



Teachers' Preparedness for Inclusive Education

Leonila R. Sito

College of Teacher Education, Benguet State University

E-mail address: lanirsito@yahoo.com

Abstract

The Commission of Higher Education mandates all Teacher Training Institutions in the Philippines to offer a professional course on inclusive education starting school year 2018-2019. The study determined the level of preparedness of the Benguet State University Teacher Education faculty members to teach the said course. Specifically, it determined their familiarity with the principles that underpin inclusive education, skill in managing inclusive classes, and attitudes towards inclusion. Comparisons on these three main variables were made in terms of the level that they taught, years in the teaching service, and whether they had orientation on inclusive education or none. Two factors related to familiarity with inclusion principles were identified - decision-making with learners and stakeholders' active involvement. The teachers were moderately familiar with both principles but were significantly more familiar with the principles related to stakeholder's active involvement. Significant differences were observed on familiarity when involving stakeholders according to level taught and years in service. Respondents with or without orientation on inclusive education had comparable levels of familiarity with the inclusion principles. The teachers were moderately efficacious in enhancing learning, classroom management, and establishing relationships. They had a significantly higher level of efficacy on classroom management than on enhancing learning and establishing partnerships. Significant differences were observed in the efficacy levels according to level taught and years of service but none in terms of attendance to orientation for inclusion. Two factors related to agreeing towards inclusion attitudes were identified: improvement for successful inclusion and mainstreaming. The agreement level for attitudes toward self-improvement is significantly greater than attitude toward mainstreaming in inclusive education. Significant differences in attitudes on self-improvement were found along the level taught and years in service. The findings have implications for an improved training level for both in-service and pre-service teachers, policy on all tertiary level programs, and consciousness-raising about diversity to the larger society.

KEYWORDS

Inclusive Education
Familiarity
Efficacy
Attitudes

Introduction

Access to education is a right, not a privilege: repeatedly stated but not totally exercised. Even in developed countries, the right is not accorded, especially to individuals of differentiated needs. From the UN's Declaration of the Universal Human Rights in 1948 up to its most recent Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007, significant accords and policies were postulated by the United Nations and interest groups to address the specific needs of individuals who are excluded. The 1960 Convention against Discrimination in Education prohibits any exclusion from or limitation to educational opportunities based on socially ascribed or perceived differences such as sex, ethnic origin, language, religion, nationality, social origin, economic condition, ability, etc.

Inclusive Education is viewed as a process of addressing and responding to the diversity of needs of all children, youth, and adults by increasing learning participation. It involves changes and modifications in content, approaches, structures and strategies in education, with a shared vision covering all children of the appropriate age range and a conviction that it is the regular school system's responsibility to educate all children. It is a transverse one that cuts across all initiatives - from early childhood education to primary, vocational, adult and teacher education and curriculum development, and spheres related culture and social development (UNESCO, 2003).

Observing that there had been a cold reaction to these rights especially along educating and caring for individuals with special needs, the UNESCO (1994), during the Salamanca Conference in 1994 affirmed its action in the field of inclusive education by asserting that "schools should accommodate all children regardless of their physical, intellectual, emotional, social, linguistic or other conditions". It added that schools put in check negative attitudes and "provide an effective education to the majority of children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost-effectiveness of the entire education system" (p. ix).

This vision was re-echoed by the World Education Forum meeting in Dakar in April, 2000 that reviewed the progress made since 1990. The Forum clarified that the Education for All (EFA) program must take account of the needs

of the poor and the disadvantaged, including working children, remote rural dwellers and nomads, ethnic and linguistic minorities, children, young people and adults affected by conflict, HIV and AIDS, hunger and poor health, and those with disabilities or special learning needs. It also emphasized the special focus on girls and women.

Dapudong (2014) presented concepts or terms that are often associated with inclusive education. She cited various researchers like Hossain (2004) and Long et al. (2011), who made distinctions of the terms "inclusive education", "integrated education", and "mainstreaming". These terms have been used interchangeably, but ultimately, in an inclusive education system, school practices were developed to support a diverse range of learners in mainstream settings, which made schools more flexible and child-centered. As society and governments worldwide get more enlightened or sensitive about Inclusive Education and Special Needs Education, there is a need for quality teacher training to provide differentiated learning for each learner. Meeting such would realize an inclusive society.

Several studies found that teachers worldwide are not prepared for inclusion. Wisdom et al. (2016) reported that teachers had no adequate knowledge about inclusion prior to the introduction of the pilot inclusive education in Ghana. Meanwhile, Forlin and Sin (2017) pointed that in most regions in the Pacific, frequently documented studies show that in-service teachers and fresh graduates from teacher training schools are not well prepared for managing inclusive classrooms and managing diverse learners. Dapudong (2013) found that teachers in Thailand were concerned that their perceived inadequate professional knowledge and skills to contribute to reducing schools' academic success.

In the Philippines, a degree in Special Education specifically caters to Learners with Disabilities (LWDs). Since its offering, only a few graduated from this program. As of February 2020, the Department of Education (DepEd) reported 259,573 LWDs from the elementary to junior high school learner beneficiaries of its programs and projects. Inciong and Quijano (2013) as cited by Surot (2014) identified the problems besetting Special Education programs like inadequate services throughout the country; limited capacity to identify and screen LWDs; insufficient early intervention programs; fast



turn-over of SPED teachers due to low pay; imbalance in the number of LWDs vis-à-vis SPED trained personnel; attitudinal barrier amongst stakeholders; lack of coordination among agencies in the provision of services; and very few research studies on LWDs. Undoubtedly, there had been several acts passed to cater to the needs of this group of learners. In the past five years, three Philippine senators filed their respective bills to address the millions of LWDs in the country.

