

Implementation of Inclusive Education Among Secondary Schools in Lingayen, Pangasinan, Philippines

Randy F. Soriano, PhD¹, Sheryn Q. Alcala², Mae Anne H. Castro³, Robie May C. Escanilla⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Pangasinan State University, Lingayen Campus

Abstract- *The study “Implementation of Inclusive Education Among Secondary Schools in Lingayen, Pangasinan, Philippines” examined how inclusive education is applied in public secondary schools and identified challenges faced by learners with disabilities. Despite existing national policies like the Inclusive Education Act and DepEd Orders, a gap remains between policy and classroom implementation. The research involved 33 junior high school teachers, selected through convenience sampling, and utilized a structured survey questionnaire with statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, average weighted mean, and Pearson Chi-square test. It assessed the level of inclusive education implementation in terms of academic progress, social and psychological support, and school physical facilities while also analyzing the extent of challenges teachers face. Findings revealed that while social and psychological support had the highest implementation, academic progress, and physical facilities were only moderately addressed, highlighting persistent difficulties. Key issues included the lack of trained SPED personnel, inconsistent school policies, large class sizes, insufficient training, and minimal parental involvement. Despite these difficulties, results showed no significant relationship between teachers' demographic profiles and the implementation level, indicating shared experiences across educators. The study emphasized the need for regular teacher training, improved resources, and stronger collaboration among school administrators, parents, and policymakers to enhance inclusive education. An intervention plan focusing on continuous teacher training, resource development, and stakeholder collaboration was recommended to bridge gaps and improve learning opportunities for differently-abled students.*

Keywords – *Implementation, Inclusive Education, Differently-abled students, Lingayen, Pangasinan, Philippines*

INTRODUCTION

Education is a fundamental human right that should be accessible to all individuals, including those with physical disabilities. Inclusive education ensures that all students, regardless of their abilities, receive equal learning opportunities. However, the reality is different for many. According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2021), over 90% of children with disabilities in developing countries do not attend school due to systemic barriers. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2022) further reports that children with disabilities are more likely to experience exclusion from mainstream education due to physical inaccessibility, lack of trained teachers, and inadequate learning materials. In rural areas such as Domalandan Lingayen, Pangasinan, where educational resources are often limited, physically challenged youths face significant challenges in accessing quality education.

The issue of educational access for students with disabilities is not only a local concern but a global one. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) emphasizes that all individuals, regardless of physical or cognitive conditions, have the right to an education that accommodates their needs. Despite this, data from the Global Education Monitoring Report indicate that children with disabilities in many countries face higher dropout rates and lower academic performance compared to their non-disabled peers. These disparities are primarily caused by structural barriers such as inaccessible school buildings, lack of assistive technologies, and inadequate teacher training.

By focusing on the distinct context of the western barangays of Lingayen, this study aims to fill the existing

gap in the literature, providing detailed insights that can lead to more effective, localized strategies for inclusive education. We hope that this research will not only contribute to academic discourse but also serve as a catalyst for change, ensuring that all students, regardless of their abilities, have equal opportunities to thrive academically and socially. Ultimately, this study aspires to promote genuine educational equity and enhance the welfare of all learners in our community.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to examine the level of implementation of inclusive education for the educational needs of differently-abled students. Specifically, this research sought to find the answers to the following questions:

1. To determine the profile of the respondents in terms of: age, highest educational attainment, academic rank, size of school, and numbers of seminars attended related to inclusive education.
2. To determine the level of implementation of inclusive education for differently-abled students in terms of: school physical facilities, social and psychological support; and academic progress.
3. To determine the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered in implementing inclusive education, particularly in terms of: school-related, teaching-related, and student-related.

4. To determine if there is a significant relationship between the teachers' level of implementation of inclusive education across their profile.
5. An interval plan will be proposed to enhance the implementation of inclusive education for differently-abled students.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The researchers employed quantitative research methods. This form of research entails applying orderly instruments like surveys, questionnaires, and devices that capture numeric data.

The research utilized convenience sampling in selecting the respondents, 33 junior high school teachers from two schools in Lingayen, Pangasinan. Precisely, 14 teachers belonged to Estanza National High School, and 19 teachers came from Domalandan Center Integrated School.

