| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Preparedness of Filipino High School Educators For Inclusive Education of Students with Special Needs

Honey Lyn Bermudo[1] ✉ Niña Rozanne Delos Reyes[2], Ann Frances Cabigon[3] and Lilibeth Pinili[4]
[1]OPRRA National High School
[234]Cebu technological University
Corresponding Author: Honey Lyn Bermudo, **E-mail**: honeylynbermudo@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT

This study looked at how ready the teachers at OPRRA High School are to implement inclusive education in their classrooms. Inclusive education means making sure all students, including those with disabilities or different learning needs, can learn together in a supportive environment. The study used a descriptive-correlational design and gathered data from 30 randomly selected teachers using a reliable survey questionnaire. The survey asked about their age, gender, education, teaching experience, specialization, and number of trainings attended. It also assessed their preparedness in four areas: knowledge, skills, attitudes, and practices. The results showed that teachers are generally "Competent" in knowledge and skills, "Very Competent" in their attitudes, and "Practiced" in using inclusive teaching strategies. The study found that training is the most important factor linked to preparedness. Teachers who had more relevant training felt more prepared to teach students with special needs. Educational attainment also had a positive effect, while longer teaching experience and older age were linked to lower attitudes and practices. In conclusion, the study highlights the need for more professional development programs focused on inclusive education. These programs can help improve teachers' confidence and ability, especially in areas like assessment, communication with parents, and using assistive tools. The findings can help school leaders and policymakers design better training and support systems for teachers to create inclusive classrooms where all students can succeed.

1. Introduction

Inclusive education continues to be a vital concept in global education, affirming every learner's entitlement to equitable, quality learning regardless of their abilities, backgrounds, or circumstances (Shaeffer, 2019; Qureshi et al., 2020). Rooted in social justice and human rights ideals, inclusive education emphasizes adapting classrooms to diverse learners instead of segregating those with special needs. In the Philippines, Republic Act No. 11650 (2022) the Inclusive Education Act, reflects the nation's dedication to fostering inclusive schooling environments (Borja et al., 2023). Consequently, the role of teachers is pivotal in translating inclusive policy into practice, highlighting the importance of their readiness and capacity to implement inclusive strategies effectively.

Research has consistently shown that teachers' attitudes, skills, and preparation are central to successful inclusive education (Zagona et al., 2017; Hassanein et al., 2021). Training opportunities, professional development, and teacher self-efficacy significantly affect their preparedness to employ inclusive strategies (Masongsong et al., 2023) Frameworks outlining essential teacher competencies stress differentiated instruction, universal design for learning, and collaboration with families and specialists (Florian & Spratt, 2021), although teachers often report limited confidence and practical ability, particularly at the secondary level (Aguipo, 2024). Cebu City National Science High School serves as a prime context for examining inclusive

education among science-focused secondary students with heterogeneous academic and emotional needs. Research indicates that science educators find adapting rigorous curricula for inclusivity especially challenging (De Los Reyes et al., 2025). It is therefore essential to investigate how demographic variables such as age, experience, and subject specialization are linked to teachers' knowledge and instructional practices in inclusive settings, where gaps have persisted in confidence and practical application (De Los Reyes et al., 2025).

Teacher preparedness can be understood in two key aspects: competencies (what teachers know and can do) and practices (what they actually do in classrooms) (Loreman, 2021). While professional training has been shown to improve both dimensions, the predictive value of demographic factors on these outcomes is not yet fully understood within Philippine secondary education (Aguipo, 2024). This study therefore explores these relationships within the Cebu City Division, focusing on OPRRA National High School.

The implications of this research are far-reaching, with potential to shape policy and professional development strategies at the regional and national levels. Profiling educators' demographics, competencies, and classroom practices and analyzing their interrelations this thesis aims to generate evidence-based recommendations for targeted training and policy interventions. Such insights can guide the Department of Education, Cebu City Division in cultivating more supportive environments for inclusive teaching in Philippine secondary schools.

