International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention 11(03): 8099-8109, 2024
DOI: 10.18535/ijsshi/v11i03.01
ISSN: 2349-2031
https://valleyinternational.net/index.php/theijsshi

Teachers' Perception Towards Inclusive Education

Ramil P. Manguilimotan[1], *Gengen G. Padillo[2], Jaquelyn C. Sanchez[3], Jean Rea O. Elaba[4], Cheryl M. Albos[5], Reylan G. Capuno[6], Raymond C. Espina[7], Emerson D. Peteros[8],

[12345678]Cebu Technological University – Main Campus, College of Education

Abstract:

This study aimed to assess the perception of teachers handling inclusive education at the identified public elementary schools in Loon South District, Bohol Province, for the school year 2022–2023 as the basis for instructional skills enhancement plans. The respondents comprised three clusters of grades one to six teachers handling inclusive classes. The respondents were selected using universal sampling and treated using inferential and descriptive statistics. Results showed that most respondents aged 44-53 were female, married, with master units, specialized in general education, and taught for 8-14 years. Moreover, the level of perception of the respondents towards inclusive education was very positive. It was also found that there was no significant difference between respondents' profile and their perceptions of inclusive education. Therefore, results showed that respondents were very optimistic about handling inclusive classes. It is recommended that the instructional enhancement plans be implemented for a more positive learning experience when dealing with inclusive classes.

Keywords: Special Education, Inclusive Education, descriptive research, Bohol

1. Introduction

Every child has the right to education. Regardless of their demographic profiles, all learners should receive high-quality education, interventions, and support for learning. Furthermore, the quality of education depends on the caliber of teachers (Padillo et al., 2021). Inclusive Education (IE) is implemented in the Philippines to enable regular and special education learners to learn together in a mainstream classroom. The quality of education teachers provide to the learners depends upon their expertise in handling classes particularly in inclusive classrooms thus shaping positive values, providing knowledge, and developing the skills of the differently-abled learners to cope with life's challenges(Dela Fuente, 2021).

The researchers have observed that new teachers, particularly Special Education (SpEd) graduates, can more effectively handle learners in inclusive classrooms than those without Special Education backgrounds. These teachers with SPED undergraduate educational qualifications are more supportive of inclusive education. Teachers with no special education training expressed less excitement for the benefits of inclusion and the competence to manage integrated classes and teach learners with disabilities.

Resistance to change in teaching and understanding learners with special needs is the hindrance for most teachers handling regular classes to become unsupportive of inclusive education (Crispel & Kasperski, 2021). Many experts have suggested that the success of inclusion depends on knowledge(Aldabas, 2020), instructional skills(Winter et al., 2021), and the attitudes and beliefs of general education teachers (Miyauchi, 2020) toward the inclusion of learners with special needs.

It is not enough for teachers to be willing and predisposed to embrace inclusive education practices. It takes more than signing decrees and accords by public policy to invest in teacher training and producing resources to make a difference. Hence, this study sought to discover the perspectives of the Grade 1 to 6 teachers in Loon South District, Province of Bohol, regarding inclusion.

1.1. Purpose of the study

This research assessed the perception of teachers handling inclusive classes at the identified public elementary schools in Loon South District, Bohol Province for school year 2021-2022.

Specifically, it determined the profile of the respondents; the level of perception of the respondents towards inclusive education in terms of general knowledge, inclusion curriculum,organization,work awareness,general skills required, specific skills required; and a significant difference between the respondents' perception towards inclusive education when grouped according to their profile.

2. Materials and Methods

This section presents the research design, respondents, instrument, procedure in data gathering, and statistical treatment of the data.

2.1 Research design

This research utilized the descriptive-comparative quantitative method of research to assess the perception of the respondents with regards to the implementation of inclusive education in their District.

2.2 Respondents

A total of 100 public elementary school teachers from Grade One to Grade Six clustered into three from the twelve public elementary schools in the Municipality of Loon, Bohol under the District of Loon South were the respondents of this study. The respondents were selected based on the predetermined criteria such as the implementation of inclusive education and the willingness to engage in this study.

2.3 Instrument

The researcher employed an adapted survey questionnaire from the study of Pérez-Jorge et al. (2021). The survey questionnaire was clustered into two (2) main components to adequately address the sub-problems: Part 1 contained the respondents' profile. Part 2 featured the questions concerning teachers' perceptions of inclusive education.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

The researchers secured an approval from the School Division Supervisor of Loon District to conduct the study. After the approval of the division office, the researchers visited the research locale and meet the target respondents. After brief explanation of the purpose of the study to the respondents, the researchers started the administration of the survey questionnaire. The researchers gave respondents time to think about and choose whether or not to participate in the survey through the informed consent. Ethical considerations and data privacy act were adhered to. Data gathered were consolidated, tabulated and analyzed.