The researchers utilized survey questionnaires as an instrument for data collection. The Likert scale is a prevalent rating scale researchers use to measure behavior and attitudes quantitatively. It consists of choices that range from one extreme to another, from where respondents choose the degree of their opinions. Furthermore, the questionnaire was accessible via Google Forms for simplified distribution. The questionnaire is divided into four sections. The first section gathers personal information of the graduates, such as their age, highest educational attainment, academic rank, school size, and number of seminars attended related to inclusive education. The second section focuses on to what extent the respondents assess the level of implementation of inclusive education. It was divided into three parts namely school physical facilities, social and psychological support and academic progress. Lastly, the third section consists of the different problems that they have encountered in implementing inclusive education particularly in terms of school-related, teaching-related and student-related issues.

Moreover, the researchers followed several steps to collect the necessary data for the study effectively. The data-gathering process began with identifying the barangay with the highest number of differently-abled students across eight barangays in the western portion of Lingayen, Pangasinan, with assistance from local government officials. Researchers then developed a validated questionnaire checklist and sought permission from selected schools, notably Domalandan Center Integrated School and Estanza National High School, to conduct the study among junior high school teachers. After receiving approval, researchers obtained respondents' consent, clarified key terms, and explained the significance of their participation. Data was collected using questionnaires and Google Forms, followed by recording, tallying, and analysis. Finally, the gathered information was carefully evaluated and interpreted to address the study's research questions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 1
Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of the Respondents

Variables	Categories	F	%
Age	26-30 years old	4	12.12
	31-35 years old	6	18.18
	36-40 years old	5	15.15
	41-45 years old	7	21.21
	46-50 years old	6	18.18
	51-55 years old	5	15.15
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor's Degree	7	21.21
	Master's Degree	15	34.88
	Master's with Academic Units	6	18.18
	Doctorate Degree	2	6.06
	Doctorate with Academic Units	3	9.09
Academic Rank	Teacher I	6	18.18
	Teacher II	5	15.15
	Teacher III	14	42.42
	Master Teacher I	3	9.09
	Master Teacher II	3	9.09
	Master Teacher III	2	6.06
Size of School	Medium	19	57.58
	Large	14	42.42
Number of Seminars Attended	0-2	16	48.48
	3-5	9	27.27
	6-9	5	15.15
	10-above	3	8.82

Age. From survey results, the respondents were classified based on age group through frequency and percentage distribution. The most significant number of respondents are in the 41-45 age group (21.21%), and (12.12%) of the respondents are in the 26-30 age group. This indicates that the majority age cohort of teachers in Lingayen, Pangasinan is mid-career professionals, emphasizing the existence of mature educators who have worked for many years.

This view is supported by a study by Ingersoll and Merrill (2021), which noted that retention rates are highest among teachers in their 40s and early 50s, having already overcome early-career difficulties and gained stability in the field. This attests that the education sector of Lingayen be made up of experienced professionals who contribute significantly towards sustaining quality teaching and learning.

Highest Educational Attainment. Survey findings show that 34.88% possess a Master's Degree, while only 6.06% have a Doctorate Degree. Increased education among educators is associated with enhanced teaching practices and student performance. A study conducted by Darling-Hammond (2020) says teachers with postgraduate education engage in more effective teaching practices, use evidence-

based practices, and exhibit greater expertise than teachers with a bachelor's degree only.

Academic Rank. The rank that is most frequently cited by respondents is Teacher III (42.42%), and the lowest is Master Teacher III (6.06%). The presence of Teacher III teachers indicates that most respondents have experienced training and promotions, a sign of school support for professional growth.

As Wong & Li (2019) observe, teachers who attain advanced ranks tend to take leadership positions, make additions to curriculum enhancement, and mentor less experienced educators, resulting in general improvements in the performance of schools.

Size of School. Most of respondents teach in medium-sized schools (57.58%), while large-sized schools accommodate 42.42% of them. Medium-sized schools typically foster a more balanced teacher-student ratio, which allows educators to focus on individualized instruction.

According to Rice (2016), class sizes affect student engagement, whereas medium-sized schools often demonstrate better student-teacher relationships, leading to more personalized learning experiences.

Number of Seminars attended related to Inclusive Education. Survey results show that 48.48% of respondents have attended only 0-2 seminars on inclusive education, while 8.82% have only attended nine above workshops.

Limited seminar attendance indicates a gap in professional development related to inclusivity. Studies by Florian & Black-Hawkins (2021) suggest that regular exposure to inclusive education training enhances teachers' ability to accommodate diverse learning needs, particularly for students with disabilities and special education requirements. The data implies that more training opportunities should be provided to strengthen teachers' skills in inclusive education.

