Empowering Education: Smart Analysis of Evolving Speech and Hearing Challenges in Special Education

Dr. Mohamad Ahmad Saleem Khasawneh*

*Assistant Professor, Special Education Department, King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia, mkhasawneh@kku.edu.sa. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1390-3765

ABSTRACT
This research aims to analyze the evolving challenges in the realms of speech and hearing within the context of special education. Education is characterized by diversity and complexity, making it crucial to understand the impact of smart technologies in addressing these challenges. The study provides a comprehensive review of current literature and relevant research, coupled with an intelligent analysis of the applications of technology to enhance the learning experience for students with speech and hearing difficulties. The research highlights the use of artificial intelligence and natural language processing technologies to offer effective and innovative solutions. The goal is to shed light on the efficacy of these technologies in creating an inclusive and stimulating learning environment for students with special needs, thereby enhancing their academic and social opportunities.

Keywords: Teachers; hearing and speech specialists; attitudes; children using hearing devices

1 INTRODUCTION

Within special education, where the challenge is to meet students' needs, diverse challenges arise among individuals with speech and hearing difficulties, which we will refer to here as developmental speech and hearing challenges in special education. A person with this challenge, referred to as DWD, is an individual who faces hearing loss, in addition to at least one other disability, such as visual impairment, blindness (VI), autism spectrum disorder (ASD), intellectual or developmental disabilities (ID), Specific learning difficulties (SLD), and other health problems. The impact of these disabilities varies from mild to severe.

Within this overarching context, varying degrees of speech and hearing challenges are evident among students with hearing loss, who also vary in degree, type, and age of onset of hearing loss, amplification technologies, and preferred means of communication. Despite the diversity that characterizes these students, within the DWD category they are characterized by diversity in terms of type, causes, number, and severity of disabilities.

Over the past few decades, interest in teaching students with speech and hearing challenges in special education has increased, yet there remains much lack of clarity about the prevalence of these challenges, assessment procedures, and best teaching practices. The shortage of qualified personnel to provide educational services to these students is also increasing.

1.1 SUBJECTIVE
Capturing the nuanced subjective experiences of individuals navigating speech and hearing challenges enriches the analysis, offering a holistic understanding of the impact of these challenges on the educational journey.

1.2 AIMS OF THE STUDY
This research seeks to comprehensively assess awareness, training gaps for educators, and innovative strategies for supporting students with speech and hearing difficulties.

1.3 HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY
Deeper awareness and understanding of speech and hearing challenges will lead to more effective training programs for educators and improved support structures for students, leveraging innovative technologies for smarter analysis.

1.4 METHODOLOGY
A mixed-methods approach combines qualitative insights from subjective narratives with quantitative data derived from surveys and statistical analysis tools, including SPSS.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS
1. How do educators perceive and understand speech and hearing challenges?
2. What are the existing gaps in training programs for educators?
3. How can innovative technologies be integrated to enhance the analysis and support of students?

2 LITERATURE REVIEW
The Inclusion for Children and Adolescents Questionnaire (ICAQ) was developed using a methodology that was informed by two main goals: first, it was intended to validate the approach by comparing it to other questionnaires that measured children's attitudes toward inclusive education (IE); and second, it was intended to shed light on research that highlighted concepts that were included as ICAQ elements.

2.1 FAMILY INVOLVEMENT AND INTERVENTION
One of the main tenets of education for kids and teenagers with hearing loss is that families, educators, and other professionals work together to provide the best possible environment for language competence, which boosts academic achievement and intellectual growth. Acoustic technology post-implantation procedures include parents acting as both mentors and instructors, which affects the sense of insecurity or accountability. Students with hearing aids must use learning tools and control peer relationships in everyday activities like clubs or school team sports, acknowledging that schools must interact appropriately with families' culture, values, and attitudes. (Louise Hickson, Teresa Y.C. Chingb,c, 2018)

