PANTAO
(International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)
Volume 5, Issue 3
ISSN 3028-0877 | DOI 10.69651/2022PIJHSS

Evaluating teachers' awareness on dyslexia, their efficacy and preparedness in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in public elementary school

Madix Lej C. Escolar*
Cebu Technological University-Main Campus, Cebu City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine teachers' profiles, knowledge of dyslexia, preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms at Lahug Elementary School and involved 92 teachers from Kindergarten to Grade 6 for the school year 2025–2026. A quantitative correlational research design was employed using standardized survey questionnaires, and data were analyzed through frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, ranking, and Pearson correlation. Findings showed that most teachers were female and belonged to the middle and older age groups, held a bachelor's degree, and had more than ten years of teaching experience. Regarding grade levels taught and professional exposure, the study revealed that most teachers handled early and upper elementary grades, placing them in a key position for both foundational literacy instruction and preparing students for higher grade-level demands. Most respondents had attended seminars or training on inclusive education, showing their willingness to improve professionally. Findings revealed that teachers generally demonstrated high knowledge of dyslexia, were prepared to apply the Science of Reading, and exhibited high self-efficacy. Significant positive relationships were found among the variables, highlighting the link between knowledge, preparedness, and confidence. Therefore, teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, preparedness to apply the science of reading, and self-efficacy in teaching reading are crucial in supporting learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. Thus, a professional intervention plan was recommended to implement appropriate evidence-based reading strategies, enhance teachers' competence and effectiveness in inclusive reading instruction.

Keywords: Special education, dyslexia, teacher knowledge, teacher self-efficacy, Science of reading, inclusive education, teachers' preparedness, reading instruction, descriptive-correlational, Cebu City.

Date Submitted: June 22, 2026
Date Accepted: June 26, 2026
Date Published: July 3, 2026

INTRODUCTION

Dyslexia continues to pose complex challenges in educational systems worldwide because literacy serves as a foundation for academic success and long-term participation in learning. As a neurodevelopmental disorder classified as a specific learning disability, dyslexia

*Corresponding author / Email: madix0901@gmail.com

Recommended citation:
Escolar, M. L. C. (2026). Evaluating teachers' awareness on dyslexia, their efficacy and preparedness in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in public elementary school. Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences) 5 (3), 271-301.

affects reading, writing, and spelling, and may significantly hinder literacy development when not identified and addressed through timely and appropriate support (Lyon et al., 2003). The International Dyslexia Association estimates that approximately 5% to 10% of the global population experiences dyslexia, yet it remains one of the most common and misunderstood learning difficulties affecting children's reading acquisition. Across countries, many teachers still lack adequate awareness, training, and confidence to identify and support learners with dyslexia, often confusing it with general reading delay, which leads to delayed intervention and inconsistent classroom responses (Falzon, 2012; McCaleb, 2020; Moss, 2019). This concern is intensified by the limited implementation of structured literacy instruction aligned with the Science of Reading, which emphasizes evidence-based teaching of phonics, decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension as essential components of effective reading instruction (William et al., 2025).

In developed nations, the Science of Reading has increasingly informed literacy instruction for learners with diverse needs by grounding classroom practice in cognitive and linguistic research. However, even where evidence-based reading frameworks are promoted, many teachers still do not receive systematic training, resulting in uneven practices in diagnosing and addressing reading difficulties (McCaleb, 2020). In developing countries across Asia, dyslexia identification and support remain underprioritized because of limited diagnostic tools, insufficient teacher preparation, social stigma, misconceptions, and inadequate access to professional development. These conditions show that teachers' awareness, preparedness, and confidence strongly influence their ability to accommodate learners with reading difficulties, making culturally responsive professional development essential in improving literacy instruction for diverse learners (Falzon, 2012; Moss, 2019; William et al., 2025).

In the Philippine context, inclusive education is supported by policies such as DepEd Order No. 72, s. 2009, yet many Filipino teachers remain inadequately trained to support learners with specific learning disabilities such as dyslexia (Cariño & Bailey, 2024; Ocampo, 2004). Although teachers may recognize that some learners experience reading difficulties, their specific knowledge of dyslexia is often limited, which affects their self-efficacy and preparedness to design appropriate reading interventions (Gepila Jr. et al., 2022). The lack of structured literacy training anchored on the Science of Reading further limits teachers' capacity to implement evidence-based strategies, often resulting in a one size fits all instructional approach that fails to address the needs of struggling readers (Rosales, 2020). National teacher education programs and reading curricula have also not sufficiently emphasized systematic literacy instruction for learners with dyslexia, as they tend to focus on phonics and comprehension without fully integrating explicit and structured approaches responsive to diverse learning profiles (Maligat et al., 2020). These concerns are connected to broader systemic issues in Philippine reading instruction, as reflected in low literacy outcomes among Filipino learners, which reinforces the need to strengthen teacher preparation through focused professional development (Cariño & Bailey, 2024).

At the local level, teachers in inclusive classrooms in Cebu face significant challenges in supporting learners with special needs, including dyslexia, because of limited training and professional development opportunities. Studies indicate that many teachers have attended only a few relevant workshops or in service training programs and often rate their preparedness as moderate in collaboration, instructional strategies, inclusive practice implementation, behavioral planning, and integration of the general education curriculum (Alido et al., 2023; Mates et al., 2025). Specialized training on dyslexia is particularly scarce, and many teachers lack focused instruction in planning and implementing Individualized Education Programs. Accessibility, availability, and financial constraints further restrict professional development, with only 23.81% of Cebu teachers having participated in inclusive education training (Benemerito et al., 2024). These conditions hinder teachers' ability to address reading

difficulties effectively and reveal a persistent gap between inclusive education policy and classroom practice.

The theoretical foundation of the study explains how teachers' awareness, efficacy, and preparedness shape their capacity to teach reading to learners with diverse needs. Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (1977) emphasizes that learning is shaped by observation, imitation, modeling, and social interaction, while also highlighting self-efficacy as a major influence on instructional behavior. Teachers develop competence not only through formal training but also by observing experienced educators, receiving feedback, and engaging in collaborative professional communities. Self-efficacy increases when individuals observe others successfully performing a task, suggesting that teachers who see colleagues implement structured literacy interventions are more likely to feel confident in applying similar strategies (Hattie, 2009). Professional development that includes coaching and modeled instruction has been shown to improve teachers' implementation of evidence-based reading methods and support the reading growth of learners with dyslexia traits (Reed & Zhang, 2025). Collaboration, shared problem solving, and reflection further strengthen teacher learning, particularly in classrooms serving diverse learners (Darling-Hammond, Flook, Cook-Harvey, Barron, & Osher, 2020). Because learning involves cognitive, emotional, and social dimensions, empathetic modeling of inclusive practices also strengthens both teacher skill and confidence (Immordino-Yang, Darling-Hammond, & Krone, 2021). Professional growth is therefore embedded in relationships and social contexts, where teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, efficacy, and preparedness are shaped by interaction with colleagues, mentors, and professional communities (Nasir, Lee, Pea, & McKinney de Royston, 2021). In this way, Social Cognitive Theory supports the study's focus on teacher development through observation, collaboration, and guided application of evidence-based reading practices (Hattie, 2009; Hattie et al., 2016).

Constructivist Theory, particularly the work of Piaget (1972) and Vygotsky (1978), further supports the study by emphasizing that learners construct understanding through meaningful interaction and experience. Piaget's Cognitive Development Theory explains that learners actively construct knowledge based on developmental readiness, making it necessary for teachers to design instruction that matches learners' cognitive capacities (Hattie, 2009). For learners with dyslexia, this means that teachers must provide scaffolded, multisensory, and student-centered reading activities that address decoding and comprehension difficulties. Translating learning science into practice requires experiences that allow learners to interact, experiment, and reflect, thereby consolidating knowledge (Norman & Lotrecchiano, 2021). The Science of Learning and Development similarly emphasizes that instruction should be developmentally appropriate and progressively built upon prior knowledge (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Hattie et al., 2016). Teachers' preparedness is therefore strengthened when they can connect cognitive development theory with practical reading strategies, especially when supporting learners with dyslexia whose information processing needs require targeted intervention (MacMahon & Carroll, 2022).

The Science of Reading provides the instructional foundation for understanding how teachers can support learners with dyslexia through systematic and explicit literacy instruction. Reading success depends on the relationship between letters and sounds, and teachers' knowledge of decoding strategies directly affects their ability to support accurate word recognition (Gough & Tunmer, 1986). Explicit and systematic phonics instruction gives learners predictable and sequential steps for decoding words, while supplemental interventions targeting phonics and decoding have been shown to improve reading outcomes for struggling learners (Buckingham et al., 2019; Coyne et al., 2018). Fluency also connects accurate

decoding with automatic word recognition and comprehension, requiring teachers to integrate repeated reading, guided practice, and pacing strategies into instruction (Stocker et al., 2023; Hunter et al., 2024). Since comprehension depends on decoding, vocabulary, and background knowledge, teachers must be prepared to scaffold comprehension through intentional questioning and guided reading strategies (Moats, 2023). Early identification and intervention are equally important because teachers who recognize signs of dyslexia can implement targeted support before reading difficulties become entrenched (Rollo & Picker, 2024; Bustos-Orosa & Ferrer, 2013). The application of Science of Reading principles depends not only on knowledge but also on teacher efficacy and readiness to translate research into classroom practice (Castles et al., 2018; Klages et al., 2021). Response to intervention models complement this framework by offering tiered support based on assessment, progress monitoring, and systematic intervention (Bautista, 2025). Local evidence also supports structured reading approaches, as the Marungko method has been found to improve beginning reading literacy in Filipino classrooms, while research on decoding errors among Filipino learners emphasizes the importance of explicit teacher knowledge of reading challenges (Boltron & Ramos, 2021; Bustos-Orosa & Ferrer, 2013). When decoding, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension are integrated into a cohesive program, teachers are better able to scaffold literacy development for learners with dyslexia and ensure that instruction addresses both skill acquisition and meaning making (Snow, 2021).

The legal and policy foundations of the study reinforce the theoretical argument that teachers must be prepared to provide inclusive and evidence-based literacy instruction. Republic Act No. 9442, which amended Republic Act No. 7277, strengthens protections and services for persons with disabilities, while Republic Act No. 11650, or the Inclusive Education for Learners with Disabilities Act of 2022, affirms the right of learners with disabilities to quality and equitable education in inclusive settings. DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2021 provides policy guidelines for educational programs and services for learners with disabilities in the K to 12 Basic Education Program, underscoring the responsibility of schools to provide appropriate accommodations, accessible learning materials, and responsive instruction. These mandates affirm that learners with disabilities are entitled to inclusive and evidence-based instruction and that competent teachers are central to the realization of this right.