2.5 Statistical Treatment

The data gathered were treated using frequency distribution and percentage for the respondents' profile and weighted mean was used to determine the respondents' level of perception of inclusive education. Lastly, ANOVA was used to test for significant differences in respondents' perceptions of inclusive education.

3. Results

This section presents the results of the data gathered.

Table 1. Age and Gender

Marital Status	f	%
Married	89	89.00
Single	7	7.00
Separated	2	2.00
Widow	2	2.00
Total	**100**	**100.00**

Table 1 shows that respondents from Clusters 1 to 3 are overwhelmingly female, with a frequency of 31 or 31 percent of respondents falling between the ages of 44 and 53. Females between the ages of 34 and 43 came in second with 30% frequency or 30% of the total, while women between the ages of 24-33 came in last with 11% frequency or 11% of the total. Contrarily, the frequency of male responders was six, or six percent. One (1), or 12%, was between the ages of 24-33, while five (5) were between the ages of 34 and 43.

Table 2. Marital Status

Age (in years)	Female		Male		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
54 – 63	22	22.00	0	0.00	22	22.00
44 – 53	31	31.00	0	0.00	31	31.00
34 – 43	30	30.00	5	5.00	35	35.00
24 – 33	11	11.00	1	1.00	12	12.00
Total	**94**	**94.00**	**6**	**6.00**	**100**	**100.00**

Table 2 reveals that most respondents from the three clusters are married, with a frequency of 89 or 89 percent, with seven (7) remaining single and two (2) separated and widowed.

Table 3. Highest Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	f	%
With Doctorate Units	2	2.00
Master's Degree	7	7.00
With Master's Units	69	69.00
Bachelor's Degree	22	22.00
Total	100	100.00

As reflected in Table 3, most teacher respondents, 69 or 69 percent, acquired master's units. Seven (7) individuals already held a master's degree, while 22 others had a bachelor's degree. There are just two (2) Ph.D. units in all clusters.

Table 4. Field of Specialization

Field of Specialization	**f**	**%**
General Education	63	63.00
Special Education	9	9.00
Filipino	6	6.00
Early Childhood Education	6	6.00
Science	5	5.00
English	4	4.00
Administration and Supervision	1	1.00
Agriculture	1	1.00
Guidance and Counseling	1	1.00
Home Economics	1	1.00
HELE	1	1.00
Mathematics	1	1.00
Failed to Respond	1	1.00
Total	**100**	**100.00**

Table 4 displays the most common field of specialty was general education, with a frequency of 63 or 63 percent. After that, special education had a frequency of 9 or 9 percent, while Filipino and Early Childhood had six (6) instructors. One (1) was assigned to each of the seven (7) specialties.

Table 5. Length of Service

Length of service (in years)	f	%
29 – 35	12	12.00
22 – 28	20	20.00
15 – 21	14	14.00
8 – 14	28	28.00
1 – 7	26	26.00
Total	**100**	**100.00**

Table 5 represents that most cluster 1-3 respondents are 8-14 years of service with a frequency of 28 or 28 percent. Teachers from the early-stage range of 1-7 years ranked second with a frequency of 26 or 26 percent. The lowest came from 29-35 years of service, with a frequency of 12 or 12 percent.

Table 6. Level of Perception of the Respondents Towards Inclusive Education

Components	**WM**	**Verbal Description**
General Knowledge	3.44	Very Positive
Inclusion Curriculum	3.63	Very Positive
Organization	3.53	Very Positive
Work Awareness	3.53	Very Positive
General Skills Requires	3.55	Very Positive
Specific Skills Required	3.34	Very Positive
Grand Mean	**3.5**	**Very Positive**

Table 6 shows a summary of teachers' perceptions of inclusive education from three (3) clusters as "**Very Positive**," with the inclusion curriculum coming in first with a weighted mean of 3.63, followed by the general skills required with a weighted mean of 3.55, and specific skills coming in last with a weighted mean of 3.34.

Table 7. Test of Relationship between the Respondents and their Perception Towards Inclusive Education in Terms of their General Knowledge

Variables	Test Statistic	p - value	Decision	Remarks
Age and General Knowledge	r=0.151	0.133	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Gender and General Knowledge	χ^2 =0.118	0.731	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Marital Status and General Knowledge	χ^2 =4.920*	0.027	Reject Ho	Significant
Educational Attainment and General Knowledge	χ^2 =0.492	0.483	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Field of Specialization and General Knowledge	χ^2 =1.811	0.178	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Length of Service and General Knowledge	r=-0.064	0.526	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant

*significant at p<0.05

The computed statistics for the relationship of the two variables are age (r=-0.151, p=0.133), gender (χ^2 =0.118,p 0.731), marital status (χ^2 =4.920 ,p 0.027), educational attainment (χ^2 0.492, p=0.483), field of specialization (χ^2 =1.811, p=0.178), and length of service (r=-0.064, p=0.526). The findings show that the p-values for age, gender, educational attainment, the field of specialization, and duration of service are all more than 0.05 (p > 0.05), indicating that the null hypothesis is rejected; however, the marital status finds it is" significant" in terms of general knowledge.

