LEX LOCALIS-JOURNAL OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT
ISSN:1581-5374 E-ISSN:1855-363X
VOL. 23, NO. 10(2025)

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN SPECIAL EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION AND INCLUSIVE SCHOOL LEADERSHIP: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES IN JORDAN— A MIXED-METHODS SURVEY STUDY

Firas Al Taqatqa[1], Moayyad Homidi [2]

[1]Al Al Bayt University
[2]Arab Open University

faltaqatqa @aabu.edu.jo[1]
m_homidi@aou.edu.jo2

Abstract
Despite the national law and UNESCO guidelines, Jordan is currently in the early stages of AI-enabled special education (UNESCO, 2025). The paper focuses on the prospects and pitfalls regarding the acceptance of '***AI-integrated disability technologies'*** in Jordan. Therefore, the technology acceptance model (TAM) was applied as a theoretical framework, suggesting how an individual's discretion influences the acceptance of specific technology(Schorr, 2023). Furthermore, the study engages with epistemology and ontology research paradigms to determine both subjective and deductive logical reasoning (Al-Ababneh, 2020). A mixed-method survey of 300 respondents encompassing "teachers, administrators, and policymakers" was employed as a data collection instrument. Open-ended questions were "explored" through qualitative '***thematic analysis***', whereas closed-ended questions were "examined" through quantitative '***sampling techniques***. Regression findings with a low (R^2= 0.009) highlight that large-scale acceptance of AI-driven special education in Jordan faces key challenges, including cultural barriers, limited tech infrastructure, and insufficient qualified personnel.

Keywords: (AI-integrated disability technologies, UNESCO guidelines, Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), Personalized Learning. insufficient qualified personnel)

1 Introduction

Context: With an emphasis on integrating students with special needs into regular classrooms, Jordanian education has made remarkable progress in recent decades toward school leadership inclusivity (Al-Omari, 2024). The idea that every child, regardless of disability, has the right to acquire an education is the foundation of special education in Jordan (Alshamiri, 2025). UNESCO (2023)
aligns international efforts to ensure inclusive education for students with disabilities. The Jordanian Ministry of Education has developed regulations to facilitate the enrollment of students with disabilities into the mainstream school system (Al Qudah, 2024). Artificial intelligence (AI) has become a valuable tool in education around the world (Alkan, 2024).
Intelligent education systems, assistive technology, and data-driven decision-making frameworks are all improved by AI technologies (Schorr, 2023). Machine learning, natural language processing, and predictive analytics facilitate students in almost all disciplines (Ali, Murray, Momin, Dwivedi, & Malik, 2024). However, notably in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) area, the use of AI in education, especially in special education, is still in its infancy (Trigui et al., 2024)

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS: [2]Moayyad Homidi, Professor, Arab Open University, Faculty of Education, Jordan, m_homidi@aou.edu.jo (corresponding author).
[1]Firas Al Taqatqa,Associate Professor, Al Al Bayt Uinversity, Faculty of Applied Medical Sciencees, Jordan, faltaqatqa@aabu.edu.jo

Problem Statement: Jordan is currently in the early stages of integrating AI within the special education sphere (Beirat, Algolaylat, & Al-Makhzoomy, 2025). The Jordanian school system has widely accepted AI-enabled technologies in the multifaceted educational sector (Rabab'h, 2025). However, it poses several challenges, such as insufficient qualified personnel, cultural resistance to adopting the latest technology, and inadequate infrastructure (Zakariya Almahasees et al., 2024).

While school officials strive to ensure their institutions can meet the educational needs of all children, teachers frequently struggle to manage classrooms with various demands (Cardona, Rodríguez, & Ishmael, 2023). Interest in how technology, especially artificial intelligence (AI), might help with these issues is expanding as the need for individualized educational experiences rises (Mariyono, 2025).

Research Objectives: This study's primary goals are to: (1) Examine the possibilities AI presents for managing special education in Jordanian schools. (2) Determine the difficulties and impediments to the use of AI in special education in Jordan. (3) Evaluate how prepared educators and school officials are to implement AI in their classrooms. (4) Examine how AI might help promote inclusive education and enhance learning results for students with exceptional needs.

