

## Views of Special Education Faculty Members on the Multitiered Support System

Khaled Awad Elballah<sup>1</sup>, Sherif Adel Gaber<sup>2</sup>, Ahmed Zakaria Hegazy<sup>3</sup>

### Abstract

*This study identifies the perceptions of faculty members in special education departments in Saudi universities regarding the application of a multitiered support system (MTSS) in inclusive education schools. The program's obstacles are highlighted as well as the proposals necessary to overcome the challenges. In addition, the relationships of MTSS to the variables of gender, specialization, academic degree, and experience were examined. The research sample consisted of 139 faculty members of various academic ranks from five universities representing the main regions in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. A descriptive approach was used to achieve the study goals. Moreover, a questionnaire was employed to measure faculty members' perceptions of teachers' implementation of the MTSS system in inclusive education schools in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The results show varied responses regarding the perceptions of faculty members about the possibility of implementing a multilevel support system according to the specialization of learning disabilities, hearing impairment, and intellectual disability. Findings also show differences in responses according to specialization in favor of higher positions. Variances in responses were recorded according to the gender of faculty members, in favor of males.*

**Keywords:** *faculty members, multitiered support systems, inclusive education, positive behavioral, evidence-based practices.*

### 1. Introduction

According to laws and legislation, inclusive education means including students with disabilities in general education classes and creating an educational environment that enables them to have full access and participation (Butakor et al., 2020). Inclusive education focuses on three basic points: integrating students with disabilities into general education classrooms, conquering the academic and social challenges of students with disabilities, and resolving the scholastic and social challenges of all students (Magnusson et al., 2019). This effort requires the provision of educational opportunities that support all students without exception, including those with disabilities. Using appropriate teaching strategies, designing behavioral programs, and developing individual skills enables everyone to participate academically and socially. In the multitiered systems of support (MTSS) framework, all students receive support at three levels. For students who do not make sufficient progress in the second (15–20%) or the third (5%) level or less,

---

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor, Special Education Department, College of Education, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia, Kelballah@kfu.edu.sa, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9131-4192>

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Special Education Department, College of Education, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia, sagahmed@kfu.edu.sa, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9787-8041>

<sup>3</sup> Associate Professor, Special Education Department, College of Education, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia, ahegazy@kfu.edu.sa, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4498-7201>

intensive and individual support is provided along with continued intervention, evaluation, and progress (Koppich, 2020).

As a result of the challenges facing the inclusive education system, the term response to intervention (RTI) emerged, which works to activate intervention models focusing on academic support for students, particularly those with learning difficulties. MTSS began on a broader scale and addresses the issuance of comprehensive support with increasingly specialized interventions for students with educational needs. More specifically, in the case of positive behavior support, the starting point is level one, or comprehensive support. This level means providing high-quality, evidence-based education to all students, with more intensive support (Koppich, 2020; Lane et al., 2007).

The concept of multitiered support represents a school-wide preventive framework based on the implementation of evidence-based practices (EBPs) to meet the academic, behavioral, social, and emotional needs of students (Harn et al., 2015). MTSS is a three-tiered preventive support system that helps teachers meet the needs of all students in a classroom. In MTSS, academic, behavioral, and social-emotional interventions are conducted with varying intensity depending on levels of prevention. General learning is aided by comprehensive surveying, EBPs, data recording, continuous assessment, and appropriate decision-making based on student results. The results of numerous studies provide convincing methodological evidence that the MTSS system is effective in improving the social and emotional outcomes of preschool children (e.g. Armstrong, 2014; Fox et al., 2021; Harn et al., 2015).

However, sufficient time must be provided for the professional development and training of teachers. In light of educational conditions, developing intervention programs remains more important than considering the feasibility and effectiveness of the MTSS system. The question remains how these practices can be scaled for use with children who require secondary and tertiary interventions to achieve multiple outcomes (Shepley et al., 2019).

## 2. Literature Review

The multitiered support system is considered a radical change in the field of education as it includes the principles of universal design for learning on basic elements, such as a comprehensive survey, data-based decision-making, progress monitoring, EBPs, and the prevention and provision of early intervention services. Other elements include precision in organization, problem-solving in cooperation with the team, and professional development. These elements have been found to improve student outcomes and are implemented in three levels that increase in duration and intensity according to each student's need (Hoover, 2020; Morrison, 2020).