Table 8. Test of Relationship between the Respondents and their Perception Towards Inclusive Education in Terms of Inclusion Curriculum

Variables	Test Statistic	p-value	Decision	Remarks
Age and Inclusion Curriculum	r=-0.031	0.761	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Gender and Inclusion Curriculum	χ^2 =1.448	0.229	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Marital Status and Inclusion Curriculum	χ^2 =2.451	0.117	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Educational Attainment and Inclusion Curriculum	χ^2 =0.090	0.764	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Field of Specialization and Inclusion Curriculum	χ^2 =0.113	0.737	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Length of Service and Inclusion Curriculum	r=-0.064	0.526	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant

*significant at p<0.05

The following are the computed statistics for the relationship of the two variables: age (r=-0.031, p=0.761), gender(χ^2 =1.448, p 0.229), marital status (χ^2 =2.451, p 0.117), educational attainment (χ^2 0.090, p=0.764), field of specialization (χ^2 =0.113, p=0.737), and length of service (r=-0.064, p=0.526). The results revealed that the p-values for age, educational attainment, field of specialization, and length of service are greater than 0.05 (p > 0.05), indicating that the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 9. Test of Relationship between the Respondents and their Perception Towards Inclusive Education in Terms of the Organization

Variables	Test Statistic	p-value	Decision	Remarks
Age and Organization	r=-0.031	0.761	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Gender and Organization	χ^2 =1.448	0.229	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Marital Status and Organization	χ^2 =2.451	0.117	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Educational Attainment and Organization	χ^2 =0.090	0.764	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Field of Specialization and Organization	χ^2 =0.113	0.737	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Length of Service and Organization	r=-0.064	0.526	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant

*significant at p<0.05

The following are the computed statistics for the relationship of the two variables: age (r=-0.159, p=0.113), gender(χ^2 =0.295, p 0.587), marital status (χ^2 =3.344, p 0.067), educational attainment (χ^2 0.014, p=0.906), field of specialization (χ^2 =13.098, p=0.000), and length of service (r=-0.064, p=0.527). The results revealed that the p-values for age, gender, marital status, educational attainment, and length of service are greater than 0.05 (p > 0.05), indicating that the null hypothesis is rejected. The findings show that the p-values for specialization and organization are all less than 0.05 (p > 0.05), hence, null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 10. Test of Relationship between the Respondents and their Perception Towards Inclusive Education in Terms of the Work Awareness

Variables	Test Statistic	p - value	Decision	Remarks
Age and Work Awareness	r=-0.062	0.539	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Gender and Work Awareness	χ^2 =2.358	0.125	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Marital Status and Work Awareness	χ^2 =0.561	0.454	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Educational Attainment and Work Awareness	χ^2 =1.993	0.158	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Field of Specialization and Work Awareness	χ^2 =4.025*	0.045	Reject Ho	Significant
Length of Service and Work Awareness	r=-0.012	0.909	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant

*significant at p<0.05

The following are the computed statistics for the relationship of the two variables: age (r=-0.062, p=0.539), gender(χ^2 =2.358, p 0.125), marital status (χ^2 =0.561, p 0.454) educational attainment (χ^2 1.992, p=0.158), field of specialization (χ^2 =4.025, p=0.045), and length of service (r=-0.012, p=0.909). The results revealed that the p-values for age, gender, marital status, educational attainment, and length of service are greater than 0.05 (p > 0.05), indicating that the null hypothesis is rejected. However, the field of specialization shows that p-values are less than 0.05, which indicates the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Table 11. Test of Relationship between the Respondents and their Perception Towards Inclusive Education in Terms of the General Skills Required

Variables	Test Statistic	p - value	Decision	Remarks
Age and General Skills Required	r=0.027	0.787	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Gender and General Skills Required	χ^2 =0.709	0.400	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Marital Status and General Skills Required	χ^2 =2.554	0.110	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Educational Attainment and General Skills Required	χ^2 =1.507	0.220	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Field of Specialization and General Skills Required	χ^2 =0.170	0.680	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Length of Service and General Skills Required	r=-0.012	0.903	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant

*significant at p<0.05

The following are the computed statistics for the relationship of the two variables: age (r=-0.027, p=0.787), gender(χ^2 =0.709, p 0.400), marital status (χ^2 =2.544, p 0.110), educational attainment (χ^2 1.507, p=0.220), field of specialization (χ^2 =0.170, p=0.680), and length of service (r=-0.012, p=0.903). The results revealed that the p-values for age, gender, marital status, educational attainment, and length of service are greater than 0.05 (p > 0.05), indicating that the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 12. Test of Relationship between the Respondents and their Perception Towards Inclusive Education in Terms of the Specific Skills Required

Variables	Test Statistic	p - value	Decision	Remarks
Age and Specific Skills Required	r=0.220*	0.028	Reject Ho	Significant
Gender and Specific Skills Required	χ^2 =0.613	0.434	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Marital Status and Specific Skills Required	χ^2 =2.774	0.096	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Educational Attainment and Specific Skills Required	χ^2 =1.775	0.183	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant
Field of Specialization and Specific Skills Required	χ^2 =9.122*	0.003	Reject Ho	Significant
Length of Service and Specific Skills Required	r=-0.150	0.135	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant

*significant at p<0.05

The following are the computed statistics for the relationship of the two variables: age (r=-0.220, p=0.028), gender (χ^2 =0.613, p 0.434), marital status (χ^2 =2.774, p 0.0967), educational attainment (χ^2 1.775, p=0.183), field of specialization (χ^2 =9.122, p=0.003), and length of service (r=-0.150, p=0.135). The results revealed that the p-values for gender, marital status, educational attainment, and length of service are greater than 0.05 (p > 0.05), indicating that the null hypothesis is rejected. Age and specific skills required result is lesser than the p- values, indicating that the null hypothesis is not rejected.

4. Discussion

The data on the profile of the respondents revealed that teaching in inclusive education is woman-dominated. There are more female teachers compared to males. The education sector particularly those interested in special needs, attracts a large proportion of female applicants as opposed to male. Hence, the large proportion of female teachers represented the actual situation. According to (Santos & Amâncio, 2019), there is gender inequality due to the dearth of masculine role models in elementary schooling, which causes female teachers to perform less well than their male counterparts and leads to social marginalization. Even though women are predominant in teaching, their research showed that women are still disadvantaged in the workplace.

Moreover, married teachers were considered the finest teachers because their lives are whole, their experiences are more comprehensive, and their grasp of youngsters more profound (Lazarus, 2019; Parlak et al., 2021). The creation of superior teachers results from all of these superiorities. But, there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups of degrees of professional adjustment. It unequivocally demonstrates that marriage has nothing to do with a teacher's profession(Pawlewicz, 2020).

On the other hand, result indicates that most teachers in all the clusters had earned master's units. This imply that teachers with higher educational attainment has deeper understanding and has a very positive perception towards handling inclusive education. (bin Nordin et al., 2019).

Most teachers are in general education thus they are in inclusive education, instructors are more likely to have general skills than specialized abilities. The UNESCO Institute for Statistics defines general education as a curriculum that improves students' general knowledge, literacy, skills, and competencies to give them the groundwork for lifetime learning and advanced academic programs (Smaniotto et al., 2022). Learners with special needs in the general education classroom, regardless of their strengths and weaknesses, needs proper teaching from teachers in general education field of specialization(Kauffman, 2021; Kuffman et al., 2022; Kauffman & Hornby, 2020). She also added in her study that teachers should be allowed to learn more about how to create successful inclusive classrooms to create and maintain a successful inclusion classroom.(O'Leary et al., 2020; Somma & Bennett, 2020) Hence, though general education is a common field of specialization for teachers, many factors must be considered in implementing inclusive education.

Furthermore, the data revealed that most teachers have taught for 8-14 years already. The respondents have longer years in teaching inclusive classroom setting. Length of service was significant to job satisfaction (Davidescu et al., 2020; Toropova et al., 2021). Also, they mentioned that teachers prefer to serve longer when they are contented with their job and develop productive ones. The effectiveness of a teacher depends on the student. There is a significant difference between teachers who are motivated by their profession, love education, want to improve society and children, and are prepared to put in significant effort, learn new things daily, and substitute old behaviors for new ones. This is true even while the length of the service allows for experience and continued learning; it may also be said. Length of service in teaching is a benefit in putting it into practice, but it never ensures effectiveness. Support from the public and the government ensures its implementation success.

According to (Alsarawi & Sukonthaman, 2023; Kart & Kart, 2021; Kauffman & Hornby, 2020), general education child learning in inclusive classrooms does not experience any adverse effects. In other words, having learners with special educational needs (LSENs) in their class does not impede general education students' social or intellectual development.

In general, the level of perception of teachers in terms of general knowledge are all very positive. This means that if teachers are willing to accept an inclusion setting for learners with special needs (LSENs) it will give confidence to them. According to (Wilson et al., 2020), the level of perceptions of having general knowledge is an essential predictor for successfully implementing inclusive education.

