troia, 2006).

Consequently, there is a vital need to meet these students' needs and guarantee their ability to achieve their maximum potential, as a lack of proper support can have long-term negative effects on them in adulthood (Morgan & Klein, 2000). The curriculum plays a substantial role in education as it is the core of any learning institute. Al-Zboon (2013) identified the significant curriculum areas for students with SLD. These areas are the general curriculum, the expanded core curriculum for students with SLD, and the individual educational programmes that were intended to address the specific needs of students with SLD.

Besides academic content, the literature reports that a curriculum for SLD should include many content domains, such as self-advocacy, transition skills, memory skills, metacognitive domain skills, organizational skills, assistive technologies (ATs) (e.g., Bender, 2008), and phonemic awareness and letter-sound knowledge (Gutiérrez et al., 2019).

However, curriculum flexibility and adjustment to meet the unique needs of students with SLD are each considered significant (Alberta Education, 2009), as if a curriculum is used with learners with SLD without modifications, they will be overloaded and therefore will not even achieve the basic skills and information (Konza, 2005). Every student with SLD has individual needs and strengths that affect their learning and teachers have to consider these (Bender, 2008). MacArthur, Ferretti, and Okolo (2001) reported that students' needs should be identified in the Individual Education Plan (IEP), after which the IEP team can decide on the degree of inclusion.

Virginia Department of Education (2014) stated that the IEP team also should consider specific needs that had impacts on the student's progress in the general curriculum.

In Jordan, the resource room (RR) is the dominant alternative learning site for those with SLD as a form of partial inclusion. The majority of RRs are hosted in local primary schools and mostly serve students with SLD from second class to sixth class. They have one SE teacher and serve 18-25 students who are diagnosed with SLD. They provide educational evaluation using: first, Princess Tharwat Al-Hasan tests for SLD diagnosis, which evaluate three achievement-related subscales: Arabic language subscale, maths subscale, and perceptual skills subscale. Second, learning packages issued by the MoE to evaluate the current level of achievement in Arabic language and maths. Third, an informal teacher-made test. Students with SLD receive teaching in regular classes and attend the RR three-five times a week. There are no other professionals in these classrooms, such as speech therapists, maths teachers, Arabic language teachers, or assistant teachers. Teachers generally have four lessons a day.

Teachers have an important role in achieving interaction and increasing learning opportunities (Rix et al., 2006). The literature mentions teacher-related variables which affect the learning of those with SLD, such as pre- and in-service training (Bradshaw et al., 2009), teachers' collaboration, and teachers' attitudes (Rose et al., 2007). Additionally, school management bodies are expected to take responsibility for the planning, organization, and evaluation of the education that is delivered to SLD (Sakiz, 2018).

There is growing interest in investigating the curricula of students with SLD worldwide. For example, one study reported that an age-level curriculum had been presented to a third of school students with SLD and that, while half of all teachers made some adaptations to the general curriculum, fewer than one in six made substantial adaptations or developed a specialised curriculum of their own (Newman, 2006). Theobald, Goldhaber, Gratz and Holden (2019) emphasized the importance of access to the general curriculum for students with SLD since it had been found that students with SLD who spent more time in general education classrooms achieved higher levels of post-secondary outcomes than those who were unable to access the general curriculum.

Natour (2008) revealed that teachers have low competence in conducting curriculum amendments, developing IEPs, developing evaluation-based curricula, and family involvement. Another study found that special education (SE) teachers perceive themselves to be more qualified

than general teachers in domains linked with teaching: planning, instructional pacing, content adjustment, and monitoring progress (Conderman & Johnston-Rodriguez, 2009). Arif and Gaad (2008) reported that the curriculum approved for students with disabilities in the Emirates is a para-curriculum, due to a belief that they are unable to achieve the general curriculum standards. They receive the same textbooks, but there are modifications; for instance, difficult chapters may be deleted.

