# Challenges in the Delivery System of the Inclusive Education Program in Selected Public Schools: Basis for a Proposed Intervention Plan

**Leanie R. Cabuyao[1],***

[1]Department of Education, Tayabas East Central School, Schools Division of Tayabas, Quezon Province, Philippines.
leanie.cabuyao@deped.gov.ph[1]

*Corresponding author

**Abstract:** The paper is anchored on a comprehensive theoretical framework that integrates Ecological Systems Theory, which considers the various environmental contexts influencing a child's development; Inclusive Pedagogy, which guided the creation of flexible learning environments; and Self-Efficacy Theory, as it pertained to teachers' beliefs in their ability to succeed. The primary objective was to assess the challenges public elementary school teachers face in delivering the Inclusive Education Program and to propose a research-based intervention plan to address them. A structured survey questionnaire served as the primary data collection tool and was administered to a representative sample of public elementary school teachers in the specified division. The study found that teachers perceived significant challenges related to learners, such as the need for more individualised support, and a critical lack of appropriate curriculum and instructional materials. While the analysis revealed no statistically significant relationship between a teacher's demographic profile and the challenges they encountered, it did reveal a significant relationship between the challenges faced and the training or seminar categories attended by the teachers. This finding highlighted a crucial gap between the theoretical knowledge and the practical skills required for effective inclusive teaching. The study proposed a comprehensive, mandatory professional development program.

## 1. Introduction

Inclusive education has increasingly been recognised as a global priority, driven by international mandates such as the Salamanca Statement and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD), both of which call for the integration of learners with special needs in mainstream schools. In the Philippines, the Department of Education has echoed this commitment through its Inclusive Education Policy Framework and its Education for All initiatives, which emphasise equitable learning opportunities for all students [7]. Despite these mandates, however, the full realisation of inclusive education remains an ongoing challenge in many public elementary schools. Studies show that gaps in teacher preparedness, access to resources, and the availability of assistive technologies continue to hinder effective implementation of inclusive programs. Hay et al. [2] noted that many teachers lack adequate training in inclusive teaching strategies, making it difficult to adapt lessons and manage diverse classroom needs. Similarly, Gonio and Bauyot [9] found that although teachers generally express positive attitudes toward inclusion, they struggle to implement it due to limited support and resources.

These findings indicate that teacher-related constraints remain a major barrier to consistent and effective inclusive education delivery. Broader systemic issues also contribute to these challenges. Ioannidi and Malafantis [8] emphasised that inadequate infrastructure, insufficient administrative support, and inconsistent implementation across schools weaken the delivery of inclusive programs. Research further suggests that inclusive classrooms, when effectively supported, foster collaboration, empathy, and improved social relationships among both students with and without disabilities [5]. This highlights the importance of ensuring that inclusive education systems are properly implemented at the school level. Given these persistent concerns, evaluating the delivery system of inclusive education at the ground level has become essential. DepEd statistics show that only a small proportion of learners with special needs are fully included in regular classrooms, often due to inconsistencies in program implementation across public schools [1]. These issues demonstrate the need for systematic assessment to identify specific gaps and propose responsive interventions. In this context, the present study examines the challenges encountered in delivering inclusive education in selected public schools in the Division of Tayabas, focusing on teachers' perceptions and the influence of their demographic profiles.

## 2. Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the challenges in the delivery system of the inclusive education program in selected public schools in the Division of Tayabas, focusing on teachers' perceptions and examining the influence of their demographic profiles. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions. What is the demographic profile of teacher-respondents in terms of:

- Age
- Sex
- Civil status
- Highest educational attainment
- Years of Teaching experience
- Relevant training in inclusive education

What is the level of implementation of the inclusive education program in selected public elementary schools as perceived by the teachers? What are the perceived challenges in the delivery of inclusive education in terms of:

- Teacher-related factors
- Learner-related factors
- Curriculum and instructional materials
- Physical and learning environment
- Administrative and policy support

Is there a statistically significant relationship between the perceived challenges in the delivery of inclusive education and the teacher-respondents' demographic profile in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, teaching experience, and category of training/seminar attended? What recommendations can be proposed to improve the delivery system of the inclusive education program in the Division of Tayabas?