Table 2
Level of implementation of inclusive education in terms of School Physical Facilities

School Physical Facilities	Mean	DE
1 Emergency evacuation plans include specific procedures for ensuring the safety of students with disabilities.	3.88	HI
2 Classrooms are thoughtfully arranged to give students with mobility needs enough space to move around comfortably, and participate fully in activities.	3.79	HI
3 School facilities undergo regular maintenance to ensure they remain safe and accessible for all students.	3.76	HI
4 The school provides accessible infrastructure, such as ramps and restrooms, to accommodate students with disabilities.	3.52	HI
5 Classrooms are designed with proper lighting, minimal noise, and comfortable seating to create a	3.48	HI

supportive environment for students with different learning needs.	3.18	MI
6 Pathways and entrances are wheelchair-friendly, making it easier for students with disabilities to move around the school comfortably and independently.	2.79	MI
7 Visual and auditory cues, such as signages and sound systems, are installed to assist students with sensory impairments.	2.52	SI
8 Assistive devices are available such as braille books, digital tools, and large-print materials to accommodate different learning needs.	3.36	MI
Overall Mean	3.36	MI

Table 2 shows that the highest mean score of 3.88 (HI) obtained by the indicator "Emergency evacuation plans include specific procedures for ensuring the safety of students with disabilities." On the other hand, the indicator "Assistive devices are available such as braille books, digital tools, and large-print materials to accommodate different learning needs" received the lowest mean score of 2.52 (SI).

According to Wolf-Fordham et al. (2015), children with disabilities are highly vulnerable to disaster impacts. This revealed that while parents of children with developmental disabilities recognize the importance of emergency preparedness, they often remain underprepared. Similarly, Ahmad (2015) emphasized that while inclusive education advocates equal learning opportunities, the lack of efficient and available assistive technologies remains a significant problem, particularly in developing regions. His work pointed out that these limitations prevent students with disabilities from engaging fully and independently in the classroom environment.

Table 3
Level of implementation of inclusive education in terms of Social and Psychological Support

Social and Psychological Support	Mean	DE
1 The school promotes an inclusive and respectful environment where all students feel valued and accepted.	4.45	VHI
2 Students are encouraged to interact with their peers through group activities that help build friendships and create a supportive learning environment.	4.42	VHI
3 Student-led initiatives and support groups are encouraged to promote inclusivity and peer mentoring.	4.24	VHI
4 Effective anti-bullying measures are in place to protect students with disabilities from discrimination and social stigma.	4.24	VHI
5 Teachers and staff are trained to create a positive and supportive social environment for all students.	4.12	HI
6 Differently-abled students are given equal opportunities to participate in extracurricular activities, including sports, clubs, and school events.	4.09	HI
7 Awareness programs on inclusivity and disability rights is conducted	3.94	HI

regularly to educate students and staff.

8 Parents and guardians are involved in social inclusion efforts through workshops and community engagement activities.

Overall Mean 4.15 HI

Table 3 presents the level of implementation of inclusive education in terms of the social-physical facilities. The highest-rated indicator was “The school promotes an inclusive and respectful environment where all students feel valued and accepted,” with a mean score of 4.45 (VHI). Meanwhile, the lowest-rated, although still highly implemented, was “Parents and guardians are involved in social inclusion efforts through workshops and community engagement activities,” with a mean of 3.70 (HI).

The highest-rated indicator, promoting an inclusive and respectful environment, affirms the findings of Shogren et al. (2015), who emphasized that students with and without disabilities perceive a sense of belonging as critical to their positive school experiences. Their study revealed that inclusive school cultures characterized by acceptance, mutual respect, and cooperative learning positively influenced student outcomes. Similarly, the strong performance of peer interaction initiatives aligns with their identification of social inclusion through structured peer engagements—such as group activities and mentoring—as key practices that foster social competence and academic participation.

On the other hand, the relatively lower score for parental and community involvement, while still within the "Highly Implemented" range, suggests a possible gap between school-based inclusion practices and broader community engagement. This resonates with the findings of Soresi, Nota, and Wehmeyer (2011), who emphasized the essential role of families and community members in promoting social inclusion, participation, and self-determination. Ruhela (2024) further supports this view, highlighting that parental involvement not only enhances inclusivity but also bridges the home-school connection, ensuring that educational practices align with the values and needs of the wider community.

Table 4
Level of implementation of inclusive education in terms of Academic Progress

Academic Progress	Mean	DE
1 Assessments are adapted to allow students multiple ways to demonstrate their understanding, such as oral exams or project-based evaluations.	3.79	HI
2 Additional academic support, including tutoring, mentoring, and remedial sessions, is available for students who require extra assistance.	3.76	HI
3 The school implements Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities.	3.70	HI
4 Regular progress monitoring and feedback is provided to students	3.70	HI

with disabilities to track their academic development.