The study of (Kuyini et al., 2020; Siyam, 2019; You et al., 2019) demonstrated the significance of the teacher's perspective in inclusive education. This is supported to the study of (Krischler et al., 2019; Moberg et al., 2020) emphasized that teachers' attitudes toward children with special needs make a difference in how successfully inclusive education is implemented in regular classrooms. Moreover, (Brussino, 2020; Mihajlovic & Meier, 2022; Norwich, 2022) pointed out that inclusive education provides a full-time or part-time planned curriculum for learners with special educational needs (LSENs) and those who qualify for special education services in classrooms with other students, including differentiated instruction. Thus, teachers' perception of inclusive education plays a big part in the inclusion of the curriculum, which will make the integration of learning a positive outcome.

The data suggest that teachers in all three groups favor inclusive education's organizational structure. It was discovered from the prior data displaying individual indications that teachers concurred that structure in a curriculum is important. Teachers have already accepted the curriculum's inclusion; the organization is only another element that must be considered for inclusive education to be effective. However, they stated that negative teachers provide the biggest obstacles to changing the educational setting (Khursheed et al., 2020).

The engagement of teachers, who are also influenced by the laws that have been put in place, inclusion practices, and the sharing of experience in the administration of inclusive education, has an extraordinary impact on the efficacy of inclusion models (Savolainen et al., 2022) . The efficiency of primary school students' adaptation and integration into society depends on the capacities of educators, which are developed via training and skill-building programs. (Albritton et al., 2023; Dinh & Nguyen, 2023). The activities and instructional techniques used by the classroom instructor have the biggest impact on special needs students' academic and social results.(Mitchell & Sutherland, 2020).

According to (Dignath et al., 2022; Somma & Bennett, 2020)some key findings indicate that while teachers see inclusion favorably, they also recognize that implementing it in courses can be challenging, specifically in work aligned to it. They are faced with a conflict between the demands of particular learners and the goals of the class as a whole. According to other findings, it is vital in work awareness that collaboration is a crucial component of successful inclusive didactic lesson preparation and lesson practice. Hence, teachers viewed inclusive education in terms of work awareness as very positive because they are also essential to the efficient administration of inclusive primary education, especially since they are doing their part as a teacher.

According to (Heyder et al., 2020; Saloviita, 2020), attitudes toward inclusive education is essential for success for learners with special educational needs (LSEN). By keeping in mind that they could emphasize student improvement more strongly than on the topic at hand, it is easier to comprehend why topic teachers have more critical views about inclusiveness. Subject specialists teach many student groups and have a larger student body than the other two teacher categories. Therefore, teachers positively perceived inclusive education in terms of general skills.

Based to the statistics, it can be deduced that most instructors working in inclusive classrooms had a favorable opinion of the requisite technical abilities. Future studies may examine and suggest models of pre-service and in-service teacher training programs for inclusive education that incorporate additional elements, such as attitudes and general skill competencies. The study highlighted the significance of pre-service and in-service teacher training for successful and effective inclusive education. In conclusion, teachers saw that inclusive education regarding specific skills required is all positive. It is essential to provide teachers with the broad knowledge, skills, and understanding needed to function effectively in the classroom (Byrd & Alexander, 2020).

In summary, the data implies that teachers' attitude to the level of perception in terms of inclusion of curriculum was very positive, which means teachers are already practicing and had the adjustment as to how to death with the integration of curriculum. The study of (Woodcock et al., 2023; Woodcock & Jones, 2020) found that the teacher's attitude and the viewpoint, beliefs, and humanity afforded to the students with disabilities become extremely important for the implementation of inclusive education since it may aid or hinder the integration, learning, and engagement of students. Teachers' beliefs and attitudes affect whether inclusive practices are successful or unsuccessful, and they are impacted by factors such as training, experience, years of teaching practice, etc. On the test of relationship, the findings show that the marital status is significant in terms of general knowledge; organization and field of specialization are significant in terms of work awareness, and age and field of specialization are significant in terms of specific skills required.

Paulos et al. (2021) found that married status impacted teachers' self-efficacy; the quantitative results showed no statistically significant relationship between marital status and instructors' self-efficacy. Hence, teachers viewed inclusive education as very positive concerning general knowledge. Additionally, there is no significant difference between the respondents'profile and their perception towards inclusion. The incorporation of a curriculum that is integrated into inclusive education is something that teachers are likely already accustomed to doing. The strategic curriculum design for the school to be executed will be carefully led in order to ensure that learners who are ready to be in an inclusive environment will be ensured, given the Department of Education's broad distribution.

