JHSSS

AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH
AND DEVELOPMENT

| **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Readiness of Philippine Secondary Public-School Teachers Towards the Implementation of Inclusive Education

Remelyn Atillo[1], Niña Rozanne Delos Reyes[2], Ann Frances Cabigon[3], and Lilibeth Pinili[4]
[1]*Lahug National High School (Night)*
[2,3,4]*Cebu Technological University*
Corresponding Author: Remelyn Atillo, **E-mail**: remelynatillo@gmail.com

| **ABSTRACT**

This study investigated the readiness of secondary public-school teachers in the Philippines to implement inclusive education, focusing on their competencies in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and practices. Literature reviews mined from this study emphasized the growing importance of inclusive education and the need for educators to be adequately prepared to address diverse student needs. Hence, the study explored the impact of demographic variables such as age, gender, educational attainment, field of specialization, length of service, and relevant training on teachers' readiness for inclusive education. The research hypothesized that these demographic factors significantly relate to the competencies required for inclusive education. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design and surveyed 30 teachers from Lahug National High School (Night) in Cebu City, using a structured questionnaire adapted from Moosa et al. (2020). The results revealed that while demographic variables have minimal impact on teachers' knowledge and skills competencies, length of service and relevant training positively influence teachers' attitudes and practical application of inclusive practices. Thus, the findings highlighted the necessity of professional development programs and targeted training to enhance teacher readiness for inclusive education. The study's findings strongly recommended prioritizing advanced training programs, aligning evaluations with inclusive education competencies, conducting further research on intrinsic motivational factors, and adopting the Action Plan for Improving Readiness in Inclusive Education among Philippine Secondary Public-School Teachers to enhance teacher readiness and effectiveness.

Introduction

In today's rapidly transforming educational landscape, inclusive education has emerged as a foundational principle that champions equitable access to quality learning for all students, irrespective of their backgrounds, abilities, or differences (Kushwaha et al., 2024). Grounded in the belief that every learner has the right to be valued, respected, and included, inclusive education moves beyond traditional paradigms of schooling by fostering learning environments that are diverse, welcoming, and supportive (UNESCO, 1994, as cited by Molina Roldán et al., 2021). Embracing the inherent diversity within classrooms, inclusive education seeks to dismantle barriers to learning, promote social justice, and cultivate a strong sense of belonging wherein each student is empowered to thrive academically, socially, and emotionally (Aguis, 2024).

However, the successful implementation of inclusive education is not without its challenges (Sijuola & Davidova, 2022). Among the most critical factors influencing its effectiveness is the readiness and capacity of teachers to create and sustain inclusive learning environments (Debasu & Yitayew, 2024). Teachers serve as the primary facilitators of inclusion in the classroom, and their attitudes, competencies, and practices significantly impact how inclusivity is experienced by students. Despite supportive policies

and growing advocacy for inclusive education, many teachers particularly in developing contexts like the Philippines often face difficulties due to limited training, inadequate resources, and a lack of institutional support (Arias et al., 2023). These constraints can hinder their ability to address the diverse needs of learners effectively. Moreover, some teachers may hold misconceptions or harbor uncertainties about inclusive practices, especially when dealing with students with disabilities or those from marginalized backgrounds (Landsman & Lewis, 2023). Therefore, understanding and enhancing teacher readiness is essential for translating inclusive education from policy into practice. Strengthening teachers' competencies and confidence through targeted professional development is key to building a more inclusive and equitable education system.

As education systems across the globe continue to evolve in response to the dynamic needs of 21st-century learners, inclusive education has gained heightened relevance and urgency (Srivastasa, 2023). Rapid technological advancements, shifting societal norms, and increasing awareness of diversity have reshaped the educational landscape, calling for more responsive, equitable, and learner-centered approaches (Bakar, 2021). Inclusive education, which emphasizes the right of every learner to participate fully and meaningfully in the learning process, regardless of ability, socio-economic status, gender, ethnicity, or other differences, is now widely recognized as a vital component of quality education (Kunwar & Adhikari, 2023). It promotes not only academic success but also the holistic development of students by fostering empathy, mutual respect, and social cohesion.