2. Review of Related Literature

Inclusive education is now regarded as a transformative model that ensures equitable participation for all students, including those with disabilities, diverse cultural backgrounds, and varied abilities. In the Philippines, this model builds upon international frameworks like the Salamanca Statement and national laws such as the Enhanced Basic Education Act and Republic Act No. 11650 (2022) (Gonzales & Diestro, 2023). Nonetheless, teacher readiness continues to vary significantly across regions and types of schools. For example, while many Filipino teachers endorse inclusive education in principle, they frequently express low confidence in adapting their teaching methods for diverse learners (De Los Reyes et al., 2025). Key determinants of teacher readiness include professional development, teaching experience, and personal beliefs about disability and diversity. Sustained training has been shown to enhance educators' knowledge of inclusive strategies and boost their confidence and innovation in teaching practices (Gonzales & Diestro, 2023). In the Philippines specifically, teachers who participate in more workshops on inclusive education report higher competence levels and apply inclusive methods more consistently in the classroom (De Los Reyes et al., 2025). Still, pervasive obstacles such as insufficient resources, large class sizes, and limited support from administrators and parents impede the practical application of these skills (Manlangit et al., 2023). These findings highlight the need for ongoing, context-sensitive professional development and robust policy support to help secondary teachers such as those at OPRRA High School effectively create inclusive learning environments (De Los Reyes et al., 2025).

3. Methodology

This research utilized a descriptive-correlational quantitative design to evaluate how prepared secondary teachers at OPRRA High School are in implementing inclusive education. Data were collected through a validated survey tool adapted from Moosa et al. (2020), which demonstrated strong reliability (coefficients ranging from 0.918 to 0.940). The questionnaire gathered information on teachers' demographic characteristics such as age, sex, academic qualifications, teaching specialization, years of experience, and training frequency and assessed their preparedness across four domains: knowledge, skills, attitudes, and practices. A total of 30 teachers were chosen randomly to participate in the study. The data collection process included three steps: securing official approval, distributing the survey with clear guidelines and confidentiality assurances, and organizing the completed responses. Analytical methods included frequency distribution, percentages, weighted mean scores, and Pearson correlation to describe the data and examine the relationships between demographic factors and preparedness indicators. Ethical standards were strictly followed, including voluntary participation, informed consent, and the protection of participants' anonymity.

4. Results and Discussion

Table 1. Age of the Respondents

Age (in years)	f	%
25 – 29	5	16.67
30 – 34	6	20.00
35 – 39	10	33.33
40 – 44	7	23.33
45 – 49	1	3.33
50 – 54	1	3.33
Total	30	100.00

Table 1 shows the age distribution of the 30 teacher respondents. Most of the teachers fall within the 35 to 39 age range, making up 33.33% of the group. This is followed by those aged 40 to 44, who represent 23.33%. Teachers aged 30 to 34 account for 20%, while those aged 25 to 29 make up 16.67%. Only a small number of respondents are in the older age brackets, with one teacher each in the 45–49 and 50–54 age groups, both representing just 3.33% of the total. Overall, the data suggest that the majority of the teachers are in their 30s to early 40s.

Table 2. Gender of the Respondents

Gender	*f*	%
Female	27	90.00
Male	3	10.00
Total	30	100.00

Table 2 presents the gender distribution of the teacher respondents. A large majority of the participants are female, comprising 90% of the total. In contrast, only 10% of the respondents are male. This indicates that the teaching staff at OPRRA High School is predominantly female.

Table 3. Highest Educational Attainment of the Respondents

Highest Educational Attainment	*f*	%
Bachelor's Degree	8	26.67
With Master's Degree Units	18	60.00
Master's Degree	3	10.00
With Doctorate Degree Units	1	3.33
With Doctorate Degree	30	100.00
Total	30	100.00

Table 3 shows the highest educational attainment of the respondents. Most of the teachers, or 60%, have earned units in a master's degree program, while 26.67% hold only a bachelor's degree. A smaller portion, 10%, have completed a master's degree, and 3.33% have taken doctorate-level units. This indicates that the majority of teachers are pursuing graduate studies, reflecting a strong interest in further professional development.