5 Teachers are provided with training on inclusive teaching strategies to effectively support diverse learners.

6 Classroom instruction incorporates multisensory teaching methods to engage students with different learning styles.

7 Special education professionals collaborate with teachers to provide additional support for students with learning difficulties.

8 Learning resources, such as braille books, digital tools, and large-print materials, are available to accommodate different learning needs.

Overall Mean 3.55 HI

Table 4 reveals that the highest mean score of 3.76 (HI) is achieved by the indicator “Additional academic support, including tutoring, mentoring, and remedial sessions, is available for students who require extra assistance.” On the other hand, the lowest score is recorded by “Classroom instruction incorporates multisensory teaching methods to engage students with different learning styles,” with a mean of 1.82 (SI).

The highest-rated indicator, “Additional academic support, including tutoring, mentoring, and remedial sessions, is available for students who require extra assistance,” aligns with the findings of Lipka et al. (2019) that a support model characterized by small class sizes, mentoring, and adjusted teaching practices positively impacted students’ perceptions of their learning experiences. Their study found that structured academic support services, when thoughtfully implemented, helped students overcome barriers and contributed significantly to their independence and educational outcomes.

Conversely, the lowest-rated indicator, “Classroom instruction incorporates multisensory teaching methods to engage students with different learning styles,” had a mean score of 1.82 (SI). Stephenson and Carter (2021) stressed that multisensory teaching can significantly enhance literacy outcomes in students with learning disabilities but requires proper teacher training and institutional support for effective implementation. The study demonstrated that students taught through multisensory techniques significantly outperformed their peers, highlighting the need for broader adoption of such strategies.

Table 5
Summary of the level of implementation of inclusive education among selected secondary schools (School Physical Facilities, Social and Psychological Support, and Academic Progress)
n=33

Indicators	Mean	DE
Social and Psychological Support	4.15	HI
Academic Progress	3.55	MI
School Physical Facilities	3.36	HI
Overall Mean	3.69	HI

As shown in the table above, it is evident that Academic Progress received the lowest mean score of 3.55 (Moderately Implemented) as compared to the School Physical Facilities and Social and Psychological Support, which were both rated as Highly Implemented. This indicates that while schools are making commendable efforts in supporting the physical environment and building social relationships for differently-abled students, they still face problems in fully addressing academic needs. The result suggests gaps in providing effective learning strategies and curriculum adjustments that can genuinely help these learners succeed in school.

Hosshan et al. (2020) highlighted that in Southeast Asia, most research and practice have concentrated on inputs and processes such as teacher preparation, resource availability, and collaboration. However, they found a lack of attention to outcomes—particularly academic performance. This shows a clear need for educational institutions to shift their focus toward evaluating whether students with special needs are truly learning and progressing in inclusive settings.

Table 6
Degree of seriousness of the problems encountered in the implementation of inclusive education in terms of school-related

School-related	Mean	DE
1 Insufficient special education teachers.	4.00	HS
2 Lack of collaboration between teachers and SPED experts.	4.00	HS
3 Limited access to assistive technology for students with disabilities.	3.94	HS
4 Lack of budget for inclusive education programs.	3.94	HS
5 Lack of clear policies and guidelines for implementing inclusive education.	3.85	HS
6 Insufficient teacher training programs on inclusive education.	3.82	HS
7 Insufficient support staff, such as teacher aides or therapists.	3.76	HS
8 Overcrowded classrooms make it difficult to cater to diverse needs.	3.76	HS
Overall Mean	3.87	HS

Based on the findings presented in Table 6, it is evident that the indicator “Insufficient special education teachers” and “Lack of collaboration between teachers and SPED experts” have both received the highest mean score of 4.00 (Highly Serious). While the indicator “Insufficient support staff, such as teacher aides or therapists” and “Overcrowded classrooms make it difficult to cater to diverse needs” has both gained the lowest mean score of 3.76 (Highly Serious).

The findings presented here specially, the indicator “Insufficient special education teachers” and “Lack of collaboration between teachers and SPED experts”, has received the highest mean score of 4.00 (Highly Serious), corroborate the study conducted by Abodunrin, S. A., & Lawal, A. A. (2023), which examined planning and budgeting for inclusive education for students with visual impairments in Oyo State, Nigeria. The researchers

highlighted that one of the most critical gaps in inclusive education systems is the shortage of qualified special education teachers, especially those with the expertise to support students with specific disabilities, such as visual impairment. Their study emphasized that even when schools have the will to implement inclusive programs, the absence of skilled professionals makes meaningful inclusion practically unachievable.