In Jordan, studies have revealed confusion in the curricula for students with disabilities; for example, one study (Al-Zboon, 2016a) revealed confusion in the curriculum for students with hearing impairments, which calls for an inclusive reform process to improve the field. Al-Zboon (2016b) reported a number of basic curriculum components for students with hearing impairments (i.e. a general and specific outcomes document, students' textbooks, teachers' textbooks, and learning resources). Al-Zboon (2019a) found that SE teachers were disgruntled with their training programmes and the situation regarding the usage of AT in curriculum implementation. Also, the teachers mentioned obstacles and ethical issues concerning the use of AT.

Al-Dababneh and Al-Zboon (2020) found that teachers perceived themselves as being highly competent in using AT in instructing students with SLD. However, Al-Zboon (2020) also pointed out that AT was scarce in SE schools and there were ethical issues in the usage of AT in the curriculum. The study reported the obstacles to using AT effectively, comprising financial and training issues, negative attitudes, and the lack of family involvement. National Council for Special Education (NCSE, 2012) reported that their literature review revealed an absence of studies that investigated the best way to design and use IEP and the most important components of IEP.

In light of the significance of the curriculum for students with SLD, the current trends of inclusion (Al-Zboon, 2018), as well as the lack of related studies, an investigation of the curricula of students with SLD in inclusive settings is in order. The purpose of this study is to examine the state of the curricula implemented in resource rooms (RR) for students with SLD in Jordan.

## JORDANIAN CONTEXT

The educational strategies of SE in Jordan have been affected by the global movement toward inclusion. In 2020, 'the 10-year Inclusive Education Strategy was launched by the Jordanian Ministry of Education and the Higher Council for Persons with Disabilities. This

strategy will assist in the success of inclusive education in Jordan (Al-Zboon, 2020). In the Arab region, Jordan is considered to have been the first country to adopt the partial inclusion of students with disabilities enrolled in resource classrooms (Rutherford, 2007). The Ministry of Education has used the RR model to achieve the inclusion of pupils with disabilities in regular schools. In this model, students with disability spend the majority of educational time in the general class, while receiving special teaching for a short time in the RR (Al-Natour et al., 2015). The Jordanian 10-Year Strategy for Inclusive Education identified inclusive education as that which secured and ensured that all students with disabilities could access, attend, participate and succeed in their local regular school.

In Jordan, a person with a disability is defined as someone who has a long-term physical, sensory, intellectual, mental, psychological, or neurological impairment, which, as a result of interaction with other physical and behavioral barriers, may hinder the involvement by that person in major life activities or hinder the independent exercise by that person of any rights or basic freedoms. The Ministry of Education also mentions this definition: SLD is a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes that are involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations. It does not include learning problems that are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or mental disabilities, or of environmental disadvantages.

Regarding the Jordanian curriculum, the National Centre for Curriculum Development as well as the Curriculum and Textbooks Department are in charge of developing the school curriculum from KG to twelfth grade. The curriculum in Jordan is compulsory for all schools. The curriculum contains: "Arabic language, English language, religious education, mathematics, science, computing, history, geography, patriotic education, financial education, art, vocational education, music, and physical education" (Al-Zboon, 2020, p. 578).

The study aims to answer the following research questions:

- What is the state of the curricula that are implemented in resource rooms for students with SLD in Jordan?
- What are the barriers to the effective implementation of the curriculum?
- What are the curriculum domains for students with SLD?

- What are the teachers' perceptions regarding their competence?
- What are the curriculum components of the curriculum of students with SLD?

## METHODS

A qualitative methodology was adopted in the current study to reach an in-depth comprehension of the curriculum implemented in RR for students with SLD. The qualitative research approach is considered a systematic path to understanding complex phenomena within a definite context. So, it is considered the best method to achieve scientific-based thematic evidence to inform educational practice and offers the basis for future inquiry (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006) as well as it is considered the most appropriate method to answer the research questions and to gather participants' perspectives about curriculum implemented in RR for students with SLD.

### Participants

A total of 35 RR teachers from public schools in Zarqa, Jordan, participated. The participants in the current study were teachers pursuing bachelor's or master's degrees in SE. The resource room includes students with SLD from ages 6 to 12. The majority of teachers were female (N=27). Participants' teaching experiences ranged from 7 to 16 years. The 35 class schedules and 35 IEPs were analyzed in terms of curriculum content.