The attention for LWDs or Learners with Special Education Needs (LSENs) has been intensified with the introduction of the K-12 Curriculum in the Philippines. The DepEd is now mandated to adopt inclusion. It means that teachers must possess the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to address diversified learners in terms of learning abilities, culture, gender, religion, socio-economic status, and race. In 2018-19, all Teacher Training Institutions in the Philippines offered the course in Foundation of Special and Inclusive Education as mandated by the Commission on Higher Education (CMO No. 75 s. 2007). This change in the curricular offering is aligned with the K-12 Program and is deemed to better prepare pre-service teachers to realize the "Education for All" program. This three-unit course orients pre-service teachers with philosophies, theories and legal bases of special and inclusive education, typical and atypical development of children, students' learning characteristics with special education needs, and practices in the continuum of special inclusive education. Henceforth, the BSU-College of Teacher Education (BSU-CTE) faculty members have to possess these competencies in training their pre-service teachers for the pre-school, elementary and secondary levels.

This study sought to determine the preparedness of BSU-CTE faculty members to teach the abovementioned course. Specifically, it sought to determine the extent to which they are familiar with the principles underpinning inclusive education; the extent of their perceived efficacy for inclusive education and their attitudes toward inclusive education. It further compared the teachers' familiarity, self-efficacy, and attitudes toward inclusive education according to the level taught, years in service, and attendance to training, seminar, and conferences on inclusion. This study's findings will have implications in

successfully achieving the overarching goal of inclusion in the academe and in the wider community.

Methodology

This descriptive research provides a picture of the state of preparedness of BSU-CTE teachers on inclusive education. The total population of faculty members in the College was surveyed, including those in the pre-school, elementary, and secondary laboratory schools of the University. The laboratory schools' teachers are also considered tertiary level teachers because they also teach pre-service teachers in some major courses, field study courses, and in in-campus training. The retrieval rate was 68%. This response rate is valid for data analysis because the issue in this study directly relates to a homogenous population (Leslie, 1972). BSU-CTE faculty members may be considered relatively homogenous given the qualification standards in hiring teaching staff.

Data were gathered through a self-administered questionnaire that revolved around the three main constructs of the study. The researcher-constructed questionnaire involved 20 items related to the principles of inclusive education crafted from several sources like the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2011), Inclusive Schools Network, (2015) and Inclusion BC (2012). Twenty items about self-efficacy on inclusion were adopted from the Self-efficacy in Implementing Inclusive Scale, an earlier version of the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TIEP) by Forlin et al. (2011). Fifteen items were constructed from the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2011) and the Sentiments, Attitudes, and Concerns about Inclusive Education (SACIE) by Forlin et al. (2011) to determine the attitudes of teachers towards inclusion. All responses were indicated through a 4-point scale of continuum—1 denoting the least through 4, denoting the highest level.

To further establish content validity on principles on inclusion, self-efficacy, and attitudes, psychologists and guidance counselors who have sufficient knowledge about the constructs in this study critiqued the tool. The reliability of the data-gathering tool sections were determined



through Cronbach's alpha and yielded coefficients ranging from 0.90 to 0.94.

Twenty-three percent of the respondents had formal training on inclusion, while 77% have not undergone formal training. On the other hand, 54% of the respondents have undergone orientation through seminars or conferences on inclusion, while 46% had none.

Data were subjected to frequency counts and computation of percentages and mean scores. The t-test and Analysis of Variance were used to test the null hypotheses that no significant differences exist in the levels of familiarity with principles on inclusive education, self-efficacy in the skills for inclusion and attitudes towards inclusive education when respondents were compared according to the level they teach, years in service, and whether they had orientation or none on inclusion. Results were subjected to post hoc tests when the f-test proved significant.

Results and Discussion

Familiarity with Inclusive Education

Several salient principles were presented to BSU-CTE teachers on inclusive education to determine their familiarity with inclusive education. The overall mean tells that teachers feel they have yet to know more about inclusion, especially in managing learners' direct learning activities (Table 1). Two factors were found regarding the extent of familiarity among the

teachers with the principles of inclusive education: principles related to decision-making with the students and principles related to stakeholders' active involvement. Decision-making with learners involves discussing matters on the nature of the inclusive learning process, planning what to be learned, setting learning activities, and assessing and evaluating. By doing so, learning difficulties can be addressed, thereby ensuring satisfactory achievement.

The second factor, stakeholder involvement, includes facilitating learning so that all students are actively involved in group learning, like consulting and cooperating. Specifically, the respondents are familiar with involving the learners in all school activities, recognizing and celebrating their achievements, making them feel valued for what they can contribute to school life and making them feel secure in school. The support that learners receive will redound to the development of their self-esteem and confidence.

The findings imply that the teacher-respondents were able to take advantage of learners' diversity by enhancing each one's learning. Further, this result implies that the respondents were aware of the basic principle of the Salamanca declaration that education is a fundamental right of every child and that support for her/his education is a prime duty of every government and its institutions (UNESCO, 1994). The teacher-respondents were cognizant that educational programs at the national and international levels support the "Education for All". Moreover, the respondents were aware that in the teaching-learning processes of inclusion, the

Table 1

Level of Familiarity of Teachers on the Principles of Inclusive Education

| Principles | Mean | DE | t-value | Sig-value |
|------------------------------------|------|-----|-----------|-----------|
| Decision-making with students | 2.91 | MoF | 4.252 *** | 0.000 |
| Active involvement of stakeholders | 3.28 | VMF | | |
| Overall Mean | 3.10 | MoF | | |

Legend: Mean scores Descriptive Equivalence (DE)
 3.25 – 4.00 Very Much Familiar (VMF)
 2.50 – 3.24 Moderately Familiar (MoF)
 1.75 – 2.49 Minimally Familiar (MF)
 1.00 – 1.74 Not Familiar (NF)



school administrators, auxiliary staff, parents, and the community have to be involved. About this, Abbott (2006) raised concern regarding teachers' expectations when dealing with diversity – creating a climate of high expectations, valuing a broad range of abilities and achievement, and removing barriers to learning.