On the other hand, the indicators “Insufficient support staff, such as teacher aides or therapists” and “Overcrowded classrooms make it difficult to cater to diverse needs” both gained the lowest mean score of 3.76 (Highly Serious) was also reinforced by the study conducted by Lopez-Gavira, Morina, and Morgado (2021), which examined barriers to inclusive education from the perspectives of students with disabilities and disability support service staff in higher education. Their research revealed that the shortage of support personnel—such as aides, note-takers, therapists, and academic mentors—led to significant gaps in the educational experiences of students with disabilities. The absence of these critical support roles resulted in students not receiving individualized accommodations, thereby undermining the principle of equity in inclusive education.

Table 7
Degree of seriousness of the problems encountered in the implementation of inclusive education in terms of teaching-related

Teaching-related	Mean	DE
1 Managing students with special needs in a large class is challenging.	3.85	HS
2 Difficulty in adjusting lessons for different learning needs.	3.82	HS
3 Limited professional development opportunities on inclusive teaching strategies.	3.82	HS
4 Not enough time to prepare adaptive materials.	3.79	HS
5 Additional workload due to lesson modifications.	3.76	HS
6 Teachers feel unprepared to handle inclusive classrooms.	3.76	HS
7 Difficulty in assessing the progress of students with disabilities.	3.70	HS
8 Lack of collaboration time with other teachers to share best practices.	3.58	HS
Overall Mean	3.76	HS

The data in Table 7 clearly show that the indicator “Managing students with special needs in a large class is challenging” has received the highest mean score of 3.85 (Highly Serious). Furthermore, the indicator “Lack of collaboration time with other teachers to share best practices” received the lowest mean score of 3.58 (Highly Serious).

This finding is supported by Bryant, Bryant, and Smith (2019), who explored strategies for teaching students with special needs in inclusive classrooms. In their work, they emphasized that classroom management becomes significantly more difficult when class sizes are large. They identified that in larger classes, teachers struggle to provide individualized instruction and tailored behavioral support

that students with special needs require. Additionally, when the teacher's attention is divided among many students, the risk of overlooking or mismanaging the needs of students with disabilities increases.

Additionally, the indicator "Lack of collaboration time with other teachers to share best practices" had the lowest mean score of 3.85, reflecting teachers' perception that the limited opportunity to collaborate and exchange effective teaching strategies poses a significant barrier to successfully implementing inclusive education. This problem is similarly highlighted in the study by Lofthouse and Thomas (2017), which explored teachers' views on collaborative partnerships in enhancing teaching practices. Their findings emphasized that collaboration among educators plays a crucial role in professional development by enabling the exchange of strategies, resources, and ideas to improve instruction. Nevertheless, they identified the absence of allocated time for meaningful dialogue and joint planning as a significant barrier to effective collaboration.

Table 8
Degree of seriousness of the problems encountered in the implementation of inclusive education in terms of student-related

Student-related	Mean	DE
1 Some students face social stigma or bullying.	3.97	HS
2 Parents of students with special needs are not always cooperative.	3.91	HS
3 Behavioral issues make classroom management more challenging.	3.91	HS
4 Difficulty in engaging students with learning disabilities.	3.88	HS
5 Difficulty in transitioning students with special needs to higher grade levels.	3.88	HS
6 Language and communication barriers for students with speech impairments.	3.76	HS
7 Lack of motivation among some students with disabilities.	3.73	HS
8 Inconsistent attendance among students with disabilities due to health concerns.	3.48	HS
Overall Mean	3.81	HS

Table 8 provides evidence that the indicator "Some students face social stigma or bullying" gained the highest mean score of 3.97 (Highly Serious). This aligns with the findings of Chatzitheochari and Butler-Rees (2023), who carried out an intersectional analysis of the school experiences of disabled youth in the UK. Their research uncovered widespread issues of social stigma and marginalization affecting students with disabilities, particularly when compounded by factors like social class. The study showed that these students frequently internalize harmful stereotypes and experience peer exclusion, which can have lasting effects on their self-esteem, sense of identity, and academic involvement.

Moreover, the indicator "Inconsistent attendance among students with disabilities due to health concerns" received

the lowest mean score of 3.48 (Highly Serious). According to the study of Allison, M. A., Attisha, E., et al. (2019), health conditions such as asthma, diabetes, and mental health disorders like anxiety and depression are significant factors leading to increased absenteeism among the students with disabilities. The authors argue that excused and unexcused absences can disrupt learning and are associated with long-term negative outcomes, including lower academic achievement and poorer health in adulthood. The policy statement underscores the importance of a collaborative approach involving pediatricians, educators, and families to address the health-related causes of absenteeism. Pediatricians are encouraged to routinely inquire about school attendance during medical visits and to work with schools to develop strategies that support students' health and consistent attendance. By recognizing chronic absenteeism as an indicator of underlying health and social issues, stakeholders can implement targeted interventions aimed at improving both educational and health outcomes for students with disabilities.

