| **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Level of Essential Best Practices and the Implementation of Inclusive Education among Regular Elementary Teachers

Marichu D. Alcantara[1]✉, Cecilia Elena P. De Los Reyes[2], Lilibeth C. Pinili[3], Jonathan O. Etcuban[4], Niña Rozanne T. De Los Reyes[5], Reylan G. Capuno[6], Gengen G. Padillo[7], Joseph C. Pepito[8]

[1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8]Cebu Technological University-Main Campus
Corresponding Author: Marichu D. Alcantara, **E-mail**: marichualcantara54@yahoo.com

| **ABSTRACT**

The study aimed to investigate the level of essential best practices and the implementation of inclusive education among regular elementary teachers in identified schools in the five districts of the Division of Capiz for the school year 2020-2021. The quantitative technique was employed, and convenient random sampling was used to determine 50 respondents. An adapted research survey questionnaire was used to gather data. Frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, chi-square, and correlation coefficient were used. The findings revealed that the participants perceived themselves as having a "moderate" level of essential best practices of inclusive education and having a "moderate" implementation of inclusive education. Furthermore, results revealed no significant relationship between the level of essential best practices in inclusive education and its profile as to age and gender, teaching position, number of years in service, number of LSENs in class, and number of special/inclusive education trainings attended. There was no significant relationship between implementation of inclusive education as to age and gender, number of years in service, number of LSENs in class, number of special/inclusive education training attended, and number of hours in special/inclusive education training attended. It is concluded that essential best practices of inclusive education have influenced inclusive school practice. To address the issue, an action plan was formulated for implementation.

1.   Introduction

Inclusive education for students with special needs (LSENs) has been a significant challenge on a global scale. Schools aim to create an environment where all children feel appreciated and like they belong, regardless of their abilities or challenges. Making sure all students deserve to be members of the school community and have access to the same resources, friendships, and experiences as their classmates is at the core of inclusive education (Juvonen et al., 2019). Schools work hard to create a friendly atmosphere where all students, including those with special needs, can succeed without any obstacles.

Inclusion is a mentality change that recognizes the individual contributions of every student, not only a set of rules (Glass et al., 2021). Everyone wins when educators and educational institutions collaborate to recognize and assist students with varying needs. Teachers develop new skills, learning how to create lessons and activities that meet a range of abilities while also collaborating closely with other educators, specialists, and parents (Byrd & Alexander, 2020; Kyriacou, 2018). In addition to fostering a feeling of community around each kid, this collaboration aids instructors in their professional development.

Nevertheless, there are actual difficulties in putting inclusive education into practice. Teachers can feel the burden of additional responsibilities because many classes are already overcrowded and resource-constrained. According to Banwo et al. (2022) and Hollowell (2019), creating a thriving, inclusive environment requires commitment from everyone involved, from school leaders to families.It involves adopting a mindset that values adaptability, ingenuity, and patience in addition to making budgetary changes. In an effort to facilitate this change, the Department of Education (DepEd) has urged school communities to offer tools and training that boost teachers' self-assurance in inclusive classrooms (Cruz, 2024; Cuizon, 2024; Dela Fuente, 2021).

In Capiz, efforts to support inclusion are evident through training programs, assessment services, and regular school monitoring to ensure learners with special needs receive the support they need. In order to help students with behavioral, intellectual, and sensory issues succeed in a typical classroom, educators collaborate to modify their curriculum and school activities to be more inclusive. Teachers occasionally find it difficult to fulfill the diverse requirements of all of their students, thus there is still work to be done to close the knowledge-practice gap. welcoming make classrooms really welcome for all students, this project investigates how schools may improve inclusive education and provide additional assistance to instructors.

2. Literature Review

This study was anchored on the fundamental concepts of Lev Vygotsky`s Theory of Social Constructivism, John B. Watson's Theory of Behaviorism, Piaget's Theory of Cognitivism, and Mel Ainscow and Tony Booth's Theory of Index for Inclusion. Furthermore, different legal bases supported this, such as Philippines Republic Act 7277 or the "Magna Carta for Disabled Persons"; Batas Pambansa Blg. 232 "Education Act of 1982."; Republic Act No. 10533 "The Enhance Basic Education Act of 2013", Republic Act. No. 10410, known as the "Early Years Act (EYA) of 2013"; and DepEd Order 72, s.2009.

According to Lev Vygotsky's (1934) theory on social constructivism state that knowledge is socially constructed in communicative practice. This theory suggests that regular elementary teachers on essential best practices and implementing inclusive education is a human product constructed in a social and cultural context. Teachers create meaning through their interaction with each other and their environment during seminar workshops and meetings (Solheim et al., 2018).

Behaviorism by John B. Watson (1913) was also one of the classical learning theories and is also recognized as the oldest. The metaphor for "learning as the acquisition of stimulus-response pairs" suggests that behaviorism is a popular psychological mode; behaviorists 'believe the objective of the theory is to impart to the learner the knowledge of reality (Staddon, 2021). Practically, behaviorism-based inclusive education practices include applying behaviorism in inclusive education settings, which appears in the emphasis on student behavior and performance in manipulating stimulus materials.

The third theory that supports IE is Jean Piaget's (1896) Theory of Cognitivism, which essentially focuses on the attributes of one's thinking, memory, self-reflection, and motivation to learn. Piaget (1896) argued that the ability to understand and learn differs during each developmental stage. The cognitive method recognizes the processes of mental planning, goal-setting, and organizational strategies and concentrates on the learner's mental activities that impact answers. Cognitive theories strongly emphasize giving knowledge purpose and assisting ordinary primary school instructors in becoming more organized and capable of connecting newly learned material to previously acquired knowledge.

The emphasis on mental information

processing and interactions in guiding instructors is one example of how Piaget's (1896) Theory of Cognitivism implies that cognitivism-based inclusive education methods involve applying cognitivism in inclusive education settings. To understand new material, regular primary teachers are urged to communicate and make connections between their existing knowledge, experiences, and skills (Wilson & Conyers, 2020).

Lastly, the Index for Inclusion Theory by Mel Ainscow and Tony Booth (2002) supports the essential best practices and implementation of IE. According to this theory, Inclusion and Exclusion are explored along three interconnected dimensions of school improvement: creating inclusive cultures, producing inclusive policies, and evolving inclusive practices. This dimension has been chosen to direct thinking about school change. Experience with the index indicates that they are widely seen as essential ways of structuring school development.

Our 1987 Philippine Constitution supports inclusive education by stating that the State must uphold and advance every citizen's right to high-quality education at all levels and take the necessary actions to ensure that everyone has access to it (Eduardo, 2018).

Senate Bill No. 1732 supports this. It stipulates that all public school divisions must establish inclusive and special education centers for children and youth with special needs, provide standards and guidelines, and appropriate funds. This establishes the states' policy to protect and promote the right of children and youth with special needs to a high-quality education and to take the necessary steps to make that education accessible to them.

Another law that affirms each student's entitlement to a high-quality education is found in Batas Pambansa Blg. 232: An Act that outlines the framework and upkeep of an integrated educational system. This Act shall be known as the "Education Act of 1982." which applies to and governs both formal and non-formal systems in public and private schools at all levels of the entire educational system. Establishing and preserving an integrated, comprehensive, and sufficient educational system that is pertinent to the objectives of national development is state policy. To achieve this, the government must make sure that, within the

framework of a free and democratic society, the educational system contributes as much as possible to the achievement and maintenance of equitable access to education and the enjoyment of its advantages by all of its citizens.

According to Section 8, Republic Act No. 10533, The Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, the Philippine basic education system is strengthened by expanding the years for primary education and strengthening its curriculum. It also appropriates funds for these and other purposes. Programs for Learners with Disabilities and other initiatives aimed at meeting students' physical, intellectual, psychological, and cultural requirements are examples of how to make enhanced basic education inclusive following Section 3 of the Act.

Furthermore, the Republic Act. No. 10410, known as the "Early Years Act (EYA) of 2013," also served as the basis for this study. This legislation recognizes the age range of 0 to 8 as the first crucial phase of educational development, appropriates funds, and fortifies the early childhood care and development system. This hereby declares the State's policy to support children's rights to survival, development, and exceptional protection while fully acknowledging the unique nature of childhood and the necessity of providing experiences that are developmentally appropriate to meet their needs and assist parents in their roles as the children's primary caregivers and early educators.

Department of Education DepEd Order 72, s.2009, or the Inclusive Education, supports the social constructivism theory of Vygotsky. Under this order, as mentioned earlier, the IE provision has been emphasized. IE, as a Strategy for Increasing the Participation Rate of Children, stresses the urgency to address and guarantee the right of these children to receive appropriate education within regular or inclusive classroom settings.

The conceptual framework of this study was formulated based on these theories, legal bases, and the results of numerous studies. The socio-demographic profile could affect teachers' general perception of inclusive education. Different factors affect the quality of education in an inclusive class, paving the way for potential challenges for teachers of students with special needs.

3. Purpose of the Study

The study aimed to investigate the level of essential best practices and the implementation of inclusive education among regular elementary teachers in identified schools in the five districts of the Division of Capiz for the school year 2020-2021. The findings of the study were the basis for an action plan. Specifically, it sought to determine the demographic profile of the respondents, the level of essential best practices on the implementation of inclusive education as perceived by the respondents, the level of implementation of inclusive education, the correlational analysis between the profile of the respondents and the level of essential best practices in inclusive education and implementation of inclusive education.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Design

This study used the mixed method employing the quantitative and qualitative techniques. The quantitative data were gathered from the demographic profile of the regular elementary teachers as respondents, the level of essential best practices of inclusive education, the level of implementation of inclusive education, and the significant relationship in the selected variables. The data gathered were treated with appropriate statistical tools, analyzed, and given interpretation.