This proposed research centers on assessing the readiness of secondary public-school teachers in the Philippines, with a particular focus on the Department of Education – Cebu City Division, to implement inclusive education. The inquiry responds to a critical gap in existing literature concerning the specific readiness of teachers at the secondary level within the Philippine educational context. While inclusive education is acknowledged as a crucial strategy for ensuring equitable access to quality learning, limited empirical research exists regarding how prepared teachers are to adopt and implement inclusive practices effectively. Thus, this study aims to bridge this gap by exploring the current state of teacher readiness and providing data-driven insights that can inform both policy and practice.

The significance of this study extends beyond scholarly interest. It holds practical implications for educational reform initiatives currently underway in the Philippines. By evaluating the preparedness of teachers for inclusive education, this research can inform policy development and guide the implementation of strategic initiatives within the Cebu City Division of the Department of Education. Furthermore, the findings can contribute to the design of evidence-based professional development programs tailored to enhance teachers' competencies and inclusive practices. Identifying areas where additional training or support is needed will help build a more inclusive and effective public education system, capable of addressing the diverse needs of Filipino learners.

Related Literature

Inclusive education has increasingly become a global priority, with countries striving to align educational practices with international frameworks such as the UN's Sustainable Development Goal 4, which advocates for inclusive and equitable quality education. Recent studies emphasize that the success of inclusive education largely depends on teachers' preparedness and attitudes. For instance, Sharma and Salend (2020) argue that while inclusive policies are in place in many countries, the actual implementation is often hindered by gaps in teacher training and professional development. Their study highlights that teachers who have undergone structured training in inclusive strategies are more likely to demonstrate positive attitudes and effective practices toward learners with diverse needs. Similarly, Arrah and Swain (2021) found that ongoing support and in-service training significantly improve teachers' confidence and efficacy in inclusive classrooms, especially in under-resourced educational systems. These findings underscore the need for targeted capacity-building programs to ensure that inclusive education moves beyond policy rhetoric into meaningful classroom practices.

In the Southeast Asian context, including the Philippines, the readiness of teachers to implement inclusive education remains a significant concern. A study by Maligalig, Reyes, and Cuenca (2022) explored the challenges faced by Filipino teachers in adapting to inclusive education mandates and found that while awareness of inclusive education principles has increased, practical implementation is still lacking due to limited access to resources, insufficient training, and large class sizes. This aligns with the findings of Tan and Yeo (2023), who investigated inclusive education in urban and rural schools in ASEAN countries. They emphasized the role of contextual factors, such as policy support, school leadership, and community engagement, in shaping teacher readiness. Their research concluded that without systemic support and adequate teacher preparation, inclusive education risks becoming symbolic rather than transformative. These studies highlight the critical need to assess and enhance teacher readiness at a local level to ensure the sustainability and effectiveness of inclusive education reforms.

Methodology

This study employed a descriptive-correlational quantitative research design to assess the readiness of secondary public-school teachers at Lahug National High School (Night), under the Department of Education – Cebu City Division, for the implementation

of inclusive education. The research design integrated both descriptive and correlational methods within a quantitative framework, aiming to systematically measure and analyze relationships between variables particularly the teachers' demographic profiles and their readiness in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and practices without manipulating any conditions (Siedlecki, 2020). A total of 30 teacher-respondents were purposively selected from a total population of 103 teachers to provide valuable insights into their experiences and preparedness for inclusive practices. Data were collected using a structured survey questionnaire adapted from Moosa et al. (2020), a validated instrument with high reliability scores (0.918 for attitudes and 0.940 for knowledge and skills domains). The questionnaire comprised two sections: the first captured demographic data (e.g., age, gender, education, specialization, teaching experience, and training exposure), while the second measured teacher readiness across four domains knowledge, skills, attitude (10 items each), and practices (15 items). Each domain utilized a 4-point Likert scale, with clearly defined scoring interpretations to assess competency and practice levels. To analyze the data, descriptive statistics were used to determine the levels of teacher readiness, while Pearson's r correlation was applied to explore the relationship between demographic variables and the readiness domains.