Research significance: The present discourse signifies several areas (Joshi & Khatiwada, 2024). In the first place, it adds research on the use of AI in special education, with a particular emphasis on Jordan (Treve, 2024). This study can influence future institutional procedures and decisions in Jordanian schools by emphasizing how AI can improve educational leadership.

Second, Jordanian educators, school administrators, and policy makers, who are considering the implementation of AI in special education may find this research study helpful as a reference. All potential Stakeholders may decide how to introduce these technologies to optimizes their monetary and non-monetary advantages (Trigui et al., 2024).

Finally, this study focuses cultural, ethical, and infrastructure factors that are essential for introducing AI to Jordanian schools. Considering the unique context of the country, the project will shed light on how artificial intelligence (AI) can be most effectively integrated into Jordan's educational system, with a focus on special education (Xu, 2024).

2 Literature overviews

AI in Special Education: A Global Perspective: Artificial Intelligence (AI) has been diligent in the field of education because of its prospects to facilitate inclusive school leadership and personalized learning(Ali, Murray, Momin, Dwivedi, & Malik, 2024). AI disability technologies in special ed, such as machine learning, natural language processing, and ***intelligent tutoring systems (ITS)***, offer tailored training, real-time feedback, and support to a range of students (Cardona, Rodríguez, & Ishmael, 2023). Students with impairments can now access course materials and engage more actively in class activities with software for text-to-speech and speech recognition (VanLehn, 2011).

Dream Box Learning and Knewton are two AI-powered platforms that tailor training based on student feedback, which is particularly advantageous for students with impairments (Dutta et al., 2024). Smart glasses and communication boards are examples of ***assistive technologies*** that improve interaction for children with cognitive and sensory impairments (World Health Organization, 2024). Educators can identify students who need remedial education; thus, tailor personalized assistance based on AI-

driven learning analytics improve instruction, and facilitate data-driven resource allocation decisions (Siemens, 2013).

The MENA region's AI-integrated special education is still in its infancy (Trigui et al., 2024). Although forward-thinking programs like the '***AI for Good'*** have been established in KSA and the United Arab Emirates (Alshamiri, 2025). On the other hand, countries such as Jordan are yet in the exploratory phase of AI-integrated special ed. For widespread acceptance of '***AI-integrated disability technologies'*** in Jordan, consistent investment, strategic planning, and strong inclusive leadership are required (El-Din et al., 2020). For instance, in inclusive classrooms, AI systems that modify course material to meet the needs of each student may be beneficial. However, adoption of the technology may encounter strong opposition if educators believe it to be challenging to use (Charness & Boot, 2020).

Theoretical Underpinning: Davis (1989) introduced the '***Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)',*** which explains how people adopt and utilize new technology (Ching & Jamaluddin, 2025). TAM suggests how individuals' decisions to adopt and use specific technology significantly influence their perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use (Marikyan & Papagiannidis, 2024). Whereby, the extent to which a person thinks about utilizing a particular technology to improve their work effectiveness or job performance is known as ***perceived usefulness, or PU***. On the other hand, ***perceived ease of use (PEOU)*** is the extent to which an individual perceives that utilizing a specific technology would be effortless (Chen, Chang, Wang, Zou, & Tu, 2024). Based on PU and PEOU, users' ***behavioral intention (BI)*** determines whether to adopt any specific technology or forgo it (Schorr, 2023). Thus, Hypotheses based on TAM are given as follows.

H_1: The behavioral intentions to use AI technology is positively correlated with the perceived value of AI in special education.

H_2: The behavioral intention to use AI technology is positively correlated with the perceived ease of use of AI tools.

H_3: Behavioral intention to embrace AI is more strongly influenced by perceived usefulness than by perceived ease of use.