The moderate level of familiarity with inclusive education principles points out that some challenges remain to increase familiarity with this issue. This finding is similar to what Wisdom et al. (2016), Forlin and Sin (2017), and Dapudong (2013) who found that teachers felt they did not possess the competence for successful inclusion. In a similar light, Muega (2016) found that teachers who have firsthand knowledge of inclusion felt that they were operating based on their very general knowledge and needed training. This study's finding is a concern that needs to be addressed immediately, especially that the Department of Education is bent on implementing DO 72, s. 2009 - Inclusive Education as Strategy for Increasing Participation Rate of Children. The adage "you cannot give what you do not have" repeatedly emphasized by the CTE teachers is now thrown back at them.

Comparing the levels of familiarity between the two factors, the result of the t-test indicated a significant difference confirming that teachers are very much familiar with involving the learners and other stakeholders actively but only moderately familiar with consulting learners in making decisions. This result is especially attributed to the teachers' moderate level of familiarity on how to plan, provide support to overcome learning blocks and assess the learners considering their individual challenges. This result implies that teachers are not very confident in providing ways to best support children's ways to best assess learning outcomes. This moderate level of familiarity can be ascribed to the training that teachers had on assessment during their pre-service years. Then assessments were focused on regular students. It is also a common apprehension of teachers that they need to learn further about assessment methods or how to construct assessment tools suited for diverse learners.

Level of Familiarity According to Moderating Variables

Table 2 presents the teachers' level of familiarity when compared according to the level they taught, years in the teaching service, and whether they had orientation on inclusion or none.

Familiarity According to Level Taught

Teachers in the pre-school were very much familiar about decision making with the learners; the teachers in the tertiary and secondary levels were moderately familiar, while those in the elementary level were minimally familiar (Table 2). However, the f-test proved that these differences were not significant. The findings point that the teachers were generally comparably familiar with the inclusion principles regardless of the level taught.

In terms of the familiarity on actively involving stakeholders, those teaching in the pre-school were significantly very familiar; the teachers in the tertiary and secondary levels were moderately familiar while those in the elementary were minimally familiar. This result can be attributed to the pre-school teachers' pre-service courses that provided them with inclusion principles. Based on informal interviews with some teachers, their training in their field study courses and actual practice teaching familiarized them with inclusion principles. Moreover, it is at the pre-school level, teachers mostly experienced the diversity of learners and were able to learned from their actual experiences. Tukey post hoc test indicates that this group of teachers were significantly more familiar about involving stakeholders than teachers in the elementary and secondary levels.

On the other hand, the tertiary level teachers were similarly very familiar with the principles of involving stakeholders. Being facilitators and mentors of pre-service teachers, they have to possess a wide sphere of knowledge on teaching-learning concepts and processes. As this group of teachers prepared for their lessons, they were able to read about inclusion. In some instances, some were able to attend conferences on special education and inclusion. It is a wonder though that the elementary level teachers were least familiar. This can be explained by the fact that teachers in the elementary level cannot but



Table 2*Level of Familiarity According to Identified Respondents' Demographic Profile*

| Demographics | Principles of Inclusion | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|
| | Decision-making with Students | | Involvement of Stakeholders | |
| Level Taught | | | | |
| Pre-school | 3.35 | VMF | 3.63a | VMF |
| Elementary | 2.48 | MiF | 2.84c | MoF |
| Secondary | 2.73 | MoF | 3.01bc | MoF |
| Tertiary | 2.91 | MoF | 3.43ab | VMF |
| F comp | 2.603 ^{ns} | | 4.035* | |
| Sig-val | 0.063 | | 0.012 | |
| Years in Service | | | | |
| <5 yrs. | 3.36a | VMF | 3.58a | VMF |
| +5 - 10 yrs. | 3.00a | MoF | 3.17ab | MoF |
| +10 - 15 yrs. | 2.40a | MiF | 2.72b | MoF |
| +15 - 20 yrs. | 3.07a | MoF | 3.37a | VMF |
| +20 yrs. | 2.65a | MoF | 3.43a | VMF |
| F comp | 2.547 ^{ns} | | 3.73* | |
| Sig-val | 0.052 | | 0.041 | |
| Orientation on Inclusive Education | | | | |
| Without | 3.00 | MoF | 3.30 | VMF |
| With | 2.88 | MoF | 3.27 | VMF |
| t comp | 0.448 ^{ns} | | 0.142 ^{ns} | |
| Sig-value | 0.656 | | 0.888 | |

Legend: Mean scores Descriptive Equivalence (DE)
 3.25 – 4.00 Very Much Familiar (VMF)
 2.50 – 3.24 Moderately Familiar (MoF)
 1.75 – 2.49 Minimally Familiar (MiF)
 1.00 – 1.74 Not Familiar (NF)

leave their classes to attend seminars or trainings. This result implies the need for this group of teachers to go through further mentoring and coaching to enhance their repertoire of knowledge on the issue.