## 3. Methodology

This study employed a descriptive quantitative research design to systematically examine teachers' perceptions of the challenges in delivering the inclusive education program in selected public schools in the Division of Tayabas. This design enabled the collection of numerical data describing current conditions and variations across respondent groups. Descriptive research is suitable for identifying population characteristics and understanding existing issues, making it appropriate for evaluating the status of inclusive education practices. The population consisted of public elementary school teachers involved in implementing the inclusive education program. A purposive sampling technique was used to select participants who directly handled or supported inclusive education. This method ensured that respondents had firsthand experience with program implementation, enabling the study to gather relevant and meaningful data. The sample size was determined by the number of qualified teachers who met the inclusion criteria. Data were collected using a researcher-made survey questionnaire validated by experts in inclusive education and research. It consisted of three parts: (1) demographic profile (age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, teaching experience, and relevant training), (2) level of implementation of the inclusive education program using a 4-point Likert scale, and (3) perceived challenges categorized into teacher-related, learner-related, curriculum and materials, physical environment, and administrative support factors.

A pilot test with 15 teachers ensured clarity and reliability, and effect size was assessed using Eta Squared to determine the proportion of variance explained by specific variables. After securing approval from the Schools Division Superintendent and school heads, the researcher administered the questionnaire either in print or online through Google Forms. An informed consent form was included to ensure voluntary participation. Respondents were given one week to complete the survey, and all completed forms were checked for accuracy before tabulation. Descriptive statistics, such as frequencies and percentages, were used to summarise demographic data, while weighted means and standard deviations were used to assess the level of program implementation and the degree of perceived challenges. Eta Squared was used to assess the strength of the relationship between teachers' demographic profiles and the challenges they encountered. Eta Squared provides a meaningful effect size by identifying how much variance in a dependent variable is explained by an independent factor. The study strictly adhered to ethical standards, including the use of a Security Clearance and Data Sharing Agreement to protect personal information. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, who were assured of voluntary participation, confidentiality, and anonymity. Survey responses contained no identifying information, and all data were stored securely in both physical and digital formats. The principles of beneficence, non-maleficence, and integrity guided the entire research process, ensuring that results were reported accurately, objectively, and without manipulation.

## 4. Results and Discussion

Table 1 shows that the majority of the respondents were aged 31–40 years (44.40%), indicating a predominantly mid-career teaching workforce. Teachers aged 20–30 years and 41–50 years each accounted for 22.20% of the sample, while those aged 51 years and above accounted for only 11.10%. This distribution suggests that most teachers involved in inclusive education were young to middle-aged, a demographic generally considered more open to new training and adaptable to evolving educational practices. However, while younger teachers may be receptive to innovations, they may lack extensive experience in handling diverse learners, whereas older teachers, though more experienced, may require additional support to keep pace with modern pedagogical approaches.

**Table 1:** Profile of the respondents in terms of age

| Age | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| 20–30 years | 18 | 22.20% |
| 31–40 years | 36 | 44.40% |
| 41–50 years | 18 | 22.20% |
| 51 years and above | 9 | 11.10% |
| Total | 81 | 100% |

These findings align with those of Español et al. [4], who emphasised that teachers of all ages often feel inadequately prepared for the demands of inclusive education due to limited training and insufficient institutional support. The age profile in this study highlights both strengths and gaps: a relatively young workforce with potential for adaptability, but also a clear need for continuous professional development, mentorship, and administrative assistance. Thus, despite the promising age distribution, addressing the challenges of inclusive education delivery in Tayabas requires structured, sustained capacity-building to ensure that teachers across age groups are equipped to meet the needs of diverse learners.

**Table 2:** Profile of the respondents in terms of gender

| Gender | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| Female | 70 | 86.40% |
| Male | 11 | 13.60% |
| Total | 81 | 100% |

Table 2 depicts that an overwhelming majority of the respondents were female (86.40%), while only 13.60% were male. This indicates that the delivery of inclusive education in the selected public schools is primarily handled by female teachers, a pattern common in elementary education. The strong presence of female educators may suggest strengths in nurturing and classroom management, yet it also highlights a lack of gender diversity within the workforce.