Furthermore, teachers considered the field of specialization and organization impacted how they perceived inclusive education. The field of specialization is one of the variables linked to teachers' mastery of skills. According to (Radó, 2020), by putting in place various programs to assist the school in overcoming obstacles and reducing external pressure, the school as a social system separates into social sub-systems. When the school loses control over how the installed organization handles inclusion education, issues start.(Meyer & Norman, 2020) This will become lighter to implement if teachers have related fields of specialization that can carry out the task and make it feasible. In this way, implementing the curriculum in the organization will be more effective.

Teachers are generally aware that their demographic profile does not influence their degree of perspective toward inclusive education in terms of work awareness. However, the specialized field shows impact since being aware of their task assesses a teacher's proficiency because they have previously studied, it may be inferred that most teachers place a high value on it. The specific skills needed are related to the work matter. This link could be reinforced due to the potential abilities present in the methods it uses as its targets.

They adopted inclusive education strategies where learners with special educational needs (LSENs) are immersed in an inclusive classroom with a typically developing learning environment. Shetty et al. (2021) explained that the instructional models must be carefully created to offer good learning opportunities for all students if inclusion is to demonstrate significant effects. Teachers in special education and general education must respect one another, be receptive to the inclusionary culture, have solid administrative backing, and be knowledgeable about addressing the needs of children with disabilities. A special education teacher's participation is essential to a combined learning environment's effectiveness in various ways. Hence, teachers' work awareness and field specialization are significant factors in their perception of inclusive education.

Based on the data, it was evident that every respondent firmly believed that their demographic characteristics have no bearing on the general abilities needed to achieve the level of perception in inclusive education. The factors showed that teachers already have the abilities required to carry out duties in instructing students. Additionally, the data showed evidence that they are competent in taking care of themselves, which causes them to be more proactive and challenge-ready. Furthermore, teachers were more assured and receptive to potential adjustments to the inclusive atmosphere.

The data implies that teachers from the three clusters showed no relationship with most of their demographic profiles except age. This can be explained by the fact that younger and inexperienced teachers may be more enthusiastic about learning and developing specific skills that will help them improve their inclusive education strategies. In their study,(Bacher-Hicks et al., 2019; Vermunt et al., 2019) found that there is no lower teaching quality for teachers still in their first three years of teaching but suggested that the teaching quality could be higher overall. Most special education teachers are trained to take an individual approach to the teaching and learning of students with special educational needs, making it easier for them to blend in and manage learners when they are transferred to an inclusive setting.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the findings of the study, the respondents had a very positive level of perception in handling classes at the identified public elementary schools in Loon South District, Bohol Province, for the school year 2021-2022. The researchers strongly recommended that the action plans be adopted, monitored, and evaluated to provide teachers handling special education needs with professional development activities and other techniques to give LSENs a meaningful learning experience.

Funding: There was no specific funding for this study.

Competing Interests: The authors declare no competition of this scholarly work.

Acknowledgment: All authors has equal contributed to the conception and design of the study