Familiarity According to Years in Service

No significant differences were observed in the levels of familiarity on decision-making with students across the years in service (Table 2). It is on the familiarity when involving stakeholders where significant differences were found. Teachers who had less than five years of teaching and those who had been teaching for 16 years and beyond were significantly more familiar than those in the service for 11 to 15 years. That the youngest group of teachers have the highest

mean score can be attributed to their pre-service training recency. Teacher training institutions of recent times now include in their curriculum orientation about inclusion. Understandably, those who stayed longer in service had more exposure to the principles and practices on inclusive education directly from practice and from their formal trainings. This finding does not support the result of Al-Khatib (2007) where the teachers' inadequate knowledge on inclusion was similar regardless of years of teaching experience.

Familiarity Based on Orientation on Inclusive Education

Seminars, conferences and trainings are aimed at enhancing the competencies of its participants. Comparing the level of knowledge between those



who had some form of orientation with those who had no orientation yielded insignificant t-values on the two factors. The results indicate that attendance to conferences or trainings were not enough to warrant sufficient learning about inclusion. Seminars or conferences for two to three days are not adequate for a deep level of learning about inclusion. Usually, the general principles and concepts are learned but are forgotten if not regularly applied. This result implies that a deeper level of learning about inclusion is imperative. A longer period of training with workshops or immersion may be adopted for better comprehension and application of the concepts. Forlin and Chambers (2011) pointed that training on inclusion should include practices inherent in the locality so that teachers become effective and adopt relevant practices.

With the above findings, the null hypothesis that no significant differences exist in the respondents' level of familiarity with inclusive education principles according to the level they teach, years in service and orientation on inclusive education is partly accepted.

Self-efficacy on Inclusive Education

To determine the level of perceived self-efficacy to manage inclusive classes, several cases on inclusion practices were presented to the respondents. Table 3 shows the findings.

When data on self-efficacy were subjected to factor analysis, three factors were determined: enhancing learning, classroom management and

establishing partnerships. In general, the teacher-respondents indicated that they had a moderate level of efficacy when managing inclusion. As advocated by Bandura (1977) self-efficacy is the belief that one can successfully engage in a task to attain targeted outcome. In other words, it pertains to the perceived skill, efficiency or capability one has as used in this study. Efficacy is different from awareness about a concept for one may be very familiar with a concept but feels inadequate to execute the processes needed to be successful. The overall moderate level of self-efficacy for inclusion means that the respondents can handle diverse classrooms to some extent. Specifically, they are very efficacious in managing their classrooms and moderately efficacious in enhancing learning and establishing partnerships.

As societies get more mobile, schools get a mix of students. Nieto (2004) stressed that schools should champion education rights for all by teaching well and with heart and soul. Advocates of inclusion, multiculturalism, and the EFA assert that diversity is a cause for celebration since learners get to be acquainted with each other's cultures, peculiarities and lifestyles. Moreover, Woolfolk (2007) avowed that when teachers have a high sense of efficacy, such is translated in students' achievement level. Furthermore, Guskey (1994) cited the contention of Woolfolk et al. (1990) that when teachers have greater level of perceived teaching efficacy, they can use a variety of teaching methods and have a repertoire of behavior management strategies.

Table 3

Level of Self-efficacy on Inclusive Education

| Self-efficacy | Mean | DE | F-value | Sig-value |
|--------------------------|-------|-----|------------|-----------|
| Enhancing Learning | 3.05b | MoE | 17.149 *** | 0.000 |
| Classroom Management | 3.30a | VME | | |
| Establishing Partnership | 2.95b | MoE | | |
| Overall Mean | 3.07 | MoE | | |

Legend: Mean scores Descriptive Equivalence (DE)
 3.25 – 4.00 Very Much Efficacious (VME)
 2.50 – 3.24 Moderately Efficacious (MoE)
 1.75 – 2.49 Minimally Efficacious (MiE)
 1.00 – 1.74 Not Efficacious (NE)



The f-test pointed to significant differences among the three efficacy constructs. Teachers were very much efficacious in classroom management which indicates that they could encourage learners to work collaboratively, adhere to classroom protocols, control and redirect learners who tend to disrupt the learning atmosphere and make learners understand what is expected of them in the learning process. The ability to ensure effective classroom management is a primary and initial quality of every teacher for successful learning. Setting routines and expectations, class policies, and the like would lead to a healthy, safe, and productive learning climate. Less time is wasted on redirecting learners' energies into productive activities and outputs. Learners develop a sense of responsibility for their learning when the teacher implements effective classroom management practices.

The respondents conveyed that they were moderately efficacious or skilled relative to enhancing learning. They provided other ways of explaining the lessons when students cannot fully comprehend or when students are confused; used a variety of assessment to determine learning outcomes and assist those who were lagging. Moreover, they were able to modify or design learning tasks to accommodate all learners. These findings imply that teachers have a moderate level of efficacy in supporting learning by accommodating learning styles and applying teaching strategies that address the learners' varied intelligences. This finding is attributed to what they preach to pre-service students – to support learning considering each learner's unique trait.

The respondents were likewise moderately efficacious in establishing partnerships. Establishing partnership engages the learners, school staff, parents, and community stakeholders through collaborative efforts. When teachers can share information and feedback to stakeholders, such will redound to the learners' best interest. Specifically, it is on engaging the home where they felt most capable—making parents comfortable when visiting the school and assisting families in helping them learn well. It is common knowledge that the involvement of the home with schooling is positively correlated. From the study of Okeke (2014), he concluded that parents care about their children's education and that home and teachers have

shared responsibilities in realizing educational goals. When parents feel comfortable about discussing learning activities with teachers, success in learning is attained.