**Table 3:** Profile of the respondents in terms of educational attainment

| Educational Attainment | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| Bachelor's Degree | 16 | 19.80% |
| Doctorate Degree (completed) | 1 | 1.20% |

| | 2 | 2.50% |
|---|---|---|
| Doctorate Degree (with units) | 2 | 2.50% |
| Master's Degree (completed) | 31 | 38.30% |
| Master's Degree (with units) | 31 | 38.30% |
| Total | 81 | 100% |

The results in Table 3 showed that a large majority of respondents (76.60%) had attained or were pursuing a Master's degree, while 19.80% held a Bachelor's degree, and only a small percentage had doctoral units or a completed doctorate. This indicated that the teaching workforce possessed relatively high levels of academic preparation, which could contribute to stronger theoretical understanding and improved pedagogical competence. However, advanced degrees alone did not automatically translate into mastery of inclusive education practices, as teachers might still lack hands-on experience in addressing the diverse needs of learners with disabilities. This finding aligns with the study by Sanchez et al. [6], which emphasised that even well-educated teachers often require more practical, skill-based training in differentiated instruction, behaviour management, and collaboration with specialists to perform effectively in inclusive classrooms. Their research suggested that academic preparation must be complemented by targeted professional development that bridges the gap between theory and actual classroom challenges. Thus, the intervention plan for the inclusive education program should focus on equipping teachers with practical strategies and real-world applications, while leveraging their academic backgrounds to address specific instructional needs within inclusive settings.

**Table 4:** Profile of the respondents in terms of teaching experience

| Teaching Experiences | F | % |
|---|---|---|
| 11–15 years | 14 | 17.30% |
| 5–10 years | 29 | 35.80% |
| Less than 5 years | 9 | 11.10% |
| More than 15 years | 29 | 35.80% |
| Total | 81 | 100.00% |

Table 4 shows that the respondents had varied lengths of teaching experience, with the largest groups composed of those with 5–10 years (35.80%) and more than 15 years (35.80%) in service. Meanwhile, 17.30% had 11–15 years of experience, and only 11.10% had less than five years. This distribution indicates that the teaching workforce involved in the study was predominantly composed of mid-career and veteran educators who had accumulated extensive classroom knowledge and instructional skills over time. The dominance of experienced teachers suggests a strong capacity to meet instructional demands, address classroom diversity, and implement inclusive education practices.

**Table 5:** Profile of the respondents in terms of grade level currently teaching

| Grade Level | F | % |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 1 | 17 | 21.00% |
| Grade 2 | 11 | 13.60% |
| Grade 3 | 7 | 8.60% |
| Grade 4 | 7 | 8.60% |
| Grade 5 | 6 | 7.40% |
| Grade 6 | 5 | 6.20% |
| Grade 7 | 3 | 3.70% |
| Grade 8 | 3 | 3.70% |
| Grade 9 | 1 | 1.20% |
| Grade10 | 2 | 2.50% |
| Kindergarten | 8 | 9.90% |
| Multi Grade Elem | 1 | 1.20% |
| Multi Grade Elem and HS | 1 | 1.20% |
| Multi Grad e HS | 2 | 2.50% |
| SHS | 2 | 2.50% |
| SPED/SNED | 5 | 6.20% |
| Total | 81 | 100.00% |

However, as highlighted by Florian and Spratt [3], long teaching experience does not automatically translate to proficiency in inclusive strategies unless accompanied by continuous, targeted professional development. Thus, while respondents' years of

service are an asset, the findings imply the need for sustained training that equips both seasoned and early-career teachers with updated, practical approaches to supporting learners with diverse needs.

Table 5 describes that respondents taught across a wide range of grade levels, with the largest proportion handling Grade 1 (21.00%), followed by Grade 2 (13.60%) and Kindergarten (9.90%). Participants also included teachers from upper elementary to Senior High School, as well as those managing multi-grade and SPED/SNED classes. This broad distribution reflects the study's capture of diverse instructional contexts, offering a comprehensive view of the challenges of implementing inclusive education across grade levels. The variety of teaching assignments suggests that educators' challenges and support needs may vary by grade or class type, underscoring the importance of tailored strategies and interventions to support inclusive practices across all levels.