4.2 Participants

The participants were 50 regular elementary teachers in the five identified schools of the five districts of the Division of Capiz selected through purposive sampling.

4.3 Instrument

This study employed an adopted survey questionnaire from Jorgensen (2012), which included essential best practices in inclusive schools, National Center on Inclusive Education Institute on Disability/UCEDD University of New Hampshire Durham on the essential best practices awareness level. The questionnaire comprised 25 items containing questions related to regular elementary teachers' knowledge about assessment, curriculum, professional development, family-school partnerships, and school leadership.

Another questionnaire was adopted from MacKinnon and Manathunga (2003). It consisted of 25 items and contained questions about regular elementary teachers' knowledge of school leadership, assessment, provision of services, curriculum modifications, and family collaboration.

4.4 Statistical Treatment of Data

The gathered data were treated accordingly. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to aid the analysis and interpretation. Computations were carried out via appropriate software. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, mean,

standard deviation, percentage, and range, were used to describe the profile of the respondents, level of essential best practices, and inclusive education implementation for regular elementary teachers and were made as a basis for the action plan.

Correlation analyses were performed to answer sub-problem four and test the null hypotheses. In all correlations, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed except when sex and highest educational attainment were involved, when the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was obtained.

5.0 Results and Discussion

5.1 Profile of the Respondents. This part provides the data about the profile of the respondents as to age and gender, highest educational attainment, teaching rank, years of teaching service, number of learners with special educational needs in class, prior experience of teaching students with disabilities, and number of special /inclusive education pieces of training attended.

5.1.1. Age and Gender. These are crucial for profiling because they help identify patterns, differences, and trends within a study population. Age influences factors such as physical abilities, cognitive development, and health needs, while gender shapes social roles, responsibilities, and access to resources or opportunities

Table 1. Age and Gender

Age	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
51 years old & above	0	0	6	12.00	6	12.00
41 - 50 years old	5	10	18	36.00	23	46.00
31 - 40 years old	5	10	9	18.00	14	28.00
30 yrs. old & below	3	6	4	8.00	7	14.00
Total	**13**	**26**	**37**	**74.00**	**50**	**100.00**

Based on the data in Table 1, most regular elementary teachers were 41 to 50 years old, which makes up 46 percent of the respondents. This implies that the majority of the regular elementary teachers in the five schools have already been in a teaching career for a long time**.** According to Grønkjær et al. (2019), this age level is midlife to mature adulthood. In this stage, they have raised families, established themselves in their work lives, and become contributors to the betterment of society through volunteerism, mentorships, and other forms of philanthropy.

Regarding gender, females dominate males, with 37 or 74 percent of the respondents being female**.** As observed in many schools, females dominate the population of school teachers**.** In inclusive education classes, the researchers have also observed that female regular elementary teachers are higher in number than males. This implies that female teachers are more inclined to teach, especially when teaching learners with special education needs.

According to the study conducted by Otunyo and Ekom-Idorenyin (2020) on teachers' attitudes toward inclusion, it was revealed that female teachers had significantly higher scores than males on what was referred to as "The Social Growth Factor," showing a more positive attitude toward the social aspects of inclusion. However, other researchers found that there was no statistically significant difference between teachers' attitudes towards inclusion in terms of gender (Emmers et al., 2020; Heyder et al., 2020; Lacruz-Pérez et al., 2021; Saloviita, 2020b).

5.1.2 Civil Status

Civil status is used in vital records, forms, and other documents to reflect a person's marital status. This has been considered an important element since it may affect the study's results or findings.

Table 2. Civil Status

Civil Status	f	%
Single	15	30.00
Married	35	70.00
Total	50	100.00

As shown in Table 2, 35 or 70 percent were married, and 15 or 30 percent were single. This data supports the findings on the age of the respondents, who were found to be 31 years and above. This simply means that the respondents have already settled down to have their own families at this age. Furthermore, this age has been considered ideal for marriage since they have already finished their schooling.

On the other hand, a minority of the respondents are single. According to the interview, this group is still upgrading their educational attainment for possible promotion or professional growth. The findings of Ghafoor et al. (2020) and Greenglass et al. (2020) found that the influence of marital status on teachers' effectiveness was significantly different between married and unmarried teachers. Furthermore, Anyamene (2020) and Özdemir and Demir (2019) found that teachers' marital status was unrelated to their professional attitude and adjustment. But Umma and Zahana (2021) found that unmarried teachers were more aware of professional responsibility than their married colleagues.

5.1.3. Highest Educational Attainment
A person's highest level of education is referred to as their educational attainment. Successful completion means academic achievement in the teacher's teaching career. Table 3 presents the results.

Table 3. Highest Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	F	%
Doctoral graduate	1	2.00
Doctoral units	2	4.00
Master's graduate	9	18.00
Master's units	29	58.00
College graduate	9	18.00
Total	**100**	**100.00**

Table 3 shows that the majority, or 58 percent, of the respondents were pursuing their Master's degree, and only a few have completed this.

This finding implies that most regular elementary teachers had priorities other than professional growth. Having reached middle adulthood, it is expected that they could have finished their Master's degree. However, being married individuals, their families are expected to be their priority. Others revealed that their health prevented them from pursuing their graduate studies. With this finding, teachers have not yet realized the importance of continuing professional development, especially in the field of special education. Therefore, teachers teaching in inclusive classes may not have the necessary competence to handle this group of children.

The findings are supported by the study of Burroughs et al. (2019), which revealed that teacher education level and experience are only proxies of teacher knowledge and skills about teaching effectively. In other words, such background teacher characteristics will influence their behaviors, which could then, in turn, affect student achievement.

5.1.4. Teaching Rank
This discusses the uppermost or lowest rank held by members of regular elementary teachers, such as teacher I, teacher II, teacher III, master teacher I, and master teacher II. Table 4 presents the distribution of regular elementary school teachers' teaching rank**.**

Table 4. Teaching Rank

High Teaching Rank	F	%
Master Teacher I	10	20.00
Teacher III	23	46.00
Teacher II	1	2.00
Teacher I	16	32.00
Total	**50**	**100.00**

Table 4 reveals that 23 or 46 percent of 50 regular elementary teachers are teacher III. However, it is noteworthy that 10 or 20 percent of them are already Master Teacher 1. This is consistent with the findings on the highest educational attainment, wherein nine are Master's degree holders, which may have allowed these teachers to rise to Master Teacher 1. On the other hand, teachers with Teacher II and I position need proper motivation to finish their Master's degree to move up to the higher level of teachers' rank. They need to set priorities to grow professionally**.** Elementary teachers need to update themselves to acquire new knowledge not only for themselves but, more importantly, for the benefit of the students, too.

The study conducted by Lastri et al. (2020) revealed that an advanced degree in science or education significantly and positively influenced student science achievement. In addition, better teaching behaviors were also positively related to student achievement in science. Students whose teachers had advanced degrees in science or education performed better on a science knowledge assessment test, even if their teacher had little experience.

5.1.5. Years of Teaching Service

Years of teaching service refer to the length of employment as a classroom teacher holding a residency or professional license in an approved education program. This also includes comparable employment as a substitute teacher or in part-time teaching positions. Table 5 gives the data on this.

Table 5. Years of Teaching Services

Number of Years in Service	F	%
31yrs & above	2	4.00
21-30 years	12	24.00
11-20 years	29	58.00
10 years & below	7	14.00
Total	**50**	**100.00**

As reflected in Table 5, most regular elementary teachers have earned more than 11 years in teaching. This finding is consistent with their age bracket of 30 years and above, which means that these teachers were able to land a teaching job shortly after they finished their baccalaureate degree.

This result is contradicted by Saloviita (2020a), who stated that the most experienced educators with more than 11 years of teaching were the least accepted in inclusive education. The study indicates that as educators gained experience in teaching, they became less accepting of class integration.

Regular elementary teachers with 14 years or less teaching service had a significantly higher positive score in their attitude to integration than those with more than 14 years. They found no significant differences in attitudes to integration among teachers whose teaching experience was between one and four years, five and nine years, and ten and 14 years (Dubbeld et al., 2019; Lacruz-Pérez et al., 2021). Teachers with seven or more years of teaching experience with students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms felt that they could potentially meet the needs of more students with disabilities than teachers with fewer years of inclusive experience.

5.1.6. Number of Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSENs) in class

The number of learners with special educational needs (LSENs) refers to the number of children who have difficulty intellectually, emotionally, or socially and need immediate intervention in special education or regular education programs.

Table 6. Number of LSENs in class

Number of Learners With Special Educational Needs (LSENs) in Class	f	%
5 - 6 Learners	4	8.00
3 - 4 Learners	4	8.00
0 - 2 Learners	42	84.00
Total	**50**	**100.00**

As presented in Table 6, the data reveal that 42 out of 50 or 84 percent of the respondents have 0 – 2 learners in class. The rest have 3 – 6 LSENs in class.

This result implies that most of the regular elementary teachers were not given more numbers of LSENs in their classes. As regular elementary teachers, they have not yet earned the necessary skills to handle this group of learners, as they confessed at the start of classes**.** Moreover, they said they do not have the capabilities to design appropriate assessment procedures for this group of learners, and much more, they lack proper training in inclusive education. Furthermore, few regular elementary teachers were given more than three LSENs in their classrooms.