### Data collection

Multiple data collection methods were adopted through the study as a method of triangulation. First, there was a document analysis of a weekly schedule and an individual's plan. Merriam (1988) states: "Documents of all types can help the researcher uncover meaning, develop understanding, and discover insights relevant to the research problem" (p. 118). Second, there was a semi-structured interview using open-ended questions to investigate the participants' perceptions of the curriculum, as this is considered one of the best means of collecting qualitative data (Kvale, 1996). Each interview lasted approximately 40 minutes and each interview was transcribed immediately after the interview had been conducted. The questions that were used in the interviews took the form of introductory, follow-up, probing, specifying, and direct questions (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

The third method comprised field observations of 35 RR teachers' practices in relation to the curriculum. Observational data were collected during 30-minute sessions

using the observation protocol, and detailed field notes regarding teachers' practices in relation to the curriculum, as well as the environmental status, were documented during each session.

### Data analysis

A thematic analysis was used to analyze each piece of data by adopting a coding system for the transcripts. Phases that were adopted were seeking patterns, inspecting themes that emerged from the initial coding, connecting themes, and selecting supporting quotes of the themes from the data (Holloway & Todres, 2006). Across several sources, the codes were revised and compared to identify the themes (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). To include quotes, these criteria were adopted: the quote's richness, its representation of the research results, and the degree of perception on the part of the study participants (Anderson, 2010). The analysis of the content of the weekly schedules and the IEPs was conducted through careful inspection of each of the IEP texts to discover data that related to curriculum content. Finally, the findings, which involved triangulation of the data from multiple data sources, were written which reflex the summary themes from the raw data in order to achieve a deep understanding of the meanings of complex data related to the curriculum. So, the six emergent themes are considered the main six findings of the study.

### Credibility

Trustworthiness and credibility were achieved by the triangulation of various methods for gathering data (interviews, observation, and document analysis). A peer control technique was also used to ensure the validity of the qualitative data.

### Ethical considerations

To ensure commitment to ethical issues when doing the current research with human subjects, approval was gained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the Hashemite University in Jordan. Additionally, the study was directed in harmony with the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki. Informed consent was gained from all participants in the study.

## FINDINGS

### The state of the curricula that are implemented in resource rooms for students with SLD in Jordan

Data analysis revealed that the teachers are the designers of the curriculum; it is a personal effort on the part of the teachers. IEP development is also the respon-

sibility of teachers. Other members of the IEP team are not involved. However, some teachers reported some IEP members being involved, such as principals, psychological counselors, parents, and general teachers. Ahlam commented that: 'Writing IEPs is one of my tasks. I prepare them based on the current performance of a student, then the administrator signs and approves them.'

The participants reported the need for some documents that could enhance their work, such as a general framework for an SLD curriculum, a teachers' guidebook, student textbooks, and attached resources. Additionally, technology devices and programmes for SLD are lacking.

### **The barriers to the effective implementation of the curriculum**

The informants' responses indicated that the barriers to effectively implementing the curriculum were: low levels of family involvement (n=15), absence of a unified national framework or curriculum for SLD (n=15), financial barriers (lack of materials, teaching aids) (n=9), physical environment (lack of school facilities and limited space) (n=8), insufficient time (n=8), lack of teachers' competences (n=7), absence of supported curriculum for GC (n=7), regulations that restrict teachers' freedom to design a curriculum (n=5) and the burden on teachers' shoulders (n=5). The student-related barriers were: lack of students' commitment to going to RR, lack of student progress and development, the individual differences between those with SLD (n=4), and the existence of some students who have other disabilities (such as intellectual disability and hearing disability). Other barriers mentioned were the lack of multidisciplinary services (n=4), low levels of supervision (n=3), general teachers' beliefs (n=2), and the lack of in-service teacher training (n=2). Field observation revealed additional barriers: failure to use technology, absence of another professional such as a speech therapist, disorganized corner system, small physical area, poor interaction between teachers, and relationship with students.

Amera said: 'The class teacher wants to send the students to RR and considers it as an alternative to the classroom, not as supporting each other.'