Republic Act No. 11650 directly supports the need for teacher training and capacity building as essential components of inclusive education. Many teachers still lack sufficient knowledge and skills to identify and support learners with dyslexia, reinforcing the need for structured professional development (Acheampong et al., 2019). Teachers' awareness of dyslexia significantly influences their ability to implement inclusive instructional practices, while their self-efficacy shapes their willingness to apply structured reading interventions (Makgato et al., 2022). Professional attitudes are also essential because teachers' empathy, patience, and commitment affect learner engagement and academic outcomes (Kadir & Jabbar, 2023). The law further encourages a neurodiversity perspective that recognizes learners' strengths rather than focusing solely on deficits (Griffiths, 2020). However, systemic barriers continue to limit access to appropriate educational and support services, making knowledgeable and confident teachers especially important in compensating for resource gaps (Chiu et al., 2023). Global perspectives affirm that inclusive education is a human right requiring flexible curricula, responsive teaching, and well-prepared educators (UNESCO, 2009; McLeskey et al., 2017). Professional learning must therefore include reflective practice, collaboration, and problem solving to strengthen teachers' adaptability and support learner participation (Duraiappah et al., 2022; Linzarini et al., 2022). Successful inclusion also requires coordinated efforts among policymakers, school leaders, and teachers, as well as school environments that value diversity and participation (Planipolis, n.d.; Mosen, 2016). National directions such as FF2023-17 (2023) similarly emphasize teacher competencies, professional

learning, and support systems, showing that effective implementation of inclusive education depends on the alignment of policy, teacher competence, and classroom practice.

DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2021 further emphasizes that inclusive education requires accessible programs, adaptive materials, and teacher preparedness. Learners with diverse needs, including those with dyslexia, require meaningful opportunities to participate in classroom instruction through appropriate accommodations and accessible resources (Al-Bukhari, 2024). Adapting reading materials is particularly important because structured and well-designed activities support decoding and comprehension development (Troeva, 2015). Teachers' capacity determines how effectively materials are selected, modified, and delivered in response to individual learning differences (Morrison & Stapleford, n.d.). Varied resources such as multisensory tools, visual supports, and interactive activities strengthen learner engagement and reflect learner centered pedagogy (Feliciano & Dy, 2021). This policy direction is reinforced by Republic Act No. 10533, or the Enhanced Basic Education Act, which promotes a learner centered and inclusive curriculum responsive to developmental needs. Earlier policies such as DepEd Order No. 26, s. 1997 and DepEd Order No. 72, s. 2009 established the foundation for inclusive education by promoting special education services and participation of learners with disabilities in regular classrooms. Evidence based reading strategies, accessible instructional design, and early targeted interventions have been shown to improve literacy and long-term academic outcomes for struggling readers (Lachmann et al., 2022; Layes, 2022; Daley, 2020). Teacher development remains central to these efforts because awareness of learning disabilities influences inclusive learning environments, while positive teacher perceptions and adaptive teaching approaches promote learner motivation and reading development (Makgato et al., 2022; Kadir & Jabbar, 2023; Shetty & Rai, 2014).

Republic Act No. 7277, or the Magna Carta for Disabled Persons, affirms the right of individuals with disabilities to education and social participation, while DepEd Order No. 72, s. 2009 promotes inclusive education by ensuring that learners of all abilities are able to participate actively in classroom instruction. Teachers play a central role in realizing these goals because their capacity to manage diverse learners directly shapes inclusion outcomes. Classroom realities show that teachers often encounter difficulties when supporting students with dyslexia, particularly in adapting instruction and providing individualized assistance (Thwalaa et al., 2020). Teachers' understanding of learning difficulties influences instructional decisions and the accessibility of classroom activities (Tosun et al., 2021), while structured professional development strengthens competence in identifying and addressing reading challenges (Acheampong et al., 2019). Reflective planning, continuous evaluation, and targeted strategies further enable teachers to respond to varied learner profiles (Korsgaard et al., 2020), while teacher beliefs and self-perceptions affect willingness to adopt inclusive approaches (Gwernan-Jones & Burden, 2010). Learner centered strategies, differentiated instruction, and inclusive resources help create classrooms where students feel valued and capable of participating (Feliciano & Dy, 2021; Parey et al., 2013; Morrison & Stapleford, n.d.). These principles are reinforced by DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2022, which strengthens responsive educational services and school systems for learners with disabilities. Accessible instructional design and clear institutional support enable teachers to sustain inclusive practices over time (Al-Bukhari, 2024; Hardy & Woodcock, 2024). However, barriers to specialized services continue to place greater responsibility on classroom teachers to provide appropriate support, illustrating the importance of teacher efficacy as a bridge between legislative intent and student success (Chiu et al., 2023).

The broader literature on inclusive education confirms that policy, teacher beliefs, institutional support, and evidence-based instruction must work together to address learners' needs. Florian (2019) argued that special and inclusive education are distinct but must coexist, with inclusive education focusing on removing barriers for marginalized learners while special education contributes specialized expertise. Hardy and Woodcock (2024) found that inclusive education policies across Global North settings have progressed inconsistently, showing that policy clarity affects how teachers interpret and apply inclusive practices. Moberg et al. (2020) demonstrated that teachers' attitudes toward inclusion differ across cultural contexts, with Finnish teachers expressing more concern about efficacy and Japanese teachers showing more positive views, which highlights the importance of context sensitive professional development. Paseka and Schwab (2020) found that German parents generally supported inclusion for students with physical or learning disabilities but were more neutral regarding behavioral or mental disabilities, emphasizing that community perceptions also shape the success of inclusion. Research on integrated support systems further shows that understanding, skills, student centered philosophy, communication, and collaboration enhance student success (Power et al., 2020), while structured integrated student support programs can reduce barriers and improve elementary achievement, particularly among disadvantaged learners (Lawson et al., 2024).

Studies on learning differences further emphasize the need for accurate teacher knowledge and scientifically grounded intervention. Han (2025) highlighted the diagnostic and educational challenges posed by the co-occurrence of dyscalculia and dyslexia, especially among culturally and linguistically diverse learners, and called for interdisciplinary and neurodiversity-based models. Layes (2022) found that children with dyslexia and dyscalculia show distinct verbal and visual memory difficulties, suggesting that interventions must be tailored to specific cognitive profiles. Van Herwegen et. al. (2024) revealed that educators in the United Kingdom were more familiar with dyslexia than dyscalculia but still held several misconceptions, showing that familiarity does not automatically reduce misinformation. Al-Bukhari (2024) demonstrated the importance of differentiated curriculum practices and assistive accommodations for students with dyslexia, dysgraphia, and dyscalculia in higher education, reinforcing the need for curriculum flexibility and institutional commitment. Korsgaard et al. (2020) further proposed collaborative inquiry as a way to bridge theory and practice in inclusive education, emphasizing pedagogical tact and flexible research approaches that allow educators to respond creatively to classroom diversity.

Philippine and related studies also show that inclusive literacy instruction requires contextualized interventions, teacher collaboration, and sustained support. Manalaysay (2021) found that public SPED centers can serve as resource hubs for inclusion and that collaboration between SPED and mainstream teachers supports the academic and social development of learners with special education needs. Toquero (2021) showed that during the COVID 19 pandemic, special education teachers faced educational apprehensions, limited social interaction, and psychological crises among learners with SEND, but supported learning through parental engagement, empathetic language, and psychological safety. Garcia et al. (2025) emphasized that Science of Learning principles can strengthen literacy instruction for neurodivergent learners in the Philippines through explicit instruction, adapted interventions, ongoing assessment, instructional support, and inter professional collaboration. Gepila Jr et al. (2022) demonstrated that the Davis Dyslexia Correction Program can yield positive outcomes when adapted to Filipino learners' individual and contextual needs. Acheampong et al. (2019) found that teachers with specialized training in special education were more competent in identifying and supporting learners with dyslexia. Chiu et al. (2023) identified systemic discrimination, socioeconomic limitations, and lack of trust in health professionals as barriers faced by Filipino families seeking rehabilitation services for children with special needs. Daley

(2020) showed that teachers' prior training strongly influenced their ability to identify dyslexic characteristics and implement research-based interventions, although consistent application remained challenging. Feliciano and Dy (2021) found that teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and practices affect classroom engagement and inclusive pedagogy. Makgato et al. (2022) reported that teachers had basic dyslexia awareness but limited strategies for support, while Almeda San Jose (2022) showed that teachers with disabilities in the Philippines navigate sociocultural barriers while also serving as active agents and role models in inclusive education.

Taken together, the literature reveals a consistent convergence around the importance of teacher knowledge, self-efficacy, and preparedness in supporting learners with dyslexia and other reading difficulties. At the same time, the reviewed studies expose persistent gaps in teacher training, access to evidence-based reading instruction, diagnostic competence, professional support, and contextually responsive intervention. Global research highlights the value of structured literacy and the Science of Reading, while Philippine and Cebu based evidence shows that many teachers continue to face limited preparation, scarce dyslexia specific training, and insufficient institutional resources. These gaps justify the need to examine how teachers' awareness of dyslexia, efficacy, and preparedness interact in shaping their ability to teach reading to learners with diverse needs in public elementary schools in Cebu.

In this context, the present study evaluates teachers' awareness of dyslexia, their efficacy, and their preparedness in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in public elementary schools. It specifically investigates how teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, level of self-efficacy, and readiness to apply the principles of the Science of Reading influence their instructional practices. Guided by Social Cognitive Theory, Constructivist Theory, the Science of Reading framework, and relevant Philippine laws and policies, the study recognizes that effective inclusive reading instruction depends on both teacher competence and systemic support. From the findings, a Professional Intervention Plan will be developed to enhance teachers' skills, strengthen instructional confidence, promote evidence-based reading practices, and support professional growth in inclusive education. Ultimately, the study seeks to contribute to improved literacy outcomes for learners with dyslexia and other reading difficulties by ensuring that teachers are knowledgeable, prepared, and empowered to deliver quality reading instruction to all learners.

Statement of the problem

This study evaluated teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, as well as their self-efficacy and preparedness in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms at Lahug Elementary School for the School Year 2025 to 2026, serving as a basis for designing a targeted professional intervention plan.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of age and gender, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level taught, attendance to related seminars and training on inclusive education, and reading exposure to literacy education?
2. What is the level of respondents' knowledge about dyslexia?
3. What is the extent of respondents' preparedness to apply the Science of Reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms?
4. What is the respondents' level of self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' knowledge about dyslexia and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' knowledge about dyslexia and their self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms?
7. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' self-efficacy in teaching reading and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms?
8. Based on the findings, what professional intervention plan can be crafted?

METHODOLOGY

This section presented the research design and methodology employed in the study, outlining the systematic procedures followed to investigate the knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy of teachers in applying the Science of Reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. It detailed the research design, illustrating how the study was structured to achieve its objectives, and described the flow of the study, providing a clear sequence of the phases undertaken.

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to assess teachers' awareness of dyslexia, their self-efficacy, and their preparedness in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in a public elementary school. Descriptive-correlational research is commonly used to examine relationships among variables without manipulating them, allowing researchers to understand naturally occurring conditions within educational settings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Polit & Beck, 2017). Quantitative research focuses on gathering and analyzing numerical data to identify patterns, explore associations, and generate conclusions that may be generalized to similar populations (Bloomfield & Fisher, 2019). This design was appropriate because it enabled the researcher to determine the strength and direction of relationships among teachers' awareness, efficacy, and preparedness while maintaining the authenticity of the school environment.