With these findings, school administrators must prepare their teachers to handle inclusive classes, which is required by Republic Act No. 9155, also known as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. This finding is consistent with the study of Bryant et al. (2019), which states that an increasing number of students with disabilities receive special education services in inclusive settings, and teachers must be prepared to address their needs.

5.1.7. Prior Experience in Teaching Students and Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSENs)

This portion denotes regular elementary teachers' previous knowledge or involvement in educating Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSENs) in regular school. Table 7 presents the data.

Table 7. Prior Experience of Teaching LSENs

Prior Experience of Teaching Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSENs)	f	%
Yes	26	52.00
No	24	48.00
Total	**50**	**100.00**

Based on the data in Table 7, it was shown that 26 or 52 percent of the regular elementary teachers have prior experience teaching LSENs, and 24 or 48 percent of them have no prior experience at all. This data may not be consistent with the findings that only 8 or 16 percent of the respondents handled inclusive classes. Prior experience should motivate these teachers to accept more LSENs in their respective classes**.** On the other hand, for those who signified to have no prior experience in teaching LSENs, most of them were made to teach this group of learners.

This finding holds school leaders responsible for formulating policies about teaching students with special education needs. As the government mandates inclusive education, teachers must equip themselves with the necessary knowledge and skills through training and seminars.

This result is supported by Nilsen (2020) and Yeo et al. (2019) who states that teachers' experiences of inclusive education vary depending on their preparation and ongoing professional development, as well as the support they receive in their position regarding time and assistance. Furthermore, the findings suggest that the school and the teachers support the government in implementing PD No. 603 and the Magna Carta for Persons with Disability. This proves that the State upholds the right of all its citizens to quality education regardless of their circumstances.

5.1.8. Number of Hours of Special /Inclusive Education Trainings Attended

One method of improving one's professional development is through training and seminars. After earning their baccalaureate degrees, they also provide opportunities for normal elementary teachers to learn more. The results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Number of hours Special /Inclusive Education Trainings Attended

Number of Hours Special /Inclusive Education Trainings Attended	f	%
21 hours & above	10	20.00
11-15 hours	1	2.00
6-10 hours	5	10.00
5 hours & below	34	68.00
Total	**50**	**100.00**

As revealed in Table 8, 34 out of 50, or 68 percent, have only attended five (5) hours and below of special/inclusive education training. Only 10 or 20 percent of the respondents have 21 hours more of training. This data supports why few of these regular elementary teachers teach inclusive classes. The lack of training in teaching inclusive courses is the reason for this.

In the study of Carballo et al. (2021),they concluded that the selected teachers considered training and preparation the most essential factor contributing to successful inclusive practices. They recommended teacher training programs to help prepare teachers aspiring to teach in inclusive settings. Furthermore, Crispel and Kasperski (2021) conducted a study recommending a teacher-training program to prepare teachers to teach in inclusive settings. On the other hand, Moberg et al.(2020) said that when teachers are not trained to handle these children with special needs in regular or segregated schools, it becomes a challenge for them to handle and develop a positive attitude toward them.

5.2 Level of Essential Best Practices on the Implementation of Inclusive Education

The level of essential best practices for implementing inclusive education was determined through different categories, such as assessment, curriculum, instruction, and support; professional development; family-school partnership; and school leadership.

5.2.1. Assessment

Teachers and other professionals typically conduct assessments in classrooms. It entails locating and analyzing facts as well as collaborating with students to determine their current learning status, the best course of action, and the future steps.

Table 9. Implementation of Inclusive Education as to Assessment

Assessment	Mean	Description
1. Pupils assess their work against learning objectives.	3.22	MP
2. Exercise assessment reports reflecting students' abilities and needs rather than deficits.	3.12	MP
3. Work on pupils to receive grades that reflect "personal best" achievement and improvement.	3.74	MP
4. Work out the pupil's difficulty communicating, develop assessment tools and strategies accordingly, and qualify assessment results accordingly.	3.72	MP
5. Prepare a variety of assessment methods to provide useful insights about students" progress	3.56	MP
Average Mean	**3.47**	**MP**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)   ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Practiced; 2.61 – 3.40 Practiced (P)
1.81 – 2.60 Less Practiced (LP) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Practiced (NP)

As shown in Table 10, regular elementary teachers have the highest mean in terms of assessment, specifically in working on pupils to receive grades that reflect "personal best" achievement and improvement (mean = 3.74), and the lowest mean in exercising assessment reports reflecting students' abilities and needs rather than deficits (mean = 3.12). The average mean reveals that the regular elementary teachers have a moderate level of practice in the implementation of assessment (3.47).

The result implies that regular elementary teachers' level of essential best practices in the implementation of inclusive education in terms of assessment shows that they have a moderate level of practice in exercising assessment reports reflecting students' abilities and needs rather than deficits, as well as working out in pupil's difficulty communicating, assessment tools and strategies to accordingly, and assessment results are qualified.

The finding is theoretically supported by Dolin et al. (2018) and Lin (2019) who stated that formative or summative assessment is an essential component in the inclusive classroom and should focus on curriculum, instruction, and measurement issues, keeping the learner outcomes in mind. Several assessment processes should be implemented to provide valid, reliable measures of the learner's performance and to identify the effects of the teacher's instruction on the learner.

5.2.2.   Curriculum, Instruction, and Support

Curriculum, instruction, and support refer to the overall plan for instruction adopted by a school or school system. Its goal is to establish consistency in objectives, content, procedures, and results while directing instructional activities. Workbooks, teaching guides, exams, supplemental media, and a variety of student-use content items are typically included in curricula. Table 10 presents the level of essential best practices in this area.

Table 10.   Implementation of Inclusive Education as to Curriculum, Instruction, and Supports

Curriculum, Instruction, and Supports	Mean	Description
1. Execute common core state standards for all students.	3.72	MP
2. Utilize visual, tactile, and kinesthetic resources and experiences		
3. to accommodate each student's preferred method of learning.	3.88	MP
4. 3.90		
5. MP		
6. Supports for difficult conduct should be reviewed with an emphasis on enhancing life quality and imparting new skills, not punishment.		
7. Work on supports related to challenging behavior, focusing on improving quality of life and teaching new skills rather than on punishment.	3.88	MP
8. Create a range of accessible formats, such as textual content in reading-level-appropriate text and utilizing several symbolic representations (e.g., video, picture/symbols, real objects, demonstrations, orally, etc.).	3.62	MP
Average Mean	**3.88**	**MP**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)   ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Practiced; 2.61 – 3.40 Practiced (P)
1.81 – 2.60 Less Practiced (LP) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Practiced (NP)

As reflected in Table 10, regular elementary teachers have the highest mean in terms of curriculum, instruction, and supports, specifically in carrying out the learning styles of all students in the class (mean = 3.90) and have the lowest mean in preparing a

variety of accessible formats including written information at appropriate reading levels, and using multiple, symbolic representations like video, picture/symbols, actual objects, demonstrations, orally,(mean =3.62).The overall mean reveals that regular elementary school teachers have moderate practice in implementing inclusive education regarding curriculum, instructions, and supports (mean = 3.88).

The result implies that regular elementary teachers' level of essential best practices in the implementation of inclusive education in terms of curriculum, instruction, and support shows that they have a moderate level of practice in carrying out the learning styles of all students in the class which means regular elementary teachers have their teaching style and pupils have their learning style. Those two must meet along the education process to achieve a common goal: acquiring knowledge and skills from the pupils with the help of the teachers. Moreover, regular elementary school teachers can moderately follow and practice the learning content based on the curriculum.

Pit-ten Cate et al. (2018) and Metsala and Harkins (2020) backed up the conclusion, stating that teachers' success in creating inclusive, successful learning experiences for all students stems from their philosophy and beliefs about teaching and learning, the curriculum content guidelines that their school district and state have adopted, and their application of a specific set of unit and lesson design principles.

5.2.3   Professional Development

After normal primary teachers join the workforce, professional development refers to their ongoing education and career training. It aids in their job advancement, skill development, and keeping up with current trends. Table 11 presents the level of essential best practices of regular elementary teachers in terms of professional development.

Table 11. Implementation of Inclusive Education as to Professional Development

Professional Development	Mean	Description
1. Go through professional development related to inclusive education as an integral component within school/district improvement goals.	3.78	MP
2. Examine school scheduling to ensure that general and special educators have frequent time to work together on shared professional development opportunities.	3.80	MP
3. Exercise professional development covers both the tenets and practices of inclusive education as well as content-specific knowledge (such as behavior and academics)	3.87	MP
4. Develop a network of mentors, coworkers, coaches, and administrators to foster professional development that is integrated into the day-to-day job of teaching and learning activities.	3.78	MP
5. Rehearse school/district must provide the necessary time and professional development to address school and district improvement goals.	3.80	MP
Average Mean	**3.77**	**MP**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)   ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Practiced; 2.61 – 3.40 Practiced (P)
         1.81 – 2.60 Less Practiced (LP) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Practiced (NP)

According to Table 11, the data showed that regular elementary teachers have the highest mean for professional development, specifically when it comes to following school schedules that allow general and special educators to work together on joint professional development opportunities and practice that the school or district must provide the time and professional development needed to address school and district school improvement goals (mean = 3.80). They also have the lowest mean when it comes to exercising professional development that covers both content-specific knowledge (e.g., behavior, academics) and the principles and practices of inclusive education (mean = 3.78).   The average mean reveals that regular elementary teachers have a moderate level of practice in implementing inclusive education in terms of professional development (mean = 3.77).