The respondents reported that they were not as efficacious in forging ties with experts in special education. However, the respondents have indicated that they were moderately familiar with principles on involving stakeholders. It may be that the teachers were not aware of the existence of institutions or with the protocol of referral, especially with the private agencies from whom they can seek assistance to enhance their capabilities on inclusion. The findings were similar with Main and Hammond (2008), Mergler and Tangen (2010) as cited by Park et al. (2014) where pre-service teachers had the lowest self-efficacy in collaborating with others but were high on the ability to use inclusive instruction.

Self-efficacy on Inclusion According to Moderating Variables

Table 4 reflects the reported level of self-efficacy when compared based on the level taught, years in service, and orientation on inclusion.

Self-efficacy According to Level Taught

Findings indicated that preschool teachers were significantly more skilled or efficacious in enhancing learning than teachers in the elementary and secondary levels. It implies that teachers in the elementary and secondary levels need to enhance their competencies along inclusion, especially since diversity is very likely experienced in these levels. Since pre-service teachers will be assigned under elementary and secondary teachers' tutelage in the field study courses and in-campus teaching, it is imperative that teachers are adept with inclusion.

In terms of classroom management, the mentors in the pre-school and tertiary levels were significantly very efficacious than teachers in the secondary level. This finding can be explained by the characteristics of the learners in these levels. Learners in the pre-school and tertiary levels are more "obedient" and submissive to their teachers' authority than high school learners who are at a critical period of development. It is during the adolescent years when learners are at the



Table 4*Level of Self-efficacy According to Respondents' Identified Demographic Profile*

| Demographics | FACTORS ON SELF-EFFICACY | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|--------------------------|-----|
| | Enhancing Learning | | Classroom Management | | Establishing Partnership | |
| Level Taught | | | | | | |
| Pre-school | 3.45a | VME | 3.56a | VME | 3.45a | VME |
| Elementary | 2.67b | MoE | 3.86ab | MoE | 2.70b | MoE |
| Secondary | 2.75b | MoE | 2.90b | MoE | 2.58b | MoE |
| Tertiary | 3.10ab | VME | 3.52a | VME | 2.95b | MoE |
| F comp | 4.061* | | 3.4396* | | 5.226** | |
| Sig-val | 0.012 | | 0.024 | | 0.003 | |
| Years in Service | | | | | | |
| <5 yrs. | 3.51a | VME | 3.53a | VME | 3.50a | VME |
| +5 - 10 yrs. | 3.11ab | MoE | 3.20ab | MoE | 2.87b | MoE |
| +10 - 15 yrs. | 2.44b | MoE | 2.74b | MoE | 2.28c | MiE |
| +15 - 20 yrs. | 3.08a | VME | 3.31ab | VME | 2.92ab | MoE |
| +20 yrs. | 3.04a | VME | 3.58a | VME | 3.06ab | MoE |
| F comp | 4.704** | | 2.735* | | 5.744** | |
| Sig-val | 0.003 | | 0.040 | | 0.001 | |
| Orientation on Inclusive Education | | | | | | |
| Without | 3.07 | MOE | 3.31 | VME | 3.03 | MoE |
| With | 2.95 | MOE | 3.24 | MoE | 2.93 | MoE |
| t comp | 0.580 ^{ns} | | 0.332 ^{ns} | | 0.452 ^{ns} | |
| Sig-val | 0.564 | | 0.741 | | 0.653 | |

Legend: Mean scores Descriptive Equivalence (DE)
 3.25 – 4.00 Very Much Efficacious (VME)
 2.50 – 3.24 Moderately Efficacious (MoE)
 1.75 – 2.49 Minimally Efficacious (MiE)
 1.00 – 1.74 Not Efficacious (NE)

crossroads of physical and psychological changes. They tend to challenge their teachers' patience and tolerance levels as they test the limits of their independence (Lounsbury, 2000). The rebellious characteristic exhibited by the high school learners may have caused the secondary level teachers to report lower level of self-efficacy when it comes to classroom management.

Regarding the self-efficacy in establishing partnership, the preschool level teachers were significantly very efficacious than teachers of all the other levels. This finding can be ascribed to their experiences of interacting very often with parents, giving parents regular feedback about the learners and involving the home in the learning process. This group of teachers also often

discussed concerns with guidance counselors and the principal about the learners. According to Comer and Haynes (1997), the school-home partnership enables children to observe that whatever is learned in school are complemented at home; how the significant adults in their lives work for their learning, how decisions are made and executed, and how problems are solved. All the experiences that children have both in and out of school help shape their belief that people care about them. From these experiences, learners' feelings of self-worth and competence and how they understand the world around them are enhanced. These are competencies that teachers across all levels need to communicate with their students.



Self-efficacy According to Years in Service

Those with least years in teaching together with teachers who had been teaching for 20 years and more were significantly more efficacious than teachers with 11 to 15 years in the job. As mentioned earlier, the youngest group are those in the pre-school level. Similar to what was said earlier about familiarity, this youngest group of teachers have just completed their degrees in Early Childhood Education. They had some courses on inclusion and these acquired competencies are still fresh in them. On the other hand, the teachers who have stayed the longest in the profession acquired so much knowledge and maybe some experiences about inclusion, thus giving them a higher sense of efficacy on inclusion. In the study of Forlin and Sin (2017) found that the teachers across all ages reported a low level of efficacy with inclusive education. They found that the young teachers who had the least teaching experiences, were most concerned about their capacity for inclusive instruction. It is the group of teachers of 11 to 15 years of teaching who need further orientation or training on inclusion to enhance their skills.

Self-efficacy According to Orientation on Inclusive Education

Lastly, when comparing the level of self-efficacy according to orientation on inclusion, no significant differences were observed on all three factors. Those who had training or attended some seminars or conferences were moderately efficacious as those who had no training or attendance. The null hypothesis that no significant differences occur in the respondents' level of self-efficacy according to level taught, years in service and orientation on inclusive education is partly accepted.

Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education

Social Science researches consider attitudes a vital component in understanding what people think, feel and how they behave towards the object of study. An attitude is "a relatively enduring organization of beliefs, feelings, and behavioral tendencies towards socially significant objects, groups, events or symbols" (Hogg & Vaughan, 2005). In this study, the object of attitude is inclusive education. UNESCO (2006) views inclusion as "a dynamic approach of responding

positively to pupil diversity and of seeing individual differences not as problems, but as opportunities for enriching learning".

This study found that teacher-respondents strongly agreed that schools should practiced inclusion. In the earlier discussions, it was found that the respondents had moderate levels of familiarity with the inclusion principles and self-efficacy in managing inclusive classes. The finding with strong attitudes toward inclusion tells that while one has less sufficient knowledge and skills about inclusion, one can have strong beliefs and feelings for its promotion and advocacy. Dapudong (2013), Villa et al. (1996), and Ward et al. (1994) found similar results where teachers had strong positive attitudes on inclusion. Moreover, there are findings in Scotland (Florian, 2012) and in Greece (Zoniou-Sidri & Vlachou, 2006) where teachers considered that inclusion would interfere with effective learning.

Two factors on respondents' attitudes towards inclusive education were identified in this study: attitudes towards self-improvement and towards mainstreaming (Table 5). The t-test for paired samples proved to be very significant. The respondents strongly agreed that there is a need to improve their competencies over mainstreaming. Relative to self-improvement, they conveyed a need to update their competencies continually, research further, reflect on and find other innovative solutions to the challenges brought about by diverse learners. Moreover, they have to strengthen their collaboration and to support each other in building inclusion competencies as a team.

The respondents' agreement towards mainstreaming indicated that learners with communication problems, those with challenges on attention, and those with learning difficulties should be in regular classrooms. While the debate between mainstreaming and inclusion continues, both aim to enhance learners' the social skills. This finding is similar to Muega (2016), who found that while teachers and administrators of inclusive schools in the Philippines felt their knowledge and skills were wanting, they had no apparent resistance towards inclusion. Related to this, Forlin and Chambers (2011) shared that an increasing number of research studies indicate that positive attitudes are equally important if not more important, than the knowledge and skills of teachers in inclusive education. In conjunction with this,



Table 5*Level of Attitudes Toward Inclusive Education*

| Attitudes | Mean | DE | t-value | Sig-value |
|---------------------------|------|----|---------|-----------|
| Towards Self-Improvements | 3.60 | SA | 4.304** | 0.000 |
| Towards mainstreaming | 3.12 | S | | |
| Overall Mean | 3.36 | SA | | |

| | | |
|---------|-------------|------------------------------|
| Legend: | Mean scores | Descriptive Equivalence (DE) |
| | 3.25 – 4.00 | Strongly Agree (SA) |
| | 2.50 – 3.24 | Agree (A) |
| | 1.75 – 2.49 | Disagree (D) |
| | 1.00 – 1.74 | Strongly Disagree (SD) |

Liew (2016) pointed out that teaching in inclusive schools comes with challenges, but patience and effort make it a fulfilling process. She added that overall, learners do not only gain academically, but they gain better self-esteem and can cope better with society. The Bright Hub Education (2012) stressed that proponents of inclusion emphasize more on life preparation and social skills over level-appropriate academic skills. With a positive attitude on inclusion, teachers will support diverse learners, thereby modeling to the young a more tolerant, respecting and accepting reaction towards diversity.

Teachers' Attitude Towards Inclusion According to Moderating Variables

Table 6 shows the differences in the teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education determined according to the study's moderating variables.

Attitudes According to Level Taught

Teachers in the tertiary, pre-school, and secondary levels were strongly in agreement in improving themselves to be more effective and successful teachers on inclusion than the teachers at the elementary level. This result implies that those in the elementary level may feel confident that their overall competence is relatively sufficient in managing inclusion. In terms of attitudes on mainstreaming, teachers in all levels had similar levels of agreeing attitudes towards inclusion.

Attitudes According to Years in Service

For both factors, no significant differences were observed, which means regardless of how much time the respondents have spent in teaching, their attitudes towards inclusion were comparable. This result is similar to Chopra (2008) and Vaz et al. (2015) who found that years in teaching service did not significantly influence teachers' attitudes towards inclusion. On the other hand, Dukmak (2013) found that teachers' positive attitude towards inclusion is inversely correlated with the years of experience.

Attitudes According to Orientation on Inclusive Education

The attitudes of teachers who had an orientation about inclusion did not differ with those who had none with regards self-improvement but significantly differed regarding mainstreaming. Those who had orientation were significantly more agreeing on mainstreaming diverse learners. This finding is comparable with Vaz et al. (2015) who found that teachers with trainings were more positive about inclusion. Undoubtedly, the orientation on inclusion enabled the teacher participants to understand better the nature of mainstreaming in view of the learners' diversity that positively influenced their attitudes.