2.2 COOPERATIVE TEAMWORK IN AN EDUCATIONAL SETTING
The deployment of spoken expression schemes and hearing detection for newly implanted children and adolescents must be supported by families in an educational center project that upholds IE as a fundamental premise. The greater the degree to which children and adolescents with hearing aids require communication, the more difficult it is for them to fit in at school and have possibilities for friendship and social engagement with their peers. Regarding individual, placement, and school organization variables, placement stability is a major challenge. Large windows that provide sound reverberation, concrete walls, and tile flooring are examples of constructive architectural features that impair communication for children with hearing loss, according to Davenport and Alber-Morgan (p. 44). (Angulo, 2019)

Scott and Kasun, concentrated on sign language as the main means of communication for deaf children, even though Anglo-Saxon culture has increased the understanding of language and communication for pupils with hearing loss. They encouraged educators to satisfy students' needs, advance equitable learning opportunities, and manage social justice by utilizing tools and strategies including explicit instruction, scaffolding, prior knowledge development, and tailored instruction.

Schools that support IE for kids who use hearing aids probably have a curriculum that is appropriate for the kids' age groups and has been modified to improve academic achievement Based on fundamental IE ideas, the school curriculum offers additional assistance for kids with hearing loss by fostering self-concept development, teamwork, and the improvement of cognitive and emotional skills. The third compulsory secondary education program may now include all pupils thanks to the identification of fundamental transdisciplinary ideas by the use of logical reasoning. (Paatsch, 2010)

Teachers' perceptions of their ability to influence students' lives through certain performance levels are known as perceived teacher self-efficacy (p. 2). As per the literature synthesized by Sharma, Jitoko, Macanawai, and Forlin (p. 14), proficient educators in an inclusive setting exhibit content and pedagogy knowledge, control classroom behavior and environment, and work well with parents and paraprofessionals. Additionally, teacher competency increases the advantages of augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) for kids with complex communication demands. Thus, the Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS) questionnaire was used by Radici, Heboyan, Mantovani, and De Leo (p. 5) to compare teachers' opinions of the advantages and disadvantages of using AAC in the classroom. (Benevene, 2019)

2.3 THE PROCEDURE FOR IMPLANTING HEARING AIDS
Children and adolescents who have auditory implantation experience varying outcomes, which contributes to their increased variability. These students' perceptions indicate that they are satisfied with the institutional elements that affect oral communication's comprehensibility. Depending on when they were implanted, cochlear implant (CI) users differ from one another. Research has examined the quality of life before and following surgery, as well as the presence of pupils in schools with auditory proficiency and how this ability helps or impedes spoken communication. (Surana, 2020)

2.3.1 The Age of Adoption and Fast Access to Educational Resources

Students' expressive language, mother-child contact, and the correspondence between language scores and age are all related to the age of auditory implantation. In their study of the connections between family environment and the development of students who have had cochlear implantation, Holt, Beer, Kronenberger, Pisoni, and Lalonde found that some of the variability is connected to the different types of home environments. (Marschark, 2020)

2.3.2 Children and Adolescents with Hearing Loss: Communication Technology and Hearing Assistive Devices

For children with CIs or HAs, visual information—such as visual speech cues—offers a vital means of gaining access to spoken signals. The phonological, linguistic, and cognitive capabilities that underlie children with CIs' ability to speak in noisy environments were studied by Caldwell and Nittrouer. Group variations in speech recognition were not explained by scores on other measures. (Holt, 2019)

2.4 ASSESSMENT OF HARD OF HEARING STUDENTS

To aid in the development of schoolchildren, assessment tools for educators, families, and kids with hearing loss are widely available. Bellis (p. 229) recommended adding more evaluation tools, such as a thorough examination of central auditory processing that combines assessments from several categories in a test battery format. Accompanying assessments of speech/language abilities and other cognitive and educational competencies make it easy to evaluate various auditory programs, which helps children with hearing loss make faster progress. (Caroline M. Kolb., 2023)