The result implies that regular elementary teachers' level of essential best practices in implementing inclusive education in professional development shows that they have a moderate level of training in exercising professional development that addresses content-specific knowledge like behavior, academics, and the principles and practices of inclusive education. Regular elementary teachers have a moderate level of collaborative effort in teaching by implementing a mini library or reading corner and filling that tiny space with all kinds of exciting books, workbooks, charts, and science instruments so that all pupils can access it and learn at their own pace.

This result is supported by Bennett and Bromen (2019) and Reyna (2019) who states that there is some consensus that professional development for teachers is most effective if teachers are actively involved in the planning and implementation process instead of using the traditional top-down approach, in which teachers are simply told what to learn and how to participate.

5.2.4. Family-School Partnerships

Family-school partnerships are cooperative relationships between school personnel, parents, and other family members of schoolchildren that are used in inclusive education and other activities. Mutual respect, trust, and shared accountability for the education of the school's youth form the foundation of these collaborations. Table 12 shows the essential best practices of regular elementary teachers regarding family-school partnerships.

Table 12. Implementation of Inclusive Education as to Family-School Partnerships

Family-School Partnerships	Mean	Description
1. Cary out family priorities a reflected in annual goals on students' IEPs.	3.88	MP
2. Recognized that educators must positively appreciate the work of families on behalf of their children, and that families must honor educators' efforts.	3.86	MP
3. Families are provided with resources to help them develop their own advocacy and leadership abilities in relation to their learners' education.	3.86	MP
4. Encourage families to regularly attend curriculum planning or case management meetings at times, days, and places that work for them.	3.44	MP
5. Go over in families to provide with information and referral to community-based services related to healthy family functioning.	3.62	MP
Average Mean	**3.73**	**MP**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP) ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Practiced; 2.61 – 3.40 Practiced (P)
1.81 – 2.60 Less Practiced (LP) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Practiced (NP)

As indicated in Table 12, regular elementary teachers have the highest mean in terms of family-school partnerships, specifically in carrying out family priorities as reflected in annual goals on students' IEPs (mean= 3.88) and the lowest mean in training families with attending case-management meetings or curriculum planning meetings regularly and during days, times, and locations convenient for families (mean =3.44) The average mean reveals that the regular elementary teachers have a moderate level of practice in the implementation of inclusive education in terms of school-family partnerships (mean= 3.73).

Regarding the implementation of inclusive education in family-school partnerships, the results suggest that regular elementary teachers have a moderate level of experience in providing information about resources to help them develop their own leadership and advocacy skills in relation to their children's education. They also have a moderate level of experience in training families to attend case-management meetings or curriculum planning meetings regularly, at times, days, and places that work for them.

The findings indicate that regular elementary teachers have a moderate amount of experience informing parents about resources to support their own leadership and advocacy skills regarding their children's education when implementing inclusive education in family-school partnerships. Additionally, they have a moderate amount of experience in educating families on how to regularly attend curriculum planning or case-management sessions at convenient times, locations, and days.

Furthermore, Ishimaru (2019) reviewed the literature on family-school partnerships in inclusive education and discovered that the two main objectives of forming partnerships with parents were (a) to empower parents (defined as a parent's capacity to find and use resources, solve problems and make decisions, and work together effectively) and (b) to improve communication between parents and professionals.

5.2.5 School Leadership

School Leadership is a process of providing direction and applying influence. It involves decisively managing people's emotions, thoughts, and actions to influence others in a preferred direction. Table 13 indicates the mean level of essential best practices of regular elementary teachers in terms of school leadership.

Table 13. Implementation of Inclusive Education as to School Leadership

School Leadership	Mean	Description
1. The principal exercise encourages and teachers' support development and continuous learning.	4.04	MP
2. The principal provides assistance and works closely with educators who have difficulties in their delivery and style of instruction.	4.12	MP
3. The principal work on encouragement for teachers to coordinate, collaborate and cooperate with each other.	4.26	MP
4. The principal seeks to promote parent ihe principal seeks to promote parent involvement in school's activity.	4.14	MP
5. The principal exercise communication in vision of the school to teaching staff.	4.14	MP
Average Mean	**4.14**	**MP**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)   ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Practiced; 2.61 – 3.40 Practiced (P)
       1.81 – 2.60 Less Practiced (LP) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Practiced (NP)

As reflected in Table 13, regular elementary teachers have the highest mean in terms of school leadership specifically in "the principal work on encouragement for teachers to coordinate, collaborate and cooperate" (mean = 4.26) and have the lowest mean in "the principal exercise encourages and teachers' support development and continuous learning" (mean = 4.04). The average mean reveals that the regular elementary teachers have a moderate level of practice in the implementation of inclusive education in terms of school leadership (mean = 4.14).

The result implies that regular elementary school teachers' level of essential best practices in the implementation of inclusive education in school leadership shows that they have a moderate level of practice in exercising encouragement by school administrators and teachers' support development and continuous learning.

To ascertain the impact of school leadership on student accomplishment, Leithwood et al. (2021) examined three different types of research studies. These studies included large-scale quantitative studies of the direct and indirect effects of school leadership on student outcomes, qualitative case studies in exceptional school settings (i.e., settings where students achieve significantly above or below expectations), and large-scale quantitative studies looking at particular leadership practices. The authors found evidence suggesting successful leadership can be important in improving student learning. The authors make two claims based on their findings. First, of all the school-related elements that influence what pupils learn in the classroom, leadership comes in second only to classroom instruction. Second, where and when leadership is most needed, its impacts are typically greatest.

5.2.6. Summary of the Level of Essential Best Practices in Inclusive Education

First, leadership is the second most important school-related factor that affects what students learn in the classroom, behind classroom instruction. Second, leadership usually has the biggest effects where and when it is most needed.

**Table 14. Summary of the Level of Essential Best Practices on
the Inclusive Education**

Essential Best Practices on the Inclusive Education	Overall Mean	Descriptive Value
Assessment	3.47	MP
Curriculum, Instruction, and Supports	3.88	MP
Professional Development	3.77	MP
Family-School Partnerships	3.73	MP
School Leadership	4.14	MP
Total Mean	**3.78**	**MP**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)   ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Practiced; 2.61 – 3.40 Practiced (P)
       1.81 – 2.60 Less Practiced (LP) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Practiced (NP)

As indicated in Table 14, school leadership has the highest mean, which is 4.14; on the contrary, assessment has the lowest mean, which is 3.47. The overall means reveal that regular elementary teachers have a moderate level of practice in the essential best practices for the implementation of inclusive education (mean = 3.78). The result implies that regular elementary school teachers' level of essential best practices in inclusive education shows that they have a moderate level of practice as a whole.

This means that regular elementary teachers' level of essential best practices of inclusive education have a moderate level of influence on inclusive school practice, as it is both directly and indirectly connected with positive outcomes for learners. Therefore, school leaders are considered crucial in any change process that aims to raise the achievement and well-being of all learners in inclusive schools.

The overall mean was supported by Shaeffer (2019) and Slee (2018) which stated that all learner diversity is worth addressing in education practices across countries if inclusive societies are to be developed, promoted, and sustained. Employing inclusive best practices in education systems would be an essential and foremost step in realizing inclusive societies.

Additionally, IE is seen as a system that minimizes barriers and maximizes resources to ensure that all children, youths, and adults, regardless of their varied backgrounds and abilities, are enrolled, actively participate, and succeed in regular schools and other educational programs without discrimination (Cerna et al., 2021; Owusu-Agyeman, 2019).

5.3 Level of Implementation of Inclusive Education

The implementation of inclusive education was categorized into the following: school leadership, assessment, provision of services, curriculum modification, and family collaboration.

5.3.1. **School Leadership**

Influence is the process of leadership that results in the accomplishment of goals. Effective leaders use their personal and professional beliefs to create a vision for their institutions.

Table 15. Level of Implementation of Inclusive Education as to School Leadership

School Leadership	Mean	Description
1. The principal employs empowerment to teachers to work with all students to gain academic excellence.	3.96	MI
2. The principle supports educators' efforts to provide inclusive education for children with disabilities.	4.06	MI
3. The principal enacts activities to facilitate teachers' efforts to educate students with disabilities.	3.90	MI
4. The principal employs knowledge of instructional strategies and special education students' needs to increase student achievement.	3.84	MI
5. The conception, execution, and assessment of programs for students with disabilities are jointly decided by the principal.		
	3.68	MI
Average Mean	**3.89**	**MI**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Always Implemented (AI) ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Implemented (MI); 2.61 – 3.40 Implemented (I)
1.81 – 2.60 Seldom Implemented (SI) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Implemented (NI)

As indicated in Table 15, regular elementary teachers have the highest mean in terms of school leadership specifically in "the principal carries out support in teachers' efforts to educate students with disabilities in an inclusive environment'' (mean = 4.06), and have the lowest mean in "the principal carries out shared decision making in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs for students with disabilities" (mean = 3.68). The average mean reveals that regular elementary teachers have a moderate implementation level in school leadership (mean = 3.89).

The result implies that regular elementary teachers' level of implementation in education in school leadership shows that they have a moderate level of implementation. This is evident in employing knowledge of instructional strategies and special education students' needs to increase student achievement by supporting special education teachers and regular elementary teachers in all the activities and programs for the good of learners with special educational needs (LSENs).

Moreover, school leaders moderately empower teachers to work with all students to gain academic excellence by acknowledging the priceless efforts of regular elementary teachers handling inclusive education; the moral support and positive feedback given to teachers boost them to work best.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004), which asserts that district and principal leaders are the main inclusive education leaders in public schools today, supports this conclusion. They are ultimately in charge of making sure inclusive special education programs are implemented successfully.