This research adopted the Input Process Output (IPO) model to present a structured representation of the study's progression from data gathering to outcome generation. The IPO framework is frequently used in educational research to organize variables and demonstrate how inputs are transformed through systematic processes into measurable outputs (McGrath, 1964; Stufflebeam & Zhang, 2017). By providing a clear analytical structure, the model supports logical interpretation and strengthens the coherence of the research design. In the input phase, the study concentrated on essential variables such as teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, their level of self-efficacy in teaching reading, and their perceived preparedness to implement the principles of the Science of Reading. These elements were considered foundational factors influencing the delivery of effective literacy instruction in inclusive classrooms. Teacher knowledge and efficacy have been consistently linked to improved instructional quality and learner outcomes, particularly in diverse educational environments (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The process phase outlined the procedures undertaken to execute the study, including the preparation and validation of research instruments, distribution of transmittal letters, acquisition of informed consent, administration of questionnaires, and statistical treatment of the collected data. Systematic research procedures enhance the reliability and credibility of findings by ensuring that data are gathered and analyzed using consistent and ethical methods (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Careful adherence to these steps safeguarded the integrity of the research and promoted methodological rigor. In the output phase, a Professional Intervention Plan was developed based on the findings related to teachers' self-efficacy, knowledge of

dyslexia, and perceived readiness to apply the Science of Reading. Analysis of these variables revealed areas requiring improvement in teacher preparedness, instructional confidence, and conceptual understanding of dyslexia. Intervention programs grounded in empirical evidence are more likely to strengthen professional competence and support instructional improvement (Desimone & Garet, 2015). Through examining the relationships among these components, the proposed plan was designed to address identified gaps through targeted professional development aligned with the realities of inclusive classrooms. This evidence informed initiative aimed to equip teachers with practical strategies for delivering effective reading instruction, ultimately enhancing learning outcomes for students with diverse educational needs. The study's progression through the input, process, and output phases to achieve its objectives was illustrated in a diagram depicting this flow.

This study was conducted at Lahug Elementary School, located along Gorordo Avenue, Lahug, Cebu City 6000, under the Department of Education, Region VII Central Visayas. The school was selected because it provided an appropriate context for examining teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, their self-efficacy in reading instruction, and their preparedness to implement the Science of Reading. Schools that serve learners with varied literacy levels offer valuable opportunities to investigate inclusive instructional practices and teacher responsiveness to diverse learning needs (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). Lahug Elementary School accommodates students with different academic profiles, making it a suitable site for observing how evidence-based reading strategies are applied in authentic classroom situations. This setting enabled the assessment of how evidence-based reading strategies were applied in actual classroom situations. A location map of the research environment further illustrated the geographic context of the school.

The participants consisted of 92 teachers from Lahug Elementary School. Purposive sampling was utilized to select respondents who were directly involved in reading instruction and inclusive education. This sampling technique is appropriate when participants are chosen based on their knowledge, experience, and ability to provide relevant information related to the research problem (Palinkas et al., 2015). Teachers who regularly engage in literacy instruction are well positioned to offer insights into instructional preparedness, classroom practices, and the implementation of inclusive strategies for learners with diverse reading needs. The respondents of this study consisted of 92 elementary teachers from Lahug Elementary School who were directly involved in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. Purposive sampling was employed to select teachers who met the specific requirements of the study, allowing for a focused examination of their knowledge of dyslexia, self-efficacy in reading instruction, and readiness to implement the principles of the Science of Reading. This approach ensured that the data gathered were relevant to the objectives of the research. The inclusion criteria required that participants were currently assigned to Lahug Elementary School, had at least one year of teaching experience, and were responsible for reading instruction. Selecting respondents based on these criteria ensured that participants possessed adequate experience and direct involvement in reading instruction. In terms of the distribution of respondents by grade level taught, Grade Six accounted for 18 teachers, or 19.57%; Grade Five accounted for 11 teachers, or 11.96%; Grade Four accounted for 9 teachers, or 9.78%; Grade Three accounted for 11 teachers, or 11.96%; Grade Two accounted for 12 teachers, or 13.04%; Grade One accounted for 21 teachers, or 22.83%; and Kindergarten accounted for 10 teachers, or 10.87%, for a total of 92 teachers, or 100.00%.

This study employed four adopted research instruments to collect data aligned with its objectives. Each tool was carefully selected from validated sources to ensure reliability, accuracy, and consistency with the variables being measured. The questionnaires were used

without modification, so pilot testing was not necessary. These instruments measured the participants' demographic characteristics, their knowledge and beliefs about developmental dyslexia, their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and their self-efficacy in teaching reading. All items were rated on a five-point Likert scale, with 5 indicating Strongly Agree and 1 indicating Strongly Disagree. The first part of the instrument gathered demographic data to describe the participants' professional and personal background. It included age, gender, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level taught, attendance in seminars or training on inclusive education, and exposure to literacy related programs. These data helped identify patterns that may influence teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, self-efficacy, and readiness to implement the Science of Reading in inclusive classrooms.

The second part of the instrument assessed teachers' knowledge and beliefs regarding developmental dyslexia using the 36-item scale adopted from Soriano-Ferrer and Echegaray-Bengoa (2014). The instrument evaluated three key areas: general information, symptoms and diagnosis, and treatment or intervention. Responses were recorded on the five-point Likert scale. This scale provided insights into teachers' understanding of dyslexia and revealed potential misconceptions that could impact their reading instruction for learners with diverse needs. The third part of the instrument, adopted from Gump (2024), measured the extent to which teachers perceive themselves as prepared and confident in applying the principles of the Science of Reading. The 10-item questionnaire focused on instructional knowledge, confidence, and the ability to implement evidence-based literacy strategies. Responses were rated on the five-point Likert scale. This section provided information on how ready teachers feel to deliver systematic and research-based reading instruction in inclusive classrooms. The fourth part of the instrument, the Reading Teaching Efficacy Instrument (RTEI), adopted from Szabo and Mokhtari (2004), measured teachers' confidence in effectively teaching reading. The 16-item instrument focused on teachers' self-efficacy in planning and delivering instruction for learners with varying literacy needs. Respondents indicated their agreement using the five-point Likert scale. This instrument helped identify the influence of teachers' beliefs about their teaching ability on their instructional performance and motivation in literacy education. All four instruments have been previously validated and widely recognized in literacy and reading research. Their use ensured that the collected data were reliable and appropriate for analyzing the relationships between teachers' knowledge, teaching efficacy, and preparedness to implement the Science of Reading in inclusive education contexts.

Data collection for this study was conducted in three phases: the preliminary stage, the data gathering stage, and the post data gathering stage. Each phase was designed to ensure systematic data collection, uphold ethical standards, and maintain the reliability and transparency of the research process. During the preliminary stage, the researcher focused on obtaining official authorization to conduct the study and preparing all necessary materials. The researcher drafted a formal request letter detailing the study's purpose, objectives, scope, and ethical considerations, highlighting that participation would be voluntary and responses would remain confidential. This letter was submitted to the Principal of Lahug Elementary School for review and signature, serving as the official permission to proceed with the research. Securing this approval ensured compliance with school policies, demonstrated ethical responsibility, and established trust with the school administration. Additionally, the researcher prepared the questionnaires and other supporting documents, reviewed the clarity and relevance of survey items, and ensured alignment with the research objectives to maximize the accuracy and reliability of the data to be collected.

During the data gathering stage, after securing the principal's approval, the researcher coordinated with the school administration to finalize the schedule for administering the questionnaires. Participants were given clear instructions regarding the purpose of the study and reassured of the voluntary and confidential nature of their responses. Questionnaires were

distributed in printed form and collected within a one-to-two-week period, depending on the teachers' convenience. During this stage, the researcher reviewed completed questionnaires for completeness and accuracy before encoding the responses for statistical analysis. Strict measures were observed to maintain anonymity, and each questionnaire was assigned a unique code to prevent any identification of respondents. Following data collection, in the post data gathering stage, the researcher encoded and analyzed the data using the appropriate statistical procedures as outlined in the research design. Individual responses were treated with strict confidentiality, and findings were interpreted to answer the research questions and test hypotheses. A summary of the results was shared with the school administration to provide feedback and support the improvement of reading instruction programs. Paper based instruments were disposed of in accordance with ethical and institutional guidelines, and all electronic files were securely stored in password protected folders accessible only to the researcher. Ethical standards for research involving human participants were strictly observed throughout the entire process.

To ensure the privacy of all participants, strict measures were implemented to safeguard personal information. All collected data were anonymized so that individual responses could not be traced back to any participant, maintaining full confidentiality. Any potentially identifying information was handled with care and accessed only by the researcher. Digital data were stored on password protected devices, while physical survey forms were securely locked in a cabinet for the duration of the study. The information was used exclusively for research purposes and was not disclosed to external parties. Upon completion of the study, data were retained according to ethical guidelines and subsequently disposed of properly to prevent unauthorized access or misuse. These procedures ensured that participants' information remained secure, maintaining their trust and upholding the integrity of the research.

This study strictly adhered to established ethical standards to protect the rights, welfare, and dignity of all participants. Participation was completely voluntary, allowing teachers to join or withdraw at any stage without negative consequences. Informed consent was obtained prior to participation, and respondents were provided with clear explanations regarding the study's purpose, potential benefits, foreseeable risks, and sources of funding, ensuring that participants could make informed decisions about their involvement. Anonymity was maintained by not collecting personally identifiable information, preventing any link between responses and individual participants. Confidentiality was preserved throughout the research process, with all data stored securely and accessible only to the researcher. Digital data were protected with password protected devices, while physical documents were stored in locked cabinets and used exclusively for research purposes. The study also minimized potential harm, whether physical, social, or psychological, ensuring that teachers were not subjected to undue stress or pressure during questionnaire administration. Data were recorded, analyzed, and reported honestly and accurately, avoiding misrepresentation or research misconduct. Ethical oversight extended to all stages of the study, including preparation of instruments, interaction with participants, and secure handling and disposal of data. These measures ensured compliance with professional standards while fostering trust, credibility, and responsible scholarship in examining teachers' awareness, self-efficacy, and preparedness in inclusive reading instruction.

The collected data were analyzed using a combination of descriptive and inferential statistical methods to comprehensively address the research questions. All analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to ensure accuracy, reliability, and systematic handling of the data. The statistical techniques employed included frequency and percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, ranking, and the Pearson

Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMCC). Frequency counts and percentages described the profile of the respondents, including variables such as age, gender, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level taught, participation in seminars or trainings related to inclusive education, and exposure to literacy instruction. These descriptive measures provided a clear picture of how the teachers were distributed across demographic and professional categories, allowing for better interpretation of the study context. The weighted mean was used to determine the overall level of teachers' knowledge about dyslexia, including general information, recognition of symptoms, diagnosis, and treatment approaches. It also assessed teachers' self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs and their preparedness to implement the Science of Reading in inclusive classrooms. Using a five-point Likert scale, the weighted mean indicated whether teachers' knowledge, confidence, and readiness were high, moderate, or low. The standard deviation complemented this by showing the degree of variation in responses, reflecting whether scores were closely clustered around the mean or widely dispersed.