Results

Table 1 presents the age distribution of the teacher-respondents from Lahug National High School (Night). The data show that the majority of respondents fall within the 35–39 age group, accounting for 30.00% of the total sample

Table 1. Age of the Respondents

Age (in years)	f	%
25 – 29	5	16.67
30 – 34	8	26.67
35 – 39	9	30.00
40 – 44	6	20.00
45 – 49	2	6.67
Total	30	100.00

This is closely followed by the 30–34 age group, comprising 26.67%, and the 40–44 age group with 20.00%. Meanwhile, 16.67% of the respondents are aged 25–29, indicating a notable presence of younger teachers who may be early in their teaching careers. The smallest group, at 6.67%, consists of teachers aged 45–49, suggesting fewer older educators within the current teaching population. Overall, the age distribution reflects a workforce that is predominantly composed of teachers in their early to mid-career stages, which may have implications for their exposure to and experience with inclusive education practices, as well as their openness to professional development and innovation in teaching strategies.

Table 2. Gender of the Respondents

Gender	*f*	%
Female	18	60
Male	12	40
Total	30	100.00

Table 2 shows the gender distribution of the teacher-respondents at Lahug National High School (Night). The majority of the respondents are female, comprising 60% of the sample, while male respondents make up the remaining 40%. This distribution reflects a common trend in the teaching profession, particularly in the Philippines, where female educators often outnumber their male counterparts. The gender balance in this study, while not equal, still provides a diverse representation, allowing for the examination of potential gender-related differences in readiness for inclusive education. Understanding the gender composition is also important in analyzing how gender may influence teaching approaches, attitudes, and engagement with inclusive practices.

Table 3. Highest Educational Attainment of the Respondents

Highest Educational Attainment	*f*	%
Bachelor's Degree	4	13.33
With Master's Degree Units	20	66.67

Master's Degree	4	13.33
With Doctorate Degree Units	2	6.67
Total	30	100.00

Table 3 shows the highest educational attainment of the respondents. Most teachers (66.67%) have earned master's degree units, indicating ongoing graduate studies. Both bachelor's degree and master's degree holders make up 13.33% each, while 6.67% have taken doctorate degree units. This data reflects a highly educated teaching workforce, with the majority pursuing advanced education. Such academic engagement suggests a strong potential for openness to new teaching approaches, including inclusive education. Higher educational attainment may also correlate with increased awareness, skills, and preparedness in implementing inclusive practices, supporting the effectiveness of professional development efforts in promoting inclusive teaching strategies.

Table 4. Field of Specialization of the Respondents

Field of Specialization	f	%
Core Academic Subjects	22	73.33
Career and Technical Education (CTE)	3	10.00
Arts and Physical Education	3	10.00
Professional Degree/Special Education	2	6.67
Total	*30*	*100.00*

Table 4 presents the field of specialization of the respondents. A significant majority, or 73.33%, specialize in core academic subjects such as English, Math, Science, or Social Studies. Both Career and Technical Education (CTE) and Arts and Physical Education account for 10.00% each, while only 6.67% of the respondents have a specialization in Professional Degree or Special Education. This indicates that most teachers are trained in general academic disciplines, with a relatively small proportion having formal preparation in special or inclusive education. The limited number of teachers specializing in special education may impact the overall readiness for inclusive teaching.

Table 5. Length of Service of the Respondents

Length of Service (in years)	f	%
1 – 5	13	43.33
6 – 10	7	23.33
11 – 15	8	26.67
16 – above	2	6.67
Total	*30*	*100.00*

Table 5 shows the length of service of the teacher-respondents. The largest group, comprising 43.33%, has 1–5 years of teaching experience, indicating that many are relatively new in the profession. This is followed by 26.67% with 11–15 years of service and 23.33% with 6–10 years. Only 6.67% have been teaching for 16 years or more. The data suggest that a majority of the respondents are in the early to mid-stages of their careers. This may influence their level of readiness for inclusive education, as less experienced teachers may require more training and support.

Table 6. Number of Relevant Trainings Attended of the Respondents

Number of Relevant Trainings Attended	f	%
0	7	23.33
1	8	26.67
2	7	23.33
3	4	13.33
4	2	6.67
5 or more	2	6.67
Total	*30*	*100.00*

Table 6 displays the number of relevant trainings on inclusive education attended by the respondents. The highest proportion, 26.67%, have attended one training, followed closely by 23.33% who have attended none or two. A smaller percentage attended three (13.33%), while only 6.67% each reported attending four or five or more trainings. These findings indicate that a considerable number of teachers have had limited exposure to training specifically related to inclusive education.