Students' challenges—whether academic or behavioral—drive the selection and implementation of interventions, as well as the allocation of efforts. Both academic and behavioral approaches are based on the philosophy that preventing problems is more effective for students than treating issues when they arise. Additionally, this focus on prevention includes interventions for all students regardless of risk as well as continuity of support for those who need more help to succeed (McIntosh & Goodman, 2016).

The MTSS is suitable for application in preschool stages where social and emotional outcomes in children improve when the system is applied. Influential factors for consideration in the system include reading, writing, receptive and expressive language, letter recognition, listening comprehension, writing information, rhythms and intonation, challenging behaviors, participation, and social skills. Teacher training and an investment in professional training lead to the development of teachers' skills to implement MTSS (Shepley & Grisham-Brown, 2019).

Educational systems face a challenge in how to support the educational, behavioral, social, and emotional needs of students. Thus, the need for teacher participation in data-based decision-making in diagnostic, prevention, and intervention efforts supporting all students has increased. This participation can occur through the application of MTSS, which is a preventive model expressing the integration of the response to intervention and positive behavior support at the school level (Morrison et al., 2021).

MTSS is a problem-solving framework that uses a data-driven process to aid decision-making about instruction and intervention. Therefore, all teachers using MTSS should be adept at using educational and behavioral data such as screening, diagnosis, and progress monitoring to identify students who need more intensive support to enhance academic or behavioral achievement. Within MTSS, both academic and behavioral components require the use of evidence-based decision-making (Adamson et al., 2019).

In particular, successful interventions require continuous monitoring, precise implementation with the provision of EBPs, the prevention and provision of early intervention services, precision in organization, problem-solving in cooperation with the team, and professional development (Hoover, 2020; Morrison, 2021; Van Miegheem et al., 2020).

Whether academic or behavioral, the challenges for students drive the selection and implementation of interventions as well as the allocation of efforts. Both academic and behavioral approaches are based on the philosophy that preventing problems is more effective for students than treating them when they arise. Additionally, this prevention focus includes interventions for all students, regardless of risk, and continuity of support for those who need more help to succeed (McIntosh & Goodman, 2016).

Cook et al. (2015), presented a study on teachers' beliefs about implementing the MTSS. The results provide preliminary support for the importance of beliefs: (a) Coaches reported that beliefs were critical to the implementation and facilitation of their roles in working with teachers. (b) Teachers' beliefs predicted initial implementation fidelity on the scale-codified MTSS practices as well as a specific measure of positive behavioral interventions and support at the school level. (c) Supportive belief intervention (SBI) was associated with significant changes in teachers' beliefs, and these changes were associated with improved implementation (Cook et al., 2015).

De Boer et al. (2011) found that teachers who have negative beliefs toward inclusive education do not have sufficient knowledge of teaching people with special needs. Meanwhile, teachers with experience educating those with special needs have a positive attitude toward inclusive education but negative views toward students who suffer from moderate learning difficulties, behavioral problems, or severe cognitive deficits compared to children with physical or sensory disabilities. Teachers' beliefs play a key role in how comfortable they are with implementing reforms (Dignath et al., 2022; Liou et al., 2019). If teachers think and feel positively about practices, they are more likely to use those practices in the classroom. However, if a teacher's prior beliefs and experiences conflict with the reform approach, those views may serve as a barrier to implementing the reform (Avramidis et al., 2019; Dias & Cadime, 2016; Fox et al., 2021).

By reviewing teachers' points of view, it is clear there is a need for teacher training, gradual interventions with students, and an understanding of the stages and steps of implementation. Furthermore, there is an urgent need for the use of EBPs and interventions in Tier 2 (Braun, 2020). Negative attitudes and beliefs are considered one of the obstacles to implementing intervention programs, in addition to knowledge gaps, resistance to change, lack of resources, and increased workloads. Cooperation and participation from teachers, specialists, and commitment from everyone to the roles and tasks to implement RTI or MTSS are required for successful interventions (Werts, 2014).

Amendments to the IDEIA (2004) indicate the need to improve transitional outcomes for students with disabilities. Moreover, educational support is needed, including access to general education curricula, while simultaneously planning for the transition out of school for students with disabilities to achieve adult life outcomes. Lawmakers also approved the Every Student Succeeds Act, which meets the need to implement a comprehensive framework for learning in terms of the process of planning, teaching, evaluation, and support for all students with disabilities (Taylor, 2019).

