

**CHALLENGES IN THE DELIVERY SYSTEM OF THE INCLUSIVE EDUCATION
PROGRAM IN SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE DIVISION OF TAYABAS:
BASIS FOR A PROPOSED INTERVENTION PLAN**

LEANIE R. CABUYAO

Tayabas East Central School Schools Division of Tayabas, Quezon Province, Philippines
EMAIL: leanie.cabuyao@deped.gov.ph

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received 22nd September, 2025
Accepted: 10th October, 2025
Published: 5th November, 2025

KEYWORDS: Inclusive Education, Delivery System, Challenges, Public Elementary Schools, Pedagogical Strategies

PUBLISHER: Empirical Research Institute of Nigeria

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).



<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ABSTRACT

The paper was anchored on a comprehensive theoretical framework that integrated Ecological Systems Theory, which considered 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 perceived challenges encountered by public elementary school teachers in the delivery of the Inclusive Education Program and to propose a research-based intervention plan to address these issues. 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 individualized 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, there was a significant relationship between the challenges faced and the category of training or seminars 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. This intervention aimed to equip educators with practical skills, foster collaborative professional learning communities, and provide ongoing support to effectively manage diverse learning needs and adapt the curriculum.

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education has increasingly been recognized as a global priority, driven by international mandates such as the Salamanca Statement (1994) 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 emphasize equitable learning opportunities for all students (Delos Santos et al., 2020). Despite these mandates, however, the full realization 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. Garcia (2019) noted that many teachers lack adequate training in inclusive teaching strategies, making it difficult to adapt lessons and manage diverse classroom needs. Similarly, Delos Santos (2021) found that although teachers generally express positive attitudes toward inclusion, they struggle with practical implementation due to limited support and materials. 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. Adams & Thompson (2021) emphasized 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 (Flores, 2019). 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 (Garcia et al., 2019). 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 the delivery of inclusive education in selected public schools in the Division of Tayabas, focusing on teachers' perceptions and the influence of their demographic profile.

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 the perceptions of teachers and examining the influence of their demographic profile.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of teacher-respondents in terms of
 - 1.1 Age
 - 1.2 Sex
 - 1.3 Civil status

- 1.4 Highest educational attainment
- 1.5 Years of Teaching experience
- 1.6 Relevant training in inclusive education
2. What is the level of implementation of the inclusive education program in selected public elementary schools as perceived by the teachers?
3. What are the perceived challenges in the delivery of inclusive education in terms of:
 - 3.1 Teacher-related factors
 - 3.2 Learner-related factors
 - 3.3 Curriculum and instructional materials
 - 3.4 Physical and learning environment.
 - 3.5 Administrative and policy support
4. 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?
5. What recommendations can be proposed to improve the delivery system of inclusive education program in the Division of Tayabas?

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 that described current conditions and variations among respondent groups. Descriptive research is suitable for identifying characteristics of a population 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 the respondents possessed firsthand experience with program implementation, allowing the study to gather relevant and meaningful data. The sample size was based on the number of qualified teachers who met the set 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 frequency and percentage were used to summarize demographic data, while weighted mean and standard deviation determined the level of program implementation and the degree of perceived challenges. Eta Squared was employed to measure the strength of the relationship between the teachers' demographic profile 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.

Results and Discussion

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%

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 comprised 22.20% of the sample, while those 51 years and above represented 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.

These findings align with Tjernberg and Matsson (2020), who emphasized 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 and sustained capacity-building to ensure teachers of all 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, reflecting common staffing patterns 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%
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 aligned with the study of Fuchs, Fuchs, and Barnes (2019), who emphasized that even well-educated teachers often required more practical, skill-based training in differentiated instruction, behavior 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, maximizing their academic background while addressing 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 capability to handle instructional demands, classroom diversity, and inclusive education practices. However, as highlighted by Florian and Spratt (2013), long teaching experience does not automatically translate to proficiency in inclusive strategies unless accompanied by continuous, targeted professional development. Thus, while the respondents' years of service serve as an asset, the findings imply the need for sustained training that equips both seasoned and early-career teachers with updated, practical approaches for supporting learners with diverse needs.

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%
Grade 10	2	2.50%
Kindergarten	8	9.90%
Multi Grade Elem	1	1.20%
Multi Grade Elem and HS	1	1.20%
Multi Grade HS	2	2.50%
SHS	2	2.50%
SPED/SNED	5	6.20%
Total	81	100.00%

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 associated with implementing inclusive education across different grade levels.