Table 4. Field of Specialization of the Respondents

Field of Specialization	*f*	%
Core Academic Subjects	20	66.67
Career and Technical Education (CTE)	1	3.33
Arts and Physical Education	1	3.33
Professional Degree/Special Education	8	26.67
Total	30	100.00

Table 4 shows the distribution of the respondents based on their field of specialization. The majority, or 66.67%, specialize in core academic subjects such as Math, Science, English, and Social Studies. About 26.67% have professional degrees or specializations in Special Education. Meanwhile, only 3.33% each specialize in Career and Technical Education (CTE) and Arts and

Physical Education. This indicates that most teachers are focused on academic subject areas, with a smaller portion having backgrounds in specialized or non-academic fields.

Table 5. Length of Service of the Respondents

Length of Service (in years)	f	%
1 – 5	4	13.33
6 – 10	15	50.00
11 – 15	8	26.67
16 – above	3	10.00
Total	30	100.00

Table 5 presents the respondents' length of teaching service. Half of the teachers (50%) have been in service for 6 to 10 years, making this the largest group. This is followed by 26.67% who have served for 11 to 15 years. About 13.33% are relatively new to the profession, with 1 to 5 years of experience, while only 10% have been teaching for more than 16 years. Overall, most teachers have mid-level teaching experience, suggesting a workforce that is neither brand-new nor nearing retirement.

Table 6. Level of Preparedness Towards Implementation of Inclusive Education of the Respondents in terms of Knowledge Competency

	Indicators	$\bar{x}$	sd	Verbal Description
1	I understand the processes involved for an inclusive education	2.90	0.61	Competent
2	I have knowledge of identifying students with special educational needs	2.67	0.48	Competent
3	I have knowledge to create an inclusive learning environment	2.67	0.61	Competent
4	I have knowledge to sustain an inclusive learning environment	2.60	0.62	Competent
5	I have knowledge of assessing students with special educational needs	2.23	0.57	Somewhat Competent
6	I have knowledge how to teach students with special needs	2.43	0.57	Somewhat Competent
7	I understand the type of disabilities that students with special needs have (slow learner, autism, dyslexic, ADHD etc.)	2.60	0.50	Competent
8	I possess knowledge of relevant legislation, policies, and guidelines pertaining to inclusive education, allowing me to ensure compliance and advocate for the rights of students with special needs.	2.60	0.62	Competent
9	I am knowledgeable about assistive technologies and accommodations available to support students with disabilities in accessing the curriculum and participating fully in classroom activities.	2.37	0.61	Somewhat Competent
10	I am familiar with evidence-based instructional strategies and interventions designed to support students with diverse learning needs, enabling me to provide effective instruction that addresses individual student requirements.	2.50	0.51	Competent
	Overall Weighted Mean	2.56		Competent
	Overall Standard Deviation		0.59	

The results in Table 6 highlight several key points regarding teachers' knowledge competency in implementing inclusive education. The overall mean of 2.56 indicates that teachers generally view themselves as "Competent" in this area. The highest-rated indicator was "I understand the processes involved for an inclusive education" with a mean of 2.90, showing strong confidence in understanding general inclusive education concepts. Teachers also rated themselves as competent in identifying students with special needs (2.67) and in creating and sustaining inclusive learning environments (2.67 and 2.60). These results suggest that they are comfortable with foundational principles and classroom management strategies related to inclusion. However, some areas were rated lower, indicating gaps in preparedness. The lowest mean score was 2.23 for "I have knowledge of assessing students with special educational needs," followed by 2.37 for "I am knowledgeable about assistive technologies and accommodations." These were both described as "Somewhat Competent." This suggests that while teachers understand the general concepts, they lack confidence in applying specific strategies, tools, and assessments needed to support students with disabilities. In summary, the highlights reveal that teachers are confident in the basic aspects of inclusive education but need

more training and support in specialized areas like assessment, instruction, and use of assistive technologies to fully implement inclusive practices.