**Table 6:** Profiles of the respondents in terms of training seminars attended

| Categories of Training Seminar | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| General Training for a receiving teacher | 14 | 17.30% |
| Inclusive Education Focused | 8 | 9.90% |
| Inclusive Education and Special Needs focused | 1 | 1.20% |
| SNeD Pedagogy Focus | 13 | 16.00% |
| SPECIFIC LAWS and POLICIES | 6 | 7.40% |
| sign language training | 4 | 4.90% |
| No TRAINING | 35 | 43.20% |
| Total | 81 | 100% |

Table 6 shows that a large proportion of respondents (43.20%) had not attended any training on inclusive education, indicating a substantial gap in their professional preparation. Among those who participated in training, the most common were General Training for Receiving Teachers (17.30%) and SNeD Pedagogy-focused seminars (16.00%), indicating that most opportunities available were broad and introductory rather than specialised. Only a small number of teachers had attended more focused sessions such as Inclusive Education-specific training (9.90%), Inclusive Education and Special Needs (1.20%), or sign language instruction (4.90%). These findings suggest limited access to targeted, skills-based training essential to effectively support diverse learners, underscoring the need for more comprehensive, specialised professional development in inclusive education.

**Table 7:** Implementation of inclusive education in school

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Inclusive education is being implemented in our school | 3.74 | 0.608 | Strongly Agree |
| Teachers are encouraged to adapt lessons to meet learners' diverse needs | 3.64 | 0.532 | Strongly Agree |
| Learners with diverse needs are included in general education classrooms | 3.75 | 0.537 | Strongly Agree |
| Parents of learners with diverse needs are actively involved | 3.53 | 0.672 | Strongly Agree |
| The school receives support from the division for inclusive education | 3.67 | 0.469 | Strongly Agree |

Table 7 reveals that respondents strongly agreed that inclusive education was being implemented in their schools, with an overall mean of 3.67. The highest-rated indicator was the inclusion of learners with diverse needs in general education classrooms (m=3.75), followed closely by general implementation of inclusive education (m=3.74) and encouragement for teachers to adapt lessons (m=3.64). Parental involvement received the lowest rating (m=3.53), suggesting slightly more variability in perceptions regarding family engagement. Overall, the data indicate that inclusive practices are actively applied across the schools surveyed. The findings suggest a generally positive implementation of inclusive education, highlighting teachers' efforts to adapt lessons and integrate learners with diverse needs. However, the relatively lower rating for parental involvement points to a potential area for improvement, as effective inclusion relies not only on teacher practices but also on family engagement and support. Strengthening communication and collaboration with parents could enhance the overall effectiveness of inclusive education programs in these schools.

**Table 8:** Teacher-related challenges

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Insufficient training on inclusive pedagogy, differentiated instructions, and collaborative practices. | 2.84 | 0.858 | Agree |

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Feel not equipped to deal with diverse learning needs in an inclusive classroom. | 2.78 | 0.851 | Agree |
| Inadequate access to special education experts makes it difficult to successfully manage learners with diverse needs. | 2.69 | 0.875 | Agree |
| Conflicting schedules and workloads make it difficult to collaborate with co-teachers, specialists, or teachers. | 2.98 | 0.836 | Agree |
| Feel unprepared to modify lessons and instructional practices effectively to address learners' diverse needs. | 2.74 | 0.863 | Agree |
| Overall Mean | 2.8 | 0.704 | Agree |

Table 8 displays that teachers in the Division of Tayabas encounter several challenges in implementing inclusive education, with an overall mean of 2.80 indicating general agreement. The most pressing concern was the difficulty in collaborating with colleagues due to conflicting schedules and heavy workloads (m=2.98). This was followed by insufficient training in inclusive pedagogy (m=2.84), which suggests that many teachers still lack the necessary preparation to support learners with diverse needs. Teachers also reported feeling unequipped to address varied learning needs (m=2.78), limited access to special education experts (m=2.69), and challenges in modifying instructional practices (m=2.74). These results highlight a combination of skill-related and structural barriers, reflecting the moderate variability and complexity of teacher-related challenges within the division.