The PPMCC served as the inferential statistical tool to examine the relationships among the main variables of the study. Specifically, it tested the relationship between teachers' knowledge of dyslexia and their self-efficacy in teaching reading, the relationship between teachers' knowledge of dyslexia and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in teaching reading and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading. This test was appropriate because the variables were measured at the interval level. The correlation coefficient (r) indicated both the strength and direction of the relationships, while a significance level of 0.05 was used to determine whether the correlations were statistically meaningful. The results of this analysis provided evidence on how the variables were interconnected, serving as a foundation for the development of a targeted Professional Intervention Plan to enhance teacher competence in inclusive reading instruction.

The evaluation of the research instruments followed the standardized scoring procedures outlined in the original studies from which the tools were adapted. All sections of the questionnaire use a five-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree). Higher scores correspond to greater levels of knowledge, self-efficacy, or preparedness. With respect to teachers' knowledge about dyslexia, this part of the questionnaire assesses teachers' understanding of dyslexia, focusing on general knowledge, recognition of symptoms and diagnosis, and treatment approaches. It contains 36 items designed to evaluate both correct knowledge and potential misconceptions regarding dyslexia. Responses are scored using the five-point Likert scale, where higher scores indicate a more accurate and comprehensive understanding. The resulting scores are then interpreted to determine whether teachers demonstrate very high, high, moderate, low, or very low knowledge of dyslexia. Specifically, a rate of 5 (SA) with a mean range of 4.21 to 5.00 is verbally described as Very High and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate accurate and comprehensive knowledge about dyslexia. A rate of 4 (A) with a mean range of 3.41 to 4.20 is verbally described as High and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate a high level of knowledge about dyslexia. A rate of 3 (U) with a mean range of 2.61 to 3.40 is verbally described as Moderate and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate moderate knowledge about dyslexia. A rate of 2 (D) with a mean range of 1.81 to 2.60 is verbally described as Low and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate low knowledge about dyslexia. A rate of 1 (SD) with a mean range of 1.00 to 1.80 is verbally described as Very Low and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate very low knowledge about dyslexia.

With respect to teachers' preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, this section examines teachers' readiness to implement the principles of the Science of Reading in inclusive classrooms. It consists of 10 items that assess teachers' perceptions of their preparedness and

their practical ability to apply evidence-based reading strategies. Responses are recorded using a five-point Likert scale: 5, Strongly Agree; 4, Agree; 3, Neutral; 2, Disagree; and 1, Strongly Disagree. The total and mean scores provide an overall measure of preparedness, indicating whether teachers are very prepared, prepared, moderately prepared, less prepared, or not prepared at all. Higher scores reflect greater readiness to effectively implement evidence-based reading practices in the classroom. In terms of the corresponding rating scale, a rate of 5 (SA) with a mean range of 4.21 to 5.00 is verbally described as Very High and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate very high confidence in teaching reading. A rate of 4 (A) with a mean range of 3.41 to 4.20 is verbally described as High and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate high confidence in teaching reading. A rate of 3 (U) with a mean range of 2.61 to 3.40 is verbally described as Moderate and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate moderate confidence in teaching reading. A rate of 2 (D) with a mean range of 1.81 to 2.60 is verbally described as Low and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate low confidence in teaching reading. A rate of 1 (SD) with a mean range of 1.00 to 1.80 is verbally described as Very Low and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate very low confidence in teaching reading.

With respect to teachers' self-efficacy in teaching reading, this section evaluates teachers' confidence in instructing reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. The 16 item Reading Teaching Efficacy Instrument (RTEI) is used, with responses recorded on a five-point Likert scale: 5, Strongly Agree; 4, Agree; 3, Neutral; 2, Disagree; and 1, Strongly Disagree. The total and average scores provide an overall measure of teachers' self-efficacy, highlighting areas where they feel most competent as well as areas that may require further support or professional development. Higher scores indicate stronger confidence in effectively teaching reading within inclusive settings. In terms of the corresponding rating scale, a rate of 5 (SA) with a mean range of 4.21 to 5.00 is verbally described as Very High and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate very high preparedness to apply the Science of Reading. A rate of 4 (A) with a mean range of 3.41 to 4.20 is verbally described as High and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate high preparedness to apply the Science of Reading. A rate of 3 (U) with a mean range of 2.61 to 3.40 is verbally described as Moderate and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate moderate preparedness to apply the Science of Reading. A rate of 2 (D) with a mean range of 1.81 to 2.60 is verbally described as Low and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate low preparedness to apply the Science of Reading. A rate of 1 (SD) with a mean range of 1.00 to 1.80 is verbally described as Very Low and interpreted to mean that teachers demonstrate very low preparedness to apply the Science of Reading.

To provide clarity and a shared understanding of key concepts, the following terms are defined in relation to the objectives and variables of this study, focusing on teachers' knowledge about dyslexia, self-efficacy, readiness to implement the Science of Reading, and the development of a Professional Intervention Plan. Dyslexia is a specific learning difficulty that affects a learner's ability to read, spell, and decode words accurately and fluently. Learners with dyslexia often experience challenges in reading comprehension, word recognition, and phonological processing despite having average intelligence and access to quality instruction. In this study, dyslexia is considered a central factor influencing how teachers plan, deliver, and adapt reading instruction for learners with diverse needs. An inclusive classroom is a learning environment where students of all abilities, including those with dyslexia and other learning differences, are educated together. Instruction is differentiated to meet diverse needs, and supports and accommodations ensure equitable learning opportunities. In this study, it provides the context for evaluating teachers' instructional strategies and effectiveness. Preparedness to

apply the Science of Reading reflects teachers' readiness and ability to implement systematic, explicit, and research-based reading instruction, including phonological awareness, phonics, decoding, fluency, oral language, and comprehension skills. In this study, it is used to gauge teachers' perceptions of their competence in applying Science of Reading principles in inclusive classrooms. The Professional Intervention Plan (PIP) is a structured program designed to address gaps in teachers' knowledge, self-efficacy, and preparedness. It offers targeted professional development, practical strategies, and support to enhance teachers' ability to deliver effective reading instruction guided by the Science of Reading framework. In this study, it serves as a framework for intervention to strengthen teacher competencies. Symptoms and diagnosis involve recognizing key indicators of dyslexia, such as difficulties in decoding, spelling, and reading fluency, and understanding how these signs guide the identification of learners with the condition. In this study, it is used to evaluate teachers' ability to identify these symptoms and respond appropriately in inclusive classroom settings. Teachers' knowledge about dyslexia measures teachers' understanding of dyslexia, including early identification, assessment, and instructional strategies to support affected learners. In this study, it is used to determine how teachers' knowledge informs and enhances classroom practices for students with dyslexia. Teachers' self-efficacy in teaching reading refers to teachers' confidence in delivering reading instruction effectively to learners with diverse needs. In this study, it is used to assess how capable teachers feel in addressing reading difficulties, influencing their instructional decisions, persistence, and problem solving in the classroom. Finally, treatment of dyslexia encompasses strategies, interventions, and instructional approaches designed to support learners in developing reading skills, such as structured, systematic, and evidence-based reading programs. In this study, it is used to examine teachers' knowledge of these methods and their capacity to implement them effectively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presented the results of the study involving 92 elementary teachers from Lahug Elementary School and provided an analysis and discussion of the findings related to teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, readiness to implement the Science of Reading, and self-efficacy in teaching learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design, with respondents selected through purposive sampling based on their direct involvement in reading instruction and inclusive education. Data were gathered using four adopted instruments measuring respondent demographics, knowledge and beliefs about developmental dyslexia, preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and self-efficacy in teaching reading, all rated on a five-point Likert scale. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, weighted means, and standard deviations, were used to describe the respondents' profiles and their levels of knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy, while the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was employed to determine the relationships among teachers' knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy variables, with significance evaluated at $p < 0.05$. The presentation of results followed the specific research sub-problems outlined in Chapter 1 to ensure an organized and systematic interpretation of the data, and the discussion that follows is grounded entirely in the data gathered from these 92 respondents and interpreted in direct relation to the objectives of the study. The discussion linked the findings with related literature to provide deeper insight into teachers' competencies and the challenges they encountered in addressing the needs of learners with dyslexia and other learning difficulties, and it also identified areas for targeted interventions that guided the development of a professional development plan, emphasizing implications for classroom practice, teacher training, and educational policy in public elementary schools.

Profile of respondents

This section presented the demographic characteristics of the respondents, including age, gender, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, grade level handled, attendance in seminars or training related to inclusive education, and exposure to literacy-related readings. These variables provided essential background for understanding teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, their readiness to implement the Science of Reading, and their self-efficacy in teaching learners with diverse needs.

With respect to age and gender, among the 7 teachers aged 56 and above, all 7 (7.61%) were female and 0 (0.00%) were male. Among the 35 teachers aged 46 to 55, 34 (36.96%) were female and 1 (1.09%) was male. Among the 33 teachers aged 36 to 45, 30 (32.61%) were female and 3 (3.26%) were male. Among the 17 teachers aged 26 to 35, 16 (17.39%) were female and 1 (1.09%) was male. In total, female teachers numbered 87 (94.57%) and male teachers numbered 5 (5.43%), for an overall total of 92 respondents. The data reveal that the largest group of teachers falls within the 46-55 age range at 38.04% when combined by age bracket totals (35 of 92), followed closely by those aged 36-45 (33 of 92, or 35.87% combined). This indicates that the majority of teachers are in mid to late career stages, suggesting that they possess substantial professional experience. Such experience may contribute to greater confidence in implementing inclusive strategies, as teachers at this stage have likely encountered a variety of classroom scenarios and adapted their instructional approaches over time. Conversely, the smallest group is the 56 and above category (7.61%), which may reflect retirement trends or fewer teachers remaining in service at this age, potentially limiting representation of very late career perspectives. Regarding gender, female teachers comprise 94.57% of the sample, while males account for only 5.43%. This pronounced gender imbalance is consistent with the broader trend in elementary education, where female educators predominate. The predominance of female teachers may influence collaborative practices, classroom management styles, and communication approaches, given research suggesting that gender can shape pedagogical preferences and interactions with learners (Acheampong et al., 2019). The combined age and gender profile suggests that the school's teaching workforce is largely experienced and female dominated. This composition may have practical implications for professional development and the implementation of inclusive reading strategies. For instance, mid-career teachers may be more receptive to structured interventions like the Science of Reading due to accumulated experience, whereas younger teachers may require additional guidance in classroom management and differentiated instruction. Similarly, gendered patterns in communication or collaboration could influence team based professional learning or mentoring in inclusive classrooms (Moberg et al., 2020). Overall, the findings imply that teacher demographics, particularly age and gender, should be considered when designing capacity building programs, as these factors interact with knowledge, self-efficacy, and preparedness to influence instructional effectiveness. In the context of Philippine public elementary schools, where female teachers dominate and mid-career experience is prevalent, professional interventions can leverage existing strengths while addressing potential gaps in newer teachers' readiness (Cariño & Bailey, 2024).