Aisha elaborated: 'The learning disabilities field in Jordan doesn't have a joint framework that organizes the field. Every teacher builds the curriculum based on his experiences.'

Shreen agreed, adding: 'The families also wash their hands of the whole process. I am the sole soldier in the battle.'

### **The curriculum domains for students with SLD**

When teachers were asked about curriculum domains for students with SLD, they reported these domains: reading (n=11), writing (n=10), maths (n=8), eye-hand coordination (n=7), inclusion skills (n=2), spelling (n=3), daily life skills (n=15), emotional-social skills (n=5), motor skills (n=5), tactile perception (n=1), visual perception (n=1), hearing perception (n=1), speech (n=1). Generally, the majority of teachers reported basic and simple skills in Arabic language and maths. In maths, the main sub-domains were numbering and the basic maths process, while the main sub-domains in Arabic were reading and writing (letters, words, and sentences), spelling, and word compounds and analysis.

According to Ali: 'The main topics of teaching my students with SLD are maths, reading, and writing.'

Nadia added that: 'In the Arabic language subject, I concentrate on reading letters, words, and sentences. I also focus on analysis and compound words. Reading and writing are the central domains in my view.'

### **The teachers' perceptions regarding their competence**

When teachers were asked about their competence, ten teachers thought that they had appropriate competence, while seven said moderate and three said low. Teachers reported that their training needs were in the following fields: maths and Arabic teaching techniques, modifying the curriculum based on students' needs, behavior modification, organizing the physical environment, collaboration with the team – especially with class teachers and their roles – inclusive education, a connection between evaluation and the curriculum, developing IEP and IIP. Different responses exemplified this perception. Mai said: 'The resource room teacher must receive in-depth training in the fields of maths and Arabic teaching techniques, as their pre-service preparation doesn't have these domains.'

Rama explained: 'I have moderate competence in the curriculum, I need to raise my competence in modifying the regular curriculum to be suitable for SLD as well as in developing IEP.'

Field observation revealed that the physical environment is based on a corner system. Most classes are divided into the following corners: individual work corner, group work corner, library corner, sale and buy corner, and block play corner.

Data analysis revealed the following teaching techniques: multisensory technique, direct instruction, using a computer, playing, singing, phonological technique, story, discussion, group teaching, and behaviorism-based

technique (e.g., skill analysis, reinforcement, modeling). Data analysis revealed that teachers used these techniques to finalize lessons: lesson revision (5), worksheet (4), writing homework (4), and playing (1). Many teachers did not use smooth transition techniques to wrap up the lesson and transition the students to another lesson.

### **The curriculum components of the curriculum of students with SLD**

Data analysis revealed that participants reported these components of the curriculum of SWLD: worksheets (n=16), regular textbooks for the Arabic language (n=24); maths textbook (n=24), IEP (n=20), IIP (n=20), teacher guidebook for regular curriculum (n=3), educational packages for RR (n=2), regular curriculum for kindergarten (n=6), daily preparation notebook (n=4), child notebook (n=3), spelling training book (n=1), font notebook (n=1), speech training plan (n=1).

Data analysis revealed these teaching aids and attached resources: interactive board, sensory games, stories, sandbox, Play-Doh, cards, blocks, balls, whiteboard, forms matching, picture cards for letters and numbers, and board for letters and numbers. Regarding the use of technology, few RR teachers used computers for curriculum implementation.

## **DISCUSSION**

This study employed a qualitative design to highlight the current status of curricula for students with SLD in Jordanian resource rooms. Generally, the findings indicated that the curriculum field is disorganized, random, and not comprehensive.

### **The state of the curricula that are implemented in resource rooms for students with SLD in Jordan**

There is an obvious lack of competence regarding working in an inclusive setting, such as working with regular teachers and preparing an SLD student with inclusion skills. These results can be explained by the fact that inclusive education has only recently been introduced into the education system in Jordan and has therefore not yet been fully adopted or understood by the different educational parties. Al-Natour and co-authors (2015) reported that the pre-service and in-service preparation programmes of general and special education teachers have not been updated to raise their competence in working in inclusive settings.