Data sources: To investigate the prospects, challenges, and preparedness of Jordanian school administrators, educators, and legislators regarding the AI-integrated special ed, this study employs a survey-based technique. Given that research paradigm ontology emphasizes logical reasoning and epistemology ensures subjectivity in this study, a mixed-method approach is used to collect data from 300 respondents (Creswell, 2009). A holistic understanding of the study problem, improved validity, and deeper insights through triangulation are included by the mixed-method approach, which blends qualitative and quantitative methodologies (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010). Open-ended questions are investigated through qualitative thematic analysis, whereas closed-ended questions are investigated through quantitative sampling techniques. The proposed questionnaire assessed TAM parameters; perceived usefulness (PU), perceived ease of use (PEOU), and behavioral intention (BI) to adopt AI in special ed contexts. It investigates contextual and objective aspects in addition to numerical patterns (Lim et al., 2023). Additionally, data is collected at a cross-sectional time horizon. For more details; data set is provided as ***DATASET-A.xlsx***

Survey Questionnaire Template

1. **Demographics**
   a) Job description
   b) Gender
   c) Unique ID

d) Age Group
e) Years of Experience

2. Qualitative Questions

Q1: How can AI be utilized to improve student learning outcomes in special education?
Q2: What are the challenges you face in adopting AI tools in your educational setting?
Q3: What types of AI technologies do you think would be most beneficial in the classroom for students with disabilities?
Q4: What types of AI technologies do you think would be most helpful in the school for students with disabilities?

3. Quantitative Questions

Based on a 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree), the following quantitative questions are designed;
Q5: Can AI improve student learning outcomes in special education? Can AI make administrative tasks in special education more efficient?
Q6: Can AI tools help personalize learning for students with disabilities?
Q7: Are AI tools easy to learn and use for special education teachers?
Q8: Are AI tools user-friendly for administrators in special education?
Q9: Would Teachers be able to integrate AI tools into their classrooms easily
Q10: Is there any adequate training available to help teachers use AI tools effectively?

3 Research

Since the first four questions are open-ended, a short content/thematic analysis is conducted to gain insights into the generalizability of recurring patterns or themes. According to the respondents of Q1, AI is an essential tool for improving individualized learning. According to Q2, the primary discrepancy identified is the adaptation of AI technologies to accommodate a range of learning needs to gain school leadership inclusivity. Q3 Respondents place greater emphasis on the value of tailored and flexible AI solutions. As Q4 responses suggest that they anticipate the government would encourage AI integration through financing, research, and policy.

Table 1:Thematic Analysis of Open-ended questions regarding AI adoption in Special education

Open-Ended Question	Common Themes	Frequency
Q1. AI Utilization for Learning and school leadership inclusivity	Learning, Tools, Systems, Feedback, Student, Personalized, Automated, Support, Smart, Cognitive	Learning (79), Tools (34), Systems (24), Feedback (23), Student (21), Personalized (20), Automated (19), Support (18), Smart (17), Cognitive (16)
Q2. Challenges of AI Adoption in school leadership inclusivity	Learning, Tools, Systems, Adaptive, Real-time, Cognitive, Support, Platforms, Feedback, Interactive	Learning (91), Tools (38), Systems (25), Adaptive (22), Real-time (21), Cognitive (21), Support (18), Platforms (18), Feedback (16), Interactive (16)
Q3. AI Technologies for Disabilities in school leadership inclusivity	Learning, Tools, Personalized, Systems, Adaptive, Feedback, Student, Cognitive, Real-time, Support	Learning (79), Tools (39), Personalized (28), Systems (24), Adaptive (22), Feedback (22), Student (21), Cognitive (20), Real-time (17), Support (16)
Q4.Government Support for AI in school	AI, Support, Education, Offer, Develop, Provide,	AI (171), Support (35), Education (25), Offer (24), Develop (23),

Open-Ended Question	Common Themes	Frequency
leadership inclusivity	Research, Ensure	Provide (22), Research (22), Ensure (21)

Table 2: An Illustration of distribution of respondents by demographic

Demographic Characteristic	**Total Respondents (n = 300)**	**Teachers**	**Administrators**	**Policymakers**
Gender				
Male	160	60	50	50
Female	140	40	50	50
Age Group				
20-30 years	90	50	25	15
31-40 years	120	30	50	40
41+ years	90	20	25	45
Years of Experience characteristics				
1-5 years	100	60	30	10
6-10 years	120	30	60	30
11+ years	80	10	10	60

Table 3: An Illustration of distribution of respondents by demographic characteristics

This study's data presentation was methodically planned to offer meaningful insights regarding the acceptance of AI in special education. Tables summarizing answers to seven closed-ended questions on perceived utility, perceived ease of use, and behavioral intention to adopt AI in special education were examined through quantitative "random sampling" techniques. Key trends were highlighted by the descriptive statistics analysis of the responses, including means, frequencies, and standard deviations. Furthermore, respondents were able to express their opinions using open-ended questions, which were then subjected to thematic coding for analysis.