With respect to highest educational attainment, 17 teachers (18.48%) were master's degree graduates, 32 teachers (34.78%) had earned master's units, and 43 teachers (46.74%) held only a bachelor's degree, for a total of 92 (100.00%). The data show that the largest proportion of teachers hold a bachelor's degree (46.74%), indicating that nearly half of the respondents have not yet completed graduate level education. Teachers with master's units make up 34.78% of the sample, reflecting a commitment to further professional development,

while only 18.48% are master's degree graduates. This distribution suggests that while many teachers are pursuing higher education, completion rates remain lower, likely due to time constraints, financial limitations, or heavy teaching workloads. This academic profile has meaningful implications for instructional practices. Teachers who have not yet completed graduate level education may possess foundational knowledge of reading instruction but may still require additional exposure to specialized strategies for addressing learning difficulties such as dyslexia. Those with master's units, on the other hand, may already have deeper theoretical knowledge and emerging competence in applying structured literacy approaches. The smaller proportion of master's degree holders may indicate a need for targeted professional development to bridge gaps in advanced pedagogical knowledge and practical application. Overall, the findings imply that teachers' educational background can influence both self-efficacy and preparedness to implement evidence-based interventions. A workforce with varied qualifications suggests that professional development programs should be differentiated to meet the needs of teachers at different stages of their academic and professional growth. Teachers with higher qualifications may benefit from advanced training in specialized instructional strategies, while those with bachelor's degrees may require foundational guidance to strengthen their confidence and instructional competence. These insights are consistent with previous research demonstrating that higher educational attainment is linked to greater teacher preparedness and instructional efficacy (Daley, 2020). Similarly, the significance of educational background in supporting inclusive practices has been emphasized in the Philippine context, where teachers' qualifications influence their readiness to deliver interventions tailored for learners with diverse needs (Cariño & Bailey, 2024).

With respect to years of teaching experience, 29 teachers (31.52%) had 16 years and above of teaching experience, 31 teachers (33.70%) had 11 to 15 years, 20 teachers (21.74%) had 6 to 10 years, and 12 teachers (13.04%) had 1 to 5 years, for a total of 92 (100.00%). The data indicate that the largest proportion of teachers have 11-15 years of experience (33.70%), followed closely by those with 16 years or more (31.52%). This suggests that the majority of respondents are mid to late career teachers who have accumulated substantial classroom exposure. In contrast, the smallest group consists of teachers with 1-5 years of experience (13.04%), representing the relatively few novice educators in the sample. The predominance of experienced teachers has meaningful implications for instructional practice. Teachers with longer tenure are likely to have encountered a wider range of learning needs, including learners with dyslexia, and may demonstrate greater confidence in applying inclusive strategies. Their accumulated experience may also enhance their ability to make informed instructional decisions, adapt lessons to diverse learners, and integrate evidence-based reading interventions effectively. Conversely, novice teachers may require additional mentoring and structured guidance to develop similar levels of instructional competence and self-efficacy. Overall, the findings highlight that teaching experience is a critical factor influencing teacher preparedness and efficacy. A workforce with predominantly experienced teachers suggests potential for strong instructional leadership and peer mentoring, which could support the implementation of inclusive reading strategies across classrooms. At the same time, professional development programs should address the needs of less experienced teachers to ensure consistency in instructional quality. These insights align with previous studies emphasizing the importance of professional experience in shaping teachers' confidence and competence in inclusive education (Acheampong et al., 2019). Daley (2020) similarly noted that experienced teachers are more likely to recognize and respond effectively to learning difficulties such as dyslexia, reinforcing the value of teaching tenure as a key demographic variable in examining readiness for evidence-based literacy instruction.

With respect to grade level taught, 18 teachers (19.57%) taught Grade Six, 11 teachers (11.96%) taught Grade Five, 9 teachers (9.78%) taught Grade Four, 11 teachers (11.96%)

taught Grade Three, 12 teachers (13.04%) taught Grade Two, 21 teachers (22.83%) taught Grade One, and 10 teachers (10.87%) taught Kindergarten, for a total of 92 (100.00%). The data indicate that the largest proportion of respondents teaches Grade One (22.83%), followed by Grade Six (19.57%) and Grade Two (13.04%). This suggests a strong representation of teachers working in early grade classrooms, where foundational reading skills are typically developed. Conversely, the smallest group consists of Grade Four teachers (9.78%), which may reflect staffing allocations or class distributions within the school. Overall, the presence of respondents across all grade levels allows for a comprehensive understanding of instructional practices and challenges across different stages of literacy development. The predominance of early grade teachers has meaningful implications for the study. Teachers handling lower grade levels are more likely to identify initial literacy challenges, including signs of dyslexia, and implement early interventions. Their instructional practices can significantly influence students' long-term reading development, as early literacy experiences form the foundation for later academic achievement. Meanwhile, teachers in higher grade levels may focus on reinforcing and extending reading skills, encountering students with persistent reading difficulties who require differentiated and targeted strategies. This distribution highlights the necessity of tailoring professional development and instructional support to the specific needs of teachers across grade levels. Early grade teachers may benefit from specialized training in phonics, decoding, and structured literacy approaches, whereas upper grade teachers may require strategies for remediation and advanced comprehension support. Understanding grade level assignments allows school administrators and policymakers to align capacity building initiatives with the developmental demands of the learners being taught. These insights are supported by previous research emphasizing that teachers' grade level assignments influence their exposure to students with reading difficulties and their ability to implement effective interventions (Daley, 2020). Yang et al. (2022) further noted that early grade teachers are particularly likely to encounter literacy challenges such as dyslexia, underscoring the relevance of grade level profiling in evaluating instructional preparedness and readiness to deliver inclusive reading instruction.

With respect to attendance to seminars or training on inclusive education, 89 teachers (96.74%) had attended such seminars or training, while only 3 teachers (3.26%) had not, for a total of 92 (100.00%). The data reveal that a vast majority of teachers have had exposure to professional development initiatives aimed at enhancing their knowledge and skills in addressing learners with varying abilities. The high attendance rate may reflect institutional emphasis on capacity building and adherence to national policies that encourage teacher training in inclusive practices. The implications of these findings are significant. Teachers who participate in inclusive education training are likely to possess greater awareness, confidence, and practical strategies for supporting students with special learning needs, including dyslexia. This foundational exposure can enhance their ability to implement differentiated instruction and inclusive teaching approaches effectively. Conversely, the few teachers who have not participated in training may require targeted support to ensure consistent instructional quality across classrooms. These results are aligned with Republic Act No. 11650 (2022), which mandates teacher training and capacity building as central mechanisms for promoting inclusive education. Research also indicates that participation in inclusive education programs positively affects teacher attitudes, preparedness, and readiness to apply inclusive strategies in the classroom (Moberg et al., 2020). By demonstrating widespread training participation, the study suggests that the school is well positioned to support evidence based inclusive instruction, though ongoing professional development remains important to sustain and deepen teachers' competencies.

With respect to reading exposure to literacy education, 38 teachers (41.30%) reported having engaged with literacy related readings, while 54 teachers (58.70%) reported no such exposure, for a total of 92 (100.00%). The data reveal that a majority of teachers reported no exposure to literacy related readings, suggesting that independent engagement with literacy research is not yet a widespread practice among the respondents. The limited exposure may reflect challenges such as restricted access to professional resources, time constraints due to heavy teaching workloads, or a lack of institutional support for ongoing self-directed learning. The implications of this finding are significant for inclusive reading instruction. Teachers who have limited exposure to literacy research may lack up to date knowledge of structured reading approaches, phonics instruction, and strategies for supporting learners with dyslexia. This could affect their ability to implement evidence-based interventions effectively and reduce their confidence in addressing diverse literacy needs. Conversely, teachers with greater reading exposure are likely to demonstrate deeper understanding, stronger self-efficacy, and more informed instructional practices. These results align with prior research emphasizing the importance of professional reading for teacher development. Yang et al. (2022) highlighted that engagement with literacy research enhances teachers' understanding of reading difficulties and intervention practices. Similarly, Acheampong et al. (2019) noted that professional reading contributes to improved instructional competence and preparedness in inclusive classrooms. Therefore, reading exposure emerges as a critical factor influencing teachers' knowledge, self-efficacy, and readiness to implement effective, evidence-based literacy instruction.

Level of respondents' knowledge about dyslexia

This section examined the respondents' knowledge of dyslexia, emphasizing their awareness of its causes, features, prevalence, and suitable interventions. Evaluating teachers' understanding of dyslexia is crucial for determining their capacity to identify learners with reading difficulties, provide appropriate support, and deliver effective reading instruction in inclusive classrooms. Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire and analyzed using weighted means and standard deviations, with verbal interpretations assigned according to a standardized rating scale in which 4.21-5.00 corresponds to Very High, 3.41-4.20 to High, 2.61-3.40 to Moderate, 1.81-2.60 to Low, and 1.00-1.80 to Very Low.

The results show that the respondents' overall knowledge of dyslexia is high, with an aggregate weighted mean of 4.09 and an aggregate standard deviation of 0.87, verbally described as High. Regarding individual indicators, teachers strongly agreed that dyslexia is a result of a neurologically based disorder (WM=4.60, SD=0.54, Very High), that dyslexia is caused by visual perception deficits producing the reversal of letters and words (WM=4.51, SD=0.82, Very High), and that a child can be dyslexic and gifted (WM=4.52, SD=0.75, Very High). Respondents also agreed that dyslexic children often have emotional and social disabilities (WM=4.41, SD=0.73, Very High), that the brains of individuals with dyslexia are different from those of people without dyslexia (WM=4.45, SD=0.78, Very High), and that dyslexia is hereditary (WM=4.21, SD=0.88, Very High). Respondents rated the belief that most studies indicate about 5% of school age students have dyslexia at WM=3.68, SD=1.04 (High), and the belief that dyslexia has a greater occurrence in males than in females at WM=3.43, SD=1.00 (High). They agreed that children with dyslexia are more consistently impaired in phonemic awareness, that is, the ability to hear and manipulate sounds in language, than in any other ability (WM=4.33, SD=0.76, Very High), and that modeling fluent reading is often used as a teaching strategy (WM=4.36, SD=0.79, Very High). The belief that people with dyslexia have below average intelligence obtained WM=3.89, SD=1.10 (High). Respondents agreed that the reading of students with dyslexia is often characterized by inaccuracy and lack of fluency (WM=4.22, SD=0.90, Very High), that seeing letters and words backwards is a basic