The MTSS represents one of the most significant pillars of comprehensive education. The system directly invests class time in activities and applications, improving learning outcomes for many students through a multilevel framework at the school level integrating education, intervention, and evaluation (Johnson & Smith, 2008). The results of some studies have indicated what the MTSS provides in the field of special education in schools. In particular, the MTSS offers equitable services, practices, and resources for each learner based on their response to learning and effective intervention, providing high-quality education that contributes to learner success (Mason et al., 2019; Nagro et al., 2019; Sailor et al., 2021). Moreover, MTSS helps in organizing the classroom and responding to students' social, emotional, and behavioral needs by preventing challenges, teaching basic skills, and maintaining continuity of attendance (Simonsen et al., 2021). Some studies have recommended the importance of referring to the perceptions of specialists and school staff about the MTSS because a failure to implement interventions as they were designed will affect students' learning outcomes (Burns & Gibbons, 2012; Castro-Villarreal, Rodriguez, & Moore, 2014; Johnson & Smith, 2008; Marrs & Little, 2014).

However, none of the studies addressed the perceptions of faculty members about the MTSS despite the major role of teachers in providing support, instructions, and interventions. The efforts of teachers ensure that the educational environment is created for the use of MTSS, thereby improving student results. To the researchers' best knowledge, a lack of studies has attempted to identify faculty members' perceptions of the use of MTSS as well as the cognitive, subjective, technical, and material obstacles to its use. Therefore, this research study identifies the perceptions of faculty members about the use of the MTSS in the field of special education and the obstacles to its use from their point of view. Recommendations are developed that urge the school, teachers, and supervisors to implement the MTSS accurately to achieve its desired goals.

The study problem lies in the following main question:

What are the perceptions of faculty members in special education departments in Saudi universities regarding the application of the MTSS in inclusive education schools?

The following sub-questions branch out from the main question:

1. What are the perceptions and beliefs of faculty members in Saudi universities about the extent of applying MTSS in inclusive education schools?
2. What are the obstacles to applying MTSS in inclusive education schools from the point of view of faculty members in Saudi universities?
3. What are the proposals that support the application of MTSS in inclusive education schools from the point of view of faculty members in Saudi universities?
4. Are there statistically significant differences in the perceptions and beliefs of faculty members in Saudi universities about the extent of applying MTSS in inclusive education schools due to the variables of gender, specialization, and academic degree?

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Participants

The study population consists of faculty members in special education departments in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and the sample of the current study was male (74) and female (65), distributed among five government universities in Arabia (King Faisal University in Al-Ahsa for the eastern region; Umm Al-Qura University in Mecca for the western region, King Saud University in Riyadh in the central region; the University of Tabuk in the northern region, Arar city; and in the southern region, Jazan University).

Table 1: Characteristics of the sample

Variables		%
Sex	Male	53.24
	Female	46.76
Specialization	Intellectual disability	48.92
	Learning difficulties	30.94
	Hearing impaired	20.14
Academic Rank	Professor	8.64
	Associate Professor	17.27
	Assistant Professor	39.57
	Lecturer	30.94
	Teaching Assistant	3.60

#### 3.2. Instruments

##### Perception of Faculty Members Questionnaire (PFMQ)

The researchers prepared a questionnaire by reviewing theoretical literature, previous studies, and some measures focusing on MTSS and RTI. The questionnaire consists of two sections: the first contained primary data (name, specialization, years of experience, training courses, academic degree), and the second included 24 items to indicate the perceptions or beliefs of faculty members regarding the possibility of teachers applying the MTSS system. The instrument contains belief statements in which the participant is asked to rate the extent of his or her agreement or disagreement using the following response scale: 1 = Never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = always. The validity of the internal consistency was verified by calculating Pearson's correlation coefficient between the score of each statement and the total score of the dimension. The results in Table 2 show that all correlation coefficients are significant at the level of (0.01).