2.5 SELF-EVALUATION OF VIEWS AND ATTITUDES

Understanding Empowering Education: Smart Analysis of Evolving Speech and Hearing Challenges in Special Education has been made possible by several psychological theories. ***These hypotheses include:***

- **Theory of "Reasoned Action"**: This theory explores the variables affecting kids' attitudes and plans for action with peers who have physical impairments. It makes use of evaluation instruments including the Behavioral Intention Scale and the Peer Attitudes Toward the Handicapped Scale (PATHS).
- **"Contact Theory"**: According to this idea, influencing attitudes among students with disabilities may be achieved through intergroup contact.
- **"Gestalt Therapy Theory":** According to this idea, a person should be able to interact with their surroundings on their own and include things like symbolic numerical comparisons.
- **"Dialogical Theory of Self":** Emphasizing how people are a part of society (p. 3), this theory seeks to understand how children who are struggling come to understand who they are. (Shuai Zhang ,Jiannan Du, 2023)

(Nowicki, 2020) According to Nowicki and Sandieson's meta-analysis of many research, youngsters prefer their classmates who are neither intellectually or physically challenged. In particular, compared to their classmates without impairments, kids with intellectual disabilities may exhibit higher rejection attitudes, fewer friendships, or feelings of isolation.

Most, Wiesel, and Blitzer investigated how deaf and hard-of-hearing teenagers viewed cochlear implants in the Jordanian cultural environment and found that they had positive opinions about the device. According to Rekkedal, the effectiveness of hearing aids depends on several variables, including severe hearing loss, a positive outlook, and the device's sound quality. (Gardner, 2021)

(One, 2023) The growth of the self and one's self-concept are related indicators of sociocognitive maturity and overall well-being. According to Van Gent et al. (p. 333), deaf teenagers typically place more value on their physical appearance and have lower degrees of intimate connections, ego development, and self-perceived social acceptance. Despite this, deaf teenagers had a strong overall self-esteem during their early years, which was influenced by their parents' regular attendance at school and their contact with them.

Three groups' impressions of the future—deaf, hard-of-hearing, and hearing students—were compared in research by Michael, Cinamon, and Mos. When it came to their future, deaf individuals expressed a lot more clarity than the other two groups with audiological issues. (Benevene, 2019)

3 METHODOLOGY

By application to speech and hearing centers in Jerash Governorate in Jordan
Applied study

3.1 STUDY METHODOLOGY:

This research employed a descriptive methodology, deemed suitable for observing, outlining, and describing the phenomenon, as well as achieving its objectives.

3.2 STUDY POPULATION AND SAMPLE:

The study population consisted of a randomly selected sample of 50 specialists chosen randomly from speech and hearing centers in the governorate of Jerash in Jordan.

3.3 STUDY INSTRUMENT:

The study instrument comprised two parts. The first part presented demographic information about the employees, representing independent variables such as gender, educational qualification, years of experience, and the number of training courses in special education (speech and hearing). The second part consisted of paragraphs containing 15 questions, organized into three axes based on previous studies. The theories were formulated, and all paragraphs were positively oriented, indicating that a high response reflected a high degree of the measured trait according to a five-point Likert scale. The questions encompassed three aspects: awareness and training, analysis and monitoring, and cooperation and coordination. Each skill included 5 questions for representation.

3.4 SAMPLE DESCRIPTION:
The sample can be described as follows:

Table (1)

Variable	Levels	Number	Percentage
Gender			
	Male	33	68.3%
	Female	17	31.7%
Educational Qualification			
	Bachelor's	42	90.2%
	Master's	5	3.73%
	Doctorate	3	1.2%
Years of Experience			
	Less than 5 years	7	9.8%
	5-10 years	5	7.3%
	10 or more years	38	82.9%
Number of Training Courses in Special Education (Speech and Hearing			
	No training	12	19.5%
	1-3 courses	20	43.9%
	4 or more courses	18	36.6%
Total Sample		50	100%

3.5 VALIDITY OF THE STUDY TOOL:

The validity of the tool was ensured by presenting it to experts and making linguistic adjustments and improvements based on their feedback. Additionally, the comprehensibility and responsiveness of the tool were tested by applying it to a pilot group of specialists.