characteristic of dyslexia (WM=4.46, SD=0.80, Very High), and that difficulty with phonological processing of information is one of the most important deficits in dyslexia (WM=4.41, SD=0.68, Very High). The belief that intelligence tests are useful in identifying dyslexia obtained WM=4.18, SD=0.94 (High). Notably, the belief that all poor readers have dyslexia received the lowest rating in this section at WM=2.77, SD=1.30, verbally described as Moderate. Respondents agreed that children with dyslexia can be helped by using colored lenses or colored overlays (WM=4.10, SD=0.88, High), and that physicians can prescribe medications to help students with dyslexia obtained WM=3.85, SD=0.93 (High). The statement that multisensory instruction is not an effective training method now obtained WM=3.75, SD=1.17 (High), and the statement that students who have reading disabilities without an apparent cause are called dyslexic obtained WM=3.85, SD=1.05 (High). Respondents agreed that people with dyslexia are not stupid or lazy and that knowing about the term helps children (WM=4.36, SD=0.66, Very High). The belief that giving students with dyslexia accommodations, such as extra time on tests, shorter spelling lists, or special seating, is unfair to other students obtained WM=3.97, SD=1.14 (High). Respondents agreed that intervention programs emphasizing the phonological aspects of language with the visual support of letters are effective for students with dyslexia (WM=4.42, SD=0.65, Very High). The belief that most teachers receive intensive training in working with dyslexic children obtained WM=3.70, SD=1.11 (High). The statement that dyslexia is a myth, a problem that does not exist, obtained the second lowest rating at WM=3.09, SD=1.29 (Moderate). Respondents agreed that repeated reading techniques are useful reading material to improve reading fluency (WM=4.32, SD=0.77, Very High), while the belief that problems in establishing laterality, or body schema, are the cause of dyslexia obtained WM=3.72, SD=1.01 (High). Respondents strongly agreed that students with dyslexia need structured, sequential, direct instruction in basic skills and learning strategies (WM=4.32, SD=0.63, Very High). The statement that dyslexia refers to a relatively chronic condition that is often not completely overcome obtained WM=3.99, SD=0.82 (High), and the belief that many students with dyslexia continue to have reading problems as adults obtained WM=4.10, SD=0.88 (High). Respondents agreed that many students with dyslexia have low self-esteem (WM=4.18, SD=0.84, High), and that children with dyslexia have problems with decoding and spelling but not with listening comprehension (WM=4.24, SD=0.79, Very High). Respondents agreed that applying an individual reading test is essential to diagnosing dyslexia (WM=4.36, SD=0.62, Very High), and that dyslexics tend to spell words wrong (WM=4.40, SD=0.77, Very High). The belief that dyslexia usually lasts for a long time obtained WM=3.93, SD=0.90 (High), and the item that dyslexia is characterized by difficulty with learning to read fluently obtained WM=4.29, SD=0.78 (Very High).

The highest rated indicators reflect awareness of the neurological basis of dyslexia, recognition that a child can be both dyslexic and gifted, understanding that seeing letters or words backwards is a common feature, and knowledge that interventions focusing on phonological awareness combined with visual supports are effective. These results suggest that teachers possess a strong grasp of both theoretical and instructional aspects of dyslexia, likely influenced by professional exposure, prior training, and direct classroom experience with learners exhibiting reading difficulties. The implications of these findings are significant. Teachers' high level of knowledge suggests that they are capable of implementing differentiated reading strategies, identifying early signs of dyslexia, and applying structured interventions aligned with the Science of Reading framework. Their awareness of cognitive and neurological differences allows them to approach learners with empathy and tailored instructional techniques, which can improve literacy outcomes in inclusive classrooms.

However, some misconceptions persist. Indicators with lower ratings include beliefs that all poor readers have dyslexia (WM=2.77, SD=1.30), skepticism about the existence of dyslexia (WM=3.09, SD=1.29), misconceptions about gender prevalence (WM=3.43, SD=1.00), and doubts about the effectiveness of multisensory instruction (WM=3.75, SD=1.17). These gaps suggest areas where teachers' understanding may not fully align with current research, potentially limiting their ability to make accurate diagnoses or apply evidence-based interventions consistently. Such gaps may also affect teacher confidence in supporting learners who do not fit stereotypical patterns of dyslexia. The findings align with prior research emphasizing the importance of professional knowledge in teacher preparedness. Acheampong et al. (2019) reported that familiarity with intervention programs and cognitive aspects of dyslexia improves teachers' competence in classroom support. Daley (2020) highlighted that understanding neurological and cognitive characteristics enhances teachers' confidence in implementing reading strategies. Makgato et al. (2022) and Moss (2019) also observed that teachers who comprehend key traits of dyslexia are better equipped to provide differentiated instruction and appropriate accommodations. Cariño and Bailey (2024) noted that awareness of the co-occurrence of giftedness and dyslexia allows teachers to tailor interventions effectively. The areas of misconception also find support in the literature. Yang et al. (2022) observed that teachers frequently underestimate the prevalence and gender distribution of dyslexia. Moss (2019) emphasized that outdated or inaccurate beliefs about dyslexia can influence instructional decision making. Acheampong et al. (2019) further stressed the need for ongoing professional development to address gaps in teacher knowledge, while Daley (2020) highlighted that understanding modern instructional strategies, such as multisensory teaching, directly affects teachers' effectiveness in supporting students with dyslexia. Overall, the results suggest that while teachers in the study demonstrate a strong foundational knowledge of dyslexia, targeted interventions are needed to correct misconceptions and strengthen evidence based instructional practices. Addressing these gaps through professional development, continuous learning, and structured training programs will enhance teachers' readiness and effectiveness in delivering inclusive, high quality literacy instruction.

Extent of respondents' preparedness to apply the Science of Reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms

This section examined the respondents' preparedness to apply the Science of Reading when teaching learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. Preparedness encompasses teachers' confidence, knowledge, and practical skills in using evidence based reading strategies, assessing learning gaps, and delivering differentiated instruction. The results are summarized using weighted means and standard deviations according to a rating scale in which 4.21-5.00 corresponds to Highly Prepared, 3.41-4.20 to Prepared, 2.61-3.40 to Moderately Prepared, 1.81-2.60 to Less Prepared, and 1.00-1.80 to Not Prepared.

The aggregate weighted mean across the ten indicators was 4.15, with an aggregate standard deviation of 0.79, verbally described as Prepared. Respondents rated their confidence in assessing student learning gaps to determine individualized teaching at WM=4.18, SD=0.77 (Prepared). They rated their awareness and understanding of the Science of Reading at WM=4.29, SD=0.67 (Highly Prepared), and their knowledge of how to effectively teach the Science of Reading in the classroom at WM=4.24, SD=0.84 (Highly Prepared). Confidence in teaching the Science of Reading in the classroom obtained WM=4.25, SD=0.76 (Highly Prepared), while confidence in teaching writing in the classroom obtained WM=4.35, SD=0.72 (Highly Prepared). Respondents strongly agreed that the purpose of reading instruction is to teach children to recognize words and pronounce them correctly (WM=4.45, SD=0.72, Highly

Prepared), whereas the statement that reading and writing are unrelated processes obtained the lowest rating at WM=2.97, SD=1.12 (Moderately Prepared). Respondents agreed that students should be encouraged to sound out all unknown words (WM=4.25, SD=0.81, Highly Prepared), and that the purpose of reading is to understand print (WM=4.32, SD=0.82, Highly Prepared). Lastly, the item stating that grouping for reading instruction is flexible, with students not remaining in the same groups from day to day, obtained WM=4.16, SD=0.62 (Prepared).

The aggregate weighted mean of 4.15 (SD = 0.79) indicates that respondents are generally prepared to apply Science of Reading principles, with most teachers reporting awareness, confidence, and readiness to integrate structured reading strategies into their instruction. The high preparedness suggests that the respondents are capable of implementing evidence-based approaches, designing lessons aligned with learners' needs, and differentiating instruction according to individual learning gaps. However, moderate variation in the responses points to some areas requiring further professional support. The highest rated indicators reflect teachers' strong understanding of the goals and methods of reading instruction, including recognizing that reading instruction aims to help learners decode and pronounce words accurately (WM = 4.45), confidence in teaching writing alongside reading (WM = 4.35), emphasizing comprehension of print (WM = 4.32), encouraging students to sound out unfamiliar words (WM = 4.25), and confidence in applying Science of Reading methods in the classroom (WM = 4.25). These findings suggest that teachers have a solid grasp of foundational literacy principles and are equipped to apply structured strategies to learners with varying abilities, particularly those with dyslexia or other reading difficulties. The implications of these results are significant for inclusive literacy instruction. Teachers' high preparedness indicates readiness to implement systematic phonics, multisensory activities, and evidence-based interventions, which are critical for improving reading outcomes among learners with diverse needs. Their confidence in teaching both reading and writing supports integrated literacy practices, enabling students to develop comprehension alongside decoding skills.

The lower rated indicators reveal persistent gaps. The statement regarding reading and writing as unrelated processes (WM = 2.97) suggests that some teachers may hold misconceptions about literacy integration. Similarly, moderate confidence in assessing learning gaps (WM = 4.18) and flexible grouping strategies (WM = 4.16) points to areas where instructional planning and classroom management may require additional support. Addressing these gaps is essential to ensure that evidence-based strategies are applied consistently and effectively across all grade levels. These findings are supported by existing literature. Buckingham et al. (2019) emphasized that teachers trained in phonics and structured reading programs demonstrate higher preparedness to implement evidence-based instruction. Moats (2023) highlighted the importance of translating Science of Reading principles into lesson planning to strengthen teacher confidence and instructional effectiveness. Hattie et al. (2016) and Klages et al. (2021) noted that familiarity with research backed literacy strategies improves teachers' readiness to support learners with diverse reading needs. Daley (2020) confirmed that teachers' confidence in delivering structured reading interventions depends on prior exposure and classroom experience. The gaps identified align with the need for continuous professional development. Moats (2023) emphasized that mastery of assessment and grouping strategies is essential for applying the Science of Reading effectively, while Hattie et al. (2016) noted that misconceptions about literacy processes can undermine instructional outcomes. Buckingham et al. (2019) stressed the importance of ongoing training to enhance teacher preparedness, particularly in inclusive classrooms. These findings underscore the value of targeted interventions and structured professional development programs to strengthen teachers' instructional competence and confidence. Overall, the results indicate that respondents possess

a high level of preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, with clear strengths in foundational knowledge, instructional confidence, and application of reading strategies. Addressing the identified gaps through focused training will further enhance teacher readiness, ensuring that inclusive classrooms provide effective, evidence-based literacy instruction for all learners.

Level of self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms

This section examined the respondents' self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. Self-efficacy refers to teachers' confidence in their ability to plan, deliver, and adapt reading instruction to address the specific needs of each student. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire and analyzed using weighted means and standard deviations, with a rating scale in which 4.21-5.00 corresponds to Very High, 3.41-4.20 to High, 2.61-3.40 to Moderate, 1.81-2.60 to Low, and 1.00-1.80 to Very Low.

Across the sixteen indicators, the aggregate weighted mean was 3.92, with an aggregate standard deviation of 0.87, verbally described as High. Respondents rated the belief that when a student does better than usual in reading it is often because the teacher exerted a little extra effort at WM=3.80, SD=0.89 (High). They rated their intention to continually look for better ways to teach reading at WM=4.36, SD=0.70 (Very High), the highest indicator in this section. The statement that even if teachers try very hard, they will not teach reading as well as they will teach other subjects obtained the lowest rating at WM=3.25, SD=1.21 (Moderate). Respondents agreed that when the reading performance of students improves, it is often because their teacher has found a more effective way to support reading (WM=4.11, SD=0.72, High), and that they will know several ways to teach reading effectively (WM=4.29, SD=0.70, Very High). The statement that respondents are not very effective in monitoring reading activities obtained WM=3.51, SD=1.20 (High). Respondents agreed that when a low achieving child progresses in reading, it is usually due to extra support offered by the teacher (WM=4.00, SD=0.86, High), and that they understand the process of reading well enough to be effective in teaching reading (WM=4.25, SD=0.72, Very High). They agreed that the teacher is generally responsible for the achievement of students in reading (WM=4.01, SD=0.79, High), and that students' achievement in reading is directly related to their teacher's effectiveness in the teaching of reading (WM=4.02, SD=0.76, High). Respondents agreed that if parents' comment that their child is showing more interest in reading, it is probably due to the performance of the child's teacher (WM=3.86, SD=0.81, High). The statement that respondents will find it difficult to teach students with reading problems obtained WM=3.72, SD=1.01 (High). Respondents agreed that when teaching reading, they will usually welcome student questions (WM=4.26, SD=0.57, Very High). The statement that respondents will find it difficult to explain to students how to improve their reading obtained WM=3.67, SD=1.10 (High), while the statement that respondents do not know what to do to turn students on to reading obtained WM=3.37, SD=1.21 (Moderate). Lastly, respondents agreed that they will use community resources to help get support for literacy in their classroom (WM=4.23, SD=0.63, Very High).