Table 2: Correlation coefficient between each statement and the total score of the corresponding dimension

No	R	p-value	No	R	p-value
1	0.381*	0.038	13	0.392*	0.032
2	0.684**	< 0.001	14	0.369*	0.44
3	0.512**	0.004	15	0.433*	0.017
4	0.554**	0.001	16	0.392*	0.032
5	0.476**	0.008	17	0.612**	< 0.001

6	0.790**	< 0.001	18	0.691**	< 0.001
7	0.513**	0.004	19	0.393*	0.032
8	0.613**	< 0.001	20	0.549**	0.002
9	0.486**	0.007	21	0.528**	0.003
10	0.745**	< 0.001	22	0.581**	0.003
11	0.668**	< 0.001	23	0.660**	< 0.001
12	0.450*	0.013	24	0.542**	0.002

Note: \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$

In Table 2, the results of the correlation coefficient between each statement and the total score show that some correlation coefficients were statistically significant at the level of 0.01, and others were statistically significant at the level of 0.05, which indicates the internal consistency of the scale and its validity for application.

To verify the reliability of the scale, the researchers calculated its stability using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the perceptions of faculty members about the application of the MTSS was 0.0893, which indicates that the questionnaire has an acceptable degree of reliability.

#### 4. Results

Table 3: Level of participants' perceptions about the implementation of MTSS (n = 139)

No	Item	M(SD)	Rank
1	Requires a multidisciplinary team.	2.83(0.44)	10
2	Requires determining the quality of educational interventions.	2.87(0.41)	5
3	Reduces the severity of behavioral problems among students.	2.63(0.54)	22
4	Requires specialized training courses for teachers.	2.86(0.34)	6
5	Demands a comprehensive database of students.	2.85(0.43)	8
6	Needs educational experts.	2.66(0.47)	20
7	Increases the level of response to students' needs.	2.78(0.41)	13
8	Achieves inclusive learning goals.	2.64(0.59)	21
9	Requires sufficient time to implement appropriate intervention programs for students.	2.89(0.31)	2
10	Contributes to achieving cooperation between the family and the school.	2.71(0.51)	18
11	Enhances psychological and behavioral guidance for students.	2.70(0.46)	19
12	Considers individual differences among students.	2.86(0.35)	7
13	Promotes students' academic progress gradually.	2.88(0.33)	4
14	Encourages positive behavior in students.	2.91(0.29)	1
15	Distinguishes between points of need and points of strength.	2.84(0.37)	9
16	Based on evidence-based practices.	2.83(0.38)	11

17	Promotes teachers' use of modern teaching strategies.	2.77(0.43)	15
18	Enhances the partnership between school work teams, administrators, teachers, and specialists.	2.81(0.40)	12
19	Requires comprehensive evaluation processes, not traditional evaluation.	2.73(0.49)	17
20	Measures the academic levels of individual students.	2.74(0.44)	16
21	Requires extensive experience among teachers to practice this system.	2.78(0.42)	14
22	The educational environment is prepared to implement this system.	2.01(0.73)	24
23	Requires parents' knowledge of the mechanisms for implementing this system.	2.61(0.56)	23
24	Mandates a periodic review of academic goals.	2.88(0.32)	3
Total		2.75(0.22)	

\*Note: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation

According to Table 3, the general mean was 2.753, with a standard deviation of 0.22. These values indicate that faculty members have a high level of awareness of the possibility of applying MTSS in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Item 14, "Encourages positive behavior in students" was ranked first with a mean score of 2.91 and a standard deviation of 0.29. Item 9, "Requires sufficient time to implement appropriate intervention programs for students" was ranked second, with a mean of 2.89 and a standard deviation of 0.31. Item 24, "Mandates a periodic review of academic goals" was ranked third, with a mean of 2.8849 and a standard deviation of 0.32. Item 3, "Reduces the severity of behavioral problems among students" was ranked 22nd, with a mean of 2.63 and a standard deviation of 0.54. Item 23, "Requires parents' knowledge of the mechanisms for implementing this system" was ranked 23rd, with a mean of 2.61 and a standard deviation of 0.56. Item 22, "The educational environment is prepared to implement this system" was ranked 24th, with a mean of 2.01 and a standard deviation of 0.73.

Table 4: Differences between male and female groups in the questionnaire

Questionnaire	Group	n	Mean	SD	df	T	p
	Male	74	66.92	5.24	137	2.084	0.39*
	Female	65	65.08	5.15			

Table 4 reveals a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the male and female groups in the questionnaire in favor of the male, as the value of T for the total score of the scale is 2.084 and the p-value is 0.39, which is lower than 0.05.