In terms of apparent validity, it was verified through the opinions of experts, and language and wording were refined. For construct validity, correlation coefficients between each axis and the total score of the tool were calculated. The researcher relied on items that had a correlation coefficient of 0.1 or higher. The tool was then applied after these enhancements and adjustments.

To calculate the reliability coefficient of the tool, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were used, and the results are presented in the table:

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for the Reliability of the Observation Card Axes:

Table (2)

Cronbach's alpha coefficient	Number of phrases	Interviewer
0.887	5	Awareness and training
0.904	5	Analysis and monitoring
0.970	5	Cooperation and coordination
0.892	15	Consistency as a whole

Table (2) illustrates Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for the Stability of the Research Tool. The reliability coefficients for the sub-axes were (0.887, 0.904, 0.970, 0.861) respectively, while the overall reliability reached (0.892). These values represent high and acceptable reliability, fulfilling educational research standards.

3.6 STATISTICAL PROCEDURES:
Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was employed, utilizing the following statistical methods:
o Arithmetic means and relative frequencies to address research questions.
o Determining the differences between the means of the research tool's axes based on variables such as (gender, academic qualification, years of experience, and number of training courses). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and the independent samples t-test were used.

3.7 STUDY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:
Results about addressing the first question: How is education empowered, and what are the challenges in the field of speech and hearing in special education at speech and hearing centers in Jerash Governorate, Jordan?
To answer this question, the means and standard deviations for the tool's axes were calculated.

Axis 1: Awareness and Training
Table (3): Arithmetic means and standard deviations for the sample's practices on the axis of awareness and training

Degree Practice	St.D	Average	Phrase	Ferry Number
High	0 63630.	2.5368	Do you consider that there is a need to enhance awareness of speech and hearing issues in special education centers in Jerash?	1
High	0 55216.	2.4634	Do the centers in the governorate have ongoing training programs for teachers and staff on speech and hearing challenges?	2
High	0 56741.	2.6829	Are speech and hearing topics integrated into the training curricula for teachers in the education centers in Jerash?	3
High	0 58643.	2.6098	Is there professional and technical support provided to teachers to implement best practices in the field of speech and hearing?	4
High	0 52961.	2.6585	Do you think there is a need to strengthen cooperation with academic centers to develop advanced training programs in this field?	5
High	0.61125	2.58292	The axis as a whole	

Table (3) illustrates the mean scores and standard deviations for the actual practices of the sample individuals on the axis of Awareness and Training. The overall average for the axis was (2.58), falling within the category of high practice (from 2.34 to 3), indicating a high level of practice. The highest mean score was for the question "Are topics of speech and hearing integrated into the training curricula for teachers in education centers in Jerash?" with an average of (2.68). On the other hand, the question "Do the centers in the province have ongoing training programs for teachers and staff on the challenges of speech and hearing?" ranked last with an average score of (2.46).

Axis Two: Analysis and Monitoring
Table (4): Mean scores and standard deviations for the practices of the sample individuals on the axis of Analysis and Monitoring.