The aggregate weighted mean of 3.92 (SD = 0.87) indicates a high level of self-efficacy overall. Teachers generally feel capable of supporting reading development, yet moderate gaps exist in areas related to monitoring student progress, explaining reading improvements, and overcoming self-doubt with struggling readers. The moderate variability in responses suggests that individual experiences, prior exposure to structured literacy instruction, and familiarity with learners with reading difficulties influence perceived efficacy. The highest rated items reveal areas of strong self-efficacy. Teachers report confidence in actively seeking better ways to teach reading (WM = 4.36), knowing multiple methods to deliver instruction effectively (WM = 4.29), welcoming student questions during reading lessons (WM = 4.26),

understanding the reading process sufficiently to teach effectively (WM = 4.25), and leveraging community resources to support literacy (WM = 4.23). These findings suggest that respondents possess a proactive approach, apply diverse instructional strategies, and engage broader support networks to enhance student learning. Such confidence indicates a readiness to implement differentiated and evidence-based reading interventions in inclusive classrooms. The implications of these results are significant. Teachers with high self-efficacy are more likely to persist when students struggle, adapt materials, and employ research-based interventions such as phonics instruction, repeated reading, and multisensory approaches. This aligns with Moats (2023), who emphasized that teachers' understanding of evidence-based reading instruction strengthens their instructional confidence. Similarly, Daley (2020) reported that prior experience with structured literacy programs increases teachers' competence in delivering effective reading instruction. Buckingham et al. (2019) and William et al. (2025) further support that systematic training and professional development in literacy strategies enhance teacher self-efficacy, enabling educators to address diverse learner needs effectively.

Areas of moderate confidence highlight potential targets for professional development. Teachers felt less certain about teaching reading as well as other subjects (WM = 3.25), initiating student interest in reading (WM = 3.37), monitoring reading activities effectively (WM = 3.51), explaining strategies to improve reading (WM = 3.67), and understanding the relationship between reading and writing (WM = 2.97, as reflected in the corresponding item under the preparedness measure). These gaps suggest that even experienced teachers may encounter challenges in differentiating instruction, assessing individual progress, and correcting misconceptions about literacy processes. Supporting literature contextualizes these findings. Daley (2020) observed that teacher confidence varies according to prior exposure to students with reading difficulties and familiarity with structured interventions. Moats (2023) emphasized that explicit instruction in evidence-based reading strategies improves teacher self-efficacy. Acheampong et al. (2019) highlighted that limited engagement with learners with dyslexia can reduce confidence in instructional decision making, while William et al. (2025) stressed that continuous professional development strengthens teachers' ability to respond effectively to all learners' reading needs. In conclusion, respondents generally demonstrate high self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs, with particular strengths in applying multiple strategies, understanding the reading process, and engaging students actively. However, areas of moderate confidence, such as assessment, individualized support, and literacy integration, indicate opportunities for targeted professional development. Strengthening these areas will further empower teachers to implement the Science of Reading effectively and ensure inclusive, evidence-based literacy instruction for all students.

Relationship between knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy in teaching reading

This section analyzed the significant relationships among teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and their self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. Examining these relationships is important because teachers' knowledge can directly impact both their confidence and their practical readiness to implement effective reading strategies. Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to assess the strength and direction of associations among the variables, with significance evaluated at $p < 0.05$.

The correlation between teachers' knowledge of dyslexia and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading yielded $r = 0.701$, indicating a moderate positive correlation, with a p-value of 0.000. Since the p-value is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null

hypothesis (Ho) was rejected, indicating a significant relationship between the two variables. This finding implies that teachers with greater understanding of dyslexia are more likely to feel prepared to implement evidence-based reading instruction. Knowledge of the causes, characteristics, and effective interventions for dyslexia equips teachers to plan lessons, differentiate instruction, and assess learning gaps accurately, enhancing their practical readiness in inclusive classrooms. The implications of this relationship are meaningful for professional practice. Teachers who are knowledgeable about dyslexia are better positioned to anticipate learners' challenges, select appropriate teaching strategies, and adapt instructional materials effectively. This aligns with Klages et al. (2021), who emphasized that understanding structured literacy approaches improves both preparedness and instructional confidence. Similarly, Makgato et al. (2022) confirmed that teachers with higher awareness of dyslexia exhibit greater readiness to apply evidence-based reading practices. Daley (2020) highlighted that practical preparedness in teaching reading is strengthened by conceptual knowledge, while Moats (2023) and Buckingham, Wheldall, and Wheldall (2019) demonstrated that teachers' familiarity with evidence-based reading correlates positively with their ability to implement the Science of Reading effectively.

The correlation between teachers' knowledge of dyslexia and their self-efficacy in teaching reading yielded r = 0.719, indicating a moderate positive correlation, with a p-value of 0.000. Since the p-value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected, indicating a statistically significant relationship. This suggests that teachers with deeper knowledge of dyslexia feel more confident and capable of delivering effective reading instruction. In other words, professional awareness fosters teachers' belief in their ability to meet the diverse literacy needs of students, making knowledge a key predictor of self-efficacy. These findings have practical implications for professional development. Enhancing teachers' understanding of dyslexia not only strengthens their theoretical competence but also directly boosts confidence in implementing interventions, engaging students, and monitoring reading progress. This is supported by Daley (2020), who noted that teacher confidence increases with knowledge of dyslexia and structured interventions. Klages et al. (2021) and Moats (2023) similarly report that evidence-based understanding of reading science enhances both preparedness and self-efficacy. Buckingham et al. (2019) further show that teachers familiar with structured reading methods demonstrate higher confidence and instructional competence, while Makgato et al. (2022) confirm that awareness of dyslexia strengthens self-efficacy in managing diverse learning needs.

Relationship between self-efficacy and preparedness in applying the Science of Reading

This section examined the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in teaching reading and their preparedness to implement the Science of Reading for learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. Self-efficacy refers to teachers' belief in their capability to provide effective reading instruction, whereas preparedness reflects their practical readiness to apply evidence-based strategies in actual classroom environments. The correlation analysis indicates a moderate positive relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in teaching reading and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, with r = 0.681 and a p-value of 0.000. Since the p-value is lesser than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating a significant relationship between the variables. This suggests that teachers who feel more confident in their reading instruction abilities are also more prepared to implement evidence-based reading strategies in inclusive classrooms. The statistical significance confirms that self-efficacy is a meaningful predictor of instructional readiness, highlighting the connection between teacher confidence and practical classroom application. Supporting studies validate this finding. Moats (2023) emphasizes that teachers' confidence in understanding

reading science strengthens their capacity to apply effective literacy instruction. William et al. (2025) demonstrate that higher self-efficacy directly correlates with greater preparedness in using structured reading approaches, particularly in inclusive settings. These findings underscore the importance of both teacher competence and confidence in ensuring successful implementation of the Science of Reading.

Taken together, the findings of this chapter demonstrate that the 92 participating teachers of Lahug Elementary School, predominantly female (94.57%) and concentrated in mid to late career age brackets, largely holding bachelor's degrees (46.74%) or master's units (34.78%), and predominantly experienced with 11 years or more of service (65.22% combined for the 11-15 and 16 and above brackets), exhibited a high aggregate level of knowledge about dyslexia (aggregate weighted mean of 4.09, SD = 0.87), a Prepared level of readiness to apply the Science of Reading (aggregate weighted mean of 4.15, SD = 0.79), and a High level of self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs (aggregate weighted mean of 3.92, SD = 0.87). All three pairs of variables examined showed statistically significant moderate positive correlations: knowledge and preparedness ($r = 0.701$, $p = 0.000$), knowledge and self-efficacy ($r = 0.719$, $p = 0.000$), and self-efficacy and preparedness ($r = 0.681$, $p = 0.000$), with the null hypothesis rejected in each case. These results directly address the study's objectives of describing the demographic profile of respondents, determining their levels of knowledge about dyslexia, preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and self-efficacy in teaching reading, and establishing the interrelationships among these constructs. The consistency of generally high ratings across constructs, tempered by specific and recurring gaps such as misconceptions regarding the universality of dyslexia among poor readers, skepticism about the existence of dyslexia, uncertainty regarding the relationship between reading and writing as related processes, and moderate confidence in monitoring reading activities and initiating student interest in reading, provides a nuanced empirical contribution to the field of inclusive literacy education by identifying both the cognitive and motivational strengths teachers bring to reading instruction and the specific areas that professional development initiatives must address. These findings collectively lay the empirical foundation for the Professional Intervention Plan presented in the subsequent chapter, which translates the identified strengths and gaps in teachers' knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy into a structured, evidence informed program designed to further strengthen the implementation of the Science of Reading among teachers serving learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms.

CONCLUSION

This study was conducted at Lahug Elementary School, a public elementary school, and involved all 92 teachers from Kindergarten to Grade 6 during the School Year 2025 to 2026. It employed a quantitative correlational research design to examine teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and their self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. Standardized and validated survey questionnaires were used to collect data on the respondents' demographic characteristics, knowledge and beliefs about dyslexia, preparedness to implement the Science of Reading, and self-efficacy in teaching reading. The respondents were selected through total population sampling to ensure complete representation of the teaching workforce. Statistical analyses included frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, ranking, and Pearson correlation to describe the respondents' characteristics, determine the levels of the major variables, and examine the significance of the relationships among teachers' knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy.

The findings revealed that the respondents were predominantly female, were generally experienced teachers, and were mostly bachelor's degree holders, with many already pursuing graduate studies. Although most had participated in inclusive education training, their exposure to literacy related readings remained limited, indicating an opportunity to further strengthen engagement with current literacy research and evidence based instructional practices. The respondents demonstrated good knowledge of dyslexia, particularly regarding its characteristics and appropriate instructional interventions. However, misconceptions persisted concerning the prevalence of dyslexia and gender differences associated with the condition. Teachers also exhibited a generally high level of preparedness to apply the Science of Reading and reported high self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs. Nevertheless, minor areas requiring further enhancement were identified, particularly in conducting assessment, implementing flexible grouping, motivating reluctant readers, and monitoring learners' progress during reading instruction.