Table 5: ANOVA results according to the specialization variable

Specialization	n	Mean	SD	F	p
Intellectual disability	68	67.51	7.38	5.437*	0.005
Learning difficulties	43	64.63	6.62		

Hearing impaired	28	64.71	3.91		
------------------	----	-------	------	--	--

Table 5 indicates a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the specialization in the questionnaire in favor of the Intellectual disability, as the value of F for the total score of the scale is 5.437 and the p-value is 0.005, which is a value equal to 0.05.

Table 6: Results of the post hoc comparisons test (LSD)

Specialization	Mean difference	p
Intellectual disability and learning difficulties	2.886*	0.004
Intellectual disability and impaired hearing	2.800*	0.016
Learning difficulties and hearing impaired	0.086	0.944

As seen in Table 6, the reason for the statistically significant differences in faculty members' perceptions of the application of MTSS according to specialization is due to the presence of statistically significant differences between faculty members who specialize in intellectual disability, faculty members who specialize in learning difficulties (MD = 2.886 and p-value = 0.004), and faculty members who specialize in intellectual disability and faculty members who specialize in hearing impaired (MD = 2.800 and p-value = 0.016). Meanwhile, no statistically significant differences are found between faculty members who specialize in learning difficulties and faculty members who specialize in hearing-impaired students (MD = 0.086 and p-value = 0.944).

Table 7: ANOVA results according to the specialization variable academic grades

Academic grades	n	Mean	SD	F	p
Professor	12	70.58	0.90	5.437*	<0.001
Associate Professor	24	68.79	1.38		
Assistant Professor	55	64.95	6.62		
lecturer	43	64.91	4.36		
Teaching Assistant	5	64.20	2.86		

In Table 7, a statistically significant difference is evident between the mean scores of the academic grades in the questionnaire in favor of the professor, as the value of F for the total score of the scale is 5.437 and the p-value is <0.005, which is lower than 0.01.

Table 8: Results of the post hoc comparisons test (LSD)

Academic grades	Mean difference	p
Professor & Associate Professor	1.79	0.305
Professor & Assistant Professor	5.64*	<0.001
Professor & lecturer	5.68*	0.001
Professor & Teaching Assistant	6.38*	0.016
Associate Professor & Assistant Professor	3.85*	0.002
Associate Professor & lecturer	3.88*	0.002



Associate Professor & Teaching Assistant	4.59	0.060
Assistant Professor & lecturer	0.38	0.969
Assistant Professor & Teaching Assistant	0.75	0.746
Lecturer & Teaching Assistant	0.71	0.762

Table 8 shows that the reason for the statistically significant differences in faculty members' perceptions of the application of MTSS according to academic grades is due to the presence of statistically significant differences between faculty members professors, faculty members who assistant professors ( $p$ -value  $< 0.001$ ), faculty members who professors and faculty members who lecturers ( $p$ -value =  $0.001$ ), faculty members who professors and faculty members who teaching assistants ( $p$ -value =  $0.016$ ), faculty members who associate professors and faculty members who assistant professors ( $p$ -value =  $0.002$ ), faculty members who associate professors and faculty members who lecturers ( $p$ -value =  $0.002$ ), while there are no statistically significant differences between faculty members who professors and faculty members who associate professors, faculty members who associate professors and faculty members who teaching assistant, and faculty members who assistant professors and faculty members who lecturers, faculty members who assistant professors and faculty members who teaching assistants, and faculty members who lecturers and faculty members who teaching assistants ( $p$ -value  $> 0.05$ ).

## 5. Discussion

The findings of the current study reveal that the perceptions of faculty members in special education departments about the possibility of implementing MTSS in inclusive education schools are consistent with the results of some previous studies (e.g., Negro et al., 2019; Romer et al., 2018), considering that the levels of MTSS are a framework for new practices that improve academic, behavioral, emotional, and social outcomes. Moreover, research shows that MTSS builds evidence through continuous comprehensive evaluation, enabling decisions to be made according to data to realize the system at its three levels. The results also show that sample members have positive perceptions and beliefs about the possibility of implementing MTSS in inclusive education schools.

### 5.1. Differences according to specialization of faculty members

The results show differences in responses regarding the perceptions of faculty members about the possibility of implementing a multilevel support system according to the specialization of learning disabilities, hearing impaired, and intellectual disability. Due to the different characteristics of each category of people with special needs, different perceptions are found according to methods of evaluation and intervention. In general, however, the sample responses demonstrate the possibility of applying a multilevel support system across various specialties. The results of this question show variations according to scientific specialization in favor of learning difficulties as a result of the priority of the learning disabilities specialization in applying the system of responses to interventions and positive behavioral support in addition to the multilevel support system (Lane et al., 2014; Nagro et al., 2019).