Data analysis revealed teachers' need for some documents that could enhance their work. The teachers are

the only designers of the curriculum and IEP; it is a personal effort of the teachers and there is no involvement on the part of other IEP team members. This result is frustrating, as the curriculum and IEP are the cornerstones of learning for students with SLD. Watson and co-authors (2014) emphasized that the IEP team should consider and address the unique needs that significantly affected each student's progress in the general education curriculum.

So, this is an indicator that those with SLD do not receive suitable learning in harmony with their differences. This could be explained by contextual factors, such as economic problems which do not address the SLD field as a priority. In Jordan, the lack of funding for SE services derives from a limited understanding of the economics of SE services, as well as a lack of conviction about their effectiveness (Al-Zboon, 2018).

This situation regarding the curriculum mirrored the results that were reported by Newman (2006), who found that the curriculum was in a chaotic state. He reported that an appropriate age-level curriculum had been introduced to just a third of students with SLD, while approximately 50% of all teachers made some modifications to the general curriculum and fewer than one in six made considerable modifications or improved on it to produce a specialised curriculum for students with SLD.

### **The barriers to the effective implementation of the curriculum**

Another important issue is the barriers to effective curriculum implementation. These barriers include: low levels of family involvement, absence of a unified national framework or curriculum for those with SLD, financial barriers, physical environment, insufficient time, and failure to use technology. This result is expected, as many studies have mentioned these barriers in Jordanian SE settings. For example, Al-Natour with co-authors (2015) showed that effective RR is constrained by various factors, including teachers' huge workloads; large numbers of students in the schoolroom; lack of awareness of the significance of collaboration between teachers; and negative attitudes of general teachers towards teaching students with disabilities.

### **The teachers' perceptions regarding their competence**

Data analysis revealed problems in teachers' competence in many fields, such as using the instruction techniques for SLD, smooth transitions between activities and employing technology. These results can be attributed to the

dominant style of non-categorical teacher preparation in Jordan. The programmes prepare teachers to teach all disability categories. However, there is worldwide debate regarding the issue of non-categorical or categorical preparation for SE teachers. Additionally, previous studies (e.g., Al-Zboon, 2020; Al-Zboon, 2019) have documented a lack of professionalism among special education teachers in Jordan. Other studies have discussed teacher-related variables that affect the teachers' levels of competence regarding the teaching of those with SLD, such as pre-and in-service training (Bradshaw et al., 2009), teachers' ability or inclination to collaborate and teachers' attitudes (Rose, McDonnell & Ellis, 2007).

Another interesting finding is related to teachers' training needs to enhance their competence regarding the curriculum. Teachers reported training needs in many fields: maths and Arabic teaching techniques, modifying the curriculum based on students' needs, behavior modification, organizing the physical environment, collaboration with a team, especially with class teachers and their roles, inclusive education, the connection between evaluation and the curriculum, and developing IEP and IIP. These training needs are logical, as Jordan adopts a non-classificatory approach that prepares teachers to teach all SE categories. Previous studies confirmed these training needs (e.g., Al-Natour et al., 2015). This result was in disagreement with that of Conderman and Johnston-Rodriguez (2009), which indicated that special education teachers saw themselves as competent in teaching domains, such as curriculum planning, content modification, and the monitoring of students' progress.

### **The curriculum domains for students with SLD**

Unfortunately, there are no comprehensive curriculum domains for students with SLD. There is a concentration on the basic and simple skills of reading and writing and daily life skills, while there is a lack of concentration on inclusion skills, emotional-social skills, motor skills, sensory perception, and speech. Data analysis revealed the absence of important domains which were mentioned in the related literature, such as the metacognitive domain, self-advocacy skills, organizational skills, and memory skills (Bender, 2008).

It is notable that the current curriculum contributes mainly to the academic learning and development of students with SLD, while its contribution in areas of social and emotional development was small. Yet, Tan (2007) reported that the long-term effects of the development of good social and emotional skills were of great significance for students' holistic learning and development.