Table 7. Level of Readiness 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	3.07	0.58	Competent
2	I have knowledge of identifying students with special educational needs	2.67	0.71	Competent
3	I have knowledge to create an inclusive learning environment	2.80	0.61	Competent
4	I have knowledge to sustain an inclusive learning environment	2.70	0.60	Competent
5	I have knowledge of assessing students with special educational needs	2.57	0.68	Competent
6	I have knowledge how to teach students with special needs	2.53	0.57	Competent
7	I understand the type of disabilities that students with special needs have (slow learner, autism, dyslexic, ADHD etc.)	2.50	0.73	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.	2.43	0.68	Somewhat 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.	2.27	0.64	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.	2.40	0.72	Somewhat Competent
	Overall Weighted Mean	*2.59*		Competent
	Overall Standard Deviation		*0.68*	

Table 7 presents the respondents' level of readiness toward the implementation of inclusive education in terms of knowledge competency. The overall weighted mean is 2.59, with a standard deviation of 0.68, indicating that teachers are generally "Competent" in this domain. The highest-rated item is "I understand the processes involved for an inclusive education" ($\bar{x}$ = 3.07), suggesting strong foundational knowledge. Other items such as identifying students with special needs ($\bar{x}$ = 2.67) and creating inclusive environments ($\bar{x}$ = 2.80) also fall within the "Competent" range. However, the lowest-rated indicators, including knowledge of assistive technologies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.27) and evidence-based instructional strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.40), fall under "Somewhat Competent. This reveals gaps in more specialized areas essential for effective inclusive teaching. While respondents show general readiness, the data highlight the need for targeted training, particularly in implementing advanced strategies and using tools to support students with diverse learning needs.

Table 8. Level of Readiness 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	2.53	0.73	Competent
13	I am able to provide information on inclusive education for parents of students with special needs	2.53	0.73	Competent
14	I am able to provide educational support for students with special needs	2.53	0.78	Competent

15	I am able to manage students with special needs	2.50	0.73	Competent
16	I am able to foster positive relationships between mainstream students and students with special needs to accommodate inclusive education	2.67	0.71	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	0.66	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	0.73	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.	2.50	0.68	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.	2.47	0.73	Somewhat Competent
	Overall Weighted Mean	*2.54*		Competent
	Overall Standard Deviation		*0.71*	

Table 8 presents the respondents' level of readiness in terms of skills competency for implementing inclusive education. The overall weighted mean is 2.54, indicating that teachers are generally "Competent", with a standard deviation of 0.71, reflecting moderate variation in responses. The highest-rated skills include the ability to foster positive relationships between mainstream and special needs students and to collaborate with colleagues and specialists (both $\bar{x}$ = 2.67), highlighting strengths in interpersonal and team-based competencies. Several other indicators, such as managing students with special needs and adapting instruction, also fall within the "Competent" range. However, the lowest-rated item proficiency in using diverse teaching modalities ($\bar{x}$ = 2.47) falls under "Somewhat Competent," suggesting a need for improved instructional flexibility. Overall, while teachers demonstrate a foundational skill set necessary for inclusive teaching, the results point to the importance of ongoing training to enhance more specialized and adaptive teaching skills for diverse learners.

Table 9. Level of Readiness 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	3.20	0.55	Competent
22	I care for the well-being of students with special needs	3.33	0.55	Very Competent
23	I understand the purpose for an inclusive education	3.30	0.53	Very Competent
24	I care for the progressive learning of students with special needs	3.30	0.53	Very Competent
25	I care for the achievements of students with special needs	3.33	0.55	Very Competent
26	I believe students with special needs can achieve their best with support	3.40	0.50	Very Competent
27	Teaching students with special needs requires more teaching aids	3.63	0.49	Very Competent
28	I need to work together with special education teachers if I have students with special needs in my class	3.63	0.49	Very Competent
29	Despite of the disabilities faced by students with special needs, they also have their own abilities	3.70	0.47	Very Competent
30	I need extra effort to teach students with special needs	3.70	0.47	Very Competent
	Overall Weighted Mean	*3.45*		Very Competent