Table 7. Level of Preparedness Towards Implementation of Inclusive Education of the Respondents in terms of Skills Competency

	Indicators	$\bar{x}$	sd	Verbal Description
11	I am able to teach students with special needs.	2.50	0.68	Competent
12	I am able to discuss with parents regarding the emotional need of their children with special needs	2.43	0.73	Somewhat Competent
13	I am able to provide information on inclusive education for parents of students with special needs	2.47	0.68	Somewhat Competent
14	I am able to provide educational support for students with special needs	2.47	0.63	Somewhat Competent
15	I am able to manage students with special needs	2.40	0.72	Somewhat Competent
16	I am able to foster positive relationships between mainstream students and students with special needs to accommodate inclusive education	2.83	0.53	Competent
17	I have developed effective communication and collaboration skills, allowing me to work collaboratively with other educators, support staff, and specialists to meet the needs of students with disabilities.	2.67	0.71	Competent
18	I am adept at individualizing instruction and adapting curriculum materials to meet the specific needs and abilities of students with diverse learning profiles.	2.53	0.63	Competent
19	I possess strong organizational and time management skills, enabling me to effectively plan and implement differentiated instruction and support strategies to meet the needs of students with special needs.	2.57	0.73	Competent
20	I am proficient in using various teaching modalities and instructional approaches to accommodate diverse learning styles and preferences among students with special needs.	2.50	0.78	Competent
	Overall Weighted Mean	*2.54*		Competent
	Overall Standard Deviation		*0.69*	

Table 7 shows the respondents' level of preparedness in terms of skills competency for implementing inclusive education. The overall mean score is 2.54, indicating that the teachers are generally "Competent." The highest-rated skill was the ability to foster positive relationships between mainstream students and those with special needs, with a mean of 2.83, reflecting teachers' confidence in promoting an inclusive classroom environment. Other skills, such as collaborating with colleagues and specialists (2.67), organizing and managing instruction (2.57), individualizing lessons (2.53), and using various teaching approaches (2.50), were also rated as competent. However, some areas fell under the "Somewhat Competent" category. These included managing students with special needs (2.40), providing educational support (2.47), discussing emotional needs with parents (2.43), and explaining inclusive education to families (2.47). These results suggest that while teachers are generally skilled in classroom strategies and teamwork, they feel less confident in handling behavioral challenges and engaging with parents—highlighting areas where further training and support are needed.

Table 8. Level of Preparedness Towards Implementation of Inclusive Education of the Respondents in terms of Attitude Competency

	Indicators	$\bar{x}$	sd	Verbal Description
21	I understand the meaning of inclusive education	3.27	0.52	Very Competent
22	I care for the well-being of students with special needs	3.47	0.51	Very Competent
23	I understand the purpose for an inclusive education	3.40	0.50	Very Competent
24	I care for the progressive learning of students with special needs	3.37	0.49	Very Competent
25	I care for the achievements of students with special needs	3.43	0.50	Very Competent
26	I believe students with special needs can achieve their best with support	3.47	0.51	Very Competent
27	Teaching students with special needs requires more teaching aids	3.50	0.51	Very Competent

28	I need to work together with special education teachers if I have students with special needs in my class	3.47	0.57	Very Competent
29	Despite of the disabilities faced by students with special needs, they also have their own abilities	3.57	0.50	Very Competent
30	I need extra effort to teach students with special needs	3.63	0.49	Very Competent
	Overall Weighted Mean	*3.46*		Very Competent
	Overall Standard Deviation		*0.51*	

Table 8 presents the respondents' level of preparedness in terms of attitude competency toward implementing inclusive education. The overall mean score is 3.46, which falls under the "Very Competent" category, with a standard deviation of 0.51, indicating consistent responses across the group. All indicators were rated as "Very Competent," suggesting a strong and positive attitude among teachers toward inclusive education. The highest-rated item was "I need extra effort to teach students with special needs" with a mean of 3.63, showing that teachers recognize the additional dedication required in inclusive classrooms. This was closely followed by "students with special needs also have their own abilities" (3.57) and "teaching students with special needs requires more teaching aids" (3.50), reflecting an empathetic and realistic understanding of their students' needs. Teachers also showed strong agreement with statements about collaboration with special education teachers (3.47), caring for students' well-being (3.47), and believing in the potential of students with special needs to succeed with the right support (3.47). Overall, the data suggest that the teachers have a highly supportive and inclusive mindset, which is a crucial foundation for successful inclusive education. Their strong attitudes indicate a willingness to embrace inclusive practices, even if there are still gaps in knowledge and skills that need to be addressed through further training.