The null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in respondents' level of attitudes toward inclusion based on level taught, years in



Table 6*Level of Attitudes Towards Inclusion According to Respondents' Demographic Profile*

| Demographics | Factors of Attitudes | | | |
|---|----------------------|----|---------------------|----|
| | Self-improvement | | Mainstreaming | |
| Level Taught | | | | |
| Pre-school | 3.68a | SA | 3.00 | A |
| Elementary | 3.07b | A | 3.09 | A |
| Secondary | 3.65a | SA | 3.00 | A |
| Tertiary | 3.79a | SA | 3.35 | SA |
| F comp | 3.116* | | 0.936 ^{ns} | |
| Sig-val | 0.035 | | 0.431 | |
| Years in Service | | | | |
| <5 yrs. | 3.66 | SA | 2.98a | A |
| +5 - 10 yrs. | 3.31 | SA | 3.10 | A |
| +10 - 15 yrs. | 3.28 | SA | 3.02 | A |
| +15 - 20 yrs. | 3.68 | SA | 3.13 | A |
| +20 yrs. | 3.90 | A | 3.36 | SA |
| F comp | 1.845 ^{ns} | | 0.176 ^{ns} | |
| Sig-val | 0.136 | | 0.644 | |
| Orientation on Inclusive Education | | | | |
| Without | 3.59 | SA | 3.24 | A |
| With | 3.60 | SA | 3.72 | SA |
| t comp | 0.58 ^{ns} | | 2.543* | |
| Sig-val | 0.954 | | 0.014 | |

| | | |
|---------|-------------|------------------------------|
| Legend: | Mean scores | Descriptive Equivalence (DE) |
| | 3.25 – 4.00 | Strongly Agree (SA) |
| | 2.50 – 3.24 | Agree (A) |
| | 1.75 – 2.49 | Disagree (D) |
| | 1.00 – 1.74 | Strongly Disagree (SD) |

service, and orientation on inclusive education is partly accepted.

Conclusions

The BSU CTE faculty members are moderately familiar with the principles related to the two constructs on inclusive education—decision-making with students and stakeholders' active involvement. The respondents had comparable levels of familiarity on inclusion principles regarding decision-making with students but differed significantly on stakeholder involvement according to level taught and years in service.

Generally, the teacher-respondents were

moderately efficacious in inclusive education. Three constructs were determined: enhancing learning, classroom management, and establishing partnership. Significant differences in efficiency levels were observed on enhancing learning and classroom management vis-à-vis level taught and years in service.

The teachers strongly agreed in favor of inclusion, specifically on self-improvement and mainstreaming. They significantly differed in their attitude regarding self-improvement level taught and on mainstreaming based on level taught and on mainstreaming according to whether they had orientation on inclusion or none.



Recommendations

With the moderate levels of familiarity about inclusion principles and self-efficacy, there is an immediate need to increase the teachers' competence especially those who had been in the service for 5 to 15 years. Learning cells can be organized and facilitated by the teachers who had training on inclusion.

An intensified orientation or seminar-workshop can include topics and skills that will address diverse Filipino learners' peculiarities while keeping in mind the uniqueness of the Cordillera culture. Moreover, experts in the field can be invited as resource persons.

With the implementation of Inclusive Education at the basic education level, fresh graduates of teacher education programs need to be oriented with the basic principles and strategies in managing diverse classes. The BSU-CTE can organize one for its graduates.

The CHED can consider requiring a 3-unit basic course on inclusive education in all programs in the tertiary level, 6-unit course (on inclusion) in programs that deal directly with diverse learners like Teacher Education, Psychology, Nursing, Social Works, and at least a 3-unit course in the Graduate level.

To increase the level of awareness to a wider section of the Filipino community, the mass media can serve as an avenue in disseminating to the public about the reality of and in accommodating the needs of marginalized individuals. Specifically, the BSU-CTE can spearhead an extension program that will orient the community on the reality of inclusion and in the management of diverse learners.

Further research can be conducted to include teachers in basic education to determine their competencies or needs for successful inclusion.

Research on learning needs from the end of stakeholders may be conducted to identify what may be planned and implemented for a relevant inclusion.

References

- Abbott, L. (2006). Northern Ireland head teachers' perceptions of inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10 (6): 627-643.
- Al- Khatib, J.M. (2007). A survey of general education teachers' knowledge of learning disabilities in Jordan. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 22(1): 72-76.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy towards a unifying theory on behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2007). Memorandum No. 75, s. 2017 - Policies, Standards and Guidelines for Teacher Education.
- Chopra, R. (2008). Factors influencing elementary school teachers' attitude towards inclusive education. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, 3-6 September 2008. <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/174842.pdf>
- Comer, J.P., & Haynes, N. (1997). The Home-School Team: An Emphasis on Parent Involvement. *Edutopia*. <https://www.edutopia.org/home-school-team>
- Dapudong, R.C. (2013). Knowledge and Attitude Towards Inclusive Education of Children with Learning disabilities: The Case of Thai Primary School Teachers. *Academic Research International*, 4(4): 496-512. <http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/ijld/article/download/6116/5169>
- Dapudong, R.C. (2014). Teachers' Knowledge and Attitude towards Inclusive Education: Basis for an Enhanced Professional Development Program. *International Journal of Learning & Development*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v4i4.6116>
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2009). D.O. No. 72 s. 2009 - Inclusive Education as Strategy for Increasing Participation Rate of Children. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2009/07/06/do-72-s-2009-inclusive-education-as-strategy-for-increasing-participation-rate-of-children/>