However, research by Mngo and Mngo (2018) and Murphy (2018) that looks at how educational leaders see inclusive education has mostly gone unnoticed. The roles, responsibilities, and attitudes of inclusion of educational leaders are the subject of relatively few research, and even fewer are up to date. Furthermore, the currently available research only looks at school

principals' perspectives on leaders' attitudes toward inclusion, despite the crucial role that district leaders play in the special education decision-making process.

5.3.2. Assessment

Assessment refers to measurement made about a learner with special educational needs (LSENs) that is useful and practical. LSENs typically involve ordinary activities inside the regular classroom, like homework, assignments, participation in class activities, and demonstrating learning through oral examinations or practical tests.

Table 16. Level of Implementation of Inclusive Education as to Assessment

Assessment	Mean	Description
1. Employ alternative outputs that may be considered, such as: portfolio assessment, project work, or continuous assessment.	4.14	MI
2. Perform test modification as opposed to exemption from testing for learners with special needs.	3.98	MI
3. Employs alternatives that may be considered, such as: portfolio assessment, project work, or continuous assessment.	4.10	MI
4. Provides assessment tools in regard with characteristics of the interpersonal/social relation in the regular settings (regular pupils' attitudes and interaction)	3.94	MI
5. Execute assessment provides opportunities for students to express their learning in different modes and modalities.	3.40	MI
Average Mean	**3.91**	**MI**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Always Implemented (AI) ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Implemented (MI); 2.61 – 3.40 Implemented (I)
1.81 – 2.60 Seldom Implemented (SI) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 16 reveals, regular elementary teachers have the highest mean in terms of assessment, specifically in employing alternative outputs that may be considered, such as portfolio assessment, project work, or continuous assessment (mean = 4.14), and the lowest mean in executing assessment in providing opportunities for students to express their learning in different modes and modalities (mean =3.40). The average mean shows that the regular elementary teachers have a moderate level of implementation in terms of assessment (mean = 3.91).

The result implies that regular elementary teachers' level of implementation in education in assessment shows that they have a moderate level of implementation. This is evident in providing assessment tools concerning characteristics of the interpersonal/social relations in regular settings like regular pupils' attitudes and interaction, and this is fulfilled by giving each section fair and there is no discrimination assessment. All children, normal or not, are treated equally, especially when it comes to assessment, which lets the children feel that they all belong to the class. All of them are fit to be in the group, and the regular elementary school teachers quickly make modifications and exemptions if needed. The result further implies that the elementary school teachers had marked evidence in employing alternatives that may be considered, such as portfolio assessment, project work, or continuous assessment.

This result is supported by relevant literature, which reported that children with disabilities cannot remain in school due to biased assessment practices (Annamma & Morrison, 2018; Reynolds et al., 2021; Sullivan et al., 2019). This is because when disabled children feel that lessons do not apply to them in reality, they drop out of school (Maciver et al., 2019; Sleeter, 2018). Inappropriate assessment and examination procedures, as well as rigid or irrelevant curricula, provide obstacles to learning and involvement (Khan, 2021).

Ormond (2019) noted that new standards-based curricula and laws requiring improved achievement outcomes on standards-based tests are being used to measure school performance goals in many countries. To strengthen, Mitchell and Sutherland (2020) and Shaeffer (2019) also argued that a standardized assessment system in inclusive education cannot determine that all children have the same learning ability; somewhat, it varies significantly across all students in a class.

5.3.3. Provision of Services

Provision of services refers to the delivery of organizational plans like resource plans, special classes, residential classes, and Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) service options. It also refers to assisting the planning processes and development of

Individual Education Plans. Table 17 reflects the implementation of inclusive education of regular elementary teachers in terms of service provision.

Table 17. Level of Implementation of Inclusive Education as to Provision of Services

Provision of Services	Mean	Description
1. Administer sufficient material to make appropriate accommodations for students with special needs.	3.82	MI
2. Carry through modified general education to meet all students' needs, including those with disabilities.	3.78	MI
3. Execute directives to students with severe/profound disabilities who must benefit from the activities of a regular school.	3.70	MI
4. While students may communicat e in a variety of ways, a fundamental method of Others recognize and comprehend communication.	3.78	MI
5. Adopt laws and/or policies requiring the inclusion of kids with disabilities in regular classroom activities and programs.	3.64	MI
Average Mean	**3.74**	**MI**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Always Implemented (AI) ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Implemented (MI); 2.61 – 3.40 Implemented (I)
1.81 – 2.60 Seldom Implemented (SI) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Implemented (NI)

As reflected in Table 17, regular elementary teachers have the highest mean in terms of provision of services, specifically in administering sufficient material to be able to make appropriate accommodations for students with special needs (mean = 3.82), and have the lowest mean in implementing policy and/or law that students with disabilities are integrated into general education programs and activities (mean = 3.64). The average mean shows that regular elementary teachers have a moderate level of implementation in terms of the provision of services (mean = 3.74).

The result implies that regular elementary teachers' level of implementation in education in the provision of services shows that they have a moderate level of implementation. This is evident in carrying modified general education to meet the needs of all students, including students with disabilities, and this is attained by providing specialized schools or classes. Learning with special needs cannot be taught to other students as they suffer from severe learning deficiencies. Furthermore, it is also evident in executing directives to pupils with severe/profound disabilities to benefit from the activities of a regular school; this can be done by providing extra time communicating with these special children to know them well so that I could understand them well.

According to Yeo et al. (2019), the availability of required resources and teacher development initiatives are critical to the success of inclusive education. The researchers also argued that a deliberate paradigm change away from a student-centered teaching approach is necessary.

5.3.4. Curriculum Modifications

Curriculum modifications refer to inclusive education, in which learners with special educational needs (LSENs) are entitled to access, participate in, and progress in the general curriculum and aspire to the same standards and expectations as their peers. The curriculum for children with special needs also targets functionality and adaptation in the regular elementary setting. Table 18 reveals the implementation of regular inclusive education, where elementary teachers are involved in curriculum modification.

Table 18. Level of Implementation of Inclusive Education as to   Curriculum Modifications

Curriculum Modifications	Mean	Description

	Mean	
1. Enforce students with an IEP to work with all the other students in the classroom, participating in the activity when possible but with a different learning objective from the other students.	3.74	MI
2. Carry out material or environmental changes so that the student with the IEP may participate in the general education curriculum.	3.76	MI
3. Provides changes in teaching procedure like more straightforward explanations, additional examples, or slowing the instructions.	4.02	MI
4. Employ standard curriculum objectives to be functionally relevant to the demands of real-life settings.	3.78	MI
5. Administer priorities according to the strengths, needs, and circumstances of the particular learners and the nature of the disability.	3.98	MI
Average Mean	**3.86**	**MI**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Always Implemented (AI) ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Implemented (MI); 2.61 – 3.40 Implemented (I)
1.81 – 2.60 Seldom Implemented (SI) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Implemented (NI)

As indicated in Table 18, regular elementary teachers have the highest mean in terms of curriculum modification, specifically in providing changes in teaching procedure like simpler explanations, additional examples, or slowing the instructions (mean = 4.02), and have the lowest mean in enforcing students with an IEP works with all the other students in the classroom participating in the activity when possible but, with a different learning objective from the other students (mean = 3.74). The average mean shows that regular elementary teachers have a moderate level of implementation in terms of curriculum modification (mean = 3.86).

The result implies that regular elementary teachers' level of implementation in education in curriculum modifications shows that they have a moderate level of implementation. Regular elementary school teachers also cited some advantages and disadvantages of implementing curriculum modification in inclusive education like incidental and accidental learnings that give the class a new experience to live with and love for humanity is being refreshed as well as considering every learner the teacher who handles them knows what's best for them to choose the most appropriate strategies that will suit for his learners. Advantages like poor learning abilities to the LSENs cannot cope with the needs and become additional work and burdens for the teachers.

The study of Bryant et al. (2019) and Parsons et al. (2018) found that general education teachers generally use strategies and adaptations directed toward the class and incorporate only minor or no modifications based on student needs. In order to equip their employees with the information and abilities necessary to successfully integrate inclusion into their classrooms, administrators must offer them professional development opportunities and training. Curriculum adaptation, differentiated instruction tactics, behavior management, academic progress assessment, creating Individual Education Programs (IEPs), and assistive technology are all areas in which general education teachers require training. Furthermore, Flood and Banks (2021) and Rowan et al. (2021) added that an increase in the diversity and breadth of learning outcomes and the variety of means that a student can achieve these learning outcomes will facilitate the successful implementation of inclusive education.

5.3.5. Family Collaboration

The term "family collaboration" describes a shared responsibility whereby families are dedicated to actively supporting the learning and development of their children with special education needs, and schools and other community agencies and organizations are committed to reaching out to engage families in meaningful ways. Table 19 shows the implementation of inclusive education by regular elementary teachers.

Table 19. Level of Implementation of Inclusive Education as to Family Collaboration

Family Collaboration	Mean	Description

1. Provide information on how to structure children's learning at home (e.g., how to help with schoolwork and monitor a child's progress at school).	3.92	MI
2. Give information about community agencies supporting children's and families' needs.	3.38	MI
3. Conduct workshops to provide information (e.g., how to structure children's learning at home, "how to's" for parents, child development, and how schools function).	3.20	MI
4. Use print resources, books, or recordings that teach parents how to discuss schooling and the lessons their children are learning.	3.84	MI
5. Deploy a homework hotline for parents to ask questions about assignments.	3.44	MI
Average Mean	**3.56**	**MI**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Always Implemented (AI) ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Implemented (MI); 2.61 – 3.40 Implemented (I)
1.81 – 2.60 Seldom Implemented (SI) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Implemented (NI)

As reflected in Table 19, regular elementary teachers have the highest mean in terms of family collaboration, specifically in providing information on how to structure children's learning at home example is how to help with schoolwork and monitor a child's progress at school (mean = 3.92) and have the lowest mean in conducting workshops to provide information example is how to structure children's learning at home, "how to's" for parents, child development, and how schools' function (mean = 3.20). The average mean shows that the regular elementary teachers have a moderate implementation in terms of family collaboration.