**Table 9:** Learner-related challenges

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Learners with diverse needs find it difficult to build relationships or take advantage of opportunities with peers. | 2.77 | 0.763 | Agree |
| Learners with diverse needs may exhibit behaviour that hinders learning. | 3.06 | 0.659 | Agree |
| Learners with diverse needs may have considerable gaps in literacy, numeracy, or communication skills. | 3.25 | 0.56 | Agree |
| Learners with diverse needs require more individualised support. | 3.5 | 0.502 | Strongly Agree |
| Some learners with diverse needs lack parental support for their educational needs. | 3.02 | 0.758 | Agree |
| Overall Mean | 3.13 | 0.467 | Agree |

Table 9 illustrates that learner-related challenges had a significant impact on the implementation of inclusive education, with an overall mean of 3.13 indicating strong agreement among teachers. The most critical issue identified was the need for highly individualised support for learners with diverse needs (m=3.53), which placed considerable demands on teachers' time and instructional planning. This was followed by noticeable gaps in learners' literacy, numeracy, and communication skills (m=3.25), as well as behaviours that hindered classroom learning (m=3.06). Other challenges included insufficient parental support (m=3.02) and difficulties in establishing positive peer relationships (m=2.77). These results suggest that teachers consistently perceived learner characteristics as significant barriers to effective inclusion, highlighting the need for strengthened home–school collaboration, targeted interventions, and structured social skills support to better address diverse learning needs.

**Table 10:** Curriculum and instructional material challenges

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Limited access to inclusive teaching guides for learners with diverse needs. | 2.88 | 0.872 | Agree |
| Inadequate funding, a lack of appropriate teaching materials, and insufficient assistive technology. | 3.07 | 0.703 | Agree |
| Limited differentiation in instructional content. | 2.94 | 0.747 | Agree |
| Absence of universal learning design (UDL) integration for learners with diverse needs. | 2.9 | 0.8 | Agree |
| Assessment tools do not accommodate learners with special needs. | 2.65 | 0.883 | Agree |
| Overall Mean | 3.13 | 0.467 | Agree |

Table 10 highlights several curriculum and instructional material challenges in implementing inclusive education, with an overall mean of 3.13 indicating agreement among teachers. The most pressing concern was the inadequate funding and lack of appropriate teaching materials and assistive technology (m=3.07), which limited teachers' ability to support diverse learners. Other notable issues included limited differentiation in instructional content (m=2.94) and the absence of Universal Design for

Learning (UDL) integration (m=2.90), both of which hindered effective instructional planning. Teachers also reported limited access to inclusive teaching guides (m=2.88) and assessment tools that did not adequately accommodate learners with special needs (m=2.65). These results reflected moderate concern and variability in perceptions across schools, indicating inconsistent access to essential instructional resources. Overall, the findings emphasised the need for stronger material support, improved curriculum adaptation, and better-designed assessment tools to enhance inclusive education practices.

**Table 11:** Physical and learning environment challenges

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| The school lacks the necessary infrastructure, including adequate lighting and ventilation, to support learners with diverse needs. | 2.68 | 0.849 | Agree |
| Facilities are not accessible to children with disabilities. | 2.51 | 0.76 | Agree |
| The school lacks assistive technology and learning tools. | 2.79 | 0.817 | Agree |
| Class sizes are too large for effective inclusion. | 3 | 0.88 | Agree |
| Learning spaces are not properly adapted for inclusion. | 2.91 | 0.809 | Agree |
| Overall Mean | 2.78 | 0.66 | Agree |

Table 11 presents the physical and learning environment challenges in inclusive education, with an overall mean of 2.78 indicating agreement among respondents. The most pressing concerns were large class sizes (m=3.00) and inadequately adapted learning spaces (m=2.91), both of which limited teachers' ability to provide individualised support. The lack of assistive technology and learning tools (m=2.79) further hindered the accommodation of learners with diverse needs, reflecting a notable gap in essential physical and instructional resources. Respondents also identified issues related to poor infrastructure, including suboptimal lighting and ventilation (m=2.68), as well as facilities that remained inaccessible to children with disabilities (m=2.51). These findings indicated that while challenges varied across schools, the overall physical environment posed moderate but significant barriers to effective inclusive education. Improving accessibility, classroom conditions, and resource availability is therefore essential for strengthening inclusive practices.