References

1. Albritton, M., Roberts, T. G., DiBenedetto, C., & Bunch, J. C. (2023). Exploring how an integrated skills acquisition activity impacts the teaching ability and perceived self-efficacy to teach agricultural technical skills of preservice teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *64*(1), 156–170. Retrieved from bit.ly/45wYIBM
2. Aldabas, R. (2020). Special education teachers' perceptions of their preparedness to teach students with severe disabilities in inclusive classrooms: A Saudi Arabian perspective. *Sage Open*, *10*(3), 2158244020950657. Retrieved from bit.ly/45gW0R2
3. Alsarawi, A., & Sukonthaman, R. (2023). Preservice teachers' attitudes, knowledge, and self-efficacy of inclusive teaching practices. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, *70*(5), 705–721. Retrieved from bit.ly/45cfruk
4. Bacher-Hicks, A., Chin, M. J., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2019). An experimental evaluation of three teacher quality measures: Value-added, classroom observations, and student surveys. *Economics of Education Review*, *73*, 101919. Retrieved from bit.ly/45geQrx
5. bin Nordin, M. N., Mustafa, M. Z. B., & Razzaq, A. (2019). The Practice of Headmasters' Leadership and Its Effect on Job Satisfaction of Special Education Integration Program (PPKI) Teachers in Johor, Malaysia. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *7*(9), 2008–2014. Retrieved from bit.ly/3skeKRh
6. Brussino, O. (2020). *Mapping policy approaches and practices for the inclusion of students with special education needs*. Retrieved from bit.ly/3QKGZ5y
7. Byrd, D. R., & Alexander, M. (2020). Investigating special education teachers' knowledge and skills: Preparing general teacher preparation for professional development. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, *4*(2), 72–82. Retrieved from bit.ly/3QLdCAk
8. Crispel, O., & Kasperski, R. (2021). The impact of teacher training in special education on the implementation of inclusion in mainstream classrooms. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *25*(9), 1079–1090. Retrieved from bit.ly/44ihfkn
9. Dela Fuente, J. A. (2021). Implementing inclusive education in the Philippines: College teacher experiences with deaf students. *Issues in Educational Research*, *31*(1), 94–110. Retrieved from bit.ly/3OEk9tT
10. Dignath, C., Rimm-Kaufman, S., van Ewijk, R., & Kunter, M. (2022). Teachers' beliefs about inclusive education and insights on what contributes to those beliefs: A meta-analytical study. *Educational Psychology Review*, *34*(4), 2609–2660. Retrieved from bit.ly/3E6e5pb
11. Dinh, H., & Nguyen, L. T. H. (2023). Teacher-practitioner inquiry in professional development A case of adaptation and resistance to genre-based systemic functional linguistic as a new writing instruction: A case of adaptation and resistance to genre-based systemic functional linguistic as a new writing instruction. *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, *16*(1), 65–80. Retrieved from bit.ly/3E3C0Fz
12. Heyder, A., Suedkamp, A., & Steinmayr, R. (2020). How are teachers' attitudes toward inclusion related to the social-emotional school experiences of students with and without special educational needs? *Learning and Individual Differences*, *77*, 101776. Retrieved from bit.ly/3P3fGSU
13. Kart, A., & Kart, M. (2021). Academic and social effects of inclusion on students without disabilities: A review of the literature. *Education Sciences*, *11*(1), 16. Retrieved from bit.ly/45y3AGF
14. Kauffman, J. M. (2021). The promises and limitations of educational tiers for special and inclusive education. *Education Sciences*, *11*(7), 323. Retrieved from bit.ly/47ChOZ6