Table 9
Summary of the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered in the implementation of inclusive education (School-related, teaching-related and, student-related)
n=33

Indicators	Mean	DE
School-related	3.87	HS
Student-related	3.81	HS
Teaching-related	3.76	HS
Overall Mean	3.81	HS

As shown in the table above, it is evident that the teaching problems had garnered the lowest mean score of 3.76 (Highly Serious) as compared to school-related and student-related, which were both rated as highly serious which indicate that teachers face significant barriers across multiple dimensions when delivering inclusive education. This mirrors the findings of Kuyini, Desai, and Sharma (2020), who investigated teachers' self-efficacy, attitudes, and concerns in Ghana. Their study concluded that the successful implementation of inclusive education largely relies on support at the school level. They highlighted key barriers such as insufficient funding, a lack of trained special education staff, and limited access to professional development and collaboration opportunities—all of which undermine teachers' confidence and preparedness to adopt inclusive teaching practices.

Alongside the study of Thapaliya, M. (2023) explored comparable problems in Nepal, stressing that inclusive education cannot be fully achieved without addressing fundamental structural issues within the school system. The study revealed that many schools are deficient in essential resources for inclusion, such as assistive devices, trained support personnel, and well-defined administrative structures. It particularly highlighted that the gap between policy and practice, driven by vague guidelines and a lack of

practical planning at the school level, hinders the transition of inclusive education from theory to practical implementation. Additionally, Crispel, O., & Kasperski, R. (2021), emphasize that teacher training in special education plays a pivotal role in successful inclusion. Their research showed that teachers with formal training in inclusive strategies demonstrated greater confidence and effectiveness in applying inclusive practices within mainstream classrooms.

Table 10
Significant relationship between respondents' level of implementation and profile using Pearson Chi-square test of association

Profile	Level of Implementation	Significance/ Alpha Level	Interpretation
Age	Physical	.334	Not Significant
	Social	.120	Not Significant
	Academic	.670	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Physical	.365	Not Significant
	Social	.816	Not Significant
	Academic	.773	Not Significant
Academic Rank	Physical	.844	Not Significant
	Social	.167	Not Significant
	Academic	.564	Not Significant
Size of School	Physical	.170	Not Significant
	Social	.078	Not Significant
	Academic	.115	Not Significant
No. Of Seminars Attended	Physical	.178	Not Significant
	Social	.115	Not Significant
	Academic	.488	Not Significant

The result of the Pearson Chi-square test revealed that there is no significant relationship between the respondent's profile variables and their level of implementation in the physical, social, and academic domains. Specifically, the p-values for age were 0.334 (physical), 0.120 (social), and 0.670 (academic). For the highest educational attainment, 0.365 (physical), 0.816 (social), and 0.773 (academic). For academic rank were 0.844 (physical), 0.167 (social), and 0.564 (academic). While for the size of school 0.170 (physical), 0.078 (social), and 0.115 (academic). And the number of seminars attended were 0.178 (physical), 0.115 (social), and 0.488 (academic). These values indicate that they do not significantly influence the degree to which they implement activities in the domains mentioned above. This finding suggests that the level of implementation is not dependent on or affected by these demographic and professional characteristics.

Therefore, the practices and approaches applied by the respondents in implementing physical, social, and academic initiatives appear to be relatively consistent, regardless of their background or professional profile. It was also supported by the study of Olayvar, S. R. (2022), using data from 187 teachers in SDO-City of Malolos. The analysis showed that variables such as age, sex, length of service, and experience with students with disabilities had weak and non-

significant correlations with teachers' implementation of inclusive education.

Additionally, Triviño-Amigo (2022), implies that as teachers get older or gain more experience, their perceived readiness for inclusion tends to decline, highlighting the need to implement strategies that enhance their skills and preparedness in this area. The study also shows that there is a large percentage of teachers who believe that their initial training is insufficient to deal with student diversity. In addition, most of them state that continuous training has helped them to improve inclusive education and that they would be willing to attend training courses on inclusion. However, in secondary school, the predisposition is lower than in high school. Moreover, Masongsong, J. M., et al. (2023), found no significant correlation between teachers' academic rank and educational attainment and their level of implementation of inclusive education. This indicates that having a higher academic qualification does not necessarily predict more effective inclusive education practices.