Table 2 presents the classification of respondents based on **gender**, **age group**, and **years of experience**. Among the 300 respondents, there is an appropriate gender distribution with more male participants (160) compared to female participants (140). The **age group** categories indicate a large proportion of respondents are from the **31-40 years** age group (120). The **years of experience** show a fairly even distribution, with the majority of respondents having **6-10 years** of experience (120).

Table 4: Representation of the findings from the closed-ended questions related to perceived usefulness

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
AI can improve student learning outcomes in special education.	40%	35%	15%	5%	5%
AI can make administrative tasks in special education more efficient.	45%	30%	15%	5%	5%
AI tools can help personalize learning for students with disabilities.	50%	30%	10%	5%	5%
AI can assist in tracking student progress and providing feedback.	45%	35%	10%	5%	5%

Table 3 illustrates the responses to questions about the perceived usefulness (PU) of AI-driven special education. According to the majority of respondents, AI can greatly enhance **administrative effectiveness (45% strongly agree), student learning outcomes (40% strongly agree), and individualized instruction for students with disabilities (50% strongly agree).** These results imply a strong belief in AI-driven technologies in improving special needs education.

Table 5: Representation of the findings from the closed-ended questions related Perceived Ease of Use of AI in Special Education

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
AI tools are easy to learn and use for special education teachers.	30%	40%	20%	5%	5%
AI tools are user-friendly for administrators in special education.	35%	40%	15%	5%	5%
Teachers would be able to integrate AI tools into their classrooms easily.	25%	45%	20%	5%	5%
There is adequate training available to help teachers use AI tools.	20%	25%	35%	10%	10%

Table 4 offers information on how user-friendly AI tools are thought to be. It reveals that 35% of respondents strongly agree that AI tools are easy for administrators to use, while 30% of respondents strongly agree that AI tools are easy for teachers to learn and use. There is some hesitancy, though, as 20% of respondents concur that sufficient training is available to support teachers in effectively utilizing AI. This suggests that while some people are concerned about appropriate training, most people believe AI tools can be used effectively.

Table 6: **Representation of the findings from the closed-ended questions related Behavioral Intention for Adoption of AI**

Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
AI can improve student learning outcomes in special education.	21.4	16.05	20.07	18.06	24.41
AI can make administrative tasks in special education more efficient.	20.7	16	19.56	17.06	23.41
AI tools can help personalize learning for students with disabilities.	22	15.89	19.67	17.86	24.31
AI can assist in tracking student progress and providing feedback.	22.8	16.2	20.07	18.06	23.81

Based on answers to related questions, Table 5 shows the behavioral intention to adopt AI. With approx. 16.05% of respondents agree, and 21.4% strongly agree, that AI can enhance administrative tasks and results; the majority of respondents express strong intentions to adopt AI. Nonetheless, a significant portion of respondents (nearly 24.4%) continue to express strong disagreement with the behavioral intention for adoption, suggesting opposition to AI-driven tools in special education.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Parameters	count	mean	std	min	25%	50%	75%	max
Perceived Usefulness	299	3.053	0.817	1.00	2.33	3.00	3.67	5.00
Perceived Ease of Use	299	3.042	0.961	1.00	2.50	3.00	4.00	5.00
Behavioral Intention	299	3.0	1.474	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00

The Descriptive statistics for behavioral intention, perceived usefulness, and perceived ease of use are shown in this Table 6. With perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use being close to one another, the mean score for each parameter is approximately 3.05, suggesting a generally favorable opinion of AI in special education. There appears to be greater variation in responses regarding the adoption of AI, as indicated by the higher standard deviation for behavioral intention.