15. Kauffman, J. M., Ahrbeck, B., Anastasiou, D., Badar, J., Crockett, J. B., Felder, M., Hallahan, D. P., Hornby, G., Lopes, J., & Pullen, P. C. (2022). Parents' and educators' perspectives on inclusion of students with disabilities. In *Research for Inclusive Quality Education: Leveraging Belonging, Inclusion, and Equity* (pp. 205–217). Springer. Retrieved from bit.ly/3qGLCTJ
16. Kauffman, J. M., & Hornby, G. (2020). Inclusive vision versus special education reality. *Education Sciences*, *10*(9), 258. Retrieved from bit.ly/3qtdxqk
17. Krischler, M., Powell, J. J., & Pit-Ten Cate, I. M. (2019). What is meant by inclusion? On the effects of different definitions on attitudes toward inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *34*(5), 632–648. Retrieved from bit.ly/3QLXUol
18. Kuyini, A. B., Desai, I., & Sharma, U. (2020). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes and concerns about implementing inclusive education in Ghana. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *24*(14), 1509–1526. Retrieved from bit.ly/3qFoSne
19. Lazarus, K. U. (2019). Gender differences in teachers' knowledge and attitude towards their roles in the education of students with learning disabilities in Ibadan. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(1), 134–142. Retrieved from bit.ly/3KOXTwd
20. Meyer, M. W., & Norman, D. (2020). Changing design education for the 21st century. *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, *6*(1), 13–49. Retrieved from bit.ly/3qIjgZ9
21. Mihajlovic, C., & Meier, S. (2022). Including students with special educational needs in physical education: An analysis of the current Finnish national core curriculum. *The Curriculum Journal*, *33*(2), 279–296. Retrieved from bit.ly/3P5tI6F
22. Mitchell, D., & Sutherland, D. (2020). *What really works in special and inclusive education: Using evidence-based teaching strategies*. Routledge. Retrieved from bit.ly/44idv2i
23. Miyauchi, H. (2020). A systematic review on inclusive education of students with visual impairment. *Education Sciences*, *10*(11), 346. Retrieved from bit.ly/3P2qosP
24. Moberg, S., Muta, E., Korenaga, K., Kuorelahti, M., & Savolainen, H. (2020). Struggling for inclusive education in Japan and Finland: Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *35*(1), 100–114. Retrieved from bit.ly/3sazlHu
25. Norwich, B. (2022). EDUCATION TRENDS AND. *The Inclusion Dialogue: Debating Issues, Challenges and Tensions with Global Experts*. Retrieved from bit.ly/3QMdEYC
26. O'Leary, E. S., Shapiro, C., Toma, S., Sayson, H. W., Levis-Fitzgerald, M., Johnson, T., & Sork, V. L. (2020). Creating inclusive classrooms by engaging STEM faculty in culturally responsive teaching workshops. *International Journal of STEM Education*, *7*, 1–15. Retrieved from bit.ly/3E9rUD3
27. Padillo, G. G., Manguilimotan, R. P., Capuno, R. G., & Espina, R. C. (2021). Professional Development Activities and Teacher Performance. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, *9*(3), 497–506. Retrieved from bit.ly/45BpYim
28. Parlak, S., Celebi Cakiroglu, O., & Oksuz Gul, F. (2021). Gender roles during COVID-19 pandemic: The experiences of Turkish female academics. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *28*, 461–483. Retrieved from bit.ly/3si7FAz
29. Paulos, L., Valadas, S. T., & Almeida, L. S. (2021). Transition from university to the labour market: The impact of personal variables in graduates' perceptions of self-efficacy. *Social Sciences*, *10*(11), 406. Retrieved from bit.ly/47BGvox
30. Pawlewicz, D. D. (2020). *Blaming teachers: Professionalization policies and the failure of reform in American history*. Rutgers University Press. Retrieved from bit.ly/47BcTaP
31. Pérez-Jorge, D., Rodríguez-Jiménez, M. del C., Ariño-Mateo, E., & Sosa-Gutiérrez, K. J. (2021). Perception and attitude of teachers towards the inclusion of students with hearing disabilities. *Education Sciences*, *11*(4), 187. Retrieved from bit.ly/3YIiWX5
32. Radó, P. (2020). The adaptability of education systems to future challenges in context: An analytical framework. *CEU Center for Policy Studies. Working Paper Series*, *1*. Retrieved from bit.ly/44fBXBk
33. Saloviita, T. (2020). Attitudes of teachers towards inclusive education in Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *64*(2), 270–282. Retrieved from bit.ly/3QLKVTB
34. Santos, M. H., & Amâncio, L. (2019). Gender dynamics in elementary school teaching: The advantages of men. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *26*(2), 195–210. Retrieved from bit.ly/3YICMRX
35. Savolainen, H., Malinen, O.-P., & Schwab, S. (2022). Teacher efficacy predicts teachers' attitudes towards inclusion–a longitudinal cross-lagged analysis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *26*(9), 958–972. Retrieved from bit.ly/45guxit
36. Shetty, A. A., Kavitha Rai, D. K., & D'souza, C. V. (2021). Level Of Awareness Of Preventive Protocols Amongst Special Educators In Schools During Covid-19. *NVEO-NATURAL VOLATILES & ESSENTIAL OILS Journal| NVEO*, 13528–13540. Retrieved from bit.ly/3qvZ3Ga
37. Siyam, N. (2019). Factors impacting special education teachers' acceptance and actual use of technology. *Education and Information Technologies*, *24*(3), 2035–2057. Retrieved from bit.ly/47AU9bx
38. Smaniotto, C., Saramin, A., Brunelli, L., & Parpinel, M. (2022). Insights and Next Challenges for the Italian Educational System to Teach Sustainability in a Global Context. *Sustainability*, *15*(1), 209. Retrieved from bit.ly/3KOAJWW
39. Somma, M., & Bennett, S. (2020). Inclusive Education and Pedagogical Change: Experiences from the Front Lines. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, *6*(2), 285–295. Retrieved from bit.ly/3E58eAg

40. Vermunt, J. D., Vrikki, M., van Halem, N., Warwick, P., & Mercer, N. (2019). The impact of Lesson Study professional development on the quality of teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *81*, 61–73. Retrieved from bit.ly/44j6pua
41. Wilson, C., Marks Woolfson, L., & Durkin, K. (2020). School environment and mastery experience as predictors of teachers' self-efficacy beliefs towards inclusive teaching. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *24*(2), 218–234. Retrieved from bit.ly/44j6JsS
42. Winter, E., Costello, A., O'Brien, M., & Hickey, G. (2021). Teachers' use of technology and the impact of Covid-19. *Irish Educational Studies*, *40*(2), 235–246. Retrieved from bit.ly/3OKpkZr
43. Woodcock, S., Gibbs, K., Hitches, E., & Regan, C. (2023). Investigating Teachers' Beliefs in Inclusive Education and Their Levels of Teacher Self-Efficacy: Are Teachers Constrained in Their Capacity to Implement Inclusive Teaching Practices? *Education Sciences*, *13*(3), 280. Retrieved from bit.ly/45x14R8
44. Woodcock, S., & Jones, G. (2020). Examining the interrelationship between teachers' self-efficacy and their beliefs towards inclusive education for all. *Teacher Development*, *24*(4), 583–602. Retrieved from bit.ly/44eVe5R
45. You, S., Kim, E. K., & Shin, K. (2019). Teachers' belief and efficacy toward inclusive education in early childhood settings in Korea. *Sustainability*, *11*(5), 1489. Retrieved from bit.ly/3P3SSCE