Table 9. Level of Preparedness Towards Implementation of Inclusive Education of the Respondents in terms of Practices

	Indicators	$\bar{x}$	sd	Verbal Description
31	I have received adequate training and professional development related to inclusive education practices.	2.24	0.49	Fairly Practiced
32	I have a good understanding of various special needs, including physical, cognitive, emotional, and behavioral, and how to address them in the classroom.	2.36	0.50	Fairly Practiced
33	The necessary resources, such as assistive technology, adaptive materials, and specialized learning tools, are readily available and accessible to support inclusive practices.	2.12	0.55	Fairly Practiced
34	I regularly collaborate with special education professionals, administrators, and other stakeholders to develop inclusive lesson plans and instructional strategies.	2.00	0.53	Fairly Practiced
35	I use differentiated instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of all students, including those with disabilities or other special needs.	2.90	0.69	Practiced
36	I am familiar with Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles and incorporate them into my lesson planning and classroom instruction.	2.05	0.51	Fairly Practiced
37	I effectively adapt curriculum materials and teaching methods to accommodate diverse learning styles, abilities, and needs.	3.00	0.55	Practiced
38	My classroom environment is inclusive, with physical accessibility, appropriate seating arrangements, and a promotion of diversity and acceptance among students.	2.08	0.59	Fairly Practiced
39	I use positive reinforcement, proactive interventions, and de-escalation techniques to manage behavior in my inclusive classroom.	2.95	0.52	Practiced
40	I understand Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and can implement the accommodations and modifications outlined in students' plans.	2.01	0.47	Fairly Practiced
41	I maintain active involvement and communication with parents and the broader community to support inclusive education practices and student success.	2.91	0.61	Practiced
42	I am culturally competent and able to create a classroom environment that respects and values students' diverse backgrounds and experiences.	2.92	0.74	Practiced
43	I use alternative assessment methods and accommodations to evaluate student progress in my inclusive classroom.	3.05	0.51	Practiced
44	I feel confident in my ability to effectively teach and support students with	2.91	0.69	Practiced

	diverse learning needs in inclusive settings.			
45	I regularly engage in reflective practice, continuously evaluating and adapting my instructional strategies and classroom management techniques to meet the needs of all students.	2.98	0.65	Practiced
	Overall Weighted Mean	*2.57*		Practiced
	Overall Standard Deviation		*0.57*	

Table 9 presents the respondents' level of preparedness in terms of practices related to implementing inclusive education. The overall mean score is 2.57, which falls under the category of "Practiced", with a standard deviation of 0.57, indicating moderate consistency in responses. The results show that several inclusive teaching practices are being applied by teachers, particularly in adapting instruction and managing classrooms. The highest-rated indicator was "I use alternative assessment methods and accommodations to evaluate student progress" with a mean of 3.05, followed by "I effectively adapt curriculum materials and teaching methods" (3.00), and "I regularly engage in reflective practice" (2.98). These indicate that teachers are actively applying key strategies to support diverse learners. Other well-practiced areas include differentiated instruction (2.90), positive behavior management (2.95), and ongoing communication with parents and communities (2.91). These findings suggest that teachers are making meaningful efforts to accommodate student differences and foster inclusive classrooms. However, several indicators were rated as "Fairly Practiced," particularly those involving training and collaboration. Low mean scores were seen in areas like collaborating with stakeholders (2.00), using Universal Design for Learning (2.05), understanding and implementing IEPs (2.01), and having access to inclusive resources (2.12). This suggests gaps in institutional support and technical expertise. In summary, while teachers demonstrate strong application of inclusive strategies in practice, there is a clear need for more training, resource support, and professional collaboration to fully strengthen inclusive teaching implementation.