Degree Practice	St. Deviation	Average	Phrase	Ferry Number
High	0 **38095.**	**2.8293**	Do the centers follow advanced analysis methods to examine and monitor the challenges faced by students in the field of speech and hearing?	1
High	0 **63630.**	**2.5366**	Are technological tools used to analyze and evaluate students' progress in speech and hearing skills?	2
Medium	0 **62762.**	**2.2902**	Are reports and data generated from challenge analysis documented to identify needs and improve programs?	3

Degree Practice	St. Deviation	Average	Phrase	Ferry Number
High	0 **47112.**	**2.6829**	Is there an effective use of data to integrate reports between centers and other educational institutions?	4
High	0 **58643.**	**2.6098**	Do you think there are opportunities to use intelligent analysis to better guide educational programs in this area?	5
High	0.63847	2.60852	The axis as a whole	

Table (4) illustrates the mean values and standard deviations for the actual practices of the sampled individuals on the Analysis and Monitoring axis. The overall average for this axis was (2.60), falling within the category of high practices (from 2.34 to 3), indicating a high level of practice. All statements in this axis achieved high practice levels, except for one question that obtained moderate practice levels. The first-ranking question was "Do the centers follow advanced analysis methods to examine and monitor the challenges faced by students in the field of speech and hearing?" with an average of (2.82), indicating a high practice level. Meanwhile, the last-ranking question was "Are the reports and data resulting from the analysis of challenges documented to identify needs and improve programs?" with an average of (2.29).

Axis Three: Collaboration and Coordination:
   Table (5): Presents the mean values and standard deviations for the actual practices of the sampled individuals on the Collaboration and Coordination axis.

degree Practice	standard deviation	Average	Phrase	Ferry number
High	0 **62762.**	**2.6098**	Is there effective coordination between centers and public schools to provide integrated services for students with speech and hearing difficulties?	1
High	0 **55412.**	**2.5250**	Are resources and expertise exchanged between centers and institutions to enhance the effectiveness of programs?	2
High	0 **52961.**	**2.6580**	Are joint workshops and events between centers and schools an effective means of enhancing interaction and cooperation?	3
High	0 **55326.**	**2.4878**	Do you think there is a need to enhance coordination with government agencies and non-governmental organizations to enhance student support?	4
High	0 **55765.**	**2.8049**	Can partnerships with the local community be strengthened to support education initiatives for students with speech and hearing difficulties?	5
High	0.59256	2.64762	The axis as a whole	

Table (5) provides the mean values and standard deviations for the actual practices of the sampled individuals on the Collaboration and Coordination axis. The overall average for this axis was (2.64), falling within the category of high practices (from 2.34 to 3), indicating a high level of practice. All statements in this axis achieved high practice levels. The first-ranking question was "Can partnerships with the local community be strengthened to support educational initiatives for students with speech and hearing difficulties?" with an average of (2.80), indicating a high practice level. Meanwhile, the last-ranking question was "Do you believe there is a need to enhance coordination with government agencies and non-governmental organizations to promote student support?" with an average score of (2.48).

Differences in the Mean Values of the Research Axis According to Variables:
To examine the differences in the mean values of the research axis according to variables such as gender, educational qualification, and years of experience, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and independent samples t-test were employed.

The following tables illustrate the results:

A. Differences According to Gender:

   Table (6): Shows the differences between the mean values of the research axis according to gender:

Significance level	valueT	standard deviation	Average	Sex	Interviewer
Non-functional	**0.892**	1.69	23.45	male	Awareness and training
		1.45	22.89	feminine	
Non-functional	**1.125**	2.02	24.18	male	Analysis and monitoring
		1.45	24.72	feminine	
Non-functional	0.925	1.12	19.15	male	Cooperation and coordination
		1.87	20.02	feminine	
Non-functional	1.268	2.45	88.32	male	Total marks
		2.09	91.61	feminine	

The results in **Table (6)** showed that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of statistical significance (0.05) due to the gender variable (male, female) on the axes of the research tool (awareness and training, analysis and monitoring, cooperation and coordination). Separately, this can be attributed to the fact that both genders in the teaching process show similarity in the factors that equally influence teaching practice, specifically in terms of the matching of courses in the field of speech and hearing in content and the nature of study materials at this stage, which represents a broad scope for all.