The variety in teaching assignments suggests that the challenges and support needs of educators may vary depending on the grade or type of class they handle, emphasizing the importance of tailored strategies and interventions to effectively 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 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 related to inclusive education, revealing 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 specialized.

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 for effectively supporting diverse learners, underscoring the need for more comprehensive and specialized 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 the diverse needs of learners.	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
Feel not equipped to deal with diverse learning needs in an inclusive classroom.	2.78	0.851	Agree
Inadequate access to special education experts that 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 the diverse needs of learners.	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 ($m=2.78$), along with 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 relationship or engage opportunity with peers.	2.77	0.763	Agree
Learners with diverse needs may exhibit behavior that hinder 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 individualized 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 individualized 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 behaviors 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 design for learning (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 emphasized 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 lack of necessary infrastructure or poor lighting and proper ventilation for learners with diverse needs.	2.68	0.849	Agree
Facilities are not accessible for children with disabilities.	2.51	0.76	Agree
The school lack of 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 individualized 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 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 ($m=2.78$), along with 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. 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 administrative and policy support gaps ($m=2.53$), all of which contributed to the overall difficulties experienced by educators. 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	η^2	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 experienced by educators.

This outcome suggests that having a predominantly mid-career, female, and highly educated workforce was not enough to address the barriers within inclusive education. Despite their qualifications and experience, teachers continued to encounter substantial challenges, implying that systemic issues rather than personal or professional characteristics played a greater role in shaping the difficulties in implementation.

Conclusion

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

1. The Null Hypothesis (H_0) is partially rejected.
2. For most individual factors (Age, Gender, Experience), H_0 is Not Significant (Not Rejected), meaning the teachers' personal backgrounds do not predict the challenges. However, the Null Hypothesis (H_0) is rejected for the variable Categories of Training Seminar, which showed a statistically significant relationship with Teacher-Related, Physical Environment, Administrative, and Overall Challenges.

3. This partial rejection correctly forces the conclusion that the hypothesis of no relationship is false, thereby supporting the alternative hypothesis (H_a) that a relationship does exist, driven specifically by the training variable. This strong finding is the primary justification for the proposed intervention plan.
4. The effectiveness of the Inclusive Education Program was significantly hampered by the lack of continuous and relevant professional development for teachers.
5. The absence of a standardized and consistent monitoring and evaluation system prevented the comprehensive assessment of the program's progress and challenges.
6. The unclear policies and guidelines on inclusive education created confusion among teachers, leading to a fragmented and uncoordinated approach to implementation.
7. Insufficient funding was a major barrier to providing the necessary resources and support services required for a genuinely inclusive learning environment.
8. The successful implementation of inclusive education was dependent on strong administrative leadership and a clear prioritization of the program at the school-head level.

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:

1. **Recommendation for the Department of Education:** It was recommended that the Department of Education implement a comprehensive and mandatory professional development program focused on inclusive education. This program should have included training on differentiated instruction, behavior management, and the use of assistive technology.
2. **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.
3. **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.
4. **Recommendation for Financial Support:** It was recommended that a dedicated budget be allocated specifically for inclusive education programs. This funding should have been used to purchase necessary teaching aids, upgrade facilities, and hire or train special education professionals.
5. **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

- Adams, L., & Thompson, H. (2021). The role of inclusive education in modern pedagogical practices. *Journal of Inclusive Education Studies*, 27(4), 213-225.
- Delos Santos, R. C. (2021). Government initiatives for inclusive education: An analysis of the NEAP's professional development programs. *Journal of Inclusive Education*, 7(2), 78-95.
- Delos Santos, R. C., Flores, P. A., & Bautista, L. D. (2020). Evaluating inclusive education practices: A comprehensive analysis. *Journal of Educational Development*, 35(2), 112-130.
- Flores, J. R. (2019). Barriers to accessing teacher training programs on inclusive education in rural Philippines. *Asia-Pacific Education Review*, 20(1), 34-49.
- Florian, L., & Spratt, J. (2013). Enacting inclusion: A framework for interrogating inclusive practice. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 28(2), 119-135.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Barnes, N. (2019). Special education teachers' knowledge and skills for inclusive classrooms: An international perspective
- Garcia, M. L., Torres, J., & Ramos, P. (2019). Innovative teaching strategies in inclusive classrooms: A systematic review. *Journal of Inclusive Education Research*, 18(3), 45-60.
- Garcia, S. P., & Bautista, E. M. (2019). Teacher preparedness in implementing inclusive education: A local perspective. *Journal of Special Education Studies*, 14(2), 22-33.
- Tjernberg, M., & Matsson, M. (2020). Challenges in an inclusive school: A qualitative study with teachers' experiences.