- Department of Education (DepEd). (2020). DepEd Programs and Projects Beneficiaries. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/List-of-Programs-and-Projects-Beneficiaries-Finals.V2.pdf>
- Dukmak, S.J. (2013). Regular classroom teachers' attitudes towards including students with disabilities in the regular classroom in the United Arab Emirates. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 9(1): 26-39. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272748089-Regular_Classroom_Teachers'_Attitudes_towards_Including_Students_with_Disabilities_in_the_Regular_Classroom_in_the_United_Arab_Emirates
- European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. (2011). Key Principles for Promoting Quality in Inclusive Education – Recommendations for Practice, Odense, Denmark: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education <https://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/Key-Principles-2011-EN.pdf>
- European Agency for Disability and Inclusive Education. (2012). Profile of Inclusive Teachers <https://www.european-agency.org/projects/te4i/profile-inclusive-teachers>
- Florian, L. (2012). Preparing teachers to work in inclusive classrooms: key lessons for the professional development of teacher educators from Scotland's Inclusive Practice Project. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(4), 275-285.
- Forlin, C., & Chambers, D. (2011). Teacher preparation for inclusive education: increasing knowledge but raising concerns. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1): 17-32.
- Forlin, C., Earle, C., Loreman, T., & Sharma, U. (2011). The Sentiments, Attitudes and Concerns about Inclusive education Revised (SACIE-R) Scale for measuring pre-service teachers' perceptions about inclusion. *Exceptionality Education International*, 21(3): 50-65. <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1040&context=eai>
- Forlin, C., & Sin, K.F. (2017). In-service teacher training for inclusion. In G. W. Noblit (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*. <https://10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.161>
- Guskey, T.R. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A case study of construct dimensions. *American Research Journal*, 31(3): 627-643. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1163230?seq=1>
- Hogg, M., & Vaughan, G. (2005). *Social Psychology* (4th edition). London: Prentice-Hall p. 150.
- Hossain, D. (2004). Inclusive education: context Bangladesh. *Journal of the Faculty of Arts*, 6(1), 22-31.
- Inclusive Schools Network. (2015). Together We Learn Better: Inclusive Schools Benefit All Children <http://inclusiveschools.org/together-we-learn-better-inclusive-schools-benefit-all-children/>
- Inciong, T.G., & Quijano, Y.S. (2013) Inclusion of Children with Disabilities: The Philippines Experience. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 24(2): 173-191.
- Inclusion B C. (2012). Inclusive Education Guiding Principles. <http://www.inclusionbc.org/about-us/social-policy-positions/inclusive-education-guiding-principles>
- Leslie, L.L. (1972). Are high response rates essential to valid surveys? *Social Science Research*, 1(3): 323-334.
- Liew, M. (2016). Is Integrating Children with Special Needs in Mainstream Classrooms Beneficial? <https://wehavekids.com>
- Long, M., Wood, C., Littleton, K., Passenger, T., & Sheehy, K. (2011). *The psychology of education* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Lounsbury, J.H. (2000). "Understanding and Appreciating the Wonder Years." National Middle School Association. www.nmsa.org
- Muega, M.A.G. (2016). Inclusive Education in the Philippines: Through the Eyes of Teachers, Administrators, and Parents of Children with Special Needs. *Social Science Diliman*, 12(1). <http://journals.upd.edu.ph/index.php/socialsciencediliman/article/view/5230>
- Nieto. S. (2004). *The socio-political context of multicultural education* (4th ed.) New York: Allyn & Bacon, 2004. 496 pp



- Okeke, C.I. (2014). Effective home-school partnership: Some strategies to help strengthen parental involvement. *South African Journal of Education*, 34(3): 1-9. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1135521.pdf>
- Park, M., Dimitrov, D.M., Das, A., & Gichura, M. (2014). The Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TIEP) Scale: dimensionality and factor structure. *Journal of Research and Special Education Needs*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12047>
- Surot, L. (2014). Capacity-Building of Receiving Teachers in Handling Learners with Special Educational Needs Through SPED-LAC. *TeacherPH Buhay Guro*. <https://www.teacherph.com/handling-learners-with-special-educational-needs/>
- The Bright Hub Education. (2012). The Advantages and Benefits of Inclusion for Special Education. <https://www.brighthubeducation.com/special-ed-inclusion-strategies/66128-advantages-and-benefits-of-inclusion/>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1994). The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. Paris, UNESCO/Ministry of Education, Spain. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2003). Overcoming Exclusion through Inclusive Approaches in Education. A challenge and a vision. Paris. unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001347/134785e.pdf
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2006). Inclusive Education A Strategy for Achieving Education for All. <http://www.unescobkk.org/education/inclusive-education/what-is-inclusive-education/inclusive-education-and-education-for-all/>
- Vaz, S., Wilson, N., Falkmer, M., Sim, A., Scott, M., Cordier, R., & Falkmer, T. (2015). Factors Associated with Primary School Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities. *PLoS ONE*, 10(8): e0137002. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0137002>
- Villa, B. A., Thousand, J.S., Meyers, H. & Navin, A. (1996) . Teacher and administrative perceptions of heterogeneous education. *Exceptional Children*, 63, 29-45.
- Ward, J., Center, Y., & Bochner, S. (1994). A question of attitudes: integrating children with disabilities into regular classrooms. *British Journal of Special Education*, 21(1), 34-39.
- Wisdom, M., Dwomoh, J.A., Opoku, M.P., Owusu, I., & Ampratwum, J. (2016). Knowledge, Attitude and Preparedness of Teachers towards Inclusive Education in Ejisu – Juaben Municipality in Ashanti Region of Ghana. *Journal of Disability Management and Special Education*, 6(2): 1-15. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308780578_Knowledge_Attitude_and_Preparedness_of_Teachers_towards_Inclusive_Education_in_Ejisu_-_Juaben_Municipality_in_Ashanti_Region_of_Ghana
- Woolfolk, A.E. (2007). *Educational Psychology*. 10th ed. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Woolfolk, A.E., Rossof, B., & Hoy, W.K. (1990). Teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs about managing students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 6: 137-148.
- Zoniou-Sidri, A., & Vlachou, A. (2006). Greek teachers' belief systems about disability and inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10(4-5), 379-39.