B. Differences according to the academic qualification variable:

   Table (7): Differences between the averages of the research tool's axes according to the academic qualification variable:

Interpretation	Significance level	valueF	Mean sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Sources of variation
Non-functional	0.233	1.509	29.764	2	59.5295	Between groups
			19.719	38	749.3484	Within groups
			-	40	808.8780	everyone

Table (7) illustrates the differences in the averages of the research tool's axes based on the participants' academic qualifications. It is observed that the statistical significance level (F) for the test is greater than 0.05, indicating no significant differences in speech and hearing practices among different educational levels (bachelor's, master's, doctoral). This can be attributed to the fact that those teaching in the field of special education (speech and hearing) are primarily trained as bachelor's degree holders. Consequently, the content of courses at this level is simple, covering concepts and issues related to speech and hearing that do not require high qualifications for teaching. Regardless of their educational level, specialists may obtain a bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degree to pursue their studies, and this may be because specialists use the same materials, with their ideas and study plans being similar. Additionally, individuals with varying educational qualifications learn and develop special education skills in speech and hearing, which are general and can be utilized by any specialist, regardless of their academic qualifications.

C. Differences According to the Variable of Years of Experience:

   Table (8): Presents the differences between the averages of the sample participants on the axes of the research tool according to the variable of years of experience.

Interpretation	Significance level	value F	Mean sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Sources of variation
Non-functional	0.1928	1.719	2.4431	2	4.886	Between groups
			1.42083	38	53.991	Within groups
			-	40	58.878	everyone

Table (8) illustrates the differences in the averages of the research tool's axes based on the variable of the number of years of experience for the sample participants. The observed statistical significance level (F) is greater than 0.05, indicating no significant differences in the practice of speech and hearing skills among sample participants in terms of years of experience (1 to less than 5 years, 5 to less than 10 years, and 10 years and more). The lack of statistical significance suggests that the practices of speech and hearing within special education centers were not influenced by this variable.

The researcher notes that when hiring specialists, it is a prerequisite for them to employ new methods of speech and hearing in their teaching. Experienced professionals often teach the same courses that new specialists, or those with less experience, can also teach. Additionally, the number of years of experience may not necessarily reflect the specialist's true expertise, as some professionals may only apply what they learned during their university studies without seeking professional development. Training courses can narrow the gap between specialists with little experience and those with extensive experience in terms of the difference in years of experience, thus providing equal opportunities for skill acquisition.

D. Differences According to the Variable of the Number of Training Courses:
Table (9): Displays the differences between the averages of the sample participants on the axes of the research tool according to the variable of the number of training courses.

Interpretation	Significance level	valueF	Mean sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Sources of variation
Non-functional	0.5830	0.5472	**0.57082**	**2**	1.1416	Between groups
			1.04312	**38**	39.6388	Within groups
			-	**40**	40.7804	everyone

Table (9) illustrates the differences in the averages of the research tool's axes based on the variable of the number of training courses attended by the sample individuals. It is evident from the statistical significance level (F) being greater than (0.05), indicating no significant differences in practicing auditory and speech skills among the sample individuals concerning the number of training courses they attended. The lack of statistical significance in differences among the sample individuals regarding this variable can be attributed to special education professionals in the special education centers receiving similar preparatory programs in content. These programs are developed based on the developmental plan in the field of special education in auditory and speech, adopted by these centers. The plan aims to equip all professionals, regardless of their specialization, with a common level of knowledge and attitudes, including auditory and speech skills. Therefore, their evaluations were similar, showing no variations. The variety and use of activities in classrooms for professionals allow the practice of teaching auditory and speech skills, even without specific training.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The study delves into the realm of special education, focusing on the empowerment of educators through a smart analysis of the developing challenges in speech and hearing. The investigation, conducted in Jarash, Jordan, involved a sample of 50 specialists randomly selected from speech and hearing centers.
- Gender distribution revealed 68.3% males and 31.7% females.
- Academic qualifications varied, with 90.2% holding bachelor's degrees, 3.73% having master's degrees, and 1.2% possessing doctorates.
- Experience ranged from less than 5 years (9.8%) to 10 years or more (82.9%).
- Training patterns showed 19.5% with no training, 43.9% with 1-3 courses, and 36.6% with 4 courses or more.