The result implies that regular elementary teachers have a moderate level of implementation in education in family collaboration.

This is demonstrated by providing parents with print materials, books, or cassettes on how to have conversations with their children about schoolwork and what they are learning at school, as well as information about local organizations that serve the needs of families and children.

This result is supported by Welsh and Little (2018) which states that it was documented that the involvement of family in school activities will promote discipline and future learning progress. Children's involvement in inclusive education programs serves as the primary indicator of parental efforts. Additionally, the claim is still supported by comparable reports on the current trends of inclusive practices across countries and ethnic groups. Therefore, programs must use a variety of strategies that involve families and view them as partners in progress if they are to continue implementing inclusive programs that involve parents. These methods suit the wide-ranging programs that offer and echo a devotion to community support.

Munje (2018) and Wulandary and Herlisa (2018), however, contradicted this finding, stating that a common belief that family members are not welcome and will, therefore, be subjected to intimidation and discrimination at school is one of the main explanations for their reluctance to participate in school activities. This circumstance is prevalent among parents who do not speak or comprehend English, those who have low incomes, and those who, for whatever reason, find it difficult to relate to school authorities. However, the majority of research findings indicate that school staff are unaware of these factors.

5.3.6. Summary of the Level of Implementation of Inclusive Education

Implementing inclusive education refers to implementing inclusive education policies, classroom management adaptation, assessment, and assistance services in regular elementary schools for learners with special education needs. The data in Table 20 show the overall mean of the implementation of inclusive education by regular elementary teachers.

Table 20. Summary of Implementation of Inclusive Education

Implementation of Inclusive Education	Overall Mean	Description
School Leadership	3.89	MI
Assessment	3.91	MI
Provision of Services	3.74	MI
Curriculum Modifications	3.86	MI
Family Collaboration	3.56	MI
Total Mean	**3.79**	**MI**

Legend: 4.21-5.00 Always Implemented (AI) ; 3.41-4.20 Moderately Implemented (MI); 2.61 – 3.40 Implemented (I)
1.81 – 2.60 Seldom Implemented (SI) ; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Implemented (NI)

As indicated in Table 20 in the summary of the implementation of inclusive education, assessment has the highest mean, which was 3.91. On the contrary, family collaboration has the lowest mean, 3.56. The summary indicated that regular teachers have a moderate level of implementation of inclusive education (mean = 3.78.)

The result implies that regular elementary teachers' implementation of inclusive education shows a moderate level of implementation overall. This means regular elementary school teachers provide a moderate level of execution in inclusive teaching to learners experiencing barriers to learning and moderate existing support structures impact inclusion. Therefore, this must be addressed, as educating learners with learning barriers relies on educators' commitment and practical support.

According to Woodgate et al. (2020), it is difficult for kids with disabilities to fit in at regular school. She said that in order to properly adopt inclusive education, a lot of work needs to be done to alter the mindsets of educators and society at large. Additionally, according to Mngo and Mngo (2018) and Pit-ten Cate et al. (2018), the successful implementation of inclusive education will depend on changing educators' negative attitudes and viewpoints as well as providing them with the required support and training. Appropriate resources, adequate training for educators, acknowledging each child's capacity for learning, emphasizing the strengths of each learner rather than their shortcomings, and realizing that instruction must be tailored to each student in order to ensure a positive educational experience are all necessary.

5.4 Significant Relationship Between the Profile of the Respondents and Essential Best Practices and Implementation of Inclusive Education

This study hypothesized that there was no significant relationship between the respondents' profiles and the level of essential best practices and implementation of inclusive education.

Table 21. Test of Significant Relationship on Demographic Profiles and Level of Essential Best Practices of Inclusive Education

Demographic Profile	Test Statistic	Computed Value	df	p-value	Decision
Age	Spearman Rho	0.107	48	0.458>0.05	Fail to reject the null
Gender	Cramer's V	0.369	48	0.033<0.05	Reject the null
Civil Status	Cramer's V	0.279	48	0.143>0.05	Fail to reject the null
Highest Educational Attainment	Spearman Rho	-0.316	48	0.025<0.05	Reject the null
Teaching Rank	Spearman Rho	-0.27	48	0.058>0.05	Fail to reject the null
Number of Years in Teaching Service	Spearman Rho	0.047	48	0.745>0.05	Fail to reject the null
Number of Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSENs) in class	Spearman Rho	-0.072	48	0.619>0.05	Fail to reject the null
Prior experience in handling Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSENs	Cramer's V	0.248	48	0.215>0.05	Fail to reject the null
Number of hours in special /inclusive education training attended	Spearman Rho	-0.307	48	0.030<0.05	Reject the null

As shown in Table 21, the data revealed that the p-value of gender (0.033), number of hours in special/inclusive education training (0.030), and highest education attainment (0.025) was less than 0.05 level of significance; hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. This is also observable in the highest educational attainment and number of hours attended in special /inclusive education training, which revealed a lesser p-value when tested at a 0.05 significance level. Hence, the null hypothesis was also rejected.

This implies that gender has something to do with the level of essential best practices of inclusive education. This means both male and female regular elementary teachers have a lower or higher extent of essential best practices in inclusive education in terms of assessment, curriculum, instruction, support, professional development, family-school partnerships, and school leadership. Further, male regular elementary teachers may have higher essential best practices than female regular elementary school teachers or vice-versa. Nevertheless, it is significant that both males and females practice inclusive education.

Concerning the highest educational attainment, this means that the highest level of education or achievement of the regular elementary teachers significantly correlates with their level of essential best practices in inclusive education. It might be

that regular elementary teachers with a doctorate and master's level have better practice than regular elementary teachers with college-level or vice versa.

Moreover, the frequency period of special /inclusive education courses and qualifications that regular elementary teachers attended are uniquely dependent on their level of essential best practices in inclusive education. This implies that regardless of the numeral value of time where the regular elementary school attended in special/inclusive education has a direct effect on the level of their practices in terms of assessment, curriculum, instruction, support, professional development, family-school partnerships, and school leadership. Regular elementary teachers with much time in special/inclusive education training have better skills and are competent in practicing inclusive education or vice versa.

The findings imply that the profile of respondents' age, civil status, teaching rank, number of years in teaching service, number of LSENs in class, and prior experience in handling LSENs have no bearing on the level of essential best practices in inclusive education in terms of assessment, curriculum, instruction, and support, professional development, family-school partnerships; and school leadership. This implies that regardless of how young or old the regular elementary teacher is, it has no connection between their level of best practices in inclusive education and the marital status of the respondents in their practice in terms of assessment, curriculum, instruction, and support, professional development, family-school partnerships; and school leadership.

Furthermore, the uppermost or lowest rank held by members of regular elementary teachers in public schools, such as teacher I, teacher II, teacher III, master teacher I, and master teacher II, has no relevance in the essential best practices in inclusive education with the length of employment as a classroom teacher holding a residency or professional license in an approved education program. This implies that regardless of how long or short the years of regular elementary teachers are in service, it does not affect their essential best practice in inclusive education.

The number of LSENs in class shows that regardless of how many children who have difficulty intellectually, emotionally, or socially need immediate intervention in special education or regular education programs, it has no bearing on their essential best practices. This is the same as their previous knowledge or involvement of regular elementary teachers in educating LSENs in regular schools.

According to Pit-ten Cate et al. (2018), advanced training for inclusive education teachers is necessary to promote a successful inclusion classroom, which supports this finding in terms of highest educational attainment. Further claimed that instructors with advanced degrees exhibit more positive attitudes and perceptions toward inclusiveness than their counterparts without such training (Mngo & Mngo, 2018). Lastly, Miesera et al. (2019) support the number of hours in special /inclusive education training attended, which states that the general teachers commonly claimed they had not received sufficient training for inclusive education. There was a direct correlation between appropriate training and positive attitudes toward inclusion. Thus, fostering and developing teachers' professional perceptions, along with providing them with the knowledge and skills to promote inclusive education, must be part of all teacher education programs.

Table 22. Test of Significant Relationship on Demographic Profiles and Implementation of Inclusive Education

Demographic Profile	Test Statistic	Computed Value	df	p-value	Decision
Age	Spearman rho	0.245	48	0.086>0.05	Fail to reject the null
Gender	Cramer's V	.220	48	0.299>0.05	Fail to reject the null
Civil Status	Cramer's V	.297	48	0.110>0.05	Fail to reject the null
Highest Educational Attainment	Spearman rho	-0.298	48	0.036<0.05	Reject the null
Teaching Rank	Spearman rho	-0.322	48	0.023<0.05	Reject the null
Number of Years in Teaching Service	Spearman rho	0.174	48	0.227>0.05	Fail to reject the null
Number of Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSENs) in class	Spearman rho	0.098	48	0.500>0.05	Fail to reject the null
Prior experience in handling Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSENs)	Cramer's V	.070	48	0.884>0.05	Fail to reject the null

Number of hours in special /inclusive education training attended	Spearman rho	-0.129	48	0.372>0.05 Fail to reject the null

As shown in Table 22, among the demographic profiles, the highest educational attainment in implementing inclusive education (p=0.036) revealed a lesser p-value when tested at a 0.05 significance level; hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. This is also observable in teaching rank (p=0.023), where it revealed a lesser p-value when tested at a 0.05 level of significance.