The results suggest that these common demographic and professional characteristics do not play a decisive role in determining how inclusive practices are applied in classrooms. In other words, whether a teacher is young or experienced, holds a higher academic rank, or works in a large or small school does not significantly influence how they implement inclusive education. This finding challenges the assumption that teacher effectiveness in inclusive settings can be predicted based on their background or qualifications.

PROPOSED INTERVENTION PLAN BREAKING BARRIERS: STRENGTHENING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION FOR DIFFERENTLY-ABLED STUDENTS

I. Rationale

Inclusive education provides everyone, regardless of ability, with equal access to quality education. In Lingayen, Pangasinan, differently-abled students experience several hindrances, such as inadequate resources, the unavailability of specialized teacher training, and limited public and peer awareness. Unless an efficient system is designed, these students might be unable to join in learning activities effectively, and there would be voids in academic and social integration.

This intervention plan may enhance the implementation of inclusive education in addressing these issues. Through special teacher training, enhanced instructional materials, and increased community involvement, this initiative aims to establish a learning setting that supports accessibility, empathy, and equal opportunity for all learners. By facilitating cooperation among educators, parents, and stakeholders, this program will help foster a more inclusive education sector where

differently-abled students are empowered to achieve their maximum potential.

II. General Objectives

1. To provide teachers with advanced training on inclusive education approaches specific to differently-abled students.
2. To create adaptive learning content and suggest assistive technologies that promote greater classroom access.
3. To raise awareness and promote acceptance among peers through advocacy efforts and interactive sessions.
4. To enhance collaboration among schools, parents, and local government units in implementing inclusive education policies and programs.
5. To evaluate and improve inclusive education practices continuously based on student performance and stakeholder feedback.

III. Proposed Intervention Plan

Breaking Barriers: Strengthening Inclusive Education for Differently-abled Students

Community and Institutional Partnerships for Inclusive Education	To build and sustain collaborative partnerships to support the implementation and sustainability of inclusive education initiatives.	- Inclusive Education Awareness Campaigns - Community Dialogues and Stakeholder Forums - Mentorship and Support Programs	- Parents and Guardians - Teachers - School Administrators - Local Government Unit - Local Community Leaders	All Year Round
Empower Differently-abled Learners and Promote Self-Advocacy	To support the personal growth, leadership, and confidence of differently-abled learners by encouraging self-expression and participation.	- Self-Advocacy and Leadership Workshops - Student-Led Forums and Clubs - Talent Showcases and Inclusion Days - Mentoring by Role Models with Disabilities	- Differently-abled Learners - Peer Mentors - Teachers - Local Government Unit - Local Community Leaders	All Year Round

Areas of Improvement	Objectives	Activities	Persons Involved	Time Frame
Awareness and acceptance of differently-abled learners among peers and in the community.	To promote understanding and inclusion through advocacy and engagement activities	Organize Peer Coaching/Facilitating Education Programs School-wide awareness campaigns	-Teachers -School Administrators -Students -Parents -Local Government Units	All year round
Weak parental and guardian involvement in social inclusion	To strengthen and build partnerships that support inclusive education initiatives	School-wide awareness campaigns Community Dialogues	-Parents/Guardians -Teachers -School Administrators -Local Government Units -Local Community Leaders	All year round

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the thorough review and analyses, the following are therefore conclude:

1. The demographic profile of the teachers in Lingayen, Pangasinan, reveals that the majority are mid-career professionals, predominantly holding master's degrees, with most teaching in medium to large-sized schools. However, participation in seminars related to inclusive education remains limited, highlighting the need for more professional development opportunities focused on inclusion.
2. The level of implementation of inclusive education in terms of social and psychological support is highly implemented, indicating a strong culture of respect and acceptance in schools. The academic and school physical facilities are moderately to highly implemented, but gaps persist in areas such as assistive technology, adaptive learning resources, and specialized instructional strategies.
3. Teachers face severe problems in implementing inclusive education. These include school-related issues (insufficient SPED personnel and unclear policies), teaching-related barriers (large class

sizes, lack of training and time for adaptation), and student-related difficulties (social stigma, behavior issues, and inconsistent parental support).

4. There is no significant relationship between the demographic profile of the respondents and their level of implementation of inclusive education. This suggests that inclusive practices and the problems encountered are consistent across age, educational attainment, academic rank, school size, and seminar attendance.
5. An intervention plan is essential to strengthen the implementation of inclusive education for differently-abled students. This should focus on training, resource provision, community involvement, and continuous evaluation to close the gaps identified in the physical, social, and academic dimensions.