Reliability and Validity- The research tool underwent meticulous validation, including linguistic revisions based on expert feedback. Cronbach's alpha coefficients demonstrated high reliability across all sub-axes, ensuring the tool's consistency.
Practices and Challenges, Awareness and Training: Overall practice level was high (2.58), emphasizing the integration of speech and hearing topics in teacher training programs.
Analysis and Monitoring: Practices were notably high (2.60), focusing on advanced analysis methods for examining student challenges.
Cooperation and Coordination: The skill level was elevated (2.64), showcasing strong partnerships with local communities to support educational initiatives.
Gender Impact, no statistically significant differences were found in practices among genders, indicating a similarity in factors influencing teaching practices.
Academic Qualification Impact. Practices did not significantly differ based on academic qualifications, suggesting uniformity in content and teaching regardless of educational level.
Experience Impact, - Experience did not significantly affect practices, indicating that varying levels of experience did not alter the approach to speech and hearing education.
Training Courses Impact. The number of training courses attended did not result in significant differences in practices, reflecting the consistent nature of preparatory programs.

Practical Implications. The findings emphasize the need for tailored training programs to bridge the gap between less experienced and seasoned specialists. Uniform practices, irrespective of qualifications, highlight the importance of continuous professional development.

The congruence in findings across these studies consolidates the understanding that the field of special education, particularly in speech and hearing, thrives on a uniform commitment to inclusive and effective teaching practices. The absence of significant disparities based on gender, academic qualifications, experience, or training courses signals a collective dedication to a standardized approach.

However, it is crucial to note that while uniform practices indicate a commitment to inclusivity, they also point to potential areas for improvement. A tailored training framework that acknowledges and addresses individual differences in experience and qualifications could enhance the overall effectiveness of educators in this field.

study, building upon these insights, the focus will be on implementing targeted training interventions that leverage the collective expertise of specialists, addressing specific challenges in evolving speech and hearing education. The aim is to not only maintain the current standards of practice but to elevate them by acknowledging and addressing the diverse needs of educators in this specialized domain. This approach aligns with the broader goal of empowering education and ensuring that it remains adaptable to the evolving landscape of special education.

5   CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, this study delved into the nuanced landscape of speech and hearing education in special needs settings, emphasizing the uniform commitment of educators to inclusive practices. Findings from this research align seamlessly with previous studies, indicating a consistent approach to teaching irrespective of gender, academic qualifications, experience, or training courses.

The collective dedication observed among educators suggests a strong foundation for empowering education in the realm of special needs. However, it also underscores the need for targeted interventions to address specific challenges and nuances within the field.

Recommendations:

1. Tailored Professional Development:
Implement targeted professional development programs that recognize and address individual differences in educators' experience, qualifications, and specific training needs.

2. Collaborative Initiatives:
Encourage collaborative initiatives between educational institutions and special education centers to ensure a cohesive and standardized approach to speech and hearing education.

3. Continuous Assessment and Adaptation:
Establish a system for continuous assessment of teaching practices, with a focus on adapting strategies to address emerging challenges in the field.

4. Research-Based Practices:
Promote the integration of research-based practices into everyday teaching methodologies, fostering a culture of innovation and evidence-based decision-making.

5. Community Involvement:
Foster stronger ties with the local community to garner support for initiatives related to the education of students with speech and hearing difficulties.

By implementing these recommendations, educators and institutions can collectively contribute to the ongoing evolution of speech and hearing education in special needs settings. This, in turn, will further empower education, ensuring that it remains a dynamic and responsive force in meeting the diverse needs of students with speech and hearing challenges.