This implies that the highest level of education that the regular elementary teachers have a significant correlation or bearing with their implementation in inclusive education. It indicates that typical elementary teachers, college students, and doctorate holders all do exceptionally well when assessing a child's strengths and limitations using official and informal measures for appropriate program grade placement. They implement more in organizing plans, including a resource plan, a special class, a residential class, and the least restrictive environment (LRE) service choices. They apply adequate accommodation to the provision of adapted general education to meet the needs of all students, including students with disabilities, and to the inclusion of pupils with disabilities into the general education program and activities.

Regular elementary teachers, regardless of their highest educational attainment, have high-level interaction affecting school staffs, parents, and other family members of learners with special needs at school which is completed by providing guidance about how to structure children's learning, coordinating children's education 'how to' for parents to cope with their child's progress, and providing daily elementary teachers with information on community-based learning.

Furthermore, this implies that uppermost or lowest rank held by members of regular elementary teachers, such as teacher I, teacher II, teacher III, master teacher I, and master teacher II has direct relevance in their implementation of inclusive education in terms of school leadership, assessment, provision of services, curriculum modifications and family collaboration. This might be because regular elementary teachers with master teacher rank have better competencies and skills in implementing inclusive education or vice versa. Nevertheless, it is significant that teacher I to master teacher II regular elementary teachers need to have an excellent level of implementation of inclusive education in terms of school leadership, assessment, provision of services, curriculum modifications, and family collaboration, which can serve as an outline for another member of an inclusive society.

Saloviita (2020) supported the significant relationship between the demographic profile and highest educational attainment, stating that teachers with master's degrees had more positive views toward inclusion than teachers with a bachelor's degree. This finding suggests that the teachers' education level may influence their attitudes toward implementing inclusive education.

Regarding the teaching rank of regular elementary teachers, the phenomenon of inclusion, as experienced by general education or non-special education teachers working in inclusive classrooms, presented challenges for them in dealing with current issues in the classroom, educating children with special needs, and internalizing daily guiding principles (Mngo & Mngo, 2018).

6. Findings

Based from the data gathered, the following results are presented:

The respondents' demographic profile showed that most regular elementary school teachers were 41 to 50 years old, females, and married. In terms of highest educational attainment, most of them were at the master's level, teacher III, had 11 – 20 years of teaching service, had 0 – 2 learners in class, and attended 5 hours and below of special/inclusive education training.

On the essential best practices for the implementation of inclusive education, the data showed that the respondents perceived assessment, curriculum, instruction, and support, professional development, family-school partnerships, and school leadership as moderately practiced while the level of implementation of inclusive education in terms of school leadership, assessment, provision of services, curriculum modifications, and family collaboration as moderately implemented.

Lastly, the data further showed that in the correlational analysis, there was no significant relationship between the respondents' profiles (except for gender, highest educational attainment, and number of hours in special and inclusive training) and the level of best practices in terms of assessment, curriculum, instruction, and support, professional development, family-school partnerships, and school leadership. There was no significant relationship between the respondents' profile (except for highest educational attainment and teaching rank) and the level of implementation of inclusive education.

6. Conclusion and Recommendation

With the results of this study, it can be concluded that the essential best practices of inclusive education have influenced inclusive school practice, wherein it should be, both directly and indirectly, connected with positive outcomes for learners and school leaders are considered crucial in any change process that aims to raise the achievement and well-being of all learners in inclusive schools. Regular elementary teachers seem able to utilize flexible grouping, providing activities that appeal to various learning-style preferences, giving LSENs choices, and creating alternative activities and assessments. In the essential best practice of implementing inclusive education, regular elementary teachers display a moderate level of practice. Therefore, they always prepare a variety of assessment methods to provide valuable insights about learners' progress. They must also exercise assessment reports reflecting Learners with Special Needs (LSENs) abilities and needs rather than deficits.

Hence, it is highly recommended that regular elementary teachers equip themselves with essential best practices in implementing inclusive education suited to the child's level they are handling. They are also encouraged to develop professionally and hone their skills and competencies in teaching LSENs in the regular setting. Building partnerships and collaboration with the community is highly encouraged to strengthen society's acceptance. Furthermore, regular elementary teachers are encouraged to support special education programs so that they can understand the needs of these young minds. Not all learners with special educational needs (LSENS) are in special education classes; most can be found in the regular setting. Finally, the implementation of the Action Plan is highly recommended.

7. Study Limitations and Future Research

The data were collected during the school year 2020-2021. Moreover, the study is confined to five districts within the Division of Capiz, which may limit the generalizability of the results to other areas or divisions.

On the other hand, future research could involve additional stakeholders, such as school administrators, special education teachers, students, and parents. Their perspectives would provide a more comprehensive view of the challenges and successes in implementing inclusive education.

8. Acknowledgement

Conflicts of Interest: The authors 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] Annamma, S., & Morrison, D. (2018). Identifying dysfunctional education ecologies: A DisCrit Analysis of Bias in the Classroom. Equity & Excellence in Education, 51(2), 114–131.

[2] https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2018.1496047

[3] Anyamene, A. (2020). Relationship between emotional intelligence and marital satisfaction of male and female married teachers in Anambra State. European Journal of Educational Sciences, 7(3), 1–16.

[4] Banwo, B. O., Khalifa, M., & Seashore Louis, K. (2022). Exploring trust: Culturally responsive and positive school leadership. Journal of Educational Administration, 60(3), 323–339.

[5] Bennett, B., & Bromen, K. (2019). Growing Teacher Leaders from the Ground Up. International Journal of Teacher Leadership, 10(2), n2.

[6] Bryant, D. P., Bryant, B. R., & Smith, D. D. (2019). Teaching students with special needs in inclusive classrooms. Sage Publications. https://bit.ly/40HCpdt

[7] Burroughs, N., Gardner, J., Lee, Y., Guo, S., Touitou, I., Jansen, K., & Schmidt, W. (2019). A review of the literature on teacher effectiveness and student outcomes. In N. Burroughs, J. Gardner, Y. Lee, S. Guo, I. Touitou, K. Jansen, & W. Schmidt, Teaching for Excellence and Equity (Vol. 6, pp. 7–17). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16151-4_2

[8] Byrd, D. R., & Alexander, M. (2020). Investigating special education teachers' knowledge and skills: Preparing general teacher preparation for professional development. Journal of Pedagogical Research, 4(2), 72–82.

[9] Carballo, R., Morgado, B., & Cortés-Vega, M. D. (2021). Transforming faculty conceptions of disability and inclusive education through a training programme. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 25(7), 843–859. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1579874

[10] Cerna, L., Mezzanotte, C., Rutigliano, A., Brussino, O., Santiago, P., Borgonovi, F., & Guthrie, C. (2021). Promoting inclusive education for diverse societies: A conceptual framework. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/content/paper/94ab68c6-en

[11] Crispel, O., & Kasperski, R. (2021). The impact of teacher training in special education on the implementation of inclusion in mainstream classrooms. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 25(9), 1079–1090. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1600590

[12] Cruz, J. A. (2024). Implementation of mainstream education in the public schools in Region V: Basis for policy formulation. https://ijeber.com/uploads2024/ijeber_04_228.pdf

[13] Cuizon, J. L. (2024). Challenges and opportunities in implementing inclusive education in school management. Nexus International Journal of Science and Education, 1(2). http://nijse.org/index.php/home/article/view/118

[14] Dela Fuente, J. A. (2021). Implementing inclusive education in the Philippines: College teacher experiences with deaf students. Issues in Educational Research, 31(1), 94–110.

[15] Dolin, J., Black, P., Harlen, W., & Tiberghien, A. (2018). Exploring Relations between formative and summative assessment. In J. Dolin & R. Evans (Eds.), Transforming Assessment (Vol. 4, pp. 53–80). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63248-3_3

[16] Dubbeld, A., Hoog, N. D., Den Brok, P., & De Laat, M. (2019). Teachers' attitudes toward multiculturalism in relation to general and diversity-related burnout. European Education, 51(1), 16–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/10564934.2017.1401435

[17] Eduardo, J. (2018). Indigenous peoples' rights act (IPRA) of 1997: A standpoint from selected higher education institutions in Nueva Ecija after 20 years. Journal of Progressive Research in Social Sciences, 8(1), 595–613.

[18] Emmers, E., Baeyens, D., & Petry, K. (2020). Attitudes and self-efficacy of teachers towards inclusion in higher education. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 35(2), 139–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1628337

[19] Flood, M., & Banks, J. (2021). Universal design for learning: Is it gaining momentum in Irish education? Education Sciences, 11(7), 341.

[20] Ghafoor, S., Chaudhry, S., & Khan, J. S. (2020). Marital status as a stress indicator in postgraduate dental students. JPMA, 2019, 158–161.

[21] Glass, C. R., Godwin, K. A., & Helms, R. M. (2021). Toward greater inclusion and success. American Council on Education. https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Intl-Students-Monograph.pdf

[22] Greenglass, E. R., Fiksenbaum, L., & Burke, R. J. (2020). The relationship between social support and burnout over time in teachers. In Occupational Stress (pp. 239–248). CRC Press. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.1201/9781003072430-21/relationship-social-support-burnout-time-teachers-esther-greenglass-lisa-fiksenbaum-ronald-burke

[23] Grønkjær, M., Flensborg-Madsen, T., Osler, M., Sørensen, H. J., Becker, U., & Mortensen, E. L. (2019). Adult-life alcohol consumption and age-related cognitive decline from early adulthood to late midlife. Alcohol and Alcoholism, 54(4), 446–454.