However, this result reflects two things: low expectations from those with SLD and low levels of competence among SE teachers regarding teaching advanced Arabic language and maths. The MoE has noticed this low competence, so there is a current trend in Jordan to appoint teachers who specialize in the Arabic language and maths in RR, instead of SE teachers. This could be due to problems in the preparation programmes that do not prepare SE teachers in these competencies.

### **The components of the curriculum for students with SLD**

Another core issue is related to components of the curriculum for SWLD. Data analysis revealed one obvious problem, the lack of use of IEP by some teachers, while many depend on worksheets. This result might mean the lack of teachers' competence is due to a lack of pre-and-in-service training. These results are consistent with another piece of research that found the need for a set of curriculum components in Jordanian SE settings (e.g., a general and specific outcomes document, students' textbooks, teachers' textbooks, and learning resources) (Al-Zboon, 2016b).

The results regarding IEP are in line with Al-Zboon (2016b), which revealed that teachers do not use IEP or IIP, considering these to be burdens. They fail to mention their significance as keystones of programmes for children with disabilities. This result is also consistent with Bulgren with co-authors (2002), who reported that teachers are always aware of a student's IEP contents. Al-Zboon (2016a) revealed a problem in using IEP with students with disabilities in Jordan.

The results indicated the use of a regular curriculum in the Arabic language and maths. There is no focus on all RC subjects. However, this is not adequate, as the teachers concentrate on the basic and simple skills of reading and writing. This reflects low expectations of students with SLD. The literature documents these low expectations (e.g., Vialle & Woodcock, 2011). However, Rix with other authors (2006) reported that the role of teachers' attitudes was basic to effective access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities. This result is consistent with Al-Zboon (2016b), who found that few teachers depend on the general curriculum. Arif and Gaad (2008) revealed that the curriculum which is approved for students with disabilities in the Emirates is a para-curriculum, due to a belief that they are unable to achieve the general curriculum standards. They receive the same textbooks, but with modifications; for instance, difficult chapters are deleted.

The results indicated the failure of RR teachers to use technology for curriculum implementation. However, many studies have revealed the importance of technology in the education of students with SLD in many areas (e.g., Al-Dababneh & Al-Zboon, 2020). This result can be explained by the economic status of Jordan, which might have an effect on providing RR with equipment and devices. Another explanation is the teachers' inability to use technology effectively.

Overall, it is evident that the current design of the curriculum in Jordan poses many challenges that prevent students with SLD from accessing the curriculum. These challenges are related to the significant curriculum areas that were identified by Al-Zboon (2013); i.e., the general curriculum, the expanded core curriculum for students with SLD, and the individual educational programmes that were intended to address the specific needs of students with SLD.

## CONCLUSION

The current study indicates that the curriculum field of SWLD is disorganized, random, and not comprehensive and that there are many problems concerning the current curriculum design. There is an obvious lack of competence on the part of teachers regarding working in an inclusive setting. Another interesting finding is related to teachers' competence, as many teachers reported the need to enhance their competence with regard to the cur-

riculum. Teachers reported training needs in many fields. Effective curriculum implementation is constrained by many barriers.

The decision-makers should focus on curriculum-oriented training in teachers' professional development by enhancing preparation programmes, as well as enhancing the curriculum field by providing a framework for organizing it and overcoming the barriers. Future research might focus on investigating the curriculum using other data collection techniques for other informants, such as parents, general teachers, or students.

## LIMITATIONS

Some limitations should be considered when reading the results of this study as the self-reported data is from a small number of teachers which impedes the generalization of the results. Therefore, future studies should investigate the state of the curriculum of students with SLD through direct observation or other methods, such as a quantitative methodology.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

None.

## DISCLOSURE STATEMENT:

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## FUNDING:

None.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Dababneh, K. & Al-Zboon, E. (2017). Understanding impulsivity among children with specific learning disabilities in inclusion schools. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 41(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731948717726497>
- Al-Dababneh, K. & Al-Zboon, E. (2020). Using assistive technologies in the curriculum of children with specific learning disabilities served in inclusion settings: teachers' beliefs and professionalism. *Disability Rehabilitation Assistive Technology*, 17(1), 23-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17483107.2020.1752824>
- Al-Natour, M., Alkhamra, H. & Al-Smadi, Y. (2008). Assessment of learning disabled students in Jordan: current practices and obstacles. *International Journal of Special Education*, 23, 68.
- Al-Natour, M., Al-Zboon, E., Alkhamra, H. & Amr, M. (2015). Examining collaboration and constraints on collaboration between special and general education teachers in mainstream schools in Jordan. *International Journal of Special Education*, 9(1), 1-14.