Table 8: Correlation Matrix

Correlation Matrix	Perceived Usefulness	Perceived Ease of Use	Behavioral Intention
Perceived Usefulness (PU)	1	-0.093185137	-0.028489112

Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU)	-0.093185137	1	-0.0887998
Behavioral Intention (BI)	-0.028489112	-0.0887998	1

Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and behavioral intention all have weak to nonexistent correlations, according to the correlation matrix. The fact that all of the correlations are tiny and negative suggests that there aren't any significant relationships between these parameters in terms of predicting behavioral intention. This is consistent with the t-test results showing no significant findings.

Table 9: Regression Analysis

Parameter	Coefficient	t-Statistic	p-Value
Behavioral Intention	3.50	12.16	< 0.001
Perceived Usefulness	-0.067	-0.64	0.524
Perceived Ease of Use	-0.142	-1.59	0.113

The findings of the t-test shed light on the statistical connections among behavioral intention, perceived usefulness, and perceived ease of use. With (p-values ≥ 0.05), none of the hypotheses **(H_1, H_2, and H_3)** exhibit statistically significant differences, indicating that behavioral intention to adopt AI is not significantly predicted by perceived usefulness or perceived ease of use. According to the regression analysis, behavioral intention to adopt AI is not significantly predicted by perceived usefulness or perceived ease of use. Perceived usefulness (coefficient = -0.067) and perceived ease of use (coefficient = -0.142) do not appear to have a significant impact on behavioral intention, as indicated by the ***p-values for both predictors being greater than 0.05***. Regression findings with a low (R^2= 0.009) highlight that large-scale acceptance of AI-driven special education in Jordan faces key challenges, including cultural barriers, limited tech infrastructure, and insufficient qualified personnel.

4 Discussion

The open-ended survey responses included in the ***qualitative analysis*** were thematically coded to examine recurrent themes about the use of AI in Jordanian special education. The study addresses four main questions that explore the prospects and challenges of AI-integrated classrooms, especially for children with disabilities, as well as the role of government assistance.

Learning with AI to gain school leadership inclusivity: With terms like "learning," "tools," and "feedback" appearing as the most commonly expressed topics, the respondents largely agreed that AI has the capacity to personalize learning. A widespread perception exists that AI can provide individualized learning experiences by customizing training to each student's needs (Rabab'h, 2025). The fact that "support" and "student" are mentioned frequently suggests that AI will be essential to tracking and improving development in real time.

Adoption Challenges for AI in school leadership inclusivity demands AI integration inside current educational institutions were the main issues revealed by the qualitative replies. "Adaptive," "real-time," and "learning" are among the themes that express respondents' worries that AI tools would not completely engage pupils, especially those with learning difficulties. According to the respondents, there is an excellent demand for AI systems that can promptly intervene and adjust to the needs of students. These results highlight a disconnect between AI's technological promise and the existing

infrastructure, as well as the readiness and willingness of teachers to utilize these tools effectively (Mishra, 2024).

AI-Powered Disability Technologies: The respondents were unambiguous in their opinion that AI technology as strategy of school leadership inclusivity, exceptionally "personalized" and "adaptive" solutions, may significantly improve learning for students with impairments. These answers highlight how important AI is to delivering personalized education. Recurring themes of "feedback" and "real time" emphasized the significance of steadfast input in sustaining student engagement and enabling consistent improvement for students with disabilities. These tools were thought to be crucial for establishing an inclusive learning environment in the classroom, where AI may help in closing gaps brought on by different learning challenges (Xu, 2024).

Government Assistance for the Integration of AI: It was emphasized how important the government is in ensuring AI is successfully integrated into special education. Key words like "support," "research," and "develop" indicated the consensus that government financing, legislation, and research projects are necessary to encourage the adoption of AI. The emphasis on "education" and "ensure" suggests that respondents think it is essential that all students have fair access to AI technologies, particularly in institutions that serve children with impairments.

The ***quantitative analysis*** collected via closed-ended survey questions sheds light on how respondents view artificial intelligence (AI) in special education, with particular attention to perceived utility, usability, and behavioral intention to use AI.

Perceived Usefulness: Most respondents felt that AI tailor learning for kids with disabilities (50% strongly agreed), improve administrative duties (45% strongly agreed), and increase student learning outcomes (40% strongly agreed). These answers imply that there is widespread confidence in AI's ability to improve academic performance as well as school operations.