Researchers attribute the existence of differences between the responses of faculty members specializing in intellectual disability versus members with a specialization in learning disabilities because the multilevel support system represents an extension of the RTI response system, which originally began to diagnose and care for students with learning difficulties in inclusive education schools.

Naturally, students with hearing disabilities have normal and above-normal degrees of intelligence, like students with learning difficulties, and this explains the existence of differences between the responses of faculty members specializing in teaching students with hearing disabilities from the responses of members specializing in mental disability in favor of the responses of members specializing in hearing disability. This result confirms that there are no differences between the responses of faculty members specializing in hearing disabilities and members with learning disabilities. It is worth noting that the characteristics of students with learning difficulties and hearing disabilities compared to those with intellectual disabilities are faster in responding to intervention services within the framework of the MTSS.

### 5.2. Differences according to academic rank

Researchers attribute the absence of differences in the responses of faculty members according to the academic ranks of professor and associate professor due to the factor of experience gained in the field of specialization. In addition, the teaching experience of professors and associate professors for the MTSS course within the optimal investment program was supervised by the Saudi Ministry of Education with a number of special education departments in Saudi Universities during the years 2021, 2022, and 2023. The presence of several professors and associate professors who obtained academic degrees from prestigious universities in The United States and Europe in the field of special education played a key role in transferring expertise about the MTSS.

In addition to the scientific supervision of postgraduate students, many faculty members attended courses, workshops, and conferences at the local and international levels. The results of some previous studies have shown a direct relationship between experience, professional development, and readiness to implement intervention programs (Romer et al., 2018). However, differences are evident between the academic ranks of professor and associate professor and between the ranks of assistant professor, lecturer, and teaching assistant as a result of the experience factor. Moreover, members with higher scientific ranks have shown a weak acquisition of the skills. In addition, academic and behavioral skills as well as data and technology savvy vary according to staff position (Lesh et al., 2021).

The attitudes and beliefs of teachers toward the inclusion of people with disabilities in inclusive education are vital to implementing MTSS. There is no doubt that changing beliefs is difficult. Nevertheless, the confidence of teachers, years of experience and training, participation in educational plans, and evaluation processes contribute to the acceptance of these new MTSS practices (Kurth, 2015).

### 5.3. Differences according to gender

The results of this question showed that there were statistically significant differences between males and females in their perceptions of the possibility of implementing MTSS in inclusive education schools. The researchers identify this discrepancy despite the compatibility of the knowledge inputs of the faculty members. The differences can be explained in favor of males due to their participation in international conferences, courses, training, and workshops, contributing to the dissemination of scientific research and field training for teachers. The differences between them may be due to the greater number of male than female members in the current study. Positive perceptions are seen among the male sample about the possibility of implementing MTSS, and consideration of the unification of educational policies and systems in comprehensive education schools. Moreover, males expressed confidence in the professional abilities of teachers and workers to gain training experience with children with special needs as well as their qualifications for continuous training to raise their skills and self-efficacy (Mason et al., 2019).

## 6. Conclusions

The current study focuses on the perceptions of faculty members in special education departments in Saudi universities about the possibility of implementing MTSS in inclusive education schools. The results of the study contribute to developing positive attitudes toward implementing MTSS and increasing awareness among teachers and parents of the importance of applying it. In addition, the potential positive emotional effects of MTSS can be highlighted regarding the academic, behavioral, and emotional aspects of the system for students. These findings may help convince teachers and those responsible for developing training programs about MTSS for teachers in inclusive education schools. Despite the differences between the faculty members of the current study in terms of gender, specialization, and academic rank, they demonstrate the possibility of implementing MTSS in inclusive education schools. An emphasis on the importance and availability of the educational and administrative environment is necessary for the success of this system.

## 7. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, this study suggests several recommendations, such as preparing a guide for the procedural stages of implementing a multilevel support system. Preparing training programs and packages for teachers of all specializations in special education will increase the awareness and scientific implementation of the system of multiple levels of support. A comprehensive survey should be conducted to identify obstacles to implementing the multilevel support system in administrative aspects, technology, financial capabilities, human competencies, the availability of different specializations, family cooperation, and proposing solutions to obstacles and working to overcome them. Additionally, the role of teachers should be activated for academic, behavioral, and emotional interventions in the MTSS framework.