- Al-Zboon, E. (2013). Current Trends and Issues in special education, Jordan: Dar Al-Fiker.
- Al-Zboon, E. (2016a). Kindergarten curriculum for children with hearing impairments: Jordanian teachers' perspectives. *Deafness & Education International*, 18(1), 38-46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14643154.2015.1133006>
- Al-Zboon, E. (2016b). Current state of the curriculum in Jordanian kindergartens for children with hearing impairments. *Early Child Development and Care*, 188(6), 731-747. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2016.1230737>
- Al-Zboon, E. (2018). Evaluation of substance abuse education at schools for students with disabilities: a preventative approach. *Journal of Child and Adolescence Substance Abuse*, 27(2), 156-164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1067828X.2018.1431991>
- Al-Zboon, E. (2018). The inclusion of disability issues and concepts in the Jordanian national curriculum from the perspective of curriculum planning experts. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 35(4), 576-585. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2020.1726090>
- Al-Zboon, E. (2019a). Assistive Technologies as a Curriculum Component in Jordan: Future Special Education Teachers' Preparation and the Field Status. *Assistive Technology Journal*, 34(1), 20-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400435.2019.1677804>
- Al-Zboon, E. (2020). Perceptions of Assistive Technologies by teachers of Students with Visual Impairments in Jordan. *Journal of Visual Impairments and Blindness*, 114(6) 488-501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X20971962>
- Anderson, C. (2010). Presenting and Evaluating Qualitative Research. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 74, 141. <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj7408141>
- Arif, M. & Gaad, E. (2008) Special needs education in the United Arab Emirates (UAE): A systems perspective. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 8(2), 111-117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2008.00108.x>
- Bender, W. N. (2008). *Differentiating instruction for students with learning disabilities: Best teaching practices for general and special educators* (2nd ed.). Council for Exceptional Children. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Bradshaw, C. P., Zmuda, J. H., Kellam, S. G., & Jalongo, N. S. (2009). Longitudinal impact of two universal preventive interventions in first grade on educational outcomes in high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(4), 926-937. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016586>
- Bradshaw, C. P., Zmuda, J. H., Kellam, S. G., & Jalongo, N. S. (2009). Longitudinal impact of two universal preventive interventions in first grade on educational outcomes in high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(4), 926-937. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016586>
- Bulgren, J. A., Lenz, B., McKnight, K., Davis, K., Grossen, B., Marquis, B., Deshler, J., Donald, & Schumaker, B. (2002). *The educational context and outcomes for high school students with disabilities: The perceptions of general education teachers*. Lawrence Institute for Academic Access, Kansas University.
- Conderman, G. & Johnston-Rodriguez, S. (2009). Beginning teachers' views of their collaborative roles. *Preventing School Failure*, 53(4), 235-244. <https://doi.org/10.3200/PSFL.53.4.235-244>
- Edwards, J. R. (1994). The study of congruence in organizational behavior research: Critique and a proposed alternative. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 58(1), 51-100. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1994.1029>
- Glasser, W. (1993). *The quality school teacher*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Gutiérrez, N., Jiménez, J. E., de León, S. C., & Seoane, R. C. (2020). Assessing Foundational Reading Skills in Kindergarten: A Curriculum-Based Measurement in Spanish. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 53(2), 145-159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219419893649>
- Holloway, I. & Todres L. (2006). Grounded Theory. In: K. Gerrish and A. Lacey, *The Research Process in Nursing*, pp. 192-207. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Humphrey, N. (2002). Teachers' and pupils' ratings of self-esteem in developmental dyslexia, *British Journal of Special Education*, 29(1), 29-36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8527.00234>
- Kemp, G., Segal, J., & Cutter, D. (2009). *Learning disabilities in children: Learning disability symptoms, types and testing*. Retrieved from: [http://helpguide.org/mental/learning\\_disabilities.htm#](http://helpguide.org/mental/learning_disabilities.htm#) (access: 2012/NOV/12).