Overall Standard Deviation	0.54

Table 9 illustrates the respondents' level of readiness in terms of attitude competency toward implementing inclusive education. The overall weighted mean is 3.45, with a standard deviation of 0.54, indicating that teachers are "Very Competent" in their attitudes toward inclusion. The highest-rated items are "I need extra effort to teach students with special needs" and "Despite the disabilities faced by students with special needs, they also have their own abilities" (both x̄ = 3.70), showing strong recognition of the value and potential of learners with special needs. Most indicators fall within the "Very Competent" range, highlighting teachers' positive beliefs, empathy, and willingness to collaborate especially with special education teachers (x̄ = 3.63). Only one item, understanding the meaning of inclusive education (x̄ = 3.20), falls slightly lower, though still rated as "Competent." Overall, the data suggest that while teachers may need support in skills and knowledge areas, their attitudes are highly supportive, providing a strong foundation for inclusive practice.

Table 10. Level of Readiness 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.	2.27	0.51	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.	2.33	0.48	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.	2.10	0.53	Fairly Practiced
34	I regularly collaborate with special education professionals, administrators, and other stakeholders to develop inclusive lesson plans and instructional strategies.	2.03	0.51	Fairly Practiced
35	I use differentiated instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of all students, including those with disabilities or other special needs.	2.87	0.71	Practiced
36	I am familiar with Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles and incorporate them into my lesson planning and classroom instruction.	2.03	0.53	Fairly Practiced
37	I effectively adapt curriculum materials and teaching methods to accommodate diverse learning styles, abilities, and needs.	2.97	0.57	Practiced
38	My classroom environment is inclusive, with physical accessibility, appropriate seating arrangements.	2.10	0.57	Fairly Practiced
39	I use positive reinforcement, proactive interventions, and de-escalation techniques to manage behavior in my inclusive classroom.	2.97	0.50	Practiced
40	I understand Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and can implement the accommodations and modifications outlined in students' plans.	2.03	0.49	Fairly Practiced
41	I maintain active involvement and communication with parents and the broader community to support inclusive education practices and student success.	2.93	0.63	Practiced
42	I am culturally competent and able to create a classroom environment that respects and values students' diverse backgrounds and experiences.	2.90	0.72	Practiced
43	I use alternative assessment methods and accommodations to evaluate student progress in my inclusive classroom.	3.03	0.53	Practiced
44	I feel confident in my ability to effectively teach and support students with diverse learning needs in inclusive settings.	2.93	0.71	Practiced

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.	2.97	0.63	Practiced
	Overall Weighted Mean	*2.56*		Practiced
	Overall Standard Deviation		*0.57*	

Table 10 presents the respondents' level of readiness toward the implementation of inclusive education in terms of practices, with an overall weighted mean of 2.56, interpreted as "Practiced," and a standard deviation of 0.57, indicating moderate variability in responses. The highest-rated indicator is the use of alternative assessment methods and accommodations ($\bar{x}$ = 3.03), followed by adapting curriculum materials ($\bar{x}$ = 2.97) and using positive reinforcement and proactive interventions ($\bar{x}$ = 2.97), suggesting that many teachers apply inclusive strategies in classroom management and instruction. However, several areas were rated "Fairly Practiced," including collaboration with special education professionals ($\bar{x}$ = 2.03), availability of resources ($\bar{x}$ = 2.10), and understanding of IEPs ($\bar{x}$ = 2.03). These results indicate that while teachers are making efforts to apply inclusive practices, gaps remain in training, collaboration, and access to necessary tools and support. Overall, the findings highlight the need for structured professional development and stronger institutional support to enhance inclusive practices.