## 8. Limitations

Despite the positive results of this research, several limitations were encountered. Researchers relied on faculty members' memories to retrieve their opinions and information about MTSS implementation, which may impact the accuracy of the data used in the study. Additionally, research was only conducted in Saudi universities, which is limited to the opinions of faculty members in these universities only and does not include the opinions of faculty members in other universities outside the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Therefore, the results may be greatly influenced by Saudi culture and values and cannot be generalized. Regarding other cultures, this study sample was only recruited from faculty members in special education departments, which excludes the opinions of faculty members in other departments at Saudi universities.

### Acknowledgments

The author acknowledges the deanship of scientific research at King Faisal University, to receive financial support for the research, authorship, and publication in grant ambitious researcher number (5131).

## References

- Adamson, M., McKenna, W., & Mitchell, B. (2019). Supporting all students: Creating a tiered continuum of behavior support at the classroom level to enhance schoolwide multi-tiered systems of support. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 63(1), 62-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2018.1501654>

- Armstrong, D. (2014). Educator perceptions of children who present with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties: A literature review with implications for recent educational policy in England and internationally. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(7), 731-745. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2013.823245>
- Avramidis, E., Toulia, A., Tsihouridis, C., & Strogilos, V. (2019). Teachers' attitudes towards inclusion and their self-efficacy for inclusive practices as predictors of willingness to implement peer tutoring. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 19, 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12477>
- Braun, G., Kumm, S., Brown, C., Walte, S., Tejero-Hughes, M., & Maggin, D. (2020). Living in tier 2: educators' perceptions of MTSS in urban schools. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(10), 1114-1128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1511758>.
- Burns, K., & Gibbons, K. (2012). *Response to intervention implementation in elementary and secondary schools: Procedures to assure scientific-based practices* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Butakor, K., Ampadu, E., & Suleiman, J. (2020). Analysis of Ghanaian teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(11), 1237-1252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1512661>
- Castro-Villarreal, F., Rodriguez, B., & Moore, S. (2014). Teachers' perceptions and attitudes about response to intervention (RTI) in their schools: A qualitative analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 40,104–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.02.004>
- Cook, C., Lyon, A., Kubergovic, D., Browning Wright, D., & Zhang, Y. (2015). A supportive beliefs intervention to facilitate the implementation of evidence-based practices within a multi-tiered system of supports. *School Mental Health*, 7, 49-60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-014-9139-3>
- De Boer, A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. (2011). Regular primary schoolteachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: A review of the literature. *International journal of inclusive education*, 15(3), 331-353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110903030089>
- Dias, P. C., & Cadime, I. (2016). Effects of personal and professional factors on teachers' attitudes towards inclusion in preschool. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 31(1), 111–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2015.1108040>
- Dignath, C., Rimm-Kaufman, S., van Ewijk, R., & Kunter, M. (2022). Teachers' beliefs about inclusive education and insights on what contributes to those beliefs: a meta-analytical study. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(4), 2609-2660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09695-0>
- Fox, R., Leif, E., Moore, D., Furlonger, B., Anderson, A., & Sharma, U. (2021). A systematic review of the facilitators and barriers to the sustained implementation of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43494-021-00062-2>
- Harn, B., Basaraba, D., Chard, D., & Fritz, R. (2015). The impact of schoolwide prevention efforts: Lessons learned from implementing independent academic and behavior support systems. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 13(1), 3-20. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1080474.pdf>
- Hoover, J., Soltero-Gonzalez, L., Wang, C., & Herron, S. (2020). Sustaining a multitiered system of supports for English learners in rural community elementary schools. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 39(1), 4-16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8756870519847466>  
<https://assets-global.website-files.com/5d3725188825e071f1670246/618172fb89f9b52f694a5c8c>
- Johnson, E., & Smith, L. (2008). Implementation of response to intervention at middle school: Challenges and potential benefits. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 40(3), 46-52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004005990804000305>
- Koppich, J. (2020). Expanding multi-tiered system of supports in California: Lessons from sanger unified and the pivot–sanger multi-tiered system of supports project. *Policy Analysis for California Education*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED609273.pdf>