Respondents expressed faith in AI's capacity to simplify activities and enhance educational processes, especially for children in need of individualized learning help, indicating that their perceived utility was a significant factor in their adoption.

Perceived Ease of Use: Regarding perceived usability, 35% of respondents strongly agreed that AI tools are easy for administrators to use, and 30% strongly agreed that AI technologies are easy for instructors to learn and utilize. Nonetheless, 20% of respondents said that there was sufficient training available, indicating some hesitancy. This suggests that even while a large number of respondents thought AI tools were rather simple to use, there is still some doubt over the suitability of training programs for giving administrators and teachers the know-how to use AI technologies efficiently. This discrepancy implies that although the adoption of AI is seen favorably, professional development gaps still need to be filled.

Behavioral Intention to Adopt AI: A sizable percentage of respondents (21.4%) indicated a strong intention to use AI technologies to enhance administrative effectiveness and student learning outcomes when asked about their behavioral intention to adopt AI. There is some hesitancy or opposition to the incorporation of AI in special education, though, as 24.4% of respondents opposed or strongly disagreed with embracing AI. Because responses varied, the behavioral intention standard deviation was comparatively large (1.47). This shows that even if adoption of AI is generally supported, some respondents are still dubious or worried, underscoring the need for more work to get beyond opposition and guarantee the successful integration of AI in learning environments.

Correlation and Regression Analysis: The association between behavioral intention to embrace AI, perceived utility, and perceived ease of use was further investigated using

regression and correlation analysis. The correlation coefficients for perceived usefulness and behavioral intention (-0.03) and perceived ease of use and behavioral intention (-0.09) were both very tiny and negative, indicating weak relationships between these variables. According to the regression study, behavioral intention was not significantly predicted by perceived usefulness or perceived ease of use, as both had high (p-values > 0.05). This result implies that the decision to use AI in special education may be influenced by other factors that are not considered by these two metrics. This is further supported by the (R^2= 0.009), which shows a very poor model fit. These findings imply that although utility and usability are significant, they are not enough to predict the adoption of AI on their own; infrastructure, support, and training are other aspects that must be considered.

According to the quantitative results, there is still variation in behavioral intention to adopt AI, with some resistance apparent, even though AI is thought to be helpful and quite simple to use. Overall, the study emphasizes how pivotal supportive (like training and government assistance) and technological (such perceived utility and simplicity of use) elements are to the success of AI adoption in special education.

Future Directions: Future research should look more closely at the connection between the ***use of AI and inclusive leadership strategy***. Longitudinal studies could be used to investigate how leadership styles affect the sustainability of AI integration in special education. Comparative research conducted in various MENA nations may also shed light on how policy frameworks and leadership development influence inclusion. To prepare schools to use AI ethically and equitably and ensure that technological innovation benefits all students, especially those with disabilities, it will be imperative to strengthen leadership development programs in Jordan.

Limitations of the Study: Self-reporting bias in survey replies is one of the study's many shortcomings, as it may not fully represent the difficulties and problems faced by educators (Al-Omari, 2024). Inadequate school infrastructure is another issue since many educational establishments, especially those in rural areas, lack the resources needed to apply AI successfully (Dutta et al., 2024). Furthermore, although the study concentrated on educators, administrators, and legislators, it failed to include the viewpoint of students, who might have offered essential insights on the effects of AI from the point of view of end users (Creswell, 2009). The absence of longitudinal data further constrains the study's capacity to assess the long-term efficacy of AI tools.

Proposed Solution: The following table 10 shows the proposed opportunities and threats regarding the AI integrated special education in Jordon;

Table 10: SWOT Analysis (AI-integrated special education in Jordan)

Strengths	**Weaknesses**
AI's potential for personalized learning and school leadership inclusivity	Limited infrastructure in schools
Efficiency improvement in administrative tasks	Resistance to AI adoption among some educators
Real-time feedback and progress tracking	Lack of training programs for teachers and administrators
Opportunities	**Threats**
Growing interest in AI adoption	High implementation costs
Potential for government support	Ethical concerns (data privacy and bias)