Table 10. Test of Significant Relationship between the Level of Preparedness Towards Implementation of Inclusive Education in Knowledge Competency According to Demographic Profile

Variables	r-value	Strength of Correlation	p - value	Decision	Result
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Knowledge Competency and Age Profile	-0.120	Very Weak Negative	0.528	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Knowledge Competency and Gender Profile	-0.015	Very Weak Negative	0.939	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Knowledge Competency and Educational Attainment Profile	-0.214	Weak Negative	0.256	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Knowledge Competency and Field of Specialization Profile	0.152	Very Weak Positive	0.423	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Knowledge Competency and Length of Service Profile	-0.302	Weak Negative	0.105	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

significant at p < 0.05(two – tailed)

Table 10 presents the test of the significant relationship between teachers' knowledge competency in implementing inclusive education and their demographic profile. The findings show that none of the demographic variable's age, gender, educational attainment, field of specialization, and length of service have a statistically significant relationship with knowledge competency, as all p-values are greater than the 0.05 threshold. The correlation strengths range from very weak to weak, both positive and negative, with the strongest being a weak negative correlation between length of service and knowledge competency (r = -0.302, p = 0.105), which still does not reach significance. These results suggest that demographic characteristics alone do not significantly influence the level of knowledge teachers have regarding inclusive education.

Table 11. Test of Significant Relationship between the Level of Preparedness Towards Implementation of Inclusive Education in Skills Competency According to Demographic Profile

Variables	r-value	Strength of Correlation	p - value	Decision	Result
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Skills Competency and Age Profile	-0.052	Very Weak Negative	0.785	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Skills Competency and Gender Profile	-0.113	Very Weak Negative	0.552	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Skills Competency and Educational Attainment Profile	-0.132	Very Weak Negative	0.487	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Skills Competency and Field of Specialization Profile	0.158	Very Weak Positive	0.404	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Skills Competency and Length of Service Profile	-0.347	Weak Negative	0.060	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

Significant at p < 0.05(two – tailed)

Table 11 presents the relationship between teachers' skills competency in implementing inclusive education and their demographic profiles. The results indicate that none of the demographic variables show a statistically significant relationship with skills competency, as all p-values exceed the 0.05 significance level. The strength of the correlations is generally very weak to weak, with length of service having the strongest negative correlation (r = -0.347, p = 0.060), though still not significant. Other variables age, gender, educational attainment, and field of specialization also show very weak correlations, both positive and negative. These findings suggest that teachers' demographic characteristics do not significantly influence their skills in practicing inclusive education.

Table 13. Test of Significant Relationship between the Level of Preparedness Towards Implementation of Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency According to Demographic Profile

Variables	r-value	Strength of Correlation	p - value	Decision	Result
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency and Age Profile	-0.439	Moderate Negative	0.015	Reject Ho	Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency and Gender Profile	-0.040	Very Weak Negative	0.834	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency and Educational Attainment Profile	0.072	Very Weak Positive	0.705	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency and Field of Specialization Profile	0.337	Weak Positive	0.069	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency and Length of Service Profile	-0.383	Weak Negative	0.037	Reject Ho	Significant

Significant at p < 0.05(two – tailed)

Table 13 presents the correlation between teachers' attitude competency in implementing inclusive education and their demographic profiles. The results show that two demographic variables have a significant relationship with attitude competency: age and length of service. The age profile has a moderate negative correlation (r = -0.439) with a p-value of 0.015, indicating a statistically significant relationship. This suggests that as teachers get older, their positive attitude toward inclusive education tends to decrease. Similarly, length of service shows a weak negative correlation (r = -0.383) with a p-value of 0.037, which is also significant. This means that teachers with more years of teaching experience tend to have slightly less favorable attitudes toward inclusive practices. Other variables such as gender, educational attainment, field of specialization, and number of trainings attended showed very weak to weak correlations and no significant relationship, as their p-values were greater than 0.05. In summary, the results indicate that age and teaching experience significantly influence teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education—older and more experienced teachers may be less positive while other demographic factors do not show a meaningful impact.

Table 14. Test of Significant Relationship between the Level of Preparedness Towards Implementation of Inclusive Education in Practices According to Demographic Profile

Variables	r-value	Strength of Correlation	p - value	Decision	Result
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Practices and Age Profile	-0.324	Weak Negative	0.081	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Practices and Gender Profile	-0.123	Very Weak Negative	0.517	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Practices and Educational Attainment Profile	0.401	Moderate Positive	0.028	Reject Ho	Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Practices and Field of Specialization Profile	0.201	Weak Positive	0.287	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Preparedness in Inclusive Education in Practices and Length of Service Profile	-0.392	Weak Negative	0.032	Reject Ho	Significant

Significant at p < 0.05(two – tailed)