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

Variables	r-value	Strength of Correlation	p - value	Decision	Result
Readiness in Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency and Age Profile	-0.056	Very Weak Negative	0.769	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Readiness in Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency and Gender Profile	-0.358	Weak Negative	0.052	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Readiness in Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency and Educational Attainment Profile	0.106	Very Weak Positive	0.577	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Readiness in Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency and Field of Specialization Profile	0.205	Weak Positive	0.277	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Readiness in Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency and Length of Service Profile	-0.161	Very Weak Negative	0.395	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Readiness in Inclusive Education in Attitude Competency and Relevant Trainings Profile	0.314	Weak Positive	0.091	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

significant at p < 0.05(two – tailed)

Table 10 presents the test of significant relationship between teachers' readiness in inclusive education in terms of attitude competency and their demographic profiles. The analysis used Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) and significance testing at p < 0.05. All variables resulted in p-values greater than 0.05, leading to the decision to not reject the null hypothesis, indicating that no significant relationships were found. The highest correlation observed was between attitude competency and relevant trainings attended (r = 0.314, *p = 0.091*), suggesting a weak positive relationship, though not statistically significant. Similarly, the relationship with gender showed a weak negative correlation (r = -0.358, *p = 0.052*), nearing significance, but still above the 0.05 threshold. All other variables age, educational attainment, field of specialization, and length of service showed very weak to weak correlations, none of which reached statistical significance. These findings suggest that teachers' attitude readiness toward inclusive education is not significantly influenced by their demographic characteristics, indicating that positive attitudes may be widely held regardless of background, training, or experience.

Table 10. Test of Significant Relationship between the Level of Readiness Towards Implementation of Inclusive Education in Practices According to Demographic Profile

Variables	r-value	Strength of Correlation	p - value	Decision	Result
Readiness in Inclusive Education in Practices and Age Profile	-0.319	Weak Negative	0.086	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Readiness in Inclusive Education in Practices and Gender Profile	-0.141	Very Weak Negative	0.457	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

Readiness in Inclusive Education in Practices and Educational Attainment Profile	0.392	Weak Positive	0.032*	Reject Ho	Significant
Readiness in Inclusive Education in Practices and Field of Specialization Profile	0.431	Moderate Positive	0.017*	Reject Ho	Significant
Readiness in Inclusive Education in Practices and Length of Service Profile	-0.224	Weak Negative	0.234	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Readiness in Inclusive Education in Practices and Relevant Trainings Profile	0.275	Weak Positive	0.141	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

significant at p < 0.05(two – tailed)

Table 10 presents the results of the test for a significant relationship between the level of readiness in inclusive education practices and the demographic profiles of the respondents. Among the six demographic variables analyzed, two showed statistically significant relationships at the 0.05 level. First, educational attainment was found to have a weak positive correlation (r = 0.392, *p = 0.032*), indicating a significant relationship between higher education levels and greater readiness in inclusive practices. Second, field of specialization exhibited a moderate positive correlation (r = 0.431, *p = 0.017*), also statistically significant, suggesting that teachers with more relevant or diverse specializations are more prepared to implement inclusive practices. In contrast, other variables such as age, gender, length of service, and relevant trainings attended did not show significant correlations, as their p-values exceeded the 0.05 threshold. Notably, age showed a weak negative correlation (r = -0.319, *p = 0.086*), suggesting a slight trend where younger teachers may be more active in inclusive practices, though not significant. Overall, the findings indicate that educational attainment and specialization play a significant role in shaping teachers' practical readiness for inclusive education, highlighting areas for targeted professional development and recruitment strategies.

Discussion

Based on the results of the study, it is evident that the overall readiness of teachers at Lahug National High School (Night) toward the implementation of inclusive education is at a "Competent" level in terms of knowledge and skills, "Very Competent" in attitude, and "Practiced" in actual implementation. The findings highlight that while teachers possess foundational understanding and a strong positive attitude toward inclusive education, there are noticeable gaps in the practical and technical aspects, such as knowledge of assistive technologies, evidence-based instructional strategies, and collaboration with special education professionals. The consistently lower scores in these areas suggest that although teachers are willing and open to inclusion, they may lack the necessary tools, training, and institutional support to fully implement inclusive practices in their classrooms. This underscores the need for targeted professional development programs, especially in areas related to specialized instruction and the use of inclusive teaching aids.