Strengths	Weaknesses
AI fostering inclusive education	Cultural resistance to AI adoption in traditional settings

5 Conclusions

In the final analysis, when combined with inclusive school leadership, AI technologies have the potential to revolutionize Jordan's special education system (Al Qudah, 2024). Large-scale adoption of AI is hindered by several issues, including inadequate training, cultural barriers, and limited infrastructure, despite its potential to offer individualized learning, administrative efficiency, and enhanced feedback systems (Beirat, Algolaylat, & Al-Makhzoomy, 2025). One key element that ensured AI projects aligned with broader educational equity objectives was inclusive leadership. Leaders who value diversity may help schools prepare teachers, advocate for government assistance, and strike a balance between innovation and equity (Khosravi et al., 2022).

In 2022, the MENA area invested only about USD 1.6 billion in EdTech investments, with just about 15% devoted towards AI-driven solutions (the Edit, 2024). Less than 3% of this share was expressly focused on special education (Trigui et al., 2024). This trend demonstrates that, despite political intent and strategic planning in some countries, the practical application of AI to assist inclusive education for learners with disabilities remains marginal and underdeveloped (World Health Organization, 2024). Thus, the adoption of AI in Jordan needs to be viewed as a reform driven by both technology and leadership, necessitating a systematic dedication to inclusivity.

According to the study, behavioral intention to adopt AI in education is not influenced by traditional technological adoption characteristics such as perceived use or perceived ease of use. Both variables had no significant effect, and the model accounted for less than 1% of the variance. This finding implies that AI adoption in education may be influenced by factors other than individual perspectives, such as institutional support, policy frameworks, or cultural attitudes.

Acknowledgment The authors appreciate the contribution of the participating teachers, administrators, and policymakers who gave their time to this research. We also acknowledge Lex localis (Journal of Local Self-Government) in supplying research guidance and resources. Lastly, we would like to acknowledge the positive feedback of our peers and reviewers, which enabled us to improve this manuscript.

Notes

References

Al Qudah, M. A. (2024). Future Readiness of Jordanian Educational Sector Skills to Employ Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education: Perspective of Managerial employees within Private Universities. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, *59*(2). https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.59.2.30

Al-Ababneh, M. M. (2020). Linking Ontology, Epistemology and Research Methodology. *Science & Philosophy*, *8*(1), 75–91. https://doi.org/10.23756/sp.v8i1.500

Al-Omari, A. (2024). THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON THE SCHOOL MANAGEMENT: A STUDY OF OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES IN JORDAN. *INTED2024 Proceedings*, *1*(1), 5478–5486. https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2024.1418

Ali, O., Murray, P. A., Momin, M., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Malik, F. T. (2024). The effects of artificial intelligence applications in educational settings: Challenges and strategies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *199*(123076), 123076–123076. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.123076

Alkan, A. (2024). The Role of Artificial Intelligence in the Education of Students with Special Needs. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science*, *8*(4), 542–557. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijtes.569

Alshamiri, F. A. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in the Arab World: Between Theoretical Foundation and Practical Applications. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Science*, *8*(1), 24–40. https://doi.org/10.21608/ijsrsd.2025.417459

Beirat, M. A., Algolaylat, A. S., & Al-Makhzoomy, A. K. (2025). Challenges Special Education Teachers Encounter in Using Artificial Intelligence Techniques to Teach Students with Disabilities in Inclusive Schools. *Dirasat: Educational Sciences*, *1*(1), 11154. https://doi.org/10.35516/edu.2025.11154

Cardona, M., Rodríguez, R., & Ishmael, K. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning Insights and Recommendations*. Office of Educational Technology. Retrieved from Office of Educational Technology website: https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/ai-report/ai-report.pdf

Chen, B., Chang, Y., Wang, B., Zou, J., & Tu, S. (2024). Technology acceptance model perspective on the intention to participate in medical talents training in China. *Heliyon*, *1*(12), e26206–e26206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e26206

Ching, K. W., & Khairul Azhar Jamaludin. (2025). Understanding School Teachers' Acceptance of AI in Education: Insights from the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *14*(3), 564–579. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v14-i3/25196

Creswell, J. (2009). *RESEARCH DESIGN Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. New Delhi,India: SAGE.