**Table 12:** Administrative and policy support challenges

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| There is inadequate administrative support for inclusion. | 2.53 | 0.823 | Agree |
| Inadequate monitoring and evaluation system. | 2.53 | 0.726 | Agree |
| Inconsistent policy implementation | 2.47 | 0.792 | Disagree |
| Insufficient budget allocation for the inclusive education program. | 2.78 | 0.806 | Agree |
| Limited opportunities for participation or engagement for learners with diverse needs because of the administrator's attitude and commitment to inclusive education implementation. | 2.33 | 0.822 | Disagree |
| Overall Mean | 2.53 | 0.661 | Agree |

Table 12 highlights administrative and policy support challenges in inclusive education, with an overall mean of 2.53 indicating moderate agreement among respondents. The most pressing concerns were insufficient budget allocation for inclusive programs (m=2.78), inadequate monitoring and evaluation systems (m=2.53), and a lack of administrative support (m=2.53). These issues suggested that teachers were implementing inclusive practices without the necessary institutional backing, limiting the effectiveness and sustainability of their efforts. Respondents showed lower agreement on inconsistent policy implementation (m=2.47) and the influence of administrators' attitudes on limiting learner opportunities (m=2.33), reflecting some variability in perceptions across schools. Overall, the findings indicated that while teachers were actively working toward inclusive education, the administrative and policy structures meant to guide and support them were not fully aligned or strengthened. This underscored the need for clearer policies, stronger leadership involvement, and improved funding to enhance inclusive education delivery (Table 13).

**Table 13:** Overall challenges

| Indicators | Mean | SD | Verbal Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher-Related Challenges | 2.8 | 0.704 | Agree |
| Learner-related challenges | 3.13 | 0.467 | Agree |
| Curriculum and instructional material challenges | 3.13 | 0.467 | Agree |
| Physical and Learning Environment Challenges | 2.78 | 0.66 | Agree |
| Administrative and Policy Support Challenges | 2.53 | 0.661 | Agree |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Overall Mean | 2.87 | 0.48 | Agree |

The overall mean of 2.87 indicated general agreement among respondents that various barriers to inclusive education persist. Learner-related challenges (m=3.13) and curriculum and instructional material challenges (m=3.13) emerged as the most significant concerns, suggesting that student diversity and resource limitations heavily influence classroom implementation. These areas reflected the greatest strain on teachers as they work to adapt instruction and meet the diverse needs of their learners. Other challenges included teacher-related concerns (m=2.80), physical and learning environment issues (m=2.78), and gaps in administrative and policy support (m=2.53), all of which contributed to educators' overall difficulties. Although teachers were actively implementing inclusive practices, the findings showed that student needs and curriculum-related constraints were the most pressing obstacles, underscoring the need for strengthened resources, training, and systemic support.

**Table 14:** Relationship of profile and overall challenges

| Profile | P | η² | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 0.915 | 0.007 | Not Significant |
| Gender | 0.83 | 0.001 | Not Significant |
| Highest Educational Attainment | 0.727 | 0.026 | Not Significant |
| Teaching Experiences | 0.512 | 0.029 | Not Significant |
| Grade Level Current Teaching | 0.692 | 0.153 | Not Significant |
| Categories Of Training Seminar | 0.027 | 0.171 | Significant |

Table 14 presents the relationship between teacher profiles and the overall challenges encountered in implementing inclusive education. The analysis revealed no significant relationship between the challenges faced and teachers' age, gender, highest educational attainment, teaching experience, or grade level currently taught. These findings indicate that demographic factors did not meaningfully influence the extent of difficulties educators experienced. This outcome suggests that having a predominantly mid-career, female, and highly educated workforce was not sufficient to address barriers to inclusive education. Despite their qualifications and experience, teachers continued to encounter substantial challenges, suggesting that systemic issues rather than personal or professional characteristics played a greater role in shaping the implementation difficulties.