The correlation analyses further established significant positive relationships among teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and self-efficacy in teaching reading. Teachers with greater knowledge about dyslexia were more likely to demonstrate stronger confidence in their teaching abilities and greater readiness to implement evidence-based reading instruction in inclusive classrooms. Likewise, teachers with higher levels of self-efficacy also reported greater preparedness to apply effective reading strategies that respond to the needs of diverse learners. These findings indicate that teacher knowledge, confidence, and instructional readiness are closely interconnected and collectively contribute to the effective implementation of inclusive literacy instruction.

Overall, the study concludes that Lahug Elementary School teachers possess a solid foundation for implementing inclusive and evidence-based reading instruction, as reflected in their generally good knowledge of dyslexia, high levels of preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and strong self-efficacy in teaching reading. However, the identified misconceptions regarding dyslexia and the observed instructional gaps highlight the continuing need for sustained professional development that deepens teachers' understanding of dyslexia, strengthens their competence in structured literacy instruction, and enhances their ability to monitor and respond effectively to learners' diverse literacy needs. These findings emphasize that continuous engagement with current literacy research and evidence-based practices is essential to improving inclusive reading instruction and learner outcomes.

In view of these conclusions, the implementation of the BRIGHT Program is recommended as the primary professional intervention developed from the findings of the study. The program should provide comprehensive training workshops, mentoring opportunities, and practical learning experiences that strengthen teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, enhance their preparedness to implement the Science of Reading, and further develop their self-efficacy in teaching reading within inclusive classrooms. Continuous monitoring and systematic evaluation of the program are likewise recommended to ensure its effectiveness, promote ongoing refinement of teachers' instructional practices, and sustain improvements in evidence based and inclusive literacy instruction for learners with diverse needs.

REFERENCES

Acheampong, E., Yeboah, M., Anokye, R., Adusei, A. K., Naadutey, A., & Afful, B. F. (2019). Knowledge of basic school teachers on identification and support services for children with dyslexia. Journal of Indian Association for Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 15(2), 86–101. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0973134220190206

Al-Bukhari, H. A. (2024). Differentiated curriculum and teaching practices for students with determination in higher education: Reforms for learners with dyslexia, dysgraphia, and dyscalculia. Springer. https://tinyurl.com/2s4xnpx6

Bandura, A. (Referenced via Hattie, 2009; Hattie et al., 2016).

Bautista, J. C. (2025). Response to intervention within a multi-tiered system of support. Frontiers in Education, 10. https://tinyurl.com/3wphx43z

Boltron, M. T., & Ramos, A. L. (2021). Improving beginning reading literacy through Marungko approach. ASEAN Journal of Basic and Higher Education, 5(1). https://tinyurl.com/yvkdndbn

Bustos-Orosa, M. A., & Ferrer, M. F. (2013). Decoding error patterns among Filipino beginning readers. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 2(4). https://tinyurl.com/mnsseutt

Cariño, M. O., & Bailey, R. R. (2024). Knowledge, attitudes and interaction on dyslexia among selected Filipino public school teachers. Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education, 14(1). https://tinyurl.com/rcymxt6b

Castles, A., Rastle, K., & Nation, K. (2018). Ending the reading wars: Reading acquisition from novice to expert. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 19(1), 5-51. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1529100618772271

Chiu, I. M. C., Sy, M. P., Oruga, M. D., & Bonito, S. (2023). Children with special needs and their access to rehabilitation services in the Philippines. Public Health Challenges, 2(2). https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/puh2.79

Coyne, M. D., et al. (2018). Evaluating effects of supplemental reading intervention. Exceptional Children, 84(4), 350–367. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0014402918772791

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97–140. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

Daley, P. (2020). Experiences of primary education teachers identifying and providing interventions for students with dyslexia (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University). https://tinyurl.com/4mkre343

Duraiappah, A. K., van Atteveldt, N. M., Borst, G., Bugden, S., Ergas, O., Gilead, T., Gupta, L., et al. (2022). Reimagining education: The international science and evidence-based education assessment. UNESCO MGIEP. https://tinyurl.com/34nhc573

Falzon, R. (2012). Early educators' awareness and knowledge of structured multisensory literacy instruction (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northumbria at Newcastle, United Kingdom). https://tinyurl.com/2zj5pw4a

Florian, L. (2019). On the necessary co-existence of special and inclusive education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 23(7–8), 691–704. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1622801

Gepila, E. C., Jr., Macalalad, J. S. S., Requiron, E. M., Jr., Balisado, J. C. F., & Rosales, M. J. D. (2022). Contextualizing Davis Dyslexia Correction Program to Filipino youth dyslexics. International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education, 14(5). https://tinyurl.com/68fzbr5c

Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. Remedial and Special Education, 7(1), 6–10. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/074193258600700104

Griffiths, D. (2020). Teaching for neurodiversity: Training teachers to see beyond labels. https://tinyurl.com/5cfy56t8

Gump, H. M. (2024). Teacher preparation and perceptions on readiness to address the science of reading. https://tinyurl.com/yvj23yex

Han, W. (2025, January). Dyscalculia and dyslexia in school-aged children: Comorbidity, support, and future prospects. Frontiers in Education, 10, 1515216. https://tinyurl.com/ckn7wjj3

Hardy, I., & Woodcock, S. (2024). Inclusive education policies – objects of observance, omission, and obfuscation: Ten years on. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 28(3), 3234–3252. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13603116.2023.2257697

Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge. https://tinyurl.com/bdkzhjak

Immordino-Yang, M. H., Darling-Hammond, L., & Krone, C. (2021). The brain basis for integrated social, emotional, and academic development. American Educational Research Journal, 58(6), 1111–1145. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ed596337

Kadir, A. B. A., & Jabbar, J. B. (2023). Special needs teachers' attitude and practices with dyslexic children. https://tinyurl.com/mubebehn

Klages, C., Scholte, M., Fowler, K., & Frierson, C. (2020). Linking science-based research with a structured literacy program to teach students with dyslexia to read: Connections: OG in 3-D®. Reading Improvement, 57(2). https://tinyurl.com/5849pmva

Korsgaard, M. T., Larsen, V., & Wiberg, M. (2020). Thinking and researching inclusive education without a banister. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 24(5), 496–512. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1469680

Layes, S. (2022). Verbal and visual memory skills in children with dyslexia and dyscalculia. Psychology & Neuroscience, 15(2), 251–266. https://doi.org/10.1037/pne0000289

Lyon, G. R., Shaywitz, S. E., & Shaywitz, B. A. (2003). A definition of dyslexia. Annals of Dyslexia, 53(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-003-0001-9

MacMahon, S., & Carroll, A. (2022). Interdisciplinary and interprofessional partnerships: Mobilizing the science of learning to impact real-world practice. In International handbook on education development in Asia-Pacific. Springer Nature. https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:6cd7a35

Maligat, D., Torio, J., Arispe, C., & Bigueras, R. (2020). Mobile game-based learning to enhance the reading performance of dyslexic children. International Journal of Advanced Trends in Computer Science and Engineering. https://tinyurl.com/44j8jbhv

Makgato, M. M., et al. (2022). Evaluating the awareness and knowledge of dyslexia among primary school teachers in Tshwane District. https://journals.co.za/doi/abs/10.4102/ajod.v11i0.807

McCaleb, A. L. (2020). Understanding classroom teachers' knowledge and practices for teaching reading to students at-risk for dyslexia (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas at Little Rock). https://tinyurl.com/bdh84enp

Mosen, J. (2016). Examining the nature of educational inclusion for students labelled with a specific learning disability (SLD) (Doctoral dissertation, Swinburne University of Technology). https://tinyurl.com/3pyrmkhe

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. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/67889

Moss, S. (2019). Teacher knowledge of dyslexia and special education policy (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida). https://tinyurl.com/2647yjmx

Moats, L. C. (2023). How children learn to read: Toward evidence-aligned lesson planning. World Bank Group. https://tinyurl.com/nfyt6rtf

Norman, M. K., & Lotrecchiano, G. R. (2021). Translating the learning sciences into practice. Journal of Clinical and Translational Science, 5(1), E173. https://tinyurl.com/wzsk6mj5

Ocampo, D. (2004). Dyslexia in the Philippines. In International book of dyslexia: A guide to practice and resources (pp. 193–198). https://tinyurl.com/4y5dhcxs

Paseka, A., & Schwab, S. (2020). Parents' attitudes towards inclusive education and their perceptions of inclusive teaching practices and resources. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 35(2), 254–272. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1665232

Piaget, J. (Referenced via Hattie, 2009; Norman & Lotrecchiano, 2021).

Planipolis. (n.d.). Philippine education for all 2015: Implementation and challenges. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000230331

Power, E., Partridge, H., O'Sullivan, C., & Kek, M. Y. (2020). Integrated 'one-stop' support for student success: Recommendations from a regional university case study. Higher Education Research & Development, 39(3), 561–576. https://tinyurl.com/4sde464e

Reed, D. K., & Zhang, H. (2025). The impact of teacher professional development on the grade 3 reading performance of students with characteristics of dyslexia. Annals of Dyslexia, 75(3), 616–636. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-025-00338-x

Rollo, G., & Picker, K. (2024). Unpacking the science of reading research. ACER. https://tinyurl.com/yc3zksz7

Rosales, S. (2020). Seeing the 'hidden' disability: A quantitative analysis of the reading comprehension in English of learners suspected with dyslexia. Asian EFL Journal, 27(4.4), 448–477. https://tinyurl.com/2ffv4sfp

Snow, P. C. (2021). SOLAR: The science of language and reading. Child Language Teaching and Therapy, 37(3), 222–233. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0265659020947817

Soriano-Ferrer, M., & Echegaray-Bengoa, J. A. (2014). A scale of knowledge and beliefs about developmental dyslexia: Scale development and validation. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 132, 203-208. https://tinyurl.com/4cfeb59v

Stocker Jr, J. D., Kubina Jr, R. M., Crumpler, E. R., Kozloff, M., & Swanton-Derushia, E. (2023). Effects of an explicit decoding plus frequency building intervention on word reading fluency for students with disabilities in an urban elementary setting. Learning Disability Quarterly, 46(4), 276-291. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/07319487221136279

Szabo, S. M., & Mokhtari, K. (2004). Developing a reading teaching efficacy instrument for teacher candidates: A validation study. Action in Teacher Education, 26(3), 59-72. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2004.10463333

Tosun, D., Arıkan, S., & Babür, N. (2021). Teachers' knowledge and perception about dyslexia. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ijate/article/684672

Thwalaa, S. K., et al. (2020). Teachers' experiences with dyslexic learners in mainstream classrooms. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1277892

Troeva, B. (2015). Helping learners with dyslexia read in English. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=304692

Van Herwegen, J., Outhwaite, L. A., & Herbert, E. (2024). Neuromyths about dyscalculia and dyslexia among educators in the UK. British Journal of Special Education, 51(2), 233-242. https://nasenjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-8578.12516

William, B., Olamide, T., & Dami, F. (2025, January). The role of teacher competence and training in enhancing literacy proficiency in Philippine public schools. https://tinyurl.com/bdh7karr

Yang, L., Li, C., Li, X., Zhai, M., An, Q., Zhang, Y., Zhao, J., & Weng, X. (2022). Prevalence of developmental dyslexia in primary school children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Brain Sciences, 12(2), 26. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci12020240