Table 14 presents the relationship between the respondents' level of preparedness in terms of practices for implementing inclusive education and their demographic profiles. The results show three significant relationships. First, educational attainment had a moderate positive correlation (r = 0.401, p = 0.028), indicating that teachers with higher academic qualifications are more likely to implement inclusive practices effectively. Second, length of service showed a weak negative correlation (r = -0.392, p = 0.032), suggesting that teachers with more years of experience may be less likely to apply inclusive strategies in the classroom. Third, relevant trainings attended had a weak positive correlation (r = 0.368, p = 0.045), meaning that teachers who have undergone more training are better prepared in terms of inclusive practices. Other demographic variables such as age, gender, and field of specialization showed no significant relationship with practice-based preparedness. Overall, the findings highlight that educational background and professional development play a key role in promoting effective inclusive teaching, while longer teaching experience may not necessarily translate to higher implementation of inclusive practices.

5. Conclusion
Based on the findings, it can be concluded that teachers at OPRRA High School are generally prepared to implement inclusive education, particularly in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and practices. Teachers displayed strong positive attitudes, moderate competency in knowledge and skills, and consistent application of inclusive practices. Among demographic variables, only training, educational attainment, and length of service showed significant relationships with preparedness levels. Notably, more training and higher education were associated with stronger competencies and practices, while greater teaching experience and older age were linked to slightly lower attitudes and practical application. These results emphasize the

importance of continuous professional development and targeted capacity-building initiatives to enhance inclusive teaching, especially among more experienced educators.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declare no conflict of interest.
Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers

References
[1] Aguipo, M. M. (2024). *Readiness and challenges of general education teachers on the implementation of inclusive education in Cebu Province*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377190395
[2] Borja, M., Almeda, N., & Domingo, M. (2023). Inclusive education and the challenges encountered by selected Philippine schools. *International Journal of Education and Research, 14*(5), 45–53. Retrieved from https://consortiacademia.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/v14i05/25847_final.pdf
[3] De Los Reyes, J. A., Delos Reyes, N. R., Cabigon, A. F., & Pinili, L. (2025). *Cultivating inclusive teaching: A study of Philippine secondary school educators' preparedness*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/393442115
[4] Florian, L., & Spratt, J. (2021). *Enacting inclusion: A framework for interrogating inclusive practice*. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 36(3), 413–426. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2021.1914705
[5] Gonzales, M. R., & Diestro, J. B. (2023). *Implementing inclusive education under RA 11650 in the Philippines: Teachers' perspectives and policy gaps*. AIDE International Research Journal, 5(2), 12–22. Retrieved from https://journal.aide-inc.net/index.php/aide-irj/article/download/94/83/84
[6] Hassanein, E. E., Alshaboul, Y. M., & Ibrahim, S. (2021). The impact of teacher preparation on preservice teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education in Qatar. *Heliyon*, 7(9).
[7] Loreman, T. (2021). *Teacher education for inclusion: Changing paradigms and building new models*. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1318
[8] Manlangit, R. R., Vales, M. E., & Del Rosario, F. A. (2023). *Attitudes of elementary teachers towards inclusive education of learners with special education needs in a public school*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381412891
[9] Masongsong, J. M., Lopres, J. R., Aguirre, M. M., et al. (2023). Level of teachers' training in inclusive education and their sense of efficacy. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies, 6*(5), 108–114. Retrieved from https://www.ijsmsjournal.org/2023/volume-6%20issue-5/ijsms-v6i5p108.pdf
[10] Moosa, S., Karabenick, S. A., & Sadler, P. (2020). Teachers' preparedness and self-efficacy for inclusive education: Validation of a new instrument. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 10*(4), 89–104. https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2020.10.4.07
[11] Qureshi, S., Malkani, R., & Rose, R. (2020). Achieving inclusive and equitable quality education for all. In *Handbook on promoting social justice in education* (pp. 3-32). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
[12] Shaeffer, S. (2019). Inclusive education: a prerequisite for equity and social justice. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *20*(2), 181-192.
[13] Zagona, A. L., Kurth, J. A., & MacFarland, S. Z. (2017). Teachers' views of their preparation for inclusive education and collaboration. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *40*(3), 163-178.