## 5. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

- The Null Hypothesis (H0) is partially rejected.
- For most individual factors (Age, Gender, Experience), H0 is Not Significant (Not Rejected), meaning the teachers' personal backgrounds do not predict the challenges. However, the Null Hypothesis (H0) is rejected for the variable Categories of Training Seminar, which showed a statistically significant relationship with Teacher-Related, Physical Environment, Administrative, and Overall Challenges.
- This partial rejection correctly forces the conclusion that the null hypothesis of no relationship is false, thereby supporting the alternative hypothesis (Ha) that a relationship exists, specifically driven by the training variable. This strong finding is the primary justification for the proposed intervention plan.
- The lack of continuous and relevant professional development for teachers significantly hampered the effectiveness of the Inclusive Education Program.
- The absence of a standardised, consistent monitoring and evaluation system prevented a comprehensive assessment of the program's progress and challenges.
- The unclear policies and guidelines on inclusive education created confusion among teachers, leading to fragmented, uncoordinated implementation.
- Insufficient funding was a major barrier to providing the necessary resources and support services required for a genuinely inclusive learning environment.
- The successful implementation of inclusive education depended on strong administrative leadership and clear prioritisation of the program at the school head level.

## 5.1. Recommendations

In light of the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations were proposed to address the challenges in the delivery of the Inclusive Education Program:

- **Recommendation for the Department of Education:** Implement a comprehensive, mandatory professional development program focused on inclusive education. This program should have included training on differentiated instruction, behaviour management, and the use of assistive technology.
- **Recommendation for School Administrators:** School heads were urged to establish a clear and consistent monitoring and evaluation framework for the Inclusive Education Program. This should have involved regular classroom observations and feedback sessions to support teachers effectively.
- **Recommendation for Policy Makers:** It was recommended that clear and accessible policies on inclusive education be disseminated to all school personnel. Policy makers should have conducted workshops or forums to ensure teachers and administrators fully understood their roles and responsibilities.
- **Recommendation for Financial Support:** Allocate a dedicated budget for inclusive education programs. This funding should have been used to purchase necessary teaching aids, upgrade facilities, and hire or train special education professionals.
- **Recommendation for Future Research:** Further research was recommended to explore the impact of administrative leadership styles on the successful implementation of inclusive education. This could have provided valuable insights for creating targeted leadership training programs.

## References

1. G. A. Toto, C. V. Marinelli, V. Cavioni, M. Di Furia, L. Traetta, S. Iuso, and A. Petito, "What is the role of technologies for inclusive education? A systematic review," in Higher Education Learning Methodologies and Technologies Online, *Springer*, Cham, Switzerland, 2023.
2. J. F. Hay, J. Smit, and M. Paulsen, "Teacher preparedness for inclusive education," *South African Journal of Education,* vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 213–218, 2001.
3. L. Florian and J. Spratt, "Enacting inclusion: A framework for interrogating inclusive practice," *European Journal of Special Needs Education,* vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 119–135, 2013.
4. M. A. D. Español, H. J. Huliganga, R. Fernandez, M. L. Velos, and G. Dayot, "Navigating inclusive education: A qualitative study on the challenges faced by special needs teachers in policy implementation," *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, vol. 43, no. 7, pp. 908–916, 2025.
5. P. Arnaiz-Sánchez, R. De Haro Rodríguez, C. M. Caballero, and R. Martínez-Abellán, "Barriers to educational inclusion in initial teacher training," *Societies*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 1-13, 2023.
6. R. Sanchez, R. Espina, R. Mangubat, H. Anora, V. Calasang, and A. Pantaleon, "Exploring the knowledge and skills of teachers towards inclusive education," *World Journal on Education and Humanities Research*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 193–202, 2024.
7. U. Pagano, "Towards inclusive education: The evaluation challenge," *Science & Philosophy,* vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 168–188, 2024.
8. V. Ioannidi and K. D. Malafantis, "Inclusive education and pedagogy: A practice for all students," *European Journal of Education Studies*, vol. 9, no. 10, pp. 1–13, 2022.
9. Y. G. Gonio and M. M. Bauyot, "Delving on the experiences of educators on professional development of National Educators Academy of the Philippines: A case study," *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies,* vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 627–641, 2024.