- Konza, D. M. (2005). Curriculum adjustments for students with learning disabilities in mainstream classrooms. In: A. Pandian, M. Kabilan & S. Kaur (Eds.), *Teachers, practices and supportive cultures* (pp. 1-11). Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. London: Sage.
- MacArthur, C. A., Ferretti, R. P., Okolo, C. M., & Cavalier, A. R. (2001). Technology applications for students with literacy problems: A critical review. *The Elementary School Journal*, 101(3), 273-301. <https://doi.org/10.1086/499669>
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing qualitative research*, (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education: Evidence-based enquiry*. New York: Pearson.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MOE, (2020). Description of Department of special education and language disorders. Ministry of Education. Ministry of Education, Department of special education and language disorders. Retrieved from: <https://moe.gov.jo/ar/node/66618> (access: 2021/09/20).
- Morgan, E. & Klein, C. (2000). *The dyslexic adult in a non-dyslexic world*. London: Whurr Publishers Ltd.
- NCSE, (2012). *Curriculum and curriculum access issues for students with special educational needs in post-primary settings: An international review*. National Council for Special Education.
- Newman, L. (2006). *General education participation and academic performance of students with learning disabilities. Facts from NLTS2. NCSE 2006–3001*. Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Special Education Research.
- Prior, M., Smart, D., Sanson, A., & Oberklaid, F. (1999). Relationships between learning difficulties and psychological problems in preadolescent children from a longitudinal sample. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 38(4), 429–436. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-199904000-00016>
- Rix, J., Hall, K., Nind, M., Sheehy, K., & Wearmouth, J. (2006). A systematic review of interactions in pedagogical approaches with reported outcomes for the academic and social inclusion of pupils with special educational needs. In: *Research evidence in education library*. Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Rose, T. E., McDonnell, J., & Ellis, G. (2007). The impact of teacher beliefs on the provision of leisure and physical activity education curriculum decisions. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 30(3), 183.
- Rutherford, R. (2007). Jordan and Disability Rights: A Pioneering Leader in the Arab World. *The Review of Disability Studies*, 3(4), 1-17.
- Sakiz, H. (2018). Students with learning disabilities within the context of inclusive education: issues of identification and school management. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 22(3), 285-305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1363302>
- Shaywitz, B. A., Fletcher, J. M., & Shaywitz, S. E. (1992). Interrelationships between disability and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. In A. J. Capute, P. J. Acardo, & B. K. Shapiro (Eds.), *Learning disabilities spectrum*. London: York Press, Inc.
- Smith, T. E. C. (2004). *Teaching students with special needs in inclusive settings*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Tan, C. T. (2007). Policy developments in preschool education in Singapore: A focus on the key reforms of kindergarten education. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy*, 1(1), 35–43.
- Theobald, R. J., Goldhaber, D. D., Gratz, T. M., & Holden, K. L. (2019). Career and technical education, inclusion, and post-secondary outcomes for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 52(2), 109-119. Retrieved from: <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/journals-permissions> (access: 2020/oct/12).
- Troia, G. A. (2006). *Writing Instruction for Students with Learning Disabilities*. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 324–336). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Vialle, W. & Woodcock, S. (2011). Are we exacerbating students' learning disabilities? An investigation of preservice teachers' attributions of the educational outcomes of students with learning disabilities. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 61(2), 223-241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-011-0058-9>
- Virginia Department of Education (2017). *Virginia's Guidelines for Educating Students with Specific Learning Disabilities*. Virginia Department of Education. Retrieved from: [https://www.doe.virginia.gov/special\\_ed/disabilities/learning\\_disability/learning\\_disabilities\\_guidelines.pdf](https://www.doe.virginia.gov/special_ed/disabilities/learning_disability/learning_disabilities_guidelines.pdf) (access: 2020/07/22).