- Kurniawati, F., De Boer, A., Minnaert, & Mangunsong, F. (2014). Characteristics of primary teacher training programmes on inclusion: A literature focus. *Educational Research*, 56 (3), 310–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2014.934555>
- Kurth, J. A. & Gross, M. (2015). *The inclusion toolbox: Strategies and techniques for all teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. [https://www.academia.edu/8726332/The\\_Inclusion\\_Toolbox\\_Strategies\\_and\\_Techniques\\_for\\_All\\_Teachers](https://www.academia.edu/8726332/The_Inclusion_Toolbox_Strategies_and_Techniques_for_All_Teachers)
- Lane, K., Carter, E., Jenkins, A., Dwiggins, L., & Germer, K. (2015). Supporting comprehensive, integrated, three-tiered models of prevention in schools: Administrators' perspectives. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 17(4), 209-222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300715578916>
- Lesh, J., Roberts, C., Cavitt, D., & Morales, L. (2021). Urban secondary school administrators and faculty perceptions of multitiered system of supports/response to intervention. *NASSP Bulletin*, 105(4), 225-249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01926365211060798>
- Liou, H., Canrinus, T., & Daly, J. (2019). Activating the implementers: The role of organizational expectations, teacher beliefs, and motivation in bringing about reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 79, 60–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.12.004>
- Lyon, R., Stirman, W., Kerns, U., & Bruns, J. (2011). Developing the mental health workforce: Review and application of training strategies from multiple disciplines. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 38, 238–253. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-010-0331-y>
- Magnusson, G., göransson, K., & lindqvist, G. (2019). Contextualizing inclusive education in educational policy: the case of Sweden. *Nordic journal of studies in educational policy*, 5(2), 67-77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2019.1586512>
- Marrs, H., & Little, S. (2014). Perceptions of school psychologists regarding barriers to response to intervention (RTI) implementation. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 18(1), 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-013-0001-7>
- Mason, E., Benz, S., Lembke, E., Burns, M., & Powell, S. (2019). From professional development to implementation: A district's experience implementing mathematics tiered systems of support. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 34(4), 207-214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ldrp.12206>
- McIntosh, K., & Goodman, S. (2016). *Integrated multi-tiered systems of support: Blending RTI and PBIs*. Guilford. <https://www.guilford.com/books/Integrated-Multi-Tiered-Systems-of-Support/McIntosh-Goodman/9781462524747>
- Morrison, J., Newman, D., & Gaumer-Erickson, A. (2021). Process evaluation of literacy practices within a multi-tiered system of supports framework. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15377903.2020.1804030>
- Nagro, S., Hooks, S., & Fraser, D. (2019). Over a decade of practice: Are educators correctly using tertiary interventions? *Preventing School Failure*, 63(1), 52-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2018.1491021>
- Pierce, D., & Mueller, G. (2018). Easy as ABC: Data-based guidelines for implementing a multitiered system of supports into rural schools. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 37(3), 183-191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8756870518777850>
- Romer, N., Green, A., & Cox, K. (2018). Educator perceptions of preparedness and professional development for implementation of evidence based practices within a multi tiered system of supports. *School Mental Health*, 10, 122-133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-017-9234-3>
- Sailor, W., McCart, A. B., & Choi, J. H. (2018). Reconceptualizing inclusive education through multi-tiered system of support. *Inclusion*, 6, 2–18. <https://doi.org/10.1352/2326-6988-6.1.3>
- Sailor, W., Skrtic, T. M., Cohn, M., & Olmstead, C. (2021). Preparing teacher educators for statewide scale-up of multi-tiered system of support (MTSS). *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 44(1), 24-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406420938>

- Shepley, C., & Grisham-Brown, J. (2019). Multi-tiered systems of support for preschool-aged children: A review and meta-analysis. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 47, 296-308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2019.01.004>
- Simonsen, B., Robbie, K., Meyer, K., Freeman, J., Everett, S., & Feinberg, A. (2021). Multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) in the classroom. Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.
- Taylor, S. (2019). The role of special education services in an equitable multi-level system of supports. Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED609668.pdf>
- Van Mieghem, A., Verschueren, K., Petry, K., & Struyf, E. (2020). An analysis of research on inclusive education: a systematic search and metareview. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(6), 675-689. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1482012>
- Werts, M. G., Carpenter, S., & Fewell, C. (2014). Barriers and benefits to response to intervention: Perceptions of special education teachers. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 33(2), 3-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875687051403300202>