[24] Grønkjær, M., Osler, M., Flensborg-Madsen, T., Sørensen, H. J., & Mortensen, E. L. (2019). Associations between education and age-related cognitive changes from early adulthood to late midlife. Psychology and Aging, 34(2), 177.

[25] Heyder, A., Suedkamp, A., & Steinmayr, R. (2020). How are teachers' attitudes toward inclusion related to the social-emotional school experiences of students with and without special educational needs? Learning and Individual Differences, 77, 101776.

[26] Hollowell, C. (2019). Culturally responsive school leadership: How principals use culturally responsive leadership strategies to develop engaging and inclusive school environments for all students [PhD Thesis, Brandman University]. https://bit.ly/3CjKVp1

[27] Huffmyer, A. S., & Lemus, J. D. (2019). Graduate TA teaching behaviors impact student achievement in a research-based undergraduate science course. Journal of College Science Teaching, 48(3), 56–65. https://doi.org/10.2505/4/jcst19_048_03_56

[28] Ishimaru, A. M. (2019). From family engagement to equitable collaboration. Educational Policy, 33(2), 350–385. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904817691841

[29] Juvonen, J., Lessard, L. M., Rastogi, R., Schacter, H. L., & Smith, D. S. (2019). Promoting social inclusion in educational settings: Challenges and opportunities. Educational Psychologist, 54(4), 250–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1655645

[30] Khan, R. A. (2021). Assessing curriculum viability. https://cris.maastrichtuniversity.nl/files/65509503/s7116.pdf

[31] Kyriacou, C. (2018). Essential Teaching Skills Fifth Edition Ebook. Oxford University Press-Children. https://bit.ly/3Z0vomU

[32] Lacruz-Pérez, I., Sanz-Cervera, P., & Tárraga-Mínguez, R. (2021). Teachers' attitudes toward educational inclusion in Spain: A systematic review. Education Sciences, 11(2), 58.

[33] Lastri, L., Kartikowati, S., & Sumarno, S. (2020). Analysis of factors that influence student learning achievement. Journal of Educational Sciences, 4(3), 679–693.

[34] Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (2021). Leadership and other conditions which foster organizational learning in schools. In Organizational learning in schools (pp. 67–90). Taylor & Francis. https://bit.ly/3CnF1TF

[35] Lin, P.-Y., & Lin, Y.-C. (2019). Understanding how teachers practise inclusive classroom assessment. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 63, 113–121.

[36] Maciver, D., Rutherford, M., Arakelyan, S., Kramer, J. M., Richmond, J., Todorova, L., Romero-Ayuso, D., Nakamura-Thomas, H., Ten Velden, M., & Finlayson, I. (2019). Participation of children with disabilities in school: A realist systematic review of psychosocial and environmental factors. PloS One, 14(1), e0210511.

[37] Metsala, J. L., & Harkins, M. J. (2020). An examination of preservice teachers' self-efficacy and beliefs about inclusive education. Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, 43(2), 178–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406419873060

[38] Miesera, S., DeVries, J. M., Jungjohann, J., & Gebhardt, M. (2019). Correlation between attitudes, concerns, self-efficacy and teaching intentions in inclusive education evidence from German pre-service teachers using international scales. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 19(2), 103–114. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12432

[39] Mitchell, D., & Sutherland, D. (2020). What really works in special and inclusive education: Using evidence-based teaching strategies. Routledge. https://bit.ly/3AMK8MF

[40] Mngo, Z. Y., & Mngo, A. Y. (2018). Teachers' perceptions of inclusion in a pilot inclusive education program: implications for instructional leadership. Education Research International, 2018, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/3524879

[41] Moberg, S., Muta, E., Korenaga, K., Kuorelahti, M., & Savolainen, H. (2020). Struggling for inclusive education in Japan and Finland: Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 35(1), 100–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1615800

[42] Munje, P. N. (2018). The impact of teacher professional conduct on learner experiences and performance in poor school communities in South Africa. Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2018.1429253

[43] Murphy, C. R. (2018). Educational leaders and inclusive education: Perceptions, roles, and responsibilities. https://bit.ly/3UuaaLl

[44] Nilsen, S. (2020). Inside but still on the outside? Teachers' experiences with the inclusion of pupils with special educational needs in general education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 24(9), 980–996. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1503348

[45] Ormond, B. M. (2019). The impact of standards-based assessment on knowledge for history education in New Zealand. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 26(2), 143–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1432564

[46] Otunyo, M. I. J., & Ekom-Idorenyin, V. W. (2020). Influence of gender and qualification on the attitude of regular secondary school teachers towards students with special needs. European Journal of Special Education Research. http://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejse/article/view/2790

[47] Owusu-Agyeman, Y. (2019). An analysis of theoretical perspectives that define adult learners for effective and inclusive adult education policies. International Review of Education, 65(6), 929–953. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-019-09811-3

[48] Özdemir, B., & Demir, A. (2019). Romantic relationship satisfaction, age, course load, satisfaction with income and parental status as predictors of instructors' burnout: Evidence from a correlational study. Current Psychology, 38(5), 1083–1098. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9724-3

[49] Pappas, M. A., Papoutsi, C., & Drigas, A. S. (2018). Policies, practices, and attitudes toward inclusive education: The case of Greece. Social Sciences, 7(6), 90.

[50] Parsons, S. A., Vaughn, M., Scales, R. Q., Gallagher, M. A., Parsons, A. W., Davis, S. G., Pierczynski, M., & Allen, M. (2018). Teachers' instructional adaptations: A research synthesis. Review of Educational Research, 88(2), 205–242. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317743198

[51] Pit-ten Cate, I. M., Markova, M., Krischler, M., & Krolak-Schwerdt, S. (2018). Promoting inclusive education: The role of teachers' competence and attitudes. Insights into Learning Disabilities, 15(1), 49–63.

[52] Reyna, S. D. (2019). A qualitative case study of teachers' perceptions of professional learning communities as effective teacher professional development for teaching and learning [PhD Thesis, Grand Canyon University]. https://bit.ly/3YYnnig

[53] Reynolds, C. R., Altmann, R. A., & Allen, D. N. (2021). The problem of bias in psychological assessment. In C. R. Reynolds, R. A. Altmann, & D. N. Allen, Mastering Modern Psychological Testing (pp. 573–613). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59455-8_15

[54] Rowan, L., Bourke, T., L'Estrange, L., Lunn Brownlee, J., Ryan, M., Walker, S., & Churchward, P. (2021). How does initial teacher education research frame the challenge of preparing future teachers for student diversity in schools? A Systematic Review of Literature. Review of Educational Research, 91(1), 112–158. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320979171

[55] Saloviita, T. (2020a). Attitudes of teachers towards inclusive education in Finland. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 64(2), 270–282. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2018.1541819

[56] Saloviita, T. (2020b). Teacher attitudes towards the inclusion of students with support needs. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 20(1), 64–73. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12466

[57] Shaeffer, S. (2019). Inclusive education: A prerequisite for equity and social justice. Asia Pacific Education Review, 20(2), 181–192. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-019-09598-w

[58] Slee, R. (2018). Defining the scope of inclusive education. http://repositorio.minedu.gob.pe/handle/20.500.12799/5977

[59] Sleeter, C. E. (2018). Why is there learning disabilities:A critical analysis of the birth of the field in its social context. In The formation of school subjects (pp. 210–237). Routledge. https://bit.ly/3YAQgPW

[60] Solheim, K., Roland, P., & Ertesvåg, S. K. (2018). Teachers' perceptions of their collective and individual learning regarding classroom interaction. Educational Research, 60(4), 459–477. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2018.1533790

[61] Staddon, J. (2021). Theoretical Behaviorism. In D. Zilio & K. Carrara (Eds.), Contemporary Behaviorisms in Debate (pp. 79–95). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77395-3_7

[62] Sullivan, A. L., Sadeh, S., & Houri, A. K. (2019). Are school psychologists' special education eligibility decisions reliable and unbiased?: A multi-study experimental investigation. Journal of School Psychology, 77, 90–109.

[63] Umma, M. S., & Zahana, M. F. (2021). Factors affecting the work life balance: Study among the teachers of a government school in Sri Lanka. Journal of Management, 15(2). https://jm.sljol.info/articles/7604

[64] Welsh, R. O., & Little, S. (2018). The school discipline dilemma: A comprehensive review of disparities and alternative approaches. Review of Educational Research, 88(5), 752–794. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318791582

[65] Wilson, D., & Conyers, M. (2020). Five big ideas for effective teaching: Connecting mind, brain, and education research to classroom practice. Teachers College Press. https://bit.ly/4fCwH0C

[66] Woodgate, R. L., Gonzalez, M., Demczuk, L., Snow, W. M., Barriage, S., & Kirk, S. (2020). How do peers promote social inclusion of children with disabilities?A mixed-methods systematic review. Disability and Rehabilitation, 42(18), 2553–2579. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2018.1561955

[67] Wulandary, D., & Herlisa, H. (2018). Parent involvement in schooling processes: A case study in aceh. Sukma: Jurnal Pendidikan, 2(1), 25–65.

[68] Yeo, L. S., Chong, W. H., Neihart, M. F., & Huan, V. S. (2019). Teachers' experience with inclusive education in Singapore. In Teachers' Perceptions, Experience and Learning (pp. 68–82). Routledge. https://bit.ly/40mPs42