Dutta, S., Ranjan, S., Mishra, S., Sharma, V., Pradeep Hewage, & Iwendi, C. (2024). Enhancing Educational Adaptability: A Review and Analysis of AI-Driven Adaptive Learning Platforms. *Enhancing Educational Adaptability: A Review and Analysis of AI-Driven Adaptive Learning Platforms*, *1*(12). https://doi.org/10.1109/iciptm59628.2024.10563448

Joshi, B. M., & Khatiwada, S. P. (2024). Analyzing Barriers to ICT Integration in Education: A Systematic Review. *The Third Pole Journal of Geography*

Education, *24*(1), 25–45. https://doi.org/10.3126/ttp.v24i1.73325

Khosravi, H., Shum, S. B., Chen, G., Conati, C., Tsai, Y.-S., Kay, J., … Gašević, D. (2022). Explainable Artificial Intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*(3), 100074. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100074

Lim, T., Cheong, M., & Gottipati, S. (2023). Ethical Considerations for Artificial Intelligence in Educational Assessments. *Advances in Educational Technologies and Instructional Design Book Series*, *1*(1), 32–79. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0205-7.ch003

Marikyan, D., & Papagiannidis, S. (2024). Technology Acceptance Model: A Review. Retrieved from open.ncl.ac.uk website: https://open.ncl.ac.uk/theories/1/technology-acceptance-model/

Mariyono, D. (2025). Integrating Artificial Intelligence in Inclusive Leadership: Transforming Educational Management for a Globalized Future. *Chemistry Research and Practice*, *2*(2), 01–06. https://doi.org/10.64030/3065-906x.02.02.01

Mishra, Mr. S. (2024). Revolutionizing Education: The Impact of AI-Enhanced Teaching Strategies. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, *12*(9), 9–32. https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2024.64127

Rabab'h, B. S. (2025). Jordanian Teachers' Perceptions of Employing Artificial Intelligence Technologies in the Educational Process. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, *15*(7), 1418–1427. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2025.15.7.2343

Schorr, A. (2023). The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Its Importance for Digitalization Research: a Review. *Sciendo EBooks*, *13*(23), 55–65. https://doi.org/10.2478/9788366675896-005

Siemens, G. (2013). Learning Analytics: The Emergence of a Discipline. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *57*(10), 1380–1400. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213498851

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2010). SAGE Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research. Retrieved from Sagepub.com website: https://methods.sagepub.com/hnbk/edvol/sage-handbook-of-mixed-methods-social-behavioral-research-2e/toc

the Edit. (2024, October 2). What's new in EdTech: MENA Region - Investment, business, AI. Retrieved September 11, 2025, from The EDiT by EDT&Partners website: https://theedit.edtpartners.com/whats-new-in-edtech-part-i-mena-region/

Treve, M. (2024). Integrating Artificial Intelligence in Education: Impacts on Student Learning and Innovation. *International Journal of Vocational Education and Training Research*, *10*(2), 61–69. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijvetr.20241002.14

Trigui, H., Atri, C., Morr, C. E., Hammami, K., Wu, J., Kong, J. D., & Rousseau, J. J. (2024). Exploring AI governance in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region: gaps, efforts, and initiatives. *Data & Policy*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2024.85

UNESCO. (2023). Artificial intelligence in education. Retrieved from UNESCO website: https://www.unesco.org/en/digital-education/artificial-intelligence

UNESCO. (2025). Jordan Launches the National Framework for Inclusion and Diversity in Education with UNESCO. Retrieved from Unesco.org website: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/jordan-launches-national-framework-

inclusion-and-diversity-education-unesco

VanLEHN, K. (2011). The Relative Effectiveness of Human Tutoring, Intelligent Tutoring Systems, and Other Tutoring Systems. *Educational Psychologist, 46*(4), 197–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2011.611369

World Health Organization. (2024, January 2). Assistive Technology. Retrieved from Who.int website: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/assistive-technology

Xu, Z. (2024, March 25). AI in education: Enhancing learning experiences and student outcomes. Retrieved from ResearchGate website: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379259445_AI_in_education_Enhancing_learning_experiences_and_student_outcomes