In the light of the conclusions, the following recommendations are hereby advanced:

1. It is recommended that schools and divisions initiate more focused and sustained professional development for teachers, particularly in inclusive education. Since many teachers have attended only a few seminars, regular capacity-building sessions on inclusive strategies and SPED fundamentals would help strengthen their competence and confidence in handling diverse learners.
2. To address the remaining gaps in physical and academic support, schools should improve access to assistive technologies and learning materials tailored for differently-abled students. Resources such as braille books, digital tools, and inclusive classroom layouts would help ensure that physical accessibility are matched by meaningful academic participation.
3. Given the serious problems teachers face—such as overcrowded classrooms, limited time for lesson modification, and lack of collaboration—school administrators and policymakers should consider providing additional workforce support, more straightforward guidelines, and more time for teachers to plan inclusive lessons collaboratively.
4. Since the study found no significant link between teacher profiles and their level of inclusive implementation, a unified strategy across schools may be more effective. This includes developing school-wide policies, resource-sharing systems, and standardized protocols that ensure consistent

and equitable application of inclusive education practices.

5. Finally, the proposed intervention plan must be supported and sustained through strong partnerships with parents, local government units, and community stakeholders. Regular feedback, monitoring, and reflection should be built into the program to ensure that inclusive education is not only implemented, but continuously improved based on the evolving needs of differently-abled students.

REFERENCES

Electronic Sources (Journal Articles)

Triviño-Amigo, N., Barrios-Fernandez, S., Mañanas-Iglesias, C., Carlos-Vivas, J., Mendoza-Muñoz, M., Adsuar, J. C., ... & Rojo-Ramos, J. (2022).

Spanish teachers' perceptions of their preparation for inclusive education: the relationship between age and years of teaching experience. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 19(9), 5750. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=No+significant+relationship+of+teacher%27s+age+in+their+level+of+implementation+of+inclusive+education+across+physical%2C+social%2C+and+academic+domains&btnG=#d=gs_qabs&t=1748139337009&u=%23p%3DML7Hpeky0MQJ

Bryant, D. P., Bryant, B. R., & Smith, D. D. (2019). *Teaching students with special needs in inclusive classrooms*. Sage Publications. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED602411>

Lofthouse, R., & Thomas, U. (2017). Concerning collaboration: teachers' perspectives on working in partnerships to develop teaching practices. *Professional development in education*, 43(1), 36-56. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1128358>

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://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1297265>

Baş, G. (2022). Factors influencing teacher efficacy in inclusive education. *Australasian Journal of Special and Inclusive Education*, 46(1), 19-32.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355288728_Factors_Influencing_Teacher_Efficacy_in_Inclusive_Education

(Forlin et al., 2017).
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236029132_The_Sentiments_Attitudes_and_Concerns_about_Inclusive_Education_Revised_SACIE-R_scale_for_measuring_teachers'_perceptions_about_inclusion

Chatzitheochari, S., & Butler-Rees, A. (2023). Disability, social class and, stigma: An intersectional analysis of disabled young people's school experiences. *Sociology*, 57(5), 1156-1174.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0038038522113710>

Kuyini, A. B., Desai, I., & Sharma, U. (2020). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes and, concerns about implementing inclusive education in Ghana. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(14), 1509-1526.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329407039_Teachers'_self-efficacy_beliefs_attitudes_and_concerns_about_implementing_inclusive_education_in_Ghana

Ebi, C. (2022). Challenges and opportunities in inclusive education in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education and Development*, 58(2), 112-127.

Electronic Sources (Webpages)

Walker, L. (n.d.). Impact of Academic Support Centers on Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Institutions.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1095784>

Galaterou, J., & Antoniou, A. (n.d.). Teachers' Attitudes towards Inclusive Education: The Role of Job Stressors and Demographic Parameters.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1184123>

Global Partnership for Education. (2021). Education and disability: A global perspective.
<https://www.globalpartnership.org>

International Disability Alliance. (2022). Global report on disability and education.
<https://www.internationaldisabilityalliance.org>

Philippine Statistics Authority. (2020). Functional literacy, education, and mass media survey. <https://psa.gov.ph>

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. (2021). Global education monitoring report 2021: Inclusion and education. <https://en.unesco.org/gem-report/>

Department of Education. (2013). Implementing rules and regulations (IRR) of Republic Act No. 10533, or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (DepEd Order No. 43, s. 2013). Retrieved from https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/DO_s2013_43.pdf