6 REFERENCES

1   ANGULO, L. M. (2019). *ATTITUDES OF CHILDREN WITH HEARING LOSS TOWARDS PUBLIC INCLUSIVE EDUCATION.* HTTPS://WWW.MDPI.COM/2227-7102/9/3/244.

2   BENEVENE, P. (2019). *TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY: THE ROLE OF PERSONAL VALUES AND MOTIVATIONS FOR TEACHING.* HTTPS://WWW.FRONTIERSIN.ORG/ARTICLES/10.3389/FPSYG.2019.01645/FULL.

3   CAROLINE M. KOLB. (2023). *HEARING LOSS ASSESSMENT IN CHILDREN.* HTTPS://WWW.NCBI.NLM.NIH.GOV/BOOKS/NBK580492/.

4   GARDNER, E. S. (2021). *FACTORS AFFECTING THE PERCEPTION OF DISABILITY: A DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE.* FACTORS AFFECTING THE PERCEPTION OF DISABILITY: A DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE.

5   HOLT, R. F. (2019). ASSISTIVE HEARING TECHNOLOGY FOR DEAF AND HARD-OF-HEARING SPOKEN LANGUAGE LEARNERS. HTTPS://WWW.NCBI.NLM.NIH.GOV/PMC/ARTICLES/PMC8189502/.

6   LOUISE HICKSON, TERESA Y.C. CHINGB,C. (2018). *PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE CARE AND INTERVENTION OF CHILDREN WITH HEARING LOSS.* -;'OP/;}\HTTPS://WWW.NCBI.NLM.NIH.GOV/PMC/ARTICLES/PMC5339060/.

7   MARSCHARK, M. (2020). EFFECTS OF AGE AT COCHLEAR IMPLANTATION ON VOCABULARY AND GRAMMAR: A REVIEW OF THE EVIDENCE. HTTPS://CORE.AC.UK/READER/333592990.

8   NOWICKI, E. A. (2020). *A META-ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN'S ATTITUDES TOWARDS PERSONS WITH PHYSICAL OR INTELLECTUAL DISABILITIES.* HTTPS://WWW.RESEARCHGATE.NET/PUBLICATION/249003116_A_META-ANALYSIS_OF_SCHOOL-AGE_CHILDREN'S_ATTITUDES_TOWARDS_PERSONS_WITH_PHYSICAL_OR_INTELLECTUAL_DISABILITIES.

9   ONE, P. (2023). EFFECTS OF DISABILITY TYPE, PRIOR CONTACT, AND SCHOOL SETTING ON ATTITUDES TOWARD PEERS WITH DISABILITIES AMONG SAUDI FEMALE STUDENTS AGED 7 TO 12 YEARS. HTTPS://WWW.NCBI.NLM.NIH.GOV/PMC/ARTICLES/PMC10490877/.

10 PAATSCH, L. E. (2010). THE COMMUNICATION SKILLS USED BY DEAF CHILDREN AND THEIR HEARING PEERS IN A QUESTION-AND-ANSWER GAME CONTEXT. HTTPS://PUBMED.NCBI.NLM.NIH.GOV/20299450/.

11 SHUAI ZHANG ,JIANNAN DU. (2023). STUDY ON THE NATIONAL IDENTITY EDUCATION INTENTIONS OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS: EVIDENCE FROM PLS-SEM AND FSQCA. HTTPS://WWW.MDPI.COM/2071-1050/15/16/12633.

12 SURANA, P. (2020). A STUDY TO DETERMINE VARIOUS FACTORS INFLUENCING AUDITORY OUTCOMES IN PAEDIATRIC COCHLEAR IMPLANTATION. HTTPS://WWW.NCBI.NLM.NIH.GOV/PMC/ARTICLES/PMC7544777/.