Furthermore, the correlation analysis revealed that while attitudes toward inclusive education were not significantly influenced by demographic factors, actual practices were significantly associated with educational attainment and field of specialization. Teachers with higher academic qualifications and those specializing in areas more aligned with inclusive education demonstrated a higher level of practical readiness. This suggests that formal education and relevant specialization play a key role in equipping teachers with the skills necessary for inclusive practice. Surprisingly, the number of trainings attended did not show a significant relationship with readiness, which may indicate that existing training programs are either infrequent, too general, or not effectively designed to address specific competencies needed for inclusive education. Therefore, the results emphasize not only the importance of continuous training but also the need to improve its quality, focus, and alignment with the demands of inclusive teaching.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that teachers demonstrate a generally competent level of readiness for the implementation of inclusive education, particularly in terms of knowledge, skills, and practices, with a very competent attitude toward inclusion. While teachers exhibit strong positive beliefs and willingness to embrace inclusive education, gaps remain in more technical and specialized areas such as the use of assistive technologies, collaboration with specialists, and application of evidence-based strategies. Significant relationships were found between educational attainment and field of specialization and teachers' readiness in terms of practices, highlighting the role of advanced education and relevant training in enhancing inclusive capabilities. However, the lack of significant correlation between readiness and factors like age, gender, and years of service suggests that inclusive readiness is not determined by experience alone, but by targeted academic and professional preparation.

These findings reinforce the need for improved, focused, and sustained professional development programs to fully equip teachers with the practical tools and knowledge required to implement inclusive education effectively.

References

Aguis, J. (2024). Inclusive education for all: A qualitative exploration of fostering social justice and supporting students with special educational needs in the learning environment. *MCAST Journal of Applied Research & Practice, 7*(3), 20–39.

Arias, C. R., Calago, C. N. S., Calungsod, H. F. B., Delica, M. A., Fullo, M. E., & Cabanilla Jr, A. B. (2023). Challenges and implementation of inclusive education in selected Asian countries: A meta-synthesis. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science, 9*(2), 512–534.

Arrah, R. O., & Swain, K. D. (2021). In-service training and teacher efficacy in inclusive education: A critical review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 25*(14), 1605–1621. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1624845

Bakar, S. (2021). Investigating the dynamics of contemporary pedagogical approaches in higher education through innovations, challenges, and paradigm shifts. *Social Science Chronicle, 1*(1), 1–19.

Debasu, H., & Yitayew, A. (2024). Examining elements of designing and managing of creating inclusive learning environment: Systematic literature review. *International Journal of Special Education, 39*(1), 33–43.

Kushwaha, R. K., Tripathi, A., Singh, C., & Yadav, M. K. (2024). *Inclusive education*. Blue Rose Publishers.

Kunwar, R., & Adhikari, S. (2023). An exploration of the conceptualization, guiding principles, and theoretical perspectives of inclusive curriculum. *Journal of Contemporary Research in Social Sciences, 5*(1), 1–13.

Landsman, J., & Lewis, C. W. (Eds.). (2023). *White teachers/diverse classrooms: Creating inclusive schools, building on students' diversity, and providing true educational equity.* Taylor & Francis.

Maligalig, D. S., Reyes, C. M., & Cuenca, J. S. (2022). Barriers to effective implementation of inclusive education in the Philippines: Perspectives of public school teachers. *Philippine Journal of Education, 101*(2), 23–40.

Moosa, V., Shareefa, M., Adams, D., & Mohamed, A. (2020). Assessing teacher readiness for inclusive education in Maldives: Instrument modification and validation. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 69*(4). https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2020.1837355

Molina Roldán, S., Marauri, J., Aubert, A., & Flecha, R. (2021). How inclusive interactive learning environments benefit students without special needs. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 661427. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.661427

Sharma, U., & Salend, S. J. (2020). Teaching in inclusive classrooms: The impact of training and professional development on teachers' attitudes and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 88*, 102968. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102968

Siedlecki, S. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. *Clinical Nurse Specialist, 34*(1), 8–12. https://doi.org/10.1097/NUR.0000000000000493

Sijuola, R., & Davidova, J. (2022). Challenges of implementing inclusive education: Evidence from selected developing countries. *Rural Environment Education Personality, 15*, 140–147.

Srivastava, S. (2023). The evolution of education: Navigating 21st-century challenges. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 5*(5), 1–9.

Tan, C. Y., & Yeo, L. S. (2023). Inclusive education in Southeast Asia: Exploring school-level enablers and challenges. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 24*, 15–28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-023-09821-w